

Proceedings of the annual meeting of the Southern Anthropological Society

Volume 39
Number 1 *Museums and Memory*

Article 8

2011

Vandalizing Meaning, Stealing Memory: Thoughts on Crime in Galleries and Museums

Avi Brisman
Emory University

Follow this and additional works at: https://egrove.olemiss.edu/southernanthro_proceedings

Recommended Citation

Brisman, A. (2011). Vandalizing Meaning, Stealing Memory: Thoughts on Crime in Galleries and Museums. *Museums and Memory: Proceedings of the Southern Anthropological Society*, 2008, 39, 145-165.

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Southern Anthropological Society at eGrove. It has been accepted for inclusion in Proceedings of the annual meeting of the Southern Anthropological Society by an authorized editor of eGrove. For more information, please contact egrove@olemiss.edu.

Vandalizing Meaning, Stealing Memory: Thoughts on Crimes in Galleries and Museums^{*}

Avi Brisman, Emory University

INTRODUCTION

In March 2008, the industrial rock group Nine Inch Nails, fronted by Trent Reznor, released *Ghosts I-IV*, an album of thirty-six near-instrumental tracks. Critical response to the album was mixed, but generally favorable, with one critic labeling it “engrossing and encompassing” (Thompson 2008a) and another referring to it as an “absorbing musical experience” (Walls 2008), with a third lamenting that it “feels emaciated and half-finished” (Briehan 2008). Given such comments, it would be hard to imagine the album generating much interest outside of the rock world; and it would seem an unlikely subject for the start to an academic paper—even in a field as broad and accommodating as anthropology. But what has garnered the attention of various news agencies, as well as of this author, is that Mr. Reznor gave the music a Creative Commons license, rather than a standard copyright, meaning that it may be shared, altered, reworked, and remixed as long as the music built on *Ghosts* is non

^{*}Originally published as “Vandalizing Meaning, Stealing Memory: Artistic, Cultural, and Theoretical Implications of Crime in Galleries and Museums,” in *Critical Criminology* 19, no. 1 (2011): 15-28. Reprinted with kind permission from Springer Science+Business Media B.V.: <http://www.springer.com/social+sciences/criminology/journal/10612> Abstract: <http://www.springerlink.com/content/0486478057713qm6/>

commercial and attributed to Nine Inch Nails (see, e.g., Briehan 2008; Deeds 2008; Jolley 2008; Lomax 2008; Norris 2008; Pareles 2008; Thompson 2008a; Van Buskirk 2008a; Walls 2008; Worthen 2008).

Coming a year after Radiohead's 2007 pay-what-you-want digital release of *In Rainbows*, Nine Inch Nails' digital release of *Ghosts* may be a harbinger of musical distribution.¹ But Nine Inch Nails' blurring the lines between artist and audience—its effective encouragement of appropriation, theft, and vandalism of its own work—is hardly a new phenomenon. Indeed, in the visual arts, this kind of “collaborative” endeavor has a rich history. For example, in 1953, Robert Rauschenberg produced *Erased de Kooning Drawing* by taking a drawing already made by Willem de Kooning—which de Kooning had given him—erasing it, framing it, and announcing that he had created a new artwork altogether.² More recently, Felix Gonzalez-Torres created *Untitled (Placebo)* (1991), consisting of 1,200 pounds (roughly 40,000 pieces) of silver-wrapped candy arranged as a carpet on museum gallery floors. *Untitled (Placebo)* has been installed in a number of venues.³ For each installation, visitors are invited to take a piece of candy; in doing so, they alter the visual appearance of the candy carpet and contribute to the slow disappearance of the sculpture over the course of the exhibition.⁴

But where Nine Inch Nails and Gonzalez-Torres have facilitated the taking, remaking, remixing (or eating, in the case of the latter) of their art—and where Rauschenberg reworked de Kooning's drawing with the latter's assent—in this paper, I focus on instances where such use constitutes *misuse* or *abuse*—where such acts are considered theft or vandalism—because the acts are uninvited (and usually unappreciated). I offer representative examples (rather than an exhaustive account) of both works that have been stolen and vandalized. First, I explore the extent to which theft may affect our consideration, understanding, and memory of a given work of art (regardless

of whether the object is ultimately recovered) as well as our experience of the museum in which the work is housed (especially if efforts are subsequently undertaken to improve security, as with the Munch Museum following the theft of *Scream* and *Madonna*). Next, I turn to vandalism and examine whether and how such acts subsequently affect our consideration, understanding, and memory of the works as art objects. Contemplating theft and vandalism together, I argue that how we regard such events should be determined not by their criminality, but by the perpetrators' intent and the effect of the acts on the meaning and memory of the works.

