## ARTFORUM

## TABLE OF CONTENTS PRINT JANUARY 1994

# **CRITICAL REFLECTIONS**

## When the fun is at its height it's time to go. — Irish proverb

Having championed <u>Gary Indiana</u>'s critical faculties in the September issue of this magazine, I was slightly alarmed for both of us when I was asked to introduce the following essay. I hadn't seen much of his writing since he stopped covering art for *The Village Voice*, back in 1988. But I did love the *Voice* column and I'd begrudge anyone else's claim to love it more.

Indiana's art writing for the *Voice* had a gorgeous, chic nihilism just below its shimmering surface. For three years, his adjectivally sequined essays simultaneously caught and refracted the variable lighting of the art world in its halcyon '80s autumn. Most of the time, Indiana made it all seem like a careless, tipsy salon—the world as an overturned wine glass spinning and spilling madly over a table set for a gluttonous buffet.

As a writer who had to meet a weekly deadline, Indiana had little time for reflection and no time for second-guessing. To get around those handicaps, he tended to avoid last-wording exhibitions and artists in favor of ambient essays that cumulatively tell us more about the temper of the culture than about the merchandise on display. He avoided the clichés that afflict most weekly review writing by somehow finding his way to issues larger than whatever was on his weekly critical menu.

Indiana wrote in many voices but there was never any doubt where he was writing from—it was Manhattan. It was, to quote Malcolm Cowley, from "the homeland of the uprooted, where everyone you met came from another town and tried to forget it, where nobody

seemed to have parents, or a past more distant than last night's swell party, or a future beyond the swell party this evening and the disillusioned book he would write tomorrow." There was in Indiana's column a consistent self-awareness of possessing insider information. He was no nun of art, assiduously avoiding those he chronicled. No, Indiana wrote with a real delight, and occasionally a horror, in being exactly where he wanted to be —dead center—in the community he had temporarily adopted. Being there led to problems (things could get way too personal) but it also kept the essays bristlingly alive (about the art and the artists who made it). Often, his colleagues' and competitors' assessments of the same material felt as if they were telegraphed in from a chautauqua circuit where culture was a placebo, not a goad.

In Indiana's '80s, for a megasecond, artists and writers and curators and dealers and collectors could all experience the delirious, cardiac anxiety of, say, Alexander Haig's maniacal lunge for commander-in-chief after the assassination attempt on Ronald Reagan. Indiana always knew the '80s art world was a sham, but he kept the wind at his back and caught the current and, as often as not, soared. Still, read closely, the work of his last year was animated by an awful, weary loathing. Indiana was caught between loving the light that played on the iceberg and knowing full well that the iceberg was tearing apart the boat on which he sailed.

## -RICHARD FLOOD

**To tell you the truth**, I've avoided any prolonged retrospective glance at my art-writing career since it ended. I fell into art criticism late in 1983 and jumped out of it in 1988, and my subsequent lack of engagement with the art world has been more or less total—a catalogue here and there when it's something I really do get hot for, but otherwise, silence. Several efforts have been made to collect my writings from that period, all instigated from outside, and I have always had mixed feelings about these efforts, mainly because other people seem to like that work more than I do. When I washed my hands of the art scene, I experienced a long period of revulsion against the little-big world I'd charted in its years of maximum exacerbation. Its present lack of frenzy has given that faraway time an improbable quality, like a long fever that finally dips to a stable temperature. I am no longer revulsed, but living on the other side of things.

Anyway, that career, which I always regarded as temporary, divides into two periods: first the end of '83 and the entirety of '84, when I wrote several long essays for *Art in America*, mainly on artists of the '50s, '60s, and earlier; and then March 1985 to I think June of 1988, when I wrote almost every week, in sickness and in health, for *The Village Voice*.

In the *Art in America* period I developed a fluency of critical vocabulary. I was not an art historian but I have always been a quick study, and the perusal of several art magazines convinced me that I could think as well as, and certainly write better than, the art critics working at the time. These writers often had something urgent to say, but were not always able to formulate it in transparent language. I view that as a writerly failing rather than an achievement. Not that what one has to say has to be simple, but people will read you more willingly if they understand you. Writers who don't want to be understood are deluded fakes, or just bad writers.

In the years I'd been hanging around artists, I'd soaked up their concerns without knowing it; and of course I shared their temperament, since my main interests were in the theater, in writing fiction, and to a lesser extent in working on movies. So I was often able to figure out what an artist was up to, and to give it language. I was, or could be at times, a Method actor critic.

