



This item was submitted to Loughborough's Institutional Repository (<https://dspace.lboro.ac.uk/>) by the author and is made available under the following Creative Commons Licence conditions.

 **creative commons**
C O M M O N S D E E D

Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 2.5

You are free:

- to copy, distribute, display, and perform the work

Under the following conditions:

 **Attribution.** You must attribute the work in the manner specified by the author or licensor.

 **Noncommercial.** You may not use this work for commercial purposes.

 **No Derivative Works.** You may not alter, transform, or build upon this work.

- For any reuse or distribution, you must make clear to others the license terms of this work.
- Any of these conditions can be waived if you get permission from the copyright holder.

Your fair use and other rights are in no way affected by the above.

This is a human-readable summary of the [Legal Code \(the full license\)](#).

[Disclaimer](#) 

For the full text of this licence, please go to:
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/2.5/>

JENNY HOLZER'S *LUSTMORD*
AND THE PROJECT OF RESONANT CRITICISM¹

Marsha Meskimmon

I

Responding to the systematic rape and murder of thousands of women in brutal acts of 'ethnic cleansing' during the Bosnian War, Jenny Holzer produced the powerful *Lustmord* during 1993 and 1994. The project is complex and thought-provoking, not least because its texts, images and objects call to observers' own bodies, insisting that they participate in the work rather than stand outside it. *Lustmord* thus redefines the conventional relationship between desire and the gaze, which locates the encounter between subject and object as a unidirectional function of lack. This work creates a different space, one which is troubling and powerful precisely because it sets up reciprocal, intersubjective relationships through spectatorship. Thinking about the implications of this project, its strategies and modes of making 'history', will concern me throughout this essay, but a few introductory comments by way of description are necessary first.

Textually, *Lustmord* describes the rape and murder of a woman in three voices: that of the woman experiencing the torture, the male perpetrator of the crime and a more gender-neutral witness to the event. These 'first-person' accounts are explicit, painful and clearly perspectival; they describe positions from which this act can occur and be read:

With you inside me comes the knowledge of my death.

I find her squatting on her heels and this opens her so I get her from below.

I want to brush her hair but the smell of her makes me cross the room. I held my breath as long as I could. I know I disappoint her.

The texts of *Lustmord* were shown in a number of different formats: from the commissioned artist pages of the *Suddeutsche Zeitung* (19.11.1993) for which Holzer reproduced close-up photographs of the texts, hand-written in blue, black or red-black ink on skin, to installations composed of these photographic 'skin texts' in combination with textually-inscribed objects, such as metal tags attached to bones, a silver ring in the form of a snake, LED displays and a 'house' whose walls were sheets of leather.

Hence, the *Lustmord* offered multiple viewing experiences for audiences, ranging from reading the Sunday supplement in their own homes to standing within a fictionalised house in a museum or gallery, surrounded by the corporeal signs of mortality. The texts might also have been heard, since they were spoken by Holzer in the virtual companion to *Lustmord, World II*. For these reasons, I will not address the *Lustmord* as an art object in this piece, but rather as a mutable place of meanings, confrontations and reconceptions in process, materialising a range of possible narratives across different spaces. It is significant in this sense that the insistent voices of 'others' (the suffering victim, the killing rapist, the ineffectual spectator), inscribed in, on and of 'flesh', refuse us a refuge. There is no place from which we may consume these texts with a masterful, or mastering, disembodied gaze; in each first-person enactment, we take up one or more awful places within an act of extreme violence, an act of violence common to modern warfare which, while in the safety of our homes and galleries, we choose to ignore.

Not surprisingly, *Lustmord* attracted a great deal of critical attention - both kudos (winning the Gold Medal from the Art Director's Club in Germany in 1994, for example) and controversy. Interestingly, the negative commentary implied that Holzer's work was somehow too visceral or too literal - 'too sensational', 'Repulsive and absurd.'² With these comments in mind, it is instructive to step back and explore the two most 'literal' reference

points for the *Lustmord* project: the iconographical trope of the *Lustmord*, which came to prominence during the early years of the Weimar Republic in Germany, and the historical fact (and mythic device) of violence against women in modern warfare.

