

I
(July 2016)

What is your thinking on monuments or memorials? Will the Robert Walsler-Sculpture be a monument?

My thinking on monuments is many-faceted, because I wish to create a new concept of the monument. My concept is new as regards the monument's dedication, location and duration and as regards the production of the monument. As regards the dedication, my concept of the monument is new because a monument is something that is dedicated to someone by an individual person or by a group of people. The monument must come into being through the love of a single person or of a group of people. To my mind, the only monument that makes sense is one that is dedicated to someone out of love. No monument can be made on commission from someone or as a wish for someone. As an artist, I cannot submit to any authority. The only reason for making a monument must be love – precisely because one cannot give reasons for love, nor can one argue about it. Love comes without any explanation. A monument can have no other legitimacy apart from being a work of art, and a monument can offer no other tribute apart from asserting itself as a work of art. It is art that is honoured, only art. It cannot be that an authority determines which person, which work or which deed "deserves" a monument. No-one has "deserved" to receive a monument: no work, no deed "deserves" a monument. Only art deserves to be worked for and not to be betrayed. I believe that only a monument that is created out of love is a monument that lasts, that lasts longer than the object. As an artist, I can make a monument only for someone whom I love. Love is assertion. Love is already a form in itself, and the dedication is hence the form of the monument.

My concept of the monument is new as regards the location, because the decision on the location of the monument must be a decision that can be taken only by an individual person or by a group. I assume that there is no ideal location for a monument, for art in public space, for art in general. Rather, it is matter of someone deciding on a location. It is an important decision because the location possibilities in public space are unlimited. This decision is a form. Hence the monument's location is already part of the monument. The location says something. It means something. It says and means everything. I think that it makes no sense nowadays to set up monuments on central squares, in parks or in front of official buildings. Here too, no official body can suggest, let alone prescribe, a location for me, the artist. No-one can determine for me where a monument should be. With my concept of a monument, it is rather a matter of determining the location as an obligation towards the work of art and as a commitment to the claim it is making. The location of a monument is a central statement: it is

form. This is why the location of a monument is an artistic decision. It is not an historical, economic or cultural choice. It is an artistic or political decision – "political" in the sense of art which believes that as art it can change something, which wants as art to change something, and which as art can change something, not in the sense of "political art"! The decision for a location is an essential and therefore a political decision, because the location already constitutes the monument. It is something fundamental. It is form.

As regards duration, my concept of the monument is new because a monument today can only be created as something precarious and can only exist in its precariousness. My monument must therefore have a precarious form. It should have a temporally limited duration and must assert itself as a monument within this pre-determined temporal duration. No material, no working technique, no protection or safeguard may preserve the monument from its precariousness. On the contrary, it is a matter of explicitly confronting the precarious. The term "precarious" is the opposite of the term "ephemeral". The precarious is alive. It wants to, must, and will live. It fights for its existence, its survival. Its logic is life. In contrast to this, the logic of the ephemeral is death – death predetermined by Nature. The logic of the survival of the precarious interests me because it is a different word for the absolute, for urgency and necessity. The precarious and temporally limited is precisely what gives the monument its duration, its everlasting quality. For this reason, I understand the precarious as form. This form opens up new perspectives and a new dynamism, for example the possibility of "presence and production".

"Presence and production" is a guiding principle or a direction of impact that I have derived from my experience with art in public places. "Presence and production" means my presence and my production on site the entire time for the entire duration of the project. "Presence and production" draws on the precarious. All of my – close to 70 – works of art in public space are precarious works of art. Precarious works of art are projects in which every moment is important, or can be important, and in which nothing is unimportant. In my understanding of precarious art in public space, nothing is unimportant, but everything can be important. It is a matter of being alert, being attentive and keeping one's eyes open. "Presence and production" in its precarious form is an assertion of the "here" and "now". It is a question of being physically present, here and now. It is a question of giving one's body, which is why "presence and production" is a form that goes beyond social media. "Presence and production" is an invention. My concept of the monument is new as regards production, because I want the monument to produce memories by the involvement and co-operation of local residents and visitors. The monument produces memory as such through its temporal limitation, through its dedication, through its location, through

"presence and production" and through the involvement of local residents and visitors. I as artist must create the conditions for this through my work. I can achieve this if the form of the work is so clear and has such a strong aura that memory, detached from the object of memory, becomes the monument's hard centre. It can be the memory of a person, of an act, or also the memory of what the monument established during its limited duration. It must, however, always be something that goes beyond memory. The monument I am interested in should enable encounters. It should allow a person, a work, a deed to be conceived in fresh terms and it should produce an event. An event is something that happens without being planned. In my concept of a monument, an event is something that can take place without any planning, guarantee, prior announcement or witnesses. Bringing forth memories is production, creating encounters is production. Remembering is production. That is the new thinking and that is what the new concept of a "monument" can produce: memory as form, created by the monument and those participating in it. Another word for memory is friendship.

As its name reveals, the *Robert Walsler-Sculpture* is a sculpture. The *Robert Walsler-Sculpture* is not a monument, because my *Monument* series (*Spinosa Monument*, Amsterdam 1999; *Deleuze Monument*, Avignon 2000; *Bataille Monument*, Kassel 2002; *Gramsci Monument*, New York City 2013) has been concluded. But for me, all the experience I have gained with the *Monument* series also counts for this sculpture project. It is to flow into the sculpture. It is a sculpture that carries within itself my thinking on monuments and memorials and attempts to take it further. From this experience I derive the competence to create a sculpture for Robert Walsler. It will be a sculpture with the same direction of thrust as the monument series. Thus, the *Robert Walsler-Sculpture* is also a "presence and production" project. With the *Robert Walsler-Sculpture* I want to work for and with a "non-exclusive" audience; I want the sculpture to form a "critical corpus" and I love Robert Walsler. My work will be a homage to Robert Walsler and his oeuvre. I am calling this work a "sculpture" because everybody understands the term "sculpture". It is up to me as artist to fill out this concept in a fresh way.

II

(August 2016)

How do you proceed when carrying out fieldwork? What is your thinking on this subject? Is there a certain method that has emerged in the course of your previous projects in public spaces?

Fieldwork, or field research, is a fundamental working step in my work in public space. Field research is fundamental because it is in itself part of the work – the first part of the work in public space. It is the foundation

III

(September 2016)

You call your Robert Walsler-Sculpture a "presence and production" project. Whose presence and whose production do you mean here and to what extent do they together form a sculpture?

By "presence" and "production" I mean my presence and production, since I will both be present and will produce something. My presence and production are the guidelines that I have been developing for some years and that I can apply to artworks in public space but also to works inside an institution. Not all of my works, however, are based on presence and production. "Presence and production" means that I am on site for the whole time and am producing something. The aim is to make a precarious, object-free sculpture. "Presence and production" is the implement for achieving this goal. I think that through "presence and production" I can impart form. As an artist I must give something. Presence and production is a gift in the potlatch sense (Georges Bataille), i.e. a gift with an intention behind it. It follows the principle of first giving something in order to challenge the recipient also to give something or even to give more! "Presence and production" are the precondition of co-operating with reality in public space. I have to and want to co-operate because I want to change something. Through co-operation with reality I want to intervene in public space, without lecturing, without making peace or calming anything down. One precondition of "presence" is exposing oneself to the rigours and the attractiveness of conditions in public space. The requirement for "production" is being in agreement with public space with its untruths, its opinions and its facts. I must be in agreement with reality in public space as in the institution, in order to be able to co-operate with it. Being in agreement, however, does not mean affirming reality. I call my work a "sculpture" because this is an open concept – a concept that everyone understands and that alludes to the history of sculpture, which I affirm. I want, however, to establish my own concept of sculpture and to create sculpture of a new kind. Thus, for example, the element of taking a walk in the *Robert Walsler-Sculpture* is a sculpture. These walks are sculptures because they are an assertion of form, since one takes a walk in order to give form – an object-free form. One does not take a walk in order to pass away the time or to remain healthy. The assertion of form manifests itself in my concept of sculpture: hence my works in public space are not participatory art projects. This is not social art. I am not making participatory art. Participation or taking part cannot be provoked. In art, participation can never be a goal or a requirement. It can, however, arise if the work of art leaves the beholder space and time. Taking part occurs when I as an artist give something through my work, when I give something of my own. "Participation" cannot

stone and it is the platform on which the work stands or from which it falls: that is why fieldwork is so important. Fieldwork is research in public space. It is a question of coming to know the place and the people who live or work in this place, coming to know what is there, on site. What counts here is keeping one's eyes wide open. It is essential to listen to everyone and everything and to spend a good deal of time on the spot. Through comprehensive fieldwork I earn the opportunity for my work to be a success. I myself always try to carry out fieldwork as much as possible alone, because it is a matter of being open, unprejudiced, attentive and alert to what can be learned. If the objective is to come to know somebody, it is important at the beginning not to come in a group or delegation. Because it is also a matter of using one's instinct and relying on one's intuition. I must be alone because I must be vulnerable. If you are going to a place you do not know, the right thing to do the first time is to go as a minority, as an individual. Successful fieldwork can be done when I can meet the same people on site several times, at intervals, so that ideas can mature, understanding can be built up, possibilities can emerge, and scepticism can be broken down. I have to put in extensive and persistent fieldwork so as to create space for happenstance and believe in grace, because I rely on happenstance and believe in grace. The cornerstone of my fieldwork is always the question as to assistance and co-operation. I never say that I or my art can help or that I am offering help. I always ask for help. This is crucial. As an artist, I never presume that art "helps". Instead, I always try to point out that art, being art, can conduct a dialogue or a one-to-one confrontation anywhere and with anybody. Art cannot be abused. Many people perhaps do not understand this straightaway, but it arouses interest and provokes curiosity. Lengthy fieldwork also helps to communicate to others one's own mission, passion and problems and hence to demonstrate to the place one's own motivations and interests. For me, fieldwork is one of the finest activities that work in public spaces brings with it, because it means trusting in the power of art, in the autonomy of art and in the inclusiveness of art and adhering to it without any compromises. It is important to make a stand for art, because as an artist I have no other legitimacy than the legitimacy of art, in which I believe and for which I fight. The claim made for the absoluteness of art must be asserted and proved in and with fieldwork. The entire dynamism derives from my competence as an artist to take my fieldwork seriously, and to see it as important, indeed as the hard centre of my work. When it is a question of an artwork in a public space, the question to ask the artist involved would be, "Comrade, have you done your fieldwork?" Fieldwork cannot be documented in its entirety. That is what makes it unique and attractive. But without intensive fieldwork there can be no credible artwork in public space. I love fieldwork.