Incidentally, I had to *live* on the meager income from those early days. I did not have a trust fund, and I was rather tardy in discovering that most of the people I knew did. If I was prolific, it was because I needed the money, and lacked the agility at careerism that many writers my age parlayed into high-paying magazine jobs, screenwriting jobs, etc. That's just a talent I lacked, and one that I'm still trying to cultivate in early middle age.

At the time, it was rather fun to make money writing about art. When I was offered Roberta Smith's job at *The Village Voice*, New York's "alternative" weekly newspaper, that looked like it might be fun too. I didn't think it would last; neither did anyone else. It lasted about a year longer than I wanted it to.

One thing that immediately bothered me, and that no advice could have prepared me for, was the fact that I almost always had to write about "the new," which, at the time, practically every artist in New York was desperate to establish him- or herself as. Between 1985 and 1988 there were fortunes to he made out of a rather narrow band of collectors eager to snap things up at bargain prices, to get in on the ground floor, etc. I met these collectors and was amazed by their craving for novelty—they seemed to be constantly scouring artists' lofts and galleries, and throwing lavish dinner parties. How did they have the time to make money? The art world felt to me like a hot-air balloon that would eventually burst. I said that once at a symposium and was instantly accused of wishing people ill. I didn't wish anyone ill, but I did get a little nauseous watching certain people inflate. I think in the '80s one constantly sensed the blind side of inexorable historical forces: the insensible need, for instance, for one or two artists to be "great," to represent their era, to have their moments of glory consolidated into permanence by the vast institutional machinery of museums. (I especially distrusted Museum People, the worst-of-the-worst bureaucrats and nonentities—except when they weren't.) The artists that got picked may in the end have been perfectly appropriate, but I thought this reflected the shittiness of the period more than any "greatness."

Because the *Voice* and the *New York Times* ran the only reviews that appeared while shows were still hanging, each had an unseemly amount of power—the power to make people talk about specific artists, shows, galleries. This talk would steer the money to a particular location. I worked hard to make the writing lively, and often went overboard poking fun at people, which I knew provided the art world with its favorite dessert, gossip. I tried to skewer only people who obviously deserved it, and who, for the most part, couldn't be harmed by it, except in their egos, which were way too big to begin with. I fucked up a few times, thinking I was doing something clever, but actually venting malice—not a good emotion to work from as a rule, but let's not pretend that criticism can ever he divorced from the pathology of the person writing it. Fortunately, I never seemed to have the same pathology operating from one week to the next.

From week to week, I tried to take the art I was seeing seriously, on its own terms, but also to measure it against the wider world, and this upset people a good deal. Often the artists themselves were impatient with notices more complex and less exalting than the customary mush-mouthed rave, though most appreciated the truth of Ross Bleckner's bon mot, "Ink is ink." The unavoidable problem always was that writing about an individual's art fed into the cult of the proper name. Once the name became well-known, the ideas behind it became illegible and irrelevant. Because the underlying ideas were, in the end, so beside the point of

the art world as a social phenomenon, I felt that there was only an ephemeral sense of community in that *crush* of '80s art-consumption, one that would vanish as soon as the merry-go-round stopped and the bank accounts froze in place. Surprise, it did.

The irritation people sensed in the column was mainly produced by the circus of importunity, and the craving for art stardom, that I had to deal with week after week. Artists and dealers had myriad subtle strategies for getting my attention. I always felt bad for the artists, good and bad, who hadn't mastered the art of dissembling ambition: they would just blatantly get my unlisted phone number and call me up, beg me to come to their studio, write about them, anything. The clumsier and more craven they were the worse I felt for them. I recognized in them the naïveté and idealism I had lost: the sense that virtue or talent or good intentions should provide their own reward, that the prize goes to the best instead of to the best hustler.

The worst feeling was to walk into an opening and know that everyone felt they had to be nice to me, and that only the most resigned-but-maniacal losers would march up and insult me. Not that I craved insult by any means, but I came to despise the shrewd calculation that led so many people who disliked me to manipulate my sympathies. Obviously people were playing for big stakes, I understood that, but I also understood that we're all going to spend eternity in the same dirt. Maybe it's simply a matter of temperament. I've never been able to spend ten minutes in the company of anyone I truly couldn't stand without giving it away. The late critic Paul Taylor once told me, at one of those interminable Art Dinners at Il Cantinori, "You're the only person I know who can palpably turn his back on somebody while you're still looking them in the face." Actually Paul was pretty good at that too.