The iconography of the *Lustmord* (which translates roughly as 'sex murder' or 'rape slaying') became extremely popular with male artists in Germany between 1918 and 1923.³ The imagery was brutal: typically, the works displayed the figure of a raped female corpse, shown mutilated, disembowelled and/or dismembered. These female figures were generally read as 'prostitutes' and their depiction, murdered in filthy beds in dingy urban rooms, tended to emphasise both the rapidity and brutality of the murderous sexual encounter and the banal and impersonal commodity exchange between prostitute and client. The visual treatment of the theme enhanced the violence through lurid colour, excessive detail of the mutilations and roughly handled, crude mark-making. This visceral visual language makes the works simultaneously attractive and repulsive; even while shocked by the literal imaging of the aftermath of rape and murder, sex and brutality, viewers are compelled to explore their voyeuristic display. The power of the gaze to dissect woman remains intact.

Violence against women, both within the home and on the street, rose sharply during the crisis years of the early Weimar Republic and, while this phenomenon may have been magnified to enhance the sales of a widespread and temporarily uncensored tabloid press, it was also a fact of grave concern to women and men across the political spectrum. Social commentators took it seriously as an indication of the failure of defeated German soldiers to reintegrate into the community, a sign of destabilised gender and sexual roles and a mark of socio-economic collapse figured through the disintegration of the 'family' and its values. Hence the *Lustmord* was both a sensational image and one designed to provoke political polemic.

Holzer's explicit quotation of this iconography in relation to the Bosnian war drew upon these histories to revive a sense of horror and outrage at the treatment of women in

moments of extreme political upheaval and crisis. But her references, and the issues raised by the *Lustmord*, go far beyond histories of art or the particular circumstances of the Weimar Republic and address the manifold abuse of women in modern warfare. For example, soldiers having perpetrated and experienced extreme brutality, returning to their homes neither as heroes nor as victors, being unable to reintegrate into civilian life and finally committing senseless acts of violence, cannot but reference the Vietnam experience for a contemporary western audience and certainly for any politically-aware viewer of Holzer's own generation. Moreover, the scandal of enforced 'prostitution' in military brothels which became public knowledge during the years of the Weimar Republic, damaging the reputation of the whole military establishment and colouring the debates which took place around the phenomenon of the *Lustmord* were not wholly unique to that moment.

Over the past half-century, the relationship between the military, 'prostitution', rape, torture and war has been demonstrated most clearly in the systematic use of rape and murder as a strategy of 'ethnic cleansing'. A few examples suffice to remind us of the unspeakable traumas Holzer's *Lustmord* voiced. Two terrible euphemisms come first to mind: the 'Joy Divisions', those sections of Nazi concentration camps in which incarcerated women prisoners acted as sexual servants to guards and officials and the 'Comfort Women', the tens of thousands of Korean women kidnapped by the Japanese army, located in military 'brothels' in China and used to service the troops. Many of the stories of the surviving 'Comfort Women', which only came to light a few years before Holzer began the *Lustmord*, are particularly shocking, such as the case of one survivor who testified to being raped continually some fifty times per day until her body could take no more and then being used as a living blood transfusion bag for soldiers brought to the infirmary.⁴ The recent and horrific use of rape as an explicit military tactic in Rwanda (frequently in the hope of spreading the HIV virus as a side-effect) suggests clearly that the connections between sexual violence against women and the strategies of modern warfare become more devastating as and when genocide is the final goal of the conflict. In this climate, 'woman' becomes an object of extreme hatred as the potential mother of the despised 'other' and

women who find themselves enmeshed in these conflicts become sexualised targets and inhuman bodies; these conditions cannot but breed atrocity.

The symbolic destruction of 'woman' is yet another element of the *Lustmord* trope and one which has come to speak of military and revolutionary exchanges between men in western culture. The rape of the Sabine women and the 'capture' of Helen of Troy, so frequently depicted in western fine art and used as metaphors in literary contexts, each cite the beginning of great wars with the sexual conquest of woman. These metaphors became all the more devastating in the period after the bourgeois revolutions in Europe, where the 'prostitute' or the 'whore' became associated with revolution and the uncontrollable masses and the concomitant destruction of the 'whore/revolutionary' was the necessary enactment of state power. Thus it was that Victor Hugo invoked the start of the 1848 revolution in France with this story of the confrontation between the National Guard and revolutionaries on the barricade at Porte St. Denis:

...a woman appeared on the crest of the barricade, a young woman, beautiful, dishevelled, terrifying, This woman, who was a public whore, pulled up her dress to the waist and cried to the guardsmen...'Cowards! Fire if you dare at the belly of a woman!' Here things took an awful turn. The National Guard did not hesitate. A fusillade toppled the miserable creature. She fell with a great cry... Suddenly, a second woman appeared. This one was younger and still more beautiful; she was practically a child, barely seventeen. What profound misery! She too was a public whore. She raised her dress, showed her belly and cried:'Fire you bandits!' They fired. She fell, pierced with bullets, on top of the other's body. That was how this war began.⁵

Klaus Theweleit's famous study of right-wing mercenaries in the period following the First World War, *Male Fantasies*, reiterated the mythic structures surrounding counter-revolutionary action and the brutal destruction of woman - particularly figured as the 'whore

of Bolshevism'.⁶ The symbolic construction of despised difference as a devouring female whore, asking for the violent sexual torture and mutilation she deserves, has had extraordinary repercussions in real terms in military conflicts throughout the twentieth century. Whether the enemy was ideological (communists, Viet Cong) or 'racial' (Jews, Gypsies, Moslems, Slavs, members of other tribes and clans), the effect of the symbolic construction of difference in sexual terms has been to enforce 'prostitution', rape and the murder of women (mainly civilians) as a military strategy. When documentary photographs of prisoners' camps began to filter out of Bosnia in the first years of the war, foreign journalists quickly noted the near-complete absence of women between the ages of 15 and 35 in the pictures. The strategies against the female population could not be effaced.

It is no surprise then that Holzer's *Lustmord* should be shocking and cause discomfort and controversy among its viewers given the subject it tackled. But how could it be seen to be 'too sensational' or 'repulsive and absurd'? The art-historical iconography which it referenced was far more direct and sensationalised, literally drawing upon the new genre of popular crime magazines for its visual language. Holzer never produced figurative representations of murdered and mutilated women. Nor could she have competed with the facts of women's abuse in modern warfare for sensational effect; or, perhaps this barbarism against women is itself just 'absurd' and not deserving of public attention.

I would argue along a slightly different line that Holzer's work made skilful use of a tradition and yet differed from it such that it became impossible to subsume her *Lustmord* into the mainstream. That is, the Weimar *Lustmord* iconography, the mythic and symbolic destruction of woman as the 'othered' whore and the actual violence perpetrated against despised women, all reinforce a conventional western logic premised upon mind-body dualism. Within this paradigm, a distanced and gendered ordering takes place and the privilege of the 'one' is bought at the expense of the 'other' - woman, for example, becomes the ubiquitous marker of difference (sexual, racial, ideological, national, etc.) while women, as embodied subjects with voice and agency, are effaced. The conventions of the gaze, as a

distanced objectification of difference, subordinating others to scopophilic mastery, are part of this paradigmatic economy of of the same.

Holzer's project operates otherwise. It participates in the violent histories it references without merely repeating their logic. Never shirking the force of these violent acts against women, *Lustmord* still refuses simply to render woman as the object of symbolic and material violence upholding the privilege of the centre. Instead it places violence against women into this very centre, giving voice to the victims, locating the brutality within a time and space and calling to the embodiment of the viewers through corporealised texts and objects. These strategies engage with histories through an active generation of ideas between materials and practices. This revitalises aesthetics as a mode of cognition in the fullest sense, refuting a definitive intellectual/sensual split within the subject and developing a notion of sensual desire which does not reside merely in the satisfaction of lack, but can maintain difference in process.

Significantly, Holzer's *Lustmord* attracted its most controversial notice when it appeared as the fourth set of commissioned artist-pages run by the *Suddeutsche Zeitung* on 19 November 1993. The project appeared as a 30-page colour supplement with the Sunday edition of the paper; the pages consisted of the photographs of the texts hand-written on skin, printed with 'bleed'. To each fleshly book was attached by hand a small, folded invitation card, on which were printed three of the texts. On the outside of the invitation, the voice of the female victim framed the whole work in red-black ink: 'I am awake in the place where women die'. Paired within, in black, the voices of the perpetrator and witness: 'The colour of her where she is inside out is enough to make me kill her', 'She fell on the floor in my room. She tried to be clean when she died but she was not. I see her trail'.

