it." Above the sculpture in the museum's neoclassical rotunda hung disembodied smile, an aluminum-and-Plexiglas sign with disco-ball l marquee-lightbulb teeth. It too is titled *Cheshire*, 2008.

As a memorial for lynching victims, *Blossom*, with its silk leaves and tless bark, felt too clean, too pat—especially in comparison to the eo *Cheshire*. A similar imbalance held sway in "Cosmic Voodoo cus," the SculptureCenter show. Here a gigantic red goddess wear- a raffia skirt faced off against a billboard-size version of the now- niliar smile. Accompanied by shattered star-shaped mirrors and a chanical trapeze, these works suggested a sinister carnival, but it all med a bit simplistic. More compelling was *Shake*, 2011, a video shot alvador da Bahia, Brazil, wherein Castillo reprises his shamanic role. he first scene, he walks out of the ocean wearing his red-white-and- e suit, like a vaudevillian Jesus who has completed the Middle Pasage. makes himself up in silver face-paint and goes coffin shopping; at the , he prays beside the sea, carrying a mini version of the grinning sign. en and trickster, he executes somber tasks, but he's having fun.

Perhaps *Shake*'s lightness despite extremity explains the whiff of neyfication in *Blossom*. Certainly something extraordinary levitates *tus*, 2007, at the Brooklyn Museum. A huge glass disc suspended in eel frame, it suggests a gong, though to strike it would be dangerous. e glass is etched with a daisy pattern of long petals. Go close, and h white petal resolves into the infamous 1787 illustration known as iagram of a Slave Ship." I report this reluctantly; it's a spoiler. Better be shocked by the revelation: Even this image can be made pure, like aid to meditation—or innocuous, like a corporate logo. It's a dis- certing combination.

—*Frances Richard*

en Kinmont

LES LIBRARY & SPECIAL COLLECTIONS

he late 1980s, Ben Kinmont began to make "project art." Through rain of Conceptualism more closely aligned with the feminist "main- ance artist" Mierle Laderman Ukeles, who cleaned art galleries in 1970s as performance, than with Joseph Beuys (though Kinmont call his early works "social sculpture"), he executed such actions nviting strangers to his New York home for waffle breakfasts (*Waffles an opening*, 1991–) and sending five bouquets of flowers to the uston nonprofit art center DiverseWorks, one for each week of a up show (*Congratulations*, 1995–). Kinmont devised these projects reate "third sculpture," a term he coined in the early '90s to identify "spaces between," that is, between the "art world and non-art world," "the dominant culture and the subculture," and "me and you," as he told curator Carlos Basualdo in a 2000 interview. To proliferate these "spaces," Kinmont has declared that these projects can be repeated by anyone, with or without his consent.

Kinmont himself revived *Congratulations* last March, this time sending flowers to the Amsterdam-based venue Kunstverein, a "domestic franchise" (so fitting) that had organized "Prospectus," a traveling survey of his output, with each show focusing on a particular aspect of his practice. The exhibition's stop at the Fales Library & Special Collections, Kinmont's first solo show in New York in eight years, concentrated on his work's relationship to archives and began with *Our Contract, or some thoughts on archive ownership and collection*, 1995–2011, a two-paragraph treatise painted directly on a wall. Also available as a Xeroxed handout, the text rendered transparent the terms of ownership and exhibition of his archives—photographs, bills, notes, correspondence, and ephemera that were presented in several vitrines and preserved in neatly tied and stacked boxes. According to the contract, "the archive can never be broken up to sell individual items" and if a change in ownership occurs, the owner or institution must notify the artist or his representative.

Even as the contract seemed a bit antagonistic, it raised a host of intriguing questions. One wondered, for instance, if in demystifying Kinmont's relationship with collectors it threatened the specificity of each project. Furthermore: Is the archive the only way in which to present such radically dematerialized art? And what does it mean to have a contract that establishes ownership and the conditions of display for immaterial artworks that are meant to proliferate, with or without the artist's consent? Finally, does allowing visitors to photocopy whichever works in the archive they wanted, free of charge, impact a collector's proprietary rights?

Kinmont has done his homework. In 1996 he organized "Promised Relations" at New York's AC Project Room, a show of artists' contracts, including Seth Siegelaub's seminal Artist's Reserved Rights Transfer and Sale Agreement from 1971. A year earlier, he established Antinomian Press to publish material about project art; in doing so, he discovered many artists whose work involved exploring issues of labor outside the traditional support systems of the art world, such as Lee Lozano and Christopher D'Arcangelo. In 1998, Kinmont began to cultivate a long-term project to sustain himself: *Sometimes a nicer sculpture is to be able to provide a living for your family*, 1998–, an antiquarian bookselling business that specializes in rare, gastronomy-related tomes. Taking a break from so many short projects has given him time to organize his archives, draft his contract, and, most importantly, play a role in organizing his retrospectives. After the final show, it will be interesting to see what Kinmont does next, whether he will keep working with the contract to seek out a new (a third?) model between viewing and ownership.