be a criterion or condition for art either. Of course, I am pleased when local residents, visitors and passers-by feel drawn into my work, enter into debate with it, adopt its ideas and defend it. But I know that participation and involvement are results of art. The person who looks at a picture by Mondrian in the museum can participate or recognize himself or herself within it. Participation can take place on a wide variety of levels. It is a mysterious dialogue or confrontation between the work of art and the beholder, one-to-one. The wonderful thing about art is that it can be neither seen nor measured. If something has to be visible or measurable in art in order for it to count as "participatory art", then it is a question merely of interaction and of "functioning" art. But something that doesn't function can be art as well! Art is not interactive but active, and hence in art there can be something that doesn't function and that precisely therefore calls on the beholder to respond thoughtfully, thus compelling him or her to reflect. The activity of thinking is, anyhow, the finest thing that art can achieve. To think is to create a sculpture.

IV

(December 2016)

If, in a joint effort with the residents of Biel, you construct a sculpture that is based on their active co-operation, how do you then understand the concept of authorship vis-à-vis yourself? Where does the activity of the artist begin and where is the borderline between this and "Jekami" [Swiss-German acronym for "Jeder-kann-mitmachen" = "Ancajo" (anybody can join in)]? How is this influenced by your understanding of undivided and undividable responsibility? "Jekami" is something that I take seriously. Because, in point of fact, anybody can join in the dialogue and the confrontation with and through art. It is fundamentally a positive thing if everybody wants to join in! Consequently, I am not against the "Jekami" principle and I have nothing against those who work with "Jekami". Being able to join in, wanting to join in, is all well and good – but the real question is: Join in what? "Jekami" thus bears witness also to the abyss of our meaninglessness and to our fear of confronting this abyss. It is up to me as an artist not to deny this abyss, nor to try to bridge it or to fill it in. It is up to me to confront this abyss by being in agreement with "Jekami". That does not mean approving it but understanding its incorporating and integrative gesture as constitutive of art – which I do. That is why "Jekami" interests me. As an artist, however, I must give form to the questions: "Join in what? Join in what for?" For me, therefore, "Jekami" is not a guideline. If I want to create something new, then, as an artist, I must invent my own guidelines. I cannot take over any existing concepts, because they don't apply to me anymore. My concepts are "presence and production", "non-exclusive audience", "energy – yes!

quality – no! or “undivided authorship”. I invented the guideline “undivided authorship” as a result of my works with “presence and production” in public space, but also in institutions. I drafted the model of “undivided authorship” while working on my presence-and-production project in the Palais de Tokyo in Paris in 2014. “Undivided authorship” means assuming authorship for the entire project, for everything. In public space or in an institution, I cannot do work based on presence and production all by myself. I need help; I have to request help. This help can come from the local residents, from the visitors, from the passers-by who want to join in. If they see that I am fighting for my work, my project in the same space as they themselves, that I am present, that I am investing myself as author 100% and am producing something as author – then the principle of undivided authorship can be set in train when someone says to me “I am an author too!” Where “Jekami” invites people merely to join in, the principle of “undivided authorship” calls on them to assert that they themselves are authors! Asserting this means taking on “undivided authorship” and hence 100% authorship and responsibility. Only if it is 100% is it at the same time “undivided”. In this way, everything is multiplied, enlarged and increased, and nothing is divided, reduced or diminished. Undivided authorship replaces the out-dated, tired and above all false comparison with the cake that can be sliced up and portioned out. The idea of slicing up the cake suggests that everything can be reduced and that therefore ever less responsibility, ever less authorship has to be taken on. Undivided authorship, on the other hand, is the new, dynamic model. It is unrestricted and boundless. It can spread and expand on an ongoing basis. A 200%, a 300%, a 1,000% authorship becomes possible! With “undivided authorship”, the logic of the boundless and indivisible is strengthened, and at the same time “undivided authorship” resists the logic of diminishment and minimization. Thus, “undivided authorship” is a dynamic movement instead of number-grubbing stagnation. The concept unleashes energy and kick-starts dynamism. “Undivided authorship” is the opposite of “Jekami”. “Jekami” does not impart energy, because “Jekami” is sufficient unto itself.

During the field-research for the *Robert Walser-Sculpture* in Biel I say to the people that I would like to undertake the art project with them. I know that I as an artist cannot have the presumption that I am helping them but that, rather, I need their help to make my work of art. The decisive thing is that I ask for help. Only with their help can I make my artwork, only by means of “undivided authorship” can I realize my project. “Undivided authorship” is the energy that leads to the realization of the ambition that is the *Robert Walser-Sculpture*. The goal or the ambition of art is an overarching goal and an unlimited ambition. The goal of the *Robert Walser-Sculpture* in Biel in 2019 is to keep the memory of Robert Walser alive, to enable encounters, to create an event and to

re-think Robert Walser's work and life. As an artist, I must live the concept of “undivided authorship” and place this concept above everything else. Indeed, I must place “undivided authorship” above “Jekami”, “participatory art”, “community art”, and “social art” and must champion its values. If I can do this, then I am confronting the abyss of our meaninglessness – embodied by, among other things, “Jekami” with the power of art. It is a frontal confrontation with art as art. Without any claim to functionality, without any claim to a result, without any claim to success – but not without its goal, ambition and utopia. I believe that art, because it is art, can make the decisive difference to our aesthetic, cultural and political customs. I believe that with and through art each and everybody can be addressed and drawn in: one-to-one. And I believe that art places its trust in absolute equality. As an artist, I must hence first of all be convinced of equality through and in art. Only if I am convinced of this do I also possess the instrument to encounter the other person as an equal. Encountering the other person, the other author, however, means also insisting exclusively on the freedom of art as an absolute entitlement. There can, may and must be no compromises made concerning “undivided authorship”. Being an author and venturing this assertion take courage. It takes will, an emancipatory readiness to take risks, intuitive “headless-ness”, energy and the readiness to take on 100% responsibility. That is the key by which “undivided authorship” unlocks what is shut away, reserved or concealed, and opens the door to grace and mystery. What pleases me most is when somebody says, “I am the author, we are authors. It is my/our work, it is my/our project, it is my/our idea and it is my/our mission!”

V

(January 2017)

Why are you convinced of equality in art? What do you mean by this exactly and how did you arrive at this conviction?

I believe in equality. I am aware of the equal things that we all share, and I am aware of all the differences that we carry around in our selves. I am convinced that equality is one of the preconditions of art. Whenever I make art or am concerned with art, equality is my starting point and presupposition. I know, however, that equality is not a given, but that equality must be fought and paid for, even in the world of art. For that reason, I make a distinction between the world of art and art itself. Why should things be any different in the world of art from in the rest of the world? One must stand up for equality, always and everywhere. Equality demands that I rise up and emancipate myself. As an artist, however, I always presuppose equality when I am concerned with art or making art. Nowadays, there is no reason to concern oneself with art other than with the aspiration of absolute equality. If this condition were not fulfilled,

then art would lose all its qualities of insurgency, emancipation and resistance and would be no fun anymore. I am not saying that equality reigns in the world of art – I am, after all, not naïve – but I assert, wish and request that an unconditional striving for equality is demanded in the world of art, because art as art is founded on equality. Without in any way taking flight from reality, I maintain that art is based on equality and that it is only for that reason that it has the power to provoke a dialogue or a confrontation with another person, one-to-one. All really good art carries this element of equality within itself. Because art, being art, is universal. Universality means justice, equality, truth and the one world. I think of the work of Marcel Duchamp or Louise Bourgeois and ask myself: How can I come into contact with these artists' works if not on the basis of equal to equal? I am convinced of equality in art because I am able and have been able to experience it when being myself addressed by art. It was only in this way that I came to art in the first place. Hence my own commitment to create myself a work that excludes no-one but is inclusive and never intimidating. This is the source of my will to impart form – however assailable, precarious and instable it may be – work that rests on the convictions of universality, justice, equality and truth. With each of my works I intend to give a universal form and I ask myself, “Could it not be that in precariousness – an experience shared by so many people today – justice, a unifying force and equality reside, and could the political not also reside there?” To proceed as an artist from the assumption of equality in art means that, at the same time, I believe that art can change something. Art can change something through its form, its achieved positioning, its assertion, its absoluteness and finally through its beauty. If I had doubts that my art was not changing anything, or if I believed that my work was only for an initiated audience, then I would not continue to work – that would be cynicism. I make art because art aspires to equality and insists on it. I think, for example, of the work of Hélio Oiticica, Robert Filliou, Elena Guro, Natalia Goncharova, Paul Thek or Andy Warhol. If I assumed that in and through my art inequality was created, then I would have no reason for making art. In matters of equality I am competent. This conviction, this competence, was always a precondition of my decision to make art. I was confirmed, encouraged and fortified in this decision by the works and positions of many artists whom I admire, from Emma Kunz to Joseph Beuys, from Kazimir Malevich to Meret Oppenheim. I have recognized that in art it is a question of believing in something. It is a question of having a plan, pursuing an idea, having a mission. However ridiculous or out of time this may seem: everything is at stake.

