

# 17, 18

Jaargang 8 NO. 36

j i n t e r n a t i o n a l e n t e n t i e		i n t e r n a t i o n a l e n t e n t i e		i n t e r n a t i o n a l e n t e n t i e	
--	--	---	--	---	--

# F

## Cloning humans is disgusting

By  
**Pierre Bismuth**

BRUSSELS, 24 MAR. - One of the works in Pierre Bismuth's upcoming exhibition at Galerie Jan Mot is *The Jungle Book Project* (2002), a work which was shown last year at

Manifesta 4 in Frankfurt. On this work which was produced with the support of the Délégation Arts Plastiques (DAP), the artist wrote the following text.

"I was always fascinated by the way children can watch the same video or listen to the same record over and over, few times a day, for weeks or months. In December 2001, looking for a present for my goddaughter, I wanted to see if "The Jungle Book" could pull her out of her few-month-addiction for Winnie the Pooh. The idea was not to buy one version, but 3 or 4: Dutch, English, Spanish, Italian, etc... I wanted to see how a 18-month-old baby would react to watching the same thing and hear something different each time. Somehow, even before I could send her the tapes, I was fascinated by the experience of listening to all the dubbed versions. I wanted to give to each character in the same film a different language." The show of Bismuth will also contain two new works. One of them gave the title to the show: "I agree--- the idea of cloning humans is disgusting"

*The show was made possible thanks to the support of the French Embassy in Brussels.*



"I agree---the idea of cloning humans is disgusting."

# 17

(advertentie)

Tentoonstelling Exposition 10/4-17/5  
Vernissage 9/4 18-21 u/h

**PIERRE BISMUTH**

Galerie Jan Mot

Rue Antoine Dansaertstraat 190 B-1000 Brussel Bruxelles

## Stéphanie Moisdon

### “moi je dis, moi je dis....” (english version)

By  
Stéphanie Moisdon

One cannot write about Tino Sehgal's works without committing a first anomaly, by attempting to give them a title, to describe or to list them, that is, to enter into rivalry with the form of the work itself, which is the affirmation of what it is.

These works can be understood as a series of traps, which render the artist and the viewer complicit, more by means of play than by default, of the context in which they come about, of the place in which they are exhibited; of the mercantile system which will, in order to sell them, inevitably seek to extract them from the trap. Sehgal's pieces do not reflect any of an artwork's characteristics for the simple reason that, most often, the difference between what is a work of art and that which isn't, is solely a formal difference. At the heart of the processes and exchange values, he unifies concept and production, the multiple and the unique, aura and demythologisation, and allegory and alienation in a precarious equilibrium.

This work opposes certain illusions of

what one could call the militant modern avant-garde, whilst nevertheless observing the mechanisms by which the art work is a spectacle destined to sacralise merchandise, to dissimulate regulations/deregulations of a system that precisely never really succeeds in distinguishing itself.

Tino Sehgal does not seek to identify himself with an artist, a poet, a playwright or an economist. He seeks most of all to dis-identify himself of everything, to disconcert the definitions of art and to see what, amongst forms and activities, is indissociable from thought.

Even if Marcel Broodthaers constitutes a kind of poetic reference, Sehgal does not necessarily consider with that same melancholy that art has entered an irreversible era of the devaluation of meaning, accomplished at the benefit of the law, of the mere value of exchange. Even though his pieces sometimes appear destined to reveal the relationship of dependence that links the artist to the economic system, they are nonetheless also completely autonomous, and disalienated from this critical and political perspective.

