

enabling restraints

Bianca Hester, November 2008

part one: within a context

In October this year, Sandra Bridie¹ emailed me a sequence of questions. One of these stood out as being the most vital: *what does art allow you to do?* A provocation like this directs attention towards art's potential for opening up a space for action, and it is within this opening that the focus of this essay will be directed. But a question of this kind requires an exploration of some associated conditions or assumptions – of the larger context within which art is entangled.

Firstly the question implies a usefulness or functionality to art in which it takes up a position of serving a quantifiable or accountable kind of 'purpose'. In the essay *Radical Autonomy*, Jeroen Boomgaard addresses this notion with suspicion, relating it to art's shift away from autonomy² towards systems of communication and process management

¹ Sandra Bridie is an artist who is currently working on her Phd at the VCA school of art which focuses upon the notion of 'composite practice'. The questions she sent form an interview component for her thesis. She is a member of Ocular Lab inc, curates the program at the George Paton Gallery at Melbourne University, and was the founding member of Talk artist's initiative.

² A major project of the various avant-gardes of the twentieth century was the dispersal of art into life; to collapse the autonomy of 'pure art' such that it be radically opened to its other – that being the heteronomy of the world's social, political and economic forces.

The notion of dispersing art into life connects to the discourse that emerged around the time of Minimalism, whereby the sculptural object was self-reflexively and self-critically opened to the duration of viewing and the contingencies involved in perception (Foster 1996: p.40). The Minimalist sculptural object precipitated awareness of the complex relay of relations between the moving and social bodies of viewers, the spatial context within which this occurred and the time involved in perceiving the object. Although this description may apply to the process of engaging with any sculpture, the process was made internal to Minimalism such that it became part of the object's explicit function. Thus the 'work' of this art – or the work that this art performed, was the exposure of art's potential as being more than a fetishized object enclosed on itself – but as an object dispersed into a larger (social, lived) context. Minimalism is thus crucial to the narrative of art dissolving into life in that it is positioned at the nexus of the contingency of relations between objects, space, time and contexts of encounter, thereby bringing a 'performative' dimension to engaging the sculptural object – or what Michael Fried denigrated as Minimalism's 'theatricality'. In the wake of the sculptural object of Minimalism activating a self-reflexive awareness of the myriad of situational contingencies, the category of sculpture began to make a radical departure from traditional forms of medium-specific object-hood (or forms of autonomy), to now include a plethora of forms that were once excluded from its realm (Krauss

(Boomgaard, 2006: pp.30-38). Boomgaard argues that this movement is evident in the rising tide of certain forms of relational practice³ that emphasize interaction and participation and which position art as 'doing good' – thereby obtaining an instrumental relationship to the world.

So what can art allow us to do if we avoid engaging it as something instrumental? Upon this idea Elizabeth Grosz proposes that *art is not "reducible to the pragmatic world of survival: it indicates that those living beings that "really live", that intensify life – for its own sake, for the sake of intensity or sensation – bring something new into the world, create something that has no other purpose than to intensify, to experience itself...(art is) the opening up of the pragmatic world or performed and judged actions to qualities, the opening up of life to excessiveness..."* (Grosz, 2008: p.39)

Positioning art in terms of excess allows us to think of it as something other than as structured by a model of communication and instead in terms of its capacity to open up a

1979: p.36) – constituting a chapter in the narrative of art's blurring into life – or into the realm of social relations.

³ The purpose of this text is not to take up a position regarding Relational Aesthetics – only to bring attention to the fact that a discussion concerning notions of autonomy opens a discussion of Relational Aesthetics in terms of art's movement away from autonomy towards the social realm – as outlined in the footnote above. The 'problem' with Relational Aesthetics – as it has been formulated by Nicholas Bourriaud (and which Stewart Martin observes in the text *Critique of Relational Aesthetics*) is that it is born of an utopian assumption that dwelling within the social enables art to disengage from forms of capitalist exchange – as if moving towards 'life' frees art from its relationship to a process of commodification apparently and/or conventionally exemplified in 'the object'.