STEALING MEMORY

Edvard Munch's Scream (1893) and Madonna (1893-94)

On August 22, 2004, two masked armed robbers burst into the Munch Museum in Oslo, Norway, and stole the museum's *Scream*, along with Munch's *Madonna*, in plain view of museum visitors. The expressionist masterpieces were recovered in August 2006, but both were damaged (Van Gelder 2007a). Blaming lax security, the Munch Museum closed for ten months for a multi-million dollar security overhaul. Today, visitors pass through metal detectors and must place their bags and personal items through a scanning device before arriving at the ticket booth, where they then must pass through a second metal detector; security cameras and guards also monitor the museum (Agence France Presse 2008).

The theft of the Munch Museum's *Scream* and *Madonna* has most probably affected the experience of visitors to the museum. Those who have visited the museum prior to the theft will undoubtedly notice the heightened security measures. Those new to the museum but who have learned about the revamped security may well contemplate these features. Only those without prior exposure to the museum and knowledge of the theft and ensuing overhaul may be unaffected

by the double metal detectors, scanning device, security cameras, and increased guard presence.

Whether the theft of the Munch Museum's *Scream* and *Madonna* has shaped the experience of the paintings themselves is a different matter. Again, I believe that knowledge of the theft may play a role, altering how one interacts with the paintings. For example, some may choose to look at these paintings precisely *because* they were stolen and the theft, recovery, and restoration were much publicized. Others may be drawn to them for reasons entirely unrelated to the theft, such as their lurid colors or art-historical significance, but they may find themselves unable to contemplate the works divorced from the fact of their theft. Some people may be able to overlook or ignore the influence of the theft; for many, the theft may become part of the works of art (apart from the mere visual indicia of the theft that restoration efforts could not correct, such as scratches, tears, and signs of dampness).

On some level, then, the theft of the Munch Museum's *Scream* and *Madonna*—an act of disrespect and desecration—has produced the reverse effect—increasing the significance and allure of the paintings. Whereas before the theft, gaining entrance to the Munch Museum and audience with the *Scream* and *Madonna* was relatively easy, today the paintings are guarded, like a political leader or some other V.I.P. Experiencing the *Scream* and *Madonna* now requires negotiating metal detectors, carrying out the performance of being screened, and subjecting one's self to constant surveillance.

In a slightly different vein, one could argue that the 2004 theft has not transformed the *Scream* and *Madonna* from art objects to cultural icons but has simply continued a process begun years before. In 1983-84, Andy Warhol made a series of silk prints of works by Munch, which included prints of *Scream*. Although Warhol's idea was to desacralize Munch's *Scream* by mass-producing its

likeness—something that Warhol was known for doing with other works and images of famous people—Munch himself had already taken such steps by making multiple versions of *Scream*, as well as lithographs of the work for reproduction.⁵ Over the years, *Scream* has been further reproduced—and, hence, further desacralized—by appearing on T-shirts, coffee mugs, and inflatable punching bags and by being featured in episodes of *The Simpsons* and *Beavis and Butt-head*. In addition, the film director Wes Craven has given the antagonist of his *Scream* horror films, Ghostface, a white mask inspired by the central figure in Munch's *Scream*. Even the 2004 theft of *Scream* may be considered a “reproduction” of sorts: the National Gallery of Norway's *Scream* was stolen on February 14, 1994 (during the Winter Olympics in Lillehammer), and recovered on May 7, 1994.

With this perspective in mind, every act of desacralization to *Scream* as a work of art—be it visual or larcenous reproduction—ironically elevates its status as a cultural icon. Whether future thefts of *Scream* will occur because the work of art is now a cultural icon and thus an appealing target or because *Scream* has become so mass-produced and quotidian that it is no longer viewed as a sacred work of art, but as a form of communal property, remains to be seen. The point is that a tension surrounds *Scream*, with the fact of its previous theft(s) and potential for future theft(s) affecting its meaning as well as individuals' experiences (and memories of their experiences) of it.

Leonardo da Vinci's Mona Lisa (c. 1503-06)

Stolen in 1911 and struck by a stone in 1956, Leonardo's sixteenth-century portrait *Mona Lisa* (also known as *La Gioconda* or *La Jaconde*) now rests in a sealed enclosure behind 1.52-inch-thick glass at a permanent temperature of 43 degrees Fahrenheit and 50 percent

humidity in the Musée du Louvre in Paris, France (Riding 2005, 2006). The “world’s most famous painting” is further protected by a wooden fence that prevents the approximately six-and-a-half million people who view the painting each year from venturing too close to it (Sassoon 2001). (The Louvre estimates that eighty percent of its visitors come specifically to see the *Mona Lisa* (Riding 2005).)

