Two are Better than One: Notes on the Interview and Techniques of Multiplication

Julia Gelshorn

Two Are Better than One:
Notes on the Interview and Techniques of Multiplication

Julia Gelshorn

In his unfinished text *De l'entretien*, published in 1997, the French philosopher Louis Marin remarked that every written conversation must be regarded as the fiction of an oral conversation, even if it has actually taken place between voice and ear and has thus been transposed from hearing into reading. Marin uses the notion of fiction in the original sense of the term, as a kind of "forming" or "modeling" in which the time of writing and reading becomes included in the signs out of which the fiction is made. Through forming and modeling, the conversation is transformed from the preceding dual-speech act into an infinitely repeatable piece of language. According to Marin, the act of transcription actually "operates" this fiction, for it appears as the immediate execution of the ephemeral "reality" of voice and listening in the dialogue.[1]

Two aspects of Marin's observations are crucial to the history and structure of the artist interview. On the one hand, Marin mentions how the temporal prolongation of the act of transcribing and reading a conversation recalls, and endlessly repeats, the past time of the oral dialogue. Marin's stress on the link between the ephemeral utterance of a "dual" voice and its infinite recurrence as language provides an indirect, structural reason for the ongoing fascination with the spoken word in the art field and for the striking proliferation of published interviews, conversations, and round tables.[2] On the other hand, his stress on the fictitious character of any written conversation explains why even faked interviews remain so fascinating. Yet first and foremost, it also reminds us of the fact that the interview, arguably the most popular medium of mass communication, is always a construction to be analyzed.[3]

The form of the interview is omnipresent today, and not only as a research method. As an instrument of diagnosis in the field of medicine, as interrogation during investigations, police examinations, or questionings in court, and finally, as a common survey practice of market research and opinion polling, one finds the interview form as a procedure in professional contexts.[4] Even if the transitions between the journalistic, scientific, and artistic interview are fluid, the sociologist Ulf Wuggenig has noted that the social use of the interview is highly field-specific.[5] Concerning the project-oriented artistic world, which Wuggenig describes as an "inverted world" (in reference to Pierre Bourdieu), the journalistic and analytically qualitative interview clearly prevails over the still dominant standardized interview of the "outside world," with its connotation of bureaucracy.[6] As he points out, though, the qualitative interview includes a wide range of methods, reaching from antitheoretical variants to theory-based forms. These include phenomenological approaches that remain on the surface of subjective representations as well as structuralist, psychoanalytic, or hermeneutic approaches that seek to go into "depth," to break with common sense in the interest of scientific objectivization in order to uncover a hidden meaning. Rhea Anastas has rightly remarked, however, that scholarly interviews and interviews conducted with clear critical methods are rare exceptions in the art world.[7]

Indeed, the artist interview must be considered as a special case. The artist interview promises to uncover a hidden personality as well as to give access to the secrets of a work of art, thus appearing to address directly our desire for meaning. Taking this into account, it is significant that knowledge of the intentional fallacy (which arose within the context of the declaration of the "death of the author"[8]) or the critical or ironic withdrawal of the neo-avant-garde artists themselves (which arose from the attempt to suppress subjectivity) have not been able to diminish the popularity of the interview in the art field. On the contrary, even when we know that the pretensions of the interview to intimacy and spontaneity are often feigned or constructed in the editing process, and even when we know about artists' and interviewers' self-fashioning and role-playing,[9] the hope for uncovering hidden truths beneath the surface persists. Johanna Burton and Lisa Pasquariello have compared the logic of the interview to the psychoanalytic conversation between analyst and analysand. In the interview, as they put it, "the fantasy of veracity, of mastery, and of knowledge circulates freely between two subjects, each of whom relies on rather incongruent, even illogically constructed, imaginings of the other."[10] Considering the parts played by fantasy and desire in the interview form, it becomes patently clear that the artist interview should not be taken at face value as a source for the understanding of a work of art. It needs to be analyzed in itself, taking into account our desire for access to the artist as well as the artist's desire for access on our part. The overwhelming proliferation of the artist interview resides within the larger frame of the interview, generally speaking. In the special context of the art world, the interview must also be understood as an artistic product in itself.[11] As its own "work of art," the interview should be related to other genres of art writing on the one hand and to contemporary strategies of art on the other hand.[12]

Although the genre as such, and especially its use within the discipline of art history, is still underexamined, several attempts have been made during the last two decades to investigate the history and functions of the artist interview.[13] Three main functions have been pointed out, and they have been studied in terms of their specific cases and contexts: the legitimation and reflection of the artist's (more or less au-

tonomous) role within a constantly changing social field; the resistance to traditional genres of discourse and art critique through the format of the dialogue; and finally, the marketing of the artist as person and brand, which is especially demanded by dealers, curators, and collectors. All of these functions deny the oral dialogue any supposed immediacy, and they indicate that the growing number of interviews in the art field only increases the need for critical analysis of the genre. As the artist John Miller has pointed out, the highly networked and globalized system the art world has become seems to demand a profusion of discourse in order to legitimate ever increasing numbers of works of art. And he argues that these legitimating processes achieve the most success when they appear under the guise of communication. The artist interview not only holds out the promise of direct information, but it also spans demands for recognition— from unestablished, charismatic challengers to reaffirmations of recognized value from institutional authorities.[14] Miller's view contributes to the assertion that the artist interview rests complexly between the procedures and functions of art criticism, artists' writing, and the broader category of writing about art. Drawing on this connection, Gwen Allen and Anastas suggest that the artist interview is currently understood as an "emblematic site" through which to consider the present conditions of criticism in contemporary art. These authors comprehend the popularity of the genre since the 1960s as a symptom of a crisis in criticism and as a rejection of the dominant models of modernist art criticism in order to enable an ongoing dialogue about meaning.[15] The artist-generated conversation can especially be understood as a mode of artists' writing alternative to formalism's verifiable empiricism and its fixing on objects and their experience. Yet as Anastas stresses, the liberating and political functions of the artist interview should not be idealized, since this is also a site in which the collision between taking liberties and assuming authority, between self-fashioning and complicity, can be experienced.[16] Andy Warhol's famous strategy of boycotting interviews is the best proof of this collision, in that it demonstrates an aversion to instrumentalization and at the same time embraces marketing and celebrity.

It is certainly true, then, that the format of the interview must be situated within a larger discursive field that includes artists' writing as well as the modernist and postmodernist production of theory as a whole, as I myself have noted elsewhere.[17] There is much to learn, however, from focusing on the specific structure of the interview as a form of conversation, and on the strategies and techniques of multiplication that underpin the format of the interview on different levels. The interview is a dual medium in the sense of a mutual oral conversation, and it is also a doubling medium in the sense that the written interview multiplies a onetime speech, transforming it into an open-ended piece of language. The current multiplication of the interview may well be the logical consequence of this idea of an ongoing process, multiplying voices, narratives, and histories and turning the interview and communication itself into a product.

