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INTRODUCTION TO THE PHD

SUMMARY

Material Adventures, Spatial Productions; Manoeuvring Sculpture Towards a Proliferating Event situates a practice-led PhD which is engaged with the research into, and practice of, sculpture as an event. Sculpture is approached as a complex condition inclusive of a multiplicity of processes related to questions of materiality, activities of making, modes of encounter and engagement, collaborating, mapping, installation processes, engaging institutional contexts, documentation, writing and discussion. These processes are emphasised in the PhD and constitute the conditions for exploring and manoeuvring sculpture as an event.

Research Questions:
The research questions that have oriented this project are:

How can sculpture be practised as a proliferating event?

How does approaching sculpture as event produce relations between modes of production, engagement and reception?

In what ways does approaching sculpture as an event contribute to contemporary practice?
BACKGROUND FOR THIS PRACTICE

COMING TO TERMS WITH THE QUESTION OF SCULPTURE AS A PLATFORM FOR ENGAGEMENT

What was initially a hunch has since undergone a deepening whereby I have developed a commitment to sculptural practice as a platform from which to orient the PhD. In the opportunity provided by the process of writing this exegesis, I have begun to understand that throughout the research project, a double-movement has occurred. Simultaneous with a process of opening sculpture up (engaging it in processes of interrogation, investigation, experimentation, re-working and proliferation across a multiplicity of terrains) so that its eventfulness finds articulation, the project has also designated sculpture as a primary platform from which to manoeuvre.

It is with caution that I assert the term sculpture, acknowledging that it summons notions of a demarcated “singleness” (Krauss 1999: p.53) and a form of object-hood handed down from “modernism’s claims for art’s autonomy allied to medium specificity” (Ross 2002: p.101). This designation is laden with assumptions that divide material from form, form from content and figure from ground. These are assumptions with which my project shares no collegiality. This situation has produced a tension that has led me to ask, Why is it that sculpture becomes the framework through which to position the practice. Why not installation, relational practices or performance? This question opens onto another: What is specific about sculpture that is particularly useful when engaging with it as an expanded and eventful practice so that its specificity orients particular kinds of engagement related to expanding the possibilities for its production and reception?

The answers to these are partially located in the conditions that a sculptural tradition brings with it. In this context theorists such as Alex Potts have identified sculpture’s intensified relationship to questions of materiality, spatial relations, and extended temporal durations in its modes of production and reception (Potts 2002). Therefore, as the PhD project has worked to engage sculpture as an event, by expanding it to engage many activities and relations, it has proceeded via the terms of what is specific to sculpture. It has been questions related to materiality, approaches towards making, the durational conditions of sculptural reception, and sculpture’s relationship to spatial production that have informed the themes articulated in the four chapters comprising the exegesis.

PRACTISING SCULPTURE IN A POST-MEDIUM CONDITION

This PhD situates sculpture as relating to questions of eventful engagements with materiality, spatial production and temporality. The project explores the specificity of sculpture with a ‘post-medium’ condition in mind. This idea is articulated in two essays written by Rosalind Krauss: A
Voyage on The North Sea: Art In The Age of a Post-Medium Condition (1999), as well as: And Then Turn Away?: An Essay On James Coleman (1997). Through these texts, Krauss discusses the notion of art as being situated within a post-medium condition in which the specificity of media is eclipsed and hybrid forms of production, such as installation, new media, relational and ‘post-production’ practices emerge.

The idea of post-medium practice is developed by Krauss in relationship to a discussion of Marcel Broodthaer’s layered use of film and image, and the photographic practice of James Coleman. She argues that the inherent complexity of media such as photography and film effectively position them as the most ‘non’ of media, because they are not reduced to a specific medium that comes to stand for the practice. They are instead more like composites, especially in the case of film, which is contingent upon a combination of heterogeneous activities, materials, gestures and forms of organisation and technique. Krauss’s designation of film as ‘post-medium’ that exceeds the limits of a traditionally unified or synthesised medium positions it as a kind of ‘compound apparatus’ that is intimately enmeshed with the myriad layers upon which it is structured.

Krauss’s account of film as a compound apparatus effectively renders film a complex medium that is irreducible to “a single instance that would provide a formal unity for the whole” (Krauss 1999: p. 31). This idea has provided me with a conceptual platform for approaching and departing from sculpture. Krauss’s ideas have functioned as a jump-off point to facilitate my realisation of the potential for engaging sculpture also as a ‘compound’ in which a myriad of relations, processes and layers converge. For example, like film, a multiplicity of relations, including process-based activities, materials, forms of organisation, spaces, institutional contexts, collaborations, discussions, images, texts etc, circulate around, structure and enable sculpture. Engaged in this fashion, the focus shifts from sculpture approached as an object or outcome, to sculpture regarded as an expanded practice in motion, irreducible to a single instance providing a formal unity. This turns the term ‘sculpture’ from a designation into a verb. It is saturated by many activities and becomes an event.

This PhD articulates a practice that takes up the challenge of engaging with the idea and production of sculpture within this situation. The practice that emerges addresses the hybridity structuring post-medium relations and simultaneously affirms an exploration of the specificity of sculpture and develops some implications of this work for current discourse. Thus, the PhD is engaged in a process of departing from sculpture as a platform, and then manoeuvring ways...
of generating, producing, engaging, encountering, installing, documenting, writing and discussing it in relationship to discourse around contemporary practice.

THE QUESTION OF SCULPTURE AS AN EXPANDED FIELD

Another conceptual platform from which to approach this PhD research is Rosalind Krauss’s concept of sculpture’s expansion, which was articulated in the essay Sculpture in the Expanded Field (1979). This work has informed my engagement with sculpture since my undergraduate studies in the sculpture department at RMIT University. Its force has had considerable effect upon the ways I engage practice today. For these reasons it, and Krauss’s relationship to informing sculptural discourse in general, is prominent in this PhD and contributes to the questions shaping this research.

Krauss developed Sculpture in the Expanded Field a decade after the advent of Minimalism, a movement whose repercussions continue to influence contemporary approaches. Briefly, the Minimalist sculptural object was opened up to the duration of viewing and the contingencies involved in perception (Foster 1996: p.40). The Minimalist sculptural object thus generated an awareness of the physical relay occurring between the moving bodies of viewers, the space this occurred in and the time involved in perceiving the object. Although this is the case with engaging all sculpture, the process was made internal to Minimalism such that it became part of the object’s explicit function. Minimalism is crucial to my research as it has informed an understanding of the contingency of relations between objects, space, time and contexts of encounter, thereby bringing a ‘performative’ dimension to engaging the sculptural object.

In the wake of the sculptural object of Minimalism activating a myriad of situational contingencies, the category of sculpture began to make a radical departure from traditional forms of medium-specific object-hood, to include a plethora of forms that were once excluded from its realm (Krauss 1979: p.36). These included earth-works and related photographic documents (Smithson), architectural interventions (Matta-Clark), and large-scale constructions in landscape (Mary Miss), such that Krauss argued that sculpture became an “almost infinitely malleable” (Krauss 1979: p.31) designation.

Krauss’ concept of the expanded field maps a terrain in which sculpture comes to share a space in a spectrum encompassing: “architecture” (and “not-architecture”); “landscape” (and “not-landscape”); “site-construction”; “marked-sites”; and “axiomatic-structures” [these terms are all developed by Krauss]. Krauss argues that this field provides “an expanded and finite set of related positions for a given artist to occupy and explore, for an organization of work that is not dictated by the conditions of a particular medium” (Krauss 1979: p.41). Thus, the concept of the expanded field, in connection to the practices of the same era, became a precedent for the
development of installation practices in the 90s, whereby installation came to occupy multiple positions within a field of relations in which the specificity of media collapsed to make way for hybrid forms.

Given that this PhD research occurs almost 30 years after Krauss’s discussion, in the wake of post-medium, relational and new-media practices, the inevitable question emerges concerning why my project positions sculpture as manoeuvring towards an event. Hasn’t sculpture’s utmost expansion already taken place? What is it about situating sculpture as an event that offers a contribution to a contemporary discussion concerning the practice and idea of sculpture?

The answer to this is two-fold. Firstly, this PhD is not concerned with establishing an historical lineage and does not locate Krauss’s position as a grand context within which to place contemporary sculpture. It is not that sculpture’s attainment of a state of expansion is the logical outcome of Krauss’s argument. Rather, her position is taken as a provocation to both approach and depart from the practice of sculpture in which the idea of sculpture’s ‘expansion’ continues to suggest new ways of thinking and practicing. Moreover, there is something in Krauss’s ideas that resonates strongly with the ways in which this PhD has developed. My engagement with sculpture has always tended towards involving a more expansive, spatialised, temporalised and proliferating approach.

Secondly, my position connects to an argument made by Pamela Lee that sculpture of the autonomous, positivist kind has actually made a grand re-appearance since the 90s in the wake of installation practices. Lee argues that its re-emergence equates with a renewed commodification afforded by discrete, display-ready objects that have reappeared in response to the “unwieldy-ness” of installation (Lee 2002: p.392). Lee’s diagnosis connects to a Euro-American context, but given the internationalism prevalent within contemporary art -- exemplified for example in the explosion of worldwide Biennales (Foster 2004: p.192) -- I would argue that her assessment is also applicable in an Australian context. There does seem to be an increase in the amount of sculpture produced as display-ready work, as is apparent in the work of practitioners such as Ricky Swallow, Emily Floyd and Patricia Piccinini. These examples (among others) seem to confirm that there has been a movement towards forms that could be described as remaining within the common register of sculptural identity based upon object-oriented autonomy.

In this PhD I have used Lee’s diagnosis as a platform from which to position my practice’s relationship to the resurgence of sculptural autonomy. Thus, by hooking into the historic discourse sparked by Krauss, and combining it with Lee’s recent discussion, I aim to both develop an understanding of this emerging form in a contemporary context, and to distance my practice from this movement towards forms of renewed autonomy. My motivation is not a dialectical or moral opposition to the production of objects, but is sparked by an interest in engaging in the
production of art in ways that promotes complexity, rather than reducing it into recognisable forms of object (and subject) and related forms of reception, narration, commodification and knowledge/meaning generation. This connects my project to an idea developed by Nicholas Bourriaud’s notion of artwork not as constituting a form of completeness, but as an ephemeral moment (an event) positioned within a flow of contributions. He writes in the book Postproduction, “the contemporary work of art does not position itself as the termination point of the ‘creative process’ (a ‘finished product’ to be contemplated) but as a site of navigation, a portal, a generator of activities” (Bourriaud 2005: p.19).

PRACTISING SCULPTURE IN A CONTEMPORARY SITUATION

This PhD reflects an intensive period of research into the possibilities for practising and engaging with the question of sculpture today. This exploration has involved responding to a series of historic and contemporary provocations, while at the same time positioning and engaging with what is specific to sculpture as a way to manoeuvre within a contemporary situation oriented by post-medium, post-autonomous, relational and post-production discourses. This PhD has therefore involved an oscillation towards, and away from sculpture, as I have addressed what is specific to sculpture, then connected these elements to questions that expand beyond its purview. These have involved topographies of engagement related to collaboration, organisation, mapping, engaging institutional situations, site-specificity, documentation, video production, writing and dialogue.

Thus, this PhD has not been about eliminating sculpture, but has instead affirmed that an engagement with it has something to offer an expansive and proliferating approach, which in turn contributes to a contemporary dialogue concerning sculptural and related spatial, relational and post-medium discourses. It is the specific questions pertaining to sculpture that relate to materiality, form-generation, object-quality, modes of production, questions of engagement and encounter, a relation to context and emplacement, and relationships to time and space which become emphasized and which enable a complex engagement whereby sculpture becomes a convergence of relations and proliferates as an event.
POSITIONING THE EXEGESIS

THE EXEGESIS IN RELATION TO THE PHD

Through the process of writing this exegesis, specific concepts became amplified and developed by virtue of the specificity offered by this activity. I have observed that writing causes a process of perpetual differentiation from its object -- being the research practice -- because the very activity of writing develops a series of divergences and possibilities. Thus, the writing does not become a description or a tracing of the practice, but a mapping that generates another project, which is the project of writing.

This exegesis locates a limit that orients and specifies platforms for engagement. It activates parts and maps possible relations between parts. But more importantly, it articulates the thinking-practice component of the research, a kind of thinking-practice that is inextricably bound up in a making-practice such that each informs the other very closely. Concerns and connections that may not be apparent when engaging projects in a studio or exhibition format are developed by virtue of the process of writing, which enables an engagement with ideas via another modality. The exegesis also provides an opportunity for making connections and articulating relationships across projects, and then offering this exploration to others, hopefully contributing to a larger dialogue pertaining to contemporary practice.

DEVELOPING A RELATIONSHIP TO HISTORY, THEORY AND PRACTICE THROUGH WRITING

The exegesis draws from an array of concepts, ideas and practices. By employing concepts from theoretical and philosophical sources, my intent is not to develop theoretical arguments, but to use these concepts as a means of activating connections and building platforms for new ways of thinking about and engaging with the idea and practice of sculpture-as-event.

The research therefore engages history and theory in terms of ‘moments’ or ‘hooks’ with which it makes connections. It is not concerned with locating grand historical and theoretical contexts within which to place the project as a form of validation. There is no definitive or overarching context in which the practice can neatly fit. Instead, it activates minor contexts by oscillating across and between discourses, hooking into and running with ideas if they become useful. In turn, the PhD becomes a platform from which specific historical and theoretical moments are

---

2 For instance, the discussions of the notion of practising within a post-medium condition, sculpture in the expanded field and sculptural specificity explored in the proceeding paragraphs are not located as absolute contexts, but as provocations that spark a way of thinking about this PhD.
activated. The exegesis is thus both a site and an apparatus to amplify and position these historic and theoretical impulses in relationship to the diversity of concerns weaving through the project.

In relationship to philosophy, this research has involved investigations into texts that relate to particular questions involving materiality, spatiality and temporality. Theory is employed as a multi-layered construction upon which to alight and connect, but these connections are primarily oriented through the concerns that emerge from the practice-led research involving sculptural production, exhibition, engagement and documentation. It is important to note, however, that an engagement with theory and writing is considered as forming a crucial component of the practice-led aspects of the research. As such, theory becomes an atmosphere that surrounds the practice, perpetually inflecting and/or reorienting approaches and processes across the last five years of engagement. The philosophical component that interlaces through the text includes ideas from Luce Irigaray, Brian Massumi, Elizabeth Grosz and Andrew Benjamin concerning materiality; Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari and associated texts by John Rajchman and Elizabeth Grosz, particularly in connection to ideas of time, forces and multiplicity; and Georges Bataille in relationship to the notion of the partial and the incomplete.

In relation to art-related discourse, the exegesis connects to discussions concerning materiality, process, production, the notion of performativity or the operational, representation, institutional critique, the contingency of perception, collectivity, collaboration, mapping as a generative practice, and site-specificity. A host of practices from post-minimalism, process-art, and contemporary international and local practices are also braided into the exegesis and provide points for discussion, elaboration and cross-over with the project components of the research. More historically oriented projects by artists such as Robert Smithson, Richard Serra, Carl Andre, Robert Morris, Barry Le Va, Bruce Nauman and the Büro Berlin artists Fritz Rahmann, Herman Pitz and Raimund Kummer are engaged. Texts by writers such as Pamela Lee, Alex Potts, Rosalind Krauss, Hal Foster, Miwon Kwon, Andrew Uroskie, Claire Bishop, Teresa Stoppani, Sven Olav-Wallenstein, Barbara Bolt and Terri Bird are explored. Recent practices discussed include those of Belgian artist Joëlle Tuerlinckx, Dutch artist Joke Robbard, Korean artist Koo Joeng-A, Sydney artist Lisa Kelly, and Melbourne peers including Terri Bird and Spiros Panigirakis. The collaborative/collective projects CLUBSproject Inc, and OSW, are also included within specific discussions relating to research concerns.

It is important to note that Tuerlinckx is the artist explored to the most intensive degree across all chapters of the exegesis. The reason for this is that her work has informed my approach from very early on (since my undergraduate studies in 1997), and has provided an exemplary model for thinking about generating a practice that opens up dynamic possibilities for engagement as they relate to many aspects of art production, exhibition, documentation and encounter. I came into

---

3 OSW stands for Open Spatial Workshop and involves the energies of people such as Terri Bird, Scott Mitchell, Natasha Johns-Messenger and myself.
contact with Tuerlinckx’s practice through an exhibition catalogue published by a Dutch institution called Witte de With in Rotterdam (Tuerlinckx 1995). The proliferating images and notes connected to her project focused not only upon the specific elements of her ephemeral sculptural ‘bits and pieces’, but addressed, with similar attention, the situational contexts structuring their display. Images of stairwells, the sky, raindrops, dust and pigeon shit on the windows, titles of catalogues, people engaging with and moving through her work, and elements of the surrounding city, combined to produce a material, spatial and temporal ‘matrix of relations’. Tuerlinckx’s work seemed like a force intersecting other spatial, material and institutional forces. There seemed to be no absolute definition to where it began and ended -- only a sense of it opening out from an ever-thickening middle. In 1999, while living in the Netherlands for 12 months, I sought out and attended one of her major exhibitions, called This Book, Like A Book, held at S.M.A.K. in Ghent, Belgium. Tuerlinckx’s work produced a formative and enduring impression, because I had never seen art produced, installed, written, and documented in its manner. It activated an opening whereby I realised that a way of producing and engaging that differed from that which I had assumed or adopted as an art student, was possible. To a greater extent, this PhD has followed that trajectory, as the research has explored a perpetual opening up of the possibilities for ways of generating and engaging a practice.

---

4 Many thanks to Terri Bird and Tanya Eccleston, my lecturers at the time, for introducing me to this practice.
5 S.M.A.K. stands for Stedelijk Museum Voor Actueel Kunst and is located at Citadelpark B, in Ghent. Tuerlinckx’s project was curated by Bart de Baere.
SUMMARY OF THE EXEGESIS AND ITS ARRANGEMENT

THE EXEGESIS IS BROKEN INTO 8 MAIN SECTIONS CONSTITUTING:

An introduction

A list of projects and the context of their presentation and exhibition

A List and table of figures for the exegesis

Part one: MATERIAL ADVENTURES, which encompasses:
   Chapter one: Coming To Understand A Particular Kind of Materiality; and
   Chapter two: Making Approached From Five Platforms

Part two: SPATIAL PRODUCTIONS, which encompasses:
   Chapter three: A Topography of Particles; and
   Chapter four: Mapping as a Process of Production

An expanded conclusion, divided into two parts:
   MANOEUVRING SCULPTURE articulates the ways that sculpture has been manoeuvred
towards becoming an event through a series of methodologies, thereby addressing the
first research question, which is: how can sculpture be practised as a proliferating event?

   TOWARDS A PROLIFERATING EVENT is the second part of the expanded conclusion and
addresses the remaining research questions, which are: How does engaging sculpture as
event produce relations between modes of production, engagement and reception?
And: In what ways does approaching sculpture as an event contribute to contemporary
practice? The contributions of the PhD are also articulated.

Chapter references and an overall bibliography
MATERIAL ADVENTURES AND SPATIAL PRODUCTIONS

The exegesis is positioned as forming the ‘thinking-practice’ component of the practice-led research, which has emerged through the braiding of connections between scholarly research and critical articulations pertaining to studio-and-exhibition based investigations.

The four chapters comprising this section have developed through a process of mapping a diversity of themes, questions and concerns pertaining to sculptural practice into a series of platforms that provide particular orientations for engagement. This approach has been generated through an avoidance of writing the exegesis as a chronological, project-by-project breakdown. It has also developed through an avoidance of locating an overarching discursive context and then ‘contextualising’ my project in secondary relationship to it.

The development of the exegesis has thus emerged through a process of mapping a series of concerns that emerged across connections and between clusters of projects. As such, four conceptual clusters shaping the exegesis were developed. These concern: questions of materiality; processes involved in making; the question of the production of spatial and temporal modes; and mapping as a process of production. Each of these clusters has been developed in the chapters listed below. Throughout the chapters, particular projects and exhibitions are addressed in relationship to constellations of ideas explored.

The four chapters are broken between two sections: MATERIAL ADVENTURES and SPATIAL PRODUCTIONS. This is because some chapters gravitate more strongly to questions related to materiality, as in the case of chapters one and two, while others moved towards questions pertaining to temporal and spatial explorations, which is the case for chapters three and four.
INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER SUMMARIES AND CONNECTIONS

MATERIAL ADVENTURES

Chapter One
COMING TO UNDERSTAND A PARTICULAR KIND OF MATERIALITY

Chapter one addresses the question of materiality grappled with throughout the duration of the PhD by interweaving studio-based research with specific theoretical positions that have inflected and guided an approach. Materiality is situated as the first chapter of the exegesis because an engagement with materiality often locates the initial contact made when generating projects. Materiality is also situated in this PhD as that which connects to the notion of sculptural specificity, because traditionally sculpture’s “sheer and unavoidable materiality” (Potts 2002) locates, in part, its difference from other disciplines, thereby bringing with it something particular to production within a post-medium situation. Materiality is also located in this PhD as a particularly rich area for investigation in relationship to the idea of manoeuvring sculpture towards an event, due to the connections that materiality has with the idea of forces and relations.

The purpose of chapter one is thus to address a process of sculptural exploration related to materiality from a number of theoretical platforms. As such, the chapter articulates a series of concepts which have been useful in expanding my understanding of the idea of matter, beyond thinking of it primarily as ‘substance’, to become a working concept in which matter locates and partakes in a field of relationships. This is explored in part one of the chapter.

From there, the chapter explores how a re-positioning of matter and the related notions of material and materiality has informed my practice in ways whereby my understanding of what the material of a practice can be has extended to encompass matters of an organisational, textual, collaborative and social fashion.

This chapter also begins to address the PhD’s goal of positing sculpture as a proliferating event. Materiality is discussed and engaged through the idea of eventfulness, force and process, thereby setting up a particular orientation for the following discussions that shape the exegesis.

Chapter Two
MAKING APPROACHED FROM FIVE PLATFORMS

In a fashion similar to chapter one, Chapter Two articulates an approach focused upon a particular question that then undergoes an expansion by virtue of the multiple ways that the
question is engaged. The initial focus of this chapter concerns the activity of making, which is splintered into five platforms of approach in order that the possibilities for thinking about what making constitutes expand and shift. The five platforms for approach include:

**Making as encountering forces: articulating body-work relations:** Explores the idea of researching ‘physical’ engagements between the force of bodies and the force of materiality, through the idea of them engaging in a field of relationships;

**Making durations:** Articulates the idea that the activity of making involves sustained engagements and dialogues within the complex duration of a project’s public presentation and is not only something that happens ‘before’ an exhibition. Instead, making becomes an expanded field of activity;

**Expanding the process of making beyond a subject-centered approach:** Discusses materiality’s activity as constituting a form of making/production that is expanded beyond an approach centered primarily by human-oriented intent;

**Engaging with making as a form of collective activity:** Explores making as a process of structuring relations between groupings of people;

**Positioning the event of encounter as a process of production:** Develops the idea that a viewer’s engagement with work becomes a form of production.

This chapter builds from the ideas developed in Chapter One, in particular the relationship to the notion of materiality as being eventful and positioned as a condition teeming with forces and energies. Positioning material as such opens up a series of possibilities for engaging the process of making, and Chapter Two charts an exploration of these possibilities imbricated with discussions connecting to the studio and exhibition-led components.

