

The Annual Conference of the Art Association of Australia and New Zealand will be held in Launceston, Tasmania, 5-7 December 2014, with an optional day in Hobart, 8 December 2014. The conference will be based at the Inveresk Precinct, hosted by the University of Tasmania (Tasmanian College of the Arts and the School of Architecture and Design) and the Queen Victoria Museum and Art Gallery.

Sessions have been set for one and a half hours, with the expectation (although not the rule) being for three twenty-minute papers, each followed by ten minutes of questions, discussion, explication or commentary from a designated discussant. Session Convenors will tailor the session to best address the concerns set out in the session abstract and with acknowledgement of the conference theme, GEOcritical. Those applying for the ARI sessions should note the specific requirements for those sessions set out in the abstracts.

Proposals for papers must be sent to the Session Convenors listed with each session abstract, not to the AAANZ nor the Session Curators. Where contact details are given for only one convenor, that person has elected to manage the proposals for that session and correspondence should only be with that convenor. Where no contact details (email or phone) are given for convenors of a particular session, that session has already been filled by the convenors: no further papers can be considered for that session however consideration should be given to applying to present in the Open Session.

Proposals should be received by Session Convenors by **Friday 29 August 2014**.

## **General guidelines for speakers**

1. Speakers may apply to present only **one paper**. Speakers may also convene a session and may also chair another session in which they do not otherwise participate. Speakers may present a paper and also apply to participate in the ARI sessions.
2. A paper that has been published or presented previously may not be delivered at the AAANZ Annual Conference.
3. Acceptance in a session implies a commitment to attend that session, participate in person, and to pay the appropriate fees (which includes conference registration and AAANZ membership).
4. Acceptance in a session implies a commitment to present a 20-minute paper at that session. (If applying for the ARI Sessions, please see specific requirements for these sessions with the session abstracts).
5. In order to present a paper in a session, individuals must complete and sign the Speaker Agreement Form, and return this form to their Session Convenor/s by **19 September 2014**.

## **Conference Participation Timeline**

**Art Association of Australia and New Zealand**  
Annual Conference, 5-8 December, Launceston

### **Proposals for papers to Session Convenors. Due: 29 August 2014**

Proposals for participation in sessions must be sent to the Session Convenor/s whose contact details appear with the session abstract.

Proposals should consist of the following:

1. Completed session participation proposal form, or an email that provides the required information.
2. A letter or email briefly outlining expertise and interest in the topic of the session and the conference theme.
3. An abstract of the proposed paper, of no more than 400 words (or short statement, for the ARI sessions).
4. A brief cv (last 5 years/ one page maximum).

Session convenors will make their selection over the following two weeks.

### **Session Convenors to respond to all applicants by 12 September 2014**

Convenor/s select participants for their sessions and contact all applicants, whether or not their proposal has been successful and supply copy of the Speaker Agreement form.

### **Participants return Speaker Agreement form. Due: 19 September 2014**

Final date for successful applicants to accept the invitation of Session Convenors to participate in their chosen session and return the Speaker Agreement form.

### **Session Convenors supply details of speakers (name, affiliation, contact details, title of paper, abstract of paper) to the Session Curators. Due: 26 September 2014**

Session convenors to forward all details of their session as attachments or in body of email to the Session Curators: Karen.Hall@utas.edu.au; Deborah.Malor@utas.edu.au

### **Early Bird Conference Registration runs 3 October - 7 November 2014**

Participation is invited from practitioners in all aspects of art, design and architecture; from those working across disciplines; from curators and educators; and from independent artists and thinkers.

**Pacific: Time, Rim, Ocean**

Sue Best (UNSW) s.best@unsw.edu.au ph: 02 89360777

Ann Stephen (University of Sydney) ann.stephen@sydney.edu.au ph: 02 93514004

This session will examine the many ways in which the vast geographical region of the Pacific has featured in art production and reception. Broad questions that the panel might address are: Is the Pacific a useful term to classify cultural production? How has this region been imagined by European and Australasian artists as both visitors or collectors? How have European conceptions of the Pacific been contested by contemporary Pacific artists like Shigeyuki Kihara and Kalisolaite 'Uhila? Possible topics include: the depiction of the Pacific and its peoples in nineteenth-century voyages of discovery; contemporary responses to such images; the Pacific as a primary site for the 'Primitive' imaginary. Similarly, we would be interested in papers that critically evaluate the Asia Pacific Triennale and the recent curatorial projects of the Getty organised around the theme of Pacific Standard Time.

The session aims to interrogate the way in which geography is mapped onto culture or used to organise cultural production. We are particularly interested in how modern and contemporary artists have critically engaged with the images and fantasies about the Pacific.

**Complex events / Shaping territories**

Dr. Terri Bird (Monash University), Dr. Bianca Hester (SCA, University of Sydney); Dr. Scott Mitchell (RMIT University)

This panel will explore the potential of geological understandings to rethink connections between the materiality of physical and social systems. In particular attention will be focused on understandings of matter and processes of formation amid various registers - organic, inorganic, social or economic. Drawing on the radically materialist philosophy of Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, panelists will investigate the conditions involved in these relations and their actualizations as artworks.

The papers will respond to the geo-logically inspired schemas offered by Deleuze and Guattari and their particular attention to territory in a geographical sense. This understanding extends Friedrich Nietzsche's privileging of milieu over origins, and sees them nominate him as the founder of a *geophilosophy* [Deleuze and Guattari 1994 102]. They propose thinking isn't what takes place in, around or between subjects and objects, but rather "takes place in the relationship of territory and the earth" [Deleuze and Guattari 1994 85]. In this relationship earth isn't understood as the primal layer of the world nor the ultimate substrate; the layers of strata described by geology make evident the contingency of foundations.

The panel will respond to this contingency through an exploration of art practices engaged with this anomalous dimension including the participant's practices as individual artists and collaboratively as *OSW* (Open Spatial Workshop). The papers presented will include a collaboratively written paper on the relationship *OSW* has developed with Museum Victoria exploring specimens in the Geosciences collection; paper by Dr. Terri Bird titled *Flesh to Frame* investigating several artworks broadly concerned with responses to landscape that elaborates the non-human potential of art suggested in the writings of Deleuze and Guattari; and a paper by Dr. Bianca Hester titled *Materialising mobilities, momentarily* discussing a range of practices in the fields of art, literature and landscape architecture where processes of tracking terrains in flux is contextualized through notion of "following the flow of matter" [Deleuze and Guattari 1987 409].

Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari. *A Thousand Plateaus*, trans. Brian Massumi, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, 1987.

Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari. *What is Philosophy*, trans. Hugh Tomlinson and Graham Burchell, Columbia University Press, New York, 1994.