Stewart Martin argues that Relational Aesthetics positions a collapse from the 'object' into the 'social' in which Art's very sociability is positioned as the principal object such that all "*art's objects are subordinate to this relational dimension*" (Martin, 2008: p. 370). Stewart Martin critiques the assumption made by Bourriaud that a shift from the fetishization of the object - through a refocusing upon the everyday or upon social exchange - locates art's radical disengagement with capitalist exchange – as if art can engage with 'life' in a direct and non-reified form outside of commodity exchange – or beyond the institutional forces which inevitably and eventually frame it. He argues that this as a "*reapplication of Romanticism [whereby] art is conceived as an immediate form of non-capitalist life.*" (Martin, 2008: p. 379). Martin continues that in relocating the focus from the object (as autonomous) and towards the social realm, that relational art not only enacts a reversal of fetishization – from the object to the social - but actively works to commodify and instrumentalise it – because the social becomes the object of this art and therefore the very site of its exchange and/or cultural value. And it does this without actually disengaging from the workings of the system that produce the situation in the first place. In this light he argues that relational art becomes "*helplessly reversible into an aestheticisation of capitalist exchange...obliviously occupying the other side of capitalism's coin*" (Martin, 2008: p. 379).

space for 'something else' to occur which reorients or de-familiarizes the terrain as we know it. In this light I find Grosz' notion of art as excess very appealing. However I'm slightly wary it locates art as 'different' to other forms of activity. The danger in conceptualising art as a practice that somehow exists outside the larger economy is that positioning art as an exceptional or heightened kind of production veers towards a form of Romanticism. It sustains delusions that art can constitute a kind of direct engagement with life disengaged from an all-pervading system of exchange (Martin, 2008: p.379). Upon this, Jaques Rancière offers an enlightening perspective on the kind of 'work' that art is, suggesting that *"the cult of art presupposes a revalorization of the abilities attached to the very idea of work. However, this idea is less the discovery of the essence of human activity than a recomposition of the landscape of the visible...artistic practices are not 'exceptions' to other practices. They represent and reconfigure the distribution of these activities..."* (Rancière, 2004: p.43).

This notion serves as a useful position that effectively side steps embedded assumptions concerning art as a particular 'work-form' (a form that seems to be perpetuated by art schools in particular, primarily with their focus on individualized production and of priming students for systems already in operation within the wider field). However if we take up Rancière's position then we are compelled to think directly about the activity that art production commonly collapses into and in turn what it might become aside from the modes and forms that are already all too familiar. This may engender a shift towards a more adventurous engagement with art's making in ways that potentially redistribute the kinds of subjectivities which recognizable modes of production both precipitate and perpetuate.

Moving from the question of what kind of work that art is, and instead touching upon a connected question concerning art's relationship to the notion of commodity, it is quite clear that art exists extremely well *within* a commodity system – particularly in terms of the value-adding that the energy and signification of art brings to urban cultural space. In respect of this notion, critic Brian Holmes stresses that art (especially of a kind that is at home within one extreme of the institutional market⁴) generates forms of cultural capital

⁴ That being the kind of system whose most obvious products include the globalized biennale circuit. However the institutional market invariably saturates all production, all action, and the institution is everywhere. What I'm trying to emphasise here is that there is no simple 'outside' of this system, it is

effectively producing a “*fluidification of symbolic commerce...(while) stimulat(ing) tourism*” (Holmes, 2008). This is evident within any urban centre in which art production, on all its various levels, lends ambience to the larger atmosphere thereby rousing the value of an area in which spaces of former ‘neglect’ become rapidly absorbed and re-constructed into prime real estate – as one particular example. So this is not simply about art as a commodity in terms of it being an object bought and sold (although art-as-object does enter into this relation rapidly), but about art as a much more nebulous, abstract commodity, enacting value of a symbolic order - or what Pierre Bourdieu refers to as ‘cultural capital’⁵.

