



## Bella, Maia and Nick (From nothing to something to something else, part 1)

By  
Anna Manubens

BARCELONA, MAY 8 - *Bella, Maia and Nick* (From nothing to something to something else, part 1), a new film by Manon de Boer, witnesses the reunion of three teenagers surrounded by musical instruments in a room overlooking the sea. They play the instruments or rather play with them, using and assembling them in unfamiliar ways. Together, they try out and abandon ideas; they switch instruments and invent others (the windowpane or the wooden cupboard). They pause, they laugh, observe each other, look outside, start again, get bored, distracted or excited. "We should", "What if", "I can't", "Try this", "What else can we do?"

Meanwhile, the camera records what happens, what is about to happen or, even, what fails to happen. It stays in the transition "from nothing to something", between one attempt and the next, lingering in an endless preliminary. *Bella, Maia and Nick* holds on carefully to the time spanning between *already* and *not yet*, which is the time of potentiality. "We should just make funny noises." Fun is playfulness and noise is that which is not yet meaningful. A sound to which one doesn't pay much attention but which already carries with it the promise of a rhythm or melody to come. Taking sides with the time in-between and before events, *Bella, Maia and Nick* counters the frenzy of functional and immediate image consumption and production.

As it is usually the case in de Boer's work, there is an intended correspondence between that which is portrayed and the way in which it is portrayed. Bella, Maia and Nick are improvising without any pressure of a coherent result, event or climax. The film tries itself out along with their play. Both the kids and the film wander, avoid the elaboration of a tension and deviate from the build up towards an aim. In the same way as the kids play with the instruments, the furniture and their voices, the film plays with, dismantles and tries out the cinematic possibilities contained in the scene. The edit explores different takes of the space and the characters. It plays with the sounds we see, the sounds we've heard before or brings in the room the sound of the waves that break outside. The film allows itself to linger in the play with its grammar, and it enjoys it.

This intricate correspondence between the *what* and the *how* is also the manner in which the film becomes responsible for the situation it builds. Can the conditions for playfulness be created at all without them feeling contrived, without a sense that safety lies behind the camera and vulnerability in front of it? In *Bella, Maia and Nick* the presence of the camera doesn't seem to be violent or intimidating to the kids. Even if shyness surfaces in their bodily language at times, the film breathes what Marion Milner calls "a certain quality of protectiveness in the environment", a feeling of safety without which, according to her, play and absent-mindedness are impossible. Milner's writings had

(advertisement)

# 205

Exhibition  
02/06 – 20/07  
Opening  
01/06, 6 - 8 pm

**DAVID LAMELAS**  
**MURS PLIÉS**  
**GEVOUWEN**  
**MUREN**

Jan Mot  
Petit Sablon / Kleine Zavel 10  
1000 Brussels, Belgium

informed Manon de Boer's previous film *An Experiment in Leisure* and reappear here as working premises. A brief laughing gaze from Maia towards the camera allows us to think that safety is possible because of complicity. The film assumes for itself the same vulnerability of the exercise that the characters are undertaking. In doing so, the film keeps a difficult, responsible and delicate balance between the power exerted by a constructed situation and the self-exposure of those improvising within it. The film can dwell in, stretch and take pleasure out of the moment of undecidedness, as the kids do and vice versa.

As spectators, we keep watching while not being sure of what to expect. We pay close attention to the details, in the lure that something unattended might become revealing or that something could suddenly crystallise where we least expected it.



Manon de Boer, *Bella, Maia and Nick* (From *nothing to something to something else*, Part 1), 2018, HD video, color, sound. 26 minutes, film still.

