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The title of MAMCO’s new sequence of exhibitions programmed by Lionel Bovier, *Récit d’un temps court* [Tale of a Short Time Span] refers to the ways in which a period is divided up by historians and underlines the narrative dimension of the museum’s discourse. Accordingly, the museum’s collections, which range from the 1960s up to the present day, have been organized chronologically from the 3rd to the 1st floor.

By means of both monographic and collective presentations, constructed around some of the collection’s principal works and supplemented by external loans, the museum shows how movements, critical concepts, and new attitudes have emerged in the art of recent decades. Visitors thus move from discussion of an “art of the real” in the 1960s to Minimal and Conceptual art; from the relationships between art and architecture to those between sculpture and performance in the 1970s; from appropriation to the “cultural turn” of the 1980s; and from the “Relational aesthetics” of the 1990s in Europe to the New York scene of the 2000s. In addition to artists never previously shown at MAMCO, such as Charlotte Posenenske, General Idea, and Renée Green, visitors will find again works by Guy de Cointet, Xavier Veilhan, and Franz Erhard Walther, in new configurations — an articulation that signals both renewal and heritage.

This reorganization is also reflected in the collection’s development politics: a number of important groups of works entrusted to the museum are currently being acquired, the most noteworthy of these being L’Appartement, the collection assembled by Ghislain Mollet-Viéville. Artists too, in particular Jim Shaw and John Miller, have offered works that were conspicuously absent from the museum. Collectors have also helped enrich the collection by enabling the acquisition of an important piece by Sherrie Levine, and by offering works by Wade Guyton, Francis Baudevin, and Tobias Madison & Emanuel Rossetti. The museum friends’ association, the AMAMCO, meanwhile, has made possible the purchase of two pieces by Seth Price. Most of these new acquisitions are presented in this sequence and color-coded labeling has been employed in order to distinguish loans from works belonging to the collection.

The fourth floor is devoted to a temporary exhibition that looks back over the dialogue between the art scenes of French-speaking Switzerland and New York in the 1980s and 1990s, a period that encompasses Olivier Mosset’s talk of “Radical Painting” with Marcia Hafif, John Armleder’s conversations about “cultural geometry” with Peter Halley, and the repercussions of these discussions on artists of several successive “generations.” Constructed from local collections, both public and private, the aim behind this show is to offer another episode in this “story of a short time,” one that precedes the opening of MAMCO and traces its early years through the prism of geography.
GVA <-> JFK

GVA <-> JFK looks back over exchanges between the New York and French-speaking Switzerland art scenes from the 1980s and 1990s. A period that spans Olivier Mosset and Marcia Hafif’s discussion of “radical painting” (to quote the title of the exhibition at the Williamstown College Museum of Art of 1979) and the apparent blast of this abstract vocabulary in the practice of artists such as Philippe Decrauzat, Stéphane Dafflon, and Lisa Beck.

As we progress from room to room, we follow the stages of an intergenerational discussion that originated in painting but rapidly transcended any definition by medium. This is as true for the conversations John M Armleder would have in the mid-1980s with Peter Halley and Haim Steinbach on the notion of “cultural geometry” (or “Neo-Geo” as critics referred to it at the time), as it is for those he had with Helmut Federle and Olivier Mosset on the legacy of abstraction in the “postmodern” period. In this sense, the project pays tribute to two exhibitions organized by John M Armleder: Peinture abstraite (Ecart, Geneva 1984) and Peinture (on the initiative of Pierre Huber, Geneva 1990).

Olivier Mosset’s close dialogue with Steven Parrino — and the reference to his show with Cady Noland in 1999 — underline that the repeated announcements of painting’s death was summoning irruptions of the real and appointing the figure of the zombie as its new herald.

For many artists of the 1990s, painting had thus to be “reloaded” with external content (music, design, appropriation, etc.). This is true of Francis Baudevin, who refashioned pharmaceutical packages into found abstract compositions; of Blair Thurman, whose constructions, in relief, are inspired by car subcultures; and of John Tremblay, who sought to give his painted objects the quality of handmade industrial components. Others, such as Dan Walsh and Michael Scott, attempted to renew the viewer’s relationship with painting through a symbolic or optical phenomenology. At the end, it is most likely the combined pressure of these various interrogations of the pictorial field that explains its spatial and referential explosion at the beginning of the 2000s, as the work shown here by Vidya Gastaldon & Jean-Michel Wicker so perfectly illustrates.

In passing, the exhibition reminds us that women remained somewhat aloof from a story still mostly narrated in masculine mode, while artists such as Sylvie Fleury and Karen Kilimnik were brought together through exhibitions (such as Bad Girls, in 1993), to highlight the emergence of a “new feminist sensibility.”

We are reminded, too, through the project’s dialogic dimension and the source of its loans (almost exclusively Geneva), of the importance of the two scenes’ go-betweens — whether artists, curators (like Bob Nickas) or gallery owners — and the co-presence of the cultural actors (institutions, schools, publishers, alternative spaces, etc.) that make up a city’s ecosystem.

— Lionel Bovier
Motel Room by George Segal is one of the works acquired in the 1970s by AMAM, the Association for a Museum of Modern Art in Geneva, with the future MAMCO in mind. Beyond its aesthetic qualities, the work also marks (more than a beginning) a departure point for the MAMCO collection, which was to be anchored in Minimal and Conceptual art. Segal’s sculpture, exhibited here with works by Vern Blosum (an artist invented by an Abstract Expressionist painter just as Pop art was emerging) seems almost to anticipate the critique of the typical museum collection of this movement, with its advertising’s seduction and topics.

As we are reminded by the title of E. C. Goossen’s exhibition at the MoMA in New York in 1968, The Art of the Real, which featured not only painters like Frank Stella and Kenneth Noland, but also sculptors like Donald Judd and John McCracken, attention to the real was not in reality the exclusive concern of the “new realists,” whether European or American: the art that emerged at the time strove “to be as real in itself as the things we experience every day: the things we see, feel, knock against, and apprehend in normal physical ways.” No representation, no metaphor and no expressivity for this new artistic sensibility, referred to as “literalism” and Minimalism by critics at the time.

The following rooms have to do with the genealogy of this definition, first by constructing a representation of painting at the time around a “shaped canvas” by Stella, likewise offered to the museum by AMAM; then around a set of works by Minimalist artists, positioned so as to provide a prelude to the “Apartment,” which hosts the museum’s biggest collection of them.
The “Apartment” is no ordinary exhibition space. Located on the museum’s third floor, it is a reconstruction of the Paris apartment where, from 1975 to 1991, Ghislain Mollet-Viéville worked to promote Minimal and Conceptual art. Calling himself an “art agent,” Mollet-Viéville initially organized his living and work space to conform with the protocols of the works in his collection, before deciding to yield to the consequences of their “dematerialization” and move to a new apartment with no visible works. This meant his collection could be entrusted to MAMCO when it opened, in 1994. In 2016, the museum has begun to acquire a large part of it—i.e. the works on view in the following galleries.

