Disordering the Establishment
Woodruff, Lily

Published by Duke University Press

Woodruff, Lily.


For additional information about this book
https://muse.jhu.edu/book/75409

For content related to this chapter
https://muse.jhu.edu/related_content?type=book&id=2616948

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.
NOTES

Introduction


6 Derivery, *L’exposition 72-72*, 6. There was heavy censorship in 1971: two works by Lucien Mathelin were taken down from the contemporary arts section of the Musée d’Art Modern de la Ville de Paris at the order of the police. The police closed a Bernard Rancillac show at Centre National d’Art Contemporain on the evening of its opening due to “disrespect of good manners.” A canvas on the subject of racism by Paolo Baratella was destroyed in the town of Brive. Two canvasses by J. P. Favre and R. Claude were seized in Tours. A Gérard Tisserand was also taken down for political reason, and further censorship took place in Houdain, Aubenas, Vimoutiers, and Villejuif.

7 The museum was given the name of Georges Pompidou in the law of January 3, 1975.


17 Commissariat Général du Plan, 151.
18 Commissariat Général du Plan, 151.
19 Commissariat Général du Plan, 146.


58 In the last decade there has been an increase in academic work on participation in art. Notable sustained and critical contributions to the field include Claire Bishop, *Artificial Hells: Participatory Art and the Politics of Spectatorship* (London: Verso, 2012), which examines a series of politically critical practices across twentieth-century Europe; and Grant Kester, *The One and the Many: Contemporary Collaborative Art in a Global Context* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2011), which addresses site-specific collaborative art projects from across the globe.


Analysis of the substitution of referential realism for a realism based on performativity that reveals the ideologies of institutions and society during the 1950s and 1960s in France is the subject of Kaira Cabañas, *The Myth of Nouveau Réalisme: Art and the Performative in Postwar France* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2013).


Chapter 1: The Groupe de Recherche d’Art Visuel’s Social Abstractions

1 *GRAV, Une journée dans la rue*, flyer distributed in April 1966, Paris, Julio Le Parc Archives.


11 The artists on view were Marcel Duchamp, Alexander Calder, Victor Vasarely, Jean Tinguely, Jesús-Rafael Soto, Yaacov Agam, Pol Bury, and Egill Jacobsen.
14 For a historical accounting and critical analysis of the often-frayed relation between art and technology during the 1960s in the context of the United States, see Pamela Lee, Chronophobia on Time in the Art of the 1960s (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2004).
20 François Molnar and François Morellet, Pour un art abstrait progressif (Zagreb: Grafički Zavod Hrvatske, 1963), n.p.
22 Abraham Moles, cited in Molnar and Morellet, Pour un art abstrait progressif, n.p.
23 Molnar and Morellet, Pour un art abstrait progressif, n.p.
26 Joël Stein, “Motus,” in Garcia-Rossi et al., GRAV, 53. This show included the works of Garcia Miranda, François Morellet, Sevanes, Joël Stein, Yvaral, and Vera Molnar. Molnar designed the invitation card for their Milan exhibition, which included a reproduction of one of her own canvases.
27 The expression was suggested by Danielle Morellet, in Garcia-Rossi et al., GRAV, 54.
28 The artists changed the name after deciding that the claim to be a “research center” was hubristic. François Morellet and Danielle Morellet, in conversation with the author, June 8, 2011. The artists’ talent for designing logos found commercial cause in 1972 when Yvaral and his father redesigned the logo for the car manufacturer Renault.
32 Michel Drancourt, La démocratie à refaire (1962), 125, cited in Boisdé, Technocratie et démocratie, 27.
34 Technocracy and the introduction of heavy industrial statistics date back to the Vichy regime when the French government complied with the occupying Germans in order to run more profitable factories. Consistent with this was a shift toward a corporatist model of labor integration designed to prevent uprisings. Michel Volle, “Naissance de la statistique industrielle en France (1930–1950),” in Histoire de la statistique industrielle, ed. Michel Volle (Paris: Economica, 1982), 329–340.
35 Boisdé, Technocratie et démocratie, 13–14.
36 Boisdé, Technocratie et démocratie, 17.
37 Boisdé, Technocratie et démocratie, 23.
38 Lefebvre, Vers le cybernanthrope, 12–13.
40 Édith Gerzenstein and S. G. Patris, Arts plastiques, Canal 1, January 1, 1962.
41 Piero Manzoni (whose Artist’s Shit [1961] is Morellet’s object of reference here) was an early associate of the members of the group, as Motus had shown at his Azimut gallery in Milan in 1960, and he designed the invitation card for the Motus show in Padua the same year. See Garcia-Rossi et al., GRAV, 53.
42 Cited in Gerzenstein and Patris, Arts plastiques.
43 François Morellet, “Pour une peinture expérimentale programmée,” in Garcia-Rossi et al., GRAV, 85.