Like Munch’s *Scream*, one could argue that Leonardo’s *Mona Lisa* has also undergone a transformation from work of art to cultural icon. Again, Warhol has played a role in this process. In 1963, he made a series of serigraph prints of Lisa Gherardini, wife of Francesco del Giocondo—the subject of da Vinci’s painting. Again, Warhol’s desire was to desacralize the painting. And like *Scream*, desacralization of *Mona Lisa* by mass reproduction had already occurred (although unlike *Scream*, the process did not begin with the original artist). In the nineteenth century, the painting gained fame as it was reproduced in lithographs, postcards, and photographs. In 1919, Marcel Duchamp created a work, *L.H.O.O.Q.*, depicting the woman with a moustache—a piece that I will discuss in greater detail below. Salvador Dali painted himself as *Mona Lisa* in 1954 and both Jasper Johns and Robert Rauschenberg integrated the image of *Mona Lisa* into their works.⁶ Endless depictions, appropriations, and permutations of *Mona Lisa* appear on the website Megamonalisa.com.

According to Sassoon (2001), however, the theft and subsequent recovery of *Mona Lisa* in 1911—both of which “unleashed a swarm of newspaper features, commemorative postcards, cartoons, ballads, cabaret-revues and comic silent films”—clinched her international celebrity and spurred the subsequent renditions by Duchamp, Warhol, and others (Nicholl 2002). Regardless of the initial catalyst—regardless of whether mass reproduction forged the path to theft or theft spurred mass reproduction—the theft of *Mona Lisa*, like that of *Scream*, has affected the experience of the museum and the painting.

First, while visitors to the Louvre may not contemplate the fact of *Mona Lisa's* theft—indeed, they may not even know that it was once stolen—its theft in 1911 has contributed to its celebrity and many may wish to see it just because it is famous. Second, that the painting has been stolen and is now roped off and placed behind glass dictates the nature of the interaction with it. Viewers must experience it from afar; that it may be seen, but not approached, contributes to its status and allure, while diminishing the visceral impact and intellectual stimulus that accompanies close examination and interaction with a work of art.

All in all, like *Scream*, one could argue that whatever significance *Mona Lisa* might have had as an artistic innovation (such as its avoidance of sharp outlines and the sitter's direct engagement with the viewer) has been overshadowed. If it has any connection to art (other than being a painting in a museum), it symbolizes *art* as a whole, while ceasing to be a specific (or singular) *work* of art with which individuals may have an intimate visual or spiritual experience.

Vandalizing Meaning

While the theft of works of art may transform the experience of the museum from which they were stolen and, if recovered, the experience of the objects themselves when re-exhibited, the vandalization of works on view in museums and galleries can also have an effect on the meaning and memory of and meaning and memories associated with a work of art. I distinguish here based on intent, addressing first the willful defacement or destruction of works of art for mischievous or malicious reasons and then turning to the defacement or destruction of works of art as artistic statements.

Attack on Art, Attack on Memory

On Sunday, October 7, 2007, during the yearly all-night festival of arts and music (called “the White Night”) in Paris, France, four men and one woman, apparently drunk, broke into the Musée d’Orsay. One of the intruders punched an impressionist masterpiece—Claude Monet’s *Le Pont d’Argenteuil* (*The Bridge at Argenteuil*) (1874)—leaving a four-inch tear (Almendros 2007; Kanter 2007a; see also Kanter 2007b). Christine Albanel, Minister of Culture, referred to the break-in as “an attack against our memory and our heritage” and lamented the recent spate of attacks on works of art in France, including a January 2006 assault on Duchamp’s *Fountain* (1917/1964) while it was on view as part of the “Dada” exhibition at the Pompidou Center in Paris; and to an incident in July 2007 in Avignon, where a woman left a red, lip-shaped smear on an untitled immaculate white canvas by the American artist Cy Twombly (Kanter 2007a). Albanel also promised improved security at French museums and called for stronger sanctions for those who desecrate French monuments, institutions, and works of art (Kanter 2007a).

