

Turning the Corner:
Deconstructing Bruce Nauman's *Going Around the Corner Piece*
(1970)



Melinda M. White
Deconstruction
Final paper
Dr. Todd Cronan
December 15, 2008

Melinda M. White
Deconstruction
Dr. Todd Cronan
Final paper
December 15, 2008

Turning the Corner:
Deconstructing Bruce Nauman's *Going Around the Corner Piece* (1970)

Humanity is always turning the next corner, waiting for what comes next, particularly with the advancement of technology. In the grip of any new technology, we are waiting, moving forward, continually anticipating what is next, what is around the next corner. Marshall McLuhan and others predicted a future of mediation, where message depends on medium, although this is not a new concept for art or language. We are always mediated in our communication of ideas, emotions, expression, and continually seeking to orient ourselves in the world, through new forms of communication and mediation. We round corners, seeking knowledge, seeking Truth (Althea). No sooner do we turn that corner than we see ourselves, mediated, retreating; we are unable to catch a glimpse of our self-image—we can never catch up. We attempt to move more quickly, around the next corner, catch our mediated selves. Paul Virilio refers to this as the “rushing standstill”, continually moving forward but not really getting anywhere. We continually seek Truth through objects and experience, and through interactivity with a work of art, putting ourselves within the frame, we become a part of this process. This is exactly the environment Bruce Nauman created in his installation, *Going Around the Corner Piece* (1970).

Imagine yourself entering a gallery room with white walls and a white cube, confronted only with a monitor displaying your own retreating image. As you turn the corner, your image has disappeared from view (McGrath). Turning the corner, the same scenario, yet another monitor, another image of self retreating, and again and again, the same. This disturbs and you speed up to try to catch more of a glimpse next time you round a corner, but, inevitably, as you speed up, your retreating image does also. You keep trying, thinking that you will catch up, but end up going around the corner faster and faster with no change in the outcome. Eventually, what is left is the sensation of your own body, your own internal reaction to this chase and the experience. Nauman's works, including the corridor pieces, are meant to confuse, discombobulate, leave the viewer alone with themselves, his or her thoughts, his or her tail chasing attempt in this case, to see themselves face-to-face, which, although it is inevitably impossible, does not stop the participant from trying to do just that. Both what's inside and what's outside determine our physical, physiological and psychological responses—how we look at an object,” Nauman says (Quoted in Wagner 68).

The glorious part of this work, however, is that the experience, the process of creating the work that is going on within the frame (or lack thereof) is entirely up to the viewer, the gallery-goers. Once inside Nauman's construction, the viewer, or rather participant, must make the decisions; they can choose to meander around the corners, walk backwards, wave their arms, become frustrated or bored and leave the work all together. It is this interaction, this involvement that allows this minimalist construction to become art, art in the making. That is both the playfulness and the frustration that confronts the viewer/participant. Nauman sought to take the “object” out of sculpture, or

at the very least to blur the boundaries of the inside and outside, the definitive object-ness of a work.

As a physical construction, or sculpture, the work is made up of a plywood cube, video cameras, and television monitors. Four cameras are mounted from above and displaying the view on four television monitors, placed on the floor of the corners. What the viewer sees is their retreating image, which disappears as they round the corner. With the corners, Nauman has left what he calls the “seam” in the work, which draws attention to the object-ness of the cube. He has, however exceeded the boundaries of the sculptural object by blurring the distinction between inside and outside. The space around the cube is gallery space and where “object” ends and gallery space begins is hazy. The viewer/participant must navigate both gallery and work-space, moving around the monitors situated at each corner to move to the next. The set-up is simple, like cameras that project back to the consumer their own image at a Wal-Mart. But instead of coming face-to-face with our own image, mirror-like, we see ourselves from behind, and retreating; here there is no chance to wave at your own image or stick out your tongue at the camera. As in the standard image, there is nothing much to see, it is the experience that makes it a work of art. The walls are white, the cube that creates the corners we walk around, white, the rest of the gallery space white, with natural light coming in through a window and track lighting above the work. The whiteness of the piece, combined with the technological equipment, gives a sterile, cold media (as McLuhan would say) feeling to the space. Instead of being passive participants in an art gallery, we are faced with ourselves as part of the artwork.

