“Why is anyone interested in distributing a thing as widely as possible?” asked Joseph Beuys in 1970. Although undoubtedly rhetorical and naive, the question points well beyond the realm of art and suggests that the socioeconomic conditions governing the distribution of consumer goods in postwar Western Europe were no longer clearly distinguishable from the processes that characterized the dissemination of artworks. Inherently connected to modernization and to its ensuing consequences in the field of everyday life, the multiple and its history form one of the most intricate subplots in modern and contemporary art—it defies singular historical frameworks, traverses geographic territories, and calls into play diverse cultural practices and artistic media. Neither a medium nor a form or practice that can be clearly and unequivocally defined, the multiple is both a product and a symptom of the technological and economic shifts that occurred “in the years after electricity but before electronics” in Western Europe.

This essay considers Edition MAT’s transformation of postwar artistic practices—the shift from creating originals to the production of editioned and transformable objects—and explores how multiples defied existing modes of selling and looking at artworks and attempted to fashion new consumers and spectators of contemporary art. An examination of the editioned and transformable object in the context of postwar consumer culture and technology reveals the formative role that Edition MAT played in the interdisciplinary expansion of postwar art. As a collective, discursive practice, it introduced a new synthesis of art, technology, and design as part of an emergent transnational network of cultural production and distribution.

Multiple Histories

The postwar history of editioned objects began with Daniel Spoerri’s exhibition of Edition MAT (multiplication d’art transformable) in November 1959 at Galerie Edouard Loeb, which presented a multigenerational roster featuring both veterans such as Marcel Duchamp and emerging artists such as Jean Tinguely and Zero group founder Heinz Mack. The works in Edition MAT were restless, transformable objects ranging from wall-mounted reliefs to freestanding boxes and books that either moved and vibrated on their own or were meant to be handled and interacted with by their viewers. Edition MAT expanded on the historical lineage of the multiplied and transformable works that spanned from Duchamp’s readymades and optical experiments, to Soviet Russian Productivism, to the industrial aesthetics of the Dessau Bauhaus, linking notions of transformability, multiplication, and participation as mutually interdependent.

After MAT’s inaugural presentation, Spoerri issued two subsequent editions of affordable and made-to-order objects in collaboration with Karl Gerstner, the Basel-based artist and designer, and the Galerie Der Spiegel of Cologne in 1964 and 1965. In the 1964 collection the transformability and mobility of animated works, a key feature of Edition MAT in 1959, was supplemented by objects and assemblages that incorporated found objects, as in the multiples of Arman, Niki de Saint Phalle, and Jacques Villeglé, who, along with Spoerri, were associated with Nouveau Réalisme, a collective initiated by the critic Pierre Restany in fall 1960 in Paris. The 1965 edition added yet another dimension to MAT’s already heterogeneous range by introducing works that utilized new materials and complex technological apparatuses, such as a boxed Rowlux image by Roy Lichtenstein, geometric abstract metal objects by François Morellet, a mirrored construction by Julio Le Parc, and electromechanical works by Davide Bonari and Gabriele De Vecchi.

By 1965, when Edition MAT’s third and final collection was published in Cologne, the multiple had become an umbrella category that encompassed a broad array of serialized images and objects. A floating signifier of the postwar avant-gardes, the multiple thrived throughout the 1960s both in Europe and the Americas and appeared within a diverse array of artistic movements and practices, including kinetic art, Pop, and Fluxus. A collaborative initiative among artists who belonged to various European collectives—Nouveau Réalisme, Zero, Groupe de Recherche d’Art Visuel (GRAV), and Gruppo T—Edition MAT featured a multigenerational and transnational network of artists whose nomadic trajectories, intermedia approaches, and performative, participatory works foregrounded practices of global contemporary art.

Fig. 1. Gabriele De Vecchi, Deformazione assonometria MAT (Axonometric deformation MAT), 1965.
Multiple Originals

The rise of the multiple reflects and exemplifies the deeply controversial nature of the relationship between art and design, the handmade original and the industrial technologies of mass production. By undoing the art and technè dichotomy, an important feature of the modernist separation of different fields of practice, the multiple reconnected technics and aesthetics and undermined the autonomy of the artwork and the artist as its author.

The multiples in Edition MAT were transformable commodities and multiplied works of art or, as Gerstner referred to them, “originals in series” or “series containing, as Gerstner stated, “an intrinsic set of multiple possibilities.”

