

Gillian Young interviewed by Barbara Clausen, Kristin Poor, and Tracy Robinson, September 17, 2020

© the authors and Joan Jonas Knowledge Base, Artist Archives Initiative, 2021

<http://artistarchives.hosting.nyu.edu/JKB/gillian-young-interview-september-2020/>

Kristin Poor: Today is September 17th, 2020. This is Kristin Poor, and I'm here with Tracy Robinson and Barbara Clausen from the Joan Jonas Knowledge Base, and today we are speaking with Gillian Young about Joan Jonas. Gillian, thank you so much for doing this.

Gillian Young: Thank you.

Kristin Poor: We'd like to start with how you first encountered Joan's work.

Gillian Young: I first encountered Joan's work at a Triple Canopy screening. This is a publication based in New York, and at the time based in Brooklyn. A good friend of mine who is an editor at *Art in America* now, Will Smith, he's the Editor in Chief actually, he had a screening of films by Richard Serra, who he was working on for his dissertation at the time, and showed Joan's *Delay Delay*. Sorry, *Songdelay*. Excuse me. Her film version of the 1972 performance *Delay Delay*. I watched it, and I was just completely blown away. I had heard Joan Jonas's name, but I really didn't know her work up until that point. That was my first year in graduate school at Columbia. I was taking a seminar where we had a final research project of our choice, so I just chose to write about Joan, and I haven't stopped.

Kristin Poor: Perhaps you could give us an introduction to your work on Joan, and what role her work has played more broadly for your own writing and teaching.

Gillian Young: Sure. So at that point when I first started researching Joan and I first started writing about her, I think it was in 2011, maybe. For that first seminar paper, when I started to look in the library, there were quite a few exhibition catalogs, and I know there had been shows about her. But I was not finding a lot in terms of art historical writing or research or that kind of scholarly approach to her work. So the more I continued to work on her and think about her place in art history, I discovered that because art history has approached video art and performance art as two separate histories or two different strains...and this is just painting with broad strokes generally. Scholars are changing this too.

Gillian Young: I thought that this created a historical blind spot that obscured Joan, because she always did video art and performance art and was one of the first artists to do that, so she would appear in these histories, but she was never a main protagonist in art history or conventional art history. I have been working on writing a new history of art focusing on the 1970s and the emergence of video and performance art with Joan as the central figure. In terms of my teaching, as I develop courses around that history, she's going to be a main player in that. The last thing I'll say on this question, and if I'm not answering it feel free to ask another question. I have a background in performance studies and also media studies from when I was studying at NYU, and I just loved the expansiveness of her work.

Gillian Young: It wasn't just relevant for art history, but for media studies and the history of performance. So writing about Joan's work has allowed me to be very interdisciplinary as a scholar, because she's a very interdisciplinary artist who doesn't regard...she trespasses categories all the time in a great way. I like to do that in my own work too, and she's an inspiration.

Barbara Clausen: Gillian, can you tell us a bit about your dissertation around Joan's work, and maybe also talk a bit about your principal arguments that you make a case for.

Gillian Young: My dissertation does have this media studies approach, or what I call or what is known as a media archaeological approach. Part of my central argument is that Joan Jonas herself is a kind of media archaeologist, meaning even though she was a cutting edge video artist and was always at the forefront of using new technologies as they became available in the 1970s—I should say the 1970s is really the scope of my dissertation focusing on Joan's early career—so even as she's a pioneer in video art and technology, I was so interested in the fact that her pieces and her performance pieces involving technology often had this archaeological component where they invoked very old media or dead media, outmoded media, in a way that was really interesting to me.

Gillian Young: I found that no one had really delved into that, so that's what I decided to do. I also argue that, related to what I said earlier, Joan's work in the 1970s, and I would say until today, can't be categorized as video art or performance. That these things are always continuous in her work. I was really interested in the way that performance, as it emerged in the 1970s, was this kind of technological category, more so than one that had to do with pure presence or embodiment that wasn't about technology. I think that she was exploring telepresence more so than

presence through video and through performance, which went hand in hand and continued to go hand in hand in her work. Thinking of this moment, where we are on Zoom right now, and so much of what we do happens in this virtual space, I think that she was exploring that fifty years ago in this very groundbreaking way.