53 Obrist, “Interview,” 93.


57 Wieczorek, “Mondrian’s First Diamond Composition,” 35.


60 Piet Mondrian, “From the Natural to the Abstract: From the Indeterminate to the Determinate,” in Holtzman and James, *New Art*, 47.

61 Julio Le Parc, “[Untitled catalogue text],” in Garcia-Rossi et al., *GRAV*, 70.


64 The government broke ground on the HML in 1955, and by 1958, the efforts of the Société Immobilière de la Caisse (SCIC) and employer-funded building companies managed to build more than 60 percent of the rental property in the Paris region. Just over ten years later—in 1969—the SCIC alone had constructed over 160,000 housing units. Newsome, *French Urban Planning*, 109.

65 While the term *sarcellite* was coined to describe the mental and physical toll taken on residents of the *grands ensembles*, its specific applicability to the suburbs was challenged in an unsigned article from *L’Express* that reflected on the fifteenth anniversary of the construction of the HLM at Sarcelles: “Quinze ans après, les Sarcellois se sont faits à Sarcelles. . . . La sarcellite n’existe pas, affirme, catégorique, un pharmacien, et nous vendons beaucoup moins de tranquillisants ici que dans le XVIe arrondissement.” “Sarcelles an 15,” *Réalités*, January 25, 1971, quoted in Anne Slack, “Le coin du pédagogue,” *French Review* 46, no. 6 (May 1971): 1106–1108.
67 Sudreau went so far as to hire Jeanne Aubert-Picard, a working-class mother of four, as a consultant on the Commission de la vie dans les grands ensembles. Newsome, *French Urban Planning*, 154.
72 Gérard Blanchard, “L’Op-art à prisunic,” *Opus International* 1 (April 1967): 90–92. It would seem that the history of Op art in fashion is further tied not just to new styles, but to new techniques of commodification. Blanchard cites Maïmé Arnodin as the first fabric designer in France to develop patterns influenced by the Museum of Modern Art’s 1965 exhibition *The Responsive Eye*. Arnodin is often credited with democratizing French fashion through the growth of standardized and mass-produced prêt-à-porter.
74 Anonymous, “Après avoir révolutionné la mode.”
80 Both Morellet and Garcia-Rossi confirm the groups’ lack of commercial success during the period and use the word “utopique” to describe the idea of installing the works in the HLM. François Morellet in conversation with the author, June 8, 2011; and Horacio Garcia-Rossi in conversation with the author, June 10, 2011.
82 Larry Busbea, “Kineticism-Spectacle-Environment,” *October* 144 (Spring 2013): 94.
ular, examines the way that the labyrinth offered a confluence of structuralist organization and phenomenological immersion.

89 Duparc, “Julio Le Parc,” 83.
90 Groupe de Recherche d’Art Visuel, “Au Public,” in Garcia-Rossi et al., GRAV, 89.
91 Garcia-Rossi et al., “Défense de ne pas participer / défense de ne pas toucher / défense de ne pas casser,” and “Assez de mystifications 2,” both in Garcia-Rossi et al., GRAV, 126.
93 The likeness between Vasarely’s descent onto the street via the street fashions that he inspired and the GRAV’s A Day in the Street was observed by numerous critics, including in the “Après avoir révolutionné la mode, l’Op’Art descend dans la rue”; and “Les rabatteurs de l’Op’Art,” Le nouveau candide, May 2, 1966, n.p.
96 Pierre Descargues, “Un groupe de manifestants d’un nouveau genre est descendu lundi dans les rues,” Tribune de Lausanne, April 24, 1966, 6. Six years later, the magazine Chroniques de l’art vivant would use a similar questionnaire in order, as it claimed, not only to define its readership, but also to establish a dialogue.
98 Wiener, Cybernetics, 164.
100 Garcia-Rossi et al., Instability questionnaire, Le Parc Archives. All of the discussion of the specific questionnaire responses derive from the Instability exhibition.
106 André Fermigier, “[Untitled],” Le nouvel observateur, July 6, 1966, 37; Georges
Boudaille, “Venise 66 Succès des sculptures la peinture en désarroi,” *Les lettres françaises*, June 23, 1966, 28. Notably, Boudaille commented that Le Parc’s games were less amusing than pinball machines, even as he recognized that beneath the amusement they were intended to be serious.