Tino Sehgal seeks to discover up to which

point the artist remains master or slave of his own strategies of visibility, enunciation, commercialisation; in which way he withdraws from and plunges back into banality. He aims for a mental reality beyond a visual reality and rediscovers the implacable (which is not irony) of affirmation. A sort of objective writing (against subjectivity), a machine for saying what is there, without excess, to say what is seen, a space without objects which is not a void, because the void is another formal invention, that is ideological and restrictive. By entitling his exhibition at Galerie Jan Mot *Le Plein*, he returns to this misunderstanding of the void, and suggests a contradictory and antagonistic reading of the space. Because speech, singing, movements, replace the necessity for the presence of things; which doesn't mean that these things have disappeared but that they could just as well be absent. He doesn't install stagings, but arrangements, devices of which the implications multiply and develop in a programmed manner over various incidents; exterior, contingent events: the institution's opening hours, the duration of the exhibition, the agreement made with the guards, the presence of the surrounding artworks, the circulation in the space. Sehgal's tautologies (*This is good, This is propaganda*) are true by definition, and serve to situate the exhibition spaces. He envisages art as such and takes as material the components, the techniques of

dispersal, but also its formats, its conventions, its true or false hypotheses. In this register of tautology, Sehgal is interested in the gap between the signature and the entitled work, between designation and the errors of enunciation.

The fact of not carrying out the actions himself and providing instructions to executors, allows him to bifurcate the stakes of all classification: of the performance as category and of the conventions of involvement (the body of the artist presented as a guarantee of his investment), which provokes a sort of liberation for the spectator, a cancellation both of identification and mythical projections. Now that Duchamp's irony and Warhol's aura no longer suffice to maintain, under new conditions, the paradigm of the readymade, the question today is to find out which instance is still in a position to declare authenticity or inauthenticity.

The signature with Sehgal, his proclamation, is this possible instance which indicates and affirms a determined reading, an order founded in oneself (« This is good » equals saying « this is art »).

Via these affirmations, which contain their own solution, he renders obvious the retreat of knowledge, expertise; this competence, which allows to determine the meaning of an enunciation.

Tino Sehgal's signature does not dominate the representation or the space, it doesn't refer to him as a real individual; it represents a place which allows ample space for other, equivalent identities.

By means of repetition of the signs of self, Tino Sehgal's enunciations finally liberate the work from the character of the author and vice versa and testify this rupture in front of the public.

In his interventions, the inflationist repetition of the signature, the title and its distribution within the space is in correlation, paradoxically, with a kind of negation: absence of the work, and of its author or of the artist. The signature only signs its own repetition, even if this formal absence doesn't necessarily signify a complete refusal, but a manner of conceiving communication as a symbolic circular exchange of questions and answers, of words and of objects.

The museum guards and gallery staff are part of this system of communication; they are the instruments, the relays that allow the artist to pursue his demonstration. Neither subjects nor objects, they simply form part of the material elements of a proposal that seeks to verify the post-Duchampian question of the museum as medium, to know whether it is the museum that makes the work or the work that makes the museum. Duchamp affirms that only the artist's signature suffices; that it is stronger than the insti-

The fact of not carrying out the actions himself and providing instructions to executors, allows him to bifurcate the stakes of all classification: of the performance as category and of the conventions of involvement (the body of the artist presented as a guarantee of his investment), which provokes a sort of liberation for the spectator, a cancellation both of identification and mythical projections. Now that Duchamp's irony and Warhol's aura no longer suffice to maintain, under new conditions, the paradigm of the readymade, the question today is to find out which instance is still in a position to declare authenticity or inauthenticity.

The signature with Sehgal, his proclamation, is this possible instance which indicates and affirms a determined reading, an order founded in oneself (« This is good » equals saying « this is art »).

Via these affirmations, which contain their own solution, he renders obvious the retreat of knowledge, expertise; this competence, which allows to determine the meaning of an enunciation.

Tino Sehgal's signature does not dominate the representation or the space, it doesn't refer to him as a real individual; it represents a place which allows ample space for other, equivalent identities.

By means of repetition of the signs of self, Tino Sehgal's enunciations finally liberate the work from the character of the author and vice versa and testify this rupture in front of the public.