Bruce Nauman's artwork is often meant to force us to confront ourselves, think about the world and our position in it, how we communicate and the language we use to do so, although often faultily so. *Going Around the Corner Piece* certainly forces this confrontation with self, this embodied presence within a work, but with less emphasis on language or the place of the artist than is seen in much of his work. Here the viewer is viewing themselves, inside the frame, expression without language, and making the work of art as they go. Lev Manovich, a new media theorist, says of interactivity:

All classical, and even moreso modern, art is "interactive" in a number of ways. Ellipses in literary narration, missing details of objects in visual art, and other representational "shortcuts" require the user to fill in missing information. Theater and painting also rely on techniques of staging and composition to orchestrate the viewer's attention over time, requiring her to focus on different parts of the display. With sculpture and architecture, the viewer has to move her whole body to experience the spatial structure. Modern media and art pushed each of these techniques further, placing new cognitive and physical demands on the viewer. (56)

Nauman's work can be considered new media installation, with some of the same affects as interactive online media. Art has always been interactive, but with technology and immersion of the viewer in the frame, much like a reader of interactive literature, it is becoming more-so—more up to the viewer to make the work, more decisions, more experience that is set up by the artist, but subjective from the point of view from the

participant themselves. In Anne Wagner's article, "Nauman's Body of Sculpture", she says:

One of the tenets—even the clichés—of Minimalism is that it puts the viewer in mind of his or her body. In Nauman, by contrast, the body Minimalism was content merely to gesture toward is somehow actively immobilized—dis-animated—by the sculpture that invokes it; through that process body and sculpture are meant to become quite scarily alike. (67).

Although most of the available images of Nauman's piece are from the outside, a cold, objective view of the work, in the gallery, there is no work of art here unless you, the viewer, are inside the frame, and viewing yourself as sculpture through a mediation, whose set-up is by all means, minimalist by definition, but so much more a process of creation. Moving through the piece you are aware of your body, but perhaps even more, being caught up within the frame, or unable to reference a frame at all, this interior process matches the exterior movements.

Derrida says, "Deconstruction must neither reframe nor dream of the pure and simple absence of the frame. These two apparently contradictory gestures are the very ones—and they are systematically indissociable—of *what* is here deconstructed" (Derrida 73). What sense do we make of the artwork, when we are invited inside the frame and while there, even one step further, to observe ourselves inside another mediated frame? Or is there a frame at all? Nauman has essentially changed how we perceive art, how we interact, how we immerse ourselves. Additionally, there seems to be an overarching

context of our larger selves, our role in society, in culture, as pursuing ourselves, and, more specifically, pursuing ourselves through technology and mediation.

If what situates us in relation to a work of art is the frame, the discombobulation we feel in *Going Around the Corner Piece* is this very lack of reference point. We may feel lost as we move around these corners searching for meaning. Where is the frame? Is it the art the image within the monitor or the experience of moving around the physical object, or the physical object/construction itself? What seems to frame the work is both the surveillance of the participant and the feedback loop of their own image, but not reflection, mediated through the monitors, with the addition of the participant's inner reaction and experience being in the work. Like the panopticon, we cannot interact with the work, without subjecting ourselves to surveillance, by the cameras in the piece, other gallery-goers, observing us as we interact with the work, and, perhaps most importantly, we are self-surveilled, as we are the ones most confronted, and most affected, with our own image. It serves as a reminder of our society of surveillance, constantly observed via the internet and surveillance cameras, constantly connected by our Blackberrys and iPhones. In the case of *Going Around the Corner Piece*, we take on the role of observed and observer simultaneously, and can also take ourselves out of the work to observe others going around corners. Although we can never be sure who else might be observing us through the camera lens, the focus is on us, as observer and observed, the main observer being ourselves. This simultaneous act is both disconcerting and pleasurable, as instead of objectively observing a work of art, we become the work of art. I would also imagine, most of us do not have the opportunity to self-observe from this angle, therefore showing us something new, a different side of ourselves than we are normally allowed

when we face our reflection in a mirror for instance. It is all an echo of our quest for self-knowledge, self-awareness. As John McGrath states in his book on surveillance:

The fascination with the elusive self-image in *Going Around the Corner Piece* points us towards an incompleteness, a dissatisfaction, inherent in self-reproduction. As with the Lacanian love object, we seek to see that which the image as other cannot know it has, yet which will, in being revealed, complete us. Our self-images almost inevitably disappoint us, and so we seek another vision, take another holiday snap in another location. The images of ourselves going around Bruce Nauman's corners entice because they leave us; they do not linger for our scrutiny. As such, they never allow the revelation of their incompleteness. (McGrath 169)

Seeing ourselves in the television monitor in *Going Around the Corner Piece* reflects the way we are represented in a mediated environment. It is our bodies, our thoughts, our confusion and frustration that make the work of art. As we chase our image around the corners of the piece, we become aware of ourselves in this quest, the inevitable fact that we won't catch ourselves or come face to face with ourselves, brings us face to face with the emotions produced by the experience and the questions it raises nonetheless. Do we need an "other" to reference ourselves and if confronted with ourselves? Will we create an "other" in that image, an "other" out of self to satisfy this gap?

Anne Wagner might disagree with this notion of incompleteness. She says, "Nauman's work turns inward, not in pursuit of introspection, but to turn the very idea of

inwardness inside out. And his work simultaneously turns outward, toward mere surface, or mere solidity, so as to forsake the privacy, the discreteness, of our sense of bodies and things. This new congress of inside and outside strikes sculpture at its heart” (Wagner 70). So it is not the creation of the other to make sense of self, but this inner experience turned outward that makes the work so incredible; here, Nauman has effectively morphed inside and outside—through the viewer/participant.

The artist is continuously trying to express the interior outward. This is continuous because of this dissatisfaction, the fallibility of mimesis, the inevitable impossibility of reproducing emotion or nature through art, the representation of althea, Truth. Instead of Heidegger’s opposition between world and earth, the space in between inside and outside, it is the combination, the unification of them that takes place in *Going Around the Corner Piece*. Here there is no line between inner and outer, frame and work; the artist does not leave a trace, there may not be a frame. As in his *Failing to Levitate in the Studio* (1966), Nauman tried to prove that artists, like ghosts, do not exist (Wagner).

Bruce Nauman is an artist for whom auto-affection is not unheard of, as he often inserts himself into his work, to the extent that some critiqued it as narcissistic (Bismarck 43). When asked about his influences, Nauman says, “Well, certainly Picasso. I think Picasso as much as anybody. And then de Kooning” (“Oral History Interview with Bruce Nauman”). These are both artists who broke through boundaries. In Anne Wagner’s article, “Nauman’s Body of Sculpture, she says that his art was “unclassifiable according to standard media distinctions of medium” (54). He moved from “medium to media” and also “art-making” to “art-as-making” (55). As Nauman said in an interview, he began to see that as an artist, if he was working in the studio, then what he was creating in the

studio must be art, and this helped him to be more open to doing and creating interesting pieces that didn't necessarily fit into the discipline of art. ("Oral History Interview with Bruce Nauman"). Nauman says, "The first real change came when I had a studio. I was working very little, teaching a class one night a week . . .and I didn't know what to do with all that time. . . . There was nothing in the studio because I didn't have much money for materials. So I was forced to examine myself and what I was doing there." (Quoted in Wagner 55).

Anything that happened in the studio was art—writing, drawing, filming, and no matter what materials were being used. This self-scrutiny was perhaps seen most prominently and encapsulated in *Mapping the Studio* (2002), where surveillance captured the happenings in the studio (without the artist and, in fact, mostly involving mice and a cat) and this process became the work. His use of video and media, however, began early on, and technology has become a focus of some of his more famous works. Prior to *Going Around the Corner Piece*, Nauman had recorded *Flour Arrangements* (1967), *Dance or Exercise on the Perimeter of a Square (Square Dance)* (1967-68, 10 minutes) and *Bouncing Two Balls Between the Floor and Ceiling with Changing Rhythms* (1967-68, 10 minutes). (*Mapping the Studio I*). The corridor pieces, where the viewer is also often a part of the work, were a successful follow-up to *Going Around the Corner Piece*. In several of them the viewer is immersed in a narrow passageway where they are confronted with their own image, causing a more claustrophobic feeling than in the corner piece. In *Corridor with Mirror and White Lights* (1971), however, the viewer was unable to enter the seemingly infinite passageway, which added to the sense of isolation.