Multiple productions of new work. Recycling both consumer goods and the avant-garde devices; others also incorporated and reordered existing everyday items by relying on the historical avant-garde strategy of the found object; and many of them attempted to animate their viewers by optical stimuli or by the solicitation of tactile interventions.

The earliest multiples included in Spoerri’s 1959 Edition MAT were primarily either constructed objects (Yaacov Agam, Gerstner, Mack, Man Ray, and Victor Vasarely) or multipart mechanical devices relying on more complex methods of fabrication (Bo Ek, Frank J. Malina, and Tinguely). The editions of MAT included newly fabricated works such as Dieter Roth’s hand-cut books, Davide Boriani’s container of electric power-driven iron dust, Man Ray’s spiral-painted aluminum object made from a discarded paper lampshade, and Pol Bury’s motorized sculpture, as well as objects that adopted commercial items and everyday materials, such as Paul Talaman’s movable painting Pong Pong balls (fig. 2): Enrico Baj’s figurative assemblage of rope, textile, and metal pins; and Niki de Saint Phalle’s shooting picture with its plaster-covered pigment.

The multiples in Edition MAT were transformable commodities and multiplied works of art or, as Gerstner referred to them, “originals in series” or “series containing, as Gerstner stated, “an intrinsic set of multiple possibilities.” By offering a novel understanding of originality without fully eradicating the notion of the original, Gerstner’s concept suggests that in Edition MAT the original was confined no longer to a singular object but its design. Since the work was variable, kinetic, or otherwise transformable, it was able to generate multiple and always different originals without structural stability or permanence, containing, as Gerstner stated, “an intrinsic set of multiple possibilities.” Whether transformable by motion or meant to be handled and thus transformed by the viewer, the multiple was open for permutation and change and thereby resisted the idea of the work as a self-contained and identical entity.

The re fabrication of the object, the material remake of the work, only further enhanced this inherent fluidity through the process of serialized material manifestations. “Originals in series” also relates to the multiple’s extended fabrication process, which guaranteed that the material features of the object can always be made anew. The serialized objects in Edition MAT thus reinvented the work of art outside the taxonomy of fine art and within the context of the new commodities and industrial aesthetic of the postwar economy.

Object World

A creative response to the mechanization of everyday life and, at the same time, a subordination, a surrender to technological society, Edition MAT eliminated the difference between artworks and mechanical toys or decorative things. Acting as engineers and technophiles and, at the same time, as bricoleurs and technophiles, the artists who participated in the three editions of MAT explored both high and low technology to address processes of industrial modernization and mass consumption. Some of Edition MAT’s multiples were fabricated objects that utilized typography, industrial design, and contemporary technological devices; others also incorporated and reordered existing everyday items by relying on the historical avant-garde strategy of the found object; and many of them attempted to animate their viewers by optical stimuli or by the solicitation of tactile interventions.

The earliest multiples included in Spoerri’s 1959 Edition MAT were primarily either constructed objects (Yaacov Agam, Gerstner, Mack, Man Ray, and Victor Vasarely) or multipart mechanical devices relying on more complex methods of fabrication (Bo Ek, Frank J. Malina, and Tinguely). The editions of MAT included newly fabricated works such as Dieter Roth’s hand-cut books, Davide Boriani’s container of electric power-driven iron dust, Man Ray’s spiral-painted aluminum object made from a discarded paper lampshade, and Pol Bury’s motorized sculpture, as well as objects that adopted commercial items and everyday materials, such as Paul Talaman’s movable painting Pong Pong balls (fig. 2): Enrico Baj’s figurative assemblage of rope, textile, and metal pins; and Niki de Saint Phalle’s shooting picture with its plaster-covered pigment.

The multiples in Edition MAT were transformable commodities and multiplied works of art or, as Gerstner referred to them, “originals in series” or “series containing, as Gerstner stated, “an intrinsic set of multiple possibilities.” By offering a novel understanding of originality without fully eradicating the notion of the original, Gerstner’s concept suggests that in Edition MAT the original was confined no longer to a singular object but its design. Since the work was variable, kinetic, or otherwise transformable, it was able to generate multiple and always different originals without structural stability or permanence, containing, as Gerstner stated, “an intrinsic set of multiple possibilities.” Whether transformable by motion or meant to be handled and thus transformed by the viewer, the multiple was open for permutation and change and thereby resisted the idea of the work as a self-contained and identical entity.

