

absolute openness towards them, in whose measure they have been produced. Some of them are work tools, like « Fluidità Radicale » ('69) and the Headgear of « Odio » ('71). They do not exist if they are not used. In these works the language is metaphor, in the sense that it not only accumulates but also translates experience from one form to another. Our faculties and our extended senses today constitute a unicum of experiences; the awareness of this extendibility of « the idea's thrust » is given to us by Zorio in both these works with the prolonging of the action from the thought to the arm (the imprint left by the action on the hand) or on the forehead (the plexiglass helmet with the writing ODIO impressed on the leather). To this same principle of visual quantification belongs the « Pugno » ('71) (concentration, closure, preparation for a sudden release), a reproduction of a forearm with a clenched fist in phosphorescent wax which, lit intermittently by two 500 Watt bulbs, is « charged with intelligence » and stands out, with a violence concentrated to the maximum, in a dark

room that cannot be approached by the public.

The analysis of the etymology of the word ODIO, in an anthropological-linguistic sense, and in the identification of the word with the action, is also conducted with the writing « Odio » on the wall ('69), obtained, as Zorio himself says, « with armed violence upon the wall » which is gradually stripped down - away with the stucco and plaster - to the bare bricks beneath the axe-blows that carve the letters; or with the insertion, with furious hammer-blows into a heavy lump of lead, of the same word formed by a cable.

In the analysis of the word-image, the « Confine » ('70), meaning the limit of human knowledge or the tragic nature of a limit, Zorio defines « the imaginary line realized with violence ». The words « Natural boundaries do not exist » are visualized as fluorescent writing on the wall, or else as an incandescent thread dividing an environment (and anyone touching it is burnt).

All these works, from 1969-70 up to today, are orientated towards the transfer

of words into action-images and they follow up the early period of his work which was aimed essentially at displaying energy and dynamics as processes in a constant self-reflection.

In these early works - from the « Chair » and « Bed » in 1966 to the « Leads » and « Lights » in 1968 (light bulbs inserted in two blocks of cement that contrast with one another), to the « Cow's skin » in 1969 - the materials, emptied of any technological function, are used in their chemical reaction, or in their obtuseness, as opposition, and as potential tension or energy.

« My problem », explains Zorio, « has always been working with energy and not matter. I have never been fond of materials; I have always done things that were useful to me at that moment. I am only interested in those elements that can be fully and as closely adapted as possible to the idea. Work that adheres to the whole of reality - subjective, objective, conscious, unconscious; external or internal. A revealing of the living reality of things ».

Mirella Bandini

Fly Concorde to the Pompidou Museum

INTERVIEW WITH PONTUS HULTEN

The Pompidou Museum is to be officially opened in January 1977 with a major exhibition of Marcel Duchamp's works. Why Duchamp, and how has this exhibition been envisaged?

Because as I see it Duchamp is the most important and at the same time the least known artist here, and because it will set the tone, you might say, for Beaubourg's future activities. We shall not be concerned so much with the fetishism of objects, paintings or sculptures as with a broader, more intriguing activity which will also be more closely involved with society. In the first part of the Duchamp exhibition there will simply be an introduction to the man himself; and then there will be all his work, with particular attention to the lesser known periods like Fauvism and the cubist paintings, and with the **Large Glass**, of course, as the main object. Then, the third part will be concerned with sources of inspiration - chess, esotericism, etc. The difference between this and other Duchamp shows is that we are treating him from a more European viewpoint than the current American anecdotism does.

We are relying on getting the whole of Duchamp's oeuvre from the United States, except of course, for the original **Large Glass**, which is untransportable, and the Philadelphia room which cannot be moved.

What is your broad exhibition programme policy?

Beaubourg's initial programmes are built on a sort of diptych. The first big exhibition deals with the relations between Paris and New York. The second is dedicated to relations between Paris and Eastern Europe, that's to say, with what happened in Leningrad, Moscow and also Berlin. These are two major theme-exhibitions on the role performed by Paris in the art of this century. To do this we felt it was necessary to show one or two key artists on a large scale. Thus we have had already the Picabia exhibition at the Grand Palais and are following this up with the Duchamp show, these being the two key personalities involved in trans-Atlantic relations. And as regards our other main theme - the Moscow-Berlin-Paris exhibition - we have already put on a Majakowsky exhibi-

tion and are doing another one on Malevitch, and also on Tatlin, we hope, prior to the main exhibition itself. All this, together with other exhibitions, forms a system that will keep Beaubourg busy for a year or two.

Are specialists from the various countries concerned giving their services for the major theme-exhibitions?

Yes, they are. I have just come back from Moscow where a group of Soviet experts are working on the organisation of the Moscow-Berlin-Paris exhibition which we have already been preparing for a year now.

So the Pompidou Museum is setting itself up as an imposing European and international organisation reaching beyond the French cultural borders.