Artists and dealers tended not to comprehend what writing on a weekly deadline was about. It meant going to as many shows as I could bear to—and that meant being cornered and courted by virtually the same number of art dealers. This was more problematic for me than for a "professional" art critic, that is, for someone who derived his or her social gratification from being important in the art world. Being important in the art world made me feel unimportant, since I wanted to write novels and hadn't gotten around to it. Writing every week, under the hideous pressure of the deadline, tended to convince me that I never *would* get around to it. Generally, dealers didn't have the slightest idea and artists didn't care that my concerns were about writing, about themes and ideas, about hunting tip reasons to keep going, rather than

about some fetishistic "love of art." Or that I was almost hysterically shy, that my extravagant persona concealed a deep reserve.

The deadline made it impossible to consider more than a fraction of the art that was appearing, and the paper's editorial bent excluded any disproportionate coverage of museum shows and "alternative" spaces: the emphasis was supposed to be on galleries. I'll admit I was more comfortable with downtown ones than with the ones on 57th Street. (I've never had a problem with bladder control, but downtown I never felt inhibited about asking where the bathroom was—in fact, Robert Miller won my heart one day by saying "Pop in any time, ignore the show, and use the bathroom if you need it.") Another complication was the *Voice* itself, and the unwritten ukase that a *Voice* writer should emit a certain political rectitude. I had my own ideas about politics and art, and a growing impatience with demented readers from one or another faction who regularly wrote disgustingly abusive letters, correcting me for some slight against a newly victimized segment of the art-making population. The letters editor of the *Voice* seemed to feel that the most insane kinds of personal attack were desirable expressions of "controversy," and insisted on printing them. After a while I simply stopped reading them, though the *Voice* continued running them, sans reply.

Everyone wants to be loved for herself and not for her golden hair, and before I'd put in too many weeks at the *Voice* even I, normally so starved for affection, began to recognize the difference between a genuine interest in me and a ferocious interest in what I could do for people. The fact that I could do a great deal for people that I could not do for myself—lift them, practically overnight, out of bohemian poverty into a life of financial security (of course it wasn't just me, but I helped)—naturally took its toll, as did the many overtures of friendship I rejected out of suspicion, as well as certain friendships I did make in good faith with people who dropped me the minute I dropped the column. I could name them here to provide a little frisson, but on second thought I owe them thanks for unintentionally providing insights into the stratagems of venality.

This doesn't tell you much about criticism, but then I never wrote criticism in quite the same spirit that others did. For me, a weekly column was a narrative challenge, also a descriptive one. When I first tried to write novels, in my 20s, I was so self-absorbed, so indifferent to the external world, that I could never remember what a character was wearing, or what color his eyes were, or what the room looked like; as an art critic, my secret agenda was to learn how to enjoy describing the look of things, the plasticity of objects, and to place things in context. So I could never describe a painting without talking about the space it was in, the people who passed in and out, the press release, the garni—it was all one thing, and ended up a sample chapter of a novel I would someday write. So what looked like a flirtatious involvement with post-Modern theory was really a selfish exercise in writing.

In any case, in the '80s, the scene had become the subject. You couldn't look at all that money, all that fame, all that expenditure gurgling up before your eyes and pretend the only significant part was this static object on the wall. Even formalist critics found that they ignored the procession of vanities around the object at the risk of their credibility. I think I probably caused a lot of people who weren't as familiar with English, or with reality, as I was to make a big fuss over their own metacritical cogitations—I'm thinking of one critic who launched a polemic about me by asking, "What's eating <u>Gary Indiana</u>?" (The better question would have been, "Who's eating <u>Gary Indiana</u>?"—at the time, nobody very thrilling.) The piece went on to bemoan the fact that by 1987 I had become "obsessed by AIDS," an obsession that came to be shared by the rest of the art world a year or so later.

I like to think I brought a breath of scandal, suspense, and fresh air to a period and a place, that I punctured a few follies and got things better than right at least part of the tine, and I especially like to think I bailed out at exactly the right moment—that leisurely half hour before the aircraft hit the ground.

<u>Gary Indiana</u>'s third novel, Rent Boy, is being published this month by Serpent's Tail/High Risk Rooks of New York and London.