Multiplying Voices: From Dual Discourse to Network
When analyzing the structure of conversations, Marin starts from the assumption of a "dual," meaning a paradoxical

subject, neither singular nor plural but twofold. As for the written transposition of such a "dual discourse," Marin remarks that the dual subject is turned into a duality or a double: two personae become firmly established as speech holders who are opposed to each other.[18] On this account, he speculates that the pure system of language (*la langue*) always longs for the spoken word and that every conversation is based on a theoretical contract. This is the case because the desire to actually express language is formalized and established in the "dual" subject that precedes every dialogue.[19]

The fascination of the interview might be traced back to the fiction of this "dual," in which the personae are not yet separated or opposed but hold a dual speech. Certainly, a comparison of the structure of "conversation" and "interview" is problematic, since the clear separation of interviewer and interviewee actually contradicts the idea of a "dual." But I would maintain that the general interest of the artist interview lies not only in the idea of the dialectical figure of the dialogue reaching back to antiquity but also, and more importantly, in the spoken word, the *dialogus* ("through words"), and, thus, the dual voice.[20] Burton and Pasquariello's comparison of the artist interview with the psychoanalytic conversation actually seems to confirm this ideal of a dual discourse at which the interview aims.[21]

Marin's characterization of the voice as a "dual" can also be found in current theories of cultural studies that locate the voice at the core of the humanities and that study and interpret the stable objects left behind by the ephemeral utterance of the voice.[22] In these theories, the voice is described as a twofold phenomenon located on a threshold between the sensory and the sense making, the physical and the psychic, the indexical and the symbolic: the voice is the distinctive sign of a person and, at the same time, the holder of conventionalized signs.[23] In this function, the artist's voice comes across as providing ideal access to the inseparable unit of life and work. And, what is more, the voice is a "dual" event in that it relies on the copresence of actor and recipient; its effectiveness necessarily depends on the fact that it is heard. The recipient perceives, then, an ephemeral sound along with the indexical trace of an individual, as well as a social body.[24] The dual character of the voice also gives it its own dynamism in that the voice can subvert or transgress the sense produced by a speech. Finally, the voice is as much individual as it is social, so that it can emphatically unite and divide. It is the "action" of the speaker and, at the same time, the "passion" of the ear that records it; therefore, sending and receiving happen almost simultaneously.[25] The transcription of an interview loses this simultaneity, transposing it, as Marin has noted, into a duality of two opposed personae. This is one reason for the fetishism of the artist's word: the persisting gap between voice and written text, and, in addition, between the artist's person and work, is therefore covered over in that "the voice as a fetish object consolidates on the verge of the void," as Mladen Dolar has generally put it in his book *A Voice and Nothing More*.[26]

The other reason for the fetishization of the artist's voice is a very simple one. In his study on the "complex present" of the art world of 1984, Lawrence Alloway observed that the system of art had developed more and more into a network in which art galleries, museums, universities, and publishers had

1 First page of typescript of an interview between Dieter Schwarz and Gerhard Richter, later published as Schwarz, "Über Aquarelle und verwandte Dinge: Gerhard Richter im Gespräch mit Dieter Schwarz, Köln, 26. Juni 1999," in *Gerhard Richter: Aquarelle/Watercolors 1964–1997*, ed. Schwarz, exh. cat., Düsseldorf: Richter Verlag, 1999, 5–16 (copy provided by Schwarz)

2 Last page of typescript of an interview between Schwarz and Richter, later published as Schwarz, "Über Aquarelle und verwandte Dinge" (copy provided by Schwarz)

all become parts of the knowledge industry, producing signifiers whose signifieds had become works of art, artists, periods, and so forth. Although decentralized, this system considers the artist as the essential figure and it assigns him a privileged role, since he is the product on which the system depends.[27] Alloway perceived that

> one aspect of the enhanced social status of artists has been an increased attention to their words. The typical verbal form of the Abstract Expressionist generation was the statement, essentially a first-person expression putting succinctly fundamental ideas about art. It is summarizing and authentic in that it originates from the same source as the art to which it relates. In the '60s the statement was supplemented, maybe supplanted, by the interview which preserves the virtue of the first person, but on a more conversational level.[28]

While the artist as "product" remains a focus of the art world, the form of the dialogue echoes the process-oriented models of artistic production of the neo-avant-gardes. Both

"forms" insist that the meaning of a work of art, no less than the act of interpretation, is never finished.[29] As a result, the interview presents itself explicitly as an open form of duality or even multiplicity at the same time that it conserves the fiction of a dual voice.

This fiction can best be illustrated by the lavish editing processes of artist interviews in which the authentic voice sometimes turns out to be a complete fake. A paradigmatic case is the interview conducted in 1999 by Dieter Schwarz, the director of the Winterthur Kunstmuseum in Switzerland, with the German artist Gerhard Richter.[30] What in the catalog appears to be the transcription of a conversation between art historian and artist turns out to be a carefully thought-out construction. The interview had been done on the occasion of the exhibition of Richter's watercolor paintings, and the typescript was subjected to many revisions.[31] The transcription of the original conversation was faxed several times between Richter and Schwarz, and while Schwarz changed some formulations in his questions, Richter made extensive corrections (Figs. 1, 2). As one can see from the typescript, almost all of Richter's original statements have been changed or completely replaced by others. Some passages were cut out without replacement, making it necessary to create new transitions. Most interesting for our context is the fact that Richter, in his written corrections, faked the immediacy of his oral speech. He composed very simple sentences and gave them the character of spontaneous ideas and memories of anecdotes. What appears to be an authentic conversation is actually a carefully planned and progressively constructed prod-

uct that, in the end, both interviewer and interviewee could support.

Considering such strategies, which are by no means unique, Alloway's allusion—that the failure to interpret has left us with a backlog of unevaluated interviews—becomes clear.[32] As the case of Schwarz and Richter reveals, we have to understand the interview as a collaborative work. Interviewer and interviewee can be seen as building a special case of what Oskar Bätschmann, in reference to the painter and the art historian, has called "the community of argumentation [*Argumentationsgemeinschaft*]."[33] If we take into account, as Anastas has pointed out, that the redefinition of artistic competence toward intellectual labor has had the effect of expanding the number and types of demands art institutions place on artists, resulting in a new collaborative role for the artist in the practices that had formerly rested in the domain of the dealer, critic, and curator, then we even need to ask in which ways critics and artists comply.[34]

I would therefore push Alloway's point even further: not only are we left with a mass of unevaluated interviews but we are also confronted with anthologies and series of interviews that explicitly replace the unique conversation with a collection and, in the process, substitute quantity for evaluation.[35] Do we have to consider the countless series of artist interviews and, in addition, the artist-to-artist interviews as another fetish that covers the frustration with a format that turns out to be more opaque than we expect it to be?[36] I would guess that this is only one side of the coin. The other side of the coin seems to testify to a contrary endeavor: instead of fetishizing the single author and his or her unique statements, the collections and series of interviews try, instead, to relativize the single voice of the artist as part of a network in which multiple voices are confronted with each other in order to achieve a complex discourse.

