Conversation between Andrew Blackley and Howard Morse. Front Desk Apparatus, New York, NY: 28 October 2019.

ROB TEETERS: -- for coming. This is the first of what I hope to be a large handful of events we do like this. Forgive me, I'm sucking on a Felix. [laughter] This is -- the starting point for the series of exhibitions is a bit -- is a bit more complex than what I want to go into now, but it's really an honor for the first work of this one month one work series, to show this piece by Felix Gonzalez-Torres. This is a work that I've known, that Howard and Barbara have owned, for many years, and it's really an honor to have it in our space. So I've had many discussions with Howard about the work of Felix over the years, and I had to nudge him a little bit to participate in this talk. [laughter] But I'm really looking forward to hearing what he has to say, and certainly looking forward to hearing what Andrew Blackley has to add, as well. So I just want to read -- I just want to introduce both of them, and this is just sort of written material. Howard Morse is a New York-based collector and retired corporate attorney. Since 1988, he and his wife Barbara have collected contemporary art. The couple started buying from Colin de Land at American Fine Arts, which led to a significant collection of institutional critique, an artistic practice that critically responded to the institutions that bought an exhibit of artwork. In the early 1990s, they were introduced to the work of Felix Gonzalez-Torres by gallerist Andrea Rosen. They went on to acquire a number of examples by Gonzalez-Torres, which came to be an anchor of their collection. Andrew Blackley is a writer and editor that lives and works in New York. Andrew has held research positions at the Felix Gonzalez-Torres Foundation and Center for Curatorial Studies at Bard College. He currently works at Salon 94. So thank you, again, for coming. I'm going to turn this over to Andrew and let us get started.

ANDREW BLACKLEY: All right, thanks, Rob. Hello, Robert. [laughter] So I thought that since -- as Howard and I are kind of in -- are in conversation for the next period of time, we could start off a little bit differently, since this is kind of a smaller crowd. And what I wanted to do is to kind of,

at the beginning of this conversation rather than at the end, ask you, as the audience, about some kind of questions that we have, or that you might have about the work, or Gonzalez-Torres's practice, so that we kind of, A, might be able to, like, go through it, and kind of answer those questions; but, B, kind of set the tone of the conversation with one of inquiry, kind of open-endedness, what and who is kind of in the room with us right now; and kind of start there, and then we'll keep those in mind as we --

HOWARD MORSE: So you're flipping the paradigm.

ANDREW BLACKLEY: We're flipping it. [laughter] And thought to start that way. And no question too small or too large. I'm sure together we have the answers for small and large questions, and... Yeah. And also, I think maybe just also, in addition to questions, assumptions, or kind of just lines of inquiry, or thoughts. We'll talk about who Felix is, and what his work kind of represents, to your collection, and kind of generally, but also, you know, very simple questions, like "What does it mean that there's candies at the perimeter of this room?", right, and "What did it look like a week ago?", all that kind of stuff. Any first hands? Yeah, Bruce.

M: This is questions?

ANDREW BLACKLEY: Yeah, yeah.

M: What did it look like when you first saw it?

ANDREW BLACKLEY: Yeah.

M: And what was your first --

ANDREW BLACKLEY: And where did you first see it?

HOWARD MORSE: Yeah, yeah, that --

M: What was your first impression?

HOWARD MORSE: Yeah, that's a good... That's a terrific question. The first Felix show at Andrea Rosen's was a stack show, and that was in 1990, and we did get a stack. And the other one -- all the other work of Felix that we have, we got in '91. And, frankly, I don't recall... Of course, the stack, conceptually, is very closely tied to the candy work, because of its disseminability, its

endless multiple-ism, if you will. But I don't remember when I first saw a candy piece. I mean, my understanding is that this candy piece was the first piece during... The initial installs of candy pieces -- this I can say -- were corner pieces, and really used the two walls as supports of the work.