However getting back to the point regarding ‘what art allows’, my approach towards art is to take it as a kind of action that enables experimentation with modes of sensation, perception, cognition and articulation. This has been informed by Holmes and by Rancière, who discusses art as possessing the potential for redistributing “*the landscape of the visible, a recomposition of the relationship between doing, making, being, seeing, and saying. ...*” (Rancière, 2004: p.43). The crucial factor in this approach is the notion of experimentation – because an experiment is contingent upon unpredictability whereby the unknowable and the unforeseeable might occur. As such, I am convinced that art is a practice that, at best, allows for the possibility for opening up experimental forms of thinking and practicing ‘alongside’ that which is already known and practiced. However this notion is not used with the rhetoric of opposition which begins to situate process against product, artist against institution, inside against out. That’s why the term ‘alongside’ becomes useful here, because it emerges from a tactic that avoids a simplified ‘critique’ but which still works to develop a ‘critical’ kind of relationship to the given. Anyway - the situation is much more entangled and requires other strategies for thinking-

the larger force within which our work takes place. Moreover, the notion of institution summoned here is not one monolithic, clearly demarcated space strapped up exclusively in museum architecture. Instead, the institution is a concept that encompasses a vast relay of situations, which support, enable, structure and present art (i.e. all space for the production-reception of art including artist-run projects, commercial galleries, biennales, publications, alternative venues) and the network of people who work within these situations, *including* artists. The institution is thus positioned as the space where discourse assembles.

⁵ This text is not concerned with establishing an oppositional rhetoric towards commodification however the point being made here is that art’s relationship to commodification is one of entwinement.

practicing that relate to a notion proposed by Deleuze and Guattari regarding the idea of working through 'the middle':

"a theory of revolution that is based neither on beginnings (the conquest of the old system) nor on ends (the implementation of a new system) but on middles...the space(s) in between, the unpredictable interstices of process, movement and invention" (Bogue, 1989: p.105)

The middle is the place where multiple forces converge – articulating a swarm of relations. Thinking about what art enables in terms of working through the middle is interesting because it proposes forms of action that are not structured by a logic that locate art as outside or disengaged from contemporaneous forces (Romantic), or as a form of resistance towards 'dominant' relations (oppositional), or as possessing the promise of a better world (instrumental), but as a practice which works experimentally (and in turn experientially) within a field of given relations to produce something unexpected.

But a notion like experimentation stimulates a series of questions. Why the urgency for a discussion about the potential of art to open up a space of experimentation in the first place? Why is a re-distribution desirable? And what specific elements of the current landscape call for critical attention?. It seems that predominant modes of production invariably favor individual production over a community of practitioners engaged in a living culture⁶, determinate outcome over risk and experimentation, reduced 'review-based' discussion over expanded dialogues, and perpetuate the fetishization of artist over artwork (etc). This is not to advance a principled position against certain forms of production, but to assert practices that work to open up the given situation in ways that produce something more open ended, volatile, and unpredictable. This makes for a much more adventurous landscape.

This text will proceed to explore a series of practices and projects that work with art's capacity for opening up some space for experimentation - in turn reorganizing modes of production, reception, publication, distribution and discourse. These practices address

⁶ The idea of 'living culture' was developed by the Danish Situationist Asger Jorn, to acknowledge that individual production is inseparable from the collective experiences of a community that lives through an engagement with its ideas and processes.

the question both directly and obliquely, and through example help to articulate what it might be that art allows for in terms of reorganizing the 'landscape of the visible' – that is – an experiment with what is do-able, think-able, see-able and say-able.

part two: reconfigurations

Expanding fields of activity

In August I met Francesco Stocchi – an Italian curator in residence at Gertrude studio 18. I was one of the last on the meeting schedule – so by this stage he had formed a fairly comprehensive view of the local situation. One of his most poignant observations was that Melbourne (and Sydney) artists in particular seem to 'do everything'. And he's totally right. Artists here do way more than make 'art' in any simplified kind of way. They write, work in collectives, teach, develop exhibition strategies, curate, open their own spaces, generate publications - thereby engaging most aspects of art production, presentation and distribution. Melbourne artists are particularly adept at developing their own cultural output and networks D.I.Y. style, and subsequently many of them are engaged in what Sandra Bridie discusses as forms of 'composite practice'.