It remains to be seen how viewers will respond to *Le Pont d’Argenteuil* after it is repaired and re-exhibited in a more heavily guarded Musée d’Orsay. My hunch is that the effect of the attack on *Le Pont d’Argenteuil* will be similar to the effect of the theft of *Scream* and *Madonna*, with some visitors oblivious of the fact of its attack; some aware of, but able to overlook or ignore, the fact of its attack; some drawn to the piece because of the attack; and some unable to divorce the fact of the attack from the work as an art object and as a renowned example of impressionism. But when attacks are perpetrated as performance pieces—when artists attack other artists’ works of art—when vandalism becomes a medium of expression, rather than a mere example of hooliganism—the range of potential meanings and memories becomes greater. Examining both

the attack on Duchamp's *Fountain* and the assault on Twombly's untitled white canvas, I argue below that Albanel errs in categorizing these incidents with the vandalism of *Le Pont d'Argenteuil*.

VANDALISM AS A(N) (ARTISTIC) STATEMENT/VANDALISM IN THE NAME OF ART/VANDALISM AS ART

If and when the untitled Twombly piece is re-exhibited, it will very likely raise the questions noted above about the extent to which an experience of it can be divorced from the kiss. But given that Sam kissed the painting as an "artistic act" and as a means of *interacting* with the artist and the work, rather than defacing it or destroying it, the potential meaning of the work is broadened. Aside from the aesthetics of the kiss (the smeared lipstick is actually a visually intriguing gesture or form), one must consider how else Sam could have acted. How else could she have expressed her love? Could she have given the painting a rose? Could she have hugged it or caressed it? Could she have taken it home—stolen it? Given the conceptual nature of Sam's kiss, is it really an artistic act—or a successful artistic act—if she "wasn't thinking"? What do we make of the fact that the alleged artistic act was not even original? (In 1977, Ruth van Herpen kissed a white monochrome painting by Jo Baer in the Oxford Museum of Art, smearing lipstick across it and claiming "[The work] looked so cold. I only kissed it to cheer it up" (Althouse 2007).

The extent to which Sam intended to engage van Herpen and Baer, in addition to Twombly, is unknown, as is the question of whether Twombly indeed "understood," as Sam claims he would have. The larger point is that vandalism for vandalism's sake can, like the theft of a work of art, affect the meaning and memory of the work and the institution in which it is housed; vandalism for art's sake, unlike the theft of a work of art (unless the theft is considered a work of art), further expands the potential meaning and memory of the work.

On January 4, 2006, the seventy-seven-year-old French performance artist Pierre Pinoncelli attacked Duchamp's *Fountain* (a piece consisting solely of a flipped-upside-down urinal) with a small hammer, causing it to be chipped (*Duchamp's Dada Pissoir Attacked* 2006; Jagvonjeul n.d.; Riding 2006).⁸

Pinoncelli was arrested at the scene and subsequently received a fine of approximately \$262,000 and a suspended prison term for the self-described destructive "happening" (*Duchamp's Dada Pissoir Attacked* 2006; Riding 2006).

This was not the first time that Pinoncelli had targeted Duchamp's *Fountain*. Indeed, much as the *Fountain* in the Pompidou is a replica of the original, made in 1917, Pinoncelli's attack in 2006 replicated or repeated an earlier attack on the same urinal. In 1993, when the Pompidou *Fountain* was on view at Carré d'Art in Nîmes, Pinoncelli urinated in it and also attacked it with a hammer, for which he received a fine of roughly \$37,500 and a sentence of one month's imprisonment for "voluntary degradation of an object of public utility" (see *Duchamp's Dada Pissoir Attacked* 2006; Jagvonjeul n.d.; Riding 2006). In his defense, Pinoncelli claimed, much as Sam did with respect to her kiss of Twombly's painting, that "Duchamp would have understood. I gave back to the *Fountain* its original purpose" and that he (Pinoncelli) wanted "to rescue the work from its inflated iconic status and return it to its original function as a urinal" (*Duchamp's Dada Pissoir Attacked* 2006; Jagvonjeul n.d.).

Chances are that Duchamp probably would have "understood" Pinoncelli's attacks because Duchamp's whole purpose in "creating" *Fountain*, which he signed "R. Mutt," was to ignite debate surrounding the question, "What is art?" and to underscore his point that artists determine what constitutes art. Thus, one could maintain that Pinoncelli's action engages Duchamp and carries on his spirit—more convincingly, at least, than the argument that Sam's kiss

converses with Twombly or that the assault on *Le Pont d'Argenteuil* communicates with Monet. But I contend that closer artistic scrutiny of Pinoncelli's "performance pieces" calls into question their effectiveness of as works of art.