VI

(March 2017)

Why does it take will, an emancipatory readiness to take risks, mindlessness and energy to be an author or artist?

Art is the assertion of form. In order to assert form as such you need love, passion, hope, courage, the readiness to take risks, a will-to-form, resilience, the power to assert, “headless-ness” and an absolute insistence on the autonomy of art. And you need the preparedness to be as artist the first to pay for your work, your form, your art and for art as such. Accordingly, I know that an artist must be a warrior. I know this because I have experienced it, was allowed to experience it and have had to experience it. So, creating something means risking oneself. I can do this only if I create a piece of work without in the same moment analysing what I am doing. Incurring risks, enjoying one's work and being positive-minded are all prerequisites for making art. Only when I am positive-minded, only when I am affirmative, can I create something of my own making – to this end I must and want to be positive-minded, even in the midst of negativity. For an artist there is no middle course, no Plan B: I must go forward and I know that there is the risk of being shot at, wounded, even shot down. But I am not without any tool or weapon, because I can give form, my form! That's why I love Andy Warhol's dictum: “Don't cry – work!” I want to and must fight for my form, my position, for my understanding of art, without being afraid of losing. Art is an experience or an experiment. Art is a risk venture. Art dares to make a statement. Art is an invention. Art asserts something new and is something active. Making art or being author of one's own work means standing up and making an assertion: this is form, this is my form. That is why it takes courage and energy. But what constitutes form? What does a form yield? A form emerges when total commitment comes into contact with the absolute will to express something. So in art it is a question of having a concern, a problem, a mission. It is a question of giving this concern, this problem or this mission a form – in distress, in a “headless”, wilful manner and in urgency. For example, making a collage, gluing together things that do not belong together is always a matter of “headless-ness”. With a collage it is the case that I as an artist often make myself look silly. But it is a question precisely of enduring this “looking silly”. Yes, the artist should not be the clever, intelligent, brilliant, all-fathoming figure. That is why it takes “headless-ness” to give and assert form.

When I set out to make art, I need energy, not quality or qualities. Hence my statement: “Quality = No! Energy = Yes!” Because I am unable to say what has quality in art. I only know what possesses energy and can pass it on. The key thing about “Quality = No! Energy = Yes!” is inventing one's guidelines oneself or appropriating and defending them. Further guidelines of mine are:

“Weaken yourself – but create a strong work!” “Do not economize yourself!” “Panic is the solution!” “Be precise and at the same time work in excess!” “Drain yourself, giving all you've got!” “Be savage to your own work!” “Less is less! More is more!” And as an artist I know that in art nothing is ever completely won, but also nothing is ever completely lost!

VII

(April 2017)

What part is played by the audience, the visitors? To what extent do you distinguish between participating authors and passive or reticent visitors? Which do you prefer?

In art, the question as to the audience, the visitors, is an important question. I wish to work for a non-exclusive audience. That specifies for whom I make art. I have coined the phrase “non-exclusive audience” because I do not want to fall into the trap of role assignment, which would mean working for the art-going public or for a target audience, a desired audience, or even an exclusive audience. I reject this, and therefore the concept of a “non-exclusive audience” is a clarification and at the same time a manifesto. On the one hand, the concept clarifies that in and with art everybody is included, that those who concern themselves with art and those who become involved in art are always making an inclusive movement. In encounters with art nobody is ever excluded: the concept of “exclusivity” is an operational impossibility here. If it is used, then this is a misunderstanding of the power of art. Art must not be misused as something exclusive. On the other hand, the concept of the “non-exclusive audience” is a manifesto for my wish to direct my art clearly in one direction – in the direction of the person who has no use for art, and the person I don't know, and in the direction of the person who has other problems than art, and the person I do not understand – in other words, in the direction of other people. For me, the “non-exclusive audience” is the only one that counts. For me, making art politically means working for others. I am the other person. But the other person can also be my neighbour or a stranger of whom I am afraid. Somebody who is there by chance. The other person is somebody I have not thought of and have not expected. In and through my work, I want to do everything possible so as never to exclude the other person from my work. I always, unconditionally, want to include him or her. The concept of the “non-exclusive audience” is not simply identical in meaning with “everybody”, the “masses” or the “majority”. The “non-exclusive audience” is a dynamic and an élan in the direction of the new, the unknown, the undefined and the not-yet-fixed. I wish to include the other person through the form of my work. The non-exclusive public exists in public spaces, in museums, in alternative art spaces and even in the commercial gallery. My ambition, in and through my

work, is to include the “non-exclusive audience” in every situation. The questions I ask myself are: Will I be successful in establishing, through my work of art, a direct dialogue or a one-to-one discussion with the “non-exclusive audience”? Will I succeed in this without any mediation, communication and explanation? Will I achieve the goal of seeing the “non-exclusive audience” come into my work? Have I sculpted the necessary openings and holes in my work that allow the “non-exclusive audience” to enter in? In art, participation can never be a goal or a stipulation. It can, however, occur if the work of art leaves space and room for the “non-exclusive audience”. Participation occurs when I as artist give something of myself in my work and through my work. Because only if I give something of my own does the possibility arise for the other person to also give something. Only then can one talk of participation.

VIII

(May 2017)

Participation can occur in art if you give something of your own and there are sufficient porosities and passageways in the work allowing the audience to give something too. To what extent do you give something of Robert Walser in the *Robert Walser-Sculpture* and what has he given you of his own?

I am struck by the fact that many people want to keep Robert Walser for themselves. Robert Walser is someone who contrives to be seclusively, egotistically, completely monopolized and absolutely exclusively loved. Many – and I am no exception – think that they are the only ones who understand, know, honour and love Robert Walser in the right way. Such exclusiveness is reserved for the truly great. My purpose is not to strengthen or reduce this exclusiveness but to knock holes, cut openings in it in order – as you say – to enable porosity and to create a breakthrough. That is my mission in art and that is what I want to do with the *Robert Walser-Sculpture*: to make a sculpture, create an event, facilitate encounters, work for a “non-exclusive audience”. My wish is to include and to work both with and for residents of Biel. My wish is to provide a form and to assert a new understanding of sculpture in public space with the *Robert Walser-Sculpture*. In order to provide a form, I must proceed solely from my own ideas. But it is essential that I don't keep them to myself. I want to be and must be free with my ideas so that the other person can become involved. Form is always something that is directed toward other people: otherwise, it is not form. The personal in itself has no form: it doesn't need it. Form arises only when it is directed to others, when it turns itself inside out. That is what I can do. That is what I can give.

Robert Walser lost himself. He lost himself for me. He is the writer of existential loss

and existential uncertainty. He lost himself for me on his path through life. In Biel I want to create a platform, an agora, a forum for this. I want to create a mental space for the possible and impossible Robert Walsers, for the Robert Walsers of today, among whom I likewise count myself. Without any nostalgia and without any melancholy I want to create a net or a porous surface for encounters through, with and about Robert Walser, but also without Robert Walser. I want to privilege the here and now and I want to assert "presence and production". I want to create a stage for the precarious, the insecure, the uncertain, the non-guaranteed, the fragile and the labile. On this stage, every moment is to be a moment of attentiveness, of alertness, of grace, of loving devotion and of the assertion of art. Robert Walser's language points the way: serpentine, full of holes, aimless, a garden path. His language fluidifies, annuls itself, comes undone. It is a language of self-dissolution, which enables me to find my way into it without dissolving myself in the process. Robert Walser paid the price for this. In his radicalness and readiness to pay the price for his work he is an example for any artist, any philosopher, any writer. Robert Walser said: "I stand on the Earth: this is my standpoint." His words gave me the key to standing for my own, fully personal position in this hypercomplex world. I stand on the Earth – to the left and the right, to the front and the rear, it bends away towards the abyss. But I stand on it. Robert Walser illuminates for me the small, the unheeded, the unserious, the unspectacular, holding his torch into the darkness and lighting up what is in the shadows. With and in my work, I want always to take everything seriously and to view it as important. For everything is important, can be and become important. Nothing is unimportant or unserious. Robert Walser wrote: "When weak people think themselves strong". He not only wrote it down, he lived it out. He lived it out rebelliously, with joyfulness and feigned subservience, truly resistant in unsuccess and truly reluctant towards success. For me, Robert Walser poses the question: What does success mean? Was does unsuccess mean? Am I prepared to make a work beyond success and unsuccess? I must recognize that unsuccessfulness does not mean being a victim. Unsuccess can be an act of heroism. Robert Walser is a hero; he shows how one can be a hero. The *Robert Walser-Sculpture* is made with the guiding principle: "Be a hero! Be an outsider! Be Robert Walser!" I want to keep to this and do not want to keep Robert Walser to myself.

IX

(June 2017)

How does one finance a presence and production project that doesn't actually emerge until during the exhibition itself? And how do you go about planning it? From what time on can you establish a priority list?