This selection of 25 works is representative of the work of the first-generation Minimalist artists such as Carl Andre, Donald Judd, and John McCracken, and of their Conceptual counterparts—Joseph Kosuth, Sol LeWitt, and Lawrence Weiner, for example. If the former explore a lexicon of elementary, logical, and radical forms that keep at bay any anthropomorphism and narrative features, the latter mainly offer protocols for execution, turning the collector into an agent on whom the works’ material existence depends. Both have dispensed with pedestals, frames, lighting, and all other mise-en-scène props, in favor of an immediate intellectual and sensory experience.

Compared with MAMCO’s other galleries, the “Apartment” sets the works the challenge of a domestic setting. For visitors this means the opportunity to experience them on more intimate terms, in a space where they are invited to step outside the conventions, whether attending a lecture, a special event, or simply pausing to read and to linger a while in the company of works that have been talking among themselves for several decades now.
Charlotte Posenenske (1930–1985) worked as an artist for a mere ten years, between 1959 and 1968. During that time, she developed a radical body of work, exploring transitions from the pictorial surface to space (Plastische Bilder, 1966), from sculpture to performance (Vierkantrohre Serie D and DW, 1967), and from sculpture to architecture (Drehflügel, 1967–1968). Posenenske was one of the few Europeans who adopted the principles of American Minimalism — seriality, delegation of production...— but her work stands apart from that movement nonetheless through its avowed social and participative dimension.

Posenenske studied at the State Academy of Fine Arts in Stuttgart, attending the classes of the painter Willi Baumeister, who introduced her to Mondrian’s Neo-Plasticism and the socio-revolutionary principles of Soviet Constructivism. From 1951 until 1955, she worked as a theater set designer, developing a concept of art as collective fulfillment. This notion of cooperation was fundamental to her Reliefs Serie B (1967), where the assembly of the modules conceived by the artist was left to those who installed them.

The Vierkantrohre (“Square Tubes”) Serie D and DW (1967), presented here, represent a further radicalization. The modules, made from cardboard and galvanized steel, are produced in a factory. Their geometric shapes are the logical conclusion of standardization. Exhibited for the first time in Frankfurt in 1967 by Paul Maenz and Peter Roehr, these modules were continually rearranged during the vernissage. From production in the factory to the layout, the artist was determined that everyone concerned with the exhibition should be directly involved in it, thereby making explicit a performative dimension inherent in Minimalist sculpture.

Posenenske took this sharing of the work a step further by migrating from art’s traditional habitats to reach a wider audience. The locations where the D and DW series appeared included an airport, a railway station, a bank, a market, a factory, and a street. By doing so, the context in which the work appears becomes a fundamental fact about it, as with works by artists such as Daniel Buren and Lawrence Weiner. Posenenske differs from them, however, in that her series induce a mimetic relationship with their environment: the artist’s formal vocabulary is on an equal footing with that developed on the production line for the ventilation ducts and other pipes and tubing: their auratic value is accordingly diminished.

It is significant that this body of work should have emerged in Frankfurt in the 1960s: the city was beset during that decade by profound challenges to the established social order: the Auschwitz trials, student demonstrations for German reunification and against the Vietnam War... All of these events would be analyzed by the philosophers of the Frankfurt School. Posenenske, who was close to these thinkers, concluded, in a manifesto she published in May 1968: “It is painful for me to admit that art is unable to contribute to the resolution of urgent social problems.” Echoing the political demands that rocked the 1960s, it was this commitment that would lead her to abandon art for sociology.

After her death, her husband allowed the D and DW series to continue to be produced and reactivated, up until his own disappearance. Thereafter, no further modules ever left the factory.

The exhibition is organized with the support of the Mehdi Chouakri Galerie, Berlin, and the Estate of the artist.
Maria Nordman (1943, Görlitz) designed this house made of precious wood by a Japanese cabinetmaker. It was constructed for the first time in Central Park (New York) in 1990 with the DIA Art Foundation.

Day and night, for two weeks, the house was open to anybody who wanted to live in it. It is a plain building, comprising only a vestibule and two bedrooms. The first bedroom is designed to accommodate a newborn baby and those taking care of it. The second is for anyone, whether a friend or passing stranger, and its walls can be adjusted to regulate the amount of sunlight that enters. The structure is raised four steps off the ground. The house is equipped with basic sanitary facilities and a few kitchen essentials, thereby naturally summoning associations of get-togethers, hospitality and community. Nothing would prevent the work from being reconstructed somewhere outdoors as the artist intended, moreover—in fulfillment of its function as a “place.” Presented unassembled in the museum’s galleries, the accent is placed on the house’s status as a “work.” The pieces are clearly asking to be put back together, but indoors they can only be exhibited as separate parts. When MAMCO first opened, in 1994, and throughout its early years, this work was scattered over the museum’s various floors, galleries, nooks, and crannies. Putting the pieces back together and setting them out results in what is at once a sculptural installation and a place sculpted by light as visitors move about it. The work’s status, halfway between reserve collection heirloom and temporary display, is constantly being reinvented by the artist according to the space, the light (which she prefers to be natural), and the time. The question of setting is therefore crucial to engaging with Maria Nordman’s work. An important part of what she does is simply deciding on a time and place in order to create, there and then, the conditions for some hospitality.
C’est en Iran, vers 1957, que Siah Armajani (1939, Téhéran) découvre fragmentairement l’art moderne (notamment les papiers collés de Braque et Picasso) et commence à mettre en place les rudiments de son œuvre. L’écriture et le collage en fourniront les premières données, inscrites dans la tradition persane autant que dans une esthétique contemporaine (celle du lettrisme, entre autres, que l’artiste ignorait). Arrivé en 1960 aux États-Unis, Armajani poursuit d’abord dans cette voie, réduisant son travail à la seule écriture. Par exemple, il recouvre all-over une toile ou une chemise de poèmes iraniens qu’il connaît par cœur. La poésie constitue-ra une constante ressource de son œuvre. À la fin des années 1960, il s’oriente vers l’art conceptuel auquel son intérêt pour l’écriture et la réflexion théorique l’avaient prédisposé. Il participe alors à des expositions majeures, telles que Art by Telephone (1969, MoCA, Chicago), Information (1970, MoMa, New York) ou Documenta V (1972, Kassel).