There is a difference between doing seemingly everything and engaging in this expanded field of activity *as a practice*. Someone like Bridie does just that - she engages the expanded field as the practice. Rather than positioning all the interconnected aspects of organization as 'outside' what is more commonly regarded as the official mode of production (the making of singularly authorized 'art works') – the interconnected activity advances into the foreground forming the very material of the practice. She's not alone in this venture: Spiros Panigirakis, Lisa Kelly, Lucas Ihlein, Terri Bird, James Deutscher, Liv Barrett and Chris Hill are artists who stand out as engaging the field in related ways. These people often work across processes in which collaboration, forms of collectivized organisation, writing and sustained dialogue is intensified as material for critical exploration. Each of these people work both individually and in groups, and the site of their individualized output also frequently involves collaboration and contributions/cross-over from others.

Situating multiple layers of activity and organisation as constituting the material of a

practice has broad social and political implications. The organizational activities locate a nexus where that practice marks an overlap with a community of practitioners thereby making an explicit connection to a larger social composite.

By positioning these organisational and inherently social dialogues as forms of material for engagement, they are included as vital components of each artist's practice, rather than relegated to a secondary role. Through this perspective, possibilities open for active processes of experimenting with and re-working these conditions – of engaging them as rigorously as one would the material of a practice that is more clearly identifiable as individualized. Because these organizational activities are positioned as forming the conditions structuring art's production in a wider sense, actively engaging them offers up other possibilities for production, dissemination and engagement in the process of re-articulating or re-working those conditions that conventionally structure art.

The positioning of an interconnected field of activity as constituting the expanded material of practice connects to what Craig Owens identifies as a legacy of feminist practices in which *"simultaneous activities are conducted on multiple fronts"* (Owens, 1983: p.63). These activities are positioned as crucial rather than supplementary by being forced into a hierarchy with that which is deemed 'legitimate' art production.

Developing an engaged relationship to cultural production

Claiming these layers as forms of material for experimentation becomes a strategy for developing an experimental, rather than an indifferent relationship to contemporary culture. This aids in developing a kind of responsive relationship to the multilayered conditions of practice, rather than leaving these questions primarily to arts 'professionals' to deal with according to agendas that don't necessarily address the nuanced concerns related to practice. By making more than art works positioned as products for swift cultural assimilation, through a process of actively engaging the conditions of art's production, becomes a tactic for situating practice as being composed of a complexity of relations that cannot be reduced to an easily identifiable outcome – because its much more ephemeral and chaotic than that. If practice is positioned as constituting a more expansive field of activities than 'simply' the making of art works – as it is in relationship to the artists cited above - then what is asserted is a form of practice that breaches categorical boundaries, in an avoidance of a movement towards reduction. Because these activities are often located within a shared

or collective space, they cannot be reduced to the cultural production of one individual; thus they proliferate beyond simple distinctions of authorship and artwork.

Engaging situational relations

The notion of 'engaging situational relations' is oriented by the idea that artwork and situation are implicitly entwined or co-dependent from the outset, and conversely, that ignoring this co-dependence supports a false notion of art as being independent from its context.

The word 'situation' is used here because it encompasses not only the physical or site-related elements of a context⁷ but also the discursive, institutional and social conditions within which all artwork must somehow inevitably negotiate if it is to enter into a public realm. Put simply, artwork must exist 'somewhere', and that place -- be it a gallery, a publication, a museum, a community centre, or a lounge-room -- is a complex *situation* teeming with material relations, social conventions, orders, forms of knowledge and practices. Therefore the term 'situation' is useful because it is positioned as encompassing the complexity of a multiplicity of relations, and does not only refer to spatial or site-oriented elements of a place.

The idea that ignoring the contingent relationship between art and its situation supports the myth of art as being self-sufficient (or timeless or autonomous from the forces of its

⁷ This expanded concept of site has been informed by Miwon Kwon's book titled *One Place After Another: Site-Specific Art and Locational Identity*. She discusses the historical transformation of the idea of the 'site-specific' broadly, from the physical to the virtual. This discussion marks out three main areas of focus:

1) **The phenomenological site:** articulated in discourses around minimalism which focused upon physical relationships and relays between artwork, body, space and time, exemplified in works such as Robert Morris's *L-Beams*, and Richard Serra's works *Shift*, *Titled Arc* and *Clara Clara*.

