

“We bought a virgin”

The Issue of the Artist in *No Ghost Just A Shell*

Rachel M. Wolff

Abstract

Pierre Huyghe and Philippe Parreno are both established artists with a significant amount of exhibitions and art criticism dedicated to their works. However, their collaborative work *No Ghost Just A Shell*, which began in 1999 and continued until 2002, has gone mostly unexamined. For this work, Huyghe and Parreno purchased an anime character from a Japanese manga firm. The character was then distributed to a handful of other artists who used it in a number of different projects across a variety of media, including film, literature, painting, and design. Huyghe and Parreno posit that, with their purchase of Annlee, they removed the character from the market, turning it into a blank slate—in their words, “We bought a virgin.” This paper argues that in doing what Huyghe and Parreno call “freeing” Annlee from those who would exploit the character, they actually do the opposite: ensure the artists’ control over the work.

Keywords

Pierre Huyghe, Philippe Parreno, *No Ghost Just A Shell*, Annlee

At the turn of the 21st century, French artists Pierre Huyghe and Philippe Parreno pursued a project entitled “*No Ghost Just A Shell*, un film d’imaginaire.” Throughout their years-long engagement with this project, which centered on a virtual character upon whom they bestowed the name Annlee, Huyghe and Parreno upheld the attitude that the aim of *No Ghost Just A Shell* was to set

Annlee free from the market. In the process, the artists insert Annlee into the myth of the creative genius who births the artistic work, personifying the character as female and charting the character's trajectory from child to adult. When Annlee reaches adulthood, the artists make a grand gesture of signing over the character's copyright, but this does not free Annlee; rather, it binds the character even more closely to its authors. This paper argues that in doing what Huyghe and Parreno call "freeing" Annlee from those who would exploit the character, they actually do the opposite: ensure the artists' control over the work.



Pierre Huyghe (in collaboration with Philippe Parreno), "No Ghost Just A Shell" (Annlee, original image, 1999). [Image source.](#)

Initiated in 1999, *No Ghost Just A Shell* began with Huyghe and Parreno purchasing the rights to a manga drawing from K-Works, a Japanese clearinghouse for animated characters. Characters such as these have a long-standing history in Japan as a central component of manga culture, and are normally bought for making cartoons or advertisements, as a plug-in platform for a narrative. The character Huyghe and Parreno chose from a mail-order catalogue was cheap, primarily because it would not fare well in any such narrative; it had very few skills, meaning it could not fight or survive in manga cartoons, some of which are quite violent.

The title of the project is a direct reference to Mamoru Oshii's 1995 Japanese anime film *Ghost in the Shell*, which was developed out of a manga series and has built a cult following in Japan and America. *Ghost in the Shell* tells the story of a young female Japanese cyborg named Major Motoko Kusanagi, who fights crime in very little clothing. For the majority of the film, Major is chasing after the Puppet Master, a powerful yet nearly untraceable figure who is able to infiltrate human minds, implanting in them fake memories, or "ghosts." The crux of *Ghost in the Shell* is the attempt to understand the difference between man and machine in a world in which most beings exist somewhere on a spectrum between the two, as some form of cyborg. While pursuing the Puppet Master, Major grapples with the fact that it is not human; it is a cyborg, but feels like a woman because it is treated like one.

As *No Ghost Just A Shell* develops, Huyghe and Parreno's character exists within a similar debate. After purchasing the character, Huyghe and Parreno named it "Annlee," slightly remodeled it, and then approached a group of artist friends and colleagues with the proposition of realizing independent works that all utilize Annlee. These artists, drawn from the worlds of conceptual art as well as fashion and architecture, developed greatly diverse projects in a variety of media, including films, books, posters, performances, and interviews.