Gillian Young:

As much as she points us forward—her investigations look ahead to what our current situation, made even more acute by the pandemic and quarantine—as much as she points us forward, I think she's also always looking back at the origins of these technologies. The origins of tele technologies in the turn of the nineteenth century and throughout the nineteenth century. More importantly, her work, I think, and I argue, digs up these alternative histories of the technologies that we're so used to today. So we could talk about, for example, telepathy is one place I'd go. This feminist history of telepathy in relation to the *Organic Honey* pieces.

Tracy Robinson:

So *Organic Honey* is one of our main case studies for the JKB, and you specifically write about visual telepathies. Can you talk about how *Organic Honey* plays a role in your writing and your argument about telepresence?

Gillian Young:

Yes. I was interested in *Organic Honey's Visual Telepathy*. Again, I found that there's probably the most scholarship on this piece, more than any other. I'm sure you found that as well, and you are adding an incredible new dimension to that scholarship and record and archive. But what I found is that nobody talked about telepathy. Joan herself, I don't believe, talks much about where that phrase came from. She told me that she got it from a book on magic, and I think she's written this elsewhere too. I know *Organic Honey* came from the jar of honey on her kitchen table that she was staring at while coming up with this work, so that's where that alter ego's name came from.

Gillian Young:

But telepathy became really integral to my argument about telepresence or this mediated presence or technologized form of performance, because telepathy was a very early form of telepresence, and one that is more occult than technological. It was part and parcel of new technologies emerging in the nineteenth century that allowed people to communicate over a distance. It's a very feminine history. Most telepathic mediums were women, so it's a gendered history as well as a technological and an occult one. Her work enabled me to dive into that whole genealogical strain, I would say, of telepresence. There is a lot of interesting scholarship around this in, especially in studies of literature from this moment around telepathy. I

wanted to bring that to Joan's work and take really seriously her choice of telepathy.

Kristin Poor:

How do you see *Organic Honey's Visual Telepathy* in particular, in relation to Jonas's feminism of this period of the early seventies, because it has been so closely associated by her and others. It would be really interesting to hear about that from your perspective.

Gillian Young:

Yeah, it has, and I'm still wrapping my head around the feminist implications of *Organic Honey*, because she herself had said that this was of this moment—of the women's liberation movement—at the same time in the early seventies. But it's complicated too, because *Organic Honey* is such a layered enigmatic figure, that is this hyper feminine persona who is not really drag. By other scholars, she's been turned into a feminine masquerade, so the layers of performance are really interesting. I was trying to think of, again, engaging with this older history of telepathic mediums, thinking about *Organic Honey* as a telepathic medium, and one that blends that technological resonances of that term, “medium,” with the occult performance of a medium.

Gillian Young:

What's strange about that is that telepathic mediums were unconscious when they were performing, and the others, whether that was people from the spirit world, or ghosts, or people who were far away, those presences, the medium embodied those. So she made room for others within herself, which I think is a really contemporary idea of identity and how we can be multiple identities. I saw a source for that in the telepathic medium from the nineteenth century. I'm still investigating this and thinking about it as how the medium is a different kind of performance than drag and masquerade, and thinking about the different history that it invokes, and then also the different implications of that, about agency, about multiplicity and about feminism, that maybe recognizes the very old constraints placed on women, I suppose.

Gillian Young:

So yeah, obviously you can tell I'm still mulling over all these ideas. And like I said, I think even though it is maybe the most closely aligned work by Joan, most closely aligned with maybe second wave feminism or the women's liberation movement, I think it's really complicated, the place of this performance, and the videos and the work itself to feminism.

Kristin Poor:

How do you see Joan's looking back to these older technologies in relation to other artists who were working at the same

moment? Is she an outlier, is this part of a larger conversation that's happening amongst artists?

Gillian Young:

Yeah, that's a great question. I've found that it is part of a larger conversation. I think that what she shows us first of all, is this imbrication or interconnectedness of performance and video, and I think other artists were very much participating in that exploration. I found also that other artists who were peers of Joan in particular, were following archaeological paths too. For example, the first piece that I wrote about, *Delay Delay* and *Songdelay*, I look at that in terms of telegraphy, so this counterpoint to telepathy. These are the first two chapters of my dissertation focus on telegraphy and telepathy. These are large scale outdoor works that Joan made, invoking, I argue, these outmoded telegraphic techniques of communicating information. In a film like *Paul Revere* that Joan made with Richard Serra, they also use these optical telegraphs in that film.