IN THIS CONTINUING SERVER ANTI-DRUP INVITES

----



When the five or at 20 harden 23 prove to gat, to brief proceeds."

Figuring characteristics of Searcy Industry's industry a state of Searchine in this September basis of Hist Integration, I want digitify alternated for basils of an addam I want added to be following using I builded some founds of the acting densi for integrand covering art. for The Higgs Fores, Sock in 1988, Buil I did lowe the Value coherest and I'd beginster approve they's chains to lowe it means.

Indiana's art writing for the Yana bad a gorgroun, othe eithilizer part betwee to attent meeting particles. For these pases, his adjustrially sequined assays invaluances of attent and refracted the variable lighting of the art world in the haloper 20% account, Plast of the time, bidana reache is all search like a carbon date, type taken, who would as a merturned area gaussing and splitting readly over a taken set for a globurous tarbar.

As a series who had to meet a seriely deadline, before had little time for other most and no time for an and genericg. Ye get around three hands ago, he tended to arrite had see along a this interact and at this is have of arbitrary many that correlatively to be most along the temper of the autom that deal the most fine and a setting the annihilative databat the temper of the autom the second provide get to method the final the second the distribution for the databat the second provide get in an arbitrary for the second the distribution for an abatement was not for second provide get.

In Indiana's 'Bhi, for a resignation of artists and writers and consisters and dealers and onlicitors usually all experiments the definition, configs memory of, any, Alexandre Halg's resoluted bright for incommunication of the definition of the solution attempt on Recold Brigges. Indiana always brows the 'Bhi art world was a share, but he lagt the world at bis basis worl cought the convent and, as often as one, sourced Bill, read closely, the world of the last processes and introduced by an awdit, every building fulfame was rought be because length the last world by last awdit, weary building fulfame was rought be because and alexand by an awdit, weary building fulfame was rought be because and the last of the last of which to saled was tracting aper the last or which to saled

off your the result, The presided pay pro-Integral entropypering glasses around are neces-er since a control, I fell attacted concernances have in 1443 and immediate of a last 1488, and an and reports that of represents while the art world has basis record or line totall-i a catalogue face and them characteristic and the state of evenine, allowers, "how well officeria have been result in out has no weekings from that presed, all matigated three burnells, and there alware had small bullings doors more efforts, mainly because other people munt, the blue share works, more share I day, "Where I washed ree bands of the are some, 5 represented a granted of terrollows against the little big works Til charged to be years of measurement examplation, for pleasing lack of freezy had glove that damaging more an improductive quality; like a long triver star timely Sipi to a stable treepersent. I and not linger to valued, has living to the other side of things.

Any way, that carety, which I always ingested as required, divides our two periods from the real of \$1 and the results of \$4, when I mean according matrix for the second care and the \$100 Why, which, well excludes an them March 1991 with finite Jame of Y000, when I mean always event, an exclusion and the health, her Director always event, the real-wave and in health, her Director always event.

To the Art or deserve a period I developed a Barrier at a remain even of event has not a set. Before the present of event development is an observed, and the present of events are stated as a set of the present of the event of the present of the event of the event

In the years Cd Jones having a second action, Cd model by their communications for second provided of events I during their temperatures, and set of both in A BANGE OF CRITICS AND THEORETS TO ARTICULATE WHAT THEY SEE AS THE RULE AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF CRITICISH TODAY

to write it the their as in moving blatter, and in-ality by figure out what we actual was tap to, and to give is farming. I man, us small he as elimin, a

maximum (G. best Polici gen a birth maximum manifolis), or second the follow with our second the beauties of the the installer and, for initiate, for our or but arriter to its "gran," to supervise their sea, to have there increased of place presentations into present

Marketenette, & Tand Profiles and the surranger surrange

## RITICAL REFLECTIONS

dama water dama. I did man harry a term thread, and I provide the law its in the country that serve of the proplay & histories alloch. M. P. mani, precidellas, in server Determinant B. maded the immediated hadead the spitter is incommen-Han many written my age particulation high parries. magnetic judy, arrented in a july, etc. That's sail a others I backets, and one that I've will rearing to color water or water muldbe such

by the pines, it was notice but to make man artising almost art. When I non-official Radiotta-femality july at The Folger Mode, New York's "ofsurvivation," servicely associates that its instantial like its might for from some 3 phillips' phone it would been written and asymptote when it formed alternat a year foregoet these I.