Eventually, we begin to give up and let ourselves daydream. Bella's long close up becomes a sudden mirror for the viewer. She stares at the always-reset motion of the waves in the same way as our attention is caught in an improvisation that moves points at its very motion, its restarting, its agitation, its push. Bella's expression could be at once that of someone who is seized by a detail in the landscape, that of someone who remembers, of someone who is listening or of someone who waits. "L'attente donne l'attention en retirant ce qui est attendu" [Awaiting gives attention by withdrawing that which is expected], claims the narrator in Maurice Blanchot's *L'Attente l'oubli*. By progressively withdrawing the expectation of an object or an event, what we begin to sense – and to face when looking at Bella – is our own attention coming and going, struggling to find its object, drifting.

*Bella, Maia and Nick* continues Manon de Boer's observation of the conditions under which creation is made possible. After *The Untroubled Mind* (2013–2016) and *An Experiment in Leisure* (2016), this new work is also geared by the will to grasp, pin down or rather wrestle and work through the gestures, the environment, the spaces, the moods, the affects and the durations that are at work in creation; that work for creation.

Or, in other words, the film is another take on a radical "how?" question addressed to the artistic process. That is to say, an interrogation of what the practice of art consists of, what it requires, or what exactly is the *doing* of art? Within this interrogation, time, which has been an object of study throughout her oeuvre, reappears as an insistent concern. Notions such as Roland Barthes' *l'idiorrythmie* – a rhythm which is irregular, singular and subjective – or Marion Milner's "reverie" – a moment of suspended action, absent-mindedness and drift – underpin de Boer's current research and production, including *Bella, Maia and Nick*. The fact that this interest of hers is growing and evolving through successive films, publications and works that complete and respond to each other shows that the particular temporality of creation is not only observed as subject matter but also enacted as a practice. There is a fluctuating and non-resolving duration that connects, stretches and wanders between each film. From *nothing to something to something else*. Each work is a sort of cut out, an image, a situation, a text in which a different relationship to time and expectations is made possible.

De Boer's recent films are different expressions of a desire that tries to understand how this very desire turns into action, becomes something or resists this

very becoming. And this is true at the scale of a film such as *Bella, Maia and Nick*, but also at the scale of her recent productions as a whole. Ultimately, it is about her own pulse, her own drive, her way of paying attention to what calls her attention, even if this means postponing a result in order to focus on its search, its restarting, its agitation, its push.

*Anna Manubens is an independent curator, writer and producer with a preference for hybrid roles at the intersection between research, public programming, close project development and exhibition making. Until 2018 she was Head of Public Programmes at the CAPC Musée d'art contemporain in Bordeaux. Between 2012 and 2016 she worked with the artist-run organisation Auguste Orts in Brussels. In parallel she was teaching at Universitat Pompeu Fabra (Barcelona) and developed curatorial projects including: When you Fall Into a Trance (La Loge, Brussels, 2014), Moving Image Contours, co-curated with Soledad Gutiérrez, (Tabakalera, San Sebastián, 2015), Hacer cuerpo con la máquina: Joachim Koester, (Blue Project Foundation, Barcelona, 2016) and Visceral Blue (La Capella; Barcelona, 2016).*

**ONE HOLE IN THE GROUND APPROXIMATELY 1' X 1' X 1'  
ONE GALLON WATER BASED WHITE PAINT POURED INTO THIS HOLE**

010

**UN TROU DANS LA TERRE DE 1 PIED X 1 PIED X 1 PIED ENVIRON  
CINQ LITRES DE PEINTURE À L'EAU VERSÉS DANS CE TROU**

**Lawrence Weiner's** *ONE HOLE IN THE GROUND APPROXIMATELY 1' X 1' X 1' ONE GALLON WATER BASED WHITE PAINT POURED INTO THIS HOLE*, constructed on 23 August 1968 is a work consisting of language and material referred to, listed as his 10th *Statement* in the catalogue raisonné *Specific & General Works* (1993). It's the first *Statement* adopting the past participle tense - compared to previously used imperative form - thus evoking an existing material work which form would question the definition of painting and sculpture.

