

Hasegawa(H): I want to start this interview with a very simple question. First you started your artistic career making performances. After these performances, you began making some sculptures, and also have mixed performances and sculptures. In this process, from the very beginning to your recent works, what is the relationship between your performances and sculptures?

Barney(B): I guess it's changed a little bit. It has been different in different situations, hasn't it? I think those first pieces I exhibited grew out of these *Drawing Restraint* (Fig. 1) experiments that I was making as a student, which were quite literally installations that were built to function as a trial's course for the act of drawing. I would put myself into this installation as a way of putting a restraint upon myself to affect the act of drawing. They were like facilities. They weren't so much installations. Then, when I started making the body of work that ended up being exhibited in 1991, those first exhibitions I had, those situations started to become more to do with storytelling. *Transsexualis* (Fig. 2) and *Repressia* (Fig. 3), those were primarily sculptural stations of the system out of which the story would grow. So, in that way, the sculptures were foundational: the object. What came later in the *Cremaster Cycle* was more of an approach taken with earthworks or land art, where a piece of geology or an architectural condition was the object at the foundation of the project.

H: Did you say "earthwork"?

B: The earthwork was the object that was at the foundation of the project in the same way that with those earlier works on object, it was at the foundation. So, I think on that level it is the same; that the object became the landscape. And out of that landscape, a story grew. Then, out of that story a family of objects grew. So, it came back to the object afterwards. And those were different types of objects. Those objects were more about trying to take the story and distill it back down to the object. So, they did not live in the foundation, they lived in the spire.

H: That is very interesting, because when I see several resources on what happened in the historical context of contemporary art in the United States, artists like Vito Acconci and Bruce Nauman that you have mentioned before, are performance-based. In the Western art history, there are strong relationships between body and sculpture. Since you mostly talk about the word "installation," not so much sculpture, I wonder if you want to make some new definition or bring new ideas to sculpture. Do you just more focus on the installation, like the form in progress, the formation in progress?

B: I think I never felt comfortable or very urgent about defining what it is that I do, in terms of its art historical context. I think it is easy for me to look at somebody like Gordon Matta-Clark and feel quite close to him in a certain way. I feel what I am doing is not that different from him and a number of his contemporaries. And on another level, there are surely some differences. I guess at the end of the day, I am more preoccupied with how my practice will continue to proliferate itself. At this point it feels more like the responsibility of having a pet; keeping an animal, feeding it properly, making sure it has the right shelter, and proper medicine. It is about the preservation of energy that has its own demands. And I think I am more obsessed with those demands that I am with where it exists in the historical context of the contemporary art.

H: In the past you did some medical training.

B: Well, not exactly. It was more about the preparation for a scientific course on a very basic level for what would eventually become an academic medical program. I think it is more accurate to say that through my childhood I always assumed that I would become a doctor. That was always what I assumed. I think it was because it was what interested me from a very early age. So when I entered university, I went into that program but immediately realized that I could not keep up with it.

I was not enough a strong student to maintain that. My energy was starting to sway toward art anyway.

H: Probably there are two things that you are more interested in: the structure and the composition like muscles and bones. Or, you are more interested in what is inside, a kind of metabolism. What was your main concern when you wanted to be a doctor in your childhood?

B: Actually, I was always thinking that I would become a plastic surgeon, not necessarily in a cosmetic way, but more in the way of corrective surgery of deformities or trauma, in the case of things like burns.

H: What do you think about special effects in Hollywood's make-ups to create monsters and aliens? Are you interested in this?

B: You mean in the potential for the body to transform? Sure. I think I am interested in it on a visceral level. I am also interested in its failure. I am a fan of rubber and its foam latex technique over the digital technique. I am interested in the way the foam rubber masks fail to achieve a real likeness. It is more of a travesty. It wants to be a something, but it can't. I quite like that.

