

3 Fluxus fetish

Conservation, desire and affect

Hanna B. Hölling

Fetish: an obsession, fixation, mania, fascination or prepossession invested with a sense of irresistible allure. Often shrouded in darkness, at the limit of understanding, in the Western intellectual tradition it usually refers to an object of desire—such as body parts and items not considered sexual, like feet or shoes—through which individuals seek gratification, treading a fine line between merely *having a fetish* and being affected by *fetishistic disorder*. Beyond sexuality, “fetish” may refer to any object or practice marked by irrational or spiritual significance, believed to harness an enshrined power—examples include lucky charms, religious relics or any object infused with symbolic meaning beyond its intrinsic value. Fetishes frequently become the focus of obsessive devotion or a belief that permeates various aspects of life. Can collecting and conserving also be understood as affective practices driven by the fetishistic desire to accumulate, salvage and cherish material things?

This chapter explores the concept of the fetish through psychoanalytic, cultural, museological and conservation perspectives, drawing on Archivio Conz’s unique collection of Fluxus fetish objects. Endowed with agency and sometimes magical irrationality, fetishes gain the ability to influence other objects, individuals and practices, thus enabling parallels to be drawn between affectionate relationships and care practices. This raises a set of questions: Why do we desire fetishes, and what desires do fetish objects harbor? Do fetish objects define their own conditions of care? What role does touch play—and what role conservation?

I begin with the act of collecting specific objects as a form of fetishistic hoarding. Conversely, I examine how, through the ritual practices of devotional stewardship and conservation, objects themselves can become fetishized and how fetish objects shape conservation as affective practice—one that not only preserves but reinforces desire.

Fetish Tisch

Berlin, on a bleak November morning in 2023: we find ourselves leaning over a “Fetish Tisch” (German for “fetish table”), overflowing with artifacts and bric-a-brac collected by the Italian connoisseur of the avant-garde Francesco Conz.¹ It is one of the Fluxus Study Days, in the *Activating Fluxus* project’s research series. Our

modest group of Fluxus enthusiasts gathers around the table, dazzled by the fecundity of objects spread before them: an aged plastic bag filled with smelly cigarette butts (Al Hansen, Figure 3.1); a red silky underdress inscribed with a blue ballpoint pen (Charlotte Moorman, Figure 3.2); a set of used painting utensils affixed to a wooden panel (Lawrence Ferlinghetti, Figure 3.3); elements of a crushed violin, each signed (Charlotte Moorman, Figure 3.4); worn leather shoes with scribbles on the insole (Dick Higgins, Figure 3.5); an autographed handkerchief and a tie (Alison Knowles, Figure 3.6); and a cardboard box full of cut-offs of electric cables (Joe Jones, Figure 3.7)—among many others.

This varied ensemble is just a small selection of the “Fluxus fetish” objects collected and named as such by Conz, now housed on the first floor of his capacious archive in Berlin. The table assembly differs from what we expect of a conventional art collection, and the longer we dwell with it, the more it becomes unsettling. These objects not only emit scents—both acrid and alluring—but also seem to retain a latent charge, as if concealing absurdities and transgressions. Not quite fringe and inconspicuous leftovers, but not entirely discrete, inert artworks either, their material presence is animated by a residual performativity, a stubborn vitality that resists containment. To be sure, this Fetish Tisch assembly defies our expectation of a collection of artifacts designed for perpetual function.



Figure 3.1 Al Hansen, *Untitled*, undated. Archivio Conz. Courtesy Archivio Conz.



Figure 3.2 Charlotte Moorman, *Untitled*, 1984. Archivio Conz. Courtesy Archivio Conz.



Figure 3.3 Lawrence Ferlinghetti, *Untitled*, 2001. Photograph, paint, plastic, wood, textile on wood. Archivio Conz. Courtesy Archivio Conz.



Figure 3.4 Charlotte Moorman, *Untitled*, 1980. Broken violin, wood. Archivio Konz. Courtesy Archivio Konz.



Figure 3.5 Dick Higgins, *Untitled*, 1995. Leather shoes, paint marker. Archivio Konz. Courtesy Archivio Konz.



Figure 3.6 Alison Knowles, Walter Marchetti and various artists, *Untitled*, 1988. Archivio Konz. Courtesy Archivio Konz.



Figure 3.7 Joe Jones, *Leftovers from Italy 1973–1986*, 1986. Archivio Konz. Courtesy Archivio Konz.

Francesco Conz: collecting as compulsion

Francesco Conz, an Italian collector and art *appassionato*, who also ventured into publishing avant-garde and experimental art multiples, turned his accumulation of objects into an act of salvage and preservation. Beginning in 1972, Conz started inviting artists to spend time with him and create work in Asolo, Italy, where he then resided. Through the artist Hermann Nitsch, Conz became acquainted with a wide range of Fluxus artists, among them Joe Jones, Nam June Paik, Charlotte Moorman, Philip Corner, Alison Knowles, Emmett Williams, Takako Saito, Carolee Schneemann and Dick Higgins, as well as the photographer Peter Moore and his wife, Barbara, herself involved in publishing Fluxus multiples.

In effect, Conz briefly established himself as a collaborator with the artists, whom he regarded as “modern saints,” hoping their “saintliness” would rub off on him.² Not only did he relentlessly photograph his visitors, but he also amassed artistic items and simple everyday objects that the artists interacted with, later banking this immense collection in barns and other storage spaces. Though contingent and accidental at first glance, the items collected by Conz were “touched”—that is, they carried evidence of the artists’ presence and engagement, often manifesting in traces of use and, above all, inscriptions and/or signatures by their donors. Conz maintained:

You have to remember that I’m a fairly curious sort of collector. There’s an awful lot of fetishism in the way I go about it. Collecting, for me, is all for purposes of keeping things together, preserving them, keeping track of them, cataloguing them and setting them aside in a place where I can feel that they are safe. Collecting is an act of impulse, or even compulsion, that some people simply have Inside them.³

Conz felt deeply passionate about his interactions with artists and their creations: “I get to be highly involved with an artist and the work that the artist makes, and the works I collect are very intensely a part of life.”⁴ He was equally passionate about not leaving anything behind. Everything that remained from a libation, a fest or a conversation, for instance, had to be signed or otherwise adorned by its user and find a safe place—in his collection:

Some people are thieves, because they’re simply possessed by an Instinct for theft, there are other people who have saintly instincts, and then there are people whose instincts make them collectors, which means searching out things that strike them as precious and setting them aside and locking them up and spending lots of time looking at them. *It’s very much like hoarding.* I hope one day to have a great enormous house or villa or a castle where I’ll be able to house all the things I own, and I’ll set them all up which [*sic*] everything clearly *ordered* and all its proper place, with a room for this and a room for that, meaning a room for every artist, but then I’m almost certain that I’ll rig up *a curtain or drape in front of every work* so as to keep other people from looking at them.⁵

The majority of the fetish objects in Conz's collection were, in fact, created for him—whether as residual objects or other material “effects” of the artists' activities that he insisted be signed and sent to his collection. While I shall return to the topic of the signature shortly, suffice it to say for now that this compulsion to collect and preserve, so clearly expressed by the collector, was both a blessing and a curse. Keeping these items together as a means of preservation and salvage from inevitable oblivion—who else would have kept cigarette butts or a box of tangled cables?—was, for Conz, a moral duty and a way of being in the world. It was also an immediate response to his impulses.