C’est, en fait, dès 1967 que Siah Armajani commence à s’intéresser à l’architecture des ponts, aux structures de l’habitat vernaculaire et à l’idée d’intervenir hors des institutions de l’art. En 1974, il décide de se définir catégoriquement comme un « artiste public ». Depuis lors, l’essentiel de son travail se développe dans l’espace public : passerelles piétonnes, bancs, jardins ou chambres de lecture, kiosques et gazebos, etc. Il s’agit toujours pour lui de proposer non plus des objets d’admiration artistique ou esthétique mais bien des structures fonctionnelles, des sites « utiles » dont les « regards » se font usagers. Son art est tout d’adresse à autrui (plutôt qu’à l’art), de contribution à la personne dans l’expérience de sa liberté, liberté de pensée, c’est-à-dire déjà de suspens réflexif dans le flux continu des contraintes quotidiennes. Ses œuvres sont des ponts, au sens propre comme au sens métaphorique, des situations qui font lien, pour se retrouver avec soi ou se tenir ensemble. C’est pourquoi elles trouvent leurs formes dans l’architecture des ingénieurs ou des cultures populaires plutôt que dans le vocabulaire autorisé des architectes.

Une exposition muséale de Siah Armajani ne peut donc rendre compte de son travail qu’à travers ses « œuvres d’intérieur ». Ce sont soit des maquettes, esquisses ou projets (réalisés ou non), soit des constructions autonomes (« sculptures », installations, etc.) qui préparent ou prolongent sa réflexion sur le sens et les conditions de possibilité d’un art tout entier tourné vers le « commun », qui s’en inspire et qui tend à y contribuer. L’exposition se développe à partir de la réimplantation des cinquante maquettes (dont Armajani avait fait don au musée en 1995) dans un espace permanent conçu comme un environnement qui serait également une chambre meublée ou un dispositif expositionnel semi-domestique.
"The viewer who acts defines the work of art and answers for it; he or she cannot be involved solely as someone who is looking at something; their entire body is engaged."

This declaration by Franz Erhard Walther (1939, Germany) suggests the framework in which part of his artistic output exist, that is, in which it is truly put to work or takes shape. It is in fact with the body of the person who activates the piece, who makes it come alive, that art assumes both its full meaning for Walther, and its place in the overall sum of activities embraced by the human subject.

It was in 1963 that Walther laid out this physical, participatory dimension of his work, specifically of his sculpture, which the artist qualifies as 'objects', thus underscoring their instrumental character. In that year the artist debuted a group of pieces under the title 1. Werksatz [Work Series No. 1]. To create these pieces, Walther decided he would no longer operate from a system of forms that was shut up on itself – artifacts that were meant to be looked at only and which the viewer was never to take in hand – but according to processes and gestures that would be unique each time, never set in stone once and for all. The objects he was to produce would be means to an impetus. These objects adopt simple geometric shapes (rectangles, squares, lines, circles, etc.) and are made of cloth, which transforms them into so many waistcoasts, rugs, strips, and so on. The way one takes them in hand is of course up to the individual and remains undecidable. In each case it is viewers’ bodies that become the means for activating, revealing or inventing the formal possibilities that are specific to these sculptural objects. Each time it is the acting individual who invents the profile and use of these available forms. The decision to employ cloth, a malleable material that has of course a certain configuration but can also be shaped according to the actions of the operator (folding, unfolding, clothing the individual), makes the physical reappropriation of the sculpture easier. It makes possible the ‘return to square one, where nothing has shape and everything begins to take shape once again’, which Walther seeks to encourage. Or in other words, it allows the body to experience the genesis of the sculpture, to feel the very process of the appearance of a form. Through this encouraged connection with the body, an action that thus lends the work all of its formal impact, an act that creates the sculpture, the artist ‘shows that it is not only our visual perception that is worthwhile but the body that has a certain sense and significance.’ In other words, to borrow the title of a book devoted to Walther, it is indeed with the body in this instance that one must see (and create the work of art). This situation gives rise to several important consequences. Unlike one tradition in the West, which has its roots in Platonic philosophy and for which art is a matter of the eye pure and simple, art is a field that is exclusively optical—this is the meaning of Leonardo’s famous definition of it as cosa mentale—in other words, unlike the status that history reserves for the Western viewer, conceived as an eye without a body (the eye of the soul), Walther ties the use of vision to the reality of the embodiment, thus making the tactile dimension of the works something fundamental. This amounts to a major historic and esthetic break. Secondly the fact that the body, its gestures and poses create the piece, transforms the body into a processual device in which time plays a crucial role. The body at work stresses the temporary-object aspect of the sculpture. Finally, with his works from the early 1960s, Walther joins a certain number of artists who, during the same period, were turning out scultpures that were not only activated by viewers but indeed configured by them. There was, for instance, the Brazilian artist Lygia Clark, who began her series of Bichos in 1960, metallic structures that can be manipulated and boast no single, permanently fixed shape. Like Clark, Walther has explored and invented the faces of artworks that are destined to remain eternally available, that is, forms that are constantly assuming new forms and are therefore—provided that someone takes them in hand—endlessly being invented and reinvented. Or we might say the German artist has created open works of art, the term coined by the semiotician Umberto Eco in a famous book published in 1962, in other words, just one year before Walther began his Work Series No.1.
French artist Guy de Cointet (1934–1983) emigrated to the USA in 1965, became assistant of Larry Bell, following him to Los Angeles where he lived for the rest of his life. For Cointet, cryptology and typography were tools for transforming words into images and for giving form to color. He employed these to make large drawings of cryptic writings whose titles appear to offer the key to deciphering them. Cointet’s interest in devising codes led him to develop these drawings into entire books of “typoetry.” Although they contained no form of comprehensible language that might prompt anyone to read them, it was nevertheless on these works that he would base his initial performances. The first took place in Paris, in 1973: as an actress played with a set of screen-printed red letters fixed to the wall, CIZEGHOH TUR NDJMB, she struck poses typical of those in fashion magazines. In the same year, this time exploring the linguistic aspect of his work, Cointet cast a dwarf actor as the author of ESPAHOR LEDET KO ULUNER!

Presented for the first time in Los Angeles in 1976, Ethiopia was the first of Guy de Cointet’s performance pieces to consist of several acts and to use a number of actors. It was also the first of several collaborations with Robert Wilhite, who looked after the musical side of the works. On stage, the objects that make up the scenery replace books as elements on which the scenario turns. Their status quickly becomes ambiguous: while the actors use and comment on them, they retain a degree of autonomy. In a piece with no real plot in the traditional sense, it is the interactions, or symbiosis even, between the objects themselves and with the actors that constitute the core of the work. A blonde woman, a Latin-American man, and an African-American man, chosen to represent archetypal figures, relate family histories. They bring the objects to life during the performance, but once this is over, these same objects become sculptures, retaining only their spatial relations as a recollection of the performance, precisely those relations that served to trigger situations.

The elements that make up Ethiopia have belonged to the museum’s collection since the retrospective devoted to Guy de Cointet in 2004.
GORDON MATTA-CLARK
OPEN HOUSE, 1972 (1985)

Gordon Matta-Clark (1943-1978) explored all manner of media: performance, drawing, sculpture, photography and film. Owing to the specific medium that brought them all together—decrepit buildings—few ‘things’ are left of his work. Yet these ‘remains’ are more than just traces, for they form a whole that still has political, social and aesthetic relevance. Despite his early death at the age of 35, Gordon Matta-Clark left a visionary legacy, an active dialogue developed through, and in opposition to, architecture: ‘anarchitecture’, ‘non-uments’, and ‘mental projectiles’—a multifaceted view of ‘imminent ruins.’