H: When was the first time you made your own transformations like monsters by yourself? Was it in the *Cremaster Series* or was it before it like *Drawing Restraint 7?* (Fig. 4)

B: I was already doing some things at school that had costuming. In that way, there were characters. They did not have any prosthetic appliances. It was in *Ottoshaft* (Fig. 5), which I made in 1992, that I used prosthetic for the first time. I was not wearing it, but my mother was wearing it. She was playing the character named Al Davis.

H: That was your mother! I remember.

Interview with Mathew Barney

7/24/2003

Appendix by Hasegawa Yuko

B: And then I made *Drawing Restraint 7* that had all of the Satyrs. I played one of those characters.

H: There is a primal question about the whole *Cremaster* series. What do you want to present? What do you want to realize to conceive your mind through the *Cremaster* series? What did you want to represent through the artwork? Do you want to show a process in which a certain form is coming? Is that correct? May I get some more ideas about what you present through the whole *Cremaster* series? What is your primal concern? What do you conceive in it?

B: I think that the idea, which I keep thinking about, that a form going from a differentiated state to another differentiated state is a model for the creative process. I think that on a very basic level the *Cremaster Cyle* could be looked at as a meditation on the creative process. There is something to do with *Cremaster 1* (Fig. 6) being about the very beginning of an idea inside one's head. *Cremaster 2* (Fig. 7) would be to do with rejecting the idea that once sparks in *Cremaster 1* and starts to form. You try to eliminate it from your mind. Because you are worried that it is not a good idea, there is that moment of doubt and rejection.

H: That is interesting.

B: Then, in *Cremaster 3* (Fig. 8), it comes back and becomes narcissistic. It becomes the best idea you have ever had. And then, you would back to doubt to in *Cremaster 4* (Fig. 9, 10), or have a kind of moment of panic, knowing that in *Cremaster 5*, it has to define itself. It has to be released into the world. So *Cremaster 4* is to do with finding a space between the two spaces of leaving the idea undifferentiated, or differentiating the idea, like trying to find that locked space in between where it can be both. But it can't so eventually in *Cremaster 5* (Fig. 11, 12), it has to die. It has to be put out into the world and be allowed to decay, which is one of the reasons I am really interested in making these

entropic pieces right now. Because I think it is really close to the nature of the project in general; that it is about an entropic system that is trying to overcome its condition.

H: When you say entropic, do you mean the system creating a form and also the system of creating a story?

B: I am talking about both. I am talking about something that is an organism that has its own will and is trying to overcome its own condition.

H: That is very clear. Because I could not get any of these comments from any other interviews and articles. You are probably now ready to talk about your work.

B: Not until recently. It is much easier for me to talk about this now, because it is finished. I felt premature to talk about these things without having all of these chapters complete.

H: You try to use different and new materials to bring new feelings to your sculptures, as in your three-dimensional works. Are there any advisors or a team with whom you developed the materials?

B: With the materials? There is a man called Matt Ryle who works in my studio. In terms of films, he functions as a production designer. When we are generating sculptures in the studio, he helps to research the materials and helps engineers with both the sets and the sculptures.

H: What is his background?

B: His background is in architecture and art. I met him working at a fabrication studio where they were making things with fiberglass. We shared a mutual interest in materials.

H: Earlier in your career, you gave an answer to an interview about your first video with performance.

What you said is that this video is showing the possibility of the story- what is going to happen, not a kind of document of the reality, which means a proposal. You also quoted Casper David Friedrich's painting as an example (Fig. 13). In Friedrich's painting, there is a man standing just showing his back. It is a proposal of what is going to happen. For me it is very interesting about your ideas, about the videos, about the moving images, and about how to present them. So, just tell me something about these things like what you found; another new possibility or a potential of videos. Also, I am very interested in the speed and the tempo of your films. It is very special. It is not something in paintings nor kind of still pictures. Yet, it is not like a normal films' speed. Also, it is not a story-telling speed. It is something else. It could be called "tempo by sculptures." But I am not sure what ideas you have.