Gillian Young:

And then at the same moment, Trisha Brown was making her roof piece that recently got revived over Zoom. I did it this summer over Zoom. That piece uses semaphore telegraphs. In other places in my dissertation, I found that somebody like Susan Hiller, who's a conceptual artist working with telepathy, I found that conceptual artists in the seventies were interested in telepathy. When you're fact checking this, correct me if I'm wrong, or editing this interview, but Robert Barry has a telepathy piece. I was interested in how Joan does telepathy differently than conceptual artists. But I found that there's this interest in occult practice too with someone like Carolee Schneemann in her performances like *Up to and Including Her Limits*. She wanted to get herself into an unconscious, medium-like, trance-like state.

Gillian Young:

I found some discussion of actually in the Getty archives, Carolee Schneemann also, at the same moment, being interested in these occult female practices. And then someone who I really want to explore more in relation to this too, who isn't the same time period as Joan, is Hilma af Klint. In that sensation around that show and just this new interest in how occultism, how spiritualism fed into modernity in a way that hasn't been recognized fully, I don't think.

Kristin Poor:

That's a really interesting connection from a different period. Yeah.

Tracy Robinson:

Some of Joan's pieces like *Organic Honey* have been transferred from performance into installations. I was wondering if you

could speak about your thoughts and how these things like telepathing can go into an installation from a performance.

Gillian Young:

Yeah. The installation question, that's a really good question because I think that in the same way that video and performance can't be separated, also eventually installation could not be separated either in Jonas's practice, about the performance and then its afterlife. It's more like everything is always feeding into each other. I believe that, and I have to look back on this, a show that Joan did I think in Houston, *Stage Sets*, I think... Oh, I feel like now this is going to be on the record and I hope I'm not getting it wrong. At the turn of the eighties, I think, was when this question really started to come up about installation and its relationship to performance and how installation could represent performance in a museum context. I think that in my opinion, with a work like *Mirage*, and *Organic Honey* too, and then definitely something like *Juniper Tree*, that Joan is already thinking of this stage set or this kind of mise en scène that was the beginnings of installation, too.

Gillian Young:

I think that the way of speaking about *Organic Honey* and this question of telepathy, the closed circuit that she set up that was so integral to the initial performance, I think that that is installation. I don't know if that exactly answers the question.

Barbara Clausen:

There's a really interesting shift. It's actually 1980 where she has her first retrospective at the Berkeley University Museum curated by David Ross, and it's one of our exhibition case studies that accompany *Mirage* and *Organic Honey*. We have three exhibition case studies in the Joan Jonas Knowledge Base for our listeners. Please do consult the separate pages for that. What's interesting about the Berkeley show is that it was one of the few times where there is an overlap in the space that she uses for performing and for installation, and she would actually move part of those installations to be able to perform. And not necessarily, there was also a junk theater, but there's a moment where she at the time felt that they were almost...there was an undefined moment of how those pre-installation models, or these prototypes, or environments would come together.

Barbara Clausen:

They do though really predate, and they do give an indication, especially for *Organic Honey*, what they will come to look like later on. I think that's a really interesting moment where her use of objects also comes into play, and the relationship between object and image, and this is obviously something also that Kristin has been researching a lot too. I'm almost addressing the question to both of you, because I think this would be a really interesting moment, Kristin, for your PhD research also to come

in, and Gillian, perhaps this is where an interesting moment could be to cross and share. I'll try to find the image and to actually show it in screen share.

Gillian Young:

Another thing that comes to mind too, thinking about *Organic Honey* and the kind of origins of this question of installation and the relationship to objects and performance and props and sculpture and image, is the influence of Jack Smith for the *Organic Honey* performances in particular. I think that his influence is apparent, and Joan has talked about this a lot. His influence is apparent in the performance of identity, and this exaggerated flamboyant character of *Organic Honey*. But I think also, she saw Jack Smith's performances right when she returned from Japan in 1970, I think, or maybe 1971, and went to his loft, which was known as the Plaster Foundation. That was a permanent installation. It's where he lived, but it was also like this giant trash sculpture that went through the ceiling, and these bleachers surrounding it.

Gillian Young:

So I wonder too, how much did that form or contribute to Joan's thinking about installation, and how it would relate to performance and her relationship to props, objects, stage sets as well.

Barbara Clausen:

Yeah. I'm pulling up, for our listeners, I'm just pulling up on the Joan Jonas Knowledge Base now, the Berkeley page where we have some installation views that were generously given to us by the Berkeley Museum of Art, and where you can really see the entire space and the different installations of these works, and where you can also really discover, for example, *Juniper Tree*, *Upside Down and Backwards*, where there was a real sense of trying to figure out where and how to install works, and where *Mirage*, for example, was a series of prints and some videos, or really *Organic Honey* was where there was really a sense of putting things on the side, and at the same time creating a tableau. I thought that was perhaps an interesting thing to share at this moment.