—*Lauren O'Neill-Butler*

BOSTON

Mike Mandel and Chantal Zakari

PHOTOGRAPHIC RESOURCE CENTER AT BOSTON UNIVERSITY

Between 1997 and 2010, the collaborative duo Mike Mandel and Chantal Zakari crisscrossed their way through Turkey in search of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, the writer, revolutionary statesman, military officer, and founder of the Republic of Turkey, who died in 1938. Or rather, the artists (who identify themselves as American and Turkish-Levantine, respectively) sought to capture the symbolic power of his

image, which continues to resonate for divergent sectors of the country. With a provocative title suggesting the multiplicity that haunts every proper name, "7 Turkish Artists: Mike Mandel and Chantal Zakari" made visible the paradoxical potency of Atatürk's multivalent likeness in a society in which the voices of secularists, Islamists, nationalists, fascists, and the military all vie to be heard.

To draw out the connection between the former president's omnipresence in the public sphere and his embodiment of often opposing agendas, values, and beliefs, Mandel and Zakari took up various visual strategies and techniques. For example, Atatürk's image looms large in documentary-style black-and-white photographs of city streets, cheesy realist paintings (hackwork outsourced to commercial studios in China) of empty office interiors and women donning headscarves, video montages of military parades and pageants celebrating national holidays, postcards (from the 1950s to the present) bearing Atatürk's visage, translucent resin busts, and a golden death mask. In this constellation of ready-made objects, fabricated artworks, and channels of mediation—and the slippages between them—the artists point to the malleability of the Atatürk icon. Despite its historical connection to the abolition of the sultanate and establishment of the secular state in 1923, the patriarch's countenance operates like a screen that accommodates and propagates numerous ideological projections.

The artists thankfully avoided the pitfalls of a didactic show-and-tell by animating this living archive with their own interventions into the Atatürk myth. The most forceful of these occurred in Ankara in 1997: As Islamists challenged the government's educational policies, Zakari stepped into the street holding a framed portrait of Atatürk while Mandel snapped a sequence of six photos (appearing here as *The Ankara Media Spectacle*, 2011). The attendant display of Turkish newspapers and their shrill headlines—"Here Is the Courageous Girl," "Her Plan to Divide the Country," and "The 'Chantal Plan' Backfired"—represents only a glimpse of the ensuing media spectacle, yet effectively reveals how political acts have become inseparable from the images that give them form and through which they are disseminated.

To examine how this liaison permeates all levels of everyday life, Mandel and Zakari temporarily affixed a portrait of Atatürk to the wall of every hotel room in which they stayed. "The Hotel Project," 1997–2007, a photographic documentation of these interiors, is accompanied by a text that proposes three scenarios that their action could effect: (1) an immediate removal of the photograph by the hotel staff; (2) an "emotional conflict" that prevents the staff from disposing of the image, which, in turn, leads to the room being granted special status; (3) the seamless integration into the existing decor of the image, which, due to its general ubiquity, went unnoticed. Resonating with Lawrence Weiner's *Declaration of Intent*, 1969, this project emphasizes Atatürk's plural condition as an adaptive visual, material, and discursive representation whose particular instantiation depends on its site and sphere of reception. Just as the artists cannot know the full ramifications of their own actions, neither can the long-term symbolic economy of Atatürk's image be foreseen; indeed it remains in a state of permanent potentiality for future acts of speech.

Recently, Mandel and Zakari started recording the proliferation of George Washington iconography across Boston, interviewing a cross section of the populace about his contemporary meaning and publishing their preliminary "findings" in the local newspaper. With the flood of images manufactured to shape public opinion in the current US presidential campaigns, one wonders whether a concerted deployment of America's founding father will make certain enunciations possible and render others outside the limits of speech.

—Nuit Banai

CHICAGO

Bruce Nauman

DONALD YOUNG GALLERY

"For the solipsist reality is not enough. He denies the existence of anything outside the self-enclosed confines of his own mind," Mel Bochner wrote in 1967, addressing the increasing use of serial operations in art. At first glance, Bruce Nauman's recent exhibition at Donald Young Gallery recalls this tendency: Taking the most basic of artistic tools, the hands, Nauman presents four drawings that explicate thirty-one possible combinations of flexed and extended fingers—an open hand, an open hand with the thumb flexed, both the thumb and the index finger flexed, and so on. Projected onto a screen at the center of the gallery was the video *Combinations Described (Chicago)* (all works 2011), in which two hands, across the work's thirteen-minute loop, are shown systematically forming each variation, with a total of thirty-one per hand. Recorded, overlapping voices, those of viewers upon seeing the footage for the first time, hastily call out the ever-changing arrangements: "Right hand, third finger, left hand, first finger," "Right hand, third finger, left hand, second finger," etc. The unusual descriptions—"third" instead of "ring," "first" instead of "index" (although thumbs are referred to as "thumbs")—only reinforce the reference to the "fundamentally parsimonious and systematically self-exhausting" proposals of the 1960s (to quote another of Bochner's 1967 texts).

Bruce Nauma
Hand Combin
of 0, 1 and 2,
pencil on pap
30 x 40".