B: I think the question about tempo is to do with trying to think about the subject as an object. I think it is to do with principle of sculpture that has to do with cinematic experience. It is about moving around an object to understand it as opposed to having a two dimensional relationship to an image. I think that it dictates not just the tempo of the film but the camera movements that repeat and have a superior view over something and a frontal view as well as a dorsal view from the side to really understand the character or object. In that way it is a slightly scientific approach too.

H: Could you further explain the scientific approach?

B: Well, I think that an organism would be looked at from a superior, anterior, and a side view. It is a kind of an exploitation of something with the interest in understanding it as a form, rather than understanding its narrative. Or it is perpetuating its narrative. In a funny way, it is economical if you are looking at it in those terms; how do you understand the form to photograph it from three perspectives in the way that specimens are dealt with scientifically.

I think that is often the way that I would set up a shooting schedule.

H: Are these ideas reflected in your camera work?

B: And the paradox is of course that in cinematic terms the pace is very slow.

H: That's right. Like Bill Viola and Gary Hill, they use slow motion. They intend to make a kind of movement between movie and painting. It is very obvious that your camera work comes from sculptural ideas. The video work is moving; it is very autotarian. It throws out to people; the people have to see it. Your work is just a kind of in-between.

B: One of the things that were very exciting for me about making the exhibition in Guggenheim after filming there was the relationship between the video and the object because it could have that state of proposal about it. You are walking through the situation; you are walking through the scene and you are looking at what has taken place in the scene. I guess in the way that the objects were re-rendered and manipulated slightly; they changed from their state in the video. I am interested in this proposal that you are not seeing everything that has happened. And you are being asked to complete the story by yourself.

H: Right, the viewers complete the story by themselves. Several film makers and also people who know your films often ask me about your tempo. It is much slower and different from what they know. They could not analyze it.

B: I think it is both interesting and also problematic a little bit in the way that the films have now taken on their own life in cinemas. When they leave the context of the object and they live purely as films, another thing happens and I find it exciting and interesting that it is possible. But I also quite honestly feel like I never set out to make movies. I think if they have to be judged purely in cinematic

terms and that is the way that they are going to live, I think there are problems. I became interested in the possibility that they could function both within the cycle as part of the system that would generate objects. They could also live in the art house cinema and tell a story.

H: In the art world, people are talking about new vocabularies and new languages. But it is getting boring for me, because we have to think about a new kind of system and a new circulation. Your work is really a good example of the idea that I conceived. A kind of circulation of your work is something completely new. That is why I am questioning why you are showing only on the screen. You must have another intension. Or you just leave all the new interpretations to the viewers and let them receive that piece by themselves. In that way, it is out of the artists' control, yes?

B: Well, I mean, not exactly. I think that as the project was being made chapter by chapter and I would finish a chapter, there was an interest in exhibiting that chapter on its own. If we were going to just take the story in the moving image and separate it from the bigger system, then the best way for the story to be told is in the cinema, projected, where a person sits down and watches it from the beginning to the end and not as a video projection in the gallery where a person walks in and out and has a kind of more elliptical experience to the story. However, once the system has been finished and there is the opportunity to bring together the system of objects and the moving image, I think it is more effective for them to be shown on the video in proximity to the object. It has been more and more complicated now that it is a finished body. It is complicated to disembodify the project- to pull one aspect of it away. It has always been complicated but it is more complicated now.

H: I am also very interested in the relation between sculpture and landscape. You said in an interview that when you saw the Isle of Man, you were

viscerally and strongly impressed. Also you were talking about your memory. The most impressive memory is the house where Stanley Kubrik's film, *Shining*, takes place. It is not a landscape but a location or a situation. Those kinds of comments for me are very interesting, because for me it looks like you see some particular strong artworks. When you get some impression, you feel it physically. It is like when you appreciate things, you are being made so by some big sculptures or big architectures. When you react, it is in turn a kind of landscape. That is quite interesting for me. So, when you make some films, for instance, *Cremaster 2*, it is the beautiful small hill-like sculptures.

B: Yes, it is a hill made of salt.

