

*** Jane Rendell**

***Critical Spatial Practice*¹: Subjects, Objects, Spaces.**

I'd like to thank Christina and colleagues for their kind invitation to come and participate at this symposium, and thereby allowing me to make my first visit to Copenhagen, and for being such generous hosts and for introducing me to the city and its spaces for art.

The curatorial premise of *KOS – Museum of Art in Public Spaces* - is one that I find very provocative. I am very interested in a curatorial practice, which aims at documenting public art, and how it approaches the question of displacement in both space and time. I'll return to this issue later, but to begin with I'd like to give you some brief background to my approach to public art.

My initial training is in architectural design, and my 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 architectural writer.

My first introduction to public art was in 1996 when I was invited to Chelsea College of Art and Design in London to teach on and later direct their MA in the Theory and Practice of Public Art and Design. I quickly became fascinated by what seemed a highly unstable form of practice, which insisted on locating itself 'a place between' fine art and spatial 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 book *Art and Architecture: A Place Between* from 2006 attempts to trace the multiple dynamics of my investigation into public art located at a three way intersection, between art and architecture, public and private, and theory and practice.

* I want to start by addressing the fine art/architectural design relation, since it was my contact with public art that changed my understanding of this relationship. (And as a backdrop this is Andrea Zittel, 'A-Z Cellular Compartment Units', (2001))

Art and architecture are frequently differentiated in terms of their relationship to 'function'. Unlike architecture, art may not be functional in traditional terms, for example giving shelter when it rains or designing a room in which to perform open-heart surgery, but we could say that art is functional in providing certain kinds of tools for self-reflection, critical thinking and social change. Art offers a place and occasion for new kinds of relationship 'to function' between people.

When art is located outside the gallery, the parameters that define it are called into question and all sorts of new possibilities are opened up. Art has to engage with the kinds of restraints and controls to which only design is usually subject. In many public projects, art is expected to take on 'functions' in the way that architecture does, for example to alleviate social problems, comply with health and safety requirements, or be accessible to diverse audiences and groups of users. But in other sites and situations art can adopt critical functions and works can be positioned in ways that make it possible to question the terms of engagement of the projects themselves.

In 1995 a couple of key publications appeared. Artist Suzanne Lacy coined the term 'new genre public art' to describe what she saw as a new trajectory where public art could include conceptual and critical work but with a focus on

collaboration, interaction, process and context.¹ Also published in 1995, Nina Felshin's edited collection *But is it Art? The Spirit of Art as Activism* pointed to the potential of socially engaged public art practice as a tool for political critique, while writer Tom Finkelpearl described this period as a time in which artists, administrators and communities 'reinvented the field of public art'.²

It is interesting to note that in the history of public art discourse, this moment has been eclipsed by more recent discussions around Nicholas Bourriaud's notion of 'relational aesthetics', which while more palatable for those from a conceptual background tend to occlude the concerns of art generated outside a gallery system, and the kind of ethical issues, around for example listening, that feminists such as Suzi Gablik brought to the fore.

In the UK, there was a noticeable increase in the funding of public art projects through the 1990s, developing a sophistication in public art practice, and drawing out a discussion where the category of 'public art' itself came to be considered a problematic or 'contested' practice.³ In *Art, Space and the City*, cultural theorist Malcolm Miles described two pitfalls for public art, its use as wallpaper to cover over social conflict and as a monument to promote the aspirations of corporate sponsors.⁴ Many so-called 'fine' artists have been particularly scathing about public art, for example, Chris Burden remarked: 'I just make art. Public art is something else, I'm not sure it's art. I think it's about a social agenda.'⁵ By linking 'social' to an 'agenda', public art gets associated with a deterministic approach.

¹ Suzanne Lacy (ed.) *Mapping the Terrain: New Genre Public Art* (Seattle: Bay Press, 1995).

² Nina Felshin (ed.) *But is it Art? The Spirit of Art as Activism* (Seattle: Bay Press, 1995) and Tom Finkelpearl, *Dialogues in Public Art* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2000).

³ David Harding (ed.) *Decadent: Public Art – Contentious Term and Contested Practice* (Glasgow: Glasgow School of Art, 1997).

⁴ Malcolm Miles, *Art, Space and the City* (London: Routledge, 1997).

⁵ Chris Burden, quoted in Suzi Gablik, *The Reenchantment of Art* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1991) pp. 79–80.

Perhaps because of this narrowed perception, but also because of the richness of the work produce by the growing number of conceptual artists working outside the gallery, and developing modes of institutional critique, across sites, both public and private, terms such as site-specific or contextual art started to be used instead.

I will, however, continue to use the term for a while longer here since the tensions at play in discussions around public art allow us to examine the ideologies at work in maintaining distinctions between public and private space.