In many ways, it was this trail which gave Holzer's work its undisputed power and made it a chilling testimony to the suffering of women, constructed around the limits of corporeality and text, body and excess. To examine the colour supplement, readers were

obliged to handle the pages and the invitation card. Only after doing this could readers find that the victim's text on the invitation was printed in a mixture of ink and blood - blood donated by German and Yugoslavian women for the project. Scandal ensued with readers outraged at having 'touched' the blood of these women and the tabloid press running completely erroneous scare stories about the transmission of diseases (particularly AIDS and STDs) through the card.⁷

This knee-jerk reaction pointed to the abuse of women and woman all the more clearly. It was not problematic for the readers of the *Suddeutsche Zeitung* (or other shocked critics) to consume texts and images centred upon the brutal rape and murder of a woman. No terrible mass outcry followed the revelations of the extent of rape and murder actually occurring to women in the former Yugoslavia as a result of the war and the genocidal policies of the military. And of course, little attention has been paid to the belated revelations of the rape, torture and murder of female civilians throughout this century. But to have their blood on our hands, to be unable to maintain the requisite distance of the empowered subject devouring the object of its gaze, was truly beyond the limits of conventional understanding.

The full-page prints of skin, the first-person narratives and the 'hand-written' texts, when combined with the materiality of women's blood, destroyed the sharp barriers between subject and object, interior and exterior, voyeuristic attraction and corporeal revulsion. As a work dependent upon participant observation, *Lustmord* challenges a gendered logic of containment premised upon the asymmetrical placement of woman and man in relation to text, art, creativity and body. Within this logic, male artists such as Pablo Picasso and Auguste Renoir can speak easily of 'painting with their pricks' and the philosopher Jacques Derrida can reference the ink of his writing pen and semen in one breath, since these uphold the privilege of a masculine creative virility. But the association of woman with body, fluidity and base matter is overdetermined; Holzer's strategic combination of blood and ink, skin and

text, with the voice of woman, articulated that which is ordinarily kept silent to maintain the disembodied objectivity of the masculine viewer and his position.

II

Few genuine challenges to the canon or the universal status of the male artist can be waged while the logic of woman as other is maintained. It is imperative for me, as a feminist art historian and critic whose work centres almost exclusively upon the manifold art practices of historical and contemporary women artists, to find the means to explore their art otherwise - understanding how exclusive and exclusionary histories marginalised women's artistic interventions without remaining within that very logic. Clearly, there is much to be learned from feminist strategies centred upon non-dualist constructions of history, subjectivity and aesthetics, such as Holzer's *Lustmord*.

I am interested in moving beyond the conception of women's art as a category of object in order to emphasise the processes through which women's art comes to be produced and consumed. Rather than asking what women's art is or was, to question what women's art does or did, rejects homogeneous models of woman and universal, 'feminine' essence beyond and before their manifestation within the world. In an important sense, processual models of aesthetics which enable differences to be voiced and help to establish powerful models of feminist, embodied knowledges should not be confused with the quest for a unified feminist or feminine aesthetic. Written in the singular, these terms establish fixed parameters around practice and meaning, some of which go so far as to define 'proper' modes of representation, subject-matter and materials to be used in producing the ideal work of feminist or feminine content. Such pre-determined models of praxis are utterly divorced from explorations in feminist aesthetics mobilising radical difference.

Exploring works of art as moments of articulation, sites of meanings in flux, capable of change and reinscription through activities in the present, does not imply that they have

no meaning or merely any; works negotiate identities and ideas through particular materials and images, made and read by embodied subjects in specific locations. These constellations of subjects, locations, materials and concepts constrain the meanings available, but never contain them. Similarly, arguing for a processual theory of aesthetics which does not have a prior programme or a set of rules for the application of a critical formula to works of art, does not imply that there are no guiding insights and ideas operating in thinking feminist aesthetics against the grain. In fact, what is fascinating about this work is that it expresses the dynamics of knowledge, voiced eloquently by Elizabeth Grosz when she wrote: 'Knowledges are practices, they are activities and not contemplative reflections.'⁸

If we think of critical practices as voices which have moved from contemplative reflection to active engagement, we are reminded of the important role which the term 'dissonance' played within feminist theories of difference throughout the 1990s. It is not merely coincidental that 'dissonance' was used to problematise the model of contemplative sameness, or consonance, propounded by universalising theories of subjectivity.⁹ 'Dissonance' defied reductive consonance, simplistic concord, agreement and contractual relations, deconstructing the myth of a normative centre and making suggestive claims for difference as a mode of thinking itself, rather than as a characteristic of marginalised categories of objects and others. Moving forward with the project of voicing difference asks that we disperse the binary of consonance/dissonance even further, exploring non-dualist connections and soundings, surfaces and intensities in becoming.