I always have to confront the issue of the financing of my projects. As an artist I have to know how one sets up a budget. I both have to and want to confront the financing issue in all phases of my work. It would be wrong and foolish to assume that someone or other will pay for it sometime or other. Wrong, because the question of the financing of so complex a project as the *Robert Walser-Sculpture* is an important part of the project itself – after all, the very financing poses the question: What is the money being spent on? Is the ratio of production costs to costs for administration, communication and operation reasonable? Do I as an artist have sufficient means to do my work? Or is it the case that, as so often, the production costs for the work of art are calculated last and are thus ranked as less important or are estimated as being "flexibly scalable downwards"? I always try of my own accord to put the question of the production costs for the envisaged work of art first, at the beginning of the project and the work. But it is also clear and logical that in the course of the project the production budget is modified upwards. There is always more money needed! I try to keep this additional expenditure in mind, to tackle the increase in the budget, to be proactive, without allowing myself to be neutralized by the argument "There's no money for that" or "That wasn't in the budget", because "more is always more". More work costs more because more work is more work, more involvement is more involvement, more energy is more energy, more input is more input, more enthusiasm is more enthusiasm, more participation is more participation, more art is more art. It is foolish if I do not confront the question of financing because it will most certainly come up, whether I want it to or not. And because – if I do not tackle it – it will eventually be posed by others. Then, however, it is too late, because this and that was not billed, because this and that was too expensive, and because this and that need to be added. This and that has already been spent on something else and now this and that can no longer be paid for. It is too late. There is no money left and I the artist am the loser because I haven't made the case for the means for my work, for the financing of my work of art, and for the work of art and art itself. I am the loser because I assumed that somebody else would tackle the question of the cost of art – although I know, after all, that I always pay for my work at first and therefore must know before anyone else how much it costs. There is no way that the work of art cannot be created for reasons of cost, or that only a part of it can be realized. I am the first person responsible, the first warden and guardian, and I cannot betray my work, costs or no costs. I must be the first one to know. For that reason, I must take an interest in everything concerning the financing of my work. I must be an artist in money matters too, i.e. someone who comes to terms with, grapples with reality, with the world and with the age in which he is living.

X

(July 2017)

What location have you chosen for the *Robert Walser-Sculpture* and what are the location's key characteristics?

I want to construct the *Robert Walser-Sculpture* on the Bahnhofplatz [Station Square] in Biel. It is not the case, however, that I picked or chose this square: the square suggests itself, indeed imposes itself. In the process of decision-making, there was a first evident requirement, namely, to construct the work in one place and not in several places in the city. Accordingly, the second evident requirement was that this should be a place in the city centre. There was, therefore, no searching, finding or selecting. Rather, there is my artistic competence for the problems of public space, for attendant problems, conflicts, complexity, grace, urgency, attractiveness, surprises, necessity and absolutely evident qualities. This absolutely evident quality is here on the Bahnhofplatz in Biel. For example, because in his texts Robert Walser speaks again and again about the railway station situation – about travelling away and arriving back, about the passengers at the station, whose paths criss-cross and fail to meet. There is a wonderful maxim of Robert Walser's – "I stand on the Earth: this is my standpoint." This "on the Earth" is thus the Bahnhofplatz in Biel.

It is equally evident, admittedly, that for a few years now Robert Walser has had his Square on the lake side of the station. And that is fine and correct. I deliberately write here "lake side" so as not to write what I repeatedly hear as a periphrasis for the location of the Robert Walser-Platz in Biel: "behind the station" or "to the rear of the station". Consequently, it is fully evident to me that I should try to join up the two sides of the station, which are linked by a pedestrian underpass, in the mind as well, creating something that allows no rear or front side. I want to create a metaphysical connection between, on the one hand, the Bahnhofplatz in Biel and the precarious *Robert Walser-Sculpture* and, on the other hand, the permanent Robert Walser-Platz. Or, as you once aptly put it, I want to "set up a bracket" between the two squares.

It is also wholly evident that the Bahnhofplatz in Biel, like all railway station squares throughout the world, is a non-place. It stands for non-placement, for chosen or suffered non-placement, since a station square belongs to no-one. If there is still something like public space – nowadays it is being more and more squeezed out – then it is there on a station square. That is true in Biel too: precarious, non-guaranteed, instable, undetermined, vibrating, energy-charged, utopian.

A further evident point is that Switzerland is interlinked by its public transport network (SBB/CFF/FFS) in such a close-meshed and many-branched manner – as represented by all its railway stations, including those no longer in operation – that here one can

become aware that one is a democrat and that one is living in a democracy, even if an incomplete one. And even finally is the fact that Schang Hutter's sculpture *Vertschaupt*, created in 1979/80 as part of the Swiss Sculpture Exhibition, stands on the Bahnhofplatz and offers a further connection – an artistic handshake transcending time and space. I want the permanent sculpture *Vertschaupt* to be the cornerstone of my precarious *Robert Walser-Sculpture* on Biel's station square. It was good to learn that Schang Hutter is himself a Robert Walser fan.

XI

(August 2017)

In connection with the *Robert Walser-Sculpture* you have mentioned also the possibility of a utopian space, a precarious utopian architecture. What does utopia comprise for you today? In what form does it take place? Or is it not rather – through the inclusion of streetwork, alcoholics' meetings and migrants' associations – a heterotopia?

For me, utopia is a concept with absolutely positive connotations. Because art is utopia that has taken on form, that has been given form, and I want the *Robert Walser-Sculpture* to be a work of art and hence a utopia. Utopia means dream, activity, life, hope, innocence, novelty, energy, courage, vision and a future. Utopia resists sentimentality, illusionism, narcissism, neutrality, criticism and glamour. Utopia resists the good or bad conscience and the compromise. There is no real work of art without utopian thinking, without utopian vision, without utopian dynamism. If I am in contact with a work of art, then I am always in contact with utopia. The utopian element in the *Robert Walser-Sculpture* is that it wants to think Robert Walser afresh, to provoke encounters, to be an event and to coin and inaugurate an entirely new form of art in public space. The utopian element in the *Robert Walser-Sculpture* is its "presence and production", i.e. not work with the groups you name. Because that is reality. It is my and our reality, the reality of the "non-exclusive audience", for which I as an artist want always to work. This "non-exclusive audience" is neither utopia nor heterotopia because I decided on it from the outset and have determined it myself. Working with the non-exclusive audience is my decision, my proposition, my mission, my contribution to art history and my responsibility. The really utopian element in the *Robert Walser-Sculpture* is that someone from the audience or a person working in co-operation wants to be there, can be there, must be there the whole time. Quite simply because I too am there, want to be there, can be there and must be there the whole time. The utopian element is that my presence and my production are givens and thus it is proposed and hoped that the other person likewise is present and produces something. The utopian element is that the summons and the

conditions are created to be always on the spot, just as I am always on the spot. The utopian element is that the *Robert Walser-Sculpture* creates the space and the time to produce something on location for 87 days on end, 12 hours per day. That it is in fact possible for someone to be in and with the *Robert Walser-Sculpture* and to take part in it from the very first moment to the very last. The utopian element is that such a place can exist at all. Just imagine that a good number of the inhabitants of Biel were to be in the *Robert Walser-Sculpture* every day, the whole day through! That is my dream, that is my vision, that is the future. My task as an artist is to create the conditions for this. Whether, in point of fact, somebody will be present on site the whole time and will produce something – that is an assertion, is art, is a utopia.

My entire work is precarious. But as with everything precarious it is a question of life, of survival, of life or death. I also want sustainability. But not at any price – for example, because of an object, because of "object-thinking" or because of something that lasts for a long time. I want sustainability through intensity, through urgency, through necessity, through "alertness" and through "being attentive". Sustainability does not mean things that last a long time. Rather, it is kindled by intensity, overthrow, breakthrough and transformation. Art must kindle transformation.

XII

(September 2017)

How do you differentiate between yourself and the reviled event business in the art world? Where is the boundary between the creation of a close-meshed net of events and the artificial creation of events in order to "sell" art better?

With and through the *Robert Walser-Sculpture* I wish to create an event. Creating this event with the *Robert Walser-Sculpture* is for me a challenge, a mission and a problem – I must create the conditions in which it can come about. The term "event", which I am using and which I believe in, I have chosen deliberately. What does this concept mean for me? "Event" is an important, decisive and again a positively charged concept. It is decisive because it is linked with the essence of art. For art creates an event which changes someone. A picture by Andy Warhol or a sculpture by Joseph Beuys is an event. Both have changed me. Art is an event when it reaches out to me, when I let it reach out to me, when it involves me. With me, for example, this is the case with Andy Warhol and Joseph Beuys. Art is an event when it portrays through its form something that is on its way. When something happens in the encounter with it. When, in the encounter with it, I am born into the world surrounding me. When, through the encounter with it, I live in the current age and in the reality that constitutes my reality.

For this reason, I can only speak for myself and not for others. Therefore, I cannot define the concept "event" for others. For as an artist I must first define and flesh out the concept myself. In order that an event can take place, I must give something that comes from within me. I must give something of my very own and be free with this very own something. An event is a breakthrough, a caesura, something that calls everything into question, making it appear in a different light and transforming it. Such an event can occur only if I impart my form. Imparting form is the decisive factor. As always in art, it is the key. There is no point in thinking that I could organize or plan an event. For something that is organized doesn't change anybody. A real event is the opposite of organized culture consumption. A real event cannot be consumed since an event involves those for whom it occurs. An event means being involved. Only if someone is involved can an event be created, just as a sculpture is formed. An event happens, forms itself, creates itself through involvement. For involvement to occur, the artist must first be involved himself or herself, and this involvement is portrayed in the expressed, given form. That is what is meant by "giving form".

So, I do not need to differentiate between myself and what you call the "event business". Rather, I must impart form. What is needed is an individual, generous form, boundless space and unlimited time to allow the emergent to take shape. Art can create something new, unforeseen, unplanned, unimaginable, unprecedented and impossible. Only if I subscribe to this thinking do I have a chance of creating through my art the conditions for an event. That is what I must work and fight for and for which I have to rely on grace.