The chapter maps a passage from physically-oriented process in which making is positioned as an encounter of forces between bodies and materials in a series of dynamic relationships. From there, it moves into a discussion of making as developing a form of engagement over a duration of time, discussing the idea of making as generating an ongoing dialogue within a field of processes. The discussion then makes a departure into approaching making as an activity that is partially disconnected from a subject-centred approach, and explores the idea of making as relating to the self-generating or self-organising capacity of materiality, which is positioned as ‘having agency’. The chapter then develops a discussion of making that proliferates the activity from the purview of one individual into a process that overlaps groupings of things and people, such as in organisational and collaborative projects. This is not to propose a principled position where collaboration is the favored outcome, but to develop an approach toward making that
displaces the image of the individual creator by recognising the inherently social and collaborative nature of production. This then opens into a discussion that positions viewing as a form of production, rather than a form of straightforward reception or consumption.

One of the major aims of this chapter is to open the practice of making beyond the domain of an author who ‘transforms matter’, whereby the subject is positioned at the center of relations with material. This chapter therefore articulates a shift towards processes of de-centering and proliferation. In this process the position of being a subject-author disperses so as to become interlaced within a field of relations and activities. The chapter articulates how this shift in perception has come about through the various activities undertaken during the PhD.

This chapter articulates a strong relationship to the idea of Material Adventures through the process of thinking about the activity of making as an expanded practice. This chapter therefore engages with one of the main objectives of the PhD, which is to engage the production of sculpture as a material adventure. The idea of Material Adventures is addressed in Chapter Two as a particular attitude directed towards the activity of making, in which an expanded approach towards production and reception shifts sculpture towards a series of open-ended encounters or adventures.

**SPATIAL PRODUCTIONS**

Chapter Three

**A TOPOGRAPHY OF PARTICLES**

Chapter Three takes a different approach from the first two chapters, developing a stronger focus upon the spatial and temporal concerns of the PhD research. It thus becomes the first chapter to fall under the notion of ‘spatial production’. The idea of Spatial Production relates to the ways that sculpture engages and activates space. The position made by this chapter is that sculpture performs spatial and temporal relations, and in this activity, it generates modes of address, which in turn activate viewing practices.

Two interrelated concepts, scatter and partiality, are engaged to explore this idea. These ideas articulate the predominant forms of spatial distribution active in the exhibition components of the research. These concepts are addressed through a discussion of particular project examples interlaced with specific theoretical concerns relating to a sculptural discourse.

Alex Potts’s discussion concerning the potential for sculpture to amplify temporal conditions, in connection to Rosalind Krauss’s notion of sculpture as a passage in time, are used to focus a
discussion upon the idea of scatter. Scatter is discussed as a strategy to exaggerate a particularly temporal and partial condition in relationship to sculpture. The aim of this is to animate the practice of viewing by manoeuvring it away from representational or interpretive frameworks, towards other modes of engagement connected to the idea of sculpture becoming an adventure with material in time.

The second part of the chapter deals with the concept of the part, or the partial, in relationship to generating projects that become indeterminate or provisional constellations, whereby the discontinuity of the part, the bit and the fragment, are privileged over ideal forms that are projected in advance. This relates to the production of ‘part objects’ within many of the sculptural projects as a means for generating proliferations that move away from being objects, towards becoming propositions.

The partial is also discussed in relationship to a notion of space that emerges through ‘localised determinations’. This idea, taken from Deleuze, is discussed with particular reference to the use of partiality in the films of Robert Bresson, and the amplification of partiality in the installations of Joëlle Tuerlinckx. These studies are woven into a discussion upon the project intensive objects: indeterminate events (2002).

This chapter addresses one of the broader aims of the PhD, which is to shift sculpture as far away as possible from becoming something resolved, resolvable or reducible into fixed entities. The focus placed upon scatter and partiality is intended to produce a proliferating situation saturated by a multiplicity of relations that cannot be ‘exhausted’. Instead sculpture is conceptualised as an incremental, bit-by-bit adventure in perpetual production.

Chapter Four
MAPPING AS A PROCESS OF PRODUCTION

Chapter Four builds upon ideas developed in Chapter Three concerning questions of space, further developing the idea of sculpture as constituting a form of spatial practice. As such, Chapter Four provides an affirmation of the more spatial aspects of the PhD research. This chapter considers mapping as a significant process, because mapping is used extensively as a generative and multi-layered methodology in the production of projects.

Chapter Four explores an expanded concept of mapping, developed through a close reading of Teresa Stoppani’s article Mapping The Locus of The Project (Stoppani 2004), and connects this concept to Robert Smithson’s Spiral Jetty project from 1970. Together, Stoppani’s theoretical account and Smithson’s project become a platform from which the PhD continually revisits the idea of mapping as a process that structures many engagements, ranging from the production
of objects, to the installation of projects, to the ways that projects engage the question of site and context, to the modes in which projects are documented.

Of crucial importance is that the notion of mapping that informs this chapter is one that is generative and is positioned as being a form of spatial production. This chapter works to shift mapping away from being used as a descriptive or representational device, to a position in which it is seen as a device that enables new relationships and possibilities to emerge for producing projects and for orienting sculpture as a spatial practice. This chapter is divided into three main sections:

1) The first engages in a discussion of the expanded concept of mapping learnt through the scholarly research component, combined with practice-led engagements. This develops into a discussion of questions concerning site, the concepts of working ‘between’ and the relationship this develops for understanding projects as activating particular spatial contexts and situations. This section sets up the idea that all processes and outcomes of the PhD become forms of mapping; the implications of this idea are addressed.

2) The second section of the chapter builds from the first, picking up on the idea of a work addressing its context, and exploring the idea of a work ‘making its situational relations visible’ (Rahmann 1986: p.12) through a process of mapping. This chapter explores this idea in relationship to the project Büro Berlin, whose approach towards production has helped to shape my practice. A discussion related to engaging within institutional situations, drawing from Joëlle Tuerlinckx’s strategies, is also investigated.

3) Lastly, the notion of documentation as a form of mapping, articulates a shift where mapping is positioned as a process that occurs across the practice. The process of mapping through the use of video, text and image to generate proliferating forms of mapping, has replaced the notion of ‘documenting work’, because documentation becomes a mapping that unleashes the potential for a project to be extended and changed, as well as a process that opens up other contexts for engagement. Documentation-as-mapping thus becomes a vital research methodology and outcome, rather than remaining in a secondary relationship to projects. The idea of image, text and video documentation gaining an intensified role in connection to the practices of Joëlle Tuerlinckx and Joke Robaard are explored.

In relation to the broader aims of the PhD, this chapter primarily addresses the notion of mapping as a methodology in which process is intensified to the point where the PhD projects are positioned as a perpetual series of mappings. This approach is connected to the objective of generating a practice based in proliferation, in which mapping becomes the strategy for manoeuvering sculpture towards becoming a proliferating event.
AN EXPANDED CONCLUSION
This section presents an expanded conclusion articulating the idea that the PhD has been engaged in a process of manoeuvering sculpture towards becoming a proliferating event. It is broken into two parts.

Manoeuvring Sculpture
Part one deals with the ‘methodological manoeuvres’ that are used to explore the potential of engaging sculpture as an event. Throughout these manoeuvres the generative, eventful and open-ended approaches related to production are emphasised. These methodologies are therefore positioned as being the activities used to proliferate the practice of sculpture.

Towards a Proliferation Event
The second part of the expanded conclusion addresses the remaining research questions by summarising the positions made by the PhD, and discusses the contributions made to contemporary practice.

APPROPRIATE DURABLE RECORD
The Appropriate Durable Record (ADR) has developed alongside the exegetical component. It is approached as a mapping, and has developed in response to the structure of the exegesis. For example, the major chapters developed in the exegesis, and all of the sub-sections enfolded within each of these chapters, provide the major platforms guiding the development and structure of the ADR. The exegetical component is a format where certain ideas gain a particular significance, and this is also the case for the ADR. The ADR’s image-based format provides an opportunity for the amplification of particular details and terrains for focus. For instance, where there is a minor discussion in relationship to a particular object or process within the exegesis, it might be dealt with in greater detail in the ADR. As such, the ADR is to the exegesis as the exegesis is to the PhD -- it is a mapping that becomes another project.

Note on how to engage the relationship between exegesis and ADR
Given that the ADR has developed in relationship to the structure of the exegesis, both are intended to be engaged with in a zig-zagging fashion. It is suggested that as each chapter of the exegesis is explored, the ADR be consulted variously whilst reading. The ADR is not an illustration of the exegesis, but articulates and positions the studio and exhibition aspects of the research in close relationship to the discussions developed in the writing.
It is also suggested that the ADR be engaged with first as an overall document before reading the exegesis, because cumulatively, the images provide an atmosphere within which to encounter the PhD overall.

The ADR is a ‘proposition for a future book’. As such, it is presented for examination as an arranged, as yet unbound image-file of the research practice.

**FINAL EXHIBITION**

The final exhibition of the PhD will take the form of an expanded material inventory that gathers together particular research layers, mapping them into a series of ‘compressions’. Book-compressions, video sequences, material fragments and re-articulations, samples, mappings, installation fragments will be presented. It is important to note that the exhibition will be a presentation of research, which means that it will engage in different kinds of format than the projects discussed throughout the exegesis. It is not intended that this exhibition represent the research, but that it will provide a series of platforms of research material from which to engage the PhD.
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COMING TO UNDERSTAND A PARTICULAR KIND OF MATERIALITY

“…my work is impure, it is clogged with matter. There is no escape from matter. There is no escape from the physical nor is there any escape from the mind…”

(Smithson 1996: p.154)

INTRODUCTION

This chapter articulates an expanded approach towards materiality; an approach that has been activated through a convergence of studio-led research coupled with examples from art history and interlaced with theoretical discourses. Exploring a relationship to materiality forms the first chapter of this exegesis because adventuring materiality is one of the initial activities engaged with in this research practice in relationship to sculptural production.

This chapter articulates four conceptual frameworks that have informed an understanding and subsequent approach towards the interrelated ideas pertaining to matter, material and materiality. The chapter is divided into two sections titled, Expanding an understanding of the concept of materiality and, Four propositions for expanding the material of a practice.

The first section, Expanding an understanding of the concept of materiality, employs four theoretical frameworks that have informed the approach made towards materiality in this research project. Firstly, Luce Irigaray’s notion of air as an ephemeral kind of matter functions as a jump-off point that facilitates an understanding of matter as something conditioned by non-physicality, inclusive of movement and change. This is coupled with an idea from Brian Massumi that proposes the notion of matter as being conditioned by incorporeality. Thirdly, Elizabeth Grosz’s idea of matter as teeming with forces and energies, developed in relationship to a reading of Nietzsche, is addressed. Fourthly, Andrew Benjamin’s idea of material as activating spatial relationships, forms a framework through which the work projects [open and hosted], produced in 2006, is discussed. Benjamin’s argument assists me in positioning my engagement with sculptural materiality as something that ‘works’ to produce space whereby an engagement with material is done so through a spatial framework.

In general, approaching matter through these ideas has assisted in informing my engagements such that my idea of matter has expanded beyond thinking of it being substance itself, to become a working concept in which matter locates and partakes in a field of relationships.

The idea of matter as partaking in a field of relationships is further developed in the second section, Four propositions for expanding the material of a practice, which explores how a positioning of matter and related notions of material and materiality, has informed my practice in
ways whereby my understanding of what the material of a practice can be has extended to encompass matters of an organizational, textual, collaborative and social fashion.

A note concerning ideas of matter, material and materiality

The process of writing this chapter has clarified my thinking and approach towards the interrelated concepts of matter, material and materiality. I have come to engage the idea of materiality as encompassing a composite of relations in which matter is conditioned by time, change and process. The idea of materiality therefore activates a perspective upon the concept of matter as active, or as a condition teeming with forces, and also of being productive, operative, generative and durational, rather than inert. A concept of materiality here indicates an expanded situation in which matter and material are nested, and in which matter and material are approached as dynamic conditions, or “materials in movement” (Deleuze and Guattari 1987: p.408). This has inflected my approach towards making and engaging sculptural-event projects; the articulations of which are braided throughout the chapter.

SECTION ONE: EXPANDING AN UNDERSTANDING OF THE CONCEPT OF MATERIALITY

First framework: remembering air (a proposition for approaching matter)

Luce Irigaray’s The Forgetting of Air in Martin Heidegger is an example of a text that has informed my approach towards matter as being more complex than an inert substance. Irigaray’s provocations in relationship to Heidegger’s discussion of ground as a site of dwelling, a solid place “from which to raise a construction” (Irigaray 1999: p.2), is to remember air also as a kind of matter, but unlike ground, air is posited as a matter that has been forgotten because it does not share the ‘density’ or presence of ground. She positions air as another kind of matter — “one which escapes mastery” (Irigaray 1999: p.12).

By approaching air as matter, Irigaray provokes a rethinking of binary relationships dividing the material and immaterial. By disconnecting air from its relationship to the immaterial, and reintroducing it as matter, Irigarary positions air as upsetting the boundaries between the material and immaterial, because air approaches the limits of what can come to be considered as matter -- Irigaray claims air as an “unthinkable that designates without ever being able to name itself…” (Irigaray 1999: p.5). “Since air never takes place in the mode of an entry into presence…(one) can think that there is nothing but absence there, for in air…(one)…does not come up against a being or a thing…” (Irigaray 1999: p.9). Irigaray evokes an avoidance of the equation of matter

6 “…Is not air the whole of our habitation as mortals? Is there a dwelling more vast, more spacious…than that of air? Can man live elsewhere than in air? Neither in earth, nor in fire, nor in water is any habitation possible for him. No other element can for him take the place of place. No other element carries with it – or lets itself be passed through by – light and shadow, voice or silence. No other element to this extent opening itself – to one who would have not forgotten its nature there is no need for it to open or re-open. No other element is as light, as free, and as much in the…mode of a permanent, available, “there is”. IRIGARAY, L. (1999) The Forgetting of Air in Martin Heidegger, London: The Althone Press, p. 8
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Second framework: immateriality as matter’s condition
In being reminded to remember that air, too, is material, I have begun to understand the notion of an “interplay of interdependence” (Bird 2006: p.2) relating notions of ‘materiality’ (matter, body) with ‘immateriality’ (process, movement, time), such that they are re-thought not as divided into a conventional hierarchy, but as constituting a relationship of indistinguishable reciprocity. In a similar fashion, concepts of materiality, physicality and “concreteness”, developed by theorists such as Brian Massumi, designate matter as that which is given with and conditioned by incorporeality and movement, rather than as being divided from these conditions (Massumi 2002: pp. 203-204). Considered as such, it becomes impossible to situate matter as that which is absolutely containable to a particular spatial location. In this re-thinking of matter, Terri Bird argues that “immateriality is implied) within the limits of materiality. This immateriality is neither beyond matter, nor tied to a transcendent ideal, rather it exceeds the confines of material limits while at the same time being an effect produced by material operations” (Bird 2006: p.1). Thus, Bird orients an approach in which materiality and immateriality are positioned not as divided, but as interrelated concepts in which each marks the limits of the other.

Third framework: teeming forces and durational relations
Extending from the idea of an immateriality implied within the limits of material, Elizabeth Grosz introduces the concept that matter is a complex tissue of relations made up of teeming forces, energies, and durations (Grosz 2004: pp. 198-199). She argues, through a reading of Nietzsche’s discussion of “will-to-power”, that life ‘seizes’ matter, and in doing so, renders it dynamic. (Grosz 2004: p.108) In her text The Nick of Time, she writes, “for Nietzsche, life is overcoming matter, making matter over into one’s image, but also succumbing to matter, bending oneself to it, using and being used by it...” (Grosz 2004: p.108). This concept assists in positioning a relationship to materiality that runs through many of the projects comprising the PhD, that impacts how material is engaged during explorative processes and the ways in which that material is presented or activated within the context of a sculptural-event project.

For example, materials are presented as articulating fleeting forces and qualities such as gravity, spillage, stretching, resting, leaning, piling, stacking and so forth. These articulations make visible a spectrum of forces, and the forms that result work to carry and make these forces apparent. This approach is evident in the material relations that were active during the project corner to corner and stretching (2004-2005), where plasticine was engaged with according to multiple processes involving melting, casting, cutting, layering and squashing. The attributes of this material are such that it quickly gathers dirt and impressions of other objects and surfaces with which it makes contact. It is a material that yields readily to the forces that engulf it (hand prints, dirt, marks where one has tripped or accidentally stepped upon it, etc.) such that its surface becomes a
kind of active archive-in-process, bearing the traces of time. Plasticine emphasizes a dynamism due to its pliability. It holds together, but only just. It is a material that makes visible the forces and relations that surround and engage it [see figures 1 and 2].

Plasticine is only one of many materials explored within this research project. An array of other ephemeral materials such as paper, processed wood (ply, melamine, MDF), felt, cardboard, rubber, tape, cast plastic, concrete, dirt, etc. are also engaged [see figure 3]. The sculptural-event projects that emerge often comprise of an array of bits and pieces of material bearing the traces of process pertaining to gravity, changes of state, squashing, stacking, leaning, piling, propping, etc. Resulting from this approach are projects that become dense with material explorations, investigations and propositions.

**Case study: one thing another thing some things other, other things stagger and...**

A focus upon the articulation of forces and energies in relation to materiality was also applied to the project *one thing another thing some things other, other things stagger and...* (2003), in which a series of ephemeral materials were provisionally installed throughout the exhibition venue of CLUBsProject inc. Paper curtains, lines of lightweight plastic tubing attached to an air pump, paper shreds and a paper bag comprised parts of this installation [see figure 4].

As this space was already very open to the forces of the outside environment, including breezes and rapidly changing light conditions, the work took on a quality of registering and amplifying those conditions. This was made especially evident by fragments such as the paper curtains, which were caught in and choreographed by the persistent breeze that passed through the room’s propped-open windows. A paper bag, installed directly upon the floor, was similarly animated by these forces, but also by the stirring of air produced when people passed through the room, which in turn worked to re-deposit the bag in different positions across the floor.

While developing this work, observing and then reflecting upon the movement of these curtains activated within me a particular understanding of materiality in an expanded sense. I began to approach the material of this work as comprising a composite of relations that included: the paper combined with the force of gravity combined with the currents of air coming in from outside combined with the displacements of air from moving bodies (and so forth). I locate this shift in thinking as one of the outcomes of the research project that connects to the aim of exploring and articulating sculpture as being eventful. This example highlights material as being eventful where materiality is engaged with as a condition replete with a complexity of relations, movements and transitions. In the case of the curtains, the paper became a surface that yielded to a series of forces – thereby reminding me not to forget the teeming energies being registered there. This example, although specific to a particular context, also functions as a proposition for considering the engagements with material addressed generally throughout this PhD, whereby a
focus has been placed upon material as comprising a composite of relations in a way in which materiality’s ‘eventfulness’ becomes apparent.

This is where my research intersects with the practice of Joëlle Tuerlinckx. Tuerlinckx deploys materials such as confetti and shreds of paper into temporary arrangements, mostly direct on the floor, to produce installations that become “a sensitive instrument, as a sort of seismograph, detecting and recording waves of energy” (Kremer 1995: pp. 79-80). Temporality is amplified in these arrangements. This is most evident when flows of people into and out of her installations disrupt arrangements of confetti lines, or when bodies pass through cones of light that emanate from her slide and overhead projectors, to cast transitional real-time shadow films upon constructed walls of translucent paper (Tuerlinckx 1999). Tuerlinckx’s work provides a space in which materiality becomes a field of exchange between an ephemeral kind of sculpture and the forces and processes of its immediate environment. Regarding this, Tuerlinckx writes in a note to her exhibition at Witte de With about working directly upon the floor as a site for the facilitation of material forces whereby, “real energies originate, and little by little one realizes that these energies express a living condition because, during their moments of expediation, they see and comprehend the world” (Tuerlinckx 1995: p.156) [see figure 5 and 6].

A note upon the amplification of process in relationship to engaging materiality

The kinds of engagement with materiality that are activated in this research are those in which material is not approached as inert stuff, as brute substance subject to anthropocentric form-making (Cheah 1996: p.129) in which form is pre-determined and imposed upon material. Instead, this PhD locates an interest in experimenting with what happens when attention shifts towards the idea of matter connected to the discussions above, and partly constitutes an exploration of the field of possibilities that emerge as a result of this shift. Of particular importance in this shift is an amplification of engaging with materiality in which generative processes are intensified in the projects, rather than employing process in a reductive sense whereby outcomes are overly refined.

Resulting from this kind of approach are projects comprising a plurality of material differentiations, repetitions and investigations. This position has been enriched by ideas gleaned from John Rajchman, who discusses such an approach in relation to the idea of the potential that a process-oriented approach generates in terms of, “releasing other spaces, mapping other territories, not by reducing sense but by multiplying it, densifying instead or rarifying, lightening instead of purifying, complexifying instead of reducing” (Rajchman 1997: p.8).

For example, a simple material such as masking tape might be present within an installation multiple times, so that the potential of this material becomes articulated and re-articulated in and as the project. In the case of masking tape, it might emerge as a line-mapping upon a floor, as a binding for a structure, as a compressed ball, as a line delineating a space, as a roll holding
up a structure, etc. This example provides a means for thinking about all the materials involved in my work: because each material is articulated in a number of ways, rather than being refined into a single outcome. The process of articulating materials in a number of ways thereby forms part of the ‘subject’ of the work. Moreover, each articulation presents the possibility for a material’s further differentiation and, as such, each differentiation opens up a field of potential. What results is a work that presents a diversity of processes in which explorations into material take on an exaggerated role. Another effect is that materials take on propositional and indeterminate quality because the work becomes more like a testing ground, rather than a display of materials set into definite formations.

A note concerning ephemerality and temporality in relationship to material

A majority of materials employed within the production of the works, as well as the means in which they are deployed throughout the projects, embraces the ephemeral. Materials are deployed into provisional configurations, so as to stress process, time and change. Materials such as shreds of paper, swathes of felt, cast lines of rubber, masking tape, piles of dirt and so on, are regularly engaged within the matrix of projects. Even when ‘heavier’ materials are engaged, such as when construction materials are used, they are used in a fashion in which provisionality, ephemerality and partiality are emphasised.

This approach towards material connects my practice to a history of post-minimal, ‘process art’ practices, in particular, to its temporally and procedurally based aspects, evident in works such as Barry Le Va’s Continuous and Related Activities: Discontinued by the Act of Dropping (1967/90) [see figure 7 and 8]. Upon this idea, Pamela Lee argues in the essay Some kinds of duration: The temporality of drawing as process art that what was important to process art, exemplified in projects such as La Va’s, was not a fetishisation of matter for matter’s sake, but in the work’s relationship to and intensification of duration as forming one of the substantial elements of the work (Lee 1999: p.34). She argues that this is a way out of the “fetishisation of matter” because the amplification of process explicitly positions material as being engaged in a reciprocal relationship with temporality. Therefore, in employing process and intensifying it as one of a work’s elements, time and entropy become configured as integral to an engagement with materiality.

Fourth framework: The activity of materiality: material as producing spatial relations

Material operations, or the activity of materiality, Andrew Benjamin argues, is sculpture’s “productive element” (Benjamin 1997 a: p.56). Approached as such, materiality is positioned as something that works to produce space by virtue of the relations it activates. What this idea opens is the possibility of approaching material as a tool with which to generate space and spatial relations. This comes about through the ways that materiality is deployed, or the particular ways that it generates spacings.
The spacings that sculptural materiality activates are discussed by Benjamin as the “internal world created by the work – created by it as an integral part of its work -- in being part of the whole, [which] indicates that the external world in which the work is positioned must in some sense have been created by the work” (Benjamin 1997 a: p.56). Benjamin’s comment is useful because it suggests that an interplay is active between material and space, so that space might be thought of as a ‘practice’ of materiality. What this means is that material and space are positioned as conditions of one another in ways in which space cannot be thought of outside of materiality. If approached as being contingent upon the activity of materiality, space thus becomes positioned not as abstract or dematerialized, but as differentiated by the specificity of a materiality that animates it.