Kristin Poor:

It really is a transitional moment in the way also, Gillian, that the exhibition you mentioned, *Stage Sets*, which was at the ICA in Philadelphia about four years before this Berkeley show, and she's really for the first time, putting these works in a gallery context, and you see how she's taken the props from *Mirage* and the set space from *Funnel* and combine them into this installation. And then when we get to Berkeley, there's a hybrid situation between the sets of the performances that are happening in the space, and then they either get moved to the side or they remain in situ to be seen by gallery visitors during

the day, and then on the weekend she's doing additional performances using the new sets. So there's this accumulation of sets and objects that are somewhere between what she now considers her installations and what we would call the setup for a performance or a stage set.

Kristin Poor:

Your talking about the closed circuit camera as an installation, I think, is really interesting. Something else we wanted to talk about in relation to *Organic Honey* is the role of the camera person, and how that fits into your thinking about telepathy and telepresence in these media concerns that you've dealt with in your writings.

Gillian Young:

Yeah. It's fascinating that in her notes for the *Organic Honey* performances, in videos, and in her instructions around them, it's always a camerawoman. Often that was Babette Mangolte, that filmmaker who was behind the camera, but I think this is another place where feminism really clearly comes in the question of gender. Because instead of a man with a movie camera, it's always a woman. It's always a woman behind the camera. I think that this has to do with the long history of dispossessing women from their images, which from an art historical perspective has a very long history, and that's just one area to look at it. But also thinking about media, obviously, and film, and the writings of Laura Mulvey just a couple of years after *Organic Honey*, for example, and Mary Ann Doane, and etc., the feminist film scholarship that was happening around this moment in *Screen Magazine*, for example. Joan was making a really interesting move at the outset of this.

Gillian Young:

I think that it goes hand in hand with the closed circuit. In a closed circuit video where the image is always present with the activity, so it's this new technology at the turn of the seventies where you could instantly see your image. I think we forget how radical that was, now that we can look on our phones and see, put on makeup or whatever, talk to each other and just instantly see images and be present with those images, the closed circuit was so new for that. So, is there a feminist potential there to be present with your image and not let it go, and not let it be taken away from you. Then this kind of further layering onto that, if anybody's going to be recording my image, they're going to be a woman too.

Gillian Young:

I think there's maybe also a question of the camera woman in this case, as a performer herself, and as part of the performance, not external to it. So really staging video and technology in that way and scripting the camerawoman into the performance in this dual conversation between image and image maker,



performer and video recorder, video cameraperson. That's another way to think about it too. I think it's such a significant decision, and I find it to be really interesting that Babette Mangolte was often the one doing that, and looking then adjacently to her filmmaking at the time.

Barbara Clausen: Yes, absolutely. And really making visible the production process.

Gillian Young: Yes. Right.

Barbara Clausen: Then recently I had a conversation about this question of special effects, and how Joan works with illusion, but deconstructs illusion. This is something that has also been written about, and how that switched between analog and digital, and between video and film in all these moments of being in control of your image. How they're so important also, is in that framework of presenting the entire production, and the *hors-champ* [what is outside of the images]. Also, in the photographs that she chose to be then published by different photographers, how often the photographs you would choose would really almost...there would be some closeups of course, but there would be also some that would really zoom out and show a bigger context that I always found really fascinating from an art historical perspective. Absolutely.

Barbara Clausen: Switching a tiny bit in that direction, especially with *Organic Honey* and *Mirage*, two questions that have always been interesting for me are, and I think for many others, is this question of narrative, and how, in a way, Jonas is really the master of the non-narrative and the...while so precise, still always going in and out of that red narrative line within her pieces. I was wondering because you have such knowledge of those two works in particular and those in between, if you could speak a bit about Jonas's use of narrative and how you see that.

Gillian Young: Narrative, they're not easy to follow. That's for sure. I think the influence of poetry and imagist poetry in particular that Joan has spoken about a lot is a kind of a cipher to the thinking about narrative and her performance pieces. And also myth...obviously that is a big topic within studies of criticism and scholarship on Joan, but these alternative narrative forms...and I think speaks also to her research and how much she reads, and how that feeds into her work. For instance in *Juniper Tree*, which I think is... with *Organic Honey* and *Mirage*, right alongside those, are kind of a similar moment that she's looking at back at the Brothers Grimm fairy tales, and thinking about the fairytales as a feminine oral tradition, which was then taken by the Brothers

Grimm and written down and entered into language and the archive at that point.