112 Thanks to Eric Michaud for this observation.


114 Pierre, “De l’instabilité,” 44.

115 Hahn, “À quoi sert Julio Le Parc,” 78.


120 Debord, “L’avant-garde de la présence,” 19.

121 Debord, “L’avant-garde de la présence,” 19.


130 Horacio Garcia-Rossi in conversation with the author, June 10, 2011.

Chapter 2: Daniel Buren’s Instrumental Invisibility

1 Daniel Buren, “Lettre à Jacques Caumont,” in Les écrits (1965–1990), tome I, 100. The situation escalated when Caumont and Sorin rejected Buren’s effort to place himself “outside of history,” stating that they would include documentation of his practice in the exhibition anyway, while proposing to make space for Buren’s dissent by hosting a debate. In response, Buren brought legal action against the organizers, and they were required to “roam the streets” in order to scrub Buren’s name from all the posters promoting the event. An anonymously published inset in the arts magazine Robho that detailed the quarrel concluded, “This rush was definitively the only demonstration that fully responded to the announced program: art in the street.” See Anonymous, “Buren contre le CNAC,” Robho 5/6 (1971): 67.


3 He replicated this model in cities throughout Europe, North America, and Japan into the early 1970s. In 1969 it was Düsseldorf, and with papers striped pink in Paris and red in Berne. In 1970 there were gray in Tokyo, Kyoto; orange in Turin; yellow in Amsterdam; and blue, gray, orange, pink, red, green, purple, and monochrome white in New York. In 1971, there was blue in Vienna and Frankfurt, and orange in Naples in 1972. In 1970 he posted them on benches across the city of Los Angeles for a project he called Fifty Bus Benches.


5 Buren, Au sujet de . .


14 Buren and Parmentier, Propos délibérés, 46.


19 Barthes, *Writing Degree Zero*, 82.
20 Barthes, *Writing Degree Zero*, 83.
21 Since their appearance as a group in 1967, it has been common to use the abbreviation BMPT, but honoring the artists’ preference, I list their names individually. For an explanation of Buren’s position against the moniker, see Daniel Buren, Charles Le Bouil, Mazaud, and Patrick Jude, “BMPT n’a jamais existé!!,” in *Les écrits (1965–1990), tome II* (Bordeaux: Musée d’Art Contemporain, 1991), 167–174.
23 Daniel Buren et al., “Puisque peindre c’est . . . ,” in *Les écrits (1965–1990), tome I*, 21. Specifically, here the reference to Vietnam is an attack on the “Salle Verte” at the exhibition, which was a space dedicated to works protesting the war.
31 Michel Claura in conversation with the author, November 9, 2015, Paris.
34 Buren and Boudaille, “L’art n’est plus justifiable,” 29, Buren’s emphasis.
36 As Jean-Marc Poinsot points out, while the term “in situ” has long had currency in the field of anthropology to specify the discovery of artifacts at archeological sites, Buren first used the locution in 1974 while speaking about the notorious debacle of 1971 in which his work was removed from the Sixth International Guggenheim Exhibition due to the protest of several co-exhibiting American minimalists. In an interview with Liza Béar from 1974, he stated, “The only thing that I wanted to say with this piece could only be said by the piece itself in situ.
In withdrawing it from view, this meant that each person spoke of it in the void.” It was not until 1976 that the term began appearing as a regular feature of his rhetoric. He directly theorized the term for the first time in the 1985 essay “Du volume de la couleur.” Jean-Marc Poinsot, *Quand l’œuvre à lieu: L’art exposé et ses récits autorisés* (Geneva: Les Presses du Réel, 2008), 95 n. 21.
suspended across the street outside the gallery. The exhibition title refers to the invitation, which provided a description of the work, thereby highlighting, and arguably equalizing, the role of the artwork and its support, the invitation. Buren says that he considered his writings to be tools to open a discussion around work that he expected people would not become capable of seeing until years later.