In May 1972, Gordon Matta-Clark created Open House, a short-lived work produced in a street in New York’s SoHo neighbourhood, between 98 and 112 Greene Street, two alternative exhibition spaces that opened in 1969 and 1970 respectively. This work continued his investigations of garbage recycling, using a dumpster that he divided up with wooden partitions—doors from hotels and restaurants that were about to be demolished. Open House also owes its name to the opening in the façade and the lack of a roof, producing osmosis and permeability in the created space, the street, the buildings. Open House instantly became an experimental, playful center for dancers, performers, and artists. Providing more freedom than alternative exhibition spaces, it was an urban equivalent to the works created in connection with land art.

An eponymous Super-8 film made on the opening day documents the public’s confrontation with this ‘place thing’ or ‘personal spatial epiphany’, as Richard Nonas put it, as well as its appearance on the margins of a prosperous, established New York whose skyscrapers are just discernible in the background. The poet Ted Greenwald recorded the sound of his truck doing delivery rounds for the Village Voice newspaper: ‘Even though it can’t move, Open House now has an engine and a sound—the sound of a team at work.’

In October 1972, a second version of Open House was set up outside 112 Greene Street, where Matta-Clark had an exhibition from 21 October to 10 November. The coincidence in place and time made this new event a counterpart to the spaces at 112 Greene Street, which the artist covered with pictures of peeling, decrepit and yet attractive façades, giving the indoor space a street-like appearance. The larger container, made of irregular, deconstructed partitions, had an open flight of steps leading to a plateau with a brasero that occupied half of the structure. What Matta-Clark was trying to do here was juxtapose the disparaged world of urban wastelands and a festive activity perceived as typically suburban—a barbecue—in order to change the city.

Although, being events and conceptual projects connected with the recycling and ‘contenairisation’ of living spaces, the first two versions of the work did not survive, the Gordon Matta-Clark Estate, aware that there were few of the artist’s spatial inventions still in existence, decided after his death to give his work and it way of presentation a lasting form. The permanent version, described in a detailed brief, made use of the industrial container from the second reconstitution of the work during Gordon Matta-Clark: a Retrospective, held at the Museum of Contemporary Art, Chicago, in 1985. This has now found a legitimate place at MAMCO in the exhibition space La Rue, close to Christo’s Corridor Store Front (Matta-Clark assisted Christo on several occasions, particularly when he was building his Store Fronts).
Designed and built in 1967, and shown the following year at Documenta 4 in Kassel, *Corridor Store Front* is in many ways a key work in Christo’s artistic output. Indeed, the piece brings together several particular features of art in those days, notably the questioning of art’s commodification and the use of modern materials (Plexiglas, aluminum, and plywood, which were finding their way into minimal art then). But *Corridor Store Front* was also a way for Christo (1935, Bulgaria) to connect his work with the history of modernism through one of its venerable motifs, the display window.

In 1963 Christo began showing shop display windows, covering up their insides with paper and opaque cloth. In 1964 he started producing life-size store fronts himself, initially with found objects and later new materials. To do *Corridor Store Front*, Christo transformed his SoHo apartment in New York into a true production and exhibition space. Once the piece had been built in his living space, it naturally took up a large part of the available volume; the half-open door seen at the end of the corridor here originally allowed people to reach other rooms in the loft. Moreover, it was possible to visit this piece of art. The production site thus became the exhibition venue. A year later the piece was transported to Germany. Christo didn’t use a ready-made store display window. But to display and sell what exactly? Certainly not products offered to consumers in a so-called consumer society, which was just then grappling with major questions about its future (*Corridor Store Front* dates from the same period as May 1968 and the student protest movements). Rather, by removing every trace of marketable goods from this corridor store front, it is emptiness, the void, that is put on display here, not a product to be admired (which also makes this piece a barely disguised homage to the 1958 void exhibition that Yves Klein mounted in Paris).

*Corridor Store Front* appeared on the New York art scene just around the time that the question of art’s relationship to the world of commerce was being raised. Indeed, in 1961, for instance, Claes Oldenburg had opened *The Store* in his studio. With that piece, the production site of artworks becomes a sales location like any other, and the artist in his shop offers all the requisite products for satisfying our daily needs, that is, what is for sale is on the order of immediately consumable goods. Thus, Christo is responding to Oldenburg here by emptying out the store.

This store front in the form of a hallway is also an integral part of the history of depicting shops. In the late 19th century, for example, Eugène Atget photographed the streets of Paris and in particular the fronts of shops. It is an iconography that overall devotes quite a lot of space to goods on sale and their public display in cities. Later, it would be the most inventive artists who were to seize on the shop window—or store fronts—as a place to make art. Marcel Duchamp, for instance, drew the door of the Gradiva Gallery, that André Breton opened in 1937 at 31, rue de Seine, in Paris. Several years after that, he was to create an installation, with the same André Breton, in the shop window of the Gotham Book Mart in New York, 9 and 10 April 1945, in conjunction with the bookshop’s promotion of Breton’s *Arcane 17* (notably the window also featured a work by Matta). In the autumn of the same year, Duchamp put together another installation, this time working with Enrico Donati, in the window of the Brentano’s bookstore on New York’s Fifth Avenue, to mark the sale of an expanded edition of *Le Surréalisme et la peinture*. A little closer to us, Andy Warhol showed his first paintings in 1961 in the window of the Bonwit Teller department store in New York, among the mannequins sporting high-fashion dresses. This diverse range of examples lays out a genealogy that clearly includes *Corridor Store Front*. Each moment of that genealogy may be no more than an exploration of what Marx calls in *Capital* the “fetishism of commodities.” Except that Christo seems to have pushed that exploration to the limit. By removing the commodities from the shop window, now transformed into an empty site, he points up the inanity of the social and political play centered on it.
Formed by AA Bronson (born in 1946), Jorge Zontal (1944–1994) and Felix Partz (1945–1994), in Vancouver, the Canadian collective General Idea produced one of the most striking bodies of work of the 1970s and 1980s. Turning upside down the glamour of popular imagery, the ideology of the mass media, and the clichés conveyed by the art world, their work extends over a multiplicity of media. Painting, sculpture, photography, film, Mail art, performance, wallpaper, but also magazines, TV shows, stores, and beauty contests: each work is to be grasped in a relationship of interdependence with the others, like the pieces of a gigantic jigsaw puzzle that is constantly being redefined.