Gillian Young:

Again, thinking of this question of dispossession, I think is interesting. I've also thought a lot about the role of narrative in, or the place of narrative in linking Joan's performances to theater, and exploring that relationship of her performance to experimental theater, especially of the seventies, which she really went to avidly and was peers and friends with figures in the experimental theater world. The way that she approaches the idea of a script, very experimentally, and narrative, experimentally, I think that is related. Then also the question of roles and the roles that we play, I think this also has a key relationship to gender because of the way that Joan takes up these feminine roles that have been written into various literature.

Gillian Young:

Literatures that come from different cultures, these kinds of foundational narratives or myths, storytelling and different cultures, for example, Iceland with *Volcano Saga*, or then more recently like *The Divine Comedy* and Dante, and these really foundational texts. The way she revives them and reinhabits the roles that they narrativize or write around figures that we're still living with. The role of narrative is endlessly fascinating. That's for sure. I find that this is something that I want to revise in my own work on Joan. In a work like *Mirage*, for example, my writing and the research I've done on *Mirage*, I find that I can get fixated on the media question and that carrier, as opposed to the media carrier or vehicle, but not what is being said.

Gillian Young:

You know what? I really do want to delve into more of these super conscious choices and powerful choices around language, around narrative, and how it's fractured and brought into performance, because I know that Joan thinks so much about that.

Barbara Clausen:

Yeah, and really also always saying about *Mirage* that for a while, it was like her definition of it being—Kristin, you know much more about this—it's having a political interest in that piece, especially when there was *Mirage 2* later on. But also there's this dancing on the volcano, the languages of rituals she uses for this piece in particular, the very specific use of that stage prop and how really she moves through these different moments and what's the story she tells with the movements of her body, the language she literally draws out on. I think that's a really important way. Kristin, do you have anything to add to that maybe?

Kristin Poor:

Well, I'm thinking Gillian, in relation to your argument, and I'm not sure whether you talk about this in relation to *Mirage*, but the way she situates it, the whole performance is a resolving of opposites, or a way of trying to hold the opposites together. Something about that resonates to me with this idea of signals being sent. If there is something between a zero and a one, or something about the actual sending of a message that is getting something from A to B, if that could be something that is also in the structure of the overall performance, which has this holding of two opposite points. It's part of the black-and-white series, but she also talks about it in relation to trying to resolve a ritual as a whole to deal with opposites or holding binary together is interesting, in relation to the...delivery system.

Gillian Young:

That's so interesting. Thanks for that. That's definitely interesting. *Mirage* is such a—as all of the performances are—so complex and multifaceted, but I love that description that you just gave of *Mirage*. It makes me think too, to go back to the telepathic, or the occult medium, that that figure is really about resolving or not resolving into binaries. That if you could be yourself and then other at the same time, that in-betweenness and that unresolved or non-duality, I think that speaks to the feminist question as well. It's a unique perspective during the moment of second wave feminism, in a way, to think more about this kind of fluidity that maybe is thematized in her work in these different ways. I think now, this question of, as scholars and curators looking back at her work, what we see there that maybe isn't immediately evident as a feminist move.

Barbara Clausen:

Do you think Joan, in these works specifically in the seventies, I'm really thinking also about the works she developed later on like *Sweeney Astray*, where she jumps certain characters. There's a fluidity in her definition of gender. Could you speak a bit about that? Because I think that's a really...from a now perspective looking at that work, even twenty years before [Judith] Butler, there's so much interesting discourse that Joan acted out in this very, maybe, actually not improvised, clearly scripted way. But I was wondering if you have any thoughts on that, because I think that's a really interesting point also in regard to narrative and the narratives of gender that she draws or paints out. In this case paints out or pans out.

Gillian Young:

Yeah. Literally. I'd have to think more about that. I think that's such a...looking to where these performances of, where she occupies different roles or different characters, different positions within that performance. *Juniper Tree* is another key example of that, where she plays all the women.