In Rosalind Krauss' article, "Video: The Aesthetics of Narcissism", she illustrates the difference between the medium of video and more traditional mediums, as far as where the artist is situated. She states that mediums like painting, sculpture, and film depend on objective materials through which the artist's intentions must pass; the concept of object-state (4). With video, "the real medium is the psychological situation, the very terms of which are to withdraw attention from an external object—an Other—and invest in the Self" (57). Although artists used the medium in a variety of ways, it comes back to this non-reflective process of self. Joan Jonas, for instance, used video as more of a performance piece in her work, most often inserting herself as image and performer. Her goal with video performance was that it "offered the possibility of multiple and simultaneous points of view" (Jonas 10). When speaking of *Vertical Roll* (1972), she says:

Performer and audience were both inside and outside.... The audience sees the process of image-making in a performance simultaneously with a live detail. I was interested in the discrepancies between the performed activity and the constant duplicating, changing and altering of information in the video. The whole is a sequence of missing links as each witness experiences a different series by glancing from monitor to projection to live action. Perception was relative. Time and space in these performances was like Borges' *Garden of the Forking Paths*. (10)

In Constance De Jong's 1973 essay on *Organic Honey's Vertical Roll* she states: "As a means of constituting, the monitor supplied an opposite: oneself given back. An

intrinsic quality of the media—feedback—was taken metaphorically. It suggested one who could become a multiple identity” (as quoted in Joselit 163). In his book, Joselit goes on to remark, “The encounters between persons and images staged by Nauman, Campus, Acconci, and Jonas represent identity as a *process*, not a televisual *presence*” (163). We are searching, not for an object, but for self as process, media as process, in a constant state of becoming; as in *Going Around the Corner Piece*, we are in a constant state of becoming self, of self-production. Although Nauman is not in his piece as perceiver and perceived, he has put the viewer there, and, as in Jonas’ work, there are gaps—missing links—that must be necessarily be filled by the viewer’s own perception.

Michael Fried prefers to call Minimal art, literalist art, and in “Art and Objecthood” discusses the shape as the object and the effect of *presence* according to Clement Greenberg. He goes on to further explore the idea of literalist art as theatrical, because the experience of it “is of an object in a *situation*—one that, virtually by definition, *includes the beholder*” (Fried 153). As in Nauman’s piece, the space between subject and object, often large in scale, that creates this situation. Fried says, “The object, not the beholder, must remain the center or focus of the situation, but the situation itself *belongs to the beholder*—it is *his* situation” (154). Similar to the experience with Tony Smith’s *Die* (1962), situational presence is created in *Going Around the Corner Piece* by the massive cube, the corners of which viewer/participants (beholders) are required to move around. Of the cube in Smith’s piece he says, “I was not making an object” (156). *Die* too has the effect of the non-presence of the artist, the lack of trace, and, yet, the situation, the experience cannot take place without the cube and the observer’s awareness of the cube. In addition to the cube, object-hood in Nauman’s piece is created with the

addition of monitors and cameras. His cube, also, is less the focus of the situation, but still an obstacle which the observer must move around, as are the monitors. The cube serves less as an object and more as a presence, anthropomorphized even in both Smith and Nauman, as the situation is more like being in a room, in a situation, with another being, not merely an object.

In the article, Fried also discusses Smith's experience with the darkened turnpike—where he describes the situation as *his* and, further, goes on to relate the beholder as he becomes subject, and the situation as object—in Nauman's case this would be the viewer as both subject and object, as he/she becomes the work. Fried says:

What replaces the object—what does the same job as distancing or isolating the beholder, of making him a subject, that the object did in the closed room—is above all the endlessness, or objectlessness, of the approach or onrush or perspective. It is the explicitness, that is to say, the sheer persistence with which the experience presents itself as directed at him from outside (on the turnpike from outside the car) that simultaneously makes him a subject—makes him subject—and establishes the experience itself as something like that of an object, or rather, of objecthood. (159).