XIII

(October 2017)

Again and again, you describe the non-planable and non-organizable as prerequisites for your art in public spaces. Isn't this identical with chance, with happenstance? How does your ambition to impart form go together with your attitude of allowing chance to reign?

I don't want to leave anything to chance, since that is passive and does not lead to any dialogue or any confrontation. Chance, happenstance, is too important a thing to abandon oneself to it. On the contrary, it is a matter of preparing everything. I want to prepare everything, plan everything; I want to think of everything, I want to have to think of everything, every moment. Yet – this is the interesting, the decisive, the active aspect – in the process I must be open, alert and sensitive to the unforeseen, the precarious, the non-controllable and the chance event. Chance makes sense only when it really is chance – happenstance – and somehow blocks my plans and preparations, and not when I passively take the chance, "chance it",

or speculate on it. I must think of the non-organizable and non-plannable. I must think! I must prepare myself for every eventuality. On this issue Joseph Beuys once said: "I must prepare, prepare again and again, and I must so act in my entire life that no single moment is not subject to preparation." Isn't that wonderful, incisively thought through, and correct? To prepare something is to think of something, to devote oneself to something, to be passionate, to have a project, an idea, a vision. It means wanting to achieve, to realize something. Only if I prepare everything is there a chance that grace will occur. Through my preparation I must be prepared for grace. My mission is to create the conditions for this. The mission is synonymous with imparting form – which, pure and simple, is making art. I will do everything in my power to see that the *Robert Walser-Sculpture* is well prepared.

XIV

(November 2017)

In what sense will the *Robert Walser-Sculpture* be a collage, in which you bring together the irreconcilable? And why is this an artistic belief that fits our age?

The *Robert Walser-Sculpture* is, in point of fact, a four-dimensional collage. I make two-dimensional, but also three- or four-dimensional collages. My starting point is always two-dimensionality. It is important that I always start from the various dimensions of a collage, even if the work is sited in interior space or public space. Making a collage is easy and can be done quickly. It's fun to do and is at the same time suspect: it is too easy, it is done too quickly. For many people it is not serious-minded enough and is characterized as immature. Thus, collages are made especially by the young. But a collage is something recalcitrant: it gets out of control, even out of the control of the person making it. This is the case also with the *Robert Walser-Sculpture*. Making a collage always has something intuitively "headless" about it. Precisely this is what interests me, because no other means of expression has so much explosive force. A collage is loaded and always remains explosive. With a collage it is true that I as the artist am often left looking silly, but that it is precisely a matter of enduring this "looking silly". No other technique is as world-encompassing as the collage, for almost everybody has made one at some time in his or her life. That is the communal thing about it and means at the same time that almost everybody has at some time or other made an image of our world. I love making collages. For me, there is something fundamental and essential about it. I love collages by John Heartfield, Hannah Höch, Kurt Schwitters and above all the three-dimensional *Grosse-Plasto-Dio-Dada-Drama* [The Great Plasto Dio-Dada-Drama] by Johannes Baader. A collage is something universal and an opening towards a "non-exclusive audience". Here lies its explosive

quality – which goes beyond the topicality of the moment and is and remains timeless. I want to make collages that speak for themselves, are manifestness per se. The *Robert Walser-Sculpture* must be absolutely manifest, evident and sovereign. I am confident that it will be and speak for itself. The manifest nature of a collage lies in the fact that it creates a new world out of elements of the present, already existing world. These diverse elements are united by the fact that – as with the *Robert Walser-Sculpture* – they are elements of our already existing world. I work with already existing things, but by sticking existing things together I wish to create a new world. I want to stick the collage *Robert Walser-Sculpture* together to form a new world-picture. If I am successful in thinking *Robert Walser* afresh, this new picture will emerge – which is one of my goals. I affirm the world and its negative sides. I affirm the world in which the negative too is shown and in which the hard core of reality, of the negative is not excluded. I want to show this hard core. I want to direct my attention to the negative without being cynical or "savvy". I don't want to look away, nor do I want to turn away, nor again to be over-sensitive. I want to be attentive and to create a new world with and within the existing world. A collage with already existing elements, with all the forms of co-operation offered by the inhabitants of Biel, means being in agreement with the world. Being in agreement does not mean endorsing everything. Being in agreement means looking, not turning away, offering resistance and resisting the facts. This is why the collage *Robert Walser-Sculpture* is not information, journalism or a commentary. It creates truth, and for me as artist it is a matter of giving this truth form. Creating truth – that is what we need today.

XV

(December 2017)

The political battle surrounding the location of the *Robert Walser-Sculpture* has already begun. What has it been like for you so far and to what extent is the course of this battle typical of your presence-and-production projects in public spaces?

I wouldn't describe it as a political battle, because I have my own ideas on what is the really political aspect of art. The concepts "political art", "committed art", "political artist", "committed artist" are used again and again nowadays although these simplifications and abbreviations are long since outdated. There is great confusion nowadays over the issue of what is political. What interests me, however, is what constitutes the really political, the "political" with a capital "P". This Political implies for me the questions, "Where do I stand?" and "What do I want?" The "political" with a small "p" consists of opinions, comments and organizing majorities. That doesn't interest me. For me, the key thing is "making art politically",

not making "political art". I have derived the maxim "Make art politically – don't make political art" from Jean-Luc Godard. He said: "It is a question of making films politically, not of making political films". How true! And I think that this is precisely what I have striven to do with the *Robert Walser-Sculpture*. As you know, over the past two years I have done seven fieldworks in Biel, each of them one to two weeks long. As planned, I wanted to come to know Biel residents and talk with them about possible forms of co-operation. These fieldworks were a success. In a large number of conversations over this period, I was able to involve 36 individuals or groups in the planned project. Several times over the entire period I had discussions with, in all, more than 200 Biel inhabitants. I was absolutely focussed on these discussions. Sometimes, it was more than ten such meetings per day. I took this seriously and enjoyed doing it since every one of these talks was always for something – for something communal, the project, a vision, for Biel, for a work of art, for *Robert Walser*. Working for something, battling for something, standing up for something is the "Political". One could see it as a mistake or as a non-consideration of local realities that I neglected to speak with those who are against. It was perhaps too light-hearted of me not to talk with those who for a certain reason are against the *Robert Walser-Sculpture*. Too light-heartedly, I ignored that people can be against my project, against me, against art or fundamentally against something. I must now come to know these reasons and in this additional year, which we have gained by postponing the *Robert Walser-Sculpture* to next summer, I must find out where, from whom and for what reasons there are opponents of the *Robert Walser-Sculpture*. In the coming months, I intend to – and have to – devote all my energies to discussions with those inhabitants of Biel who are against. And in the process, I must not neglect those who are for. That is how I see the continuation of my fieldwork in Biel.

XVI

(January 2018)

Could the moment come where you even accept failure? And what would that moment be? If the project cannot take place or if it doesn't turn out in line with your conceptions?

"Failure" is a concept that carries too heavy a moral or romantic charge. I don't trust anyone who says, "I've failed". Because that's too easy. I prefer to use the term "defeat". I know what I'm talking about, because almost all of my works consist of many defeats or contain at least one defeat. For me, there is no moment of failure, but defeat is a constant companion throughout my entire work. And I know where in the work the defeat lies. There is no work, and no art, without defeat again and again, and it has been like that

from the very start. I've always recognized that it is a question of working on and moving on beyond defeat. I am not saying that I don't sometimes have successes. But I know that a work is never a really total success. Hence my work – art – is also never only defeat. The decisive thing is that I do not make my work as an artist dependent on a result, or on success, or again on defeat. What is important in the final analysis is that my work makes a breakthrough – despite defeats, errors and flaws. Because art must survive despite these and must lead on beyond them. I have always had to fight for my work, for my art, for my vision of art, and have suffered many defeats in the process. I've got no choice anyway. I am a fighter. What helps me is knowing that all art has to be fought for. That's why I say: I am an artist, a worker and a soldier. Creativity must be worked for and fought for. Creativity is born in a crisis. It is not born through or in satiety, affluence and luxury. As Antonio Gramsci said: "A crisis consists in the fact that the old is dying and the new cannot be born." In a crisis there is unforeseen potential for creativity and out of a crisis something can unfold and be extracted. Moments of crisis are moments of decision. This is why making art means taking decisions and fighting for this decision. So, I am never fighting against anything, but fighting for my work, for my standpoint, for my art and for art in general. For this reason, I would also never say that it is worthwhile to fight. If I fight for something, then not to preserve anything or to be "victorious" – a "victory" is uncertain anyway – but I fight because I have to fight. It is not a question of being rewarded for fighting. It is not a question of reward. My thinking is therefore not "No Pain, No Gain". It is rather a matter of espousing something, committing oneself and being prepared to pay the price for this espousal, this commitment. If I fight for something, the "reward" cannot be the result, the accomplishment, the success, the defeat. The "reward" is rather that I have done a battle, that the fight has been fought and art has been made. I think that every fighter knows that.

XVII

(February 2018)

What was the crisis that led to the *Robert Walser-Sculpture* being postponed until 2019?

The Stiftung Schweizerische Plastik-Ausstellung [Swiss Sculpture Exhibition Foundation], who had issued me the invitation to exhibit in Biel in the first place, wanted to halve my work in Biel – without asking me in advance or informing me at all. Things went even farther: the halving of the *Robert Walser-Sculpture* was already being reported on in the press, and this although I reacted immediately, saying, "Nobody halves my work!" This type of thing, to my mind, is not acceptable to any artist and you can't do this type of thing with art. But I wasn't taken

XVIII

(March 2018)

What happened in the days and weeks after the postponement of the *Robert Walser-Sculpture* until 2019 became known? In retrospect, what surprised you about the reactions of those involved, and what pleased or disappointed you?