In his interventions, the inflationist repetition of the signature, the title and its distribution within the space is in correlation, paradoxically, with a kind of negation: absence of the work, and of its author or of the artist. The signature only signs its own repetition, even if this formal absence doesn't necessarily signify a complete refusal, but a manner of conceiving communication as a symbolic circular exchange of questions and answers, of words and of objects.

The museum guards and gallery staff are part of this system of communication; they are the instruments, the relays that allow the artist to pursue his demonstration. Neither subjects nor objects, they simply form part of the material elements of a proposal that seeks to verify the post-Duchampian question of the museum as medium, to know whether it is the museum that makes the work or the work that makes the museum. Duchamp affirms that only the artist's signature suffices; that it is stronger than the insti-

tution. With Buren, the signature is the institution; he has no need to place his signature. Tino Sehgal inscribes himself into this perspective, in producing a third voice, a displacement; a subversion of the historical function of the signature and the readymade. With him usage has the upper hand over syntax, when a phrase succeeds in making itself understood as a proper noun.

We know that the artistic discourse, at least in its most modern tradition, veers above all towards a critical discourse, that has been held in the interdependence of an affirmation – a judgement – and of a denotation – an object (whether this is sensitive or not). In this obliged point of encounter, a commonplace has imposed itself, a topos, a place for

# 18

(advertentie)

Voorstelling Présentation 15/5  
20 u/h

MANON DE BOER  
DORA GARCIA

TWO WORKS ON  
INTERNET

A DISCUSSION

Galerie Jan Mot  
Rue Antoine Dansaertstraat 190 B-1000 Brussel Bruxelles

their own solution, he renders obvious the retreat of knowledge, expertise; this competence, which allows to determine the meaning of an enunciation.

Tino Sehgal's signature does not dominate the representation or the space, it doesn't refer to him as a real individual; it represents a place which allows ample space for other, equivalent identities.

By means of repetition of the signs of self, Tino Sehgal's enunciations finally liberate the work from the character of the author and vice versa and testify this rupture in front of the public.

In his interventions, the inflationist repetition of the signature, the title and its distribution within the space is in correlation, paradoxically, with a kind of negation: absence of the work, and of its author or of the artist. The signature only signs its own repetition, even if this formal absence doesn't necessarily signify a complete refusal, but a manner of conceiving communication as a symbolic circular exchange of questions and answers, of words and of objects.

The museum guards and gallery staff are part of this system of communication; they are the instruments, the relays that allow the artist to pursue his demonstration. Neither subjects nor objects, they simply form part of the material elements of a proposal that seeks to verify the post-Duchampian question of the museum as medium, to know whether it is the museum that makes the work or the work that makes the museum. Duchamp affirms that only the artist's signature suffices; that it is stronger than the insti-

invention. That which Tino Sehgal bestows upon the place of his signing, is precisely this space of invention, its necessity: why invent? Why even « present a world » which would « add to » reality? To produce a discourse, a fiction, a representation? Perhaps merely for the creation of employment.

*Translation by Kate Mayne*

*Works by Tino Sehgal (°1976, lives in Berlin) have been shown this summer at Manifesta 4, Frankfurt and in the exhibition 'I promise, it's political' at the Ludwig Museum, Köln. Le plein is the first solo exhibition of the artist in a gallery.*

# You never know where it goes

**Interview with Robert Barry**  
By Raimundas Malasauskas

NEW YORK CITY, 3 MARCH – *Before leaving New York to curate the show of Jonathan Monk, Raimundas Malasauskas had a conversation with Robert Barry whose Telepathic Piece from 1969 was the starting point. The show is on view till 26th of April at AD 46.*

**Raimundas Malasauskas** I found it very interesting to think about your *Telepathic Piece* (1969), which became a reference point for Jonathan Monk's show at the project space of Jan Mot Gallery. One could think that the telepathically transmitted message is still out there even if no one has acknowledged that they have received it. Due to its immaterial and open character it could be also linked with the ideology of an open source software, especially after you've said "the work is always completed by other people."<sup>1</sup> I wanted to ask you where you did get the message or its idea yourself from and whether you would recognize it after those 30 years. - It might have been heavily distorted during the continuous transmission.