Conz's love for artists and the things they produced disregarded whether an artifact held aesthetic value or was just a piece of scrap, a toxically disintegrating animal cadaver or a used remnant from a libation, performance or sexual act. In effect, what is now housed in his Berlin *archivio* is both intriguing and somewhat repulsive—tokens and relics of the revered and the eerie. It is also weird, rotting stuff—signifiers for which the signifieds have temporarily been removed into history, causing in the observer an uncanny desire for a moment that has passed. It is the dislocated and the rotted with unclear purpose, without conclusion.

Consider, for instance, that next to leftovers from a libation, faded lipstick on cigarette butts and a night gown (or moccasins) displaying stains of sweaty dirt, were two small animal cadavers. Briefly recorded in the archive's object inventory, these had to be removed by staff as biological hazards in the course of this research. As observers, we find ourselves in the ambiguous space between reverence and repulsion, unable to imagine what it must have been like for the archivists or conservators working directly with the collection. Although the majority of these items carry traces of the artist's body—and thus their relic value seems undeniable—we feel both drawn to them and estranged. The instinct to separate from the impure and the abject functions as a form of self-protection.

This unsettling situation may be read through the lens of Julia Kristeva's notion of abjection, developed in *Powers of Horror* (1980).⁶ Kristeva describes subjective horror (abjection) as the sensation that arises when an individual encounters or is confronted with the raw experience of what she terms one's typically repressed “corporeal reality,” or when the Real disrupts the Symbolic Order (rethinking Lacan and Freud). She locates the abject in the impure bodily functions that are unsuitable for public discourse or display. We thrust these aside as part of our survival mechanism, according to the philosopher. The abject can occur in many forms. Kristeva's paradigmatic example of the abject is the human corpse, which, “seen without God and outside of science, is the utmost abjection” and horror-causing trauma.⁷

In their heterochrony, the animal cadavers perform a double function: they are the incarnation of the dead in the deadening effect of the archive—and they sit among the archive's metaphorical dead. Any attempt at their activation in the ritual theater of preservation would stretch the conservator's performative participation beyond its norms. The carcasses exposed the *archivio*'s workers not only to an extreme form of corporeal reality but also to potential harm, since they were home, as all rotting corpses are, to disease-carrying vermin, including bacteria, viruses, pests and worms. They also demonstrate that life and death are contested and

ultimately unhelpful dichotomies: life thrives in what appears dead, while death lingers among those living. In such differing states of vitality, death might become bearable, as a radical transition between changeabilities, in a pluriverse made up of active, ever-transitional matter.

Whether a piece of clothing or simple debris, Conz, in requesting signatures and inscriptions for the majority of these collected and gifted items—on the items themselves or on the boxes holding them—ensured that there is no confusion between their scrap value and their art value (as well as their gift value—an aspect that I will leave aside for reasons of space).

One final confusion lingers within this assembly, upon closer inspection: beyond the presence of a signature, there is no immediately recognizable attribute of fetish. To a passer-by, the items remain unidentifiable as such. The category of the “fetish object” appears to reside instead in a meta-sensorial—perhaps even metaphysical—dimension of all this stuff on the table that glances back at us through the awkwardness of its rudimentary material constellation.

All this stuff

The only people who remain are the people
who leave tangible works of art behind them.

Francesco Conz⁸

A random search of a child’s pocket uncovers curious constellations of shells, stones or stickers—objects that, while precious to the child, hold little meaning for many adults. The affinity for collecting, evident from an early stage of child development, unites us as humans. Its origins may lie in the gathering and storing of food to survive lean times, a central aspect of our predecessors’ hunter-gatherer lifestyle. Ancient Egypt’s tradition of amassing items in burial chambers—which Krzysztof Pomian identifies as the oldest form of (recorded) collecting⁹—along with the Ptolemaic dynasty’s collection of books, are among the earliest recorded examples. As a human practice, therefore, collecting has a millennia-long cultural history; its communal and social roots reach back to Mesopotamia and Ancient Egypt, and forward to the Medici family in Florence, as the first to offer private patronage. The sixteenth century’s ways of explaining the world in Cabinets of Curiosities—with certain similarities to Archivio Conz’s Fetish Tisch ensemble—continued the tradition of collecting curiosities that reflected the particular interests of their curators while also performing a social role. The modern human participation in a consumer culture and the significance attached to possessions involves, according to Russell W. Belk, “an existential emphasis on having over doing or being.”¹⁰

But constructing a relationship with the world through collecting has never been a uniform practice. Susan Pearce, for instance, has distinguished between souvenir, fetishistic and systematic modes of collecting.¹¹ Souvenirs—also referred to as “personalalia” or “memorabilia”—are tokens of events that can only be remembered but not relived, according to the author. At the other end of the spectrum lies the

fetish collection, characterized by a possessive and reverential attitude on the part of the collector. These two modes converge in their shared tendency to create a private universe, with unclear rules of access. Systematic collections, by contrast, are typically conceived as forms of display: they lay out material knowledge in ways intended to be accessed and interpreted, and thus rely on the presence of a viewer. Whether or not Pearce's typology is exhaustive,¹² it is perhaps against the backdrop of a variety of modes of collecting that we can grasp the true exceptionalism of Conz's effort.

Collecting is hoarding is preserving is passing on. It is establishing orders in which time collapses into heterotopias of infinite accumulation.¹³ David Lowenthal likens humans to pack rats:

We collect. We save. We hoard. Why do we do this? Because we've learned that we need to save in order to survive. We store up food, clothing, and other goods to survive physically. We store up skills, habits, and memories to survive socially.¹⁴

Belk and Lowenthal agree: we define ourselves by our possessions.¹⁵ Artifacts of lasting value define the collector's identity and contribute to their personal growth.¹⁶ Through collected objects, collectors such as Conz become a part of something larger than their mortal selves. Ownership is, after all, as Walter Benjamin noted, the most profound relationship one can have with objects.¹⁷ Collectors not only acquire specialized knowledge and expertise but also connect with the great predecessors and events that their collectibles represent. Through deciding the rules, registers and categories of a collection, collecting—and preserving, as I will later argue—grants a sense of control and mastery over an otherwise uncaring, contingent and chaotic world.¹⁸

In our indebtedness to the past and our efforts to conserve it for the future, we make meaning of the present. We cherish what we own, not only for its inherent value but because it is ours, handed down to us by our forebears.

Each of us is the inheritor, the beneficiary, of millions of years of DNA, of thousands of years of civilized history, of tens of thousands of hours of our own life history. These legacies underlie everything we do and are essential to our lives. We could not survive without them.¹⁹

Importantly, however, and like Conz, Lowenthal connects collecting with conservation: "We collect. We save," he writes, adding, "conservation is not only innate, psychologically speaking. It's imperative, biologically, and essential to our being. There's no escaping it."²⁰

Hoarding between ordering and disorder

Fred Moten suggests that subjectivity is defined "by the subject's possession of itself and its objects," which is "troubled by a dispossessive force objects exert

such that the subject seems to be possessed—infused, deformed—by the object it possesses.”²¹ Moten points to a deformation, even a perversion, of the person who enters a relationship with objects. The thin line between collecting and hoarding, the latter being a form of disordered behavior, is not too far from what we glean from Conz’s practice.