H: You made the sculpture on the lake. To you, are those sculptures like a stage set for films or more like landscape? You said that your videos and sculptures can be read and digested in different ways in the gallery. People see a certain shape, form, in videos and films, and they see some actual sculptures there in the gallery. There are some relationships between them. It is like a process of digestion and eating. Is there any relationship between sculptural construction or landscape in your films and actual sculptures in the gallery? It is very complicated. For instance, about the big salt sculpture like a big stage set in *Cremaster 2*, what are your ideas and the relationships between them? For you, is there no definition to make landscape or to make sculpture?

B: I think what I wanted out of the *Cremaster* was to be able to jump between a number of different scales; from the scale of the landscape, to the scale of the body, to the microscopic, and to freely move between the different scales. I think at this point, the project definitely assumes that it can do it. I think that the Rocky Mountains were the spine of Gary Gilmore, for instance. And the spine of Gary Gilmore was the path between he and his parents and grandparents. This was also like a genealogical path. It was all these things at the same time. And that

saddle, if you turned the saddle upside down, it is the valley that the glacier created, and it is the groove for the backbone of the Gilmore clan. It is all these things at the same time. I think that it is true of the sculptures that are built after the stories and true of the films as well, that it wants the story to fluctuate between essentially. I think it wants to liberate the story from the scale of the figure and from my body. I want this story to come out of my body to be able to live on the scale of architecture, or on the scale of landscape, or on a microscopic scale.

H: Also, it is mostly the same when you make a mask and you want to transform yourself. You are just jumping different scales of ideas. Also it is an extension of ideas and transformation of your body. In process of filming, you sculpturize all these subjects, I thought. This is a very new thing for me.

B: Yes, which makes the selection of the place quite important. I think not very place can be transformed that way. I think a transformation can only happen if it is already related in some way to my language. When I go out, I am only looking for certain things that can function that way. It is similar to the notion of a virus, for it is a discriminating virus that needs a host body but won't take any host.

H: That is very interesting. May I ask you about eroticism in your very recent drawings presented in the 50th Venice Biennial. Once you gave us this comment in an interview, your eroticism is "auto-erotic." What do you mean by "auto-erotic"? Just give me some of your ideas.

B: "Auto-eroticism" would just mean self-eroticism like masturbation. It is self-serving, auto-eroticism. I was referring to the fact that this is a story that is taking place within one organism, so to speak, and so that the organism is something like a city. It has got many characters within it and many different factions. But at the end of the day it is one thing. So auto-erotic, in those terms, there are certainly relationships within that organism, but at the end of

the day, it is one thing.

H: In terms of the new drawing series, explain to me something about your views. I took time to study each one. Each one is quite different. I could not analyze its relationship to the title.

B: I think it is a departure from the kind of eroticism that we are talking about in the *Cremaster Cycle*. I think that it is sort of more to do with allowing for an external relationship to take place. I think that its title, which is *Drawing Restraint 8*, is to do with this notion of taking the concept of *Drawing Restraint*, where you have a body that is under a restraint or resistance of some sort- that it is placed upon itself as a creative agent. And for the first time it is removing this restraint, this resistance. It is opening the valve of this closed system, this self-reflective system. And I think the kind of eroticism that these drawings are dealing with is one that exists outside of that- the bubble that the *Cremaster Cycle* was.

H: You show some photographs from the films. Also you make some photographs independently, not from the films. What are the relations between these types of photographs and also what is the position of photographs in all of your works?

B: I think that there are a couple of different types of photographs. There are some which are there to articulate a critical intersection within the narrative or the form. And there are others, like the portraits that are useful as an organizing principle. They are the way of organizing the factions, a way of understanding the conflict.

H: Is this more like a conceptual diagram?

B: I think that they are diagrammatic in a funny way, the portraits are about braking down the factions. And I think for that reason they were very useful in the *Cremaster Cycle* exhibition where I did not really use any of the narrative pictures. I used the portraits, and let the sculpture be more about those

intersections and the distillation of the stories. The portraits were attempts to create a diagram that could surround the sculpture. And then I think that there is a thing that happens with the photograph that is almost practical in the way that the details are quite articulate in the photography. And often detail is lost in the film or actually does not ever appear on screen. So I think that they are quite valuable in the way that they inform the moving image.

