

LA TEMPESTAD

PSEUDOMATISMOS

by Christian Mendoza



"Surface Tension" by Rafael Lozano-Hemmer, image courtesy of bitforms gallery.

This year, the artist Rafael Lozano-Hemmer presented the piece *Confidence level* proposed subverts the purposes of biometric technology and becomes a search for the missing students perpetuates the Rural Normal Ayotzinapa. The University Museum of Contemporary Art acquired the piece for exhibition at the entrance: an institutional and artistic positioning. Yesterday the exhibition opened *Pseudomatismos*, Hemmer first monographic exhibition in Mexico.

"It was a very complicated project. The complexity is the work of Rafael technologically, in terms of curatorial and management, is problematic. For me it was very important to show that their work are not toys, there is a conceptual support, which has only to do with the interactivity and that does not have a comfortable relationship with technology. The work is done by a critique of technology from technology," said Jose Luis Barrios, curator of the exhibition along with Alejandra Labastida, in an interview with *The Tempest*. *Pseudomatismos* together forty-two works that cover the path and Hemmer their major aesthetic and political concerns. "There is a body of work in the work of Rafael. They are not occurrences of an eccentric scientist. There are questions, lines of research on the technique, about art, about politics. The mixed messages from the aesthetic experience with the machine. This is to reverse the notion of interactivity. Generally, in the digital reality, interactivity becomes passive user. When you work with interactive toys, the rule imposes the machine. Here the opposite happens. Rafael's big bet is that the body disturbs the machine, and the machine has to build relationships with their environment to possibly build a meaning, and that meaning is a kind of *mise en abyme*. That is the great paradox aesthetics curatorial thesis work," said Barrios on the articles in the sample speech. He also explained the importance of the sample to an institution like the MUAC. "The exhibition takes the very significant risk of shortening the distance between art and contemporary art and technology. It is one of the great fallacies

that has occurred in the discourse of art in Mexico that contemporary art is a path and other technological art. It seems to me that in that sense is very relevant show an artist who represents the cutting edge in the use of technology on the horizon of contemporary art. Historiographically, as is a commitment to another form of discourse. This is to reiterate the position or MUAC vocation as a museum research on artistic production in a limit of artistic practice and logic of the exhibition. “

For its part, the artist speaks about the structure of MUAC as an institution. “Much is said about this museum from architecture and infrastructure. But it is also important that the staff was fantastic. I’m talking about directors, curators, technicians, transportation. Working with them was an unforgettable experience. We are before an exhibition that I do not think were possible in another museum. “ Hemmer delved into Barrios explained by the relationship between the body and technology. “It always depends on the work. There are works that have a more political content or a more poetic content. Are forty-two works, twenty years of production. But many of the works are open platforms, where the work is incomplete, and the participation or presence of the active audience. This active position of the viewer has always been part of the art. Duchamp said that is the look that makes the picture. We seek the complicity of the public, create relationships that can be rejection, love, closeness, loneliness. Topics always worked for art. “

The tension between science and art is a constant in the work of Hemmer. How it is approached art from science? “I have a career in science. I am against those who believe that we live in a new Renaissance, as if there were a new era full of Leonardos that combine art and science. I think there is. The science is looking to simplify things, it is a formula to predict the natural behavior. In art we seek to ambiguity. What we like is interference. What we like are the paradoxes that can not be solved by its own definition. I think that there is a common place between the two that is experimentation, the idea of trying to work something that is unpredictable. At year-end, you can have no idea of the outcome of the work. That outcome happens in the experimental conditions of the work. “