ANDREW BLACKLEY: And the floor for that matter, too, as a --

HOWARD MORSE: And the floor, absolutely. And so it had that triangularity, if you will, that Smithson-like corner. And my understanding, because I've had this discussion once with Andrea, and she didn't totally embrace it off the bat -- that this was the first candy piece that Felix, during his lifetime, displayed as an array on the floor. And the array also had a non-object-based aspect to it, because it was just flat on the floor. The corner piece was sort of defined by the corner, so it had object-lessness to it, as well, even though it had defined triangularity. Clearly the first time I saw a candy piece was in a corner, and whether it was at Andrea's, or whether it was in as images or installed elsewhere, I don't remember.

ANDREW BLACKLEY: And, you know, this -- you've had this work in your apartment, with Barbara, and when you've had it in your apartment you've installed it in the corner. I remember a very iconic image --

HOWARD MORSE: Yeah, of--

ANDREW BLACKLEY: -- and --

HOWARD MORSE: I mean, we've had it installed on and off, you know, for a number of years, and it was essentially a corner piece. Though at one time we installed it as an array.

ANDREW BLACKLEY: I see. And if I -- if memory serves me correctly -- and there may be -- Andrew may have other knowledge, but I believe the first time this work was shown was in Madrid at a show that Dan Cameron curated, and it was a... The title of the show was "Savage Garden," and it was -- or maybe "The Savage Garden" -- and it was in a corner, exactly as you mentioned --

HOWARD MORSE: Okay, and I... You know, and I don't have that --

ANDREW BLACKLEY: Yeah.

HOWARD MORSE: As a little piece of knowledge. I mean, the -- there is some other -- I guess there's an image of it as an array at the Renaissance Society --

ANDREW BLACKLEY: Exactly, yeah.

HOWARD MORSE: -- right? Okay. And there I think the windows were open, and there were curtains --

ANDREW BLACKLEY: That's right --

HOWARD MORSE: -- which dealt with the -- once again, a perimeter piece rather than an object within a space. It was installed on the perimeter of a space, like the beads are. And I do think the candy has that same object-lessness consideration, because it's... It's appended to the space, either in a -- it's appended to the perimeters of the space, either in a corner or on the floor.

ANDREW BLACKLEY: Howard, what were some of the other works that you were kind of collecting at the time that contextualized the artists in the collection you have with Barbara, right? Like, who else are the kind of peers that -- as you see them?

HOWARD MORSE: Well, very fortunately, we met and bonded early on, in the late '80s, with Colin de Land, and we were very loyal to Colin, because Colin was always struggling to survive and didn't have a lot of collectors, so to speak. And so we had a certain partiality to buying Colin's artists, and we became close with a number of the institutional critique artists, and it was really that grouping that initially formed the basis of our collecting, and... But, you know, we were out there. I mean, you could cover -- the neighborhood, at that time, I guess was SoHo, and Andrea Rosen was, what, on Prince Street --

ANDREW BLACKLEY: Prince Street.

HOWARD MORSE: -- 30 Prince Street or something. And Andrea introduced us to Felix. We had dinner together, and then we got to know Felix, and we visited him in Miami and elsewhere, and we started to buy. So we bought, in addition to the candy piece, a stack, a mirror piece, the light piece, a dolphin piece.

ANDREW BLACKLEY: [inaudible]?

HOWARD MORSE: Yeah, some puzzles. And that -- yeah, that -- the dolphin piece was an iron on a shirt.

ANDREW BLACKLEY: Yes --

HOWARD MORSE: We have an ironed-on shirt.

ANDREW BLACKLEY: Okay, yeah.

HOWARD MORSE: I should have worn it tonight.

ANDREW BLACKLEY: You should have. [laughter]

HOWARD MORSE: I thought about it.

