`

THE UNIVERSITY OF QUEENSLAND

A U S T R A L I A

Cosmopolitan Tendencies in Recent Intersubjective Art

Kiley Joy Gaffney

Bachelor of Arts (Hons)

A thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at

The University of Queensland in 2015

School of Communication and Arts

Abstract

This thesis asks what can recent intersubjective art tell us about the character of late capitalism? It theorises and exemplifies an analytical concept called the cosmopolitan disposition. As an analytical tool, it provides insight into the intersection of late capitalism and cosmopolitanism, as they are expressed in intersubjective art practices. As an attitude towards others that is predicated on openness and mobility, cosmopolitanism is a practice of the self as much as a theory of governance. This is where cosmopolitanism and intersubjective artworks come together. Cosmopolitanism and intersubjective art are imagined as 'felt communities' and as such, they are affective and deeply political strategies.

It asks in what ways can intersubjective art act on the disparities brought about by late capitalism through the auspices of cosmopolitanism? That is to ask: how do the same processes that oppress others allow the artist to be mobile, curious, open, take risks, be self-reflexive while accruing and deploying a broad range of knowledges and competencies. The answer is paradoxical: those oppressed by the processes of late capitalism become the focus, theme, and content of the intersubjective art work while the artists benefit from a system they seek to problematise and critique. This dissertation analyses that apparent paradox and its implications by investigating how cosmopolitan themes are mobilised to explore issues of exploitation and its opposite—benefaction in the form of hospitality—and how the labouring Other has therefore become a central theme in such art.

I draw on the creative practice of six artists for my case studies. They highlight the complex and disconcerting politics that underpin cosmopolitan virtues when they are abstracted from late capitalism's socio-economic realities from which they grew. The artist and their subjects are mutually shaped by the power that works through their relations. The artist exercises their authority in their exchanges with the subject, even when they claim to be producing mutual relations as a kind of democratic action. The artist disseminates and embodies a variety of expertise—managerial, aesthetic, social and emotional.

This thesis takes a cultural studies approach: I am concerned with analysing cultural practices in relation to social and economic power. To achieve this I focus on textual analysis contextualised by Foucauldian critical theory. I analyse intersubjective art practices and in doing so, show that their forms, media, discourses, and expertise provide a lens on how they evidence the role of the cosmopolitan disposition in late capitalism. Cosmopolitanism and intersubjective art share a mutual normative emphasis on openness and hospitality. Both are optimistic approaches that are articulated in relation to an Other (person, community, space, time). Both are dependent on the Other remaining relatively passive in relation to the movement of the cosmopolitan disposition as an historical subject (or discourse) formation in late capitalism.

Within the optimistic imaginaries of cosmopolitanism and intersubjective art, our paradoxical entanglements with local and global contexts mark a sense of movement and openness that was hitherto impossible, both economically and spatially, and this has amplified the sense of democracy in action on a global scale. Global flows are, at root, individual, but they are calculated collectively as evidence of our increasing global freedom. In a cultural context, these multiple paradoxical tendencies are exemplified by the figure of the artist as a member of a global elite who embody what I define as the cosmopolitan disposition.

<u>Declaration by author</u>

This thesis is composed of my original work, and contains no material previously published or written by another person except where due reference has been made in the text. I have clearly stated the contribution by others to jointly-authored works that I have included in my thesis.

I have clearly stated the contribution of others to my thesis as a whole, including statistical assistance, survey design, data analysis, significant technical procedures, professional editorial advice, and any other original research work used or reported in my thesis. The content of my thesis is the result of work I have carried out since the commencement of my research higher degree candidature and does not include a substantial part of work that has been submitted to qualify for the award of any other degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution. I have clearly stated which parts of my thesis, if any, have been submitted to qualify for another award.

I acknowledge that an electronic copy of my thesis must be lodged with the University Library and, subject to the policy and procedures of The University of Queensland, the thesis be made available for research and study in accordance with the Copyright Act 1968 unless a period of embargo has been approved by the Dean of the Graduate School.

I acknowledge that copyright of all material contained in my thesis resides with the copyright holder(s) of that material. Where appropriate I have obtained copyright permission from the copyright holder to reproduce material in this thesis.

Publications during candidature

Gaffney, Kiley. "Capital-C Culture: The Perfect American at the Brisbane Festival." The
 Conversation Media Group, 2014. Vol. September. Web.

---. "Worldly Feelings Made Material: Cosmopolitan Aesthetics, Affect and Recent Relational Art."
 Cultural Studies Association of Australasia Annual Conference 2012: Materialities:
 Economies, Empiricism & Things. 2012. Print.

---. Rev. of *Culture and Power: A History of Cultural Studies*, by Mark Gibson. *Media
 International Australia, Incorporating Culture & Policy*, No. 131, May
 2009: 165-166. Print.

---. Rev. of *Random Order: Robert Rauschenberg and the Neo-Avant-Garde* by Branden Joseph.
 M/C: A Journal of Media and Culture. 2008. Web.

---. Rev. of *Over Here: International Perspectives on Art and Culture,* ed. Gerardo Mosquera and
 Jean Fisher. *M/C: A Journal of Media and Culture.* 2007. Web.

---. "The Other APT: An Exhibition of Other Perspectives*",* Rev. of *The Other APT*, curated by
 Jenny Fraser. *Machine Magazine.* 2006:17. Print.

---. Rev. of *How to Get a 2:1 in Media, Communication and Cultural Studies*, by Noel Williams.
 Media International Australia, *116*: 151-152. Print.

Publications included in this thesis

No publications included in this thesis.

Contributions by others to the thesis

No contribution by others.

Statement of parts of the thesis submitted to qualify for the award of another degree

None.

Acknowledgements

Keywords

Australian and New Zealand Standard Research Classifications (ANZSRC)

ANZSRC code: 200204 Cultural Theory	50%
ANZSRC code: 200206 Globalisation and Culture	30%
ANZSRC code: 190199 Art Theory and Criticism not elsewhere classified	20%

Fields of Research (FoR) Classification

FoR code: 2002 Cultural Studies	70%
FoR code: 1901 Art Theory and Criticism	30%

Table of Contents

Introduction

This thesis asks what can recent intersubjective art tell us about the character of late capitalism? Since the mid-1990s, new perceptions of the social have been shaped and aligned through a specific formulation of advanced liberal democracy that is predicated on attitudes of openness and hospitality. This articulates a form of cultural cosmopolitanism through which specific subjectivities are symbolically 'settled' within the context of a fast-moving form of global capitalism that I call *late capitalism*. Contemporary articulations of cultural cosmopolitanism emerge from a liberal progressive mindset, which is better understood as the socio-cultural underpinnings of late capitalism. I proceed by presenting a genealogy of cosmopolitanism, intersubjective art, and their isomorphic articulation in the present context. The case studies I present elaborate a particular set of knowledges and competencies that I argue constitute *the cosmopolitan disposition.* A central element of that disposition is "the capacity of positive recognition of the Other" (Delanty, *The Cosmopolitan Imagination* 86).

I argue further that both cosmopolitanism and recent trends in intersubjective art are advanced by some theorists as salves to the social problems produced by the growth and movement of late capitalism and the subjects beholden to its movement. I show that the professional artists I analyse here sit at the intersection of artistic and economic freedoms and embody, represent, and in some cases authorise the expanded power field of late capitalism through their artistic practice. The dispositional traits of the mobile artists circulating within the transnational art world have become symbolic of the joys and freedoms on offer for "winners" in late capitalism.

As Fraser pointed out in 2006,

> the freedom from function and use that characterized modernist aesthetics
> predisposed art to represent and legitimize the freedom from need afforded by wealth
> … In the past twenty or so years, we have added a freedom from place and national
> cultural traditions as they are transmuted within the global idiom of contemporary
> art. (qtd. in Anastas et al. 115)

In some ways, this is no more than saying that art is always of its time. In another it points to the perennially achieved privilege of art that plays a socially integrating role for power structures of its day.

David Harvey asks, "in what ways can a cosmopolitan project of opposition to cosmopolitan neoliberalism be formulated?" (94). I adapt that question to ask: in what ways can intersubjective art act on the disparities brought about by late capitalism through the auspices of cosmopolitanism? That is to ask: how do the same processes that oppress others allow the artist to be mobile, curious,

1

open, take risks, be self-reflexive while accruing and deploying a broad range of knowledges and competencies? The answer seems to be paradoxical: those oppressed by the processes of late capitalism become the focus, theme, and content of the intersubjective art work while the artists benefit from a system they seek to problematise. This dissertation analyses that apparent paradox and its implications by investigating how cosmopolitan themes are mobilised to explore issues of exploitation and its opposite—benefaction in the form of hospitality—and how the labouring Other has therefore become a central theme in such art.

I draw on the creative practice of six artists for my case studies: Santiago Sierra, Renzo Martens and Lise Bjørne Linnert are dealt with in depth, Marina Abramović, Thomas Hirschhorn and Rirkrit Tiravanija are presented as exhibiting some of the tendencies I identify. I focus on Martens because his creative practice amplifies the problematic aspects of the subject of this thesis, where narratives of cosmopolitanism and (re)produced and (re)presented within a discourse of empathetic gesture and universal responsibility for others. This highlights the complex and disconcerting politics that underpin cosmopolitan virtues when they are abstracted from late capitalism's socio-economic realities from which they grew.

The artist and their subjects are mutually shaped by the power that works through their relations. The artist exercises their authority in their exchanges with the subject, even when they claim to be producing mutual relations as a kind of democratic action. The artist disseminates and embodies a variety of expertise—managerial, aesthetic, social and emotional. These techniques are 'relational technologies', a cluster of therapeutic practices in which an individual

> intervenes upon oneself (alone or with the assistance of others)…through self-inspection, self-problematisation, self-monitoring and self-transformation. Encounters in a diversity of sites that used to be governed by their own codes and values now take a broadly therapeutic form. (Rose, *Powers of Freedom* 90)

Individuals in turn have been disciplined in how to regulate each other's behaviours through the same techniques.

How this project began

The impetus for this thesis came about while I was a visiting scholar in Barcelona. I was regular visitor of two major local cultural institutions. The Museu d'Art Contemporani de Barcelona (MACBA) and the Centre de Cultura Contemporània de Barcelona (CCCB) have long pioneered the 'art, culture and society' nexus through their independent studies program (PEI). PEI generally consists of a series of interdisciplinary courses, activities and seminars aimed at those either working in, or aiming to work in, the culture sector. The pedagogical platforms of these institutions

are well-conceived and work symbiotically within the institutions' curatorial programs and with broader cultural events within Barcelona. Both institutions are well regarded internationally and a celebrated, international mix of artists, critics, curators and scholars deliver courses and seminars there. Attending and participating in these various pedagogical fora introduced me to a different perception of cultural engagement within local contexts. Barcelona was not my 'home' but rather my 'home away from home'. I noticed that particular notions of (European) cosmopolitanism and intersubjective aesthetics were being increasingly naturalised in institutional discourse around citizenship and art. Even though I was a European Australian, and privileged enough to be able to reside in Europe voluntarily, I was not addressed by these conversations. I wondered how many of those living in Barcelona were.

The night I heard Ulrich Beck speak about cosmopolitanism and the risk society was particularly revelatory. Beck's lecture argued that a cosmopolitan outlook was essential as the boundaries between binary thinking—"us and them", "internal and external", "national and international"—had become porous and less powerful (*The Cosmopolitan Vision* 7). After speaking about the European Union, global flows, and the flagging relevance of national identities, Beck moved briefly to discuss the plight of the victims of globalisation, those that are compelled to move, to be uprooted from their lives due to persecution or employment opportunities that lead to them leaving their families and homes. These less romantic realities are also the very real effects of the processes of what Beck calls "cosmopolitanisation" or "unintended" cosmopolitanism. They are the "unintended and unseen side effects of actions which are not intended as 'cosmopolitan' in the normative sense" (Beck and Sznaider 7).

After the event, the mix of local and international audience members were engaged in conversation about the potential freedoms brought about by enhanced mobility, connectedness, and flexibility. Outside the CCCB was an Hispanic migrant family "dumpster diving" – standing inside an industrial bin looking for food. Passing by the impoverished family on my way out of the CCCB that night, I wondered how an institution that interrogates the 'problems' of maintaining local identity in the face of social fragmentation and late capitalism understood the relationship between their programming and what was happening right outside their door. While embracing the utopian ideals of cosmopolitanism and intersubjective art the institutions seemed to lack recognition of how power operates and flows through relations in those social imaginaries. With an emphasis on dispositional processes and unrealised states, the tacit perceptions about normativity and the present structural conditions that underpinned these approaches seemed deeply problematic. And so this project began.

Contribution to knowledge

This thesis purports to make a contribution to knowledge through a new theorisation of contemporary cosmopolitanism, specifically by tracing its links to intersubjective art in the achievement of a mediating settlement among late capitalism, advanced liberal democratic ideals, and the lived experiences of individuals 'Othered' by those trends. Nava names three "interlinked analytical zones" that have been overlooked in recent theories of cosmopolitanism—"disposition, gender and the domestic". She argues that while feeling, or affect, has tended to be absent from interrogations of cosmopolitanism, gender has been disregarded almost completely ("Domestic Cosmopolitanism" 46). These elements are also noticeably under-interrogated in intersubjective art frameworks and evidence the gap in the literature that underpins the direction of this thesis. The profound impact of feminist praxis on discourses of cosmopolitanism and intersubjective art is most evident where global politics intersect with our own sense of belonging and home, producing "opportunities for hospitality and belonging that cut across difference and are engendered through conversations with embodied others" (Meskimmon 7). The political expedience of affect, the absorption of feminist strategies, and the framing of 'feminised labour' all speak to a feminist genealogy that is rarely acknowledged within the discursive frameworks of either cosmopolitanism or intersubjective art approaches. The perspective I present here is informed to a large degree by an awareness of feminist praxis, although that aspect of my theorisation is not emphasised. Rather, I focus specifically on the dimension of *affect*, its role in the formation of the cosmopolitan disposition, and its role in the artistic 'fix' I identify and theorise here. The entire discourse of cosmopolitanism is in fact underpinned by the concept of 'domesticity', a term that here applies to both political and economic conceptions of the domicile, whether in the civic space of the nation-state (*polis*) or the private comforts of the household (*oikos*). Conceptions of intimacy, labour and class are intrinsic elements of all three zones that Nava outlines and they are central themes to the artworks that I analyse in my case studies.

Cosmopolitanism, like intersubjective art, is based on a problematic of difference, of alterity. It

> regulates the interactions of individuals who belong to different civic entities who encounter one another at the margins of bounded communities. A cosmopolitan ethic acts as a reminder of belonging to humanity beyond a singularity of identity. The right of hospitality is situated at the boundaries of the polity: it delimits civic space by regulating relations among members and strangers. (Benhabib, *The Rights of Others* 27)

This remarkable ambiguity is at the centre of my approach. At the heart of cosmopolitanism is a

paradox: the recognition of the stranger as 'one of us', as human, as deserving of our hospitality. In literal terms, to be a cosmopolite is to be a citizen of the world. Yet, simultaneously, the ethos of cosmopolitanism is inherently bound up in the parochial, in differences and distinctions wrought within the boundaries of the *polis*. It is an ethos framed by an admonition to simultaneously recognise and discount the idiosyncrasies of locale, both 'ours' and 'theirs'. This almost schizophrenic ethos is, I argue, a key mechanism of late capitalism, with its emphasis on the free movement of ideas, labour, and capital across the globe (Jessop). The role of intersubjective art is equally paradoxical. Its ostensive role in the interplay of hospitality, exploitation, and related notions of progress on a global scale, is to problematise, foreground, and critique the effects and workings of power. Yet, as I show below, it can also been seen as a political, intellectual, and affective mechanism in the achievement of a "new political settlement" between individuals, the state, and advanced capital (Jessop).

Methodology and methods

As a cultural studies scholar, I am concerned with analysing cultural practices in relation to social and economic power. To achieve this I use conceptual research, theoretical synthesis and textual analysis methods contextualised by Foucauldian critical theory. I analyse the art practices of a small sample of intersubjective artists and in doing so, show that their forms, media, discourses, and expertise provide a lens on how their specific art practices evidence the role of the cosmopolitan disposition in late capitalism.

I acknowledge that my approach involves assumptions about the power relations that underpin the discourses I analyse here. However, I have been careful to avoid mapping analysis onto any assumptions about the *reception* of those artistic practices. Instead, I treat them as symbolic of the broader trends that are the focus of critique in this thesis. The limits of this study determine that I focus on the paradoxes inherent in the normative assumptions that underpin the cultural imaginaries at the centre of both cosmopolitanism and intersubjective art rather than their reception or any wider 'effects' they might have.

Background and definitions

I define *late capitalism* as the economic aspect of what has otherwise been called globalisation, global capitalism, neoliberalism, and so on, and understand *advanced liberal democracy* as being the political arm that underpins and legitimates that economic project. I define *cosmopolitanism* as an ethical and political philosophy that envisions a single community of world citizens. I provide further detailed definition of the concept in chapters two and three. I use the term *intersubjective art* to encompass a range of aesthetic frameworks, including relational aesthetics,

social aesthetics, connective aesthetics, and dialogical aesthetics. They have in common the fact that they are produced through social encounter as the form and content of the artworks. These forms are understood as a possibility for communication—meant in the broadest possible sense—to take place between strangers.

Cosmopolitanism and intersubjective art therefore share a mutual normative emphasis on openness and hospitality. Both are optimistic approaches that are articulated in relation to an Other (person, community, space, time). Both are dependent on the Other remaining relatively passive in relation to the movement of the cosmopolitan disposition as an historical subject (or discourse) formation in late capitalism. As a critical process and a philosophical ideal, cosmopolitanism offers a middle ground between theories of 'above' and 'below', an expedient framework for reconciling the tension between disenfranchisement and progress, between the 'high' and 'low' of political economic cultural formations. As society becomes increasingly unstable and incoherent, the obligation of 'hospitality' at the root of cosmopolitanism offers an integrative and complex notion of the 'localised transnationalism' embodied in the fluid consciousness of the cosmopolitan disposition.

The attributes of agency and community are essential to that disposition. They are the most highly desirable attributes in late capitalism and the intersubjective artist helps to open those channels conceptually. The artist's expertise calls less on the resistant strategies of identity politics, or the political economies of class once central to participatory forms of art, and more on processes of communication through personal, communal, and ethical enlightenment. The basic premise of what I am calling intersubjective art is that the public's interaction with the artwork and each other enables a temporary and exclusive community founded on the possibilities of art as human agency, offering an insight into the integrative power of art and the complex set of social relations it can communicate.

Within the optimistic imaginaries of cosmopolitanism and intersubjective art, our paradoxical entanglements with local and global contexts mark a sense of movement and openness that was hitherto impossible, both economically and spatially, and this has amplified the sense of democracy in action on a global scale. Global flows are, at root, individual, but they are calculated collectively as evidence of our increasing global freedom. Global relations and interrelations are imbricated with an international lexicon of symbols, complemented by what Ulrich Beck refers to as a "deep engagement in local activities, local consciousness, connection to local people", as if the cosmopolitan had "wings and roots at the same time" (qtd. in Boyne 48). In a cultural context, this is increasingly represented by the figure of the artist as a member of a global elite who embodies the set of tendencies and competencies that I define as the cosmopolitan disposition.

Utopian thinking and contemporary anxiety

Utopias are imagined communities, social idealisations that conjure up imaginative solutions to present day problems, envisioning an ideal community and, at the community's heart, an ideal subject. The concept of a peaceful and egalitarian world utopia is the lynchpin of the advanced liberal democratic imagination. As potential futures that are projected in response to present circumstances, they afford a valuable insight into how the present is perceived and (re)produced. Utopian thinking allows the anticipation of a world of different political, economic, and social realities. In this way, utopian thought offers a kind of freedom even if only in the most illusory sense of the word. This seems particularly salient when considering how utopias are also non-places, unanchored from temporal or spatial relativities yet still they are projected forward from a present perceived as unsatisfactory or even dystopian.

Ideology and utopian thinking are inextricably linked. Both characterise and instantiate the belief system of particular groups. Utopias are forged in relation to lived experience and multiple power relations shape those experiences. Each new social group and generation projects and embodies slightly different understandings of familiar concepts so that "each idea acquires a new meaning when applied to a new life situations" (Mannheim 188). It follows then that utopias are most often imagined as communal spaces; they are the embodiment of communal hopes for transcendence of present day conditions. Utopian thinking is embedded in the emotional centre of communities as a way of forging and maintaining affiliations, discounting present problems in favour of future benefits, and, in the jargon of business, providing a strategic sense of shared purpose.

The universal subject of cosmopolitanism and intersubjective art

Cosmopolitanism and intersubjective art tend to universalise the social and historical conditions of what are essentially gender- and class-based realities for individuals. As I show below, the dominant cosmopolitan dispositional model is keenly European, emerging in a time when individual mobility is tacitly assumed by the beneficiaries of late capitalism as universally accessible. Hence the artists analysed here are all European, with the exception of Tiravanija, though his identity is consistently positioned as itinerant with multiple national affiliations. The assumption of a universally mobile cosmopolite is closely associated with the moves to open Europe into a diverse, tolerant, and democratic European community at the close of the twentieth century. The renewed interest in cosmopolitanism and intersubjective art both emerged from the post-unification culture of advanced liberal democracy in Europe. Considered as a socio-spatial project, the 'new' Europe can be seen as symbolic of how the shared logics of the cosmopolitan disposition and intersubjective art are part of a structure of *feeling* grounded in the culture of a

7

particular time and place, and shaped by political and economic circumstances (Williams, *Long Revolution*; Williams, *Marxism and Literature*).

For example, border crossing is a relatively easy and routinised activity for European citizens but something often far more precarious and dangerous for those from outside its borders. For many, perhaps more than ever, national identities are severe strictures on mobility. Euro-centric assumptions of such freedoms, as an essential part of the cosmopolitan disposition, show how the disposition can be construed as elitist. Miwon Kwon notes, within some professional domains like the art world and academia,

> the success and viability of one's work are now measured by the accumulation of frequent flyer miles. The more we travel for work, the more we are called upon to provide institutions in other parts of the country and the world with our presence and services, the more we give in to the logic of nomadism, one could say, the more we are made to feel wanted, needed, validated, and relevant. (Kwon 156-57).

There are many such practices at the core of the cosmopolitan disposition and intersubjective art (see Chapter 3). For example, both share an assumption that all subjects are potentially equal, despite widespread evidence of glaring and increasing inequality. Such perceptions have come about through the orthodoxies of late capitalism and advanced liberal democracy (see Chapter 2). These ways of seeing the world both shape and are shaped by discourses about our selves (the 'us' of the text) in relation to the Other (the 'them') that inscribe these relations with power.

It is, as such, a kind of in-between space—between self and other, the affective and the cognitive, the individual and their social realms, the local and the universal—that the cosmopolis of a unified global humanity is imagined as being possible. The very notion of cosmopolitanism contains ethical, political, and aesthetic admonitions:

> *aesthetic* in the strongest possible sense; as a politics that operates at the interface of materiality and imagination…cosmopolitanism asks how we might connect, through dialogue rather than monologue, our responsibility to our responsibilities with a world community. (Meskimmon 7)

It is through the lens of intersubjective art praxis – seen here as a primarily aesthetic manifestation of the cosmopolitan disposition – that I view the operation of the cosmopolitan ethos and its paradoxical role in underpinning and legitimating, if not proselytising, late capitalism.

Thesis structure

Chapter One: Recent theories of intersubjectivity in art

Chapter one explores the history and development of common features and conceptual approaches among the group of practices I am labelling intersubjective art. I detail four aesthetic frameworks that together comprise what I am calling intersubjective art practice: relational aesthetics, connective aesthetics, social aesthetics and dialogical aesthetics. Bourriaud's relational aesthetics is the most well known of these, and although Bourriaud's framework offers the most insight in terms of framing intersubjectivity, I also include connective aesthetics, social aesthetics and dialogical aesthetics to counter and round out what I see as Bourriaud's apolitical detachment from critical issues. I also briefly outline two critiques of relational aesthetics, but leave the majority of my own critique for later chapters.

Chapter Two: Cosmopolitanism, self-regulation and the redemptive power of culture

In this chapter, I elaborate how particular ideas of the self in relation to the Other in liberal democracy are at the heart of cosmopolitanism and how this concept can be viewed in governmental terms. The social imaginaries of intersubjective art and cosmopolitanism intersect through their shared embrace of the therapeutic discourses of advanced liberal democracy and the ways the desirability of knowing oneself through knowing the other have been naturalised as part of today's cosmopolitan disposition. I draw on Nikolas Rose's Foucauldian assessment of advanced liberal democracy which is grounded in the socio-political reality of Blair's England, just before cosmopolitanism and intersubjective art approaches emerged as responses to the perceived falling away of binary politics and the rapid rise of "radical centrism" (Rose, *Powers of Freedom* 139-40; Giddens 44-46).

Chapter Three: The affective economies of the cosmopolitan disposition

Chapter three explores the underpinning affective economy of the cosmopolitan disposition. It views the habitus of the intersubjective artist as an exemplar of this disposition and the intersubjective artwork as one of its exemplary formal expressions. I use the term intersubjective art to define artworks that involve framing interactions with the subjects of the artwork as the form and content of the artwork. I use the term creative practice to signify the total creative activity of an artist. That includes artworks, curatorial work, discursive texts, and the dispositional aspects of their artistic persona.

These dispositions, and the ethics embodied within them, communicate particular ways of understanding the self and others in relation to the self. Intersubjective communication is ultimately

the transmission of these dispositional truths between selves. The collective and the communal are formed where those dispositional truths and affects meet and are given bodily 'surface' (Ahmed, "Communities that Feel" 14). Following the first three chapters, I focus on three case studies that examine and challenge the notions of openness and hospitality articulated at the centre of intersubjective artworks and cosmopolitanism.

Chapter Four (Case Study 1): Obligatory and ambivalent intimacies: Marina Abramović and Santiago Sierra

This chapter compares and analyses artworks that emphasise space and personal distance, as exemplified by Abramović's *The Artist is Present* and Sierra's *Polyurethane Sprayed on the Backs of Ten Workers*. These studies are treated together as exemplars of intersubjective art involved with revealing the surfeit of affect that accompanies late capitalism and global connectedness. Sierra's enactments of humiliation and exploitation are designed to bring the audience into contact with the ways in which late capitalism distances the consumer from the exploitative practices that make it possible. He thereby foregrounds a sense of distance in his work, describing the deep paradoxes of late capitalism by using exploitation and humiliation as the organising principle of his artworks while simultaneously proclaiming their critique. In *The Artist Is Present* Abramović uses intimacy and closeness, and the construal of almost complete passivity, to engage the public in an emotional confrontation with emotional and personal deprivation. These exemplary intersubjective artistic treatments of distance and intimacy capture the paradox of cosmopolitanism within the context of late capitalism: the Other as subject-participant involved in a critique of what underpins both the cosmopolitan disposition and late capitalism itself.

Chapter Five (Case Study 2): Other places and unresolvable strangeness: A case study of Thomas Hirschhorn and Renzo Martens

Hirschhorn and Martens are treated together here as intersubjective artists whose site of creative practice is pre-existing communities. For Hirschhorn, the urban community serves as a canvas, a backdrop upon which to make philosophical statements, statements about the nature of reality, where it is made, and by whom. In this intersubjective construction, the community is paradoxically rendered as a passive object in relation to the artwork yet constructed as active in terms of it being the site of cultural reality. Martens' artistic practice is focused on impoverished communities and based in documentary film. It highlights the paradoxes of late capitalism by such rhetorical turns as framing poverty as an economic resource, by showing the inversion and perversion of global philanthropy, and by ironically proliferating intersubjective art as a means of alleviating poverty.

Chapter Six (Case study 3): The comfort of strangers: A case study of Rirkrit Tiravanija and Lise Bjørne Linnert

Tiravanija and Linnert share in common an artistic focus on themes of domesticity. Tiravanija creates the formulation of an illusory 'Other' space. He is an exemplary cosmopolite and his work is the exemplar of what Bourriaud describes as a "microtopia", a utopian space in miniature. Linnert focuses on borders and boundaries, exploring craft and feminised art forms to critique the extreme existential precarity on the peripheries of late capitalism. Her art is simultaneously a conscious advocacy for the plight of women workers who are victims of late capitalist deprivations. It is exemplary in connecting the domesticity of *oikos* with *polis* and *cosmopolis*.

Chapter 7: Discussion and conclusion

While Abramović, Hirschhorn, and Tiravanija embrace the spirit of cosmopolitanism and the excesses of late capitalism as a theme in their institutionally sited artworks, Sierra, Martens, and Linnert have a more provocative engagement with the processes that sustain their positioning while oppressing others. They question the unevenness that underpins a cosmopolitan attitude and their complicity within those processes. Unlike the symbolic exercises of hospitality that Abramović, Hirschhorn, and Tiravanija perform, Sierra and Martens assume the role of villains in their artworks, playing up their positions as exploitative agents of late capitalism and drawing on the language of late capitalism to dress up as saviours, simultaneously pointing out the paradoxes of their involvement, and of the system itself.

Cosmopolitanism is an optimistic response to late capitalism. However, to be truly open and hospitable there must be, a positive recognition of the Other, but also, an acknowledgement of and action against, the cosmopolitan disposition and its complicity in the processes that liberate the cosmopolite while simultaneously limiting the movement of others. The global underclass are the by-product of the same processes of 'human progress' as the cosmopolitan elite.

Hirschhorn, Martens, and Linnert intervene in the everyday lives of those whose lives are made even more precarious through the structures that support everyday life in the West. A focus on those precluded from cosmopolitanism helps to provide a counterbalance to, or a re-politicised imagining, of cosmopolitanism:

> The aim or critique of everyday life is quite different. It is a question of discovering
> what must and can change and be transformed in people's lives in Timbuktu, in
> Paris, in New York or in Moscow. It is a question of stating critically how people
> live or how badly they live, or how they do not live at all. (Lefebvre 18)

There are at least two versions of the everyday implied in the concept of the cosmopolitan disposition. One posits unlimited personal freedom: to be mobile; willing to take risks; open and curious about other people, cultures, and places; and to be self-aware enough to be self-reflexive. The other everyday sits alongside this one rather than in contradistinction to it. This everyday is marked by lack: lack of agency; and lack of access to fundamental resources of life such as food, water, shelter, health care and, personal safety. Despite working hard, one of the foundational tenets of late capitalism is that there is no reprieve for these people from marked inequality and dangerous conditions.

Chapter 1

A recent history of theories of intersubjectivity in art

As cultural institutions have embraced the notion of transnationalism and cosmopolitanism, particular understandings of local and global problems have proliferated. Central to those formulations is how subject(s) are conceived and how intersubjectivity is transacted. Firstly I outline the theoretical and historical precedents that have informed intersubjective art's focus on the artist's role in activating the viewer/participant. Then I unpack four aesthetic frameworks that have emerged since the late 1990s and call for intersubjective art practices: relational aesthetics, social aesthetics, connective aesthetics, and dialogical aesthetics. My primary point of analysis in this chapter is on relational aesthetics because this is the most readily adopted conceptual marker of intersubjective art. I then interrogate two the major critiques of relational aesthetics. In doing so, I map a genealogy showing how cosmopolitanism and intersubjective art intersect through their focus on contact with and idealisation of unknown others. With a shared emphasis on sensibility, sentiment and exchange, their approaches reveal how subjectivity and social relations are imagined and transacted within intersubjective art practices.

The theoretical models underpinning intersubjective art

Social art practice has its roots in the Dadaist 'artificial hells'[1] of the 1920s and Bolshevik mass spectacles designed to politically activate citizens. Both approaches deployed art with revolutionary intent as a way to activate the masses from their 'numbed' stasis. Participatory approaches attempt to break down the distance between the artist and the viewer and to shift the power from the idea of an auratic art object and the habitus required to engage with its aesthetics, to an open text with multiple possible readings dependent on the reader's own experiences and knowledges. This is an optimistic task, especially when the art world is contingent on the labour and presence of the artist as exceptional individual. Although artists have critiqued the politics of spectatorship across a long history of artistic movements, I am concerned here with a theoretical trajectory that marks out attempts to activate the viewer while negating the auratic power of the artwork and the artist. These approaches centre on democratising the power relations between the

---

[1] The concept of participatory artworks as 'artificial hells' was initially outlined by Breton's exploration of Dada ("Artificial Hells: Inauguration of the '1921 Dada Season'). More recently, this term has been drawn on in Claire Bishop's Artificial Hells: Participatory Art and the Politics of Spectatorship.

viewer and the artist through the negotiation of perceived activity and passivity. However, despite their search for a more democratic and mutual engagement with art, the capitalistic drive of the transnational art world necessitates the individualism marked by the figure of the artist, whose self-capitalisation in auratic power is often abstracted and emphasised rather than obliterated.

Critique of the authorial concept has been an ongoing theme in art. Intersubjective artworks and their viewer/participants are posited as open texts whose meanings are collectively produced and negotiated. The theoretical underpinnings of this desire to activate the viewer are easy to enumerate. Benjamin's "Author as Producer" (1934), Duchamp's "The Creative Act (1957), Eco's "The Open Work" (1962) Roland Barthes's "Death of the Author" (1967) have all greatly influenced experiments in the artwork as an open text. In terms of specifying a work's meaning, those texts argue for author intentionality to be diminished in favour of an activated audience. Any text has multiple readers and therefore multiple meanings. The relations between the artist and the viewer/participant are intrinsic to understandings of intersubjective aesthetics. It is notable that while poststructuralists argue that all texts are intrinsically open texts, Bourriaud, who looks to poststructuralist thought to validate a number of his assertions, argues that relational artworks are distinguished from other artworks by their open form (*Relational Aesthetics)*.

The Russian Formalists formulated a new aesthetics to establish an art that could be didactic and a political force in the active transformation of the working classes into a mobilised collective. By breaking down the dichotomy between form and content in language, they introduced a linguistic method for analysing an artwork/text as a distinct entity, as an organised whole to be deconstructed and demystified in an almost scientific manner. Viktor Shklovsky's concept of defamiliarisation (*ostranenie*) was particularly amenable to the ambitions of avant-garde poets, designers and artists who believed in the power of art to break down and renew perception. Shklovsky argued that art's purpose is to "impart the sensation of things as they are perceived and not as they are known…Art is a way of experiencing the artfulness of an object; the object is not important" (Shklovsky 12). Artists drew on this method to experiment and 'make strange' 'habitual' forms of understanding and being. For writers, this meant showing how the use of language constructed realities that could be subverted, while visual artists 'de-automatised' visual signs to confront the viewer with their constructedness.

The concept of the 'habituated' viewer as numb citizen mirrors the persistent sociological formulation of Fordist and late capitalist aesthetics as a kind of anaesthetics of automated, deadening signs that necessitate artistic intervention to shock the viewer/citizen into (political) action (see Benjamin, "Author as Producer"; Buck-Morss, "Aesthetics and Anaesthetics"; Jameson, "Postmodernism, or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism"). Although a number of subsequent avant-garde movements have drawn on nonsensical and alogical strategies for destructive means, it

was Russian Formalism's foregrounding of the potential radicality and transformative power of language and image that became paramount in political strategies for mobilising revolutionary action.

Influenced by Marx, Constructivism (1919-34) abandoned the Russian Formalists' emphasis on aesthetics in favour of constituting art as a social practice. The Constructivists saw cognition as an active and processual event rather than the effect of passive contemplation. They understood art as an ideology rather than an artistic movement, emphasising that the focus of art should be on the process of communication that it enables and not on the aesthetic experience itself. This signals a shift toward an ethical and collective (external) experience of art rather than an aesthetic and singular one (internal). Drawing on fashion, photomontage, and graphic design, the Constructivists employed art in the service of the revolution and advocated a

> movement against aesthetics as manifested in the various fields of human activity. For the most part Constructivism is an inventive, creative activity, embracing all those fields which relate to the question of external form, and which implement the results of human ideas and their practical application through construction. (Stepanova 69)

The work of Shklovsky and the Russian Formalists inspired Stepanova to seek new ways to transform the work of art from the realm of sacred, subconscious inspiration into an intellectual and dynamic organised activity. This method reformulated the production of art as "an experiment, a form of laboratory work", promoting a rigorous intellectual engagement that rejected the notion of 'art for art's sake' and aesthetics as a "unnecessary and forced form of stupefaction" (Stepanova 70).

In this view, art seemed to have become a kind of science, validating its role in the ethical wellbeing of people's lives. Across the varied movements of the historical avant-garde, the concept of the laboratory that Stepanova's manifesto had highlighted endowed the processes of art (production and reception) with a certain kind of democratic and ethical political agency that transcended the philosophical aspirations of aesthetics. As leftist politics began to dominate new movements globally, aesthetics were invested with the power to transform the working class into members of an active public sphere by the instrumental intervention of the artist. In this way socialism was elevated into a kind of spiritual, ethical and affective movement. This idea of the intersubjective artwork and institutional spaces as sites of experimentation is threaded through the corpus of intersubjective art. A number of collaborative projects are even referred to as workshops or laboratories, which in turn authorises the process and outcomes of the 'work' done within the projects.

Rather than seek political transformation through an emotional investment in a quasi-religious community, Brecht believed that emotional distance would trigger a politically active reader. Influenced by a trip to Moscow in 1935, Brecht developed his 'alienation effect' (*Verfremdungseffekt*) as a dialectical device to educate 'the masses' (91-99). Inspired by Shklovsky, Brecht formulated an approach to performance to prevent the audience's passive, sympathetic identification with the characters created on the stage. Brecht's aim was to shock the viewer out of their state of passive emotionality and into the role of critical (and detached) observer. *Un Teatre Sense Teatre (A Theatre Without Theatre)*, an exhibition at Barcelona's Museu d'Art Contemporani de Barcelona (MACBA) in 2007, revealed the influence of Brecht's approach when outlining the aesthetic and theoretical reciprocity between theatre and twentieth century avant-gardism from the 1960s until the late 1980s. Formulated around a kind of synergistic 'flowchart', the exhibition drew on the interactive elements that married the two disciplines – artist/spectator, body/spatiality and visual/performative. In doing so, it interrogated what performativity might mean for the subject as spectator and agent. Apart from the temporal flux created in works that are contingent on viewer participation, the MACBA exhibition interrogated how renouncing 'visuality' had compelled an instrumentality of the artwork. This highlights the pedagogical impetus in a considerable body of this work. Although art might no longer appear to show the viewer some truth of the world, the artist and the viewer/participant have been increasingly formulated, instructed and obliged to embody some truth of the world.

Walter Benjamin's case for reproductive technologies in art followed on from the Russian advancement of an aesthetics for everyday life that was accessible to all. Benjamin was concerned however that the increasing proliferation of commodities would trigger the 'aestheticisation of everyday life', where the spectacularisation of reality would distract and disconnect people from the economic and socio-political structures within the media and reinforcing modernity as a whole. Benjamin attempts a theory of art that could be "useful for the formulation of revolutionary demands in the politics of art" and this revolutionary potential would come by dispelling the ritual of art and the mythology of an artwork's aura (Benjamin, "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Production" 49). Benjamin's conception of modern life was "neurological": consciousness operated as "a shield" defending the organism against the sustained impact of the "excessive energies" (shocks) of external forces (Buck-Morss 16). Incessant perceptual shocks force the consciousness to shut down memory, which in turn diminishes experience and causes a "crisis in perception", producing *anaesthetics* where the senses are deadened and the organism numbed rather than opened to the aesthetic experience (Buck-Morss 18). Overstimulation of the senses deadens them keeping subjects (as consumers) passive and complicit with the structures of capitalism. To Benjamin, the expansion of technologies in cultural production afforded a more

democratic and potentially liberating art, one that might even forge new types of collective exchange.

Drawing on Marx's account of capitalistic production, Benjamin concludes that by stripping away the ritualistic value traditionally attributed to art, art would, in effect, be based on politics. Inherent to the 'parasitical' ritual of traditional art was the authority of the belief in the 'aura' of the artwork, the sense of wonder and veneration that a trained individual should experience in the presence of a unique artwork. This aura speaks to both the artwork's authenticity as an original work of singular genius and its contextual elements, the fields into which it has emerged and been circulated. The ownership, exhibition, cultural value and signatory cult value of art mutually embed an artwork in the overlapping structures of power implicit to these domains despite the tacit logic that aesthetics transcended the earthly realities of class and politics. Aesthetics are contiguous with these specificities. The cultural associations of art with religious awe, primitive ideas of magic and ritual, and even the elevation of science during the Enlightenment only highlighted the complicated interstices of power relations in which art existed: "The manner in which human sense perception is organized, the medium in which it is accomplished, is determined not only by nature but by historical circumstances as well" (Benjamin, "The Work of Art" 51).

Benjamin's "The Author as Producer" formulates an applied pedagogical approach to his theory of subverting the value of the artwork's aura. Nominalising the author as representative of all artists, Benjamin outlines three tasks of the author figure: to organise the working class, to activate the working class, and to subvert the dominant class. Benjamin perceives all artworks as interactive and site-specific and in this way, they are embedded in real material situations. It is an author's responsibility to create audience-specific artworks that acknowledge and address the reader accordingly. In this way, the author produces the reader. The artwork should illuminate, transforming and activating the viewer into their own production because "an author who teaches a writer [an artist] nothing, teaches nobody anything" ("The Author as Producer" 93). In Benjamin's formulation all readers are empowered as authors, defined as "someone who describes or even who prescribes…an expert—even if not a professional, but only a job-occupant—he gains entrance to authorship" (87). In this way, there is a political tendency inherent in all artistic processes because even attempts at being apolitical are political. This integration of art as an everyday and amateur creative process that is democratic runs through the history of cultural (and media) studies.

In terms of everyday aesthetics, the importance of Michel de Certeau's work cannot be overstated. De Certeau argued that "readers are travellers; they move across lands belonging to someone else, like nomads poaching their way across fields they did not write"(174). He saw reading as a potential act of resistance. The reader, imagined as a kind of nomadic figure, "transforms another person's property into a space borrowed for a moment by a transient" as they

interpret the text through their own experiences and imagination (xxi). Shifting creative agency to the reader "depends on a transformation of the social relationships that overdetermine his relation to the texts" (173). During de Certeau's consultation and collaboration with various French governmental agencies from 1970-85, he advocated an inclusive rearticulation of France's diverse citizenry as active and empowered viewers. De Certeau advanced the idea that communities are enriched by "privileging of immigrants as primary producers and consumers of public culture"- a potential space for radical democracy enacted through the participatory culture of the marginalised (Highmore 154). To de Certeau, the immigrant

> creates for himself a space in which he can find *ways of using* the constraining order
> of the place or of the language. Without leaving the place where he has no choice but
> to live and which lays down its law for him, he establishes within it a degree of
> *plurality* and creativity. By an art of being in between, he draws unexpected results
> from his situation. [emphasis in the original] (30)

In de Certeau's aesthetic and social formulation, the stranger is idealised, as a foreigner to new lands (immigrant) and to elite cultural institutions (amateur), and adds value to the culture through their dynamic processes of practicing and producing (new) culture. This came at a time when culture was seen as a pure and naturally occurring phenomena, particularly in France. De Certeau's approach reworks the concept of 'making strange' that began with the Constructivists and developed through continental philosophy's engagement with alterity. Shocking the viewer out of their torpid stasis, the stranger's outside perspective affords a fresher or more authentic engagement with art, culture and politics. This is a distinctly political position.

Barthes notes that "in ethnographic societies the responsibility for a narrative is never assumed by a person but by a mediator, shaman or relator whose 'performance' – the mastery of the narrative code – may possibly be admired but never his 'genius'" (41). Barthes rejected the positivist belief in the author as an elite cultural medium, seeing the emphasis on the singular genius as a direct result of capitalist ideology. The need to explain the text by contextualising it within the backstory of its author maintains the idea that the story is an intimacy of sort: "the voice of a single person, the *author* 'confiding' in us" (Barthes 42). Barthes's approach to negating the power of the author is similar to Shklovsky's theory of defamiliarisation and Brecht's notion of alienation, subverting the presence of the author through substituting language for a person. Turning to Stéphane Mallarmé, the immensely influential nineteenth century writer whose work would inspire the Futurists and Dadaists, Barthes also sees political effectiveness in the poetic act of language. Mallarmé imagined language as the key to utopia as he freed language from the constraints of grammar, of the page and of meaning, drawing out a new linguist world of symbols.

Barthes argues against the author being "always conceived of as the past of his own book: book and author stand automatically on a single line divided into a *before* and an *after*" (Barthes, 43). Here, Barthes alludes to the ways an author's narrative persona gives life to the text, animating any reading of the text with their personal history and authorial intentions. In this way, the authorial presence is embedded within the narrative of the story positioning the text as an extension of the author rather than an autonomous text. In contrast, an autonomous text remains open. Rather than celebrating and privileging the reader, Barthes similarly asserts that one reader's meaning is just one of many possible readings. The potential meanings of the text are unlimited. Without an author, the text is liberated and, ultimately, so is the reader.

Fluxus' light-hearted and playful actions were immediate and interactive but created fun at the expense of the seriousness of high art rather than attempting to radicalise the everyday life of their audience. Their often-vaudevillian style theatricality married the hedonism of art-for-art's-sake with the new directive movement in art. Didactic and performative, this new relational tendency acknowledged the audience as an implicit element within the realisation of contemporary artworks. The notion of viewer agency was still not fully realised, however, as the didactic model of the master-student transmission of information still dominated performance art. This pedagogical tendency has proven markedly resilient in strategies to activate the viewer. Even before Barthes had pronounced the author dead, Jauss' reception aesthetics (*Rezeptionsästhetik*) had negated the assumed passivity of the audience, pointing out that viewers were actively negotiating a text through their own experiential contexts. Starting out as an intervention in traditional literature studies, reception theory has revolutionised understandings of audience agency across the arts and humanities so that the critical model of art/text as one-way communication shifted from the *artist/transmitter → art/object → audience/receptacle* model to something that reflects the complexity of engaging with and interpreting works.

The concept of aesthetic cognitivism is another approach that is based on activating the viewer through its contention that truth is embedded in a scientific grounding of anthropological discourse. An aesthetic cognitivist approach hinges on two assumptions: that art produces "(non-trivial) knowledge" and that the artwork's capacity "to give us (non-trivial) knowledge (partly) determines its value *qua* art" (Gaut 436). In this way, aesthetic cognitivism views art as information. The viewer is activated within a pedagogical relation, often based on a shared language (visual or linguistic) and practices of communication. In this formulation, art's ultimate value is judged in the way it forges understanding for the viewer. Jacques Rancière contends that hierarchical power structures can be eradicated through activity and dialogue. Following the tradition of Benjamin's "Author as Producer" and Barthes' "Death of the Author", Rancière calls for an activated reader/viewer whose emancipation invokes a political action. Rancière reiterates

that spectatorship is undesirable as the passive reception of the artwork as spectacle masks the complex, political conditions of its production. Spectatorship, as looking, is "the opposite of knowing" and "the opposite of acting", positing the passive viewer as ignorant, disempowered and static "without any power of intervention" (Rancière, "Emancipated Spectator" 272).

Art should activate the 'power' of the spectator compelling a performance "where spectators will no longer be spectators, where they will learn things instead of being captured by images and become active participants in a collective performance instead of being passive viewers" (Rancière, "Emancipated Spectator" 272). Like Shklovsky and Brecht, Rancière suggests that shocking the viewer from their passivity requires "the spectacle of something strange, unusual, which stands as an enigma and demands that he investigate the reason for that strangeness" (272). Here, strangeness, as the affective embrace of the alien, demands a critical engagement with the artwork. A good artist is able to invoke a sense of strangeness, triggering a kind of curiosity rather than familiarity within the viewer so that they are compelled to act on their curiosity. And "a good community is a community…whose collective virtues are directly incorporated in the living attitudes of his participants" (272). In this way, art's role is a disciplinary one. How strangeness and community are formulated within intersubjective artworks raises a number of salient questions in relation to cosmopolitanism, such as: what sort of relations does this artwork produce? How does the artist create tension (strangeness) within the artwork so that it may be resolved by the presence and conduct of the viewer/participant? And, who is the ideal viewer/participant that is invited into the community that the artwork produces or seeks to make?

I have outlined the theoretical models that have influenced recent approaches to intersubjective art to show the affective and political dimensions ascribed to art, and the pedagogical imperative that underpins the intersubjective art frameworks elaborated in the remainder of this chapter. As I will detail in chapter two, 'good' art has long been advanced as art that activates the viewer/participant. To this end, art should not only educate the viewer; art should also make the viewer curious enough to act on themselves and their worlds. In intersubjective artworks, where the subject of the artwork becomes the form and content of the artwork, art acts directly on the conduct of the viewer-participant.

Four approaches to intersubjective art

Hospitality and Hands On Utopias: Relational Aesthetics (1996)

Since French curator and theorist Nicholas Bourriaud coined the term 'relational aesthetics' in 1996, his proposal of a relational art has proven popular, both as a point of influence and dissension. Bourriaud's aesthetic framework was introduced in the exhibition catalogue for the

Traffic show he curated at CAPC, the Bordeaux museum of contemporary art. *Traffic* included a diverse range of artists—such as Vanessa Beecroft, Maurizio Cattelan, Liam Gillick, Douglas Gordon, Jens Haaning, Carsten Höller, Pierre Huyghe, Philippe Parreno, Gabriel Orozco, Felix Gonzalez-Torres, Dominique Gonzalez-Foerster, Jorge Pardo, Rirkrit Tiravanija, and Gillian Wearing—some of whom would become synonymous with relational aesthetics and the ever-expanding transnational circuit of large-scale, cyclical survey exhibitions (biennials, triennials, Documentas). This disparate group of artists and art practices are consolidated by Bourriaud's claim that they forge a space that is "interactive, convivial, and relational" ("Traffic: Space-Times of the Exchange")

Bourriaud frames his theory of a relational aesthetics in opposition to the expansive spectacularisation and excessive commercialisation of everyday life, where "the ideal subject of the society of extras is thus reduced to the conditions of a consumer of time and space" and "artistic activity, for its part, strives to achieve modest connections, open up (one or two) obstructed passages, and connect levels of reality kept apart from one another" (*Relational Aesthetics* 8-9). Bourriaud asks: "What are the real challenges facing contemporary art vis-à-vis society, history, and culture?". In response he suggests that "the critic's first job consists in reconstructing the complex set of problems which emerge in any given period, and taking a close look at the various solutions proffered" (7). Drawing on Debord, Bourriaud claims that "human relations are no longer 'directly experienced'" but are instead becoming "blurred in their 'spectacular' representation" (9). Unlike Debord however, Bourriaud sees artistic praxis as a site of social and political disruption, as "a rich loam for social experiments" where artists can create "hands-on utopias" (9).