After **stanley brouwn's** [walk during a few moments very consciously in a certain direction (...)] in the previous issue of the Newspaper, this is the second contribution in a series of presentations of works in the form of a text.

Source: Lawrence Weiner. *Specific & General Works*, Le Nouveau Musée / Institut d'Art Contemporain, Villeurbane 1993. Courtesy: Stichting Egress Foundation Amsterdam / Seth Siegelau.

# Space in Space

By  
Dessislava Dimova

BRUSSELS, MAY 14 - One of my first encounters with three-dimensional space and its representations was an embroidery kit given to my mother - a kind of paint-by-numbers canvas that enjoyed a brief popularity at the time in Bulgaria. The more advanced ones usually represented a Vermeer painting or some intricate landscape, but as a beginner my mother was given a simpler design, "for the children's room". The picture represented a Mickey Mouse holding a cube of block colors, on an impenetrable, solid black background. I have no recollection of the image of the mouse, its flat decorative pattern must have dissolved into the pixels of the stitches. Although it was a recognizable sign, I had never seen the cartoon itself and could not attach any kind of story to it. The character seemed to be there only as a child friendly ruse to introduce the troubling deepness of space; as a necessary transition between infinity and three-dimensional reality.

My mother had never tried embroidery before, but like with everything else on her to-do list, she just got on with it. It took time and it made time space. I remember sitting hypnotized by the blackness that slowly invaded the canvas, against which the bright silk of green, red and blue lozenges, was shaping space right in front of my eyes. My mom eventually finished the picture, but didn't deem it worthy of the walls of the children's room. Instead she folded it, like some theoretical model of the Universe, and put it away in a box. I like to imagine it sitting still there, a cube within a cube, a hidden portal filled with space-time holes nibbled through by cartoon mice.

It's hard to think of anything more magical and fascinating than the illusion of space on a flat surface. Maybe only the real presence of space in space - the apparition of three-dimensionality in what we believe to be three-dimensional, the materialization of the definition of our universe, which lures and reassures space into the shape of the world we have already built. Its tautology is both comfortingly banal and terrifying - a closure and an opening at the same time, and after all not a tautology at all.

This is the contradiction haunting all tautologies, including that of the "specific objects" in minimal art. These objects, supposed to show nothing but themselves, to be absolutely present, static, impenetrable and ultimately three-dimensional in order to avoid any surface of representation or reference, took the form of mostly cubes or cuboids. Containers without anything contained, simply angles and planes, sleek and industrially produced, they strived to express nothing human, only the absolute.

Their tautologies were many. Neutral and extracted from everyday reality - they inadvertently repeated the spatial and symbolic structure of the white cube, which surrounded them. A white cube is also an apparition of space within space - a space without qualities, only right angles and white planes. Even if the white cube is effectively a container, implying an "inside" that the minimal object vehemently denies, its content may come and go while the cube remains neutral and unaffected by it. This tautology is probably important to grasp the aspect of minimal objects as space rather than objects. Sol LeWitt's studies of unfinished cubes both in volume and in drawings are a pure geometrical exploration of the three dimensional notion of space, alluding more to architecture than to objects.

"Specific objects" were also meditations on the whole set of contemporary conditions of production and consumption that constituted the objects of their time. They reflected industrial fabrication, using materials and techniques, which didn't require artistic "touch". Some of the works (such as Carl Andre's) used preexisting industrially produced modules. Others, like those of Donald Judd or John McCracken, also mimicked the sleek surface appeal of objects of consumption. In relationship to the claim of "simply being" of those objects, a Brillo box, with its printed logo surface was arguably as "present" and tautological as a Plexiglas minimalist box, which glossy reflective surfaces congealed the desirability of all commodities. Both boxes reflected the same reality - that of banalized, reproduced consumer goods: the Brillo as a literal reproduction of the product's surface, the minimalist box - a more abstract sign of the product and its production, the materials more generally

pointing towards an ensemble of industrial techniques. A minimalist object seemed to illustrate perfectly Adorno's concept of the work of art as a windowless monad - an autistic object, made of the same fabric as all of society, which yet resists its flow and stares back at it with its blind absorbing or reflective surfaces.