Daniel Buren in conversation with the author, June 26, 2018, Minneapolis, MN.


49 Buren notes that the relative invisibility of the work made it possible for him to produce incredible work because no one was expecting it. He was able to work in the middle of the day, in this case, because the work was so banal that few people recognized it as art. Conversation with Daniel Buren, June 26, 2018.

50 Daniel Buren, letter to Lucy Lippard, July 3, 1969, in Daniel Buren: Mot à mot, § A11–A12. The volunteers’ names were printed in the exhibition catalogue along with the color of the posters they placed as a sort of key that would highlight the collaborative nature of Buren’s work.


59 Catherine Millet and Daniel Buren, “Esquiver les allégeances,” Art Press 219 (December 1996): 63. Additionally, he was never interested in collaborating with the Art Workers Coalition in its campaign against museums because he refused to believe that artists and institutions formed two opposing blocs. Buren also never participated in the Front des Artistes Plasticiens, the group that organized much of the resistance to 72-72.
60 Crimp, “Ends of Painting,” 87.
63 Buren, Photos-souvenirs, 4.
64 Martin Jay, Downcast Eyes: The Denigration of Vision in Twentieth-Century French Thought (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993). In particular, Jay discusses these themes in chapters 5, 6, 8, and 10, which focus on the work of Maurice Merleau-Ponty, Jacques Lacan, Roland Barthes, Michel Foucault, Guy Debord, Louis Althusser, and François Lyotard, among others.
65 Sarah Wilson, The Visual World of French Theory: Figurations (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2012), 158. In 1978 Lyotard published his first essay on Buren, in which he responded to several recent texts by Buren, notably his 1971 essay “Limites critiques,” while integrating a discussion of the Collectif d’Art Sociologique, which is the subject of chapter 4 of this book.
67 Buren indicated that the positions could be changed by a curator as long as they were never displayed inside the museum.
68 Buren, Mot à mot, § A47.
73 As with the other artists about whom Lyotard wrote, he and Buren had developed a friendship at the beginning of the 1970s. Buren had invited him to the “Colloquium on the Semiotics of Painting” in Urbino in 1973. Conversation with Daniel Buren, June 26, 2018.
75 The paintings under which he mounted his striped canvases were Francis Picabia, L’œil cacodylate, 165 × 133.5 cm; Theo Van Doesburg, Peinture pure, 136 × 86.4 cm; Maurice Utrillo, Le jardin de Montmagny, 63 × 85.5 cm; František Kupka, Plans verticaux I, 156 × 99.5 cm; and Amedeo Modigliani, Tête rouge, 64.5 × 53.1 cm.
77 Buren, “Les formes.”
78 Buren, “Les formes.”
85 Rudolf Sagmeister, Eckhard Schneider, and Daniel Buren, “Questions à Daniel Buren,” in Daniel Buren: Les couleurs traversées – Arbeiten vor Ort (Cologne: Walther Koenig, 2001). It is notable also that in 1960 Buren received his diploma from the school of the Métiers d’art, where he studied painting and decoration, which was considered the most liberal of the disciplines at the time. In 1965, a commission to decorate the Grapetree Bay hotel on the Virgin Islands with mosaics led him to think about the relationship between art as architectural installation for the first time, which, Besson argues, can be perceived in the in situ works for which he would later become known. Christian Besson, “Naissance de Daniel Buren,” in Daniel Buren: Catalogue raisonné chronologique, tome II, 1964–1966, ed. Annick Boisnard (Le Bourget: Ed. 11-28-48 / Villeneuve d’Ascq: Musée d’art moderne Lille Métropole, 2000), 6–22.
89 Haidu, Absence of Work, 239–240.
90 Haidu, Absence of Work, 251.
91 Haidu, Absence of Work, 266–268.
93 The Cabala reference appears in Roger Caillois, Man, Play, and Games (Champaign: University of Illinois Press, 2001), 88: “As the Cabala warns, one becomes a ghost in playing a ghost.”
Chapter 3: André Cadere’s Calligrams of Institutional Authority

1 The bar was eventually recovered in 2006 for a retrospective, also titled *Unlimited Painting*. Presumably it was in the possession of René Denizot, the curator of *A Painting Exhibition*, during the three intervening decades.


