Family Tyranny
Modelling & Molding

Video Tape by Paul McCarthy
Father..................Paul McCarthy
Son.....................Mike Kelley

Revolving, cultural conditioning, perversion of
innocence by a corporate father, a heritage that is
passed on.

Bad Boy
Make him eat what he doesn’t want to eat.
My daddy made me eat this
Shove it down him
Do it at home
My daddy did this
You can do this at home
He will pass it on.
Worm breath
Noono
I told you the other day
I told you how my dad
You are going to be sorry you had me for a dad
Here, wear this boy
You need to wear it
You look so good
Hold this, you piece of shit
I knew you’d come through
No, Ahhh, Ahhh No

Ahhh, Ahhh
Hold still Wear this
There you go, drink up
Daddy comes home from work again
Daddy comes home from work
Do it slowly, let them feel it
Let them get used to it
They will remember it
Not too fast
They will use it
See how I am working it in
Using the arm
This is what you like
Ahh, Ah Ah
The part where I use the bat
Ahh, Ah
Clickety, clack, Clickety clack
Blah, aha, aha
This is your dad
Haa Haa Haa Haa

This is how
Ahh, Ah
Hold on
Ride
Clickety, clack, Clickety clack
I knew you had it in you
Took a minute
Time to go to school
I am sorry, yeh
Daddy
I am sorry
Daddy
Daddy’s little boy
So sorry
THREE WHISTLES:
for a whistle to work, certain features must be in particular relationships. Other features may vary within wide limits. The sound in the room exhibits strong nodes and anti-nodes. They are products of interference between the three tones.
ROOT, HUSK and SHOOT are three pieces cut from a single four foot length of twenty-four inch pipe. It is an attempt to maximize material by cutting, stretching and recombining.
NOMAD IS AN ISLAND
excerpt of an interview with Roland Brener
by Bruce Ferguson
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Bruce Ferguson: The three works you’ve made for Venice [Bienniel]
elaborate themes already present in other works and also suggest
transformations of those themes in complex ways. Could you talk
about some of those similarities and differences?

Roland Brener: The first one is called The Gate (1987-88). I had
previously made two works that used walking robots. In both of them
the robots walk on tethoptoes balanced by a weight which is
underneath. My intention here was to produce a robot that could
walk on two feet, or at least give the appearance of walking on two
feet, on a flat surface. I wanted it to have the ability to move freely
enough to have an anthropomorphic quality without this movement
being seen as a ‘gait’ or expression. I wanted to avoid a humanistic
identification for the viewer. To do this I arrived, through stages, to
its present form where the robot walks inside a clear box and func-
tions more or less as a piston does in a cylinder.

The aluminum table is originally built for the professional drawing
of maps. Finding a table with a perfect surface led to the solution of
the upright robot. I then included an ‘organ’ with coloured liquid to
further identify the robot with a living condition as well as to create a
further level of complexity in the movement. I think that the ‘organ’
could initially be seen to be the driving mechanism.

The figure maintains a degree of freedom of movement sufficient
to liken it to a human movement, while at the same time, it moves its
box with it. The transparent container is at once a prison and a
necessary support. I also wanted the robot to perform a repetitive
menial task. I thought of the gate as a powerful element in that the
passing through it was both a task, and, possibly, a symbolic act. My
thought was that the continuous passing through the gate and return-
ing was like many aspects of our own repetitive activities, like going
to and from work.

While looking at Satellite (1987), the viewer may be stationary
while the sound circles around both the work and the viewer. The
viewer may be between the reflection of himself and the moving
sound element. The way I’m drawing the radio signal from the world
and the way one experiences the sound coming by makes it poign-
ant. It comes, it is with you, and then, it is gone. What you literally
hear is incidental. At the same time you are hearing the sound, you
are seeing a reflection whose relation to you shifts from the ground
to the ceiling or vice versa. The ethos of the piece is both reassuring
because of its circular nature and perceptually disturbing because it
makes the familiar remote and distorted. And this is simultaneous.

Again, all the elements are totally mundane and familiar and yet
their newfound cohesiveness seems to disengage them from their iden-
tities. Its repetitive circularity has a mesmeric effect. People aren’t
sure whether the sound source is radio and only after a while do they
sense its embeddedness. Tuning the receiver to a local religious sta-
tion refers to the idea of beaming information which is “universal.”
On a recent long boat trip, I became acutely aware that the air is full
and you can pull out one of a million persuasive messages which are
bounced off satellites every moment. But one isolated message,
even from a casual selection, is always potent.
The framing devices in Small Talk (1968), give the speaker an authority. The disjunction between the frontal authority and the object nature of the hand is the central issue in the piece. The work was completed before the speaker was given anything to say, which tells much about my construction procedure. In other words, sound is used within a democracy of elements and is not the central motivating element. In fact, I'm more interested in the method rather than the message itself.

The source of the 'speaker' is Teddy Ruxpin, stripped bare. Using Teddy Ruxpin made their work easier because he could already talk and he makes the piece credible, which is more interesting than making the attempt from the ground up. By changing his subject matter everything about him was changed. A new persona emerged. Like The Gate, I think that the way in which Small Talk switches on and off creates an expectation for the viewer which is important.