H: I myself have a very specific definition of form. May I clarify your ideas of your usage of the word, form.

B: I think it is getting this idea of a body that has multiple scales, a body which is made up of different levels of information. Within this body there are primary forms, secondary forms, and tertiary forms. But in general, I would call that the body, that sculptural body a form. I guess I would use that word both in terms of object distillation and narrative. And also as a way of thinking about how drawing, photography, sculpture and film can come together as a sculpture. I would call that a form as well. So I think it's a word that I probably use too much. But I think it is useful in both of these cases, because I do tend to think of all these things as one thing.

H: When I use the word, form, the water is the material and the river is the form. That is a very simple understanding. Now, I just want to investigate more about your interest in Casper David Friedrich. Your piece in Cologne titled *Chrysler Imperial* (Fig. 14), represents a car crash at the bottom of the Chrysler building. You made a beautiful sculpture with concrete, metals, and some parts of a car. When I saw the pieces I immediately remembered the very famous Friedrich painting of a big ice world (Fig. 15). The piece is not so monumental or a dramatic piece for me anymore. It is a very thrilling thing. It is very prospective. It prospects something that will happen in the future. This is not a kind of documentary that has happened in the past. There also exists a kind of tension. *Also*

you mentioned about your concern about the artist.

B: Yes, I think I was thinking about that painting a lot with *Cremaster 5* specifically. There is a scene in number 5 which is an echo of the condition in number 4 that we talked about before; this is the condition of panic, of wanting there to be a space between the undefined space and the defined. In number 5, it is this proposal of the performer on stage, either looking into the audience or turning away from the audience, and looking into backdrop. There are two different problems; both which deal with authority. One is turning toward the audience and claiming a kind of authority over me as a performer which is possible but is temporal. It is about a moment, about achieving resonance in the moment and then having that moment pass. And the other model which was the model that Friedrich painting was evocative of, is this notion of turning away from the audience and looking into this painting, essentially the backdrop as a model of nature. It is claiming an authority over that, thinking about the way that the character in the Friedrich paintings is standing and that the type of authority his stance has. The third possibility in that scene was that the character would turn to the side and face the Proscenium Arch, which is like an access between those two spaces, and would find its own reflection in the gold gilded arch. In the story of number 4 and 5, it is unable to find any clarity in that reflection. It is not able to find a space in between. But I have also thought about Friedrich's painting in other ways. I think that notion you were speaking of there being a lot of potential in that picture. I think it has to do with the type of *contraposto* that the character stands in. For me it has something to do with the position that the body would take in a recoil; that the body would take and would make it possible to move in any direction. This is a complicated thing. It is like a memory from football

and playing the quarterback position where you are passed the ball between the legs of another and you start in a position with your feet, which is quite similar to the position of Casper David Friedrich's paintings. And the reason why you hold your feet in that position is that you can move in any direction once you are given the ball. If you always stand in the same position, then the defense does not know which way you would move. So, it is both. It is nearly aesthetic the way that the stance looks, and it doesn't give anything away to the defense. But for yourself, you have the potential to move any direction with power. I think that one of the first things I started thinking about from football was that it is a model for an artwork or a way of looking at art. There was this notion of these thresholds that exist, again this threshold of performance where at what point the game begins and at what point energy is lost. You know that moment that the ball is put into play and put into the hands of the player and the game begins. It is quite charged for me, and it always felt quite charged for me. It was also always a sort of like melancholy. And it always felt quite problematic for me to actually have to play the game. It is such a fertile place, a space of preparing, gaining and storing energy or strength, which is in a heightened state.

H: I have never experienced being a football player, but when a player has a ball in the game, everybody pays attention to him. He is like a living sculpture, an elegant and beautiful sculpture, realized by a lot of training. Yet, he never gives any signs where he is going to move. There are a lot of potentialities. There also exist a lot of high tensions. It is very theater-like. Also it is like a performance. The last thing I am still wondering is about a story, narrative. Even if it is not the same as an ordinary narrative, it is still a character zone and there exists a narrative. There is also a relationship between the narrative and the

character zone. Your character zone is connected with each other and narrative is very breakable compared to a normal narrative. You bring in some character like Houdini, Freemasons, also yourself randomly.