Hoarding, otherwise defined as “amass[ing] and put[ting] away (anything valuable) for preservation, security or future use,”²² is also an extreme form of psychological ownership, accompanied by feelings of responsibility and proprietorship. In psychology, this form of ownership allows the hoarder—a person who, according to Jane Bennett, is “preternaturally attuned to the call from things”²³—to fulfill some basic needs: efficacy and effectance, self-identity and having a place.²⁴ Hoarders often display “exquisite sensitivity to the somatic effectivity of objects.”²⁵ Hypersensitive hoarders distract themselves from deeply ingrained, negative experiences and painful feelings. Defining and expressing self-identity to others and maintaining it across time, along with finding a place that is their “own,” are among their most significant motives. Taking the “call of things” seriously as a proponent of vital materialism, Bennett locates in hoarding an expression of “thing-power,” where “the appearance of the call of things seems particularly insistent.”²⁶

Hoarders express discomfort when others touch, move or displace their possessions, for fear of losing control. Conz’s devotion to his amassed artifacts and his desire to shield his collectibles from the gaze of others (recall his insistence on a curtain to protect his objects) are psychological symptoms of hoarding as a disorder *par excellence*. This condition is marked by an inability to part with saved items, whether through physical removal or by allowing others to look at them.

The ethnopsychiatrist and psychoanalyst Werner Muensterberger sees the collecting impulse as beginning when an infant realizes that they are separate from their mother.²⁷ The baby reaches for a security object, such as a blanket or toy, which provides temporary comfort (the child psychoanalyst Donald Winnicott calls this “the transitional object”).²⁸ As an adult, acquiring new objects also provides temporary relief from anxiety, loneliness and uncertainty. As the comforting impact of the object gradually diminishes, the collector must continue to add to the collection to stave off unwelcome feelings.²⁹

Preservation architect and artist Jorge Otero-Pailos proposes to apply the concept of transitional cultural objects to artworks and buildings that help us to cope with the anxieties of transitioning into the future. Preservation, he asserts, “is an attempt to hedge these risks [related to uncertainty about what comes next] by controlling the passage of a few privileged objects into the future,” or “the future anterior.”³⁰ These objects invariably reflect the specific point in time when they were chosen for preservation. The notion of transitionality extends from the object to the very process of conservation, which is, recursively, influenced by the preserved object. The transitionality of the period during which we pass on the object is also significant. Lastly, and with relevance for my discussion, Otero-Pailos identifies:

a powerful critique of preservation to be unpacked within the notion of fetishism, because heritage should help us transition from one stage of culture

into another. But when we hang on to an object beyond what should be a transitional period, then we are still stuck, and we become fetishistic toward that object.³¹

While the question of who determines the healthy duration of a transitional period for a society or culture remains open, one point is clear: preservation undertaken not for growth, but for the sake of clinging—to stagnant, overly cherished objects—makes conservation complicit in cultural stagnation. Here, fetish begins to take shape as a feat of conservation.

Collecting and conserving as a symptom

Limitless preservation, like hoarding, ultimately confronts us with the question of what to keep and what to let go. If we keep everything, we risk suffocation in the past and there is no place for the new—an argument resonating in architectural preservation (for example, in Rem Koolhaas)³² and applicable to all regimes of human-made things.

Conz found deep gratification in collecting. If Benjamin asserts that objects not only come alive in the collector but also that “it is he who lives in them,”³³ then Conz exemplifies this. His collecting eccentricities extended beyond an insatiable restlessness for accumulating objects; they resided in the very concept of the fetish, which he deliberately embraced and encouraged artists to engage with in his emotionally charged practice.

Conservation must include context. (This is a lesson best learned from folklore studies, in which *con-text* reveals that folklore is not just an isolated “text”—a story, a ritual, a song and so forth—but something deeply embedded in the situations, relationships and media that give it meaning.) In other words, no conservation—nor collecting as an act of conservation—can exist without the effort to understand the objects’ broader meaning and their surrounding world, including the material, social, political and economic conditions that brought them to life. This understanding operates in both directions and includes an awareness of the conservation process itself and the impulses that drive it. (Conservation is considered here as a discursive, epistemic and pluricultural practice.)

To study a collection such as Conz’s involves not only examining the objects extracted from their formal social life (that is, libation, walking, sex) into the abstraction machine of a collection but also analyzing the mental condition that led to their accumulation. In other words, to engage with Conz’s fetish collection—and, by extension, with the fetishization of his collection—is to diagnose the underlying condition that fueled its creation and subsequent preservation. Herein lies the subtle intrigue of the collection’s initially unrecognizable aura: engaging with it requires becoming complicit in its disorder—in the acts of compulsion and excess. (This aligns with Conz’s aspiration to one day find a home where the collection could be housed in an orderly fashion—as a heterotopic space, perhaps even a private museum that would hold the excess of his practice.)³⁴ Ordering it occurs through a process of interpretation—making sense of the collection, situating it within a broader context and empathizing with the impulses that shaped it.

Conz's compulsive hoarding sheds light on the underlying logic of other public and private collections, prompting reconsideration in the context of psychological ownership. These collections often reflect curators' and conservators' (quite often obsessive) tendencies to accumulate objects and assume exclusive responsibility for their care, simultaneously evoking feelings of protectiveness, nurturing and proactive intervention to prevent harm and ensure their "well-being." In a tour-de-force survey of conservation, Salvador Muñoz Viñas sees in such "conservation as obsession" the first symptom of what he tentatively projects as the end of conservation.³⁵

Conservation and stewardship are inherently affective acts. Conservators frequently develop an extreme protectiveness, perceiving themselves as advocates for cultural objects that cannot "speak" but must be shielded from damage caused by improper display, environmental conditions or use.³⁶ These affective dynamics become deeply problematic in institutional collections rooted in colonial looting and harm. In such cases, the resistance to repatriation often hinges on the assertion that the originating communities are unable to provide the type of care that Western museums can, according to Western-defined standards.³⁷ This scenario perhaps illustrates another layer of Otero-Pailos's critique: "When we hang on to an object beyond what should be a transitional period, then we are still stuck."³⁸ Through practices which, in the most extreme case, masquerade as acts of care, the inability to let go enforced by such fixation perpetuates unequal power structures. Lastly, the notion of the fetish, to which we now turn, offers a fertile ground for exploring the drive to collect as it relates to desire—or the absence of the object of desire. If conservation-through-collecting can be understood as a form of fetishization, might conservation itself be understood as a process of fetish formation?

Fetish, fetishism and the new saints

The collector . . . always retains some traces of the fetishist and . . . ,
by owning the work of art, shares in its ritual power.

Walter Benjamin³⁹

A piece of memorabilia—be it an article of clothing, underwear, an instrument or a handkerchief once belonging to an actress—is auctioned at an exorbitant price. The traces of the artist, often in the form of a biological substance or a mark of use, such as a lipstick stain or wear on a guitar, imbue the object with a sense of the extraordinary. This is the fundamental mechanism of the fetish object known from idolatry, where an item comes to embody the divine or the unrepresentable. In celebrity and artist worship—a modern form of sainthood as alluded to by Conz—these objects acquire symbolic significance.

