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Painting Time
Daniel Birnbaum

Time, said Austerlitz in the observation room in Greenwich, was by far the most artificial of all our inventions, and in being bound to the planet turning on its own axis was no less arbitrary than would be, say, a calculation based on the growth of trees or the duration required for a piece of limestone to disintegrate, quite apart from the fact that the solar day which we take as our guideline does not provide any precise measurement, so that in order to reckon time we have to devise an imaginary, average sun which has an invariable speed of movement and does not incline towards the equator in its orbit. If Newton thought, said Austerlitz, pointing through the window and down the curve of the water around the Isle of Dogs glistening in the last of the daylight, if Newton really thought that time was a river like the Thames, then where is its source and into what sea does it finally flow?

W.G. Sebald

“Its walls are of alabaster, but worn and shattered, and darkly stained with age.” Ruskin’s famous words about Venice form a starting point for this exploration of time and matter, history and visual richness. When I first encountered Jorge Otero-Pailos’s work, I knew nothing about the issues he explores or about the field of research in which he is one of the leading authorities. I looked at his work with the eyes of an art critic, and what I saw appeared to me to represent a surprising approach to painterly themes. There are so many uninteresting “returns to painting,” but perhaps the real question is, does it have to be a “return”? After all the talk of the alleged “end” of painting, ongoing since the emergence of conceptual art in the 1960s, it now seems as if the question could be displaced and reformulated in terms of discipline-transcending strategies. A different view on the disciplines insists on their fluidity: drawings, watercolors, canvases, wall paintings, post- ers, architectural models, lamps, sculptures, installations can all be linked according to a transformative logic reminiscent of the Baroque city. Otero-Pailos’s work is a case in point, and so is that of many other artists in the 53rd Venice Art Biennial. As Gilles Deleuze argued, writing about the 17th century: “Painting exceeds its frame and is realized in polychrome marble sculpture, and sculpture goes beyond itself by being achieved in architecture; and, in turn, architecture discovers a frame in the facade, but the frame itself becomes detached from the inside, and establishes relations with the surroundings so as to realize architecture in city planning. From one end of the chain, the painter has become an urban designer.” Thus the consideration of painting in the extended field centers on the idea that the medium no longer exists as a strictly circumscribed mode of expression; rather, it emerges as a zone of contagion, constantly branching out and widening its scope.

Of course, Otero-Pailos’s work cannot be reduced to a discussion about the possibilities of painting as a discipline. So many other themes are of relevance, for instance the infinitely rich and puzzling question of how to represent time. Immanuel Kant famously said that time has only one dimension. It is the form of our inner intuition and as such lacks visually discernable contours. It has no evident shape—Gestalt—but we produce our own images of time through various analogies. We borrow models from geometry to get a better grasp of the inner workings of time. Thus, we represent time as an infinite line, and from this image we then draw conclusions concerning its nature. Commenting on the phenomenological conception of time, Maurice Merleau-Ponty contends critically, “Time is not a line but a network of intentionalities.” On the other hand, Jorge Luis Borges, the most severe of all critics of linearity, says, “I know of one Greek labyrinth which is a single straight line.” And he adds, “Along that line so many philosophers have lost themselves…” Other thinkers have suggested other metaphors: the river, arrow, circle, spiral, cone, pyramid, crystal, fold, maze. I doubt that Otero-Pailos will help us finally find a way out of the labyrinth, but in his company getting lost in time seems less of a problem. In fact, for me it has been pure joy.