If materiality is considered to be actively productive of spatial relations, then materiality-as-active becomes a condition for the bringing forth, or facilitation, of a myriad of spatial possibilities. This PhD articulates those experiments with materiality, exploring them as a terrain of possibilities for spatial differentiation and production. In turn, this process and its multiple outcomes comprise an intensive aspect of the form-content of the sculptural-event projects.

Case study of materiality activating spatial relations: project projects [open and hosted]

An example of the idea of materiality as being productive of spatial relations was investigated within a recent installation at RMIT project space called *project projects [open and hosted]* (2006). A myriad of materials were deposited directly upon the room’s concrete floor as a means to investigate, activate and differentiate the space. Processes involved a form of direct casting upon the floor surface, conducted with a plasticine patch casting. Other processes involved sweeping daily dust residues generated through process of construction. These accumulated over time and were swept into a thin, ephemeral line momentarily dividing two sections of the room. Other processes involved construction techniques with which a plywood flooring system was installed directly upon the floor’s surface.

These experiments constituted ‘material propositions’, in which each material event, ranging from the plasticine patch to the plywood flooring, activated different relationships with the concrete floor so as to draw attention to it, thereby highlighting the different possibilities for its apprehension. For example, the plasticine patch worked to draw attention to the floor and also to frame it as a cast surface. However, in the event of the plasticine activating this connection, the difference between the floor and the patch was made apparent. Important to this point is that the materiality of the work consisted of more than the plasticine patch; to comprise a
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7 A patch of plasticine, constructed over a series of days, poured layer by thick layer directly onto the concrete-aggregate floor, served to accentuate the activity of the plasticine’s materiality in relationship to the surrounding ground. Heated to a molten state, the plasticine was deployed directly, finding its level and congealing into a smooth, extended surface as it approached room temperature. The plasticine became a small, slightly spread-out patch leveling with the horizontal floor. Successive layers were poured one atop the other; with former layers becoming zones of constraint by restraining and channeling the flow of molten material above.
composite of relations, recalling the example provided earlier in this chapter of the paper curtains. It is this system of relations that becomes the materiality of the work, involving the plasticine patch plus the effect of its connection with the larger concrete floor, plus the difference between them -- a difference that emerges in the event apprehending their difference.

Moreover, in the event of the plasticine patch becoming a device through which to consider and connect to other material events, such as the floor, or the road outside, or the footpath (which are all different forms of casting), the literalised ‘here-ness’ of the plasticine patch, for example, becomes splintered into the ‘there-ness’ of those other material instances -- instances with which it forms, activates or maps a connection. By setting up a chain of connections, the material relations of any particular sculptural-event project thereby bring the limits of material into focus due to the process of connection-making that materiality activates.

A materiality positioned as active becomes a materiality that ‘reaches beyond’ its limits to constitute a form of spatial production. The boundaries established by material become transgressed by the movement which material activates, a movement that expands virtually beyond materiality’s limits. An example is Carl Andre’s bricks, which were placed together side by side in a line, effectively producing a trajectory that extends virtually in both directions, beyond the limits marked out by the ‘actual’ bricks [see figure 9].

In being oriented as productive, materiality becomes an eventful condition that encompasses a series of relations. Through this framework, materiality is not approached as the simple substance of a sculptural practice, but as active in the production of space. This approach re-orient space so that it becomes included in the composite of relations, to form a part of sculpture’s medium, rather than a ground or a backdrop onto which sculpture is deposited.
SECTION TWO: PROPOSITIONS FOR EXPANDING THE MATERIAL OF A PRACTICE

The effect of linking together the four conceptual frameworks provided by Irigaray, Massumi, Grosz and Benjamin; of air as a model for repositioning the possibilities for approaching what matter might be; of incorporeality being the condition of matter; of matter understood to be made up of teeming forces such that it is rendered dynamic and temporal; and of material as active in the production of space is that a new approach towards engaging material related to my practice has been enabled. As well as effecting forms of engagement with a more sculpturally-oriented materiality, these ideas have assisted in shaping an understanding of what might be considered the ‘expanded materials’ of practice -- to involve matters not only of a sculptural nature, but also of an organizational, textual, collaborative and social fashion. I consider this expanded approach towards material as constituting one of the contributions of this research project. By approaching material as an expanded condition, I have been able to engage with research across a wide spectrum of situations and activities; this in turn opened my research activity beyond the model of a private studio, into a dynamic relay of organizational and discursive situations.

Layers of production as constituting the expanded material of a practice

The idea of the material of one’s practice being more than the literal stuff from which work is made has not only been inflected by theoretical positions, but has emerged as a result of my experience of working with CLUBSproject through which an engagement with a wider social and discursive field is evident. Working with CLUBS has involved my engagement with myriad layers of production, including the development of critical writings, the organization of large scaled projects, collaborative activities and workshops, and developing models for sustaining peer-to-peer dialogues. Through the process of critically reflecting upon my research, especially in relationship to writing this exegesis, I have come to appreciate these multiple activities as constituting vital materials of my practice and research. My understanding of material has thus expanded beyond the literal materials involved in any particular project, into the conditions of practice. As a result, I now approach my practice as a composite of engagements ranging from the production of sculptural-events to exploring and developing social and organisational forms.

Practice as a field of activity

Situating these multiple layers of activity and organisation as constituting part of the material of my practice has social and political implications. The organizational activities locate a nexus
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8 CLUBSproject was initiated in 2002 as an artist-driven project exploring the possibilities for experimenting with organizational relations and for generating multiple ways of making practices public. CLUBS began as a project space that operated above the Builder’s Arms hotel between 2002-2005. After vacating these premises, CLUBS has organised a series of off-site projects involving ‘nesting’ within other spaces such as offices, galleries, sporting grounds, balconies, shop fronts and lounge rooms. CLUBS has been active in developing engaged peer-to-peer dialogues, workshops and publications. At the time of writing this exegesis, the CLUBS committee involves Bianca Hester, Terri Bird, Spiros Panigirakis, Chris Hill, Laresa Kosloff and Cate Consandine. For more information visit www.clubsproject.org.au
where my practice makes an overlap with those of my peers thereby making an explicit connection to a larger social composite. As such my practice becomes a field of activity teeming with others. As a result, I approach my practice as an inherently collective situation connected to a particular group or network of people who engage in shared sets of concerns. My practice both emerges from, and contributes to, this network in a dynamic fashion.

Organisational activities as constituting the material of a practice and the conditions structuring art’s production

By positioning these organisational and social activities as forms of material for engagement, they are included as vital, 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 an ‘individual’ practice. Because these organisational 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.

For example, through the framework of working at CLUBS, my research has involved collaboratively exploring diverse ways that art might be organised, written about, discussed, mediated and distributed. This has effects upon the reconsideration of the possibilities for art’s production. This research has culminated in activities such as:

- the collaborative development of ‘feedback sessions’ as a process used to generate and sustain critical peer-to-peer dialogue;
- experimenting with large-scaled organisational projects involving a diverse range of practitioners, with a focus placed upon activity, discussion and experimenting with modes of organisation, such as in the project multipleMISCELLANEOUSalliances (2004).
- experimenting with producing publications (ranging from project catalogues to websites), as platforms for generating critical dialogue that expands beyond ‘PR’-oriented publicity connected to exhibitions, and becomes an opportunity for developing discourse around projects, such as in the development of the multipleMISCELLANEOUSalliances (2004); project dossier and the publication titled things full of people (2005);
- the development of a writing practice that actively engages with the practices of other peers, such as in the writing of expanded essays for peers such as Tom Nicholson and Christopher Hill;
- exploring collaborative models and sustaining a collaborative practice, for example with The Open Spatial Workshop (OSW).

In positioning these activities as constituting the expanded material of a practice, this PhD makes a connection 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 to practice, rather than supplementary by being forced into a hierarchy with that which is deemed ‘legitimate’ art production (Owens 1983: p.63). Similarly, Liam Gillick, in a recent essay in October -- also acknowledging methodologies arising from feminist practices of the 70’s -- stresses the importance of engaging the multivalent activities within which projects and practice are nested, as being integral in constituting a form of material (Gillick 2006: pp. 102-103). This has precursors in practices of the 60’s, especially in relationship to artists such as Robert Smithson, who actively engaged with discursive aspects of practice, articulated for example in his prolific critical writings developed in relationship both to his own work and the work of peers.9

This point locates my PhD research within a contemporary situation in which many artists, locally and internationally, position themselves not as object-makers, but as being engaged primarily in organisational practices in which collaboration, self-organisation, writing and dialogue are intensified as material for exploration, and the output of practice. This is evident in a plethora of local activities, exemplified by practices such as Sandra Bridie [see figure 10 and 11], Spiros Panigirakis [see figure 12 and 13], Lucas Ihlein and Lisa Kelly [see figure 14 and 15] (who all work individually and in groups, but whose individual practices frequently involve collaboration and contributions from others); and international activities such as the collective projects of Copenhagen Free University (Denmark), Basekamp (Philadelphia), 16 beaver (New York), and The Bureau of Research into Post Autonomy (London). By making connections to this contemporary field, this PhD seeks to address the questions of authorship, collaboration and organization within the framework of materiality, whereby materiality is oriented as an expanded condition.

Developing an engaged relationship to cultural production

I consider it critical to actively engage with the layers of activity, articulated here as a form of expanded material that proliferates around and structures the production of any singular ‘work’. Claiming these layers as forms of material for experimentation becomes a strategy for developing a critical relationship to contemporary culture. This aids in developing a responsibility to the multilayered conditions of practice, rather than leaving these questions primarily to arts professionals (curators, administrators, writers, institutions) to deal with.

By making more than art works positioned as products for cultural consumption, 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 easily identifiable material outcomes. If one positions practice as research involving a more expansive
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9 Smithson’s writing practice encompasses essays related to processes of production, essays on peers, interviews and notes upon specific projects (see Smithson: The Collected Writings 1996). Artists such as Carl Andre (see Cuts: Texts 1959-2004) and Robert Morris (see: Continuous Project Altered Daily: The Writings of Robert Morris 1993) were also active in developing texts positioning their practices’ relationship to issues of cultural production and discourse. Similarly, writing was intensified in the practice of Adrian Piper, whose texts are published in the two-volume work Out of Order, Out of Sight, 1996).
field of activities than the making of art works, then one effectively asserts a form of practice that breaches categorical boundaries, in an attempt to avoid practice being reduced to material artefact. When practice is positioned as expansive, the activities that activate this expansion are not things that can easily be identified, assimilated, and commodified. Most importantly, 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.

Summary
Exploring the interrelated ideas of matter, material and materiality through various conceptual frameworks has facilitated a re-orientation of my approach towards material through practice-led research. This ranges from:

Working literally with material in the context of a sculptural-event practice. My understanding, informed through the process of enfolding theoretical research with studio-based investigations, has produced a shift in my thinking of material primarily as a physical substance, into engaging it as a condition teeming with forces and energies in which material becomes positioned more as a composite of relations. Part of my research practice constitutes an exploration into articulating and presenting material animated by this shift. As a result, the sculptural-event projects yielding from these investigations become dense with materials differentiated and re-differentiated into a multiplicity of propositions. As such, projects are structured by, while actively presenting, a field of material possibilities in which process and its effects are amplified.

Extending from this, my approach towards working with material has been focused by a spatial practice in which material becomes active in the production of space and spatial relations. Thus, material has been engaged with in terms of its capacity to generate spatial possibilities. In this PhD, material and space are approached not as one divided from another, but as being engaged in a co-productive relationship. Spatiality therefore becomes a part of the ‘material’ of the sculptural-event practice, and its activation becomes the work of sculptural material through the ways that this material is deployed within a given context.

Engaging with material has also been radically re-oriented by shifting my thinking towards it as a physical substance, to encompass matters of an organisational, textual, collaborative and social fashion. This has enabled me to engage these layers of organisational material in an experimental and critical fashion. This process involves working beyond an individual practice into a space in which collaboration and dialogue become amplified. In this positioning, material becomes a field of activity teeming with the energies, ideas and activities of others.
This chapter articulates an expansive approach towards material that includes a spectrum of engagements ranging from experimenting with a patch of plasticine, to the organisation of relationships within a collaborative project. It situates a practice that does not divide the material from the immaterial, but seeks to position them together as conditioning each other within a larger field of activity. Thus, this research practice articulates an attempt to come to terms with a broad range of interests involving a process-oriented engagement with sculptural material. It aims to move towards a more relational engagement in which collaboration and discourse are mobilised through the framework of material research so that they become positioned as forming the materials of a practice in an expanded sense.
Chapter Two:

MAKING APPROACHED FROM FIVE PLATFORMS

INTRODUCTION

This chapter articulates the practice of making through five different, yet interrelated platforms. It builds upon the ideas developed in Chapter One: Coming to Understand a Particular Kind of Materiality. It discusses expanded notions of making focused through theoretical frameworks coupled with discussions around the work of related artists and critical reflections made upon aspects of practice-led research.

To begin with an idea borrowed from Deleuze, “in art, it is not a matter of...inventing forms, but of capturing forces” (Deleuze 2004: p.56). This notion of forces, connecting Deleuze to Nietzsche, positions the world “without any particular origin or goal, which never comes to rest at a terminal or equilibrium state. These forces interact ceaselessly, constituting a dynamic world-in-flux rather than a collection of stable entities” (Stagoll 2005: p.108). When material is approached as a force, a particular orientation opens for a re-consideration of what “making” might constitute, in ways that expand it beyond the purview of an individual “maker-author” who transforms matter (Cheah 1996: p.129). This notion drives a discussion woven variously throughout this chapter, in which the forms of making that are engaged with mark a shift away from the centrality of a maker-author. In the process of this shift, the author-subject is de-centered so as to become enveloped in the midst of a larger process. More importantly, this chapter works to develop the idea that self-generating processes can be articulated in relationship to materiality. It frames these as processes that exceed the will, intent or projection of an author-maker in order that the subject is not positioned as being primary, but is enmeshed within a field of relations and activities. The aim of this chapter is thus to articulate an idea of expanded forms of production. These ideas will be focused through five major platforms including:

1. **Making as encountering forces: articulating body-work relations:** Explores the idea of researching haptic engagements between the force of the body and the force of materiality, through the idea of a field of relationships;

2. **Making durations:** Articulates the idea that the activity of making involves sustained engagements and dialogues within the complex duration of a project’s public presentation and not only as something that happens before the public event constituting a work’s presentation. Instead, making becomes an expanded field of activity;
3. **The process of making expanded beyond a subject-centered approach**: Discusses materiality’s activity as constituting a form of making/production, expanded beyond a centered or primarily human-oriented intent;

4. **Making engaged with as a form of collective activity**: Explores making as a process of structuring relations between groupings of people;

5. **The event of encounter positioned as a process of production**: Develops the idea that a viewer’s engagement with work becomes a form of production.

**A note on the idea of material adventures**
Weaving through these discussions is the idea that an expanded practice of making can become a form of material adventure. The notion of material adventures is a working concept that orients materiality as being in excess of a human-oriented will to contain (Lyotard 1990: p.303) that usually underpins the conventional interpretive models imposed upon art in relationship to signification, identification and meaning. The situation of making as a form of material adventure connects to a major aim of this PhD, which is to manoeuvre the idea of making away from the concept of mastering material, towards that of adventuring it. This has two major implications for the practices of production and viewing.

In terms of production, engaging with the process of making as a material adventure is an act that seeks to unhinge the position of a maker-author from that of a transcendent subject, into a force engaged within a field of proliferating relations, process and energies. If we orient making as a force within a field of other forces, the situation becomes more focused upon the work as a larger process or multiplicity of relations enfolding materiality, bodies, spaces, times, viewers and structures. Moreover, positioning making as a material adventure has the potential to generate a situation in which the unknown is embraced so that accidents, chance encounters, bifurcations and unexpected conjunctions become vital elements within processes of engagement.

Similarly, positioning the space of viewing as a form of material adventure works to re-orient modes of engagement away from a representational realm in order to strategically open up a space for other forms of engagement with art, based more in encounters that are not pre-determined or mediated in advance. This re-positioning of the space of viewing helps to orient the production of knowledge as an outcome that emerges in an ongoing process of engagement such that it becomes positioned as a form of production contingent upon the specific contexts of apprehension, rather than a form of reception in which viewing is a practice of ‘deciphering’ the ‘meaning’ of an art work.
Platform One: MAKING AS ENCOUNTERING FORCES: ARTICULATING BODY-WORK RELATIONS

“...the body we inhabit, the body that is looking at and in contact with the world, is not...a mass of solid stuff. It is also a field of awareness and sphere of possible action that extends well beyond the limits of the body as bound object...”

(Potts 2002: p.220)

Brian Massumi defines the moment of an encounter with materiality as constituting “force against force, action upon action, the development of an envelopment...there is no end, no unity in the sense of a totality that would tie it all together in a logical knot...” (Massumi 1992: p.11). This idea provides a platform for thinking about what might emerge in the process of encountering materiality, whereby materiality, approached as a force, becomes something that has the potential to impinge upon the body, as much as the body subjects it to process. For example, in an event of engagement, materiality places demands upon one’s body, requiring that an engagement be performed in a dynamic relation. In terms of practice-led research, this becomes apparent when the activity of engaging material requires a process of one adjusting and responding to certain qualities expressed by different materials.

The concept of the body as an element enters into the discussion here, positioned as being immersed or engaged in a network of relations. This idea is elaborated through Barbara Bolt’s reading of Heidegger, whereby the body is positioned in a way in which traditional “relations of mastery” are challenged, instead, Bolt discusses a relationship of “co-responsibility and indebtedness” and “in a reversal of the causal chain of means and ends -- artist, object, materials and processes are posited as co-responsible for the emergence of art...for the bringing forth of something into appearance...” (Bolt 2004: p.52). This argument resonates with the series of approaches taken within this PhD to making, which have involved research into the generation of situations in which subjects are approached as being co-produced in the process of engaging. This approach has relevance for considering the expansion of the making of art from a studio context, to encompass collaboration, organization, and the practice of viewing.

Documents of body-work relations

For a number of years, making, specifically the idea of making as a process that emerges in the event of encountering forces, has been documented as a research process. This documentation generally takes the form of video footage and stills. This documentation of making as a research process is the result of my interest in negotiating the resistance that develops between material forces during a specific encounter, for example in relationship to researching the movement of a body as it negotiates a terrain, or hands as they grapple with oversized sheets of paper. These engagements, occurring between bodies and materials, become an event whereby processes, movements, and gestures are generated. For example, numerous experiments have involved an array of physical interactions in which my body becomes ‘choreographed’ around the resistance
of forces set into play by the prosaic materials present within many of my sculptural projects, such as rubber, sticks, paper, cardboard, plasticine and plywood [see figure 16 and 17].

The existing video documents produce a connection with projects such as Richard Serra’s film work titled Hand Catching Lead (1968) [see figure 18], Valie Export’s research into material-body relations in the Body Configurations in Architecture (1982) [see figure 19 and 20] image series, and some of the early video works of Bruce Nauman, which present a body involved in repetitive gestures within a studio situation, such as in his videos Bouncing two balls between the floor and ceiling with changing rhythms (1967-68) [see figure 21] and Bouncing in the corner no. 1 (1968) [see figure 22]. In relationship to this research project, effort is made to document most, if not all, of the hundreds of processes involved in building up each installation project, including walking-oriented and site-based video documents, casting processes, banal, repetitive activities such as shifting dirt, and laying out and cutting paper. Even though many of these process documents include my body within the frame, I have avoided presenting them until recently. This was due to an anxiety that including the body would constitute a fetishization of by way of locating it as a primary site of production, thereby supporting a retroactive form of anthropocentrism in relationship to a traditional stereotype of ‘the hand of the artist’.

**Locating the body within a field of activity**

In the process of making this exegesis, my understanding of the body-work relation has shifted — I consider it to be located within a field of material forces. The architect Stephen Holl posits a notion of ‘enmeshed experience’, which has assisted my understanding of the body according to the idea of it being located within a field of relations, rather than situated outside these relations, in a masterful position. Upon this idea Holl writes, “when we sit in a room or a desk by a window, the floor material, the wood of the desk, and the eraser in our hand begin to merge perceptually...We must consider space, light, colour, detail and material as an experiential continuum...” (Holl 2000: p.62). The body and its movements are positioned as contingent to this continuum.

As a result of this shift, I have become more comfortable in making these video research documents public. For example, during projects [open and hosted] (2006), a four-part video component was screened, which documented sets of processes in involving material interactions and spatial situations. These video documents reveal a partial body, engaged in a field of material, process-oriented, spatial, temporal and object-based relations. These video documents do not position the body apart from the work in a definite distinction, but locate it within the midst of a process-oriented dynamic.

**Partial bodies, hands: some images by Joëlle Tuerlinckx**

These activities and their documentation link to the video documents of Joëlle Tuerlinckx, which I initially observed during her exhibition This book, like a book (1999) at S.M.A.K. in Ghent, and later
through a series of video stills within her publication titled *Autour de FILM. CINÉMA. EXPOSITIONS. PROJECTIONS: 1982. 1985. 1986. 1987. 1988. 1990. 1991. 1992. 1993. 1994. 1995. 1996. 1997. 1998. 1999. 2000* (Tuerlinckx 2000). In these documents, Tuerlinckx’s hand is often one of many elements pictured within the frame. It is a hand located within a situation teeming with relations, similar to the hand of Agnes Varda that constantly appears within her documentary *The Gleaners and I* (2000) as a hand that grapples with its subject as she narrates her footage. In the case of Tuerlinckx, the hand presented is one that counts, points, throws, cuts, adjusts and fidgets, thus recalling Richard Serra’s hand that catches (but mainly misses) falling lead in the film-work *Hand Catching Lead* (1968) [see figure 18]. Distinctive about Tuerlinckx’s hand is the fact that it engages incessantly within the flow produced by repetitive activities. This positions the hand not as masterful, but as being immersed in various processes that unfold around it, which it modifies and addresses [see figure 23, 24 and 25]. The example provided by the images of this disembodied hand offers a framework for articulating a relation that this PhD makes with the body. Like Tuerlinckx’s fidgety hand, my body is submerged within the flow of process, it is not oriented as being independent or transcendent of them (Jones 2000: p.2) [see figure 26 and 27].

**Platform Two: MAKING DURATIONS**

Extending from this discussion of the relations articulated between body and process, many works conducted during this PhD have involved situations in which I have remained explicitly within the temporal framework of projects during their public presentation and exhibition. This is done so as to present this process as an active component of the project -- not as a means to an end or something that’s rendered as hidden from view. This approach relates to a series of projects involving installations, collaborations and workshops and in projects that engage in perpetual changes. For example, during *project projects [open and hosted]* (2006) the multi-linear processes of making-as-research were brought to the fore by actively and visibly laboring within the work, both alone and collectively, over a period of time [see figure 28]. Mundane processes were enacted, such as shifting dirt, rearranging the structure of the exhibition, cleaning the space, and carrying out specific process-oriented tasks. Such an engagement recalls Robert Morris’s *Continuous Project Altered Daily* (1969) [see figure 29], but also to more contemporary practices such as Koo Jeong-A’s project, titled *∞/24* (1998), at Moderna Museet Projekt in Stockholm. In this installation, Jeong-A lived within her working situation, sleeping and eating within the project during an extended process of installation (Bimbaum 1998: pp. 17-23).