One of the most unstable terms in general use, whose contingency incites etymological fantasies, "fetish" refers to any object, idea or activity to which a person develops an unusually strong and obsessive attachment or devotion. This can manifest, for example, in fixating on certain topics, collecting certain items or engaging in particular behaviors repeatedly. Fetish theory in the Western intellectual

tradition branches into three main strands: the anthropological-historical notion of the magico-religious object, Marx's concept of commodity fetishism and Freud's theory of sexual fetishism—each carrying multiple, sometimes intertwined, meanings depending on the context.⁴⁰

The arrival of the fetish in European thought dates back to the fifteenth century as a result of a deep misreading of West African religious practices and cosmologies. Much like the plundered objects from Africa and beyond that still fill Western museums—framed as proof of the “primitiveness” of their makers and the “civilized” stewardship of their collectors—the very concept of the fetish was appropriated and later mobilized to rationalize such acts of dispossession.⁴¹ Portuguese traders and missionaries used the terms *feitiço* (meaning “magic charm”) and *feitiçaria* (“sorcery”) to describe the objects and religious rituals they encountered on the African Gold Coast.⁴² Later travelers characterized African religion as a “fetish”—deviant and centered on the worship of objects—a view later rejected by nineteenth-century anthropologists such as Marcel Mauss. The fetish placed Africans in the “dark origins,” in contrast with an “enlightened,” self-aggrandizing Europe, casting non-European civilizations as primitive. Although it retained its negative connotation—a motif eruditely exposed in the recent revisitation of the term from the perspective of African American studies by J. Lorand Matory⁴³—the concept subsequently evolved and was adopted by European scholars to categorize objects believed to possess magical properties, eventually expanding into sociological and psychological contexts.

In Karl Marx's critique of capitalism, “commodity fetishism” addresses the way in which social relationships in production are obscured by the value placed on commodities.⁴⁴ People relate to goods as if they have inherent value, rather than seeing the labor and social systems behind their production. For Marx, value does not come from the object itself but from the socially necessary labor time it takes to produce it. Critics argue that Marx's framing retains Eurocentric biases and, somewhat inconsistently, oscillates between serving as a metaphor for capitalist mystification while at the same time reproducing a stereotype that casts African religions as the “irrational other.”

In psychological and sexual contexts, fetishism can be described as the act of redirecting desire and fantasy toward substitute objects or specific body parts, like a foot or a shoe, to avoid dealing directly with the complex psychological issue of castration. Further reliant on the colonial origins of fetishism as a false belief or illusion (imagined as a result of the underdevelopment of Africans), Freud's notion of fetishism signifies an effect of the fear of castration. The mental sequence of events that follow from this fear is carried out through the processes of disavowal, substitution and marking.⁴⁵ The fetish object functions as a “sign” by substituting for the maternal penis, which is perceived to be lacking. The substitute also serves as a mask, concealing and denying the distressing sight of absence, particularly if the “absence” evokes associations with the injured, bleeding body. In his essay on fetishism, Freud came to realize that individuals with fetishistic tendencies are capable of simultaneously believing in their fantasies while acknowledging them as mere fantasies.⁴⁶ Surprisingly, this recognition of the fantasy's unreal nature

does not diminish its hold over the person. Octave Mannoni characterized this contradictory mindset thus: “Je sais bien, mais quand-même” (“I know very well, but just the same”).⁴⁷

The main criticisms of Freud’s theory point to its phallogentric and patriarchal presuppositions (assuming the male experience as universal and identifying women with “lack”), as well as its pathologizing (casting non-normative sexual practices as “perversion”) and reductionist aspects (the fetish is limited to child trauma and unconsciousness), as espoused by feminist scholars such as Luce Irigaray, Julia Kristeva and Sandra Bartky.

Nevertheless, psychoanalysis provides conceptual tools to think about psychological and emotional relationships to objects, which will allow me to explore unconscious, symbolic and affective dimensions of collecting, beyond purely economic, historical or materialist accounts. In this chapter, I turn to psychoanalysis not to reproduce anthropological stereotypes or to ignore its reductive genealogy, but to critically probe the cultural and psychological dimensions of the fetish-like attachments to objects—both within collections at large and, more specifically, in the case of Conz. What interests me in particular are four key ideas: that the fetish substitutes for what cannot be seen, represents what is lost or feared lost, fixes meaning through a formative—often traumatic—event, and condenses contradictory feelings.

For Conz, the Fluxus artists that he invited and spent time with represent the extraordinary: “That’s simply what they are. They’re the new saints.”⁴⁸ Objects touched by these modern saints—used and stained, such as Moorman’s nightgown, Higgins’s worn leather shoes or, even more extreme, Hansen’s cigarette butts—are charged. They stand in for the artists (as relics for the saint’s body) in their absence.

When we admire something, we wish to be touched back: a handkerchief from a celebrity might reciprocate the touch, and we would probably keep it unwashed. Memorabilia from a famous convict, by contrast, causes repulsion. Fetishism, thus, is highly bound with affect: for example, Moorman’s worn nightgown feels acceptable, the animal cadaver less so, and the same can be said for the multiple *Fluxus Clippings* (c. 1968), for which Ken Friedman packaged cut nails and calluses.⁴⁹ For the connection to the object to be positive, we need to be familiar and/or establish another line of reference with the maker. Otherwise, a box of cut-off cables is simply a box of trash, rather than a charged remnant from a work by the musical poet Joe Jones.

Here is an important takeaway: an object may be “charged” or function as a fetish for one collector or individual (a curator, a conservator), but not for others. The collection of Fluxus fetishes does not stand alone on this stage; religious relics or other objects created by non-Western societies (often problematically christened “ethnographic” in the so-called World Cultures museums) function similarly. The beholder needs to be initiated to uncover what might at first be unapparent. This goes both ways: an artifact that displays certain external characteristics of a ritual or fetish object can turn out to be an “uncharged” replica fabricated in response to popular demand or tourist interest rather than a product of colonial appropriation.⁵⁰

But is loss or absence, as Freud suggests, indeed at the center of a fetishistic drive? Lacan reveals something else.

Beyond the phallogocentric economy of desire: the object of desire as *desire itself*

For Freud, the fetish object is a substitute, a stand-in, for something that cannot be represented. For Jacques Lacan, on the other hand, the object is not a stand-in but rather becomes a barrier between the subject and the object of desire, between the subject and the ideal that upholds it.⁵¹ A handkerchief by Knowles or a piece of underwear from Moorman, for instance, creates a distance between the subject (the admirer) and the object of desire (the artist). Were we to encounter Knowles or Moorman, we would conclude that they were human beings like anyone else. Conz, by asking artists to sign, give or send him pieces, anticipated the idolatry and their potential cult status.

For Lacan, desire masks the fear of achieving what one desires. For the collector of memorabilia, it is the idol itself. In Conz's case, it was the proximity and embodiment of creativity elevated to the status of saintliness. The central lesson of psychoanalysis is that we fear achieving our desire—in other words, what we truly desire is *the desire itself*.⁵²

To satisfy a desire means to lose it, which is a central mechanism of consumer culture: another new item acquired hooks us to the mechanism of upholding the desire, the enjoyment of not reaching the end because there is always something else. This factor, combined with the sense of repetition and the surplus level crucial to the oral and anal drives in psychoanalysis, might have been the ultimate logic behind Conz's years-long dedication to the amassing of objects.

***Noli me tangere?* The “autographic moment” revisited**

Whether worn shoes, stained cigarette butts bearing traces of lipstick and saliva or an underdress inscribed with words, Conz's fetish object is typically an item touched by the artist, carrying undeniable traces of their presence. These objects bear the marks of a life lived—sometimes together with the marks of the artist—and in that regard, they are akin to relics, imbued with the power of a deceased saint, whether genuine or projected—recall Conz's reference to artists as modern-day saints. This connection ties Conz's notion of the fetish to the concept of the relic.⁵³ According to Pearce, the Portuguese word *feiticos* (meaning “charm”) was not only used in the fifteenth century to describe contemporary Christian relics but also denoted that which is “made by man,” thus conveying the idea of “something ‘artful’ or ‘magically active.’”⁵⁴ Sven Lütticken, in turn, associates *feitico* with that which is “made by human hand.”⁵⁵ Conz's fetish appears to combine both of these dimensions.