**Robert Barry** Questions how did it start or where did I get the idea from are the most difficult to answer. I am not really sure where I've got the idea from. I get most of my ideas just from everyday life, and I just sort of recognize something that could be useful in my work. Sometimes it can be just a magazine article or I hear something on a radio like with inert gas and I guess it just sat in my memory for a while, and then I just recognized that this is a perfect thing for me to use. It just happens that I have developed a certain style, which is a part of my being, it's part of my way of thinking, and if something comes along that I can work within my style, then I just grab it immediately. It's always been that way. *Telepathic Piece* was just a kind of logical extension of what I was doing before that, working with gas and things like that, and it appears logical afterward, but when you do that it's just a kind of recognition, lucky chance that somewhere I have must have heard about the possibility of telepathy and I just used for a couple of occasions. Would I recognize it? Absolutely, no problem at all.

**R.M.** In the case of *Telepathic Piece* at Simon Frazer University in Vancouver, you said it was neither image nor word.

**R.B.** Well, it's basically a feeling, a sense. It's a kind of feeling which sometimes is very difficult to put into words, because I think it's the most elusive part of our being. We have those feelings come through us and we are not exactly sure what it is - we cannot put these elusive feelings into words. It was something which I think fits into the basic experience of art, which after all of its intellectual aspects is still based in a personal experience that we have from looking at an artwork. It was not anything mysterious really, just ultimately something extremely personal.

**R.M.** How did it happen?

**R.B.** It was a telephone hook-up in New York where Seth Siegelau organized the exhibition. At Simon Frazer University there was some set up in the auditorium or some public meeting place, I don't remember exactly, but I do remember sitting at Siegelau's apartment. Siegelau was there and some of the other artists in the show like Lawrence Weiner, Doug Huebler and Joseph Kosuth. I remember that there was some discussion, there were some questions we could hear via the telephone hook-up and we tried to answer them. I just tried to get my thoughts together about what I was feeling at the time. I tried really to concentrate on what it was and for however long I could do it. That's basically what it was. I don't remember whether anybody got it, although some people said they have caught it. How to send things telepathically? I don't know.

**R.M.** In the interview with Patricia Norwell in 1969 you say that you transmit it unconsciously.

**R.B.** Yes, you have it in your mind. Who knows how you transmit things like that, I don't know, really.

**R.M.** Well, there are all kinds of books and manuals on the technique of telepathy.

**R.B.** I actually researched it. There was also an *Institute of Telepathy* in a building on 57th street in New York City, the same building where many galleries were before Soho. *This Institute of Telepathy* had a small library and actually I went there a few times. I am always very sensitive when I walk into a room and you have a certain feeling about it, a certain vibration hard to locate. I tried to translate this idea into some of the pieces I did, like the radio wave piece and inert gas. You are going to the room that is essentially empty, but there would be a label on the wall saying that there are radio waves or microwaves or something like that. So it's based on this idea of being very sensitive emotionally or psychologically to the space that you are in. That it has a way of affecting you in a personal way. And that all of our experience is that kind of personal experience, we just don't see objectively all the time. So I tried to use this idea in these pieces that I was doing. Natural ability of sensing when you enter into a space. Sometimes it could be quite something. Meeting someone personally, you sort of size them up, trying to figure out what these people are like.

**R.M.** I like to use the category of frequency or intensity.

**R.B.** I have feelings about things or sense



Something that is just a magazine cut, a...  
C... ..



From 'What is a...'  
I... ..

things about people, or a bad vibration about a place, I don't want to go into much detail because it sounds like fore-guessing the future.

**R.M.** What I find interesting about the telepathic messaging is that its addressee is almost always random. It could be picked up by "someone a thousand years from now or someone five minutes before you've thought about it." In some respect it reminds me a bottle in the sea or spam messaging in email channels.

**R.B.** You never know where it goes. You never know about art, you put art into the world, but you never know who sees it or what they are thinking about it.

