ONE DAY SCULPTURE

A NEW ZEALAND-WIDE SERIES OF TEMPORARY PUBLIC ARTWORKS

JANE RENDELL

(THE RE-ASSERTION OF TIME INTO) CRITICAL SPATIAL PRACTICE [i]

I'd like to thank Massey and Claire Doherty for their kind invitation to come and participate at this symposium, and thereby allowing me to make my first visit to New Zealand, and to Claire and David Cross for being such generous hosts to me over the last few days, and for introducing me to Wellington and to the *One-Day-Sculpture* programme.

The time-based curatorial premise of *One-Day-Sculpture* is one that I find very provocative. So much so that it has encouraged me to think again about some key spatial terms that I have been working with for several years now – in particular critical spatial practice and site-writing.

My initial training is in architectural design, a practice which is inherently spatial and concerns the building of places. This interest in spatial constructions has influenced the work that I have gone on to do, first as a feminist architectural historian, and more recently as an art critic and writer.

But over the past few days I have been asking myself what occurs when time comes to the fore rather than space.

My talk begins, however, by outlining my development of the concept of critical spatial practice, I will go on to explore this through the discussion of a number of key concepts and projects – in particular definitions of the terms site, place and space, Michel de Certeau's phrase 'space is a practiced place', and the use of terms site/non-site/off-site in contemporary curating. I will end by outlining the main tenets of my practice of site-writing as a way of starting to rethink these spatial terms temporally.

My first introduction to public art was in 1996 when I was invited to Chelsea College of Art and Design to teach on and the direct their MA in the Theory and Practice of Public Art and Design. I had very little idea of what expect from public art, but I very quickly became fascinated by what seemed to me to be a highly unstable form of practice, which insisted on locating itself 'a place between' fine art and architectural design.

* Two years later when I was invited to guest edit a special issue of *The Public Art Journal*, I had become interested in examining the overlapping concerns of those artists engaged in various forms of 'spatial practice' and the writings of cultural geographers interested in 'spatial theory'. My recent book *Art and Architecture: A Place Between* attempts to trace the multiple dynamics of my investigation into public art, through teaching and research, located at a cross-roads, a two way intersection, between art and architecture on the one hand, and theory and practice on the other.

* At its core, *Art and Architecture: A Place Between* is concerned with a specific kind of practice, one that is both critical and spatial, and that I call 'critical spatial practice' –work that intervenes into a site into order to critique that site. To encounter such modes of practice, I visit works produced by galleries that operate 'outside' their physical limits, commissioning agencies and independent curators who support and develop public art or 'site-specific' work and artists, architects and collaborative groups that produce critical and spatial projects from performance art to urban design.

This new term, 'critical spatial practice', aims to draw attention to the importance of the spatial and the critical. I am going to start by thinking about the critical.

While term 'theory' is often understood to refer to modes of enquiry in science through either induction, the inference of scientific laws or theories from observational evidence, or deduction, a process of reasoning from the general overarching theory to the particular, critical theory is a phrase that refers to the work of a group of theorists and philosophers called the Frankfurt School operating in the early twentieth century. The group includes Theodor Adorno, Jurgen Habermas, Max Horkheimer, Herbert Marcuse and Walter Benjamin; and their writings are connected by their interest in the ideas of the philosopher G. W. F. Hegel, the political economist Karl Marx, and the psychoanalyst Sigmund Freud. Critical theory could be characterized as a rethinking or development of Marxist ideas in relation to the shifts in society, culture and economy that took place in the early decades of the twentieth century. As Raymond Guess writes in *The Idea of Critical Theory*,[ii] critical theories are forms of knowledge which differ from theories in the natural sciences because they are 'reflective' rather than 'objectifying' – in other words they take into account their own procedures and methods.

Critical theories aim neither to prove a hypothesis nor prescribe a particular methodology or solution to a problem; instead, in a myriad of differing ways critical theorists offer self-reflective modes of thought that seek to change the world, or at least the world in which the inequalities of market capitalism, as well as patriarchal and colonial (or post-colonial) interests, continue to dominate. Although the term critical theory can be used as a technical term to describe a particular kind of philosophy emerging out of a specific moment of the Frankfurt School. I argue that it is also possible to extend the term 'critical theory' to include the work of later theorists – postcolonialist, feminists and others – whose thinking is self-critical and desirous of social change. For me, this kind of theoretical work provides a chance to reflect not only on existing conditions but also to imagine something different – to transform rather than describe.[iii]

In *Art and Architecture* I extend this definition of 'critical' taken from critical theory to include critical practice – those practices that involve self-reflection and social critique.

So if this explains what I mean by the term critical in 'critical spatial practice', what of the spatial?

In the mid to late 1990s a number of academic disciplines – geography, anthropology, cultural studies, history, art and architectural theory, to name but a few – were drawn into debates on 'the city'. Such discussions on the urban condition produced an interdisciplinary terrain of 'spatial theory' that has reformulated the ways in which space is understood and practised. Two figures are key: philosopher Henri Lefebvre and anthropologist Michel de Certeau.

For Lefebvre, spatial practices, along with representations of space and spaces of representation, form a trialectical model where space is produced through three inter-related modes.[iv] In Lefebvre's writing, spatial practices can be understood in terms of perception and representations of space in terms of conception. Lefebvre also makes a careful distinction between representations of space and spaces of representation; the first he sees as operations which involve a systematized set of abstract and dominant codes, the second as the spaces of resistance, where invention and imagination flourish.