> Nowadays, we live our utopia on a subjective, day-to-day basis, in the real time of tangible and intentionally fragmentary experiments. The artwork is presented as a social interstice within which these experiments, and these new 'possibilities of life' turn out to be feasible. It would seem more pressing, here and now, to invent possible relationships with our neighbors than to hold out for brighter tomorrows. That's all there is to it, but it's an awful lot. (Bourriaud, "Traffic")

Bourriaud perceives relational artworks as producing a social interstice. Whereas Marx drew on the concept of the interstice to describe trading communities that exist outside of capitalist economic structures by their use of non-profit systems of exchange, Bourriaud co-opts the idea to imagine a social space that is exempt from auspices of capitalism and social fragmentation (*Relational Aesthetics* 16). Bourriaud sees these social interstices, which are predominantly created within institutional space, as a kind of functional utopia, an interstitial space he calls a *microtopia*.

The "social utopias and revolutionary hopes" that have traditionally defined both politics and the art world "have given way to everyday micro-utopias and imitative strategies" (31). Bourriaud calls for social change in the smaller details, citing Félix Guattari's emphasis on community and neighbourhood organisations as exemplars. By adopting "small-scale models of communication situations" he argues that there will be "a change in the collective sensibility" (Bourriaud, "Traffic").

Bourriaud's transition from utopia to microtopia advances the idea that individual participation in art-defined communities will bring about a transformative democratic politics. Bourriaud focuses on the destabilisation of society due to increasing detachment and fragmentation in the face of technological advance while simultaneously inferring a widening gap between art and the everyday lives of its audiences. The interstitial spaces produced by relational artworks are imagined as antithetical to both the dystopian public sphere of mainstream culture and the utopian bourgeois sphere of the elite art world. The solution lies in small 'everyday' social encounters. Relational artworks produce "relational space-times—interhuman experiences which attempt to free themselves from the restrictions of the ideology of mass communications. In some ways, these are places formulated, along with critical models and moments of constructed conviviality" (Bourriaud, "Traffic"). The relational artwork is imagined as an ameliorative space to reintegrate the viewer/participant back into hospitable sociality.

Despite the obvious influence of critical engagements with alternative political models elaborated in response to late capitalism, the absence of broader political incentive in Bourriaud's utopian space dissipates the radicality of other imagined micropolitical social spaces, such as Hakim Bey's Temporary Autonomous Zones, Deleuze and Guattari's rhizomes, or Hardt and Negri's multitude. Indeed, Bourriaud seems to interpret the theoretical focus on small-scale dissension as a sign that direct action is politically ineffective and even suggests that marginal identities are equally illusory and regressive (Bourriaud, *Relational Aesthetics* 31). However, these hands-on utopias require a multiplicity of identities to achieve the revelatory performance of connection within the social encounter of the work. As Bourriaud even notes of Felix Gonzalez-Torres' artworks: "the idea of *including the other* is not just a theme. It turns out to be as essential to the formal understanding of the work" (52). In intersubjective artworks, communication seems more meaningful and political when transacted between unknown others but Bourriaud fails to acknowledge that other identities or even the small group dynamics might be fraught with contention and disputes over power. Bourriaud imagines microtopian spaces as neutral, as sites of equality where consensus can prevail. He stresses that "meaning and sense are the outcome of an interaction" and that truth is a negotiation between parties (80).

The immersive environments of microtopian artworks, and their varying institutional

contexts, map their own "possible universes". The possibility of other universes within a singular artwork reiterates their contingent nature and emphasises that they are a work in progress centred on and defined by the human relations they produce (Bourriaud, *Relational Aesthetics* 13). Bourriaud claims that relational works have no grand utopian aspirations as they merely seek to establish solutions in the moment, even if the 'problems' they seek to provide solutions for might not be clearly articulated, might not even be clear. As the artists, and their viewer/participants, are "*learning to inhabit the world in a better way*" they are simultaneously establishing functioning microtopias in the present rather than dreaming of distant and unreachable futures (Bourriaud, *Relational Aesthetics* 13). When Bourriaud claims that "it is not modernity that is dead, but its idealistic and teleological version" he frames a relational approach as somehow outside or beyond the grand narratives of political utopias and rationalities that defined modernity (13).

Bourriaud's tendency to focus on microdynamics rather than on macrostructures would seem to be a closer engagement and a more realistic goal of art, affording the artist the opportunity to forsake grandiose aspirations of rupture and epiphany to focus on the more intimate spaces of shared dialogue and affect. In that moment, when the artwork triggers a sense of self-directed agency and community within the viewer/participant, Bourriaud sees the political substance of his relational approach. The problem inherent to Bourriaud's vision, however, is that the emphasis on sociability tacitly infers that the social is somehow a more authentic space in which to work. In fact, a recurring element across the body of participatory work is the belief that intervening in the social realm will somehow endow the artwork with not only some sense of reshaping people's ways of being (and in turn, the public good) but also that this endeavour is subsequently framed as a more authentic and useful aspiration. As Bourriaud states: "Art was intended to prepare and announce a future world: today it is modeling possible universes" (Bourriaud, *Relational Aesthetics* 13). It is in how those universes are imagined, the utopian strategies enacted and realised, that a utopian tendency is evidenced.

One of Bourriaud's exemplary relational artist, Liam Gillick, picks up on the notion of a 'functional utopia' in an essay he wrote in relation to the exhibition, *Utopia Station*, installed as part of 2003's Venice Biennale. In his essay, Gillick states that he chose to avoid participating in any exhibition structures that incorporated the term 'utopia' due to his "rejection of the assumption that any progressive movement is somehow utopian" ("For a Functional Utopia" 278). Gillick had favoured the term 'post-utopian' until his participation in *Utopia Station,* which he suggests is a structure "working towards a temporary, if rather visible, marker of a sequence of 'becoming utopias'" (279). Gillick defines a functional utopia as "a model of a more discursive and contingent exhibition structure that could cut free from the generalised experience of the Biennale as a whole and retain a utopian becomingness throughout the time of the exhibition" (281). This idea of

becomingness cuts to the cosmopolitan aspect of a cosmopolitan approach. Gillick's conception of a utopia station as "an ongoing arrival and departure framed by waiting at an in-between space" speaks to the tacit mobility that determines the relations of both intersubjective art and cosmopolitanism (279).

The myth of the artist as rarefied "scholar/philosopher/craftsman" and "medium and transcendental subject" put forward by Benjamin Buchloh is modified by Bourriaud to refigure the artist as an "entrepreneur /politician /director" (Bourriaud, *Relational Aesthetics* 108). As the central mediator in the production of relational art encounters, the artist must "*show* something [and] the act of showing suffices to define the artist, be it a representation or a designation" (108). In 'showing something', and it is difficult to know which of the two words to emphasise here, the entrepreneurial endeavour of the artist must extend beyond the economic and career imperatives of the art world to encompass some kind of social entrepreneurship. The role of the artist is to produce and demarcate these "everyday micro-utopias and imitative strategies" (31).

To break with its avant-garde forebears, Bourriaud claims that the generation of relational artists

> considers intersubjectivity and interaction neither as theoretical and faddish gadgets, nor as the auxiliaries (alibis) of a traditional practice of art. This generation takes these things as both a springboard and a culmination—in a word, as the principal informers of its activity. ("Traffic")

Yet the influence of Dada, particularly Marcel Duchamp, The Situationists, Fluxus, Conceptualism, Guy Debord and institutional critique are clear in relational aesthetics. Art critic Hal Foster argues that this new generation of artists have "transformed the familiar devices of the readymade object, the collaborative project and the installation format" ("Chat Rooms" 191). However, Bourriaud claims that they are "a group of artists, which for the first time since the emergence of Conceptual Art in the mid-1960s, in no way seeks support from the reinterpretation of a past aesthetic movement" ("Traffic"). He makes a number of contradictory claims about relational art in his attempts to contextualise it within a critical trajectory while simultaneously framing it as something entirely revolutionary. Bourriaud acknowledges that challenging the traditional teleology of art has its roots in twentieth century avant-gardism arguing that "all one has to do is simply reread the lecture given by Marcel Duchamp in 1954—"The Creative Process"—to be persuaded that interactivity is scarcely a novel idea" ("Traffic"). But then in the same essay, he claims that relational art "is not the revival of a movement or the comeback of any style …[because] its basic assumption—the realm of human relations as a setting for the work—has no example to follow in art history)" (Bourriaud, "Traffic"). Bourriaud mentions ideas in passing that have historical or

conceptual predecessors but he fails to elaborate on them or formulate any substantive connection between his selection of contemporary artists and the discursive world in which they circulate.

Bourriaud formulates his aesthetic framework from art emerging in the 1990s that was "an activity consisting in producing relationships with the world with the help of signs, forms, actions and objects" and that "art, for us, is a thing of the past" (Bourriaud, *Relational Aesthetics* 107-08). This same collective 'us' should "remain open to what is happening in the present, which invariably exceeds, a priori, our capacities of understanding" (108). Bourriaud's use of the inclusive speaking position (us) throughout the text highlights the exclusive inclusivity within his domain. This is an important but ambiguous element of the inclusive speaking position he adopts, as this has a profound impact on the relations that he is attempting to define. As Documenta 12 curator, Roger Buergel argues: "contrary to what the term relationality implies for many people in the art world, it has nothing to do with a communitarian aesthetic … it is a formal category that refers to the capacity of the subject to find its own image in the world" (3-4). Rather than seeking the other as a point of contradistinction, the viewer/participant is in fact seeking identification.

The theoretical shift toward the social realm in art was not particularly new or insightful at the time of Bourriaud's writing but it does reflect the heightened emphasis on the social as a remedial domain for a great number of political, economic and cultural problems in the late 1990s. In art historical terms, this relational turn is a reiteration of the inseparability of art from every day life that has persisted since Kant. The political salience of instrumentalising art for its social utility has shifted over time and this most recent incarnation has emphasised sensation and affect in what is perceived as a time of increasing personal detachment wrought by media technologies. In these approaches to art, the creative force of the artist is framed as being less contingent on internalised technical genius than the ability to be the lynchpin of potentially powerful social exchange.

Relational artworks are positioned by advocates as a social interstice between public and private, the everyday and the elite, the domestic and the institutional. Even when Bourriaud pre-emptively argues against critiques of the elitist contexts of relational art, his lack of acknowledgement of the political contexts of the gallery evidences his privileged viewpoint. He claims that by dismissing relational art as "a watered down form of social critique", the critics "judge the social and political content of a relational 'work' by purely and simply shedding its aesthetic value" (Bourriaud, *Relational Aesthetics* 82). Bourriaud argues that relational approaches "do not stem from a 'social' or 'sociological' form of art" and that the exhibition is in itself "an interstice defined in relation to the alienation reigning everywhere else" (82). Bourriaud wants to create new social spaces but imagines them as free of the politics that define all other social spaces. Bourriaud posits microtopias as quasi-autonomous zones outside the auspices of global capitalism and the politics of art. The potential transformative power of micropolitical action is reduced to

social encounters produced within the paragons of high culture.

Labour and the exploited other: Social Aesthetics (1999)

> The social aesthetic artwork involves a utilitarian or practical aspect that gives a
> sense of purpose and direct involvement. In the construction of the subject's
> interaction with culture it could be said that social aesthetics discusses a notion of the
> lasting phenomenon that substantiates a critical cultural analysis, a reason for one's
> existence. (Larsen, "Social Aesthetics" 77)

Lars Bang Larsen's brief article elaborates a 'social aesthetics'[2] running through the work of eleven Scandinavian artists since the 1960s. Rather than elaborating a theory, Larsen charts a "dialogue across history" through his analysis of eleven artworks to show how particular motifs and ideas have resonated across time (78). Larsen's social aesthetics hinge on the relationship between productivity and aesthetics. His framework for a social aesthetics is explained via the art practices of a number of Scandinavian artists who create functional artworks that focus on social activity and have both ethical and aesthetic effects. Stressing the disposition of the artist and viewer/participant, Larsen frames social aesthetics as "an artistic attitude focusing on the world of acts…[that] experiments with the transgressions of various economies" (77). Larsen draws on Finn Thybo and Per Bille's collaborative artwork, *The Oslo Trip* (1970) as an example of a disruptive artwork. Thybo and Bille spent their DKK8000 commission on fifty return tickets on the Copenhagen to Oslo ferry and recruited fifty young people—predominantly musicians, artists, and architects— to participate. The fifty 'readymade' artists were installed along with the Danish band, Furekåben, as an artwork on the opening night of the Young Nordic Biennial. This artwork was intended to challenge the privileging of specific types of production in art and its institutional spaces and reflects the popularity of Happenings as a form of creative disruption at the time. This artistic attitude describes "a sensibility and a practice aligned to the heritage of Fluxus and Situationism" but asserts that the familiar avant-garde dichotomy of art and life is deemed untenable and "usually hides the positioning of art in a privileged and aloof status in relation to other forms of cultural activity, however weak art may be when located in 'living reality'" (77).

Larsen shows how play can be a central element of engagement and refers to Palle Nielsen's artwork in Copenhagen's *Festival 200* exhibition in 1969 where a rifle rang, roulette wheel and an

---

[2] More recently, Okwui Enwezor has employed the term "social aesthetic" to speak about art collectives in Africa ("The Artist as Producer in Times of Crisis" 14).

off-set lithographic printing press were installed as "functioning representations of mass communication with popular appeal, imbuing the exhibition with a theme park atmosphere" (Larsen, "Social Aesthetics" 80). I suggest that although Nielsen's work focused on play as a point of productivity, the concept of the transnational art show as theme park resonates today with the plethora of travelling art shows and the showcase style spectaculars that have made the transnational art world similar to the excesses of theme park entertainments in film and music from the 1980s onward. Art as spectacular entertainment stands in contrast to art as play-based pedagogy.

Larsen focuses on Danish artist Jens Haaning's investigation into labour and production lines. *Flag Production* (1995), which involved recruiting a group of local Asian school children to sew flags for an unknown country, was Haaning's contribution to the Bourriaud's "Traffic" exhibition. Haaning's exploration of everyday production culminated with *Middleburg Summer* (1996). Haaning transported Maras Confectie's entire manufacturing facilities and its associated activity, including a canteen, office and blasting Türkü [3] and popular music, to the De Vleeshal Kunsthalle in the seaside resort town of Middleburg in The Netherlands. Here the workplace, more than just the site of production, was revealed to the viewer. Haaning argues, "social processes should happen where people are, in direct relation to what they do. But since social reproduction is in dire straits, there is a strong need for the production of participation, and for accessible metaphors of freedom" (Larsen, "Social Aesthetics" 81). Immersed but not included in the world of the factory's migrant workers, the viewer was "trespassing in foreign territory: not only an alien workplace, but a place where 'aliens' work" (81). Larsen notes the way that the *Middleburg Summer* rejects

> art's service relationship to information society. Its laconic, alienating stageplay
> resisted the communication driven prescriptions of the agents of the digital age,
> along with their (our) continual innovation of forms and modalities for the
> commerce of ideas. (82)

Larsen sees this work as the ordinarily invisible world of the migrant worker who claims the institutional space of the gallery while similarly bringing the economic imperatives of the factory into the not-for-profit domain of the public art gallery. Larsen claims that Haaning implies that there is "no freedom or actuality apart from activity and social exchange" and that the "contradiction between powerlessness and the desire to make a difference link the [artwork's] social and the aesthetic experiences" (Larsen, "Jens Haaning" 71). As such, the only freedom on offer here is self-

---

[3] A kind of Turkish folk music

focussed or social. Larsen sees Haaning's orchestration of disputes and negotiations between "different social and artistic economies" as indications of his "respect for the individual's self-esteem and desire to test his or her own sense of reality" (71). Haaning sets up a potential unsettling experience for the viewer where

> Consistency and communication aren't available assets in the contextual conflicts of the artwork, and its implicit claim seems to be that no one controls the all-encompassing, global economy, from which the average visitor to de Vleeshal has made a vain attempt to escape by going on holiday in Middelburg. (71)

Haaning's *Middleburg Summer* highlights how the very real demands of physical labour are increasingly abstracted by late capitalism's emphasis on immaterial labour. As I will advance in my case study of Santiago Sierra, these kinds of intersubjective artworks show how the West most often imagines the realities of migrant labour as happening elsewhere. Those that are potentially alienated within the gallery's institutional space perform their labour (both their factory work and their otherness) for the normative 'us' of the gallery viewer. This is the affective work at the heart of more 'difficult' intersubjective artworks, such as those produced by Haaning, and as I will show later, Sierra and Marten. These artists reveal the global underclass of late capitalism by producing their subjects as curated objects, something like the noble savages of late capitalism, to unsettle the liberal-minded viewer within institutional art space.

Empathy and Obligation: Connective Aesthetics (1992)

Suzi Gablik's 1992 essay, "Connective Aesthetics", calls for an art that responds to the renewed focus on community in culture and sees art as a pedagogical and therapeutic tool that can heal. Barely five pages in length, Gablik's framework reads more as a manifesto than a curatorial or critical positioning statement. Gablik formulates her aesthetic framework as a break with the competitive individualism that defines the art world and capitalist society in general. Written in the wake of the excess and spectacular celebrity of the 1980s art world, Gablik announces: "I no longer see my role as defending or promoting the work of individual artists. I am more interested in advancing a profound and necessary paradigm shift … away from the myth of the hard-edged, autonomous individualist that has formed the artist's identity, particularly in modern times" (Gablik, "Connective Aesthetics" 2). Gablik argues that "the highly individualized consciousness [of the art world and late capitalism] seeks to impose its own images upon the world" and as a corollary of that, "artists see themselves as quintessential free agents pursuing their own ends" (Gablik, "Connective Aesthetics" 2).

Gablik sets forth a disavowal of the relationship between the spectacular presence of the

artist and the passive, disembodied gaze of the viewer in favour of an empathic, interactive one. She perceives the Kantian notion of aesthetic distance as a negation of the social and moral obligation on the part of the artist and argues that an "art that is rooted in a 'listening' self rather than in a disembodied eye challenges the isolationist thinking of our culture because it focuses not so much on individuals but on the way they interact" (Gablik, "Connective Aesthetics" 4). 'Empathic listening' takes place within a participatory framework and the goal is directed toward finding a mutual space of shared understanding. An art that makes foundational "our interconnectedness and intersubjectivity" must have "a quality of relatedness that cannot be fully realized through monologue: it can only come into its own in dialogue, as open conversation" (Gablik, "Connective Aesthetics" 4). Receiving dialogue, or more accurately testimony, is not only an act of observation, it is also one of empathy.

In this way, Gablik sees empathic listening as reciprocal, giving "each person a voice", which in turn "builds community and makes art socially responsive" (Gablik, "Connective Aesthetics" 6). The aesthetic experience of the artworks is reciprocal and contingent on the artwork inviting dialogue and mutual empathy. As the "medium of expression", this interaction enables "an empathic way of seeing through another's eyes" (Gablik, "Connective Aesthetics" 6). This is an ambitious claim but Gablik gives a brief overview of a few community-based artworks that she argues evidence how this dialogue might be transacted. One of these is Jonathan Borofsky's prison-based video documentary *Prisoners* (1985-86). This artwork involved visiting three different prisons to observe and speak to inmates as a way to understand what the loss of freedom might means for individuals. This was communicated by interviews with thirty-two prisoners who shared personal stories and creative works that defined their life within and outside the prison. These works matter, Gablik argues, because "being heard … creates a sense of empowerment" (Gablik, "Connective Aesthetics" 4).

Another project Gablik outlines is photojournalist Jim Hubbard's *The Shooting Back* Education and Media Center program. This program grew out of Hubbard's own art practice documenting homelessness and photographing the homeless. Hubbard established a series of photography and writing skills workshops for homeless children in Washington, D.C. that were delivered by a range of professionals. This program, which ran for a number of years, was formulated to help isolated individuals find a sense of communal belonging through participation while learning a range of skills to help them express themselves. Rather than just bearing witness to those without a voice in public life, the aim is to make social space for disadvantaged groups. In effect, these artworks are consciousness-raising projects that are contextualised and framed with a mix of art discourse and the language of community cultural development. While undoubtedly altruistic in nature, these kinds of educational outreach projects risk been deployed by governmental

agents as a way to focus on self-improvement rather than instigate structural change for disenfranchised communities.

And it is notable that Gablik psychoanalytically-informed standpoint equates the shift to intersubjective and interconnected aesthetics as a "feminine perspective that has been missing not only in our scientific thinking and policy making, but also in our aesthetic philosophy, which has been based on traditions of separation and heroic independence, in which other people and the world are viewed as essentially alien forces" (Gablik, "Connective Aesthetics" 6). Empathic listening was a communication technique of active listening and 'feeling with' that emanated from second wave feminism and was popularised during the 1970s and 1980s within interpersonal communication theory. The call for openness, empathy and exchange also reflects the utopian intersubjective strategies at the heart of cosmopolitanism. The relational self at the centre of Gablik's aesthetics is contrasted with an independent self:

> The relational self knows that it is embedded in larger systems and tends toward integration" The independent self is invested in self-assertion. Both are necessary. What I am suggesting is not to abandon one in favor of the other but to find a greater balance between the two. (Gablik, "Connective Aesthetics" 6)

In a later version of connective aesthetics, Gablik posits the viewer/participant as "a more intersubjective version of the self", where "the boundary between self and Other is fluid rather than fixed: the Other is included within the boundary of selfhood" (Gablik, "Art After Individualism" 84). This mirrors in many ways Sara Ahmed's account of how the collective body is materialised (Ahmed, "Communities that Feel" 14). The idea of a collective body will be interrogated in chapter three of this thesis.

Even when disavowing the superficiality of the art world and attempting to defuse its rampant individualism, Gablik still holds up the artist as a cultural and social exemplar. In the opening part of her essay, Gablik calls for a new mythology of the artist, one requiring the cultivation of the "the connective, relational self" as a key to reconnecting the individualist gestures of the 'monocentric' artist to the social realm (Gablik, "Connective Aesthetics" 2). Notably, Gablik's plea for the artist's disposition to manifest a more interactive, *relational* self precedes Bourriaud's elaboration of his artist-directed relational aesthetics and would seem to repudiate the privilege of the art world evident in Bourriaud's institutional contexts in favour of a more community-based approach to art. However, despite their differing approaches and political aspirations for art, the explicit logic that underpins both aesthetic frameworks continues to revere the centrality of the artist—as impetus, mediator and role model—in facilitating the communication that activates the artworks and defining and contextualising their meaning.

Gablik draws on a statement by Christo to show how deeply embedded the idealisation of the artist as the personification of freedom is in the West. Of his own creative practice, Christo claims that: "the work is a huge individualistic gesture that is entirely decided by me...One of the greatest contributions of modern art is the notion of individualism...I think the artist can do anything he wants to do…The work of art is a scream of freedom" (Christo qtd. in Phillips 135). With his large-scale installations such as *Surrounded Islands* (1980-83)—which involved surrounding eleven of the islands in the Bay of Biscayne with 603,870 square metres of floating pink fabric—Christo requires substantial amounts of outsourced labour to complete his artworks. This is made explicit in the sheer size and presence of his artworks. Yet, even when acknowledging the scale of the project, Christo reasserts his authority as artist and administrative expertise in managing such a large-scale project. The Other's labour is diminished in the shadow of the artist's authoritative presence. Christo's 'scream of freedom' is seemingly managed and sustained by the unacknowledged labour of those that help realise the artwork.

Conversation and Performative Interaction: Dialogical Aesthetics (2004)

The final intersubjective framework I will cover is Kester's formulation of dialogical aesthetics. Kester's initial critical focus on socially engaged art was an interrogation of the intersection of Christian moral pedagogy, urban regeneration and the strategic deployment of terms like 'community' and 'collaboration' in community public art ("Aesthetic Evangelists"). Central to Kester's analysis was the way the issue of patronage fundamentally shapes the moral pedagogy of community-based works. This is a complicated and potentially paradoxical aspect of patronage in the current art world in which corporate benefactors can be instrumental in causing damage to the communities they in turn seek to 'help' through art. Martens explores the contradictory outreach of Unilever in chapter five. Kester, however, forsakes the kind of criticism evident in his initial analysis of community public art in favour of a more affirmative approach because he "wanted to move past critique as sheer negation…to account for the positive effects of projects that were so simple in their execution…and yet so complex in their effect" (qtd. in Wilson 108). Kester's later and more influential work, *Conversation Pieces* (2004), is an attempt to seek out and articulate a more productive engagement with socially engaged art and Kester names it as 'dialogical aesthetics'.

Kester's dialogical aesthetics are similar in many ways to Gablik's connective aesthetics, although Kester places a stronger emphasis on community engagement as activism and the potential transformational power of the art projects he chooses as exemplars. Kester argues that dialogical artworks should be judged as a conversation, as "a locus of differing meanings, interpretations and points of view" (Kester, *Conversation Pieces* 10). Kester lists a number of artists and collectives

who draw on a consultative approach in their activist art practice: Ala Plastica (Buenos Aires), Maurice O'Connell (Ireland), MuF (London), Huit Facettes (Senegal), Ne Pas Plier (Paris), Superflex (Denmark), Stephen Willats (London), Iñigo Manglano Ovalle (Chicago) and Temporary Services (Chicago). This selection covers considerable ground, both geographically and historically, but Kester argues that what unites them "is a series of provocative assumptions about the relationship between art and the broader social and political world and about the kinds of knowledge that aesthetic experience is capable of producing" (Kester, *Conversation Pieces* 9). In this way, Kester's approach is similar to Larsen's. Rather than seeing a generational shift, Kester marks out a dialogical tendency developing across time. For Kester this is also marked out across space. Rather than focussing on a particular area—such as Bourriaud's predominantly European focus, Larsen's focus on Scandinavia, Gablik's focus on the United States—Kester looks to global variants of dialogical aesthetics. Although these artists and art collectives are very much rooted in local contexts, Kester sees their work as "global in scope" and stresses that their projects defy institutionalisation and institutional imperatives as it is produced almost entirely "outside the international network of art galleries and museums, curators and collectors" (Kester, *Conversation Pieces* 9).

Kester initially developed dialogical aesthetics as a critical framework supporting the work of UK based art trust, Littoral, headed by curators Ian Hunter and Celia Larner. Littoral draws on "arts, social, cultural, community and environmental research, and employs conferences, exhibitions, projects, publications and research papers to propose creative solutions to real-life problems" (Hunter and Larner). Their role is very much a mediating one, blurring the line between artist and curator, as they function as the kind of artistic-come-social interlocutors that Bourriaud, Gablik and Kester all promote. The trust's approach stresses the 'in-between-ness' and conditional nature of the collaborative projects that they instigate and administrate, and frame their projects as hybrid, interstitial practices that function as an interface "between art and the life world … where acute social, economic, and environmental problems are increasingly redefined as an intractable 'wild zone', seemingly resistant to conventional modes of creative inquiry and professional practice" (Hunter and Larner).

In differentiating the participatory art of the 1990s from its socially engaged predecessors, Kester notes that the confluence of "old-school community art traditions" and "younger practitioners" has led to a "more complex set of ideas around public engagement" (Kester, *Conversation Pieces* 128). Larsen, Gablik and Kester interrogate artworks that favour consultation and collaboration with community and operate outside of institutionally sanctioned spaces, showing their historical foundations in cultural activism as well as art history. Many are analogous with the kinds of interactive community-based projects framed as 'new genre public art' in the 1990s (Lacy;

Gablik, "Connective Aesthetics" 4-5; Kester, *Conversation Pieces* 9). In discussing the varying approaches of dialogical artworks, Kester states that "these projects tended to be responsive to local contexts and cultures: less concerned with the creation of objects *per se* than with a collaborative process that would transform the consciousness of both the artist and his or her co-participants" (Kester, *Conversation Pieces* 128).

In these more community-based aesthetic frameworks there is a stronger narrative of performance art, feminism and community cultural development than in Bourriaud's relational aesthetics. Kester sees these kinds of engagements as art projects that "unfold through a process of performative interaction" (Kester, *Conversation Pieces* 10). Kester asks that these projects be neither judged on their aesthetic success or their formal properties nor should they be assessed on their political cogency. However, Kester still insists that the works be viewed as artworks not activism despite their overarching political principles. Despite considerable details on how dialogical artworks should not be assessed, Kester suggests that as all the artworks he focuses on are interventionist artworks engaged in communities then as such, they are open to interpretation.

Kester's focus is on the processual nature of dialogical works that function as "a locus of discursive exchange and negotiation" (Kester, *Conversation Pieces* 12). Reminiscent of both community-based art and community cultural development programs (CCD), the artworks involve collaborative projects between artist and particular groups that take place outside of the artist's studio and art institutions. These are site-specific artworks installed in places relevant to the community or group involved. Like Gablik's examples, in dialogical art the artworks function as a mediation tool primarily through documenting the social problems of particular groups as voiced by their members. The artist does not need to be engaged with the work but can function from a distance as a spokesperson or advocate on the behalf of communities in negotiations with other entities deemed central to the problem and its possible solution. Kester includes British artist Stephen Willats as an historical anchor within his dialogical framework. Willats' dialogical artworks evidence a more extensive and intimate engagement with community than most of the artists discussed in all four aesthetic frameworks outlined in this chapter.

Willats' work throughout the 1960s and 1970s reflected the more directly political engagement of community art but Willats' mode of experimentation was to embed himself within public housing estates in England, Germany and Finland. In the late 1960s, the United Kingdom sanctioned art as a public activator through their 'town artist' scheme. Town council funds were invested in the selection and employment of a 'town artist' scheme to mediate, draw from and create works specific to the given community. The scheme had flowed on from the 'success' of the self-originating community arts projects developed in urban neighbourhoods as tools of socio-cultural emancipation and self-expression but looked less to emancipate disenfranchised

communities than to forge a distinctive and attractive identity for the township. This was due to the particularly strategic enlistment of town artists by 'new towns', created to accommodate a burgeoning suburban life, to help put them on the cultural map. The projects developed in new towns like Scotland's Glenrothes[4] or England's Milton Keynes are notable for their range of distinctive public art as physical monuments, like Milton Keynes' concrete cows or Glenrothes' crocodiles and marching hippopotami.

The town artist was believed to be the key to unearthing some anticipated communal social imagination that would bring residents together while distinguishing one town from another, formulated as a conduit through which the "social imagination and collective creation" of the community members could be channelled to "express identity, concerns, hopes, and fears" (Goldbard 1). This governmentally sanctioned utilisation of community art best evidences the distinction between community and public art. Although similarly monumental in size to many emerging artworks within the institutional rubric of public art, town artists were expected to forego the more experimental and philosophical explorations of a public art in favour of some sense of communal empowerment and collective expression. Within more institutional circles, there was a critical insistence on consciousness and ethical responsibility implicit in the work of the artist within community. For artists like Hans Haacke, Adrian Piper, Martha Rosler and Willats, direct collaboration with their surroundings through community/audience participation was intended to challenge their own conceptions of 'community'—a term still synonymous with disenfranchised or self-articulated subcultural groups—as much as their audience's perception. This was a personal as much as a public exercise. These conceptually focused artists were still seeking to redefine the interactions between audience, object, and author.

By tracing the social systems and everyday acts of opposition and self-determination, he investigated the structures in place to regulate the citizens of planned urban environments such as those in government housing. He collected and displayed the portraits, interviews and assembled paraphernalia of his participants' everyday lives into visual assemblages, networks of meaning and connectedness. Rather than view these communities as cohesive clusters of alikeness, Willats made visible the everyday detritus of society's underclass. His artworks are endowed with more than just a sense of documentation but reveal the 'invisible' realities of urban life in a heavily classed environment. These works show the complexity and competing and often contradictory narratives that underpin 'community'. Willats counters the risk of objectifying the Other inherent to some ethnographic approaches to community-based artworks by his long-term commitment and

---

[4] Glenrothes was the first town in Scotland to introduce the town artist scheme in 1968.

investment in the lives of his subjects. Willats empathises with his subjects.

In many ways, Willats' performance of artist-as-interlocutor replicates accepted approaches to community art at that time but his critical engagement with philosophical strategies and the drawing out of the relational networks of his participants distinguishes his work from his peers. Willats' *Pat Purdy and the Glue Sniffers Camp* (1981) details the lives of a group of displaced youth relocated to a housing tower in London due to gentrification. The youths are physically and psychically caught between the suburban sprawl of outer-suburban London and their tenements, in the interstitial spaces of the city. They carve out a home in that 'Lurky Place', as they call it, by demarcating their territory through their strategic placement of the pragmatic objects of their everyday life. Willats aimed "to embody the collection of objects found in the camp directly in the work, and to ask Pat Purdy to write her own quotations straight on to the photographic panels connected with the wasteland" (*Between Buildings and People* 58). Purdy was then invited to Willats' studio to write her quotations and to help decide what photographs and objects would be utilised and how they would be placed. The studio-based component of the artwork took nine months to complete and required Purdy's final approval.

Kester contends that the dialogical artist's obligation is to listen and function as an interlocutor for the community, mediating the voices of the participants and the potential viewers of future documentation of the artwork. In his earlier critique of community art, Kester likens the collaborative community-based artist to a self-proclaimed delegate "who claims the authority to speak for the community in order to empower himself politically, professionally, and morally" (Kester, "Aesthetic Evangelists" 6). However, this does not mean that the artist necessarily instigates the collaboration. The figure of the artist has proven politically useful for a number of institutional bodies (galleries, museums, governmental agencies, non-profits, etc.). In "Aesthetic Evangelists", Kester warns against the re-emergence of terms like 'participatory democracy' and 'empowerment' evidenced in "the rhetoric of community artists who position themselves as the vehicle for an unmediated expressivity on the part of a given community" (Kester, "Aesthetic Evangelists" 6). This kind of community-based rhetoric has been recuperated and exploited by institutional forces for political means particularly as an expedient tool within the moral pedagogical framework of advanced liberal democracy. The rhetoric of democracy underpins the perceived usefulness of socially engaged art and is threaded through many of the underlying assumptions within the aesthetic frameworks discussed in this chapter. In Kester's earlier critique of community art, he claimed capitalism's incorporation of such concepts "must be understood in relation to the successful assimilation in the U.S. [and many other democratic nations] of conservative arguments about the underlying causes of poverty, social and cultural inequality, and disenfranchisement" (Kester, "Aesthetic Evangelists" 5). The ways in which concepts of democracy

have shifted and been utilised for cultural and political means is discussed at length in the following chapter.

Rather than undermining the potential good works that these kinds of interventions can achieve, Kester seems to be suggesting that the multiple ways in which power runs through and circulates in these environments is not being rightfully acknowledged. As Clare Doherty points out in relation to community-centred projects commissioned by large-scale art institutions: "the consideration here is not simply how the artists and commissioning biennials may have delimited the participants, but also how the nature of the collaborative relationship may have been predetermined" ("Curating Wrong Places" 5). Negotiating a position that acknowledges the paradoxes and complex politics of undertaking socially engaged art is precarious. As Kester has since noted, socially engaged art

> can never be anything but didactic, reductive, and simplistic in this account, and
> 'authentic' art is always complex, contradictory, and challenging. Any effort to
> identify or work within an existing social collectivity is suspect, and any suspension
> or critique of such identity is assumed a priori to be both ethically and aesthetically
> superior. (qtd. in Wilson 108)

The artist's creative identity must be robust enough "to speak as well as listen but it remains contingent upon the insights to be derived from their interaction with others and with otherness"; the artist is defined "through their ability to catalyze understanding, to mediate exchange, and to sustain an ongoing process of empathetic identification and critical analysis" (Kester, *Conversation Pieces* 118). Kester distrusts the therapeutic impulse evidenced in most community-based art that he defines as an "orthopaedic aesthetic" (80). This orthopaedic aesthetic centralises the role of the artist in unearthing "the hidden symbolic assumptions of their [the community's] life-world" (95). The artist's superior insight positions them as a heroic figure with the community relationship and negates any authentic dialogue and exchange. A therapeutic approach maps out a structural relation that simultaneously fixes the viewer/participant as socially disempowered and the artist as problem solving social mediator. In the work of an artist like Willats, Kester claims this is countered by being "seen less as a gift (made possible by the superior critical faculties of the artist) than as the product of a collaboratively generated insight" (95).

Within a dialogical aesthetics framework, Kester claims that all participants are positioned as equal interlocutors (just as Bourriaud does) and this is a precarious undertaking. The potentially uneven terrain between access to, and the quantifiable capital of, an art world professional is palpable in much of this art. The often profoundly disadvantaged communities in which intersubjective artists transact their art, presupposes equality amongst the community participants

themselves and this risks masking the actual power dynamics and hierarchies that function within the community. In fact, these power relations might be intrinsic to the issue being framed as problematic. When these projects are based in disenfranchised communities, the artworks take as their canvas the plight of that specific community with the artist assuming a position of psychological, social and political expertise that they may not be necessarily equipped for. In these situations there is a heightened risk of the artist over-identifying with the hardship or undervaluing the strengths of the community. When Kester claims that the artists are united by "a series of provocative assumptions about the relationship between art and the broader social and political world, and about the kinds of knowledge that aesthetic experience is capable of producing", this reveals the complexity of assumptions about these communities and the power of art to shape community at play in Kester's framework (Kester, *Conversation Pieces* 9). This a precarious element across all of the aesthetic frameworks outlined so far. Despite Kester's rejection of the therapeutic aesthetic in community-based art, he relies on the same resistant belief in art's ability to solve and shape social realities.

Acknowledging the connections between "relational practice" and "dialogical projects", Kester sees a shared attempt to "address the formation of social networks as a mode of creative praxis" (qtd. in Wilson 111). Kester even positions himself as the interlocutor compelled to speak out on behalf of socially-engaged artists because "given the disparaging attitude that many mainstream critics and historians have toward activist or engaged art practice, they're happy to have an informed interlocutor (110). Despite the proliferation of texts focussed on socially-engaged artworks and aesthetics, Kester claims it was difficult to find a publisher for *Conversation Pieces*. Although there was "no market for a theoretically informed book about activist art practice", Kester attributes three factors to the book's eventual publication: "the success of Nicolas Bourriaud's work and the significant influence of biennials as privileged venues for mainstream art, and due to the fact that younger artists and groups continue to work in this way, quite often on the margins of the 'official' art world" (110). Here, Kester highlights the importance of a discursive element to contextualise intersubjective artworks. Kester frames the artworks Bourriaud discusses as "essentially choreographed or staged; they still operate within what I term a 'textual' register, in which the work of art, whether it's an object, a space, or an event, is programmed ahead of time and then set in place before the viewer" (112). Dialogical projects, on the other hand, "involve a more open-ended form of participatory interaction, drawn out over extended periods of time" (112). All of these aesthetic frameworks and the artworks they select as exemplars are contextualised and authorised through theoretical and critical discourse.

Critiques of intersubjective aesthetics

Antagonism and consensus: Claire Bishop

To some extent, Claire Bishop's scholarship has helped define the field of recent participatory artworks. In her contentious critique of Bourriaud's relational aesthetics, Bishop questions the privileged logics that underpin Bourriaud's framework ("Antagonism and Relational Aesthetics"). Bishop has extended her focus on participatory artworks in a compendium that includes artist and curatorial statements and selected excerpts from art historical and theoretical texts to contextualise recent participatory art practices (*Participation)*. Bishop's *Artificial Hells*, her more recent work, breaks with her critique of recent intersubjective approaches to look at the development of more theatrical and performance-based participatory art practices.

Bishop begins her critique of relational aesthetics by drawing attention to the increasing elevation of the curator as the creative director and manager of the exhibition. Bourriaud's curatorial approach mirrors a number of his European contemporaries— Hans Ulrich Obrist, Maria Lind, Hou Hanru, Barbara van der Linden—who favour a 'laboratory' model (Bishop, "Antagonism" 52). This is a direct response to the interactive and durational works that came to the fore in the 1990s. Bishop frames this as a 'work-in-progress' aesthetic that came about from a "creative misreading" of poststructuralism and the 1990s emphasis on critical theory, where the artwork *itself* is deemed in perpetual flux rather than the multiple *readings* of a work of art which are open and ongoing (52). The laboratory model rearticulates the gallery and museum as "a space of leisure and entertainment" (52). This rearticulation positions these interactive spaces as more inclusive and egalitarian, distinct from the contained cloisters of the traditional gallery and museum institution.

Reframing Bourriaud's argument (*Relational Aesthetics* 18), Bishop states that relational artworks "seek to establish intersubjective encounters (be these literal or potential) in which meaning is elaborated *collectively* rather than in the privatized space of individual consumption" ("Antagonism" 54). The audience is imagined as a community produced and cohering in relation to the artwork and each other. Rather than the traditional individual relation between artwork and viewer, Bishop argues that "viewers are not just addressed as a collective, social entity, but are actually given the wherewithal to create a community, however temporary or utopian this may be" (54). Consequently, the new art-mediated community is defined by the resources provided by the artist and institution setting but also by the resources brought by and embodied by the viewer/participants. In this way, the realisation of the artwork is "entirely beholden to the contingencies of its environment and audience" (54). Within the context of the art institution or art event, these contingencies seem more manageable and less likely to provoke any tangible political

antagonism.

Physical immediacy is central to intersubjective aesthetics. Bishop claims that this dates back to the 1960s and the "premium placed by performance art on the authenticity of our first-hand encounter with the artist's body" (Bishop, "Antagonism" 54). In intersubjective artworks, the artworks are realised by the first-hand interactions of the viewer/participants bodies in relation to the artwork. In this way, Bishop argues that Bourriaud's *structures* are a descendent of installation art, an art form that has always summoned the "literal presence of the viewer" and been critically disparaged as spectacle without any conventional criteria in which to evaluate it (63). Bourriaud tries to negate conventional and social critique by outlining his own criteria for a relational artwork, a "criteria of co-existence" (Bourriaud, *Relational Aesthetics* 109). Critique is circumvented by Bourriaud leaving the success of the artwork up to the viewer/participant's decision to engage with the work or not; if the work invites the viewer/participant to communicate within the artwork and how communication might be transacted in that space (109). This vague definition, as Bishop points out, could easily be asked of all art. When relational artworks are disconnected from both artistic intention and the broader contexts in which they circulate they are merely adding to the incessant and fragmented flows of everyday life without reflecting on their relationship to it, they "claim to defer to their context … [but] do not question their imbrication within it (Bishop "Antagonism" 64-65).

Absence and complicit denial: Dean Kenning

Dean Kenning argues that despite claims of the openness of relational artworks there are only two real options open to the viewer—engagement or nothing. Kenning develops this by arguing that a preoccupation with "*external* exclusions" risks overshadowing the social, economic and political antagonisms existing *within* relational artworks (437). Without conflict there is only authoritarian domination. Kenning and Bishop align on this point. However, Kenning admonishes Bishop's later claim that "there can be no failed, unsuccessful, unresolved, or boring works of collaborative art because all are equally essential to the task of strengthening the social bond" (Bishop, "Social Turn" 180). Although Kenning acknowledges Bishop's good intentions, he argues that ultimately she is reducing art to an "insipid inclusivity" that is depoliticising (440). With reference to Ranciere's argument that "the essence of equality is not so much to unify as to declassify, to undo the supposed naturalness of orders and replace with the controversial figures of division" (*On the Shores of Politics* 32-33), Kenning argues that the antagonism that emanates from the push toward equality "must take root from below" (440). This mirrors the more minoritarian understandings of cosmopolitanism that are outlined in the next chapter.

Central to Kenning and Bishop's critiques of relational aesthetics is Bourriaud's lack of

engagement with the very real politics of art's institutional spaces. Bourriaud constructs a political paradigm from which relational artworks emerge from to act upon the social but he fails to interrogate or even acknowledge the very political conditions in which relational artworks are circulated, or the nature in which their relations are produced. Despite the taking up of relationality as a popular theme in curatorial and pedagogical programs, Bourriaud's claims of relational art's inclusive and progressive aesthetics seem to celebrate the participants' relations without any critique of what kind of relations are being prescribed and produced by these artworks. Kenning alludes to their not so tacit privilege when he asks, "is anyone able to participate in an event, or interact with a piece of work, or only those invited to a private view, or the person who owns the work? Are the relationships in any way meaningful, or do they feel contrived, or even coercive?" (437).

Kenning counters Bourriaud's claim that microtopias are alternatives to the commodified spaces of late capitalism and neutral spaces that allow atomised subjects to become unified and cohesive subjects within intersubjective artworks (435). He argues that the proliferation of participatory art practices has occurred concurrently with an increasing competition and expanded individualism within the transnational art world (Kenning 435-46). The expanded discursive field in which intersubjective artworks circulate evidences the renewed focus on communication and participatory art as therapeutics to address the undesirable effects of globalisation. This field includes an extensive array of artist's books, art anthologies and theoretical texts, as well as blogs, online databases, culture-focussed leisure and social media (magazines, travel guides, entertainment pages). Then there are the public engagements of the artist, critic and curator who offer their expertise within the art, educational and other cultural sectors.

Although Bishop's and Kenning's critiques focus solely on relational aesthetics, I see these criticisms intersecting with aspects of all the intersubjective frameworks discussed in this chapter. Despite the perceived open address of intersubjective artworks, they address very explicit publics, particularly when transacted within art-sanctioned spaces, such as galleries, museums, and the transnational circuit of large-scale, cyclical survey exhibitions. And despite attempts at egalitarian outreach, educated and middle class audiences primarily frequent these institutions. The institutional 'we'—artists, curators, gallerists, critics, and collectors—are still positioned outside the 'everyday' cultures that these works are formulated as an action against. The art world suffers little from exhibiting uncomfortable artworks; in fact, it prospers from them. They appear as novelty in curatorial programs and inspire critical dialogues and publicity within an ever-expanding line up of transnational art shows. This element of discomfort, labour and complicity is a central element of the work of Sierra, Martens and Linnert, all discussed at length in the case studies of this thesis. All three artists draw on and problematise intersubjective art approaches through a cosmopolitan lens,

and in doing so they suggest potential meaningful ways for art to act on the social.

A Fightback: Gillick, Kester and Bishop

The competitiveness of the art world is evidenced by the critiques and counter critiques that define its discursive boundaries. There is a lot at stake for all those involved, particularly in establishing critical authority within the competitive domains of the artworld. This might be best evidenced by Bishop's criticism that Bourriaud's selection of artists in *Relational Aesthetics* would be "familiar to anyone who has attended the international biennials, triennials, and Manifestas that have proliferated over the last decade [since the 1990s]" ("Antagonism and Relational Aesthetics" 55). Bishop's aggressive critique of Bourriaud's approach and the tacit privilege that underscores it has elicited responses from a number of art professionals with a vested interest in relational aesthetics and its conceptual relatives, such as Kester and Gillick. Kester and Bishop's to-and-fro rebuke played out in the front pages of *Artforum* and Gillick and Bishop's exchange in the letters and responses section of *October*[5].

Gillick admits that Bourriaud's theory is fraught with contradictions and problems, particularly as he posits a

> tag-team face-off between the rather melancholic avant-gardism of Thomas
> Hirschhorn and the somewhat exploitative reflections of the dominant culture that
> are reinforced by Spaniard Santiago Sierra, pitched against my own convoluted,
> occasionally opaque and imploded practice and Tiravanija's production of sites for
> the examination of exchange and control (and eating and drinking and playing table-
> football). ("Contingent Factors" 153)

Gillick emphasises the utopian aspect of Bourriaud's [and his] work when he defensively argues critiques of the over-positivistic utopian claims of relational aesthetics: "it is clear that we are going to have to work hard to find new progressive models in a text that instead relies on melancholy and failure in art as a comforting reinforcement of existing social models" ("Contingent Factors" 155).

Gillick's response to Bishop is extensive—eleven pages long including lengthy footnotes. He is known for this kind of loquaciousness, as essay writing is an element of his art practice. The tone evident in Gillick's response reads as a personal attack on Bishop at times, revealing a stark sense of entitlement and arrogance. This also taints the critical counterarguments he sets up to

---

[5] Gillick republished his response to Bishop as an essay, "Contingent Factors", which I reference here.

discredit Bishop's critique of relational art. Gillick's letter begins by questioning Bishop's authority to produce art critique that meets the "usually high standards of *October*" due to her previous career as a journalist for the *Evening Standard* ("Contingent Factors" 151). In response to a perceived diminishment of the seriousness of his work by Bishop, Gillick's response is blatantly sexist. He denigrates Bishop's position as both sexualised *and* popular. Whereas Bishop dismisses the artwork of Gillick and Tiravanija, Gillick claims that Bishop gives a …

> breathless description of her experience of works by two more artists, Hirschhorn and Sierra, both of whom are men: it seems as if Bourriaud is not the only one who has *failed to learn the lessons of feminist practice and critique from the seventies*. Both artists have clearly titillated the writer and activated her journalistic taste for art that supposedly upsets or disturbs the dominant system. [emphasis added] ("Contingent Factors" 155)

Gender is a salient issue in relation to intersubjective art practices, particularly in relation to Bourriaud's framework. Intersubjective artworks draw on a genealogy of feminist practices that were developed to counter the masculinist archetype of the artist as heroic figure—such as the call to arms approaches of Gablik's connective aesthetics. However, these relational practices, particularly when they are produced within the elite art world, are increasingly elaborated in a way that reconstructs the hero artist, now imbued with the seemingly softer masculinity of advanced liberal democracy. The softer sexism that underpins Gillick's essay to Bishop is particularly telling. Gillick implies that he is 'more feminist' than Bishop because she has failed to learn the lessons of her second wave foremothers, with the implicit subtext that Gillick has. Gillick instrumentalises feminism as a means to denigrate and shame Bishop's position, in the process revealing more about his own empowered position and the tacit engendered codes of who has a right to speak and how within the art world. As Gillick alludes to in his attack on Bishop, there are very few women artists mentioned within *Relational Aesthetics* and feminism's legacy is noticeably absent.

