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Bruce Neuman’s exhibition at the Moma focused on making the spectator understand time, movement, space and language through a series of art pieces. The exhibition included paintings, architectural models, installations and video models, among other representations. The first piece that caught my attention once I entered the exposition, was a painting that had a dark background and a silhouette made of light movement, which resembled the body of a person sitting down. This got me thinking about the relationship between time and movement. Time: because of the duration of the light in the darkness; movement: due to the fact that the light was shifted in such a way that it could perfectly resemble a body sitting down. In this specific painting, I could sense the objective of the Bruce Neuman, that of using time, space, movement and language to create conflicting views or perspectives in people. I highlight “conflicting views” because my perception of this specific piece of art was different to that of the person that accompanied me to the museum. Therefore, with this idea that Bruce Neuman wants to challenge the human mind by sometimes presenting creations that diverged from spectator to spectator, I launched myself into the whole exhibition.

The exposition was filled with many pieces that left a lot to talk about. The initial introduction which suggested a combination of time, space, movement and language didn’t disappoint. After the initial piece of art, which I described above, the exhibition was divided into art pieces related directly to one of the themes of Bruce Neuman. Straight ahead, a big white box with cameras on each corner denoted the point of movement. This one really made me reflect on the artists goal of using movement to challenge the spectator. At the corner of the white box was a television in which you could see your projection as you walked around the square. At each corner of the four walls there was another T.V and another camera ready to film you. As I went around the four walls, I was barely able to catch a glimpse of myself at the turn of every corner. The rational expectation is to be able to see yourself if you are in front of the television, but this was not the case. Since the televisions reflected the filming of the camera in an opposite corner, challenging the spectator by forcing him or her to move. For me this was the artist best representation of movement and conflict.

If you continue walking, a small TV, old TV, also had a person in it, performing some uneven or “irrational” movements. To the right, a big structure filled the space. I didn’t know what this was, until understanding, as explained in the museum, that this were architectural models aiming to make the spectator imagine one thing yet perceive another. Although, this space segment of the exhibition was also impressive, it was the language piece of art that truly impacted and challenged me.

The last piece on the exhibition and that which I found most interesting was a room where you could hear different voices reciting the days of the week. There were many panels and whenever you got really close to one, you could hear perfectly clear the voice recorded on that panel, and when you moved on to the next it was another voice saying the same thing. Monday…Tuesday. However when I was standing in the middle of the room and all I could hear was a thousand voices talking over each other, I was left thinking about the particularity of the human voice and how we can understand some voices better than others, and why we sound the way we do.