

Mobility and “things going in and out of storage” “or women going in and out of storage”

Rachel Harrison

Nevelson: walking around in new york and seeing objects that you want to rehabilitate.

“relationships and rehabilitating relationships. Rejection. (she could go back in the staples box)

mobile viewer

thinking about meaning, and how we can come to meaning or can't.

narrative: hope for a story. Move to genealogy, people want to talk about minimalism or Duchamp. Finding ways to defer the connection to genealogy. “perth amboy” vision between objects, viewers trying to look at things against objects looking at other things. Abstraction/image/representation fluctuating. Rubbing, faith-based.

What does it mean when something abstract looks at something representational?

Figures/people looking at abstraction, and another mobile element looking at the whole thing. Narrative.

Puppies looking at Jeff Koon's puppy.

The supermarket.

Food design, color, formalism.

Kiosk with three sides with three experiences.

Cat sitters, with telephone strips to tear off.

The Paradox of Choice

By barry Schwartz

Official syllogism: (empirically false)

The more freedom the more welfare.

The more choice the more freedom.

Freedom and choice are the same.

Choice at the supermarket.

Three fold 1990's increase in brands on shelves.

Always had choice, now there is more choice.

In addition to having more options, there are whole new domains in which we never had choice and now we have more choice.

Phone service.

Too much choice produces paralysis.

Reducing selection in a grocery,

Strong brands gain market share.

As long as you keep shelves stocked, decrease brands, ie reduce variety.

Choice paralysis:

Preference articulation: if you know exactly what it is you are looking for, the more the odds are you will be able to find exactly what you want.

Alignable options: can all be scaled on the same dimension. If all options differ only in one way, say size, then people have an easier time choosing, but that never happens, because it always involves trade-offs.

Simple criteria don't really matter. We need harder criteria.

Too much choice does:

Satisfaction?

People may do better, but they will feel worse...

Capability vs. Usability

People rated digital cd players. Asked which cd player they preferred. Chose 21 features.

Let them construct their own, they only choose 19 features.

Third time, let them play with the features, they choose the simplest one.

Maximum capability does not equal usability.

Protect people from themselves.

Regret. You choose something and its good. Not perfect, but nothing is perfect. Anticipated regret.

Opportunity costs. Trade-offs. The more options you look at, the more you will identify attractive features in the options in things you passed up.

Everything suffers from comparison. (prospect theory) (tversky and kahneman)

Branding?

Escalation of expectations: the more options increase our desires for perfection. Our expectations are increased by variety.

It used to be possible for experience to exceed our expectations.

Choose x over making more money – beyond subsistence, happiness flattens out. Always choose x over making more money in career.

Self-blame from making bad choices.

Choose good enough, not the best. Don't look back.

Good feelings satiate: The pleasure is gone, the discomfort increases.

No choice you feel infinitely bad.

Some choices, good feeling increases until it flattens and goes negative.

Principal-agent decision.

Dealer-collector. If you have an agent choosing, you won't have to make the choices.

Separating the choice from the experience. This is true even if the agent doesn't know anything more than you do.

Search engine – acting as agents.

Greek diners – create an insoluble problem – 1000 choices. Today's specials in the front.

Libertarian paternalism:

The more choices, the less chance people will act.

Organize options so that people can do nothing and make the right choice.

When you do nothing, good things happen. Defaults will make people happy.

Create trees intelligently so that people will not go down the wrong branch.

ABSTRACT PAINTING: Achim Hochdorfer

Laying bare the dialectic of the literal and the aesthetic. "we are invited to stare into the gap and experience the tension of irreconcilable poles."

"Beholding does not take place *either* in literalness *or* in its transcendence, but rather as a constantly shifting series of events – during which different modes of perception and faculties of cognition collide, but also form occasional connections."

"a specifically **aesthetic** consciousness is now constituted *only* in the discontinuous destabilization of meaning – as opposed to the timeless truth of religious symbols."