I wanted, as far as possible, to explain in person to all the Biel inhabitants who were prepared to co-operate on the *Robert Walser-Sculpture* what the reasons were for the postponement. To accomplish this, I did a full week's fieldwork in Biel. It seemed important to me at this critical moment to show up and to stand up for my work and my policy. I wanted all the partners in the co-operative venture to learn from me, the artist, what reasons had led to the time-extension of the project. I didn't want them to hear first from the press or from third parties. I wanted to tell them that I was having difficulties, that there was a major problem with my project and that my work was in danger. I wanted to tell every person concerned in person, how the decision to postpone was arrived at, and why the extension was necessary for me as the artist. In addition, I wanted to underline that I still wanted to work with them and was counting on their co-operation. It was essential for me to clarify that I continued to stand up for and to fight for my project, my vision of art in public spaces and my work of art. My commitment to carrying through the *Robert Walser-Sculpture* in 2019 in the position planned, in the original size and with the same temporal duration could still be counted on. I also tried to explain that a work of art in public space is one of the most wonderful things, but also always very difficult. Because there are no absolute guarantees or total certainties here. I think that I was successful in justifying credibly the postponement and the extension. I was glad to see that, without exception, everybody showed understanding for the postponement and signalled a readiness to continue working. It was good to see how the inhabitants of Biel were, naturally, somewhat disappointed, because they had been looking forward to the *Robert Walser-Sculpture* in 2018, but that they were all open-minded, understanding and undisputedly concerned about the reasons that had led to the extension. It is noteworthy that almost all the co-operations planned remain intact. Those that do not, could not be kept up for organizational or personal reasons, or for reasons of time. That again is understandable in turn. Informing the people concerned

XIX

April 2018

What has gone right so far in the preparations for the *Robert Walser-Sculpture*? What would you have liked to have done differently in view of the current crisis? Or do the processes involved in creating major art projects in public space always take a similar course?

Yes, from my experience I can say that processes involving works in public space do always take a similar course – namely: nothing is guaranteed. Nothing is absolutely certain. Nothing happens in a predetermined way. Nothing takes place as hoped or planned. Everything is always indeterminate until the very last moment. At the same time, however, I know that this is the way it has to be, because there is definitively no guarantee with art in public space. That's the fine and wonderful thing about it, and that's the especially difficult and complex thing about it. So, there is never total failure with art in a public space, and there is never total success either. Success and unsuccess are near neighbours: they are conjoined. What looks like a success can in the final analysis mean failure and vice versa. Art in public space means debate, conflict, crisis, war. Yes, making the *Robert Walser-Sculpture* means, to some extent, waging war. In order to make this work of art, I have to be a warrior. Of course, it is not a war against something or against somebody. Rather, it is a war for something, just as everything in art is always for something. The *Robert Walser-Sculpture* is a battle for *Robert Walser*, for his importance and for his memory. At the same time, it is a battle to decide on the location of the sculpture, and a battle for public space and for art in general. It is not about understanding the term "war" as a provocation: rather, it is about understanding that nothing can be created without debate, without doing battle, without direct, frontal conflict. At least, I cannot achieve it without a battle, without major exertion, although I am not interested in conflict as an end-in-itself. But in each and every one of my works in public space – to date, I have done almost 70 such works – there have been conflicts, problems, difficulties and unresolved issues. I have never experienced it any other way. Always, I have to fight. I have never achieved anything without a fight. It is not possible without really exerting oneself. However, I enjoy a fight, because at the same time it means fighting for my work, for my position, for my understanding of art and in the final analysis for

art itself. What is important is waging the war, joining battle. It is not a matter of wanting to emerge as the victor; rather, it is a matter of asserting and defending – beyond any victory or defeat – one's vision and understanding of art in public space and of trying to give this understanding form. For me, being a warrior in art means becoming aware that art means resistance. Art is resistance as such, because art resists facts, resists political, aesthetic and cultural customs. Art stands for movement, art is positive-minded. Art stands for intensity and the belief in art. Working on the *Robert Walser-Sculpture* reminds me of this at every moment and in every stage. For me it is a matter of accepting this and remaining true to myself, without any narcissism but in full understanding of what the genuinely political in this process consists in. There are perhaps artists who make it without problems and difficulties – I don't know of any. On the contrary, I often hear from colleagues that they have experiences similar to mine. Art in public space makes excessive demands on any artist: it is an ongoing process of self-imposed undue strain. I think that it has to be that way, because with works in public space I am coming into contact with the tough core of reality. The tough core of reality comes into contact with reality's other tough core. This establishing of contact is not peaceful, not free of resistance and not consensual. Incompatible facts, differing visions, opposing interpretations and emphases in life come up against one another face to face. It is a conflict. The danger, however, is not the conflict in itself: the danger for the artist consists in not facing up to this conflict but shying away from it and letting oneself be discouraged or neutralized by the insoluble nature of this collision. It is a matter rather of making one's mistakes without being afraid of doing so and of fighting for what is essential. What is essential is never avoiding errors or reducing flaws: the essential thing is to impart form. I know that my work contains errors and flaws. But I know also that the issue is to achieve a work that can exist as form despite its errors and flaws. The issue is to impart a form whose aura shines out over and above its errors and flaws. This is what the *Robert Walser-Sculpture* must be able to do.

XX

(May 2018)

What is your answer to those sceptics who think that Robert Walser himself would not have appreciated the *Robert Walser-Sculpture*?

The question "What would Robert Walser have thought?" is a typical journalist's question. Without any courage, without any personal content, without any reflection, a question is simply asked, because something has to be asked. The question is stupid, lazy and cowardly. The question is stupid because it subliminally pretends that Robert

Walser made a statement on the reception of his work prior to the event. Precisely that is wrong, since Walser never authorized anyone to speak in his name or to pose questions in his name. In addition, the question "What would Robert Walser have thought?" tries to intimate that there is a typical form of Robert Walser reception. It suggests what Robert Walser "would have liked". To insinuate this is the height of disrespect, but also of the non-understanding of authorship. To allow such ideas to creep in is not only foolish but also unjust, since it is precisely this that I am questioning with the entire form of my work. If the question "What would Robert Walser have thought?" were valid, it would be tantamount to saying that justice can be done to Robert Walser's oeuvre only in a certain aesthetics – I have seen this form of an illustrative, anaemic, shallow aesthetic only too often in the past. The question is, moreover, lazy because, as often when journalists are asking questions, there is not really any interest in the answer – rather, the intention is only to suggest a fabricated, mentally lazy non-approval on Robert Walser's part and so to stir up a pseudo-controversy. And finally, the question is cowardly because it hides behind a non-existent position of Robert Walser's and because it tries to pretend something under the cover of its own lack of attitude and its own non-courageous non-thinking. Robert Walser is dead: his work is alive. He doesn't think anything about my work. His work lives on without him, the author. Robert Walser's work lives on with me and others. So, the question should be the other way around: "What do I think? What form do I give to my thinking on Robert Walser's work? What do you think? What form do you give to your thinking on Robert Walser's work?" An artist must and can provide his own form, coming from himself, his entirely own form. That is my mission today. That is the task of the people alive today. That is the problem of whoever or whatever is still alive today, and the *Robert Walser-Sculpture* will have to face the verdict of art criticism and art history.

XXI

(June 2018)

The fundraising process is not yet complete, and a quarter of the budget remains to be covered. Why, in your opinion, should a sponsor support the *Robert Walser-Sculpture*? What is its potential significance for Biel, for Switzerland and for art? Such a demanding and ambitious presence-and-production project as the *Robert Walser-Sculpture* doesn't come for free. In such a project, fundraising is an important task from the very outset. I am grateful for every large or small sum donated to the *Robert Walser-Sculpture*. There is a whole range of possible ways to support this work. I myself am involved in the fundraising, because I think that it is legitimate for an

artist to seek money for a project he believes in and to try to get financial backers from all kinds of backgrounds to become involved in the project with all kinds of monetary amounts. I can only give potential backers this promise: I want to make a work of art, I want to give my maximum for this work of art, and I will not betray art, my work or my position!

XXII

(July 2018)

If one considers the opposition and obstacles that the *Robert Walser-Sculpture* has to overcome, how do you view the possibilities for critical art today? Are there possibilities at all at the present time? For while on the art market critical art is neutralized through its sellability, in public spaces it is threatened with being debilitated by administrative parameters and voting procedures. How do you see this, being active, as you are, in both fields?

If art encounters opposition, that is normal. It is a good sign. It means that art still has bite, that art can still hurt and can achieve something. At least, it can arouse opposition, however inappropriate this may seem to me. I would be the first person to acknowledge that art means opposition. Art is opposition per se. Art resists aesthetic, political and cultural customs and practices and art resists being usurped or appropriated. For this reason, I never complain when my art encounters resistance. Because I have always known that this is part and parcel of making art and because I know that I am not, and never have been, alone. Every artist can tell you of similar experiences. And art history teaches me how difficult it has always been to make art – not only in public space but to make art at all, at any time and anywhere. To assume anything else is modish claptrap. I think of Meret Oppenheim and Ferdinand Hodler, to mention only Swiss artists, and then – this is something I never forget – I think of all the magnificent artists whose works were reviled, ostracized and destroyed as "degenerate art". Here art history teaches me, the artist, to measure day-to-day events in the art world to which my work is subject against an appropriate yardstick. Art history also teaches me, however, that it never, really never, has been easy to make art – and I know that that's how it has to be! Emil Nolde wrote in 1949: "Only easy things have things easy"? How true, how right this title is! How it hits the nerve! And how full of hope it is! "Only easy things have things easy" is sharp-witted and clear-sighted. It is an assertion, a position, and yet also describes a movement, a dynamism. Because "Only easy things have things easy" appeals to the gracefulness, the mystery of art and doesn't content itself with the exhausted current terms such as "critical art", "political art" or "committed/engaged art". These terms don't mean anything to me anyway. I never use them, and I reject them.