The emphasis of the artist’s activity in this section is not done in order to fetishize artistic production, nor to situate production solely within the realm of individual authorship, thereby
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supporting a myth of authenticity (Kwon 2002: p.52), but to develop a form of responsibility to one’s work in order to generate situations in which processes of response to the material that is engaged with are enabled.

**Process as a strategy**

The intention to keep the work open as a 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 his post-minimal phase, 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.

Potts’s criticism requires a response given that this PhD asserts a notion similar to Morris’s for generating and sustaining a form of dialogue with one’s work so as to keep the process open and frayed. In contrast to Morris, however, this assertion is not motivated by the interests of protecting work from forms of commodification, but is presented in order to pursue a mode of production that is based in a complexity of relations, and to privilege practice. This is not to suggest that elements of this practice can avoid becoming objects for cultural consumption, but that practice comes first. And, if forms of practice replete with a multiplicity of relations that involve material adventures, developing collaborative relations, dialogues, organisational experiments, writing, etc. are emphasised, an equally complex situation for engagement with practices by peers, curators, writers and audiences is generated. This engenders other modes for engagement in which complexity and dialogue are necessarily produced.
Platform Three: THE PROCESS OF MAKING EXPANDED BEYOND A SUBJECT-CENTERED APPROACH

Moving on from a body-oriented focus in the discussion of making, this section deals with a concept of production that exceeds relations structured by author-makers.

Following the flows of matter
Deleuze and Guattari’s concept ‘following the flows of matter’ provides another platform for this research project regarding the notion of making. It also connects to the idea of material adventures. Deleuze and Guattari discuss the idea of following the flows of matter through the example of metallurgists following mineral lines through the sub-soil, an itinerant process assembled along trajectories laid out by the slow deployment of that material over eons (Deleuze and Guattari 1987: pp. 409-410). Within this discussion, they position materiality as “a matter in movement, in flux, in variation...[and suggest that]...this flow can only be followed” (Deleuze and Guattari 1987: p.409). This example is used to support the proposition developed here concerning a form of making that expands beyond an anthropocentrism seeking to transform of matter (Cheah 1996: p.129). Instead, the idea of following the flows of matter amplifies a process of following (or adventuring), rather than forming, as constituting a kind of making. Moreover, by following the flows of matter, one is potentially led into unexpected terrains rather than territories projected in advance.

Engaging the idea of following the flows of matter helps to generate modes for thinking beyond the domain of human-oriented intent, and approach material processes and relations that occur outside a primarily subject-oriented hierarchy as a form of making. Manuel De Landa’s text 1000 Years of Non-Linear History (1997) provides a concept that facilitates an approach towards an expanded understanding of making. It articulates the concept of morphogenesis, in which production takes on a terrestrial scale when vast layers of sedimentary rock emerge from centuries of ‘material flows’ incorporating associated forces such as larval distribution, gravity and the buckling of tectonic plates (De Landa 1997). De Landa’s example provides a platform for thinking of the process of making in relationship to the notion of materiality’s ‘self-organising’ capacities, and considering it as a form of production that thereby exceeds human-centered relations.

Robert Smithson: situations where matter follows matter
If we absorb this idea and use it as a platform through which to approach the activity of making in works such as Robert Smithson’s works Asphalt Rundown (1969) [see figure 30], and Partially Buried Woodshed (1970) [see figure 31], the associated idea of matter following matter, becomes a useful tool in thinking about the relationship that Smithson developed with this work in terms of the question of making. In the case of the project Asphalt Rundown, Smithson facilitated a situation involving the release of a load of asphalt down a Roman hillside, enabling this material, by force, to assume a viscosity, and merge slowly with the eroded escarpment underneath
(Hobbs 1981: p.174). In the process, the asphalt mapped out the eroded gullies marking the surface of the hill, while at the same time became ‘molded’ by that surface. Approaching this process as a form of making emerging in the exchange between forms of materiality – the asphalt and the hillside – shifts the relationship an author-subject might have with production from a centered and masterful one, to become more of a facilitator, or host for the unleashing of forces [see figure 32 and 33]. In this example, Smithson is positioned as engaging in a ‘collaboration’ with materiality through the setting up of a situation in which materiality may be allowed to ‘do its work’ in an expanded sense, beyond his control. It could be argued that materiality always proliferates beyond the control of an author, but in projects such as Asphalt Rundown, this fact is made prevalent within the structure of the work so that it becomes an active component of it.

Similarly, within many of the sculptural-event projects comprising this PhD, I approach my activity as one of collaboration with materiality’s potential in ways where this activity might disperse beyond my intent. This process engenders a form of material adventure in which relations do not become determined, but are encountered as a surprise, such as in the occurrence of accidents when using plasticine or when making from molds plastic objects that turn out unexpectedly, yet become jump-off points for the generation of another series of processes. This also involves setting up situations which might enable materiality to move beyond my control, for instance by using ephemeral materials such as in the example discussed in Chapter One: Coming to understand a particular kind of materiality in which paper curtains became a site for an unforeseen, performative billowing, by virtue of the force of the draft that circulated in the room where they were installed.

The process of repetition positioned as a strategy in a critique of anthropocentrism

Expanding from this discussion of setting up situations in which a process of making might develop beyond a subject-centered approach is an exploration of the use of repetition as a strategy to expand the activity of making beyond the directed intent of an author-maker. Repetition has been employed as an ongoing process in the development of projects in order to generate open systems, which “self-generate” once established. Setting up systems for production re-orient decision-making processes away from the artist-subject (as an ‘originating center’) and towards the movement of the system that is set into motion. For example, a green polyurethane-rubber length was constructed for intensive objects: indeterminate events (2002). During this project, the length was installed at the threshold of the gallery doorway, functioning as an ‘index’ to the green metal balustrade of the stairwell adjacent to the gallery. For the duration of this project, the green line-object perpetually fell off its wooden perch onto the constructed platform situated below, over and over again.

Recalling this process and appropriating the repetition involved in its continual fall, I spent an afternoon throwing the same green line into the air while videoing its collapse onto a constructed
floor module. It was thrown into the same corner in a repetitive fashion, yet each position it assumed upon the floor was different from the ones proceeding it. From this process a video sequence emerged, mapping an endless series of provisional forms made in the event of the rubber meeting the floor, again and again and again [see figure 34].

Re-orienting the decision making process away from a subject and onto a system recalls the seriality of minimalism, explored in Richard Serra’s *Casting* of 1969 [see figure 35], in which lines of lead were repetitively splashed into the conjunction of a floor and a wall so as to produce a repetitive series of corner castings. The quality of ‘one thing after another’ (Krauss 1977: p.244) established by the process of repetition generates a potentiality for the work to extend or proliferate without logical termination (Krauss 1977). Repetition becomes a movement that sets the work into play not only in terms of its mode of generation, but also in terms of the spatial and temporal rhythm that it produces, which is not subject or author-driven, but becomes the work of repetition.

A similar idea is expanded by Kathyrn Chiong in her text *Nauman’s Beckett Walk*, where she discusses Bruce Nauman’s engagement with the productive force of repetition during his early video works made between 1967 and 1969. In *Stamping In The Studio* (1968) [see figure 36], an upside-down video provides an abstracted perspective of Nauman stomping out a circle as a repetitive, percussive foot-beat. Chiong argues that this engagement with repetition produces an excess that “signals its own presence” (Chiong 1998: p.65) over and above the subject involved in the process. She argues that this is not a sound of someone stomping, but of a stomp-stomp-stomp produced through the mechanism of repetition, which, becoming detached from a centered author, becomes an event ‘of its own’.

**Platform Four: MAKING ENGAGED AS A FORM OF COLLECTIVE ACTIVITY**

This section focuses upon the expansion of the activity of making into a network of relations between authors. In this emphasis, material is proposed as being a ‘tissue’ within which collaborative relations are activated and developed, and in which making is positioned as an activity related to response and dialogue. This situation has emerged a number of times during this PhD research and the next section outlines four examples in which making is engaged as a collective activity in which the question of authorship shifts and expands to include collaborative relationships.

**Example A: developing projects in response to an-other**

In response to an invitation by Lisa Kelly to contribute to the project titled *Resistance Through Rituals* organized at Westspace in 2004, I developed a parallel project titled *multipleMISCELLANEOUSalliances (mMa)*, which was hosted concurrently at CLUBSproject inc.
Resistance Through Rituals and multiple MISCELLANEOUS alliances became double-barreled projects which developed through dialogue between Kelly and myself over a number of months. multiple MISCELLANEOUS alliances grew from a project designed for presentation within Resistance Through Rituals, into its own organisational project that responded to the ideas and questions, which were presented at CLUB$project inc.

The experience of developing a project in a responsive fashion positions making as a shared activity whereby peer-to-peer relationships are generated. In this regard, my working relationship with Kelly engages an extended conversation over a number of years. This is evident in a number of other projects that we have developed in response to each other’s work, for example during Kelly’s project titled Long Conversation: Working Notes: Studio Situation (1992-2005) [see figure 14 and 15] presented at the MCA, Sydney for the large-scaled survey project curated by Russell Storer titled SITUATION: Collaborations, Collectives & Artist Networks from Sydney, Singapore and Berlin (June-August 2005). Kelly’s contribution to this event was based in the process of citing five practitioners whose practices related to or informed hers. Kelly employed archival materials that were re-articulated as enlarged texts inscribed upon provisional constructions. Kelly reanimated this material by incorporating it into her project and mapping it to new configurations. Alongside this process, Kelly also invited these practitioners to contribute material to a publication presented parallel to the installation. In response to this invitation, I generated a small publication, titled things full of people (2005) [see figure 37], that took the form of a booklet indexing a series of material, social and collaborative relations in the form of ideas, projects, events and texts. This booklet was developed as an annual of projects ranging from individual works of my own, to collaborative situations, to the practices of peers. This booklet articulates the idea of responding to the work of others, and engaging response as a material and a means to generate projects based in relation, and in reference, to a shared sphere of production.

Example B: nesting practices

The notion of nesting practices has emerged through the experience of working closely with a number of peers since 2001 and also articulates a situation that is prevalent within many current Melbourne practices. I have observed a growing trend of individual artists inviting peers and friends to make material, organisational and process-oriented contributions to each other’s projects such that solo projects disperse to become expanded situations. The effect of this is that authorship is re-configured to become more of a collective or overlapping situation that cannot easily be reduced to the production of one person. This is especially evident in the practices of people such as Sandra Bridie, Andrew McQualter, Lucas Ihlein, Scott Mitchell, Spiros Panigirakis and Lisa Kelly, in which authorship becomes a situation for exploration within an organisational,

11 These five practices were of the artists: Maria Cruz, Mikala Dwyer, Bianca Hester, Anne Kay and Anne Ooms.
5 This publication articulates this idea of a collective of people and things informing one another through space and time. See the accompanying ADR for an example of this publication.
curatorial or collaborative project. Importantly, the engagement with others that occurs in these practices is experimented with and acknowledged as part of the process of production. It is not an engagement that becomes dissolved into the project so that the position of singular authorship absolutely dominates. Instead, the forms of authorship explored in these practices are ones that are splintered, multiplied and diversified. Authorship is rendered as an open question for negotiation.

Connected to this approach, I have been involved in generating projects in which contributions from others have been requested as a means to initiate projects and to investigate and then experiment with modes of authorship and production. This is evident in projects such expanding.compressing.figures.fields [2001], multipleMISCELLANEOUSalliances (2004), and more recently, during the project titled indexing projects: practices in production (2006) in which ten peers were invited to contribute a fragment of their practices for a project which indexed a series of overlapping relations between practices.

During indexing projects: practices in production (2006) Spiros Panigirakis was invited to contribute in light of his involvement in developing collaborative frameworks within which relations between people are activated, such as in his recent events titled WITH (2004) and WITHOUT (2006) [see figures 12 and 13]. Spiros’s response to this invitation was to provide an organizational contribution that re-articulated my initial conceptual structure for assembling the fragments of others’ projects, thus opening the work beyond my expectations. In effect, my project simultaneously nested and presented his contribution, while becoming conceptually reconfigured in the process. Spiros’s intervention into the structure of this project was engaged and acknowledged in a diagram and listing published in the work.

Working in this fashion becomes an adventure because the process of working with another necessarily requires a degree of openness to indeterminacy and the unexpected. A process of call-and-response is set in motion, in which the call often generates a response that expands the project into unplanned and dynamic situations.

Example C: collaborative groupings: case study of the Open Spatial Workshop

Collaboration articulates another situation in which the activity of making shifts from a centered form of authorship into a network of relations. This is the case for OSW, a workshop-based collaboration providing an opportunity for research into spatial practice, while also being an ongoing experiment with possibilities for exploring the potential of collaborative practice. The OSW approaches collaboration as a situation for shifting the focus away from individual practice into group production. However, OSW is not so much an “amalgamation of individuals as in an ‘us’, becoming a mechanism for impersonal articulations. It is not the production of a collective
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13 Involving Terri Bird, Natasha Johns-Messenger, Scott Mitchell and Bianca Hester
subject, in the sense of integrating various I’s into a ‘we’, rather there is a multiplication of singularities that are not cumulative. Voices divide and proliferate” (OSW 2006).14

OSW exemplifies an experiment in sharing the generation, production and dissemination of material. It is also a situation in which making is approached as a collective activity resulting from responsive dialogues structured through the form of workshops.

The notion of making as marking a site of collectivity in which making is approached as a shared activity is crucial to the position that this research takes regarding the site of authorship. Authorship is approached as an inherently collectivized site teeming with the presence of others: other people, ideas, objects, materials and spaces. This is most obvious within a collaboration, but is useful in reorienting one’s thinking in relationship to questions of individual production if the work that emerges from this production is approached as a convergence of many relations, and becomes a composite that exceeds the potential of any one individual. Elizabeth Grosz positions this idea in relationship to a text as being a site where a multiplicity of ideas are stolen:

“…from all around, from its own milieu and history, and better still from its outside, and disseminates them elsewhere. It is not only the conduit for the circulation of ideas…but a passage or point of transition from one (social) stratum or space to another. A text is…a process of scattering thought; scrambling terms, concepts and practices; forging linkages, becoming a form of action…Texts, like concepts, do things, make things, perform connections, bring about new alignments…” (Grosz 2001: pp. 57-58).

In a similar fashion, the process of making this PhD has involved connecting together an array of ideas, dialogues, materials and people, such that the research becomes a field teeming with others.

**Platform Five: THE EVENT OF ENCOUNTER POSITIONED AS A PROCESS OF PRODUCTION**

Extending from the notion of making as a collective activity, this PhD positions the event of encounter also as a form of making. The implications of this are that viewing is not oriented as a passive or inert activity, or mode of consumption, but as a form of making (Barthes 1967). This position has been broadly informed by ideas such as Barthes’s concept of *Death of the Author* (1967). This concept has enabled me to position viewing as a form of production that emerges in a process of engagement where meaning is located in the connections produced or activated through an artwork, rather than primarily in the intent of an author. Thus, artwork is oriented as being active in the production of relations and effects, which gives rise to signification. This

---

14 Text collaboratively written by Terri Bird and Bianca Hester.
position has also been informed by texts around Minimalism, and later discussions pertaining to installation, in which the art-object is positioned as a composite condition within which spatial and institutional contexts, coupled with the duration of perception, constitute a public event in which meaning and discourse arise.

Minimalism’s legacy was that “metaphysical dualism dividing subject and object” (Foster 1996: p.40) were said to have been overcome through an amplification of the “contingency of perception” (Foster 1996: p.40). Of importance in this shift was the focus placed upon physical relationships and the process of relay between artwork, body, space and time, which was exemplified in works such as Robert Morris’s *L-Beams* (1965-1967) [see figure 38]. Krauss describes the space that emerges in this shift as a public realm since Minimalism demonstrates that language and meaning are not private events within an enclosed realm, whether that realm be located within the internal relationships of an art-work, or within the self construed as enclosed and unique. Krauss argues that meaning is an event that develops externally in relationship to a social and discursive situation. Thus, meaning is oriented as contextual, rather than private -- meaning is positioned as emerging as a public event because its entry into discourse is a public activity.

The idea of meaning arising in the public space of reception extends into contemporary discourses related to Installation, and is discussed in terms of an implicit relationship between viewer and installation work. For example, Claire Bishop claims that one of Installation’s key characteristic is its presumption of a viewer or participant (Bishop 2006: p.10), because installation projects are often constructed as ‘immersive environments’ that enable different modalities for experience. In turn, these viewing modalities propose different models of a viewing subject (Bishop 2005: p.8). In Bishop’s account, the presumption of viewer connects to the idea that meaning generates in the relay between artwork, viewer and context, whereby an artwork is ‘completed’ by the viewer. In this process, the artwork and the viewer are both performed and produced in the process.

In connection to these ideas, this PhD takes up the position that meaning is something that is not preordained, but is actively produced in the convergence of materials, spaces, contexts and bodies. This convergence is an eventful process in which meaning is not primarily centered by an author, or by a viewer, but becomes a public event involving an artwork-viewer-context relationship, and positioning an artwork as activating a series of relationships. This event constitutes a form of making, because meaning is made in that process, rather than being located, determined or contained by an artwork, thus requiring an interpretation.

This position formed the framework for the development of a combined viewing-dialogue practice known as CLUBS feedback sessions. Of particular importance in these dialogues is that
engaging and apprehending are positioned not as processes of interpretation, but as forms of production.

**CLUBS Feedback sessions as a material adventure**

CLUBS feedback provide a situation for thinking through the idea of viewing as a form of making. Feedback sessions position materiality not as inert, but as active in the generation of relations and effects, contingent to a particular place and time (a context). They constitute a material adventure because they develop from a process of engagement with work in its specific situation. Engaging with work in a particular situation requires responsiveness to the myriad contingent factors with which the encounter intersects or converges. This is different from approaching work in which meaning is primarily conditioned by the prescribed intent of an author-subject or through institutional forms of mediation structured by an interpretive approach. Feedback sessions exemplify modes of engagement in which the question, “what does this mean?” is repositioned to become, “what does this work do materially, spatially, temporally, socially, institutionally? And, “what are the actual effects of this?” In this orientation, artwork is not approached as representing or depicting the world, but takes “the world of art as the reality one inhabits” (Potts 2002: p.234) – a world which art is considered as productive -- and as an actual form of space-time relationships.

**Activating particular viewing practices**

Feedback sessions are also a form of research into the process of viewing, and as such they have become models that have facilitated reflection upon the ways in which work is produced and installed. One of the research aims in regards to production is to develop projects that activate situations for re-orienting the practice of viewing, or activating it in ways discussed above. For example, in the situation of encounter and apprehension of one of my projects, a viewer will need to construct a series of relations between objects, texts, constructions, architectural details and collaborative processes. I consider this the case for the mode of encounter with any artwork. However, the sculptural-event projects discussed in this PhD emphasise this as an integral part of their form-content, and as such, an engagement with them necessitates forms of physical, visual and conceptual production of connecting, following, re-tracing, projecting and moving. Therefore, as all work might require this form of production the works discussed in this PhD are positioned as actively working to animate or generate this process.

This aspect of the projects discussed here is positioned as a form of resistance to modes of viewing that are structured by interpretative and representationalist frameworks. The projects discussed in this PhD work to deflect the question, “What does this mean?” by prompting viewers to consider what they do when they engage viewing, in order that they become aware that viewing is an active practice. Positioned as such, the activity of viewing might be approached not as interpretive, but as a process of production.
Summary
Throughout the research-practice, making has developed into a multi-faceted action encompassing a plethora of activities and relations. As such, my understanding of making includes a spectrum of engagements ranging from the bodily-oriented to the collaborative.

The approach made towards making is that of an ongoing research activity. Making is not engaged with as a means to determined or determinable ends, but as a way of proliferating possibilities, of following trajectories as they open in, and as, a series of exploratory processes.

The activity of making is also positioned as an area for research and investigation -- as a condition to be tested and experimented with. The idea of writing about making from five different platforms was generated from this idea of researching the activity of making. One of the outcomes of this PhD is therefore the development of an expanded relationship with making, whereby making is positioned as constituting a spectrum of productive relations.

Through the particular theoretical frameworks informing my approaches, my understanding of the activity of making has shifted so that making becomes an event expanded beyond human-centered relations, whereby the self-organising capacities of materiality and process are positioned as productive forces, or forms of production. As such they are embraced within the projects to constitute layers of production.

Each project yielding from this practice thus mobilises many forms of production into a composite of relations. In regards to one of the broader aims of this PhD, the amplification of production and process connects to the objective of embracing and delivering sculpture as an event. Production is engaged with as eventful, and as occurring across many stages of a project. It is specific not only to the process of a work’s generation, but includes the process of its installation, to the collaborative events that emerge from it, to the activity of its materiality, to its apprehension and to its discourse. Thus, making and production are positioned as activities in perpetual emergence, where art-work is never fully made, but becomes an event that is perpetually in-the-making.
Chapter Three:

A TOPOGRAPHY OF PARTICLES

INTRODUCTION

A Topography of Particles is a concept that addresses two interrelated spatial conditions that are prevalent within the projects generated throughout the research practice. This chapter introduces spatial and temporal concerns that are oriented through a sculptural approach. The two concerns interlaced throughout this chapter are the notions of:

1) **scatter**: which articulates a mode of spatial distribution, and
2) **the partial**: which articulates an emphasis upon parts and fragments, and also upon an open-ended approach towards production.

Positioning the sculptural-event projects within the framework provided by the title A Topography of Particles is done for the following reasons:

1) It aims to intensify an approach towards generating sculptural-event projects that are scattered and dispersed, both literally and conceptually. The notion of topography provides a way of thinking about the projects as conditions rather than things. As conditions, they are expanded beyond fixed positions into larger spatial situations in which distance, time and duration become emphasized.

2) The ‘particles’ aspect of A Topography of Particles is used in order to develop a focus upon the part. For example, all of the sculptural-event projects are structured from a multiplicity of fragments, or bits and pieces. This characteristic relates both to projects that assemble and distribute sculptural and material fragments, and to projects that assemble a multiplicity of activities or events. Extending from this idea is that of the partial. The partial is positioned in this research as a condition of open-ended-ness emphasized within the projects, particularly in terms of their construction and presentation as ephemeral situations.

The larger aim of positioning this research through a framework provided by these interrelated ideas addresses the production of projects that are ‘disaggregate’. This idea has been informed by Pamela Lee’s discussion of process-art practices from the 60’s, exemplified by works such as Barry La Va’s distribution pieces such as *Installation # 1 Outward (from the left)* (1969) [see figure 39], Robert Morris’s works *Untitled* (1968-69) [see figure 40] and *Untitled* (1968) [see figure 41] and Carl Andre’s *16 Steel Rod Run* (1970) [see figure 42] and *25 Aluminium Run* (1976) [see figure 43] (Lee
1999: p.28). A disaggregate condition produces the partial, through an excess of parts, fragments and bits. This results in work that is primarily structured as a composite of re-workable relations.

Most importantly, this chapter concerns the development of works that accentuate a movement away from unified relationships, because scatter and partiality multiply encounters. A work’s physical spatial distribution renders impossible that work’s exhaustion from any one position, relation or moment. Therefore, this chapter relates specifically to a primary objective of the PhD, which is to investigate and experiment with the concept of sculpture as an eventful situation in which a multiplicity of relations are activated.

PART 1: SCATTER, SPRAWL

Many of the sculptural-event projects generated during this PhD consist of spatialised arrangements of bits and pieces strewn laterally across floors, thereby amplifying a process of horizontal distribution. These sprays often expand towards the limits of the spaces in which they appear, and beyond -- into adjacent rooms or footpaths. Projects such as of events into tiny chunks (an occasion of relocation) (2003), one thing another thing some things other, other things stagger and... (2003), corner to corner and stretching (2004-2005), [see figure 44] and projects (2006) all articulate scattered layouts as a predominant form of spatialisation.