The boundaries drawn around notions of private and public are not neutral or descriptive lines, but contours that are culturally constructed, change historically and denote specific value systems. The terms appear as social and spatial metaphors in geography, anthropology and sociology, as terms of ownership in economics, and as political spheres in political philosophy and law. Public and private, and the variations between these two terms, mean different things to different people – protected isolation or unwelcome containment, intrusion or invitation, exclusion or segregation. And as the privatization of public space increasingly occurs in all directions – extending outwards to all regions of the globe and inwards to hidden reaches of the mind – we need to define carefully how we use the terms.

In the Western democratic tradition, 'public' stands for all that is good, for democracy, accessibility, participation and egalitarianism set against the private world of ownership and elitism. For those who support the public realm, 'privatization' is associated with the replacement of public places by a series of private places with exclusive rules governing entry and use. But if we take instead a liberal-rights-based perspective, then privacy is understood to provide positive qualities, such as the right to be alone, to confidentiality and the safeguarding of

individuality.⁶ For those who support the private realm, public spaces are seen as potentially threatening, either as places of state coercion or sites of dissidence in need of regulation.

The terms 'public' and 'private' are not mutually exclusive categories; rather, their relationship is interdependent. For example, public art located outside the private institution of the art gallery may still be inside the corporate world of private property and finance.⁷

In *Art and Architecture*, in order to draw attention to the importance of the spatial and the critical in public art practice and to consider how they are related, I suggested a new term, 'critical spatial practice'. So I am going to say a few words about what I mean by this term. Starting with the critical.

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, whose writings are connected by an 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.

⁶ Judith Squires, 'Private lives, secluded places: privacy as political possibility', *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, vol. 12 (1994) pp. 387–410.

⁷ Jane Rendell, 'Public art: between public and private', in Sarah Bennett and John Butler (eds) *Locality, Regeneration and Diversities* (Bristol: Intellectual Books, 2000), pp. 19–26; Jane Rendell, 'Foreword', in Judith Rugg and Dan Hincliffe (eds) *Recoveries and Reclamations* (Bristol: Intellect Books, 2002), pp. 7–9. See also Jane Rendell (ed.) 'A Place Between', *Public Art Journal*, October 1999.

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.

Although the term critical theory can be used as a rather 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 all those whose thinking is self-critical and desirous of social change, who do not only reflect on existing conditions but also to imagine something different – to transform rather than describe.ⁱⁱⁱ

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.

Lefebvre put forward a trialectical model where space is produced through three inter-related modes: spatial practice which can be understood in terms of perception and representations of space in terms of conception.^{iv} Lefebvre also makes a careful distinction between representations of space which he sees as

operations which involve a systematized set of abstract and dominant codes, and spaces of representation where resistance, invention and imagination flourish.

And in de Certeau's discussion of spatial practices, he uses the terms strategies for those practices, which seek to create places that conform to abstract models; and tactics for those that do not obey the laws of places.^v For my *Art and Architecture* book this theoretical concepts formed the guiding principles for the selection of works, I went in search of art works and architectural designs, where the spaces of resistance, invention and imagination flourished, and which operated tactically.

It was the writings of another key spatial thinker, postmodern geographer, Edward Soja, suggested the three part structure of my book.^{vi} His examination of the interrelation of the conceptual categories of space, time and social being, suggested three sections each of which emphasized a different aspect of a place between: the spatial, the temporal and the social.

I am now going to draw out some of the key kinds of critical spatial practice I explore in the book focusing on art projects.

So in Section 1: 'Between Here and There', the focus is on the spatial and through three chapters I investigate three particular spatial issues.

In the first, I consider the relationship between site, non-site and off-site, [see here the work of artist Robert Smithson who invented the terms site and non-site, which I'm going to return a little later in more depth]

* Adam Chodsko's intervention, *Better Scenery* (2000) commissioned as part of the Camden Arts Centre's off-site programme, 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.^{vii}

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.'^{viii}

The signs point only to each other, their relationship is entirely self-referential; they make no attempt to relate to their immediate context. And in speaking only about where they are not, Chodzko's signs critique the ethos of site-specificity and accessibility behind many off-site programmes.

* The second spatial theme I explored Rosalind Krauss's notion of an 'expanded field' first introduced in 1979 to describe the work of artists producing interventions into the landscape,⁸ and where she expanded the term sculpture in relation to architecture and landscape. I aimed to bring this up to date by examining the curation of shows across large sites which engaged debates across the disciplines of art, design and architecture. For example, *In the Midst of Things*, where curators Nigel Prince and Gavin Wade invited 27 artists to critique existing social models and offer new propositions at Bourneville, a village and factory complex, built in the late-nineteenth century, as a paternalist development conceived of by an enlightened capitalist, George Cadbury, a chocolate manufacturer who wanted to create a pleasant environment for his workers both outside and in the buildings themselves.⁹

Third, was the possibility, following de Certeau's notion of space as a practiced place, for creative interventions to transform places into spaces of social critique.