Conz's encouragement of artists to send him signed artifacts points to a deliberate fabrication of fetish objects as *autographic* objects. As if traces of bodily substances were insufficient, a common object—be it a shoe, a bottle of wine or a piece of industrially fabricated attire—needed to be signed and thus transformed,

once more, into something specific to a particular person or event. For instance, Knowles's handkerchief inscription reads, "This is the handkerchief for tonight. Francesco," while an inscription on a related tie states, "This is the tie for tonight. Francesco. Alison Knowles Jan 25 88" (Figure 3.6). No guesswork is needed; the signature confirms the object's unique character and elevates it to the status of authorship, which cannot be mistaken for another's.

Here, again, the figure of the artist as modern saint emerges as the canonical persona of the artist-genius—one who creates unique artifacts.⁵⁶ The signature marks the moment when an ordinary object becomes unique and authorial, and when the artist fulfills their role as creator. By applying autographic marks with their own hands, the author draws attention to a crucial moment of determination, affirming to collectors or viewers that "this is what it is." A reminder of conventional art-making practices, the autographic mark completes the work and acts as a form of "authorization." The artist "affix[es] a seal of authenticity" to that artwork, in Jacques Derrida's words, making it a unique event—the "capitalization of an irreplaceable fetish in the age of the technical reproducibility to which it simultaneously bears witness."⁵⁷ Doubly transformed by touch and mark, these fetish objects become definitive rather than contingent and provisional.

Such transformation through touch or mark-making is not only permitted but encouraged. Touched or signed objects accrue value. They are presented for aesthetic—primarily visual—appreciation, rather than for practical use. For example, a visitor to the archive or to an exhibition is forbidden from wearing Moorman's dress or Higgins's shoes. In fact, they are not even allowed to *touch* them.

The realization of an artist's-hand-derived signature or inscription—rooted in the tactile act of creation of a fetish object—thus results in the withdrawal from touch and tangible inspection by the beholder once the object becomes a work of art, following the premise of *noli me tangere* ("touch me not," in biblical sources, or, in museum parlance, "do not touch"). In John 20:17, Jesus asks Mary Magdalene not to touch him—a motif popularized through centuries of Western painting and drawing. After the Resurrection, this act shifts the corporeal link between God and human beings to a mental one, to the act of faith. This parallels the replacement of tactile interaction by the visual appreciation of objects enclosed in museum vitrines—and the belief that this is, indeed, the unique thing that the observer must bring to their interaction with such objects. An artwork entering a collection undergoes an axiological shift: the realm of the artist's hand is left behind; the realm of touch becomes reserved solely for those considered stewards of heritage—curators, conservators, archivists and art handling professionals. Often, aside from the artist (and sometimes no longer even the artist), these are the only persons permitted to physically interact with the object once it enters a collection.

Touching is a privileged way of learning. Conservators pride themselves on their ability to touch and sense the materiality of the work—and, by extension, to develop a particular relationship with its maker. This involves a tacit, at times arcane, body of knowledge and expertise embodied in the gestures of mending, improving or simply maintaining the work. Second, marked by their exclusion

from the author's choices and creativity, the conservator affectively touches the object, and *fetishizes* it.⁵⁸ It is a second-level creation qua fetishization that alters an object by interrupting its material flow. This is not to say that, through conservation interventions, change is discontinued; rather, it is channeled. The conservator's touch turns the work/object into a "conservation object," and into a fetishized object with a quasi-perpetual function.

To be sure, touch leaves behind traces of who or what has done the touching. We touch and are touched in return. Whoever touches aspires for an afterlife—a provisional, temporary eternity, an immortalization in the face of the mortal self, for those who fall under its spell.

Conservation as desire: a Lacanian lens

If collecting things can be guided by the sustenance of desire, rather than its fulfillment, can the affective mechanism of preservation operate along a similar axis?

To recapitulate: in Freud's perspective, the focus is on the object as a substitute for loss, whereas in Lacan's, it centers on the prolongation and maintenance of desire—the sustenance of loss. Accordingly, I locate the desire of conservation in its focus on the "future," on what *may* be rather than what *is*, or on "eternity," on atemporal timelessness outside time altogether. As conservators, we preserve things to pass them on to the coming generations, aspiring for their indefinite extended life (even if the latter is only implicit). Here is where the true fetish of conservation lies: in the upholding of the concept of the future, of what is not yet—and yearning for it. We pursue objects not to satisfy desire once and for all, but to keep desire sustained. This can manifest in our projections for an artwork's extended afterlife (in the ontological model, where the event of the work's realization is followed by the timespan of its life *after*) or as its imagined future (where the work is seen as a process expanding and extending beyond the "now").⁵⁹

In conservation, following Lacanian lines, the fulfillment of desire—the arrival of future generations, future worlds and future conditions (of an artwork)—is an unachievable illusion and an allusion to conservation's attachment to a linear conception of time, as I have argued elsewhere.⁶⁰ Lacan situates the locus of anxiety in the proximity of desire's fulfillment, suggesting that the true motif of desire is that it should remain unfulfilled. Similarly, one might argue that while we conserve objects with an imagined future in mind, this desire is endlessly prolonged and extended, since the future constantly shifts within individual or social imaginaries and never really arrives (otherwise it would not be a future). Despite or even because of its remaining unfulfilled, this desire is one of conservation's primary *raisons d'être*.

Any over-approximation of the future in conservation, to put it another way, risks diminishing our longing for that future. Imagine a phantasmagoria of a museum passing before our eyes: perfectly pristine objects, devoid of biological life, encapsulated under translucent helmets of virtual vitrines. A state of terminal hyper-preservation in which the traditional function of conservation might even

become obsolete. This dystopian imaginary raises a critical question: Is conservation possible without a “future”? Is the capacity to imagine futurity a precondition for conservation itself?

If Lacan builds on Freudian anxiety of loss and transforms it into the anxiety of *lack*—to paraphrase, it is not that you want it because you can’t have it; rather, you want it *as long as you can’t have it*—the same might hold for conservation. Conservation’s “lack” becomes the very thing we desire so long as it remains unattainable. Recognizing this constitutive agency of desire is not a negative realization but an emancipatory one: the object of conservation structures the conservator’s desire. Conservation imagines a new world and seeks new incentives to reorient the excess of desire.

Through Francesco Conz, we have glimpsed a deep-seated drive to control, possess, preserve and eternalize—an impulse familiar to many contemporary collectors. Yet his obsessive accumulation of Fluxus artifacts reveals more than personal mania: it illustrates how objects, once imbued with personal and cultural meaning, are preserved not merely to safeguard their material form but to channel desire. More crucially, these objects point toward conservation itself—not as a neutral gesture, but as a practice complicit in, and perhaps even constitutive of, fetishization. Recently understood as an affective co-performance with objects—through ritualized, repetitive acts of care, or what Rebecca Schneider calls “the theater of preservation”⁶¹—conservation here emerges as a performative act that sustains and regenerates desire. In this sense, conservation is not merely shaped by desire; it actively produces the very desires it seeks to sustain.

Acknowledgments

The idea for this chapter emerged during the Fluxus Fetish event at Archivio Conz in Berlin (November 3, 2023). My sincerest thanks to Hubertus Ameluxen, Mariamargherita Maceli and Manana Potskhverashvili for their openness to our research and for co-organizing the event. I am indebted to Josephine Ellis, Marcus Gossolt, Elke Gruhn, Johannes M. Hedinger, Sally Kawamura, Émilie Parendeau and Aga Wielocha from the project *Activating Fluxus*, with whom I had the opportunity to think through the concept of fetish. Thanks to Francesca Bewer and the anonymous reviewers and friends who offered comments.