Scatter also relates to modes of dispersal in time in which aspects of projects are distributed from the site of their display. For example, expanding.compressing.figures.fields (2001) [see figure 60] consisted of an expanded archive of interviews and documents that were able to be photocopied at the site of their presentation, with the aim of a layer of the work being multiplied so as to splinter from one site into many. This mode of distribution is common to the more publication-oriented aspects of projects in which multiple copies of elements such as booklets, posters, food, diagrams (etc.) are offered for removal from their initial site of display.

A mode of appearing: scatter as procedural

The sprawling approach discussed, is employed as ‘a mode of address’ (Potts 2002: p.315). The work has a performative dimension, which is articulated or enacted in its mode of presentation. Therefore a work’s form performs relations, and this produces effects (signification being one of them). Terri Bird articulates this idea in a recent paper titled Matter’s Medium (2006), where she discusses an art-work’s form as that which activates “a particular mode of appearing or process of production”(Bird 2006: p.3). This idea orients an artwork’s form as operational, rather than simply stylistic.
Approaching the question of form in this way orients it as a condition that is *inseperable* from content. This is important, because form and content are often approached as being divided, whereby form becomes a receptacle for content. However, this PhD engages with form as a force, as active or having agency, and therefore as a vital component in ‘content production’. Thus, the modes of an installation’s appearance, engendered through its various forms, are positioned as activating particular spatial, temporal, material, institutional and conceptual relationships.

**Activating practices of viewing**

Expanding on the idea of scatter as effecting relations opens this discussion to the idea that scatter activates practices of viewing. For instance, a scattered or dispersed work includes movement as one of its crucial elements, because to engage such work requires the viewer to take temporal passages through it. For example, Carl Andre situates his metal floor pieces as ‘causeways’ [see figure 45 and 46]. Andre discusses this use of the term in connection to his work, arguing that “they cause you to make your way along them or around them or to move the spectator over them” (Andre: Potts 2002: p. 313). Picking up on Andre’s observation, I argue that the use of scatter in my own project, similarly activates forms of viewing that are based in movement, due to the kinaesthetic engagements that scatter animates, thereby activating potential passageways over, through and within the work, due to the processes of dispersal whereby particular works engage large horizontal expanses.

**Case study: corner to corner and stretching (2004-2005)**

Related to this idea, the project titled *corner to corner and stretching* (2004-2005) employed scatter as a strategy for engaging a large horizontal expanse such that engaging it required a series of staggered or broken passages [see figure 44]. This work comprised low-lying black templates installed across an equally black concrete floor, hugging a ground-bound trajectory from one corner of a large exhibition hall to another. Positioned atop, adjacent, beneath and across these surfaces, was a constellation of ‘part-objects’\(^\text{15}\) consisting of fragments of polyeurethene lines, folds of rubber sheet, lengths of jointed pine cast in plastic and so forth. The blackness of the templates corresponded with the blackness of the floor, activating a dynamic relation between these surfaces such that it was difficult to distinguish where one ended and the other began. Entwined in an object-floor partnership, this installation mapped a broken diagonal trajectory scattered across a twenty-metre expanse. Moreover, this work produced a physical cut across the expanse of floor by being laid out in such a way that it engaged that floor’s immense horizontal expanse in a manner similar to an Andre floor piece. Because of the work’s sprawling condition, a temporal dimension was made explicit through its expansive, stretching spatiality.

\(^{15}\) The notion of ‘part-object’ is developed below in the discussion of the partial.
The work’s performative trajectory presented a situation in which the possibility of ‘seeing’ it was structured by a scattered mode requiring a series of engagements in time, because it could not all be seen ‘at once’. The structural dispersal of the work thus presented a multiplicity of parts such that any movement towards containment was overwhelmed by the splintering of possible passages into, over, and through the work. This point connects my research to discussions pertaining to installation practice, articulated by Claire Bishop in her book *Installation Art: a Critical History*, in which she addresses installation’s production of polyvalent perspectives. She argues that installation’s multiple modalities destabilise the site of experience because its expansive immersiveness simultaneously addresses and de-centers the viewer (Bishop 2005: pp.35-36) by denying “the viewer any one ideal place from which to survey the work” (Bishop 2005: p.13). A project such as *corner to corner and stretching* (2004-2005) de-stabilises subject-object relations, because the subject is de-centered through an encounter with a work which is not ‘whole’ as such, but is performed through a process of scattering.

The idea of positioning the outcomes of this PhD research as sculptural-events was adopted in order to activate a difference from the existing category of installation art, and to bring sculptural specificity to a contemporary discussion. For instance, Bishop’s claims concerning installation cited above reveal an approach that is pictorially inclined, because the frontal orientation connected to painting is implied in the very notion of ‘multivalent perspectives’. The three-dimensional quality of object-based work brings a different emphasis to the discussion of installation, whereby the question of multiplying perspectives is not so important because spatial and temporal conditions are already set to work through sculpture. Put simply, from the outset, the notion of ‘sculpture-in-the-round’ is useful because it indicates that sculpture opens up a multiplicity of spatial and material engagements in time.

It is therefore the spatial and temporal relations activated by the traditional ‘object-quality’ of sculpture that inform the idea of sculpture as an event. Extending on this, the research project is positioned as engaging in the production of sculptural events, rather than installations, primarily because of the interrelated conditions of materiality, spatiality and temporality that are specific to a sculptural tradition. This approach is positioned as having significant value within a contemporary post-medium situation because installation is considered here as being too broad a category and, as such, it fails to bring a sufficiently specific emphasis to production. Thus, the notion of sculpture-as-event is useful because it brings with it the conditions particular to a sculptural tradition, which are materiality, spatiality and temporality.

**Sculpture and time**

The argument about a temporal dimension being made prominent by scattered spatial distributions connects my research to a discussion around more unified, or object-oriented forms of sculpture. For example, in *Passages of Modern Sculpture*, Rosalind Krauss addresses sculpture as
constituting a transition in time, arguing that temporality constitutes one of sculpture's primary conditions (Krauss 1977). Similarly, Alex Potts develops an account of sculpture as an art-form that, more than other art-forms, intensifies temporal engagements, by arguing that the apprehension of sculpture involves being "drawn into its modes of temporality" (Potts 2002: p.231).

Potts argues that this process arises when engaging a close-range viewing of sculpture, through which an awareness of materiality and surface is amplified (Potts 2002: p.98-99). This, coupled with one's literal passage around a sculpture, mobilizes an experience in which sculpture becomes "...potentially dispersed and formally incoherent" (Lee 2002: p.394), as it splinters into a multiplicity of approaches, moments and viewpoints. For example, the apparent cohesion of a Rodin figure gleaned from a distant viewing is radically undone when the work is viewed at close range and as such the assumed "inert positivity" upon which its apparent object-ness depends becomes virtually unfixed in the event of its apprehension (Potts 2002: p.233) [see figures 47, 48 and 49].

A question emerges regarding scatter

In relationship to the positioning of this PhD, an important question emerges related to using scatter as mode of spatial distribution in order to accentuate eventfulness. The position provided by Krauss and Potts is that all sculpture, when it is apprehended, is already eventful because apprehending it depends on partial -- and thus temporal -- modes of engagement. Thus, their position is that time and eventfulness are intrinsic conditions of sculpture. In taking up this position the question emerges: why do the sculptural-event projects comprising this PhD require an amplification of scatter as their predominant form of spatialisation, given that the partiality and temporality that these spatial modes amplify are argued as already integral to the experience of viewing sculpture?

Amplifying the temporal and the partial

This exegesis takes up the argument that using scatter as a form of spatial distribution produces an effect where the partial and the temporal literally cannot be avoided. Scatter relies upon exaggerated forms of dispersal which effectively unhinge works from becoming centered either materially, spatially, visually or conceptually. Thus, even if the most seemingly unified or object-oriented sculptures engenders temporal and partial engagements by way of durational encounters with it ‘in the round’, I argue that conventional viewing practices are still largely structured by an optically-centered engagement, or what Krauss has designated as the myth of the ‘instant’. Therefore, the act of bringing the partial and the temporal to the fore is a means to magnify them as important factors structuring forms of engagement.

16 "...that eye, is the one that stares, forever open and fixated, into the visual pyramid of the legitimate construction. That eye’s logic specifies...the present as itself contracted to a point – occupying the geometry of the limit, understood as the infinitely small of brief or contracted. The vanishing point’s infinity is mirrored in that of the viewing point, a concentration at this end into the infinitely short duration of the “now”, a present which is – as it achieves this limit – indivisibly brief and thus..."
Scatter is thus employed as a strategy for presenting and activating the time of encounter. Therefore a sculptural-event project that uses scatter as its primary mode of distribution is one that demands to be viewed according to drawn out, kinaesthetic engagements. Thus, even though a more unified sculptural object might engender this mode of engagement, this PhD takes the position that a scattered work makes this characteristic internal by positioning time and partiality as unavoidable conditions of engagement.

**Scatter and questions of representation**

In positioning this approach, the aim is to produce works whose modes of address resist ‘appropriative forms 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 Oslowski 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. However, by producing projects that are structured by scatter and dispersal, I argue that temporality, and therefore eventfulness, are amplified as conditions, which work to overwhelm a movement towards unification.

**Transition and provisionality: scatter as a strategy towards non-monumentality**

The use of scatter has another aim, which is to align my research project to discussions around ‘non-monumental’ approaches. The notion of the non-monumental addressed here is articulated by Pamela Lee in a discussion on the practice of Gordon Matta-Clark. Lee argues that in architectural intervention projects such as *Splitting* (1974), Matta-Clark “radicalizes the entropic monument to render it a non-ument” (Lee 2000: p.55). She argues that this occurs because Matta-Clark did not “aspire to the fantasy of historical stability as conventional monuments do: if anything these works embrace the impossibility of inhabiting that moment. Counter-intuitively, they do this in

the marking of such a place, only to be removed or destroyed, acknowledging the historicist presumptions around which the conventional monument is established..." (Lee 2000: p.55).

Although radically different in approach to Matta-Clark’s interventions into architectural structure and context, the projects of this PhD are positioned as engaging in entropic, non-monumental approaches mainly because they avoid crystallizing into stable entities, and instead move towards becoming provisional, volatile configurations.

For example, the sculptural-event projects of this PhD do not become definite structures or wholes that remain fixed or constant from studio, to exhibition space, to image in a catalogue, to store room. Each time context shifts, so do the works -- they become continuously re-configured or re-mapped from context to context. A project generated in a studio situation is always re-made during a process of installation, so that installation becomes a form of research. For example, I was invited to re-show the project intensive objects: indeterminate events (2002) one year after its initial presentation. Rather than being re-displayed in its former state, this project was dismantled and was subject to a process of restructuring for a new context, to become another work titled of events into tiny chunks: an occasion of re-location (2003). Similarly, a large form-ply platform, developed initially for projectprojects [open and hosted] (2006) became re-assembled for actual transformational [winters end] (2006) into a production surface and dance-floor for a 12-hour project in a backyard in Carlton, Melbourne. This platform then became a display device for a presentation by OSW, to later become re-deployed as an archive system for the compression and presentation of work for projectprojects [compressed] (2006), displayed at RMIT, Melbourne.

In this way, the sculptural-events comprising this PhD only ever hold together lightly, and for a brief duration. Even then, projects often undergo shifts in the form of continual on-site re-arrangements, amendments and supplements, so that any one project is deemed as perpetually provisional in the timeframe for which it appears in exhibition format. This non-monumental quality is delivered through the repetitive use of modularity, fragmentation and ephemeral materials that articulate a transitional and process-oriented approach.

**Emphasis upon ‘ground’**

The notion of the non-monumental, in connection with the idea of scatter and the associated concept of topography, is further articulated through the focus placed upon the ‘ground’ in many of the sculptural-event projects. Ground becomes an active site for research, and is also ‘folded’ into projects through processes in which ground-space is activated, referenced, mapped, used as a site for the generation of objects and installed upon directly.

Ground is therefore approached as a research material with which to engage when developing, constructing and installing work. This has been the case for projects such as intensive objects:
indeterminate events (2002) whereby the surrounding grounds of West Space,\textsuperscript{17} including an asphalt footpath, terrazzo stairs, concrete flooring and carpeted arena, became sites from which to generate, differentiate and install a series of flooring devices. corner to corner and stretching (2004-2005) is another example of a project that developed a relationship to ground through spatially and optically engaging the expanse of floor upon which it was installed in order to fray the distinction between floor-space, and installation space. More recently, projectprojects [open and hosted] (2006) focused upon the materiality of the ground situated both inside the gallery in relation to the uneven, differentiated grounds composed of concrete and brick, and the asphalt extending beyond the room’s window. Moreover, ground or floor-space is engaged with directly as a situation where work is both produced and installed. Ground is approached as a condition teeming with forces, and as a place where energies generate and enter the work, for instance the circulation of dirt and rubbish, movements of viewers treading and tripping on work, people leaving bags in corners of the work and spillage and breakage of objects. As such, the ground is a space implied when discussing scatter in relationship to the conditions of horizontality and dispersal, trajectories, movements and qualities of the non-monumental.

Summary of part 1
A work literally scattered so as to engage the space that extends around it is a work that cannot be located at one point. Moreover, due to the persistence of a horizontal logic connecting scatter to the space of the floor or ground, a scattered work resists forms of frontal engagement predicated upon the vertical orientation of a viewing subject. A scattered work also disperses beyond the physical position of a viewer, providing the possibility of an engagement proliferated into a multiplicity of moments, tangents, trajectories and junctures. Thus, scatter is positioned by this PhD as constituting a mode of appearance which generates a situation that can only be engaged within and through time, but which also perpetually escapes the viewer as matter is deposited in multiple places, and activates a process of expansion by opening out onto many directions at once. As such, scatter has become a major strategy in this PhD for positioning, articulating and embracing sculpture as an event.

\textsuperscript{17} The name of the gallery where this work was generated, installed and exhibited.
PART 2: PARTIALITY

This section discusses the emphasis placed upon partiality, fragmentation and open-endedness by this research project. Partiality, or a focus on the partial, relates to an understanding of the production of ‘space’, which is positioned in this PhD as a condition structured by the excess of the bits and pieces that comprise it, rather than an abstract totality. This approach has been informed by specific theoretical and practice-led precedents including Deleuze’s discussion of fragmentation in the films of Robert Bresson, an elaboration of the partial in the practice of Joëlle Tuerlinckx, and an exploration of George Batialle’s argument for an ethic of the incomplete concerning questions of representation. These positions provide a platform from which to articulate an engagement with a notion of partiality as it orients a particular engagement with the production of space, active within sculptural-event projects such as project projects [open and hosted] (2006), and multipleMISCELLANEOUSalliances (2004).

A note regarding an approach towards the idea of space

Firstly, the notion of ‘space’ is argued by Brian Massumi to be a totalizing concept, a retrospective construct or designation assigned to a dynamic continuum of events (Massumi 2002: p.6). Elizabeth Grosz calls for a theoretical and practice-led engagement with space that does not position it as abstract, nor as a neutral container given prior to the relations that assemble it; she argues that the concept of space “itself needs to be reconsidered in terms of multiplicity, heterogeneity, activity and force” (Grosz 2001: p.162). She goes on to position space “not simply as an ether, a medium through which other forces, like gravity, produce their effects: it is inscribed by, and in turn inscribes those objects and activities placed within it” (Grosz 2001: p.162). Grosz’s approach towards space is as a condition emergent (Grosz 2001: p.116) from within the activities, practices, materialities, forces and objects which mobilise, rather than as a pre-given or abstract receptacle.

In this repositioning of the concept of space within a sculptural-event practice, what emerges is an appreciation of the productive potential of this practice to actively engage and produce space through the relations that a work sets up or activates. In the case of this research, the approach made towards spatial production is one in which space is positioned as being localised by a multiplicity of parts. In an unpublished essay generated in response to the project intensive objects: indeterminate events (2002), Adrian Parr suggests that this form of spatial production is constituted through relations of bits and pieces when she writes:

“via a complex matrix of texture, plane, surface, colour, form, and object, the work effects an assembly of common experience along lines of variation. That is to say, striated space is taken, with all its order and unity, and is opened up to multiple spatial organisations. The notion that space is a container in which objects are placed is hereby confounded, as space itself is used self-reflexively...” (Parr 2002: p.1)
In this example, Parr articulates the idea of space produced by this project as being a condition teeming with parts, and the relations that these parts mobilise, rather than as a container into which the work is deposited. Instead, space is seen to be produced as an outcome in the process of multiple engagements.

**Partiality in Bresson’s films**

This particular orientation towards the concept of space connects with, and has been informed by, Deleuze’s approach towards the question of space in relationship to a discussion of the films of Robert Bresson. Deleuze argues that in these films, space is oriented as a condition that is localized by the part, the fragment and the sample, such that space approached as a unity, becoming unfixed. In resonance with Deleuze, Bresson himself appeals for an exaggeration of the partial. For example, in the book titled *Notes on Cinematography*, Bresson argues for processes of fragmentation when making work, suggesting that this approach is “indispensable if one does not want to fall into representation...isolate the parts as a way of giving them new independence” (Bresson 1997: p.46). Deleuze expands this idea further by exploring Bresson’s use of fragmentation as a strategy for spatial production:

“…a sample of the floor, a sample of the wall, a door without a knob, an opaque window...these objects in space are strictly identical to the parts of space...it is completely determined, but it is determined locally -- and not globally...it is any-space-whatever in fragmentation” (Deleuze 1993: p.165).

“…everything takes places as if Bressonian space was made up of a series of little pieces with no predetermined connection...Bresson’s space is a distinct type of space...[he makes] space with little disconnected pieces, little pieces with no predetermined connection. And I would add: at the limit of all these attempts at creation are space-times. Only space-times” (Deleuze 2006: p.317).

Deleuze’s discussion of space produced in Bresson’s films has a strong resonance with the production of the project *intensive objects: indeterminate events* (2002), which initially involved video mappings as a methodology for the generation of the work. Multiple video sequences capturing a series of trajectories up the West Space stairwell were developed, whereby different spatial conditions were sampled. These spatial samples were then used to build fragmented components that were constructed and installed. Spatial events such as a turning platform in the stairwells, a balustrade, an electricity cover box, a doorway, a threshold and wall divisions of the gallery, were sampled in video and then reconstructed from building materials.
Bits and pieces and part-objects

A discussion related to the part and the sample reverberates with the general approach made towards production through this research, because the processes of this production proliferate in ways in which I find myself being left with nothing but bits and pieces, shreds of things and partial constructions. At the beginning of this PhD I found this worrying, concerned that I wasn’t engaged with making anything ‘substantial’ or ‘identifiable’, as everything I produced seemed like scraps of nothing-in-particular. However, as I involved myself deeper with both practice-led and discourse-led research, I became more aware of the potential that this approach activates in terms of approaching sculpture as being eventful, rather than something that’s static or finite. I thus began to understand my work’s particular approach towards the question of the partial.

For example, a focus placed upon developing a multiplicity of parts without a whole that regulates them, affects the way in which a project is generated and constructed. By avoiding a whole that may be projected in advance, and amplifying a relationship to the partial, one is left with a process of generating potentially endless series of bits and pieces to assemble and reassemble, connect, un-make, and re-articulate into a series of possible constellations that eschew synthesis or reduction into finalized entities.

Another important realisation that occurred as I engage in this approach was that what I was producing could be approached as ‘part-objects’, because each object constructed is done so in relationship to another object or spatial situation. ‘Objects in themselves’ that function outside of a context are avoided. In this sense, objects are positioned as always contributing to a larger composite of relations. This emphasis is made in order to develop a critique of an entity-oriented sculptural object. It also orients the objects that are produced as models or propositions, because they yield through engaging in sequences of processes, rather than developing into definite endpoints. What is important here is that there is no overriding, teleological progression from ideal to outcome that regulates these parts. Instead, favour is given to processes involving a perpetual opening out, or proliferation. I have found a connection here to the methodologies of architects Herzog and de Meuron, who spurn linear or progressive development in their practices “working instead to generate a repetitive oscillation in order to generate multiple endings” (Phelan 2003 p.291) [see figures 50, 51 and 52]. This idea of multiple endings resonates strongly with how I engage the production of all of my objects and projects, in that what persistently emerges is a sprawling field of bits and pieces, open-ended situations teeming with multiple openings and endings.

The emphasis upon bits and pieces and part-objects as forming the bulk of my work means that the sculptural-event projects that emerge as exhibitions develop into constellations teeming with incomplete or propositional objects, things in construction and process, propositions for events-to-come, objects as propositions for more objects and processes, performative moments, vague outlines or suggestions of things to come, collaborative activities, partially built structures, images
indexing changes, partial mappings, diagrams, bits and pieces of materials and things and so forth.

**Case Study: multipleMISCELLANEOUSalliances (2004)**

*multipleMISCELLANEOUSalliances* was a large-scale, multi-networked, collective event that involved over 40 participants over a four week duration. Many ‘projects’ occurred in this time, consisting of collaborative activities, forums, discussions, a library of essays and publications, workshops, interview projects, performances, a series of meal events, a resource section with a photocopier, wall drawings, diagrams and production space.

*multipleMISCELLANEOUSalliances* was structured by a chaotic and provisional conglomerate of projects, or as a project of many projects, such that its identity was always subject to a process of re-articulation, or of becoming. It became set into a process of perpetual negotiation by virtue of the proliferation of projects and provisional groupings that it facilitated, and which intersected with it over time.

**Case study: partiality in projectprojects [open and hosted] (2006)**

An example of another project in which the partial was used excessively as a strategy of positioning space as being localised by particles, and thereby worked to overwhelm representational frameworks, was *projectprojects [open and hosted] (2006)*. This work comprised an excessive assembly of cast objects, found fragments of concrete, cast polyurethene surfaces, a pile of dirt, sweepings, a pile of sand, a clock, low-lying constructed platform, two tables, a rubber mat, a plaster cast of a rock facet, a platform-fragment, two collaborative essays, a pile of posters of a pile of dirt on the adjacent pavement, fluorescent lights installed into the ceiling, an off-cut branch, a mound of plasticine poured directly onto the floor, a rubber casting of a section of wooden floor, a performative-collaborative activity with two peers, a video-projection, two constructed ply-wood bench seats, two empty water bottles, two plastic-buckets, an opening event, a bucket with concrete cast in the bottom, tape line-markings on the floor, cardboard support structures, a box of rocks cast in plasticine, wooden lengths, paper fragments, a feedback session, a catalogue, and so on, all of which were worked and reworked as an ongoing series of articulations and re-articulations, experiments, processes and spatial propositions. The parts and their chains of relations worked to activate space as constituted by a proliferation of fragments in which different parts took on a different emphasis, but no one bit conceptually centered or determined the project. It was a project teeming with a multiplicity of partial projects.