In fact, Bourriaud presents the 'contemporary artist' as a universal, cosmopolitan figure without any real reference to race, sex or class. Like art history, social and cultural politics are easily absented from Bourriaud's analysis. Bourriaud's white, highly-classed male habitus could not be more evident than when he dismisses "feminism, anti-racism and environmentalism" as "the most die-hard forms of conservatism" (*Relational Aesthetics* 61). To Bourriaud, these are obsolete ideologies that bind us to our identities when the "aura of contemporary is a free association" (61). Our real world affiliations and responsibilities will seemingly get in the way of realising Bourriaud's neutral social structures. Gillick and Bourriaud make their privilege clear by framing Otherness as a kind of cultural motif best understood in relation to how it affects the deportment of

the self.

> We are currently experiencing the glorious degradation of *boundless subjectivity*,
> and this is normal, essential and also a by-product of the politics of identity, which
> compels us to understand more and more stories. This tension between difference
> and the collective interests me. The fact that we are *obliged to recognize differences*
> and that we carry simultaneously a sense of collectivity within us. [emphasis added]
> (Gillick qtd. in Jocks 181)

It is unclear here whether Gillick is referring to less bounded subjectivity brought about by the dominance of affective, service-centred labour in late capitalism that have blurred the divisions between private and public life. The tone of his statement seems to be much more celebratory, echoing the assumption that underpins Bourriaud's approach, that late capitalist subjectivity is marked by endless freedom of choice when it comes to self-formation. But seemingly endless choice in late capitalism has created a surge in anxiety, insecurity, stress and depression. These "affective dimensions" underpin a "(neoliberal) common sense" where people are instructed that "greater freedom and personal choice" are primary responsibilities so that "not only are we given 'freedom to choose', we are required to choose" (Hall and O'Shea 11-12). In this sense, Gillick seems to be suggesting that the Other's social and cultural difference are a kind of embodied knowledge resource that we must become familiar with. Otherness is experienced and acknowledged as a way of working on and improving a self that is potentially atomised by the technological proliferation. The normative subject at the centre of Gillick's understanding of late capitalism speaks to the logic of his and Bourriaud's politics.

Gillick argues that Bishop rejects relational aesthetics because she has been taught "to reject such a substitute auratic object, yet she returns again and again to a desperate search for the singular auratic signifier to covet and assess in the manner of an enlightened collector in search of a 'souvenir' to retain from the work of an interesting and socially conscious artist" ("Contingent Factors" 159). Gillick ignores the symbolic experience of Tiravanija's work and the subsequent commodification of the work's documentation that are by their very collectable nature, marked as souvenirs. Gillick sees this as an attack aimed squarely at Tiravanija and himself. He claims that Bishop's harsh critique of his and Tiravanija's work while she "proudly reports Hirschhorn and Sierra's feelings of hopelessness in the face of the dominant culture and turns their words into a populist assertion that 'art can't change anything'" is a distinctly political ploy (154). Gillick claims that Bishop's "journalistic taste for art" is titillated by art that attempts to upset or disturb

> the dominant system, playing on a petit-bourgeois hunger for art that either

humiliates or taunts its human material, as well as for art conceived as an easily
exchanged conceptual singularity that can be simply described and therefore passed
on to weary insiders in search of some new form of amusement in the art context.
(155)

To Gillick, Hirschhorn and Sierra "are being used", just as they have "used working-class people;
they are employed to bulldoze the houses of their relatives, because Bishop can't make sense of the
prime suspect's [Bourriaud's] testimony" (154). Vehemently arguing his case, Gillick frames
Bourriaud as a prime suspect in what he perceives as Bishop's illegitimate accusation. This
argument reveals the political assumptions that underlie the logics of relational aesthetics. To
conflate the privileged position of Hirschhorn and Sierra with the disadvantaged and vulnerable
subjects of their artworks, reveals Gillick's somewhat naive perspective of the socio-economic
realities that underpin Hirschhorn and Sierra's subjects. For Gillick, to frame Tiravanija,
Hirschhorn, Sierra and himself as 'relatives' speaks directly to the positioning of the artist as the
originary centre of relational artworks and as the definers of the institutional we that Bourriaud
draws on throughout his text.

Conclusion

The field Bourriaud defines—social relations framed as aesthetic relations—lacks clarity
and precision and consequently, the terms 'relational' and 'relationality' have been taken up as a
theme in art and deployed to suit any number of institutional and curatorial specificities, mostly
related to audience engagement and art's usefulness in bridging the gap between the world of high
culture and the everyday. This emphasis on the social power of art in turn bolsters the value of the
art event as a means of outreach. The perceived waning of human kindness is attributed to a deficit
in face-to-face social encounters and the idea of bringing people together through cultural
intervention is framed as a meaningful political response. Bourriaud claims that relational art
focuses on "a set of artistic practices which take as their theoretical and practical point of departure
the whole of human relations and their social context, rather than an independent and private space"
(*Relational Aesthetics* 113). Bourriaud's subsequent curatorial essay, *Postproduction* (2002),
attempts to clarify the social autonomy of the encounter opened up in a microtopian interstice.
When he claims that "encounters are more important than the individuals who compose them"
(*Postproduction* 49), Bourriaud implies that the process of movement—the in-between-ness of the
journey—is more important than the point of departure or the destination. It is as though the
microtopia is a shared journey that allows the subjects to unanchor themselves from their varying
social contexts to become something Other for the duration of the work. Not only does this
contradict his earlier claim that human relations and their social contexts are the locus of the work

but when Bourriaud implies that an artwork can somehow catapult the viewer out of all of their social contexts, he reiterates the same utopian aspiration that he claims to reject.

Bourriaud's abstract and vague explanation of relational aesthetics has been extensively critiqued and I have drawn on two of these critiques to support my own critiques of relational aesthetics and the other three intersubjective frameworks discussed here. I have shown that the social spaces and encounters produced by intersubjective artworks are inherently political. The formulation of microtopias, interstitial spaces and 'conversations' does not counter the uneven terrain of the intersections of art and everyday life. Despite art's symbolic centrality in the flows of late capitalism, these aesthetic frameworks place art and its institutions as the locus of a new radical small-scale politics to act on the social without interrogating how these socially-engaged artworks represent and shape particular ways of understanding and engaging with the world. Just as work has become an extension of our social lives under post-Fordism, our social relations have become [self] work. Particular "technologies of the self" (Foucault, *Technologies of the Self*; Rose, *Inventing Our Selves*) are deployed that appear to ameliorate or work on large-scale political and economic problems through intersubjectivity often as a kind of talk therapy. A genealogy of the ways that culture has been formulated as a social curative within liberal democracy is discussed at length in the next chapter.

When Bourriaud claims that "the artist dwells in the circumstances the present offers him, so as to turn the setting of his life into a lasting world" (Bourriaud, *Relational Aesthetics* 14), he touches on two salient points: the artist's life in itself is enacted as an ongoing performance, a point that I will elaborate further in chapter three; and, the artist has learned to make the most of 'his' privileged position within late capitalism. Rather than attempt to change structural impediments and inequality, the professional artist has learned to live within them. So we can see that instead of being outside the machinations of the spectacularised and commodified, post-Fordist service economy, the transnational art world exemplifies the commodified relations of advanced liberal democracy. Art, in all its institutional settings, produces the "kind of commodified relations that isolate even as they bring people together – art as entertainment, leisure, marketing opportunity, financial investment" while simultaneously suggesting to artists (and viewers) the possibility of a meaningful intervention in the everyday world outside the art world via the "networked, resourced and highly visible infrastructure made available to artists" (Kenning 435).

But this approach is evident across all four of the aesthetic frameworks discussed in this chapter. All the intersubjective frameworks outlined here advocate the forging of convivial and open relations as a dialectic response to the excessive commodification and fragmentation of the art world and everyday life. Consequently, the somewhat celebratory discourse surrounding these artworks takes on a descriptive rather than critical format. This risks reducing the *content* of the

artwork to the *formal* qualities of the artwork. This disavows any potential transformational power of the social relations produced within the artworks. By emphasising relations and communication themselves as outcome and form, the assumption that this communication will lead to consensus overrides the accommodation of *bad* outcomes. In this sense, intersubjective aesthetics conflates *all* social relations as *good* social relations and thus leaves little room for dispute. This is most notable in the institutionally located artworks but also in problematic areas where the artist has been commissioned to troubleshoot. In these areas, there may be no interactivity at all. Not acknowledging dissent belies the interconnectedness of antagonism and utopian strategies because without utopian thought "there is no possibility at all of the constitution of a radical imaginary—whether democratic or of any other type" (Laclau and Mouffe 190). Dissent and debate are central to recalibrating the democratic utopianism at the heart of capitalism.

Chapter 2

Cosmopolitanism, self-regulation, and the redemptive power of culture

In this chapter I show the how a particular conception of culture has come to be meaningful in advanced liberal democracies, particularly as a mode of self-actualisation and as a medium through which populations can be regulated and improved. In interrogating the processes and historical shifts of citizenship and the shaping of art as socially transformative, I scrutinise how contemporary individuals are constituted as ethical citizens intrinsically defined by their activity as mobile cultural agents. To do so, I draw on Nikolas Rose's expansion of Foucault's theory of governmentality to explore how governmental practices have long used the idea of culture as a transformative tool and how the role of art and the artist remain intrinsic to conceptions of creating solutions to broad socio-economic problems and regulating social practices as ethically normative. Finally, I explore the recent re-emergence of cosmopolitanism as a moral stance. To do so, I give a brief outline of a number of general socio-cultural shifts that have taken place since the post-war period that have changed the way subjectivity is imagined and realised in liberal democracies. I then show how a cosmopolitan attitude, as a response to those shifts, imagines that communal wellbeing can be realised through an individual's self-realisation brought about by experiencing unknown others. This elaborates a cosmopolitan disposition that I believe is embodied in the practices of the intersubjective artist and the subjectivities that they produce. These subjectivities are elaborated at length in chapter three.

Culture is "produced under particular political and economic conditions, through collective activities that are socially organized" and consequently, any perceived sovereignty of the individual and their cultural formations is contingent on a host of assumptions about the subject and their social bonds that are highly problematic (Hall, Neitz and Battani 158). The importance placed on culture at the beginning of the twenty-first century is not the consequence of some natural evolution of human subjectivity but rather the effect of governmental technologies. Rather than countering the effects of capitalism, identity and culture are harnessed as devices through which we make sense of the world without drawing on the structural relations of the past, such as race and class. In this way, culture and identity have come to mean everything and nothing simultaneously, and the once strong distinction between culture and society has been obscured.

The distinction between the social and cultural was traditionally stressed through the effective power of one on the other (Bennett, T. "Acting on the Social"). However, recent conceptions of the social world reposition culture as the central locus of contemporary citizenship

and identity and as the central organising system through which social interaction takes place. As "the medium in which the public sphere emerges in the eighteenth century…[culture] became a means to internalise social control (i.e. via discipline and governmentality) throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries (Yúdice 10). This reconsideration of the relationship between culture and the social, and the conflation of the two, has seen a potentially exaggerated capacity attributed to the power of culture in remedying social problems. In this way, culture has become a therapeutic tool of sorts applied to any number of broad structural problems. This is evidenced throughout the intersubjective art frameworks outlined in the previous chapter. However, this is not a recent phenomena; the expediency of culture as a tool of governance is an historically specific process dating back to the nineteenth century and correlating with the emergence of the liberal democratic individual (Rose, *Powers of Freedom*; Bennet, *Birth of the Museum*). Today's advanced liberal democracies constitute cultural citizenship as mobile and multifarious, framing individuals as consumers of their own identity, knowledgeable and strategic about their allegiances, singular and collective in their actions (see Bauman; Urry; Beck). As I will show later in this chapter, these tenets are central to cosmopolitanism.

The significance of the 'cultural turn' in advanced liberalism cannot be overstated. The conflation of industry and culture in the 'creative industries' of post-Fordist life has seen 'creativity' increasingly deployed as a synonym for both industrial innovation and all forms of social activity (Gill and Pratt 2-3). Initially conceived of as a vehicle of empowerment for disenfranchised and minority groups, social science scholars sought to elucidate the creative potential of people's lived realities (see Hoggart; Williams). 'Creativity', as a social practice, substantiated the varying negotiations of identity across class and race and imbued some 'invisible' groups with reflexive agency. This was an explicitly political strategy. Working from a Leftist framework, scholars, artists and activists set out to contextualise working class and minority cultures as sites of resistance and accordingly framed identity as a distinctly creative and polemical construction (see *Resistance Through Rituals*). The idea of a creative 'Refusal' was central to the development of subcultural studies and a more inclusive approach to cultural studies at the Birmingham Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies (CCCS) in the 1970s (see Hebdige, McRobbie, Willis). All matter of forms of self and communal expression have come to be understood as creative acts and creativity has become the nexus through which social, cultural and economic acts and processes are understood, reflecting the degree to which entities are imagined as mobile and constructed. Central to the idea of a constructed and creative identity is a self that is actively engaged in exercising choice over its individual and collective identities, a flexible self that appears to be the result of a continuing process of enlightenment and autonomy (Rose, *Inventing Our Selves* 17).

The relationship between art and liberal forms of governance has undergone a number of

shifts over the last 150 years. As polities strategically 'take up' civil society's rights-based discourse, primarily conditional on the freedom of the individual, culture has become an expedient medium for speaking to, for, and about their citizens. Art, as a means of self and community expression, mediates and educates ideas about the world to specific and strategic publics. The underlying logics of liberal democracy empower art as a regulatory 'divining rod' able to elucidate problems that construct different social identities and communities (Bennett, T. "Acting on the Social" 1415). Despite generational shifts in the conceptualisation of these social groups and theoretical challenges to the legitimacy of varying articulations of liberal democracy, art remains intrinsically linked to the disciplined and self-reflexive practices of contemporary liberal polities (1415). As a legitimated cultural form, art has become an instrument of governmental intervention 'from a distance' (1416). Looking inward and backward, art represents and reflects on its temporal and spatial place in a trajectory of ideas about humanity and within the framing of institutional 'shows', collections of art interrelate ideas about the communal and relational contexts of humankind.

However, despite creativity and cultural expression being pursuits of self-actualisation, the strong moral pedagogy that underscores art as a means of self *qua* communal improvement requires regulation by particular kinds of expertise. Despite a discursive emphasis on democracy and participation, advanced liberal democracy is dependent on, and idealises, the exceptional individual. In this way, art serves as a 'practice of freedom' performed by 'experts of subjectivity' harnessed by a multitude of forces as a way of thinking about, judging and acting upon ourselves and ultimately, exemplifies how "power works through, and not against, subjectivity" (Rose, *Inventing Our Selves* 151). Artists, as experts of culture, and more recently a range of other psychosocial fields, emulate and regulate particular kinds of behaviour and ways of thinking about the world. In local contexts, artists might be deployed to troubleshoot problematic populations and zones or as a means to disseminate a range of experiences and practices to new populations and communities through cultural tourism (Bishop, "Antagonism" 53, 61). Artists are celebrated for both critiquing and exemplifying the systems in which they operate and circulate (Fraser, "From the Critique of Institutions").

Cosmopolitanism and its discontents

A renewed focus on cosmopolitanism emerged as the twentieth century drew to a close. The term was first introduced in the writing of Greek philosopher Diogenes, who claimed, "I am a citizen of the world [*kosmopolitês*]" (Laertius 63). However, rather than a commitment to a global politics of difference and hospitality as in later understandings of cosmopolitanism, Diogenes was instead indicating his sense of diminished obligations to his home city. His cosmopolitanism figure

felt no sense of obligation or affiliation to tether him in place. In the late eighteenth century, cosmopolitanism was again taken up and developed. As a philosophy, cosmopolitanism promoted an open-minded and impartial attitude, the disposition of an urbane, relatively detached traveller who felt neither local affiliations nor cultural prejudices. Kant's embrace of the concept in the late eighteenth century has proven particularly popular as a point of both agreement and dissension in more recent theories of a contemporary cosmopolitanism. Written after the signing of the First Treaty of Basel between Prussia and revolutionary France, Kant's essay, *Perpetual Peace*, ponders the inevitably of war and what a truly democratic republic might be like. Kant imagines three definitive articles vital to achieving human unity and world peace, the third of which outlines the hospitality at the centre of a cosmopolitan ethic:

> Hospitality means the right of a stranger not to be treated as an enemy when he arrives in the land of another. One may refuse to receive him when this can be done without causing his destruction; but so long as he peacefully occupies his place, one may not treat him with hostility. It is not the right to be a permanent visitor that one may demand. A special contract of beneficence would be needed in order to give an outsider a right to become a fellow inhabitant for a certain length of time. It is only the right of temporary sojourn, a right to associate, which all men have. They have it by virtue of their common possession of the surface of the earth, where, as a globe, they cannot infinitely disperse and hence must finally tolerate the presence of each other. (Kant qtd. in Benhabib, *Rights of Others* 27)

Kant touches on the transience of the relations at the centre of cosmopolitanism and stresses that the sojourn is only temporary. The cosmopolitan figure is allowed to pass through and be tolerated "so long as he peacefully occupies his place" (27).

Cosmopolitanism, as a philosophical and dispositional framework, is contingent on a citizenry of mobile and ethically compelled individuals, whose openness and generosity presumably distinguishes them from other articulations of liberal democracy. Cosmopolitanism as an ethico-political framework is held up as a way to offer citizens the possibility of new and diverse experiences and knowledges, and the opportunity to "learn more about ourselves" through a shared sense of openness (Nussbaum, "Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism" 11). Cosmopolitanism as an ethico-political framework is held up as a way to offer citizens the possibility of new and diverse experiences and knowledges, and the opportunity to "learn more about ourselves" through a shared sense of openness (11).

Vertovec and Cohen identify six understandings of cosmopolitanism: as a socio-cultural category; as a philosophical position; as a political strategy to establish transnational institutions; as

a political strategy for acknowledging multiple and fluid identities; as an attitude or disposition; and, as set of competencies and practices (8-20). These six ideas are interconnected and overlap. Delanty folds these varying understandings into three distinct conceptions of cosmopolitanism: political cosmopolitanism, moral cosmopolitanism and cultural cosmopolitanism (Delanty, "The Cosmopolitan Imagination" 28). Moral cosmopolitanism is the strongest variant and is reflected in more philosophically centred humanitarian arguments that mirror the objectives of intersubjective art outlined in the previous chapter. Cosmopolitanism and its corollary adjective, cosmopolitan, are often used interchangeably with multiculturalism and multicultural but these two concepts do not align. Cosmopolitanism should be differentiated from multiculturalism by an emphasis on a more affective engagement with the other. Cosmopolitanism is an "empathetic gesture of social inclusion" (Nava, "Domestic Cosmopolitanism" 44).

Just as cosmopolitanism and multiculturalism are distinct concepts, so too are cosmopolitanism and cosmopolitanisation. Recent re-workings of cosmopolitanism come at a time when some people have enormous freedoms and mobility, both economically and geospatially, while other people's movement is limited, coming as a result of seeking economic security and/or personal safety. This distinction between voluntary and forced movement is an important one. Beck draws a sharp distinction between cosmopolitanism, as an elite Eurocentric discourse, and cosmopolitanisation, as a socio-political process intrinsically linked to the mechanisms of globalisation and global risk. Cosmopolitanism as a set of philosophical principles cannot be simply applied to societies because the very real forces of cosmopolitanisation limit its ethical aspirations. Cosmopolitanisation is an "enforced cosmopolitanism", one of the processes of expanding global capital, which forges transnational connections and relations between once extraneous and not necessarily sympathetic agents (Beck, *World at Risk* 61).

But that does not mean that cosmopolitanisation and globalisation are necessarily interchangeable. Beck and Sznaider argue that globalisation is something occurring "out there" while cosmopolitanisation takes place "from within" the nation state (9). These people do not choose this kind of cosmopolitanism, as an outlook or disposition, but rather it is thrust upon them as an effect of the movement of global capital. Cosmopolitanisation is a notable aspect within the artwork of my three major case studies: Sierra, Martens and Linnert. In a European context, cosmopolitanisation attempts to forge a unified European identity by undermining national identity markers and distinctiveness through its absorption and celebration of differential identities. However, the distinctiveness of national and regional identities continues as these affiliations are strengthened by the perceived fear of their negation and a cosmopolitan attitude, despite its global outlook always emanates from those with the security of a home. It is this aspect that reframes cosmopolitanism as always locally defined, however universal its aims (Brennan, "Cosmo-Theory"

660). I argue here that contemporary forms of cosmopolitanism are simultaneously governmental forms that have emerged in response to globalisation and the rise of the individual following the collapse of Bretton-Woods and the political individualism that emerged from the dissolution of that post-war political settlement.

Culture as discipline

A central principle of the Enlightenment was the employment of art as a tool of moral guidance and regulation. Kant's faith in reason (*aufklärung*) located the quest for some ultimate ontological truth through the detached observation, education, and heightened awareness of the self (Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*). Although spiritual and moral in aim, this quest for transcendence was understood s entirely secular. Kant's critique distinguishes between two cognitive capacities that work symbiotically to produce judgements: 'sensibility' (*sinnlichkeit*) as "the passive ability to be affected by things by receiving sensations, not yet at the level of thought or even experience in any meaningful sense" and reason or 'understanding' (*verstand*) as a discursive capacity working with "general concepts, not individual intuitions...the active faculty of producing thoughts"(Crawford 56). Kant argues that in producing thoughts, individuals made judgments that indicate their own tastes and their knowledge of the broader domain of aesthetics. Kant advocated detached observation as a cultivated and educative tool that hindered over-emotionality and improved social interaction, shifting 'illumination' from religious worship to the acquisition of wisdom through contemplation, education and self-awareness (Kant, *The Critique of Judgement* 1-2). Through an appreciation of aesthetics, individuals would become self-aware and capable of exercising self-control, an intrinsically moral power. Although Kant's reason emphasised rationality and self-control, the body's capacity to register sensorial engagement—sensation, feeling, imagination, desires, affects, intuition—was central.

By the nineteenth century, the idea that aesthetic engagement was a means of self-improvement had moved beyond philosophical enquiry into the realm of state and civil governance. The opening of museums as public institutions in Britain in the late nineteenth century was a strategic move to guide citizens, particularly the male working class, into refraining from drunken and reckless behaviour that jeopardised familial and community bonds (Bennett, T. "Acting on the Social" 1414). Culture, through its authoritative presence, was advocated as a tool of transcendence capable of turning even the most uneducated and 'brutal' of men away from their amoral behaviour to a space of contemplation. Although the promotion of museums as a public entertainment to rival less savoury amusements was not new, it was the emergence of quasi-democratised cultural institutions as an act of approved and public good and the belief that art was capable of enlightening and enabling the uneducated and poor that is most notable.

The transformative power of art had come to be understood as deeply personal and internalised, fostering moral behaviours and capable of producing self-regulating, moral citizens who worked hard toward the betterment of themselves, their families and the state (Bennett, "Acting on the Social" 1413). Within the newly accessible space of the nineteenth century museum, exemplary conduct was represented and celebrated through depictions of individual and collective pride for all citizens. The museum's role was primarily moral pedagogy targeted toward the working class (Bennett, *Birth of the Museum* 90-91). While the nationalist platform of Romanticism among Western nations supported the state's collectivising aims, its aesthetics offered a twofold space of improvement: as a visual cue for the perfection idealised in the artwork, and through the cultivation and acquisition of specific philosophical and moral knowledges and practices (100). The marriage of ethics and aesthetics was advanced through the idea of self-contemplation and civic relations. This understanding of culture as a source of self-improvement and social betterment remains markedly resilient despite much theoretical work to the contrary (Becker 52).

Despite the aims of museums and galleries as purveyors of some 'truth' of humanity, the 'power' of the art exhibition is consistently subject to criticism and the 'politics of art' remain a central theme of creative and theoretical work. The differing perceptions of art are mediated by the institutional mechanisms that legitimate art as a locus of value—both economic and symbolic—and the ways that value is calculated reflect the field in which it is located. Throughout the twentieth century, dialectical debates played out about the commodification of art in opposition to some 'purer' artistic expression. While antagonistic, both drew on Enlightenment ideals regarding the auratic power of art. The idea that an artwork's aura evokes an almost mystical aesthetic quality that could be contemplated and ultimately known dates back to Kant. The auratic distance of an artwork makes it desirably unapproachable, sustaining its authenticity uniqueness and cult value (Benjamin, *Illuminations* 224-25). Bourdieu, working from and clarifying Benjamin, correlates the symbolic with the economic, stating that the utilisation of an aura for art established its commercial conditions of circulation (Bourdieu, *Field of Cultural Production* 113-14). However, the line between art, commerce and community are increasingly fluid and interconnected. Recent understandings of the locus of value in intersubjective art, including contemporary articulations of auratic power, will be elaborated at length in chapter three (Bishop, "Delegated Performance" 95).

In its most exclusive form, art is the domain of an elite community who are equipped with an understanding of a specific set of knowledges and practices. But this is similarly true of community-engaged art. When art is transacted as a means of individual and community empowerment capable of entertaining, educating and activating citizens, there are assumptions about the audience's capabilities to engage with the artwork and the possible outcomes of the work. The conceptual division between art as a site of capital investment and art as a democratic tool of

pure expression has diminished as art has proven extremely useful as a curative and social activator in the creative economy of neoliberalism. Although art is often perceived within two interrelated binaries (art/commerce and high art/community engagement), Curatorial processes—what is selected as art and how it is displayed—are never neutral.

The development of art galleries as commercial entities evidences the growth of art as a market force in the earlier twentieth century. Museums and galleries now form a distinctive part of urban regeneration as emblems of national spirit. As national agents compete with global and local rationalities, art becomes a means of national distinction and cultural diversity (Bennett, "Acting on the Social" 1421). This opens up a space of cultural rationalisation where capitalising interests intersect through the matrices of rights and representation, and the belief in transcendence through art sublimates the institutional transactions at work (1421). This seems like decidedly familiar terrain. In the nineteenth century, most art museums resulted from "private initiatives rather than being the result of clearly articulated public arts policies…[but] all owe their existence, to a large extent, to private funds or donations from the rich" (Wu 21). A notable example is England's Lady Lever Art Gallery, which will be elaborated further in relation to my exploration of Renzo Martens in chapter five. However, even when publicly funded, the state's interests were similarly pedagogical. Bennett, Emmison and Frow draw on Bourdieu to condemn the public funding of cultural institutions which "far from delivering a general benefit to all, deliver a selective benefit of distinction to those who are equipped, by their social and educational formation, to make use of them" (230). Today, the market of cultural tourism dictates to some extent the content of exhibitions, changing the content but not necessarily the context of its reception. This is particularly true of curatorial decisions in relation to transnational art shows as purveyors of both symbolic and economic prestige for the sites in which they are located. Finding new problematic or abandoned areas to (re)colonise in the name of art and tourism is an ongoing factor in planning large-scale art exhibitions. Sydney Biennale's use of Cockatoo Island and Hirschhorn's series on immersive installations, such as *Bataille Monument* (2002), speaks to this.

Mary Kelly argues that the educative aims of institutionalised art have changed as the "exhibition as a system of meaning aimed at educating the 'good citizen' has been displaced by the tendency to entertain him" (242). To Kelly, the increasing emphasis on spectacle 'dis-locates' art as an educative resource about citizenship, and relocates it as a site of (not necessarily less meaningful) pleasure. However, rather than seeing these two aspects—moral pedagogy and entertainment—as two separate aims they have been increasingly brought together through an ethical turn that reinstalls art (and culture) as problem-solving 'communication' (Lui 227). Indeed,

the emphasis on educational programmes within cultural institutions attaches an authority to any number of entertainment-focussed programming that sit alongside them[6]. This reinvigorates the Enlightenment's emphasis on liberty and reason through a performative ethics centred on a revision, or more appropriately an evolution, of the tenets of liberal democracy. The nexus through which these two apparently disparate concepts come together is through formulations of the self. In constructing culture as a remedial locus for an increasing list of social, environmental and economic problems, culture has become both the source and the channel through which ideas of the self and its world/s are produced and disseminated. By interrogating the historically specific circumstances in which the logics of liberal democracy reflect, shape and transform notions of selfhood, a more lucid comprehension of the power of art as a vehicle of regulation can be developed.

The rise of the self and political individualism in liberal democracy

How the individual, community and citizenship are imagined within liberal democracy correlates with conceptualisations of the self and other in art. By charting a number of general socio-cultural shifts that affect most liberal democratic populations, I will show how they produce and shape particular subjectivities. These subjectivities are evident in both the articulations of the cosmopolitan subject of advanced liberal democracy and the intersubjective art practices that have emerged since the mid-1990s.

'Democracy' is commonly understood as liberal democracy, and the contemporaneous range of processes intended to emancipate and empower are implicitly liberal inventions. For the latter half of the nineteenth and the first seventy or so years of the twentieth century, liberal democracy was generally State directed (Foucault, "Governmentality" 103; Rose, *Powers of Freedom* 18). Late twentieth century formulations of democracy have advanced ideas about the rights and freedoms of the individual to act as an autonomous subject invested in its own realisation and capitalisation in the name of a communal wellbeing that is not necessarily State-centred. Rose's expansion of Foucault's concept of governmentality is helpful here. Rose is concerned with the particular terrain of "knowing and acting" that coincides with the emergence of "regimes of truth" that sanctioned the 'conduct of conduct': "the invention and assemblage of particular apparatuses and devices for exercising power and intervening upon particular problems...[and] to act upon the conduct of others, or oneself, to achieve certain ends" (Rose, *Powers of Freedom* 19). The general socio-cultural shifts

---

[6] Two of Australia's major state galleries—QAGOMA and Victoria's NGV—have a music curator who develops a musical program to accompany major exhibitions and to bring larger, younger crowds to the gallery on Friday evenings.

in conceptions of subjectivity reflect the interrelatedness of systems of governance and how changing ideas of the self are embedded in a reflexive relationship between institutional regulation and individuals. These shifts indicate a culturally specific historical trajectory of practices that have normalised a teleological belief in the self as a site of ontological realisation. By conceptualising the self as the key to an ultimate 'truth' of humanity, the search for metaphysical meaning inherent in modern life has become an internalised and individual project.

By the late nineteenth century, governmental critics were arguing for a more equitable system than the 'pastoral' approach of nineteenth century liberalism that had fragmented 'problematic' individuals into a life of unmanageable disenfranchisement. Freedom was increasingly framed as an ideal aspired to by all despite overwhelming social and economic disparity and the logics of a capitalist state that articulated individual sovereignty through the auspices of the marketplace. With the 'emergence' of the individual from its collective bonds and 'needy' citizens forged out of national populations, a welfare system with benefits to remedy social problems could potentially assist the creation of 'good' citizens within institutionally regulated processes that would moderate the integration of its subjects (Rose, *Powers of Freedom* 27). Nations realised that their aim of building better citizens would be best served through the implementation of specific welfare mechanisms that fostered a national spirit. In the earlier part of the twentieth century, national spirit had revolved around industrial management and women's role in the production of healthy (both morally and physically) and responsible future generations. By operating a paternal and pedagogical system, governments collectivised individuals into single territorial polities by instituting intricate normative practices that created a "space of regulated freedom" (Rose, *Inventing Our Selves* 164). Just as museums were instituted as a means of moral transcendence and training, welfare also served a calculable moral purpose in the way it shaped normalised family structures and common national goals. It was in the articulation of the nation as a source of social care and wellbeing rather than merely defence that the public and private lives of citizens were opened up to governmental regulation through the premise of benefit and protection.

Considering how strikingly differently the 'welfare state' was realised across national paradigms, Rose suggests it may be more useful to think of this technique of governance as "from the social point of view" than as an historical marker within liberal democracy (*Powers of Freedom* 130). This approach quashes any reticence about the historical effect of such a political framework and accommodates ongoing debates around citizenship, ethics, and democracy especially in light of increasing globalisation and the resurgence of nationalism. I think it is more helpful to consider this 'social style' of power as being one particular articulation of an overarching narrative of liberal democracy rather than an historical 'phase' to be superseded by newer modes of communal regulation. However, the idea of a welfare state, regardless of its temporal and spatial incarnations,

remains a resilient trope of governance and intrinsic to political platforms across party lines. Governments are expected to provide for and protect their subjects and it is the name of welfare – whether financial, social and existential – that subjects are constructed.

After World War II, welfare benefits were a socially accepted 'hand up' payment to help counterbalance obvious class disparity and give the 'less fortunate' an opportunity to become better citizens. By the 1980s however, welfare recipients were no longer seen as less fortunate, but rather undesirable citizens, pushed outside the margins of 'society', and becoming not only economically but also criminally and morally problematic (Rose, *Powers of Freedom* 100). Obviously, marginalised others have always been placed central to the freedom on offer in liberal democracies but it was how readily the disenfranchised became problematised as inactive, dependent and out of control that distinguishes the post-war period. This reflected the increasing rationalisation of larger economic, social and political inconsistencies as the responsibility of individuals rather than the polity as a whole. In analysing the still obvious class disparity in this post-war period, welfare policies 'dammed up' class conflict by encouraging a "continuous rise in the standard of living" (with accompanying advantages) and conceiving a new set of social divisions that intersect with the old and ultimately defuse struggles over distribution (Habermas, *Lifeworld and System* 348-50). Disenfranchisement was articulated less as a class issue and more as an issue of individual responsibility. This shift went across political boundaries, dominating left and right arguments, placing the individual at the centre of their own world, self-responsible, self-capitalising, and self-actualising. Activists both within and outside the academy had pushed for recognition of citizens as active and distinct entities, more capable of self-regulation than assumed within the post-war political system. It was through the initially radical movements of identity politics that the individual emerged as an articulated self, a coherent force with rights and freedoms more diverse and ambitious than the national paradigm on offer.

The 1960s and 1970s evidenced growing dissatisfaction from citizens about manifestations of power in society, which directly related to identity and systems of regulation. Society was becoming a questionable 'reality'. Grassroots activism and theoretical work both attacked the authenticity of systemic collectivising, and produced 'tactical' subversive codes in response (de Certeau xix). With an emphasis on subjectification, traditional allegiances were disputed in favour of self-identified collectivities beyond national and familial bonds. Through the nexus of self-realisation, people turned inward to find answers to the problems that had been traditionally 'solved' through the regulation of moral conduct. From the 1960s, a culture of the self flourished, promising individuals emancipation from the social constraints of the previous generation through an inward interrogation of ontological questions in a time of increasing secularity and national instability. As an implicitly political mobiliser, identity politics developed through a platform of

social justice, seeking equality and recognition for those identities deemed deviant or invisible in society. Through the act of making visible, a radically inclusive democratic landscape was imagined. An expanding, educated middle-class was searching for meaningfulness in a time of dislocated national narratives, global instability, a burgeoning consumer culture and a now adult baby boomer generation.

As a more cynical engagement with long-held national and political imaginaries emerged, artists, scholars and activists increasingly questioned the role of the 'obedient' citizen and even the creative heroes that demarcated cultural history. New understandings of identity came to the fore as individuals began to seek an identity through exploring the external and internal forces that shaped them. People's affiliations diversified and belonging to and being with particular social groups were often proving more meaningful than traditional obligations. Particular social groups became the focus of political art—usually defined along ethnicity, gender and class lines—and were often framed as being emblematic of the problems with post-war liberal democracy under expanding capitalism. Despite a more contextual approach to the study of culture, it was through interrogating the varying social roles of collective domains that social behaviour and performance became central to political discourse. Identities conceptualised through gender, race, ethnicity and later, sexuality, were articulated in opposition to the mainstream Eurocentric ideal perpetuated through Western history. A fear of the different and the unknowable had proven central to sustaining the us/them paradigm of Cold War governance. In the era or civil rights, after nearly a hundred years of normative classification, some citizens were challenging a system of government that promised public freedom at the expense of personal liberty. The adoption of a psychoanalytical term—the Other—into the analysis of cultural phenomena became a powerful trope, particularly in postcolonial societies (Said, *Orientalism*). Interrogating what the 'not-me' and the 'not-us' are of any society defines the normalised subjectivities of any cultural imaginary. More sophisticated arguments emerged that, although still primarily discursive, questioned the totalising media landscape of everyday life.

The sociological concern with group narratives gave way to the more personal concerns of psychological discourse in the arts and the academy, as internal life became the focus of analysing the self and *all* its social communications. As both individualising and collectivising, the rationalities instigated by identity politics hinged on multiple loyalties that in combination served to distinguish individuals from each other while also collectivising them in non-traditional communities. Incrementally, identity politics had fought to have all citizens recognised, as independent and with democratic rights granted accordingly. These rights were increasingly constituted as individual and elective. By the 1980s, essentialist models of cultural groups, particularly feminism, were being challenged by models of difference that evidenced the diversity

within commonality but also fragmented the power of a cohesive political force. The emphasis on memberships of choice highlighted the ability of individuals to 'name' themselves, to articulate their own points of identification and begin to practice a more active politics of the self. Identity was becoming something self-defined. Second wave feminism's claim that "the personal is political" seemed to foreshadow the conflation of private and public life (Hanisch; Ahmed et al. 12). At this point, representation and visibility became major issues in art, particularly in terms of how identity was inscribed on the artist's body and their actions (Auslander 59-63). Performance art introduced a more affective engagement, as the auratic object had become the artist herself. Installation art and participatory models have continued to dominate art practice corresponding to increased professionalisation within the transnational art world. As explicated in the previous chapter, affect and immaterial labour are central themes in intersubjective art.

Neoliberalism and expertise

Although contentious during the 1960s and 1970s, by the 1980s the political articulation of self-regulation offered governments an escape clause from the increasing financial burden of a welfare system, especially as populations grew and the gap between 'the haves' and 'have nots' was expanding (Rose, *Powers of Freedom* 140-41). Margaret Thatcher and Ronald Reagan both embarked on 'reinvigorating' democracy through institutionalising the 'responsibility' of the individual and shifting the States political role from that of caretaker to manager (142). The rhetoric claimed that the State could govern better by less intervention. This new incarnation of liberal democracy necessitated dismantling welfare infrastructures to accord citizens the 'right' to structure their life as the "pursuit of a range of different enterprises" (Gordon, C. 42). The loyalty of the populace was increasingly forged through social welfare mechanisms that emphasised individual wellbeing and self-realisation. These disciplinary techniques could be "checked as to fulfilment", downplaying the role of the individual as a 'citizen' in favour of their role as a 'client' (Habermas, *Lifeworld and System* 147-50).

Although the concept of 'self-help' was an elementary factor of nineteenth century liberal democracy, neoliberalism moved away from both the traditional collectivist formations (friendly societies and trade unions) and the individualistic ethico-philosophical practices (sobriety and moral enlightenment) of early liberal democracy to initiate a distinctly political economic model that encouraged individuals to become entrepreneurs of their own lives. Freedom was reimagined; "no longer freedom from want, which might be provided by a cosseted life on benefits…[but as] the capacity for self-realization which can be obtained only through individual activity (Rose, *Powers of Freedom* 145). This incorporated an individualist economic rationale into the discourse of rights and freedoms. Promising and protecting individual interests, the constrained freedom of

neoliberalism framed citizens as consumers of their own authority, able to make choices and act upon them, while moderating any potential infringements on others' rights:

> The erosion or dismantling of public and communal provision of health, education
> and welfare services associated with economic restructuring and the turn towards
> post-Fordist, flexible forms of capital accumulation is one of the contexts, if not, for
> some, *the* context, in which the idea, and the necessity, of individuals looking after
> themselves, making choices and thereby supposedly assuming more responsibility
> for their care and their fate has been increasingly advanced. (Smart 78)

The self had become an internal site of power to be interrogated, realised, and maintained, which posited subjectivity as a site of both work and pleasure, correlating with the shifting goals of 1980s liberal governance. Since the articulation of specific cognitive and ethical imperatives into the scientific discipline of psychology in the late nineteenth century, the self had been central to a shifting range of political realities. These shifts have normalised problematic assumptions about society through the institutional 'evaluation' and 'care' of individuals; first as dependent subjects of welfare, and by the 1980s, as independent subjects of enterprise (Rose, *Powers of Freedom* 138). Psychology helped normalise ideas of 'civility' through pathologising 'improper' behaviour and framing people's internal worlds as both the problem and possible solutions, if only there was a concerted effort in realising the self (Rose, *Inventing Our Selves* 159).

During the 1930s, the Frankfurt Institute of Social Research theorists had attempted to integrate psychoanalysis with Marxism through analyses of class, socio-political beliefs and familial structures (Adorno et al., *The Authoritarian Personality*). Horkheimer framed the central argument of their key investigation into family and the workplace as an attempt to

> understand why a society functions in a certain way, why it is stable or dissolves
> demands therefor a knowledge of the contemporary psychic makeup of men in
> various social groups. This in turn requires a knowledge of how their character has
> been formed in interaction with all the shaping cultural forces of the time.
> (Horkheimer 54)

Erich Fromm's psychological analysis of authoritarianism to a degree informed the Frankfurt School's argument that the fear of social and economic instability restrained the behaviour of the bourgeoisie and sections of the working class (*Escape from Freedom [Fear of Freedom]*). Although somewhat sidelined as a result of the rediscovery of Gramscian hegemony theory by Stuart Hall and many of the scholars associated with the CCCS, the marriage of psychoanalytical readings of social and political behaviour, particularly those of Lacan, Irigaray, and Deleuze and Guattari, would

dominate Leftist theoretical debates well into the 1970s. This complicates readings of professionalised 'know-how' as a tool of the Right. The interpretive and organisational authority of psychology has been legitimated by the institutionalisation of codes of behaviour across political domains so that psychosocial discourse has been normalised, enforcing a diagnostic gaze to everyday life (Rose, *Powers of Freedom* 85).

With the public and private realms transformed by the varied and contradictory ethical obligations within advanced liberal democracy, a new understanding of the social emerges. Social performances are increasingly imagined as the consequence of personal choice and everyday life is framed as a 'way' of life. In this context, national citizenship has become just one element of identification, and a highly contentious one at that. The emerging active and interventionist citizenry of advanced liberal democracy has compelled institutional agents to take up the rhetoric and ideas of micropolitics into everyday contexts to 'contain' polities, elaborating more specific and individualised technologies for shaping human conduct and making cultural citizenship central to the idea of democracy (Rose, *Powers of Freedom* 5).

'Micropolitics' is a term with many, often contradictory, definitions but I use it here in its most basic form: as the political principles that arise from the interactions of small social groups often referred to as single issue groups or contemporaneously, communities. Rather than counterposing micro to macro, micropolitics are best understood as the cumulative agents of macropolitics that mediate relations between individuals and macro agents (Latour 120-1). Race, religion, sexuality and gender have been splintered and combined into more divergent categories that evidence increasing social fragmentation, interpreted variously as both a 'lack' of identity and a more 'dense' and complex process of identification. Micropolitical techniques "recoil back upon subjective dispositions and intersubjective understandings", providing new issues to be internalised, problematised and acted upon (Connolly, *Neuropolitics* 18). So with left and right ideals increasingly conflated, issues of individual sovereignty and perceived mobility situate a more fluid self as the moral basis for all social, political and economic platforms. In this formulation, community functions as an organising framework. Acknowledging this more complex system of governance, political issues are no longer framed in the binaries of left and right as much as right and wrong, as ethical choices regulate a citizen's conduct through the types of citizenship they exercise, the communities they inhabit and their level of engagement (Rose, *Powers of Freedom* 167).

The political, institutional and ethical dimensions of government highlights the interrelatedness and effectiveness of micro agents in regulating citizens, particularly in contrast to the theories of domination in bipartisan rhetoric (Rose, *Inventing Our Selves* 152-53). The link between these three dimensions is through a culture of enterprise and expertise that pits entities,

whether social, political or personal, in competition with each other for resources. Individuals are encouraged to think and act strategically, to harness their potential capital for the sake of themselves and the greater good so that the potentially destructive 'deviant' in society is no longer defined by disenfranchisement but by laziness (Rose, *Powers of Freedom* 238-39). Rather than interrogating the contextual factors of adversity, limits had become markers of personal ineffectiveness rather than structural socio-political barriers. During the 1980s and 1990s, welfare policies were renounced through two disparate arguments that both centred on the inactivity of the citizen. Economic conservatives argued that poverty resulted from the "moral inferiority" of individual workers rather than the result of systemic structural unevenness in "capitalist labour markets" (Kester, *Conversation Pieces* 132). Meanwhile the Left argued for less paternalistic governance and instead a system that encouraged mobility and activity.

Expertise is intrinsic to this logic. In a society "saturated with psychological narratives" of the self and its varying relationships, being taught how to scrutinise and pathologise everyday interactions is learning how to be 'good' citizens (Rose, *Powers of Freedom* 91). These narratives are not merely the domain of mass media; expertise offers a distinct authority to all claims of knowledge. The professionalisation of experts of 'the social' demarcates a diagnostic landscape outside the realm of everyday reality (Rose, *Powers of Freedom* 141). The dominance of psychosocial discourse since the post-War period evidenced the accessibility of emerging cultural forms in need of a higher educative aim than mere entertainment.

For example, by the 1980s, televised talk shows with an explicit expert and a 'troubled' subject reclaimed the home as the dominant site to pathologise behaviour and act upon the self. As a "particular kind of social authority…deployed around [social] problems, exercising a certain diagnostic gaze, grounded in a claim to truth, asserting technical efficacy, and avowing humane ethical virtues", expertise ratifies heterogeneous concepts into utilitarian frameworks (Rose, *Inventing Our Selves* 86). The expansion of the interdisciplinary field of political psychology demonstrates the progressively sophisticated expertise involved in evaluating how psychology is used to map the ways people think about democratic processes and make political choices when shaped by an increasing employment of heuristics, affect, core values and moral principles in political reasoning. The ethico-philosophical discourse and practices that ground the social aims of intersubjective art evidence the distinctive moral authority of the artist-as-expert of diagnosis and expert mediator of social problems.

The professionalisation of self-work negated claims of narcissism and helped authorise the 'responsibility' implicit to individual capitalisation as a public act of ethical goodness (Rose, *Powers of Freedom* 139). In this discursive formation, to know, love and believe in one's self is to achieve the ultimate state of being. Through discovering, assessing and transforming the internal

workings of the self, an ontologically separate self was imagined to distinguish between the 'present' you and the 'potential' you. Increasingly the emphasis was on the "relationship of the self being performed to the self performing" (Carlson 38) and an ontologically separate self was inherently knowledgeable but somehow disconnected from us through a lifetime of 'performing' for others instead of 'being' ourselves. This separation of self from itself produces a somewhat confusing relational ambiguity that frames *all* problems as somehow psychological. The pathologised subject of the welfare state has been remade in the image of the enterprising client of neoliberalism so that 'good' citizens were now "all consuming selves…[and] all-consuming selves" (Simonds 15). The road to success is through self-realisation by maximising choices and tapping an inner potential so that what had begun as a distinctly left-wing approach (see Fromm) had coalesced into the psychosocial economic rhetoric of neoliberalism that had become markedly familiar. Aspiring to but never quite achieving self-actualisation, the self is imagined as a trajectory of in-between states, of permanent immanence, an idea taken up in both cosmopolitanism and intersubjective approaches to art.

Since second wave feminism first challenged orthodox ideas about the power of the personal lives of individuals, the conventional dichotomies of politics have had to be re-evaluated. The politics of representation, defined by a myriad of social, political and cultural identities, have defined a new political terrain that questions the efficacy of traditional forms of government in defining and acting on societal problems. This 'ethical politics' refuses citizen deference to state-centred party politics, focusing instead on the transformative power of individuals, families and communities to "take back to themselves the powers and responsibilities that, since the nineteenth century, have been acquired by states, politicians and legislators" (Rose, *Powers of Freedom* 2-3). Although this shift appears revolutionary, it is part of an historical trajectory that has incrementally changed the emphases of liberal democracy from collective to individual, from welfare recipient to entrepreneurial self and, more contemporaneously, from moral subject to ethical citizen with multiple communal allegiances and responsibilities.

From the 1990s onwards, parties on the centre-left have also advocated the 'less is more' style of governance, adopting the conception of a 'third way' politics of "the radical centre" to interpret neoliberal ideals in a social democratic platform (Giddens). The third way approach is a 'hands off' type of governance (Rose, *Powers of Freedom* 167). As a managerial model of government, it is imagined and promoted as a kind of impersonal, professional space, which reinforced the client/expert relation within liberal democracies. The 'success' of neoliberal policies such as "trade liberalization, privatisation, the reduction (and, in some cases, near elimination) of state-subsidized social services such as health care and education, the lowering of wages, and the evisceration of labor rights" have been factored into the left's political attention, shifting away

"from the takeover of state power (which in many cases has not resolved the question of sovereignty) to issues of civil and human rights and quality of life" (Yúdice 5).