This effort becomes obvious in Hans Ulrich Obrist's *Interarchive*, a project presented in 2002 in the Lüneburg Kunstraum, Germany, in which Obrist exhibited his private archive as well as a memorial board listing the names of the artists he had already interviewed.[37] The alphabetical list of names displays a decentralized multiplicity of voices, and it also explicitly links them to the curator's archival practice, thus assembling them together as participants of an open-ended collaboration. While Obrist insists that he wants only to be the catalyst and generator of impulses in his interviews,[38] the exhibition of his own archive—with its claim to present and promote a collaboration—makes clear that he considers himself an essential part of this network. Collaborative production of knowledge here certainly ends up in a complicity between artists and institutional expectations represented by the curator.

One therefore needs to ask whether the idea of community presented here is less democratic and political than it is spectacular, since this idea lacks any critical reflection on a form of complicity perfectly in line with market conditions. As Wuggenig has argued, the spreading of the individualistic interview in the media corresponds with the tendency toward the personalization of the personality cult characteristic of the culture industry.[39] Obrist's network, performed in the interviews, therefore builds up temporary platforms of conversation, but it does not understand them as collaborative

practices in order to subvert the spectacle of the cult of personality. On the contrary, as a "catalyst," he shows little interest in negotiating auctorial positions and productive models. Instead of pursuing the dialogue as a form of controversial discussion, the interviews enter the conflict-free zone of relational aesthetics and perform sociability as a democratic model beyond contradiction.[40] As a consequence, the multiplication of voices results in "a Babelesque confusion of tongues" at the same time that it produces collaboration and sociability as a good in itself.[41] The interview thus turns out to be the ideal embodiment of that intermediate space to which its etymology refers: the *entre vue*, the "short seeing in between," still recalls the model of the dual discourse. In *Interarchive*, as in Obrist's whole interview project, though, this dual dialogue is transformed into a many-voiced memory that relies on the ideological category of the "in between" as a fundamental quality of the relational and, supposedly, nonhierarchical network.[42]

Multiplying Narratives: The Interview as "Contact Zone"

Obrist's practice is based less on analysis of the interview than on material that speaks for itself. It is the "reader" who bears the responsibility for interpreting the material. In this respect, his project resembles a general tendency in the artistic uses of interview material. Wuggenig has argued that this tendency to present results in weak analyses, in entirely unanalyzed forms, and without comment arises from an inclination to maintain the interview's distinctiveness from scientific studies and field-specific conventions.[43] Indeed, one could add that artists who make extensive use of interviews, for example, the African American artist Renée Green, follow models from ethnography and use methods of oral history. However, in an attempt to create open-ended and multiperspectival narratives, they present the interviews almost without comment.[44]

Instead of merely collecting interviews and creating an all-embracing archive of oral history, as Obrist does, Green uses the tool of oral history in order to examine specific social, political, and historical constellations. The interview is the crucial instrument in this procedure, not only as a research method but also as narrative material included in her installations, either in the form of hours of videotaped conversations or in fragmented montages with found footage, filmed sequences, quotations, and so on (Fig. 3).[45] Her artwork is dedicated to fields as different as hip-hop or electronic music, black politics, personal and artistic genealogies, or forgotten figures and places in history. The theoretical framework to which Green's works refer pertains to questions of identity politics in relation to postcolonialism, gender issues, and subjectivity, but also to an engagement with a wider discourse about the role of the archive and of history.[46]

"Who owns history? Who can represent its complexity?" asks Green in her video *Partially Buried Continued* (1999), attesting to her ongoing preoccupation with possibilities of representing complex identities and power relations.[47] Her view of the network as an appropriate form of presentation for a nonhierarchical, participatory narrative is demonstrated by the diagrammatic visualizations of names, places, and events as narrative strands of knots and lines in her notes, as well as by the transfer of these connections into the config-

3 Renée Green, video stills from *Wavelinks*, installation, 2002–4, 7 octagonal units, each with TV monitor and DVD player, 1 video as the sound source. Baltimore Museum of Art (artwork courtesy of the artist and Free Agent Media; photograph from *Renée Green, Ongoing Becomings: Retrospective 1989–2009*, 129)

uration of individual installations or into the apparatus of entire exhibitions.[48] Making connections for Green means to continually redetermine geography and chronology. In so doing, her analysis of art and politics deconstructs the significant antithesis of exclusion and inclusion and creates a place that is neither within nor without but that keeps the theme of positioning, and thus of identity, in view. Many of her artworks raise the issue of a dynamic "gap," an "intermediate space," which Homi Bhabha, one of the main theorists of postcolonialism, has also called the "third space," in which identity is negotiated in a continuous process.[49] In Green's case, the interview as a dual or intersubjective discourse could be regarded as an allegory of such a space of negotiation. With reference to the terminology of Mary Louise Pratt, a linguist of Latin American languages, Green herself had invited artists and critics to participate in "negotiations in the contact zone" on the occasion of a symposium held in 1994.[50] The notion of the "contact zone," in Pratt's critical theory, defines a space of colonial encounters, a temporal and spatial copresence of subjects that had been geographically and historically separated before and whose encounter produces a mingling of languages.[51] Green's interviews, and their presentation in the context of complex installations, can be interpreted as "contact zones," in the sense that they create provisional and temporary encounters of different subjects in the dual speech. The encounter therefore includes both—those being interviewed and those listening to their voices and creating their own narrations out of the material.

What remains is the radically decentralized narration and boundless connectivity of installations building "actor-networks" of personal, textual, and material testimonies of history.[52] The exhibition visitors are as much participants as they are isolated spectators and listeners confronted with an overwhelming mass of interview statements, anecdotes, everyday objects, cultural products, texts, and other media. In reassembling the public of her exhibitions around screens and making them listen to interviews and other narrations mostly via headphones, Green generates both isolation and sociability of the participants (Fig. 4). The installations, in their conception as aesthetic laboratories, come to resemble similar projects of relational aesthetics, such as Obrist's 1999 curatorial project *Laboratorium* in the city of Antwerp, which aimed to stage the relations between a network of scientists, artists, dancers, and writers scattered across the urban territory.[53] However, I would maintain that Green's work is less interested in collaborative production in the direct sense and more with addressing an "emancipated spectator."[54] By making the public experience the limits of community and sociability and by demanding far too much in presenting video-

taped and reading materials that would take weeks to listen to and read, she insists on inequality, difference, and division. At the same time, she directly addresses the problem of testimony by always explicitly connecting seemingly "objective" information to subjective and poetic narrations and by revealing fiction as a necessary aspect of subjectivity.