The project functioned in this form primarily because of what Annlee is: a static image that was rendered into a computer model in order to be an open-source, freeware character at the use and disposal of a particular group of artists. Annlee is nothing, but the character can be made to seem to be anything—sad, happy, scared, curious, apathetic—and there is little continuity in personality across the artists' projects. Descriptions of Annlee that have been assigned to the character by various artists, historians, and critics include "a cybernetic ghost," "a walking, talking living doll," and "the perfect commodity fetish."¹ In this way, Annlee is endlessly filled in and then emptied, like a container, with no consistency of presence. The character truly is a shell without a ghost; Annlee has no memories, no "being" inside.

No Ghost Just A Shell was brought to an end when, in 2002, Parreno and Huyghe drew up a legal agreement that signed over all rights and copyright of Annlee to Annlee, which provides the character with rights in terms of its use as well as forbids reproduction of its likeness in any medium. The works were gathered together in a traveling exhibition, and after a brief international tour, the Van Abbemuseum in the Netherlands purchased the exhibition in its entirety. This copyright agreement, along with the sale of the exhibition, was marked by a dramatic funeral for Annlee, hosted at Miami Art Basel in December of that year, complete with an IKEA coffin and fireworks in the shape of the character's face. Not surprisingly, several different artists have hijacked Annlee since the character's "death." Most notable is Pedro Velez's work *Ann Lee Lives!*, a photograph of a young woman over which is scrawled in ink, "Philippe + Pierre, you can't kill ANN LEE! She is alive and well, in Puerto Rico. Go fuck yourselves!" This work was shown in an exhibition in Miami during Art Basel the year following Annlee's funeral.

No Ghost Just A Shell collides with ideas related to originality, copyright, and ownership. Throughout the project, Huyghe and Parreno are obviously aware that recognition of originality is embedded in artistic discourse, in that artists produce and the public encounters art with an expectation of and respect for that which is unique, authentic, and springs from original thought. This perspective is evidenced in thinkers whose ideas have become implicit within dialogue about art history, such as Immanuel Kant, who in his *Critique of Judgment* aligns aesthetic value with originality, arguing that creating something new is an act of genius and that genius cannot be taught, but must already reside within the individual. Nearly 200 years later, Roland Barthes pushes

against this idea in his essay on the death of the author, a text that has also been folded into artistic discourse. In the essay, Barthes challenges the importance of a singular author inextricably linked from the content of the work, arguing that instead the power of art resides in the viewer. But even with this new perspective, the recognition of the unique creative output of the artist does not fade, and artworks and artists are judged not just on production level or content but also on originality of thought and presentation. Every character needs an author, and the production of that character is an act of creative genius.

A defining moment within this discourse is a talk given by Marcel Duchamp in 1957 entitled "The Creative Act." Early in the talk, Duchamp spells out that "the artist may shout from all the rooftops that he is a genius: he will have to wait for the verdict of the spectator in order that his declarations take a social value and that, finally, posterity includes him in the primers of Artist History."² He talks of how, in creating art, the artist undergoes a "struggle toward the realization that is a series of efforts, pains, satisfaction, refusals, decisions, which also cannot and must not be fully self-conscious."³ This struggle results in "a difference between the intention and its realization," where the artist begins with an idea that requires nurturing over time in order to grow into something that exists outside of the artist and in the world. At the end of this talk, Duchamp states that the spectator, who "adds his contribution to the creative act" by "deciphering and interpreting its inner qualification," must refine what the artist produces.⁴ Overall, Duchamp is advocating for a concept of art that follows a cycle that matches that of life: the art object is produced by the artist through great struggle, the art object matures through support of the artist and intelligent viewers, and, upon reaching the point of being fully realized, the art object is freed to exist on its own in the world.