## **Geocritical Modernism: Transforming Surrealist Photography**

Dr Donna Brett (University of Sydney); Dr Victoria Carruthers (ACU); Associate Professor Natalya Lusty (University of Sydney)

The recent global turn in modernist studies has brought to the fore questions of diaspora, exile, and peripheral modernist cultural work. As an avant-garde movement, Surrealism had earlier signaled the importance of internationalism as a bulwark against colonialism, Eurocentrism and Imperial hegemony. Whilst Breton notoriously censured the “surrealist conformism” virally spreading in the wake of the movement’s international success, his commitment to a global avant-garde movement nevertheless challenged the hierarchical logic of “original” and “copy”, “centre” and “periphery”. In an essay for *Art in Australia*, Breton argued “each one of us, from Paris to Sydney, from New York to the very depths of Asia, has an actual physical part in this world convulsion”, cementing his vision of an aesthetic movement tied to geo-cultural transformation.

This session explores the eclectic experimentation with Surrealist photography from beyond the centre. The papers, by Donna Brett, Victoria Carruthers and Natalya Lusty, explore an engagement with the aesthetics of transgression and transformation that are attached to a modernist commitment to the city as a site for both desire *and* alienation.

## **[dis]Pleasures of the Spectacle in Interfaces of Art and Architecture**

Dr Jen Brown (University of Tasmania) [jen.brown@utas.edu.au](mailto:jen.brown@utas.edu.au) ph: 0427507225

The pleasures of the mega-spectacle are evermore persistently asserted in contemporary urban public spaces. Inevitably, it seems, they arise in the context of specially engineered occasions such as arts festivals, cultural celebrations and observations of historical anniversaries, as well as in creative design for the ubiquitous promotion and advertising of capitalist economies. The large-scale projection and mapping of imagery/sound onto iconic buildings after dark and the proliferation of huge electronic screens in public spaces are peculiarly 21<sup>st</sup> century interventions that promote the pleasures of looking and listening within an intense and restless flow of ever-more spectacular imagery. Navigating public spaces in the city after dark has always been an experience of intense immersion but now, in a radically altered electronic mediascape, the parameters have changed. On the one hand, one may now find oneself swimming through imbricated layers of the real and the virtual wherein the apparently solid surfaces of buildings disappear behind a dance of ephemeral signifiers. On the other, one may find oneself pushing through a crowd of sweaty bodies, lured by the spectacle into an urban milieu, yet simultaneously distanced from it and from those around, preoccupied with texting and uploading images to the Internet via smart mobile devices.

What precisely are the pleasures of this brave new world that plays seductively with art and design as public spectacle and in what sense are they undercut by darker currents? What are the politics at play in specific manifestations of the spectacle in interfaces of art and architecture? Where has discourse on the dangers of the spectacle moved to since Guy Debord’s seminal critique of 1968? What are the potentials and risks for artists who make video works for public screens or engage in projecting and mapping architecture with imagery? Can the critical voices of ephemeral public art forms (eg artists such as Krzysztof Wodiczko, Barbara Holzer and Rafael Lozano-Hemmer in the 1980s) still maintain potency in a globally oriented world where advertising is quick to appropriate the tools and processes of the artist in the service of capital and a passive public may no longer recognize the difference?

Underpinning such questions is a desire to articulate and reflect on how our connections with place, as contemporary artists and designers and audiences, may intersect productively and critically with the multiple emerging social and technological vectors of our times. This aim of this session is to draw together insights from both theory and creative practice in order to illuminate and evaluate the import of the mega-spectacle in contemporary life, a geo-critical project of global proportions!

## **Geographies of Professionalisation**

Danny Butt (University of Melbourne) [danny@dannybutt.net](mailto:danny@dannybutt.net) ph: +61 428820766 \* for correspondence  
Rachel O’Reilly (writer and curator, Amsterdam/Berlin)

The expansion of the market for university qualifications (for artists, curators, and administrators) has combined with the rise of the international biennial/festival to produce expanded and geographically synchronised fields of professional art discourse. Professional practitioners travel in circles of international prestige, evaluated less by their development of an institutional archive and more by their relationships with contemporary producers and institutions. The historical marker of professionalism was a certain autonomy and a disinterested, neutral, public character that distinguished itself from mere exchange-value. However, the expansion of mechanisms of professionalisation through privatised universities and cultural institutions questions this disinterest. As Samuel Weber notes, professionalism

requires “a certain kind of *place*, or, more precisely, a certain kind of *placement*.” The professional is in a structural location, programmed by global forces, that formats particular places and sites in terms of their potential for profit. The dynamics of this “placement” have been on display in actions against corporate sponsors of large-scale exhibitions funded from industries including oil and gas, mandatory detention, and speculative finance. Sponsoring corporations are actively profiting from the neoliberal and neocolonial transformation of territory, property and democratic governance. The political economy of the presenting institution supports a curatorial ideology of neutrality: a withdrawal from thinking the political as the means of holding institutional power. This neutrality is justified in an appropriation of art’s “autonomy”, yet the autonomy of the artist is never global. As Guattari describes it, “the task of the poetic function... is to recompose artificially rarefied, resingularized Universes of subjectification.” In other words, the aesthetic work of resingularisation can be seen as moving in an opposite direction to globalising neutralisation. This panel asks how artists, critics and curators orient themselves to the geographical imaginary of professionalisation, navigating local and global forces that produce contemporary artistic subjectivities.

It is a direct response to the question of the “geo”, asking about the planetary distribution of knowledge formations that produce contemporary art. We aim to solicit papers that engage the tension between international discourses and local sites, incorporating issues such as local and indigenous knowledges, reterritorialisation of national cultural institutions, and the rise of environmental and ecological issues in contemporary art.

### **Light, sight, meaning**

Georgina Cole (National Art School) Georgina.cole@nas.edu.au ph:(02) 9339 8770; 0414 453 179

This panel examines the construction and meanings of sight and seeing in works of art and architecture. It aims to elucidate the ways in which seeing is conceptualised in various cultures at various times and to examine how and what the viewer of an artwork is made to see. For example, close looking may reveal that a building’s meaning may be dependent on the changing light of the day, something concealed by the static nature of photographs. At the same time, the panel addresses the representation of the absence of sight and the critique of vision. The senses of touch, hearing, taste and smell have animated art making and art writing since the Renaissance. Blindness, for example, was explored in art and philosophy as an alternative epistemology exclusive of sight. A thorough questioning of vision continues to inform contemporary artistic approaches that expose the limitations of ocular-centric perspectives. Papers may explore any dimension of seeing, including the absence of visual perceptual faculties and the critique of vision. They may address the relationship between seeing and knowing, seeing and believing, and seeing and surveying, as well as the curtailing of sight and the role of light in shaping visual experience. Artworks or works of architecture may be discussed for their representation of various kinds of seeing or relationship to natural or constructed light sources. Representations of blindness may also be considered, as well as artworks that privilege non-visual forms of sensory engagement.