First, while urinating in a urinal that has been turned upside-down and labeled *Fountain* may return the urinal to its original purpose, attacking it with a hammer makes less sense. Hitting *Fountain* and chipping it seems more like an aggressive attempt to leave a permanent mark on the work, rather than clear and coherent artistic expression. If urinating in the urinal did not sufficiently satisfy Pinoncelli's desire to return the urinal to its original purpose, could he not have tried attaching plumbing to *Fountain*? What about placing a urinal deodorizing block (also known as a deodorizing urinal cake) in *Fountain*—perhaps to suggest that this work of art "stinks"? Given that individuals rarely attack urinals that appear in restrooms with hammers, it is hard to understand how hitting *Fountain* (an upside-down urinal appearing in a gallery) returns the urinal to its original function.

Second, while Pinoncelli claimed to have wanted to "rescue the work from its inflated iconic status," in light of the thefts of *Scream* and the theft and vandalism of *Mona Lisa*, it would seem that Pinoncelli's action achieved precisely the opposite effect—further inflating its iconic status. The original *Fountain* was deemed neither original nor art when Duchamp offered it for the first exhibition of the Society of Independent Artists in New York in 1917. What better way to elevate the iconic status of *Fountain* than with a high-publicity attack causing damage to the urinal—damage necessitating restoration by art restoration experts, rather than by plumbers? If rescuing the work from its "inflated iconic status" was Pinoncelli's goal, then would not subtly replacing *Fountain* with another urinal—perhaps one from the restroom at the Pompidou Center—have more

successfully achieved his stated intent? Given that vandalism to ordinary urinals does not garner media attention and fines of \$10,000 or \$100,000, it would seem that Pinoncelli selected precisely the wrong way to desacralize the work.

Finally, while Duchamp might have understood Pinoncelli's attacks as Dadaist performances, it seems that a far more compelling conversation might have unfolded between Pinoncelli and Duchamp had the former contemplated the latter's own efforts at desacralization. As noted above, Duchamp's *L.H.O.O.Q.* involved taking an "objet trouvé" (a found object)—in this case, a cheap postcard reproduction of da Vinci's *Mona Lisa*—drawing a mustache and beard on the woman's face, and changing the title.⁹ While Duchamp could have vandalized the original *Mona Lisa*, his Dadaist attempt to destroy conventional notions of art proved far more successful by taking a pedestrian object—a postcard—a reproduction of a work of art, rather than a work itself—and rendering it art by altering it slightly and renaming it. In other words, Duchamp understood that attacking conventional notions of art would (need to) entail symbolic gestures to convert utilitarian objects into art objects, rather than actual acts of violence that would simply transform art objects into damaged or destroyed art objects.¹⁰ To rescue *Fountain* from its inflated iconic status—to return the urinal from a work of art to an ordinary utilitarian object—Pinoncelli would have needed to have engaged in a symbolic gesture like Duchamp's with *L.H.O.O.Q.*

In sum, Pinoncelli's attacks or performance pieces illustrate how vandalism for art's sake can add another element or layer of meaning to the assaulted object. But like Sam's kiss, Pinoncelli's self-proclaimed tributes to Duchamp highlight how "art vandalism" may not necessarily make good art—art that is, among other things, conceptually coherent, tight, and memorable art.

In order to further understand my last point—that vandalism for art’s sake may add another element or layer of meaning to the assaulted object, but may not produce compelling art in and of itself—consider Kazimir Malevich’s *Suprematisme 1920-1927* (also known as *White Cross on Gray* (1921)), an oil on canvas painting depicting a white cross on a light grey background, that Alexander Brener, a thirty-nine-year-old Russian performance artist damaged in 1997. On Saturday, January 4, 1997, Brener sprayed a green dollar sign over fellow Russian Malevich’s painting while it was being exhibited at the Stedelijk Museum of Modern Art, Amsterdam, Netherlands. Brener surrendered himself to museum authorities, explaining that he intended the dollar sign to appear nailed to the cross, and demanding that his work be viewed as a protest against “corruption and commercialism in the art world”—and, as such, performance art (Art Crimes n.d.; see also Cash 1998). Brener claimed that “[the] cross is a symbol of suffering, the \$ a symbol of trade and merchandise. On humanitarian grounds are the ideas of Jesus Christ of higher significance of those of the money. What I did WAS NOT against the painting, I view my act as a dialogue with Malevich” (Art Crimes n.d.). He further asserted that:

the borders of art are sharply defined: art uses symbolic language and art is not allowed to harm people bodily. My act wasn’t violent but symbolic. Other artists are predecessors. I did not surpass any border. Art has its own: artists have agreed themselves about what is acceptable: e.g., Sagrese in the 70s with Picasso’s *Guernica* made a protest against the Vietnam War. Now he is a member of the establishment. I know I will be part of it once too. My target was real communication between people. (Force Mental 2005)