In de Certeau's discussion of spatial practices, he uses the terms strategy and tactic. For de Certeau, strategies seek to create places that conform to abstract models; whereas tactics do not obey the laws of places.[v]

It is possible then to draw connections between de Certeau's strategies and Lefebvre's representations of space on the one hand, and de Certeau's tactics and Lefebvres' spaces of representation on the other, and suggest a distinction between those practices (strategies) that operate to maintain and reinforce existing social and spatial orders, and those practices (tactics) that seek to critique and question them. I favour such a distinction and call the latter – critical spatial practices – a phrase, which serves to describe both everyday activities and creative practices which seek to resist the dominant social order of global corporate capitalism.

My readings of the works of postmodern geographer, Edward Soja, in particular his concept of trialectical as opposed to dialectical thinking, borrowed from Lefebvre, suggested the conceptual framework for my book *Art and Architecture: A Place Between*.[vi] Soja's triad of space, time and social being provided the structure for the three sections, each one emphasizing a different aspect of 'a place between' art and architecture: specifically, the spatial, the temporal and the social.

The subtitle of Soja's *Postmodern Geographies* of 1989 is the 'reassertion of space in critical social theory', referring to, in the 1970s, one of the main projects for cultural geographers.[vii] A number of marxist geographers in that period took issue with the dialectical processes of historical materialism, where history was taken to be the active entity in shaping social production; and space was considered merely as the site in which social relations took place. Geographers such as Soja, David Harvey and Doreen Massey argued for the importance of space in producing social relationships and in so doing turned to the work of Lefebvre.[viii]

* At the start of *The Production of Space*, Lefebvre notes that one of the key problems with studies of space is that spatial practice is understood as the 'projection' of the social onto the spatial field. Lefebvre suggests instead that this relation is two-way, that space also has an impact on the social: 'Space and the political organization of space', he argues, 'express social relationships but also react back upon them.'[ix]

Soja describes this concept of Lefebvre's as the 'fundamental notion of the socio-spatial dialectic: that social and spatial relations are dialectically inter-reactive, interdependent; that social relations of production are both space forming and space contingent'.[x] It is not simply that space is socially produced, but that social relations are spatially produced.

The 'turn' to spatial theory in the late 1980s and early 1990s highlighted the importance of space rather than time in the postmodern period. Academics from all kinds of disciplines turned to geography for a rigorous and theoretically informed analysis of the relationship between spatial and social relations, and of place and identity.

Published in 1993, Michael Keith's and Steve Pile's edited collection of essays*, Place and the Politics of Identity,* marked a moment in the debate when identity and place became central to discussions of space.[xi] By interrogating the reciprocity of the relation between the politics of place and the place of politics, the introduction and many of the essays in the collection highlighted an interest in 'unfixing' place.

The editors argued: 'A different sense of place is being theorized, no longer passive, no longer fixed, no longer undialectical – because disruptive features interrupt any tendency to see once more open space as the passive receptacle for any social process that cares to fill it – but, still, in a very real sense about location and locatedness.'[xii]

* Like many of the authors in Keith and Piles's *Place and the Politics of Identity*, Massey put forward a view in favour of understanding place as 'unfixed, contested and multiple'. For Massey, although a place may comprise one articulation of the spatial or one particular moment in a network of social relations, each point of view is contingent on and subject to change.[xiii]

Harvey also highlighted how the specific qualities of individual places can have certain pitfalls within the context of the expansion of postmodern global capitalism: 'the less important the spatial barriers, the greater the sensitivity of capital to the variations of place within space, and the greater the incentive for places to be differentiated in ways attractive to capital.'[xiv]

As an intellectual tool, the 'unfixing' of place operates as a critique of writings that have emphasized the special qualities of particular places as if they are somehow pregiven and not open to change or connected to wider conditions. The focus on 'genius loci', in architecture in particular, has held tremendous appeal for designers, despite and perhaps because of its essentializing tendencies.[xv] Yi-Tu Tuan's notion of topophilia and Gaston Bachelard's concept of topoanalysis, have been invaluable in emphasizing a humane, imaginative and sensual understanding of place.[xvi] Harvey and Massey stress the importance of understanding the specifics of particular places but only as parts of larger networks, systems and processes, physically and ideologically. However, it is interesting

to note how the desire to 'unfix' one term, be it place or space, usually involves the 'fixing' of another.

This is particularly the case in the relation between space and place made by anthropologist de Certeau. In his highly influential text, *The Practice of Everyday Life*, he develops an understanding of space and place that is closely linked to linguistic practice.[xvii]Drawing on Ferdinand de Saussure's notions of langue and parole, in which langue is the complex of rules and conventions that constitute a language and parole the practice of speech, for de Certeau 'space is a practised place'.[xviii]

While de Certeau's understanding of space as being socially produced and experienced resonates with the work of cultural geographers, his arguments on 'place' seem to be more problematic, particularly in relation to the discussion of the 'unfixing of place' I have just outlined. In arguing for space as dynamic and constituted through practice, place somehow becomes fixed and passive in his writings, indeed at one point he compares place with a 'tomb'.

It is worth quoting de Certeau's distinction here at length:[xix]

> At the outset, I shall make a distinction between space (*espace*) and place (*lieu*) that delimits a field. … The law of the 'proper' rules in the place: the elements taken into consideration are *beside* one another, each situated in its own 'proper' and distinct location, a location it defines. A place is thus an instantaneous configuration of positions. It implies an indication of stability.
>
> A *space* exists when one takes into consideration vectors of direction, velocities, and time variables. Thus space is composed of intersections of mobile elements. It is in a sense actuated by the ensemble of movements deployed within it. Space occurs as the effect produced by the operations that orient it, situate it, temporalize it, and make it function in a polyvalent unity of conflictual programmes or contractual proximities. On this view, in relation to place, space is like the word when it is spoken, that is when it is caught in the ambiguity of an actualization … situated as the act of a present (or of a time).[xx]

De Certeau's understanding sets up a relation between two concepts: where one – 'place' – is fixed, and the other – 'space' – is mobile. If we think of site-specific art in relation to de Certeau's notion of 'space as a practised place', it is possible to argue that in 'practising' specific places certain artworks are capable of producing critical spaces.