⁸ Krauss, 'Sculpture in the expanded field'. This essay was originally published in *October* 8 (Spring 1979).

⁹ See Nigel Prince and Gavin Wade (eds) *In the Midst of Things* (London: August Media, 2000). See also Gavin Wade (ed.) *Curating in the 21st Century* (Walsall: New Art Gallery/University of Wolverhampton, 2000).

Here I followed the work of commissioners – namely New York’s Public Art Fund and Art Angel of London.^{ix}

* I examined for example, ‘Breakdown’ (2001), where 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.^x

* And Jeremy Deller’s *The Battle of Orgreave* (17 June 2001) also commissioned by Art Angel, which 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.^{xi}

In Section 2: ‘Between Now and Then’, I highlighted the importance of the temporal dimension of ‘a place between’, specifically, the relation of past and present in allegorical, montage and dialectical constructions and the time of viewing and experiencing art and architecture.

In Chapter 1 (‘Ruin as Allegory’) I suggested that projects that focus on aspects of the ruin, disintegration and transience not only inspire feelings of melancholic contemplation in the viewer but also provide experiences where critical transformation can occur through quiet but active thought.

* ‘Caliban Towers I and II’ (1997) is one in a series by artist-photographer Rut Blees Luxemburg entitled *London – A Modern Project*.¹⁰ * The photograph images two high-rise buildings aspiring to touch the skies. Shot at night with a long exposure, the architecture gains a strange luminescence. * For a short period in

¹⁰ See Rut Blees Luxemburg, *London – A Modern Project* (London: Black Dog Publishing, 1997).

1998, as part of a public art project, the image was installed under a railway bridge in east London, a mile or so down the road from the very housing projects depicted in the image, and * where on a sunny Sunday in July, while 'Caliban Towers I and II' were resident in south Hoxton, a block of flats just like them was demolished, dust in nine seconds, to make way for regeneration.

In Chapter 2 ('Insertion as Montage') I examine the principle of montage through contemporary works where new insertions into sites produce juxtapositions which displace dominant meanings and interrupt particular contexts create visual, audio and tactile environments in which the experience may initially include shock, but over time starts to engage with the more subtle ambiguities usually associated with allegory.

* For 'New Holland' (1997), by positioning a piece of the local vernacular, a shed for factory-farming turkeys that is throbbing with techno sounds, at a rakish angle next to a Henry Moore sculpture and Norman Foster's gallery for fine art for *East International* at the Sainsbury Centre for Visual Arts, Norwich, England, artists Cornford & Cross produced a sculpture that holds in tension everyday materials and monumental structures.

* And in Chapter 3 ('The What-has-been and the Now') the focus is on history and on the position of the dialectical image as a threshold between past, present and future. I look at a number of artworks that insert new fragments into existing contexts, but here the act reclaims or unearths certain aspects of history lying buried in the present.

Pointing to what has been displaced and marginalized as a way of critiquing contemporary culture, artist Janet Hodgson chose to inscribe archaeologists' drawings of rubbish pits into the York stone slabs set as a landscaped element in the new shopping complex designed by Chapman Taylor and built by Land

Securities in Whitefriars Canterbury, England. Hodgson titled her work 'The Pits', so marking Whitefriars with information the site already contained about its own lost past and buried topography, and read as a colloquialism, itself a kind of language often categorized as rubbish, the suggestion is that the commodities around us *might* be thought of as rubbish?

This is a work which expresses a key aspect of public art, the need to operate somewhat ambiguously, offering a number of interpretations, which rather than tell us what to think ask us to question the ways in which we assign value to matter.

Finally, in Section 3: 'Between One and Another', I shift emphasis to the social and examine the spatial construction of subjectivity in feminist and psychoanalytic theory investigating the relationships people create in the production and occupation of art and architecture. Here the 'work' is considered less as a set of 'things' or 'objects' than as a series of exchanges that take place between people – subjects – through such processes as collaboration in * chapter 1, [see here the work of art-architecture collaboration muf] * social sculpture in chapter 2 [see here 'Park Products' (2004) by public works (artist Katrin Böhm and architect Andreas Lang),] and * walking in chapter [see here the work of environmental artists Platform].

So what I tried to do in *Art and Architecture* was to consider different approaches to critical spatial practice. What intrigues me today is how the programme of KOS, which I believe is unique, aims to document public art, so I want to raise three final thoughts for discussion.

First, I'd like to think about how sites might be related.