Suspicion about the minimalist claims that simple three-dimensional shapes could resist everything that surrounds them or even everything they evoke, arose very early, the most famous of them being Michael Fried's accusation of theatricality. What Fried meant, was that a blind and autistic object, not only turns the attention of the viewer towards what surrounds it, but also essentially plays itself out, thus in fact being a relational object more than anything else. Indeed, as Adorno prescribed, the artwork as an object is also a kind of subject.

For all the spiritual tendencies of the 1960s advocating oneness and togetherness, a minimalist object seemed suspiciously indebted to an individualistic, autonomous and dissected model of the world pertaining to a developed capitalist society. However a collective "we" appeared somewhere in these seemingly dehumanized objects - in their play on the anthropomorphic scale, in their emptied out volumes sending back an image of our own transience, in the collective subject of their production and technical execution.

Despite or likely because of the density of the tautologies involved in the minimalist cube, it is hard to chase the image of a Space Odyssey monolith they sometimes evoke, some otherworldly, almost divine presence lurking beneath their present-ness, the black cube of Kaaba in Mecca also coming to mind. (McCracken in fact considered his works as other-worldly apparitions, an approximation of what aliens could have produced; Judd's concrete constructions in the desert from the 1970s, while probably not intended, have also such quality of other worldly appearances.) The insistence on the presence of the minimal object only reinforces the feeling that we could glimpse something absent in its pure materiality. Indeed a pure presence can only be perceived as such if it is confronted to its opposite - an absolute absence. The very

question of the image in religion has been positioned between these two opposites. Georges Didi-Huberman suggested this was in fact the very dialectics of seeing in “Ce que nous voyons, ce qui nous regarde” (1992). It’s a text that has fascinated me for years partly because of the task of decrypting its French, partly because it formulated my own lingering question – namely how to reconcile the matter-of-factness of minimal objects with a suspicion they come close to some sort of representations of the divine. Or to put it in Didi-Huberman’s terms – how the apparent scission between tautology and belief eventually turns the act of seeing into a back and forth between these two seeming opposites.

The play between empty and full, absent and present, separation and unity in the empty volumes of the works of minimal art was already present, Didi-Huberman suggested, in the cuboid of the tomb. The tomb is a volume carrying void, it speaks about the loss of a body. It reflects the observer’s material presence, but also sends back to him an image of his absence – we too will be this void one day. The solid stones of the tomb outlining an empty inside, condense our human presence and absence in the irrevocable simultaneity of a “now” beyond time. Some of the “boxes” of Tony Smith, of Robert Morris and in particular his “Box with the sound of its own making” (1961), or Sol LeWitt’s “Buried Cube Containing an Object of Importance but Little Value” (1968) could almost serve as illustrations of this idea of the tomb as a container of absences. The “whole” the minimalist object tries to capture is also a “hole”, its totality expresses lack. As Carl Andre, put it – “A thing is a hole in a thing it is not”.

It is interesting that the fascination with the cube as a particular form of three-dimensionality did not easily transcend the conditions of developed capitalism, which were able to sustain both the cube’s relatively sophisticated technical production and its conception as an ultimate presence of the here and now. While there is undeniably a strong critique towards the traditions of art and society, and even reference to ancient forms in such works, we could suggest they also required a level of contentment with the possibilities opened by the present.

Certainly a sleek Plexiglas or steel surfaces would have been feasible even in the socialist ideology of rough, primary material production.<sup>1</sup> However, even if



Mickey Mouse holding a cube, 1979. Embroidery by Stefka Dimova.

access to such a production was to be justified and granted to an artist, what could have it expressed? What fascination with objects and materials, with technical possibilities, with the hidden spatial presence of the present?