Adapting the language of civic and rights-based activism, a third way politics aims for "a new relation between the individual and community, a redefinition of rights and obligations…no rights without responsibilities…no authority without democracy" (Giddens 64-67). Claiming a "commitment to social justice…but flexible, innovative and forward-looking", Tony Blair's treatise on the topic mediates between the polarised "new right's" free-market individualism and "old left's" state-centred collectivism (Blair 1). No doubt the renovation of neoliberal ideas as "capitalism with a human face" reflects the political focus on civil society, community and rights, distinguishing the increasing emphasis on 'values' (Rose, "Inventiveness in Politics" 469-70). The third way logic is that quality and opportunity come through responsibility and community, forging a social contract based on a reciprocal power relation between sovereignty and obligation. Polities, united now through shared 'values', are mapped by secular belief systems contingent on moral reciprocity and an outward-looking practice of the self.

Civil society and cultural citizenship

All 'meaningful' actions have been transformed into resources in the service of a knowledge economy that places a premium on 'knowing'. As Castell argues:

> new power lies in the codes of information and in the images of representation
> around which societies organize their institutions, and people build their lives, and
> decide their behavior. The sites of this power are people's minds. (*Power of Identity*
> 425)

The conception of an 'information age' where technological advances enable advanced understandings and mediations of culture and citizenship is prevalent in contemporary theories of social trends (see Castells, Stevenson, Chaney, Beck, Bauman, Lash). Culture, as the consequence of a specific set of social processes and relations that mediate the conduct of citizens and institutions, is increasingly complicated by the expansion of transnational networks that '*un-fix*' traditional conceptions of society and citizenship. Accordingly, theories of citizenship have been transformed to accommodate these more complex understandings of culture and identity, highlighting the "need to link the struggle for rights and social justice with the quest for recognition and cultural respect" (Stevenson, "Cultural Citizenship" 331). An individual's cultural freedoms have become among the most salient of democratic rights despite cultural rights being the most ambiguous of all the human rights (Yúdice 21).

Advanced liberal democracy advocates freedom through the auspices of an empowered civil

society, where the multiple associations, parties and groups that constitute its institutional core (Habermas, "Further Reflections on the Public Sphere" 453) expand, restructure and democratise governmental actors in the name of equality and liberty (Flyvbjerg 211). As the foundation of his enlightenment theories, Kant placed obligatory civil duties as the public facilitation of knowledge and reason but the disputable instrumentalisation of these rationales in the name of progress and teleological 'truths' can transform 'myths' into 'realities' (Horkheimer and Adorno 9). Contemporaneously, the increasing pluralism of authorities and range of multifarious expertise on offer, locates the secular authority of civil society firmly in the personal domain and on a global scale. These global contexts are localised through an emphasis on community so that distinguishing between "ethics (questions of what's right for me) and morality (questions of what's right for the community) means that the public sphere is continually involved in a process of determining what can reasonably be decided by the community and what can not" (Stevenson, "Cultural Citizenship" 335).

Community is just as strategic as any other governmental concept, situated as "zones to be investigated, mapped, classified, documented, interpreted…to be taken into account in numberless encounters between professionals and their clients, whose individual conduct is now made to be intelligible in terms of the beliefs and values of 'their community'" (Rose, *Powers of Freedom* 175). These zones are increasingly defined and regulated through the auspices of a therapeutic aesthetic, articulated as social problems that require mediation by cultural experts. By "opening up a moral surface within the individual as the interface through which…[culture] acts on the social" the complex institutional mechanisms of a burgeoning civil society foster an ethical politics that centres on the comportment of the individual in their various individual and collective circumstances (Bennett, T. "Acting on the Social" 1419). Human beings are no longer regarded as social, rational or psychological, as they were in previous liberal democracies, now they are regarded as intrinsically ethical beings. This internalised aesthetic affects the way individuals imagine community and how publics are formed. Community is the "new ethical space in which people are supposed to find their well-being" (Yúdice 332). The moral pragmatism that grounds these contemporary articulations of democracy positions the individual as an ethical citizen with unprecedented choices, constituting a kind of mobility that presupposes freedom.

In the wake of European Community expansion, transnational identities are imagined in contradistinction to the hegemonic matters of state, their multiple, overlapping citizenships dis/connecting them from local, national, regional and global governments (Stevenson, "Cultural Citizenship in the 'Cultural' Society" 47). The imagined collapsing in of traditional citizenship containers, best understood as the local/national/international tripartite, has elicited a litany of theoretical work on cosmopolitanism and new social formations. This work questions the shifting

power dynamics of governmental and non-governmental agencies when cultural citizenship and civil society have become primary means of understanding contemporary life. Mapping a global domain demarcated by fragmented but networked communities, these theories look forward to imagine a wholly inclusive polity free of traditional socio-political containers that reflects the utopian thinking underlying the more optimistic articulations of cosmopolitanism. But, the imminent death of the nation-state appears to be quite premature. The recent revitalisation of nationalist rhetoric and pride in the face of increasing globalisation shows how the fear of a loss of national sovereignty is still a powerful trope when called upon to bring citizens together in spite of growing heterogeneity.

The assumptions of advanced liberal democracies hinge on the belief in the power of the ethical individual to participate in transformative acts that better themselves and others in a globalising world where the reach of the individual extends outside national borders into 'transnational' space. Transnational logics, such as those of an expanding European Community, see personal mobility as a way to "create space[s] for communication" between individual, communities and nations (Delanty and Rumford 68), although arguably, those groups precluded from the most basic of rights are excluded from this 'space'. Mapping transnational "flows" and "mobilities" (Urry, *Sociology Beyond Societies*), "liquid modernity" (Bauman, *Liquid Modernity*) and "entangled modernities" (Beck and Gane 145) define movement as both an internal and external rationality. The belief in a transnational space of democratic communication is a persistent trope of new theories of 'the social'. Differentiated from society by its use as a qualifier for political means, 'the social' is being increasingly replaced by 'community', as both a modifier and spatial zone within a patently ethical domain (Rose and Gane 80). Some theorists see this shift as a timely reinvigoration of politics through a social lens (Beck, *The Reinvention of Politics*; Bauman, *Culture as Praxis*; Giddens) as the 'reflexive' nature of modern life. Constant reflecting on how and who one is and "how one governs" (Rose and Gane 173) are central to these analyses, discerned as both macro and micro rationalities. The perpetual questioning and search for some truth of the world is what distinguishes an ethos of Enlightenment.

Lash, Giddens, Beck and Bauman see an advanced, reflexive or liquid modernity, with a number of agreed assumptions. Firstly, that the goals of modernity have been realised and modernity has now turned on itself. Secondly, a sense that globalisation has caused traditional institutions to be dissolved or fragmented, for example, the nation-state giving way to a sense of globality, the family breaking down due to flexible working conditions and women's achievements outside of the home, and a general sweeping loss of belief in the political system. The shifting shape of these institutions is undeniable but their demise has been somewhat overstated. Another shared assumption is that this is a period marked by increasing individualisation and precarity. Beck

defines this as a stage of modernity marked by risk (*Risk Society*). This is a time in advanced liberalism marked by anxiety about safety relating to personal, social and financial security. However, risk is not distributed equally but rather, much like wealth, is distributed and dispersed unevenly so that the conditions of the present and the wellbeing and lived reality of some is seemingly sacrificed for what is imagined as some future common good.

New cosmopolitanisms

In an attempt to imagine a more inclusive cosmopolitanism, one that operates 'from below', a number of approaches have been formulated to place minorities and marginalised identities at the centre rather than at the borders of a cosmopolitan society. Qualifying adjectives distinguish between a number of cosmopolitanisms, with adjectival variations such as 'discrepant cosmopolitanisms' (Clifford), "vernacular cosmopolitanism" (Bhabha, *Location of Culture*), "subaltern cosmopolitanism" (de Sousa Santo) and "rooted cosmopolitanism"(Cohen), "cosmopolitan patriotism" (Appiah, "Cosmopolitan Patriots") and a number of other "comparative cosmopolitanisms" (Robbins). All approaches share a generalised understanding of cosmopolitanism as a practice comprising an obligation to a set of universal principles that acknowledge and respect local differences. Minoritarian formulations of cosmopolitanism are a response in part to the substantial flaws in the anthropological assumptions that underpin Kant's cosmopolitanism.

Homi Bhabha envisages a vernacular cosmopolitanism founded in minoritarian formations, such as gender, race, class, generation, sexuality. Arguing against the dominant view of sovereignty as a nation-centred citizenship, Bhabha stresses that an emphasis on majoritarian identity limits an individual's sense of belonging to minoritarian formations as a secondary relation (Bhabha, *Location of Culture* xvii). This hierarchy naturalises the problems of citizenship. Bhabha suggests that a vernacular cosmopolitan would consider a "right to difference in equality" as a process of constituting emergent groups and affiliations has less to do with the affirmation or authentication of origins and 'identities', and more to do with political practices and ethical choices" (xvii). The fluid nature of identity is similarly elucidated in Bhabha's adoption of hybridity as the in-between state or 'third space' of transcultural formations (53-56). The formulation of a space outside the politics of everyday life mirrors the in-between space or interstitial space imagined in the approaches to intersubjective art discussed in chapter one. The idea of an interstitial or third space created by the coming together of fluid identities emphasises the liminal nature of the imagined relations of both cosmopolitanism and intersubjective art, forged through the subjectivities in process and in action. These spaces are sited at the intersection of public and private life yet they are marked by their separation from them, partly to accentuate the formation of a 'new' register but also to distinguish a

perceived step away from the binaries that have come to demarcate contemporary life, economically, politically and culturally.

Mehta maps out a similar understanding of cosmopolitanism but stresses that encounters may not forge hospitable connection but rather amplify disconnection (22). He discerns cosmopolitan dialogue as an affective discourse, centred on the possibility and mutual hope that shared exchanges will enhance understanding even when encountering disconnection and unassimilable difference (22). In cosmopolitan relations, the cosmopolitan figure

> enters a dialogue with the unfamiliar and accepts the possible risks of that encounter. Those risks include the possibility of being confronted with utter opacity—an intransigent strangeness, an unfamiliarity that remains so, an experience that cannot be shared, prejudices that do not readily fuse with a cosmopolitan horizon, a difference that cannot be assimilated… making it no more than a conversation between two strangers… the cosmopolitanism of sentiments. (Mehta 22)

By acknowledging the potential failure of communication, Mehta attempts to ground his approach to cosmopolitanism in a more pragmatic understanding of antagonism, discomfort and even shame. The negative emotions and bad feelings that might arise from these encounters is an important element of the affective dimension of intersubjective encounters that I take further in the following chapter.

Another approach that attempts a more inclusive approach to cosmopolitanism is that advanced by Kwame Anthony Appiah. Like Mehta, Appiah advocates establishing a dialogue through which consensus can be reached regarding the foundations of our ills. Appiah promotes respectful dialogue between individuals and communities, who share common goals but may have dissimilar beliefs, to forge a better understanding and tolerance of each other's differences. He stresses that people have a considerable amount in common "in abstraction across the global moral view" and what often appears like moral disagreements might actually be struggles about power and desires, in the same way that reconsiderations about morality are not necessarily precipitated by moral decisions (Appiah, "Cosmopolitanism: An Interview"). The premise is that difference and conflict leads to mutually beneficial dialogue that will in turn impact the greater good. Acknowledging the inherent contradictions and complexities in the processes of cosmopolitanism, Appiah suggests a form of cosmopolitanism that practices "universalism + difference" as a kind of shared moral outlook that is global in its focus ("Cosmopolitanism: An Interview"). This formulation of cosmopolitanism emphasises a type of inclusive, global citizenship contingent on a collective moral community, a community that upholds that all citizens are entitled to their multifarious lifestyles and beliefs.

Appiah venerates pluralism and acknowledges that "there are many values worth living by and that you cannot live by all of them…we hope and expect that different people and different societies will embody different values" (*Ethics in a World of Strangers* 144). Like contemporary theories of the social, Appiah's cosmopolitanism envisions a multivalent society populated by culturally omnivorous people adept at engaging with their own and other's cultures. Drawing on his own experience of a life lived in Ghana, England and the United States, Appiah shows his adept grasp of global cultures as he compares and contrasts the experience of urbane, Western life with that of small tribes and discrete cultures. He highlights the limits of cultural belief systems by showing that what passes as rational for some groups might just as easily pass as superstition for another ("Cosmopolitanism: An Interview").

Appiah maintains that accord already transpires regularly in our multitude of collective socialities and is reflected in how we empathise with others despite their differing beliefs and choices ("Cosmopolitanism: An Interview"). He conceives of kindness as a metaphor for openness and mutuality but within the realms of the advanced liberal democratic imaginary that he champions. Appiah stresses how individuals are obliged to take care of each other but within limits. People are intrinsically partial in the way that they tend to care more about those that they share communities and practices with and, so Appiah argues, rather than advocating indiscriminate liberalism that risks becoming paternalistic or 'culturally blind', cosmopolitanism should commit to "baseline obligations so that everyone has the right to get what they *need* not necessarily the *best* of what they can have" ("Cosmopolitanism: An Interview"). Here, he places parameters around the kind of freedom on offer within his seemingly grassroots approach to cosmopolitanism. Needs will be met but exactly who defines what those needs might be and how they might be met is not elaborated. True emancipation is seemingly self-constructed and meritocratic; cosmopolitanism comes through self-actualisation. This affective terrain of this 'needs-based' aspect of Appiah's approach is not particular elaborated at any length.

Appiah elaborates a global society where *"everyone* is a rooted cosmopolitan, attached to a home of one's own, with its own cultural particularities, but taking pleasure from the presence of other, different places that are home to other, different people" ("Cosmopolitan Patriots" 618). And in Appiah's utopian world, the cosmopolitan figure realises that "not everyone will find it best to stay in their natal patria, so that the circulation of people among different localities will involve not only cultural tourism (which the cosmopolitan admits to enjoying) but migration, nomadism, diaspora" ("Cosmopolitan Patriots" 618). In framing all global flows and relocations as choices made in light of 'not finding it best to stay in one's homeland', Appiah abstracts, even romanticises, the global processes that fragment communities and necessitate itinerancy and displacement. Thus, the romantic figures of the nomad and the cultural tourist are conflated with the figures of the

refugee and the migrant displaced by the destabilising forces of globalisation.

The spatial dimensions of globalisation are an often-overlooked element of theories of cosmopolitanism but place/space is inherently political and grounded along class, ethnic, gender and national lines. Cosmopolitanism is a contingent formation—socially, historically and geopolitically. The material conditions of time and place shape understandings of cosmopolitanism. Like intersubjective art, recent variations of cosmopolitanism are grounded in the codes and practices of particular geo-spatial sites, such as cities like Paris and London, and even continents, such as Europe. The global city is understood as permanent yet also as an ever-evolving dynamic site of social change. Yet the global city is paradoxically also framed as a process, "valorized as a site of unlimited growth, endless activity, boundless variety, and infinite possibilities" (Shusterman, *Urban Aesthetics* 743). Paris is a pertinent example here. As the site of the Palais de Tokyo, where Bourriaud served as curator while instigating and honing the field of relational aesthetics, Paris has a considerable mythology surrounding it, taking

> on the character of some kind of 'permanence', an evolving receptacle open to the whirling currents of global flows of goods and services, of people, commodities, money, information, cultural values, and capital in motion. The inhabitants of the city engage with these flows through physical, material practices and encounters in particular locations that are themselves always 'in process' (under threat, for example, of urban renewal). (Harvey 192)

The city is increasingly called upon as "a symbolic solution to one of philosophy's most central problems--the many and the one" (Shusterman, *Urban Aesthetics* 742). Locating art in both space and time affords a richer understanding of the complex conditions in which the art is produced and exhibited. Just as social theory has focussed on transnational identity due to perceptions of increased mobility, site specificity and the contingency of the art object have been the focus of creative and critical attention since the early 1990s. These two align through the growth and economic expedience of cultural tourism within urban centres, evidenced by the expansion of public art and cultural programming as a means to enhance the symbolic capital of cities and to acculturate the city's populations, both permanent and transitory. The processual nature of intersubjective artworks means that by their very nature these artworks are socially embedded and they speak to various communities whether pre-existent or artistically formulated. With increasingly deterritorialised and mobile populations, the ethically ameliorative project expected of art compels institutional bodies to support and fund locally engaged projects that simultaneously contain a global focus. The institutional imperative is to embody something very much like Appiah's conception of cosmopolitanism, universality + difference. Not only does this obligation limit the

scope of programming but in the process of speaking to the many and the few simultaneously, there is a heightened risk of fixing minorities and disenfranchised communities as an essentialised thematic locus within the artwork.

A lack of space, particularly in urban centres, demands close proximity and interaction with others. Intimacy means something different when residents of major cities are compelled to be intimate with many strangers daily, whether on subways, on the streets and in the queues that demarcate large-scale urban life. Uninvited encounters and bad feelings are unavoidable elements of city life and cosmopolitanism and intersubjective art both emerge from pluralist European cities. Rather than taking the position that city dwellers need mediation to come together, the global city allows an "ethics of indifference…a capacity to be unseen, to be unexceptional, to be impersonal" (Tonkiss 27). This allows citizens of the city to be at home in the world and detached from it simultaneously. Not everyone wants to be known or seeks connectedness; anonymity brings its own joy. One of the virtues of living in the city

> lies in its qualities of amorphousness, anonymity, and anomie…In the city, in fact, there is sufficient anonymity for one to be able to play a part, reinvent oneself and camouflage oneself so as not to have to live with the stigma of one's origins. In this context, the famous pronouncement of Max Weber is always cited, 'Die Stadtluft macht frei' (city air makes one free). (Rubert de Ventos 3)

Here, Rubert de Ventos touches on an important aspect of a city life. The advancement of self-re-invention as the most valued freedom within late capitalism, underpins Appiah's understanding of cosmopolitanism and much of the literature that elaborates the traits of a cosmopolitan disposition that I outline in the next chapter.

Nava calls for "a viscerally experienced domestically located and gendered cosmopolitanism in the imagined and geopolitical spaces of contemporary metropolitan England particularly London" ("Domestic Cosmopolitanism" 42). She argues that in highly diversified populations, such as London and other global cities, some differences have become banal. However, despite difference being commonplace in cities, some identities remain strikingly conspicuous, unassimilated and unromanticised. A striking example of this is the escalation of anti-Islamism across the Western world over the last few years, even in highly diverse urban locales. As Pollock et al. argue, "cultural pluralism recognizes difference so long as the general category of the people is still fundamentally understood within a national frame" (582). Rather than wilfully overlooking traditional identity markers (race, class, gender, etc.), it is important to note that race and racial hierarchies have been "integral to the process of state formation" (Ahmed and Fortier 256). Difference is tolerated politically and socially if the overriding affiliation and loyalty of all citizens

is to the shared collective identity.

The effects of globalisation have an impact on local populations in myriad ways, producing any number of social problems that require institutionally implemented unifying projects to bring together publics fragmented by its processes. The complex relations that unfold often necessitate undertaking the precarious negotiation of state funded projects to ameliorate state-articulated problems that can result in the exclusion of particular minorities and the fixing of certain identities in a pathologised, static relation to some idealised, normative majority. Despite advocating a pluralist and inclusive position, the universalising application of cosmopolitanism's rights-based strategies seems to maintain discourses produced under the material conditions of capitalism and European colonialism (Keane 21; Said, *Orientalism*).

Arguments against the cosmopolitan

Kant's understanding of moral cosmopolitanism regarded *all* rational human beings as members of a singular moral community, "as 'brothers' (with obvious gender bias) — an analogy with which aimed to indicate the fundamental equality of rank of all humans, which precluded slavery, colonial exploitation, feudal hierarchy, and tutelage of various sorts" (Kleingold and Brown). Kant's cosmopolitanism has long borne "the taint of elitism, idealism, imperialism and capitalism" (Beck, *World At Risk* 61). This is evidenced by the way Kant privileges his own experience and culture. Kant's claim that "humanity achieves its greatest perfection with the White race" is unfathomable in relation to a cosmopolitanism based on difference and hospitality but this aspect of Kant's approach to the otherness is mostly overshadowed by the scholarly focus on his grand narratives (Kant qtd. and translated by Harvey 26-27). With arguably less extreme views, the masculine and Eurocentric positioning of the cosmopolitan figure is an ongoing problem with many contemporary understandings of cosmopolitanism. The gendered tension between distance and closeness is dissipated as what are traditionally understood as feminised emotions—sentimentality, sympathy, empathy, compassion—are encouraged to help defuse the overwhelmingly masculinised cosmopolitan figure (as flâneur).

In many ways, the cosmopolitan disposition can be seen as simply a set of practices that replicate and reinforce European privilege, bourgeois ideals, and late capitalism's (self) work ethic. The regime of universal rights and benefits implicit in contemporary cosmopolitanism are intrinsically neoliberal in character. The implied logic is that everyone must embrace late capitalism—be productive, competitive, and self-reflexive—to qualify as cosmopolites. Claims of universality are in themselves imperialist because universality often comes at the behest of a deracinated universal (Harvey 26). In this way, cosmopolitanism risks advocating a universal that is ultimately imperialistic, something Appiah refers to as "liberalism on safari" (*The Ethics of Identity*

214). As globalisation flattens the world and makes more areas accessible to the mobile few, old worlds are re-inscribed and re-excised with the politics of privileged ethnographic encounters and accounts of the cosmopolitan figure.

Being cognisant of the privileges and limitations of global conditions means acknowledging the communities displaced by the economic logics of globalisation. The affective impetus of cosmopolitanism centralises the ability to recognise the experience of the other, to both feel with the other (universal) and to acknowledge the self in relation to the other (particular). Although the disenfranchised subjects of globalisation are themselves unanchored, often without state recognition and/or support, they are immutably fixed in place as a 'problem group' or a community in need. This place is not necessarily geographic but rather functions as an interstitial space of globalisation where communities are harnessed and instrumentalised as forms of symbolic capital and as the site of hospitality and dialogue for those benevolent forces reaching out to them.

In this way, the benevolent impulse that drives the majority of creative works assessed as 'cosmopolitan' reiterates cosmopolitanism as an ethical standpoint aimed at facilitating an open, generous dialogue between people of varying contexts. Often this positions the cosmopolitan as an individual figure while the Other is marked as symbolic of a collective identity (the refugees, the returning diaspora, the migrant, the stateless). Identity always exists in its alterity because "identities are always collective and relational" (Connolly, *The Ethos of Pluralization* xvi). This process *fixes* these differential identities in interdependent relation to the marked *mobility* of the cosmopolitan. Appiah's privileging of the self-actualised cosmopolitan subject of advanced liberal democracy shows how his cosmopolitan imaginary is another dimension of "the flat world of neoliberal utopianism" (Harvey 51). The tacit rationale of Appiah's cosmopolitan patriotism is that all subjects must embrace advanced liberal democracy's values and work ethic if they hope to lift themselves, their communities and their nations up into the competitive domain of late capitalism.

The transient exchange at the centre of cosmopolitan mobility leaves little room for deep engagement with others. The relations forged between cosmopolitan figure and other potentially limit an understanding of the complexity of the unknown culture or identity. Indeed, the other is formulated only in relation to the cosmopolitan figure. The cosmopolitan figure knows that "there is much to learn from our differences…[and with] so many human possibilities worth exploring, we neither expect or desire that every person or every society should converge on a single mode of life" (Appiah, *Ethics in a World of Strangers* iv). In this sense, the spirit of the cosmopolitan imaginary is anthropological, not only accepting difference but also categorising and learning from it. The goal seems to be learning about difference as a step toward the cosmopolitan figure's self-actualisation and transcendence of their own (privileged) experience. Others risk being positioned as exotic innocents, victims (of racism, globalisation, themselves) to be liberated not by advocating equality

and disrupting the system but rather by learning how to work under its auspices. Liberation comes via exceptional subjects whose work and obligation is to reach out to particular others.

> Refugees, peoples of the diaspora, and migrants and exiles represent the spirit of the cosmopolitical community. Too often, in the West, these peoples are grouped together in a *vocabulary of victimage* and come to be recognized as constituting the 'problem' of multiculturalism to which late liberalism extends its generous promise of a pluralist existence. [emphasis added] (Pollock et al. 582)

The cosmopolitan figure fulfils a kind of pedagogical role, teaching others how to harness their potential, self-actualise and self-capitalise. Martens' clumsy colonialist performance in *Enjoy Poverty* detailed at length in my second case study parodies this perfectly.

Cosmopolitanism scholarship mostly formulates cosmopolitanism as an exilic position, whether as a choice as evidenced by the artists included in my case studies (Appiah; Said), or as a position thrust upon them (Beck; Pollock et al.). The popular adoption of 'cosmopolitan' to signify something urbane, cultured and well-travelled evidences how this is perceived as a desirable state, echoed in Said's contention that "seeing the entire world as a foreign land makes possible originality of vision" ("Reflections on Exile" 366). But cosmopolitanism is a purely symbolic form of global citizenship as national citizenship is a requirement of entry to and from most States. Even those who decry national identity for a sense of global social belonging do so from the safety of State political citizenship. Although the 'right to difference' is a central component of moral cosmopolitanism, some differences are not so easily accommodated by openness and curiosity. Any notion of symbolic citizenship should be ground by the prevailing "surveillant culture of 'security'" that raises ethical problems around "how do we tell the good migrant from the bad migrant?" (*The Location of Culture*, xvii).

Insecurity within the nation state is a salient issue. A cosmopolitan imaginary is only projected from the safety of statehood; it "is the privilege of those who can take a secure nation-state for granted" (Ignatieff 13). Another potential flaw in cosmopolitan universalism is the potential to gloss over intolerable local and regional differences. The local is often revered in favour of the national in universalising narratives because the national is more likely to be associated with broader and farther-reaching institutional politics. Local politics are subsumed as community problems, a much more sentimental imaginary, often articulated as the result the difficult large-scale dehumanising forces, such as neoliberalism and its corollary effects. However, significant parts of the world are involved in conflicts and a substantial proportion of these began as localised religious, ethnic or civil conflicts that have spread through whole regions. The finite capacity of the world to contain, both spatially and politically, the globe's ever-expanding populations, means that

human beings are undoubtedly "forced to accommodate (sometimes violently) with each other" (Harvey 17).

Global capital may move fluidly across borders seeking opportunity but there are wars being fought in the name of (social and economic) 'freedom' that have heavily constrained the movement of some national and ethnic identities. Although the dominant imperial nations may have given way to bilateral and trilateral alliances, national borders are still heavily enforced possibly more now than during the European colonial period. The resurgent nationalism of many post-9/11 advanced liberal nations has limited the mobility of some citizens and definitely curbed the hospitality of nations. Australia's foreign policy—Operation Sovereign Borders—is testament to the constraints placed on asylum seekers primarily escaping the war zones of the Middle East and Africa[7].

The political invisibility of certain groups, such as the undocumented immigrant, Rom and homeless communities, excludes them from many analyses of European Community mobility but does not necessarily absent them from the capitalisation processes of their (new) environment. The expansion of creative and cultural economies in post-Fordist societies has seen city councils and urban planners give precedence to the provision of public spaces and opportunities for chance encounters with others. These social encounters help resuscitate local systems and "give life" to cities (Castells, "La Ciudad De La Nueva Economia"; Yúdice 19). Not just through the expected revivification processes of gentrification but also through the ways that the disadvantaged and unacknowledged bring distinctive diversity. Disadvantaged groups represent a type of embodied symbolic capital in the creative or knowledge economy because the disadvantaged 'give life' and their cheap labour to the cultural economies of locales where cultural diversity runs at a premium. This type of human capitalisation represents "the new stage of capitalist development" (Rifkin, *Age of Access* 265). The shift away from a class-based focus in contemporary social theory, despite the economic reality of late capitalism, obfuscates increasing underclass invisibility. With a focus on self-constructed social identity rather than a focus on the harsh realities of economic or political status, differences can be constituted as indicators of diversity and cultural harmony. However, many of these others remain estranged from access to any number of public institutions and welfare services and in this way, their mobility is limited.

Hospitality and tolerance emerge "as a badge of Western superiority in the civilisational

---

[7] This operation is mounted in the name of protecting both Australian borders and the lives of refugees and asylum seekers, commonly referred to as 'illegals' or 'boat people' by the Australian federal government, from being exploited by unknown others in other lands defined as 'people smugglers'.

discourse framing aspects of contemporary international relations" (Brown, *Regulating Aversion* 226). The cosmopolitan's gesture of tolerance is bestowed upon the other from a distance, risking reinforcing a rationale of Eurocentric superiority. The very act of performing tolerance toward someone or something suggests that engaging with the other is intrinsically risky, harmful or undesirable and as such, an inner reserve of self-control and resilience is required in response. Because tolerance is extended toward the other *despite* its otherness, tolerance is forged in an antagonistic and interconnected relation with prejudice. The distinction between responsibility and obligation as a choice and the relations imposed through cosmopolitanisation must be acknowledged here. For the subject colonised by imperialism—whether through the auspices of the expansion of nations states or the more recent inexhaustible reach of globalising capital—cosmopolitanism might seem less like an attitude and more like an imperative.

Conclusion

The ongoing pursuit of reciprocal understanding, pluralism, and egalitarianism are central elements of a democratic society built on consensus and transparency. This means that new and revised ways of making sense of, and potentially resolving, the disjunction between utopia and practice are being continuously elaborated. Discussions of our multiple identities and mobilities (Urry; Bauman; Beck) can often paint a utopian picture of endless opportunity and experience but these envisioned mobilities could obscure the less visible to privilege the ideal within the cosmopolitan imaginary. Extensive mobilities "generate novel, extensive and elaborate forms of social inequality", as the logics of cosmopolitanism compel a growing number of people "to 'inhabit' their world at a distance (Szerszynski and Urry, "Visuality, Mobility and the Cosmopolitan" 15). In another way, cosmopolitanism as an ethical aesthetic seems to have re-entered the contemporary milieu as a potential way forward as socialism and advanced liberal democracy seem to have failed 'the multitude'. The heightened focus on openness and connectedness defines a politics based on the interactivity of the social self, disciplined through its bodily interactions. Intersubjectivity is strategically employed as an interstitial space in which collective understanding and the dissolution of public/private space is characterised. Intimacy and distance are reframed in relation to power. In this way, subjectivity embodies ethical agency, aligning with cosmopolitanism as "grounded, materially specific and relational" so that "relational subjectivity and imagination are crucial to political transformation" (Meskimmon 6,41).

The renewed focus on the dynamic relations between the self and its communities is in many ways a positive attempt to reconstruct the contemporaneous complexities of our internal and external relations within an ethico-aesthetic framework. Moving toward a focus on the social seems to offer a discursive bridging of the divide between the ontological and the communal, widened by

the hyper-individualism of neoliberalism. Calling on cosmopolitanism's historical pedigree appears to ground these approaches in an ongoing philosophical trajectory, transcending the shallow surface play of contemporary life. Our free-floating selves are anchored to a politically cogent narrative that potentially promises to reveal a hidden, more optimistic truth of our selves through its philosophical (and historical) idealisation. This is its utopian function. A cosmopolitan imaginary delineates an idealised sensorial engagement with contemporary global conditions, as a way to unify humanity in spite of ongoing endemic structural inequality. An emphasis on getting along despite our differences seems to reduce any political resistance of deeply problematic structural conditions as an issue to be resolved through intimate forms of dialogue until consensus is reached. This approach advocates consenting to eke out an existence within current conditions rather than rallying for equality or as Appiah frames it, committing to "baseline obligations so that everyone has the right to get what they *need* not necessarily the *best* of what they can have" ("Cosmopolitanism: An Interview"). The disparity between the ideals of cosmopolitanism (intention) and the realities of late capitalism (implementation) limits a more practical and radical engagement with cosmopolitanism's potential utopian pleasures.

Chapter 3

The affective economies of the cosmopolitan disposition in intersubjective art

Cosmopolitanism as a theory is differentiated from its lived application as a subjective attitude, a sensibility or practice (Appiah, "Cosmopolitan Patriots"; Urry, *Sociology Beyond Societies*; Hall, "Political Belonging"; Hannerz, *Transnational Connections*; Held, "Culture and Political Community"; Nava, "Domestic Cosmopolitanism"; Tomlinson; Vertovec and Cohen). Being open to humankind, seeking connectedness and mutual understanding across cultural and national divides are the dominant psychosocial traits of the cosmopolitan disposition. As with intersubjective art, these traits hinge on the encounter so the affective elements of these social exchanges is central. In this chapter, I examine how emotions move people, giving rise to collective feelings and an affective economy. I then look at how these social relations underpin the codified practices of distinction, identification, and belonging that demarcate the *habitus* of the cosmopolitan figure, or what I am calling here *the cosmopolitan disposition*. By mapping out the affective characteristics of the cosmopolitan habitus, I draw correlations between the traits of the cosmopolitan figure and the social practices of intersubjective artists operating in the transnational art world.

Cosmopolitanism and intersubjective art both articulate a desire to form a "felt community" (Ahmed, "Communities that Feel" 21). The kind of social relations idealised in cosmopolitanism and intersubjective art give an insight into what triggers feelings of belonging in advanced liberal democracies and how people become attached to others. We are implicitly attached to our various social contexts, both the worlds we inhabit and imagine, and in this way, "public spheres are affect worlds" (Berlant, "Public Feelings"). Those attachments are not innate nor are they necessarily intentional; our affective attachments are the outcomes of our experiences and are essential to human life. To unpack the relations between politics as "the place where you are always disappointed" and the political as "the place where you are always excited", Berlant speculates on how feelings bind us not only to the people we know but to the people we don't know (Berlant, "Public Feelings").

With a heightened emphasis on affect and empiricism in art, there is a risk that broad structural problems are unhelpfully reduced to personal issues. Clare Hemmings suggests that the focus on affect "frequently emerges through a circular logic designed to persuade 'paranoid theorists' into a more productive frame of mind – for who would not prefer affective freedom to social determinism?" (548). I see this evidenced in the optimistic, affective thread that runs through

intersubjective art frameworks and cosmopolitanism. However, a heightened emphasis on affect in studying social and cultural phenomena risks obfuscating the political and economic machinations at work within the social spaces in which these relations are produced and imagined. Hard fought political gains risk being dissipated by a focus on sentiments that are grounded in the individual, even if the individual's intersubjective and collective settings are the current locus of attention. Issues of class and gender have become increasingly obscured by an emphasis on our multiple social and cultural affiliations that imagine everyone capable of moving however and being whoever they choose.

Affect is increasingly conceived of as a "qualitative experience of the social world, to embodied experience that has the capacity to transform as well as exceed social subjection" (Hemmings 549). Perhaps affect actually affords insight into the conditions of power at work underneath the conviviality and optimism intersubjective artworks promise because "affect might in fact be valuable precisely to the extent that it is not autonomous" (565). In this way, individual autonomy is imagined not as a right but as a simple matter of personal choice despite the discernible and demonstrated realities of how the logics of global capital confine some so that others are free to move.

This emphasis on the non-cognitive aspects of encounter is positioned as a corollary to theories of cosmopolitanism rather than as a central theoretical organising structure. The specificity of gender to the intersubjective relations of cosmopolitan encounters is an important yet neglected element, particular in respect to empathy and otherness. A focus on the affective as well as the cognitive aspects of cosmopolitanism affords a more holistic understanding of the intersubjective relations idealised within the imagined democratic exchanges of cosmopolitanism and intersubjective art, particularly in relation to gender and the different forms of labour that underpin these imaginaries. Dialogical approaches are the preferred method to enact cosmopolitan hospitality and kindness and, as discussed in the first chapter, dialogical approaches to social problems have been a distinctly feminist strategy. Gablik's connective aesthetics and Kester's dialogical aesthetics seem to embody the "dialogically related yet more benevolent history of hospitality, sympathy and desire for cultural and racial 'others'" that Nava explores (Nava, "Domestic Cosmopolitanism" 42). These feminist-inflected approaches emphasise an affective discourse of care that is claimed but not necessarily embodied in the majority of work on cosmopolitanism.

The feeling body: attaching and belonging

Emotions are social, the glue that bind our intensities and investments and do the work of making us social beings. Whereas feelings are somewhat immutable and unconscious, although their sensations may be felt similarly, emotions are social projections dependent on previous

encounters. A number of influential studies have argued that certain emotions are universal and innate and evidenced by pan-cultural facial expression markers (Ekman, Sorenson and Friesen; Ekman, "Universal Facial Expressions"; Ekman, Friesen and Tomkins; Ekman, Friesen and Ellsworth; Ekman and Friesen; Izard; Tomkins, "Affect Theory"; Ekman and Rosenberg). These findings stem from psychological research and focus on such 'basic' emotions as fear, anger, disgust, happiness, sadness, surprise, contempt, shame and guilt, although the number and description of what constitutes the basic emotions differs across the field. Social construction theorists question claims that there are discrete and universal emotions (and emotional responses) but rather that our emotions are learned, shaped and regulated through our experiences, communal values and social norms.

Stemming from the Latin *emovere*, 'emotion is simultaneously defined as "a public commotion, "to cause to move" and as "movement from one place to another" ("emotion, n"). Emotions are object-directed and kinetic; they move us toward and away from objects. For some people "being moved" comes through "'fixing' others as 'having' certain characteristics" in relation to them (Ahmed, "Communities that Feel" 12). The movement of feelings shows how emotions emanate not from one individual but rather originate through the collective consciousness of sociality. Thus feeling unifies the group, 'sticking' it together. They are about the attachments that connect us and "are precisely about the intimacy of the 'with'; they are about the intimate relationship between selves, objects and others" (Ahmed, "Communities that Feel" 11-12).

These are contingent relations predicated on a movement that impacts on each of us differently. So if we consider emotions as predominantly cultural processes rather than psychological states, we can see how sociological thinking often flips the dominant logic of emotion as "the inside getting outside" into the "the outside getting inside" (Ahmed, "Communities that Feel" 22). The feeling does not remain without the individual, as the force of the external collective feeling "must penetrate and become organized inside us; it becomes an integral part of our being and in doing so it elevates and enlarges that being" (Durkheim 157). It is this very distinction, between inside (the individual) and outside (the social), that permeates both cosmopolitanism and intersubjective art.

In an affective politics like cosmopolitanism, affective affiliations forge community and in doing so, map our multiple and varied worlds. They merge our internal and external worlds through the space where our physical selves become something more than mere bodies in space by attaching us to others through shared understandings and experiences. Ahmed argues that emotions do not 'inhabit' bodies so much as exist in the intercorporeal points of contact between bodies, the contact zones that glue us socially and position 'the subject' as "simply one nodal point in the economy, rather than its origin and destination" ("Communities that Feel" 14). Sometimes these emotions

'stick' to bodies but they do not necessarily reside in them. Ahmed argues that in becoming attached to bodies, emotions "give surface" to bodies (14). Here, Ahmed uses the phrase 'give surface' to show how emotions are expressed not only psychologically but also physically. However, "it is not simply the body of the individual body that surfaces through affective encounters", it includes the worlds of collective bodies (14). The multidirectional movements of emotion are not contained within an individual subject but rather outline "a relationality that works through the circulation of signs" between objects and subjects and as such, "affective economies need to be seen as social and material, as well as psychic" (Ahmed, "Affective Economies" 121).

It is not necessarily the proximity of other bodies but in the ways other bodies create and leave impressions on us that the collective or the community are formed so that "how we feel about others is what aligns us with a collective, which paradoxically 'takes shape' only as an effect of such alignments" (Ahmed, "Collective Feelings" 25). So rather than thinking of 'collective feeling' as mutual feeling, it might be more appropriate to think of the collective as those bodies which we feel aligned with or feel emotions toward. Emotions make bodies cohere (*adherence*) to produce a collective effect (*coherence*) (Ahmed, "Affective Economies" 119). These affective relations also emphasise how important social unity is to our understanding of our selves. Seeking the consensus of 'common sense' and 'feeling in common' within our varying social realities in turn shapes the ongoing process of our individual self-making. Emotions are social actions,

> they align individuals with communities – or bodily space with social space – through the very intensity of their attachments…they work, in concrete and particular ways, to mediate the relationship between the psychic and the social, and between the individual and collective. (Ahmed, "Communities that Feel" 19)

Distinctive elements specific to one's culture, such as language and social practices, play an important role in the development of emotions. Establishing and reinforcing emotional norms is pivotal to the regulation of social behaviours and values as they reflect and shape the interrelated institutions and processes of a society. Emotions are given meaning by the prescribed behavioural norms that might make success desirable (envy) and infidelity undesirable (guilt) and even when the larger parent cultures codified behaviours and values are rejected or subverted, resistant emotions are still learnt through peer or familial endorsement. Our manifold circumstances often dictate that we project certain emotions in particular circumstances to fulfil our social obligations and roles. It follows then that as our emotions are social, auto-historical and cognitively embedded, they continuously inflect all our present and future social exchanges.

Affective economies

In the previous chapters I have outlined some of the ways in which social behaviour has been increasingly framed in relation to labour and capital in advanced liberal democracy. As Rose contends, all matter of social activity is…

> now reconceptualized along economic lines – as calculative actions undertaken through the universal human faculty of choice…all manner of social undertakings – health, welfare, education, insurance – can be reconstrued in terms of their contribution to the development of human capital. (*Powers of Freedom* 141-42)

The affective capacities of individuals shape their social encounters and in this way, emotions act "as a form of capital…[because] affect does not reside positively in the sign or commodity, but is produced only as an effect of its circulation" (Ahmed, "Affective Economies" 120).

Bourdieu's conceptions of distinction, the habitus and the field are useful here as they help unpack how the dispositional characteristics of the cosmopolitan figure shape particular kinds of social relations. Bourdieu was interested in how various forms of capital worked symbiotically with economic factors to generate and reproduce social hierarchies, as well as embodiments of those hierarchies. Initially developed as three interdependent resources of status (economic, social and cultural – both embodied and symbolic), Bourdieu's conception of 'capital' has become an expedient for explicating the relationship between agents and their level of investment in systemic and personal affiliations ("Forms of Capital" 241-58). By mapping an economic concept onto the social domain, Bourdieu highlights the complex processes of subjectivity at work in society, by interrogating all social, cultural and economic interactions as valuable means of self-advantage not necessarily limited by birthright (*Distinction*). Although criticised extensively for its perceived failure as a universal framework due to its Francocentric scope, Marxist influence, and dated class structures (see Turner and Edmunds; Bennett, Frow and Emmison; DiMaggio), *Distinction*'s technical interrogation of status remains useful. Since the nineteenth century's institutionalisation of a pedagogical framework for cultural betterment, status had been a tacit backbone to the political assumptions made about and for liberal democratic citizens. Class was used to signify not only the economic wealth of subjects but also their cultural and social position. Interestingly, Turner and Edmunds see shifts via generations not classes but the expanded definitions of structure of feeling see these shifts as both generational and class driven.

Within advanced liberal democracy, class has diminished in theoretical and political discussions of status, as the aspirational goals of liberal democracy encourage perceptions of mobility between classes. The individual still remains a highly calculable unit, however, judged now in relation to perceived notions of mobility and through a status framework based on strategic

accumulation and the display of cultural knowledges. Being knowledgeable across cultural groups and forms produces a diverse and distinctive eclecticism, connectedness, and 'cultured-ness' that constitutes the mobility central to contemporary articulations of democracy. Peterson and Kern's extrapolation of Bourdieu's theories of class status provide a more substantive analysis of how particular people 'use' cultural practices and forms to enhance their social mobility. By interrogating the ways that those of a higher social status participate in a wide range of activities, from 'elite' to 'popular' forms, they developed the 'taste' model of "the cultural omnivore" to highlight the expansive and diverse tastes of the affluent (Peterson and Kern 900-07). That emphasis on affluence has made Bourdieu's model a much-contested position. Bennett, Frow and Emmison draw on Foucault to interrogate the social uses of cultural practices and choices of the Australian public, with a much broader sample to include different social formations. They contend that, although relatively fluid, contemporary "regimes of value" (the normative codification of good and bad taste) remain regulatory; "they are not themselves expressions of power but sites through which power flows" (Bennett, Frow and Emmison 260).

These studies elaborate the systemic shift away from presuming that power rests within cultural forms to the usefulness of cultural forms and knowledges in mediating power relations. The key to increased social mobility is the capacity to harness specific and diverse cultural knowledges in a society that rewards the deployment of particular kinds of information and learning. By accruing these knowledges, a certain type of freedom is afforded, a freedom of choice predicated on the capitalisation of identity and the self. Cultural mobility is ultimately the expression of individual capitalisation, and cultural connoisseurship is a highly valuable skill that bridges financial and social sectors. The accumulation and utilisation of multiple distinct identities and knowledges articulates a freedom to choose identity(ies), imagining a reflexive self 'shaped' by the individual and free of societal constraints. The artist's lifestyle is marked by their ability to self-define and self-capitalise their own identity as a "singular art of living", an invention which is

> a fundamental dimension of the enterprise of artistic creation. One of its
> major functions… is to be its own market. This society offers the most
> favourable and comprehensive welcome to the audacities and
> transgressions that writers and artists introduce, not only into their works
> but also into their existence (itself conceived as a work of art); the rewards
> of this privileged market, if they do not manifest themselves in cold cash,
> have at least the virtue of assuring a form of social recognition. (Bourdieu,
> *Rules of Art* 58)

Foucault's critique of subjectivity posits identity as something invented by individuals as an

active aesthetic practice: "the self is not given to us…we have to create ourselves as a work of art" ("On the Genealogy of Ethics" 351). This often-cited claim of Foucault's neatly ties up the Enlightenment aesthetics of self-realisation with contemporary notions of creativity and mobility and the freedom to name our selves for ourselves. Over time identity has been constituted as a performative set of socio-cultural practices positing identity as creative and normalising self-construction as a practical application of citizenship. This perception is central to Appiah's understanding of the cosmopolitan figure. However, despite the assumption of porous boundaries between cultures and classes, the currency of specific knowledges and cultural responses still delimit aesthetic attitudes that differentiate social positions and aspirations and legitimate ideas about culture and art. Culture is a markedly uneven terrain, structured through inequalities of privilege and power, and individuals use the difference or 'strangeness' at the heart of culture for distinction and the display of prestige. As Foucault would later point out, the socio-cultural practices of identity construction "are not something that the individual invents by himself…they are patterns that he finds in his culture and which are proposed, suggested, imposed on him by his culture, his society and his social group" (Foucault, "Ethic of Care" 122). This conception is analogous in principle with Bourdieu's conception of the habitus.

Embodied knowledges

Central to the skilful accumulation and mobilisation of symbolic capital is an active and sensitive 'feeling body', manifested in part through other people's bodies. The concept of the habitus provides a link between sensation and cognition to show how feelings (as affective knowledges) are both of the body and of the mind. The mind bears witness to the body and thus differentiating between thinking and feeling can become an increasingly muddy exercise because both thinking and feeling are: "located in the brain, located in the body, socially constructed, complex human behavior, opaque, transparent, motivates action, has consequences" (Berlant et al.). These consequences are political. The habitus functions as an embodied history, a kind of living genealogy of historical practices and logics internalised and naturalised, but it is simultaneously an adaptive system. A habitus

> is what gives practices their relative autonomy with respect to external
> determinations of the immediate present. This autonomy is that of the past, enacted
> and acting, which functioning as accumulated capital, produces history on the basis
> of history and so ensure the permanence in change that makes the individual agent a
> world within the world. (Bourdieu, *Logic of Practice* 56)

The habitus is a "structuring structure, which organises practices and the perception of

practices" (Bourdieu, *Distinction* 170). This encompasses everyday techniques of the body (techniques du corps) of individuals, groups and nations. These techniques encompassed the totality of embodied competencies, tastes, styles, customs, rituals and other unspoken formal and informal processes. In other words, particular conduct is imposed and unconsciously embodied by individuals through the dispositions of the habitus; they are internalised accounts of external structures. The habitus coerces particular practices and experiences. There is a limited determination to act freely but this autonomy is constrained by the rules in which an individual circulates. In this way, the habitus is both individualised and collective. Bourdieu emphasises an individual's capacity to activate and enforce their symbolic capital in the various social structures of power and he looks to how their competencies and dispositions, as a set of acquired patterns of thought, behaviour and taste, demarcate their habitus. Bourdieu's initial use of the habitus had been in direct relation to class but later he refined habitus as fundamentally a concept to escape "both the objectivism of action understood as a mechanical reaction 'without an agent' and the subjectivism which portrays action as the deliberate pursuit of a conscious intention" (Bourdieu and Wacquant 121).

Rather than determining behaviour, the habitus coerces through the rules of the field in which it operates. As stated in the previous chapter, the material conditions of the time/place shape the habitus and these practices are sedimented in particular geo-spatial sites, like cities, such as Paris and even continents, such as Europe. Beyond elite social groups and cultural practices, the quotidian practices of everyday life—particular in relation to domestic and labour systems—equally convey and reinforce ideas about hierarchical social relations and what constitutes legitimate culture. However, it is undeniable that the privileged attitudes and behaviours of the transnational elite are reflected in the cosmopolitan habitus. Class is an important factor in both. So is gender. However, both are often overlooked in favour of focussing on cultural and epidermal [racial] difference.

The tacit practices and perceptions of a habitus are always socio-spatially located. Central to Bourdieu's work on capital and the habitus is the concept of a *field* (*The Field of Cultural Production*). Fields are structural rather than instrumental, organised around specific types of capital or groupings of capital. Fields represent spheres of production, exchange, and appropriation of commodities, services or knowledges, and all the competitive positions occupied by individuals as they struggle to accumulate and control these various types of capital. In this way, the field is coercive rather than enforcing. A person's position within the hierarchy of the field depends on the intersecting relations between their capital, habitus and the rules specific to the field. There is a structurally isomorphic relation between habitus and field, so that there are correlations between the dispositions and beliefs of particular social groups and different cultural practices. What is

understood as normal or common sense within any given field indicates which groups and their corollary practices are legitimised. Although the dynamic relationship between field and habitus are continuously shifting, causing some degree of incongruity between the two, the prevailing underlying social logic shapes both.

