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Interval is a research project, a conversation shared by 5 artists, Conor Kelly, Moyra Derby, Nicky Hamlyn, Joan Key, and Jost Münster. Interval implies a break or pause, a spatial or temporal in-betweenness. The spacing of intervals approaches framing as a shared convention between film and painting, and framing as a consequence of the architectural and durational containment of work through exhibition. The research takes place through experimental set-ups of work, motivated by the potential for cross cuts, edits, and interruptions between works that operate as components within the expanded frame of a space. These set-ups are conceived as discursive and provisional, accessed as a pause in a sequence of possibilities, and providing feedback for the individual practice of each artist. The installation at Tintype is one such moment in sequence.
Current cognitive research suggests that our perception of the world is never seamless; inbuilt into our attentional processes are discontinuities. Attention is episodic, so although our visual system is capable of extreme focus, interruptions or gaps mark the fluctuations between temporal episodes of attention [1]. These almost imperceptible blanks in attentional processing are exposed by the phenomena of attentional blink, miniscule time lags in visual processing and evidence of attentional capacity reaching a limit [2].

Visual attention is necessarily selective, as though we cut out a frame of focus from a wider visual field. Selection provides an edge and an exclusion; there is always the loss of what we are not paying attention to. The panning glance of a viewfinder, the bracketing of picture, the frame by frame properties of film, the enclosing structures of painting, all imply the perceived pause of selective attention but also the potential for its dispersal.
Our contemporary condition can be characterized by a crisis in attention, distractedness the by-product of the technological, cultural and social shifts that start with industrialisation and escalate in a digital multiplicity. The requirement to rapidly switch attention from one thing to another is part of ‘the cultural logic of capitalism’ [3]. This switching might be a high functioning and productive solution to an information saturated context or it might be an instance of unproductive and unsettling inattention. Art is often associated with idealised forms of attention, but the attention provoked by Interval [ ] works in tandem with distraction ¶, the pull of salient stimuli flickering on the periphery of focused looking. As optical attention and cognitive attention do not always align, so the cross cuts and edits of this collaboration work with disjunctions. Attention is captured, segmented, displaced and recaptured from work to work to work and into the space, punctuated by blanks and gaps in between.

A specific quality of the gallery at Tintype is the framing of its exhibition space from the street. The large window, just off square, captures and pictorializes. This architectural circumstance establishes an event boundary for the visitor first viewing the space from outside, holding a visual capture of that framed interior as they move towards the doorway and into the gallery. Event boundaries mark ‘points of perceptual and conceptual changes in activity’ [4] like strategic cuts in a film. These boundary moments are part of perception’s segmentation of continuous experience, and seem to encode visual data more securely into memory. The cut in time and structured spacing implied by the term interval highlights this change of view and position. Attention is framed and distanced from the street, and is dispersed and recaptured inside the gallery.
A formal engagement with framing and limit ties the practices of film and painting together art historically. These qualities can also be approached as evidence of a cognitive structuring of visual stimuli. The inevitable displacements and exclusions that occur are intervals that access the processes of memory and imagination, and signal the blank spots that resist capture and withhold picturing.
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MD: Through physical division and cast shadows, your use of frames makes a compositional intervention with other works and with the architecture against which they are seen. Do you think about the works having the characteristic of a frame?

JM: Most of these shapes and structures have their beginning with line drawings. The rectangular shape emerges as lines connect with each other. This process of finding through drawing results from looking at my visual surrounding, structures, how the world is built, held together. The frame, a simple but very powerful shape and structure can be found everywhere in our visual and virtual world. It holds, builds space - it frames space and time. Your work plays actively with the gallery space and forces the viewer to engage with it from different viewpoints. I am thinking of your screens painted on both sides or your drawing on a paper roll crossing the gallery floor. The imagery used in both is very animated and seems to be spilling over. How important is movement for you in your work?