ANDREW BLACKLEY: So just for those of you who are familiar with maybe the more popular or -- yeah, more popular kind of works of Gonzalez-Torres's, there are kind of a number of different types or kind of, say, classes or kind of groupings of work, some of which are called like manifestable works, and they are created anew at the point of exhibition; others -- and you just mentioned a number or kind of more static objects that take the kind of physical form that you kind of associate with most artworks, right? They're not made anew every time they're exhibited. So you -- I mean, with work in particular, "Untitled" (Revenge), you've seen it take multiple forms, and exist in multiple different contexts over the years.

HOWARD MORSE: Well, I think the... You know, that characteristic, particularly of, let's say, candies and stacks, given their disseminability, they change. And that's something that Felix embraced. I mean, he embraced the interaction between, whether it was the collector -- I suppose it was the collector or the curator involved -- and the work. So, but inherent, built into the work, given the ability to take a piece, the piece inherently changes, and... I think that was important to Felix. I mean, if you think of the clock piece, the clock piece doesn't change, but maybe simply the pairing that exists in so much other of Felix's work, whether it was two chairs or two mirrors or two clocks or two lightbulbs, you know... There was this coupling aspect, so -- which was very personal, which really was an element that was evoking the personal side, or the particular

content in the work was very personal to Felix's relationship with Ross, and as that was reflected in these twosomes. But by coupling works, inherently, certainly with respect to lightbulbs and clocks, one element was going to go out or stop before the other. So it was such an elegant way to express loss, if you will, with these two static objects. Without it being any more didactic than that, he was dealing with an issue that was both cultural and personal and inbred into this minimalist idiom that Felix had appropriated and used, giving it his personal and/or cultural content.

ANDREW BLACKLEY: One might also say if you put two identical, or seemingly identical things, next to one another you immediately introduce the idea of difference or change, right? And that is something that seems to be kind of common throughout much of his work, but also in the installations of his work, you know, that, you know, this manifestation has had a variety of installation formats, even in just this one exhibition, right? And also the most previous exhibition that you would have loaned this work to has kind of fundamental difference when compared to what you've agreed to do here. How... What is kind of, like, the wide range that you've seen this work take? You know, you've had it for almost 30 years.

HOWARD MORSE: Right. Right. Yeah, I -- the... Again, I think most... You know, it's been out on loan... I mean, the one thing about a piece like this when it goes out on a loan is that you don't deliver anything; they have to manufacture the components... We give them a candy manufacturer, [laughs] and a couple samples. And Andrea's always been, you know, quite flexible and embracing in terms of how candy is reproduced, how close to the... I mean, Rob did a great job, and he really tried to stick to my classicist idiom, if you will, [laughter] and it really looks like the candy piece. The... But, I mean, Nate -- Rob has had four iterations. The original iteration was an array, a rectilinear array, with two, if you will, beveled edges. And the reason why it had beveled edges, because it was reflective of the perimeters of the architecture, the space. So I think that that was really a savvy touch that they put to it, that beveled edge. The second one was really great because it came -- it was sort of the cornucopia of candy. [laughter] It

came flowing out of the fireplace. And on this piece, the so-called “idealized weight” is 325 pounds, which was the combined weight of Felix and Ross. So I don’t know whether or not Rob installed 325 pounds, you know. Oh, he did, so there’s verification for you. The third iteration was in a corner, but it wasn’t a corner that had... There are no good corners in this space, because there -- you have other architectural elements that intrude upon the purity they require. So it was a mound that was adjacent to the corner, but it was not -- but the walls were not supports. And I mentioned to Rob that that was the only -- that was the only iteration that I really technically -- disapproved of. [laughter] And that’s because it became an object, and I really felt that there is something about Felix’s work that is -- whether because of its mutability, its changeability, whether it’s because of the disseminability of the work, that’s non-object-based. I really think that part of Felix’s politics represented a certain pushback against the commercialism of the art world, although he worked within it.

ANDREW BLACKLEY: Well, something you said kind of reminded me that something we definitely should talk about, which is with these works that are manifested anew in new exhibitions, when you loan the works, you loan certain -- you task the exhibitor, you loan them the rights to make decisions, right? And... Yeah.