Close readers of Marshall McLuhan’s communication theory and of Roland Barthes’ Mythologies, they first staged a beauty contest to choose Miss General Idea: a mythical, loosely defined, faceless persona of indeterminate sex to serve them as a muse. The following year, the group embarked on a vast fictive venture, The 1984 Miss General Idea Pavilion, which would last for 13 years. Behind this “project,” which recalls the universal exhibitions, a narrative structure able to accommodate all kinds of forms was put in place. In accordance with their “form follows fiction” principle, each of the works produced during this period thus refers systematically to the muse and her pavilion, in an allusive, fragmentary way. In 1977, the imaginary destruction of the pavilion led them to produce fake archaeological remains. Jumbling the chronology, the modern pavilion to come was now reduced to ruins similar to those of Pompeii. These included frescoes featuring ziggurats and poodles — recurring images in the collective’s iconography. Indeed, the geometric structure of the Mesopotamian pyramid was present from the artists’ earliest works, first as an ornament, then as a costume, and, finally, as an architectural feature of the pavilion.

The geometric rigidity of the ziggurats also contrasts with the arabesques of the poodles, omnipresent in the ruins of the pavilion — an example of which is presented in this room. The animal first appeared on the occasion of a performance given at the Centre d’Art Contemporain of Geneva in 1984, entitled XXX (bleu). At the time, the three artists were parodying Yves Klein’s anthropometries with fake poodles dipped in blue paint... While the art world was focused on Neo-Expressionism, General Idea took as their emblem a household animal, an ostentatious status symbol, ironically proposing an image of the artist brought to heel by the market. An ambiguous totem, the poodle also offers scope for play with the gay culture the collective is associated with.

Although General Idea had achieved global recognition by the mid-1980s — representing Canada at the Venice Biennale in 1980 and taking part in the documenta of 1982, 1987, and 1997 — they are now mainly associated with the AIDS project they initiated in 1987. At a time when AIDS was still a taboo, they set out to “infect” other artists’ works: Mondrian’s paintings, whose colors they changed, and, above all, Robert Indiana’s Pop icon LOVE, which was recast as AIDS and transmitted like a virus to the galleries, museums, and public spaces of cities worldwide. In 1994, the death of both Jorge Zontal and Felix Partz put an end to General Idea. AA Bronson continues to pursue his career as an artist.


Avec cette nouvelle génération d’artistes, à laquelle appartient Sherrie Levine, s’opère un changement de paradigme: l’objet de la critique n’est plus l’institution muséale mais les discours idéologiques qui visent à envahir et dominer l’ensemble du corps social ; il s’agit notamment des discours situés en dehors de l’institution muséale proprement dite, ceux des massmédias par exemple.

Le travail de Levine sera d’abord interprété, au début des années 1980, comme un certificat de décès adressé à l’endroit de l’auteur/artist. Son développement ultérieur nuance ce type d’interprétation, placé pour l’essentiel sous l’influence des textes de Roland Barthes et de Michel Foucault2. L’intérêt du travail de Levine ne s’épuise pas dans cette seule déconstruction. Il n’est pas à interpréter, semble-t-il, comme une nouvelle variation morbide sur la lancinante question de la disparition de l’auteur mais laisse plutôt à penser que la notion d’auteur n’est en rien un invariant: elle est d’abord et avant tout une construction historique. Cette remise en question de la notion d’auteur traverse l’histoire de l’art moderne.

L’œuvre de Sherrie Levine s’inscrit bien évidemment dans cette tradition. Mais au lieu de rejeter la notion d’auteur, pour conclure, comme tant d’autres avant elle, à sa disparition définitive, elle cherche plutôt à la redéfinir, consciente que cette catégorie s’inscrit dans une histoire, à commencer par celle de ses variations linguistiques et juridiques.


— Lionel Alèze

JOHN MILLER

PILOT, 2000

John Miller (b. 1954, Cleveland, lives in New York and Berlin) is an artist and theorist who, since the beginning of the 1980s, has developed a radical critique of our society’s value systems. Like Mike Kelley and Jim Shaw, but also Tony Oursler and Stephen Prina (all shaped by CalArts programs), Miller utilizes both the tools of representation and deconstructive methods. His anti-heroic paintings, the photos he takes during the vacant time of midday, and his sculptures coated in a brown impasto, evoking the link between abjection and creation, are all forms that destabilize our relation to the image, to the creative act, and to valuation mechanisms.

The installation presented here, which the artist offered to MAMCO in 2016, makes these issues explicit in an allegorical way. Entitled Pilot (as in pilot for a TV series), it offers a synthetic image of a TV game show set (podiums, “wheel of fortune,” and other display elements), of a place, that is, where the spectacularization of everyday life and the artificial creation of value are brought together. The TV game show is one of the archetypes of late twentieth-century capitalist societies: from Italian Neorealist films of the 1960s up to the most recent sci-fi scenarios, the game is always the sign of a disenchantment with the world. The most unfair social codes, the violence of cultural clichés, and the vacuity of a society based on consumption are “performed,” day after day, by anonymous participants acting out a ritualization of increasingly asymmetrical exchanges. By simplifying the set into abstract elements and removing any narrative or anecdotal topics, Miller reveals the game’s devices more than he criticizes the shows themselves.

The installation is echoed in another work just offered to the museum (presented on the first floor), in which the artist reproduces the face, fraught with emotion, of a woman participating to what is nowadays called “reality TV”—exactly the opposite, that is, of what the term designates: a form of contemporary theater in which even the tears are scripted.
After a somewhat discreet debut on the Californian neo-Conceptual scene in the 1980s, the work of Jim Shaw (1952, Midland, MI) had gained widespread institutional recognition by the end of the 1990s. By that time, it was clear he had made a decisive contribution to identifying the issues for his generation, in particular the critique of the author’s status and the loss of the work’s aura.

Shaw most frequently works in extensive series, which may encompass a wide range of diverse content. For instance, *My Mirage* (1986–1991) — a huge fictional biography of a character called Billy — comprises almost 170 pieces and journeys through the popular iconography of the American 20th century; while Shaw’s recent project *The Hidden World* assembles several hundred collected objects to do with religious imagery and the narrative invention of sects. Since 1992, Shaw has also been recording his dreams as drawings (*Dream Drawings*): in pencil, using always the same format paper, he traces a tightly structured narrative, with virtuoso reduction effects. Reassessing America’s reception of European Surrealism, the dream drawings set out to restore the unconscious of the artist “Jim Shaw.” Works of art are therefore a prominent feature, both those of artists who are close to him (like Mike Kelley) and his own. At the same time, Shaw has set about making the objects that inhabit his dreams, giving us the *Dream Objects*. These bear extravagantly long titles describing the situations in which they appeared. Unlike the drawings, whose form never varies, the *Dream Objects* are stylistically diverse, evoking by turns pastiches of other artists, amateur paintings, furniture and relics — they frequently fall into several of these categories at once. Most of the objects in this room have been offered by the artist to the museum in 2016 and might serve as a summary or index of this body of works: in it, set out as if in a thrift store, are costumes, illustrations, and toys which, while seeming to conjure a fantastic universe of castles and cornucopias, are also eager to flaunt their cast-off vocabulary.
Combining found texts and images in a seductive form of visual communication, Larry Johnson’s photographic works belong to the output of “The Pictures Generation,” alongside those of other artists who appeared on the American scene at the end of the 1970s (and who were grouped together in the eponymous exhibition at the New York Metropolitan in 2009).