MD: For me the frame defines an inside and an outside, an edge which then needs to be negotiated. This is where movement most clearly comes into my work, the movement between and across framed visual information, and the gaps in between, and a cut in the continuation of an implied space that stops you short and pulls your attention back in from the edge. So the movement from front to back, from one to another, and that spilling over you identify, is mostly to do with incompleteness, that the work can’t be seen all at once.
JM: The work’s configuration increases an awareness of the movement necessary to see the work. The set-up of work in a space to be viewed and moved through changes the perception of a space. Using the idea of making an intervention with wall painting, sculptures and installations has been an important part of my practice for many years. It is rooted in a trip to Italy I did in 1997. Seeing these extraordinary mosaics in Ravenna and wall paintings in the churches and palazzi in and around Florence made an incredible impact on me.
...That experience has been fundamental and changed the way I wanted to make work and how I wanted my work to be received from that time on. Since then, I have often made work specifically for a space, using wall paintings as well as installations to challenge our perception physically and mentally. I want the viewer to have a different experience from a distance or up close - physical engagement is therefore a requirement. The frame encourages multiple readings in this context. It defines what is in-between, it can function as a pause as well as being a border to the next space/image, or it could also be an image layered underneath another image. Different frames allow different views that animate the structure of the work and articulate spaces around the work. In this encounter connections form more intimately, both to the spaces of the work and the spaces of the world in which it is found.

...
...the installations that are constructed will comment...on the operating conditions of the site itself. To this end they will have recourse to every material support one can imagine, from pictures to words to video, to readymade objects or films [1].

Depending on how moving projections or still paintings are related together and with other objects in the gallery, patterns of loci emerge. The viewer, moving through an installation, begins to form dialogues, sequences, narrative directions. The conventional fiction, in which edge and frame distinguish autonomous works of art, begins to dissolve as visual cross-references are modified to include relative spacings between works, the influence of texts and whatever else lies within the architectural frame. The idea of exploiting such diffusion was rehearsed in Marcel Broodthaers’ ‘museum’ film installations. Numbered arrow signs, black and fixed on a white cinema screen, proposed random but suggestively sequenced points of interest, bearing fluctuating relation to the moving images projected over them. Although the arrows appeared to direct the eye towards pictorial incidents within the action of the films the viewer scanning the films’ imagery reads the film as moment by moment stasis [2].

Rosalind Krauss writes about Broodthaers’ arrows that they mediate the image, fracturing privileged points of interest within the frame itself. The arrows occur not only on the screen but on sites around the space of the projection [3]. By displacing viewpoint away from the focus of the lensed view of the camera or projector Broodthaers allows ideas and processes encoded in the outskirts of the image, which also include furniture, signage and publications that suggest historic relations to other sites of presentation.

The irony of the arrows themselves is that rather than functioning to construct priorities, they create a levelling principle, an aleatory logic into which anything could be included. In Broodthaers’ museum everything co-exists and is equally brought into relation with that privileged sight encoded in the structure of film projection (if not in the content of images actually projected). Pointing to sites of interest in both the films and the space creates a museum-fiction that renders everything simply but significantly present.

This environment elaborates on how museums fetishize their contents: iconographies, specified use values (or their lack), means of production, curatorship of labels or texts while links between component parts within the exhibition become improvisatory. The artist’s work merges with the gallery work of attendance to telephones, desks, maintenance and security.
The viewer’s work is research and response to all these factors as a logic of equivalence re-frames the distinctively framed imagery of the exhibition. Krauss regards this logic as representing a “homogenising principle” familiar to the viewer from experience of the way in which commodities are re-framed through a systemisation of equivalents that becomes transparent in exchange. In the case of Interval at Tintype this transparency is literally a condition of the site itself; the shop window of the gallery frames the ‘still : now’ exhibition, turning the whole installation into something to be seen from inside and outside the gallery, including the framing of the street, and the reflections of people in the street.[4]*.

Broodthaers’ arrows tension stillness and motion throughout the moments of the viewer’s attention to different flows of combination. Each moment gives way to the multiplicity of moments but retains potential specificity.

The viewer’s work is research and response to all these factors as a logic of equivalence re-frames the distinctively framed imagery of the exhibition. Krauss regards this logic as representing a “homogenising principle” familiar to the viewer from experience of the way in which commodities are re-framed through a systemisation of equivalents that becomes transparent in exchange. In the case of Interval at Tintype this transparency is literally a condition of the site itself; the shop window of the gallery frames the ‘still : now’ exhibition, turning the whole installation into something to be seen from inside and outside the gallery, including the framing of the street, and the reflections of people in the street.[4]*.

Broodthaers’ arrows tension stillness and motion throughout the moments of the viewer’s attention to different flows of combination. Each moment gives way to the multiplicity of moments but retains potential specificity.