B: I think that a good example would be *Cremaster 4*, for instance. In this, you have the yellow ascending team, the motorcycles. And you have the ascending fairy whose hair is pulled up this way. And they organize one of the three legs. Then you have the descending blue team and the descending fairy whose hair is down, organized another team. And then you have the Loughton leg, which is the Loughton candidate and the four horned sheep, and the way that those three zones make the tartan; the yellow, blue and white tartan of the Isle of Man which refers to the sea, the sky, and the flowers which grow there. I guess by zones I mean that those three legs are the materials. They are both the narrative materials and the physical materials that this body is made out of. And I don't think we are talking about emotions. We are talking about qualities, or states of being. So I think that is what differentiates it from a typical cast of characters in cinema. They are not carrying emotional baggage.

H: Is it somewhat related to what you said about form?

B: Well, I think so. I think any aspect of the story is not describing a relationship between two characters. It is describing the relationship between two aspects within the interior of this organism.

H: This interview has made me think that the whole *Cremaster* series interrelate to one another like an ecological system; one could call it 'Cremaster Matrix.' Thank you very much for your time.

(Edited by Murata Daisuke. This interview took place in Kanazawa on 24 April, 2003)

Appendix: Post Interview

Contemporary art is in a time of great transition in terms of its identity. The definition of art and its value are changing. Positively speaking, they are making diverse developments. Negatively speaking, they are becoming more obscure. Who forms a consensus in these matters? There are as many consensus as different cultural contexts. The changes in the environment surrounding contemporary art, in mass media, society, and the market, provide links between art and the world. At the same time, owing to the wide accessibility of easily manipulated media, artistic expression and our daily lives have become more equivalent. This has also brought about a great number of similar artworks with minimal differences. The "expression" emerging in this situation, is a report of everyday life, an insignificant interference with reality. It is not anything difficult, but rather an easy "expression" to accept. There is, however, a disparity when it comes to the question of whether such expressions would be accepted as art. This is because the consensus of art is a political product supported by contexts, systems, societies, and markets. In this mainstream of standardization, creating small stories minimized into the unit of the individual, Mathew Barney is one of the few unabashed artists who tell a story on a transcendent scale. When Barney is understood in term of consensus, there are two interestingly contradictory aspects. While he tries to deviate from the conventional consensus, he uses the same consensus as a basic foundation of his artwork. Of course, "creative tradition" has been repeated again and again in art history and is nothing new. For example, Barney explores his themes, transformation of body and form, using traditional elements such as the body, portrait, landscape, emblem, and story. The media Barney uses are still photography, film, sculpture, two dimensions, three dimensions, and movies, telling a story in multi-layered and diverse structures. Barney, with his tableau vivant characteristics, exhibits sculptures used in his films and photographs. The complex pleasure of enjoying different details coming from each medium is one of the excitements of visual art. The reasons why Barney creates basically everything in analog and does not rely on computer graphics come from his determined preference for materials and complexity, which include certain resistance in details. The characters he developed in *Cremaster* are rather intelligible, the kind often found in conventional narratives, including the criminal, Neptune, the magician, a young man who passes through an initiation, a goddess who directs the beginning of the world, androgynous fairies, a giant, a racer, and other similar tropes. While using the conventional media and visual vocabulary, this grand work of five serial episodes do not suggest any conclusion. Each viewer reaches individual interpretations and conclusions.

Some analyze his work as a repetition and deviation of surrealism and Dadaism, or an example of deconstruction through a hybrid. However, it is not a deviation but the proposal of a bio cycle in another form. Barney said that the form of a sculpture becomes vibrant when it is eaten and digested as the structure of a story.