The panel invites close examination of the evident yet overlooked aspects of artworks, elements that have been marginalised in art historical discourse. It examines the means by which artworks construct and characterise different kinds of sight, which contributes, in turn, to the imaging, imagining and inhabiting of place. The consideration of the absence of sight and the critique of vision relates to the bodily apprehension of objects and spaces and is suggestive of the themes of place, earth and being that GEOcritical entails.

### **HELL: Underworld, Unworldly, Ungrounded Earth**

Dr Edward Colless (University of Melbourne) ecolless@unimelb.edu.au

As an antique and medieval underworld, the geological and geographical depiction of Hell obtained some spectacularly horrifying art direction: vast canyons seared by howling infernal winds; rivers of filth and boiling blood sweeping along corpses or souls clotted together like clumps of effluent; miasmatic and volcanic swamps of ordure blistering, bubbling and bursting plumes of acidic stench.... The modern theological prospect of Hell as a non-place, a lonely condition of banishment or even self-imposed exile from God’s grace, appears timidly and dismally unimaginative in comparison with the panoramic vigour of this tellurian terror. Ecological sentiments of supplication to the Earth – honouring it as planetary ark in space, maternal body, nest or cradle, or (worse still) as homeland and territory – sound like sanctimonious fairytales in comparison with the indiscriminately irradiating noise of terrestrial cataclysm. And perhaps the most treacherously anthropocentric sentiment of all: the Earth bearing the security of *terra firma*, as the ground, *nomos* and dwelling place of life (ethical, intellectual, artistic).

Ought we not redeem the Earth from these timid pieties, even if it means acknowledging earth’s geology, geography and geomancy as black storms, as groundless matter, traumatic eruptions, putrescent sludge, molten horror, or as corpse-grinder and death-drive: catastrophic and convulsive? What would this Hellish pit beneath the crust of the Earth’s many worlds disgorge were we to conjure and open up its Hell Mouth? Georges Bataille invoked a black, faecal

sun as the occulted, eclipsed counterpart to the generative star of spiritual illumination; we might address in turn a black, damned earth and call it Hell. In this session, let us go to these Hells, past and future.

### **Locating art and social practice**

Gretchen Coombs (QUT) gretchen.coombs@qut.edu.au

Marnie Badham (University of Melbourne) m.badham@unimelb.edu.au

The emerging practice and subsequent discourse of 'art and social practice' draws on legacies of community art, activist art, and the like. More generally, socially engaged art (SEA) has proliferated as a discourse through conferences, books, and residences, most recently at the Open Engagement conference at Queens, New York. Until recently, the dominant discourse of this field of practice pitted the aesthetic to the ethical; however, it was in this conference that the polemic faded in favour of discussing specific projects and their production, less of their reception or the critical frameworks that informed the artwork.

Because of this tendency, we felt that a conversation of how localised practices would afford a layered and rich understanding of how local politics and funding might inflect how artists who are now working in this field. This panel will consider how funding, higher degree research, and presentation of these various practices influence how artists construct their practice. For example, in the US, often social practice comes out of an interest in new social economies while in the UK and Australia, it may come out of a rejection of governmentalized/ instrumentalizing community arts practices.

The goal of this panel is to illustrate how socially engaged art responds to its context and the histories that have constructed its conditions of production as well as its reception. As such, these art and design practices would mark deep contours of localized practice each with specific genealogies. The panel invites participants working in communities both local and global; this juxtaposition will highlight rich differences in practice, locational identity, and deepen the current socially engaged art discourse.

Grant Kester illustrates the importance of a site context in *Conversation pieces* and *The one and the many* when considering socially engaged art practices. He believes site plays a critical part in the inception, creation, and execution of artworks that includes work with or on behalf of members or a public or a community. Building on this notion, this panel seeks to understand the variegations of socially engaged art.

### **The ARI Sessions**

#### **The non-geographical geography of artist-run practices**

##### **Presentations and roundtable**

Fernando do Campo fernando\_docampo@gmail.com

Laura Hindmarsh laura.a.hindmarsh@gmail.com

*The convenors will accept 25 applications from those who will commit to both sessions. Each applicant should submit a statement of interest in the session, responding directly to the concerns set out in the summary of session 1 (below) and in consideration of the future conversation that might develop in Session 2. (This statement takes the place of a paper abstract in the proposal to convenors). Six applicants will be invited by the convenors to speak to their statements for 10 minutes. These presentations will occur in Session 1. In Session 2, the floor will be open for discussion of the issues raised in Session 1, with speculation on the present and future of artist-run practice, post GFC.*

#### **Session 1: The non-geographical geography of artist-run practices**

*NOTE: this session has a variation on the usual speaker participation format. Please read organisational details, above.*

This session will focus on mapping out the geography that exists within ARI culture. Rather than focusing on location, we will utilize the GEO prefix and all it alludes to in order to analyse the ecology, systems, definitions and relationships within artist-run-practices/initiatives. The focus here is on 'artist-run' as now a common definer of collective and open presentation of new work through various forms and numerous platforms. This discussion will also begin to operate outside of location and rather look at practices that play within the definitions of individual/collective practice, artistic/curatorial, organisational/editorial. Where does the cooperative situate itself? There are now many peripatetic initiatives, operating across geographical boundaries; these types of models will be a focus, whereby the ARI is not defined by location but rather by practice.

## Session 2: Roundtable – Mapping the next stage of artist-run practices

*NOTE: participation in this roundtable is by application only. Please read organisational details, above.*

The roundtable format is an invitation for all participants to speak, picking up on conversations stimulated by the convenors and the six speakers in the previous section, with a focus on what's next. The generational ecology of ARI models means that many participants may already be in dialogue (most likely across geographic borders) but it's also likely that a collective, analytical conversation between these individuals/collectives has not yet occurred. It's also worth considering as a collective, the implications of current Australian federal government's changes to arts funding (along with many other national governments and funding bodies, post-GFC) coupled with a new set of concerns arising around the transparency of philanthropic support (which rarely benefited ARI's). This session invites you to consider the new ways that artist-run models are currently operating or could begin to function within these constraints. What new initiatives may be developed from collective artist-run practices in a post Abbott, post Tranfield era? This roundtable session will offer a critical platform through which to continue to discuss, present and publish material which maps these trajectories retrospectively, maintaining the urgency to produce, archive and disseminate material now and collectively speculate into future actions.