3 Also participating in the show were Bernd Lohaus, Brice Marden, and Agnes Martin.

4 Conflicts between Cadere and Buren seem to have started when Buren protested Cadere’s inclusion in an exhibition in Duerle following a symposium on “Art and Its Cultural Contexts” in Brussels in 1973. Buren was irritated by Cadere’s practice of showing his work uninvited at other artists’ exhibitions, which would have included *Unlimited Painting / A Painting Exhibition* only a few weeks earlier. Cadere began a sustained polemic against Buren and others, the height of which came in 1975, when Cadere printed and distributed a text to art-world figures at *Europaalia 75*. He titled the text “Waterloo” in reference both to the festival location’s proximity to the town of Waterloo and to its history as the site of Napoleon Bonaparte’s final defeat as he attempted to solidify power and expand his empire. In the text, Cadere accuses all of the artists who were sanctioned to exhibit, which included Buren, as being “official artists of the Common Market” and accused them of being “Little Napoleons, the dictators of Art in France” that “are today so frequently used that, according to the logic of things, they have arrived here at the limit of Waterloo.” This limit, as he specified, was the artists’ dependence on the museum as a site for exhibiting their works. Cadere, *Histoire d’un travail*, § 26.

5 As evidenced in chapter 2, Cadere’s clean opposition here is not completely appropriate, given that in numerous cases during Cadere’s lifetime, Buren attached his stripes to surfaces outside arts institutions, and in several cases he affixed them to surfaces that were defined by their mobility. Notable examples of the latter are his 1968 exhibition *Homme/Sandwich* and his 1975 New York City exhibition *Seven Ballets in Manhattan*, although in both cases the mobility could be said to be “dependent” on the social expectation of the surfaces, given that their functions were to circulate, in the first as spaces of advertising and in the second as protest placards. Magda Radu suggests that Cadere even borrowed his idea of circulating beyond the gallery from Buren. Magda Radu, “André Cadere,” in *André Cadere / Andrei Cădere*, ed. Magda Radu (Bucharest: National Museum of Contemporary Art, 2011), 65.


7 In a recent roundtable Sarkis shared his opinion that Cadere had wanted to participate in *A Painting Exhibition* officially, but that he “didn’t stand any chance” because, according to Sarkis, he did not get along with them. “Sarkis, Conversation with Dinah Bird and François Michaud,” in Radu, *André Cadere / Andrei Cădere*, 429.
9 Radu, “André Cadere,” 90.
12 Sanda Agalides, “Cold War Cadere,” in Radu, André Cadere / Andrei Cădere, 195.
14 Radu, “André Cadere,” 72–73. Prior to Radu’s book, none of the English- and French-language scholarship on Cadere provided more than passing reference to Cadere’s life and career before he moved to Paris. This division between East and West is evident in the bifurcated structure of Radu’s book, in which the Romanian authors concern themselves with filling out his biographical and artistic profile from the years before he entered the history of the West, while the last section, consisting of conversations with artists who met him after he moved to Paris, makes no mention of his life and work before his move to Paris.
15 André Cadere and Lynda Morris, “André Cadere. Talking with Lynda Morris,” in Alexander van Grevenstein, Astrid Ihle, Fabrice Hergott, and Karola Krässlin, André Cadere: Peinture sans fin (Cologne: W. König, 2007), 33. Cadere’s conflictual engagements with art institutions are frequently narrated in terms of suffering. Christian Boltanski said of the Documenta incident that it demonstrated the “horror of the artworld. . . . It is a good example of the cruelty of that world. He was accepted only on the condition that he suffer, that he make his way there as though on a kind of pilgrimage, that he beg, in a way, to be exhibited.” Radu, “André Cadere,” 75. This sentiment is echoed by Sarkis, who said of Cadere’s encounter with A Painting Exhibition, “he developed himself with an enormous amount of suffering,” in which he analogizes this suffering with expressionism. “Sarkis, Conversation with Dinah Bird and François Michaud,” 429. Similarly, Agalides argues that it is important that Cadere is sometimes the victim of his stratagems, that he remains visible even as he stumbles. She calls him a trickster in the sense that he is “homeless and nomadic, absurd, mischievous and hoaky.” Agalides, “Cold War Cadere,” 217.
16 As told by Peter Jacobi. See Ioana Vlasiu, “Andrei Cădere,” 139–140.
18 Agalides, “Cold War Cadere,” 204.
19 Radu, “André Cadere,” 76.
22 If the chosen colors were red, purple, and green, the resulting bar would be composed of either four or seven spools of each color organized in every possible combination of three, to produce a bar that was twelve or twenty-one times as long as its diameter. Were the bar red, purple, green, and black, each color would appear
five, six, or thirteen times in as many permutational possibilities to compose a bar that was twenty, twenty-four, or fifty-two times as long as it was thick.