Significantly in this framework, the *Oxford English Dictionary* citation for 'resonance' contains the following lines:

1. The reinforcement or prolongation of sound by reflections, or *spec.* by synchronous vibration... **b.** Path. The sound heard in auscultation of the chest while the person is speaking, or that elicited by parts of the body.¹⁰

Resonance brings together different voices, reinforcing them at a synchronous moment without making them the same. Scientifically, resonance refers to wave motion or vibration, notions always problematic since we come to know of them only through the co-ordinated study of irreducible differences (matter and process). And, as the reference to the body within the dictionary definition reminds us, we are always part of this multiple phenomenal experience. Our bodies resonate all the time - through resonance, our bodies are connected to the world, but not by the reductive logic of the same, but by mobile contact with different materials, objects and actions.

It would be impossible to speak of resonance and physics without pointing out the most memorable feature of resonance, namely, its ability to shatter what had been thought to be solid. When bridges and buildings find their massive forms shaken to pieces through the introduction of an inaudible frequency, we see the power of resonance. This power is the self-same power that erupts intellectually when diverse concepts come into connection and shatter our complacent knowing, when our skies and maps meet the evidence of those who have travelled *around* the flat globe, or when, on a more intimate scale, we *recognise* something which we have never seen or understood before. If consonance presumes assimilation into one and dissonance disrupts that simplistic logic by voicing the effaced other, then resonance enables us to conceive the power which differences may have when they connect and harmonise. The 'synchronous vibrations' which resound are not the same, they do not become one. Instead, it is because they meet at coincident points while maintaining their difference that they can act in the here and now, that they can resound.

It is the logic of resonance that I would put forward as a feminist political strategy for art historical and critical praxis, precisely because the differences which can coalesce powerfully in one context need not be determined once and for all by that singular address. A resonant criticism is fluid and permits reconfigurations with other differences through attentive explorations of time, matter and space within the nexus of the critical act. The activity of thinking histories and knowledges in this way is creative, strategic and

interventionist. The subject interpellated by these activities is embodied and in process, an intersubjective agent in the world. As Rosi Braidotti wrote of feminist agency: "The feminist theoretician today can only be 'in transit', moving on, passing through, creating connections where things were previously disconnected or seemed unrelated, where there seemed to be 'nothing to see'."¹¹

Exploring criticism as an act of making connections implies a temporal shift away from both teleological models of theory and linear, progressive narratives of history. The power of critical acts which work through strategic, short-term interventions toward long-term gains (the precise nature of which may not be determined), does not reside in replacing one hegemonic meta-critical system with another, but rather, in their ability to reveal the myth of hegemony itself. In doing this, experimental interventions take calculated risks. Assimilating material into a singular system of meaning and value is safe but it continues to reproduce the knowledge already known; exploring multiple connections by bringing diverse materials together to exploit their resonance, risks creating connections which are either unproductive or, indeed, counter-productive, in the hope of effecting new relationships with histories, sources and concepts yet unknown.

For feminists, forging a productive relationship with past histories and ideas is problematic since these commonly enshrined masculine-normative values and supported the material empowerment of men over women. Yet there is no place 'outside' or beyond history from which to develop an untainted, woman's theory or practice. Exploring this uneasy situation, with particular reference to science, Sandra Harding refigured the activities of feminist thinking as 'riffing': 'We [feminist scholars] need to see our theorising projects as illuminating 'riffing' between and over the beats of patriarchal theories, rather than as rewriting the tunes of any particular one.'¹² This is a dynamic and resonant approach to history through which coincident ideas and activities are able to amplify one another and change the static shape of what had been fixed before - just as Jenny Holzer's *Lustmord*

played its riff between and over the histories of art, war and violence against women, without ever merely rewriting their tune.