### Creating/Action: Physical and Abstract Sites of Arts Practice

Miik Green (Curtin University) miik@miikgreen.com ph: + 61 402 030 254 \* for correspondence

Lauren McCartney (Curtin University)

This session sees the conference theme, GEOcritical encompassing territory of two sites: from the artist as maker/creative producer to approaches in/developing of methodologies in arts practice. 'Creating/Action: Physical and Abstract Sites of Arts Practice' seeks to open a platform to discuss ways of making and doing, from critical sites of practitioner to researcher. It is here that abstract concepts in creative practice become tangible works of art, and production in the studio inspires the conceptual.

We would welcome proposals that encompass this area of the theme, also to reflect ideas of

- Modes of exchange – shifting spaces or concrete sites?
- Transitions in arts practice: doing and being, making and researching
- Negotiating research and creative production
- Liminal spaces: material/immaterial,
- Site: places of process and outcomes

This panel would primarily focus on the role of the artist in a contemporary arts practice, from art making to researching, from studio production to interdisciplinary exchange and collaborative spaces.

Our response to the conference theme GEOcritical undertakes an analysis of site in terms of arts practice, thematically combining 'critical' (critique/critically/crisis) with the prefix GEO (earth/ground/land). While visual artists and researchers work in various ways to pursue knowledge or produce creatively, delineators exist when shifting from making to writing or approaching cross-disciplinary research. These liminal spaces can be seen as either modes of exchange or sites of transition, where the artist crosses from the 'critical' to the 'GEO'. These locations are the dialogic heart of arts practice, where distinctions between artist/researcher and maker/producer dissolve or clarify, merge or materialise.

### Art and the natural world: 'making spaces that see' \*

Eva Hampel (University of Wollongong) elh253@uowmail.edu.au ph: 0439448073

Kim Williams (University of Wollongong) kimw@uow.edu.au ph: 0405700142

The Land Art movement of the 1970s defined new directions and thinking for art relating to nature. Artists explored new forms, processes and concerns in this groundswell of work exploring the natural world, dissolving boundaries as they did so. But what happened after that? To what extent and in what form did the natural world enter the field during the return to language in postmodernism and postcolonialism? And where is it now? In 1996 the literary critic Cheryl Glotfelty commented on the near invisibility of concern with the natural world in contemporary writing at that time, saying:

*If your knowledge of the outside world were limited to what you could infer from the major publications of the literary profession, you would quickly discern that **race, class, and gender** were the hot topics of the late twentieth century, but you would never suspect that the Earth's life support systems were under stress. Indeed you might never know that there was an Earth at all. (Glotfelty and Fromm, 1996, pxvi)*

In the last decade there has been a strong return to nature in eco-art and the new materialism. But did the natural world drop so far out in the 1980s and 90s, or has this work just been overlooked? This session calls for papers that explore the artistic and theoretical journey in the last two decades of the twentieth century.

The session proposal invites an exploration of forms of earth and environmentally focussed art, in theory as well as practice, specifically in the historical context of the last twenty years of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, when environmentally focussed work appeared to lose visibility in artistic discussion after an intense flowering in the late 1960s and 1970s. Exploration of earth, world, ground is clearly fundamental, and the role of critique, imagining, subjectivities, instabilities, anxieties, urgency and so forth equally so. The intent is to explore the shifts in both theory and practice, and by implication social context, which occurred during this period in relation to their implications for art engaging with nature or the earth, and which prepared the ground for the upwelling of work on this theme over the last decade.

Glotfelty, C. and Fromm, H. (eds) 1996. *The Ecocriticism Reader: Landmarks in Literary Ecology*. University of Georgia Press, Athens and London.

\* Phrase used by James Turrell to describe his work: Chinati Foundation Symposium, 1995, *Art in the Landscape*, Marfa, Texas.

### **Site-specific art in Australian art museums**

Lucy Hawthorne (University of Tasmania) hawthorne.lucy@gmail.com ph: 0438712602

This session will examine site-specific art in Australia's art museums, with a focus on its role in interpreting, challenging and re-presenting existing knowledge as mediated by the museum. For many artists, the museum is not only an exhibition space, but also a material and subject in itself. The types of site-specificity vary greatly, and may relate to the physical, ideological and/or historical aspects of the museum. Site-specific art has the ability to question cultural norms, highlight gaps in knowledge, and address other current issues relating to national identity and politics. It can also highlight aspects of the museum usually invisible to the visitor, including the connotations associated with architectural features, locational politics, and display methods. Due to art's marginality, it is an ideal platform from which to publicly challenge these cultural assumptions and norms, and it can do this in ways unavailable to curators, museum boards and historians.

Papers in this session might examine projects that address issues specific to Australia, such as Australia's colonial past, the lack of representation of women and Aborigines in official histories, the historical roots of these collecting institutions, or the role museums play in developing a national identity, constructing knowledge and concurrently reflecting and promoting dominant values. Papers may also address recent trends in site-specificity, the relationship between art and museum architecture, the politics of display and layout, or the 'institutionalisation' of institutional critique.

The session examines the role site-specific art plays in deconstructing the ideologies and politics of the art museum. The museum is identified as not just a location or a neutral space to exhibit art, but a meaningful place with the ability to construct knowledge and promote dominant cultural values. Therefore, the 'GEO' of 'GEOcritical', relates to the physical museum as a site and basis for artworks that *critique* these values as communicated by, for instance, gallery layout, architecture, collections, exhibitions or accessibility.

### **c.1970 – The ends of painting**

Paris Lettau (University of Melbourne) plettau@student.unimelb.edu.au ph: 0450014368

David Homewood (University of Melbourne) davidchomewood@hotmail.com ph: 0408514710

The late 1960s and early 1970s is often remembered as a moment of radical artistic transformation. Strategies related to the forms of the readymade and installation grew increasingly popular. In order to remove the 'artist's hand' from the production process, artists increasingly outsourced fabrication of their works. The Xerox machine, Instamatic camera and Portapak video became increasingly ubiquitous. In addition, new genres emerged around this time: durational performances made up of everyday gestures and actions, ephemeral artworks located outside the gallery, site-specific interventions that critiqued the museum as a social institution, and theoretical essays about art presented as artworks themselves.

This art-historical development can also be framed in negative terms: as a widespread abandonment of the traditional artistic media of painting and sculpture. Many artists, as well as writers and curators, genuinely believed painting and sculpture had finally exhausted their potential. The traditional forms had become 'sick' – owing perhaps to the weight of their own history, and no doubt exacerbated by Late Modernism's preoccupation with the purification of the medium. The solution was to adopt new forms better capable of responding to their historical moment and materials not burdened with the 'look' of art. Art-historical accounts of the period have often focussed on these novel forms and materials. They are taken as somehow representative or paradigmatic of the period, while artists still working in the ostensibly traditional modes are arguably swept to one side.