HOWARD MORSE: Well, it’s really Felix who had, so to speak, ordained that --

ANDREW BLACKLEY: Yes, of course, yes.

HOWARD MORSE: -- because just like so much of the work exhibits a coupling, I think that on some level he saw a coupling between the artist and the collector, because he was really getting -- I mean, if you will, rising to the level of a postproduction collaboration.

ANDREW BLACKLEY: Sure.

HOWARD MORSE: And, of course, he used the certificate -- I mean, others have done that; I’m not suggesting that Felix was the first one to use a certificate, but he used the certificate to provide that license. And I -- you know, I think that there was... I mean, it’s just an interesting coordination between the certificate and the work. It’s almost like the work is coupled --

ANDREW BLACKLEY: Exactly.

HOWARD MORSE: -- with the certificate. There's a certain dualism there that mirrors some of the physical aspects of the works.

ANDREW BLACKLEY: Well, there's an openness in kind of the language that accompanies the work, and, you know, with some artists and -- you know, certificates of authenticity are kind of a, you know, proof of purchase, right? And for other artists that they're an instruction sheet.

HOWARD MORSE: Exactly.

ANDREW BLACKLEY: And Felix's work is something a little more nimble and nuanced, and puts a lot of attention onto the owner as kind of a participant, and, when you loan things, same to the exhibitors.

HOWARD MORSE: Yeah. You could think of the traditional certificate of the work that gets refabricated or the like of the artist reaching out and looking to maintain control over the work, even once he or she has let it go. And Felix's certificates sort of function in a different way: they empower; they enable; they suggest a more nimble -- I think the term that you used -- role of the collector in terms of the display of the work. And, of course, the work has this total flexibility in terms of how it's displayed, given its fragmentation or however you want to describe the elements that comprise the whole. But one other thought -- I'm jumping a little bit because it came to mind, something I said before, how Felix, I think, was somewhat pushing back against the preciousness of the art object, representing the commercial side of the art world.

ANDREW BLACKLEY: Well, I know that my experience of the work is very kind of... It's beautiful, it's sensuous, and then that's when I see it as an artwork, but then at the end of the day, you know, it's kind of raw material, and it goes kind of back and forth. It's a little antagonistic against the ways in which we normally think of conservation, preservation, kind of maintaining or the materials with which its produced, and... Thinking anything along those lines?

HOWARD MORSE: No. That wasn't --

M: Is it something about that he manages to really critique the commodity status of the artwork, of the art market itself, what an object is, but he never fully abandons either?

HOWARD MORSE: Yeah.

M: He still plays within it somehow.

HOWARD MORSE: Well --

M: He redirects --

HOWARD MORSE: -- correct. I mean, he relies on the certificate to do that, but... Yeah, I know my point was to show how he was pushing back, if you will, against the art object. I use the term "preciousness," or the like, to indicate that.

F: I have a question.

HOWARD MORSE: -- you know, you could --

ANDREW BLACKLEY: Yes.

HOWARD MORSE: -- continue to pry, if you'd like. [laughter]

F: Why did he use candy? And what were the specifics about what you could use in candy?

HOWARD MORSE: Yeah. I really have no idea as to why he chose candy. Of course, there's something of an endless multiple facility inherent in the structure of candy, no different than it's inherent in the structure of a stack of papers. The... And I think he liked that concept, again, going to the notion of pushing back against the preciousness of the art object, is because these works could dematerialize. In other words, if you take all the sheets of paper, the work is gone. If you take all the candies, the work is gone. Now, two things I have to say about that. One, on the other hand, the certificate allows you to replenish, so it does go both ways. And I think there's a wonderful elegance to the fact that you can have a dematerialization of the art object, and that has significance, certainly, and it supports my notion of the pushback against the art object in terms of its prominence within the, you know, economic cycle within the art world. But at the same time he embraces it, and he permits it, because he uses the certificate, so... But it does, as Andrew said, it does a lot more than simply convey ownership, or memorialize ownership, which was the

traditional purpose. Here, he's delving into the partnership between him and the subsequent owner or owners. And there may be more elements, because the certificate took different iterations, and I know that Andrea Rosen, also had certain input into the nuances within the certificates. And our certificates are quite early on, so -- because they're -- the -- it was in the early part of... I mean, Felix died, I believe, in '96, and we bought the work in '90, '91, so a lot happened between that period.