"Only easy things have things easy", however, possesses the power to rescue artists through their work, with their work, in their work. Just as happened to Emil Nolde, with respect and distance. My work too has never had things easy: I too have never found, do not find and will not find things easy – yesterday, today and tomorrow. I know. What is easy for me is to believe in art!

XXIII

(August 2018)

On the one hand, in your work over the past two years you have demanded "total commitment" from yourself, and, on the other hand, you reject the concept of "committed art". Why, actually?

Yes, I reject the term committed art and never use it, because it is merely a journalistic concept. No reputable art critic has ever used this concept. No artist uses such a vacuous classification. Why? Because every artist is totally committed to and in his or her work. I do not know any artist worth taking seriously who is not one hundred per cent committed to and in his or her art. Without total commitment nobody gets anywhere and without absolute commitment nobody can work a whole life through. So, I am also 100% committed to and in my work, but not more or less than others – and for this reason I am not a "committed artist", but simply, like all others, an artist. You see, the concept of "committed art" doesn't work, since it has no bite. If a journalist uses the concepts "committed art" or "committed artist", the implication is that there is also "non-committed art". This can only be the assumption of someone who doesn't know anything about art and who is ignorant of art history. Here, at least, art history could offer insights and – were people to study it – could help to clarify concepts. I reject the terms "committed art" and "committed artist" also because those who operate with the concepts assume that true, real art is "uncommitted art". Those who say "committed art" do not mean art but only "commitment"; otherwise they would say "art". Committed art is hence the negation of (this) art. Such people act as if the problem were the commitment. The problem, however, is always the art: commitment is only its condition – so why use the terms "committed", "political", "critical" if one believes in the real, the original force, the force per se of art? For me, it is clear that those who believe in art do not need such empty concepts. I think that people say "committed" because they do not want to take up a clear stance and so flounderingly use a term that doesn't hurt anyone. Those who use this term are trying to chicken out of a clear statement and to hide behind a meaningless classification. The use of the term "committed art" reveals that instead of risking a judgement these people are making a lily-livered classification. They are chickening out of paying the price for a personal and uninhibited judgement, not daring to judge but instead

hedging their bets. They do not want to risk saying whether something is an inept, meaningless, bad work of art or whether it is an enduringly forceful and good work of art. We know that to deliver such a verdict demands sensitivity, intuition, conviction, clear-sightedness and courage.

XXIV

(September 2018)

Why do you also reject the concept of "critical art"? It is, after all, a traditional feature of art that it sets out to raise consciousness. This can lead to critical thinking and cannot possibly be something that one needs to reject. So, what is the reason for your rejection and what, on the other hand, would be the potential of art that induces critical thinking?

I reject the concept of "critical art" because those who use the term – it is mostly used only by journalists anyway – are suggesting that there is such a thing as "uncritical art". That is nonsense, because all art is critical, must be critical – otherwise it is not art but decoration, fashion or architecture. It is as clear and simple as that. So, whenever someone argues by using the term "critical art", this is always a sign of a lack of trust in art. It is a distrust of the power of art to be able, as art, to change something, to bring about a transformation in each and every human being. I have trust in art because I know that art – because it is art – can put everything in a new light. I have trust in the power of art because, as art, it can involve every individual, on a one-to-one basis. Because I trust art and because I believe in its strength and power, I am always concerned to use art to construct a "critical body". To construct a "critical body" means to impart a form which, as a new form, criticizes existing forms. It also means imparting a new form which, because it is a new form, is criticizable. Indeed, my work must be criticizable and I must be prepared to take criticism. Incidentally, my work is often criticized – often unjustly, often inaccurately, often superficially – but that's the way it is has to be. Because I the artist must know myself why I think what I think, why I make what I make, and why I do my work in art as I do it. In the final analysis, constructing a "critical body" means imparting a new form which, as form, is in a critical condition. A thing in a critical condition is something that is alive, that wants to stay alive, but that is hovering precariously between life and death. If I can construct a "critical body" with my work, then my art is something very different from what can be labelled with the platitudinous terms "critical art" or "uncritical art". My mission is to construct a "critical body" – there is no such thing as an "uncritical body" because it, accordingly, would be dead.

XXV

(October 2018)

Your *Robert Walser-Sculpture* is a place of meeting, of the exchange of ideas, and of events. What type of space is it with reference to community? Does it create a community through consensus? Is it hence a utopian place with reference to an ideal democracy? Or is the *Robert Walser-Sculpture* concerned for what Chantal Mouffe calls the "agonistic space" – a space in which we learn precisely to endure otherness and being different?

Of course, it is fine to have a space where "otherness" and "being different" can be lived and tolerated, and I hope that this does take place in the *Robert Walser-Sculpture*. I as an artist, however, always start from my own goals. My very own, four goals for the *Robert Walser-Sculpture* are: to create a monument for Robert Walser; to think Robert Walser afresh; to create encounters and produce an event; to formulate a new concept of sculpture in public space. My ambition is to achieve these four goals. As always, I proceed from a boundless aspiration and from the immeasurable assertion of art. My wish is to give this assertion and this aspiration a new form. I am not illustrating anything: I must impart form, and I have no wish to lean against or rely on any thinking – however valuable it may be, as the thinking of Chantal Mouffe is. I want to impart a form entirely of my own to my work: hence my four goals and hence also my motto – derived from Hélio Oiticica – which guides and will lead me through the work: "Be a hero! Be an outsider! Be Robert Walser!" I want to and must give form to this motto. That is my assertion and my ambition, and that is my instrument for achieving this. For me, art is an instrument for coming to know the world, for experiencing the age in which I live and for confronting myself with the reality that surrounds me. Art is an instrument also because it is thanks to art that I can set in train an individual and collective emancipatory process. That is my starting point in and with my work and I believe that through art, even today, an aesthetic experience can be a liberating one. These are the assumptions by which I want to and must judge the *Robert Walser-Sculpture*.

XXVI

(December 2018)

We are now four months away from the moment when the construction of the *Robert Walser-Sculpture* is due to start. The building permit has been issued. Resistance to the project has been mollified by patience and lively dialogue. Individual opponents have been integrated into the scheme. What we do not yet have at this stage is the full financing for the project. What thoughts and feelings does this leave you with? We are still looking for money to finance the *Robert Walser-Sculpture*. I too will go on

looking until all parts of the project have been financed. I'm familiar with the saying that "l'argent est le nerf de la guerre" – "money is the sinews of war" – and I know that it is apt, also for a work such as the *Robert Walser-Sculpture*. The financing of such an ambitious project is highly important and a great deal depends on it, a very great deal – but not everything, since, precisely because there is a lot of money at stake, it is a question of keeping one's nerve, keeping cool-headed and not getting into a panic, even if the overall financing – and that is the case with us – is not yet assured. For that's the way it has to be! My intention with the *Robert Walser-Sculpture* is to create a precarious, unstable, unsecured work, without any guarantee. My intention is to create a work that, in its entire fragility, fulfils no known function, a work that dispenses with measurable results. My intention is to construct a sculpture that allows space and time for grace, for moments of grace, in both senses of the word. My intention is to create a work that is open and is prepared to allow moments of grace to come about. These moments, however, cannot be planned or provoked. Rather, I must be alert, sensitive and attentive so as to experience the touch of grace, knowing that these moments cannot be documented or held fast. What I can do, however, is to be a witness of such moments and to keep my consciousness prepared for them; and I can sharpen and refine my work through the memory of previous moments of grace. If I am alert, I know that grace can occur, irrespective of any success or unsuccess. Even something that is not a success can contain grace. In concrete terms, this means that I as an artist must lose myself in and with my work. It means that I must experience this self-loss in such a way that it becomes the only competence. Losing myself in and through my work must be the only competence that I, the artist, have in order to perform my work! Simone Weil described this wonderfully: "Grace fills empty spaces, but it can only enter where there is a void to receive it, and it is grace itself which makes this void." It is my intention to work and fight for grace with and in the *Robert Walser-Sculpture* and for this grace I must be open and prepared. In these circumstances, how can it be that everything is financed and calculated in advance? How can it be that everything is factored and budgeted for in advance?

XXVII

(January 2019)

You speak repeatedly of gracefulness and grace, words that are rather baffling in contemporary art discourse and that I as an art historian tend spontaneously to associate with the French words, "grâce" or "gracieux", as an aesthetic quality akin to "charming" and "delicate", i.e. something that has more to do with the Rococo period than with today. What exactly do you

understand by these terms? And what, apart from Simone Weil, are the further roots of this understanding?