The re fabrication of the object, the material remake of the work, only further enhanced this inherent fluidity through the process of serialized material manifestations. “Originals in series” also relates to the multiple’s extended fabrication process, which guaranteed that the material features of the object can always be made anew. The serialized objects in Edition MAT thus reinvented the work of art outside the taxonomy of fine art and within the context of the new commodities and industrial aesthetic of the postwar economy.

Fig. 2. Paul Talaman, Objekt (Object) or Kugelbild (Ball image), 1964.
touch wood; some subjected viewers to optical vibration, mirrored reflections of rotating disks, and moiré effects; some simply called on people to observe the process of decay. By departing from the solitary contemplation that tradition-
ally characterizes the encounter between viewer and artwork, the participatory objects in MAT proposed a practice of corporeal and multisensory vision that opposed disembodied experiences of modern spectators. Like the assemblage, the multiple, according to the art historian William Seitz, was also a “reconquest” of “the realism that abstract art replaced.” The open-ended invitation to engage with the object—to touch the work of art or to cope with the retinal shock it provoked—countered the alienating effects of mechanized life and modern technology. The grid-shaped aluminum strips in Lichtrelief of 1959 (fig. 3)—a stela-like construction by Mack—and the layered wire-mesh grids in Morellet’s untitled multiple of 1965 both create light and shadow effects that disorder the clarity of their geometric structures, cloud the viewer’s vision, and play perceptual games on their beholders. Other works surprise their spectators with a clarity of mechanized movement: Tinguely’s Constante indéterminée (Indeterminate constant), a 1959 motorized sheet-metal sculpture, is set in motion with sudden shifts and sustained vibrations, while Bury’s wall-mounted and motorized perforated metal panel from 1959 features slow, oscillating movement. In addition to artworks that generate optical and perceptual effects or operate as mechanical and kinetic structures, all MAT editions included objects that solicited the viewer’s touch, thus contravening their technological aspects. Talman’s painted black-and-white Ping-Pong balls can be turned inside a gridded framework to form different configurations of geometric patterns, while Dieter Roth’s Book AA offers an even more engaged form of participation by inviting the viewer to rearrange the pages of his boxed set of black and white sheets of card stock that, via their hand-cut slots, can be recomposed in multiple variations.

By triggering unusual optical sensations and encouraging direct physical contact with the artworks whose outcome was not predictable, let alone quantifiable, the multiple antagonized those conditions that Jacques Ellul, writing in the early 1950s in France, articulated as an experience of disso-
ciation: “Today the human being is dissociated from the essence of life; instead of living time, he is split up and parcelled out by it.” By transforming the perception of the artwork into an unusual sensation or an indeterminate set of actions, the participatory object simultaneously sabotaged the cult of productivity and alleviated the estrangement of social relations brought about by the postwar modernization process that, paradoxically enough, made Edition MAT possible. The participatory object thus appeared as a redemptive device, a technically informed apparatus seeking to remedy the evils of mechanization and providing temporary relief from the discontents of civilization.

Multiple Mediums

The assemblages, kinetic apparatuses, interactive objects, and ludic devices of Edition MAT were joined by their collective refusal to engage with the image, the two-dimensional artifact meant solely to be looked at—be it a painting, a print, or a photograph. The multiple, the ultimate “open work,” as defined by Umberto Eco in 1962, not only transformed how artworks could be conceived, made, and remade but also shifted the role of artists, dealers, and fabricators as well as the distribution and presentation system of the artwork. These institutional changes were complemented by the capacity of the fabricated object to generate virtual or actual motion that also occasioned temporal and durational changes.

Edition MAT prompted encounters with works that proposed new spectatorial regimes of fine art—they mobilized and activated their viewers by soliciting them to become doers, collaborators, players. As Eco stated, the poetics of the “work in movement”—of participation and ludic engagement, the fundamental aspects of his understanding of the open work as well as, by inference, of the majority of objects in Edition MAT—sets in motion a whole new “cycle of relations.” It opens a new page in sociology and pedagogy, as well as a new chapter in the history of art. It poses new practical problems by organizing new communicative situations. In short, it installs a new relationship between the contempation and the utilization of a work of art. A systematic transformation of life and modern technology, materials and experiences, Edition MAT sought, as Gerstner suggested in 1955, “to make the observer an active participant in the work’s design, to make him more than merely contemplative.” By turning looking and contemplation into a collaborative and participatory act, MAT “echoed Duchamp’s oft-quoted statement—‘It is the onlookers who make the pictures.’” By incorporating the mechanized and the kinetic, the multiples aimed to overcome the regime of the image, which, as Fredric Jameson later argued, was “the ultimate form of commodity reification in contemporary con-
sumer society.” Making editioned and fabricated objects was an overt refusal of modernism and the most obviously institutionalized practice of Western art.