This argument about the relationship between originality and artistic genius brings about the question of value, which manifests in economic considerations. So here is the point at which the discourses of art history and economics cross. One can trace this overlap through the issue of copyright, a measure that seeks through various methods to protect original creative output by identifying the value of the output, most often in the form of financial security. Within the *No Ghost Just A Shell* anthology that includes documentation, essays, and interviews on the projects with the artists involved as well as the contributions of a number of scholars, art historians, and art critics, Jan Verwoert provides a historical summary of copyright. Invented at the end of the 18th century, Verwoert understands copyright as "a blending of the legal

discourse with the aesthetic discourse of originality” where “the concept of the author was consolidated in legal terms.”⁵ Indeed, he goes on to say that the “enthronement of the subject as genius was solidified in capitalist categories of property rights.”⁶ Copyright originated from situations in which publishers and printers’ guilds had firm control over all printed production, with no accountability to authors or to the public. Thus, laws were adopted that protect the intellectual property of authors up until a certain point, when the work then becomes fair use, following the belief that ideas belong to the public.

Though circumstances may have shifted, contemporary discussions of copyright draw on these beginnings, as laws are still primarily concerned with protecting people rather than ideas or things. Lawrence Lessig, a prominent author on copyright and a proponent of the notion that current copyright law simply does not keep up with technology, believes that “ideas released to the world are free” and that copyright law works in contradiction to this inherent fact.⁷ According to him, copyright seeks to define a concept of property that “can be owned and sold” where the “law protects against its theft.”⁸ In many cases, property is tangible, as in a house or car, but copyright deals with ideas, or intellectual property. Lessig asserts that the “copyright owner gets to hold out for any price he wants” where “markets reckon the supply and demand that partially determine the price she can get.”⁹ In this way, copyright law maintains the same assumption as art historical discourses: the creator is a genius, and the creator’s unique output warrants protection not of the output, but of the genius. The power of the artist lies in his ability to participate in the market through copyright, by ensuring that any and all recognition—financial or otherwise—goes directly and only to he who deserves it.

David Throsby, who is widely read and followed when it comes to issues of creative industries and intellectual property, expands upon this line of thinking. Developed throughout his writings and collected in *The Economics of Cultural Policy*, Throsby presents what he calls the concentric circles model, which “asserts that it is the cultural value, or cultural content, of the goods and services produced that gives the cultural industries their most distinguishing characteristic.”¹⁰ Within the concentric circles model, creative industries are dependent upon and benefit most from a world in which the “pure creative arts” (i.e. high or fine art) are regarded as the epicenter of all creative production.¹¹ For Throsby, artists who produce original creative output are at the center of the concentric circles model, and all other artistic activity radiates out from them. In other words, all creative production has its roots in

what would be called high or fine art, which originates with some creative genius.

On the surface, *No Ghost Just A Shell* pushes against this concept of the artistic genius. It challenges Throsby's concentric circles model, as the project's aesthetic origins are found in a Japanese manga clearinghouse, with a character that is bought and sold as any other (popular culture, not fine art) object would be. In sharing this character among a group of artists, Huyghe and Parreno seem to challenge the notion of singular artistic genius, attempting to make Annlee everyone's rather than just their own. Furthermore, they assert that the copyright rules that they develop are for the sake of Annlee as an entity separate from themselves. They are noble in their rhetoric, arguing that they are pursuing an understanding of intellectual property that protects an idea rather than an individual.

In explaining the legal agreements they had drawn up regarding Annlee's copyright, Huyghe states, "We wanted the character to be the owner of its own rights."¹² Parreno follows this up in saying, "We're trying to give rights to a thing, whereas copyright was invented to protect people's interests," inserting *No Ghost Just A Shell* as well as himself into a history of author's rights that "moves from the king to the printer to the publisher, then from the publisher to the authors, and today, from the authors to the character."¹³ The goal of this is, in Parreno's words, to "protect her [Annlee], through copyright law, to ensure that she can't be robbed of anything."¹⁴

In the official language of the legal agreement, "The acquisition of ANNLEE is in line with a poetic plan consisting of liberating a fictional character from the realms of representation."¹⁵ Indeed, in interviews Huyghe and Parreno continually and consistently assert that they are the liberators of Annlee, removing the character from the cultural sector "in order to enable her to continue to exist independently of the sector to which she belonged and to allow her story to be told."¹⁶ In reference to this, Huyghe states,