The protagonists of Green's narratives of diverse cultures, genders, and times are thereby given a voice. They lay claim to individuality, context, and history, but they do not take an active role in the artwork's composition. Nevertheless, applying Jacques Rancière's concept of "indifference" to Green's narrative techniques makes apparent that the voiceless and invisible have the possibility to intervene in the commonality, to alter its sensory division by speaking, by being heard and being seen. With Green the share of the dispossessed (within the discourse at least) can be understood, according to the double meaning of the French word *partage* pointed out by Rancière, as an act of "participation" in which social "divisions" neither disappear nor dissolve but instead become visible.[55] By reflecting this, Green also deals with the common reproach against social scientists that they are complicit in the forms of "the interview society" through which accounts of "experience" and revelations of a "private" emotional life are potentially expected of any societal member, and are actually expected of anyone accorded the status of celebrity. As the sociologists Paul Atkinson and David Silverman have argued, the widespread misuse of interview-derived narratives means that the data are too often treated as if personal accounts granted the analyst direct access to a realm of the personal that is not available through other means, and that categories such as "experience" are treated unproblematically.[56] Green's conversations, in contrast, correspond to the format of the "understanding" interview described by the French sociologist Jean-Claude Kaufmann, in which the focus lies on the interviewee while the researcher simultaneously acts in a flexible and modest way.

Instead of collecting data, the "understanding" interview functions as "a tool to access social mechanisms that themselves can be regarded as tools to develop new theoretical concepts."[57] Sociological "understanding," according to Bourdieu's term, thus claims that both subjective understanding and the subjective order of things, as well as the unconscious and semiconscious effects of social forces, are taken into account.[58] Green's interest in the subjective order of things is, of course, also grounded in Michel Foucault's critical theory and can, more specifically, be read in the context of new historicism and its basis in the ethnography and anthropology of Clifford Geertz.[59] New historicism's textile metaphor seems to be especially fundamental to Green's

4 Green, *Wavelinks*, installation view, Galeria Filomena Soares, Lisbon, 2004. Baltimore Museum of Art (artwork courtesy of the artist and Free Agent Media; photograph from *Renée Green, Ongoing Becomings*, 128)

interest in the interweaving of heterogeneous anecdotes and narratives, thereby creating "counterhistories."[60] In Green's artwork, the dialogic resonance between texts of new historicism is transposed to a dialogic structure between the artist and her interview partners as well as to the contact zones of her installations. Both Stephen Greenblatt's new historicism and Green's multiperspectival narratives thus uncover a poetics of culture and a textuality of history that, in Green's case, is mainly delivered through the interview, which makes the speechless speak.

Multiplying Interviews: Communication as Product

Whereas Green's insistence on the subjective voice refers back to methodological and theoretical discussions of oral history, critical theory, and identity politics since the 1970s,[61] Warhol's preoccupation with the interview resulted from a completely different situation. His famous withdrawals as interviewee, indifferently affecting not to know anything about his own motivations or ideas, must be understood as an attempt to radically suppress subjectivity and to minimize any subjective voice or personal experience underlying his working and acting. Representation of the subjective voice is therefore as much refused in his interviews as it is in his silk-screen prints. Just as his silk-screen prints were conceived as surfaces onto which the outside world inscribed itself through mechanical reproduction, his "mechanical" behavior in the interviews built up a surface for projections from outside. This is not to say, however, that the passivity of this technique produced no meaning at all; it emphasized instead the phenomenological character of the event and of the media onto which it was recorded. Sebastian Egenhofer has lately characterized the relation of Warhol's works of art to the outside world as a form of "inversion," a turning inside

out: the picture is no longer intentionally conceived by the author but randomly "fixed" onto the surface by the technical production process. Inevitably, the picture enters into a relation with the environment in which it competes with other works and mass-media images. Production of meaning is thus the effect of a reflecting surface that mechanically reproduces and multiplies images and passively "shows" traces of the working process and its tools.[62] The represented motifs—Coca-Cola bottles, celebrities, or car accidents—function as images or labels for Warhol's work, and even if they can be interpreted in this or that way,[63] the work itself is not devoted to the real subject it represents; conversely, it borrows the motif's visibility and semantic impact.[64] In the same way, Warhol's interview technique can be described as a passive borrowing of subjects and ideas mentioned by the interviewer and accepted or rejected ("recorded" or "erased") by Warhol with short answers such as "Yes" or "No" or "I don't know."[65] In a famous interview with Gretchen Berg, Warhol made this idea of a passive borrowing explicit: "I always feel that my words are coming from behind me, not from me. The interviewer should just tell me the words he wants me to say and I'll repeat them after him. I think that would be so great because I'm so empty I just can't think of anything to say."[66] His indifferent behavior imitates the reflective surface of his pictures: he reacts mechanically, while the contents of questions and answers function as image or label for the artist, whose personality remains opaque. Still, in both cases, the mechanical process of silk-screen print and interview ironically creates traces of expression, be it the random spots and irregularities of his prints, be it the inadvertent or supposed insights into his intimate and personal life. These mistakes are not only to be considered as the collateral damage of mechanization, but they also seem to be the cynical by-

product of Warhol's inverted relation to a world in which human beings have acquired the properties of industrially manufactured commodities, while machines suddenly appear humanoid, as Stefan Neuner has pointed out.[67] Warhol's passive and indifferent mode of mechanization refuses every psychological or bodily dimension of artistic production and thereby seems to mirror the production procedures of commodities in our consumer society.