Brener was put on trial at the Criminal Court of Amsterdam, with the city of Amsterdam claiming that Brener had caused permanent damage and a loss of one-quarter of the market value of the painting (Art Crimes n.d.).¹¹ On Feb. 26, 1997, the Criminal Court of Amsterdam sentenced Brener to ten months of imprisonment, of which five months were suspended with time spent in pre-trial detention subtracted. He was also given two years of probation, during which time he was prohibited from entering the Stedelijk Museum (Art Crimes n.d.).¹²

Like Sam and Pinoncelli, Brener maintained that his attack/performance piece was an attempt to engage in a dialogue with the original artist. While Brener asserted that his act was symbolic, thereby couching it in Duchampian or Dadaist terms, it is hard to fully understand his argument in this respect. Admittedly, Brener did not slash Malevich's painting, the way Gerard Jan van Bladeren knifed Barnett Newsman's 8 x 18-foot blue monochrome *Cathedra* 1951. But despite the fact that both the cross and the dollar sign (\$) serve as symbols, it is difficult to comprehend how *spray-painting* Malevich's canvas is symbolic or for what the vandalization serves as a symbol.

As with Sam and Pinoncelli, my sense is that Brener could have produced a "better" or "more successful" work of performance art. For instance, if one of his purposes was to engage in a dialogue with Malevich, he might have painted the \$ in grey or white, rather than in green. Doing so would have produced a far more subtle effect and would have related more coherently to Malevich's aesthetic. If Brener wanted to call attention to the "corruption and commercialism in the art world" and to emphasize that stature is measured by dollar signs, he might have chosen to spray a dollar sign on one of Andy Warhol's dollar-sign paintings. (The dollar sign, like the Campbell's soup can, is a recurrent theme in Warhol's work, and with his dollar-sign paintings, Warhol undeniably signaled that "big-time art is

big-time money” and that the sign for money as the sign for art (Gagosian Gallery 1997; see generally Hartocollis 2008).) Given Warhol’s “in your face” message of commercialism conveyed in flamboyant colors, it seems that Brener might have created a more conceptually coherent and visually consistent work had he targeted Warhol with his green spray paint. In other words, critiquing Brener’s attack/performance from an artistic point of view, one is left with the conclusion that he either picked the wrong color and medium (green spray paint) for his assault/performance piece or he selected the wrong work (Malevich’s cross rather than Warhol’s dollar sign). While his attack/performance—his spray painting a green dollar sign on Malevich’s painting—adds another element or layer of meaning to Malevich’s work, it is a shallow or thin layer—one that could have achieved greater depth or thickness with better conception and execution.

CONCLUSION

This paper has endeavored to show that two types of ostensibly straightforward criminal acts—theft and vandalism—affect and complicate how we understand, interpret, and remember the works of art that we view and the institutions in which they are exhibited. With respect to theft, it is difficult to argue that the theft of a work of art constitutes a work of art. (Perhaps that is why no one, to my knowledge, has made such a claim and perhaps this is why marginal works of art are rarely stolen.) Nevertheless, theft has an impact on the experience of the work and the museum. The theft of a work of art can change the work of art, rendering the work “the piece that was stolen,” rather than a piece that is “good,” “interesting,” “inspiring,” “stimulating,” and so on; the theft of a work of art can also produce changes in the museum, transforming the museum from a temple or shrine, where intimate interaction with works is facilitated, to a fortress or zoo, where the objects are (literally) placed behind bars.

With respect to vandalism, we encounter instances in which the defacement of works of art are (allegedly) intended as artistic statements. While symbolic assaults, such as *L.H.O.O.Q.*, are often more successful artistic endeavors than actual ones, such as Sam's kiss, the bottom line is that assaults in the name of art further complicate the meaning and experience of the works and the venues in which they are viewed. This is not to suggest that individuals *should* engage in theft or vandalism of works of art. The only position I take in this regard is that if a theft or assault is to occur in the name of art, it should be well-conceived, well-executed, conceptually coherent, and aesthetically tight—like any work of art—in order to garner acceptance rather than (criminal) condemnation.