Larry Johnson (b. 1959, Los Angeles) is the paradoxical heir to an education received at CalArts from his mentor, the Conceptual artist Douglas Huebler, and to the “camp” cultural practice of Kenneth Anger’s films and bestsellers Hollywood Babylon. His studies completed, he immediately made a name for himself with his first work, Untitled (Movie Stars on Clouds), 1982-84, which projects the names of six movie stars who died in tragic circumstances onto fluffy cotton-like clouds.

Like Richard Prince, who was one of his first collectors, Johnson is fascinated by language, the rhetoric of celebrity and by procedures of appropriation. By superimposing texts culled from popular press and forms that reference the language of classical modernism (we catch a glimpse of painter Joseph Albers here and of graphic designer Paul Rand there), he confronts the viewer with a twofold decryption process: that of the text becoming image and that of our own fascination with popular icons (the Kennedy brothers, 1950s American brands and the city of Los Angeles itself). These discursive elements turn out to be crisscrossed by other narratives, as in Untitled (John-John and Bobby), 1988, in which gay sexuality features explicitly, or Untitled (Heh, Heh), 1987, a copy of an ad run by the New York Times showing language at a point of collapse. If the formal influence of Edward Ruscha’s word paintings may be apparent, Johnson’s works seduction is in fact so marked by modernism’s “end game” atmosphere that, structurally, they have more in common with William Leavitt’s deconstructions and Sherrie Levine’s appropriations.

In the 1990s, Johnson began writing his own texts, drawing inspiration from popular writers whose narrative systems he radically condensed. The landscapes he went on to create, inspired by idealized representations of Hokusai and Hiroshige but “stolen” from a Hanna-Barbera cartoon, serve as supports for stories written on placards at the centre of the image. It was not until the end of the 1990s that Johnson stopped using traditional means of visual communication (animation, collage, photo-typography, etc.) to make his works, in favor of digital technology whose limits he tested by occasionally including some blurriness or his own hands in the process.

Johnson stopped working for several years prior to 2007, when he presented a series of works that thematize the question of image production by representing machines (photocopiers, projectors) and cartoon characters whom he subjects to various torments as they emerge as drawings on paper – these mise en abyme processes, an example of which can be seen in Untitled (Raven Row Giraffe), 2015, clearly also bearing sexual connotations.

The exhibition is made up of works stored in the MAMCO collections, complemented by several external loans.

—Lionel Bovier
SYLVIE FLEURY
BE GOOD! BE BAD! JUST BE!, 2008

At first sight, Sylvie Fleury’s grotto seems to have turned her work on its head, for here she counters its usual themes of consumption and luxury with a dark bareness; and the sidereal voyages suggested by her rockets and flying saucers with a place for withdrawing inside oneself. The grotto, a quintessentially womb-like place, invites us on an exploration that also entails looking back over our past and returning to our origins. As an observer of popular forms of esotericism, Fleury’s response to this mystical recess is to enjoin us all to be ourselves: Be GoO! Be BaD! JuSt Be!— thereby returning to the world of consumption since this slogan has been lifted from a perfume advert.

One area of Sylvie Fleury’s work consists in sounding the opposition between superficiality and interiority. By using quotations from the world of advertising, the artist is echoing Conceptual art, which uses language as the material for work that may sometimes, as in the case of Joseph Kosuth, have philosophical ambitions. This kind of sampling-with-a-twist is the same as that she employs in her pastiches of Mondrian, Buren, and Carl Andre with fake fur and nail polish. Artists such as these inspire both fascination and iconoclastic longings in Fleury. Be Good! Be Bad! Just Be! could therefore be seen as a crucible in which the Geneva-based artist’s multiple preoccupations are recast, for their better redeployment in the extravagant forms more usually associated with her work.

Created for the retrospective Sylvie Fleury (1961) had at MAMCO in 2008, this work was offered to the museum by the artist in 2011. It was restored in 2012, with support from the BNP Paribas Foundation.
Inseparable Angels – The Imaginary House for Walter Benjamin, 2000, is a constellation that gathers cultural and everyday objects, a precedent artwork, and texts inspired by it, to create a new encounter where personal and factual experiences become inseparable.

Esther Shalev-Gerz created and installed for the first time this ephemeral house for the philosopher Walter Benjamin on the top of the Bauhaus University in the German city of Weimar. With its rich and complex historical and cultural legacy, Weimar had been the home and workplace of Schiller and Goethe, and throughout the years of the Weimar Republic hosted the National Assembly. A few kilometers away are the concentration camps of Buchenwald and Mittlebau-Dora.

The installation The Imaginary House for Walter Benjamin is inhabited by four artworks that unfold movements in time and material. Les Inséparables is a double clock merging two faces whose four hands are simultaneously counting time backwards and forwards. This duplication generates a perpetual movement: time goes toward the future and the past whilst becoming inseparable in the present. The double clock Les Inséparables, this time in a monumental format, is permanently installed in Sweden and now in Geneva too, thanks to the FMAC, with whom this exhibition is organized.

This formation is echoed in a dual chair where two persons lean against each other’s back despite looking in opposite directions. A series of photographs and a video depict a journey by taxi from Weimar to Buchenwald, with comments by the driver populating the passing landscapes with realities of the past. From time to time, the image stutters, slows down and becomes double-exposed. In this expanded instant a spatiotemporal occupation occurs, in which one can listen to texts that testify to the endless interpretative potential of a work of art (among which are words by Franz Kafka, Heiner Müller, Gershom Scholem, Paul Klee, and Walter Benjamin), all inspired by the relationship uniting Benjamin to Paul Klee’s Angelus Novus painting.
There are three works by Claudio Parmiggiani (1943, Italy) on display at MAMCO, two of which are diametrically opposed and complementary at the same time. On the one hand, we have *Cripta* (1994), or Crypt, chronologically one of the very first pieces ever installed in the museum space and designed specifically for it (in this regard it is just like Parmiggiani’s site-specific *Clock*, from 1994). On the other hand, there is *Delocazione* (Delocation). This piece, created on site in 1995, is based on a working principle that the artist first developed back in 1970. Three works of art, three time-related objects.