The prioritizing of the experience, the experience as object, the beholder subject, is a valuable aspect of interactivity in literalist installation and, moreover, is also what pushes it into the realm of the theatrical, or what Fried says “might be called the theatricality of objecthood” (160). As Artaud states in “The Theater of Cruelty”, “what

the theater can still take over from speech are its possibilities for extension beyond words, for development in space, for dissociative and vibratory action upon the sensibility” (Artuad 89). The non-verbal expression of *Going Around the Corner Piece* expresses so much more, brings us closer to Truth through the theatrical and interactive experience of the viewer. As one of Nauman’s light sculptures reads, “The true artist helps the world by revealing mystic truths” (Bismarck 40).

So without orientation to a frame, without a reference point, where is the Truth and how do we find it? Andrew Solomon says, “Nauman’s work is unpleasant and mortifying and upsetting, but when you give in to it and let him be the one in charge, then you’ll be able to do things in the world that you couldn’t do before. You’ll be more useful, worth more, maybe better off, once he’s broken you” (Quoted in Bismarck 43). Moving around Nauman’s corners, either playful or frustrated, we may not consciously be aware of Truth, but as we, as subject, create the situation by interacting with the environment created by the artist, we are discovering a message, and an inner Truth—about ourselves, about art, and perhaps about technology.

Wittgenstein declared, “A point in space is a place for an argument” (Quoted in Wagner 70). Anything can serve as a reference point—like a jar—to frame our world and make sense of it. As Heidegger discussed, it is this argument, this opposition between world and earth where the work-being of the work takes place (48). As in Nauman’s *Going Around the Corner Piece*, it is this striving, this conflict, this process that pulls us into the frame and encourages us to make sense of things, using ourselves and our mediated selves as the reference point, the co-creator of the situation as object. As Wagner recognizes, Nauman has taken this argument to a whole new level where “the

quarrel is considerably expanded, to take in nearly every aspect of sculpture's materiality—its expressive form. It is staged, moreover, by sustained recourse to a medium to which he owes everything, yet is fully resolved to leave physically and analytically exhausted—as indeed he does” (70). His argument, however, is not with sculpture as a discipline, or even art for that matter, but perhaps with the ideas surrounding where Truth lies in a work, how we pursue it, and what the role of the participant (or beholder) is in the situation and experience as object.

If we consider Derrida's idea of “always already”, what is there already, before we enter the frame, the work, is the technology, the surveillance, the mechanisms which set up our search for self, our search for Truth (althea). (Derrida). In this case, the greater truth within the work of art, is not there until we enter it; we, in effect, are the truth and the act of continually chasing our own image, re-presents to us the search for truth, a constant and infinite quest. The point here is not to express the interior externally, but to produce an internal affect in the viewer. The corners and surveillance produce an inward affect that affect the external motion, our body's interaction with the piece, and thereby creates an interior reaction or affect to our own interaction with the piece. Moving around corners, becoming aware of our inner truth as we battle with the outward environment, we are reminded that we are in a constant state of becoming.

This fits in with Derrida's ideas of auto-affection, that by viewing ourselves, we become the other, and so can never view ourselves as such. In *Going Around the Corner Piece*, we are even more distanced from ourselves, as we are viewing ourselves from an angle higher up and from behind, moving away from us. Nauman says of his corridor pieces:

I used a wide-angle lens and it was above and behind you as you walked into the corridors, so you were removed from yourself, sort of doubly removed—your image of yourself was from above and behind, and as you walked, because the wide-angle lens changes the rate that you're going away from the camera, so as you took a step, you took a double step with your own image. It's a strange feeling. (“Oral History Interview with Bruce Nauman”).