Venice, May 2009
Ingathering depends has become the definition of Thysan-Bornmaur Art Contemporary’s projects and special commissions, so much so that these projects make their way to us, rather than the other way around. The Ethics of Dust: Doge’s Palace, Venice, 2009 is interesting one of those projects that has come full circle. I had invited Jorge Otero-Pailos to Lopud near Dubrovnik for one of our debate sessions in June 2007, after being encouraged by Mark Wigley, Dean of the Architecture Department at Columbia University. Mark had been impressed with the conservation work that I had been undertaking with ARCH / Art Restoration For Cultural Heritage, a foundation created in 1991 to undertake conservation projects all over the world: Islamic Manuscripts from the Institute of Oriental Studies of Tbilisi, the hanging coffins of the Bo in the Chinese Yunnan province, a frieze of the Sobassion in Aphrodisias in Turkey, and the “Chettou-Chouf” (laugh and talk) fountain in the medina of Marrakesh, to name a few. During the last fifteen years, the foundation had focused its work across Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina, Lopud had lost a lot of its natural beauty and heritage, it needed a new and fresh impulse. Of resurrection, of “bringing it back to life.” Like Dubrovnik, the trying to determine which angle to take on the Lopud restoration in the Dubrovnik area, restoring many Renaissance altar paintings and frescoes from the Sebasteion in Aphrodisias in Turkey, and the “Cherb-ou-Chouf” garden nearby. They conceived a “toxic garden,” which was reminiscent of its historical role as the nursery for medicinal plants for the monks. Although this project had received great praise from the architectural press for its visionary and courageous nature, it was turned down by the local planning authorities. Such reactions are consistent with the traditional approach to conservation which is still unfortunately over-regulated, and essentially geared towards freezing heritages and rigorously protecting it by restricting interventions and activities within it.

The Lopud Debate Sessions took place twice a year. “Preservation and Reanimation through Contemporary Art and Architecture” was one of the topics that we discussed with Jorge Otero-Pailos, François Roche, Mark Wigley, Andreas Ruby, Albert Heta, and Dinko Peracic in June 2007 and subsequently published in a Columbia University journal called Future Anterior. Because it was precisely that publication however that got us all believing that we were onto something important, I am happy to present the transcript on the next few pages to make it available for you as well.

During this time, many projects have been instated and not all of them furthered or nurtured by T-B A21. In the summer of 2007, Raqs Media Collective, Ragnar Kjartansson, Osk flor, Cerith Wyn Evans, Brad Kahlhamer, and Ilaria Cavaggioni, the architect assigned to follow Jorge’s work on Venetian architecture with life, thus, not condemning it to death by freezing it in time. Together with the Graduate School of Architecture, Planning and Preservation of Columbia University, T-B A21 has also organized a symposium—triggered by Jorge’s work—at the Istituto Veneto in Venice, entitled “The Last Temptation of the Contemporary,” which focuses on the importance of contemporary creativity within the world of conservation and on the role of contemporary art in classical or traditional museums which in the recent past have been compelled to open contemporary art departments.

My special thanks go to Jorge Otero-Pailos: you have put so much effort and commitment into this, I can hardly believe you also managed to father a baby in the process! I would like to thank Mark Wigley for his encouragement to believe in such unorthodox practices and for his having given these experiments their full and undivided support and attention as well as Columbia University for the funding that went into the realization of the project and its publication. Daniel Bilbairns’ courageous decision to venture out and beyond our otherwise rather narrow understanding of the visual arts is nothing short of a sure demonstration of his brilliance. In Venice I would like to thank Renata Codello, Superintendent for the Architectural and Landscape Resources of Venice and Lagoon, who gave us the authority to work on Venice’s crown jewel, the Doge’s Palace, as well as Ilana Cavaggioni, the architect assigned to follow Jorge’s work on behalf of the Soprintendenza.

Diana Zeyran, who coordinated this project and kept the dialogue flowing over a great span of time and long distances, has to be celebrated for her perseverance! I would like to thank the T-B A21 team that I am always so very proud of, which includes Philipp Kries, Jutta Knecht, Tereza Friml, Elena Eleninskaia, Alexandre Henning, Andreas Hohinger, Angela Hirsch, Samaela Bilc-Eric, Barbara Simma and Elisabeth Marechal. My thanks also reach out to Jorge’s assistants Joshua Draper and Carlos Hube who have produced invaluable support for this project, and who have reminded us once again how team spirit makes everything possible.

I would like to thank Spanish State Corporation for Cultural Action Abroad (SEACEX) who has generously supported the project, and especially Arts Mundial of FTB Rommer for sponsoring the kits on kisses of latex needed.
Preservation and Reanimation through Contemporary Art and Architecture

Since summer 2009, Thyssen-Bornemisza Art Contemporary has been hosting seminars and debates on the Croatian island of Lopud. Conceived to create an impetus for innovation, dialogue, and exchange by interconnecting active agendas and practices the “Lopud Seminars” negotiate relevant issues regarding art, architecture, and preservation. It was at this meeting in June 2007 that TAI 211 had invited Jorge Otero-Palacios, Mark Wigley, Beatriz Colomina, François Roche, Raqs Media Collective, Daniel Burenbaum, and Nikolaus Hirsch for the first time on the occasion of the reopening of Olafur Eliasson’s and David Adjaye’s Your Black Horizon Art Pavilion in Lopud.