Since the museum opened its doors, *Cripta* has never been displayed anywhere else, making it one of the oldest pieces to have entered MAMCO’s collections and still be on view at the museum. As its title suggests, the work consists of a crypt, which adult visitors must bow and crouch a little to enter. Plunged into the dark that reigns within, they discover a number of handprints on the walls and ceiling done by the artist himself using his left hand and color acrylic paint. As Parmiggiani remarked, “It’s a work of art that can only be seen with the eyes and in the dark because the darkness is its own light; it’s a work that you can only experience directly.” Similar to a prehistoric cave, this unique piece playfully revisits the roots of art history (the negatives of hands visible in the Gargas cave in Ariège, France, immediately spring to mind). It plunges us in the darkness of beginnings and anchors the museum of contemporary art in the ancient past. It makes this a tool for traveling back in time from the present, the crypt becoming a dark vestigial core deep inside the institution. In this regard it also indicates that for an artist, to work means to remember, to move around in time. To invent is to recollect anew. The religious aspect of the classic crypt melts away here in favor of a profane celebration of memory.

Installed next to his crypt, Parmiggiani’s second work on view is *Delocazione* (Delocation), which was realized for the retrospective MAMCO devoted to the artist’s work some years ago. *Delocazione* also entails a spatialization of prints, but, unlike *Cripta*, the principle at work is one the artist had employed on a number of earlier occasions in other venues. Also unlike his practice in the crypt, the artist’s hand was not directly involved in producing the piece. At MAMCO, it is the ghostly presence of modest-sized paintings that *Delocazione* (the term could be translated as dislocation) records on the soot-covered walls of one of the museum’s galleries. To produce a *Delocazione*, Parmiggiani burns tires inside an enclosed space. The smoke spreads and sticks to the walls. If objects are placed on those walls beforehand (painting, clock, shelf...), a trace of them remains once they are removed. This is what we see in the MAMCO piece. The room, which visitors cannot enter because of the fragility of the work, reveals absent frames, spectral works of art. It is as if all that is left of the painting today were traces without figures, blurred memories of the picture form. It also suggests the effects of a violent explosion (recollection of Hiroshima) or a cataclysm (remembrance of certain remains at Pompeii) on an object that is inscribed in the long timespan of art history. Finally, a clock designed by the artist, both accompanying and overlooking *Cripta* and *Delocazione*, reinforces and underscores the connection with time that runs through these particular pieces, and Parmiggiani’s work more generally. That connection, however, is altogether singular in this instance. The clock is in fact an inverted one that takes time counterclockwise. Going back in time, approaching chronology and history the wrong way round – here is a proposal the philosopher Walter Benjamin championed in his attempt to invent an anachronistic relationship with the past, a proposal which Parmiggiani offers a possible image of. And as always, with the obligation that this return in time be a means, not for fostering nostalgia, but rather for genuinely producing a renewed, dynamic relationship with memory. Thus, time turned topsy-turvy becomes a working tool for the artist, his altogether personal way of being contemporary.
Renée Green (b. 1959, Cleveland) utilizes activities such as writing, teaching, and archive researching as extensions of her artistic practice. Her investigation of our society is thus informed by a wide range of knowledge derived from popular culture, critical theory, film, poetry, history, feminist thinking, postcolonial studies, politics, and sociology.

The Import/Export Funk Office installation was created in 1992 and presented for the first time at the Nagel gallery in Cologne. The exhibition was originally set out as an office dedicated to funk music and structured by metal shelves on which books, VHS, newspapers, and archive boxes were filed. In the center of the room, two monitors played videos. “Browsing booths” positioned around the shelving allowed visitors to consult the archives’ content and to listen to a lexicon of keywords on the subject. Between the booths, fixed to the wall, were various texts. As the word COLLECTANEA suggests, the installation was the product of collecting, of a collection of archives of Afro-American music and literature: that of the German critic Diedrich Diederichsen, then editor of the music magazine Spex in Cologne, which Green compared with her own knowledge of the subject and supplemented with quotations, personal accounts, sounds, theoretical writings, etc.

In 1995, she digitized Import/Export Funk Office and produced a mobile version in the form of a CD-ROM which allowed the user to navigate the six fields VIDEOS/FUNK STATIONS/LEXICON/INDEX/COLLECTANEA/MISCELLANEOUS that appeared on the screen. The version of the work on show at MAMCO uses the same layout as Anticipation. Version 4, which was presented at Saint-Gervais Geneva, in 1998. The walls are painted in six Pantone colors on which the keywords are applied. The same colors are used for the cushions arranged near the low table that supports a computer containing the whole of the archive.

Just as she did with Color II (1990) and Color IV (1990) to show how the associations linked to color and, by extension, those linked to ethnicity, are arbitrary, here Green pairs together two coded communication systems known and used worldwide: a color chart and an alphabet, each of which allows many combinations to be selected. The visitors have an integral role to play, their work consisting in sitting, looking, listening, navigating, and establishing links between their own culture and what is offered up to their curiosity.
The book published in 1998 by critic and curator Nicolas Bourriaud, *L'Esthétique relationnelle*, was based mainly on articles that had appeared in *Documents sur l’art*. It proposed an “aesthetic theory consisting in judging works of art on the basis of the interhuman relations which they represent, produce, and prompt.” Bourriaud built on the work of artists (European for the most part) who appeared on the scene between 1989 and 1997, such as Carsten Höller, Angela Bulloch, Liam Gillick, Pierre Huyghe, Rirkrit Tiravanija, Philippe Parreno, and Dominique Gonzalez-Forster. Texts, films, moments of conviviality, and conversations thus became territories for exhibitions that redefined the parameters of the spectator’s experience. Collective projects proliferated between artists who laid claim to a kind of “reciprocal pollution” of what they proposed. The work was no longer “an autonomous object but a generative situation” (Eric Troncy). In short, among these new aesthetic concerns, the exhibition itself was conceived as nothing less than a medium at the artist’s disposal.

Dominated by neoliberal globalization and wars of identity, the 1990s also saw the birth of the first online utopias and the anti-globalization movement. Social reality as a construct, the flow of life, and, by extension, the sphere of human relationships, became material for artworks. Dominique Gonzalez-Forster (1965, Strasbourg) set out clues and constructed story-charged environments that were openly cinematographic and literary. Pierre Huyghe (1962, Paris) explored the ambiguous relations between reality and fiction. Philippe Parreno (1964, Oran) turned an exhibition into a moment of uncertainty bearing a lost temporality. Liam Gillick (1964, Aylesbury) investigated the discursive structures, both institutional and cultural, that framed the appearance of works.

All of these artists (like MAMCO, which was developing at the same time as their practices) took Conceptual art as a reference point, in contrast to the Neo-Expressionist sensibilities that occupied the market in the second half of the 1980s. Figures such as Lawrence Weiner and Allen Ruppersberg (whose posters for the *No Man’s Time* exhibition in Nice in 1989 are exhibited on the exterior wall of these galleries), accordingly came to occupy positions of influence once again.
After intruding on various places in Europe, La Forêt (The Forest), a work by Xavier Veilhan (born in 1963 in Lyon), is now spread over one of MAMCO galleries for a second time. It first sprouted on Geneva’s soil in 1998, when the museum hosted a solo exhibition by the artist. Instead of rustling leaves and swarming insects, wide bands of felt cover the floor and walls and simulate defoliated tree trunks—this undergrowth’s only denizens. Under a cold neon light these tall, irregular cylinders outline a forest landscape.