It is only by being outside ourselves, externalizing ourselves and our expression, in this case our image, surveilled by cameras and transferred inside the frame of the television monitor; it is our expression as we choose to stay, moving around the walls, from corner to corner, chasing our image. Is it only by seeing this image, outside of ourselves, that we truly encounter, truly become self? The mechanism here does not need to be revealed, Nauman has produced a transparent technology; we see the cameras, the television screen, the mechanism working. The affect here is our own internal experience it seems, although that is triggered by our externalized image within the smaller frame of the television screen. What is it that Nauman wishes us to experience within his technological framework, trapped in his corners? As we move around and around, eventually we stop looking for the affect in the external corners, walls, retreating images and begin experiencing our interior thoughts, our being within a gallery, chasing our own image. It must seem ridiculous at the moment we realize we cannot possibly catch our image or come face-to-face with ourselves, but can only keep moving, faster and faster, in this dance with mediation. Because desire needs an “other”, we pursue our image,

appearing as other in the monitor before us; if we can catch it, become one with it, we can overpower this other self and master it. Or during this chase, this interaction with the work, we are becoming one with the work, we are becoming sculpture, and becoming self. We can also stop, move outside of the frame (perhaps not absolute), and watch others move around corners, but then what are we observing? Is it art if we are outside of it or only if we are experiencing it first hand? The internal affect, then, becomes the art itself. For me, this is the idea of immersion in technology, by immersing ourselves in technology, we become one with the technology—a synthesis, a cyborg. But we are also continually going around corners, chasing ourselves, always becoming, chasing technology faster and faster.

Going Around the Corner Piece seems to provide a dystopian view of technology, with this chasing ourselves and never getting anywhere feeling. We can also view it from a more McLuhanistic point of view, where we are inevitably immersed in technology, continually turning corners, hopeful for the future and what is to come. By immersing the viewer in the artwork, the viewer becomes the art. At the same time surveilled and surveying self, the viewer is not only participant, interacting, they are the art work. From inside the frame, the perspective, the reflection, is on us as viewers, our thoughts, sensory perception, our participation in the technology chase.

Virilio sees this as the “rushing standstill”, in *Negative Horizons* he discusses technology as a vehicle, how when we are within the vehicle we are moving forward, yet because we are immersed in the technology, we are, in fact, sitting still. He sees a danger here in that what we perceive, are presented with through the mediation, appears as progress, but in actuality is not. He also states that we are moving “forward” with such

speed, but we don't know where we are going. There is an underlying fear of the technology that propels us, when we don't know how it could end up. Cyborg soldiers for instance. Or a culture where all of our experience is mediated, reality only observable through a medium. (Virilio). This is a fear many have about television. Not only is so much of our lives, our culture, dominated by the media, as David Joselit states in *Feedback*, "Television existed as a technology before it was clear how it might be marketed as a product" (15). This plays on Virilio's point that we are moving so fast, before we know where we're going. Of closed-circuit installations like Nauman's, Joselit says, "motion is so narrowly channeled in them that its ostensible dynamism results in virtual stasis: scan lines *reconstitute* images while the feedback loop *recycles* them" (28).

Essentially, in *Going Around the Corner Piece*, our image is moving, but static within the mediated space of the television monitor and our actual self, our actual movements, showing up delayed as they are recycled back to us on the monitor. Joselit says, "One might argue that the whole history of modernism has been a response to the short-circuiting of humans and objects in which bodies and things have grown into one another as cyborgs and fetishes" (28). This only worsens when we are confronted with a surveilled medium such as the internet, where we can even maintain a "second life" online. As anonymous or known as we desire to be on the World Wide Web.

There is, of course, an upside to technological advancement, this network of communication and ideas; McLuhan sees this as the "global village". The Web allows us access to knowledge otherwise unavailable to us, or at least not without restrictions. We can communicate with others, geographically distant, can access text, visuals, maps, information, and even art in a way we couldn't imagine even in the age of television. We

feel more connected to others, and also self, as we search through mediation to find these truths, these fragments of ourselves, in the world around us. We use the tools available to us as extensions of ourselves in our artistic endeavors, as a paintbrush—we are one with our materials in the act of creation. And anyone can be the artist—upload their thoughts, their perception, or ideal perception of self, to a social networking site. At the same time as we feel bombarded by information, we are also free to express and access the expression of others.