Socialist industry was little concerned with actual products, ideologically objects for consumption were almost a side effect of heroicized work. The real object of industrial production was the worker, or more generally the new man that was created through the working process. A focus on presentness would have enclosed this subject into the conditions of its production in a hopeless impasse. It is why late socialism didn’t produce much minimal forms. Even when modest attempts at modernist shapes were made, they often bore the trace of the artist’s spirit and humanity manifested in uneven surfaces, of anthropomorphic shapes breaking free from angular volumes. This is possibly what Bulgarian sculptor Krum Damianov meant when he said about his experience in international sculpture symposia – even our most modernist forms “smelled of socialism”.

The tautology of the minimal “What you see is what you see” was an act of embracing reality. Here it would have meant the death of seeing, as seeing hinged

on the glimpses between the cracks and holes of the big tautology of ideology and life. When tautology collapses into belief, the cube is not dialectical but totalitarian.

A comparable tautological shape of the late socialist underground art would have been the pyramid – solid but centralized and clearly directional, always pointing somewhere else – the communist future or the imagined single point of an outside (Western) world. The first three-dimensional forms of the Bulgarian neo-avantgardes of the 1970s and the 1980s often used industrial leftovers, but in lighter and more flexible materials such as rope, textile or soft plastic. They took unstable, temporary forms and understandably attempted to distort grids and solid shapes, letting the materials follow the surface of the landscape and the forces of nature. Those who nevertheless tried their hand at more rigid constructions unsurprisingly looked towards the pyramid as a formal structure.<sup>2</sup> This was the case with the “Opening of the Pyramid” installation in Group De’s first gallery presentation in 1991. Many of the group’s other structures contained pyramidal shapes. Vesselin Dimov’s geometrical constructions included some cuboid forms but even in them there were lines that converged towards single vanishing points. In 1986 during a performance Dimov created a

“Pyramid of Air” with rope and a weather balloon. Vassil Simitchiev’s “Self-Building Sand” (1977) or “Tetrahedral” (1979) were also pyramids.

This does not mean the cube did not exist. On the contrary, it was omnipresent, its formal ideology appropriated by a real tomb – the mausoleum of Georgi Dimitrov in Sofia – famously built in 6 days, in 1949 and destroyed in 1999, for 6 days again, requiring multiple detonations. Its empty site still haunts the city of Sofia as a landmark of “touristic spiritism”, as philosopher Boyan Manchev called it – an empty space, which has nothing to account for, except for the negative of the Mausoleum’s absence. This void fascinated artists for years, and numerous (unrealized) projects tried to deal with its wound, while in the meantime real life offered cafes, beer festivals and their leftovers as temporary inhabitants.

Right now as I write, the first elements of “The Bronze House” – a monumental artwork by Austria-based Bulgarian artist Plamen Deyanoff are being mounted on this site. This is the first time since 1999 that an intentional structure takes the place of the Mausoleum. Inspired by the design of medieval Bulgarian stone and wood architectural decorations and most particularly by the 14th century fortification The Hreljo’s Tower, “The Bronze House” will be an open rectangular construction of metal tracery grids. Unlike other variations of this same work by the artist, which have square proportions, “The Bronze House” in Sofia will be more elongated, probably in reference to the tower, but most likely to avoid repeating the volume of the Mausoleum itself.

It is curious to see the precautions with which the see-through structure was presented to the public by the urban planning press campaign. There were three elements on which the campaign was based. One was that the work would not take up all the space left empty by the mausoleum, thus leaving a reasonable amount of indigestible void to suggest no new ideological structure will replace the old one. The work was also announced as temporary – it anticipates its own demise after one year. The third point was that the space outlined by the structure could be a potential art “space” (judging by the artist’s other similar works, this was very unlikely his original intention), and be used to host events or other artworks, although no specific plans are made clear yet. In some

earlier communications it was even insisted that this absolutely transparent and visibly open structure had doors and windows, which confirmed its status as a space that can contain further meaning, other forms.