Market Conditions

The editioned and manufactured object’s resistance to the image and the institution of painting was closely connected to its challenge of the market and distribution system of contemporary art. Despite the multiple’s critically informed approach to the business of art, the first exhibition of Spoerri’s unorthodox enterprise at Galerie Edouard Loeb was a moderate commercial success. Edition MAT’s initial presentation took place during the exceptionally prosperous phase of the Paris art market, which was generated by what Raymonde Moulin famously called the decade of pictomanie, a triumph of abstract painting. Whether cold or hot—that is, geometric or lyrical—abstract painting did well in an art market euphoria; contemporary paintings became highly sought-after commodities, generating a climate that also favored other mediums, including the promo-
tion and sale of editioned and manufactured objects. As he wrote to Dieter Roth in the summer of 1959, Spoerri’s interest in introducing a new type of work and an unconventional sales structure to the art market was motivated by frustration: “The art business with its commercial ambitions bothers me, and I’m not the type to sit around in a gallery all month until someone finally buys something for two thousand marks.” And indeed he did many things, but sitting around in a gallery was certainly not one of them. He assembled the edition; published its catalog, which contained blatantly commercial removable order slips; and organized a series of traveling exhibitions after the first in Paris—in Milan; London; Newcastle, England; Stockholm; Krefeld, Germany; and Zurich—to market the multiple as a new type of work and to secure the finances for its continued production.

MAT not only aimed to transform artistic labor and production pro-
cesses, it also shifted the work’s market and distribution system and redefined the artist’s role as a manager or entrepreneur. By launching Edition MAT, Spoerri—who had already worked in dance, theater, concrete poetry, and in fine art, as well as in publishing as the editor of material (1956–60)—became an art manager, a curator, and a producer and promoter of art. A “wanderer between worlds” who was “at home everywhere and nowhere, both in term of place of residence and
artistic discipline," Spoerri, in his newfound role and agility at moving from place to place across Europe, as well as among different tasks and responsibilities, evokes the multifaceted and nomadic trajectory of Duchamp. His career also points to the postwar emergence of a managerial consciousness that combined art, business, and administration, as seen in the otherwise disparate activities of such figures as Restany and the Lithuanian–born American artist, graphic designer, and Fluxus founder George Maciunas.

Spoerri, however, was not entirely comfortable in the role of cultural promoter, producer, and art administrator, and after the last exhibition of the first Edition MAT, in 1963 at the Kunstgewerbemuseum in Zurich, he decided to suspend the project: “I’m going to stop working on Edition MAT for a while. I don’t want to turn into a traveling salesman.”21 His reluctance to continue to play the market and, at the same time, undermine it turned out to be a timely decision. The market boom of postwar Paris that had made it possible for Edition MAT in 1959 to reach a limited success was nearing its end by 1962, in the wake of the Wall Street crash known as the Kennedy Slide.

Made in Cologne

When in 1963 Karl Gerstner approached Spoerri and proposed a relaunch of MAT, it became clear that support for the edition and fabrication of multiples objects could not be found in France. By forming a strategic alliance with the Cologne gallerist Hein Stünke, the two artists could relieve themselves of the assiduous task of object production, and they transferred the collection’s promotion and administration to Stünke. As Spoerri’s letter to Sibylle Späthinger indicates — “this collection will become, like all others, very expensive and what I wanted will be lost”22 — he was clearly aware of the inevitability of market forces, as was Gerstner. The latter, through his work in advertising, design, and typography, was deeply familiar with the economic conditions that governed the production and circulation of both ideas and artifacts.