The contract provides a legal framework for this whole story. The acquisition of Annlee took place within a poetic project, which consisted in freeing a fictional character from the realm of representation. Logically, Philippe and I had to give up our rights. Now that Annlee's rights finally belong to her specifically, and won't just fall into public domain,

we have worked with the legal firm to create an association under the name Annlee. Ceding our rights to the Annlee Association is what seals her definitive liberation.¹⁷

All of this speech glosses over what Huyghe and Parreno actually accomplish, which is an assertion of their ownership. Earlier in the same interview in which they say that giving Annlee its own copyright is an act of liberation, Parreno states, “it’s the idea of the author that concerns us here. Can it be reduced to the work, to the position of its producer, to the benefits it generates? Or to the copyright, to the resistance it shows, the quotes it uses, the remixes?”¹⁸ According to Huyghe, the disappearance of the presence of the author encourages the circulation of cultural goods, and so Annlee is circulated through a group of artists, but he then states that “an author doesn’t boil down to a copyright.”¹⁹ So though Annlee may be in control of its own copyright, this doesn’t secure Annlee as an author. Huyghe and Parreno, despite what they say about freeing Annlee, still see the character as in need of authors, of liberators—roles for which they are happy to be recognized.

This perspective is supported by several instances within the project and surrounding discourse that frame Annlee as a child who is raised, and then, upon reaching a certain age, set free to make a way in the world. For example, French researcher and scientist Jean-Claude Ameisen discusses Annlee in reference to infants who must become a part of something in order to live, arguing that the development of a neonate is dependent upon networks of complex relationships.²⁰ In an interview with Annlee outside of the book, Joe Scanlan, the participating artist who crafted Annlee’s IKEA coffin, tells Annlee that the funeral is important because “even though you are a digital file, your existence should have physical consequences.”²¹ Notably, a review of the project in the journal *Tema Celeste* states that Huyghe and Parreno “adopted” the orphan Annlee.²²

But to return to an earlier quotation: Parreno did not say that he wished to protect Annlee; rather, he said he wished to “protect *her*, through copyright law, to ensure that *she* can’t be robbed of anything.”²³ The rhetoric of Annlee as a thing that is adopted, circulated within a group, and then released into the world on its own is reinforced by an additional set of rhetoric that Huyghe and Parreno employ—that of Annlee as female. From the very outset of the project, they establish Annlee as a female as well as a child, one who needs to be guided and controlled. Nowhere is this more apparent than in Huyghe and Parreno’s own words about the

project. In his interview with the artists, Stefan Kalmar poses the question, “How far do you think about ‘it’ as a gendered sign? Would you agree that Annlee is interchangeable, a kind of transsexual—or a shell, for projection?” To this, Huyghe replies, “It isn’t a ‘she,’ it’s an ‘it.’”²⁴ Yet, Huyghe consistently contradicts his own statement. In an interview in *ArtForum*, the artist tells Philip Nobel that Annlee is “almost like a tool,” that one “can use her.”²⁵ He goes on to say, “She’s just a virgin... We bought a virgin.”²⁶ Furthermore, in Huyghe’s own film with Annlee, the character speaks in the third person as a helpless “she,” saying, “Nobody planned that she would ever have to speak... Given no particular ability to survive, she would probably be dead by now.”²⁷ Housed in the *No Ghost Just A Shell* anthology, Kathryn Davis’ freeform essay “Annlee Darling” asks the question, “Who made you?” and then goes on to recount birthday presents given to Annlee, such as a My Little Pony, Felicity the American Girl doll, and jazz dance lessons. Davis states that these are gifts that help little girls grow up to “be whatever they choose.”²⁸ These gifts set up a type of exchange—the birthday presents demonstrate that Annlee is aging, and the giving of them is some sort of consolation for the artist using Annlee in any way desired.²⁹ These examples are just a few among the many in the artwork related to and writing produced about *No Ghost Just A Shell*, where references to Annlee as female are too numerous to recount, and go entirely unquestioned.