In the following discussion a new vision of contemporary preservation is formulated with the encouragement of Jorge Otero-Palacios, which puts creativity and contemporary interpretation ahead of the traditional approach to the conservation discipline. In this revised paradigm, contemporary architecture (as exemplified by Your Black Horizon Art Pavilion) is seen as an act of preservation—quite literally by preserving the lights of Lopud—and the preservation of the Franciscan Monastery is formulated with the encouragement of Jorge Otero-Palacios, which I believe is extremely relevant to this discussion. Because he’s got a very interesting study group at Columbia University, and David Adjaye has a religious history as well as a protective function, along with the historical role that the Franciscan order had in the education of the community. I see here a link to the process of restoring the historical renaissance gardens of Lopud and creating a special botanical garden there, as another logical part of the revitalization of the island. The historical importance of botany and medicinal plants of renaissance Dalmatia is directly connected to the Franciscan order, which was very committed to these remedies and their pharmacies since the thirteenth century onwards. You have also seen visited Olafur Eliasson and David Adjaye’s beautiful, extraordinary Art pavilion, a contemporary art and architecture collaboration that TAI 211 commissioned two years ago first shown at the Venice Biennial in 2005, and now rebuilt a stone’s throw from the monastery. I’d like to start this debate by asking Jorge to talk about his impressions because he’s got a very interesting study group at Columbia University, which I believe is extremely relevant to this discussion.

Jorge Otero-Palacios: We’re in a historical moment in which art and architecture are beginning to rediscover each other through historic preservation. In order to make valuable discoveries in each other, these three disciplines must lower their guards. The question for me is how can we lower the guard of preservation, which is so much about guarding—protecting heritage—so that it becomes open to other interpretations of heritage that are not intra-disciplinary but that are extra-disciplinary and that come from art and architecture. I think that is where the contribution of the pavilions, already seen as part of Lopud’s heritage, is really quite striking. The pavilion allows to ask questions of this historic site, that might not have been possible within just the realm of conservation. How can historic Lopud inform contemporary art and aesthetic perception? Questions like this are not considered legitimate in historic preservation. So the main fact that you are beginning to open up a space, for asking questions that are not considered legitimate in historic preservation is a huge contribution. I hope that in the process of our discussions, we will begin to make those discoveries of things that were unarticulated somehow, of new types of methods and ways of thinking about heritage that somehow have been excluded from the heritage discussion in order to really further a way of thinking about heritage. Today, connections are more important than boundaries, and preservation is all about setting boundaries, setting boundaries about what you can touch and what you cannot touch, which is excluded and what is included, where history begins and where it ends. We negotiate what a monument is and what, two meters away from it, is not. We are beginning to question those boundaries. I am very excited to be here and to be a part of this, and looking forward to lowering my guard and seeing what other people can contribute and bring into the discussion of preservation.
which investigates what happens in a country after liberation or after an emergency situation. On the one hand you have this extreme petrifaction of the past in the name of authenticity and on the other hand you have situations where the past is just bulldozed as if nothing had happened since the tabula rasa days of modernism, like in China where old villages or old city cores are replaced by big high rises and CBDs. This think might be interesting to know that almost seamless transition be which were destroyed in the big migration wars in the fifth and sixth centuries. There was no idea of rebuilding them, but rather happened during times of peace. Today, this already dead building is being restored and made dead again, because it is being isolated from the people and not allowed to communicate with the people where it’s located. Similar initiatives exist in the region. The most extreme case in Kosovo is the issue of cultural heritage, which in the process of political negotiations had the biggest importance, or at least the biggest space. A large amount of “Serb” Orthodox churches are in Kosovo right now, and that cultural heritage today is politicized because it is ethnicized. They don’t belong to the people. They belong only to an eth- nicity, and through these churches one part of the population is claim- ing a territory. The churches have been awarded a certain amount of land around them. If there were more churches they would have more land. It is as if you had eight monasteries that you could claim indi- pendency. In this case, through five or six churches they will have un- der control twenty eight percent of the territory of the country. In that environment, a critical virus, and we aim to address these issues on another level which doesn’t exist right now down there.