the story dot moniforsh bottoord in, and Note that advant a shall have proposed on from the first that has been advanted at the second s save, " solvaits, so the mines, processally over article in a South man despected to resulting have no hyperell. su. Battaneed 1998 Cash 2004 shalar most berman to be make one of a coffee partner, band of policies and per tra-mong chicago any at horizonte preserve, to got in-out the general Home, res. I near three collectories and war arranted by place contring for according which period to he assessed, assessing around him and definition. and throaning liamont disease parties, blive that they Bana the time to make monary? The set would be to me the a free der bullenen plat would eventually mater, I taid that since at a interpretate and was inmustly terrored of mobiling grouple 23. 8 distribution

It required to distances Manuary Perights for some off. the most harmony and mountime on opticity they mercury, I the second that got packed that the the and have been permitted to approprocess, they have a this subsetted the elements of the patient mean them and "granteness

Decision the Marie and the New York Direct can the and review for approved white these sees tell Ramphan, and had an investigate assume of propertythe process of weather proping with plasma spacific account. showly galacter. The talk would ever the minute in a personiar launce. I worked buril to make the merring lively, and others were creatlasted pulling him se propti, which I know provided the art worth with to favorat density group. I triad to thrave only people who she made desired to and who, the die more pure, manifely's be havened by it, procept pa them open, arbuid tarry was out by 14 larges with U.La.had up a bear times, chicking I take drong according choose, but accountly consisting weather own is good investigation in more from an a radio, but he's not present. their relations can see by driving hours the particuluation of the previous according to Dermanutily, I accord control to have the same pathology spreading from man wood to the state.

From much in mask. I read to take the set I not making gradulantly, and its order presses, basi allow to make many or squaress the wider would, and they apart protille 4 groud dead. Others the armost thereadying more intopainter with many mine complete and the matters

## GARY INDIANA

most approximal the math of Ross Machine's how may, "Bok is lab." The presentability problem places was that serving street as exhibits of hid insuchcult of the proper name. Over the name became week transments the interventional at beautions disputition and structure and the protocol of the second of ping, where we want to the second of the protocol of the second of the pharmone, ) hit day their non-only in collinson a sense of potentiances in this court of "blocket-score incorporate, one share received incorporate an electric and the manity gas reasoned appared and the bank account trent in place. Incording, of Hid

The income people around in the informer was presents printment by the classes of impressions, and the processing data and transforms, Plant I had be shall write on plan week, house and deduce had avoid solube secondates for general art attention. I almost this load for the attent, great and ball, who hade't year need the set of glasser-liking problems: they would like the part of any antional planer supplier and part on up, byg our recourse in their multis, write elevel them, anothing, Way characterized many characteristics secon the screen 1120 for them. I morphismlise then the survey and children I had lost the same due survey or relative or good manifold model provide sharin some over and, that the point part in the base to of all all effect basis becauting -

The wood theiring man is weally previous parents, and Amount this constraints for they had be be used to be, and they amb the boost war bar but the second of the second proved up and peak the fit of these furthered in where  $r_{\rm eff}$  is a set of the set of th and provide the second se growing the sume beau diffe

### DARGIS .....

positive images. Just as he's never trafficked in class romance, Leigh doesen't slty away from difficult women (notably in Abigail's Party, 1977), even if he is vague in Naked as to asky "women still do allow things to happen," (On the other hand, Hand Labour, one of his grimmest pictures, could serve at a cinematic companion to Engels' The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State.)

Leigh may think Johnny a comprehensible "reorptacle of cares and worries and preoccupations' about the late 20th century, but he's an unstable reorptacle nevertheless. Leigh drops clues as to why hnny is off-balance (in the repeated references to his mother, for one) but never spins effects into causes. That's one reason why the character of Jeremy (Greg Cruttwell)-Johnny's wealthy, ortling analogue, a rapist/stockbroker who barks French into his cellular phone-exists in the first place. (Leigh considers Jeromy "irredeemably worse than Johnny.) Successful or not, Leigh's unesceptional class one-upmanship is essentially as much a dodge as Johnny's riff on 666, the European bar code, and prophecy.

Indeed, the not-so-secret heart of Naked is the loose community of women Johnny enters and exits. His encounters with the various women in their various rooms-his curious spatial choreographyis the most poignant instance of the film's controllis image of evodus and deliverance. That the scores can scarcely keep up with his wild discursive flights is finally beside the point; after all, what's the point of all that fast talk when Johnny himself can't listen? The crucial exception to this tongae tied company is Louise, the lone woman who speaks Johnny's langauge and the one, in turn, to whom he listens. Leigh puts it another way: "Finally, there is love."