ANDREW BLACKLEY: In addition... Oh, I'm sorry. Go ahead.

HOWARD MORSE: No, no, no, that's all. I think that -- I think the one notion I wanted to get across was the dematerialization, if you will, of the art object is inherent in these pieces, and I think that goes to the core of Felix's political pushback against the art object and the art world, which he then compromised back by providing the certificate. So he worked within and without the system.

ANDREW BLACKLEY: In addition to that, and to answer your question, I think, from my perspective, I think that because it is beautiful, and it tastes good, people are more likely to both kind of take it away and help it kind of dematerialize in the exhibition, versus, say, you know, Smithson rocks or dirt, you know what I mean? And so it is something kind of enticing and seductive that might invite -- especially when a notice is given that one's allowed to. Somebody wants to -- maybe would want to take one of these pieces of candy away. And so in order for it to kind of dematerialize out through audience participation, it needs to be kind of enticing, right, and a little, you know, succulent.

HOWARD MORSE: Yeah, I don't know whether the... I mean, there are elements of the body in all works of art, and there are elements of the body, I think in Felix's work, as, you know, as well. And I don't know whether the consumption aspect plays into that element of the work. We have a puzzle that -- it's called "Untitled" (Waldheim to the Pope), and it's the Pope giving Kurt Waldheim, a --

ANDREW BLACKLEY: Sacrament, I believe, or...

HOWARD MORSE: -- a bad guy, [laughs] communion. I'm not about to suggest that was on Felix's mind, that he was going to provide, you know, a sweet cube rather than a bland wafer or something like that, but there is this other piece, so...

ANDREW BLACKLEY: Well, there is something -- sorry -- there is something kind of common there, which is, like, taking a material and kind of making it something else by the way that it's used and the context that it exists in, right? So if we're taking kind of raw materials and making -- or, you know, Felix did, right?

HOWARD MORSE: Right.

ANDREW BLACKLEY: Felix kind of took these materials and made it art through his nomination and the context in which it participated. There are some parallels maybe, right?

HOWARD MORSE: Yeah.

M: The piece is called "Untitled" (Revenge), right? Like, in parentheses?

HOWARD MORSE: Yeah, yeah.

M: Yeah. So, I mean, revenge is sweet, right? So candy, and the sweetness. What are the other...? I mean, that's just one --

HOWARD MORSE: Well, that's good, because I hadn't thought of that. [laughter] I think, is someone gonna ask me, you know, about "revenge"? Because I don't know the derivation of the title, and I'm... I don't know, I pretty much always have ignored the title.

M: Well, I wondered what the other titles of the candy pieces are. Like, I wonder if they --

HOWARD MORSE: I don't know offhand. You would know.

M: -- if they were jokes. [laughs]

ANDREW BLACKLEY: Oh, well, I don't know them all, but they... Another -- I was thinking earlier today of a work that, in this conversation --

HOWARD MORSE: (Lover Boys)?

ANDREW BLACKLEY: Yes.

HOWARD MORSE: That was a candy piece.

ANDREW BLACKLEY: And “Untitled” (Placebo), “Untitled” (Public Opinion). They were -- some were named after streets. Some were named after... I think most of them --

ANDREW KACHEL: But all of the candy pieces have “Untitled” in quotation marks --

ANDREW BLACKLEY: Yeah.