The involvement of Stünke and his Galerie Der Spiegel shifted the place of MAT’s production to Germany, a country that, despite the Wirtschaftswunder of Konrad Adenauer’s social market economy, struggled with a sluggish art market that had also been weakened by the ascendancy of US artists and dealers.23 While Stünke followed the operational method of the first edition and, instead of prefabricating the objects, manufactured them according to demand, the 1964 and 1965 MAT collections departed from Spoerri’s initial project in several regards. The unified prices of the first edition — which, at 20,000 old French francs, leveled the value of each object regardless of the status of its maker, material composition, and size — were replaced by individual prices that reflected the market value of each of the participating artists.24 Similar to MAT’s first collection, the 1964 and 1965 Cologne editions featured an international roster of artists and were shown at the Milan gallery of Arturo Schwarz, who, in addition to working on Duchamp’s replicas, had an already established professional nexus with Spoerri. Later editions were also presented in Frankfurt, Zurich, and Paris, as well as in New York, at the Museum of Modern Art Lending Service gallery.25 The rise of Pop art in New York following Sidney Janis’s New Realisms exhibition in December 1963, the introduction of French practitioners to the New York scene, and the overt acknowledgment of the artwork as a commodity — as reflected in the Bianchini Gallery’s exhibition The American Supermarket in fall 1964 (fig. 4) — propelled the global production of multiples, arguably also contributing to the new market and display strategies that characterized MAT’s later editions.26

Fig. 4

After the second Cologne edition, Spoerri and Gerstner abandoned the project, and Spoerri transferred MAT’s exclusive rights to Stünke for a mere 2,000 deutsche marks.27 The relatively large edition of the objects (one hundred) and the diversity of the participating artists and their works presented a challenge for collectors and made MAT’s marketing and sales a rather difficult enterprise. In spite of its troubled life, Edition MAT achieved some commercial success, its exhibitions generated considerable media attention, and as the primary project and model enterprise to produce and market editioned artworks and objects, it shaped the rise of the multiple, which, by the end of the decade, became a fashionable new phenomenon. As Jeanne Vilardebo wrote in 1968 in Connaissance des Arts, “during the past six months, the word ‘multiple’ has appeared on every page of this journal, on the invitations and posters of many exhibitions, as well as on the radio and on television — in brief, it multiplies.”28

On the Move

The multiplication of the multiple as a new artistic category in the second half of the 1960s was facilitated not only by the novel production and business strategies that Edition MAT introduced but also by the physical and geographic mobility of Spoerri and Gerstner’s project. The multiple’s journey from Edouard Loebs’s Paris gallery, where it appeared as a new form of art that challenged the conventional value system of the market, to German, Swiss, British, and US galleries and museums, where it became an object to be looked at and acquired, was a crucial instance of traveling art practices and theories.

Edition MAT’s nomadism was also a reflection of the project’s engagement with the notion of transformability. The multiple’s historical trajectory already demonstrated how fluid its practice was, but it seems that MAT itself was a manifestation of different forms and senses of transformation. The collection varied from edition to edition, incorporated a diverse roster of artists, and its exhibition venues changed from one city to another. MAT was a roaming enterprise marked by formal and conceptual mobility that also mirrored the in-between, transitional existence of its main protagonists.
The mobility of Edition MAT as a collaborative project is clearly mirrored in its movable and interactive objects. By inviting the audience to play and interact with the manufactured objects, the artists of MAT appeared to answer Henri Lefebvre’s question in the affirmative: “Could play be the starting point from which we could envisage the metamorphosis of the everyday?”

Restany’s reading of MAT “as a social phenomenon” recognized and to some extent also overstated the interactive multiple’s socially engaged nature and critical potential.

The practice of play promised to function as a device to resist the command of mechanization and counteract functionalism, and by turning the spectator into an emancipated homo ludens, it modeled ludic activity as creative education. Many of the multiples in Edition MAT were designed to enchant and educate their users and were geared toward disrupting the regulated and monotonous urban life famously described by Lefebvre as “the bureaucratic society of controlled consumption.”

Roith’s Stempelkasten (Rubber stamp box, 1968), for example, invited viewers to produce drawings with a preexisting set of rubber stamps supplied by the artist, thus proposing both a creative exercise and an amusement. I was telling Marianne (1965)—a board game without rules—by the French artist and Fluxus associate Robert Filliou—was an invitation to invent a game and fashion a social activity based on the imagination of its participants.

By joining creative impulses with forms of entertainment to resist the technocratic regimes of contemporary society, with its programmed choices and consumer preferences, the multiple offered its users a joyful release. The participatory objects provided a distraction from and an awareness of the everyday experience of economic, political, and social control without any measurable output, thus also disrupting the demands of efficiency and productivity in everyday life.