**R.M.** We discussed where the ideas are coming from, but would it be interesting for you to look at where they are going to?

**R.B.** Only in a very general way. Not to be too specific whom I make work for? There are some people that you know – friends, acquaintances, that you think do understand your work. I cannot say that I don't completely make work for them, I try not to, I try to make basically work for myself and sometimes I may displease some people. Somebody who has been supporting your work suddenly sees something new and they don't like it very much. At least that's my experience, because I am always changing. What I do now in one way is very different from what I did 30 years ago, in another way on a very basic level it's very similar, I haven't changed my basic premise very much at all.

**R.M.** Which is?

**R.B.** I suppose it's a kind of phenomenal way of operating in the world. I am always getting back to basics, trying to get to how we understand things or how we function emotionally, psychologically. How we get through our day. How we move around in space. How we move in time, how other people affect us. I suppose the questions about mind and how things are, very elemental things. My attempt is to appeal to people on the most elemental level that I can think of through art, which I think is a wonderful means of doing this.

**R.M.** Does that mean that art could function as a tool of living, at least for an artist?

**R.B.** It just does automatically if you are an artist. Normally you cannot avoid that, and I am just talking about myself, I am not talking about other people. Everybody has got a good reason for making art. Everybody has got a story of where it comes from and what

it's about, whatever it is. They are all legitimate reasons for making art. Art can come out of anything anywhere. The thing that distinguishes the artist from I suppose a philosopher is the reason for making your work. The thing about art is a very elusive part that is hard to control and that part really comes out of yourself. It's really not very intellectual, it's very hard to write about, it's very hard to get a grasp on it.

**R.M.** Another thing in your work which I find very important is some sort of infocology. As we know there's much more information being produced than being consumed in the world nowadays. Therefore I find the operations of erasing, suspending and canceling more relevant to the situation than mere visualizing. If I think of your closed gallery or... Robert Rauschenberg erasing the Willem de Kooning drawing...

**R.B.** If he did a whole series of that it could be interesting. If he developed that idea into something else. There are examples of those things that artists do some things that seem out of the character of their work. Looking at one piece can be interesting, but I want to know the broader context.

**R.M.** In this sense is the notion of formula important to you?

**R.B.** Not at all, I am a very intuitive artist. As I said before I sort of developed a style or a style has developed me, however you want to call it. I just naturally follow this way of thinking about making art, but I think it's closely related to my basic thoughts about life. I am not trying to tell stories or anything like that. Whatever I come across that seems to fit in the style, I grab it. There's a connection between style and life, style and your way of your being. This is the way you feel comfortable to operate in, part of your way you think about the world or the way you view your world through art.

**R.M.** Is it interesting for you to follow how your ideas are being translated into other artists' works?

**R.B.** Not really. I don't really care what other artists do. I mean there are artists I like very much, but I don't want to be responsible for all lousy art that's out there that is made by artists who seemed to have looked at my work and took some ideas and then build a career on it.

**R.M.** You mean avoiding the reference or just simply ripping things off?

**R.B.** Just making crummy art. I don't care if



## In brief

1 MARCH - Three artists of the gallery participate at the 50th Venice Biennale which takes place from June 12 until November 2. **Deimantas Narkevicius** was invited by Francesco Bonami. **Dominique Gonzalez-Foerster** and **Tino Sehgal** participate in the exhibition *Utopia Station* curated by Molly Nesbit, Hans Ulrich Obrist and Rirkrit Tiravanija.

16 MARCH - **Tino Sehgal** won the "Kunstpreis der Böttcherstrasse" (Kunsthalle Bremen) with the work *This is Propaganda* (2002). The exhibition is on view until April 13 at the Kunsthalle Bremen.

19 MARCH - **Jonathan Monk's** exhibition at AD 46 is open every Saturday from 2 to 6.30 pm, until April 26. **Tino Sehgal's** exhibition *Le plein* lasts until April 5 at Galerie Jan Mot, 190 rue Antoine Dansaert.