2) **The institutional site:** articulated as a situation comprised of a network of relations between discourses, ideologies and exchanges in which the artwork and its representation and discourse, circulates. The institutional site is oriented not so much towards objects as towards conceptual and critical activities exemplified, for example, in the strategies of Conceptualism, Happenings and forms of Institutional Critique.

3) **The discursive site:** articulated as fields of knowledge and exchange located across sites that are traditionally located outside of institutional frameworks, such as in contemporary practices involving community groups, activists and collectives. The emphasis here is more upon realist strategies common to the sphere of the everyday, exemplified for example by collectives such as Oda Projesi, N55 from Copenhagen, 16 Beaver street group in New York and Sydney's squatspace collective.

contemporaneous context) has been informed by various theoretical and practice oriented positions, such as Daniel Buren's call for art to address, rather than ignore, its architectural context in his seminal text *The Function of Architecture* (1970), as well as by Andrew Benjamin who cautions against positioning space as an "empty, neutral and thus static site that comes to incorporate" the presence of a work (Benjamin, 1997 a: p.56). I argue that by attempting to address its various contexts, a work positions the spatial and situational as active elements for consideration. These contextual relations form part of a project's 'subject'. Thus, the process of addressing context is a strategy for re-orienting relations between assumed insides and outsides (art and whatever happens to reside 'outside' of its frame) - embracing them as conditions that are negotiable, rather than absolutely determined. What becomes vital here are the ways that these processes of negotiation might be made visible by an artwork, such that the visible is opened up to a process of re-organisation or re-distribution.

Inhabiting institutional situations: The installation projects of Joëlle Tuerlinckx

The projects of Belgian artist Joëlle Tuerlinckx provide an energetic model for a possible way of working in relationship to institutional contexts. In many ways, Tuerlinckx is committed to a radical kind of plurality, and this takes on innumerable forms, from installation making, to an ongoing 'proliferating' publication project, to abstract film production, to site-specific interventions. For example, one of the strategies employed by her vast, provisional installations is to playfully call into question, through making visible, the limits of the contexts within which those works are located. Her position is 'critical', but as Frank Vande Veire suggests, Tuerlinckx does not attempt a grand escape from the institution via well-worn oppositional strategies, nor does she employ ironic gestures of distancing (Vande Veire, 1996). Instead, her installations work dynamically, subtly and subversively by addressing their spatial and institutional contexts through methods of incorporating the space into the material matrix of her work. In regards to Tuerlinckx's strategies, Vande Veire argues that "even through the gallery does its best to look 'neutral'...[Tuerlinckx] signifies, even over-signifies the question raised by the [physical and institutional] space. She does not take possession of the space but repeats it time and time again, lets its structure enter into all articulations of the work itself..." (Vande Veire, 1996: p.453).

She does this through a plurality of means to draw attention to, and to incorporate, the

periphery of what is shown. Tuerlinckx saturates her projects with the materiality of particular contexts, and in so doing ruffles any absolute distinction between inside or outside. Her projects become apparatuses that process all the contingencies, churning them into materials for engagement.

Reworking institutionalized forms of authorship: Spiros Panigirakis' *Studio Conditions*

Studio Conditions by Spiros Panigirakis at the VCA gallery in October 2008 is an example of a local project that engages with situational relations head-on, so as to rework assumptions concerning the relations between process, production, product, and presentation. Panigirakis' *Studio Conditions* operates as a 'meta' project because it takes *nothing* for granted. Taking well-worn assumptions concerning authorship, the studio as a place of production, the institutional frame, and the role of the document in relation to action and event - Panigirakis positions all the terms constituting art's terrain as radically open to negotiation. In many ways the projects of Panigirakis emerge from dealing with the 'thickness' of art – becoming conceptual apparatuses for grappling with art's constituting layers whereby the resultant work emerges as a re-staging of these negotiations.