---

18 For a listing of those involved, please see the list of projects on pp. 23-24

19 This recalls Bataille’s idea of the ‘incomplete project’ – one that is necessarily fractured and splintered in order that it avoids the logic of a totalising project that has progress and unity as its goal.
**Partiality in the work of Joëlle Tuerlinckx**

Joëlle Tuerlinckx’s installations similarly activate space as being localised by particles, or the particular. Her works comprise a scattered inventory of bits and pieces, or a bulk of ‘pulverized’ materials (Tuerlinckx 1999). Tuerlinckx’s installations work to deploy and redeploy “a constellation of little things which literally never get off the ground” (Vande Veire 1996: p.452) so that space becomes made and remade countless times, never arriving at a unified whole into which those fragments are synthesised or regulated. The excessive use of partial-objects and of ephemeral materials works to breach representational frameworks that would regulate and contain. It’s as if the installations are in a process of slipping away, as her “zones of deposits, (vague zones of memories), zones of colours, zones of tattered images, zones of absence...” (Tuerlinckx 1995) engage the work in a movement towards becoming almost nothing. In the wake of this extreme partiality, Vande Veire states that “it seems as if everything still has to begin, still has to find its place. At the same time, everything is no more than a trace, a memory” (Vande Veire 1996: p.452) [see figures 53 and 54].

**Bataille and the notion of the incomplete**

Similarly to the discussion of scatter, a focus upon the partial within this research is not employed so much as a stylistic device, but is positioned as having an operative quality and an ‘ethic’ attached to, or provided by, it. This addresses one of the larger aims of this PhD, which is to produce works that emphasize time, multiplicity, discontinuity and proliferation as strategies for overwhelming representational frameworks.

This applies to the spectrum of production that is engaged in this PhD, which ranges from processes involved in making work, to the modes of address a work activates, to the way work is written about, and to the modes in which works become documented and circulated. In all of these processes partiality and proliferation are emphasised so as to embrace conditions of process, change and indeterminacy. This aim has been informed by Dennis Hollier’s exploration of Bataille’s process of writing and text production, whereby he writes:

“...every partial object is slowly and laboriously sacrificed in this endless movement (that is: the movement that cannot be reduced to some end which one might wish to assign it, where one would like to fix it)...governing all of Bataille’s production and, precisely to this extent, preventing all this work from becoming ‘perfect’, ‘complete’ and ‘separate’ books that are ‘closed back on themselves’. Never is their content independent of their context, or their composition. One must keep to these incomplete texts, distracted by blanks, these heterogeneous texts that intersect from a process of repetition, endless repetitions, texts that are informed from the redistribution of identical sequences. They lay out a whole that moves like one wave lost in a multitude of waves...” (Hollier 1993: p.75)
This account positions Bataille’s argument for embracing the incomplete as an ethic against appropriative frameworks that seek out unification, as such, it resonates with a larger objective of this PhD. By developing projects that are fragmented, partial, process-oriented and open, the aim is to generate sculptural-events that cannot be contained at once, that resist regulation into absolute identities, and which open up an eventful situation for multiple forms of adventure.

**Summary of part 2: including chapter summary**

The objective of focusing upon the part, and the related idea of the partial in regards to sculptural production, constitutes two major strategies of this research project.

Firstly, in relationship to the question of space, a concentration upon the partial has been made in order to develop a connection between sculpture (as partial and temporal) and spatial production. Rather than position space as a container in which sculpture is deposited, this PhD situates space as being produced by the parts, relations and activities that a sculptural-event project assembles. Space thus becomes an outcome of the particular arrangements, connections and relations that converge to become projects.

This argument finds connection with ideas that exceed an art-focused domain, and enters into terrains related to similar spatial discourses that interlace with philosophy, where the question of spatial production is prominent, such as in the sibling arenas of interior architecture and landscape architecture. This connection has occurred because an engagement with ideas from theorists such as Gilles Deleuze, Elizabeth Grosz and Brian Massumi, which have made an impact upon these practices, has informed this research project. This PhD thus claims a place within a larger contemporary spatial discourse for a sculpturally oriented practice as a movement towards a wider field of research activity dealing with questions of space.

Secondly, the prevalence of the part, bit and fragment, which saturates the sculptural production connected to this research project, constitutes a strategy to position sculpture as being engaged in a process of proliferation. This applies both to its production, and to the activity related to its reception. The aim of this strategy is to shift sculpture as far away as possible from becoming something that is resolved, resolvable or reducible into fixed entities. This emphasis is crucial because it proposes that in never being fully given, sculpture is situated as something that cannot be ‘exhausted’, either in its making, viewing, documentation or discourse, and thus it becomes an event in excess of both making-subjects and viewing-subjects. The idea of producing work that promotes the impossibility of a final exhaustion is a strategy used to intensify the idea that sculpture isn’t something that is ever finally made, but becomes a process in perpetual production. This orients the project towards an ethic of positioning the question of ‘identity’ (of objects, practices,
subjects) as one that is open-ended, and that engages in processes of becoming, of changing, of re-articulation, and of transition.

Thus, the chapter A Topography of Particles introduces the more spatial and temporal concerns of the research project. This chapter articulates an engagement with forms of spatial production that avoid approaching space either as an entity, or as fixed or abstract. Instead, this chapter affirms a reciprocal relation between sculpture and space, whereby space becomes a ‘practice’ of sculpture, because it is activated and oriented by sculpture. In the case of this research project, it is the scattered, dispersed, open-ended and partial qualities of the projects that produce forms of space that are open-ended and eventful, to become a topography of particles engaging adventures in time.
Chapter Four:

**MAPPING AS A PROCESS OF PRODUCTION**

**INTRODUCTION**

Building upon the idea developed in chapter three concerning questions of space, this chapter further develops the concept of sculpture as constituting a form of spatial practice, and as such provides an articulation and affirmation of the more spatial aspects of the PhD research. This chapter considers mapping as a significant process within spatial practice, especially because mapping is used extensively as a generative process for the production of projects.

The sculptural-event projects use mapping as a layered process to engage in ‘spatial research’. Spatial research is a working term employed here to indicate that this PhD engages in the exploration of space as a subject for research. The process of mapping becomes prominent because each of the projects engages in the exploration of forms of spatial production.

This chapter therefore articulates mapping as a principal process in the investigation of the possibilities of sculpture as a spatial practice. Consequently:

i. Mapping is a process used extensively to generate projects. This occurs on a number of levels and involves strategies such as movement-mapping, video-mapping, measurement, the production of built-constructions and objects, and the production of diagrams and texts;

ii. Mapping is also considered as a research outcome. Projects are positioned as mappings because the projects work to activate spatial relations between contexts, projects and viewers.

This chapter draws from a series of theoretical, art-historical and contemporary positions concerning mapping. Together, these positions form a platform from which mapping is explored as a complex research methodology related to the production of particular projects, such as

*intensive objects: indeterminate events* (2002), *expanding, compressing, figures, fields*. (2001), *one thing another thing some things other, other things stagger and* (2003), and *corner to corner and stretching* (2004-2005). Mapping is addressed three ways. Accordingly, this chapter is broken into three main sections:

1) **Approaching Mapping as A Generative Process:** articulates the approach made towards mapping, which has been informed by Teresa Stoppani’s notion of mapping as being generative, not descriptive. This idea is discussed in relationship to Robert Smithson’s *Spiral Jetty* (1970) with particular attention placed upon the interrelated relationship developed between the earth-work and film-work components of his project. These examples are used as platforms from which
to discuss the approach made towards mapping by the project *intensive object: indeterminate events* (2002) and how this project engaged with questions of site and the idea of working ‘between’.

2) *Mapping Situational Relations*: explores the idea of developing projects with an aim that each project actively engages with its situational relations or conditions. An argument is developed around making these relations apparent in the process and structure of projects as a strategy for avoiding a form of indifference to issues of context. This idea is articulated through an account of the German group *Büro Berlin*, which was active between 1979 and 1986. This idea extends into a discussion of Joëlle Tuerlinckx’s approach towards the idea of engaging situational relations within a contemporary context.

3) *Documents as Mappings*: expands the notion of mapping as a process applied across all aspects of the research project in relationship to the proliferation of research activities and ‘documents’ or traces that generate around them as forms of mapping. The notion of the ‘document-as-project’ that is evident in the work of Joëlle Tuerlinckx and Joke Robaard is explored as exemplary models that have shaped this orientation towards images in relationship to the research practice.

APPROACHING MAPPING AS A GENERATIVE PROCESS

Mapping as generative

The idea of mapping traditionally invokes the notion of a guide that maps something given -- a terrain or a space -- to which it makes a secondary relation. However, through spatial research processes, interlaced with theoretical positions, another approach towards the process of mapping has emerged in this PhD as a way to generate sculptural projects that are spatially oriented, or where spatial production forms one of the subjects for research. In this shift towards mapping as a generative endeavour, mapping becomes distanced from having a representational relationship with space, whereby it would be used descriptively. Briefly returning to the idea of a representational approach that was explored in Chapter Three: *A Topography of Particles*, the idea of representation is avoided here in favor of a movement towards proliferation. Mapping based in a kind of representational approach would work to ‘reveal’ that which it mapped, thereby fixing or locating space as an origin to which the mapping made a direct and discernable relationship to its terrain. Instead, the mapping engaged in this research project is a process of proliferating spatial productions, rather than representation or description.²⁰ Accordingly, mapping becomes a strategy used in this research for developing sculpture as a layered form of spatial practice.

²⁰ Representation and description are also forms of production, but the point being made is that this research manoeuvres away from the idea of representation as being descriptive.
Mapping as differential rather than descriptive

This idea has been informed by ideas from Teresa Stoppani. In her article *Mapping The Locus of the Project* (Stoppani 2004), she argues that mapping makes a double movement. Firstly she discusses mapping as producing a ‘partial’ knowledge of that which it initially attempts to map. She argues that this is the case because mapping is a process of selectively registering the ‘chaotic complexity’ of space (Dewsbury and Thrift 2005: pp. 89-108). Connected to this idea is the argument that a mapping, in its partially, is not co-extensive with that which it maps, but produces a relation of difference because it is differentiated from its terrain. Put simply, a road-map made of paper is not co-extensive with the terrain that it maps because it literally exists as a different material, spatial and temporal entity.

As one of the major aims of this PhD is to investigate ways of producing sculpture so that it becomes a proliferating event, Stoppani’s arguments concerning mapping have become especially important in assisting me to position the project, especially in relationship to mapping as generating an excess. Concerning this, Stoppani argues that mapping “produces an excess to the terrain, given in its distance from it” (Stoppani 2004: p.181). An excess is produced precisely because the distance that develops between mapping and its terrain enables the possibility for another ‘project’ to emerge, as given in the example above between the road, and the map of the road. This notion is of particular importance to the research practice, because it is through the generation of excess that this project seeks to engage sculpture in and as a process of proliferation.

Stoppani further expands her discussion to position the process of mapping as generating excess, or endless proliferations, because of the inexhaustible complexity of space with which mapping makes a relation (Stoppani 2004: p.182). The implications of this idea are that there is not one way to engage mapping, but that a multiplicity of possibilities open in the process. Stoppani argues that “in this sense, mapping is the locus of the project; the generative tool that is capable of producing and accommodating together the many different possible unfoldings of the project(s)...” (Stoppani 2004: p.182). This has two significant implications for the positioning of the projects of this PhD in relationship to mapping. Firstly, it implies that the process of proliferation which my project aims to engage and present is delivered through a focus placed upon mapping; and secondly, it implies that mapping becomes one of the major forms of spatial production with which my works engage on a number of different levels. Before these considerations are addressed, a deeper exploration into mapping, in relationship to Robert Smithson’s Spiral Jetty project, is discussed.

---

21 This idea of mapping as a form of registration has been informed by the work of John David Dewsbury and Nigel Thrift, in which the idea of register replaces that of representation. Register is an evocative term because it implies the recording of a spectrum of relations. See: DEWSBURY, J and THRIFT, N. (2005) “Genesis Eternal, after Paul Klee” in Deleuze and Space, eds. I. Buchanan and G. Lambert, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, pp. 89-108.

22 The approach this PhD takes towards mapping, as it relates specifically to sculptural-event projects, is also addressed at length in the section Maneouvrving Sculpture.
Robert Smithson and mapping as a process for developing a relationship to ‘site’

This section approaches Robert Smithson’s *Spiral Jetty* (1970) project through the framework provided by Stoppani’s articulation of mapping, as a means to develop a discussion of mapping relevant to my own work in relationship to questions of site, emplacement, process, the role of the video and image documentation and working within institutional situations. *Spiral Jetty* (1970) is comprised of two interrelated elements -- an earthwork and a film-work [see figures 55, 56 and 57]. What opens up when the film component is approached as a partial mapping of the earth-work, is that the film-component becomes more than a documentation of the earth-work: it becomes a project in itself. This film was discussed by Smithson himself as a non-site, literally differentiated from the earth-site of the Jetty. Because the film-work consisted of an entirely different medium, it produced another project in space and time, one that was distanced from the earth-work, thus relating to Stoppani’s notion of a mapping as being partial, differentiated, distanced and in excess of the terrain that it maps, and thereby becomes another project related to, but proliferated beyond, the terrain.

In the article *Shooting the Archaeozoic* (Holte February 2005: p.80) Michael Ned Holte takes the concept of mapping further and argues that the earth-work was already a form of mapping to begin with because it was a reconfiguration of rocks from around the Rozel Point location, and was thus a differentiation constructed at the same site. The implications of this idea are that the earth-work is positioned simultaneously as a site and a non-site, a space and a map -- and not simply a place of origin from which the film was derived. Thus, this concept is not as simple as positioning the earth-work as the site and the film-work as the mapping.

Expanding from this idea, the interrelated film-work is also considered as being both a site and a non-site. It is a non-site because it is a partial and differentiated mapping of the earth-work, but it is also, as Holte argues, a primary cinematic site (Holte February 2005: p. 80) because it is through the film that a primary ‘experience’ of the *Spiral Jetty* is provided. This proposition applies both to the time the film was made, and to our current timeframe. Moreover, due to the remote location of the *Spiral Jetty*, the film functioned as the primary interface to the project as a whole. These facts effectively situate this film as much more than a secondary document derived from the earth-work, because it constitutes an integral element of the *Spiral Jetty* project, which is a larger event comprised of two enmeshed components. Thus, a simple division or dialectic between a so-called primary site (earth-work) and secondary non-site (film) is confounded as each becomes both site and non-site unto the other, while at the same time each also becomes a form of mapping or proliferation.

Stoppani’s discussion of mapping, combined with Smithson’s *Spiral Jetty* project, has shaped my understanding and approach towards questions of space, site, mapping and proliferation as they relate to the concerns of my research practice. To begin, my understanding of site has made a radical shift from being place-bound or fixed. Smithson’s complex engagement with site discussed above has facilitated a re-orientation in my understanding such that I have come to approach it more as a proliferating condition; a situation constituting a multiplicity of relations; a
relay between spaces, times and mappings. Of most importance is that these discussions have provided me with a critical position to address the generative processes of mapping present throughout the PhD, to the point where I approach almost all aspects of the research as constituting different mapping projects. Thus, it is in the mapping-laden methodologies of this PhD where the proliferation, in the proliferating sculptural events, emerges and is active.

Mappings multiplied: a shift from making works, to making mappings

As a result of the shift in perception of site coupled with the proliferating nature of the projects, I have come to approach the array of generative processes occurring in this PhD, together with the outcomes of these processes, as constituting a series of mapping projects. Whether these mappings assume the form of an installation, a text document, a diagram, an expanded title, a tape drawing on the floor, a walk or a video, by being positioned as mappings they become oriented as spatial practices, and therefore active in the production of spatial relations, rather than mere representations ‘of’ space.

Another implication in considering projects and their constitutive elements as mappings is the amplification of their open-ended, and thus propositional, aspect. This idea draws from Stoppani’s argument that “the mapping produces a space that is never closed and never defined” (Stoppani 2004: p.182), implying that the process of mapping remains open to becoming perpetually re-workable.

Considered through this framework, each mapping generated in this research practice -- from tape drawing to video mapping to interview -- shifts in emphasis from being a finished ‘artwork’, towards becoming a process-oriented mapping that can potentially become absorbed or re-worked into other sequences of mappings. When approaching work in this way, there is a shift from a concern with outcome and identity, to a focus on proposition and process. A shift in emphasis from work-as-finished object to work-as-proposition has been active across a number of projects, including intensive objects: indeterminate events (2001), multipleMISCELLANEOUS alliances (2004), corner to corner and stretching (2004-2005), and project projects [open and hosted] (2006). Due to the propositional conditions emphasised within the structures of these projects, elements of each of them became re-absorbed into further waves of process involving the production of video sequences, diagrams, expanded texts, performative events, collaborative activities and publications. In this orientation, projects become less like ‘art-works’ and more like fields of activity.

---

23 This is not only specific to the example offered by Smithson, but to other artists of his generation, such as Gordon Matta-Clark, who developed multi-part projects in which various elements, such as building interventions coupled with performative activities and film and photographic mappings, were interrelated into complex events, as was the case for the project Splitting (1974).

24 For example, when I was asked to re-exhibit the project intensive objects: indeterminate events (2002) it was necessary to address the new spatial context in which the work was to be exhibited, and use that context as an opportunity to radically re-articulate the project. This process of re-articulation, or re-mapping, of the work, meant that the project was worked into an entirely different situation, becoming a new project or a new form of mapping.
Case Study: intensive objects: indeterminate events 2002

**intensive objects: indeterminate events** (2002) developed from a multi-layered process of mapping a walk up a stairwell into a series of video documents. In turn, these documents were translated into a suite of movements compressed into a small room; which in turn generated tape markings on that room’s floor notating the movements; which then proliferated into a series of tape drawings mapped into another space; which then generated the production of raised platforms that became a layered flooring system which was re-installed into the small exhibition room at West Space gallery.

This work indexed the myriad conditions (material, spatial and temporal) associated with its spatial situation. The idea of the index is significant in connection to a practice of mapping, because indexing relationships works to develop a series of explicit physical connections between a work and its contexts (or terrains). Indexing material, spatial and temporal relations as a means to begin a process of mapping is therefore used as a strategy to generate projects that become contingent upon a situation, but which also activate a relationship to that situation, thereby re-making it in the process. Through the process of mapping by indexing relations, a work potentially discloses information about the process of its production, while also establishing an enmeshed relationship to its ‘site’. By using mapping as a means to develop a series of explicit physical connections, a work becomes saturated with contextual information, which is then activated through points of connection that particular work activates.

**Intensive objects: indeterminate events** (2002) was a project that performed as a mapping involving the indexing of a series of architectural ‘attributes’ such as the twists, trajectories, changes in elevation and thresholds that one encounters as a series of stairwells, thresholds, trajectories and rooms which together assemble as Westspace gallery. The sculptural-event project that was produced became a built construction installed at the Westspace site. This project emerged from a multiple-mapping process and thus articulated a transitional negotiation with its place of generation and presentation. A movement between the work and its spatial situation was made ‘internal’ to the structure of the work, so that the work partially indexed the process of its production and this process became part of the ‘research’ or ‘subject’ of the work. The project’s capacity to act as an index meant that it activated a series of spatial relationships so that these relationships were then articulated by the work.

This work was thus approached as a mapping both in terms of its generation, and in terms of outcome. Because the work worked to activate a spatial, temporal and material relationship to the stretch of space through the adjacent room and down the stairwell, the work itself became a physical apparatus for engaging and experiencing the surrounding space differently. Therefore, by being positioned as a form of mapping, the work did not represent the space with which it

---

25 I specify physical here, because the notion of the apparatus, especially in its relationship to the camera-as-apparatus which is relevant to film or photography, tends to emphasize the optical. Although visuality is obviously important to a consideration of engaging sculptural projects, my primary focus is upon physicality, embodiment, movement and materiality as it relates to the production of space.
developed a relation, but physically reworked and interacted with it, thereby differentiating, and thus producing, space in and as the process (Stoppani 2004: p.186).

**Mapping relations of indiscernability**

In positioning this project as a mapping, I must clarify that it is not the kind of mapping that worked to ‘expose’ or ‘unearth’ its site as if this were a pre-given condition, or an abstract generality (Benjamin 1997 a: pp.56-59) -- this was not a Cartesian exercise grounded by a centering of subject and space. Employing Andrew Uroskie’s discussion upon Smithson’s Spiral Jetty project is useful here, because like the Spiral Jetty film-work, *intensive objects: indeterminate events* (2002) is positioned as a kind of mapping in which its “ostensible object is persistently displaced” (Uroskie 2005: p.74).

The notion of something becoming persistently displaced at the very same time it is being ‘outlined’ is what Deleuze calls a “relation of indiscernibility” between the actual thing and its proliferating representation or counterparts” (Uroskie 2005: p.64). This idea recalls Stoppani’s argument that a mapping distances itself from its object, and in the process of becoming distanced, causes the emergence of a new project. Thus, the object is not outlined or described, because the map does not “reproduce the real, but constructs on it, connects it, opens it, and generates it “[Stoppani 2004: p.186].

Approached as such, *intensive objects: indeterminate events* (2002) became a type of multiple mapping that worked not to fix its place, but to set its relationship to that place in motion -- to make it and displace it as the form-content-subject-operation of the work. This work was neither a depiction, nor a representation ‘of’ the site, but a proliferation from the site and therefore a form of spatial practice that produced another situation in the process.

**A note on the question of site-specificity framed through mapping**

The above discussion locates my research as activating and developing relations between projects and their particular spatial, material and temporal situations. These projects have engaged in forms of mapping within these situations, while also producing differentiations in the forms of tape drawings, flooring templates, sculptural installations, texts, videos, constructions and diagrams. These mappings work to generate new relations and contexts, or new situations for engagement with the spaces that they activate.

It is important to specify here that these projects engage with questions of site, but they are not positioned as ‘site-specific’ for the reason that the premise of each project has not been to reflect upon or articulate the ‘being’ of a place. To do this would be to engage with place through a representational logic whereby notions of being and identity are centered. It would also orient my practice towards a form of ‘place-bounded-ness’, which has been critiqued by Miwon Kwon in her book *One Place After Another: Site-Specific Art and Locational Identity* (Kwon 2004).
In this text, Kwon wages a critique on this kind of positioning of site-specificity, arguing that it asserts traditional notions of uniqueness structured by conceptions of a site-specific work’s supposed un-repeatability in its bounded-ness to one particular place (Kwon 2004: p.38). With this critique as a framework for consideration, it is important to discuss the particular relationship that this research practice develops to the questions of site. Specifically, mapping has been used as a tool with which to make each project construct its place within a given situation (Bird 1998), and in the process of doing so, to produce a differentiation from that place, rather than be specific to it by way of reflecting ‘upon’ it.

**Mapping as working between**

With this caution in mind, a concept that has been helpful in orienting my approach towards the idea of site is the notion of the work generating a space ‘between’, rather than discussing the sculptural-event projects as being ‘site-specific’. This notion has been informed by Elizabeth Grosz’s concept of in-between from her text *Architecture from the Outside*:

“...instead of conceiving of relations between fixed identities, between entities or things that are only externally bound, the in-between is the only space of movement, of development or becoming...the space in between things is the space in which things are undone, the space to the side and around, which is the space of subversion and fraying, the edges of any identities limits. In short, it is the space of the bounding and undoing of the identities which constitute it...” (Grosz 2001: p.93)

This articulation has been useful in orienting my project’s relationship to questions of site-specificity, because it is this in-between condition where both ‘site’ and ‘work’ enter into a process of negotiation with each other. Mapping is used to make this interconnection prominent, which in turn highlights the idea that site and work are not pre-given before entering into a relation. Furthermore, this negotiation needs to be perpetually made according to the different contexts within which each project emerges, as was the case during **intensive objects**: in**determinate events** discussed above.