If processual feminist aesthetics explore non-linear temporal activity, then they also question static constructions of space. The questions posed for thinking spaces differently are two-fold: what sort of space is described when differences coalesce without effacement and how can these spaces be made productive within the here and now? Answering the first question implies thinking of spaces as aesthetic in the fullest use of that term. That is, constructing spaces which admit of productive desire (rather than unfulfilled lack), coextensive difference (rather than assimilation) and becoming (rather than being), describe a spatio-temporal frame of cognition which is corporeal, multi-sensory and non-teleological. However, if this aesthetic space remains merely within the realm of abstract, utopian, theoretical possibility, it loses its potential to act politically in the present as a mode through which alterity might be voiced. At this point, the spaces described by a feminist aesthetics of radical difference meet those envisaged by a feminist, non-judicial ethics.

Rosalyn Diprose, in her pivotal work on an ethics of sexual difference, critiqued the self-same logic of mind-body dualism and the concomitant structures of universal, first principle ethics. By contrast, she moved toward models of process, ethical agency and located practices, reiterating the significance of the spatio-temporal frame of the subject. Her fascinating work drew on the double meaning of *ethos* (from which we have derived 'ethics') as the noun 'dwelling' and the verb 'to dwell', concentrating on the activity of dwelling or taking up a position as the critical component of ethical action.¹³ This is not simply abstract theory about position, it relates directly to the spaces of material subjects and their places within the world; this conception of dwelling as agency situates subjects as constrained, but never fully contained, by the histories within which they act.

The connections between histories, sexed and situated subjects and a processual, experimental ethics based upon the logic of becoming, rather than being, were explored

further in a closely-argued text by Moira Gatens.¹⁴ While the details of her work, like that of Diprose on feminist ethics, may seem very far removed from feminist art history, criticism and scholarship on women's art, her insights provide a valuable link in thinking difference differently without simply succumbing to the desire to pose apolitical, utopian aesthetics. The link between feminist aesthetics, as the experimental action of subjects against the grain, and an ethics of sexual difference, which locates the social and political potential of those actions, may rest upon the way in which 'becoming' is thought. As Gatens observed, while the potential to become never specifies a final outcome and permits limitless configurations and reconfigurations of ideas, concepts, subjects and objects to occur, actual becomings are always specific, corporeal and located. Hence, becoming is open-ended, experimental and utopian, but able to act within specific contexts; becomings can change the world. So, for example, an open-ended critical configuration between particular works of art, historical data and theoretical texts may move in many different directions and cannot be limited to a pre-determined destination, but it will take some directions, produce some insights and arrive at some point, if only temporarily. These, in turn, will bear a material relation to the specific elements which were brought into contact - the critical act does not simply emerge from the ether and it does not remain an abstract ideal. It makes anew.

This makes the critic all the more accountable for her position; it is not for me to hide my investment in my own praxis or my theoretical, methodological or political perspectives behind a mask of 'objectivity' when I explore the work of historical or contemporary women artists. Rather, engaging with the practice of a feminist aesthetics locates me within an ethical project, an explicit positioning of myself and my actions within my work. The strict boundaries maintained between subject and object in art historical and critical work premised upon 'objectivity' and a distanced, rational mode of observation, produced the authority of the critic through a conceit. The conceit implies either that the critic knows, in advance, the meaning of art and thus applies theory to illustrate this point or that a unified truth resides within works and is brought to the fore by their objective reading. The loss of the transcendent authority of these critical modes, with their monolithic, objective and

distanced truth claims, need not be accompanied by a move to radical relativism or a nihilistic subjective stance in which anything might be said and no arguments can be made for the efficacy of an interpretation. Rather, acknowledging the creative, productive activity of the critic/theorist as a participant in the project of an experimental feminist aesthetics, emphasises the strategic value of the questions raised, the material explored, and the constellations of sources, histories and ideas produced in interpretation. It is located and responsible for its results - it acts in the here and now.