Interval [ ] still : now reflects on such exchanges, allowing a private accumulation of images to occur between co-incidental choices and staged contingencies. The viewer’s formulations of viewpoint moves between fixed or fluid, filmic framings. Within the judgement of such relations lies potential for crystalline clarity, that complex moment in which an image becomes rich, memorable, condensed, valued even more so on account of its fugitive existence. The viewer may then possess the completeness of this compound image, its shifting adjacencies and its ephemeral construction.
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The work in Interval differentiates between practices of framing in film and painting. The shared term ‘frame’ is misleading in use since picture frames and film frame/frames are very different in terms of medium and technology, even if they sometimes share certain things both institutionally, and in the way they point to their context by agreeing to contain themselves within it. This caveat includes paintings in which the ‘frame’ is painted over (e.g., Howard Hodgkin), the effect of which is to displace it outwards to the adjacent contextual frame -the gallery wall. To further confuse things, the definition of ‘frame’, in English usage -though not in other languages- includes the tiny translucent photograph held inside the projector, whose content is enormously magnified in its brief moment of projection.

The screen is ‘a void, whose limits are designed to bring focus to the projected image’ (Joan Key). This points to the contradictory nature of the film image. As long as it is focused, at least where the action is, we can be drawn into it. The US artist-filmmaker Stan Brakhage railed against lenses ‘ground to achieve the effect of Western monocular perspective’. He attempted to subvert the security of the transcendental gaze typical of the narrative spectator, in order to restore a more exploratory kind of seeing to the film viewer. The effect of much of this kind of filmmaking is to prevent the viewer from entering effortlessly into the space of the image. Rather, one must become conscious of its surface and its limits; in this sense ‘experimental’ film aspires to
the conditions of visibility of painting and is hence opposed to narrative cinema’s relentless drive. The drawing of attention to the screen’s surface, thence to the framing edge, prevents centripetal immersion and thereby encourages non-directed -unforced-contemplation of the whole visual field including its edges. When films are deliberately thrown out of focus, the framing edge will also eventually blur, thereby beckoning the viewer beyond its boundaries, not, however, to the off-screen space of narrative cinema, but to its literal physical surroundings. This has a bearing on the concerns of [ ] Interval, in that the dissolution of the frame is both a strategy and a consequence of calculated interactivity: as framing edges of one work overlap those of another they lose the power to contain their proper contents, to stop them spilling out and interacting with adjacent phenomena.
Here, the film and video frame enters into a new kind of relationship with its surroundings, which includes a temporal aspect. The juxtaposition of durational work with static paintings and constructions leads to a different kind of temporal experience, in which the problem of holding a viewer’s attention for more than a few seconds is displaced into a looser, roaming, more productively promiscuous kind of attention. The term ‘promiscuous’ here does not imply cursory or superficial modes of spectatorship: one hopefully is not flitting impatiently from one work to another, but rather producing relationships between and across various juxtapositions of works in the line of sight †.

Interval’s juxtapositions of serial, modular and free-standing paintings, wall-works and projections, are planned and their effects anticipated, so that their interrelationships and interdependencies (actual and potential) are explicitly exposed. The works are disposed so as to encourage the spectator to form their own juxtapositions—virtual works, in effect—by standing in such a way that two or more works overlap, or one is seen through another, or abutting it. Thus, the widespread curatorial practice of confronting disparate works sequenced with each other in order to force a dialogue between them, is questioned much harder than is typically the case.

Nicky Hamlyn 2018
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JK: Finding a title for an exhibition is always a moment of definition. In this case [ ] still: now was decided on because it suggested the difference between static and dynamic potential in the sound of a simple English phrase. This distinction, marked by punctuation, could represent a shift in the flow of meaning.

NH: We are grappling with the possibilities of not treating the film frame as a kind of container, so it can be a dynamic part of the work. By, say, projecting a film onto non-standard screens, which might be other artworks, or the gaps between them, you can have a different kind of experience in which the frame is dynamised or, alternatively, dissolved in some way.

CK: To me the perpetual possibilities and mercurial unsteady nature of the media of sound and moving image, as they are re-presented through various processes, have often led to unexpected outcomes. A collaborative work Nicky and I installed at Roomartspace [ii] in 2014 called Double Displacement connects to the current thinking around [ ] Interval. The use of live film and sound recording effectively linked sound to the specific architecture of the building we were working in: we found a rich architectural fissure to exploit and explore as the material of the work. The building itself acted as an extra cog in the 16mm film projection as we drew the film loop from an old roof outside the gallery, through a hole in the wall, into the space of the viewer in the exhibition. The journey of the film loop pulled across the head of an activated sound recorder connected to a speaker transmitting ‘live sound’[i].