To understand art is to be able to locate it; to identify and classify art by the rules that inform its creation and judgement. When the acquisition and mobilisation of these skills is honed, the "trained eye" seems tacit, what Bourdieu referred to as a "feel for the game" (Bourdieu, *Logic of Practice* 66). In this adage, 'feel' corresponds with the habitus and the 'game' with the field. Bourdieu argues that for the bourgeoisie a feel for the game is acquired from lifelong training. Through the subject's ongoing participation within particular institutions from childhood the acquisition of the parents' habitus is naturalised so that in turn their own children will be similarly trained. Aesthetic appreciation has been historically an art in itself, anchored to concepts of taste and moral intuition, but the renovation of aesthetic theories by the Left during the twentieth century has seen a marked shift in how aesthetic properties are defined and mobilised. While the rules of the game are seemingly more accessible through participatory practices, the art world is still the domain of privilege. If a feel for the game hinges on a finely tuned attitude, then art is understood as a kind of visual, textual, and dispositional language, operating via a set of discursive, institutional, and social competencies and knowledges.

The cosmopolitan disposition

Cosmopolitanism as an ideal is enacted through the practices of the cosmopolitan figure; a figure generally regarded as someone who finds all cultures equally valuable through their very difference. Hannerz defines cosmopolitanism as "an orientation, a willingness to engage with the other…an intellectual and aesthetic stance of openness towards divergent cultural experiences" (Hannerz, "Cosmopolitans and Locals" 239). Hannerz's analysis of a cosmopolitan *attitude*— which has been drawn on by Tomlinson, Urry (*Consuming Places*), Vertovec and Cohen, and more recently, Nava ("Domestic Cosmopolitanism")—centres on the cultural competencies acquired and performed by well-travelled, Western (or Westernised) men whose singular mobility is reflected in their open but detached encounters with different cultures and their people.

A cosmopolitan must be "in a state of readiness, a personal ability to make one's way into other cultures through listening, looking, intuiting and reflecting" (Hannerz, "Cosmopolitans and Locals" 239). At its most morally centred, cosmopolitanism is an outlook of openness toward many different identities and cultures; it is contingent on encountering strangers and seeking commonalities within difference (Hannerz 239; Nava 44; Delanty 86; Urry, *Consuming Places* 167; Szerszynski and Urry "Cultures of Cosmopolitanism"; Nussbaum, "Patriotism and

Cosmopolitanism" 11; Appiah, "Cosmopolitanism: An Interview"). The cosmopolitan figure thrives by consuming other peoples and places. However, the luxury of seeking new lands as sites of ephemeral exchange rather than permanent security cuts to the heart of the unspoken advantage of having a homeland in times of economic uncertainty and global friction. The world has become smaller and more easily experienced by a large proportion of those in the West, whether through entertainment and the media or through cheaper and faster forms of travel.

Urry argues that this kind of dispositional attitude represents an "aesthetic cosmopolitanism" and lists six discerning features in his model:

1. Extensive patterns of real and simulated mobility in which it is thought that one has the *right* to travel anywhere and to consume at least initially all environments.

2. A *curiosity* about all places, peoples and cultures and at least a rudimentary ability to map such places and cultures historically, geographically and anthropologically.

3. An *openness* to other peoples and cultures and a willingness/ability to appreciate some elements of the language/culture of the place that one is visiting.

4. A willingness to take *risks* by virtue of moving outside the tourist environmental bubble.

5. An ability to *locate* one's own society and its culture in terms of a wide-ranging historical and geographical knowledge, to have some ability to reflect upon and judge aesthetically between different natures, places and societies.

6. A certain *semiotic* skill - to be able to interpret tourist signs, to see what they are meant to represent, and indeed to know when they are partly ironic and to be approached coolly or in a detached fashion. [emphasis added] (*Consuming Places* 167)

Urry's six traits clearly outline the central elements of a cosmopolitan disposition as detailed across the range of literature covered here. He also touches on the moral, cultural, and political tenets that run through the broader philosophical dimensions of cosmopolitanism. His model encompasses the tenets of moral cosmopolitanism that Appiah advocates, and is the most useful for my purposes here. I draw on his traits in my own argument and then extend them by advancing the often-overlooked affective dimension of cosmopolitanism, particularly in relation to gender and labour. A

central tenet of a cosmopolitan disposition is "the capacity of positive recognition of the Other" (Delanty, *The Cosmopolitan Imagination* 86) but I would argue that an ethical form of a cosmopolitan disposition should also include the capacity to acknowledge the inequities brought about by the same conditions that enable a cosmopolitan 'spirit', and then having the capacity to act on this inequality.

Nava sees the cosmopolitan disposition as the "imaginative disregard for borders and feelings of inclusivity…differently interpreted and valued in different contexts" ("Domestic Cosmopolitanism" 47). The cosmopolitan figure is positioned as simultaneously at home in the world and distinct from it, choosing to adopt a kind of exilic position, because "seeing the entire world as a foreign land makes possible originality of vision" (Said, "Reflections on Exile" 366). Extolling potential rootlessness, the cosmopolitan figure can appear to be beyond national, cultural, historical and economic affiliations. Indeed, the utopian idealisation of seeking connectedness amongst strangers is predicated on mobility and universality. The cosmopolitan figure seems "to emerge fully formed and unattached to any particular history, geography or culture. To some extent the critical potential and utopian appeal of cosmopolitanism lies precisely in this detached universality" (Molz 2). Yet, cosmopolitans essentially emerge from the security of a nation-state that they have citizenship or at least residency rights to retreat to. Apart from enforced cosmopolitanism, rootlessness is a chosen condition rather than something imposed upon the cosmopolitan figure. In this way, the idealised and romanticised state of in-between-ness can be enjoyed as simply seeking belonging and connection, rather than being forced to seek safety in a strange land. This feeling of being uprooted can also arise from forced domestic migration due to global capital. The internal migration of Mexican women to work in the US-owned factories in Juárez, which inspired Linnert's artwork *Desconocida Unknown Ukjent,* is a salient example of this.

Reflecting Kant's emphasis on temporary transit and fleeting relations, there is a marked distinction between the movement of cosmopolitan travel and permanent migration. Migration can change the way people experience home. Whereas once people may have been predominantly familiar with one homeland, one language and one culture, increasing global flows and migrations means that two or three languages, cultures and homelands are now normal. This creates a "plurality of vision" that articulate "simultaneous dimensions" so that "for an exile, habits of life, expression or activity in the new environment inevitably occur against the memory of these things in another environment" (Said, "Reflections on Exile" 366). One outcome might be that a kind of symbiosis is forged, where multiple narratives of the self (two cultures, languages, homelands) can come into an interdependent, harmonious rhythm. Old homelands (or natal patria, as Appiah refers to them) are often eulogised and mythologised by memory while new homelands can equally challenge understandings of our self and our roots. Migrants (both forced and voluntary) can form a

kind of 'double consciousness' where culture, home and identity become something else, something in between what is and what we imagine it is.

Du Bois posits a sense of self measured "by the tape of a world that looks on in amused contempt and pity" but this "two-ness" can similarly evolve through the unreconciled imaginaries of cultures we have never physically inhabited but that are mapped onto us through our familial and communal affiliations (Du Bois 12). This sense of affiliation but not necessarily singular belonging underpins Appiah's understanding of cosmopolitanism. However, the security of citizenship in a secure and relatively democratic nation-state is a taken for granted element in this mindset. A cosmopolitan disposition is ultimately projected onto the world from the security of a nation-state to retreat to.

Appiah understands cosmopolitanism as a set of practices—social and dialogical—that enable people to speak across cultural differences so that they can reach consensus about certain things, whether they are moral, social or political. He advocates a nationally grounded but international looking cosmopolitanism, a kind of "cosmopolitan patriotism", practiced by someone who "can entertain the possibility of a world in which everyone is a rooted cosmopolitan, attached to a home of one's own, with its own cultural particularities, but taking pleasure from the presence of other, different places that are home to other, different people (Appiah, "Cosmopolitan Patriots" 618). Appiah's cosmopolitan patriot is focussed on acquiring and enacting dispositional qualities rather than becoming stuck in philosophical debates about the metaphysical truth of morality (Appiah, "Cosmopolitanism: An Interview").

Appiah's conception of kindness and social obligation hinges in part on the distinction between an individual's ethical and moral duties. Ethical duties are obligations extended toward those we are connected to, whether through familial or communal ties, whereas moral duties are universal principles. Our ethical obligations are performed within our everyday social realm and consequently, our ability to be ethical subjects is dependent on our relations with each other because "to value individuality properly just is to acknowledge the dependence of the good for each of us on relationships with others" (Appiah, *The Ethics of Identity* 21). Appiah furthers this by adding that without our social bonds "we could not come to be free selves, not least because we could not come to be selves at all" (21).

Appiah writes with an inclusive 'we' to address his readers as likeminded cosmopolitans. He 'grounds' his approach by asserting the benevolence of the cosmopolitan figure as they grant the same freedoms to others as the cosmopolite embodies: "cosmopolitans value cultural variety, but we do not ask other people to maintain the diversity of the species at the price of their individual autonomy" (Appiah, "Cosmopolitan Patriots" 635). Appiah seems to be suggesting here that the Other cannot remain as a static entity existing merely as an unknown phenomenon for the

cosmopolitan to experience and value. However the tacit logic about autonomy and the kinds of freedom on offer underpinning this statement speak to the core of Appiah's cosmopolitan imaginary.

The idea of personal autonomy through identity construction is central to Appiah's approach. He claims that "the fundamental thought of the cosmopolitanism I defend is that the freedom to create oneself—the freedom that liberalism celebrates—requires a range of socially transmitted options from which to invent what we have come to call our identities" ("Cosmopolitan Patriots" 625). The ability to make oneself is the ultimate freedom in Appiah's framework and this belies the profound economic and political hardship endured by the global underclass that he often draws on to elaborate his understanding of cultural distinctiveness. He equates the freedom to choose one's social identity as the ultimate human right. This is the hallmark of subjectivity in advanced liberalism.

To Appiah, the ideal subject at the centre of cosmopolitanism, just as in intersubjective art practices, is a self ultimately created through freedom of choice. Yet, he argues, this same self is constituted and shaped through the "web of practices and collectivities in which it emerges" (*The Ethics of Identity* 21). Here it becomes clear that Appiah hopes almost all difference can be overcome through kindness and mutual openness, as though cultural differences are the primary constraints within advanced liberal democracy. As a philosophy and practice, Appiah's cosmopolitanism privileges culture as the most meaningful point of difference and dissent. This speaks to Appiah's own privilege and mobility. Despite claiming an identity forged along ethnic, cultural, sexual, and geographic lines, Appiah's life has been one of opportunity, with ready access to education, wealth, and understanding. He has been affluent enough to travel the world seeking out a place to belong. Although Appiah acknowledges the fallibility of his expansive and overly optimistic understanding of cosmopolitan society, his desire to articulate a set of universal values and a practice of mutual kindness foregoes a deeper critical analysis of the tacit power relations at work within a cosmopolitan disposition.

The cosmopolitan disposition as manifested in intersubjective art

The shift from representational to intersubjective art has emphasised "a critical shift from asking what artworks show us about the world to asking how they can enable us to participate in, and potentially change, the parameters through which we negotiate that world" (Meskimmon 6). The power required and harnessed by the social relations forged within an intersubjective artwork is central to the process and success of the work. The engagement with art has now turned from the inward contemplation that required a detached, philosophical gaze, to the externalised hospitality of the social contexts of art. The artist at the centre of the intersubjective artwork corresponds with the

ideal subject of cosmopolitanism, someone open to and familiar with a range of discursive and affective registers that give shape to convivial communication and mutual exchange at the centre of the artworks.

Cosmopolitanism is a disposition and a process marked by the connoisseurship of a range of experiences and knowledges. This cosmopolitan expertise reflects the privileging of particular kinds of knowledge and access in advanced liberal democracy. Access to an ever-expanding range of expert knowledges signals the persistence of the Enlightenment ideal of a 'rational social order' despite the obvious domination by particularly 'irrational' logics that preclude certain sectors of everyday life (Abbinnett 5). What kind of expertise is on offer and the kinds of people delegated as experts is culturally contingent and politically fraught. Within the public institutions that house and elevate intersubjective art—such as cultural centres, museums and art galleries—expertise might be delivered by critics, scholars and artists inculcated with a particular range of competencies and knowledges that are deemed valuable for the public. So what skills are required of the artist in the increasingly professionalised, service role of the art world: self-discipline; flexibility; mobility; curiosity; innovation; a democratic impulse; self-reflexivity; an ability to understand and appreciate other cultures; and, emotional and critical literacy, the deployment of which requires semiotic skill.

The artist Yvonne Rainer critically registered the different roles occupied by artists in the transition to the post-object period: artist as exemplary sufferer, self-absorbed individualist, changer of the subject, medium, ventriloquist, innovator, consumer, transgressor, failed primitive, failed intellectual, shaman, visionary, transcendental ego and misfit (86-91). Although somewhat facetious at the time, Rainer's list reveals the transformation of the conceptual role of the artist into the ideal flexible cultural worker, able to call on a litany of acquired dispositions and knowledges to be able to undertake any number of roles whether abstract or concrete. This transition has come via an enhanced capitalisation of the artist and the instrumentalisation of their role in society as one of responsibility and action.

Art, its institutions and its practitioners, are formulated at the centre of an ethico-aesthetic community and communicative action that empowers individuals and communities in substantial ways. Conversely, these authoritative institutional and discursive contexts—critical books, art talks, workshops, lifestyle pages, television—legitimise the artist's expanded field of expertise—art, philosophy, community, communication, urban gentrification, culture, travel, politics. These changes are advanced as a shift away from art as the private realm of the bourgeoisie to the more 'democratic' and accessible domain of participatory practices and public exhibitions. Within the intersubjective art frameworks detailed in chapter one, the shift from an inner private realm to an external public realm is triggered and mediated by the institutional structures of the artworld. It is no coincidence that the rapid and conspicuous expansion of the transnational artworld is intertwined

with the rise in intersubjective art.

A cosmopolitan stance allows the inner sanctum of the transnational art world to be juxtaposed and renewed by encounters with the outside world. Thus, artists are rewarded for critiquing the very system in which they circulate and are given power. The emphasis on community and social aesthetics seems to endow the artist with the kind of psycho-social expertise that is idealised in advanced liberal democracies while simultaneously obfuscating the art world's escalating competitive individualism and the artist's role within the flows of global capital. Emphasising a desire to activate spectators, troubleshoot politics and break down the boundaries between art and life, can garner substantial and ongoing rewards for the artist. However, this is not to say that all these strategies are cynical and self-serving. A cosmopolitan tendency in art also evidences the seeking of an ethical stance that makes art useful and redeemable after the excesses of the 1980s art world.

With the material objects collected and displayed within art giving way to post-object art, an affective economy based on experiences and processes has been foregrounded. In this way, the affective terrain of commodity exchange predicates intersubjective transactions as part of a "pre-market 'gift exchange'" that roughly translates as: "I do a favor for you; I engage in an activity – and it is likely that after a while you will do a favor for me, or if not you will wish me well" (Hochschild 33). This idea of a gift exchange, particularly linked to entrepreneurialism and outsourced labour, is an important aspect of Tiravanija's work that I discuss in chapter six. The exchange may not necessarily be financially defined but it still operates as a type of barter system where each person's contribution should be matched by a likewise contribution. The assumed open and convivial relations shared within cosmopolitanism and intersubjective art practices suggest a willingness to engage in a precarious affective gift exchange. Outwardly projected positive emotions – kindness, generosity, hospitality, gratitude, and compassion – are revered as tools that enrich our communities while simultaneously making us feel better as well. This shifting attitude to the Other is reflected in Bordowitz's adage that in the 1970s, the popular idiom was, "I hear you…I hear what you're saying"; in the 1980s and 1990s, it was "I see you," reflecting the emphasis on visibility and representation with regard to identity politics (race, gender, sexuality); and since the mid-1990s, "I feel you", highlighting the emphasis on sensation and feeling that has emerged (qtd. in Anastas et al. 111).

Artistic labour in late capitalism

The artist's role as an intermediary reflects their white-collar foundations. The lengthening chain of service roles in the art world sees institutions outsource to curators who outsource to artists who then either outsource to either other artists or to the viewer/participant. When this facilitation is

at the behest of governmental agencies, then the viewer/participant is simultaneously addressed and embodied as a citizen. As detailed in chapter two, the intensified perception of meritocratic success in advanced liberal democracies has diminished conceptions of class, gender and sexuality in favour of disciplinary techniques aimed at producing self-regulating individuals. In this way the ideal citizen is one who is able to both pathologise and work on themselves and others. These kinds of dynamic and creative exchanges, within and outside cultural institutions, are a source of innovation and reflect the kinds of entrepreneurial strategies that are currently valued in late capitalism. This clearly articulates a gift exchange that can also simultaneously articulate new communities as potential markets. The viewer/participants within intersubjective artworks embody emotional labour through their collective engagement and amplified affect.

The expanded role of the artist is matched by the way the institutional function of the artist is shifting. The conflation of two historically distinct roles, the artist and curator, has undoubtedly influenced the rhetoric about the function and form of art, with spatial and managerial elements factoring into the development of 'platforms', 'stations', 'networks' and 'communities' in large scale art events. The competitive struggles that institute changes in the field operate as much through the appetites of these economic demands as aesthetic innovation. There is considerable pressure on most contemporary artists to negotiate the social, creative and economic terrains of the transnational art world [and late capitalism] as self-regulating and ethical individuals operating collectively across these very platforms. The logic of representation and exhibition being reward enough is highly suspect for most working artists as financial sustainability is undoubtedly an issue for those at the bottom end of the art world's hierarchies. However, the aspirational centre of the art world, and late capitalism, maintains that few succeed but any of us might be 'lucky' enough to break through if we work hard enough and, of course, sustain belief in ourselves.

Bourriaud's approach is the most politically problematic in this aspect. He makes clear the mediatory role intersubjective art plays in late capitalism when he claims that the "imaginary of modernism was based on conflict, the imaginary of our day and age is concerned with negotiations, bonds, and co-existences" (*Relational Aesthetics* 31). The intersubjective artist's role is filling in the gaps to keep late capitalism working smoothly because it is "through little services rendered, [that] the artists fill in the cracks in the social bond" (36). The underlying message is that in the time of hyper-individualism, mass organisation is futile. Individuals need to make small spaces of resistance within their dwindling social circumstances. Or, even better, learn to work with rather than against the demands and limitations of late capitalism. In this way, the interstitial space of the intersubjective artwork becomes the brief reprieve from the demands of late capitalism that helps the viewer/participant re-engage and participate more fully in the social of advanced liberal democracy. And while the artist is located within certain structures of power, he/she is seen as being

able to struggle with, and move beyond, those same structures. The artist is an exemplary contributor to the moral, intellectual and economic drives of late capitalism as

> the traditional profile of the artist as unattached and adaptable to circumstance is surely now coming into its own as the ideal definition of the post-industrial knowledge worker: comfortable in an ever-changing environment that demands creative shifts in communication with different kinds of clients and partners; attitudinally geared toward production that requires long, and often unsocial, hours; and accustomed, in the sundry exercise of their mental labor, to a contingent, rather than a fixed, routine of self-application. (Ross 11)

Like any other profession in the creative sector of advanced modernity, being an artist is a precarious pursuit. A considerable amount of an artist's labour now takes place outside the production of art, as self-promotion, research and troubleshooting, accentuating the increasing professionalisation of artist. The competencies and values of art training have increasingly focused on theoretical and entrepreneurial skills rather than technical ones, correlating with budget cuts for costly specialised training in universities and art schools. This also marks the transition of the artist to an openly entrepreneurial role in advanced modernity. The vocational imperatives of an art school education have seen graduates trained and encouraged "to aim for their own studios and for freelance jobs and projects" (McRobbie, "Reflections on Feminism" 72). The increasing professionalisation of the job of being an artist now necessitates this kind of operational flexibility to adapt to the complexity of roles for the artist. As Gabriel Orozco claims, "I am the head of a team, a coach, a producer, an organizer, a representative, a cheerleader, a host of the party, a captain of the boat…in short, an activist, an activator, an incubator" (qtd. in Foster, "Chat Rooms" 192). Abramović's and Martens' embrace of institutionalising their own pedagogical expertise (and other artists in the case of Martens) is exemplified by the establishment of schools—Abramović's Marina Abramović Institute (upcoming) and Martens' Institute for Human Activities (since 2012).

> The world is made up of random encounters…Art, too, is made up of chaotic, chance meetings of signs and forms. Nowadays, it even *creates spaces within which the encounter can occur.* Present-day art does not present the outcome of a labour*, it is the labour itself, or the labour-to-be.* (Bourriaud, *Relational Aesthetics* 110)

The emphasis on the processual element of intersubjective art practices highlights the precarious, immaterial labour that underpins and produces these artworks. The expedience of these kinds of intellectual, creative and emotional labour within the dominant system of consumption, production and related socio-economic tendencies has been defined as precarious, immaterial and affective

labour.

The once dominant industrial emphasis on material production and repetitive tasks has given way to more symbolic and service-orientated regimes. The attributes and processes ascribed to being indicative of late capitalism are: technological advance, flexible modes of engagement (work and life), service specialisation, small-scale production, economies of scope in this production, the growth of managerial and creative workers, the perceived disappearance of class in favour of classifying consumer types and an emphasis on what are regarded as 'feminine modes of interaction'. These conditions have led to labour being a central theme in art, in creative practice, curatorial programs and critical writing. As globalisation flattens the consumer's marketplace, a premium has been placed on particular fields of specialisation and modes of engagement that emphasise labour conditions, market demands and the affective terrain of (consumer) culture.

Cultural fluency and expertise

The shift from visual to ethnographic approaches to art reflects the increasingly interdisciplinary mode of teaching the visual arts within art schools and universities. Ideas such as agency, participation, and relationality, have become central to the curricula of visual art studies as much as cultural and creative studies degrees. Artists are schooled in the politics of the Left that have defined the pedagogical aspects of the cultural field particularly as the expense of technical training has necessitated the taking up of more discursive teaching models. These ideas have been in turn adopted, not as strategies to bring down capitalism as had been the impetus for these concepts' development, but as aesthetic or thematic concepts for creative practice. The art world is "a field of specialized production", founded on the accrual and appropriation of distinct objects and knowledges and is consequently, distributed unequally (Fraser, *Museum Highlights* 41). Staying abreast of the competences and strategies at work in the art world is central to the self-capitalisation of the artist and other art professionals as their status hinges on their utilisation and fluency of these knowledges, because artists are "cultural producers, engaged first and foremost in the reproduction of their own dispositions and competencies" (40).

Discourse about art is how most people learn to engage with and understand art. It is often through these discursive engagements that the viewer/participant contextualises the artwork. Indeed, a substantial amount of art discourse is written at a distance from the artwork. These are pedagogical as much as analytical texts, educating the viewer/participant in how best to engage with the work, and also provoking aesthetic arguments that maintain the relevance of art professionals in the cultural and social realms. The preferred kinds of participation and contextualisation are often prescribed by the texts that circulate an artwork (reviews, artist statements, themes, curatorial statements, popular culture etc.). Intersubjective art is only Art because of those contextualisations.

This is evidenced by the way that artist talks and critical scholarship are central elements in framing the themes and content of artwork on the programs of biennials, triennials, and globally focussed galleries and museums. The message is that understanding art and engaging with art in the correct way requires the expertise of others. In the context of late capitalism, artists are increasingly inculcated with the logics that the artist's role is to mediate broad problems as 'private entities'. The inculcation of a broad ranging field of expertise from public intellectuals, anthropologists, and cultural policy brokers as arbiters is a distinct characteristic of this. Gillick acknowledges that *Relational Aesthetics* has received "renewed attention in light of the increasing commodification and marketing of critical art discourse" ("Contingent Factors" 152). The elevation of critical discourse comes as "artists and curators now figure prominently—in places such as China, very prominently—among the transnational elite" (Anastas et al. 114).

The adoption of a semiotic approach was exemplified by Joseph Kosuth's *One and Three Chairs* (1965), an installation consisting of a chair, a photograph of that chair in-situ, and an enlarged dictionary definition of the word 'chair'. The artwork was a formal critique of the singular authority of the artist, and the art world's gatekeepers, to define what an artwork means. Inspired by Duchamp's readymades and Fluxus' 'event cards', Kosuth's approach was expanded in the 1980s by appropriation art's negation of an artwork's residual meaning by reinscribing artworks within new contextual frameworks. More recently, Bourriaud exalts the "contemporary artist" as "a semionaut…[who] invents trajectories between signs" (Bourriaud, *Relational Aesthetics* 113). Bourriaud's relational art developed as a distinctly European movement where utility is prized over contemplation and found objects are appropriated, incorporated and 'remixed' to give them new meaning. This process has a long historical lineage and Bourriaud name checks Duchamp and the Dadaists and Situationists within *Relational Aesthetics.*

In a later work, Bourriaud extends his concept of the artist as a semiotician to claims the artist as a DJ (Bourriaud, *Postproduction*). Bourriaud's artist/DJ is another incarnation of the bricoleur, whose ability to select the right everyday objects to recontextualise and revere within art contexts evidences their authorial expertise and the auratic personal presence of the artist. This expertise is recuperated and transacted through disposition. A bricoleur—like a flâneur, like a cosmopolitan—is able to acquire objects/knowledges across social boundaries and create new cultural objects/knowledges. These objects and knowledges are both material and immaterial. Rather than diluting the power of authorial presence, distancing the artist from the production of the artwork and reimagining them as the central catalyst of the artwork has only elevated the artist's authority as a visionary, both culturally and entrepreneurially. The artist is reimagined as a cultural interlocutor.

Artist, cosmopolitan, flâneur

The intersubjective artist, like the cosmopolitan, practices seeking and accumulating knowledges and experiences articulate a form of cultural souveniring, where collections of symbolic experiences (other cultures, other identities) are made meaningful through experiencing and cataloguing of them. In this way bodily experiences and social encounters are catalogued as cultural artefacts just as material goods are. Indeed, experiential tourism in now imagined and marketed as a more satisfying, less commercial endeavour of self discovery and exploration of other geographies, cultures and others. The Other's subjectivity is defined in relation to the cosmopolitan figure. In this way, the practices of the cosmopolitan figure, and by extension, the artist circulating in the transnational art world, correlate with those of the flâneur. Collecting experiences was originally imagined as "a strategy for integration" for the flâneur (White 115). So rather than considering cosmopolitanism and intersubjective art as responses to new conditions, it is worth noting that claims of the destructive impact of modernity have a long lineage. The elevation of mediated intersubjectivity as an artistic and moral strategy more recently might signal a reformulation of a 'blasé attitude' rather than a break with it.

Cosmopolitanism is a distinctly urban sensibility and more depoliticised iterations of a cosmopolitan disposition resemble flânerie. Baudelaire imagined the flâneur's subjectivity as "a mirror as immense as the crowd itself; or a kaleidoscope gifted with consciousness, responding to each one of its movements and reproducing the multiplicity of life and the flickering grace of all the elements of life" (Baudelaire 11). The presence of the artist/ flâneur was imbued with almost magical qualities, the sheer presence of the flâneur able to somehow trigger transcendence in the viewer. Baudelaire embraced the disposition of the flâneur as a way to engage with "the ephemeral, the fugitive, the contingent" sensations of modernity (23). The open disposition of the flâneur, who has both a sense of belonging and sense of separateness from the crowd, embodies in many ways the spirit of cosmopolitanism (and capitalism).

The open disposition of the flâneur, who has both a sense of belonging and sense of separateness from the crowd, embodies in many ways the spirit of cosmopolitanism and late capitalism. Just as Baudelaire viewed himself as a tourist in his own city, the cosmopolitan city is now predicated on encouraging residents to feel like tourists and tourists to feel like residents in a kind of in-between citizenship that some might refer to as liquid. The city and its institutions (galleries, museums, universities) are where the local and the global come together. The flâneur's gaze becomes a knowing gaze, a kind of passionate spectatorship. For the flâneur, life is "to be away from home and yet to feel oneself everywhere at home; to see the world, to be at the centre of the world, and yet to remain hidden from the world" (Baudelaire 9).

Despite the emphasis on being immersed within the crowd, flânerie is a disembodied

fascination with the surface spectacle of capitalism, where the flâneur's being-in-the-world is all-looking but only surface engagement. The pursuit of flânerie is purposeless beyond being *within* and *without* the experience of the collective body, both being affected by and bearing witness to the crowd. The flâneur travels in search of sensation, looking for a way of being in the world that affects him, shocks him into seeing/feeling something new. But there is little empathetic engagement with the masses he immerses himself in. The ambling is aimless and the gaze is contemplative. Even in the shallow act of voyeuristically 'reading' the "profession, character, background, and lifestyle of passers-by," the flâneur evidences their acquired understanding of the habitus of others and the social processes of their time (Benjamin, *Writer of Modern Life* 70). In this way, the strangeness of the stranger is made familiar. The flâneur embodies the very sensorial impulses of late capitalism, exemplifying the interconnected and mutually generative relationship between intersubjective approaches to art and the social forms implicated within them.

Conclusion

This chapter has explored and theorised the intersection of socialised affect, the cosmopolitan disposition, and its exemplification in intersubjective art. Taking Bourdieu's concept of habitus, I have argued that the cosmopolitan disposition is a manifestation of late capitalism's governmental admonitions. Throughout this chapter, I have shown how these formulate a set of dispositional traits that are exemplified in the art professional—the artist, the curator, the critic—who operates and circulates within the transnational art world. In this way, they are systematically located as ideal cosmopolitan subjects of late capitalism. Entrepreneurial, self-reflexive and instructive, the socio-cultural grounding of the artist—their education, milieu, and accessibility—contributes to the viewer/participants understanding and experience of intersubjective art. Distinguishing between what has aesthetic properties and what does not then relies on a familiarity with the competencies and dispositions of the art field, particularly when it comes to the somewhat vague domain of aesthetic knowledge.

Without a definitive 'patron class', art professionals define a provisional class of sorts, predicated on the collection and mobilisation of symbolic goods. The idealised artist is perceived as a social role model, able to mediate at-risk communities, educate and inform, manage bureaucratic processes and revive local economies. Increasing commissions to troubleshoot problem areas sees artists deployed as an institutional strategy to give life to disadvantaged and decaying areas of cities. The artist is self-directed and appears self-regulated, taught to have a deft command of a multitude of the roles and skills required to participate successfully in a mediatory position. This is not an enforced relationship but the effect of a knowledge economy that places a premium on creative thinking and working as a way to energise and innovate in late capitalist economies. This milieu is

the result of the slow coercion of creative workers into the "voluntary embrace" of late capitalism, where the artist has been "relocated from their traditional position at the social margins of the productive economy and recruited into roles closer to the economic centers of production" (Ross 11). The pragmatic reality of the economic and political environments in which the artist circulates as a site of meaning and value are still predicated on their authorial presence.

As a cultural interlocutor the artist is endowed with the premium value of the experience of art within the contemporary art world. At the centre of these aesthetic frameworks is the idealised role of the artist whose expertise stretches across a number of roles—as a connoisseur, an anthropologist, as service provider, and an interlocutor. These varied roles are evidenced within the context of the case studies that follow. As Bourriaud claims, "intersubjectivity does not only represent the social setting for the reception of art, which is its 'environment', its 'field' (Bourdieu), but also becomes the quintessence of artistic practice" (Bourriaud, *Relational Aesthetics* 22). As the material object is increasingly absented from art, the artist's residual presence, their symbolic capital, is in turn inscribed on the bodies of the delegated participants. As social diviner and mediator of value experiences, the symbolic power of the artist overwhelms the absence of artefact within the intersubjective artwork.

However, the absence of a material artwork and the privileging of site both work to reinforce the authority and centrality of the artist's presence. Extending Barthes metaphor, rather than the death of the author or the birth of the reader, mostly this work evidences the "return of the author" (Kwon 51). Moving outside of the frame of the artwork, the artist mediates and administers the production and ongoing life of the artwork. The successful, transnational artist assumes the role of the cosmopolitan figure able to move freely between encounters and institutions, both physical and disciplinary.

Art is distinct from other analytical and mediatory practices, both critical and political, by its sole focus on cultural production as its "object of engagement…as a symbolic system, but also on the level of the social relations and social structure of which this system is the site" (Fraser 42). Civil society (government, non-profit agencies, corporations) utilise the artist in the same way that the artist in turn, utilises the viewer/participant: "everyone is potentially a partner in this newly fluid civic sphere where private and public can no longer clearly be distinguished" (Ross 9). The type of shared relations advocated by cosmopolitanism and intersubjective art idealise active citizens who work together toward a 'common good', suggesting that all citizens are able or even want to transcend their conditions and experiences in favour of seeking what is imagined as a collective ideal. Cosmopolitanism incorporates and naturalises substantial aspects of late capitalism, such as self-realisation, entrepreneurialism and institutional hierarchies that impose and reinforce unequal structural conditions.

In the next section of this thesis, I show how cosmopolitan dispositional traits manifest through three particular and overlapping rubrics in intersubjective art practices and cosmopolitanism: ambivalence and intimacy, risk and intervention in 'other' places, and the domestic as a site of affective labour in art and cosmopolitanism. Each case study draws on the art practice of two artists: one artist figures as a cosmopolitan figure who produces successful and celebrated intersubjective practices, and the other artist problematises both cosmopolitanism and intersubjective art practices while still falling within this intersection.

Chapter 4 (Case study 1)

Obligatory and ambivalent intimacies

In this chapter I analyse the work of Marina Abramović and Santiago Sierra to show contrasting intersubjective engagements that emphasise space and personal distance, as exemplified by Abramović's *The Artist is Present* and Sierra's *Polyurethane Sprayed on the Backs of Ten Workers*. These studies are treated together as exemplars of intersubjective art involved with revealing the surfeit of affect that accompanies late capitalism and global connectedness. Sierra enacts humiliation and exploitation designed to bring the audience into contact with the ways in which late capitalism distances the consumer from the exploitative practices that make it possible as a political economic system. Sierra thereby foregrounds a sense of social and political distance in his work, describing the deep paradoxes of late capitalism using exploitation and humiliation as organising principles of his work while simultaneously proclaiming their critique. In *The Artist Is Present* Abramović uses intimacy and closeness, and the construal of almost complete passivity, to engage the public in an emotional confrontation with emotional and personal deprivation. These exemplary intersubjective artistic treatments of distance and intimacy capture the paradox of cosmopolitanism within the context of late capitalism: the Other as subject-participant involved in a critique of what underpins both the cosmopolitan disposition and late capitalism itself.

The paradox of affective distance

The tension between intimacy and ambivalence is evidenced in cosmopolitan encounters and in the intersubjective art practices of Santiago Sierra and Marina Abramović. Both Abramović and Sierra are successful artists who exhibit and circulate in the transnational art world and their work is installed in leading galleries and museums of the transnational art world. They receive high levels of critical evaluation and praise internationally. Both are renown for making 'uncomfortable' even heroic works achieved through intersubjective relations.

To problematise the political and economic hierarchies that underpin the art world (and late capitalism), Sierra presents artworks that are utterly inhospitable. Despite benefitting substantially from the symbolic and economic rewards of the art world that support his own creative practice and cosmopolitan lifestyle, his artworks focus on the dehumanising and abstracted inequalities of late capitalist labour and how these relations make the world decidedly *uncosmopolitan* for some. Abramović makes no attempt to ameliorate social conditions for the disenfranchised. Instead he brings these facts into close and uncomfortable proximity with his audience. Both Abramović and Sierra have made reputations through showing bodies in pain. Abramović has predominantly used her own body. Sierra's reputation has come through the ways he exploits the bodies of the already

exploited to make his point and his livelihood. Sierra absents himself from the brutality of the artworks physically but also psychologically by performing these acts as remunerable transactions.

Openness and affective economies: Marina Abramović

Marina Abramović is not ordinarily considered an intersubjective artist, due in part to her long-term career as a performance artist and the increasing centrality of celebrity within her performances. In this thesis, I draw on her more recent artwork here that position the viewer as a participant in performances that engage with the ideas of observation and affective excess. These encounters are formulated to produce a sense of unsettling intimacy between artist and viewer. Abramović has been performing since the early 1970s and is a well-known figure in the art world. A significant element of her celebrity persona is based on her reputation as an 'exilic' artist, who has prospered outside her homeland (Meerzon 3). Born in Belgrade, Abramović moved throughout the Slavic states as a young student before settling in Amsterdam in 1976. It was here that she began her iconic collaborative performances with German artist, Ulay. Referring to themselves as a singular unit, 'The Other', they performed a series of tests—of courage, endurance, and transcendence—over twelve years before the relationship ended. She migrated to New York in 2000. This itinerancy is a central element of Abramović's persona. She adopts an exilic cosmopolitan persona, referring to herself as European (*An Artist's Life Manifesto: MOCA Gala*).

The Artist is Present (2010)

Abramović's experiments with affective transference and psychical-physical endurance have aimed to test the boundaries of what it means to feel and to be human. Abramović makes emotional performance-based art and is notorious for extended performances where she, and sometime others, endure extreme acts of deprivation and endurance that border on masochism to test the connections between the body and profound emotional states. Abramović's eponymous performance at her career retrospective, *The Artist is Present* (2010), explores the possibilities of affective exchange between the artist and her participants while simultaneously testing her stamina as a durational element of its extended installation.

In 2010, for seven and a half hours a day, six days a week, from mid-March until the end of May, Abramović was *installed* within the atrium of New York's Museum of Modern Art. Participants queued (some for days) for the opportunity to sit opposite Abramović and to make direct eye contact with her. No talking or touching was allowed. Some participants sat for a few minutes, some for hours and one participant sat for a day's whole seven and a half hour performance. The performance zone was delineated by tape on the floor, with all the potential participants queued up around the borders of the artwork watching the artist-participant exchange

and waiting their turn. The line of people extended outside of the venue and around the block. Outside, the queuing public chatted quietly amongst themselves or waited quietly as though preparing for their own test of endurance and the potentially affective overflow of 'meeting the artist'. Inside, the mood of the atrium suggested something between a royal audience and reality television auditions, illuminating the ecstatic aura of the art object (Abramović) and the newly acquired, reflected aura of the participant. The artist had somehow become overflowing and empty of affect simultaneously: a catalyst of pure sensation. Art critic Arthur Danto claims in his account of sitting with the 'shamanic' Abramović that there was an almost ecstatic transference attributed to the artist's transcendent presence:

> Marina leaned her head back at a slight angle, and to one side. She fixed her eyes on me without—so it seemed—any longer seeing me. It was as if she had entered another state. I was outside her gaze. Her face took on the translucence of fine porcelain. She was luminous without being incandescent. She had gone into what she had often spoken of as a 'performance mode'. For me at least, it was a *shamanic trance*—her ability to enter such a state is one of her gifts as a performer. It is what enables her to go through the physical ordeals of some of her famous performances… For a wild moment I thought my physical ailments would fade away, as if I were at Lourdes. [emphasis added] ("Sitting with Marina")

As an art critic, Danto's belief in the power of the artist and in turn, the power of art to trigger personal transcendence is not so surprising. However, Danto was not alone in feeling that the experience of viewing and participating in *The Artist is Present* was transcendent. Participants were overwhelmingly *moved* by the experience. The artwork's intersubjective encounters were orchestrated to be performed one after the other in a continuous stream. This meant that while the viewer/participant waited for their audience with Abramović, they bear extended witness to Abramović's physical and psychological discipline. She is in control. Indeed, the perceived unearthly discipline required for Abramović's performance of sitting silently and relatively still for 736.5 hours in total was a significant element of the media coverage and her perceived shamanistic quality. Engaging with each sitter/participant's gaze and individually being present with them invites further interrogation. This is a performance of a kind of ascetic openness toward the viewer, like a public secular penance. In Abramović's performance, she positions herself as the other in relation to the viewer/participants who formed a mass of sorts by their sheer numbers in the confined space of the museum. Abramović opened herself to the experiences of the crowd by positioning herself as an aesthetic (and transcendent) trigger. Abramović's documentarian, Matthew Akers referred to MoMA's atrium as a temple and alluded to the "secularized 'religious

experience'" of the installation (Vizcarrondo). This is reinforced by Abramović's prayer-like ritual of completing each participant's sitting by closing her eyes, bowing her head and recomposing herself before looking up with 'new' eyes for the next sitter

The Artist is Present is more physically contained than most of Abramović's previous performance pieces but that containment works strategically for those familiar with her oeuvre. After a career of capturing the viewer's gaze with spectacular acts of self-inflicted brutality and isolation, Abramović's endurance is now softer, less reliant on visceral responses of shock and horror. *The Artist is Present* evidences Abramović performing openness as an artistic strategy so that she appears as a kind of martyr for the viewer/participant's emotional projection. Before the installation, Abramović states that the performance would become "close to life itself", where "the hardest thing to do is something that is close to nothing because it demands all of you" (qtd. in Akers). Rather than relying on the viscera of cuts and self-deprivation, Abramović strips back the spectacle of violence to reveal a performance of austere 'realness'. Just the viewer and Marina; eyes locked.

In an earlier performance artwork, *The Lips of St Thomas* (1975), Abramović lay spent on blocks of ice after gorging herself on honey and wine with a five-point star cut into her abdomen. Jill Bennett wrote of this performance that

> if Abramović, the artist, experiences the body—or the artwork—in this manner, what
> of her audience? Seeing sensation for an audience surely entails feeling or, at the
> very least, experiencing a tension between an affective encounter with a real body in
> pain and an encounter with body as image or ground of representation. (38)

So this prompts the question that if Abramović is performing realness, what kind of 'real' does this performance represent? And what sort of relations? The artist's open and performatively therapeutic gaze is a metaphor for advanced liberal expertise at its most affective. With no dialogue allowed, the exchange is all about 'pure' affect. It is as though looking and being looked at is enough to unlock repressed emotion and help us work on whatever personal ill ails us.

Any reconstruction and representation of the 'real' is always "largely marked by excess, setting up the interplay between spectacle and reality" and this is an artwork marked by its affective excess (Demaria 305). *The Artist is Present* seemed to tap into an excess of emotional yearning, obscuring even the palpable cult of celebrity embedded in Abramović's performance. Celebrity itself is an excess of affect. It is notable that although Akers' documentary only includes a few celebrities participating numerous websites detail a larger collection of public figures that sat with Abramović. And the feelings kept flowing long after the viewer's encounter and long after the show ended. Akers' documentary, *Sitting with Marina*, was feted internationally, a Facebook 'support'

group, "Sitting with Marina", was established for affected sitter/participants, and a piece of tape acquired post-performance from under one of the chairs sold on eBay for US$242.50 (Bartlett). The accompanying portraits by Abramović's photographer, Marco Anelli, capture each sitter/participant at the time of their sitting, fixing the often-overflowing affect of the subject. The absence of sanctioned, exegetical meaning seems to create an incomprehensible void that the sitter/participant must make meaning within so as not to be overwhelmed by their own presence/absence. It is as though staring into the empty space made by the absence of Abramović creates a sense of urgency within the viewer to fill it with whatever lies hidden just below the surface of their own presence, which might make it seem instinctual and more *natural* than it might necessarily be. The hyperbole that accompanied the exhibition created such a heightened state of expectancy in the viewer that it would be hard to consider the outpouring of emotion within the space spontaneous or instinctual after the first week.

Abramović seems to challenge her audience, testing whether they can endure the sensation of bearing witness to her openness. The open, desiring gaze of the viewer is reciprocated by Abramović's, seeming to right the ordinarily unequal relationship between viewer and performer; from looking to being looked at to sharing a look. The viewers seem to believe in the transformative power of Abramović's exchanged gaze, as though somehow their connection will shift the individual experience of the artist to a collective one. As Abramović says herself, "so many people have so much pain. I am a mirror of their own self" (qtd. in Akers). The performance is framed so that those minutes of direct eye contact trigger an emotional resonance that invites intimacy, understanding, and invites an empathetic relation between the spectacularised emotion of Abramović and the invisible interior life of the viewer/participant. The range of the feelings projected by the sitters is evidenced in the artwork's documentation: joy, sadness, concentration, desire, empathy, excitement, shame, shyness and pain. Seemingly the affective intensities of the artwork are amplified in the resonating space between the sitter and Abramović. The intimacy is somewhat unnerving to watch as an abstracted viewer of the subsequent documentation. The audience's group affect seems to waiver between a quasi-scientific detachment and hysteria.

Intersubjective artworks like Abramović's *The Artist is Present*, position the viewer in intimate relation to Abramović's own performance of feeling, where a kind of *labile affect* unfolds as the flattened affect of Abramović's blank visage ostensibly yields to the escaping intensities of the relational exchange between participant and artist. *Labile affect* is an "instability or fluctuation of emotions" and *flattened affect* is the "absence or near absence of emotional expression" (Colman). The affective exchange of the encounter cannot be contained. This posits the internal state of the artist (and the viewer) as instinctual and primary. The outward display of public emotion, manifested and mediated through a lifetime of experiences and environments, is suddenly

usurped by the primacy of the sensation and the 'surfacing' of private intensities between two strangers in a shared space. As stated in the previous chapter, the face is our primal and most critical core of being. Searching faces for affective intensities is what we have done since our first exchange with our mothers and we replay this gaze with lovers and our own children because faces amplify affect and anything seems significant when intensified and amplified by affect. Affect "always makes good things better and bad things worse" (Nathanson xviii) and perhaps more appropriately here, "interactivity can make the useful less boring and the serious more engaging" (Massumi 2).

It is the viewer/participant's feelings that are out of control not Abramović's. She is a flat surface, a mirror onto which they project themselves. Maintaining her composure is what leads to her psychical and physical exhaustion. Abramović's performance hinges on her affective, embodied labour. She performs bravery by taking on the emotional force of the audience as a kind of gendered labour, which drains her accordingly. A considerable aspect of the affective impact and narrative of *The Artist is Present* hangs on Abramović's perceived generosity and endurance in opening herself to the viewer/participant as a kind of gift exchange. After each viewer's sitting, Abramović looked down as though to 'regain' her composure before raising her face to greet another stranger's face. At the end of each day's performance, assistants and security staff slowly helped her to her feet. In Akers' documentation, these closing performances resemble that of an ascetic martyr, a disciplined and transcendent channel burdened with the weight of a higher calling. It is a problematic role she is playing. This kind of role-play signifies excess and the significant amplification of affect undoubtedly coerces the viewer/participant to feel more in return.

Most viewer/participants not only respond to the open face of Abramović but to the large spectacular open space in which she is installed, and to all of the historical representations of Abramović and her body of work. Notably, the viewer/participants would witness the viewer/participants that came before them, taking in a range of social and behavioural cues before, during and after their sitting with Abramović. Akers' documentary shows one participant disrobing once invited into an audience with Abramović. The ever-present security guards immediately removed her from the museum despite her tears and protestations, but not before Akers had recorded the moment on film. When interviewed by Akers after her removal from the gallery, the woman declared her own intentions to become a performance artist inspired by the intensities *The Artist is Present* had triggered in herself and others. Undoubtedly, the public interest and small glimpse of notoriety was similarly inspirational.

An Artist's Life Manifesto (2011)

Soon after the installation of *The Artist is Present*, Abramović presented a highly

controversial work at the Museum of Contemporary Art in Lost Angeles. In the short documentary film of the installation released by MOCA, Abramović contends that an artist is a servant to the public and that in the United States, unlike Europe where artists are viewed as integral to the maintenance of national culture and are consequently supporting by governmental funding, the aristocrats and patrons of the arts come from industry (*An Artist's Life Manifesto: MOCA Gala*). "Who sponsors the culture?", she asks (*An Artist's Life Manifesto*). As an artist/servant, she perceives her role not as a provider of entertainment but rather to cause unease in the viewer so that they leave with a sense of experiencing something they hadn't experienced before.

The performance itself played out like a Dionysian spectacle, an overwhelming and confusing mix of excess and its corollary, worship. Approximately 750 guests —celebrities, media identities and industry figureheads—paid between $2500-$10000 to see Abramović curate the evening's event. After initial canapés and cocktails in the foyer, the guests were dressed in lab coats and herded into the performance space, which was laid out in the style baroque banquet rooms. This was reminiscent of the mise-en-scène in *The Cook, The Thief, His Wife and Her Lover* and the ensuing performance drew on similar themes of sex, lust, food and gluttony. Younger artists (mostly white women) appeared as rotating heads as centrepieces on each table, sitting on rotating Lazy Susans concealed under the table. Naked women were positioned on larger Lazy Susans underneath to-scale human skeletons. Deborah Harry arrived under a sheet and carried by toga wearing young men. Once revealed to the audience, Harry, wearing a red sequin gown, sang two Blondie songs while and danced with Abramović. Finally they served cake in their own likenesses (Abramović and Harry) to the audience. The performative element of the wearing lab coats, for Abramović and the audience, was to reiterate that this was not merely spectacle but a quasi-scientific experiment about the acts of witnessing and being observed.

Like *The Artist is Present*, *An Artist's Life Manifesto* was constructed to produce an unsettling intimacy between the viewer/participants, the contracted workers and Abramović. The viewer was positioned as both witness and participant within the unfolding surfeit of sensation produced throughout the night. There was considerable controversy surrounding the demeaning and oppressive demands on the minor performers that Abramović employed. And I use 'employed' here with emphasis. The performers' treatment and remuneration were central to popular and critical discourse circulating the performance. After expressing interest, prospective workers were told what to expect from participation. They were warned that during the night's performance "gala guests could try to poke or feed them, they would be expected to sign a non-disclosure agreement, and would be paid with $150 and a year-long MOCA membership" (Wagley).