This panel aims to pose a bundle of counter-questions: What happens to the medium of painting in Australia and New Zealand during the late 1960s and early 1970s, when Modernism is seriously put to the test? How do painters respond to the novel forms threatening the primacy of their medium? And how do problems often regarded as specific to painting persist in forms that appear unrelated to painting? How does the memory of painting persist in these new forms? What would it mean to understand painting as anachronistic?

This panel aims to critically reassess the changing nature, value and significance of painting during the late 1960s and 1970s. While it is generally recognised that a radical, global artistic transformation occurred at this time, the panel will focus on how painting practices remained critically engaged and responsive to the specific local conditions in Australia and New Zealand. In this sense we believe the panel will resonate well with the conference theme, GEOcritical, for two primary reasons: firstly, it will open discussion on geographically and artistically peripheral practices arguable sidelined by dominant centrist art historical narratives; secondly, it will reassess painting practices whose criticality may have been overlooked. The panel will be open to papers that offer original, insightful and speculative accounts of the period, and that engage the enduring critical potential of painting, with contributions by art historians, practicing artists, curators and critics.

### **Routes and Roots – narratives, processes, networks and traces of Australian Art and Architecture**

Dr. Flavia Marcello (Swinburne University of Technology) fmarcello@swin.edu.au ph: 0421 575 041

Dr. David Beynon (Deakin University); Dr. Ursula de Jong (Deakin University); Dr. Mirjana Lozanovska (Deakin University); Ian Woodcock (University of Melbourne)

Australia is a place of overlapping geo-cultural mobilities that both complement and problematise totalising narratives of influence on Australian art and architectural historiography. This session explores the interplay between Routes and Roots<sup>1</sup> to engender a more heterogeneous and multi-representational view of Australian art and architecture. Papers are invited that analyse patterns, processes and networks to test geo-critical influences as additive sets of parts rather than sequences of individual moments and that address the following over-arching questions: What identity slips are inherent in the dialectics of European v. British? Australian v. Indigenous? Western v. Eastern? How has Australia negotiated the paradox between its geographic and cultural proximities? How can the relationship between Routes and Roots lead to new understandings of shifts in cultural identity from loss (the tyranny of distance between an emigrant people and their origins) to surplus (the overabundance of identities within a hybridising/localising populace of diverse origins).<sup>2</sup> This session welcomes responses within four areas:

1. Australia as progeny of empire: the uses of art and architecture to fabricate unity, identity and authority in a fledgling colonial settlement through opportunity, adaptation and experimentation.
2. Australian modernity: modes of dissemination of Modernity-Modernism-Moderne via Australian artists and architects; differences of approach to the modernist agenda; the position of Australia as a conduit between East and West.
3. Australia as immigrant nation: the dialectics of migrant v. émigré and their agency & socio-cultural status, struggles with belonging, displacement, language, and re-settlement.
4. Australia as Asian: Asia's presence (marginal or integral?), the filtration of Asian cultural expression, the appropriateness (and appropriation) of Asian models, the relationship of art and architecture to changing demographics.

Papers may end up posing more questions than they answer and therefore provide more scope for reconciling Australia's shifting geo-cultural identity with its production of art and architecture.

The session articulates with the conference theme, GEOcritical by exploring how Australia's artists and architects have reconciled their own roots with their routes to the Southern land and what trans-culturalisms are brought about in these processes. By situating history as a series of narratives, flows, networks and traces it enriches debates on Australia's position as an unstable centre with a multitude of dissolving peripheries. It proposes a complex and interdisciplinary historiography that involves the act of mapping as history. It engages with Australia as a place from which to speak and to create taking into account both the roots of practitioners and the varied and complex routes that various lines of influence, and sometimes the practitioners themselves, took to arrive here. Each specific sub-theme of the session respectively engages more deeply with the conference themes: empires and imaging, shifting subjectivities, migratory artists and transculturalism.

1. Mirjana Lozanovska, 'Migrant housing in the city and the village: from Melbourne to Zavoj', in *Open House International*, vol.34, no.3, September 2009, 44.

2. Nikos Papastergiadis, *Spatial aesthetics: art, place and the everyday* (London: Rivers Oram, 2006).

## **(Re)making the Australian home – a new ‘view from the interior’**

Professor Peter McNeil (UTS) peter.mcneil@uts.edu.au

Professor Mark Taylor (University of Newcastle) mark.taylor@newcastle.edu.au

Dr Georgina Downey georgina01@adam.com.au

There has not been a major conference on the Australian domestic interior held for more than a generation. Yet ‘Australia is the small house’ was the famous contention of Robin Boyd in *The Australian Ugliness* (1960). Indeed the aspiration to the ideal Australian home continues into the twenty-first century, with Australians obsessed with domesticity, reflected in our consumption of décor advice (in print, television and online media).

We start from the intellectual premise that the Australian home was an interior space ‘from another place’ – that it was, and remains, hybrid, travelled, impure. Moreover, home, as Sigmund Freud cautioned, can be unheimlich, that is, not always comfortable, or secure. The Australian home was a site for cross cultural Imperial and colonial exchanges that were rarely equal, especially so when white homes came at the cost of the dispossession of a race of first people. Given the disturbing, and at times violent aspects of our colonial history, we concur with Haskins and Jacobs when they propose that: ‘Leaving home, making home, and being dispossessed of one’s home overlap and intersect in historical experiences of colonialism.’<sup>1</sup>

We ask ‘how did the Australian settler house become ‘home’ in terms of comfort, taste, and security?’ And in turn, we wish to consider how ‘making home’ enabled the building of networks for integration and citizenship. We welcome papers that challenge preconceptions regarding taste, objects and authenticity, and expose new networks and cultural exchange around the topic of home and its contents. Studies of the representations of home are welcome. Papers that respond to the *GEOcritical* themes involving the themes of Empires and imaging; Vernacularisms; Transculturalism; and Land shaping are likely to be most apposite here.

1. Victoria Haskins & Margaret D. Jacobs, 'Introduction', *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies*, vol. 28 nos 1 & 2, 2007, p xi

## **Curators and consequences in Australian art**

Associate Professor Joanna Mendelsohn (University of New South Wales) j.mendelsohn@unsw.edu.au

Professor Catherine Speck (University of Adelaide) catherine.speck@adelaide.edu.au

This session invites papers that examine the trajectory of the development of curatorial scholarship in developing both knowledge of and an understandings of Australian art. It especially invites papers that interrogate the impact of particular curatorial careers and policies in collections management and in specific exhibitions. In brief this would be an examination of both the impact of curatorship on shaping what constitutes the field of Australian art, which in relation to the geography of Australia, takes in its expanded geographic field.