To talk about Annlee as a “she” humanizes and subsequently sexualizes what is a digital rendering that possesses none of the characteristics of human beings, much less sexual impulses. In the same way that Major in *Ghost in the Shell* feels like a woman only because the cyborg is treated as one, Annlee is an “it” that becomes a “she” only because it is treated and talked about as one.

Perhaps unaware of these layers, Ameisen points to exactly this in the interview he conducts with Parreno and Hans Ulrich Obrist about the project. Though the main topic of Ameisen’s interest is the interdependence of living organisms, he is unearthing Huyghe and Parreno’s completely un-self-examined personification of Annlee as female. In this interview, Ameisen states, “there’s something profoundly arbitrary about giving a character like Annlee the status of a metaphor for a living being,” going on to say, “We construct such characters in a way that has nothing to do with the way living beings are made...they lack a basic property possessed by living organisms: the ability to, on their own, either become part of an existing collective or to bring forth a new collective.”³⁰ Parreno seems to miss the challenge in this statement—implied in words

such as “arbitrary” and “construct”—replying, “if we can’t create another collective that Annlee can become part of, then *she* dies.”³¹

Thus, Annlee is entered into a market that is completely controlled by Huyghe and Parreno, who provide the character with what defines life: existence in a collective. Giving Annlee control of copyright is an empty gesture, as Parreno points out himself and Huyghe. So in saying that the copyright was meant to “protect her” by not allowing the image of Annlee to be used outside of *No Ghost Just A Shell*, what Huyghe and Parreno are effectively doing is ensuring that Annlee cannot have any existence beyond them—they are in complete control of “her.” No one will ever be allowed to use Annlee without their permission, because Annlee—without a doubt—is their creation, and thus their property. It was, after all, Huyghe and Parreno who gave “her” a name.

Ameisen—again, potentially unknowingly—walks Parreno into this idea when he says to the artist, “So the question is not whether or not Annlee is alive. Instead, what we should ask is this: How does her behaviour, or rather the relationships with her that human beings enter into, reflect...a certain number of the rules of the behaviour of living beings?”³² The essence of this question is that Annlee, personified as female, has been entered into relationships with artists and with society, and thus the way Annlee is treated within those relationships shows the artists and society something about how actual women are treated. Huyghe and Parreno never acknowledge this, but instead time and again take for granted that Annlee is female and that only they can free “her” through these artist projects. This assumption is in line with belief in the artistic genius: as explicated earlier, every character needs an author. And every little girl needs a father.

And every artwork needs a creator. According to Duchamp, the creative act follows the cycle of life: the art object is produced by the artist through great struggle, then the art object reaches its potential through support of the artist, and thus the art object can be set free into the world—the artist brings up an artwork within the world just as one would raise a child. Little girl Annlee, according to Huyghe and Parreno, belongs in this cycle as well. The artists produce Annlee, conceiving of it as a young girl, lead her through life experiences and stories, and then—upon her reaching a reasonable age—determine that Annlee can now be on her own.

It is useful here to consider the argument David Joselit makes in relation to the work of Marcel Duchamp: that recognition

of the female as different from the male is processed and ultimately overcome by entering the woman into exchanges that are linguistic, economic, and erotic. This is a form of mensuration, or an act of measuring the female within and against accepted understandings of language, money, and sex, where the entry of a woman into these relationships marks her entry into society. Thus it is in this exchange, or transaction, that a woman gains value within a recognizable system of signs that is widely perceived and understood.³³ Thus, a woman is completely defined by her relationship to patriarchal linguistic, economic, and erotic systems, and her value is determined by what men gain by exchanging her within these markets.³⁴ This concept is also prominent in the writing of Judith Butler, who defines the difference between male and female as that of “a user of signs [man] rather than a sign-object, an item of exchange [woman].”³⁵ In demonstrating his point, Joselit cites the arguments made by French philosopher Luce Irigaray about the value of women in exchange economies, summarizing Irigaray’s thoughts in the statement, “Women in their status as commodities enable relations between men to occur while they themselves disappear.”³⁶