NOTES

1. On May 5, 2008, Nine Inch Nails released their latest album, *The Slip*, on their website. All ten tracks may be downloaded for free; and like *Ghosts I-IV*, *The Slip* was released under the Creative Commons “attribution noncommercial share-alike” license (see, e.g., Bateman 2008; Cromelin 2008; BBC News 2008; Malone 2008; Thompson 2008b; Van Buskirk 2008b).
2. Rauschenberg considered his ideas to be as interesting as drawings and *Erased de Kooning Drawing*, given to him by de Kooning specifically for the purpose of erasing it, is the visual result of Rauschenberg's idea.
3. Most recently, it appeared from December 1, 2007-March 23, 2008, at the Williams College Museum of Art in Williamstown, MA.
4. In another version of *Untitled (Placebo)*, the candy sits in a pile in the corner of the gallery, rather than as a carpet in the middle of the gallery floor. But the same principle applies: visitors are invited to take or eat pieces of the candy. Gonzalez-Torres created the piece as a

response to the AIDS epidemic and, in particular, to the death of his partner, Ross (Williams College Museum of Art 2007).

5. In addition to the Munch Museum's *Scream*, composed in oil, tempera, and pastel on cardboard, the National Gallery of Norway owns a painted version, as does the Norwegian billionaire, Petter Olsen. The Munch Museum apparently owns a second painted version of the *Scream*.

6. Jean-Michel Basquiat, who at times collaborated with Warhol, also adapted the portrait of Mona Lisa in his work.

7. Apparently, Sam also stated: "I stepped back. I found the painting even more beautiful. The artist left this white for me" (Van Gelder 2007b).

8. The Pompidou's *Fountain* is one of eight signed replicas made by Duchamp in 1964; the original *Fountain* was made in 1917 (see *Duchamp's Dada Pissoir Attacked* 2006; Jagvonjeul n.d.; Riding 2006).

9. *L.H.O.O.Q.*—the name of the Duchamp's piece—is a pun in French. When the letters are pronounced, they form a sentence—"Elle a chaud au cul"—loosely translated as "there is fire down below" and literally translated as "she is hot in the ass" (or "she has a hot ass"). (The slang term, "avoir chaud au cul," may be translated as "to be horny.") Part of Duchamp's intention here was to make reference to da Vinci's alleged homosexuality (see de Martino n.d.).

10. This distinction is understood quite well by Mike Bidlo, as evidenced by his series *Fountain Drawings* (1998) (see Brisman 1999).

11. According to Cash (1998), Malevich's painting was restored within months and re-exhibited.

12. Brener allegedly engaged in a hunger strike to protest what he perceived to be a harsh punishment (Art Crimes n.d.).

WORKS CITED

- Agence France Presse. 2008. 'The Scream' to go Back on Display after 2004 Heist. Mar 3. http://news.yahoo.com/s/afp/20080303/ts_afp/norwayartmunch.
- Almendros, Cecile. 2007a. Intruders at Paris' Orsay Damage a Monet. *Associated Press*. Oct. 7. <http://abcnews.go.com/Entertainment/wireStory?id=3699678>.
- Althouse, Ann. 2007. When I Kissed it, I Thought the Artist would Have Understood." Nov. 17. <http://althouse.blogspot.com/2007/11/when-i-kissed-it-i-thought-artist-would.html>.
- Artcrimes. n.d. <http://www.artcrimes.net/pages/malevich.html>.
- Bateman, Patrick. 2008. Review of *The Slip*. *SputnikMusic*. May 7. http://www.sputnikmusic.com/review_16134M.
- BBC News. 2008. Nine Inch Nails Offer Free Album. BBC News. May 5. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/entertainment/7384324.stm>.
- Briehan, Tom. 2008. Review of *Ghosts I-IV*. *Pitchfork Record Review*. http://www.pitchforkmedia.com/article/record_review/49274-ghosts-i-iv.
- Brisman, Avi. 1999. Re: Appropriation and Bidlo. Unpublished manuscript.
- Cash, Stephanie. 1998. "Newman's *Cathedra* Slashed at Stedelijk." *Art in America* 86(1):27.
- CBC News. 2007a. Kiss on \$2.8M Painting More Than Just a Kiss. Oct. 9. <http://www.cbc.ca/arts/artdesign/story/2007/10/09/kiss-painting.html>.
- _____. 2007b. Artist Twombly Gets One Euro Award for Unwanted Kiss." Nov. 16. <http://www.cbc.ca/arts/artdesign/story/2007/11/16/twombly-kiss.html>.