The same can be said about his practice as interviewer for his own magazine *Inter/View*. As Miller reports, Warhol hired high schoolers to do the transcription of his taped interviews, and he decided to retain all their mistakes. Like the mistakes produced by the "machine" in his silk-screen prints, the errors produced by the high schoolers reintroduced a human and lively, quasiexpressive trace into the mechanized process of recording. This does not mean that authorship was simply lost. Rather, Warhol's claim, "My mind is like a tape recorder with one button: erase," is a direct allusion to a new conception of authorship and subjectivity beyond the norm,[68] although he actually did not erase but simply let his recorder run.[69] Miller compares this way of recording to André Breton's Surrealist ideal of automatic writing, with technology doing the automation, and to Truman Capote's praise of Jack Kerouac's "typewriting" instead of "writing," which produced a comparable "stream of consciousness" and "sense of real time."[70] I would maintain, however, that the Surrealist automation process served only to uncover an "inside" in the form of the unconscious, whereas Warhol's concept of artistic subjectivity replaces it with a "technological unconscious." Miller rightly draws attention to the "opacity" of this procedure, which signals resistance to the transparency of the message, but he also observes its conventionalization in the early 1970s by the introduction of Warhol's notion of "art as business."[71] To this, I would argue that the residual revelations of Warhol's approach, and his resistance to the market, automatically functioned to reflect the other side of the coin: by insisting on the surface of painting and person and by showing that there is no depth and no memory, he demonstrated the absurdity of the sociological idea of "understanding"—be it of a painting's or a person's interiority. An "in-depth interview" with Warhol therefore turned out to be a paradox.[72]

At the same time, Warhol allowed the public to project any desire onto him, presenting himself (and his paintings) openly as a kind of fetish. This commodification and branding logic also revealed itself through the "quasi underground-feel"[73] of his magazine *Inter/View* and in his films. Be it the front page of the first issue of *Inter/View* in 1969 or the passive camera view of Edie Sedgwick's body in *Poor Little Rich Girl* in 1965, the technological look onto half-naked female bodies literally revealed to what extent Warhol's mechanized "counteraesthetic" itself became a product to be commercially exploited.[74] The collapse of any resistance to the market was thus no more than the logical consequence of Warhol's mechanical turning of artworks and people (including himself) into ready-mades, that is, into industrially manufactured objects. In this sense, the consequential development of his magazine *Inter/View* into a pure lifestyle and gossip magazine directly follows Warhol's embrace of celebrity and lacks only his ambivalence between affirmation and analysis.

Isabelle Graw has analyzed Warhol's ambivalent networking activities, as well as his instrumentalization of formerly professional and private activities, as a paradoxical imitation and subversion of the nascent celebrity culture in the context of a "post-Fordist-condition" in which "life" and "work" become indistinguishable.[75] She refers to theorists such as Antonio Negri and Michael Hardt, who have argued that under our biopolitical regime, the production of capital amounts to the reproduction of social life.[76] One could add with Paolo Virno that in the course of the assertion of immaterial labor as the principal form of production, communication itself has become the "reigning productive force."[77]

Warhol cynically revealed that the artist's discourse and communication were going to be commercially exploited as much as every other product in consumer society. Yet strangely enough, in the 1990s the theory of relational aesthetics claimed to actually replace the commodity fetish of the artwork by subordinating objects to the social and relational dimensions of art, and subsequently to strategies and techniques of communication and information. As Nicolas Bourriaud notes in his much discussed book *Relational Aesthetics*, "what [the artist] produces, first and foremost, is relations between people and the world."[78] As seen above, art's sociability is therefore the principal object or work of so-called relational art. This realized utopianism—of art as a supposedly direct form of nonreified life and community—has made relational aesthetics resonate with the emergence of anticapitalist movements since the 1990s. As Stewart Martin has shown, relational aesthetics in this context presented itself as the manifesto for a new political art confronting the service economies of informational capitalism. In contrast to that, Martin has convincingly demonstrated that this utopianism must actually be read as a naive mimesis or aestheticization of novel forms of capitalist exploitation. In drawing attention to profound limitations in Bourriaud's conception of art as a form of social exchange, Martin has been able to explain why relational aesthetics is so "helplessly reversible into an aestheticisation of capitalist exchange."[79]

A similar problem can be perceived in regard to other poststudio art practices. Brian Holmes has remarked in this context that some poststudio art can be seen as fatally involved with the motivational strategies of neomanagement, completely permeated with the opportunism and individualism of the flexible personality. He draws such conclusions by observing the uses made of the "artistic critique" of the 1960s and 1970s, as Luc Boltanski and Ève Chiapello have done in *The New Spirit of Capitalism:*

> The imaginary of rebellion and liberation, the quest for individual authenticity, the ideal of self-management, the anti-hierarchical social form of the network/rhizome, have all been appropriated as rhetorical and organizational devices that respond to broad aspirations of emancipation, but deliberately channel those aspirations so as to reinstate exploitation and alienation under another guise.[80]

Despite my contention that projects such as Renée Green's and especially her use of the interview actually try to reflect and subvert those conditions, it certainly has become clear

that the inflationary circulation of interviews in the art field must not be confused with criticality and political debate per se. Taking into account that interview practices of the 1960s and 1970s can be considered as a challenge to art criticism of that time, perhaps one needs to ask, with Anastas, whether the present condition of the artist interview as the dominant form of artists' writing is yet another sign of a crisis in criticism.[81] In this context, Obrist's interview project stands out as a paradigmatic case: instead of exerting an effective critique of the neoliberal social model, his idea of "infinite conversation" obeys the imperative of communication, while the initiation of interview marathons involving leading figures in contemporary culture even (ironically?) contributes to the logic of overproduction.[82] One is therefore encouraged to ask: Are twenty-four hours better than one?

Julia Gelshorn is professor of art history at the University of Hamburg. She publishes on modern and contemporary art, especially the Western neo-avant-gardes, as well as on eighteenth-century European art and culture. Among her current research fields is the metaphor and model of the network in art and science [Institut für Kunstgeschichte, Universität Hamburg, Edmund-Siemers-Allee 1, 20146 Hamburg, Germany, julia.gelshorn@kunstgeschichte.uni-hamburg.de].

Notes

1. Louis Marin, *De l'entretien* (Paris: Les Éditions de Minuit, 1997), 13, quoted from the German translation by Bernhard Nessler, *Über das Kunstgespräch* (Zurich: Diaphanes, 2001), 13.

2. For the increasing resonance of the spoken word in art publications, see Patricia C. Phillips, "Something to Talk About," *Art Journal* 64, no. 3 (Fall 2005): 3.

3. Christoph Lichtin has been one of the first to dedicate detailed research to the artist interview as an artistic product, which he analyzed as construction; Lichtin, *Das Künstlerinterview: Analyse eines Kunstprodukts* (Bern: Peter Lang, 2004). For the fictitious character of the artist interview, see also Julia Gelshorn, "Der Künstler spricht: Vom Umgang mit den Texten Gerhard Richters," in *Legitimationen: Künstlerinnen und Künstler als Autoritäten der Gegenwartskunst* (Bern: Peter Lang, 2005), 127–48.

4. See Ulf Wuggenig, "A Society of the Interview: Techniques of the Interview in Sociology, Art and Market Research," *Texte zur Kunst* 67 (September 2007): 142–47; and Paul Atkinson, "Qualitative Research—Unity and Diversity," *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum Qualitative Social Research* 6, no. 3 (2005), http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:0114-fqs0503261.