I want to do this by discussing briefly two projects – one by Michael Landy, the other by Jeremy Deller – both commissioned by Artangel, an agency that selects, funds and helps artists produce mainly temporary work for unusual sites in the UK, specifically London.[xxi] From magazine inserts to short films for television, from an empty club house in London's West End to a suburban storage centre, the pattern of sites mapped by Artangel projects follows the choices of the artists with whom it has chosen to work.

* For 'Breakdown' (2001), in a vacant C&A store at the western end of London's busiest shopping thoroughfare, Oxford Street, artist Michael Landy decided to divest himself of all his possessions, from a sheepskin jacket inherited from his father to a drawing given as a gift by artist friend Tracey Emin: 7010 objects in 15 days.[xxii]

For a period of a month, a large conveyor belt was installed inside the store to form a circuit with people in blue overalls positioned inside it at various machines. All kinds of household items, each in a plastic bag and labelled with an inventory number, circulated on the belt. Those in overalls, including the artist, engaged in different operations – one, for example, removing the plugs from various appliances, another passing pieces of wood into a shredder. Behind them, pinned onto the wall, were lists of objects under categorized headings such as 'Electrical Equipment', 'Furniture' and 'Clothing'.
In the context of a shopping street like Oxford Street, any attempt to refuse to buy, let alone destroy, commodities makes a strong statement, yet despite what we know of the complex discriminations which exist between different kinds of objects, it is interesting to note that Landy chose not to distinguish between gifts, souvenirs, commodity consumables, originals, replicas – all were broken down.[xxiii] The refusal to distinguish between the objects, was also repeated in the lack of precision in the ways in which they were broken down. Some were taken apart physically, others were destroyed, but not all and not all to the same extent.

The day-to-day activities that take place on the production line, in the recycling plant and at the landfill site were referenced by 'performing' them and in so doing connections were made to a number of different sites linked to the lives of commodities. But what kind of relationship was Landy trying to establish between these sites? And how did he use performance to make his points? Irony, parody, mimicry – all these are modes of performance where the relationship between the 'copy' and the 'original' action differ – some copies replicate in order to critique, others exaggerate difference for comic effect.

The decisions Landy made about the performative qualities of the work seemed to be based on pragmatic rather than aesthetic concerns, and what he had to say about the lives of different kinds of objects and the ethical issues surrounding consumption is less than clear. Yet despite this, by acting out the various spatial practices of 'breaking down' objects on a site where the spatial practices of commodity accumulation normally predominate; it remains possible to argue that Landy's work provided a 'space' of critical engagement in the 'place' of commodity consumption.

By performing various spatial practices connected with the after-life of commodities, in Landy's 'Breakdown', to follow de Certeau, 'space occurs as the effect produced by the operations that orient it, situate it, temporalize it'.

This idea of space occurring as an effect of the operations that temporalize it is important to *One-Day-Sculpture*, and one I will return to. But for now, I want to look now at how another work commissioned by Art Angel also practiced place.

* On a cold grey day in June 2001, on a field somewhere outside Sheffield, a fight took place between the police and a gang of men in jeans and T-shirts. Surrounding them, yet held back by a rope, a crowd strained for a view. I stood in that crowd, trying to take a photograph, one that sought to crop out the man with a microphone, the heads of the crowd around me, the array of hotdog stands and ice cream vans and the film crew taking footage of the event for broadcast on Channel 4. At a certain point I realized that my endeavours to frame 'the work' were entirely misplaced, that I needed to document the event 'the way it really was'.[xxiv]

Jeremy Deller's *The Battle of Orgreave* (17 June 2001) commissioned by Art Angel was a restaging of one of the most violent confrontations of the miners' strike that took place on 18 June 1984 in the town of Orgreave outside Sheffield in the United Kingdom.[xxv] Orgreave marked a turning point in the strike and the first use of military strategies by the police for settling resistance. Deller's apparent concern was with an accurate restaging of the events as they had occurred. He involved a battle enactment society to restage the battle: some miners chose to play themselves and some sons played their fathers, though only one policeman played himself.

By appearing to fall in line with the principles of re-enactment and the society's dogged desire for so-called historical accuracy in replaying the battle scenes, Deller's approach revealed a certain irony in pointing to its own obsession with historical facts. The presence of cameras filming the battle for broadcast as a documentary film directed for television by Mike Figgis enhanced the role-playing aspect of the event, prioritizing a consideration of the 'facts' not as they had occurred in the past but as they were being constructed in the present.

In attempting to recreate a political struggle that took place at a specific moment, *The Battle of Orgreave* points to the importance of time in the practising of place as space, something present, as I have noted, in de Certeau's theoretical propositions but which remains relatively undeveloped in discussions of his work. By drawing on the importance of history in our understanding of certain sites, this work of Deller's shows how an act of remembering the past can reconfigure a particular place as a critical space in the present.

In so doing, it demonstrates the revolutionary impetus offered by a specific historical moment and the importance repetition can offer in recognizing this potential and keeping it alive.