ANDREW KACHEL: -- and are followed by --

HOWARD MORSE: And then with a paren--

ANDREW KACHEL: -- a parenthetical portion of the title --

HOWARD MORSE: Yeah, with a parenthetical.

ANDREW KACHEL: -- which, as Andrew knows and can talk about more, I’m sure, there’s a very specific conceptual significance to that punctuation, even --

ANDREW BLACKLEY: What I -- exactly. So what I was going to kind of bring up is that kind of a very, like, important notion of authorship and meaning making that’s relevant to Felix’s work and in the titles, right? So we... You know, Gonzalez-Torres was working in a theoretical and kind of concept-- intellectual camp that understood meaning to be kind of codeveloped among multiple parties, right? Not just, let’s say, authors or kind of primary sources. And that the readers and participants and the people that engage with works bring to it their own kind of experiences, thoughts, ideas, etc. And fundamentally that these works are, in fact, untitled, and have kind of a participatory, relational aspect to them, right? So what you may think of when you think of “revenge” surely is different than what I think of, even if there’s some overlap, right? And we can’t truly, like, estimate with exactitude, like, one thing that kind of this work means, but, in fact, it means many things. Which... Do you agree?

HOWARD MORSE: Yeah, yeah. No, I’m sure. I like the notion that sort of that revenge is sweet, [laughter] right. The... I don’t know, I’ve also thought for -- and I don’t think it’s a very good point, but the way that all the works are, as Andrew said, “Untitled”, and then a parenthetical, and in this case parenthetical (Revenge). So maybe it’s very simplistic just to think of two very distinct -- discordant, if you will -- elements to the title, as also being somehow reflective, if you

will, of the pairings that are -- that exist in so much of Felix's work. So, you know, it's just at least a passing thought. But I have no further insight into "revenge."

ANDREW KACHEL: There are also these other kind of interesting moments of tension between two parts of information. If you look at the caption for this work, which is also so interesting, that the candies are -- it's an endless supply of candies, right?

HOWARD MORSE: Right.

ANDREW KACHEL: But there is an ideal weight of --

HOWARD MORSE: Right.

ANDREW KACHEL: -- 325 pounds.

HOWARD MORSE: Correct.

ANDREW KACHEL: So the idea that there is a certain kind of amount, what even an ideal weight is, and how you might interpret that is really interesting, and then to hold that against this idea of being endless. But, you know, I also wanted to ask, Howard, that -- you know, you mentioned your interpretation of this ideal weight as being the combined bodies of Felix and Ross. It's also really interesting to note -- and I will maybe provoke you a little bit here, but -- or challenge you -- that Felix typically declined to offer very much information about the meaning of something like an ideal weight, and they varied across the candy pieces. Some of them are even quite similar, like "Untitled" (Lover Boys) has an ideal weight that's not the same as this piece, but it's sort of within a range, right?

HOWARD MORSE: Right.

ANDREW KACHEL: It's kind of comparable. But, you know, Felix also deployed biography in very specific, and also really limited ways. So I guess -- I wonder what your thoughts are on how the idea of biography functions in Felix's work.

HOWARD MORSE: Yeah, if it's a -- and maybe it's too... First, you know, the biography. I think Felix was -- he didn't -- I'm... From what I... [cellphone rings] [laughter]

M: Saved by the bell.

HOWARD MORSE: Uh... The biography, I think, is, you know, part and parcel of all of his work. I mean, he was... He didn't want to be pigeonholed as a gay artist; he wanted -- whatever that means. But clearly that issue, both personally to him and both more broadly culturally, was embedded and structured into the work. But, you know, very subtly, because you don't -- nothing is apparent. The beauty about Felix's work is that nothing is so clearly apparent, but once you start getting into it and you discuss the work, it's functioning on so many levels -- I don't think that he naturally was a minimalist artist. I mean, I think he sort of adopted, or appropriated, if you will, that particular genre in order to deal with his biographical issues, and to imbue works that may statically look very conventionally minimalist, but to imbue them with a range of content, which -- all had a biographical side or element to it, so...