The dialectics of presence and absence, of full and void seems to be at play here too – “The Bronze House” is something that should also remain nothing, taking space while leaving place for something else, content and container at the same time. Transparency seems the only way for the cube to exist today, replacing the dialectics of tautology with inclusivity and permeability, a new tautology of “what you see is all there is”. If the impenetrable surface of a minimalist cube exposed the hidden conditions of its production and consumption, the cut-outs of the metal grid reveal nothing but the visible surface of the world, polished by public polls and press campaigns. The shadow of ideology still weighs heavily on the site (even today it is still called “the Mausoleum”), and the House can have nothing of the solemn interiority of the tomb. The House is not just empty, it has neither exterior nor interior, it dissolves into its surroundings. Before it is yet erected, we know it will be dismantled and “folded” in pallets. Its presence then can function at best as a temporary unfolding of space, revealing a dense grid of space-time wormholes.

*PS. After this text was finished, the Mickey Mouse embroidery was eventually found by my mother and photographed, after spending nearly 40 years in a shoe box.*

#### Notes

1. Macedonian theorist Suzana Milevska claimed that there was a big difference in the quality of industrial production in the West and East, which gave similar artistic manifestations (in particular the readymade) a very different material quality that reflected their economical context. (S. Milevska, “The Readymade and the Question of the Fabrication of Subjects and Objects”, 2000)

2. Some very early works from the 1970s by V. Ivanov (drawings) and V. Simitchiev (mirror cubes) did indeed quite directly used cuboid forms, however these particular pieces were not socialized in Bulgarian art and were made in direct reference to examples of Western art. The cuboid and pyramidal structures from Vesselin Dimov’s 1982 exhibition “Terrain and Construction”, were all destroyed by the authorities one day after the opening.

“Pyramid of Air” with rope and a weather balloon. Vassil Simitchiev’s “Self-Building Sand” (1977) or “Tetrahedral” (1979) were also pyramids.

This does not mean the cube did not exist. On the contrary, it was omnipresent, its formal ideology appropriated by a real tomb – the mausoleum of Georgi Dimitrov in Sofia – famously built in 6 days, in 1949 and destroyed in 1999, for 6 days again, requiring multiple detonations. Its empty site still haunts the city of Sofia as a landmark of “touristic spiritism”, as philosopher Boyan Manchev called it – an empty space, which has nothing to account for, except for the negative of the Mausoleum’s absence. This void fascinated artists for years, and numerous (unrealized) projects tried to deal with its wound, while in the meantime real life offered cafes, beer festivals and their leftovers as temporary inhabitants.

Right now as I write, the first elements of “The Bronze House” – a monumental artwork by Austria-based Bulgarian artist Plamen Deyanoff are being mounted on this site. This is the first time since 1999 that an intentional structure takes the place of the Mausoleum. Inspired by the design of medieval Bulgarian stone and wood architectural decorations and most particularly by the 14th century fortification The Hreljo’s Tower, “The Bronze House” will be an open rectangular construction of metal tracery grids. Unlike other variations of this same work by the artist, which have square proportions, “The Bronze House” in Sofia will be more elongated, probably in reference to the tower, but most likely to avoid repeating the volume of the Mausoleum itself.

It is curious to see the precautions with which the see-through structure was presented to the public by the urban planning press campaign. There were three elements on which the campaign was based. One was that the work would not take up all the space left empty by the mausoleum, thus leaving a reasonable amount of indigestible void to suggest no new ideological structure will replace the old one. The work was also announced as temporary – it anticipates its own demise after one year. The third point was that the space outlined by the structure could be a potential art “space” (judging by the artist’s other similar works, this was very unlikely his original intention), and be used to host events or other artworks, although no specific plans are made clear yet. In some

earlier communications it was even insisted that this absolutely transparent and visibly open structure had doors and windows, which confirmed its status as a space that can contain further meaning, other forms.