I find it interesting then, given how in de Certeau's work the importance of time features in the construction of space, how a number of contemporary commentators are turning to place as the term valorised in contemporary spatial practice. I am thinking here of Cameron Cartiere's interest in place-specific work, the recent *Psycho Buildings*

blockbuster at the Hayward Gallery, London, where place took centre stage in accounts of the work, and the use of Miwon Kwon's term 'the wrong place'. I wonder why the emphasis is turning to place not space, and wonder whether this move is related to a need to displace another key concept in critical spatial practice – site. I would like to turn now and examine that term with reference to particular curatorial strategies.

* A recent interest in 'site-specific' art has developed an understanding of site beyond indicating the physical location of a work but instead in relation to performance and ethnography. Nick Kaye has made a strong argument, along the lines of de Certeau's 'space as a practiced place', for site as a performed place, while authors in Alex Coles's edited collection position site within an ethnographic perspective that includes the research processes of fieldwork as well as the artist as a contemporary ethnographer.[xxvi] These new understandings do not define sites simply in terms of geometry or morphology but in relation to the cultural and spatial practices that produce them, including the actions of those who investigate them. Indeed, self-critique, along with culture, context, alterity and interdisciplinarity, have been noted as aspects of anthropological research to impact on fine art practice.[xxvii]

In *One Place after Another,* Miwon Kwon notes that site-specificity has been 'embraced as an automatic signifier of "criticality"' in current art practice and goes on to argue that in fact there is a lack of criticality in much site-specific work and that while site-specific practice has a radical potential it is always open to co-option by institutional and market forces.[xxviii] The title of her book sounds a warning of 'undifferentiated serialization', one of the dangers associated with taking one site after another without examining the differences between them.[xxix]

Kwon points to Homi Bhabha's concept of 'relational specificity' as a way of emphasizing the importance of thinking about the particularity of the relationships between objects, people and spaces. Akin to James Clifford's notion of site as a mobile place, located between fixed points, Bhabha's concept suggests an understanding of site that is specific but also relational.[xxx]

These are relatively new ways of thinking about site, but it is possible to look at an earlier trajectory, coming out of Rosalyn' Krauss's notion of an expanded field in her seminal essay of 1979, as well as an even earlier indication of relational specificity in the dialectical work of artist Robert Smithson.

In 1965 to 1966 Smithson worked as a consultant artist for an architectural firm called TAMS on designs for Dallas Forth Worth Airport. The project alerted him to ways of working outside the gallery, to consider how works might be viewed from the air and to think about how to communicate aspects of exterior works to passengers in the terminal building. This latter aspect he termed the 'non-site'.[xxxi]Commenting on this project he states:

> I was sort of interested in the dialogue between the indoor and the outdoor … I developed a method or a dialectic that involved what I call site and non-site … so I decided that I would set limits in terms of this dialogue (it's a back and forth rhythm that moves between indoors and outdoors).[xxxii]

Through his interest in entropy, ready-mades and the monumental forms of industrial architecture, Smithson had been exploring specific sites since 1965.[xxxiii] His first non-site was made in relation to Pine Barrens, New Jersey, 'A Nonsite (an indoor earthwork)'.[xxxiv] Later retitled 'A Nonsite, Pine Barrens, New Jersey' (1969), this work consisted of bins filled with sand taken from the runways of a little-used wilderness airfield laid out in a hexagonal pattern in the gallery with a photostat map and a text that read: '31 subdivisions based on a hexagonal "airfield" in the Woodmansie Quadrangle – New Jersey (Topographic) map. Each subdivision of the *Nonsite* contains sand from the *site* shown on the map. Tours between the *Nonsite* and *site* are possible. The red dot on the map is the place where the sand was collected'.[xxxv]

The most comprehensive description of Smithson's concept of the dialectical relationship between site and non-site can be found in his 1972 essay on 'Spiral Jetty'. Here he lists the qualities of sites and non-sites.

According to Smithson, sites have 'open limits', 'outer coordinates', and include processes of subtraction or the removal of material, combining a physical place with 'indeterminate certainty'. Non-sites, on the other hand, have closed limits, inner coordinates and 'contained information'; they include processes of addition, combining abstraction or 'no place' with a 'determinate certainty'.[xxxvi] Although Smithson stresses the dialectical aspect of the site and non-site relation, by sometimes using the term 'non' with a hyphen and sometimes without, the implication is that site is assigned the more privileged position in the relationship.

* In the last decade in the UK, many contemporary galleries have adopted the term 'off-site' to describe the commissioning and curatorship of works situated outside the physical confines of the gallery where, in a strange reversal of Smithson's concept, the gallery is the 'site'.

'Off-site' works are commissioned within the gallery system but for locations outside the physical envelope of the gallery, sometimes, but not always, under a different team of curators from those who oversee the internal spaces of the gallery.

'Off-site' programmes can be initiated for pragmatic reasons, for example when gallery premises are being refurbished or repaired. They can also be included as part of an ambition to encourage socially engaged practice, since there is an expectation, not always made explicit, that off-site works should be, in general, more accessible to the general public and aligned with the needs of an educational programme.

Thus, the works, artists and curators connected with off-site programmes are often allocated a special role within the gallery system, one that on many occasions, while not openly or formally acknowledged as such, are not assigned the same status as those located inside the physical boundary of the gallery, even though the programmes can often be far more ambitious conceptually and critically.

There are plenty of off-site gallery programmes I could talk about, but today I will briefly mention a two-year programme of off-site projects, 'North London Link', commissioned through the Camden Art Centre to work with communities within Camden that started in

June 1999.[xxxvii] When artist Adam Chodzko was invited to make a piece of work as part of this off-site programme, he questioned the notion of an identifiable 'public' and the possibility of producing an 'accessible' work.