Notes

- 1 While the boxed bag of cigarette butts is not officially listed as a collection item, Hansen created two versions of *Venus*, a composition in which he employs cigarette butts to represent female forms. These works are listed in Archivio Conz’s online catalog. The bag might then have served as a leftover or a resource for these or future works, linking this category of fetish to Ferlinghetti’s utensils.
- 2 Francesco Conz and Henry Martin, “A Conversation with Francesco Conz by Henry Martin,” George Maciunas Foundation, <https://georgemaciunas.com/essays-2/a-conversation-with-francesco-conz-by-henry-martin/>. Originally published in *Lund Art Press* 2, no. 2 (1991), and re-edited for *Under the Influence of Fluxus* (Winnipeg: Plug in Editions, 1991).

- 3 Conz and Martin, "A Conversation," capitalization in the original.
- 4 Conz and Martin, "A Conversation."
- 5 Conz and Martin, "A Conversation," capitalization in the original, emphases mine.
- 6 Julia Kristeva, *Powers of Horror: An Essay on Abjection*, trans. Leon S. Roudiez (New York: Columbia University Press, 1982 [1980]).
- 7 She continues: "It is death infecting life. Abject. It is something rejected from which one does not part, from which one does not protect oneself as from an object. Imaginary uncanniness and real threat, it beckons to us and ends up engulfing us." Kristeva, *Powers of Horror*, 4.
- 8 Conz and Martin, "A Conversation."
- 9 Krzysztof Pomian, *Ursprung des Museums* (Berlin: Wagenbach, 1988). Many thinkers succumb to the collection of books, a well-known example being Peter Weibel's intricate ZKM library. In another instance, Hannah Arendt speaks about Walter Benjamin's bibliomania/bibliophilia as a form of collecting. Hannah Arendt, introduction to Walter Benjamin, *Illuminations: Essays and Reflections*, trans. Harry Zohn, ed. and intro. Hannah Arendt (New York: Schocken Books, 1968), 39, 42.
- 10 Belk here addresses the "I am what I own" mentality. Following Sartre and Fromm, he adds that possessive having involves a certain form of "acquisitive doing." Russell W. Belk, *Collecting in a Consumer Society* (Abingdon: Routledge, 1995), 140.
- 11 Susan Pearce, *Museums, Objects, and Collections: A Cultural Study* (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution, 1993), 110–37.
- 12 For a nuanced account of fetish collection vis-à-vis Western objects, see Sven Lütticken, "Fetishize This! Artifacts and Other Agents at the Edge of Art," in *Curatorial Things*, eds. Beatrice von Bismarck and Benjamin Meyer-Krahmer (London: Sternberg Press, 2019), 283–309.
- 13 On the concept of heterotopia, which attempts to contain time and accumulate everything as a general archive—all time, all ages, all forms, all tastes in one place—see Michel Foucault, "Different Spaces," in *Aesthetics, Method, and Epistemology*, ed. James D. Faubion (New York: New Press, 1998), 182.
- 14 David Lowenthal, "Conservation Past and Present," Sylvester Baxter Lecture, Harvard University Graduate School of Design, November 17, 2017, YouTube video, 1:30:57, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=a4u9HWNcpKQ>.
- 15 Lowenthal, "Conservation Past and Present"; Belk, *Collecting in a Consumer Society*.
- 16 Belk, *Collecting in a Consumer Society*.
- 17 Walter Benjamin, "Unpacking my Library: A Talk about Book Collecting," in *Illuminations*, 60.
- 18 Among the collectors who cultivated their collections as a form of protection against death and demise was Henry Huntington, who amassed books and had himself buried among his possessions in a tomb at the Huntington Library.
- 19 Lowenthal, "Conservation Past and Present."
- 20 Lowenthal, "Conservation Past and Present."
- 21 Fred Moten, *In the Break: The Aesthetics of the Black Radical Tradition* (Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press, 2003), 1.
- 22 The value ascribed to hoarded artifacts fluctuates, but for the hoarder, even the most modest artifact might be endowed with value. Oxford English Dictionary, "Hoarding," <https://www.oed.com/search/dictionary/?scope=Entries&q=hoarding>.
- 23 Jane Bennett, "Powers of the Hoard: Further Notes on Material Agency," in *Animal, Vegetable, Mineral: Ethics and Objects*, ed. Jeffrey Jerome Cohen (Galeata, CA: Punctum Books, 2012), 241.
- 24 Charlene Chu, "Psychological Ownership in Hoarding," in *Psychological Ownership and Consumer Behavior*, eds. J. Peck and S.B. Chu (Cham: Springer Nature, 2018), 138–39, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-77158-8_8. See also Patrick W. Moran, "An Obsession with Plenitude: The Aesthetics of Hoarding in Finnegan's Wake," *James Joyce Quarterly* 46, no. 2 (Winter 2009): 434.

- 25 Bennett, "Powers of the Hoard," 246.
- 26 Bennett, "Powers of the Hoard," 237–69.
- 27 Werner Muensterberger, *Collecting: An Unruly Passion—Psychological Perspectives* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993), 27–28.
- 28 Donald W. Winnicott, *Playing and Reality* (London and New York: Routledge, 1989), 1–25.
- 29 Muensterberger supports his views with his stories of obsessive collectors who sacrificed their families and fortunes for the sake of their collecting desires. Muensterberger, *Collecting*.
- 30 Jorge Otero-Pailos, "Preservation and MoMA's Proposed Expansion," *Artforum* 52, no. 8 (April 2014), <https://www.artforum.com/columns/preservation-and-momas-proposed-expansion-219727/>. Jorge Otero-Pailos and Hanna B. Hölling, "Materials, Objects, Transitions: Jorge Otero-Pailos in Conversation with Hanna Hölling," in *The Explicit Material: Inquiries on the Intersection of Curatorial and Conservation Cultures*, eds. Hanna B. Hölling, Francesca Bewer and Katharina Ammann (Leiden: Brill, 2019), 258–59.
- 31 Jorge Otero-Pailos and Danielle Choi, "The Not-Me Creation," *Harvard Design Magazine*, no. 44 (Fall–Winter 2017), <https://www.harvarddesignmagazine.org/articles/the-not-me-creation/>.
- 32 Rem Koolhaas, "Preservation Is Overtaking Us: With a Supplement by Jorge Otero-Pailos" (New York: GSAPP Books, 2014), <https://www.arch.columbia.edu/books/reader/6-preservation-is-overtaking-us>.
- 33 "For inside him there are spirits, or at least little genii, which have seen to it that for a collector—and I mean a real collector, a collector as he ought to be—ownership is the most intimate relationship that one can have to objects. Not that they come alive in him; it is he who lives in them." Benjamin, "Unpacking my Library," 67.
- 34 Patrick Moran likens the museum to Benjamin's depiction of the angel of history, facing the "the incessantly accumulating past—the pile of debris growing skyward," which represents the alienating excess of culture. Moran, "An Obsession with Plenitude," 435. See Walter Benjamin, "Theses on the Philosophy of History," in *Illuminations*, 253–64; Foucault, "Different Spaces," 182.
- 35 Salvador Muñoz Viñas, "The End of Conservation?" *Studies in Conservation* 70, no. 4 (2025): 267–79, <https://doi.org/10.1080/00393630.2024.2370726>.
- 36 For affective and sensory aspects of care, see the introduction to *Performance: The Ethics and the Politics of Conservation and Care*, Vol. II, eds. Hanna B. Hölling, Jules Pelta Feldman and Emilie Magnin (London and New York: Routledge, 2024), 4–5.
- 37 For critical discussions, see recent writings by Dan Hicks and Ariella Aïsha Azoulay, among others.
- 38 Otero-Pailos and Choi, "The Not-Me Creation."
- 39 Walter Benjamin, "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction," in *Illuminations*, 244.
- 40 On this topic, see E.A. Wallis Budge, *From Fetish to God in Ancient Egypt* (London: Routledge, 2014 [1934]). For general works on fetish, see Rosalind C. Morris, "Fetishism (Supposing That It Existed): A Preface to the Translation of Charles de Brosses's Transgression," in *The Returns of Fetishism: Charles de Brosses and the Afterlives of an Idea*, eds. Rosalind C. Morris and Daniel H. Leonard (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2017); James Lorand Matory, *The Fetish Revisited: Marx, Freud, and the Gods Black People Make* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2018); Alfonso Maurizio Iacono, *The History and Theory of Fetishism* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016); Louise J. Kaplan, *Cultures of Fetishism* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006). See also Shannon Lee Dawdy, "The Antique Fetish," in *Patina: A Profane Archaeology* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2016), 137–42.