If, as McLuhan claims, the “medium is the message” in Nauman’s piece, it is the always already of the structure, and the way the surveillance of the participant, and the feedback loop of his or her image appears on the screen, and the entirety of the interactive experience that makes up the message. Ideally, through the simple set up of the cameras and the feedback loop, which ultimately echoes the physical looping of the participant through the piece, the medium Nauman has created becomes a message for the participant. As we move through *Going Around the Corner Piece*, we may not feel discombobulated, but, as Wagner suggests, we might become inside and outside, not just an interactive participant with the work we find ourselves immersed in, but one with the work—at once the medium and the message.

In McLuhan’s famous expression, “The Medium is the Message” there is also a danger, however. It is this: are we now focused more on the technology than the message? If the medium is the message, it is the surveillance, the projection of our retreating image that is the message in Nauman’s piece, not our experience. This is disturbing, but appropriate in our culture of immersive technology and mediated experience. As a culture, we try to catch up, try to master new technologies, but by the

time we near them, they are gone. Around the next corner waits another and yet another, we continue to try to catch them. By the time we master a technology, it is gone, or improved and has to be re-learned or learned anew.

What Nauman has created with his *Going Around the Corner Piece* is an environment where not only is the viewer within the frame, but co-creates the work of art with their interaction with it. In pursuit of an externalized self, the other, we seek Truth, and attempt to master our elusive self in the television monitor. Or, as we move through the piece, we find ourselves and other becoming one immersed sculpture. From Virilio's standpoint, we are focused on neither the medium nor the message, but instead on speed. Going faster and faster around the next corner, trying to catch ourselves. How quickly can we get there—to this unknown destination? And, perhaps more importantly, what will we see when we get there? Or, perhaps, while moving towards this unknown destination, this unknown Truth, we find ourselves—already there.

Bibliography

- Artaud, Antonin. *The Theater and its Double*. New York: Grove Press, 1958.
- Cameron, Dan. *Living Inside the Grid*. New Museum of Contemporary Art. February 28 to June 15, 2003.
- Derrida, Jacques. *Speech and Phenomena*. Evanston: Northwestern UP, 1973.
- Derrida, Jacques. *Writing and Difference*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1967.
- Feenberg, Martin. *Heidegger and Marcuse: the catastrophe and redemption of history*. New York : Routledge, 2005.
- Fried, Michael. *Art and Objecthood*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998.
- Hansen, Mark. *New Philosophy for New Media*. Cambridge: The MIT Press, 2006.
- Heidegger, Martin. *Poetry, Language, Thought*. New York: Perennial, 1971.
- Joan Jonas: Five Works*. Valerie Smith and Warren Niesluchowski, eds. Exh cat., Queens Museum of Art: Queens, 2003.
- Joan Jonas: The Shape, the Scent, the Feel of Things*. Karen Kelly, ed. Exh cat., Dia: Beacon, 2005-2006.
- Joselit, David. *Feedback: Television Against Democracy*. Cambridge: The MIT Press, 2007.
- Krauss, Rosalind. "Video: The Aesthetics of Narcissism". *October*, Vol. 1. (Spring, 1976), pp. 50-64.
- Manovich, Lev. *The Language of New Media*. Cambridge: The MIT Press, 2001.

Mapping the Studio I. DIA center for the arts press release. Dec. 14, 2001.

<<http://www.diacenter.org/dia/press/nauman.html>>

Marcuse, Herbert. *One Dimensional Man*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1991.

Nauman, Bruce. *Going Around the Corner Piece*. Installation. Centre Pompidou, 1970.

Nauman, Bruce. *Mapping the Studio*. New York: Sperone Westwater, 2002.

Nauman, Kruger, Jaar. Daros Exhibitions. October 26, 2001 through March 2002.

“Oral history interview with Bruce Nauman”, 1980 May 27-May 30, Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution.

<<http://www.aaa.si.edu/collections/oralhistories/transcripts/nauman80.htm>>

Space Odysseys: Sensation and Immersion. Melbourne: Australian Centre for the Moving Image, 2001.

Taylor, Brandon. *Sculpture and Psychoanalysis*. Burlington, Vermont: Ashgate Publishing, 2006.

Wagner, Anne M. “Nauman’s Body of Sculpture.” *October Magazine* (MIT). 120, Spring 2007. p. 53-70.