In this session the “GEO” is the geography of Australia, and its specific cultural needs. “Critical” because the proposed papers will interrogate the present by examining the past actions of those people who have worked to shape what we see and how we see it.

## **Border Crossings: photography as a medium of inter-cultural connection**

Dr Melissa Miles (Monash) Melissa.Miles@monash.edu

This session aims to shed new light on photography’s histories and potential as a medium of inter-cultural connection. Photographs are striking markers of difference and similarity, and the ease with which they circulate in print and online makes them potent tools for inter-cultural engagement. Advancing beyond discussion of photography as a tool for objectifying and disempowering racial ‘others’, the session will consider the many ways that the production, publication, circulation, exhibition and reception of photographs have fostered international cultural exchange or connections from the late colonial period to today.

These forms of photographic connection take a variety of forms. They may occur at the level of production and related ‘people to people’ connections between photographers working in foreign lands, their subjects and their peers. Yet they also extend to the circulation and consumption of photographs across geographical and cultural boundaries, through the publication of photographs in post cards, magazines, books, exhibitions and websites. More formal modes of inter-cultural connection may also be addressed in relation to the important role of photography in contemporary international cultural diplomacy, and in curated exhibitions, events, festivals and publications.

Papers may address these issues in relation to any number of historical moments, cultures and photographic relationships from the late colonial period to the present. They may also consider how contemporary photographic artists are dealing with inter-cultural relationships in their practice; the points of difference and similarity between cultural approaches to photography at the stages of production, circulation and consumption; or how instances of cross-cultural photographic connection may challenge or reinforce historical assumptions about cultural difference.

Papers that focus specifically on questions of methodology when considering cross-cultural photographic connection are also invited.

This session relates directly to the conference theme, as it is grounded in the circulation of photographs across geographical, historical and cultural spaces. Photographs have long traversed borders, and as such are an ideal medium for exploring issues of cultural difference and exchange. In taking a critical approach to the inter-cultural production, circulation and consumption of photographs, the session seeks to examine the ways in which the local and the global are imbricated in visual culture historically and in the contemporary moment. The practice of migratory photographers, and the consumption of photographs across borders and amongst diverse cultural groups are key to this session. As a result, the session testifies to the instability of the notion of cultural centres and their marginalized peripheries. More complex, intricate patterns of cultural exchange and connection will be revealed in this critical process.

### **Contemporary art and feminism**

Dr. Jacqueline Millner (University of Sydney) [Jacqueline.millner@sydney.edu.au](mailto:Jacqueline.millner@sydney.edu.au) ph: 0400000808

Dr. Catriona Moore (University of Sydney) [catriona.moore@sydney.edu.au](mailto:catriona.moore@sydney.edu.au) ph: 0488290101

There has been an international groundswell in engagement and curiosity about feminism's role in the development of contemporary art. 'Contemporary Art and Feminism' examines this generative relationship, and feminism's current relevance to art making and analysis. Arguably, feminist critique has suffused the thinking of many disciplines, from art history to literary studies and indigenous history. It has illuminated the assumptions that underpin knowledge and exposed gaps in perspectives to generate far more complex, inclusive and comprehensive histories and theories, creating paths to greater social justice and equity. Feminism scrutinizes the building blocks of culture and identity, seeking to explain how power relations — including those that naturalise gender inequality — are embedded in knowledges and practices. As such, feminism is one of the ways in which we can most usefully come to an understanding of our image culture and the way visual images narrativise power relations.

Pioneering this critique in Australia nearly fifty years ago, feminist artists helped to forge the transition from modernist to postmodernist cultural strategies. They prioritised skills, subject matter, media and design principles that had been neglected in late modernism's formalist enthusiasms. They communicated inventively with broader audiences and re-routed both women's traditional arts and the conventional high art media of painting and sculpture. Today these experiments remain a central platform of contemporary art, including notably of emergent forms of visual arts interventions in participatory and networked democracy known as 'social practice'.

The session will map specific contemporary practices and theories engaging with feminist art practice, history and theory. More broadly, it asks how feminism has informed and framed contemporary art practices, theories, collections and histories. Examples might include papers addressing theories of contemporary art, public arts activism, environmental art, pedagogy and/or curatorial work.

The conference theme, GEOcritical, is inclusive. It understands critical practice in part as "(speaking, writing, process, action) in both its contemporary and historical frames" and the proposed CAF panel does this in an interventionist sense, as outlined in the conference themes statement. The CAF panel interrogates current thinking and practice on contemporary art and creative cultural politics from feminist perspectives. It addresses several of the issues noted in the conference themes statement, such as "shifting subjectivities; unstable centres and dissolving peripheries; vernacularisms; anxieties and urgency; transculturalism and migratory artists (and) spatial negotiations". Moreover feminist interventions in contemporary art have targeted the kinds of environmental and ecological concerns that the conference prioritises.

### **Hacking the metropolis**

Nancy Mauro-Flude (University of Tasmania) [Nancy.MauroFlude@utas.edu.au](mailto:Nancy.MauroFlude@utas.edu.au) ph: 0409997189

'Hacking the metropolis' applies a hacker ethos (creative speculation) to thinking how one can address a city as a living system with its gaps and limitations; an integrative poesis of processing between orders as extant between geology, plants, machines and humans. Aware that nowadays many of not most electronic devices (from phones to cameras to traffic sensors) are factually internet-enabled micro computers. There is an abundance of data flying about that is not entirely species-dependent for its encoding, decoding or recoding, in many ways we are no longer the sole traders in the realm of the symbolic as a species, for example, within the interaction of human text with machine coding, language is not the exclusive domain of human thought but also that of the internal logic of computers.

'Hacking the metropolis' is a rebuff to the mechanical control codes hardwired into daily urban spaces that we find ourselves living in and through; by no means is it advocating for digital withdrawal but attempts to reach a point of

awareness through demonstration in order to inform our embodied awareness and daily use of gadgetry; highlight the everyday engagement we have with computers and the fact we are sharing meaning with machines.

In an age when even the availability of natural resources depends on computational logistics, are contemporary municipalities increasingly becoming like a black box? The 'black box' is a commonly used term within computing, theatre and engineering. It refers to a system or device whereby transfer characteristics (the input / output signals) maybe known or visible, but it is the internal workings or liminal space is where this unknown materializes.

There is a desire for transparency in opening and laying the black box (input and output code) bare, knowing that there can never be total transparency, because it will always be relative to the position of citizen, audience or viewer (or the field of research). Practically, the idea of the black box, a vast capacious or abyss-like space to be demystified, probed and re-enchanted (and even placed into a white cube) and this is the perspective or terrain from which this panel discusses these terms.