ANDREW BLACKLEY: And by doing so kind of exposing the kind of -- the former generation of minimalist artists who kind of denied any sort of biographical content --

HOWARD MORSE: Correct.

ANDREW BLACKLEY: -- at least --

HOWARD MORSE: Correct.

ANDREW BLACKLEY: -- you know, what they really did was they kind of reinforced kind of a naturalized or kind of inherent, you know, straight, white, male, artist, macho, whatever. And, you know, Felix's work called them out on that, right?

HOWARD MORSE: But it -- and, of course, his work was so much -- was so, well, postmodernist, if you will, post-minimalist, I suppose, because it was drawing upon so much cultural content, and drawing upon so much of the personal. So that... You know, Michael Fried says, I suppose, his work was ultimately theatrical, because it really called for the... It called for the interaction with the viewer, and it embraced that. And it found its interpretation [and its content out there in the real world. It was not this self-reflexive, autonomous art object.

ANDREW BLACKLEY: That's why I asked for questions, right? To bring in the world into our conversation right now. [laughter] Do we have any others?

M: Was he diagnosed at the time?

HOWARD MORSE: Yeah, I --

M: Was it recent, or...?

HOWARD MORSE: Yeah. Yes. Absolutely.

M: Can you, on that note, talk a little bit about Andrea? She's been such a steward, an amazing part of his legacy. Can you talk about her in those days, how she dealt with Felix?

HOWARD MORSE: Well, they had a very close and special relationship, and I think there's an element of, you know, total respect, awe, semi-worship, if you will. I mean, she was... There was... It was a nice love affair that was going on between Andrea and Felix, yeah. There was never any suggestion or possibility of disloyalty from Felix's standpoint. I mean... I don't have any more specifics to add. I mean, she... There was once -- she celebrated a birthday, I think it was --

BARBARA MORSE: Of Felix's, yeah.

HOWARD MORSE: -- of Felix's. Was that when he was still alive, or...?

BARBARA MORSE: Yes, when he was alive.

HOWARD MORSE: Yeah, when he was still alive.

BARBARA MORSE: And when he got very sick, when he was in Miami, she went down to be with him. In fact, she was there when he died.

HOWARD MORSE: We were privileged to share some excellent Cuban food in Miami with Felix, which was also very special. Felix always talked about the moon over Miami. "You gotta come down, you gotta come down, see the moon over Miami." He sent us a postcard of the moon over Miami. He was very, you know, personal, and, of course, his relationship with Andrea was very close and personal.

F: I guess building on this idea of partnership and transubstantiation, is there any sense, when you have this work installed in your home, that you -- the stewardship of it requires something...? [laughs] So how much of this candy have you eaten, [laughter] and how do you think about that

in terms of taking care of the work, taking care of this representation, or not, of Felix and his lover?

HOWARD MORSE: Well, I think I have a very good answer of a circumstance which would sort of fill out that question without my getting -- without my trying to answer it literally. [laughter] Installed as a corner piece -- so you have three hundred... Our grandchildren would dive right into it. [laughter] And that was something that they would do all the time, and that was... That was totally embraced. It's wonderful, with --

M: Oh, shoot.

HOWARD MORSE: -- sorry about that -- with candy work, is that, you know, it's just candy.

M: So you don't have to make an insurance claim that --

HOWARD MORSE: Right. [laughter] Right.

M: Wow.

HOWARD MORSE: You could do a Donald Trump. You could throw it over [inaudible]. [laughter]

M: No, let's not --

HOWARD MORSE: This I can use [inaudible], but...

ROB TEETERS: Any other questions, or additions anybody has? [pause] Thank you both. Thank you both. This was a real treat and a pleasure, and I greatly appreciate you both being here and spending time with us. Thank you. [applause]

HOWARD MORSE: Cheers.