After Yvonne Rainer learned of the working conditions for those artists lower on the artworld hierarchy, she drafted a letter to Jeffrey Deitch, the director of MoCA. This led to Deitch

inviting Rainer to attend a rehearsal of the performance. Unsatisfied, Rainer sought publication for a final letter composed after the visit and co-signed by 49 other artists, critics and scholars. Rainer argued against the physical containment of younger artists whose "live heads will be rotating as decorative centerpieces at diners' tables and others—all women—will be required to lie perfectly still in the nude for over three hours under fake skeletons, also as centerpieces surrounded by diners" ("Final Letter to Jeffrey Deitch"). She argued that the artwork had no "credibility…only a questionable personal rationale about the beauty of eye contact and the transcendence of artists' suffering" ("Final Letter to Jeffrey Deitch"). Rather than an "épatering of the bourgeoisie", Rainer saw the installation as a "titillation for wealthy donor/diners as a means of raising money" ("Final Letter to Jeffrey Deitch").

> I can't help feeling that subjecting her performers to possible public humiliation and bodily injury from the three-hour endurance test at the hands of a bunch of frolicking donors is yet another example of the Museum's callousness and greed and Ms Abramović's obliviousness to differences in context and some of the implications of transposing her own powerful performances to the bodies of others. ("Final Letter to Jeffrey Deitch")

Despite the elite of the art world rallying against their perceived exploitation, most of the local artists contracted seemed grateful to have participated in such a large-scale production (Wagley). I would argue that these artists' willingness to participate in the performance despite their exploitation speaks to the competitive and hierarchal nature of the art world, where participation and propinquity to celebrity—whether artists, potential patrons or film and television stars—are tightly interwoven aspects of forging an art career. Very few guests actually offered negative opinions of the performance, which is understandable considering their complicity in the precarious labour politics that defined the event (Wagley).

Importantly, Abramović's performance shows how the artist is endowed with the premium value of the experience of art within the contemporary art world. Rather than merely bearing witness, *The Artist is Present* shows how the social elevation of the artist is increasingly understood as plenary rather than simply present. This is particularly obvious in Abramović's recent performance in *An Artist's Life Manifesto*. She presents herself as a social diviner and mediator of value experiences, overwhelming any potential agency for the participant within her artworks.

The overwhelming message is that art, like life, should move you—to think, to feel-anything—and the artist is the trigger. As Massumi notes

> What is central to interactive art is not so much the aesthetic form in which a work

presents itself to an audience…but the behaviour the work triggers in the viewer. The viewer then becomes a participant in the work, which behaves in response to the participant's actions. Interactive art needs behaviour on both sides of the classical dichotomy of object and viewer. (1)

To the imagined fragmented, desensitised individuals that make up the audience, *The Artist is Present* is positioned as a kind of microtopian space, a reprieve from the unrelenting emotional hardness of everyday life outside the gallery. The gallery is the place where the viewer comes to feel, to 'let it go'. Within the institutions of art, these utopian artistic experiments formulate a version of society that sees hospitality, optimism, and dialogue as tools of self-determination powerful enough to empower individuals who can transcend the limitations of their structural conditions. Those amplified moments are the heart of the art world. In seeking new connections and ways of belonging, the underlying logic is that the intersubjective artist and their ideal viewer/participant both value the pleasures of consuming difference while simultaneously seeking belonging. The pleasure of consuming difference is a central element of a cosmopolitan attitude.

Unproductive labour and uncomfortable relations: Santiago Sierra

Spanish artist Santiago Sierra's creative practice addresses issues relating to social marginalisation, especially in relation to labour, migration and poverty. The works take the form of critiques of labour and exploitation within late capitalism. Sierra's artwork shows how despite the advance of the white-collar service economy, the 'dirty work' of hard physical exertion and the outsourcing of low-level service labour remains the domain of the globally disenfranchised. Sierra's performance artworks are processes of spectacularisation where the embodied commodification of his workers highlights the abstraction of this kind of labour within the flows of global capital. With self-explanatory titles—*Line of 30 cm Tattooed on a Remunerated Person* (1998), *Ten People Paid To Masturbate* (2000), *Workers Who Cannot be Paid, Remunerated to Remain Inside Cardboard Boxes* (2000), *The Wall of a Gallery Pulled Out, Inclined Sixty Degrees from the Ground and Sustained by Five People* (2000), *Person Saying a Phrase* (2002), *Spraying of Polyurethane over 18 People* (2002), *Polyurethane Sprayed on the Backs of Ten Workers* (2004), *Burial of Ten Workers* (2010)—Sierra's artworks address capitalism by foregrounding how the disadvantaged and powerless are systematically exploited within its logics, including within the domain of his own art practice and those institutions that support it.

Polyurethane Sprayed on the Backs of Ten Workers (2004)

Ten people are lined up facing the wall of the gallery huddled together covered in black plastic sheeting that drapes down from their heads like hooded raincoats. Waiting, they occasionally

turn looking for the tall man wearing the white protective jumpsuit and breathing apparatus who has assembled them in place. The wait seems longer than it is. They seem considerably shorter than the white figure, like women or possibly children, although a review states that the Iraqi workers comprised seven women and three men (Searle 12). This thought makes for an even more uncomfortable feeling for the viewer. Upon his return, the white figure moves two industrial gas canisters into place and then leaves again. The tension builds. Knowing the workers are Iraqi immigrants and that this artwork is a response to the now iconic images released in 2003 of torture and prisoner abuse by American military personnel in Abu Ghraib underpins the tension, the guilt, and the empathy. Rather than merely witnessing, we are compelled to feel complicit in the exploitation. The white figure returns again, picks up an industrial gun and begins spraying white foam over the back up toward the heads of the now static workers. They stand still in place.

A man in a business suit enters the scene and walks down the line, moving and separating and placing the workers—alone and in groups of two and three. The authoritative figure is iconic British art dealer Nicholas Logsdail, the celebrated director of the Lisson Gallery in London where the work is installed (Searle 12). Only art world insiders or enthusiasts would recognise the director Logsdail, who was recently named as one of "the most powerful people in the art world" by *The Guardian* newspaper (Farago). Where there were once black hooded workers there are now white ossified mounds resembling the black and white images of Pompeii's petrified bodies that terrified me as a child. All that remains of the workers is their shells.

This is Sierra's *Polyurethane Sprayed on the Backs of Ten Workers* (2004). Just as curators are now frequently positioned in the same way that artists are, Logsdail's role as director, places him at the centre of the artwork. This is most definitely a strategy by Sierra to implicate his complicity in the creation of the artwork and Sierra's exploitation of the already exploited. *Polyurethane Sprayed on the Backs of Ten Workers* (2004) builds on Sierra's earlier artwork, *Spraying of Polyurethane over 18 People* (2002). In the earlier work, eighteen mostly Eastern European sex workers assume sexual positions in underwear and high heels, while workers spray polyurethane at their black plastic covered genitals. *Spraying of Polyurethane over 18 People* was performed in an abandoned 12th century church in Luca, Italy and without an audience. Rather than install the artwork as a performance, Sierra chose to show how detached these images (and workers) are from the elite institutions in which they are exhibited. Large-scale photographs documenting the artworks' process were installed in a Bourriaud curated show, *Hardcore,* at Paris' Palais de Tokyo in 2003. Sierra's politically salient themes—sex work, the contradictions of religion, the underclass of globalisation, human trafficking—bring grim social realities into the luxurious emptiness of the Palais de Tokyo. For those unfamiliar with this art gallery, it is housed in Paris' former Japanese pavilion from 1937's World Fair was renovated and reopened as the Palais de Tokyo in 2002.

Rather than the traditional white cube spaces, the gallery was defined by its vast and unfinished spaces that resembled a chic warehouse studio come experimental laboratory. The juxtaposition of degradation and glamour is blatant in the Palais de Tokyo and Sierra's documentation of *Spraying of Polyurethane over 18 People* reiterates the distance between the workers and the viewer. There is not the sense of immediacy that would come with being present with Sierra's workers while they are captured and fixed by his polyurethane at their most vulnerable. There is the distance created by the camera's eye and the process of documentation.

Sierra produces a performance of objectivity as much as he produces the workers' performance of subjectivity. He reiterates that this is an orchestrated transaction, a performative high culture interpretation of everyday exploitation. The sex workers are fixed at their most vulnerable in this documentation, but the viewer is distanced from the affective specificities of Sierra's labour transactions—the smells, the sounds, the specificities of the site, language. The viewer is afforded one sensorial slice, the moment of a visual image. The video documentation of *Polyurethane Sprayed on the Backs of Ten Workers* now installed in Lisson Gallery animates this process of subjugation differently. Sierra's grainy black and white footage resembles surveillance video more than exhibition quality documentation and the lack of sound makes the unfolding image more sinister. These subjects are being disciplined and surveilled for our viewing 'pleasure'. The distance between the participant and the viewer expands. Video demands a different temporal engagement with the work.

> What I do is refuse to deny the principles that underlie the creation of an object of luxury: from the watchman who sits next to a Monet for eight hours a day, to the doorman who controls who comes in, to the source of the funds used to buy the collection. I try to include all this, and therein lies the little commotion about remuneration that my pieces have caused. (qtd. in Margolles 64)

The performances and images spectacularise the quotidian processes of exploitation in late capitalism. His exploitation is not just about the transaction of physical labour for remuneration; one of the most uncomfortable parts of Sierra's artworks is that the workers endure humiliation, shame and physical discomfort for none of the symbolic rewards that an artist like Abramović gets for similar performances. What do you have to do for money when you have none of the preferred experiences or knowledges favoured in the exchange of capital at the heart of late capitalism? This is where Sierra's artworks intersect with those of Renzo Martens, the focus of the next chapter's case study. Both show the relations of late capitalism at their harshest. When spectacular suffering is someone's means of earning an income in late capitalism, the system is obviously profoundly flawed.

Burial of Ten Workers (2010)

With an obvious focus on the ordinarily unrecognised and exploited underclass of late capitalism, invisibility and absence are at the heart of Sierra's work In *Burial of Ten Workers* (2010). The artwork involves ten workers are photographed in incremental stages as they are being buried alive. The workers stare at the port in the distance, not toward the tide or the camera, as they slowly disappear under the sand and mud of an industrialised shoreline. The final photograph shows the incoming tide has removed the last traces of where their graves had been dug. Their dematerialisation is complete. Rather than merely delegate participatory roles to the privileged viewers within the gallery or museum, Sierra employs and pays his participants as workers to highlight the labour transacted at the centre of the artwork. This emphasises the hierarchical system of labour that determines which tasks are mundane enough to be outsourced. This applies equally to the transnational art world as it does the structural hierarchies of late capitalism. The outsourcing of blue-collar work across borders shows cosmopolitanisation at its most exploitative. Sierra's work reproduces the abstraction of outsourced labour in global capitalism but it also shows how the abstracted labour of the worker drives the symbolic economy of the art world. The inextricable links between money, labour and power are amplified in Sierra's artworks.

Sierra's work is institutional critique and is transacted for the art world's elite institutions. The business of art and being an entrepreneurial figure necessitates a hierarchy of social relations and which practices can be delegated to others. This is a distinctive element of the realisation of his artworks. After the contract with each worker has been processed, Sierra absents himself any further decisions or administrative exchanges with the participants. Kenning notes that the "anti-expressive conceptual purity of his realism...is the purity of capitalism: the agent of exploitation is absent, with money the neutral mediator meaning that any transaction is entered into 'freely'" (441). By financially compensating his participants for their 'work', Sierra reiterates the discrepant politics played out in installations that delegate labour to others. The viewer is made aware that Sierra pays his workers but that their remuneration is meagre, mostly the least that the workers will accept. Again, Sierra emphasises the distance between the artist, as representative of the transnational art world, and the worker by having the worker's employment and payment process managed by a third party—literally outsourcing artistic labour. In Sierra's case, the overwhelming social and economic inequalities of the participants are amplified by the endurance, humiliation and physical commitment required of them within the artwork.

By monetising the labour transaction, Sierra shows the disparity between the value of the labour within the artwork and the value of the artwork once realised as a commodity. This could not be clearer than in *Person Saying a Phrase* (2002), where a homeless person begging on Birmingham's New Street states directly and without emotion to the camera (and viewer): "My

participation in this project could generate $72,000 dollars profit. I am paid five pounds" (*Person Saying a Phrase*). In this work Sierra implies that everyone is complicit in the capitalising logics that underpin exploitation, including the indigent figures being exploited. The relation between labour, self-capitalisation and exploitation is similarly advanced in the work of Renzo Martens and will be explored at length later in this thesis.

Sierra's creative practice highlights the complex and contradictory nature of intersubjective aesthetics. Despite fulfilling the loose criteria of Bourriaud's relational aesthetics, Sierra's omission from Bourriaud's survey is a conspicuous exclusion. Having received considerable critical attention, Sierra's work focuses on and mediates social relations but as a brutal critique of the impact of globalisation and late capitalism rather than a celebration of togetherness. Sierra's artworks are excessive, in the relations that they formulate and the responses that they elicit. Rather than the celebratory rhetoric of global flows and mobilities—such as those in cosmopolitanism at its most utopian—Sierra reveals and enacts the exploitation that underpins globalisation and capitalism and the moral paradoxes inherent to advanced liberal democracy.

The intersubjective communities of Sierra's artworks are brought together through negative affect. Whereas many intersubjective artists tend to establish encounters that centralise the place of dialogue, mediation, and cohesion as goals of their art, artists like Sierra can achieve dialogue and negotiation "without collapsing these relationships into the work's content" (Bishop, "Antagonism" 70). Bishop argues that the relationships produced through Sierra's artworks "are marked by sensations of unease and discomfort rather than belonging" and in this way, they negate the possibility of a microtopia as they sustain "a tension among viewers, participants, and context" (Bishop, "Antagonism" 70). Within the privileged domain of art's elite institutions, this kind of reactive discomfort can be a way to introduce novelty and the perception of political salience into curatorial programming particularly when the transnational art world and its cultural institutions is producing an ever expanding line up of art events.

Any political intentions Sierra might have run secondary to his institutional critique. There is little room for conviviality within his artworks, even amongst the workers equally humiliated during his performances. The orchestrated and heavily scripted temporary formation of a group of disenfranchised workers have little hope of forming any significant bond with each other let alone triggering any broader structural changes that will alleviate their hardship within the bureaucratic and detached space of Sierra's performances. Emotional responses are not triggered by the inherent traits of others but rather "it is through affective encounters that objects and others are seen as having attributes, or certain characteristics…[giving] the subject an identity that is apart from others (Ahmed, "Communities that Feel" 16). With emotions such as hate and fear, other bodies are collectively constituted as a 'common threat' evidencing how some emotions cannot be figured as a

singular object or subject and how "emotions are economic; they circulate between signifiers in relationships of difference and displacement" (Ahmed, "Communities that Feel" 11).

Despite attempts to strip away the artifice of art to reveal a more naturalistic and un-idealised representation of contemporary life in the age of globalisation, Sierra's implicitly political artwork, with its unemotional depictions of working life, are balanced by his performance of 'heroic' notoriety. This reinforces his position as the archetype of the sovereign individual. Sierra's sincerity and its institutional setting legitimise the works as art in contrast to the banal cruelties and humiliations that populate reality television. This is not entertainment to be enjoyed as a guilty pleasure but rather this work insists on the uncomfortable emotional labour of the viewer is obligated to witness the depravity and inequity of the transnational art world and global capitalism.

Only particular people will participate in works requiring endurance and humiliation. Those diminished and disempowered by the processes of global capital are briefly elevated as luxurious and useless cultural commodities in grotesque theatrical performances that present "the pinnacles of culture as the documents of barbarism" (Kenning 438). This is the kind of paradox that drives the transnational art world, where you can "present as art those whose systematic exclusion from art is a direct effect of the inequalities and consequent exploitation that art relies upon in its status as luxury commodity and cultural capital" (438). These artworks show how submission is inscribed on the bodies of the participants contained within and by the performance. Captured in the documentation of his artworks, the participants are fixed by Sierra's lens as "the dispossessed global underclass" and sold on to collectors and galleries as commodities and investments within the global flows of the art world (438). This element of Sierra's work is mirrored in Martens' exploration of the deployment of images of disenfranchisement and abject suffering in the West.

Acknowledging the paradoxical nature of critiquing what he is simultaneously reproducing in the advance of his own career, Sierra admits that "self-criticism makes you feel morally superior, and I give high society and high culture the mechanisms to unload their morality and their guilt" (qtd. in Margolles 64). Sierra's artworks show that formulating a space in which social relations can take place does not equate to enacting democratic exchange. These are complex and controversial relations. Bishop contends that bearing witness to the degradation and suffering of the participants creates "awkwardness and discomfort" that negates any mutual conviviality amongst audience members producing 'relational antagonism' instead (Bishop 79).

While acknowledging the aesthetics of discomfort that Sierra attempts to produce, the subjects are further abstracted from the viewer through the paradoxical siting of Sierra's artworks within elite institutional space. This is not only the uneasy recognition of how art and its institutions are increasingly the site of precarious forms of entertainment, consumption and leisure. But also how art and its institutions are so abstracted from the exploitation that takes place in the network of

cheap outsourced labour that produces items for the retail spaces within them. Sierra's artworks are spectacular in their big picture brutality but it is in the retail spaces of galleries and museums—the cafes, restaurants, bookshops, gift shops—that we see the most telling abstraction of art and labour. These kinds of retails sites now provide substantial income for the gallery and operate as sources of symbolic accrual for visitors. Who makes the pens, tea towels, snow domes, laptop covers, and the other souvenirs that dominate the burgeoning museum and gallery shop?

The elaborate behind-the-scenes networks of labour and capital implicit in the production of art see both labour and capital cross borders in the quest for cheaper manufacturing costs and higher profit margins for the gift shop. Sierra exploits and simultaneously critiques the disproportionate distribution of labour and capital that drives the art world. The focus on openness and contingency of intersubjective artworks seems to dematerialise or neutralise the labour required in the social transaction that gives the work meaning. In intersubjective artworks, framing the participation and contribution of the viewer/participant as in their own best interest obfuscates the participant's affective and physical labour. This paradox is a hallmark condition of late capitalism.

Conclusion

Abramović's public performances show how she positions her self and her creative practice as inextricably intertwined. Life is an artistic experiment. *The Artist is Present* received considerable critical and popular attention mostly focused on Abramović's bravery and endurance and the affective impact of sitting with such a singular (heroic) human force. Touted as Abramović's comeback, her renewed bodily engagement focussed on new encounters that were positioned as an act of hospitality, where the artist opened herself to the viewer/participant and empathised with whatever emotions they brought to the interaction. Within the art world, the artist is increasingly judged on their conduct and attitudes—their practices and process—rather than the fixed object of the artwork.

For an artist like Abramović, performing emotional labour goes toward countering claims of narcissism and celebrity seeking. Even when the artist's physical presence is absented from performance-based artwork, as is the case with Sierra, their "artistic persona often persists as the privileged centre around which discursive and material effects take shape" (Kenning 437). This is evident in the creative practices of both Abramović and Sierra. Sierra's intersubjective artworks are 'anti-social' however, as with Martens' work in the following chapter, there is strong awareness that they are complicit in the social inequality they are exposing. They remind the viewer that these aren't just social issues, they are structural ones. Antagonism is central to Sierra, Martens and even Hirschhorn. This kind of affective exchange is as much about the materialisation and capitalisation of the viewers through the symbolic, embodied otherness as it is about the utopian ideal of

hospitality and kindness.

Chapter 5 (Case Study Two):

Other places and unresolvable strangeness

This chapter focuses on the work of Thomas Hirschhorn and Renzo Martens. I treat them together as exemplars of intersubjective artists whose site of creative practice is pre-existing communities. For Hirschhorn, the urban community serves as a canvas upon which to make statements about the nature of reality, where it is made, and by whom. In his intersubjective construction, the community is paradoxically rendered as a passive object in relation to the artwork yet discursively constructed as active in terms of it being the site of cultural reality. Martens' artistic practice focuses on impoverished communities and is based in the medium of documentary film. It highlights the paradoxes of late capitalism by such rhetorical turns as framing poverty as an economic resource, by showing the inversion and perversion of global philanthropy, and by ironically proliferating intersubjective art as a means of alleviating poverty.

I draw only briefly on the work of Thomas Hirschhorn, focusing specifically on his installation, *Bataille Monument*. This intersubjective artwork was installed as a satellite site for the Documenta exhibition in 2002. I draw on it here as a contrast to the work of Renzo Martens, who is the main focus of this case study. Hirschhorn and Martens both embody cosmopolitan tendencies in the way that their creative practices are enabled by the exilic position that they adopt. Both live and work transnationally. They display curiosity about and openness to other cultures and social formations through their creative practice, and in this way, they deploy a particular set of artistic and intellectual knowledges in an ironic and detached fashion. Their artworks, and parallel lifestyles, are predicated on their willingness to take risks and move into potentially dangerous places. However, there is a notable distinction between the planned communities of Hirschhorn and Martens. Whereas Hirschhorn sticks to Western cities, Martens travels to 'other' places marked by poverty and deprivation. Both artists focus on sites marked by excess—as a complicated appeal to the sentiments, as a site of transformative action, and as a point of distinctiveness within the transnational art world.

Contradiction and antagonism are central elements of both Martens and Hirschhorn's interventions. Hirschhorn's artworks are produced as utopian experiments that hope to trigger intellectual thought and. Unlike Martens' artworks, they are not produced with the direct task of instigating structural change. Hirschhorn's aspirations are purely symbolic while Martens aims for the symbolic capital of his work in the Democratic Republic of Congo to be transformed into economic capital for his Congolese participants.

Precarious monuments and utopian communities: Thomas Hirschhorn

Swiss artist, Thomas Hirschhorn, is known primarily for a series of intersubjective artworks referred to as 'precarious monuments' and 'cardboard utopias'. These ramshackle installations are built as social environments that shape possible relations between Hirschhorn's philosophical heroes and sites of urban disenfranchisement. These are positioned as alternative models for thinking and being in the world by the philosophers he chooses—Spinoza, Bataille, Deleuze, Gramsci—and the sites he chooses— predominantly housing projects in European cities. *Gramsci Monument* (2013) was installed in the Bronx in the United States. Hirschhorn's installations are constructed from mundane but precarious materials, such as cardboard, wood, masking tape, staples, glue, recycled plastic, and aluminium foil. Importantly, he employs members of the community in which he stages the works to help construct these immersive environments. His primary goal for the viewer/participant is pedagogical: "This is something essential to art: reception is never its goal. What counts for me is that my work provides material to reflect upon. Reflection is an activity" (Hirschhorn qtd. in Bishop, *Installation Art* 127). Hirschhorn chooses suburban sites because he sees them as a source of inspiration and authenticity:

> What I need, as an artist, is to live in a space of truth, and this space of truth exists in
> Paris. As in almost every large city, the space of truth is its suburbs, their so-
> called *banlieues*…It's in the suburbs that there is vitality, deception, depression,
> energy, utopia, autonomy, craziness, creativity, destruction, ideas, young people,
> hope, fights to be fought, audaciousness, disagreements, problems, and dreams. It's
> in the suburbs that today's big issues are written on the building facades. It's in the
> suburbs that today's reality can be grasped, and it's in the suburbs that the pulse of
> vitality hurts. (Hirschhorn qtd. in Cruzvillegas)

Hirschhorn's lionising of the suburban environment as central to contemporary life is in stark and paradoxical contrast to the passivity that place plays in his artwork.

DIY utopias

There is often a tacit assumption of authenticity underpinning intersubjective artworks that are installed within pre-existing communities. This is particularly true of those that call on minoritarian identities as both the content and form of the work. The word *community* itself suggests an organic, self-determined social formation but the contemporaneous over-use of the term risks obscuring the inherent struggles within communities that mark their processual and ongoing nature. Communities are not static; they reflect the transitional identities of their members and their multiple contexts. Just as individual identity adapts and flows, so does communal identity. Much of

118

the intersubjective work staged outside galleries and museums follows in the footsteps of community cultural development strategies, particularly by embedding the art installation or project within communities that are chosen and marked for their minoritarian identity. In this way, they fix the community as a static formation.

The controversy and upheaval surrounding the placement of a work like Thomas Hirschhorn's *Bataille Monument* (2002) at Documenta 11 evidences this well. Hirschhorn's monument was a social sculpture consisting of eight participatory elements - a sculpture, television studio, library, snack bar, four web cams, workshops, a sculpture and a shuttle service (between the main Documenta site and the venue) - embedded in Friedrich-Wöhler-Siedlung, the working class and predominantly Turkish section of Kassell. As part of Documenta 11, Hirschhorn's 'social sculpture' reflects a post-Fordist understanding of a Do-It-Yourself aesthetic where the physical labour is outsourced and Hirschhorn takes on the intellectual and administrative labour.

During construction and throughout the exhibition, Hirschhorn lived in the community. Hirschhorn paid 20-30 local residents 8 euros an hour to help build the cardboard, foil, packing tape and hardboard buildings. Admonishing against volunteerism in art, Hirschhorn states, "I refuse to appeal to volunteers, that is, unpaid workers, in order to implement my work of art" ("*Bataille Monument*: Artist's Statement" 135). Within the first week of construction, locals broke in to his locally rented apartment and stole his camera gear and electrical goods. When Hirschhorn contemplated shutting down the project, the thieves returned most of his gear and the power relation between the two parties, the artist and his workers, was in evidence. In an impoverished community, twenty to thirty lost jobs has considerable repercussions. Hirschhorn claims,

> I had never thought the *Bataille Monument* could be discussed and criticised as a
> social art project. However, I do think social issues can be raised through an art
> project. It is a question of the surrounds, the environment, the reality. That is a goal
> of my work. ("*Bataille Monument*: Artist's Statement" 137)

The very real internal tension Hirschhorn triggers within the community in which he installs his artwork seems to be lost on Hirschhorn. His impact on the local people has been figured purely as a manifestation of his own struggle to realise his artistic vision rather than the calculable cost to the community and their very real circumstances.

Like *Utopia Station* (2003), which is treated in the following chapter, and countless other artist-directed communities installed within the curator-directed community of the transnational art world, identities are layered as texts one on top of the other to make something more (or less) meaningful. This excess is what marks Hirschhorn's philosopher monument series, proving that an artist must work "with precision and with excess" (Hirschhorn, "*24h Foucault*: Artist's Statement"

154). The lack or surplus of meaning is mapped onto the site and community within it, revealing the inherent problem of these kind of ethnographic works as I outlined in the previous chapter. The immersive festival environment of the transnational art show works to convince the transient cosmopolitan art tourists that they are in a third space or what Miwon Kwon might call a 'wrong place' but that 'other' space is already home to an existing community (Kwon 156-57).

The normalisation of cultural tourism, of passing through and experiencing places as a form of connoisseurship, locates the already existent communities as fixed in relation to the cosmopolitan art tourist as viewer's mobility. The authenticity of the experience for the cosmopolitan art tourist as viewer is in that relation, between movement (indeterminacy) and stasis (pre-determined). The attachment to the ideal of authenticity requires an ongoing negotiation between the exotic (distant) and the visceral (close), which enables an art-led public sphere to develop, something between a rhetorical, counter and cosmopolitan. Rather than negotiating the politics of speaking *for*, speaking *of* and speaking *with* culturally and socio-politically articulated communities, the artist formulates an intersubjective community from the itinerant art tourists who promenade the communities like Baudelaire in the arcades. Hirschhorn claims that "one thing has always been clear for me; I am an artist and not a social worker" but he strategically engages with real communities to bring art into life and implicates himself into the lives of his participant workers by employing them (Hirschhorn, "*Bataille Monument*: Artist's Statement" 137). In ways his entrepreneurial transparency makes the invisible economics of the transnational art event visible.

Utopian thinking is central to cosmopolitanism and theories of intersubjective art practices. Bourriaud's formulation of relational aesthetics highlights this with his adoption of the term microtopias to define the social interstices he sees developing in relational art projects. Rather than seeing this forward-looking optimism as a somewhat simplistic re-stating of the very nature of the present's constant drive toward the unknown possibilities of the future, Ben Anderson imagines the space opened up by utopian thinking as one for potential radical change and the fostering of optimism "in the face of the tragedy and injustice of suffering" (692). This approach is one that marries optimism with an intellectual grounding in pessimism, striving for an emancipated life through hope and openness despite the overwhelming constraints of our many fixed, closed systems. Here, Anderson locates the ethos of hope as a potentially radical move toward change, a *movement rather than stasis.* This enacted process shifts our affective engagement with the world while remaining at the very front of the present rather than some future mythic "elsewhere and elsewhen" (Anderson 694).

Hope, as an anticipatory relation, is the form and content of the utopian, embodying "both the act of wishing and what is wished for" (Levitas 66). As the future is the embedded potential of every different reality, the not-yet cannot be singular or unifying in meaning, spirit or function. The

future is an ongoing process with dynamic and multifarious effects so attempts to imagine the future as a unitary or resolved state would be to negate its potential and complexity. Rather than be paralysed by the proliferating repercussions of late capitalism, Anderson attempts to articulate a pragmatic engagement with utopian thinking, one that imagines a more hopeful disposition will allow us to focus on change in the relations we can affect. This is a key premise of both cosmopolitanism and intersubjective art.

Although Kant's conception of cosmopolitanism is tempered by his belief that humankind's natural disposition has an inclination toward "radical evil", he also imagines that the key to managing corruption and wrongdoing lays in autonomous city-state nations and small-scale governance (*Religion within the Limits of Reason Alone*). Kant conceptualises cosmopolitanism as a moral paradigm, advocating the free movement of people as a human right but he does not advocate a nomadic stateless society; Kant's ideas are always mitigated by his belief in the authority of the state above all else. Consequently, his conception of cosmopolitan right is merely a *potential* freedom or hospitality even though it is a central component of his development of "perpetual peace", a distinctly utopian concept (Kant *Perpetual Peace)*. Jameson is another who frequently seeks utopian principles in the cultural texts he analyses. Jameson notes that rather than find solutions for real problems, particularly those to do with industrial and economic imperatives, these activities are simply relocated "outside the city walls" so that potentially pernicious and less utopian or even anti-utopian activities (commerce, war, food production) are absented from the utopian frame (Jameson, "Of Islands and Trenches" 20). This demarcates a local and global paradigm within the universality of the utopian imaginary, where local contexts are less fraught with the pragmatic demands of human comfort and progress, the hallmarks of most utopias. This relegation of the still necessary problems of human life to 'outside the walls' is particularly marked in the formulation of utopian sites within art. The juxtaposition between the formulated utopia and the outside (real) world is what makes the utopian aims of intersubjective artworks seem useful. It is the promise of what Bloch calls the "not-yet-being" on the horizon that makes present-day suffering seem worthwhile.

> The open text, whether the intersubjective artwork or cultural identity then, "can function (for its audience and/or its producer) as a figure of desire for something beyond itself, a something else that looks not back to a past but forward… to a not quite foreseeable future. (Layoun 226).

Like the cosmopolitan, the transnational artist is celebrated for living outside their class and national containers; they are marked by their mobility. As nomadic cultural workers, they seek out and communicate the problems of the global disenfranchised. However, as Martens performs so

well in *Enjoy Poverty*, instead of than trying to intervene in the structural conditions that impoverish the group, these artistic interventions often take the form of a pedagogy of self-capitalisation, or as Appiah suggests, making the most of the situation. In this way, these interventions seem to acknowledge the hopelessness of attempting to disrupt the systems that constrain the group rather than offering the hope that cosmopolitanism advocates. The 'problem' is articulated as a psychological and entrepreneurial one, not an economic and political one.

Risky encounters and an economy of exploitation: Renzo Martens

Renzo Martens is a Dutch artist living in Brussels. He studied political science at the University of Nijmegen and art at the Royal Academy of Ghent and the Gerrit Rietveld Academy in Amsterdam. Martens is the artistic director of the Institute of Human Activities (IHA), a project that will be discussed at length in this chapter. His creative practice initially drew attention for the two documentary-style films he produced in global 'trouble spots'. Critical success has come as the correlating administrative and discursive work he produces—artist's talks, seminars, workshops, press releases—has helped contextualise his collective output and amplified their impact by doing so. Martens was a World Fellow at Yale University in 2013 and he is currently enrolled as a doctoral candidate at the University College of Ghent.

There are currently two completed films in circulation, one depicting the Congolese (*Episode III: Enjoy Poverty*) and the other, Chechens (*Episode I*). *Episode II* is a work in progress. A part of his doctoral project, it is formulated as the final part of the triptych. Chechnya and Democratic Republic of Congo represent the extremes and *episode* II will be the middle that speaks to them both. Martens transacts his interventions on the "outskirts of the world", but his artworks and documentation are exhibited predominantly within the transnational art world (Martens, "Artist's Talk"). His work *Episode III: Enjoy Poverty* has been exhibited at the 6th Berlin Biennale, Stedelijk Museum Amsterdam, La Vireinna, Barcelona, Van Abbemuseum Eindhoven, the Sydney Biennale 2014 and screened at Tate Modern, London and Centre Pompidou, Paris. Martens' artworks deal with precarious labour, income equality, colonialism, and reveal the precarious relations that come from bringing together two very different social realities (urban Europe and the DR Congo countryside) by mounting collaborative projects.

Martens' work astutely demonstrates the ambivalence of cultural cosmopolitanism when it merely replicates the incoherent and de-politicised narratives of late capitalism. He focuses on the way that Western media instrumentalises suffering and trauma for the West to consume as a kind of unsettling infotainment. *Episode 1* and *Enjoy Poverty* look at the "power relations between the people watching and the people being watched" (TV2 Africa interview). His cosmopolitan character amplifies the problematic aspects of advanced liberal outreach, where these narratives are

(re)produced and (re)presented within a discourse of empathetic gestures and universal responsibility. The murky territory he traverses highlights the complex and disconcerting politics that underpin cosmopolitan virtues when they are abstracted from late capitalism's socio-economic realities from which they grew. This is uncomfortable viewing for the generally liberal observer of his "reverse ethnography" (van der Kroef 260).

> Martens questioned the point of artists making work that criticizes capitalism, colonialism, or other social inequities, but is then sold in New York and London and feed the economy and superstructure that is the target of criticism. He instead advocated for 'reverse-gentrification', his way out of the cul-de-sac of the ubiquitous hypocrisy of the West. (Liu 2)

Episode I (2003)

Martens' first film, *Episode I,* serves as a precursor to the journalist role he assumes in *Episode III: Enjoy Poverty*. I draw on it here as it reveals the trajectory of Martens' creative process and how what began as a detached albeit confrontational exploration of global spectacle has evolved into direct intervention as action as an ongoing source of cultural production. *Episode I* is a 44-minute long film, capturing Martens journey into the war zones of Chechnya, and is shot in the same documentary style as *Enjoy Poverty*. The film depicts the graphic horrors of war juxtaposed against the artist's performance as a narcissistic Westerner. There is the expected footage of destroyed houses, now homeless citizens living in tent cities and lining up for food, soldiers policing borders and the UN contingent. These are the kinds of exploitative images that Martens is reacting against. Martens' journalistic persona incorporates some of the bravado, vanity and celebrity associated with television news correspondents who make their careers from being embedded in war and disaster zones. Throughout the film, the camera is often focused on Martens rather than the local people, the guerrillas, the United Nations workers or the violence playing out in the environment in which he is embedded. Rather than objective coverage, the self-reflective on air revelations that detail the journalist's own experiences at the frontline become a part of the news narrative of these places.

Martens' character asks the shocked locals, soldiers, and peacekeepers. "What do you think of me?", looking for feedback on his performance. This sets up a paradoxical relation where the victim, who is often rendered flat and voiceless in contemporary media reporting, is given a voice and identity outside of their role as 'victim', but still only in relation to the interviewer. They are not allowed to speak of their own situation but exist merely to bolster the journalist, who is formulated as a kind of cosmopolitan figure. Martens presents himself as a spokesperson for the Western viewer watching from the safety of their secure homelands. His questions are not only about him (as

someone with authority in the media landscape) but also about the viewers whose conscience this kind of reporting seeks to affect. He highlights the cynical reality that it is only when the emotions of the global viewers are affected that political powers are likely to intervene in wars, disasters and famines where there are is no expedient economic or political purpose for intervening. This appeal to the at-home viewer's capacity to feel global responsibility and pity enough to a act on images of distant suffering evidences how the affective aspects of cosmopolitan mindset are abstracted and exploited by mediating agents. As stated earlier, Martens highlights how the current mediation of disaster and suffering priorities how the viewer feels rather than how the subjects of war feel. This is a provocation from Martens and it is formed in relation to the political assumptions that underpin the cosmopolitan privilege of the transnational artist (and in Martens' case, the media and NGO workers) is a unifying element of the creative practice of Sierra, Linnert and Martens.

Episode I questions who has agency over what and who is made visible in a globalised media landscape. This power relations of who is observed and who does the observing is central to Martens work.

> If these people desperately want to be seen, because their life depends upon it, it's utterly useless to ask them how they feel. The real question is how we, the audiences, feel. That will decide who gets aid and who will be bombed. So I try to infiltrate, and adopt, on the spot, the most important role in contemporary war: that of its audiences. (Martens qtd. in Herbert 84)

Martens focus is on the economic and political power of visual imagery, where trauma and misery are commodifiable resources, so that "in short, the subjectivity of those suffering does not really matter: they depend on us watching them, and the way we see them" (90-91). Indeed, no other aspect of life in Chechnya is revealed; the subjects are trapped in their circumstances. This theme is explored further in Martens' subsequent work.

Episode III (2008)

Episode III – Enjoy Poverty (2008) is the second of his travel documentaries where he performs the role of a narcissistic artist pretending to be a journalist. This time he is on an artistic quasi-colonial mission through the DR Congo. Martens' depiction of the narcissistic emancipator delivering a pastiche of underdeveloped and insensitive political insights paired with his physical resemblance to the actor Klaus Kinski directly references the colonialist narratives of the cinematic collaborations of Kinski and Werner Herzog, such as *Aguirre, the Wrath of God* (1972). *Fitzcarraldo* (1982)*, and, *Cobra Verde* (1987)*. Aguirre, the Wrath of God*'s acclaimed depiction of the colonialist destruction of the Amazon, South America's own 'heart of darkness', has the

narrative of the film's productions contexts (the subsequent destruction of the landscape and exploitation of and corruption within the local population during filming) as a corollary effect[8] and this is also true of *Enjoy Poverty*. Toward the end of filming, international media agents located in the DCR were claiming that the confrontational strategies of Martens' "action art project" were part of an "'ill-placed project' that caused considerable offence and should result in the remission of Martens' UN-accredited journalist's pass (Downey 601).

Martens draws on the language of community development, and in a similar manner as his character in *Episode I*, he displays a marked awareness of his mediated audience in his insensitive interactions with local residents. The visual signature of *Enjoy Poverty* is the large blue neon sign abstractly stating "*poverty enjoy*", punctuated by a small red "*please*" flashing intermittently. As Martens assembles the piece in front of some of the townspeople, he asks a local man if he knows what the sign will say. "Pauvreté?" the man replies, seemingly mystified. "No, it's poverty," Martens replies, "for the audience, it needs to be in English" (*Enjoy Poverty*). The film cuts to darkness as a generator starts up and the neon sign illuminates the villagers, who then proceed to make music and dance bathed in its cold blue light. One man stands to the side switching the "*please*" off and on. Another reads Martens' notes from a large white presentation notepad, normally reserved for workshops and brainstorming sessions: "Assisting Africa in taking charge of its own resources". Another man almost chants his scripted dialogue: "taking charge of my own resurrection" (Martens, *Enjoy Poverty*). Encountering the impoverished Congolese, Martens overtly frames their suffering as a resource commodified and commodifiable, exploited and exploitable, not only by the Congolese government but also by the embedded global humanitarian organisations that Martens claims negotiate a similarly precarious path between saviour and exploiter (*Enjoy Poverty*; Turner). Pointing out that the DRC's resources have been long exploited by foreign parties, Martens suggests that this narrative of Africa as a land of plenty has been replaced by one of lack, framing their most significant export product as poverty (qtd. in Żmijewski).

As the Enjoy Poverty sign is switched on, the community seems aware of and complicit in their own exploitation. It is as though the community comes together in celebration in the glow of a foreign symbol that reiterates their entrenched position within the global community. This scene makes apparent that complicity comes not through a misunderstanding of their political circumstances but rather that submission indicates an absence of access to transform their situation. Martens deftly reveals the intensified ambiguity between reality and spectacle, witnessing and complicity, kindness and cruelty in the complex relations of global exchange, both economic and

---

[8] Herzog's documentary *My Best Fiend* (1999) documents the adversity of filming in such a harsh landscape with the added difficulty of negotiating Kinski's unpredictable and tyrannical behaviour in an isolated environment.

symbolic. This is where I would locate the cosmopolitan aesthetics of this work. Although the viewer does not participate in the actual performance of the work recorded on film (that is the job of the Congolese), the viewer comes to participate through our affective witnessing of Martens' exploration and showcasing of Congolese poverty. In this way, we are better located to assess the situation than those participating. The terrain of inequality is mapped out by an affective economy of spectacular suffering and *Enjoy Poverty* reminds us that we are implicitly located within that economy. The calculable cost of global inequity and suffering is forged through the collectivising images of the emaciated, the war-ravaged and the dead. In this way, these images abstract the people within the frames; they are commodified into symbolic representations of the ill effects of the struggle for global capital.

One of the most confronting and heartbreaking scenes for this viewer was when Martens instructs the poorly paid Congolese photographers, who earn less than a dollar per photograph capturing family celebrations, to focus their intention instead on the abject suffering around them. The Congolese photographer is seen moving around a severely emaciated young child trying to frame the most affecting photograph. This scene is matched by an earlier one where a group of white, Western photojournalists are seen searching for the dead and the starving looking for the perfect shot for the global media franchises for whom they work. Their predatory pursuit of abject misery is stomach churning. Undoubtedly, the Western photographers see their role as detached observers documenting the atrocities of the DR Congo for Western audiences. But Martens reveals the metanarrative of depravity that underscores the whole film: how the most vulnerable are further exploited by agents sent to alleviate their suffering.

Martens' training of the Congolese photographers in the techniques of producing the affective 'money shot' and the art of self-capitalisation seems like common sense by the logic of late capitalism. But they are ethically detestable. Common sense is in itself particular, reflecting the contexts of the time, place and culture that frames it. The everyday, rather than being universal is plural and particular. The Congolese subjects within *Enjoy Poverty* have lives that those of us in the West will most likely never experience except through visual imagery. Martens' encourages the Congolese to claim and exploit their spectacular suffering as a lucrative and global form of capital as a kind of "fair trade poverty" (van der Kroef 260). His unflinching entrepreneurial attitude emphasises the overwhelming imperative to exploit whatever resources are within reach regardless of their abhorrent logics and this mirrors the self-capitalising strategies of a significant proportion of community development and outreach incentives in the West. In case we missed this point, Martens frames the villager's participation in constructing and mounting his "*enjoy poverty*" sign as a "community-based group meeting" (*Enjoy Poverty*). *Enjoy Poverty* emphasises the instrumentalisation that takes place when agents of outreach (news agencies, artists, religious

groups) recolonise the abject while enacting their own generosity and hospitality.

T. J. Demos refers to this kind of mediation as "a pornography of poverty" and positions the work as "a reality check for optimistic globalists and a lethal blow to the ambitions of concerned documentarians, especially those that seek to ameliorate suffering by representing abjection in developing nations" (Demos 1). In the space that Martens marks out, the generous and dialogical spirit of cosmopolitanism and intersubjective art seems like a different kind of torture. The controversy surrounding *Enjoy Poverty* stems from its depiction of the complex and ambiguous positions within the interstitial spaces of globalisation, "the fault lines" that demarcate the catastrophic effects of "neoliberal structural adjustment policies implemented in the global South, the failures of humanitarian practice and its compromised ethical discourse, and the paradoxes of a politically engaged photojournalism and contemporary art" (Demos 1).

Cramerotti sees Martens' work as exemplary of the blurring of the lines between artistic practices and the informational strategies he names as "aesthetic journalism" (90-92). Here the artist builds a critical conversation while simultaneously critiquing the aesthetic and technical strategies of the medium, potentially exposing the shortcomings of documentation, fieldwork, and the ethics of representation. With the techniques and strategies of informational practices appropriated and aestheticised by the art world, art often shows spectacular political surfaces but gives them very little meaningful attention. As with Sierra's work, the emphasis is on shocking and unsettling the viewer. The proliferation of communication resources produced and made available by digital technologies has seen information practices normalised as depictions of reality. What is being expressed seems secondary to how it is being expressed.

This reflects the broader shift to mediatory strategies in art (informational, administrative, pedagogical, dialogical, relational, orthopaedic) distinguished from their historical forbears by their heightened employment on the exchange of affect. Juxtaposed against the highly charged images of suffering, Martens' narcissistic performance as part anthropologist, part entrepreneurial coach heightens the impact of just how overtly exploitative his conduct is. Martens character is drawn to the spectacle of suffering, but rather than maintaining the anthropologist's detached engagement with the local population he disciplines the locals in the tenets of late capitalism. However, although he is embedded in the community in a proximate relation with those suffering, he remains emotionally insensible in the face of an overwhelming surfeit of affect. It is unsettling for the viewer, positioned as complicit in the symbolic violence. Martens encourages the locals to embrace the spectacular exploitation of their suffering. This demonstrates that he is aware of the value of instrumentalising emotions and what ones have the most impact (grief, pity, empathy, sympathy), both on the subjects within the artwork and the viewers made complicit with the artwork. This strategy intentionally locates the viewer as a cosmopolitan figure in relation to the Congolese other,

whose irrevocable and static misery the viewer is moved in relation to. Martens makes clear the underlying privilege inherent in the cosmopolitan disposition.

Martens' ironic manipulation of exploitative codes highlights how skilled we in the West are with encountering and making sense of the images of those harsh, lived realities from the safety and comforts of Western privilege. Once this flow of mediated images might have instigated a cycle of shock, pity and charity, back when war, poverty and suffering were imagined as happening in some far off somewhere else. However, the proliferation of disaster images in contemporary media discourse, paired with the waning of governmentally legislated support initiatives, has shifted the perception of altruism as an occasional act of the good citizen to an ongoing obligation to a crisis of compassion fatigue. Compassion fatigue is also know as "vicarious traumatization", or secondary traumatisation, and is the focus of a field of psychosocial research with an emphasis on treating caregivers in the West who have been (over)exposed to traumatised people (Figley 1). The compassion fatigued

> have not been directly exposed to the trauma scene, but we hear the story told with
> such intensity, or we hear similar stories so often, or we have the gift and curse of
> extreme empathy and we suffer. We feel the feelings of our clients. We experience
> their fears. We dream their dreams. (Figley 1)

Those condemned to endure violence, inequality, and poverty are suddenly positioned as a traumatic trigger for those privileged enough to care too much.

The Institute for Human Activities: "Gentrification Program" and "Settlement"

Martens' primary focus now is the Institute for Human Activities (IHA), which was instigated by Martens' experience making *Enjoy Poverty*. The Institute was established in 2010 with offices in Amsterdam, Brussels and a settlement on the river Congo, about 800 kilometres upstream from Kinshasa. The Institute's "Gentrification Program" employs the methods of art production and launches a five-year cultural and economic plan. Part of this long-term plan is another project referred to as "Settlement". It is a five-year project that deploys art production processes because

> even when art critically engages with global inequalities, it most often brings beauty,
> jobs, and opportunity to the places where such art is exhibited, discussed and sold –
> London, Venice, New York and Berlin. To counteract this situation, the IHA aims to
> make critique profitable in those places that provide artistic content, thus
> recalibrating art's critical mandate" (IHA: Mission Statement).

Artworks produced with the Congolese participants are exhibited in elite institutions within

the transnational art world. The Institute's joint exhibitions, often presented under Martens' name, exhibitions often take the form of Martens setting up an office within an elite institutional setting and mediating projects with communities based in the DR Congo. They are accompanied by educational platforms and fundraising drives, usually manifested as seminars, roundtables and screenings. Institute This contextualises the work at the IHA while simultaneously garnering media and critical attention for the Institute, and Martens. As the IHA's work builds Martens profile, he is now positioned as a curator, political agent, artist and scholar. This self-capitalising aspect of his own work with the disenfranchised communities collaborating with him in the IHA, is something he acknowledges. The Institute functioned as a satellite venue of the 7th Berlin Biennale in 2012, with the Institute's opening seminar launched during the event. Martens hosted a parallel information evening with a seminar and the screening of a video reporting on activities undertaken in the DR Congo settlement at Berlin's KW Institute of Contemporary Art in the final stages of the Biennale

The initial site for the IHA settlement was a palm oil plantation once owned by Unilever that had been sold to Canadian palm oil operator Feronia in 2009. The IHA leased the property from Feronia in 2012. While the settlement project was still in its formative stage, Feronia unexpectedly cancelled their contract with the IHA, blocked their entry to the property and destroyed the Institute's premises in 2013. Even artworks produced by Congolese children during a therapeutic workshop were confiscated. With their headquarters demolished, the IHA were forced to abandon the community they had been working closely with to find a new site.

IHA's Critical Curriculum was launched in 2014 and after resettling in an undisclosed location, "New Settlement I" opened in 2015. The IHA hope to continue "to explore how art that is fully engaged with the globalized conditions of its own functioning can make more profound claims on reality" (IHA: Settlement). More recently, Martens' website announced the opening of "Settlement II". To coincide with the Critical Curriculum program, the Institute hosted a series of workshops where three local Congolese artists taught the plantation workers how to "embark on the production of elaborate self-portraits, and make the transition from lowly paid plantation labour into more lucrative post-Fordist affective labour" (Martens, "News"). Most of the plantation workers who participated were members of another Institute incentive, the Congolese Plantation Workers Art League. After the IHA's eviction from the Feronia owned plantation of Settlement I, the Institute worked with local plantation workers to set up the League.