His intervention, *Better Scenery* (2000) consisted of two signs, one located in the Arizona Desert and the other * in the car park of a new shopping centre, the O2 Centre, in Camden.[xxxviii] The plain yellow lettering on the black face of each sign gives clear directions of how to get to the other sign. Both sets of directions end with the phrase: 'Situated here, in this place, is a sign which describes the location of this sign you have just finished reading.'[xxxix]

The signs relate the two sites dialectically, giving neither one preference. In pointing only to each other, their relationship is entirely self-referential; they make no attempt to relate to their immediate context. Neither sign can be described as marking a site or non-site; the two are entirely equivalent, each one bound up in the other. In speaking only about where they are not, Chodzko's signs critique the ethos of site-specificity and accessibility behind many off-site programmes.

If art is placed outside a gallery, why should it be closely related to a particular site, which site and in what way?

If art is placed outside a gallery, why should it be more accessible, how and to whom?

* An installation by Mexican artist, José Dávila, at Camden Arts Centre, marking the start of a major refurbishment of the gallery, further explored the boundaries between site, non-site and off-site.

On my visit to the work the gallery was empty except for a platform made by scaffolding poles and planks running along the edge of two walls next to the windows. Stepping up onto this platform, I walked through the window, from inside to outside, onto a scaffolding gangway two floors above the street.

Earlier, on looking up at the building from the street outside, it had appeared to me that construction works were underway and that this gangway was the site of the workmen's operations, off limits to the gallery visitor; but standing on the scaffolding platform, I was outside the building but still occupying gallery territory, located in both a site and a non-site, and simultaneously, according to more contemporary distinctions, between site and off-site, able to trace the boundary between them with my fingertips.

* Such work starts to question the often-binary distinctions between site and off-site work, and suggests a trajectory away from such divisions.

Claire Doherty's curatorial approach has been ground breaking in this respect. A number of temporary works commissioned by the Ikon Gallery for *As It Is*, an off-site exhibition launched in 2000 under Claire's curatorship, focused on the urban issues that arose for a city undergoing rapid urban regeneration, and started to question the distinction made between art located inside and outside the gallery.[xl] And more recently in commissioning works for the Bristol-based *Situations* programme, she has been questioning the very tenets of site-specificity itself, suggesting that works may point elsewhere, away from, rather towards, the locations in which they are positioned.

This links up with a term coined by Penny Florence of the Slade School of Fine Art, London, and myself, when we collaborated in curating an exhibition of practice-led PhD work by artists and architects in 2003, which we called 'Dislocating Specificity'.

It may be then that the term 'site' is exhausted, and that Kwon's harsh critique of site-specificity has sounded a need to either re-think the term, or to abandon it for place. I am interested in how currently site-specific theory and practice is drawing much more careful attention to the spatiality of the work, asking the question, made explicit in Cornford & Cross's piece *Where is the Work?* from 2004 (shown here) in which the artists removed the old grille from the heating vent set into the floor of the South London Gallery, and replaced it with a new one, pitting the location of the work as action against its position as object. The interest is in operating precisely around those sites *where* the work is not, and also perhaps those times, *when* the work is not? Such possibilities were present in the works of Kate Newby and Lara Almarcegui *for One-Day-Sculpture*.

* These other sites can be interior as well as exterior, drawing connections between the spatial politics of internal psychical figures and external cultural geographies.[xli] I am interested in how art criticism can itself engage with those changing sites and positions we occupy as critics materially, conceptually, emotionally and ideologically.[xlii]

Art historian and critic Claire Bishop has suggested that it is the 'degree of proximity between model subject and literal viewer', which may 'provide a criterion of aesthetic judgement for installation art'. [xliii] Although she does refer in passing to the processes of writing criticism in terms of the implications of not experiencing the work first-hand,[xliv] Bishop does not discuss the critic as a precise category of viewing subject. I suggest, however, that with his/her responsibility to 'interpret' and 'perform' the work for another audience, the critic occupies a discrete position as mediator between the artwork and Bishop's viewing and model subjects.

For my part, the kind of writing that emerges from acknowledging the *situatedness* of the critic plays a key role in determining the performance of the critic's interpretative role. Through the process of writing *about* critical spatial practice I came to realize that the changing sites I occupied in relation to art, architecture and theory – physical as well as ideological, private as well as public – did more than inform my critical attitude but rather produced it.[xlv] I concluded *Art and Architecture* by arguing that criticism is *itself* a form of critical spatial practice.

* My new book *Site-Writing: The Architecture of Art Criticism* picks up where *Art and Architecture* leaves off, shifting the focus from a place between art and architecture to the sites between critic and work. *Site-Writing* explores the position of the critic, not only in relation to art objects, architectural spaces and theoretical ideas, but also to the site of writing itself.[xlvi]

My suggestion is that this kind of criticism, in operating as mode of a practice in its own right, questions the terms of reference that relate the critic to the artwork positioned 'under' critique. This is an active writing that constructs as well as traces the sites between critic, artwork and reader.

I'll show two examples in passing: here is a piece of site-writing I made in response to * Elina Brotherus's triptych *Spring* called * *Les Mots et les Choses,* which juxtaposes Brotherus's anticipation of spring as a forward longing with presentations of three sites connected with the melancholy of nostalgia's backward gaze.

And here is another I made in response to * Nathan Coley's *Black Tent* called * *An Embellishment: Purdah*, which, like the artwork, operates as a screen protecting inner from outer, but relocates the protected space of the tabernacle as sanctuary in the gendered practice of purdah - the separation and screening of women from men.