This disappearance of the sign as related to the disappearance of woman as commodity in markets of exchange is what also engineers Annlee as a female thing at the disposal of (male) authors. This again is what Ameisen points to in his question about whether what is interesting about Annlee is how “the relationships with her that human beings enter into, reflect...a certain number of the rules of the behaviour of living beings?” Annlee is a sign as site at which exchanges between creative geniuses occur, and Huyghe and Parreno have personified that site as female. Interestingly, tucked into Joselit’s summary of Irigaray is the word “disappear.” In discussing the exhibitions of *No Ghost Just A Shell*, Huyghe and Parreno often (although not always) state that they purposefully avoid talking about the death of Annlee; rather, they say, “The shows are really the celebration of the disappearance of the sign.”³⁷ “Disappear”—this is what Huyghe and Parreno prefer to say happens to Annlee, rather than “die.” Though of course, as already established, Annlee “dies” without Huyghe and Parreno “creat[ing] another collective” in which she can live. Thus, Huyghe and Parreno treat Annlee not only as an object at their disposal, which they can fill up and make disappear, but also as a feminized subject, which they can enter into patriarchal relationships of exchange. Nowhere, though, is Annlee a subject with a sense of self or self-identification; Annlee remains a character, a digital file, a shell with no ghost.

As previously mentioned, upon the close of *No Ghost Just A Shell* in late 2002, the Van Abbemuseum bought the entire project. This was an unprecedented move, with the museum committing to purchase 28 works by 18 different artists for their collection while at the same time agreeing to enter into the contract laid out by the Annlee Association. Upon its purchase, a version of the exhibition was shown at the museum, and this was primarily coordinated by Huyghe and Parreno. Since then, the museum has joined as a participating member “Inside Installations: Preservation and Presentation of Installation Art,” a three-year research project beginning in 2004 on the care and administration of an art form that is challenging prevailing views of conservation, managed by the Netherlands Institute for Cultural Heritage and funded by the European Commission, Culture 2000 program. The project has selected over thirty complex installations as case studies to be re-installed and studied toward developing best practice in key museum administration fields. The project’s website contains a significant amount of documentation about the re-installation of *No Ghost Just A Shell*, a project taken on by the Van Abbemuseum in 2005.

At that time, Inside Installations re-envisioned the project as a series of installments led by Christiane Berndes, the curator of the Van Abbemuseum collection. In her notes, Berndes states that Huyghe and Parreno were “both very busy with other projects and seemed to have little time to engage in this.”³⁸ Though she says that Huyghe eventually showed enthusiasm for the re-installation, neither artist contributed significantly to the plans and the final presentation was carried out without their consent. Berndes notes that Huyghe and Parreno “have withdrawn, leaving the ‘maintenance’ (whatever that may mean) of the project to the museum” and that “this process and attitude fit seamlessly into the concept of the artwork.”³⁹ But while it seems that in some ways Huyghe and Parreno have left options open for the future of the exhibition, the legal contract is still under the purview of the corporation of which they are a part. Because of this, it remains unclear at this point how the contract will impact the Van Abbemuseum’s ownership of the project. Nonetheless, use of Annlee is still at the discretion of the artists, maintaining Huyghe and Parreno’s role as controller of Annlee.

In conceiving of Annlee as a small girl so thoughtfully raised to adulthood, then as a woman who can be granted rights by generous creators, Huyghe and Parreno continually reassert their own power and significance in *No Ghost Just A Shell*. In their treatment of Annlee as an object-to-become-woman in need of

liberation, they establish themselves as Annlee's originators, liberators, and fathers. They gave birth to Annlee, and they ultimately know what is best for "her." Despite the claims they make about protecting Annlee as an object, what they are really seeking to protect is Annlee as a demonstration of their own creative output, a manifestation of their artistic genius. In this way, their granting of copyright to Annlee while they maintain the Annlee Association and continue to hold the position of experts on the character does nothing to challenge the traditional notion of intellectual property protection—the idea is completely controlled, and any further use of the idea relies completely on the author. Annlee disappears, while the genius of Huyghe and Parreno never dies.