Jorge Oteo-Pallos: I think that’s an important point to bring in, to re- mind preservation of politics, because so often preservation stands back and assumes the mantle of detachment of the architectural histo- ry. Or, the beginning of preservation, beginning of preservation’s invocation of style as a means to de-politi- cize architecture. The interesting part of the conversation with the con- servators of the monastery was that they can’t seem to find the style in fact; tied into the hardware of another structure yet to come, with of- ten totally contradicting ideological premises. I mean, there couldn’t be a bigger gap than between the heretical spirit of a Roman bath and a Christian monastery for men only. Unless you think that there’s an anticipation of a gay club. That type of sovereignty, of dealing with history by incorporating its material traces while giving them a new programmatic trajectory is something that we can find in different peri- ods of history but are somewhat lacking today, and I’m wondering why that is and whether we can find that kind of spirit.

Francesca von Habsburg: Albeit, you have a problem rising in Pristina now, which revolves around the reconstruction of an old hammam. Please tell us about it.

Albert Heta: First of all, I don’t come from a background of architec- ture. I’m an artist, and I’m a bit more critical toward an approach, a political situation. On the one hand you have this extreme petrifaction of the past and the present, and that transition would be interesting to know. Is there a way to acknowl- edge the past but not enslavement to it? Is there a way to tie future into the past without annihilating the past? This type of continuity seems to have no lobby yet. The preservationists seem to be the lobbyists of the past, while the people have the past, post, post, post-mod- ernists who still believe in inventing an entirely new future, as we can see in the tiger states of Asia where the past simply has no lobby. It could be interesting to think about that almost seamless transition be- tween past, present and future. It seems that there existed a knowl- edge of this transition, if we look back in history, for instance, Christian monasteries were built in the remnants of old Roman baths which were destroyed in the big migration wars in the fifth and sixth and seventh centuries. There was no idea of rebuilding them, but rather constructing them as a raw construction, infrastructure, sheer mater, in fact, tool into the hardware of another structure yet to come, with of- ten totally contradicting ideological premises. I mean, there couldn’t be a bigger gap than between the heretical spirit of a Roman bath and a Christian monastery for men only. Unless you think that there’s an anticipation of a gay club. That type of sovereignty, of dealing with history by incorporating its material traces while giving them a new programmatic trajectory is something that we can find in different peri- ods of history but are somewhat lacking today, and I’m wondering why that is and whether we can find that kind of spirit.
want to preserve is the memory of the monument with all its different layers, also including part of the condition that it’s in now. This concept is very difficult to get through to the Institute of Protection of Monuments because for them it’s crucial to restore the original condition as best as possible, obviously erasing records of recent neglect. In view of the discrepancy between my intended reuse of the complex and the conservation authorities’ insistence on complete restoration, I commissioned Janet Cardiff, a Canadian artist, to create a “video walk” through the monastery. She has already been here twice, filming, doc- umenting, and immersing herself in the multilayered history of the com- plex, and she will come back for several more visits. The final project will incorporate those many visits into one video-walk, drawing the view- er into Janet’s imagination. In parts of the walk one will be able to see the process of change—and that’s the only way I could recuperate that memory. Interestingly, working with a contemporary artist has become the most efficient way to keep this memory alive. I know that once the building is finished, it will be very difficult to recollect those years spent battling with its restoration. It is also my intention to revitalise the fortress and transform it into a creative platform for new artworks. This has now led to other new commissions such as Olafur’s project to create a hanging bridge that creates an essential new public access to the fortress from the monastery. Catherine Sullivan will come and create a new work here in the fall based on Shakespeare’s Twelfth Night and the dual sexual role of the two main characters that he created for his play, using Illyria as a backdrop. It’s really important to me that the walls of the fortress don’t turn into a stage backdrop, but rather become an integral part of the creative process of the artists’ projects, thus giving new meaning and purpose (form and function) to the building. I am very interested in the work of people who have an unusual sensi- tivity and approach to the context of a site.