Johnny's incursions in and out of the women's rooms and through the streets of London are neither tial larks nor instances of sexual space-as-des tiny, but rather a pained and painful refusal of, and departure from, the only knowable community that might have welcomed him. Beign's warning-"Don't waste your life"-and Louise's counsel fall on deaf ears. Johnny talks but he doesn't hear; his words belong to a voice outside discourse, hermetically swaddled in false presence. In Naked, individual con sciousness takes a beating, and the lonely walker, no longer cloaked in a mantle of seductive, roman tragic isolation, is finally and inexorably stripped

Ravinski Willami, Divise 2019.
Bolog 2481.
Bolog 2481.
Bolog 2481.
Mike Legde, quened in Nina Hilden, "Legd": Blood Numbrain for Ram Jimma," "Sty Messang Kan, 21 February 1973, p. 1008.

### INDIANA.

spend ten minutes in the company of anyone I trals oldn't stand without giving it away. The late critic Paul Taylor once told me, at one of those inter minable Art Dinners at Il Cantinori, "You're th only person I know who can palpably turn his back on somebody while you're still looking them in the face." Actually Paul was pretty good at that too.

Artists and dealers tended not to comprehend what writing on a weekly deadline was about. It meant going to as many shows as I could bear to-and that meant being cornered and courted by virtually the same number of art dealers. This was more problematic for me than for a "professional" art critic, that is, for someone who derived his or her social gratification from being important in the art world. Being important in the art world made me feel unimportant. since I wanted to write novels and hadn't gotter around to it. Writing every week, under the hideous ressure of the deadline, tended to convince me that never would get around to it. Generally, dealers didn't have the slightest idea and attives didn't care that my concerns were about writing, about themes and ideas, about hunting up reasons to keep going, rather than about some fetishistic "love of art." Or that I was almost hysterically shy, that my extravagant persona cealed a deep reser

an a fraction of the art that was appearing, and the paper's editorial bent excluded any disproportionate verage of museum shows and "alternative" spaces the emphasis was supposed to be on galleries. I'll admit I was more comfortable with downtown ones than with the ones on 57th Street, (Fve never had a problem with bladder control, but downtown I never felt inhibited about asking where the bathroom was-in fact, Robert Miller won my heart one day by aying "Pop-in any time, ignore the show, and use the bathroom if you need it.") Another complication was the Voice itself, and the unwritten ukase that a Voice writer should emit a certain political recti tude. I had my own ideas about politics and art, and a growing impatience with demented readers from one or another faction who regularly wrote disgastingly abusive letters, correcting me for some slight against a newly victimized segment of the artg population. The letters editor of the Voic seemed to feel that the most insame kinds of personal

attack were desirable expressions of "cos and insisted on printing them. After a while I simply stopped reading them, though the Voice continu running them, sams reply,

Everyone wants to be loved for herself and not for her golden hair, and before I'd put in too many weeks at the Voice even I, normally so starved for affection, began to recognize the difference between a genuine terest in me and a ferocious interest in what I could do for people. The fact that I could do a great deal for people that I could not do for myself-lift them, stactically overnight, out of bohemian poverty into a life of financial security (of course it wasn't just me, but I helpedi-naturally took its toil, as did the many overtures of friendship I rejected out of suspicion, as well as certain friendships I did make in good faith with people who dropped me the minute I dropped the es. I could name them here to provide a lit son, but on second thought I owe them thanks for untentionally providing insights into the stratagents of venalies.

This doesn't tell you much about critic I never wrote criticism in quite the same spirit that others did. For me, a weekly column was a narrative challenge, also a descriptive one. When I first tried to write novels, in my 20s, I was so self-absorbed, so indifferent to the external world, that I could never remember what a character was wearing, or what color his eyes were, or what the room looked like; as an art critic, my secret agenda was to learn how to enjoy describing the look of things, the plasticity of objects, and to place things in context. So I could never describe a painting without talking about the space it was in, the people who passed in and out, the press release, the garni-it was all one thing, and ended up a sample chapter of a novel I would some day write. So what looked like a flirtatious involve ment with post-Modern theory was really a selfsh exencine in writing.