This suggests a process of doubt and vain efforts in trying to solve complex problems, fully employing intelligence and sensitivity. However, it is, in fact, as simple as different people having different ways of digesting the same food.

As one enters into the world of Mathew Barney, he/she lands in the world with different presuppositions. Using rather familiar visual language, Barney creates totally different organisms and landscapes by putting them in different systems, organic and bio cycles.

While none of our consensus were violated, our bio-cycles were transformed. It is as if, after we ate apples and oranges, they would be absorbed through photosynthesis.

In his book, *Empire*, Negri and Hardt speaks of nature as a barbarian against the Empire, perceiving nature as an artificial domain that is open to continuous transformation, mixing, and combinations. Such possibilities of physical transformation, structuring human diversion, link to Barney's creative world. "Today's corporeal mutations constitute an anthropological exodus and represent an extraordinarily important, but still quite ambiguous, element of the configuration of republicanism "against" imperial civilization. The anthropological exodus is important primarily because here is where the positive, constructive face of the mutation begins to appear: an ontological mutation in action, the concrete invention of a first new place in the non-place". (1)

"The concrete invention of a first new place in the non-place"- Barney's scientific knowledge and experiential and realistic approach through his scientific and sports medical studies, contribute to the "concreteness" of his work.

In other words, this type of concreteness is what would be visualized when a person with orthopedic techniques and knowledge of new materials would plan a physical transformation and metamorphosis. The borders between man and woman, human and animal, body and landscape are broken down, and a dynamism in the process of transformation, generating a new existence, is presented. This is not a visual metaphor, but is expressed with the precision found in orthopedic surgery, a reform of deformation and transformation of muscle through sports and training.

Furthermore, it is a proposal of new materialism, and new physicality. What is most interesting in this interview is the way Barney uses the concept of "form." For example, Mathew Barney said, "a form going from a differentiated state to another

differentiated state is a model for the creative process." "the system creating a form and also the system of creating a story" is "entropic" and is "an organism that has its own will and is trying to overcome its own condition." (These impulses come from Barney's experiences in sports and performance and his knowledge of the life cycle) Barney calls a sculptural body a "form." He also calls a form a way of thinking about how drawing, photography, sculpture and film can come together as a sculpture. In a question regarding landscape, he said he wanted to "jump between a number of different scales" and "the Rocky Mountains were the spine of Gary Gilmore." These are also examples showing that he perceives the landscape as an extended "body."

His sense of materials drawn from this form is reflected also in his films. The pace of his film, which feels too long for one scene, is generated through the scientific approach of observing the subject form from three perspectives: from the superior, anterior, and side view. The subject is understood as a form rather than as a narrative. That makes his films different from cinematic narratives. His perspective is that of God's, which thoroughly observes the world without any intention or prejudice.

The relation between narrative and character zone is explained by saying that the character zone is, in the physical sense, a narrative material. Barney said, "I don't think we are talking about emotions. We are talking about qualities, or states of being. So I think that is what differentiates it from the typical cast of characters in cinema." Thus, no aspect of the story is describing the emotional relations of characters, but "is describing the relationship between two aspects within the interior of this organism."

This discourse reveals Barney's grammar. For example, what the "queen" represents and signifies does not change. In *Cremaster Cycle*, when the queen is in the character zone, becoming involved with other character zones, a new form is produced. This alchemical cycle is energized through Barney's extreme performance. He prepares a definite non-place after he escapes through this grand odyssey of spirit and body. He injects a great quantity of adrenaline into the domain called Art and reconstructs its organic function. It appears that what has been created is a new space, however, it is actually a space that has been extremely activated, thus, oblivious to its own genes, and starting to metabolize in a different cycle and system. In the present time where consensus created through ideologies and philosophies are not valid anymore, this, so to speak, political new physicalism and materialism, where physicality and materials are multiplied and activated through contemporary informative environments and technologies, have a certain consensual foundation. Barney's world clearly reveals this new possibility.

(Translated by Setsuko Miura)

(1) Antoni Negri and Michael Hardt, *Empire*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass., 2000, pp.215-216.