François Roche: It’s very strange how our future is a sensation of the past, it’s nostalgic. Our future has been designed in the sixties, and there is a vintage sensation of the future. So I don’t know how we could introduce preservation in this world, it is very difficult for me to use. There is an hour of time between past and future, hesitating, palpitating between both sensations. It is something very interesting, in a way. I remember a movie of Kiyoshi Kurosawa, Charumbia, about a tree, a very old tree, which illustrates the social pressures historic pres- ervation faces. In the movie the tree was at first protected because it was the oldest in the forest. But the community found out that the tree was infiltrating the ground and toxifying the real forest, which was the source of the local economy. So they decided to destroy the tree, because it was not preserving what the humans created after the dino- saur period. So do we need to preserve the toxicity of the monastery, or do we need to inject a new toxicity into the monastery?

Andreas Ruby: Couldn’t we also understand historic preservation as that is less value-laden, something like a transformation, which may have a whole variety of connotations but which does not imply that any one period has any kind of moral sovereignty over any other. If we take this monastery as an example, there is an interest in keeping it as historical heritage, but there is also a need to reprogram it. Francesca, what is the challenge for you, the monastery’s history or the potential that you can see connected to it?

Francesca von Habsburg: I walked into that building ten years ago. It was a really terrible ruin with most of its roof missing. However, I felt the stones were alive and there was still an incredible vibrancy to the place. It had been abandoned about 150 years, and many people had used, abused and looted it since then. When the Italian fascists came here in the Second World War they wrote “Il Duce” in big graffiti on a wall, adding yet another incredible layer to the site’s history. What I
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can learn that the true nature of preservation is transformation. If I make a statement or intervention that radically changes the situation, I'm actually making a preservative act. Obviously that challenges the self-understanding of the discipline so far because as you said even if preservation undertakes these radical changes they always do it for the sake or in the name of keeping things as they are. So the question is how can you break up the self-image of preservation and how can you change the idea of what a preservationist does.

François Roche: So if you want to revive the stone, then put a manifesto inside the stone, palpitating, reviving its instructions. We can invent an instruction for using something. In the case of the monastery, we can introduce a narrative function, which is not only reworking the iconography of the existing patrimony. We can introduce a narrative way to deal with this dead body, so it comes from the grave to say “hello!” We can write a scenario of this narrative revival of the dead body as a ceremony. The ceremony is important, we want to recreate a Franciscan monk. Imagine a conspiracy: People leaving the tower… we don’t know exactly what’s happened…

Andreas Ruby: But I think it’s important that you said the ceremony should not be the same ceremony that it has been. You’re saying that the stone is not enough and we need to invent some kind of scenario that helps us to use it as an infrastructure for life and not as a fetish that is of a museum. I think that’s probably what you’re doing. You’re trying to create that type of ceremony that helps us to see in it more than stone.

Francesca von Habsburg: There is this need and desire and, of course, there is a freshness in designing your own building, something raw, and it’s really difficult to find an architect who’s really willing to look at the old building and help you reinterpret it. This is a discussion – how do you do that? Contemporary architects find it very difficult to get excited about those kinds of problems, and preservation architects are bogged down in theory, are very restricted in their ideas.

Jorge Otero-Pailos: Preservation is not just working on monuments but also includes these kinds of performance pieces, ceremonies if you will, that happen during the process of visiting historic sites. Preservation organizes how one visits. In fact, I define preservation as the organization of attention. It’s the kind of organization of attention that is all about distracting. It’s distracting you from looking at that which you are not supposed to be looking at. For instance, think about the coast here and the whole branding of Croatia as “the Mediterranean as it used to be.” It’s interesting that it’s diverting you from Croatia as it used to be. The whole organization of your attention is towards the Mediterranean, and that’s the whole journey and the whole experience that you’re supposed to have. But what would happen if we were to re-slogan Croatia in the journals and travel magazines as “Croatia as it used to be.” That alone would reorganize attention.

Albert Heta: Croatia during Ante Pavelić! In terms of preservation it is like asking if the Taliban were doing preservation when they destroyed the Bamiyan Buddhas.

Mark Wigley: Yes, from a stupidly abstract point of view, the Taliban have to be understood as expert preservationists. One could look at the Taliban arguments made during the moments of maximum violence and the language there would be a language of preservation. Of course, it’s the preservation of the self and destruction of the other. Not only is preservation always haunted by simultaneous protection and violence but there’s always violence in preservation. One wonders to what extent the sort of Western legitimation of those figures also led to their destruction.

This debate session took place on June 18, 2007 on the island of Lopud.
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