21 MARCH - **Manon de Boer** and **Dominique Gonzalez-Foerster** contributed to the first issue of *Hélène*, a new journal published every season by Elein Fleiss in Paris. Manon de Boer made an interview with Herman Asselbergh who visited Palestine and Dominique Gonzalez-Foerster wrote about the link between fiction and newspapers. For sale at the gallery for euro 3,60.

2 APRIL - **Pierre Bismuth** made an artist contribution for the italian magazine *Tema Celeste*. This untitled project counts 6 pages and will appear in the issue of April (Nr. 97)

15 MAY - On May 15 at 20.00 hrs two internetprojects of **Manon de Boer** ([www.PanoramicPortraits.com](http://www.PanoramicPortraits.com)) and **Dora Garcia** (<http://aleph-arts.org/thekingdom>) will be presented at the gallery followed by a discussion on related themes with two theorists (names will be announced later).

Manon de Boer made an interview with Herman Asselbergh who visited Palestine  
a  
Exposure for sale at the gallery for euro 3,60.

to  
in  
V  
u  
r  
v  
r  
t  
a  
f  
s

1  
-  
:  
f  
-  
1  
e  
t  
s

For more information, please contact: The reproduction and repair in form of a piece information



# Agenda

## Eija-Liisa Ahtila

Centro Nazionale per le Arti Contemporanee, Roma, 20/3-11/5; Tokyo Opera Gallery, Tokyo, 22/3-8/6 (solo); *Reel Sculpture*, SF MOMA, San Francisco, 5/4-3/8; *The Present*, Kunsthalle Dominkanerkerkirche, Osnabrück (D), 23/4-18/5

## Sven Augustijnen

*Cocunutour*, Centre Régional d'Art Contemporain Languedoc-Roussillon, Sète (F) 2/2-31/3; *Hard Kijken*, Festival, Nijmegen, Arnhem (NL), 19/3-22/3; *Revolution/Restauration 01*, Palais des Beaux-Arts/Paleis voor Schone Kunsten, Brussels, 28/3-8/6 (projection/projection *Le Mont des Arts*, 18/5, 19 u/h)

## Pierre Bismuth

*Arte per tutti, ma capita solo da te*, Galeria Sonia Rosso, Torino, 28/2-15/4 (solo); *Falsa Innocenza*, Miro Foundation Barcelona 21/3-1/6; Galerie Jan Mot, Brussels 10/4-17/5 (solo); *Copyright Europe exists*, MMCH, Thessaloniki, vanaf 2/6

## Manon de Boer

*MOPH*, by BDV, Tokyo, 1/3-30/6, [www.moph.jp](http://www.moph.jp)

## Rineke Dijkstra

*Selbstgespräch: Sam Taylor-Wood, Tracy Moffat, Rineke Dijkstra, Ausgewählte Positionen zeitgenössischer Fotografie aus der Sammlung und aus Privatbesitz*, Pinakothek der Moderne, München, 1/2-30/3; *Experience, Media strategies in an immersive visual culture*, Nederlands Fotomuseum, Rotterdam, [www.fbr.nl](http://www.fbr.nl), 14/3-21/4; *Witness*, Barbican Centre, London, 12/2-27/4; *Die Realität der Bilder, Zeitgenössische Kunst aus den Niederlanden*, Staatlichen Museum Schwerin, 28/2-11/5; *Imperfect Innocence*, The Debra and Dennis Scholl Collection, The Palm Beach ICA, Miami, 12/4-15/6

## Honoré d'O

Programa Art Center, México City, March (met/avec Franciska Lambrechts); *Le colloque des chiens*, Centre Wallonie-Bruxelles, Paris, 7/3-25/5; Galerie Jan Mot, Brussels, 21/5-21/6 (solo)

## Dora García

*The Kingdom*, MACBA, Barcelona, 20/2-30/3 (solo, cat.); *The Breathing Lesson* and *The Glass Wall*, International Short Film Festival, Oberhausen, 1-6/5 (cat.); Ellen de Bruijne Projects, Amsterdam, 19/4-24/5 (solo); *The Breathing Lesson*, The

Norwegian Short Film Festival, Grimstad, 12/6-17/6

## Dominique Gonzalez-Foerster

*No Ghost, Just a Shell: The Ann Lee Project*, Van Abbemuseum, Eindhoven, 19/1-August (cat.); *Micro-utopias*, Biennale de Valencia, 6/6-30/9 (cat.)