For example, instead of taking authorship as a given in terms of an already known or pre-structured hierarchy of relations between producer and produced (and also between producer and audience), Panigirakis opens the site of authorship up to experimentation so that what is produced is done so through a convoluted sequence of processes. The site of authorship becomes defamiliarized because it gets flooded with innumerable collaborative engagements, dialogues and a series of limits that open production up to multiple forces and outcomes that are irreducible to the intent or projection of a singular individual. The 'works' that Panigirakis produces are radically de-individualized. The effect of this is a re-distribution of the site of authorship in terms of its already all-too-familiar mode of organization, resulting in something much more adventurous and even hard-to-handle, therefore becoming a situation that opens the possibility for other kinds of engagement within the frame whereby it becomes public.

The politics of process

Ardi Gunawan develops volatile constructions that emerge from processes of collecting and reconfiguring detritus – usually institutional off-cuts from previously constructed

gallery walls and exhibition furnishings – and deploying this bulk into provisional conglomerates that threaten to topple at the slightest of moves. These works result from Gunawan's routine 'travels' within the architectural frameworks within which they are installed. As such they become material diagrams which foreground both the processes involved in their assembly, and also of their precarious emergence within an institutional frame. For his project at Gertrude Contemporary Art Spaces in May 2008 titled *The Super Light* – Gunawan's work not only presented overlooked material residue gleaned from the store-rooms and passageways of the building, but also included the residue of its own construction – including sawdust, plaster crumbings, wrappers, a 10 litre paint tin and a series of empty plastic drink bottles. This residue worked upon a different register than his more staged assemblages by articulating an interest in 'letting things be as they are', whereby Gunawan effectively avoided intervening into the material relations of this residue too severely (with too much intent). In this case, these residues seemed to emerge unconsciously or anaesthetically alongside the prime spectacle and in the periphery (both visually and physically) of production. They thus exist as a simultaneous *staging* of process and a *foregrounding* of process, both in and as the work.

The assertion of process has a historical precedent in the practice of Robert Morris, who argued that the keeping of work in transit, open and mutable, produces a situation in which the question of contracting it into a finalized entity in either space or time does not hold (Berger, 1990: p.72). Morris strategised, through the expanded modes with which he engaged his practice, for art's 'desublimation' from the "*fetishistic, repressive nature of its exhibition and display*" (Berger, 1990: p.72), using a tactic that involved remaining 'inside' the process as a way to fray the edges of a work's stability and identity.

Morris's position regarding the idea of a desublimation of art has received intensive criticism from theorists such as Alex Potts, who regards Morris's relationship to process as bordering on becoming romantic in its "*fetishization of process over product*" (Potts, 2002: p.251). The problem identified by Potts is of Morris searching for a space free from the 'corrupting commodification' of the contemporary world. Potts argues that this approach, amplified during post-minimalism, which coincided with essays such as *The Phenomenology of Making* (1970), marks a shift from an "*open public ethic to a protective private or individualistic one*" (Potts, 2002: p.251). Potts argues that the assertion of process is analogous to a desire to assert absolute control over production.

This in turn activates a form of resistance to allowing one's work to enter into, or belong to, a public arena.

However, process in Gunawan's practice is approached in a different manner, and is not necessarily motivated by the interests of protecting the work from forms of commodification but is presented in order to pursue a mode of production that is based in a complexity of relations – spatial, temporal, material and social. Gunawan's practice provides an interesting model, and like other practices in which process is brought to the foreground (in terms of the modes in which work is generated and in terms of process constituting part of the 'subject' of that work) – the effect that this has is to open a space for engagement which requires a sensitivity to or empathy with complexity, ephemerality and unpredictability. When complexity - delivered here through the framework of process - is amplified what is generated is an equally complex situation for engagement because work of this nature demands forms of approach that cannot be based upon a reductive logic whereby the work is easily assimilated into a system of representation⁸ structured by the logic of 'identification'.