I want to end now by turning back and rethinking some of the spatial terms I have described so far in terms of time, as *One-Day-Sculpture* has prompted me to do.

* In *Thinking Space*, a collection of essays from 2002 edited by two geographers Mike Crang and Nigel Thrift, the authors review the 'seminal' theorists whose 'spatial thinking' had influenced geographers.[xlvii] They identify a number of new themes in spatial thinking such as experience and travel, trace and deferral, mobility, practice and performance – themes that could be said also to describe the focus of much recent art theory and practice, marking a new intersection between art and geography around spatial practice.[xlviii] It is interesting to note here, as in the work of Kaye and Kwon, mentioned earlier, the valorization of the relational and the performative, two terms which cannot be theorized or practiced it would seem to me without reference to time.

These emerging critical thematics are all spatio-temporal configurations, what is being called the 'performative turn', is a re-acknowledgment of the time of space, place and site. This has huge implications for spatial practice in general, and specially for my term critical spatial practice.

The term critical spatial practice emphasises the spatial and the critical, as I described earlier, but it took practice for granted, however, since practice is a process, it is nothing if not time-based: to practice is a verb, verbs are words of action, they make or take place over time.

It is perhaps stating the obvious then that spatial must be thought of in relation to the temporal, but not necessarily time as history, the history which dominated historical materialism, and which led geographers to call for the reassertion of space, but other temporal modes: flow, flux, duration, ephemerality.

What are the temporal equivalents of space, place and site? Could they be time, moment and event?

Is it perhaps time to rethink Soja's call for the 'reassertion of space in social theory' as the 'reassertion of time in spatial practice'.

Now in the second section of *Art and Architecture* I did highlight the importance of the temporal dimension of critical spatial practice, specifically, the relation of past and present in allegorical, montage and dialectical constructions and in the time of viewing and experiencing art and architecture.

* I suggested that allegorical projects that focus on aspects of the ruin, disintegration and transience not only inspired feelings of melancholic contemplation in the viewer but also provided experiences for critical transformation through quiet but active thought.

* I examined the principle of montage through works where new insertions into sites produced juxtapositions displacing dominant meanings and interrupting particular contexts, in which the experience might initially include shock, but over time might engage with the more subtle ambiguities usually associated with allegory.

* And I looked at a number of artworks where through the insertion of new fragments into existing contexts, certain aspects of history lying buried in the present, were unearthed or reclaimed.

Within the context of *One-Day-Sculpture* it is possible to think of particular temporal approaches in individual pieces, such as disintegration in the work of Roman Ondak and the reclaiming of history in the projects of Liz Allen and Kah Bee Chow.

* But what perhaps needs fuller consideration not how individual works are time-based but rather how 'time-specificity' operates as a way of transforming spatial curating.

How does one curate across time rather than, or as well as, or as, space?

How does one commission works temporally rather than spatially – positioning one work next to another in terms of time-based locations?

What does it mean for an artist to choose a time rather than a site?

What happens if time takes priority over space? If time governs the conceptual operations of a work and the spatial concerns follow on as pragmatics.

How do the times of one year and of '24 hours' operate as a series of individual sites but also as a way of understanding the project as a totality?

A little like a view of the night sky in which each star occupies a discrete position in relation to the others, but also has a different time or life span; it is possible to consider the pattern of all the works commissioned as a constellation.

A constellation is perhaps both map and calendar – a spatial and temporal configuration. The distance between one work and another is not only a function of space but also of time.

* The different artworks, like stars, each have different durations, what we see of a work today is not simply a function of what is physically present, what exists in the here and now is also a suggestion of what is to come, and a trace of what has occurred. (This is an image of what is left of the Morison's work)

In trying to imagine *One-Day-Sculpture* as a constellation, the problem for me has been how to map the works temporally as well as spatially – how to present what occurred one week ago, along with today, as well as what will happen next month….

This time last week I was facing this possibility through the website of my computer screen, in south London, thousands of miles, as well as, many hours away. I made the phenomenological presumption that in coming to New Zealand the distance would diminish, it has spatially, not but temporally, although I am here, I am also not here: I am 180 degrees out of time, your day is my night, your autumn, my spring, producing a decentering experience, that remains even as the jetlag fades.

In his remarkable essay, 'The Unfinished Copernican Revolution', French psychoanalyst Jean Laplanche draws connections between astronomy and psychoanalysis, discussing the de-stabilizing affects of reversing the structures of relationships we take for granted socially, culturally and personally, from the macro-scale of the cosmos to the micro-scale of the psyche.

Laplanche argues that the revolutionary move made by Copernicus in 1543, which demonstrated that the earth revolved around the sun, rather than the reverse, can be paralleled to Sigmund Freud's discovery of an unconscious whose existence de-stabilized the central position of the ego in the formation of the subject.