The panel invites papers which demonstrate a speculative or hacker spirit through the subversive, playful and thought provoking approach to existing processes and communications systems. It draws attention to the structures and sociopolitical dynamics, which govern our spaces, reflecting on how our communication channels are constructed, offering visions of, or new perspectives on, current urban conditions, scenarios and poetics.

### **Critical Actions in Fashion meets Art Projects.**

Dr Llewellyn Negrin (University of Tasmania) [Llewellyn.Negrin@utas.edu.au](mailto:Llewellyn.Negrin@utas.edu.au)

Dr Jess Berry (Griffith University) [j.berry@griffith.edu.au](mailto:j.berry@griffith.edu.au)

Since the 1980s there has been an increasing convergence between fashion and art. Thus, fashion designers on the one hand, have increasingly explored the role of dress beyond its functional purposes while on the other, artists have incorporated dress in their exploration of more embodied forms of art practice. The conceptual convergences between fashion and art projects often have at their core, a desire to engage with social and political critique especially in relation to the institutions and systems of power that shape them. Projects such as Belgian designer Walter Van Beirendonk's collaboration with Erwin Wurm critiquing the perfected body through performative sculpture; to Martin Margiela's re-assessment of the fashion system through deconstructivist and subversive practices; or Lucy Orta's clothing and architecture projects that confront social and environmental issues, are among many recent examples where the blurring of the boundaries between fashion and art has led to new critical paradigms. This panel invites papers from any historical period that consider the work of artists, designers or fashion/art collaborators who have worked with dress as a social tool, political action, resistance, intervention or institutional critique. This proposal engages with the conference theme insofar as it seeks to highlight the way artists, designers and theoreticians from differently grounded and located practices are seeking to challenge established institutional structures and power hierarchies through the development of hybrid creative practices which transgress traditional boundaries.

### **Feminist Practice and Visual Arts Research: Australian contexts**

Dr Courtney Pedersen (QUT) [cb.pedersen@qut.edu.au](mailto:cb.pedersen@qut.edu.au) ph: 07 31383092

The creative practice-as-research paradigm has significantly influenced Australian artists over the past decade. Increasingly, artists in this country and elsewhere are seeing postgraduate research as an integral part of their creative development. The critical and reflective perspective required of practice-led and practice-based research has much in common with feminist research methodologies, but an ongoing productive dialogue between these two fields is yet to be established. Feminist scholarship has evolved significantly over the last four decades, not only reinterpreting 'history', but also reimagining the structure of knowledge and our engagement with it. As Griselda Pollock has pointed out, feminist interventions in art are fundamental reassessments of both "the objects we are studying, and the theories and methods with which we are doing it." This applies equally to processes of making. Although practice-led and practice-based research has become increasingly popular, its strategies for contributing to academic discourse still seem to be contested and/or undervalued. With the ERA research assessment ranking process still a live issue for university art schools and departments, this panel asks what feminist art practice can contribute to visual arts research culture, and considers what has been achieved by feminist practice within the institutional frameworks of creative practice research so far.

This session topic is grounded in Australian experiences of institutional research culture and the rise of creative practice-led research in the visual arts. By exploring the possible connections between creative practitioner research and feminist research methodologies, this session aims to contribute to the critical discussion of new approaches to the visual arts in this country. Paper topics could include historical precedents for feminist art practice as research, approaches to feminist art epistemologies, contemporary case studies and practitioner reflections.

## Drawing as a mode of thinking GEOcritically.

Annalise Rees (University of Tasmania) info@annaliseres.com ph: 0400296466

### *How are contemporary drawing-based practices revising the environment?*

This session will open up discussion in relation to current drawing practices that investigate environment as a primary source. It is intended that the session will instigate dialogue between artists who use varying methodologies to engage with environment, examining how it is contextualised and expressed within creative practice. Drawing-based practice will be thought of broadly to consider drawing within an expanded and trans-disciplinary field, to consider how these types of methodologies are used to encounter and respond to site. The questions raised aim to investigate the destabilisation of established languages and systems of 'knowing' and especially those historically associated with drawing and landscape. The following questions may be starting points for discussion.

How does contemporary drawing practice:

- Subvert established pictorial frameworks?
- Interrogate monological narratives and linear time concepts?
- Ask questions about belonging and displacement?
- Expand our thinking in relation to knowing and unknowing?
- Operate as a methodology of exploration?
- Establish alternative modes of re-thinking our relationship to environment?

In this session, Annalise Rees will present *Navigating the unknown through place, space and drawing*, examining physical and metaphorical connections between navigation and artistic approaches to the location and dislocation of place; Antonia Aitken will present *Drawing Contested Ground*, exploring how walking and drawing can be used as modes of embodied practice to develop meaningful, ethical dialogue with the land. Additional papers are invited for this session.

## Ruins in/of the Landscape

Yvonne Scott (Trinity College Dublin, The University of Dublin) SCOTTY@tcd.ie

This session is devoted to the critical analysis of imagery and objects responding to the idea of ruination in its spatial and temporal contexts, and its potential practical and philosophical interpretation.

The creation, and representation, of ruins in the landscape enjoyed a peak in the visual culture of the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries when a fascination with antiquities as a means of reconstructing architectural history, coincided with picturesque and romantic engagements with notions of a lost past, and the related philosophies of the struggle between nature and culture. This fascination found form both in the contemporaneous landscaping of demesnes, and in the traditions of landscape painting, particularly in – but not confined to – Europe.

Since the twentieth century there is evidence of a continued fascination with the image of the ruin, manifest in a strategic range that appropriates selectively, alluding to traditional ideas as points of reference (and of departure) for contemporary issues. Definitions of the term 'ruin' vary not least due to the inference of process rather than fixity and, while in the past, the meaning of 'ruin' in creative productions tended to be narrowed to the conventions of the time, its more recent appropriation as a motif absorbs and extends from selected/combined past usages, providing a platform for more recent semiotic interpretations.

The contemporary application of related theory includes ideas projected by Robert Smithson who, in 1967, coined the evocative phrase 'ruins in reverse', a term that has taken on new inferences in the wake of the more recent global impact of economic and related ecological hubris. In addition, contemporary events involving (ie caused by or impacting upon) natural phenomena, have triggered timely responses, ecocritical and other, by artists and by interpreters of their work.