Yes indeed. This is the very purpose of the Beaubourg operation. I think the lack of an institution like the Centre has been felt in Europe, due also to the influence that New York has gained in the situation of the past years. This can be important. When Beaubourg is criticised for being too big and too centralized,

people forget that it is not at a level of Paris or France but rather of Europe that we need substantial instruments and means of research for transmitting the importance of artistic experiences. In Paris there may be a large museum, but you know that in New York there are three museums for modern and contemporary art.

Can you give me an outline of the programme for the Paris-New York exhibition?

The main point of the show is the relationship between France and the United States in the field of art. It is, of course, based on painting, sculpture, drawing and photography, but will also be extended to fashion, literature, architecture, cinema, dance, etc. The arc of time covered will be from 1906 up to more or less recent years. In other words, it starts with Stieglitz and the early exchanges which were still personal, when there were still no galleries or centres to establish these things; and it was Stieglitz who invited the first European artists to his photographer's gallery. And it also starts from Gertrude Stein's arrival on

the scene and her installation in Paris. Next come the Armony Show initiative in New York, Picabia's and later Duchamp's journeys to America, and the influence of cubism there. After the war, in 1918, Americans began to arrive in Paris, and Man Ray was one of the first; then there was the influence of Surrealism in New York, followed by the installation of Mondrian, Léger and the surrealists in New York. In short, all those adventures that are in part - I say in part - the story of art in this century. The choice of paintings closely follows the course of events throughout this epoch and recovers precisely those works known to have played a definite role then. If we choose a Léger - an artist who played an important part in these relations - it isn't going to be just any Léger, but that same Léger which was in that particular exhibition. The exhibition is not enormous; it will include not more than about 250 works. So it will be a fairly small but extremely precise collection. Around the central exhibition other activities and less ambitious exhibitions will be held, dealing with parallel points of interest, as I was

telling you, in music, the theatre, etc. The exhibition will close, I believe, at any rate for the moment, on the theme of Brancusi's influence over a number of American artists, for example Andre and Serra. It will end with this striking fact of an artist belonging almost to the turn of the century inspiring young artists who are forty-five today.

Lastly, we shall add one or two final points to the exhibition. With the Guggenheim museum there will probably be a small video exhibition which will open in New York and Paris on the same day and at the same time. I believe this will be the first time that two museums have opened the same show at the same time. All that is scheduled for mid-May 1977, immediately after the Duchamp exhibition.

Simultaneously, numerous parallel events will be held at Beaubourg: a large construction in the forum, the film library, and so forth. It's going to be a cultural city in which you can choose what interests you most, and rather than the individual events it will be interesting to see what happens among these different things simultaneously.

Christo the Running Discussion

The discussion

We invited for a discussion on the Christo **Running Fence**, **Massimo Asnagli**, artist, **Alanna Heiss**, director of the Institute for Art and Urban Resources, NY, **Richard Nonas**, sculptor, **David Ross**, video curator of the Long Beach Museum of Art.

What was your experience of the « Running Fence »?

Ross. I went up feeling quite cynical about it, an attitude that I shared with a lot of people. I thought it would be a grand work that had got out of control. I took a flight over it and I must admit that I was very impressed by it. It was impossible not to see the real elegance and beauty of the work. There are issues however, around the work, equally significant than the work itself. The work cannot be considered only as a formal statement. It is too involved with the communities living there and with a series of political decisions to exist just as a formal statement.

For example there was a real difference between the way workers were treated and the art people. It should be established which share of the comfort

and enjoyment is to be returned to the workers working at an artist's project. All these issues were raised but not clarified and formed a kind of cloud around the project and its realization.

What do you feel about the fact that « Running Fence » is only there for a short time, as for other works of Christo, like the « Australia Coast » or « Valley Curtain »?

Ross. It's part of the work. It's meant to be a temporary thing. If it were not it would hurt the feelings of all that don't want a great China wall across the country. The experience of it was wonderful but how many can do it? In a way the work is supposed to be enjoyed by a second generation people as information, through films, photos, drawings and I have a hard time dealing with that. If I had to deal only with information I don't think I could overcome the original cynicism. It is very ambiguous. Either you've never seen it and deal with information or you've seen it and fall in love with it. The conclusion is **double face**. Perhaps this was his intent, to create a situation impossible to be sorted out.

Heiss. There's an incredible situation anti-Christo in New York. The critics ignore him or easily put him down. They think it is terribly unchic and unfashionable even to discuss the Christo project. Before going to California I met friend, a sculptor, in the street who asked me what was I going to California for. I said to see « Running Fence ». And he « You're kidding, why would you want to do a thing like that? » No, I won't say who it was. But if I had said that I was going to shop in Bloomingdale's...

Nonas. He wouldn't have answered that way. People mention Christo to me and they expect my reaction to be just like what Richard Serra's was. They expect me but I don't want to do that. But in the same time all my defence of Christo becomes an attack on a kind of snottiness that says that the only interesting art is this really cold, intelligent, etc. My defence is that Christo as a man and as an artist is hard working and serious and good at what he does and this is what the critics are not ready to admit.

Why not?

Nonas. Because their definition of serious art is a very narrow one and does