* In 1965 to 1966 Robert Smithson worked as a consultant artist for an architectural firm called TAMS on designs for Dallas Fort 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'.^{xii} 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^{xiii}

His first non-site titled 'A Nonsite, Pine Barrens, New Jersey' (1969) 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.^{xiv}

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 reclaims its position as the site of the work. So I wonder here for KOS what relation the site of documentation has to the site of the original work, and how value is ascribed?

The 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. Indeed, self-critique, along with culture, context, alterity and interdisciplinarity, have been noted, and here I am referring to Hal Foster's key essay in *Return of the Real*, as aspects of anthropological research to impact on fine art practice.^{xv}

* In *One Place after Another*, Miwon Kwon points to Homi Bhabha's concept of 'relational specificity'. 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.^{xvi} Perhaps relational specificity provides a useful way of thinking about the relations between sites, off-sites, and non-sites: their particular qualities and circuits of connection.

* Second, I am interested in how the interpretative act of art criticism can itself engage with those changing sites and positions we occupy as critics materially, conceptually, emotionally and ideologically.^{xvii}

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'.^{xviii} Although she does refer in passing to the processes of writing criticism in terms of the implications of not experiencing the work first-hand,^{xix} 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 the audience.

For my part, I argue that the *situatedness* of the critic plays a key role in determining the performance of his/her interpretative role. It was through the process of writing *Art and Architecture*, 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.^{xx} I concluded by arguing that criticism is *itself* a form of critical spatial practice.

* So in my new book *Site-Writing: The Architecture of Art Criticism* the focus shifts to the sites between critic and work, essay and reader. *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.^{xxi} 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, instead I use different modes/genres of writing to construct as well as trace 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.

So I’d like us to consider kind of writing might be appropriate for writing the sites that document public art.

* And third, and finally, perhaps the most important aspect – I want to return to the public of public art. I believe we've developed a huge amount of spatial sophistication from site-specific theory and practice, and elsewhere I've written about this in more detail, today, I want to suggest that we should return to the term public for political reasons. The public realm world-wide is under severe threat from the forces of neo-liberal capitalism. For those of us in countries with a tradition of a public welfare state, we are increasingly alarmed, at the speed at which the demolition of the welfare part of the public sector is taking place.

Education, health, social services and housing, all have had massive proportions of their budget stripped out by the ConDem government in October 2011 following an argument that we need to take austerity measures. (The so called credit crisis is now being used as a reason (which many even right wing economists have decried as nonsense) to batter the hell out of the poor and keep the cash for the rich (the opposite of the Robin Hood principle) We have yet to see the results, but the emerging signs are desolate. Just for starters, 400 libraries are set to close, 2.9 billion has been stripped out of the education fund for the study of arts and humanities subjects. There will be no public funding for arts education, any one who wants to study art will have to pay around £9000 per year to go to university. In case you think £2.9 billion is a lot of money, bear in mind that this is under half the amount that bankers in the city of London are taking home this year just in bonuses. Without the welfare part of the state, we are left with a state, whose main role is control: like the police force who dressed like the paramilitary 'kettled' school children last month in the public spaces of London for 12 hours on a bitter winter evening for protesting.

What does this mean for the public? Clearly we are going to attend to this issue of the demolition of the public sphere, differently, depending on our different political positions and our different cultural histories. Indeed we might even ask whether it is worth fighting to protect the public, or whether we would be better

moving on, and engaging perhaps with Hardt and Negri's idea of the commons, as a way of producing space for art that is not public nor private, but rather art in common, or perhaps producing the commons is a form of making art.

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, 2010).

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} 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.

^{viii} Chodzko, *Plans and Spells*, pp. 40–41.

^{ix} I borrow and develop the term 'expanded' from Rosalind Krauss, 'Sculpture in the expanded field', in Hal Foster (ed.) *Postmodern Culture* (London: Pluto Press, 1985) pp. 31–42. This essay was originally published in *October* 8 (Spring 1979).

^x 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).

^{xi} 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.

^{xii} Boettger, *Earthworks*, pp. 55–8. See Robert Smithson, 'Towards the development of an air terminal site' (1967), in Flam, *Robert Smithson*, p. 291.

^{xiii} "'Earth'" (1969) symposium at White Museum, Cornell University, in Flam, *Robert Smithson*, p. 178.

^{xiv} Boettger, *Earthworks*, p. 67.

^{xv} Hal Foster, *Design and Crime (and Other Diatribes)* (London: Verso, 2002) p. 91.

^{xvi} 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.

^{xvii} 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.

^{xviii} Claire Bishop, *Installation Art: A Critical History* (London: Tate Publishing, 2005) p. 13, p. 131 and p. 133.

^{xix} Bishop, *Installation Art*, p. 10.

^{xx} See Jane Rendell, *Art and Architecture: A Place Between* (London: I. B. Tauris, 2006).

^{xxi} 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.