If play, as Lefebvre suggested, can indeed initiate an imaginable transformation of the everyday, then referring to the multiples as toys, ornaments, and relaxation, or delight. Saint Phalle’s Shoot-it-yourself-picture—a satirical take on the do-it-yourself culture of postwar consumerism and a commentary on the French military aggression in Algeria—is exemplary in its transgressive merger of collective fun and violence (fig. 5). Other works brought into play what Jesus Rafael Soto called the “œil moteur,” unstable optical effects that resulted from the experience of mobility. The visual noise and chromatic vibration triggered by the object transformed perception into a chaotic and perplexing experience, into a form of sensorial aggression. As Morellet stated when speaking about the assault on the eye produced by works such as his Random Distribution of 40,000 Squares Using the Odd and Even Numbers of a Telephone Directory (1960), a painting featuring a tightly woven grid of red and blue squares that decentered the pictorial and optical field and blind their spectator with their conspicuousness.

Some of them may have functioned as toys and gadgets, but MAT’s editioned and participatory objects did not always offer creative engagement, relaxation, or delight. Saint Phalle’s Shoot-it-yourself-picture—a satirical take on the do-it-yourself culture of postwar consumerism and a commentary on the French military aggression in Algeria—is exemplary in its transgressive merger of collective fun and violence (fig. 5). Other works brought into play what Jesus Rafael Soto called the “œil moteur,” unstable optical effects that resulted from the experience of mobility. The visual noise and chromatic vibration triggered by the object transformed perception into a chaotic and perplexing experience, into a form of sensorial aggression. As Morellet stated when speaking about the assault on the eye produced by works such as his Random Distribution of 40,000 Squares Using the Odd and Even Numbers of a Telephone Directory (1960), a painting featuring a tightly woven grid of red and blue squares that decentered the pictorial and optical field and blind their spectator with their conspicuousness.

Restany’s reading of MAT “as a social phenomenon” recognized and to some extent also overstated the interactive multiple’s socially engaged nature and critical potential.

The practice of play promised to function as a device to resist the command of mechanization and counteract functionalism, and by turning the spectator into an emancipated homo ludens, it modeled ludic activity as creative education. Many of the multiples in Edition MAT were designed to enchant and educate their users and were geared toward disrupting the regulated and monotonous urban life famously described by Lefebvre as “the bureaucratic society of controlled consumption.”

Roith’s Stempelkasten (Rubber stamp box, 1968), for example, invited viewers to produce drawings with a preexisting set of rubber stamps supplied by the artist, thus proposing both a creative exercise and an amusement. I was telling Marianne (1965)—a board game without rules—by the French artist and Fluxus associate Robert Filliou—was an invitation to invent a game and fashion a social activity based on the imagination of its participants.

By joining creative impulses with forms of entertainment to resist the technocratic regimes of contemporary society, with its programmed choices and consumer preferences, the multiple offered its users a joyful release. The participatory objects provided a distraction from and an awareness of the everyday experience of economic, political, and social control without any measurable output, thus also disrupting the demands of efficiency and productivity in everyday life.

If play, as Lefebvre suggested, can indeed initiate an imaginable transformation of the everyday, then referring to the multiples as toys, ornaments, and Max Kozloff wrote in 1965, “visuacondiments,” is not necessarily a judgment against them. In Spoerri’s and Roith’s correspondence, multiplied objects are often referred to as a Spielsachenserie, a series of playthings. Playthings, however, can be considered as toys or gadgets, as Denise René stated somewhat wistfully in 1959 when approached by Spoerri to exhibit MAT’s first edition in her Paris gallery.

Rene’s reluctance to support MAT suggests that gadgets were neither serious nor precious enough to be taken for works of art. In a similar vein, René Block, the Berlin publisher of Fluxus objects and of Beuys’s multiples, suggested that editioned objects “are more like decoration pieces cut out for the homo ludens in us, straddling the border of the gag item industry.”

Others, like the literary critic and journalist Heinrich Vormweg, took the multiples of Edition MAT “for ‘games for adults’—poetic, paradoxical, enjoyable games… whose artifice tickles and delights.” The German philosopher Eugen Fink—who introduced the term Spielsachenserie in his 1957 book about the ontology of play—considered play “a strange oasis, an enchanted rest-spot” that, by suspending the temporal sequence of everyday existence, “affords a type of temporal present” and “interrupts the continuity and purposive structure of our lives.”