"conflict between optical illusion and literalness"

picturing multiple modes of inquiry simultaneously

delaying conclusions or genealogy.

DELAY as an idea.

"I want to lose consciousness of myself. I want to be able to give to something outside of myself – and in this sense painting is outside of myself." Joan Mitchell

corporeal experience, memory and imagination, during act of painting as well as reception.

What about writing out an index of marks in painting?

In my attempt to be exhaustive, I fall sadly short of my goal. My desire is to generate a usable document, an archive of sorts, for use in future painting projects.

Three categories:

1. Describe each kind of mark, referring only to its literal index on the canvas.

2. describe the possible gestures of the body in making the mark.

3. describe the impressions the mark could conceivably make on the viewer.

Try to pull all from available writings from artforum.

"the brush is drawn horizontally across the surface so that the paint runs down in long rivulets."

Critical readings of the mark: "the brushstroke therefore reflects its elapse in time"

"this stroke identifies itself as a gesture that has already passed, the trace of an act whose origin is unknown. In this way, the downward-streaming paint constructs an elegiac temporal structure: the present is perceived in the mode of the past."

"narrations of indeterminacy, the simultaneity of competing perspectives and signs confers the act of composition on the viewer, urging him or her to form unstable structures of signification."

"an experience that is divided between alienation and authenticity."

"playing out painting against a ground"

It asks not only what's to be done about painting but how is painting valued?

How does painting assert its authority? What is painting's

speed? Can painting enact radical social and cultural critique?

What is painting's place within the mainstream? How does painting implicate itself in capital?

Flatness, as Tim Graham suggested, is not a high modern thing. Painting has been depicting flattened space since the paintings of David in the 18th century. The space of the proscenium, or theatrical space. In Latin, the stage is known as the proscenium, which means "in front of the scenery." The proscenium is a stage with a prominent frame or arch. The frame generates an associative connection to painting, which is distinguished, whether metaphorically, or physically, by a frame.

This notion of a painting's space as theatrical is different from the traditional one of a window, depicting illusionist space, and from Greenberg's decree from the 1950's of "flatness" as the essence of painting. Neither completely material, as with flatness, nor entirely artificial, like a window, a proscenium space is performative, ie it denotes a space in which real, live, actors perform artificial activities. The space of the proscenium is shallow, not flat and not deep, not continuing to an imaginary, illusion of a horizon, and neither drawing attention to the surface of the painting, but rather pointing offstage, to an ostensible "real" behind the masks, in the wings, and behind the curtain. In theatre, the proscenium arch was placed in front of the action, with the audience arrayed in front, facing the stage, and looking *through* the framing device of the proscenium.

David Joselit recently wrote about Jutta Koether's 2009 show at Reena Spaulings, "The exhibition centered on a single work mounted on an angled floating wall—much like a screen—which, as Koether put it, had one foot on and one foot off the raised platform that delineates the gallery's exhibition area, as though caught in the act of stepping onstage.² This effect was enhanced by a vintage scoop light trained on the painting that had been salvaged from The Saint, a famous gay nightclub that officially closed in 1988 largely as a consequence of the AIDS crisis.

In a proscenium theatre, the audience directly faces the stage, which is typically raised several feet above front row audience level, and views the performance through the proscenium "arch". The main stage is the space behind the proscenium arch, often marked by a curtain which can be lowered or drawn closed. The space in front of the curtain is called the "apron". The areas obscured by the proscenium arch and any curtains serving the same purpose (often called legs or tormentors) are called the wings. Any space not viewable to the audiences is collectively referred to as offstage. Proscenium stages range in size from small enclosures to several stories tall.

In general practice, a theatre space is referred to as a "looking in gods eye" any time the audience directly faces the stage, with no audience on any other side, even if there is not a formal proscenium arch over the stage. Because it seems somewhat incongruous to refer to a proscenium theatre when no proscenium arch is present, these theatres are sometimes referred to as "end-on" theatre spaces.