- 41 Dan Hicks, *The Brutish Museums: The Benin Bronzes, Colonial Violence and Cultural Restitution* (London: Pluto Press, 2020); Max Haiven, "The Fetish Revisited: Marx, Freud and the Gods Black People Make by J. Lorand Matory," *Journal of Cultural Economy* 14, no. 6 (2021): 785–89.
- 42 Roger Sansi-Roca, "The Fetish in the Lusophone Atlantic," in *Cultures in the Lusophone Black Atlantic*, eds. Nancy Priscilla Naro, Roger Sansi-Roca and David H. Treece (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), 19–20. "Fetish" must be differentiated from "fetishism," as designating "the logic of the fetish," which can be traced back to the publication of *Du culte des dieux fétiches* (1760), by Charles de Brosses. See Morris "Fetishism (Supposing That It Existed)," vii.
- 43 Matory, *The Fetish Revisited*.
- 44 Karl Marx, *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy*, Vol. I (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 2015 [1867]).
- 45 Sigmund Freud, "Fetishism," in *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, ed. and trans. James Strachey (London: The Hogarth Press, 1927), 152–57; Laura Mulvey, *Fetishism and Curiosity* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1996), 5.
- 46 Freud, "Fetishism."
- 47 Octave Mannoni, "Je sais bien, mais quand-même. . .," *Clefs pour l'imaginaire ou l'autre scène* (Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1969). This is also the reason why Hartmut Böhme opens his essential book, *Fetishism and Culture* (2014), with an anecdote about a horseshoe fixed to a door, whose owner, when asked whether he is superstitious and believes that it brings good luck, responds, "certainly not," but that he trusts that it helps nonetheless. Hartmut Böhme, *Fetishism and Culture: A Different Theory of Modernity* (Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter, 2014), 1.
- 48 Conz and Martin, "A Conversation."
- 49 See Ken Friedman, "Flux Clippings," *Artists Books and Multiples* (blog), March 12, 2014, <https://artistsbooksandmultiples.blogspot.com/2015/03/ken-friedman-flux-clippings.html>.
- 50 This is an argument posited to assert that not all ethnographic artifacts share the violent histories of Europe's colonial past. See Nicholas Thomas, "The Museum Inside-out: Twenty Observations," in *Matters of Belonging: Ethnographic Museums in a Changing Europe*, eds. Wayne Modest, Nicholas Thomas, Doris Prlić and Claudia Augustat (Leiden: Sidestone Press, 2019), 33.
- 51 Adrian Johnston, "Jacques Lacan," in *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, Summer 2024 edition, eds. Edward N. Zalta and Uri Nodelman (April 2, 2013), <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2024/entries/lacan/>.
- 52 Johnston, "Jacques Lacan."
- 53 Relics, as venerated objects, are also closely linked with reliquaries—also present in Fluxus, as in Geoff Hendricks's *Flux Reliquary (Reliquaire flux(us))* (1973–76), a collection of seven Fluxus relics including objects as diverse as nails, shit, sweat and rope.
- 54 Pearce, *Museums, Objects, and Collections*, 128.
- 55 Lütticken, "Fetishize This!," 289, 292.
- 56 On this topic, see Nelson Goodman's analysis of autographic and allographic arts, discussed at length in Hanna B. Hölling, *Paik's Virtual Archive: Time, Change, and Materiality in Media Art* (Oakland: University of California Press, 2017), 49–50. See especially the section on the "autographic moment" (52–53) for an in-depth discussion of this topic.
- 57 Jacques Derrida, *Copy, Archive, Signature: A Conversation on Photography*, ed. Jeff Fort (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2010), 23.
- 58 For a similar view, in the context of a discussion of ruins, see Lucas Pohl, "Aura of Decay: Fetishising Ruins with Benjamin and Lacan," *Transactions: Institute of British Geographies* 47, no. 1 (March 2022): 153–66.

- 59 “Longtermism,” which identifies our moral obligation to influence the long-term future, might be also a variant. See Fin Moorhouse, “Longtermism: An Introduction,” *Effective Altruism*, January 27, 2021, <https://www.effectivealtruism.org/articles/longtermism>.
- 60 Hanna B. Hölling, “Time and Conservation,” *ICOM-CC 18th Triennial Conference Preprints, Copenhagen, 4–8 September 2017*, ed. Janet Bridgland (Paris: International Council of Museums, 2017), 1–7.
- 61 Rebecca Schneider and Hanna B. Hölling, “Not, Yet: When Our Art Is in Our Hands,” in *Performance: The Ethics and the Politics of Conservation and Care*, Vol. I, eds. Hanna B. Hölling, Jules Pelta Feldman and Emilie Magnin (London and New York: Routledge, 2023), 54.

Bibliography

- Arendt, Hannah. Introduction to Walter Benjamin’s *Illuminations*, translated by Harry Zohn, edited and with an introduction by Hannah Arendt, 1–55. New York: Schocken Books, 1968.
- Benjamin, Walter. “Theses on the Philosophy of History.” In *Illuminations*, translated by Harry Zohn, edited and with an introduction by Hannah Arendt, 253–64. New York: Schocken Books, 1968 [1940].
- Benjamin, Walter. “The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction.” In *Illuminations*, translated by Harry Zohn, edited and with an introduction by Hannah Arendt, 217–51. New York: Schocken Books, 1968 [1936].
- Benjamin, Walter. “Unpacking My Library: A Talk about Book Collecting.” In *Illuminations*, translated by Harry Zohn, edited and with an introduction by Hannah Arendt, 59–67. New York: Schocken Books, 1968 [1931].
- Bennett, Jane. “Powers of the Hoard: Further Notes on Material Agency.” In *Animal, Vegetable, Mineral: Ethics and Objects*, edited by Jeffrey Jerome Cohen, 237–69. Goleta, CA: Punctum Books, 2012.
- Böhme, Hartmut. *Fetishism and Culture: A Different Theory of Modernity*. Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter, 2014.
- Budge, E.A. Wallis. *From Fetish to God in Ancient Egypt*. London: Routledge, 2014 [1934].
- Chu, Charlene. “Psychological Ownership in Hoarding.” In *Psychological Ownership and Consumer Behaviour*, edited by J. Peck and S.B. Chu, 135–44. Cham: SpringerNature, 2018. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-77158-8_8.
- Conz, Francesco, and Henry Martin. “A Conversation with Francesco Conz by Henry Martin.” George Maciunas Foundation. <https://georgemaciunas.com/essays-2/a-conversation-with-francesco-conz-by-henry-martin/>.
- Corner, Philip, Hanna B. Hölling, Aga Wielocha and Josephine Ellis. “Philip Corner: On Creativity as Discovery—A Conversation with Hanna B. Hölling, Aga Wielocha and Josephine Ellis.” In *Activating Fluxus*, edited by Hanna B. Hölling, Aga Wielocha and Josephine Ellis, 291–301. London and New York: Routledge, 2026.
- de Brosses, Charles, Rosalind C. Morris and Daniel H. Leonard. *The Returns of Fetishism: Charles de Brosses and the Afterlives of an Idea*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2017.
- Derrida, Jacques. *Copy, Archive, Signature: A Conversation on Photography*. Edited by Jeff Fort. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2010.
- Foucault, Michel. “Different Spaces.” In *Aesthetics, Method, and Epistemology*, edited by James D. Faubion, 175–85. New York: New Press, 1998.
- Freud, Sigmund. “Fetishism.” In *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, edited and translated by James Strachey, 152–57. London: The Hogarth Press, 1927.