5. Wuggenig, "A Society of the Interview," 143.

6. Ibid., 145. Concerning variants of qualitative interviews, Wuggenig refers to Siegfried Lamnek, *Qualitative Sozialforschung* (Weinheim: Belt, 2005), 329–407. It should, of course, not be forgotten that conceptual artists such as Hans Haacke have also used forms of questioning in the style of survey research and opinion polling and introduced the standardized questionnaire into the field of art in order to perform a kind of sociological work as a form of institutional critique.

7. Rhea Anastas, "A Response," *Art Journal* 64, no. 3 (Fall 2005): 78–83, esp. 78.

8. William Kurtz Wimsatt and Monroe Beardsley, "The Intentional Fallacy," in *On Literary Intention*, ed. David Newton-De Molina (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1946), 1–13; and Roland Barthes, "The Death of the Author" (1968), in *Roland Barthes: Image Music Text*, ed. Stephen Heath (London: Fontana Press, 1977), 142–48.

9. For the artist interview as a kind of practiced role-playing, see Tim Griffin, "Method Acting: The Artist-Interviewer Conversation," *Art Journal* 64, no. 3 (Fall 2005): 71–77.

10. Johanna Burton and Lisa Pasquariello, " 'Ask Somebody Else Something Else': Analyzing the Artist Interview," *Art Journal* 64, no. 3 (Fall 2005): 46–49, esp. 48.

11. One of the most extensive studies on the interview as popular medium of mass communication is Michael Haller, *Das Interview: Ein Handbuch*

12. On this topic, see Julia Gelshorn, "Der Produzent als Autor: Künstlerische Theorie als kunsthistorische Herausforderung," in *Kunstgeschichte & Gegenwartskunst: Vom Nutzen & Nachteil der Zeitgenossenschaft*, ed. Verena Krieger (Cologne: Böhlau, 2008), 193–211; concerning Robert Smithson's writings and the general "invasion of language into the artistic field," see Craig Owens, "Earthwords," *October*, no. 10 (Fall 1979): 120–30.

13. See Lichtin, *Das Künstlerinterview*, who studies the history, genre, and function of the artist interview; Gelshorn, "Der Künstler spricht"; Michael Diers, "Infinite Conversation—Kunstgeschichte als Gespräch und Interview," in Gelshorn, *Legitimationen*, 107–25; *Art Journal* 64, no. 3 (Fall 2005), dedicated to "Analyzing the Artist Interview"; *Texte zur Kunst* 67 (September 2007), dedicated to "Gespräche / Conversations"; Dora Imhof and Sibylle Omlin, *Interviews: Oral History in Kunstwissenschaft und Kunst* (Munich: Verlag Silke Schreiber, 2010); and Michael Diers, Lars Blunck, and Hans Ulrich Obrist, eds., *Das Interview: Formen und Foren des Künstlergesprächs*, Fundus, vol. 206 (Hamburg: Philo Fine Arts, 2012). As one early attempt, see also the short article by Iwona Blazwick, "An Anatomy of the Interview," *Art Monthly* 200 (1996): 15–16.

14. John Miller, "Talk Is Cheap? On Artist Interviews between Legitimation and Reflection," *Texte zur Kunst* 67 (September 2007): 148–53, esp. 148.

15. Gwen Allen, "Against Criticism: The Artist Interview in *Avalanche* Magazine, 1970–1976," *Art Journal* 64, no. 3 (Fall 2005): 51–61; and Anastas, "A Response," 78. For the crisis in art criticism after the bankruptcy of high-modernist formalism, see George Baker et al., "The Present Conditions of Art Criticism," *October*, no. 100 (Spring 2002): 201–28. Philip Ursprung established a similar argument concerning the dominance of the artist word in the 1960s and early 1970s: Ursprung, "Eh? . . . mmmmm . . . uh . . . but . . . well . . . oooh!" *Monopol: Magazin für Kunst und Leben*, July 22, 2010, http://www.monopol-magazin.de /artikel/20102071/Eh-mmmmm-uh-but-well-oooh.html.

16. Anastas, "A Response," 81.

17. Gelshorn, "Der Künstler spricht"; and idem, "Der Produzent als Autor."

18. Marin, *Über das Kunstgespräch*, 12–14. One could describe the paradoxical "dual subject" as a "figure of two" that is strongly set apart both from "one" and from "many" and that can be understood by the formal and topological figure of symmetry, as well as by Jacques Lacan's model of subjectivity in which the subject is persistently at the heels of the other in the self, without ever being able to overtake it. See Jörg Huber et al., eds., "Die Figur der Zwei / The Figure of Two," special issue, *31. Das Magazin des Instituts für Theorie* 14, no. 14 (December 2010).

19. Marin, *Über das Kunstgespräch*, 13.

20. For the "dual voice," see ibid., 15. For the *dialogus*, see David Boom, *On Dialogue* (London: Routledge, 1996).

21. Burton and Pasquariello, " 'Ask Somebody Else Something Else,' " 48.

22. John Durham Peters, "The Voice and Modern Media," in *Kunst-Stimmen*, ed. Doris Kolesch and Jenny Schrödl (Berlin: Theater der Zeit, 2004), 85–101, esp. 85.

23. See Sybille Krämer, "Negative Semiologie der Stimme," in *Medien / Stimmen*, ed. Cornelia Epping-Jäger and Erika Linz (Cologne: DuMont, 2003), 65–84. Slavoj Žižek has remarked, however, that there always remains an "unbridged gap" that separates a human body from "its" voice, so that, when we see somebody speaking, "there is always a minimum of ventriloquism at work"; Žižek, *On Belief* (London: Routledge, 2001), 58. For Mladen Dolar, the voice therefore embodies the impossible division of a truncated body, a body "cloven by the impossible rift between an interior and an exterior"; Dolar, *A Voice and Nothing More* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2006), 71.

24. For qualities of the voice as the performative phenomenon par excellence, see Doris Kolesch and Sybille Krämer, "Stimmen im Konzert der Disziplinen: Zur Einführung in diesen Band," in *Stimme: Annäherung an ein Phänomen*, ed. Kolesch and Krämer (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 2006), 7–15, esp. 11.

25. Ibid., 11–12.

26. Dolar, *A Voice and Nothing More*, 69.

27. Lawrence Alloway, *Network: Art and the Complex Present*, Contemporary American Art Critics, vol. 1 (Ann Arbor, Mich.: UMI Research Press, 1984), 6.

28. Ibid., 6–7.

29. See Allen, "Against Criticism," 61.

30. Dieter Schwarz, "Über Aquarelle und verwandte Dinge: Gerhard Richter im Gespräch mit Dieter Schwarz, Köln, 26. Juni 1999," in *Gerhard Richter: Aquarelle/Watercolors 1964–1997*, ed. Schwarz, exh. cat. (Düsseldorf: Richter Verlag, 1999), 5–16.