Rachel M. Wolff is a dual-Master's candidate at the School of the Art Institute of Chicago, pursuing degrees in Art History, Theory, & Criticism and Arts Administration & Policy. She has held curatorial and development positions at museums in Chicago and New York, and is the Editor in Chief of e-merge: journal of arts administration and policy.

Endnotes

¹ Jan Verwoert, "Copyright, Ghosts and Commodity Fetishism," in *No Ghost Just A Shell*, ed. Pierre Huyghe and Philippe Parreno (The Netherlands: Van Abbemuseum, 2003), 185.

² Marcel Duchamp. "The Creative Act," in *Marcel Duchamp*, ed. Robert Lebel (New York: Paragraphic Books, 1967): 77.

³ *Ibid.*, 77.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 78

⁵ Verwoert, 186.

⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷ Lawrence Lessig, *Free Culture: The Nature and Future of Creativity* (New York: Penguin Books, 2005), 84.

⁸ Lessig, 83.

⁹ *Ibid.*

¹⁰ David Throsby, *The Economics of Cultural Policy* (Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 2010): 26.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 27.

¹² Pierre Huyghe, Stefan Kalmar, Philippe Parreno, Beatrix Ruf, and Hans Ulrich Obrist, "Conversations," in *No Ghost Just A Shell*, ed. Pierre Huyghe and Philippe Parreno (The Netherlands: Van Abbemuseum, 2003), 24.

¹³ Ibid.

¹⁴ Jean-Claude Ameisen, Philippe Parreno, and Hans Ulrich Obrist, "To Be or Not To Be...Nothing More...Perchance To Dream," in *No Ghost Just A Shell*, ed. Pierre Huyghe and Philippe Parreno (The Netherlands: Van Abbemuseum, 2003), 274.

¹⁵ Luc Saucier, "Annlee Association Articles, Assignment of Rights Contract Governing the Author of Annlee," in *No Ghost Just A Shell*, ed. Pierre Huyghe and Philippe Parreno (The Netherlands: Van Abbemuseum, 2003), 303.

¹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷ Huyghe, Kalmar, Parreno, Ruf, and Ulrich Obrist, 28-9.

¹⁸ Ibid., 19.

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ Ameisen, Parreno, and Ulrich Obrist, 266.

²¹ Things That Fall, "Roll Back the Stone: Annlee Interviews Joe Scanlan," <http://www.thingsthatfall.com/annlee.php> (accessed December 2010).

²² Francesco Poli, "Philippe Parreno, Air de Paris, Paris," *Tema Celeste* 82 (October-December 2000): 90.

²³ Ameisen, Parreno, and Hans Ulrich Obrist, 274. Italics mine.

²⁴ Huyghe, Kalmar, Parreno, Ruf, and Ulrich Obrist, 16.

²⁵ Philip Nobel. "Sign of the Times," *ArtForum International* v. 41 no. 5 (January 2003): 106.

²⁶ Ibid.

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ Kathryn Davis, "Annlee Darling," in *No Ghost Just A Shell*, ed. Pierre Huyghe and Philippe Parreno (The Netherlands: Van Abbemuseum, 2003), 239.

²⁹ Davis' account of exchanging gifts is perhaps the most obvious moment to point out an additional layer of *No Ghost Just A Shell*: the exploitation of an arguably sexualized female child. The fetishization of young girls, particularly young Japanese girls, is a large topic, and therefore not included in this examination. This would be a thread for further research.

³⁰ Ameisen, Parreno, and Ulrich Obrist, 275.

³¹ Ibid., 276. Italics mine.