When in operation, the palm plantation that would eventually become the IHA's first Settlement site, had been central to Unilever's global business interests. The palm oil frown and harvested there was a central ingredient of Unilever's Sunlight soap. Unilever is an important proponent of both community development and benevolent funding of the arts. The privately funded Lady Lever Gallery opened in 1922 within the model village of Port Sunlight. The gallery

was designed as a cultural institution to enrich the lives of the town's residents. Port Sunlight is a model village constructed to house the employees of industrialist, Lord William (Lever) Leverhulme's soap factory in 1888. From its inception until 1914, the Lever Brothers built 800 houses to accommodate 3500 workers. Alongside relatively ordinary town institutions —schools, a hospital, churches, and a public swimming pool—Lever built a concert hall, theatre and the Lady Lever Art Gallery to ensure his workers benefited from cultural engagement. Lever implemented a moral pedagogical programme for his workforce, regulating their behaviour through the threat of eviction from tied housing and a 'profit sharing' scheme that involved Lever re-investing share profits back into what he considered to be valuable investments for the workers greater good. Although influenced in part by William Morris and the Arts and Crafts Movement, Lever's ambition for the town did not consist of a community of autonomous craftspeople but rather involved disseminating and regulating his aesthetic and social vision like a kind of philanthropic paternal figure to his workers. Martens' character in *Enjoy Poverty* adopts a similarly paternal posture as he teaches the Congolese how to exploit their suffering for Western audiences.

One of Martens' most recent public engagements was as a panel member at the Tate Modern called "Art and Politics Now". Martens used the opportunity to elucidate the contradiction inherent in Unilever's sponsorship of a series of exhibitions at the Tate Modern while their Congolese workers were earning only 200 euros annually for labouring full time. Unilever's total global profits were €5.17 billion for 2014 (Evans). Even though the developing world comprises nearly 60% of the company's sales, very little if any of those profits make their way back to their largest market segment. Martens critique within an institution that directly benefits from profits forged through Unilever's exploitation of the Congolese labour draws attention from artists and audiences to the (business) relations of art. With governmental support for the Arts diminishing, cultural institutions are increasingly forced to turn to industry to fund their expanded cultural programs, because it is the cultural programs that bring the crowds. Exhibitions are increasingly transient global touring events (much like artists themselves) rather than a collection of static works bequeathed to or purchased by the gallery and held in collections ad infinitum.

Encounter, Intervention and the Risk of (Re)Colonisation

Without the contextualisation and commitment of Martens' ongoing project in the DR Congo, it is questionable whether the viewer could tell whether Martens' experiences in *Enjoy Poverty* were real, performed or simulated. It becomes clear that Martens is definitely playing a character but none of the other subjects of the film seem to be in on his performance. Martens' performances juxtaposed against the seemingly unaware participants of *Episode I* and *Enjoy Poverty* evidence the potential corruption of cosmopolitanism when the tenets are deployed outside

the boundaries of a Eurocentric, democratic imaginary. Openness, curiosity, empathetic gestures, mobility and the deployment of late capitalist knowledges are all evidenced by those within the frame of the films, but they are out of place and highlight just how the ideals of the cosmopolitan imaginary normalise a particular kind of non-universal privilege. Cosmopolitanism is manifested as a dystopia rather than a utopia. Underneath Martens' performance as the bumbling journalist come boorish community development artist, the real Martens is something more like an artist performing a kind of critical ethnography as a creative and political act. This has been demonstrated more through Martens' work with the IHA than by his films. Martens' creative practice—his artworks, his curatorship, his public person—show intersubjective art transacted as a kind of fieldwork, where the interactions and communication exchanges of his participants are observed and catalogued through documentation. The Congolese participants have become both the object and subject of the study and Martens bring them together as a kind of ethnographic practice within the cultural institution of art. The direct points of contact between research subjects and researchers seem to offer a kind of transmutation or even symbolic democratisation of the authorial power relations of the artwork and the art world. However, these power relations continue to define both the artwork and its institutional contexts, as the authorial presence of the artist remains exemplary. This is evidenced by Martens' acknowledged accrual of prestige and authority brought about by the circulation of the artworks and the discursive forms that contextualise them.

The idea of the artist as "a model of the anthropologist *engaged*", where theory is a praxis and a "socially mediating activity…[that] 'depicts' *while* it alters society", was advanced by Joseph Kosuth in 1975 ("The Artist as Anthropologist" 182). Kosuth argued that the artist is not a part of the community but "his activities embody the culture", and that the anthropologist, as a scientist, is "*dis*-engaged" (Kosuth, 183). He claimed that this is why it is impossible for the artist to anthropologise their own culture and society; they do not have the emotional distance required to make a scientific observation. Like the contemporary intersubjective artist, the artist-anthropologist's activity requires "cultural fluency" with an *acquired set of cultural tools* enabling a "*fluency* in another culture" (Kosuth 183). This anthropological impulse, of being immersed in a culture but still distinct from it, is also embodied in the social encounters of the flâneur, and is advanced as a dispositional tenet of cosmopolitanism. The intersubjective artist, refigured as an anthropologist, maps a "non-static 'depiction' of art's (and thereby culture's) operational infrastructure" (184). In 1995, Hal Foster's "The Artist as Ethnographer" interrogated the pseudo-scientific and deeply political logics behind Kosuth's theory. Foster critiques what he perceives as an ethnographic turn in art since the 1960s.

Foster's interrogation is marked by a heightened emphasis on the emergent politics of alterity that had come to dominate creative and critical discourse. It is not coincidental that this

essay was published in the same period in which formulations of global citizenship such as cosmopolitanism and intersubjective art strategies were receiving increasing amounts of critical attention and were being championed by elite institutions. The increased articulation of Otherness within the academy and the arts since the 1970s has produced a set of discursive assumptions about the working class, marginalised identities and minority communities. These social groups are imagined as problematic, sites for artistic intervention that required articulation and empowerment through artist directed political transformation. The instrumentalisation of alterity by privileged agents such as artists has the potential to perceive and locate problems within these communities. Rather than ameliorating these communities, this kind of particularising framing is at risk of replicating the colonising gaze. Foster's main concern is that the artist (as ethnographer, as saviour) tends to over-identify with the community in which they are embedded, either romanticising the Other's culture as somehow more authentic than their own, or positioning themselves as authoritatively enlightening the Other.

Artistic interventions implemented as outreach risks positioning all other (non-dominant) cultures as modern-day 'noble savages', a romanticised view of the uneven terrain of contemporary global society as a reversed hierarchy where those with a lot of capital have the least authenticity and vice versa. This is a relation that Martens plays with in his parody. In this way the artist projects their own political agenda onto the Other, instrumentalising their presence through an identity the artist has ultimately constructed. This is not to negate the presence and mobilisation of self-determined and pre-existent communities but rather to show how their framing within the institutional discourse of art shapes their subjectivity in particular ways. Foster argues that the potentially unequal mapping of political frameworks onto the Other risks confirming rather than contextualising "the authority of mapper over site in a way that reduces the desired exchange of dialogical fieldwork" (Foster, "The Artist as Ethnographer" 190). In the opening lines of this essay, Foster positions his argument in relation to Benjamin's call for artists "to side with the proletariat" (qtd. in "The Artist as Ethnographer" 171). Benjamin had actually called for a "trustworthy solidarity with the proletariat", which I would argue implies much more personal investment on the part of the artist ("The Author as Producer" 95). While Benjamin encouraged the artist to activate the spectator as an equal, this aim is often re-interpreted as an artist's job is to find an Other, to political transform their Otherness through encounter with the artist and in turn, the process equally transforms the artist.

The anthropological gaze that Foster elaborates is a diagnostic one. This kind of uplift approach is well-intentioned and intended to subvert (colonial) anthropological authority but it risks reinforcing a subordinate position in the Other by (re)asserting the artist's position as expert and interpreter of Others. Kester likens the collaborative community based artist to a self-proclaimed

delegate "who claims the authority to speak for the community in order to empower himself politically, professionally, and morally" (Kester, "Aesthetic Evangelists" 6). This does not mean however that the delegation of the artist has been instigated by the artist but rather, as I elaborated in chapter one of this thesis, the figure of the artist has proven politically useful for a number of institutional bodies (galleries, museums, governmental agencies, non-profits, etc.). Kwon sees Kester's argument as "provocative", in part because it is in stark contrast to more celebratory critical engagements but also because he suggests the rhetoric of 'usefulness', which is central to community centred art and is implicit to the "current 'moral economy' of capitalism" (142). The rhetoric of utility similarly runs across the artist and curatorial statements of a number of the intersubjective artworks and socially-engaged artists and "must be understood in relation to the successful assimilation in the U.S. [and many other democratic nations] of conservative arguments about the underlying causes of poverty, social and cultural inequality, and disenfranchisement" (Kester, "Aesthetic Evangelists" 5). Rather than undermining the potential good works that these kinds of interventions can achieve, Kester seems to be suggesting that the multiple ways in which power runs through and circulates in these environments is not being rightfully acknowledged. As Doherty points out in relation to community-based projects commissioned by large-scale art institutions: "the consideration here is not simply how the artists and commissioning biennials may have delimited the participants, but also how the nature of the collaborative relationship may have been predetermined" (Doherty, "Curating Wrong Places" 5).

In the cosmopolitan imaginary, it is the cosmopolitan figure who opens themself up to the experiences of the Other, easily moving from one accessible world to the next. In the intersubjective art frameworks outlined in chapter one, it is the figure of the transnational artist whose fluency and mobility stands in marked opposition to the subjects of their artworks. Anthropologists and ethnographers risk reinscribing meaning on their discoveries from a distance, (re)mapping and colonising new territories and inscribing the bodies of the subjects within those territories with their mix of philosophy, politics, art theory and autobiography. These are nomadic journeys that unfold from a self-imposed exilic position. They are journeys of self-discovery as much as they seek some sense of broader humanity.

Witnessing, testimony and affective communication

Theories of cosmopolitanism and intersubjective aesthetics tend to formulate communication in its most literal and literate social form, relying equally on the somatic presence of the viewer/participant and their personal interactions. Dialogue, and being compelled to speak to, for, and about particular groups or ways of being demarcate the social field and socially engaged practices. Appiah's outlined cosmopolitan practice correlates with this kind of dialogical approach.

As do Kester's and Gablik's advancing of a dialogical approach to art. Again, communication and in particular, dialogue, is seen as a neutral space in which mutuality and consensus can be negotiated. However, the privileging of speech communication as the most meaningful form of communication fails to fully acknowledge neither the uneven terrain of linguistic competency nor the dispositional relations that operate with institutional space. Even within the perceived egalitarian spaces created by community-based artworks, there are stratification and classification processes contingent on non-verbal communication and cues that can only understood by those familiar within that social and cultural paradigm.

Martens' journey through the DR Congo evidences this well. Martens' exchanges would have been less incisive without his ability to speak French (to the Congolese participants) and English (to the viewer). As Martens point out, the artwork needs to be in English for the audience and it is with this moment that he reinforces the hierarchical positioning of languages in a globalising world. Despite the English *poverty* originating from the French *povert*é, accessibility for Western viewers necessitates adopting the English language as universal within the transnational art world. Language has always been central to the cognitive aspirations of conceptually based art but with increasingly migratory populations, language could now become problematic. An expanded emphasis on affective spatial and social relations however, appears to de-emphasise language in favour of the seemingly universal language of sensations and bodily interactions. In this equation, foreigners are no longer strangers and the experience of the artwork seems no longer dependent on the cultural imperatives of institutions. This approach makes the artwork appear transcendent of its cultural and political conditions and in doing so, reinforces the utopian element of the work. Thus the world that art is being brought into is not a material world, defined by discrete objects, but rather an experiential one, defined by contingent subjects.

> Who is able to tell the truth? What are the moral, the ethical, and the spiritual
> conditions which entitle someone to present himself as, and to be considered as, a
> truth-teller? About what topics is it important to tell the truth? And finally: what is
> the relation between the activity of truth-telling and the exercise of power, or should
> these activities be completely independent and kept separate? Are they separable, or
> do they require one another? (Foucault, *Fearless Speech* 5)

The role of the artist as truth-teller reveals more about the institutions in which it and its subjects operate than they do about some ultimate ontological truth. It is art's political mandate. In this regard, the most enlightening insight offered by the intersubjective artist lays in looking at the normalised knowledges and tacit structures in which and through which they operate. Why are artists able to tell the truth? Or what truth are artists able to tell? Why are the institutions in which

they circulate empowered as sites of truth telling?

In this formulation, the artist is conceived as a kind of 'organic' intellectual. As opposed to traditional intellectuals, who regard themselves as distinct from society, organic intellectuals are immersed in the processes, conflicts and production of capital and realise the creative potential of progression and capitalist logics. Organic intellectuals are those "distinguished less by their profession, which may be any job characteristic of their class, than by their function in directing the ideas and aspirations of the class to which they organically belong" (Gramsci 3). Gramsci argued that these kinds of intellectuals emerge naturally from each stratified group within society. Rather than merely describing society, organic intellectuals draw on the emotions, language, culture and experiences of those who cannot speak for themselves but this is problematised when artists and curators take on the role of public intellectual on another group's behalf. This risks becoming patronising or even colonising. There is rarely the open dialogues and idealised participant-led exchanges that are promised of intersubjective artworks. Shaped by the codes of behaviour in institutional space, engagement is restricted and tends to adhere to rather instructive guidelines followed as artist-directed exercises.

As I showed in chapter one, Willats' *Pat Purdy and the Glue Sniffers Camp* (1981) details the lives of a group of displaced youth relocated to a housing tower in London due to gentrification. Gentrification processes have been understood as economically positive but socially negative processes in urban environments that dislocate communities (generally culturally or socio-economically) to revivify the local economy. Martens' approach is that the Congolese have nothing to lose and everything to gain from gentrification processes. Martens reiterates that new forms of colonisation are waged through globalised capital and labour and that by introducing gentrification process into the DR Congo, the cultural tourism that comes with gentrification will bring capital and require local labour. Late capitalism can either be the downfall or the uplift of a struggling nation like the DR Congo.

Martens argues that artworks deployed as a point of critical intervention are mostly made by Western artists and those that might not be Western but operate/function in the western artworld ("Artist's Talk: Renzo Martens"). Rather than intervene in the West, like Sierra does, Martens' artistic interventions' are staged "on the outskirts of the world" ("Artist's Talk: Renzo Martens"). Intervening in 'other places', places that are inhospitable and dangerous, is a central element of Martens and Linnert's work. Martens' whole argument hinges on the distinction between the assumed benefits of symbolic capital and economic capital. He argues that there must be a distinction made between the kinds of capital generated in the places where the artwork intervenes and where the artworks are exhibited and sold. These critical artworks might produce "a beautiful symbolic impact (education, expansion, etc.) but there is a very real material impact" for the

subjects of the interventionist artwork. Artworks like *Enjoy Poverty* are exhibited in elite places—
European galleries, museums, art shows—that might have a minor element of outreach but
ultimately it is about the calculable capital that these artworks and their exhibitions bring through
gentrification, town planning, cultural tourism, taxes, etc. that never makes its way to those that
need it most.

> The result has been an ever-widening gap between the material conditions of art and
> its symbolic systems: between what the vast majority of artworks are today (socially
> and economically) and what artists, curators, critics, and historians say that
> artworks— especially their own work or work they support—do and mean. (Fraser,
> "There's No Place Like Home" 30)

Martens' Congolese projects are an attempt to bridge the obvious gap in interventionist
cultural programs that sit outside of community and cultural development programs. Martens
targets these programs due to the authority they command over considerable resources delegated for
the impoverished. Martens approach aligns with Fraser's critique that art and its discursive contexts
often reproduce "the dissociation of power and domination from material conditions of
existence…[and] has contributed to the marginalization of labor and class-based struggles" (Fraser,
2012 "There's No Place Like Home" 30). This kind of thinking is naturalised in advanced
liberalism so that "class privilege and hierarchy" are easily accessed resources now equated with
"cultural and educational rather than economic capital" (30).

Conclusion

Martens is a contradiction. He is undoubtedly compelled by a personal ethic but rather than
try to break down the hierarchal systems that forge inequality, he sets about teaching the most
impoverished people in the world how to make art as a way to lift themselves out of their
deprivation. He believes, somewhat cynically, that the only way to subvert the processes that
exploit the Congolese is to teach them the 'rules of the game' of late capitalism. It is highly
problematic but also a promising strategy in some ways. Bourriaud and Appiah both advocate
learning to live in the interstices of late capitalism as a way of claiming some sense of personal
autonomy. Martens strategies are consciousness raising in both directs; the Congolese learn how to
self-capitalise and produce the right kind of culture (it references European, elite discourses) and he
educates the Western viewer about their own complicity in the social and economic processes that
cause such profound inequality.

Martens' IHA is still very much a scientific experiment. The project itself is part of a
doctoral study that will bring more rewards and potential career opportunities for Martens. He is

building his symbolic and economic capital as he goes while the Congolese have a much more precarious investment in the project. Martens is mapping (European) Western strategies onto a landscape that is marked by the failure of Western development and social projects such as colonialism. However, despite these problematic aspects, his ongoing exposure of the hypocrisy that underscores various forms of ethical outreach is admirable. I would even argue that his performance deconstructs the privilege and uselessness of a cosmopolitan attitude when it is unquestionably underpinned by the advanced liberal democratic thinking that characterises late capitalism.

Martens refers to the "fight against poverty" as "an important natural resource" for the Congolese government, garnering $1.8 billion from the World Bank delegate (Martens qtd. in Turner). The banking delegate admits that "aid brings in more money to the Congo than copper, cotton or diamonds, even if combined" (Martens qtd. in Turner). To Martens, this evidences that the poorest are not those that 'profit' from aid money: but the Western workers "driving through the DCR in four wheel drives, staying in expensive hotels and earning $10 000 per month" while the Congolese plantation workers are paid on average 13c a day (Martens qtd. in Turner). Local photographers make $1 a month for taking photos of weddings and parties (Martens qtd. in Turner).

Between Hirschhorn and Martens we can see the extremes of intersubjective artistic interactions with communities. If intersubjective art is going to be advanced as a reprieve or solution for communities from the destabilising and disenfranchising processes of late capitalism then Hirschhorn's and Martens' approaches might be the most cosmopolitan in spirit insofar as their differences highlight the central paradox of that concept. If the cosmopolitan disposition is to any way enact a truly progressive attitude, then it must be as an active, political, and humane articulation.

Chapter 6 (Case Study Three)

The comfort of strangers

In this chapter I will focus on two artists who incorporate creative forms long associated with the domestic sphere and immaterial labour as their primary art practice: Rirkrit Tiravanija and Lise Bjørne Linnert. Firstly, I will interrogate what the domestic means from a cosmopolitan point of view and how those understandings are produced within intersubjective artworks of Tiravanija and Linnert. While both artists engage in intersubjective approaches, they are markedly different in approach and political engagement. I will examine what kind of subjects are the focus of the artworks, who is invited to participate in the artworks and the differing worlds that they inhabit. The creative practice of these two artists reflects two very different engagements with cosmopolitanism.

Like many accounts of cosmopolitanism and intersubjective art practices, descriptions of immaterial labour are often 'de-politicised' in favour of an "enthusiastic account of the contemporary meaning of affective and immaterial labour" (McRobbie, "Vulnerability, Violence and (Cosmopolitan) Ethics" 69) Yet affective labour and immaterial labour are often used interrelatedly to refer to the kind of embodied labour that has been traditionally perceived as 'women's work' or feminine modes of interaction. The conditions of late capitalism produce particularly precarious and exploitative conditions for women. Contemporary labour conditions reflect, in part, the complex relations that have unfolded between "the women's movement…and the modes of counter-response which capital, the state and consumer culture develop to constrain and re-shape, by means of a range of biopolitical strategies, the whole terrain of gender and sexuality" (McRobbie, "Reflections on Feminism" 61).

Implicated in this complex reactive relation is the shift toward increased outsourcing of domestic activities and emotional labour, such as childcare, domestic service, healthcare and the forced migration of many of the female maquiladora workers that are the focus of Linnert's key artwork. These workers sacrifice themselves to the borders of their homeland in a kind of interstitial space—not quote Mexico, not quite the United States— for the economic survival of the family. This self-sacrifice is often referred to as economic migrant heroism, particular in relation to Mexican and Filipino migrant labour.

Why do I compare Linnert to Tiravanija? Tiravanija is exemplified as a cosmopolitan figure and his artworks are advanced as exemplary for his taking up of domestic, hospitality, care strategies. His exceptionalism comes in large part through his thematic adoption of 'female-identified' labour. But what of an artist like Linnert who produces work through ordinarily feminised techniques (collaboration, craft, dialogic exchange)?

Domestic microtopias

Just as the private tastes and dispositions of the bourgeoisie came to be regarded as universal and desirable, particular understandings of the everyday domestic lives of today's middle class have come to be regarded as universal and desirable. The shift

> of this domestic and professional culture [art appreciation and artist] into public culture is one of the primary operations of museums and other public cultural institutions. It is also one of the primary mechanisms whereby dispositions acquired in privilege are imposed as universally legitimate within a public sphere, as the domestic culture of a particular class becomes the public culture of a city, a nation, or a 'civilization'. (Fraser, *Museum Highlights* 40)

In a climate of global insecurity and heightened anxiety, home and the domestic represent a safe haven, an escape from the fragmented and unpredictable realities of the outside world. The home has also become the extended site of self-work, where decorating, cleaning and cooking are ways of showing your generosity not only toward others but toward the self. And this work is never done. In this way, it is the much-scrutinised site of the gendered division of domestic and emotional labour. Home also carries considerably political weight as the central element in the nationalist imaginary of the Australian Dream, at least, and on a broader scale the domestic also represents the national in a global context. In fact, the dissatisfaction with the political has led to seeking

> 'utopia in the gaps'… not the search any more for a distant utopia, somewhere else, but simply…something that lodges these little utopias – be they sexual, religious, cultural, musical or otherwise – in the little interstices of existence, in other words daily life. (Maffesoli 27)

This aligns with Bourriaud's call for the microtopian space. However, these small-scale utopias take place in the domestic, an intimate and sentimental domain of hospitality that has been increasingly professionalised within popular culture and thematised by the art world. As a site of intense and affective commodification, the domestic has been taken up by the art world particularly as a means of creating intersubjective environments. The domestic, particularly kitchens and dining rooms, suggests home and all its affiliated affective capacities—love, security, belonging, hospitality and authenticity. In this way, the domestic is contemporaneously situated as a nexus for the aesthetic, the political and the everyday.

The creative quest to bring art into life has inverted the everyday into a kind of utopian imaginary that potentially abstracts the material labour of the domestic and detaches the domestic

realm from its more personal and (privately) political contexts. Whereas once artworks that called on the domestic were critiques of the conditions of labour in domestic settings, the domestic is now increasingly imagined as the site of authentic human relations. The search for belonging creates an anticipatory nostalgia for domestic life, where the sentimental feelings of home and belonging at home are employed to give the work purpose and enable the work to transcend its institutional setting. The affective resonance of home obscures the institutional politics of the work.

> [T]he domestic – the materials, tropes, images and spaces associated with 'home' – occupies an important site within contemporary transnational art, yet, the experimental work of feminist artists and scholars, from which it derives much of its force, is rarely acknowledged. (Meskimmon 1)

As I noted in chapter three, intersubjective artworks speak to a feminist genealogy that often goes unrecognised in contemporary art discourse. In her analysis of the 'domestic turn' in art, Meskimmon draws distinctions between domestic themed works and the emerging cosmopolitan imagination. She notes that the most subtle and distinctive depictions of the domestic are "decidedly not 'local'…[as] the domestic has become a central motif in practices that specifically seek to engage the transnational flows and cross-cultural exchanges that characterise globalisation" (Meskimmon 2). This focus on the domestic is evidenced by the increasing number of artworks that deal with issues relating to the engendered division of labour in the wake of globalisation and the conditions in which bodies circulate. These artworks "record the tenuous conditions of economic migrancy while articulating subjectivity as a visual, material and spatial engagement between domesticity and transnational exchange" (3). While emotions move and fix bodies in affective economies, the global trade and traffic of bodies similarly moves and fixes bodies in a corporeal economy that extends beyond bodily representation to include "the articulation of embodied subjectivity in and through a network of circulation and exchange" (54). These transitive effects create conversations and "suggest a passage between times and places, through images, ideas, and objects (55).

Regardless of the social and political aspirations of these kinds of intersubjective art, "contemporary art circulates along the same pathways as global capital and its makers traverse the routes charted by both empowered, metropolitan elites and the economic migrants left in their wake" (Meskimmon 6). Perhaps this is why the notion of belonging and home has come to mean so much creatively, politically and economically. The emphasis on home within much of this art not only shrinks the space between the private and public domain but it also evidences the domestic sphere as a surface and site for the affective and often gendered economies of transnational flows. Home is increasingly articulated as mobile, as a state of mind so that we can be at home anywhere

we choose to and belong at home everywhere. This embeds the cosmopolitan ideals of hospitality and generosity within these intersubjective and participatory art practices, while bridging the space between the universal and the particular, between the public and the private. The viewer/participant is positioned as an intimate outsider in the space created between public and private. In this way, these practices are "grounded, materially specific and relational" and "the ethical and political implications of be(long)ing at home everywhere, of a 'cosmopolitan imagination'…[are] premised upon an embodied, embedded, generous and affective form of subjectivity in conversation with others in and through difference" (Meskimmon 7).

Conviviality and the gift economy: Rirkrit Tiravanija

The creative practice of Argentinean-born Thai artist Rirkrit Tiravanija emphasises a persona based on mobility, hospitality and in turn, his cosmopolitan character. A large part of Tiravanija's narrative is his itinerant childhood, moving between Buenos Aires, Thailand, Ethiopia and Canada and current residence in New York, Berlin and Chiang Mai. As the son of a diplomat, Tiravanija is not only accustomed to travel without a strong sense of national affiliation but his generosity and hospitality also seem 'natural'. These aspects are advanced as a part of his habitus. Tiravanija remains detached from the affinities and affects of national identity, beyond calling on the food cultures of his parents, and is positioned as the embodiment of the well-travelled, cosmopolitan flâneur.

The Soup Kitchen Series (1990-)

Tiravanija's artworks are based on intersubjective exchange and predominantly feature the creation and sharing of hot meals, mostly South-East Asian foods that reflect his cultural heritage. In fact, his best know artworks involves making and serving soup, noodles and curries. Tiravanija has prepared and served: Pad Thai, for *untitled (Pad/Thai)* in 1990 and recreated as *untitled (Free/Still)* in 2007; Tom Ka soup, for a 12hr banquet *Soup/No Soup* as a prelude to Paris' La Triennale (2012); and a green curry, with instructions for the Carnegie Museum of Art (1995). By (re)creating a domestic atmosphere, Tiravanija emphasises the communal spaces of home and the universal task of sharing food and eating. Home, of course, means something else when large amounts of travel are involved; being comfortable at 'home' in these circumstances requires a fluency in locations, languages and cultural habits.

Tiravanija's cooking performances, which he has done for over twenty years now, have been installed in elite institutions throughout the transnational art world. His kitchens and dining rooms have been installed in central sites of the experiential economy of cultural tourism—Venice Biennale, Whitney Museum, QAGGOMA, Gavin Brown Galleries and New York's MoMA. The

institutional settings of Tiravanija's artworks prescribes viewer responses, as the codes of behaviour in these sites are moderated by a substantial amount of security staff and other gallery personnel. This is despite claims that they are open to anyone whether they are regular gallery attendees, people off the street, strangers or friends. Unlike Abramović, the artist is not always present, particularly in smaller lesser important exhibition sites such as his inclusion in a recent QAGGOMA exhibition in Brisbane.

Tiravanija's *Untitled (lunch box)* (1998) was installed in Queensland Art Gallery's Gallery of Modern Art in 2014. In this iteration of the artwork, the celebrity-infused conviviality of Rirkrit Tiravanija as the host and cook of the shared meal was not available to the Australian audience. Gallery staff randomly selected four gallery attendees every Thursday and Sunday to dine on Thai takeaway ordered in from a local restaurant. Interestingly, this iteration of *Untitled (lunch box)* (1998) was part of an exhibition called *Harvest* (2014) that spoke as much to the globalised food culture currently dominating Australian popular culture at the moment as it is to critical engagement with art.

Tiravanija's artworks, like all intersubjective artworks, are processual. In this way, the aesthetic experience is realised in bodily presence, making the artistic moment even more distinctive and elite. Rather than democratise the art gallery by inviting anyone into the space, this marks the locale as special and selective. Set up in the transnational art capitals, Tiravanija's kitchens appeal to a specific metropolitan viewer/participant and create an ambience of exchange that extends beyond the food on the table. Tiravanija's generosity acknowledges a limited crowd, as many of those "who have experienced Mr. Tiravanija's hospitality have not been strangers. They have been members of the tightly networked art world: artists, curators, dealers and critics, along with visitors to galleries or museums" (Cotter 44). The artist interacts with his guests/viewers but it is the atmosphere that they create, the ambience of their engagement with each other that matters. In this way, 'the familiar' seems to be less about the domestic and more about the familiar atmosphere of networking in the art world. This is not a soup kitchen; Tiravanija constructs Soup Kitchens. In the world outside the art institution, soup kitchens are for the hungry and the impoverished, those unable to afford or access nutrition. In the art world they are positioned as convivial micro communities, established as a point of revivification for those seeking culture and/or a reprieve from the demands of their everyday life in the world outside.

Conviviality is a term often deployed to describe and critique Tiravanija's artworks and this undoubtedly stems from his ongoing work with food in institutional settings. Conviviality is "the quality of being convivial; the enjoyment of festive society, festivity; (of persons) convivial spirit or disposition" and stems from the Latin word for feast, *convivium* ("conviviality, n."). Tiravanija's cooking installations are transacted in galleries, museums and survey shows around the world as

social interventions build around the pleasures of sharing a meal. Some take the form of a banquet, which undoubtedly influenced Abramović's *An Artist's Life Manifesto*. In popular Western culture, the emphasis on sharing a meal has shifted away from the social aspects of the group meeting around a table toward the celebration of the performance of the food and its preparation. There is now a different set of demands attached to preparing the family meal. Rather than merely providing sustenance to the kin group, there is an expectation of culinary expertise and social ease attached to being a home cook now—not so much for nourishment of those you love but proving your love by the quality of your skills and quantity of time put into the preparation.

Even Tiravanija's Thai identity adds to the authenticity of the meal and idea that his intrinsic Asian-ness is somehow reflected in his choice of Pad Thais and Tom Yums. We would imagine that those foods represent 'home' and comfort food for Tiravanija despite his itinerant childhood and adult mobility. There is a comfort in a home cooked meal and when home is a multiplicity of places, the immediacy of food and other cultural traditions can represent home more than physical places. Tiravanija is an artworld celebrity as

> one of the most established, influential, and omnipresent figures on the international art circuit, and his work has been crucial to both the emergence of relational aesthetics as a theory, and to the curatorial desire for 'open-ended', 'laboratory' exhibitions. (Bishop, Antagonism 58)

His art is one of Bourriaud's primary exemplars of relational aesthetics and his artworks are a salient example of how the communal 'us' is formulated within the privileged domain of the exhibition. Tiravanija's communal tables link institutional critique with the idea of carving out a social space for art professionals and their broader community and reflects two iconic artworks of the 1970s. Tiravanija's conviviality and blurring of the private and public space of institutions is a contemporary take on the open institution reminiscent of Michael Asher's 1974 performance installation at the Clare Copley Gallery. Asher removed the partition between the gallery's exhibition space and office space so that visitors were privy to the banal machinations of the gallery normally contained behind the white walls of the exhibition space. Besides the obvious institutional critique, Asher's work highlighted the performative nature of 'being an artist'. This is particularly salient to Tiravanija's art practice and his performance of generous host. Another obvious predecessor is Gordon Matta-Clark's Soho restaurant Food (1971-74). Food was designed and built by Matta-Clark as a social space for artists and local residents of downtown New York City. The restaurant commissioned artists such as John Cage to prepare meals in the open and visible kitchen and extend their performance from the abstracted space of the gallery and theatre to the intimate space of the kitchen and dining room. Forged as an act of community building for downtown New

York artists, Food was produced as a shared domestic space for a community of artists to network and prepare works for each other (and their audience). Matta-Clark saw this commercial enterprise as community work and as an artistic project (*Food*). However, Tiravanija's domestic community is performed on a much more global stage and on a more reproducible scale.

Tiravanija's artworks are positioned as distinctly cosmopolitan gestures. The hospitality and generosity he performs is projected toward and onto the viewer/participant. As I outlined in chapter three, these gifts he bestows circulate in an affective economy. We do not have feelings for an (art) object, but rather in our experiences with the object and, in this way, Tiravanija, as the artist exchanging hospitality (and soup) with the viewer/participant, positions himself as the object of art and of our affections. When these affective exchanges are embedded within the elite structures of the art world they can seem even more generous, as the artist's gift is a form of embodied sharing and bodily sustenance in the ordinarily impersonal site of artistic contemplation.

By incorporating a kitchen and dining area as an art installation within an elite art setting, Tiravanija (re)creates the juxtaposition of the hospitality, safety and comfort of home within the ephemeral, art-centred community of an elite transnational art show. The kitchen is often the centre of the home's private socialisation and it is often regarded as the heart of the home. Here, art has found a way to (re)create and (re)present intimate spaces or shared exchanges of conviviality that engage with the social through the domestic and in this way reveal how the domestic and the social are increasingly idealised, aestheticised and commodified. As a public space within the home, built primarily for creating and sharing sustaining goods with others, Tiravanija appears to ground the fragmented, transient viewer/participant in the domestic framework of the kitchen and dining room. The focus on the preparation of and sharing of meals recalls the utilitarian aesthetic of the Arts and Craft movement, who perceived of the home as a site of both (domestic) work and (private) pleasures, as a kind of authentic retreat from the overwhelming demands of an accelerated, public life. This idea of the installation as a reprieve from the overwhelming obligations and clamorous affect of the outside world recurs throughout Tiravanija's creative practice.

Utopia Station (2003)

Another Tiravanija project that idealises the formulation of an illusory 'other' space to escape everyday conditions is *Utopia Station* (2003). Like most successful contemporary artists, Tiravanija assumes numerous roles within the field and *Utopia Station* is one of his major curatorial projects. The curatorial statement for 2003's Venice Biennale's collective project *Utopia Station* opens with a retelling of Adorno and Bloch's 1964 debate. The curators—Molly Nesbit, Hans Ulrich Obrist and Tiravanija—note that Adorno's rejections of utopian thinking "went very far" while Bloch argues that "utopia cannot be removed from the world in spite of everything, and even

the technological, which must definitely emerge and will be in the great realm of the utopian, will form only small sectors" (qtd. in Nesbit et al., "What is a Station"). The statement then references a conversation with Rancière where he advances an interest in utopias only in the ways that they might be useful to produce dissensus as "ruptures in speech, in perception, in sensibility" (Nesbit et al., "What is a Station"). The curatorial statement goes on to decry the misuse and overuse of the concept of utopia so that it has become "a conceptual no-place, empty rhetoric at best, more often than not an exotic vacation, the desert pleasure island of cliché" (Nesbit et al. "What is a Station"). The curatorial statement contextualises *Utopia Station* by drawing on the discursive field of critical theory and philosophy. This is not a mere art project but a philosophy; an attempt to reinvent the way the viewer lives.

Utopia has become a valuable rubric under which branding opportunities have aligned the "traditional appeal to a better world…with the pursuit of immediate, material satisfaction and happiness" and in this way, it has proven similarly useful in political initiatives and campaigns that summon up a better world in the (near) future (Moylan and Baccolini 13). Utopian narratives underscore many foundational works of politics, philosophy and aesthetics, with Modernism's call for radical social transformation triggered and shaped by these utopian strategies. Modernism centred on building and working toward utopias. The art world maintains a utopian impulse in the way that art and aesthetics continue to be empowered as workable strategies for resolving social, economic and political problems in the cultural imagination despite the fact that a realised utopia would consist "largely only in a repetition of the continually same 'today'" (Bloch, "Something's Missing" 2).

Utopia Station was developed as an open work, a functional and domestic space of sorts, replete with designer fixtures and eco-friendly facilities, an open, hospitable space in which to generate new relationships between the transient Biennale community of buyers, curators, critics, artists and the 'general public'. The curatorial trio framed their installation as a 'way-station', ordinarily a place for reflection on a journey, a hospitable space in between destinations. However, the work's hospitality is limited by its very real elite contexts, seeing utopia ultimately realised as an elite quasi-neighbourhood within a spectacular transnational art event. The station was large enough to support the works of over sixty contributing artists, collectives and architects, with a small stage for the pedagogical elements (lectures, seminars, performances) planned for the duration of the Biennale and of course, the roaming viewer/participants that the space invited.

The conceptual framework of this project reflects Tiravanija's own status as a nomadic art figure, whose creative practice repeatedly positions him in a domestic setting where he plays the role of the generous, welcoming host. *Utopia Station* invited contributors and viewer/participants to reflect on the concept of utopia, to trigger and to experience the relations that emanated from that

shared dialogue. *Utopia Station* seems to emulate the creative pedagogical frameworks of utopian art enclaves like Black Mountain College, with an emphasis on an immersive avant-garde environment, interdisciplinarity and art as an intervention into everyday life. This is married with a nod to the emotionally charged transitory communities of music festivals and even the carnivalesque, with an emphasis on leisure, entertainment and unpredictability. Abramović's *An Artist's Life Manifesto* adopts similar motifs and aesthetics. Within the curatorial space of *Utopia Station*, the surfeit of artworks potentially overwhelms the viewer/participant and paradoxically reflects the kind of fragmented, hyper-aestheticised 'everyday' that *Utopia Station* seeks to distinguish itself from. In this way, the potential relations and contemplation the curators seek to inspire seem virtually impossible as a cacophony of sensations engulf the viewer/participant.

These kind of artworks aim to remove the barriers between the public (institutional) and private (social) spaces of the art world and "to allow a convivial relationship between audience and artist to develop" (Bishop, "Antagonism" 56). The private domain of the art world here is predicated on a kind of domesticity that evidences the hospitality and generosity of the artist. As the host, Tiravanija is positioned at the centre of the artwork and mediator of the viewer experience. Making meals and entertaining guests is the ultimate mark of domesticity and goes some way to deflecting the claims of heroic masculinity and hierarchical celebrity abstraction that continue to dominate the transnational art world. Bourriaud positions Tiravanija's hospitality as something exceptional because he is a male who adopts the mundane task of food preparation. From a feminist perspective, Bourriaud elevates Tiravanija's creative practice because it assumes feminised practices but rises above them. Apart from the obvious sexism of Bourriaud's critical engagement with domestic themes, this also highlights how within the sanctified space of the art institution, every performance is a 'performance' and Tiravanija's celebrity informs the meal's reception. The elevation of Tiravanija's food based artworks as a special experience is evidenced by the way viewer/participants clamour to be fed by Tiravanija. This shows how the reified status of the artist is strangely reflected onto the experience of the food. The institutional setting and the proximity to the artist seem to imbue the dining experience with the resonating presence of the artist even when he is no longer a part of the performance.

As I elaborated in chapter one, Bishop's critique of Tiravanija provoked a lengthy response from Tiravanija's colleague, Liam Gillick. He argues that

> The concurrent issue raised about the embrace of Tiravanija himself as a commodity
> is based on bogus projection. He is neither unique in nor does he lack a context for
> his stress on the implicated role of the artist in relation to her or his work. This
> revealing of one's self within the work is an important legacy of postcolonial and

feminist discourses that deemphasize and exaggerate the historical construction of artistic persona. The fact that Bishop is seemingly unfamiliar with the many artists who travel and involve themselves in the manifestations of their work does not mean that Tiravanija is implicated in the same kinds of processes going on in Starbucks or with job outsourcing. (Gillick, "Contingent Factors" 159)

This folding back of the emancipatory potential of the politics of identity onto championing the privileged, nomadic global lifestyle of the cosmopolitan figure of Tiravanija evidences the distance between the politics that underpinned postcolonial and feminist thought and those that underpin the intersubjective art practices favoured by the transnational art world. The value of the artwork is no longer in the artwork itself but in the cult of the professionalised artist whose fiscal and symbolic rewards—prizes, critique, inclusion on highly competitive curatorial programs, media attention—work as "the true guarantors of value in a self-replicating system of success" that sees artists names "listed along with the names of collectors and galleries in an invocation that has more affect than the presence of any actual artwork" (Kenning 436). Tiravanija's profile and artworks evidences how the symbolic and the economic capital of the transnational art world are brought together through the creative practice of the artist. These practices include dispositional, social and artistic production.

Empathy, precarity and labour across borders: Lise Bjørne Linnert

I will now focus on the creative practice of Norwegian artist, Lise Bjørne Linnert to show how a more socially productive and politically active engagement with the domestic might be realised. Linnert, employs craft strategies as a means to invite a potentially radical and communal dialogue. She uses crafting techniques to interrogate contested territories and make visible the private traumas that haunt her participants with an emphasis on notions of identity, language, longing and loss. The affective realm of what have been traditionally considered domestic creativity and crafts is increasingly called upon as a way to celebrate everyday life but also importantly, as a feminist strategy. Artistic labour has been valued as morally and aesthetically superior to industrial labour since William Morris' emphasis on craftsmanship as an ethical stance. The changing role domestic crafts have played in women's everyday lives throughout time reflects a set of broader social, economic and cultural frameworks, from the denigration of craft as 'women's work' during the backlash of the 1980s to the re-emergence of crafting as a site for self-expression, activism and communal sharing from the mid-1990s on.

As a creative practice, craft work is dominated by women within the home and the industrialised factories and workshops of the world's sweatshops. Handcrafted items that require innumerable hours of (often underpaid) work are aesthetically evaluated in part because of the

dedicated labour involved in the production of the item. The conditions in which this work is produced, in terms of both physical labour and emotional labour, is part of its aesthetic pleasures. The spectacle of seeing so much technical skill and labour embodied in an artwork is particularly salient. I interrogate the art practice of Lise Bjørne Linnert to show how some artists are employing traditionally feminised, domestic domains and practices in their intersubjective art practice. Linnert uses craft-centred artworks to explore deeply affective and political issues, with thematic investigations of the human costs of capital and labour crossing borders. She has a particular interest in the violent impact of late capitalism on the global underclass, and how affective encounters and the artistic strategies of women might be a way to create community as a site of potential resistance.

Desconocida Unknown Ukjent (2006-)

Linnert's most well known artwork, *Desconocida Unknown Ukjent* (2006-). is an intersubjective art project that has been ongoing since 2006. The artwork consists of a series of collective processes before the final work is realised as an installation. The project includes a pedagogical element, a dialogical component, and the crafting work. All of these elements relate to the femicide crisis in Ciudad Juárez, an town on the border between Mexico and the United States. On the other side of the border is the Texan town of El Paso. Linnert refers to this threshold as a "frontier entity [that] is both porous and harsh. It exists but yet does not…Families live astride it, workers commute across it" (Linnert, *Threading Voices*). With approximately two million residents and over 350 factories commonly that contribute $43 billion in exports to Mexico's economy (Consulate General of the United States). The factories are commonly known as maquiladoras and most of their workers relocate to the town to seek employment in the factories. Ciudad Juárez' primarily resource is cheap labour. Drug cartels dominate the black economy of the town, with the prolific murder rate often attributed to the extreme violence of these gangs.

Desconocida Unknown Ukjent centres on acknowledging the thousands of women killed in Ciudad Juárez over the last twenty-two years. The process driven artwork requires collective labour and has involved the collaboration and creative labour of a large array of participants, whose contribution is essential to realise the dialogical and material aims of the artwork. Linnert states that *Desconocida Unknown Ukjent* is "democratic as it is open for all to participate" ("*Desconocida Unknown Ukjent*: Artist's Statement"). Despite these collaborative efforts however, Linnert drives the project and the output is attributed solely to her. The material component involves embroidering the names of every woman murdered or missing in the city of Ciudad Juárez since 1993. The dialogical component of the workshops are communal conversations triggered by the pedagogical framework that underpins them. In a way, Linnert sets about to raise awareness and encourage the

participants to be more empathetic, curious and hospitable to those enduring intolerable hardship. In this way, Linnert's cosmopolitan character shapes the conduct of her participants, encouraging them to adopt the same principles.

Each participant embroiders two nametags: one with the name of a missing or murdered Juárense woman and on the other, the word '*unknown*' in the participant's own language. While the first label specifically refers to the Juárense women, the 'unknown' label represents more broadly all the female victims of violent crimes throughout the world. The participant workshop groups are organised in and around local communities and have been engaged across the world. As of September 2013, 4700 international participants have embroidered 6700 nametags and these crafting workshops have taken place in 450 different globally dispersed communities ("*Desconocida Unknown Ukjent*: Artist's Statement"). The stitching circles have gathered in schools, universities and privates homes across the United States, in Pakistan, Israel, Palestine Australia, Philippines, and across the breadth of Europe (Spain, Portugal, Greece, Turkey, Italy, Germany, France, Sweden, Denmark, Finland, Poland, Norway, Netherlands, and United Kingdom). In Ciudad Juárez, a group of the victims' mothers have embroidered their daughter's names.

Since the project began it has grown to include the names of other women who have died through gendered violence worldwide. Linnert sees an inherent power in naming those murdered, both through the political act of articulation and also in the gifting of time by the workshop participants. Through naming the murdered women, they are remembered and through the shared dialogue and labour of the workshop, the participants have a now memorable experience in which the murdered women continue to be remembered.

> The essence is the time each participant gives. We all have a relationship with names
> – our name is the first thing we learn to write. To stitch the murdered woman's name
> on a small piece of cloth is a physical act, time consuming, repetitious; an intimate
> experience. It is an act of care, in remembrance and of protest. The embroiderer
> brings back an identity to each name, through the trace of handwriting, stitches, and
> colors. The protest is brought forward through the format of workshops; historically,
> sewing-circles have played an important role in feminism and the fight for equal
> rights. ("*Desconocida Unknown Ukjent*: Artist's Statement")

In particular borderlands, there is a direct correlation between the demands of late capitalism's globalised labour imperatives and violence against minorities, particularly women. Production lines reach across national borders in pursuit of lower overheads and low-cost labour. As male migrants choose more substantial incomes in the US, the maquiladora workers are

predominantly women. This works in management's favour as "women tend to have fewer social and political rights, and therefore less bargaining power" (Akers Chacón and Davis 119). With pregnancy often a non-negotiable condition of job termination, the precarious work conditions of the women drives down wages even further (119). Linnert 'gives voice' to those that have none. She records the names of the women that are nameless in the conditions of outsourced late capitalist production that dominate border towns such as Ciudad Juárez. Ciudad Juárez is notorious for having one of the highest rates of homicide, and particularly femicide, in the world. The term *femicide* itself is closely aligned Ciudad Juárez, although recent reports claim that femicide is now widely dispersed across Mexico (Matloff). The escalation of female murders began in the early 1990s. While there were on average only three murders annually before 1993, there were two murders per month in 1993. In 2001, there was one per week. As of July 2012, on average six women a day are murdered "with impunity" by gendered violence in what Mexico's National Citizens' Observatory on Femicide frame as a "context of structural and generalized violence" (OCNF). In Ciudad Juárez, an overwhelming proportion of femicide victims are young, impoverished maquiladora workers and these murders have been widely publicised internationally.

Linnert's focus aligns with Martens through their shared emphasis on the systemic violence embodied in the cruel logics of late capitalist labour. The exploitative tactics enacted by media agents and NGOs in the Congo, the micropolitics of social activism have been slowly co-opted by late capitalism. Impoverished groups are often incited to 'lift themselves out' of poverty by establishing small manufacturing industries, such as those that produce crafts for Western NGOs, where their often intense labour practices are compensated by limited economic reward. The idea that poverty is the fault of the poor is reiterated through the logic that just as they let themselves slip into poverty, they can pull themselves out through entrepreneurial endeavour and hard work. These schemes discipline the impoverished groups in the ways of late capitalism's global marketplace. Parallel to this, disenfranchised communities are employed as offshore labour for multinational firms. At times, these multinationals are even rewarded with government incentives to cross the border and bring jobs with them. As low-wage labourers working in the maquiladoras, the women of Ciudad Juárez are doubly disadvantaged; as an easily replaceable labour force for US off-shore businesses and as the victims of Ciudad Juárez's alarming rate of femicide that the Mexican government continue to ignore. In Central America, the maquiladora workers earn on average a daily minimum wage that is only 13% of the United States' federal minimum wage (Crossa).

Just as Martens' projects in the DR Congo are as fraught with contradictions as they are promise, there is a precarious politics to *Desconocida Unknown Ukjent*. The participants donate and impress their own care and affective labour onto the fabric, tracing the lines of another's pain with their own needle and thread. In this way, the fix the trauma, not in a remedial sense, but by making

the absence of the murdered women and the affective labour of the participant material. There is a real risk that Linnert could be merely instrumentalising the already exploited but these artworks seem like critical interventions into a global social problem rather than simply an exercise in accruing capital. Although it must be acknowledged that Linnert's art career has undoubtedly benefited from articulating such a violent problem that is work on through the kind 'care' she orchestrates. However, Linnert is the lesser known of the artists included in my case studies and appears less motivated by celebrity or artistic 'heroism'.

By selectively arranging and juxtaposing mass representations of individuals lost into a synthesised whole, Linnert constructs a collective and unifying feeling. This feeling embeds a particular kind of collective and unified subjectivity within the work and its institutional contexts. As with Sierra's and Martens' artworks, the goal of the work is confronting. This is an affective and political strategy that embodies the search for "global empathic consciousness" that runs through academic writing on cosmopolitanism and intersubjective art (Rifkin, *The Empathic Civilization* 42). Whereas Sierra and Martens purposefully depersonalise the subjects of their artworks, Linnert personalises the loss of every murdered woman. However, the affective narrative of each individual murdered woman is to an extent subsumed by the collectivising ambition of the work. But *Desconocida Unknown Ukjent* works on a number of levels. For this viewer, the impact of being immersed in an institutional space marked by what seems like an impossible roll call of dead women's names was overwhelming, but it was on closer inspection of the names and reflecting on the level of care that had been gifted throughout the whole process of honouring each of those women that the artwork truly resonated.