31. Schwarz has kindly put the typescript with those revisions at my disposal. It has already been published within my articles on Richter's writings and interviews as well as on his reception; Gelshorn, "Der Künstler spricht," 145; Julia Gelshorn, "Geschichtsrezeption und Rezeptionsgeschichte: Zur Zeitgenossenschaft Gerhard Richters," in *Sechs Vorträge über Gerhard Richter: Februar 2007, Residenzschloss Dresden*, ed. Dietmar Elger and Jürgen Müller, Schriften des Gerhard Richter Archiv Dresden, vol. 1 (Cologne: Verlag der Buchhandlung Walther König, 2007), 70–95, esp. 79. See also Lichtin, *Das Künstlerinterview*, 115.

32. Alloway, *Network: Art and the Complex Present*, 7. In my studies on the work of Richter, I have therefore claimed that his interviews and texts, as much as his paintings, need to be analyzed as works of art, in that his seemingly authentic remarks or explanations often turn out to be repetitions or even citations of his own comments made in other genres of texts that are clearly fictitious ones or that at least do not have a documentary status. What is more, I even understand Richter's text production (and, with it, his interview practice) as a format parallel to his appropriation of images in his paintings. Therefore, using his comments as interpretations for these works of art becomes highly problematic.

33. Oskar Bätschmann, *Einführung in die kunstgeschichtliche Hermeneutik: Die Auslegung von Bildern* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1992). For an analysis of the collaborative work between artist and art historian, see also Lichtin, *Das Künstlerinterview*, 113–16.

34. Anastas, "A Response," 79–80.

35. Hans-Ulrich Obrist, *Interviews*, 2 vols. (Milan: Edizioni Charta, 2003); and idem, *The Conversation Series*, 25 vols. to date (Cologne: Verlag der Buchhandlung Walther König, 2003–).

36. For the frustration with the format, see Burton and Pasquariello, " 'Ask Somebody Else Something Else,' " 46.

37. *Interarchive: Archivarische Praktiken und Handlungsräume im zeitgenössischen Feld / Archival Practices and Sites in the Contemporary Art Field*, ed. Beatrice von Bismarck et al. (Cologne: Verlag der Buchhandlung Walther König, 2002), 27.

38. See Lichtin, *Das Künstlerinterview*, 112–13.

39. Wuggenig, "A Society of the Interview," 144.

40. These reproaches have already been made concerning "relational aesthetics," to which Obrist himself has contributed as a curator and critic. See, for example, Jacques Rancière, *Le partage du sensible: Esthétique et politique* (Paris: La Fabrique Éditions, 2000); Claire Bishop, "Antagonism and Relational Aesthetics," *October*, no. 110 (Fall 2004): 51–79; and Stewart Martin, "Critique of Relational Aesthetics," *Third Text* 21, no. 4 (July 2007): 369–86.

41. Hal Foster, "Chat Rooms," in *Participation*, ed. Claire Bishop (London: Whitechapel; Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2006), 190–95, esp. 193–94.

42. For the structure of knots and a flexible intermediate space characterizing the network, see Hartmut Böhme, "Einführung: Netzwerke; Zur Theorie und Geschichte einer Konstruktion," in *Netzwerke: Eine Kulturtechnik der Moderne*, ed. Jürgen Barkhoff, Böhme, and Jeanne Riou (Cologne: Böhlau, 2004), 17–36. For the metaphoric and ideological qualities of the intermediate space, see Carsten Höller, "Dazwischen, daneben, danach: Ein Interview mit dem Postkolonialismus-Theoretiker Homi K. Bhabha," *Springerin: Hefte für Gegenwartskunst* 4, no. 1 (1998): 35–37; and Julia Gelshorn and Tristan Weddigen, "Das Netzwerk: Zu einem Denkbild in Kunst und Wissenschaft," in *Grammatik der Kunstgeschichte: Sprachproblem und Regelwerk im "Bild-Diskurs"; Oskar Bätschmann zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Hubert Locher and Peter J. Schneemann (Emsdetten: Edition Imorde, 2008), 54–78.

43. Wuggenig, "A Society of the Interview," 145–46.

44. For the imitation and reflection of ethnographic methods in the art of the 1990s, see Hal Foster, "The Artist as Ethnographer," in *The Return of the Real* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1996), 171–203.

45. See, for example, Renée Green, "Partially Buried," *October*, no. 80 (Spring 1997): 38–56; and *Sombras y señales / Shadows and Signals: Renée Green*, exh. cat. (Barcelona: Fondació Antoni Tapies, 2000).

46. See, for example, Nicole Schweizer, ed., *Renée Green, Ongoing Becomings: Retrospective 1989–2009*, exh. cat. (Lausanne: Musée Cantonal des Beaux-Arts, 2009).

47. For an analysis of the video, see Monica McTighe, "The Family Slide Show as Critical History in Renée Green's Video *Partially Buried Continued*," *Third Text* 21, no. 4 (July 2007): 441–50.

48. See, as a paradigmatic example, *Renée Green "Between and Including,"* exh. cat., 1999 (Cologne: DuMont, 2001).

49. Homi Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* (New York: Routledge, 1994). On the "Figure of the Third" as a paradigm of cultural studies, see also Eva Esslinger et al., eds., *Die Figur des Dritten: Ein kulturwissenschaftliches Paradigma* (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 2010), esp. Albrecht Koschorke's general introduction "Ein neues Paradigma der Kulturwissenschaften," 9–31.

50. The conference papers have been published as Renée Green, ed., *Negotiations in the Contact Zone / Negociações na zona de contacto* (Lisbon: Assírio & Alvim, 2003).

51. For the notion of the "contact zone" in Mary Louise Pratt's writings, see her book *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation* (New York: Routledge, 2002), esp. chap. 1, "Introduction: Criticism in the Contact Zone," 1–14. In a chapter under the title "Renée Green: Genealogies of Contact," Jennifer A. González has worked out the idea of "contact" in other works by Green, in González, *Subject to Display: Reframing Race in Contemporary Installation Art* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2008), 204–49.

52. For the concept of the actor-network, see Bruno Latour's introduction into what he calls actor-network-theory: *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).

53. Brian Holmes has mentioned Obrist's project as an example for art projects creating mobile laboratories and experimental theaters in order to investigate and instigate social and cultural change; Holmes, "The Artistic Device, or The Articulation of Collective Speech," *Ephemera: Theory & Politics in Organization* 6, no. 4 (2006): 411–32.