³² Ibid., 277.

³³ David Joselit, "Mensuration *En Abyeme*: Marcel Duchamp's Cubism," in *Infinite Regress* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press, 1998).

³⁴ An example of this can be seen in marriage: a financial agreement is made between father and husband which transfers a women from one to the other (economic), the agreement is secured by the husband taking the virginity of the woman and subsequently having use of her body at his will (erotic), and upon which point the

husband has the right to identify the woman as his property (linguistic).

³⁵ Judith Butler, "Prohibition, Psychoanalysis and the Heterosexual Matrix," in *The Visual Culture Reader*, ed. Nicholas Mirzoeff (London: Routledge, 2002), 148.

³⁶ Joselit, 57.

³⁷ Nobel, 109.

³⁸ Christiane Berndes, "Report case research," Inside Installations, http://www.inside-installations.org/artworks/detail.php?r_id=378&ct=research (accessed December 2010).

³⁹ Ibid.

Works Cited

Ameisen, Jean-Claude, Philippe Parreno, and Hans Ulrich Obrist. "To Be or Not To Be...Nothing More...Perchance To Dream." In *No Ghost Just A Shell*, edited by Pierre Huyghe and Philippe Parreno, 264-293. The Netherlands: Van Abbemuseum, 2003.

Amir, Fahim, Evan Egermann, Marion von Osten, and Peter Spillman. "What Shall We Do...?" *e-flux* 17 (June-August 2010): 1-14.

Berndes, Christiane. "Report case research." Inside Installations. http://www.inside-installations.org/artworks/detail.php?r_id=378&ct=research (accessed December 2010).

Butler, Judith. "Prohibition, Psychoanalysis and the Heterosexual Matrix." In *The Visual Culture Reader*, edited by Nicholas Mirzoeff, 147-151. London: Routledge, 2002.

Davis, Kathryn. "Annlee Darling." In *No Ghost Just A Shell*, edited by Pierre Huyghe and Philippe Parreno, 238-241. The Netherlands: Van Abbemuseum, 2003.

Duchamp, Marcel. "The Creative Act." In *Marcel Duchamp*, edited by Robert Lebel, 77-78. New York: Paragraphic Books, 1967.

-
- Huyghe, Pierre, Stefan Kalmar, Philippe Parreno, Beatrix Ruf, and Hans Ulrich Obrist. "Conversations." In *No Ghost Just A Shell*, edited by Pierre Huyghe and Philippe Parreno, 14-31. The Netherlands: Van Abbemuseum, 2003.
- Joselit, David. "Mensuration *En Abyme*: Marcel Duchamp's Cubism." In *Infinite Regress*, 9-70. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press, 1998.
- Lessig, Lawrence. *Free Culture: The Nature and Future of Creativity*. New York: Penguin Books, 2005.
- Nobel, Philip. "Sign of the Times." *ArtForum International* v. 41 no. 5 (January 2003): 104-109.
- Poli, Francesco. "Philippe Parreno, Air de Paris, Paris." *Tema Celeste* 82 (October-December 2000): 90.
- Saucier, Luc. "Annlee Association Articles, Assignment of Rights Contract Governing the Author of Annlee." In *No Ghost Just A Shell*, edited by Pierre Huyghe and Philippe Parreno, 302-314. The Netherlands: Van Abbemuseum, 2003.
- Stallman, Richard. "The GNU Manifesto." GNU Project. <http://www.gnu.org/gnu/manifesto.html> (accessed December 2010).
- Things That Fall. "Roll Back the Stone: Annlee Interviews Joe Scanlan." <http://www.thingsthatfall.com/annlee.php> (accessed December 2010).
- Throsby, David. *The Economics of Cultural Policy*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Verwoert, Jan. "Copyright, Ghosts and Commodity Fetishism." In *No Ghost Just A Shell*, edited by Pierre Huyghe and Philippe Parreno, 184-193. The Netherlands: Van Abbemuseum, 2003.