## Douglas Gordon

*Black Box Recorder*, ATA, Sofia, 28/3-5/5

## Joachim Koester

*Le beau corps de la mémoire*, Musée des arts contemporains, Hornu, Belgium, 16/3-29/6 (cat.); *The Portable Artis*, Instituto México, Paris, 28/2-17/4; Cloudless, Bard College, 16/3-16/4

## Sharon Lockhart

Barbara Gladstone Gallery, New York, 22/3-26/4 (solo)

## Deimantas Narkevicius

*Aidas Bareikis and Deimantas Narkevicius*, National Gallery of Contemporary Art, Zacheta, Warsaw, 28/3-28/4; Kunstverein, Köln, from 9/5

## Tino Sehgal

*Le plein*, Galerie Jan Mot, Brussels 20/2-5/4 (solo); *Kunstpreis der Böttcherstrasse in Bremen*, Kunsthalle Bremen, 1/3-13/4 (cat.); *Open the curtain*, Kunsthalle Kiel, 12/4-1/5, *Spectacular*, Museum Kunst Palast, Düsseldorf, from 26/4

## The air is blue / part 2

Casa Museo Luis Barragan, México City, until 3/4, met/avec Dominique Gonzalez-Foerster, Douglas Gordon (e.a.)

## Over wij/About We

Van Abbemuseum, Eindhoven, 19/1-August 2003 (cat.), met/avec Dominique Gonzalez-Foerster, Douglas Gordon (e.a.)

(advertentie)

## HÉLÈNE

Nouveau journal, n° 1

Avec des articles de  
**Manon de Boer, Dominique  
Gonzalez-Foerster, Claude  
Lévêque, Olivier Zahm...**

En vente chez Jan Mot

## 50th Venice Biennale

12/6-2/11 (cat.), met/avec Dominique Gonzalez-Foerster, Deimantas Narkevicius, Tino Sehgal (e.a.)

# New Publications

**Honoré d'O**, *Tous les détails en fracture/Recomposition*, Le Collège éditions/Frac Champagne-Ardenne, Reims and MUHKA, Antwerpen. Text by Philip Luyckx. 176 pages, FR/EN/NL, 12 euro.  
*A book about Honoré d'O's trip to the Himalaya, his exhibitions at Kiasma in Helsinki, the FRAC in Reims and the MUHKA in Antwerp.*

## Vernissage

gesponsord door / sponsorisé par:  
**Passendale / Duvel Moortgat NV SA  
Restaurant Vismet**

The exhibition by Jonathan Monk is realised with the support of the British Council.

L'exposition de Pierre Bismuth est réalisée avec l'aide de l'Ambassade de France.



## Colofon

Publisher: Jan Mot, Brussels  
Design: Maureen Mooren & Daniel van der Velden, Amsterdam  
Printing: Cultura, Wetteren

(advertentie)

## GALERIE JAN MOT

rue Antoine Dansaertstraat 190  
B-1000 Brussel Bruxelles  
tel.: +32 2 514 10 10  
fax: +32 2 514 14 46  
[galeriejanmot@skynet.be](mailto:galeriejanmot@skynet.be)  
[www.galeriejanmot.com](http://www.galeriejanmot.com)

donderdag-vrijdag-zaterdag 14-18.30 u  
jeudi-vendredi-samedi 14-18.30 h  
en op afspraak / et sur rendez-vous