In any case, in the '80s, the scene had been subject. You couldn't look at all that money, all that fame, all that expenditure gargling up before you eves and pretend the only significant part was this static object on the wall. Even formalist critics found that they ignored the procession of vanities around the object at the risk of their credibility. I think I probably caused a lot of people who weren't as familiar with English, or with reality, as I was to make a big fuss over their own metacritical cogitations-I'm thinking of one critic who launched a polemic about me by asking, "What's eating Gary Is dianal" (Th better question would have been, "Who's eating

CANDERS LINES 113

Gary Indiana?"-at the time, nobody very thrilling.) The piece went on to bemoan the fact that by 1987 I had become "obsessed by axes," an obsession that came to be shared by the rest of the art world a year or so later.

I like to think I brought a breath of scandal, sus pense, and fresh air to a period and a place, that I punctured a few follies and got things better than right it least part of the time, and I especially like to think I bailed out at exactly the right moment-that leisurely half hour before the aircraft hit the ground. Carts Indiana's sheet accord, Root How, is being published day month by Full-Mark Red Roots of New York, and Longham

### O'BRIEN

since I was manipulating the sessions for my own purposes, I wasn't really being passive. Actually I found the experience liberating, in the sense that when there's nothing left to hide, you can move on. It was like getting rid of a secret.

GO'B: Do you think acomen should serve in

KS: I find it kind of funny that this issue should be h a barometer of liberal view vs: decades ago, lib erals were against combat. But I goess if women to fight in wars, let 'em.

GO'B: Do you think gays should serve on

### RS: Yeah

GO'B: Then you disagree with the President? KS: He doesn't think they should serve on sub-

GO'B: No, the bunks are too close together.

KS: What do you think?

GO'B: I think if gays searct to be in the military they should join the Marines. They'd be prouder if they had new service. They'd he competitive. KS: Why the Marines?

CO'B: There seems to be a lot of gay Marines anyway. Their slogan is "We're looking for a few good men." Do you have any unusual skills or talents? KS: Finding and killing bugs and hailing cabs are my

o good skills.

## GO'B: What about talents?

KS: I think I have talent as a poet. And I can

GO'B: Do you practice poetry? KS: It's something I did in college

GO'B: Are you sight-handed or left-handed!

KS: Right-handed.

GO'B: Are you a registered voter?

KS: I'm a registered Democrat. GO'B: Have you ever had an out-of-body experience?

## 805) No.

GO'B: Do you believe in sein 805 No. GO'B: Do you have recu

RSs No.

GO'B: Tell me a dream you remember.

KSc [Extremely long pause] I was crossing an a going to a shrink appointment, and it was flooded Therapy was like an art-school critique with the shrink being the teacher. There were various artists there. At me point the shrink was talking about Us work, say ing how good it was, using the word "thin," meaning had no excess, it was beautifully economic. only problem was Us inability to talk about it. I said That's okay, that can be learned. It's better for it to work visually than verbally. I asked if the teacher/shrink could come to my studio because my work was too big to bring in. I had some disappointment about not be-ing adequately critiqued. Then I was sitting in a bar drinking Diet Coke with the shrink/teacher. We were having a fun, flirtatious conversation. I was thinking he would have liked more but for the prohibitions of the therapeutic relationship. It was as if we were on a date getting drunk together. I couldn't remember th name of the avenue that was flooded. Then I rememdi it was Second Avenue

GO'B: Do you have any petal

KS: Not now. Growing up I had lots of cats. And then lons of dogs.

## GO'B: Do you have planted

KS: No, just stuffed animals.

GO'B: What's your favorite article of clothing? KS: I have a long black dress I like, but that will change. I go through favorites; they last about a I don't have a deep-commitment to clother GO'B: What about shoes?

KS: I think shoes are important and wonderful, but I hate buying them and I often wind up buying shoes hat are too small or too big. I have one pair that worked out well last year, sort of platform loafers. ry all-purpose.

## GO'B: Are there any words that you live by? RS: It's necessary to be slightly underemployed.

GO'8: Do you scant to hear your bare Street Works

GO'B: Canver pro bitions fearlessly. If you haven't any clearly defined goals, get some, C

S UBSCRIBE OUTSIDE THE U.S. 212-475-4000 1-800-966-278

AND ANY TRACT LAB

Gary Indiana with an introduction by Richard Flood

All rights reserved. artforum.com is a registered trademark of Artforum International Magazine, New York, NY.