Whether it was considered a vulgar commodity of consumer-oriented technology meant to distract or believed to be an emancipatory, creative tool, the multiple overcame generational divides and was intended for both children and adults. The serialized artworks of Edition MAT were duplicitous toys, and as such they differed not a bit from other commodities of postwar European mass society whose consumers were subjected to positions that were, as Rebecca Pulju has argued, “at once empowering and infantilizing.”

The ludic nature of the editioned object, combined with its relatively low price, guaranteed that the work could reach viewers, users, and consumers beyond the limits of the art world. This popular appeal and accessibility also warranted an understanding of the editioned and participatory object as an instrument of democratization. Akin to Restany, who praised Edition MAT for its alleged sociopolitical engagement, Frank Popper—a curator, writer, and vocal supporter of kinetic and participatory practices—also considered the multiplied, interactive object as a model of political participation and agency. Like Restany, Popper, and Eco, Genster understood the multiple as a political act and manifestation. As he stated in 1964 in his text on kinetic art and editioned objects for the Nouvelle Tendence exhibition in Paris, “Our art is everyday art, so much so that some of us would wish to qualify it as socialist. It is any rate, social.”

Some of them may have functioned as toys and gadgets, but MAT’s editioned and participatory objects did not always offer creative engagement, relaxation, or delight. Saint Phalle’s Shoot-it-yourself-picture—a satirical take on the do-it-yourself culture of postwar consumerism and a commentary on the French military aggression in Algeria—is exemplary in its transgressive merger of collective fun and violence (fig. 5). Other works brought into play what Jesus Rafael Soto called the “œil moteur,” unstable optical effects that resulted from the experience of mobility. The visual noise and chromatic vibration triggered by the object transformed perception into a chaotic and perplexing experience, into a form of sensorial aggression. As Morellet stated when speaking about the assault on the eye produced by works such as his Random Distribution of 40,000 Squares Using the Odd and Even Numbers of a Telephone Directory (1960), a painting featuring a tightly woven grid of red and blue squares that decentered the pictorial and optical field and blind their spectator with their conspicuousness.

Morellet’s statement resonates with the phrase “boucaux de la retine,” which Jean Clay introduced in a text on Vasarely to account for the violence of optical sensations present in his and his followers’ works.

Fig. 5. Edgar Nash, president of the Minneapolis Collectors Club, aiming at Niki de Saint Phalle’s Shoot-it-yourself-picture, Walker Art Center, Minneapolis, 1964. Photograph by Duane Brinkley, Minneapolis Star Tribune.
Private Gadgets

Playing, touching, and shooting are not activities well-suited for public spaces, especially for museums designed for "the somber pleasure of retrospection." No wonder that the objects of Edition MAT were often meant to exist in domestic places. Like Madame Arpel's mechanized suburban household in Jacques Tati's Mon oncle (1958), they needed to be displayed as the right thing for certain kinds of objects to be used and amused or consumed by.

As Gerster stated in a 1966 journal article he wrote about multiplicated images, "The work that is designed as a participatory object is intended for private ownership. As a public work of art displayed in a museum, it would have little value since it's next to impossible to manipulate a work in that context." By designing and producing objects that could not be fully utilized in public institutions and spaces, Edition MAT not only partook in what Cornelius Castoriadis called the "tremendous crisis of socialization" of postwar society but even furthered and enacted the experiences of privatization and the withdrawal to domesticity characteristic of this social crisis. Seen in this light, the ludic and participatory aspects of Edition MAT did not counteract but in fact facilitated the transformation of the objects from freely circulating market commodities and collectively produced artifacts into prized possessions and "private gadgets." A radical experiment and a heterogeneous constellation, Edition MAT was formed by those uncertainties that governed the encounters of objects, art, and technology in postwar Europe at the end of the first decade of the economic miracle. The MAT multiples, as Gerster wrote, formed "a collection with the greatest possible variety" that demonstrated "that the opposite of the opposite is also true." Edition MAT was a dialectical object that wanted to overcome different degrees of separation in the making, presentation, and sale of works of art in "an era both overlaid by the proliferation of things and singularly attentive to them." A critique of the existing regimes of consumption and, at the same time, an emulation of the illusorium of leisure and comfort, Edition MAT is a veritable demonstration tool and instructional device of the convergences between participation, consumption, amusement and emancipation, distraction and liberation that were brought into play by the events and processes of postwar modernization.
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