In Laplanche's view Freud did not pay proper heed to the possibilities inherent in his discovery, and went astray: 'the wrong path was taken each time there was a return to a theory of self-centering'.[xlix] This notion of going astray, Laplanche relates to astrology, describing how the word for planet derives from the verb *planao*, 'to lead astray, to seduce':

> One cannot ignore the fact that the wandering stars, [*planets asteres*], derive their name from the verb [*planao*], which means 'to lead astray, to seduce', ….[l]

Laplanche's account of seduction emphasises the importance of inspiration, or the role of the other as muse.[li] In this investigation Laplanche inverts the traditional model of creative self-expression outlined in Freud's 'Creative Writers and Daydreaming' from 1908, arguing instead that the 'moment of address' should be inverted from its narcissistic aspect, where a public provide a beneficial *response* to the creator's self

expression, to its enigmatic aspect, where it is a public whose expectation *provokes* the creative work. He argues:

> … it is the public's expectation, itself enigmatic, which is therefore the provocation of the creative work … There would thus be an opening, in a double sense: … being opened up to and by the indeterminate public scattered in the future. [lii]

For me, to produce a piece of site-writing which fully responds to the situated time – the one-year/24-hour period of *One-Day-Sculpture* – would be precisely to write this inversion, to write the expectation that is scattered in the future, as well as the traces of this expectation's past … the flood line anticipating the sounding of Amy Howden-Chapman's bells, the cinema awaiting Javier Teller's lions, the way in which the 27 August 2008 longed for Maddie Leach's predicted storm.

---

[i] Much of the material in this presentation is taken from Jane Rendell*, Art and Architecture: A Place Between* (London: I. B. Tauris, 2006) and Jane Rendell*, Site-Writing: The Architecture of Art Criticism* (London: I. B. Tauris, forthcoming).
[ii] Raymond Geuss, *The Idea of Critical Theory: Habermas and the Frankfurt School* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981) p. 2.
[iii] For a detailed discussion of the various possibilities opened up by critical theory for thinking the relationship between theory and practice, see Jane Rendell, 'Between two: theory and practice', in Jonathan Hill (ed.) *Opposites Attract: Research by Design, Special Issue of Journal of Architecture* (Summer) vol. 8, no. 2 (2003) pp. 221–38.
[iv] See Henri Lefebvre, *The Production of Space*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1991.
[v] Michael de Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988, p. 29.
[vi] Edward Soja, *Thirdspace: Expanding the Geographical Imagination* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1996); and Edward Soja, *Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Social Theory* (London: Verso, 1989).
[vii] Edward Soja, *Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Social Theory* (London: Verso, 1989).
[viii] See David Harvey, *The Condition of Postmodernity* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1989); and Doreen Massey, *Space, Place and Gender* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1994).
[ix] Henri Lefebvre, *The Production of Space* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1991) p. 8. This quote from Henri Lefebvre emphasized by David Harvey is discussed in Soja, *Postmodern Geographies*, p. 81. See footnote 4.
[x] Lefebvre, *Production of Space*, p. 81.
[xi] Michael Keith and Steve Pile (eds) *Place and the Politics of Identity* (London: Routledge, 1993).
[xii] Keith and Pile, *Politics of Identity*, p. 5.
[xiii] Massey, *Space, Place and Gender*, pp. 4–5.
[xiv] Harvey, Condition of Postmodernity, p. 296.
[xv] See, for example, Christian Norberg-Schulz, *Genius Loci: Towards a Phenomenology of Architecture* (New York: Rizzoli, 1980).
[xvi] See Gaston Bachelard, *The Poetics of Space*, translated by Maria Jolas (Boston: Beacon Press, 1969); and Yi-Fu Tuan, *Topophilia: A Study of the Environmental Perception, Attitudes, and Values* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1974). See also Paul C. Adams, Steven Hoelscher and Karen E. Till (eds) *Textures of Place: Exploring Humanist Geographies* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2001) pp. xix.
[xvii] Michel de Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988). See Michel de Certeau, Luce Giard and Pierre Mayol, *The Practice of Everyday Life*, volume 2, *Living and Cooking*, translated by Timothy J. Tomasik (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1998).

[xviii] de Certeau, *Practice of Everyday Life*, p. 117.
[xix] de Certeau, *Practice of Everyday Life*, p. 118.
[xx] de Certeau, *Practice of Everyday Life*, p. 117.
[xxi] Artangel has been commissioning artworks since the early 1990s when the company was set up by James Lingwood and Michael Morris, both of whom had previously worked at the ICA (Institute of Contemporary Arts) in London. See van Noord, *Off Limits*; and www.artangel.org.uk (accessed 14 March 2006).
[xxii] Michael Landy, 'Breakdown' (2001), C&A Store at Marble Arch, 499–523 Oxford Street, London, W1. See Gerrie van Noord (ed.) *Off Limits, 40 Artangel Projects* (London: Artangel, 2002) pp. 162–7; and Michael Landy, *Breakdown* (London: Artangel, 2001).
[xxiii] See, for example, Dave Beech's review of Michael Landy, 'Breakdown', *Art Monthly*, March (2001) pp. 30–1.
[xxiv] Walter Benjamin, 'Theses on the philosophy of history' (completed in 1940 and translated by Harry Zohn), in Hannah Arendt (ed.) *Illuminations* (London: Fontan, 1992) p. 247. Walter Benjamin, who quotes the positivist historian Leopold von Ranke, argues that such an endeavour is impossible for a critical historian to achieve.