54. Jacques Rancière, "The Emancipated Spectator," *Artforum* 45, no. 7 (March 2007): 271–80. For a broader discussion of collaborative practices in the art field, see Sabeth Buchmann and Tom Holert, "Materielle Praxis, Wissensproduktion: Kollektivität und Kollaborativität als Fluchtlinien des Künstlerischen," in *"Mit-Sein": Gemeinschaft—ontologische und politische Perspektiven*, ed. Elke Bippus, Jörg Huber, and Dorothee Richter, T:G, vol. 8 (Zurich: Edition Voldemeer; New York: Springer, 2010), 189–213.

55. Rancière, *Le partage du sensible*; and idem, "The Emancipated Spectator."

56. Atkinson and Silverman, "Kundera's Immortality."

57. Jean-Claude Kaufmann, *L'entretien compréhensif* (Paris: Nathan, 1996), 79, 111–12; see also Wuggenig, "A Society of the Interview," 146.

58. For Bourdieu's notion of "understanding" in the broader context of his huge sociological project to write a history "from below" by conducting countless interviews of "ordinary" people in France, see his publication *The Weight of the World: Social Suffering in Contemporary Society* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999), esp. 607–26; see also Wuggenig, "A Society of the Interview," 146.

59. See Stephen Greenblatt and Catherine Gallagher, *Practicing New Historicism* (Chicaco: University of Chicago Press, 2000), esp. chap. 1, "The Touch of the Real," 20–48.

60. For counterhistories and anecdotes, see ibid., 49–74.

61. For the methodological discussions of oral history, see, for example, Paul Thompson, *The Voice of the Past* (London: Oxford University Press, 1978); Lutz Niethammer, ed., *Lebenserfahrung und kollektives Gedächtnis: Die Praxis der "Oral History"* (Frankfurt: Syndikat, 1980); Anthony Seldon and Joanna Pappworth, *By Word of Mouth: "Elite" Oral History* (London: Methuen, 1983); Ken Howarth, *Oral History: A Handbook* (Stroud, U.K.: Sutton, 1998); and *The Oral History Reader*, ed. Robert Perks and Alistair Thomson, 2nd ed. (London: Routledge, 2006). I have not dealt here with the efforts the discipline of art history has made to initiate projects based on oral history and to critically reflect on their implications. For these issues, see, for example, Christina Végh, "Art History und Oral History—eine schwierige Beziehung: Ein Plädoyer für Geschichten und Sprachen," in Gelshorn, *Legitimationen*, 87–105; and, especially, Imhof and Omlin, *Interviews: Oral History*.

62. Sebastian Egenhofer, "Subjectivity and the Production of Meaning in Warhol's Early Work," in *Andy Warhol: The Early Sixties; Paintings and Drawings 1961–1964*, ed. Bernhard Mendes Bürgi and Nina Zimmer, exh. cat. (Ostfildern-Ruit: Hatje Cantz, 2010), 32–43.

63. Thomas Crow has attempted to read Warhol's work of the early 1960s through the lens of a political iconography by establishing an interrelation between the motifs of death and Warhol's critical look at the dark side of consumer society; Crow, "Saturday Disasters: Trace and Reference in Early Warhol," in *Modern Art in the Common Culture* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996), 49–65.

64. Egenhofer, "Subjectivity and the Production of Meaning," 38.

65. See, for example, Gretchen Berg, "Nothing to Lose," *Cahiers du Cinéma in English* 10 (May 1967): 38–43. For remarks on Warhol's interviews, see also Lichtin, *Das Künstlerinterview*, 78–92.

66. Berg "Nothing to Lose," 43.

67. Concerning Warhol's early work, Stefan Neuner has described the effects of mechanization as a "comedy of painting": "Warhol's painting

opens onto a vista that turns the capitalist world into a great big comic entity. No individuals and no individual destinies crop up in it because human beings have acquired all the properties of industrially manufactured commodities. . . . What is funny is no longer Bergson's notion of human beings who fail to realize their vital potential and are reduced to a subset of automatic qualities; what is funny now is the machine that fails to realize its mechanical potential, making it appear humanoid—just as Warhol's painting operations produce expressive signs when their rhythm is off: it is not the mechanical that is superimposed on the vital but vice versa"; Neuner, "Warhol: Comedy of Painting," in Mendes Bürgi and Zimmer, *Andy Warhol: The Early Sixties*, 48–61, esp. 61. One could add that Warhol's passive interview technique transposed this effect directly onto himself.

68. See Egenhofer, "Subjectivity and the Production of Meaning," 42–43.

69. As David Joselit has argued, the concept of surface in postmodern art must be regarded as a deflation of psychological depth, resulting in a visuality in which identity manifests itself as a culturally conditioned play of stereotype. However, by reading the postmodernist surface as a legacy of modernism's flatness, he is able to demonstrate that in both, flatness and depth, the psychological, the optical, and the political are intricately interwoven. The shift from a model of subjectivity founded in interiority to one in which the self is constituted through surfaces can therefore also be read as a political move from an essentialist model of subjectivity toward an identity that is constituted only in the moment of articulation. Joselit, "Notes on Surface: Toward a Genealogy of Flatness," *Art History* 23, no. 1 (March 2000): 19–34.

70. Miller, "Talk Is Cheap?" 149–50.

71. Ibid., 149.

72. For the "in-depth interview," see Wuggenig, "A Society of the Interview," 146.

73. Miller, "Talk Is Cheap?" 149.

74. For Warhol's "counter-aesthetic in the field of painting, sculpture, film, and writing," see Benjamin H. D. Buchloh, introduction to "Andy Warhol: A Special Issue," *October*, no. 132 (Spring 2010): 3, and the following articles dedicated to this aesthetic.

75. Isabelle Graw, "When Life Goes to Work: Andy Warhol," *October*, no. 132 (Spring 2010): 99–113.

76. Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, *Empire* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2000), 405ff.

77. Paolo Virno, *A Grammar of the Multitude: For an Analysis of Contemporary Forms of Life*, trans. Isabella Bertoletti, James Cascaito, and Andrea Casson (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2004), 60.

78. Nicolas Bourriaud, *Relational Aesthetics*, trans. Simon Pleasance and Fronza Woods (Dijon: Les Presses du Réel, 2002), 42.

79. Martin, "Critique of Relational Aesthetics," esp. 371.

80. Brian Holmes, "Artistic Autonomy and the Communication Society," *Third Text* 18, no. 6 (2004): 547–55, esp. 552. See also Luc Boltanski and Ève Chiapello, *The New Spirit of Capitalism* (New York: Norton, 2005).

81. Anastas, "A Response," 80.

82. It is therefore to be asked whether his reference to Maurice Blanchot's idea of "plural speech," which is developed in his book *Infinite Conversation* (1969; Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1993), is more than a theoretical background.