This work is neither an imitation nor a faithful representation of a forest: what is being played here is a theater without plot or dialogue, and the actors are the visitors. For Xavier Veilhan, “the locus of the exhibition [...] places the visitors in a fictitious space, the very space of the fiction. By stepping onto an ‘abstract pedestal,’ the spectator becomes an object of representation, just like the other components of the work.” So it is up to the visitor to occupy the space, to walk about, stop, and sit down in the heart of this wood, where other ways of apprehending, seeing, smelling, hearing and touching are possible. Sound is muted by the materials and voices are muffled. Nothing perturbs this cocoon devoid of barbs and prickles. Detached from the world, it may just be possible to feel safe here, as the solitary walker Jean-Jacques Rousseau wrote: “Beneath the forest shade, it is as if I am forgotten, free and at peace as if I had no more enemies.”
WADE GUYTON, SETH PRICE, AND KELLEY WALKER

Wade Guyton (b. 1972, Indiana), Seth Price (b. 1973, Jerusalem), and Kelley Walker (b. 1969, Georgia) belong to a generation of New York-based artists who emerged in the 2000s. Heirs to the Pop art of the 1960s and to the Appropriationists of the 1980s, but also to radical painting practices (like that developed by Steven Parrino), the three artists have explored and reflected on the status of the work of art in the age of the Internet and digital reproduction.

Each of them has set out to test the limits of processing software and image distribution technologies. Guyton makes monumental monochromes on an inkjet printer, Walker scans and screen-prints chocolate and toothpaste, and Price thermoforms objects into the format of paintings. This use of image multiplication technologies and the exploration of the technical limits of the tools highlight the production processes to the detriment of any subjective investment. Guyton composes at his computer, using keyboard strokes (such as the X or U keys), while Walker distributes his images on CD-ROMS, letting the buyer select the print scale, and the objects Price makes bear their year of manufacture rather than his signature. Machines also allow data to be moved from one format to another in an assault on the work’s uniqueness. Each form, each of the images of Guyton, Price, and Walker is subjected to non-stop recycling that covers it with new layers of meaning. Like a compulsive online search or electronic music sampling, the works display a mesh of references blending advertising, music, and art history. Kelley Walker’s Aquafresh Plus Crest With Tartar Protection exemplifies this polysemy of the sources by spreading a well-known toothpaste over a photo of “Race Riot” from the 1960s as if Andy Warhol and Dieter Roth had collaborated to produce a magazine cover.

By playing on the processes of duplication, distribution, and of images’ increased value as merchandise, the three artists take over the operations of our consumer culture for their own purposes. The packaging of Price’s Vintage Bomber gives this item of clothing, formerly a symbol of rebellion, consumable fetish value. The works presented here, each in their own way, hijack and short-cut mercantile strategies, whether those of mass consumption or the art market, inevitably becoming themselves on the way objects of desire.
Mamco Events

May

Tuesday 31
— 6-9pm, VERNISSAGE.
Exhibitions open until September 4, 2016.

June

Wednesday 1
— 7pm, MEETING with Olivier Mosset, artist, about the exhibition GVA <-> JFK.

Tuesday 7
— 12:30pm, WALKING WITH… Pierre-Antoine Héritier, art restorer.

Wednesday 8
— 6:30pm, COMMENTARY by Bob Nickas, art critic and independent curator, on the exhibition GVA <-> JFK.

Tuesday 21
— 6:30pm, VOIX OFF, Chambre d’écho 8.

Wednesday 22
— 6:30pm, COMMENTARY by Lionel Bovier, Director of MAMCO, on Récit d’un temps court.

Wednesday 29
— 6:30pm, COMMENTARY by Paul Bernard, curator at MAMCO, on General Idea’s exhibition.

July

Friday 1
— 6:30pm, MAMCO in the sky — 1’000’053 ANNIVERSARY OF ART.
Celestial writing by Robert Filliou above the Salève.
In collaboration with l’Aéroclub de Genève.

Wednesday 6
— 7pm, MEETING with Alexandre Bianchini, artist, about the exhibition GVA <-> JFK.

August

Wednesday 3
— 6-9pm, GVA <-> JFK special PLAYLIST.

Wednesday 31
— 6:30pm, COMMENTARY by Nicole Schweizer, curator at Musée cantonal des Beaux-Arts de Lausanne, on Renée Green and Esther Shalev-Gerz exhibitions.

September

Wednesday 7
— 7pm, NEW DISPLAY of Charlotte Posenenske’s exhibition.

Other Events

Passeport-Vacances: « Moi aussi je peux le faire » with Jonas Hermenjat
— 5, 6, 7, 12, 13 and 14 July, from 9:30am to 4:30pm
Jonas Hermenjat proposes to youngsters aged 13 to 15 years old how to put together an artwork in relation with a story that marked them this year.
Pack a picnic and old clothes.
In collaboration with the Service des loisirs et de la jeunesse de l’État de Genève.
Information and registration: +41 (0)22 546 21 40 / passeport.vacances@etat.ge.ch / http://www.geneve.ch/

Passport Visits

On the occasion of Passeport Musées suisses’ 20th anniversary, MAMCO is organising four guided visits entitled Passport Visits (for double artistic destinations). Guides will talk about two artists’ works belonging to different geographic areas:
— Sunday 12 June, 3pm: Germany – Toscana
— Sunday 11 September, 3pm: Japan – Vaud
Press Office

For all requests, information and visuals, please contact:

Jennifer Ng Chin Yue, Press Office
j.ngchinyue@mamco.ch
tel. +41 22 320 61 22

Information

MAMCO
Musée d’art moderne et contemporain, Geneva
10, rue des Vieux-Grenadiers
CH-1205 Geneva

tel. +41 22 320 61 22
fax +41 22 781 56 81

www.mamco.ch

The Museum is open Tuesday through Friday from noon to 6pm, the first Wednesday of the month until 9pm, and Saturday and Sunday from 11am to 6pm. Closed on Mondays, Monday 1 August and Thursday 8 September 2016.

MAMCO — Récit d’un temps court [Tale of a Short Time Span] — Press Kit

Partners

MAMCO is overseen by Fondamco, which is made up of Fondation MAMCO, the Canton and City of Geneva.

Fondamco would like to thank all its partners, both public and private, and in particular JTI and Fondation de Famille Sandoz as well as Fondation Coromandel, Fondation de bienfaisance du groupe Pictet, Fondation Leenards, Fondation Lombard Odier, Fondation Valeria Rossi di Montelera, Loterie Romande, and Sotheby’s.

Partners: Alain Choisy, Hôtel Bel’Espérance, Hôtel La Cour des Augustins, Payot, Saunier SA, les Transports Publics Genevois.

Media partners: Le Courrier, Espaces Contemporains.

Regular admission CHF 8.–
Reduced admission CHF 6.–
Group admission CHF 4.–