- Kristin Poor: She plays all the women. Or even *Glass Puzzle* where there is Lois Lane. Coincidence of course the name, but where it's this great duet, two women. It's not just narcissism. It's a really much more fluid transition of the self, not just being mirrored by going through, and in through, another and coming back.
- Gillian Young: And using media to facilitate that fluid transformation. I think that's something about video in particular, is that it is this fluid signal. That's the definition, until it's put on a cassette. Yvonne Spielmann has written about this a lot. The name of her book is *Escaping Me*. You can add it in the transcript. But this is her argument, about the fluidity of signal as being the essence of a video. I think that which forms what we're talking about with Joan's performance is that quality. I was totally thinking, I love *Glass Puzzle* with Joan and Lois Lane. They blend in this persona-like way. I was thinking about that performance in relation to the camerawoman and the performer. *Organic Honey* and the camerawoman in *Organic Honey*, too. That relationship. They're bound together in the way that they...
- Barbara Clausen: Totally. It's so interesting too that Babette Mangolte...we're totally having here PhDs colliding in space, because it's what my PhD was a lot about. But it's so interesting too, because it's really this moment where right after *Organic Honey*, Babette is the cameraperson shooting *Glass Puzzle*. We also interviewed Babette Mangolte about this, and how there's the sense of...Babette speaks about the light, and about this mirroring of light, and how the transition and the fluidity of the signal, but also really capturing these different frames, which then points this use of scrim and different image spaces that she creates.
- Barbara Clausen: There's a really interesting thing when then with Lois and Joan dancing, how they blend over, go apart. There's of course the music that's really similar to *Organic Honey*. There is really a meeting of these two women that just creates its own space that's really an interesting moment.
- Gillian Young: I was thinking of the clicking. I guess she's using glass, or beads, or balls or something similar especially in *Vertical Roll*, the video that comes out of *Organic Honey's*... That really intense sound is translated a little bit into *Glass Puzzle*. *Glass Puzzle*, too, has these historical layers that I was really interested in that they're mimicking poses from... I'm forgetting the name of the photographer who took...there's a movie about him that I watched, that he [Ernest J. Bellocq] took photographs of sex workers in New Orleans. Joan and Lois were imitating those. There's also a point where there's a stereoscope, which is a

nineteenth century binocular illusion machine device that is shown as well.

Gillian Young:

Thinking about the way that Joan and Lois converge and come apart again, and its relationship to video, but also these older optical technologies too. It's a fascinating piece. I hope that you gather information and somebody writes about that soon.

Barbara Clausen:

Thank you so much. We're coming to an end. I'm going to leave the final question. Tracy, Kristin, do we have one or two more questions? I think so.

Tracy Robinson:

Do you have any thoughts or advice for future curators, future museum workers who want to restage and exhibit Joan's work in the future, and what they should be aware of, what questions they should keep in mind?

Gillian Young:

Such a good question. I think you all are doing that work. I don't know how much I can add to it. One thing I will say is that when I've presented my research on Joan, a question that I often get from the audience, especially those who are unfamiliar with Joan's work, for instance, when I presented my work down here in South Carolina. I was really out of that New York context that I feel so familiar with, because I got my PhD in New York, I met Joan in New York, and I just was living in the streets where she performed and the spaces she performed. A question of the original audience comes up a lot. Who would have seen this? What would they have thought? Almost like the art historical concept of the period eye, how to engage that.

Gillian Young:

It seems to be, because especially thinking of a public audience, or people who might happen upon her work in a museum and not have any prior knowledge of it. I think whatever could aid the...on the one hand, opening the insularity that some of these performances were created in, this very tight knit... Especially I'm thinking of the performances in the seventies in New York. This tight knit audience and group who would have performed in each other's pieces and watched each other's performances. So opening up that insularity, but also providing the context and consideration of who were these made for, and how would they have been seen originally, to address the question of decontextualizing. Or the potential of that. That's a question that I get. The question of, "who would have seen these?" "What do you make of that?"

Kristin Poor:

That's such a great question to be asking of these works down the line, also, as they move from the artist's loft and other small downtown spaces where they originated into museum spaces

and so on. To keep that context present is such a great piece of advice or guidance for thinking about it.

Barbara Clausen: Thank you so much.

Gillian Young: Thank you. This was a true pleasure. It was nice to talk to you all, and I'm so excited about what you're doing. I just feel like such a gift to be asked questions about this and get to just go on and on, look at that cat tail. Thank you for that opportunity, and I hope that this helps in any way.

Barbara Clausen: Thank you so much.

Kristin Poor: Thank you.

Barbara Clausen: I think this is going to be very, very valuable. Thank you.

Gillian Young: Cool.