This is not, therefore, an essay *about* the work of Jenny Holzer, nor does it replace the complex aesthetic spaces which her work constructs for participants. Neither is it about the work of feminist philosophers, the inscription of violence against women as a structural necessity in modern warfare or the politics of race and ethnic cleansing. It is itself a critical space for thinking differently by making connections where things had not been connected before. When you read about art practices, you do not enter the aesthetic spaces produced by the artists, you enter those made by the critic; the configurations of objects, materials, images, texts, concepts here developed are coextensive with practice, they do not define it or posit its 'real' meaning. For me to interpret the meaning of these objects in that way would be to re-enact the disembodied and static logic of subject over object, privileging the satisfaction of my desire/lack through a mastering gaze. I produce this essay instead, as a participant in an aesthetics of radical difference and I hope that the constellation which I have constructed will indeed resound for others. The wider project is one of community and communication, of having an aesthetic dialogue with artworks, texts, histories and ideas which cannot be reduced to sameness. As dialogic, this reconception can only move toward a new ecology of knowledge through the responses and activities of others, as it is read in the present and itself reconfigured in the future.

Endnotes

1. This article comes from a longer piece on feminist criticism and aesthetics: 'Practice as Thinking: Toward Feminist Aesthetics' which is forthcoming in *Reconceptions: New*

Ecologies of Knowledge, edited by Martin L. Davies and Marsha Meskimmon, London: I.B. Tauris, 2001).

2. Joan Simon, 'No Ladders; Snakes: Jenny Holzer's *Lustmord*', *Parkett*, no.40/41 (1994), pp 79-97 (p.82) 3. Simon, 'No Ladders; Snakes', p.82.

3. See Beth Irwin Lewis, '*Lustmord: Inside the Windows of the Metropolis*' in *Berlin: Culture and Metropolis*, edited by Charles Haxthausen and Heidrun Suhr (Minneapolis and Oxford: University of Minnesota Press, 1990), pp 111-40.

4. Kristine Stiles, 'Shaved Heads and Marked Bodies: Representations from Cultures of Trauma' in *Talking Gender: Public Images, Personal Journeys and Political Critiques*, edited by Nancy Hewitt, et.al. (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1996), pp 36-64 (p.41).

5. Victor Hugo, *Chose Vues*, reprint 1985, p.163 cited in Kaja Silverman, 'Liberty, Maternity, Commodification', in *The Point of Theory: Practices of Cultural Analysis*, edited by Mieke Bal and Inge E. Boer (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 1994), pp 18-31 (p.28).

6. Klaus Theweleit, *Male Fantasies*, volume I: *Women, Floods, Bodies, History* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1987). See especially the section 'Attacks on Women', pp 171-82.

7. Simon, 'No Ladders; Snakes', p.82.

8. Elizabeth Grosz, 'Bodies and Knowledges: Feminism and the Crisis of Reason', in *Space Time and Perversion* (London: Routledge, 1995), pp 25-44, p.37.

9. See Rosalyn Diprose and Robyn Ferrell, eds. *Cartographies: Poststructuralism and the Mapping of Bodies and Spaces* (Sydney: Allen and Unwin, 1991); Catriona Moore, *Dissonance: Feminism and The Arts, 1970-1990* (Sydney: Allen and Unwin, 1994); Hilde Hein, 'The Role of Feminist Aesthetics in Feminist Theory', in Peggy Zeglin Brand and Carolyn Korsmeyer (eds). *Feminism and Tradition in Aesthetics* (State College, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1995), pp 446-63 and, even quite recently in Griselda Pollock, *Differencing the Canon* (London: Routledge, 1999).

10. *The Shorter Oxford English Dictionary, on Historical Principles*, Third Edition (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973), p. 1808.

11. Rosi Braidotti, 'Toward a New Nomadism: Feminist Deleuzian Tracks; or, Metaphysics and Metabolism' in *Gilles Deleuze and the Theater of Philosophy*, edited by Constantin V. Boundas and Dorothea Olkowski (New York and London: Routledge, 1994), pp 159-85, (p.177).
12. Sandra Harding 'The Instability of the Analytical Categories of Feminist Theory', reprinted in *Knowing Women: Feminism and Knowledge* edited by Helen Crowley and Susan Himmelweit (Oxford: Polity Press in association with the Open University, 1992), pp 338-54, (p.341).
13. Rosalyn Diprose, *The Bodies of Women: Ethics, Embodiment and Sexual Difference* (London and NY: Routledge, 1994), pp 18-19.
14. Moira Gatens, 'Sex, Gender, Sexuality: Can Ethologists Practice Genealogy?', *The Southern Journal of Philosophy* vol XXXV, Supplement, 1996, pp. 1-19.