NH. Film is temporary, but it’s also momentary. I was thinking, in relation to Double Displacement, of the framing as being the point at which the sound is generated. It travels around the
microphone so that one sees it's the source, then there's an outward expansion, which stimulates the question what does it mean to talk about framing in relation to sound?

**CK:** The architecture became associated with that sound, as if to frame it, but yes there remains a question of when is sound ever framed. Traditionally sound is framed because it is lower down the pecking order, framed by the requirements of picturing but without forming a picture. In Double Displacement, the 16mm film passes over a microphone and then loops round some haphazardly cobbled-together possibilities, and eventually through a projector such that the image of a rotating film spool is projected onto an external wall then relayed to a monitor in the gallery by a video camera. The image cannot logically be the source of the sound but is nevertheless reunited with the sound in the mind of the viewer, who realises that the two are connected but distanced by their disposition in space ‡.
...In terms of framing sound there is another idea from our first collaboration around [ ] Interval, in the train station waiting room at Whitstable. I filmed through the window of the waiting room, out towards the tracks, the trains arriving, stopping and leaving. This was played back into the space as part of a projected loop, without sound, but there was the perpetual real sound of the trains arriving and stopping and sometimes flashing past during the show. The live sound acted as a sort of out of sync real time loop to the image in the show. In one sense the hierarchy is reversed here with this little brother small loop accompanying the thunderous real life outside sound drawing the viewer to include all that in one sense or another into the show. Including of course the flashing images of train windows passing at speed through the waiting room window echoing film frames shooting by.
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Leaving the tube, 2010. Unlock, click right to the map app, raise phone to face. Staring towards the microphone, the tiny speaker and the screen (catching a glimpse of a face before it flashes from black). Then, lowering the arm parallel to the floor, divining a route. Wait, while climbing to the exit, for the gaps to connect and for the map to load, grid filling-up square by square. Thinking through this state of acquired perpendicularity, and wondering which way to go. There are many exits from this station, some on opposite sides of one road. A left turn on to this street could mean north or south. Choose. Move. It will push the avatar on-screen far enough to confirm the direction of travel.

Before that sudden blinding, They had been gregarious, curious, familiar with all the important views – and personalities - of the day, warm, strong (but gentle and nimble also), sceptical, but never cynical, free with their time. Their eye, translucent green, larger than a cabbage, seemed constantly to be suspended in expression between stern judgement and pitiful compassion. Since nobody had obscured their vision (rather, the whole backdrop had been winched around a huge bobbin), nobody had become a target. Boulders and biscuit tins fell in nobody’s wake.
When O and P join the next scene it’ll be because they want to clean those dirty windows.

Who would build a wall in the proscenium arch?

It’s not a real wall. Do you see those wires attached to the top? – Now, look up... Not there, through ... Hoists for each of them. It’d fall over. My guess is it’s a temporary fixture. Otherwise there’d be props to support.

You’d better hurry up with my windows, then.

Why?

(Wall begins to rise slowly) So you can see the rest of the play. You’ve missed the first act already.

You’re too late. They won’t have heard a thing you’ve said, you know.

(Aside) Here they come...

(O and P enter from left. P picks up the Sponge and places it in the Bucket Of Soapy Water. O takes the Ladder. Exeunt via stairs)
Cupping your chin with your hand, you pivot to look through the window of the slowing train. The works on the new high-rise looming over the raised tracks here are still unfinished. You can still see through the steel-frame outline of the building, although concrete panels and columns bisect and enclose the once-open spaces of the upper floors. As the train rolls past, the glass façade of an older new-build set behind the new development slides into view. Behind the blinds, you imagine, stands a photographer, zoom lens extended, fixing on the passenger across the aisle from you. He twists, like a hunter, keeping locked to his moving subject and, as his finger presses the shutter, a grey mass of steel fills his viewfinder.

A buzzing sound echoed through the forest. She wandered towards it, leaving the clearing behind her. Her shins were veined with sweat, trickling paths through the dry earth and sawdust she’d kicked-up marching through the tyre tracks that ran around those abandoned stumps. She began to take smaller steps, thinking of the concentric rings on the stump-tops. Before her stood the living trees, which marked time internally as new growth gradually pushed against bark-stain, withholding this index of their age, living secretly. Behind her, the severed trunks, generously presenting what has been and no longer is. She looked back at her footsteps and drew to a halt.
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