Thus the kind of mapping outlined in this chapter, oriented through Teressa Stoppani’s discussion coupled with the example provided by Robert Smithson’s Spiral Jetty project, has been used as a strategy to develop a research practice which engages with questions of site, but in ways in which site is taken not as fixed or singular, but as involved in a relay of relations between spatial conditions, material and temporal relationships. Mapping has been engaged extensively as a process to generate projects and also to activate connections between spatial situations. Thus, the projects developed in this PhD depend upon the process of mapping as a means of production, while becoming forms of mapping themselves. Mapping thus becomes an important process orienting this research as a spatial practice, whereby the sculptural-event projects that manifest from the research become forms of spatial production.
MAPPING SITUATIONAL RELATIONS

Following from the discussion above, in which mapping is discussed as one of the primary elements constituting my research as a spatial practice, this section more closely considers the notion of mapping as a strategy employed as a means for activating and articulating ‘situational relations’ so that these relations are explicitly activated within projects.

The word ‘situation’ is used here because it encompasses not only the physical or site-related elements of a context, 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.

This section will explore the implications of taking up this position, in relationship to the aim of positioning my research as being critically engaged with questions of context. A project called Büro Berlin, active between 1979 and 1986, is explored alongside the projects of Joëlle Tuerlinckx. These are approached as exemplary models of practices that investigate possible modes for engaging situational relations and, by extension, for inhabiting institutional contexts. Particular elements of my research practice are investigated and mapping is discussed as a strategy for exploring particular modes of engagement that are not indifferent to the contexts from which they emerge.

26 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, Thomas Hirschhorn’s Bataille Monument and the N55 collective from Copenhagen.

27 The notion of institution summoned here is not as one monolithic, clearly demarcated space strapped up in museum architecture and protocol. Instead, the institution is a concept that encompasses a vast relay of situations which support, enable, structure and present art (ie. such as artist-run projects, commercial galleries, biennales, publications, alternative venues) -- WALLENSTEIN, S.O. (2006) “Institutional Desires”, in Art and its Institutions, ed. N Montmann, London: Black Dog Publishing, pp. 114-122. -- and the network of people who work within these situations, including artists. The institution is thus positioned as the space where discourse assembles.
Manoeuvring towards contextual involvement (avoiding relations of indifference)

The objective of producing projects that venture into the task 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 notion of art as being self-sufficient from its context. This position 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). It has also been informed by the ideas of 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 insides and outsides which embraces them as conditions that are negotiable, rather than absolutely determined. What becomes important here are the ways that these processes of negotiation might be made visible by an artwork.

Extending from, and taking up, the idea that an artwork needs to develop a critical relation to its situation, this section broadly positions mapping as a possible strategy through which to develop, animate and make visible the situational and contextual relations within which art is produced, functions and circulates. The purpose of each sculptural-event project is to partially activate these relations, with the aim of developing a critical connection to each project’s situational conditions, rather than posing an indifference or ignorance towards them.

Before I discuss how this has occurred specifically throughout a number of projects, the notion of a work’s ‘situational reality’, as has been articulated by artists from the Büro Berlin project, will be explored, given that this project has been significant to my current understanding and to the positioning of this PhD research. The writings of the artists involved, mainly Fritz Rahmann, Herman Pitz and Raimund Kummer, have been influential in the engagement I have developed in my practice, both individually and collectively.

Büro Berlin as a model for thinking about the relations between artwork and situation

Büro Berlin was an artist-led project that emerged in West Berlin between the years 1979 and 1986 [see figures 58 and 59]. In the essay Difference to Realspace, Rahmann, Kummer and Pitz argue that the “situational reality of production…should be evident in the visual appearance of the

---

28 I specify the term partial as I do not regard my projects as instrumental or functional. There are a platform of other concerns with which my work engages; these have been articulated through the other chapters of this PhD.

29 This influence is due to the impact that that Büro Berlin project has had upon a generation of Melbourne artists such Peter Cripps and Terri Bird; who were my primary educators in undergraduate studies. Moreover, Rahmann’s ideas have entered into Melbourne-oriented dialogues around the issue of the production of space, the ‘publication’ of artwork, and issues of ephemerality in relation to site-specificity. Rahmann’s ideas live on and have mutated through the ongoing dialogues between Terri Bird and myself, emphasized especially in relationship to our collaboration involving working to develop CLUBS project inc. Julie Davies, Alex Rizkala and Tom Nicholson from Ocular Lab are also practitioners who have a connection to Rahmann through living and working in Berlin during the late 90s. I also have a specific connection with them through practice oriented dialogue.
work itself” (Rahmann 1986: p.12). An example is when an artwork articulates its specific conditions and makes those conditions a part of the material, structure or organisation of a work, to constitute the content or subject of the work. This is discussed by Rahmann as occurring throughout projects that emerged from Büro Berlin when:

> “the interrelation of a thing and its surroundings becomes a visual language…
> first this interrelation was that of mobile objects and architecture…consequently...
> definitions of architecture, its physical condition, possession and administration became subjects of the work…” (Rahmann April 1992: p.1).

Rahmann advocates that if a work neglects to do this, then it is in danger of “degenerating into a meaningless mode of thing-ness which simply fills up the space and is perceived in a mode of institutional indifference” (Rahmann 1986: p.13), thereby supporting the myth of art as being self-sufficient and timeless.

**Examples of the use of mapping as a strategy for activating situational relations**

The position made by these artists resonates strongly with the strategies employed in this PhD, whereby many of the projects have become engaged in activating critical engagements with their contexts, so as to address their situational conditions. Such strategies are explicit in my involvement within CLUBSproject in relationship to developing engagements with the conditions of art production particular to the context of contemporary practice in Melbourne.

This position is also evident in more singular projects, such as expanding.compressing.figures.fields (2001) [see figure 60], which comprised of a series of nine interviews conducted with artists whose works were included in the same group exhibition. This project activated relations between the artists, their work, their expectations and the institutional situation in which these works were to be exhibited, and mapped these relations into an expanded archive. Expanding, compressing, figures, fields. (2001) aimed to employ the context of a particular exhibition event as grounds for investigation and as a means for generating and presenting work, with the larger aim of activating situational relations and making them appear in the work so that they became part of the project’s material and subject.

Other projects, such as intensive objects: indeterminate events (2002), multipleMISCELLANEOUS alliances (2004) [see figure 61], projectprojects [open and hosted] (2006), and indexing practices (projects in production) (2006), are further examples of projects which engage the various situational realities of their production and make these visible both in the work, and as the work, so as to develop a reflexive or critical relation to them, rather than taking them as simply given and immutable. These objectives are generally engaged through a process of focusing upon the ‘spectrum’ of those relations, which ranges from material, to spatial, to organizational, to discursive relations, and then actively mapping the relations into projects such that they form part of the expanded material and structure of those projects.
Inhabiting institutional situations: The installation projects of Joëlle Tuerlinckx

Turning the focus of this discussion once again upon the practice of Joëlle Tuerlinckx, I consider her projects as providing 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 publication project. 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: p.453). 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: “…lighting, opening times, use of colour and the publishing of details in a catalogue. She sets out to incorporate all the ‘overarching frameworks’, with the result that she also highlights her own observing and recording activity and that of the exhibition visitor….every component of the exhibition machinery is reviewed: labeling, placing in alphabetical or numerical series, archiving correspondence, taking photographs and documenting and commenting on her work in every possible manner…” (Kunstonline 2003; p.2) [see figures 62 and 63]. Tuerlinckx therefore 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. Tuerlinckx’s practice has thus been a crucial model for helping me to develop and position my own relationship to working contextually in ways that avoid established binaries between a project and its conventional outside.

In a fashion similar to Tuerlinckx, some of my sculptural-event projects have also been used to call limits into question, by mapping, or proliferating, these limits as a strategy for working within a given situation. This was especially the case during the project corner to corner and stretching (2004-2005) where it became unclear which ‘parts’ of the large sprawling floor work could be stepped on. This uncertainty was amplified by the installation of the first flooring device in front of the wall where the institutional ‘title-card’ was fastened. To read this card required visitors to

---

30 The strategy of locating title card ‘within’ the material matrix of a project is used in order to highlight the idea that there the limits of a work must be negotiated and are not simply given or absolute. This strategy has been used in the projects:
step on the flooring device – otherwise the text on the card remained illegible. This relationship was not administered by any instructions, so the decision was left as an open-ended question potentially requiring negotiation. Further, by working to include this particular device within the space of the work (usually placed in a position marking an ‘outside’), the boundaries of the work were further called into question and thereby become rendered as negotiable.

Similar strategies have been employed within numerous other projects whereby particular aspects of elements of projects actively map out connections between other elements, for example by incorporating spatial details of the exhibition site. This was produced by the removal of a front door and two windows in the CLUBS project space in 2003 during the project *one thing another thing some things other, other things stagger and* (2003) and by the cutting and prising open of a floorboard at 200 Gertrude Street during *objects: translations* in 2001, and through the repeating of colour schemes in adjacent spaces, which was used as a way to map a relationship between the installation and the stairwell, such as was the case in *intensive objects: indeterminate events* (2002).

These gestures are not performed in order to propose a project’s limit-less-ness, nor are they borne by a desire to merge the sculptural-event projects into their backgrounds. Instead they are used to repeatedly call that background which frames and enables art into question, by making aspects of it visible through the process of specifying, or indexing them. This is done in order that the limit between the work and its supposed outside (the architecture which frames it, the catalogues which embed it into discourse and set it circulating, and the curatorial frameworks which organize it etc.) are positioned as negotiable and open, rather than fixed and untouchable.

**DOCUMENTS AS MAPPINGS**

**Document and event: space as multiplied in the document**

The notion of mapping as a form of proliferation promotes a discussion of the question of documentation within this research. The mappings that have been generated within this PhD become documents (templates, images, videos, etc.) that extend and are differentiated from the temporal contexts specific to each sculptural-event project. For example, each project always becomes more than simply an exhibition event, because it expands from its physical and temporal site to become a research ‘bulk’ encompassing diagrams, notes, texts, samples of objects, fragments of constructions, a plethora of images, video footage, transcripts from feedback sessions, etc. that exist well past the timeframe provided for any one exhibition. However, even though each project generates an excess of associated materials, this is not to say that these items are positioned as residual after-effects, or secondary documents.
Instead, by learning from examples provided by Smithson’s *Spiral Jetty* project, and reflecting on more contemporary examples by artists such as Francis Alys’s *When Faith Moves Mountains* (2002), these residues/documents are affirmed as possessing the potential for other kinds of projects to develop. For instance, I have become increasingly interested in exploring ways that a project might be extended and translated through object or image, and also through the visual and textual documents that are generated around each project. This potential was explored during and after *project projects [open and hosted]* (2006), when I reused the large plywood platform as a device to generate a series of other spatial situations for collaborative engagements. The exhibition also became an opportunity to develop an image-based project, as I used video extensively to produce a series of images sequences, which later became video stills compiled into a ‘film-book’. This ‘film-book’ of stills will be used in the final research exhibition of this PhD as a way of mapping *project projects [open and hosted]*. The process of mapping work through video, text and image has thus replaced the notion of ‘documenting work’. Documentation becomes a mapping that unleashes potential for a work to be extended or to change and produce other contexts for engagement. These ideas have been informed once again by Smithson’s *Spiral Jetty*, particularly the relationship generated between the film-work and earth-work, whereby the film was much more than secondary documentation, but became the nexus of the project. Specific to this discussion is the proliferation that the film-work generates. This idea makes a strong relationship to the position of the image-as-document in my own projects, in which documentation, both photographic and video-based, is engaged to a degree such that these items surpass being secondary documents, to become projects of their own. This is evident in the ADR, which has become a space where the research has not simply been documented, but through an excessive engagement with the process and potential of documentation, has become a project in itself. This project is thereby positioned as a ‘book compression’ and a research index.

This approach has also gained influence from the contemporary practices of Joëlle Tuerlinckx and Joke Robbard. These artists are both engaged in ongoing photographic and inventory-making projects which map together a diversity of activities, spaces, materials and ideas so that the ‘sites’ of their practice become proliferated to an intensive degree, from exhibition sites, to films, to inventory-styled books of images, film stills and texts.

**Documents in excess and dispersal: perpetual proliferation in Joëlle Tuerlinckx’s projects**

Tuerlinckx’s work is especially interesting in that the entire practice is considered as a ‘bulk’ or an inventory-in-transit that is perpetually dispersed, compressed, re-articulated and re-dispersed across multiple times and spaces. Her abundant practice (reminiscent of Marcel Broodthaer’s expansive *Museé des Aigles* project) produces a situation in which the idea of site is multiplied from the outset, such that one is confronted with a sense of being located in an ever-thickening 31 Similarly to Smithson’s *Spiral Jetty*, Alys’s project consisted of an event in a remote site: a desolate landscape outside the city of Lima in Peru. When Faith Moves Mountains is more than simply located in a given space and time work, splintering into a multiplicity encompassing collaboration, video production, a contemporary/mythic narrative and a publication.
middle. This applies both to the physical experience of engaging one of her vast, provisional installations, or by engaging one of her book projects, which are often displayed, sometimes in fragments, within these installations so as to further render the relations between space, time, memory, perception and document as complex, nested and recursive.

In 1999, I visited her project titled *this book, like a book* at the S.M.A.K. museum in Gent. It consisted of a sprawling field of fragments displayed on tables, in books, on the ground and in videos. These fragments mapped relationships across the display site, and into past and future projects. Within this exhibition, her former *Witte de With* project from 1997 titled *pieces, pieces, things, things and pieces* (of which I had previously seen images of in a booklet), 32 was compressed into a space one-eighth of the size of the original installation area such that all the bits and pieces comprising confetti, plasticine balls, strings, title cards, and paper shreds, were re-articulated into an open, floor-based cardboard ‘vitrine’.


**Document as project: the practice of Joke Robaard**

Similarly, Joke Robaard’s recent publication, titled *folders, suits, pockets, files, stocks* (Robaard 2003), is best articulated as a book-becoming-inventory-becoming-mapping of a practice situating an immense diversity of activity, prop, image and text. This book connects an array of fragments including forms of spatial research, documents from photo shoots, images of props, found imagery, scaled-down posters and texts. Collected together, this ensemble delivers, in a manner similar to Tuerlinckx’s, a practice structured by an ever-thickening series of processes, such that it becomes a complex kind of mapping [see figures 64 and 65].

Connection to these practices is made because the image and text document becomes the vehicle through which the activities of the practice are mapped and made visible. To some extent, especially in the case of Robaard, the book of documents somewhat becomes the practice. Moreover, due to the projects developing through a multiplicity of mapping-oriented processes -- consisting for example as movement experiments, tape plottings, object developments, collaborative processes, discussions, video making etc. -- these activities

---

32 In Dutch this is written: *dinge, dinge, stukje, stukje und dinge.*
generate an endless bulk of material. This bulk is not handled as secondary to the project, but as being a vital part of the project.

The relationship this activates with both Tuerlinckx’s and Robaard’s complex activity and document/book-based practices is that both in their projects, and my own, it is not possible to arrive at or fix a final object, because the projects proliferate wildly beyond finite times or places. This forms an important point of connection to my research projects, operating for example, in projects such as *expanding.compressing.figures.fields* (2001), *things full of people* (2005), and *indexing practices: projects in production* (2006), in which the concept of the document as a mapping has been intensified, and whereby each project renounces a point of stability in favor of a proliferation of mappings which overwhelm the possibility of a centre emerging at all.

**Note on the development of the Appropriate Durable Record (ADR) in relationship to idea of proliferation**

This discussion also has relevance to the ways in which the ADR component of this PhD research project has been structured, in that the proliferation of image mappings forms a material-bulk that is structured in a way that indexes a multiplicity of relationships that have developed throughout the PhD. The ADR is much more than a document ‘of’ the research, because it is also articulates a form of research into ways that a proliferating sculptural-event practice might be mapped and articulated. It also locates a research outcome into exploring ways of publishing multifarious activities, and of developing a series of complex connections across a practice. The ADR thus becomes a critical project in itself.33

**Summary**

*Mapping as a Process of Production* situates mapping as both a research process, and an outcome of the research practice. Mapping has been used in numerous ways throughout this PhD: as a process for engaging in spatial research; as a layered process used to generate projects; as a means to develop a project’s relationship to site and context; as a means to engage in the situational relations connected to production; and as a way to engage in a proliferating process of documentation.

Mapping has therefore become a strategy for developing a particular kind of sculptural engagement based in an exploration of space and spatial relations. Because of this emphasis, the sculptural practice generated throughout this research is positioned as being particularly spatially inclined. The resultant projects are therefore positioned as forms of spatial production that are ‘saturated’ by many mappings. These projects also become forms of mapping ‘in themselves’. This is an important point for qualification, because mapping is not primarily used as

---

33 In conjunction with this idea, the ADR has developed as a document drawing from and appropriating the structures of both Joelle Tuerlincks and Joke Robaard’s book projects cited above. These structures have been combined and re-articulated appropriate to the context of my research project. The ADR thus refers to these practices while making a diversion from them.
means-to-ends, but becomes intensified and thickened across all projects. By situating projects as mappings, their operative or procedural qualities are accentuated. What this means is that projects become material and spatial ‘apparatuses’ that animate connections and relations. This brings a sense of activity to projects in a way that renders them propositional and open to process within the context of their exhibition -- which conventionally marks the end-point of an artwork-as-artifact. Instead, projects become fields of activity, rather than finalized objects or artifacts.

The approach made towards mapping as generative and productive, rather than as representational or descriptive, also has an important emphasis in relationship to the extended aims of the PhD, which are to engage in modes of production that are based in proliferation. The proliferating movements that mapping engenders are delivered through the amplification of activity and process inherent to it. Thus, mapping has been a principal strategy of exploring the production of sculpture as a proliferating event, because the process of mapping is open-ended, endlessly amenable and thoroughly propositional. Mapping’s process of opening up and out to other spaces, objects and activities makes it a generative kind of force throughout the research practice. In relationship to the projects of this PhD, this generative has been used continually, in order to engage sculpture as both a form of spatial production, and a process that is open to ongoing articulation, movement and possibility.

The next section will develop this idea further by focusing upon the ways that sculpture has been specifically moved and manouvred, to become an event.
EXPANDED CONCLUSION

MANOEUVRING SCULPTURE

This section presents an expanded conclusion divided into two parts. Part one extrapolates a series of ‘methodological manoeuvres’ that have been used to explore the potential for engaging sculpture as an event. Throughout these manoeuvres the generative, eventful and open-ended approaches related to production are amplified. These methodologies are therefore positioned as being the activities used to proliferate the practice of sculpture, from within the terms specific to the processes of its production. It is in part one that the first research question How can sculpture be practiced as a proliferating event? is articulated. Part two addresses the remaining research questions by summarising a series of positions and articulating the contributions that this PhD makes to contemporary practice.
PART ONE

MANOEUVRES FOR PROLIFERATING THE PRODUCTION OF SCULPTURE

This section provides an account of the methodologies engaged in relation to the studio and exhibition components of this research.34

The way that the ‘methodological manoeuvres’ are articulated in this conclusion has arisen by approaching the research practice as a field saturated by a diversity of processes. These activities overlap a number of projects, forming common platforms of engagement and investigation. As such, the methodologies are not organised in a chronological order, but are grouped together according to particular points of focus and connection.

The ‘methodological manoeuvres’ are assembled into a series of paragraphs. They explore relationships to particular themes present within the four chapters of the body of the exegesis. These methodological manoeuvres demonstrate how, through a practice, sculpture has been proliferated to become eventful. These methodologies include:

– enacting spatial notations: movement-actions
– mapping as a process for project generation
– indexing materiality
– proliferating material relations
– developing repetitions and translations
– installation as a research process
– proliferating documentation
– writing as research
– collaboration as research
– engaging in organisational projects as research
– feedback sessions as proliferating a project’s possibilities

Following are articulations of each of these methodological manoeuvrings whereby connections are made to particular ideas developed in the four chapters of the exegesis.

34 An engagement with ‘studio practice’ varies from production in a ‘private space’ to more collaborative engagements with groups of people through processes of workshop and discussion. The studio practice also extends to public spaces, such as at the sites where projects are developed. Studio practice is therefore approached as a situation in which multiple forms of production occur, and studio activity is oriented as having a collective, networked and public dimension.
1. ENACTING SPATIAL NOTATIONS: MOVEMENT-ACTIONS

Many projects comprising this PhD were generated through the use of ‘spatial notation’ as a research methodology. This is often performed as an initial process to generate visual, textual and diagrammatic material that sparks a project’s development. Spatial notation occurs primarily at the site of an eventual project, and often locates an initial point of contact with a context or situation. Spatial notation is a methodology that connects conceptually to the discussion of mapping in Chapter Four: Mapping as a Process of Production, particularly in relationship to ideas of mapping as being a generative process. It also relates to ideas of mapping as being a process of ‘working between’ in relationship to questions around space and context.

This process involves making a series of ‘notations’ in the form of images, drawings, video recordings and samplings. At its most basic form, it involves engaging with a situation over an extended period of time, or multiple times. Conditions such as spatial volumes, temporal rhythms, contextual location within a building or street, and the flows of events, people, things and materials in and through a site are engaged as research material. These conditions are approached as having an interlaced relationship to site. Together, these relations converge to produce an event, an overall atmosphere for engagement and response. Spatial notation relates to the discussion in Chapter Four: Mapping as a Process of Production, in particular to the idea of developing projects which engage and respond to ‘situational relations’ by addressing these relations and making them visible in the work.

Spatial-notation also involves a process of ‘indexing’. This idea relates to a discussion in Chapter Four: Mapping as a Process of Production whereby elements and conditions are indexed and, in the process, become new forms of material that are then drawn from in the generation of projects. Indexing is engaged in order to develop projects from a series of spatial and material contingencies. It is also used in order to activate physical linkages between projects and their situations, so that an encounter with projects might involve a process of oscillation between the materiality of a project, and the materiality of the situation. For instance, the materiality of a particular construction might activate an awareness of the floor, or the surrounding ground. This process connects to ideas explored in Chapter Three: A Topography of Particles, in particular to the discussion concerning ‘activating practices of viewing’.

Examples of the process of spatial notation:

a) making movement
This involves moving/walking/pacing through a spatial volume according to the trajectories that have been structured through architectural layouts or other forms of construction, paying particular attention to bends, steps, thresholds and architectural apertures which locate, orient and provide and block passageway. This process is noted through diagrammatic drawings,
written notes, general and precise measurements and by collecting information from sites mostly in the form of photographic documents.

**b) articulating passages**
The passageways provided by architectural situations are often re-imagined according to a ‘projected’ restructuring of architectural layouts. These are tracked on-site in the form of ephemeral tape drawings on floors and walls, or through the use of large sheets of paper to collect traces of trajectories and orientations. These notations are often relocated in a studio environment at a 1:1 scale, and used to develop relations between the exhibition site and the studio site.

c) noting flows
Observing the habitual movements and flows of people within particular situations also forms a part of this research methodology, and is noted, videoed, photographed and then absorbed into diagrammatic layouts and drawings. It often becomes a form of information orienting the construction of flooring structures, semi-architectural structures, and part-furnishings within projects.

2. MAPPING AS A PROCESS FOR PROJECT GENERATION

Various forms of mapping have developed in connection to the projects produced. Mapping is considered as both a generative method producing spatial-temporal-material information, and as a research outcome. As a method, mapping expands upon the spatial notations methodology above as a means for gathering information in order to ‘embed’ or ‘dissolve’ that data into specific constructions. This discussion of mapping relates specifically to Chapter Four: *Mapping as a Process of Production*, in particular relationship to proliferating processes of generation, so that the kind of sculptural-event projects that result become a form of spatial practice.