[xxv] See Gerrie van Noord (ed.) *Off Limits, 40 Artangel Projects* (London: Artangel, 2002) pp. 190–195 and Jeremy Deller, *The Battle of Orgreave* (London: Artangel, 2002). See also Dave Beech, review of Jeremy Deller, 'The Battle of Orgreave', *Art Monthly* (July–August 2001) pp. 38–39 and Rendell, *Art and Architecture*, pp. 61–63.
[xxvi] See Nick Kaye, *Site-Specific Art: Performance, Place and Documentation* (London: Routledge, 2000); Alex Coles, (ed.) *Site Specificity: The Ethnographic Turn* (London: Black Dog Publishing, 2000). See also Julie H. Reiss, *From Margin to Center: The Spaces of Installation Art* (Cambridge MA: MIT Press, 1999). Reiss argues that site-specificity is one of the key characteristics of installation art.
[xxvii] Hal Foster, *Design and Crime (and Other Diatribes)* (London: Verso, 2002) p. 91.
[xxviii] Miwon Kwon, *One Place After Another: Site Specific Art and Locational Identity* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2002) p. 1.
[xxix] Kwon, *One Place After Another*, p. 166.
[xxx] James Clifford, 'An ethnographer in the field', interview by Alex Coles, in Alex Coles (ed.) *Site Specificity: The Ethnographic Turn* (London: Black Dog Publishing, 2000) pp. 52–73.
[xxxi] Boettger, *Earthworks*, pp. 55–8. See Robert Smithson, 'Towards the development of an air terminal site' (1967), in Flam, *Robert Smithson*, p. 291.
[xxxii] '"Earth" (1969) symposium at White Museum, Cornell University, in Flam, *Robert Smithson*, p. 178.
[xxxiii] See Robert Smithson, 'Entropy and new monuments', in Flam. *Robert Smithson*, pp. 10–23; and Robert Smithson, 'A tour of the monuments of Passaic, New Jersey' (1967), in Flam, *Robert Smithson*, pp. 68–74.
[xxxiv] Discussions with Heizer, Oppenheim and Smithson/Liza Bear and Willoughby Sharp, in Flam, *Robert Smithson*, p. 244. This discussion was first published in *Avalanche Magazine* (Fall 1970) p. 3.
[xxxv] Boettger, *Earthworks*, p. 67.
[xxxvi] Smithson, 'The spiral jetty' (1972), in Flam, *Robert Smithson*, pp. 152–3.
[xxxvii] This programme included Anna Best's 'MECCA', State Mecca Bingo Hall; Felix Gonzalez-Torres's 'Untitled' (America) (1994–95); Maurice O'Connell's 'On Finchley Road'; and Orla Barry's 'Across an Open Space'. Others artists worked with participants at Swiss Cottage library and the Royal Free NHS Trust.
[xxxviii] See Adam Chodzko, *Plans and Spells* (London: Film & Video Umbrella, 2002) pp. 40–41 and Adam Chodzko, 'Out of Place', John Carson and Susannah Silver (eds) *Out of the Bubble, Approaches to Contextual Practice within Fine Art Education* (London: London Institute, 2000) pp. 31–36.
[xxxix] Chodzko, *Plans and Spells*, pp. 40–41.
[xl] See *As It Is*, off-site exhibition by Ikon Gallery, Birmingham (2000); also Claire Doherty (ed.) *Out of Here: Creative Collaborations beyond the Gallery* (Birmingham: Ikon Gallery, 1998).
[xli] See for example, Susan Stanford Friedman, *Mappings: Feminism and the Cultural Geographies of Encounter*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998; Diane Fuss, *Identification Papers,* London: Routledge, 1995; Elizabeth Grosz, *Volatile Bodies*, Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1994; Irit Rogoff, *Terra Infirma,* London: Routledge, 2000 and Kaja Silverman, *The Threshold of the Visible World*, London: Routledge, 1996.
[xlii] See Jane Flax, *Thinking Fragments: Psychoanalysis, Feminism and Postmodernism in the Contemporary West*, Berkeley, Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1991, p. 232; Donna Haraway. 'Situated Knowledges: the Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Knowledge', *Feminist Studies*, v. 14, n. 3, (Fall 1988), pp. 575-603, especially, pp. 583-8 and Elspeth Probyn, 'Travels in the Postmodern: Making Sense of the Local' in Linda Nicholson ed., *Feminism/Postmodernism,* London: Routledge, 1990, pp.

176-89, p. 178. See also Rosi Braidotti, *Nomadic Subjects*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1994 and bell hooks, *Yearnings: Race, Gender, and Cultural Politics,* London: Turnaround Press, 1989.
[xliii] Claire Bishop*, Installation Art: A Critical History* (London: Tate Publishing, 2005) p. 13, p. 131 and p. 133.
[xliv] Bishop, Installation Art, p. 10.
[xlv] See Jane Rendell*, Art and Architecture: A Place Between* (London: I. B. Tauris, 2006).
[xlvi] For another account of the conceptual framework that underpins my practice of 'site-writing' see Jane Rendell, 'Architecture-Writing', Jane Rendell (ed.) *Critical Architecture*, special issue of *The Journal of Architecture* v. 10. n. 3 (June 2005) pp. 255–264.
[xlvii] Mike Crang and Nigel Thrift (eds) *Thinking Space* (London: Routledge, 2000).
[xlviii] See Crang and Thrift's 'Introduction' to *Thinking Space*, pp. 1–30, especially pp. 19–24.
[xlix] Jean Laplanche, 'The Unfinished Copernican Revolution' [1992] translated by Luke Thurston, *Essays on Otherness* (London: Routledge, 1999) pp. 52–83, p. 60.
[l] Laplanche, 'The Unfinished Copernican Revolution', p. 54, footnote 6.
[li] Jean Laplanche, 'The Theory of Seduction and the Problem of the Other', *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis* v. 78 (1997) pp. 653–666, p. 665.
[lii] Jean Laplanche, 'Sublimation and/or Inspiration', translated by Luke Thurston and John Fletcher, *New Formations* v. 48 (2002) pp. 30–50, p. 49. See also Sigmund Freud, 'Creative Writers and Day-Dreaming' [1908] *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud, Volume IX (1906–1908): Jensen's 'Gradiva' and Other Works*, translated from the German under the general editorship of James Strachey (London: The Hogarth Press, 1959) pp. 141–154.