The dialectics of presence and absence, of full and void seems to be at play here too – “The Bronze House” is something that should also remain nothing, taking space while leaving place for something else, content and container at the same time. Transparency seems the only way for the cube to exist today, replacing the dialectics of tautology with inclusivity and permeability, a new tautology of “what you see is all there is”. If the impenetrable surface of a minimalist cube exposed the hidden conditions of its production and consumption, the cut-outs of the metal grid reveal nothing but the visible surface of the world, polished by public polls and press campaigns. The shadow of ideology still weighs heavily on the site (even today it is still called “the Mausoleum”), and the House can have nothing of the solemn interiority of the tomb. The House is not just empty, it has neither exterior nor interior, it dissolves into its surroundings. Before it is yet erected, we know it will be dismantled and “folded” in pallets. Its presence then can function at best as a temporary unfolding of space, revealing a dense grid of space-time wormholes.

*PS. After this text was finished, the Mickey Mouse embroidery was eventually found by my mother and photographed, after spending nearly 40 years in a shoe box.*

Notes

1. Macedonian theorist Suzana Milevska claimed that there was a big difference in the quality of industrial production in the West and East, which gave similar artistic manifestations (in particular the readymade) a very different material quality that reflected their economical context. (S. Milevska, “The Readymade and the Question of the Fabrication of Subjects and Objects”, 2000)

2. Some very early works from the 1970s by V. Ivanov (drawings) and V. Simitchiev (mirror cubes) did indeed quite directly used cuboid forms, however these particular pieces were not socialized in Bulgarian art and were made in direct reference to examples of Western art. The cuboid and pyramidal structures from Vesselin Dimov’s 1982 exhibition “Terrain and Construction”, were all destroyed by the authorities one day after the opening.

Specific plans are made clear yet. In some



*accrochage des collections*, Musée régional d'art contemporain, Sérignan (FR), 23/06 - tbc; *Superstition*, Marres, Maastricht (NL), 22/09 - 25/11

#### stanley brouwn

#### Manon de Boer

*Groundwork*, CAST, Cornwall (UK), 01/05 - 08/07; *Kaleidoskop*, Museen Worpswede, Worpswede (DE), 24/06 - 04/11

#### Rineke Dijkstra

*Rineke Dijkstra*, De Pont, Tilburg (NL), 10/03 - 22/07 (solo)

#### Mario Garcia Torres

*Textile as Art: Antonio Ratti Entrepreneur and Patron*, Museo Nazionale Romano, Rome, 08/03 - 29/05; *Hello World. Revisioning A Collection*, Hamburger Bahnhof, Berlin, 28/04 - 26/08; *γεωμετρικές*, The Agricultural University of Athens, Athens, 27/03 - 15/06; *The Way They Looked at Each Other*, Stockholm School of Economics, Stockholm, 01/05 - 30/05 (screening); *For Good*, The Good Room, Munich (DE), 03/05 - 24/07; *All Our Secrets*, Center for Contemporary Arts, Celje (SI), 20/07 - 16/09; *Mario Garcia Torres: Illusion Brought Me Here*, Walker Art Centre, Minneapolis (US), 25/10 - 17/02 (solo)

#### Dominique Gonzalez-Foerster

*Dreaming Awake*, Marres, Maastricht (NL), 10/03 - 03/06; *Welt ohne Aussen*, Martin Gropius Bau, Berlin, 08/06 - 05/08