24 While this is what Cadere claimed, it is worth noting that for his April 1975 exhibition at Berlin’s Folker Skulima gallery, he chose to demonstrate this principle with a display that would seem to undermine it. For this show he lined six bars up against a wall, each composed of two colors that were the same, with the third color changing to one of the six remaining colors. The two fixed colors were red and yellow, and the first bar on display reconfigured the colors of the German flag: red, yellow, and black. Although it is not possible to determine his intentions from his color choice, as part of the same exhibition, Cadere chose to demonstrate that the bar “is independent from the wall as support” by leaning one against the Berlin Wall. The juxtaposition would seem to elevate his critique of immobility to a new level in presenting a contrast between the bad stasis of not just art, but walls generally, and the good freedom of mobility promoted by his own work.


30 Cadere and Lotringer, “Boy with Stick,” 150.


35 Cadere and Morris, “André Cadere,” 27.

36 Bernard Marcelis, “From Round Wooden Staff to Constellation,” in van Grevenstein et al., *André Cadere: Peinture sans fin*, 73.

37 Cadere and Morris, “André Cadere,” 23.

38 Several months before the opening of the heavily publicized and contentious *72/72 Douze ans d’art contemporaine en France* exhibition at the Grand Palais, Cadere participated in the Salon de Pâques at the Akademia Raymond Duncan in Paris, where he exhibited a bar atop a heat radiator that was exactly its same length. Writing about his participation in the salon, he wrote, “My idea was to show that a work that is independent in relation to the institutional cultural structures can be shown anywhere, in a circuit completely different and even contrary to that of the great official pomp of the Grand Palais.” Cadere, *Histoire d’un travail*, § 2.


40 For the influence of Magritte on Broodthaers, see Haidu, *Absence of Work*.
Foucault, *This Is Not a Pipe*, 20–22.

42 Foucault, *This Is Not a Pipe*, 31.

43 Foucault, *This Is Not a Pipe*, 44.


46 This gallery changed the numeral in its name for every exhibition to indicate the reciprocal relationship between the work show and the identity of the gallery itself. In total, the numbers ran 1–42 before it closed.


51 Agalides, “Cold War Cadere,” 207.

52 Ida Biard, “La Galerie des Locataires et French Window, ou ces aspet du travail des artistes aujourd’hui” (master’s thesis, Université de Paris I, 1974). Biard wrote her master’s thesis on the subject of her gallery. In it she emphasizes the distinction between reality and reproduction. In particular she gives prominence to a lengthy quote from a 1973 edition of Claude Lévi-Strauss’s *Structural Anthropology*, in which he uses the characters from William Wyler’s film *The Collector* (1965). In the film, Lévi-Strauss argues, there is a total inversion of values in which the hero obsesses over natural beauty—insects and pretty girls—while contemporary taste for artificial things is symbolized by a student who lives only through books because the artworks she learns to value are too expensive. False taste, he says, satisfies itself with reproductions in place of the immediacy of reality (though it is perhaps ironic that the anthropologist fails to mention that the hero’s preference for natural beauty is also shown to be perverted, as his “collecting” proclivities turn out to be those of a serial killer). For Biard, the lessons in this reading are Marxist: “It is important, today, to show at all levels of human activity, the uselessness of privatization, of possession, which have become subjects of life and the categories in which it is inscribed. To persuade man of the intentional spiritual lie of private property, to show him the logic of the collectivization of the means of existence (food, housing, clothing . . .) will bring the end to the economy of consumption, of profit, of capital and will be the beginning of the human economy. This collective use of all the means of production and of existence will permit the realization of life—as creative work—art. Everything that is hoarded in man in the conscious form of the proprietor (small and large), and which Marx rejects under the name of ‘Moloh’ [juggernaut] will be put aside, and then only will man be that free being to which he aspires. From this attitude follows all my activity called The Galerie des Locataires and French Window.”