- Haiven, Max. "The Fetish Revisited: Marx, Freud and the Gods Black People Make by J. Lorand Matory." *Journal of Cultural Economy* 14, no. 6 (2021): 785–89.
- Hicks, Dan. *The Brutish Museums: The Benin Bronzes, Colonial Violence and Cultural Restitution*. London: Pluto Press, 2020.
- Hölling, Hanna B. "About Fish, or Towards Radical Affinity in Paik's Scores." *Activating Fluxus*, November 5, 2022. <https://activatingfluxus.com/2022/11/05/radical-affinity-on-fish-and-other-forms-of-being/>.
- Hölling, Hanna B. *Paik's Virtual Archive: Time, Change, and Materiality in Media Art*. Oakland: University of California Press, 2017.
- Hölling, Hanna B. "Time and Conservation." In *ICOM-CC 18th Triennial Conference Pre-prints, Copenhagen, 4–8 September 2017*, edited by Janet Bridgland, 1–7. Paris: International Council of Museums, 2017.
- Hölling, Hanna B., Jules Pelta Feldman and Emilie Magnin. "Introduction: Sustaining Care for Performance." In *Performance: The Ethics and the Politics of Conservation and Care*, Vol. I, edited by Hanna B. Hölling, Jules Pelta Feldman and Emilie Magnin, 1–24. London and New York: Routledge, 2023.
- Iacono, Alfonso Maurizio. *The History and Theory of Fetishism*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137541154>.
- Johnston, Adrian. "Jacques Lacan." In *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, Summer 2024 edition, edited by Edward N. Zalta and Uri Nodelman, April 2, 2013. <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2024/entries/lacan/>.
- Kaplan, Louise J. *Cultures of Fetishism*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.
- Koolhaas, Rem. "Preservation Is Overtaking Us. With a supplement by Jorge Otero-Pailos." New York: GSAPP Books, 2014. <https://www.arch.columbia.edu/books/reader/6-preservation-is-overtaking-us->.
- Kristeva, Julia. *Powers of Horror: An Essay on Abjection*. Translated by Kleon S. Roudiez. New York: Columbia University Press, 1982 [1980].
- Lee Dawdy, Shannon. *Patina: A Profane Archaeology*. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2016.
- Lowenthal, David. "Conservation Past and Present." Sylvester Baxter Lecture, Harvard University Graduate School of Design, November 17, 2017. YouTube video, 1:30:57. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=a4u9HWNcpKQ>.
- Lütticken, Sven. "Fetishize This! Artifacts and Other Agents at the Edge of Art." In *Curatorial Things*, edited by Beatrice von Bismarck and Benjamin Meyer-Krahmer, 283–309. London: Sternberg Press, 2019.
- Mannoni, Octave. *Clefs pour l'imaginaire ou l'autre scène*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1969.
- Marx, Karl. *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy*, Vol. I. Moscow: Progress Publishers, 2015 [1867].
- Matory, James Lorand. *The Fetish Revisited: Marx, Freud, and the Gods Black People Make*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2018.
- Moorhouse, Fin. "Longtermism: An Introduction." *Effective Altruism*, January 27, 2021. <https://www.effectivealtruism.org/articles/longtermism>.
- Moran, Patrick W. "An Obsession with Plenitude: The Aesthetics of Hoarding in *Finnegan's Wake*." *James Joyce Quarterly* 46, no. 2 (Winter 2009): 285–304.
- Morris, Rosalind C. "Fetishism (Supposing That It Existed): A Preface to the Translation of Charles de Brosses's Transgression." In *The Returns of Fetishism: Charles de Brosses and the Afterlives of an Idea*, edited by Rosalind C. Morris and Daniel H. Leonard, vii–xvi. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2017.
- Moten, Fred. *In the Break: The Aesthetics of the Black Radical Tradition*. Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press, 2003.
- Mulvey, Laura. *Fetishism and Curiosity*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1996.
- Muñoz Viñas, Salvador. "The End of Conservation?" *Studies in Conservation* 70, no. 4 (2025): 267–79. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00393630.2024.2370726>.

- Otero-Pailos, Jorge. "Preservation and MoMA's Proposed Expansion." *Artforum* 52, no. 8 (April 2014). <https://www.artforum.com/columns/preservation-and-momas-proposed-expansion-219727/>.
- Otero-Pailos, Jorge, and Danielle Choi. "The Not-Me Creation." *Harvard Design Magazine*, no. 44 (Fall–Winter 2017). <https://www.harvarddesignmagazine.org/articles/the-not-me-creation/>.
- Otero-Pailos, Jorge, and Hanna B. Hölling. "Materials, Objects, Transitions: Jorge Otero-Pailos in Conversation with Hanna Hölling." In *The Explicit Material: Inquiries on the Intersection of Curatorial and Conservation Cultures*, edited by Hanna B. Hölling, Francesca Bewer and Katharina Ammann, 255–72. Leiden: Brill, 2019.
- Pearce, Susan. *Museums, Objects, and Collections: A Cultural Study*. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution, 1993.
- Pohl, Lucas. "Aura of Decay: Fetishising Ruins with Benjamin and Lacan." *Transactions: Institute of British Geographies* 47, no. 1 (March 2022): 153–66.
- Pomian, Krzysztof. *Ursprung des Museums*. Berlin: Wagenbach, 1988.
- Sansi-Roca, Roger. "The Fetish in the Lusophone Atlantic." In *Cultures in the Lusophone Black Atlantic*, edited by Nancy Priscilla Naro, Roger Sansi-Roca and David H. Treece, 19–39. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.
- Schneider, Rebecca, and Hanna B. Hölling. "Not, Yet: When Our Art Is in Our Hands." In *Performance: The Ethics and the Politics of Conservation and Care*, Vol. I, ed. Hanna B. Hölling, Jules Pelta Feldman and Emilie Magnin, 50–69. London and New York: Routledge, 2023.
- Thomas, Nicholas. "The Museum Inside-out: Twenty Observations." In *Matters of Belonging: Ethnographic Museums in a Changing Europe*, edited by Wayne Modest, Nicholas Thomas, Doris Prlić and Claudia Augustat, 25–36. Leiden: Sidestone Press, 2019.
- Winnicott, Donald W. *Playing and Reality*. London and New York: Routledge, 1989.