If art allows for the opening of a space for experimentation precipitating the unpredictable, then it's not simply any and every kind of art that does this. An opening occurs by particular forms that emerge from practices that both directly and implicitly engage with the question of art's relationship to the terrain of production in general. These practices grapple with and address a larger question concerning the kind of work that art is and subsequently the modes of being that it engages, thereby opening up the

⁸ The system of representation to which I refer is based upon 'appropriative modes of perception'. An appropriative mode of engagement is argued by Andrew Uroskie, in discussion of Robert Smithson's work, as one in which art is subject to an interpretive will that seeks to contain, center and identify (Uroskie 2005: p.68) through recourse to linear progression or representational logic. The notion of representation used here has been informed by writers such as Barbara Bolt and Dorothea Olkowski as being conditioned by "a mode of thinking and a relationship to the world that involves a will to fixity and mastery" (Bolt 2004: pp. 9). In the book *Art Beyond Representation*, Bolt argues that this concept of representation positions a predetermined separation between subjects and objects, such that art is oriented as an object, given over to a subject (Bolt 2004: pp. 13). A representational approach privileges a movement towards identification based upon the logic of unification, because "representation searches out the common elements underlying difference" (Olkowski 1999: p.23). Therefore, through a representational framework, the 'being' aspect of art is amplified. The implications of this are that practices of production, reception, discussion and dissemination are based upon a centering or narrowing of meaning and identification. This approach is anthropocentric because subjects take up a central position in relationship to processes of production and reception. I argue that an amplification of process, as evident in Gunawan's projects becomes a strategy for overwhelming a movement towards unification.

potential for mobilizing these very engagements. These forms of artwork are flooded by this question such that modes of production, engagement and distribution aren't taken for granted, but become re-organised. This process effects a redistribution of the terrain in ways where the possibilities for what becomes do-able, see-able, thinkable and say-able are opened up to an adventure from an ever-thickening middle.

ENDNOTES

(2003) Joëlle Tuerlinckx. Gent Online.

BENJAMIN, A. (1997 a) The Activity of Space. IN BENJAMIN, A. (Ed.) *Sculpture: Contemporary form and Theory*. West Sussex, Academy Group.

BERGER, M. (1990) *Labyrinths: Robert Morris, Minimalism, and The 1960's*, New York, Harper & Row.

BOGUE, R. (1989) *Deleuze and Guattari*, London, New York, Routledge.

BOLT, B. (2004) *Art Beyond Representation; The Performative Power of the Image*, London, I.B. Tauris & Co. Ltd.

BOOMGAARD, J. (2006) Radical Autonomy: Art in the Era of Process Management. *Open: Cahier on Art and the Public Domain*, 5, pp. 30-40.

FOSTER, H. (1996) *The Return of The Real: Art and Theory at the End of the Century*, Massachusetts, The MIT Press.

GROSZ, E. (2008) *Chaos, Territory, Art: Deleuze and the Framing of the Earth*, New York, Columbia University Press.

HOLMES, B. (2008) An egalitarian culture by participatory means, for whoever wants to start right now: <http://brianholmes.wordpress.com/2008/05/02/an-egalitarian-culture/#more-312>

KWON, M. (2004) *One Place After Another: Site-Specific Art and Locational Identity*, Massachusetts, MIT Press.

KRAUSS, R. (1979) Sculpture in the Expanded Field. IN FOSTER, H. (Ed.) *Postmodern Culture*. Port Townsend, Bay Press.

MARTIN, S. (2007) Critique of Relational Aesthetics. *Third Text*, 21, 369-386.

OLKOWSKI, D. (1999) *Gilles Deleuze and The Ruin of Representation*, California, University of California Press.

OWENS, C. (1983) The Discourse of Others: Feminists and Postmodernism. IN FOSTER, H. (Ed.) *Postmodern Culture*. Port Townsend, Bay Press.

POTTS, A. (2002) *The Sculptural Imagination: Figurative, Modernist, Minimalist.*, Yale University Press.

RANCIÈRE, J. (2004) *The Politics of Aesthetics*, London, New York, Continuum.

UROSKIE, A. V. (2005) La Jetée en Spirale: Robert Smithson's Stratigraphic Cinema. *Grey Room*, 19, 55 - 79.

VANDE VEIRE, F. (1996) Something About how a Tuerlinckx Machine Traverses the Exhibition Machine. In DEZEGHER, C. (Ed.) *Inside the Visible: An Elliptical Traverse of 20th Century Art in, of, and From the Feminine*. The MIT Press.