I have always known that as an artist one must hope for grace, trust in grace and work towards grace. For years now, every year, my to-do list has contained the line: "I must be prepared to be touched by grace." I don't care if people laugh at this and if somebody says that I haven't understood anything about grace, because I know what I'm talking about when I'm doing my work – art. "Grace" is an important term because it prepares something, because it opens up something, because it allows something, because it is "that which is coming", and to say "Yes" to grace you have to be courageous and competent. I maintain that, in my work, with my form and through my position, I know what it means to be competent about grace. I know that if I want to work in public space and if, in addition, I want to involve a "non-exclusive audience", then this is just not possible without grace or moments of grace. I also know that grace – in both senses of the word – is a tough term. "Grace" is something one must endure. Something tough is something that exists in itself, something that resists being appropriated, something that puts up resistance. Real grace is "hard-core" and unrelenting. Soft things don't interest me anyway. By the way, "graceful" has nothing soft about it. Precisely because it has gone out of fashion, it is important to translate the term "grace" – in its two senses – straightaway. I associate the two meanings of grace with other positive terms such as dream, hope, willingness to make sacrifices, blindness, using oneself as a weapon, justice, eternity, absoluteness, truth, dignity, belief, generosity, ethics, energy, power, mission. I do not confuse aesthetics and form either, because grace, in both senses, is clearly part of form. When encountering something "graceful" or "gracious" I never think of aesthetics. Simone Weil, whose writings I discovered only a short time ago, writes of grace: "Grace fills empty spaces, but it can only enter where there is a void to receive it, and it is grace itself which makes this void."⁹ I came to know Simone Weil's thinking while researching for a public lecture on the subject of "Grace and Gravity". In my lecture, I spoke on the importance of grace for my work and demonstrated when and how "grace" has appeared in my work. I reported as an eye-witness of "grace moments" in my work. In the process, I neither illustrated "grace" in either of its two meanings, nor did I use them as documentation or justification. Grace has definitely nothing to do with Rococo: a captain of Italian industry, who was caught up in a financial scandal, committed suicide and left behind on a visiting card the one word – GRAZIE.

XXVIII

February 2019

In the public discussions revolving around the *Robert Walser-Sculpture*, but also in your lectures, it is striking that you use words which have a marked spiritual or religious flavour. "Grace" is one such example. But so is your insistence on a "mission", which you are bringing to people as a missionary. What is your attitude here? Does it not disturb you that in the post-colonial age, undertaking a mission is seen as something very negative? Why should an artist also be a missionary?

It doesn't disturb me if someone finds fault with the vocabulary I use or if the concepts that I employ are criticized. For that means, at least, that I am not using run-of-the-mill, stereotyped vocabulary, but am using original concepts that say something to me, that mean something to me, and not concepts that have been foisted on me from outside or are used in current art discourse. If I speak of a/my "mission", I do so consciously. In every film and every TV series today, everybody has a mission. Why should the artist be the only person who has no mission? Having a mission has nothing to do with religion but with an idea, a plan, a project, a vision, a utopia. My starting point is always my mission, i.e. the mission I have myself set, have myself invented, have myself created. I have never thought that an artist should be a missionary, but I have always assumed that, as an artist, one has a mission. It has been my experience that having a mission as an artist can be decisive. The decisive thing is that nothing becomes simpler, nothing becomes easier, nothing works better – but everything is clear. It is clear that, come what may, I must fulfil my mission. I admire people, artists, people in the art world or, on principle, all people who have a mission. When a person is fulfilled by a mission – I think of Emma Kunz, Robert Walser, Harald Szeemann or Hannah Arendt – that person exudes a beautiful, absolute aura. I think there is nothing more beautiful than when a person is fully and entirely elated by his or her mission, whatever this mission may be. When I think of people who have a mission or have fulfilled a mission, then it is always with feelings of admiration. I associate the concept of "mission" with fighting for something, standing up for something, committing oneself to something, and committing oneself so totally to something that the success or unsuccess of the mission is not the most important thing. Alongside the concept of "mission" there always stands the *mission impossible* and this concept says everything about why it makes sense today to have a mission. Because it is precisely not a question of whether something is possible or impossible, but of whether one has a mission. It is the impossible that makes the concept of "mission" interesting. The possible, in contrast, is boring. Having a mission is thus far removed from being "a missionary", but it is close to the concept of the soldier.

A soldier accepts a mission, even an impossible one, and I can conceive a work such as the *Robert Walser-Sculpture* only as a "mission impossible"!

I would like to clarify here that if I use concepts such as "mission" or "grace" and if in my texts or when speaking to a public audience I try to be precise and assertive, then I do so because I think that in art assertion is what is required – the assertion of form. And not because I think that I am in possession of, or know, "the truth". As the artist, I am prepared to pay the price for this assertion of form and this insistence on it. I have – like everybody – my doubts. Only, I refuse to cultivate my doubts, argue with them or turn them even into an artistic value added ("the artist has such self-doubts"). I reject the idea that, when writing or speaking in public, I have perpetually to apologize or to express my doubts at length. I reject the idea that, under the pretext of being an artist, I do not have to or am not able to express myself clearly and understandably. My mission is to "impart form", my entirely own form – also in language. My mission is to create a work that forms a "critical body" and to work for a "non-exclusive audience".

XXIX

(March 2019)

You are against classic art mediation and outreach work and have referred in this context to Jacques Rancière's *The Ignorant Schoolmaster*.⁴ What type of art mediation seems to you appropriate for the *Robert Walser-Sculpture* and what are your reasons for this?

The *Robert Walser-Sculpture* is made with and for the inhabitants of Biel. As announced, I have tried to invite the non-exclusive audience of Biel to this sculpture – to involve them in it. This means that all those who will collaborate on this sculpture will be authors. Authors do not need any mediation and thus in the *Robert Walser-Sculpture* there is no need for any art mediation. Since in a situation where all those who take part are participating actors and are informed about the work of art in which they are participating, there is nothing more that needs to be mediated, and if a visitor does wish to ask questions, any of the authors can provide the necessary information. Each of them is able to talk about the work of art from his or her personal perspective and each of them can report on his or her own experience. Thus, there will be many, different and varying experiential reports in and about the *Robert Walser-Sculpture*. The attractive thing is that nobody experiences the sculpture like anybody else. This is an important part of this new sculptural realization and constitutes, among other things, the novelty of this sculpture.

Thus, it is not, for example, the case that a certain person, an art mediator, might be authorized to give information on the work of art, but everybody is encouraged to

experience the work of art in their own way and to pass this experience on, because with the *Robert Walser-Sculpture*, as with any work of art, it is a question of getting an experience. But an experience is something you must go through yourself: you must venture something, risk something, you must risk your selfhood. This is why, on the one hand, mediation is never an experience and why, on the other hand, a real experience can never be mediated. The mediation of art is hence a non-concept, since art cannot be mediated but has to be experienced. The phrase "art mediation" is therefore deceptive, because it pretends something that doesn't exist and because it is something that is unnecessary: for art, being art, can speak to each and every person directly, one-to-one. Art can provoke a dialogue or a confrontation on equal terms. Art can trigger a transformation in its audience without any commentary, without arguments, and without information, and so, being something complete in itself, cannot be mediated. Whenever art is mediated, therefore, the audience is, consciously or unconsciously, being held back from experiencing it. Art mediation today is either consumerist (it can be bought, it has to be paid for), distancing (it builds up a remove between the work of art and the audience), or patronizing (art mediators are specialists). There is, however, no need for specialists in art: what is needed are curators. What is needed are curators, whose most important task is to know art, to know artistic positions and to decide – among hundreds, thousands – on the one artistic position or the other. I say "decide" and not "select", because such a decision always has its cost for the curator. The curator decides by exhibiting this position or another one, or by inviting the artist to do his or her work – as you did by inviting me to Biel and so deciding on my work, my position, my art. This is how you mediate my work, my position, my art – through your decision, not with words, not with arguments, not with explanations, but with your decision. That's the way it has to be! That is real art mediation and that is the real work and the real responsibility of the curator. So, when a curator decides to exhibit a position, he or she is mediating. Real mediation is therefore never something random or gratuitous: it must be a total commitment. To decide, among an unlimited plurality of artistic positions, on that work which makes sense for the curator is decisive. And only because the curator has decided on this and not another position can this work shine out into the world and encounter dialogue or confrontation. Real art mediation and what is mediated consist in this so very important, incisive curatorial decision. Consequently, there is no need of any further mediation. The work of the curator is done, and it is then up to the artist to comment on his or her work – or not. Experience shows that it is always the artists who have the most to say about their work and who always speak about their own work in the clearest terms. Artists do this in their own very special way, which is itself

part of the statement. Sometimes specialists put forward the argument that the artists do not express themselves well or that they refuse to speak about their work. In such cases, this has to be respected and the lack of expressiveness or the refusal to say something about their work has to be taken seriously. I always learn the most important things about the works of artist colleagues from the artists themselves. This is why I am convinced that with the *Robert Walser-Sculpture* – a work that is possible only thanks to the involvement of many Biel residents – questions can be best answered by those involved themselves, including myself. The *Robert Walser-Sculpture* is an experience and will become an experience.

- 1 See Hirschhorn's remarks in XXVII, January 2019, pp. 29.
- 2 "Eine Zeit viel Liebes u. Schönes enthaltend u. auch manches Schwere, wie es wohl nie Menschenkindern erspart bleibt, denn nur leichtes Leben ist leicht!" [A time that contained much kindness and beauty and also some difficulty, such as human beings are probably never spared, because only facile life is easy!], quoted from Caroline Dietrich, "Emil Nolde's späte Liebe" [Emil Nolde's Late Love], in *Museumsjournal*, 2013, 4, pp. 64-65.
- 3 Simone Weil, *Gravity and Grace*, translated by Emma Crawford and Mario von der Ruhr, London 1952, p. 10.
- 4 Jacques Rancière, *The Ignorant Schoolmaster: Five Lessons in Intellectual Emancipation*, translated with an introduction by Kristin Ross, Stanford 1991.