Papers are invited that critically explore the concept of Ruins in, or of, the Landscape as represented by visual artists and practitioners. The proposed session relates extensively to the conference theme, and its potential range of interpretation. The relationship between art and man-made structures (including architecture) is effected in the representation of ruins expressed through painting, sculpture, photography, and new media both static and time-based. Critical analysis of the imagery and objects necessarily involves contextualizing and interpreting them in relation to socio-political environments, and drawing on relevant theoretical perspectives. The placement of ruins within the inferred 'scene' of the image plays on spatial relationships and hierarchies, while the process of ruination itself raises questions of causality, of inter-temporal relationships and references, of conflicts of nature and culture (and the ecocritical perspective it gives rise to), and so forth – and the potential for analysis can embrace most or all of those listed as potentially included in the Call for Session Proposals: in particular in referencing the current or contemporaneous state of the world or earth in which artists habitually intervene.

## **Nation, translation and exchange in modern Southeast Asian art**

Clare Veal (University of Sydney) clare.veal@gmail.com/ ph: +61 432529603

In 2013 the Guggenheim Museum, New York, held an exhibition of contemporary Southeast Asian art, entitled *No Country: Contemporary Art from South and Southeast Asia*. The exhibition's title reinforced the tropes of fluidity and borderlessness that pervade discourses of 'global' contemporary art. This may be contrasted with efforts in the wake of post-colonial narratives to expand the modernist canon beyond the purviews of Euramerica, and to recognise the specificity of modernist artistic development in different geographical and cultural contexts. These developments, which have been generally grouped under the term 'alternative modernisms', have been significant in opening up of a field of modernist studies in non-Euramerican contexts. However, they have also been increasingly tied to histories of artistic development that confirm nationalist narratives and ideology that may limit the ability to recognise the importance of international and inter-regional exchange between image producers in the development of modernism. In addressing case studies in Southeast Asian artistic modernism this panel examines the ways in which local producers have articulated art making through relationships, exchanges and translations with the foreign. To this end, the panel will evaluate the extent to which contemporary discourses of post-nationality may be viewed as novel developments in the history of Southeast Asian art. Papers are invited that examine the ways in which relationships, exchanges and translations through the geographical movement of artists, texts and artworks, may impact our understandings of national narratives of artistic development. This may be extended to papers that examine or problematise the discursive constitution of 'local' and 'foreign' in Southeast Asian artistic discourses, and how these may be linked to different ideological positionings. The 'foreign' here is taken as a broad and fluid category, and papers are welcomed that examine relationships with European producers operating in a colonial context as well as inter-regional and cross-regional exchanges.

*Nation, translation and exchange in modern and Southeast Asian Art* will critically interrogate the situation of Southeast Asian modernist art discourses within a national framework that is based within reified and geographically defined borders. In drawing attention to the ways in which modernist artistic discourses in Southeast Asia have been constructed through relations with the 'foreign', it moves beyond contentions that the dissolving of borders and boundaries in art is a novel development occurring with the advent of the contemporary. In examining the geographical movement of artists, texts and works, the panel also encourages discussion on the ways in which artistic meaning may be constructed in relation to or in opposition to the limitations and potentialities of working and speaking from different geographical locations, as well as the ideological significance of the construction of artistic identities along those lines.

## **No-man's-land: wasteland and wilderness**

Martin Walch (University of Tasmania) Martin.Walch@utas.edu.au

One represents a critical moment in humanity's relationship with our planet. The entrenched battlefields of the Western Front were the sites of cataclysmic events that landscaped France and Germany on a scale and intensity never before seen. Significantly, it was the stalemate of trench warfare and the need for daily updated maps of the conflict that led to the technological synthesis of the camera and the airplane. This moment was the critical point that led to the development of photogrammetry and ultimately to satellite imagery and the contemporary geo-referencing of data and images. The session invites contributions that stimulate discussion to reveal a range of interpretations of what No-man's-land might mean, what places and spaces might embody the concept in the present day, and how those spaces might be represented.

I would like to personally present a paper that investigates the origins of the term, the establishment of its usage in World War One, and its representation in Aerial and hand held photographs taken during that period. I will argue that there is a distinct aesthetics of no-man's-land that can be traced back to the images and literature of the First World War, and that a contemporary analysis of this aesthetic and its origins has significance for critical engagement with visual representations of wilderness, environmental change and post-apocalyptic narratives as represented in contemporary video games. Other contributions to the session might pick up on this context and consider that cross-over between wasteland and wilderness – when is a place one or the other or both?

## **Space-time and the studio: the teaching and making of contemporary art**

Mark Webb (QUT) ma.webb@qut.edu.au ph: 07 31385538

Charles Robb (QUT) c.robb@qut.edu.au ph: 07 31383761

The complex spatial interactions of objects and encounters that comprise individual art-making and studio teaching processes are poorly served by linear accounts of those activities.

Both making art and teaching art are constituted in the temporal process of negotiating the present by linking the immediate past with an immediate future. Given this complex spatio-temporal dimension to the studio, a simple linear model falters when considering many practices. Both individual creative practices, and the practice of studio teaching, are by definition, an assemblage of approaches, methods, and works, but also activate impulses, engagements, influences and references that cannot be apprehended by one-dimensional models.

Instead both are potentially better served by more complex and speculative models, such as zones, genealogies, ecologies, and topologies, to reflect on and respond to. Indeed the methodological imperatives of studio-based research degrees require artists/lecturers to consider the meta-form of their studio activities, provoking and informing the academic exigencies of teaching contemporary art.

This session invites papers from both practitioner/studio lecturers and historian/theorists that consider these spatio-temporal accounts of the contemporary art studio and the limitations/problematics of speculative theories of practice. These may include studies of practice-led methodologies, analyses of artist practices, art pedagogies, interdisciplinary practices including traditional and digital studios formations.

This session topic seeks to critically examine the different 'spaces' – both literal and conceptual - that shape art-making and its pedagogies. As a result, this session connects directly to the conference theme, GEOcritical.

### **Open Session: GEOcritical**

Karen Hall (University of Tasmania) Karen.Hall@utas.edu.au

Deborah Malor (University of Tasmania) Deborah.Malor@utas.edu.au ph: 0416190248

This panel accepts papers that engage with the conference theme, GEOcritical, and that do not otherwise fit into any of the other listed sessions. GEOcritical is a concoction that both delimits and opens up creative speculation. Taking the GEO prefix sits us firmly on earth, world, ground, and by extension, in specific places and conditions of being. Importantly for this conference, it can be the place from which to speak or create. Together with GEO, 'critical' can work in at least two ways: for example, referencing critique (in speaking, writing, process, action) in both its contemporary and historical frames; or in reference to the current state of the world or earth in which artists and architects must inevitably intervene.

Broad topics that might be considered for the Open Session include:

- Performance and performativity
- Activism as geocritical interventions
- The moving image/ the image moving

... but the convenors are open to all proposals.