- Cromelin, Richard. 2008. "NIN's 'Slip' a Free Dive in Dark Waters." *Los Angeles Times*. May 7.
- de Martino, Marco, n.d. *Mona Lisa: Who Is Hidden Behind the Woman with the Mustache?* Translated by Camillo Olivetti. <http://www.artscienceresearchlab.org/articles/panorama.htm>.
- Deeds, Michael. 2008. "Review of *Ghosts I-IV*." *Washington Post*. Mar. 27:C04.
- "Duchamp's Dada Pissier Attacked." 2006. *Art in America* 94(3):35.
- Force Mental. 2005. <http://www.clubmoral.com/forcemental/16/page.php?sid=139>.
- Gagosian Gallery. 1997. Press Release: Andy Warhol: Dollar Signs. Oct. 8. <http://www.gagosian.com/exhibitions/beverly-hills-1997-11-andy-warhol>.
- Hartocollis, Anemona. 2008. "A Warhol Surfaces, Headed for Court." *The New York Times*. Feb. 19:A19.
- Jagyonjeul, Kalitan. n.d. Under Destruction. *hEyOkA mAgAzInE*. <http://www.heyokamagazine.com/HEYOKA.3.PINOCELLI.htm>.
- Jolley, John. 2008. Review of *Ghosts I-IV*. *Tiny Mix Tapes*. <http://www.tinymixtapes.com/Nine-Inch-Nails,5829>.
- Kanter, James. 2007a. "Vandal Punches Hole in a Monet in Paris." *The New York Times*. Oct. 8:A8.
- _____. 2007b. "5 Held in Monet Attack." *The New York Times*. Oct. 11:B2.
- Lomax, Alyce. 2008. Music Industry Gets Nailed Again. *The Motley Fool*. Mar. 4. <http://www.fool.com/investing/general/2008/03/04/music-industry-gets-nailed-again.aspx>.
- Malone, Michael S. 2008. Will We Ever Pay for an Album Again? *ABC News*. May 9. <http://abcnews.go.com/Business/story?id=4813233andpage=1>.

- Nicholl, Charles. 2002. The Myth of Mona Lisa. Review of *Mona Lisa: The History of the World's Most Famous Painting*. The Guardian. Mar. 28. <http://books.guardian.co.uk/lrb/articles/0,6109,675653,00.html>.
- Norris, Chris. 2008. Review of *Ghosts I-IV. Blender*. <http://www.blender.com/guide/reviews.aspx?id=5052>.
- Pareles, Jon. 2008. "Review of *Ghosts I-IV*." *The New York Times*. Mar. 10:B1, B6.
- Riding, Alan. 2005. "In Louvre, New Room With View of 'Mona Lisa.'" *The New York Times*. Apr. 6.
- _____. 2006. "Conceptual Artist as Vandal: Walk Tall and Carry a Little Hammer (or Ax)." *The New York Times*. Jan. 7.
- Sassoon, Donald. 2001. *Mona Lisa: The History of the World's Most Famous Painting*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Thompson, Ed. 2008a. Review of *Ghosts I-IV*. IGN. Mar. 7. <http://music.ign.com/articles/857/857752p1.html>.
- _____. 2008b. Review of *The Slip*. May 7. <http://music.ign.com/articles/872/872307p1.html>.
- twosee. 2007. Cy Twombly. Nov. 26. <http://twoseelife.blogspot.com/2007/11/cy-twombly.html>.
- Van Buskirk, Eliot. 2008a. "Nine Inch Nails Gets Creative With Radiohead-Style Release." *WIRED*. Mar. 3.
- _____. 2008b. "Nine Inch Nails Give Fans the Slip." *WIRED*. May 5.
- Van Gelder, Lawrence. 2007a. "Arts, Briefly: Prison Sentences in Munch Thefts." *The New York Times*. Apr. 24:B2.
- _____. 2007b. "Arts, Briefly: Kiss for a Twombly Is A Case for the Police." *The New York Times*. July 23: B2.
- _____. 2007c. "Arts, Briefly: A Costly Kiss." *The New York Times*. Nov. 17:A20.

Walls, Seth Colter. 2008. "Nine Inch Nailed: How Artists' Online Distribution of Music (sorta) Works." *Newsweek*. Mar. 4.

Williams College Museum of Art. 2007. Press Release: Williams College Museum of Art Presents Felix Gonzalez-Torres 'Untitled' (*Placebo*). 1991: December 1, 2007-March 23, 2008. http://www.wcma.org/press/07/07_Felix_Gonzalez_Torres.shtml.

Worthen, Ben. 2008. "Internet Lessons from Nine Inch Nails and Obama." *Wall Street Journal*. Mar. 3.