53 Ivana Bago, “A Window and a Basement: Negotiating Hospitality at La Galerie des

54 Bago, “Window and a Basement,” 125.

55 Bago, “Window and a Basement,” 144.


57 Ida Biard’s Galerie des Locataires sent out exhibition announcements in advance, alerting people to Cadere’s guerrilla exhibition at the Adami exhibition.


59 Cadere, “Presentation of a Work,” 10.

60 See note 4.


63 Cadere demonstrated the importance of the regularity of the layout of this style of invitation in a typed and handwritten note for a 1978 show at the Galerie Vega. In the note he instructs that the unidentified address can fill in the dates and times that are convenient, but that all alignment and spacing between blocks of information must be respected so as to form neat rows and columns.


66 It is possible that Cadere singled out Andre not only because of the museum’s recent acquisition, but also as a reprisal for the role Andre played in the conflict in Duerle in July 1973 (see note 4). The conflict arose over Cadere’s participation in an exhibition that had to be reconceived due to lack of funding. The Wide White Space and Paul Maenz galleries were incensed at his participation, according to Cadere, and incited a polemic against him. Cadere notes that Andre, who was represented by both galleries, sent him numerous postcards asking him to desist in defending himself, although it is not clear in what that defense consisted. Cadere, *Histoire d’un travail*, § 7; Sophie Richard, *Unconcealed: The International Network of Conceptual Artists 1967–1977: Dealers, Exhibitions and Public Collection*, ed. Lynda Morris (London: Ridinghouse, 2009), 148.

67 Cadere, *Histoire d’un travail*, § 31. It is not exactly correct to say that Carl Andre’s works were fully dependent on architecture. While it is true that most of his works were installed in, and therefore dependent on, architectural support, Andre composed numerous works beyond the bounds of the gallery, and though his works were often conceived in regards to a site, Andre did not see them as being site specific, but, rather, argued that they could be transposed anywhere. Carl Andre and James Meyer, “There Is No Such Thing as the Ideal Space,” in *Cuts: Texts 1959–2004* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2009), 185–187.
NOTES TO PAGES 179–186

68 Peter Bürger, Theory of the Avant-Garde (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984). While Cadere’s equation of patronage in the Renaissance with the contemporary market economy offers a polemical flourish that allows him to define autonomy according to an absolute relationship to the criteria of space and funding, doing so ignores the historical distinctions that Bürger has been careful to outline. The degree to which Andre and Renaissance artists benefited from dependency-inducing patronage systems was determined by the control that the patron exercised over the artistic product and the social function it was intended to serve. While Bürger argues that the courtly art of the Renaissance saw the first step toward the “emancipation of art” as the artist became an individual figure possessed of an artistic identity, he observes a distinct break between art commissioned to reflect royal power and the experimental portrayals of “bourgeois self-understanding” sold on the free market. Further, he argues that while the avant-garde accepts bourgeois aestheticism, it rejects the idea that art should be autonomous from society. While Bürger noted that the historical development of artistic autonomy is generally ignored so as to argue that art is essentially autonomous, Cadere collapsed historical periods in support of his argument that no patronized art has ever been autonomous.


70 Lynda Morris has suggested an interpretation of Cadere’s Space and Politics project that emphasizes a sympathy he had with Carl Andre. In 1976 a controversy erupted over the Tate’s 1972 purchase of Andre’s Equivalent VIII (1966), which was composed of 120 firebricks and portrayed by media as a scam perpetrated by the artist. Morris argues that in response to this misplacement of responsibility on the artist, rather than on the museum that purchased the work, Cadere wished to highlight the fact that it is arts institutions, and their purchasing power, that influence the meaning given to a work of art. “Lynda Morris on André Cadere,” recorded June 6, 2013, Artists Space, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5NHZ70sOALY.
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