**Examples of specific mapping processes:**

a) Mapping often involves the use of masking tape and string, placed according to processes outlined in the series of points made in the discussion of spatial notation. The mapping process is regarded as a form of 1:1 spatial drawing in time. Mapping generates information with which to generate paper templates, or semi-architectural devices such as flooring systems, supports, walls, thresholds, doorways and semi-functional furnishings with which the project eventually constructs a relationship.
b) Mapping is also employed as a process to situate projects in relationship to a particular context or series of contexts. Works are never ‘made’ prior to installation. Works are not ‘deposited’ in a space without some kind of relationship being actively developed through that process. Installation (positioned here as a verb) then becomes a process of mapping relations – of developing connections and articulations. The work that yields then becomes a form of mapping of that process. Thus, the installation of work is not approached as the finalisation of a project, but as an opportunity for the generation of more processes, including making video and photo mappings, generating texts, diagrams and writings, generating performances, collaborative activities, discussions and publications.

c) Alongside this, mapping is used as a process to generate relations between material experiments that develop into sequences of part-objects, and to develop relationships between groupings of material.

3. INDEXING MATERIALITY

Indexing materiality relates to the materiality of spatial contexts in which a project eventuates. These contexts are paid close attention and are approached as fields of contingencies from which to generate material indexes that are then used to develop sculptural elements. For example, the materiality of specific situations (the asphalt of roads, footpaths, entranceways, municipal furniture, gutters, flooring, etc.) becomes a focus of investigation, and this materiality is ‘indexed’ using various methods such as collecting material fragments, making videos which focus upon changes in material relationships (such as the change in ground materials), and using digital photography to catalogue material relations, which then become a reference when developing the sculptural object components of projects. For example, the concrete aggregate floor at RMIT project space was responded to through the production of silicone flooring samples, casting chunks of concrete, and casting directly onto this floor.

4. PROLIFERATING MATERIAL RELATIONS

Proliferating material relations relates to more ‘internal’ processes of experimentation that develop through exploring material possibilities, bifurcations and forces with materials such as cardboard, plasticine, felt, plywood, rubber, dirt etc. Particular attention is focused upon materiality as being ephemeral and provisional. Projects that are generated then become testing grounds for material experimentation. This methodology makes a connection to Chapters One: Coming to Understand a particular Kind of Materiality, concerning materiality as ‘teeming with forces’ and as ‘activating spatial relations’, and to Chapter Two: Making Approached From Five Platforms, concerning the idea of making as ‘following the flow of matter’.
Proliferating materiality is a methodology that is used to open the possibilities for sculptural production so that projects become fields of materials articulated in a multiplicity of ways. The sculptural fragments that result from this approach become more like propositions than finished objects. This emphasis therefore connects the methodology of proliferating materiality to Chapter Three: *A Topography of Particles*, in particular to the idea of sculptural production involving the generation of bits and pieces, or parts and samples, where what emerges are series of part-objects rather than objects-in-themselves.

An example of process used to develop a sequence of part-objects – in this case, a set of fragments for the project *projectprojects [open and hosted]* (2006) is discussed below.

A rock is found/chosen from the street ⇒ this becomes temporary end-point object.

A mould is made from this object

A plasticine skin-object is made from the mould (hollow object).

This undergoes a series of experiments in which the plasticine is squashed, piled up, and opened out into skins.

A series of identical plasticine skin-objects are made ⇒ some become temporary end-point objects for the project space, while some are absorbed back into the ongoing process.

These objects are opened up into surfaces.

The surfaces are pieced together to form a larger, undulating rock-textured surface.

A retaining wall is made around this surface for the pouring of liquid silicone.

This sparks another process of casting silicone directly onto the floor so as to make flat silicone-readings of the wooden floor boards of the studio ⇒ this becomes temporary end-point object.

A single-sided mould is made from this surface in rigid polyurethene ⇒ this becomes temporary end-point object.

The surface is then used as a negative surface from which to cast another surface in silicone ⇒ this becomes temporary end-point object.
Another object is cast from the initial rock-mould, this time in rigid polyeurethene => this becomes a temporary end-point object.

A rigid polyeurethene rock-object becomes a support for the propping up of the floppy silicone surface.

More plasticine, hollow rock-objects are cast from the initial rock-mould => these become temporary end-point objects.

Plasticine objects undergo another process of being opened out into flat skins => these are pieced together directly onto the concrete aggregate floor at the project space => this becomes a temporary end-point object.

Yielding from this kind of methodology is a set of fragments that range from cast objects to ephemeral surfaces that together form the material bulk for exhibition such as in project[projects [open and hosted]] (2006). Important here is the emphasis placed upon open-ended process and an expansive approach to generation. This kind of process applies to the material explorations involved in many of the other research projects. As such, it relates to one of the aims of the PhD concerning investigating ways of proliferating the production of sculpture.

5. DEVELOPING REPETITIONS AND TRANSLATIONS

Repetition is employed to develop processes, objects and constructions. Repetition is a method used to activate a process of proliferation by reabsorbing objects into new processes for generation, differentiation and re-articulation.

For instance, during corner to corner and stretching (2004-2005) repetition was engaged as a means of “…developing networks of partial-objects, where repetition is used to bring about a change thereby generating series of variations across an array of object-materials” (Hester 2004). This process related to the development of flooring components through a process of mapping and translation. For example, the floor plan of the gallery space in which this work was to be exhibited was appropriated, scaled down and fragmented into a series of computer drawings which were then scaled up into tape drawings upon another (wooden) floor. These were then translated into a series of paper templates, which were then developed into a series of black ‘melamine’ flooring-modules, which were, in turn, installed upon the black concrete floor from which their development was derived. They were then mapped into a sequence of video documents and images.
Each step in the process produced a ‘shift’ in register and materiality (i.e. from paper, to tape on wooden floor, to tape on paper, to sections of chipboard on concrete, to video sequence, to image), such that each shift produced a difference through the process of repetition, and was engaged as an opportunity for translation from one situation to another.

The generation of repetitive sequences of objects and constructions does not accord with a linear model in which an object is progressed from a point of origin towards a point of final realisation. Instead, repetition is used to open up a series of lateral trajectories so that a myriad of objects and relationships might proliferate, with an emphasis placed upon the differences that generate in the process. The layers of material and object residues that yield from these processes almost always become folded into the fabric of the project, in order to become the project. For example, the bulk that emerges is not edited into reduced outcomes. The impetus for this approach is to present a multiplicity of outcomes and, in turn, to present those outcomes as open-ended parts which belong to larger contexts, whereby each part or singularity is connected through a continuum of related processes.

Repetition as a methodology relates to the idea developed in Chapter Two: *Making Approached from Five Platforms*, to promote engaging in forms of making based in generative processes whereby repetition establishes systems that expand the decision-making beyond a centered author, to the system that is set into motion.

6. INSTALLATION AS A RESEARCH PROCESS

Installation is engaged as a process (not as a category). As such, it provides a research opportunity to continue developing work during an exhibition timeframe. For example, installing often becomes a major component in a project’s development, sometimes stretching over a number of weeks. This methodology relates to Chapter Two: *Making Approached From Five Platforms*, in particular to the idea of ‘making durations’ whereby making becomes an expanded activity and installation becomes a process of production.

This has been the case for projects such as *one thing another thing some things other, other things stagger and...* (2003), which was developed over an extended period of time and engaged with on a daily basis. As such, the project underwent continual developments during the entire exhibition period. A similar process was carried out during *projectprojects [open and hosted]* (2006) at RMIT project space, where I worked in the space daily so as to keep the installation process open-ended. This enabled response to spatial, temporal and social contingencies as they arose within the timeframe.
In both projects installation became an ongoing process of research, involving activities such as building, restructuring, video production, performance, generating sound recording, collaboration and expanded processes of documentation.

7. PROLIFERATING DOCUMENTATION

Documentation has become a research methodology used to generate videos, images and texts expanding from sculptural-event projects. Therefore, documentation is not something that is used not only to capture projects through visual means, but becomes an opportunity to further expand projects and generate connections. In this regard, documentation becomes a methodology for the production of visual material and connects to ideas explored in Chapter Four: Mapping as a Process of Production, in particular to the notion of documentation as being a form of mapping that is generative and differential.

Examples involving proliferating documentation include:

a) Making video documents and transitional video notations
Video is used as a mapping device, a process for recording activity and construction, and a device for exploring spatial and temporal relationships activated within projects. For example, video was used extensively for exploring spatial trajectories and possibilities during the development of the project intensive objects: indeterminate events (2002). In this instance, video became a form of spatial research.

Video is also used as an expanded documentary tool after projects are installed. Using video not just as a recording device, but as an apparatus through which to rethink and reorient approaches, a project potentially expands from being a ‘finished’ work into a source for a series of moving-image experiments. The camera thus becomes a productive apparatus for developing explicit relationships, which in turn provide a means for reconsidering objects as props (propositions) -- materials develop into animation; an installation becomes a ‘set’ of activities; and interactions and events involving audiences and co-collaborators become performative gestures. By employing video as a research method with a project as the material, a sculptural-event project becomes a resource for more work to come.

For instance, extensive video footage was made during projectprojects [open and hosted] (2006). Video stills were extracted from the footage. These stills were then developed into a compilation of images mapping ‘material sequences engaging the floor-space’. Important here is the approach taken towards documentation, which is not positioned as a form of representation of work, but as a means to extend work and thereby produce new projects. Considering a project as a resource from which other articulations are possible has been an
important development in my research practice and is something that I intend to employ more explicitly in future projects.

**b) Generating image mappings**

As a methodology digital photography is employed in a similar fashion to video, however the emphasis with the still-camera is upon the details of materiality and object relationships as they apply to site-based research. Many of the images gleaned through the photographic process are used in the developmental phases of project generation. For example, images become reference points for subsequent material investigations.

As an apparatus for documenting process, digital imaging is used extensively during material investigations, object developments, construction experiments, installation possibilities and productions, or when performative events and collaborative activities occur within the spectrum of a project. These images are often re-employed as resources that become absorbed into projects by becoming posters, public image-files, images for video sequences, and images in publications.

As such, image-making becomes integral to a sculptural-event project. Moreover, as this research has evolved, it has become evident that the distinctly layered, temporal and process-based relations require an expansive and proliferating approach to documentation, because single-mode images are inadequate for articulating these myriad relations. Photographic documentation is therefore generated to excess. I have been interested in the potential that this excess generates, as is evident in the ADR, which presents hundreds of images generated from the research practice.

**8. WRITING AS RESEARCH**

Writing has constituted an important methodology in relationship to generating notes, titles and texts that proliferate projects. For example, many of the projects have a series of notes published parallel to an exhibition, in the form of ‘expanded titles’ that articulate connections. The use of writing as a methodology relates to Chapter One: **Coming to Understand a Particular Kind of Materiality**, concerning the idea of expanding the material of a practice so that it includes an array of matters, whereby text becomes an important material for engagement.

The methods used to generate writing are similar to the methods discussed concerning mapping, whereby writing becomes a form of diagramming relations, activating connections, and cataloguing events. This occurs specifically when ‘expanded titles’ are developed for projects, and are exhibited as components of a work.
When projects are collaborative and organisational, writing becomes a process of generating platforms for conceptual engagement and often takes the form of collaboratively written essays. In these instances, text becomes a platform for the generation of written and spoken dialogue. This methodology relates to Chapter Two: Making Approached From Five Platforms in connection to the idea of making engaged as a form of overlapped or nested activity.

Writing is also used as a research method in relationship to the practices of others. A number of essays have been written in response to the practices of peers, particularly when their projects resonate with the research concerns of the PhD. Writing becomes a process of articulating research questions using the work of others as material upon which to focus. In this regard, writing relates to Chapter One: Coming to Understand a particular Kind of Materiality in connection to the idea of developing an engaged relationship to cultural production, and to the idea developed in Chapter Two Making Approached From Five Platforms whereby making becomes a form of response to another’s practice.

9. COLLABORATION AS RESEARCH

Collaborative engagements comprise a major part of research process, development and outcome. Collaboration is approached as a situation through which to explore ideas in an intensively dialogue-oriented fashion. Particular collaborative situations locate a nexus of shared research interests in which specific questions are engaged and explored, depending upon the nature of the collaborative grouping. Collaboration has been engaged variously throughout this PhD as a means to explore possibilities for dispersing forms of authorship into networks of relations and dialogues and, as such, this methodology relates to Chapter One: Making Approached From Five Platforms, concerning the different ideas of making positioned as an overlapping, nested and sometimes shared activity.

Collaboration is a methodology used in manoeuvring sculpture towards becoming an event, because collaboration generates the potential to proliferate ideas, approaches and outcomes. It also brings an eventful quality to projects through the movements, input and energies of others.

10. ENGAGING IN ORGANISATIONAL PROJECTS AS RESEARCH

Engaging within, and developing organisational projects extends from collaborative research, but with a focus trained upon experimenting with the ways that organisational structures enable specific relations to be activated. This idea has formed a major focus within CLUBSproject, the premise of which was to “experiment with reconfiguring organisational relations and the impact

35 In particular, to the practices of Tom Nicholson, Elizabeth Newman and Christopher Hill.
they have on the practices they make public” (CLUBSproject 2006). As such, exploring methods for structuring projects relates to Chapter One: *Coming to Understand a Particular Kind of Materiality* concerning the idea of organisational activities forming part of the material for a practice.

Engaging in organisational formats has necessitated research into methods for generating experimental approaches towards assembling relations. This has involved developing organisational structures in response to situations, activities and process of production, rather than imposing structures beforehand. For instance, *multipleMISCELLANEOUSalliances* became a large-scaled event involving a diversity of people and projects. This occurred through a rapid networking of ideas between individuals and groups; the project proliferated into a layered and complex event inclusive of many unplanned activities.

11. FEEDBACK SESSIONS AS PROLIFERATING A PROJECT’S POSSIBILITIES

Feedback sessions are positioned as a research methodology that I have been involved in developing while working with the artist organisation CLUBSproject since 2002. Within the framework of this PhD, feedback sessions constitute both a research process and a research outcome. As a process, they are engaged regularly and involve extended dialogue with a group of peers. Feedback sessions are an important methodological manoeuvre because they become an opportunity to further proliferate the potential of a project through the process of group dialogue. As a methodology, feedback therefore relates to Chapter Two: *Making Approached From Five Platforms* in relationship to the event of encounter positioned as a process of production, and Chapter One: *Coming to Understand a Particular Kind of Materiality*, related to the idea of generating an engaged relationship to cultural production by activating and experimenting with forms of discourse.

These eleven ‘methodological manoeuvres’ have been the processes through which sculpture has been proliferated through the terms of practice, thereby addressing the research question, *How can sculpture be practiced as a proliferating event?* The next part of this extended conclusion develops a discussion around the effects of manoeuvring sculpture as such, and considers the contributions made by the PhD to contemporary practice.
PART TWO:

TOWARDS A PROLIFERATING EVENT

If the first part of this conclusion articulates a series of manoeuvres for proliferating the practice of sculpture as a strategy for addressing the research question, How can sculpture be practiced as a proliferating event?, the second part provides a response to the remaining two research questions, which are: How does approaching sculpture as an event produce relations between modes of production, engagement and reception? and: In what ways does approaching and engaging with sculpture as an event contribute to contemporary practice? By responding to these questions, the following discussion articulates the PhD’s contribution to contemporary practice.

How does approaching sculpture as an event produce relations between modes of production, engagement and reception?

Positioning the event

In this PhD, sculpture-as-event encompasses adventuring materiality, expanding the possibilities for making, generating sequences of objects, collaborating, organising, reading, writing, mapping as a form of generating spatial projects, documenting, installing, investigating relationships to questions of site and context, exploring modes for engaging institutional situations and exploring possibilities for generating and sustaining dialogue. In this process, projects become less like artifacts and more like events in perpetual production.

Approaching sculpture-as-event therefore affects relations of production by expanding that realm to include a diversity of encounters and engagements. As such, projects develop through an approach that is at some times collaborative, at other times more discursive, at other times more material, and at others more spatial.

In the adventure that constitutes this PhD, I have come to regard all art production as being embedded within complex systems of relations pertaining to questions of making, process, site, contextualisation and discourse. In this sense one could argue that all art could be approached as an event and as eventful. However within this PhD it is the profusion of relations that becomes situated in the foreground. This practice addresses the conditions that enable eventfulness explicitly, thereby making these the forces of the development, form, presentation, content and outcome of projects.
Asserting practice as a complexity

By engaging, presenting and affirming sculptural practice as a complex composite of relations so that projects overwhelm any one frame of reference or point of resolve is a tactic used to assert complexity over simplification and unification, process over product, and an open-ended discourse over an interpretive or intent-driven one. This constitutes a strategy of broadening the idea of exchange so that it can be situated as more complex than involving the commodification of art-as-artifact. This applies both to production (in terms of generation) and to reception (in terms of engagement as a form of production) whereby research-driven, process-oriented, dialogue-based, collaborative and relational aspects of practice are animated and remain open-ended.

Proliferating the possibility for exchange

A contemporary art system that favors and encourages artifact-based production is one whereby particular regimes of authorship rule. I argue that positioning sculpture-as-event opens production by manoeuvring it in ways so that it might disperse across a field of activities. In the process, an author-maker is not situated primarily at the centre of relations, but becomes incorporated or submerged within a meshwork, or a process. This field encompasses a swarm of impulses ranging from adventuring the force of materiality to the situational relations structuring production, to the force provided by the ideas and trajectories of others. The open-ended nature of the practice, and the expanded approach taken towards making, necessarily mobilises forms of collaboration, while simultaneously becoming a product of collaboration. However, this approach is taken not to propose a principled position where collaboration is the favored outcome, but to develop an approach toward production that displaces the coherence of an individual by recognising and highlighting the inherently social and collaborative nature of production.

What sculpture-as-event therefore affirms is the idea of ‘living culture’, notion developed by the Danish Situationist Asger Jorn, acknowledging that “individual production is inseparable from the collective experiences of a community [which] lives through an engagement with its ideas and processes, making spurious any claim to ownership of cultural output” (Workman 2003). This is not to suggest a naivety in relationship to the force of history, which inevitably extracts individuals from the thickness of working contexts, situating them as ‘delegates’ of ideas and eras. Instead, adopting the idea of ‘living culture’ is a strategy for advocating and engaging forms of practice that are situations teeming with others (where the idea of ‘an-other’ is not only human-centered, but inclusive of a multiplicity of relations concerning materiality, temporality and spatiality). In this sense, sculpture-as-event situates an elastic practice that involves the production of multi-layered projects alongside the development of a critical engagement with the conditions for art’s production, which necessarily involve collaboration, contributing to critical discourse,
experimenting with ways that art might be organised and generating situations for other forms of engagement and production within a community of practitioners.

**Proliferation and the question of ‘meaning’**

In the process of manoeuvring sculpture towards becoming an event, whereby the notion of production multiplies, the question of where and how ‘meaning’ emerges also shifts. Building upon what has been learnt from discourses around Minimalism and sculptural theory, in which the object-quality of sculpture was argued as activating a relay between object, space, viewer and duration, the projects developed during this PhD have worked to activate forms of engagement whereby the question commonly projected onto art, which demands: *what does this mean?* shifts to become: *what does this work do* materially, spatially, temporally, socially and institutionally? And *what are the actual effects of this?* The work produced has been developed to precipitate this shift through its modes of address, or the relations it activates.

I argue that it is in the ways in which materiality is engaged, the modes of authorship structuring a project, the processes of generation and production, the ways that space is activated and produced, the ways in which a project engages its context and/or situation, the means through which practices of viewing are activated, and the forms of dialogue that it enables -- activates a multiplicity of entry points so that meaning does not become something that resides in ‘a space of representation’, but becomes an *effect* of the relations that are brought forth. Therefore, rather than being reducible to an artist statement, iconic image or validating catalogue essay, meaning instead becomes a process -- a provisional and ephemeral movement. In this relation, meaning is not something to be made once and for all, and fixed into place for rapid consumption, but becomes an event in perpetual production.

In this orientation, sculpture-as-event is not situated as representing, depicting or expressing anything, but is reoriented to become ‘operational’ a kind of apparatus which activates connections, produces effects, generates relationships with social and institutional contexts, thickens the time and activity of encounter, and offers up a platform for a multiplicity of encounters between materials, spaces, things and people. In this sense, sculpture-as-event works to open a space ‘beyond the realm of representation’ whereby the question is not so much about *getting it*, but *engaging it* in one of many possible means, whereby engagement becomes a proliferating adventure and a process of production.
In what ways does approaching and engaging sculpture as an event contribute to contemporary practice?

Contribution to contemporary practice
Exploring sculpture-as-an-event has become a research project involving an oscillation of manoeuvres both towards, and away from sculpture. The practice has explored processes of opening sculpture up by investigating, experimenting, re-working and splintering it across a multiplicity of terrains so that its eventfulness finds expression, while simultaneously affirming sculpture as a specific platform from which to practice.

Thus situated as an event, the practice of sculpture has been saturated by a host of other processes and concerns pertaining to relational practice, forms of organisation, processes of mapping, ways of engaging institutional situations, installation and issues related to imaging and documentation, writing and dialogue. I argue that manoeuvring sculpture into these areas, while simultaneously asserting its prominence in this research practice, constitutes one of the contributions of this PhD.

An option would have been to abandon sculpture altogether in favor of an installation or relational-based practice. However, embracing sculpture as a platform for this research, and practising it in ways where it is made to tremble, becomes a strategy whereby the questions that are specific to sculpture are brought to other fields. As such, sculpture is recognised as continuing to posses potential for new ways of thinking and practising, because the specific questions and problematics that sculpture yields, encompassing: having an intensified relationship with materiality, questions of form-generation, modes of production, and an activation of spatial and temporal relations, brings an inflection and focus to these other terrains. Thus it has been via the trajectories provided by sculpture that this practice has engaged in a process of making installations, generating videos, developing collaborations, producing part-objects, and engaging in situational and institutional relations, among other encounters.

At the beginning of the PhD I was unsure whether to pursue an exploration of questions pertaining to the social/relational, or questions relating to materiality. I believe that in the course of developing this research project, the notion of the ‘event’ has provided me with an opening that has enabled me to think beyond a binary division between the social and the material, and therefore to develop a practice that engages a spectrum of relations in which these questions become enmeshed. Manoeuvring sculpture-as-event has therefore allowed me to develop a composite practice connecting and assembling concerns that range from the theoretical, to the material, to the collaborative, to the spatial. This adventure has been liberating in this breadth of possibility,
Moreover, I argue that it is precisely the questions that are specific to a sculptural tradition that deliver an ambience of eventfulness to the practice of sculpture. Extending from this, the process-oriented, temporal and provisional aspects of production are also made explicit within projects. Thus, it is because these conditions combine and have gained prominence in this practice that eventfulness abounds.

If sculpture continually gravitates towards forms of autonomy (Lee 2002), this PhD yields an opening of trajectories into terrains of possibility for engaging it otherwise. However sculpture’s proliferation as event can never be finalised or resolved. It is not an aim to be achieved; rather it is a mode of operation, an attitude related to engagement, production, process, theory, reception, writing, and critical dialogue. Sculpture as event is therefore a provocation for ways to engage in a particular kind of thinking-making-practice. It articulates and contributes a series of possible approaches and methodologies for others to appropriate, open, connect and develop; for a people-to-come who might also proliferate sculpture-as-event.

Material adventures, spatial productions: manoeuvring sculpture towards a proliferating event is a research practice that both explores and affirms openness, process, and the provisional. It is a platform for adventuring connections between a multiplicity of parts, expanding notions of materially and modes of production, and producing temporal, spatial and social relations. It sets these relationships into motion as a strategy for animating new arrangements and openings. Sculpture-as-event is irreducible to one frame of reference, outcome or alignment, whereby possibilities emerge and generate through a proliferation of potential encounters -- perpetually.
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