#### Douglas Gordon

*k.364*, Kunstsammlung NRW / K20, Dusseldorf (DE), 14/04 - 19/08 (solo); *Douglas Gordon*, Instituto Moreira Salles, Sao Paulo (BR), 14/04 - 26/08 (solo); *About Photography*, Gagosian Gallery, San Francisco (USA), 24/04 - 23/06; *The Rat-Catcher*, Wrocław Contemporary Museum, Wrocław (PL), 11/05 - 24/09; *Douglas Gordon - Artist Rooms*, The Granary Gallery, Berwick (UK), 02/06 - 02/09 (solo); *Douglas Gordon*, Galerie Eva Presenhuber, New York (US), 31/08 - tbc (solo); *Zidane - A 21st Century Portrait*, Dunedin Public Art Gallery, Dunedin (NZ), 21/09 - 23/11 (solo)

#### Joachim Koester

*Written in Light. Early Photography*, Moderna Museet, Malmö (SE), 25/05 - 13/01; *Group Therapy*, FRYE Foundation, Seattle (USA), 15/09 - 06/01; *Superstition*, Marres, Maastricht (NL), 22/09 - 25/11; *Ekstase*, Kunstmuseum Stuttgart, Stuttgart

(DE), 29/09 - 24/02; *Joachim Koester*, National Gallery of Denmark, Copenhagen, 10/10 - 02/02 (solo); *Camera Austria*, Museum der Moderne Salzburg, Salzburg (AT), 24/11 - 04/03

#### David Lamelas

*A Life of Their Own*, MALBA, Buenos Aires, 23/03 - 11/06 (solo); *David Lamelas. Fiction of a Production*, Eli and Edythe Broad Art Museum Michigan State University, Michigan (US), 02/06 - 28/10 (solo); *Murs pliés. Gevouwen muren*, Jan Mot, Brussels, 02/06 - 20/07 (solo)

#### Sharon Lockhart

*Sharon Lockhart*, Fondazione Fotografia Modena, MATA, Modena (IT), 07/04 - 03/06 (solo); Gladstone Gallery, Brussels, 07/09 - tbc (solo); Jan Mot, Brussels, 07/09 - tbc (solo)

#### Tino Sehgal

*Welt ohne Aussen*, Martin Gropius Bau, Berlin, 08/06 - 05/08

#### Philippe Thomas

*[SIC]. Works from the CAPC Collection*, CAPC musée d'art contemporain, Bordeaux (FR), 13/10 - 27/10; *Inéchangeable*, Wiels, Brussels, 19/04 - 12/08; *Art Conceptuel*, MAMC Saint-Etienne Métropole, Saint - Etienne (FR), 19/05 - 16/09; *Readymades belong to everyone? An Investigation of the Avantgarde Strategy in Contemporary Art and Architecture*, Swiss Institute, New York City (US), 21/06 - 12/08

#### Tris Vonna-Michell

Galeria Francisco Fino, Lisbon, 09/05 - 31/08 (solo); Italian Institute, Stockholm, 18/05 (screening)

#### Ian Wilson

#### Colophon

*Publisher* Jan Mot, Brussels  
*Concept Design* Maureen Mooren & Daniël van der Velden  
*Graphic Design* Maureen Mooren, Amsterdam  
*Printing* Cultura, Wetteren

thus leaving a reasonable amount of  
i v  
i d  
c y  
t .  
- e  
year. The time was also

riminalist who exposed the hidden  
c l  
l l  
c e  
g e  
o s  
a e  
f r  
a s  
tl y  
n v  
v v  
t t  
I t  
c s  
p s  
o s  
v l  
tl n  
a r  
c a  
n e  
e c  
p e  
o e  
p l  
c y  
c t  
tu y  
v v  
t .  
t t  
s s  
c s  
o e  
v l  
tl l  
a l  
g e  
e l  
p r  
s e  
s y  
v e  
g v  
tl y  
a t  
y e  
s e  
s e

BRUCH COLLECTIONS OF IS

(advertisement)

# JAN MOT

Petit Sablon / Kleine Zavel 10  
1000 Brussels, Belgium  
tel: +32 2 514 1010  
office@janmot.com  
www.janmot.com

Wed - Fri 2 - 6.30 pm  
Sat 12 - 6.30 pm  
and by appointment