Threading Voices (2008), Still Lives, Distant Faces (2012-), Fences (2009-)

Linnert's investment in the community of Ciudad Juárez has inspired corollary artworks, two of which I will briefly discuss here as they add perspective to Linnert's ongoing investment in Ciudad Juárez. The 24-minute long film, *Threading Voices* (2008) was inspired by Linnert's journey and research mission to Ciudad Juárez in 2007. *Threading Voices* is edited in a documentary style, which underlines the informational aspect of the piece. Linnert returned to Ciudad Juárez with a small camera crew in 2008 to document the activist work instigated by Marisela Ortiz Riviera and the part organisation/ part movement, Nuestras Hijas de Regreso a Casa. Linnert and her crew stayed with Marisela and her family, who engaged in lengthy conversations with Linnert about what life is like for them in the town. They opened their lives to Linnert, who states that they shared

> their home, thoughts, doubts, and presence. We stayed in their home during footage,
> despite that they had no extra bedroom. They just found space for us. We were taken

everywhere; from hospital visits to late night opera, from radio workshops with the organization Nuestras Hijas de Regreso a Casa to breakfast with a psychiatrist. They took us to the desert, to the maquiladoras. They sat up interviews for us with teachers, youth and families of the victims. ("*Threading Voices*: Artist's Statement")

The participants speak of the risk and limitations placed on them. In one shot, pink crosses are shown dotted across the arid landscape as a local participant states that "there have been many women murdered and these are the crosses…Many times they have been removed, broken and replaced because for many others it maybe represents great shame" (Linnert, *Threading Voices*).

However, there is a strong affective element to the film. Through a series of encounters and conversations with local residents, the conversations Linnert includes in the film are revealed to the viewer as testimony, through direct gaze and obvious raw emotion. Besides the personal narratives of the local participants, Linnert narrates shots of daily life in the town, detailing information about how gendered violence impacts the everyday lives of the women living in the town through both the working conditions of the maquiladoras and the frontier mentality of a town like Ciudad Juárez. Linnert refers to it as "a city of transit, a pivotal point of colonisation that was originally named El Paso del Norte" (*Threading Voices*). It is a town that now lies "between something and nothing…[part of a] new frontier entity, one might call *Amexica*" (Linnert, *Threading Voices*). This interstitial space of the frontier entity is forged through the (re)colonisation of Mexico, this time by global capital. Linnert argues that the US companies that own the maquiladoras move their production to the town to benefit from tax breaks and yet, still pay their workers only $3-$4 a day. She claims that despite this, the maquiladoras "attract thousands of people coming in from poor areas hoping for a better future. Many of them being teenage girls. Employers prefer women. Some 70% of the workforce is young and female" (Linnert, *Threading Voices*).

The film depicts Marisela and the other local activists fighting for a woman's rights to be safe and to be treated with dignity. They employ potential liberatory strategies that are politically contentious in a paternalist and patriarchal culture like ciudad Juárez where women's lives are seemingly valued so very little. Marisela and the other participants in Linnert's film are activists fighting against the silencing of women and the political abstraction of their loss by local authorities. Witnessing and testimony are weapons of potential liberation and 'speaking out' has become an act of resistance and solidarity for the women of Ciudad Juárez. Their urgency reflects that this is a humanitarian crisis and a civil war of sorts. She even refers to the border town as "the killing fields for young women" ("*Threading Voices*: Artist's Statement"). The atrocious statistics seemingly do not merit intervention by tactical response or funding incentives from either local authorities or the maquiladoras that employ many of the victims (Bell). Women are seemingly

perceived by the maquiladoras as a boundless replaceable workforce. The police are focused on gang violence of the drug cartels, which is more of a threat to industry and governmental agents, than the gendered sexual violence of femicide. Fear and intimidation are rife for both residents and foreigners investigating or speaking out against the murder of women (Herrera et al. 10). Despite these limitations, Linnert saw that the community was active in trying to bring about change through protests, activism and mutual care. This was predominantly led by older women, many who had lost young women from their own family. Linnert notes that these collective efforts were "trying to change a society from within" (*Threading Voices*: Artist's Statement"). This is a salient point. The risk of projects like Linnert's is that they may only raise the consciousness of outsiders who ultimately have no capacity to effect change within the precarious politics of Ciudad Juárez.

Linnert's frustration at the unchanging conditions in Ciudad Juárez inspired a corollary art project called *Still Lives, Distant Faces* (2012-). This is a smaller scale project and much more personal, and although it was inspired by Ciudad Juárez, the primary materials were sourced in England. Whereas the stitching in *Desconocida Unknown Ukjent* was formulated as "an act of care and protest…[that] also contains hope", *Still Lives, Distant Faces* is an aggressive act and ultimately one of profound sadness. Linnert purchased a large amount of 'lost' photographs after coming across an even larger box of them at a flea market stall in London in 2010. These were family photographs that now did not belong to anyone. They were discarded depictions of everyday moments in now anonymous women's lives. There are photographs of women with children, with parents, with lovers, on holidays, and in their homes. These significant moments in the women's lives are now abandoned. This abstraction spoke to Linnert's own grievance about the perceived worthlessness of some women's existence.

After so many years working on *Desconocida Unknown Ukjent,* Linnert details being overwhelmed by the lack of intervention in the violence that marks many women's lives:

> The years pass and nothing changes in Ciudad Juarez. Daily I read of women and children globally used as targets in wars, abused, murdered and disappearing. The statistics for domestic violence are continuously high. A strong sense of hopelessness arrived in me. ("*Still Lives, Distant Faces*: Artist's Statement")

Linnert embroiders bold black stitches like pen scrawl across each woman's face, stealing their remaining identity. Importantly, she stitches every photograph herself. Frustration and anger are mapped onto these women's lost moments. Seemingly ordinary women whose faces have been rendered unrecognisable and unknowable dominate each photograph, with the most forceful showing beaming children holding onto now absented mothers.

Another of Linnert's ongoing public intersubjective artwork is *Fences* (2009-). This artwork

involves Linnert embroidering onto wire fences to visualise or highlight holes in the fences of private or official property. Although Linnert claims no direct relation to *Desconocida Unknown Ukjent*, its influence is clear. These newly threaded signposts call attention to the fissures and gaps in the boundaries between public and private space. These are predominantly stitched in red thread, with the red thread resembling bloodlines that trace the struggle over these often contentious spaces and the violence fought to maintain boundaries.

Linnert see these lines "a trace of care informed by the manner of stitches and the labor of doing it…[but also as] an intrusive performance done on private or official properties without any permission" (Linnert, "*Fences*: Artist's Statement"). She documents her fence stitching installations and leaves the threaded hole in place to become a part of the landscape, as a graffiti of sorts. The demarcations between public and private space are made clearer with the fences Linnert stitches demarcating private homes. These boundaries mark out the spaces of domestic intimacy and safety, and Linnert's stitching could seem more intrusive than fences bounding public buildings. As of January 2013, she has left her 'red trace' in 110 locations internationally, often in arguably contestable spaces with direct reference to the political significance of her chosen site, such as Jerusalem, Tel Aviv, Berlin and the border territories between the United States and Mexico.

> I work with fences, an obvious symbol of boundaries and barriers, with a yearning to look inside, touch boundaries; also those not created in steel but created through interrelations...In some places I feel hugely uncomfortable when doing the work. (Linnert, *Fences*: Artist's Statement").

It is notable that the contentious sites where Linnert performs the process based element of this work are only made accessible by Linnert's mobility. Not just the physical spaces covered by her own excursions across borders and seas, but by her European citizenship that allows her access to many nations that are inaccessible to some. For example, one component of the *Fences* project involved Linnert stitching red thread on the wire fence separating the politically fraught zone that marks the border between the Occupied Territories and Gaza strip. This is a symbolic act on her behalf. Not simply because this is a politically contentious border for the Israelis and Palestinians, which I believe is her point, but because Linnert's privileged position affords her access to a space marked by its inaccessibility. This right of passage is not granted to many.

Linnert's public stitching invites complex reactions from these 'border' publics; some people rush past, some stop to watch, some offer to help and other become enraged by her intervention into contested space. Through their very porousness, wire fences invite curiosity. Indeed, part of the purpose of a wire fence is there transparency so that the property remains visible from the street and ordinary citizens can help surveil the ground to report any strange activity.

Barber and Macbeth notes that in this way the wire fence operates more as a textile membrane, a borderline rather than a boundary (38). They claim that the *Fences* project by "challenging our lack of connection, by highlighting the material and psychological boundaries we erect between us. A wire fence is an indicator of the end of one space and the beginning of another (38).

An emphasis on borders and boundaries is evidenced across Linnert's work. This emphasis on what contains people—the socio-economic politics of space—is at the centre of Linnert's investigations of gender, labour, and place. *Fences* challenges perceptions of gendered resistance just by taking embroidery, a domestic activity normally performed inside the home, outside into public space.

Conclusion

Tiravanija's transcultural identity assumes an exilic position but his artworks are defined by his role as hospitable and generous host. He adopts the imagined domestic space of the 'ordinary' as an artistic metaphor rather than embedding the artwork in a 'real' community. Tiravanija depoliticises the home and the domestic realm. The domestic and domesticity are imagined as sites of nostalgic authenticity and safety, although within domestic setting of the familial home, the kitchen is often a central site of (feminised) unpaid and often unacknowledged labour that literally sustains the family. The most salient aspect of Tiravanija's food based installations is that domestic life is increasingly outsourced to cheap migrant labour in cosmopolitanising economies, articulating the invisible cosmopolitan underclass who are forced to relocate to survive (Beck, *World at Risk* 61). This kind of invisible cosmopolitan movement is intrinsic to the management of the domestic lives of the affluent and the very visibly mobile. Job flexibility increasingly demands longer rather than the shorter workdays and the division between work and leisure is rapidly dissipating, so an increasing portion of our domestic and emotional work - childcare, healthcare, domestic responsibilities – is being outsourced to others and a considerable portion of outsourced labour are relocated into global capitals for employment. The domestic utopian is imagined in relation to the fragmented, spectacular and often dehumanising drive of contemporary life, positing the social realm and its relatively standardised set of relations as a source of comfort and predictability (Hochschild 33-34). However, the domestic is not necessarily a communal space marked by love and care but also one of potential fear and control.

Unlike Tiravanija, who produces his work within art's institutional space as institutional critique, Linnert's concerns are more socially-engaged and political. The processual elements of her artworks are transacted in other spaces—other people's houses, schools, prisons, migrant communities, the street—often outside the normal routes and networks of the transnational art world, particularly her ongoing commitment to and work in Ciudad Juárez. Linnert faces

confrontation from her subjects on site, not in the sanctioned space of the art world. Her art works are undertaken as a strategy to bring people together for dialogical exchange and informational consciousness raising. This is similar to both Martens' and Linnert's creative practices.

Linnert's work focuses on presence and absence. She instigates group discussions about often invisible violence and through the act of stiching the 'disappeared' women's names, keeps their absences in the (global) public sphere. She memorialises the dead through the gifiitng of time and labour by the stitchers that participate in her workshops worldwide. Her artworks harness the collective feeling of loss but also of the resilience and social cohesion brought about through the groups' activities.

Many of the women that Linnert memorialises have their identities subsumed by the sheer number of gendered murders, particularly in the border town of Ciudad Juárez. Unlike Martens, Linnert can not intervene to any great extent in the social conditions that put her Juarense subjects' lives at risk. This is clearly too risky for a foreign woman. But her efforts are not purely symbolic either. But powerful nonetheless. With increasing rates of gendered violence through the world, femicide is a global issue that is garnering more media attention now although in a country like Australia, this has not necessitated an increase in government-funded support mechanisms but ironically, reduced financial aid.

This is a global cultural and attitudinal problem that Linnert attempts to address through workshops that centre on a shared creative activity and dialogical exchange. Despite an emphasis on the shared task of stitching because it contributes to the final, realised artwork, Linnert's creative process of forming community groups and spending time and labour inviting discussion is politically salient. These acts are a a direct point of critical intervention into the lives of regular citizens because as she points out, everyone is capable of violence and cruelty. Ordinary society is positioned as being both the potential problem and resolution.

Like Tiravanija's artworks, the highlighting of the labour required of each piece reveals the generosity involved in the execution of the artwork. Unlike Tiravanija's work however, the predominantly female crafters who participate in *Desconocida Unknown Ukjent*'s stitching circles, donate their time and labour as a kind of empathetic gift of solidarity with women lost to gendered violence. This sense of communal belonging that crosses borders is forged not only through the shared task of stitching and sharing as part of a localised crafting group that Linnert has orchestrated across the globe, but also through the shared threat of violence that they are potentially subject to as women.

Tiravanija and Linnert share in common an artistic focus on themes of domesticity. Tiravanija creates the formulation of an illusory 'Other' space. Linnert focuses on borders and boundaries, exploring craft and feminised art forms to critique the extreme existential precarity on

the peripheries of late capitalism. Her art is simultaneously a conscious advocacy for the plight of women workers who are victims of late capitalist deprivations. It is exemplary in connecting the domesticity of *oikos* with *polis* and *cosmopolis*.

Conclusion

This thesis theorises and exemplifies an analytical concept called the cosmopolitan disposition. As an analytical tool, it provides insight into the intersections of late capitalism and cosmopolitanism as they are expressed in intersubjective art practices. It highlights a deep paradox in the cultural character of late capitalism, as expressed in the cosmopolitan disposition, one example of which is intersubjective art. The paradox is that of the core value underpinning cosmopolitanism: hospitality, the unqualified recognition of the Other as worthy. On the other side of the equation stands the deep structural inequalities of late capitalism that needs such relations, attitudes, and subjects to operate.

Cosmopolitanism is an affective economy forged through the calculation of difference, where some bodies and entities are able to move and circulate freely in relation to others that cannot. It is a felt community shaped by the tension between distance and intimacy. As a disposition *toward* others, cosmopolitanism is articulated in the relationship between the self and others. Cosmopolitan identities are not fixed; their movement and progression as beings-in-process who are seeking belonging-in-the-world is what defines them. The longing in belonging is salient. The openness and hospitality claimed at the centre of the relations of cosmopolitanism and intersubjective art emphasises the search for some point of identification with another, emphasising the ongoing, processual notion of identity as a work in progress in the advanced liberal democratic mindset.

Culture and art have long proven expedient as tools of civic mediation. Intersubjective art practices and cosmopolitanism are two parallel strategies for advocating conviviality and social connections in the small spaces that open up in everyday life. The social is imagined as being the cure for any host of cultural, economic and political problems. Egalitarian concepts of dialogism, agency and rights based discourses are deployed as an ethico-political framework within the discursive field of intersubjective art approaches. However, despite the promise of democratic exchange, intersubjective artworks are still generally ascribed by ideal subjects, those who are adept at mobilising their particular tastes and knowledges in the assessment of the formal properties of a work. Aesthetic judgment is still predicated on very particular kinds of understanding and engagement with the world.

Intersubjective art practices speak to and about the social realm in specific ways and contradictory and overlapping values often proliferate. The multiple meanings and values that unfold can suggest a complexity to the artwork on one hand but they can equally reflect the fragmented and isolated application of these methods, emphasising a surface quality to the work. The dilemma with these kinds of artworks, particularly those that claim no political context beyond the work itself, is that they potentially obscure or diminish the complexities and broader structural

problems that help define them. There seems little reflection on or cohesive action against the larger economic and political issues at stake. In this way, the value-pluralism evidenced by these cosmopolitan aesthetics shows how the values (re)produced by these kinds of social interventions are often incompatible and incommensurable.

In attempting to personalise the mediatory power of the artwork, these artworks map a distinct ethical and political landscape in the interstitial space between the artwork and the viewer/participant. Intersubjective art practices produce subjects through the social strategies of the artwork and in turn, these viewer/participants become objects within the artwork. The value of the work is in its perceived practical application and socio-political impact. The affective relations forged through the encounters within the work are commodified through the auspices of the artwork's institutional settings. Interrogating the privileging of intersubjective art practices in broader cultural and institutional contexts shows how power circulate through the social and institutional hierarchies of the art world and how art and culture circulate within the broader matrices of late capitalism.

Cosmopolitanism and intersubjective art practices are embedded within a late capitalist framework that privileges *how* particular phenomena occur rather than contextualising *why* they do. These strategies are exemplified in the micro-exchanges within the interstitial spaces that intersubjective art (and cosmopolitanism) construct. Particular examples of human relations have been transformed into meaningful resources in the service of late capitalism's emphasis on collecting and mobilising experiences. Micropolitical techniques articulate new concerns to be internalised, problematised and worked on so that individual freedoms and mobility establish a more fluid self as the ethical basis for all social, political and economic strategies and community locates that self within an organisational structure. Community, where people are now to look for all manner of expertise, has come to mean everything and nothing simultaneously.

Cosmopolitanism, as a philosophical and cultural framework, is formulated on the mobilisation of ethically obligated individuals, whose hospitality and desire for intersubjectivity marks them from previous articulations of liberal democracy. The intersubjective artist, as a culturally fluent and mobile mediator, embodies the tenets of cosmopolitanism when they activate their viewers into participants and compel them to be open to and interpret their new and diverse experiences and knowledges. This expertise reflects the privileging of those particular experiences and knowledges. In this way, cosmopolitanism has become an expedient context in which to frame the intersection of the aesthetic, the ethical and the political.

It is not that the sentiments of empathy and hospitality are unwarranted; of course, they offer hope in increasingly anxious times. However, it is the domain where these exchanges take place that extends the adaptive grasp of late capitalism. They are performances that do little to change the

broader structures in which they are transacted. The artworks of Martens and Linnert work some way to recuperating intersubjective aesthetics as a political strategy. The intersubjective relations of *Enjoy Poverty* and *Desconocida Unknown Ukjent* take place in Other places. In these potentially unsafe locales, the artists are expecting to be the recipient of hospitality rather than extending hospitality toward a stranger in their own land. There is a significant distinction between the concept of a guest, who we invite into our home[land]s and an alien, who appears uninvited and often unwelcome

Even when using irony to highlight the tacit politics underpinning the transnational artworld (or the paradoxes of the processes of liberal philanthropy and the repercussions of globalised labour conditions) the fact is that those constructing counter-narratives are often rewarded rather than disadvantaged by the unequal terrain of late capitalism. The nomadic life of the artists, curators, patrons, and scholars who benefit from technological advance are charmed as it frees them to choose their affiliations and to work on themselves as beings-in-process. The global underclass endures and survives. The narratives of fragmentation and separation serve as a rhetorical grounding for their counter narratives of community and uplift. Would the children indentured to the sweatshops of Bangladesh, the ones that make the tea towels for sale in museum gift shops around the world, benefit from talking about their problems with each other through the mediation of an artist? Would this transformational power be enough to change one aspect of their abject existences? Even lamenting the notion of individual fragmentation is a privileged position. The idea of community in impoverished sites is often about the pragmatic aspects of life—shared responsibility for children, elders, safety, etc.—not about feelings and self-transformation. There is a pervasive logic embedded in this work and that is that an individual ultimately has the power to transform the limitations of their existence. This kind of meritocratic narrative sees abject poverty and violence as states in which individuals can absent themselves from their circumstances through sheer will power and self-belief. It is the psychological drive at the centre of advanced liberal democracy that shifts the emphasis of profound structural inequities away from the cold hard logics of politicised economics toward the warm embrace of an affective socio-cultural paradigm.

Within the context of an intersubjective artwork, democracy in action is often claimed within any collective activity, despite the abstracted power relations of the artwork's production and its institutional contexts. In this logic, it is merely when a subject expresses themselves publicly and interacts collectively that democracy is enacted. Linnert's artworks attempt to recuperate the affective potential of intersubjective art practices by openly engaging the feminist tactics that underpin and yet are often overlooked in the discursive framing of cosmopolitanism and intersubjective art. Martens shows the inequity and smooth surface of the transnational art world where the other is encountered from a site of unspoken privilege. Martens makes a point of

showcasing that the artist has nothing to lose in these cosmopolitan encounters.

Just as thin understandings of cosmopolitanism that advocate openness and hospitality tend to gloss over the inequities of the global flows of capital, Bourriaud's treatise openly points to the ways that the unequal terrain of the art world reflects its broader place within the globalised realm of late capitalism. But rather than advance ways to remake the art world outside of this structural hierarchy, Bourriaud instead argues that the universal 'we' must learn to live with this inequality (xxv). To counter any discomfort of feeling complicit in the brutality of globalisation and late capitalism, the therapeutic aesthetic at the heart of advanced liberal democracy shifts the overarching structural conditions into a narrative of personal responsibility solved through self-work. Cosmopolitanism and intersubjective works intersect through their similar focus on the other as a locus of self-improvement. Mutual self-work is articulated as the primary building block of community building.

Art has long attempted to address our higher needs and the hierarchy of our higher needs has been defined by the political landscape in which we are governed. Individual social and cultural freedoms are increasingly framed as the most meaningful of our human rights and require considerably self work as well as collective expression. Cosmopolitanism, as an ethical comportment, works in the same way. However, freedom is a discursive formation; it is "neither a philosophical absolute nor a tangible entity but a relational and contextual practice that takes shape in opposition to whatever is locally and ideologically conceived as unfreedom" (Brown, *States of Injury* 6). The logic underpinning intersubjective artworks is that if we can not be generous with our other freedoms (economic, geographic), let us be generous with our gestures and our affect. In a global political landscape that can feel cruel, overwhelming, and hyper-accelerated, an art engaged with the social realm is proposed as a remedy to these intensities. The proximal intimacies of participation within an artwork seem to offer the viewer some reprieve and some hope. The hope at the centre of both cosmopolitanism and intersubjective aesthetic frameworks is for a future human unification, one that acknowledges difference (of identity) yet seems to preclude our capacity for isolation and the desire to retreat from others. Within the institutional spaces where intersubjective artworks tend to be installed, the audience is accustomed to being addressed in a particular way and responds accordingly.

Late capitalism is a period of perceived volatility. For the middle class, the years following the global recession have been a time of heightened metaphysical and existential precarity. For the global underclass, despite lives marked out by ongoing and pernicious feelings of risk, the outcomes seem much harsher and widespread. The rise of outsourcing in late capitalism has seen some offshore labour markets defined by a kind of indentured labour built on forced migration and, in the case of Linnert's subjects, forced reproductive control and even death.

Most cosmopolitan thought over-exaggerates the freedom to move as a universal condition of late capitalism but there is an unambiguous difference between choosing to move (tourist cosmopolitanism) and having movement forced upon you (forced cosmopolitanism). Not all global subjects are overwhelmed by digital mediation and the unlimited choices of self-identification and unbridled citizenship. The subjects at the centre of Sierra's, Martens' and Linnert's artworks are located within markedly different social worlds and many have limited access to the resources that are claimed as overwhelming.

The redemption of cosmopolitanism and IA through Linnert and Martens

Martens and Linnert both create intersubjective artworks whose relations are to some extent undertaken away from the global urban centres that the finished artworks and documentation are in turn exhibited in. This juxtaposition is orchestrated as part of the artwork's impact. Indeed, the way Martens maps European logics onto the Congolese not only highlights the colonising undercurrent of advanced liberalism's idea of global outreach but it also shows how despite Martens' position as an anthropologist/outsider in Congo, he still manages the relations for his own desired outcome. However, it is worth noting that the exhibitable products of their intersubjective artworks are exhibited in the major global centres of the art world. Rather than receiving guests within their own domain, they seek out the Other and transact their cosmopolitanism in 'strange' lands bringing them 'home' for display in more privileged urban domains.

A cosmopolitan aesthetic focuses less on *transforming* the politics of public governmental structures, privileging instead the private work of *witnessing* and *tolerating* the more intimate and localised effects of the movement of global capital. Although Pollock et al. argue that "cosmopolitanism is infinite ways of being" (588), these aesthetics are, in fact, quite specific and discernible by the discourses that they privilege. The intersubjective art works of artists like Martens and Linnert critically intervene in the lives of others. These artworks complicate the kind of universal thinking advanced by both cosmopolitanism and intersubjective art frameworks by showing us that a large amount of people across the world can not be offered 'a reprieve nor a repair' from their social (economic or political) conditions. No amount of self-articulation, openness or hospitality will alleviate their hardship from the incessant hierarchical processes of late capitalism.

This project started with my own assumptions about the nature of cosmopolitanism and intersubjective art. I felt as though this project was revealing itself as a cynical rejoinder to both but drawing on the work of Linnert and Martens was encouraging. The privilege that underpins contemporary conceptions of cosmopolitanism and intersubjective art is undeniable but it is the acknowledgement that the freedom and mobility of the cosmopolitan figure and/or the transnational

artist comes via their complicity with the machinations of late capitalism that keep the Other in their place. Martens and Linnert do not deny or sacrifice their privilege but rather exploit it to help give agency to those that are the underclass of global capitalism. There is still very much to find problematic about their art works and cosmopolitan process that underpin their dispositions and the transnational artworld over all. No matter how compassionate and democratic collective collaboration aspires to be, it can never be entirely non-hierarchical. The rationale here is that it does not matter so much what we feel *about* art but what we feel *through* art. However, the very prescriptive nature of behavioural codes within cultural institutions and the often unacknowledged competencies required to engage with intersubjective artworks effectively delimits the audience.

Intersubjective art attempts to bring art into life, specifically as a point of intervention into the personal lives of the viewers. These kinds of artworks act through coercion not doctrine, for art "can not oblige us to act, its register is affective not prescriptive" (Meskimmon 8). The idea that art can teach us about the world and ourselves hinges on the normalised belief that an artwork's aesthetics contain some inherent moral truth that teaches or triggers appropriate ethical behaviour in the viewer. The impetus shifts to the intersubjective artist who is judged for their behaviour not for their works. *What* is taught is implicated in *how* it is taught.

List of Works Cited

Abbinnett, Ross. *Culture and Identity: Critical Theories*. Politics and Culture. London: Sage, 2003. Print.

Abizadeh, Arash, and Pablo Gilabert. "Is There a Genuine Tension between Cosmopolitan Egalitarianism and Special Responsibilities?" *Philosophical Studies* 138.3 (2008): 349-65. Print.

Abrahamson, Mark. *Global Cities*. New York: Oxford UP, 2004. Print.

Abramović, Marina. *The Lips of St Thomas*. 1975. Performance Installation. Sean Kelly Gallery, New York.

---. *The Artist Is Present*. 2010. Performance Installation. Museum of Modern Art, New York.

---. *An Artist's Life Manifesto*. 2011. Performance Installation. Museum of Contemporary Art, Los Angeles.

---. *Marina Abramović An Artist's Life Manifesto, MOCA Gala*. Online Video Clip. *MOCA: The Museum of Contemporary Art, Los Angeles*. YouTube, 19 Dec 2011. Web. 10 Feb 2014.

Abramović, Marina, and Klaus Biesenbach. *Marina Abramović: The Artist Is Present*. New York: Museum of Modern Art, 2010. Print.

Abrams, Jerold J. "Aesthetics of Self-Fashioning and Cosmopolitanism: Foucault and Rorty on the Art of Living." *Philosophy Today* 46.2 (2002): 185-92. Print.

Adorno, Theodor W. *Aesthetic Theory*. Theory and History of Literature. London: Athlone, 1997. Print.

Adorno, Theodor W., Else Frenkel-Brunswik, Daniel Levinson and Nevitt Sanford. *The Authoritarian Personality*. Studies in Prejudice. New York: Norton, 1969. Print.

Ahearne, Jeremy. *Between Cultural Theory and Policy: The Cultural Policy Thinking of Pierre Bourdieu, Michel De Certeau and Regis Debray*. Coventry: Centre for Cultural Policy Studies, U of Warwick, 2004. Print.

Ahmed, Sara. "Communities That Feel: Intensity, Difference and Attachment." *Affective Encounters: Rethinking Embodiment in Feminist Media Studies*. Ed. Koivunen, Anu and Susanna Paasonens: University of Turku, Finland, 2001. Print.

---. "Affective Economies." *Social Text* 22.2 (2004): 117-39. Print.

---. "Collective Feelings or, the Impressions Left by Others." *Theory, Culture & Society* 21.2 (2004): 25-42. Print.

Ahmed, Sara, and Anne-Marie Fortier. "Re-Imagining Communities." *International Journal of Cultural Studies* 6.3 (2003): 251-59. Print.

Ahmed, Sara, Jane Kilby, Celia Lury, Maureen McNeil, Maureen McNeil and Beverley Skeggs. *Transformations : Thinking through Feminism*. London: Routledge, 2000. Print.

Akers, Matthew, dir. *Marina Abramović: The Artist Is Present*. 2012. Film. Dupre, Jeff and Maro Chermayeff, 13 Jun 2012. Film.

Akers Chacón, Justin, and Mike Davis. *No One Is Illegal: Fighting Violence and State Repression on the U.S.-Mexico Border*. Chicago: Haymarket, 2006. Print.

Anastas, Rhea, Gregg Bordowitz, Andrea Fraser, Jutta Koether and Glenn Ligon. "The Artist Is a Currency." *Grey Room* 24 (2006): 110-25. Print.

Anderson, Ben. "Transcending without Transcendence": Utopianism and an Ethos of Hope." *Antipode* 38.4 (2006): 691-710. Print.

Anderson, Ben, and Paul Harrison. *Taking-Place: Non-Representational Theories and Geography*. Farnham, Surrey: Ashgate, 2010. Print.

Andreasen, Søren, and Lars Bang Larsen. "The Middleman: Beginning to Think About Mediation." *Curating Subjects*. Ed. O'Neill, Paul. London: Open Editions, 2007. 20-30. Print.

Appiah, Kwame Anthony. "Cosmopolitan Patriots." *Critical Inquiry* 23.3 (1997): 617-39. Print.

---. *The Ethics of Identity*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2005. Print.

---. *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers*. London: Allen Lane, 2006. Print.

Appiah, Kwame Anthony, Nigel Warburton, and David Edmonds. "Cosmopolitanism: An Interview with Kwame Anthony Appiah [Podcast]." *Philosophy Bites*. philosophybites.com 2008. Web. 25 Oct 2008.

Auslander, Philip. *Performance: Critical Concepts in Literary and Cultural Studies*. New York: Routledge, 2003. Print.

Barber, Claire, and Penny Macbeth. *Outside: Activating Cloth to Enhance the Way We Live*. Newcastle Upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars, 2014. Print.

Barthes, Roland. "Death of the Author [1967]." *Participation*. Aspen 5-6. Ed. Bishop, Claire. London: Whitechapel, 2006. 41-45. Print.

Bartlett, Man. "Marina Abramović Artist Is Present Spike Mark." eBay.com 2103. Web. 4 Jan 2013.

Baudelaire, Charles. *The Painter of Modern Life and Other Essays* Trans. Mayne, Jonathan. London: Phaidon 1964. Print.

Bauman, Zygmunt. *Culture as Praxis*. London: Sage, 1999. Print.

---. *Liquid Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity, 2000. Print.

Beck, Ulrich. *Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity*. London: Sage, 1992. Print.

---. *The Reinvention of Politics: Rethinking Modernity in the Global Social Order*. Cambridge: Polity, 1997. Print.

---. *The Cosmopolitan Vision*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2006. Print.

---. *World at Risk*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Polity, 2009. Print.

Beck, Ulrich, and Elisabeth Beck-Gernsheim. *Individualization: Institutionalized Individualism and Its Social and Political Consequences*. London: Sage, 2002. Print.

Beck, Ulrich, and Nicholas Gane. "The Cosmopolitan Turn." *The Future of Social Theory*. Ed. Gane, Nicholas. London: Continuum, 2004. 143-66. Print.

Beck, Urich, and Natan Sznaider. "Unpacking Cosmopolitanism for the Social Sciences: A Research Agenda." *The British Journal of Sociology* 57.1 (2006): 1-23. Print.

Becker, Howard S. *Art Worlds*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1982. Print.

Bell, Eleanor. "The Hidden Victims of Mexico's Femicide." *ABC News*. 12 Mar 2010. *abc.net.au*. Web. 10 June 2013

Benhabib, Seyla. "Transformations of Citizenship: The Case of Contemporary Europe." *Government and Opposition* 37.4 (2002): 439-65. Print.

---. *The Rights of Others: Aliens, Residents and Citizens*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2004. Print.

Benjamin, Walter. *Illuminations*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1968. Print.

---. "The Author as Producer [1934]." *New Left Review* 1.62 (1970): 83-96. Print.

---. *The Arcades Project*. Ed. Tiedemann, Rolf. Cambridge, MA: Belknap 1999. Print.

---. "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction." *Media and Cultural Studies: Keyworks*. Eds. Durham, Meenakshi Gigi and Douglas M. Kellner. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2001. 48-70. Print.

---. *The Writer of Modern Life: Essays on Charles Baudelaire*. Ed. Jennings, Michael William. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 2006. Print.

Bennett, Jill. *Empathic Vision: Affect, Trauma, and Contemporary Art*. Cultural Memory in the Present. Stanford: Stanford UP, 2005. Print.

Bennett, Tony. *The Birth of the Museum: History, Theory, Politics*. Culture: Policy and Politics. London New York: Routledge, 1995. Print.

---. "Acting on the Social: Art, Culture, and Government." *American Behavioral Scientist* 43.9 (2000): 1412-28. Print.

Bennett, Tony, Michael Emmison, and John Frow. *Accounting for Tastes: Australian Everyday Cultures*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1999. Print.

Berlant, Lauren Gail. *Compassion: The Culture and Politics of an Emotion*. Essays from the English Institute. New York: Routledge, 2004. Print.

---. *Cruel Optimism*. Durham: Duke UP, 2011. Print.

---. "Public Feelings Salon with Lauren Berlant." Barnard Center for Research on Women, 12 Apr 2011. Web. 11 Aug 2012.

Berlant, Lauren Gail, Debbie Gould, Mary Patten and Rebecca Zorach. "Twenty Reasons by Feel Tank Chicago." Illinois Humanities Council 2008. Web. 11 Aug 2010.

Berlin Biennale. "A Gentrification Program: Screening and Conversation." Berlin Biennale 2012. Web. 20 Oct 2014.

Bhabha, Homi K. "Unsatisfied: Notes on Vernacular Cosmopolitanism." *Text and Nation: Cross-Disciplinary Essays on Cultural and National Identities*. Eds. Garcia-Morena, Laura and Peter C. Pfeifer. Columbia, SC: Camden House, 1996. 191-207. Print.

---. "Making Difference." *Artforum* 41.8 (2003): 73. Print.

---. *The Location of Culture*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge, 2004. Print.

Birrell, Ross, and Thomas Hirschhorn. "The Unwork of Art: Precarious Questions for Thomas Hirschhorn." *Art & Research*. 3.1 (2009). Web. 3 Feb 2013.

Bishop, Claire. "Antagonism and Relational Aesthetics." *October* 110 (2004): 51-79. Print.

---. *Installation Art: A Critical History*. London: Tate, 2005. Print.

---, ed. *Participation*. London: Whitechapel, 2006. Print.

---. "The Social Turn: Collaboration and Its Discontents." *Artforum* 44.6 (2006): 178-83. Print.

---. "Letters and Responses." *October* 115 (2006): 95-107. Print.

---. *Artificial Hells: Participatory Art and the Politics of Spectatorship*. New York: Verso Books, 2012. Print.

---. "Delegated Performance: Outsourcing Authenticity." *October* 140 (2012): 91-112. Print.

Bishop, Claire, and Marta Dziewanska. *1968 - 1989: Political Upheaval and Artistic Change*. Museum under Construction. Warsaw: Museum of Modern Art, 2009. Print.

Bishop, Claire, and Grant Kester. "Letters." *Artforum* 44.9 (2006): 22, 24. Print.

Blair, Tony. *The Third Way: New Politics for the New Century*. London: Fabian Society, 1998. Print.

Blanco Cano, Rosana, and Rita Urquijo-Ruiz. *Global Mexican Cultural Productions*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011. Print.

Bloch, Ernst. *The Principle of Hope*. Studies in Contemporary German Social Thought. 1st American ed. 3 vols. Cambridge, MA: MIT P, 1986. Print.

---. "Something's Missing: A Discussion between Ernst Bloch and Theodor W. Adorno on the Contradictions of Utopian Longing [1964]." *The Utopian Function of Art and Literature*. Ed. Bloch, Ernst. Cambridge, MA: MIT P, 1988. 1-17. Print.

Blumer, Clare. "Australian Police Deal with a Domestic Violence Matter Every Two Minutes." *ABC News*. 5 June 2015. *abc.net.au*. Web. 5 Jun 2015.

Blumer, Herbert. "Sociological Implications of the Thought of George Herbert Mead." *American Journal of Sociology* 71.5 (1966): 535-44. Print.

Borofsky, Jonathan. *Prisoners*. 1985. Providence Pictures. Film.

Bourdieu, Pierre. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Trans. Nice, Richard. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1984. Print.

---. "The Genesis of the Concepts of Habitus and Field." *Sociocriticism* 1.2 (1985): 11-24. Print.

---. "Forms of Capital." *Handbook of the Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*. Ed. Richardson, John G. New York: Greenwood, 1986. 241-58. Print.

---. *The Logic of Practice*. Cambridge: Polity 1990. Print.

---. *Sociology in Question*. London: Sage, 1993. Print.

---. *The Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Art and Literature*. Cambridge: Polity, 1993. Print.

---. *The Rules of Art*. Cambridge: Polity 1996. Print.

Bourdieu, Pierre, and Loic J. D. Wacquant. *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*. Cambridge: Polity, 1992. Print.

Bourriaud, Nicolas. "Traffic: Space-Times of the Exchange." *May.* 12 (1996/2014). Web. 4 June 2014.

---. *Postproduction: Culture as Screenplay: How Art Reprograms the World*. New York: Lukas & Sternberg, 2002. Print.

---. *Relational Aesthetics*. Collection Documents Sur L'art. Dijon: Les Presses du Réel, 2002. Print.

---. "Precarious Constructions: Answer to Jacques Rancière on Art and Politics." *Open: Cahier on Art and the Public Domain* 17: A Precarious Existence (2009): 20-37. Print.

Bourriaud, Nicolas, and Bartholomew Ryan. "Altermodern: A Conversation with Nicolas Bourriaud." *Art in America* (2009). Web. 1 Oct 2011.

Boyne, Roy. "Cosmopolis and Risk: A Conversation with Ulrich Beck." *Theory, Culture & Society* 18.4 (2001): 47-63. Print.

Brecht, Bertolt. "Alienation Effects in Chinese Acting." *Brecht on Theatre: The Development of an Aesthetic*. Ed. Willett, John. London: Methuen, 1964. 91-99. Print.

Brennan, Timothy. *At Home in the World: Cosmopolitanism Now*. Convergences. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1997. Print.

---. "Cosmo-Theory." *South Atlantic Quarterly* 100.3 (2001): 559-691. Print.

Breton, André "Artificial Hells: Inauguration of the '1921 Dada Season'." *October* 104 (2003): 137-44. Print.

Brown, Wendy. *States of Injury: Power and Freedom in Late Modernity*. Princeton, N.J: Princeton UP, 1995. Print.

---. *Regulating Aversion: Tolerance in the Age of Identity and Empire*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 2006. Print.

Buchloh, Benjamin. "The Primary Colors for the Second Time: A Paradigm Repetition of the Neo-Avant-Garde." *October* 37.Summer (1986): 41-52. Print.

---. "Conceptual Art 1962-1969: From the Aesthetic of Administration to the Critique of Institutions." *October* 55.Winter (1990): 104-43. Print.

Buchmann, Sabeth, and Jamie Owen Daniel. "Information Service: Info-Work." *October* 71. Winter (1995): 103-08. Print.

Buck-Morss, Susan. "Aesthetics and Anaesthetics: Walter Benjamin's Artwork Essay Reconsidered." *October* 62 (1992). Print.

Buergel, Roger. "How Do We Want to Be Governed [Interview]." *Revista* (2004): 1-5. Web. 5 July 2005.

Bürger, Peter. *Theory of the Avant-Garde*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984. Print.

Carlson, Marvin. *Performance: A Critical Introduction*. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge, 2004. Print.

Castells, Manuel. "La Ciudad De La Nueva Economia." *La Factoria.* 12.Jun-Sept (2000). Web. 12 Feb 2013.

---. *The Power of Identity*. The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture. 2nd ed. Vol. 2. Oxford: Blackwell, 2004. Print.

---. *Communication Power*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2009. Print.

Chaney, David C. "Cosmopolitan Art and Cultural Citizenship." *Culture and Society* 19.1 (2002): 157-74. Print.

Christo. *Surrounded Islands*. 1980-83. Installation. Biscayne Bay, Florida.

Clifford, James. "Traveling Cultures." *Cultural Studies*. Eds. Grossberg, Lawrence, Cary Nelson and Paula A. Treichler. London: Routledge, 1992. 96-116. Print.

Cohen, Mitchell. "Rooted Cosmopolitanism: Thoughts on the Left, Nationalism, and Multiculturalism." *Dissent* Fall (1992): 478-83. Print.

Colman, Andrew M. "Affect, *n.*" *A Dictionary of Psychology*. (2012). *oxfordreference.com.* Web. 10 Jan 2013.

Connolly, William. *The Ethos of Pluralization*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1995. Print.

---. *Neuropolitics: Thinking, Culture, Speed*. Minneapolis, MN: U of Minnesota P, 2002. Print.

Consulate General of the United States. "History of Ciudad Juárez." *ciudadjuarez.usconsulate.gov*. Consulate General of the United States, 2015. Web. 13 Feb 2015.

"conviviality, n." *OED Online*. Oxford UP, March 2015. Web. 1 Apr 2015.

Cotter, Holland. "Work Whose Medium Is Indeed Its Message [Review]." *The New York Times* 18 Mar 2005, sec. E: 44. Print.

Cramerotti, Alfredo. *Aesthetic Journalism: How to Inform without Informing*. Bristol: Intellect, 2009. Print.

Crawford, Donald W. "Kant." *The Routledge Companion to Aesthetics*. Eds. Gaut, Berys Nigel and Dominic Lopes. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge, 2005. 55-70. Print.

Crossa, Mateo. "Maquiladora Industry Wages in Central America Are Not Living Wages." *Global Research*. 20 May 2015. Web. 23 May 2015.

Cruzvillegas, Abraham. "Thomas Hirschhorn [Interview]." *Bomb: Artists in Converations*.113. Fall (2010). Web. 24 Feb 2013.

Danto, Arthur C. "Sitting with Marina." *Opinionator: Exclusive Online Commentary From the Times*. 23 May (2010). Web. 9 Jan 2013.

de Certeau, Michel. *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1984. Print.

de Sousa Santo, Boaventura. *Toward a New Legal Common Sense: Law, Globalization , and Emancipation*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2002. Print.

Debord, Guy. *For a Revolutionary Judgment of Art*. 1961. Situationist Internationale, Paris.

---. "The Society of the Spectacle." (1994). Web. 25 Nov 2007.

---. "Towards a Situationist International." *Participation*. 1957. Ed. Bishop, Claire. London: Whitechapel, 2006. 96-101. Print.

Delanty, Gerard. *The Cosmopolitan Imagination: The Renewal of Critical Social Theory*. New York: Cambridge UP, 2009. Print.

Delanty, Gerard, and Chris Rumford. *Rethinking Europe: Social Theory and the Implications of Europeanization*. London: Routledge, 2005. Print.

Deleuze, Gilles, and Felix Guattari. *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1987. Print.

---. *What Is Philosophy?* New York: Columbia UP, 1994. Print.

Demaria, Cristina "The Performative Body of Marina Abramović: Rerelating (in) Time and Space." *European Journal of Women's Studies* 11.3 (2004): 295-307. Print.

Demos, T. J. "Poverty Pornography, Humanitarianism, and Neoliberal Globalization: Notes on Some Paradoxes in Contemporary Art." *Stedelijk Bureau Newsletter* 121 (2011): 1-14. Print.

Doherty, Claire. "Curating Wrong Places...Or Where Have All the Penguins Gone?" *Curating Subjects*. Ed. O'Neill, Paul. London: Open Editions, 2007. 100-08. Print.

Downey, Anthony. "An Ethics of Engagement: Collaborative Art Practices and the Return of the Ethnographer." *Third Text* 23.5 (2009): 593-603. Print.

Du Bois, W. E. B. *The Souls of Black Folk*. Rockland, MD: Arc Manor LLC, 2008. Print.

Duchamp, Marcel. "The Creative Act [1957]." *Marcel Duchamp*. Ed. Lebel, Robert. New York: Paragraphic Books, 1959. 77-78. Print.

Durkheim, Émile. *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life*. Trans. Cosman, Carol. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2001. Print.

Eco, Umberto. *The Open Work [1962]*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1989. Print.

Ekman, Paul. "Universal Facial Expressions of Emotions." *California Mental Health Research Digest* 8.4 (1970): 151-58. Print.

Ekman, Paul, and Wallace V. Friesen. *Unmasking the Face: A Guide to Recognizing Emotions from Facial Clues*. Spectrum Book. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1975. Print.

Ekman, Paul, Wallace V. Friesen, and Phoebe Ellsworth. *Emotion in the Human Face: Guide-Lines for Research and an Integration of Findings*. Pergamon General Psychology Series. New York: Pergamon, 1972. Print.

Ekman, Paul, Wallace V. Friesen, and Silvan Tomkins. "Facial Affect Scoring Technique: A First Validity Study." *Semiotica* 3 (1971): 37-58. Print.

Ekman, Paul, and Erika L. Rosenberg. *What the Face Reveals: Basic and Applied Studies of Spontaneous Expression Using the Facial Action Coding System (FACS)*. Series in Affective Science. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1997. Print.

Ekman, Paul, E. Richard Sorenson, and Wallace V. Friesen. "Pan-Cultural Elements in Facial Display of Emotions." *Science* 164 (1969): 86-88. Print.

"Emotion, n." *Oxford English Dictionary*. (2011). *oed.com*. Web. 3 Feb 2013.

Enwezor, Okwui. "The Artist as Producer in Times of Crisis." *Empire, Ruins + Networks: The Transcultural Agenda in Art*. Eds. McQuire, Scott and Nikos Papastergiadis. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 2005. 11-51. Print.

Evans, Peter. "Unilever Profit Rises Despite China Sales Slump; Consumer-Goods Group Reports 6.8% Rise in Full-Year Net Profit on a 2.7% Fall in Revenue." *Wall Street Journal (Online)* 20 Jan 2015. Web. 24 Jan 2015.

Farago, Jason. "Movers and Makers: The Most Powerful People in the Art World." *The Guardian*. (2014). Web. 8 May 2014.

Flyvbjerg, Bent. "Habermas and Foucault: Thinkers for Civil Society?" *The British Journal of Sociology* 49.2 (1998): 210-33. Print.

Foster, Hal, ed. "The Artist as Ethnographer?" *The Return of the Real: The Avant-Garde at the End of the Century*. Cambridge, MA: MIT P, 1996. 171-204. Print.

---. "Chat Rooms [2004]." *Participation*. Ed. Bishop, Claire. London: Whitechapel, 2006. 190-95. Print.

Foucault, Michel. "The Ethic of Care for the Self as a Practice of Freedom." *The Final Foucault*. Eds. Rasmussen, David M. and James William Bernauer. Cambridge, MA: MIT P, 1987. 1-20. Print.

---. *Technologies of the Self*. Eds. Martin, Luther H., Huck Gutman and Patrick H. Hutton. Amherst, MA: U of Massachusetts P, 1988. Print.

---. "Governmentality." *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*. Eds. Burchell, Graham, Colin Gordon and Peter Miller. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1991. 87-104. Print.

---. *Fearless Speech*. Los Angeles: Semotexte, 2001. Print.

Fraser, Andrea. *Museum Highlights: The Writings of Andrea Fraser*. Cambridge, MA: MIT P, 2005. Print.

---. "How to Provide an Artistic Service: An Introduction [1994]." *Museum Highlights*. Eds. Fraser, Andrea and Alexander Alberro. Cambridge, MA: MIT P, 2005. 153-61. Print.

---. "From the Critique of Institutions to an Institution of Critique." *Artforum* 44.1 (2005): 278-83,332,10. Print.

---. "There's No Place Like Home / L'1% C'est Moi." *Continent* 2.3 (2012): 186-201. Print.

Fromm, Erich. *Escape from Freedom [Fear of Freedom]*. New York: Farrar & Rinehart, 1941. Print.

Gablik, Suzi. "Connective Aesthetics." *American Art* 6.2 (1992): 2-7. Print.

---. "Connective Aesthetics: Art after Individualism." *Mapping the Terrain: New Genre Public Art*. Ed. Lacy, Suzanne. Seattle, WA: Bay, 1995. 74-87. Print.

Gaut, Berys. "Art and Knowledge." *The Oxford Handbook of Aesthetics*. Ed. Levinson, Jerrold. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2003. 436-50. Print.

Giddens, Anthony. *The Third Way: The Renewal of Social Democracy*. Malden, MA: Polity, 1998. Print.

Gill, Rosalind, and Andy Pratt. "In the Social Factory? Immaterial Labour, Precariousness and Cultural Work." *Theory, Culture & Society* 25.7-8 (2008): 1-30. Print.

Gillick, Liam. "*Utopia Station*: For a Functional Utopia [2003]." *Proxemics: Selected Writings (1988-2006)*. Dijon: Les Presses du Réel, 2006. 277-82. Print.

---. "Contingent Factors: A Response to Claire Bishop's " Antagonism and Relational Aesthetics [2005]." *Proxemics: Selected Writings (1988-2006)*. Dijon: Les Presses du Réel, 2006. 151-68. Print.

Goldbard, Arlene. "Looking before You Leap: Community Arts in Context." *Art/Vision/Voice: Cultural Conversations in Community*. Ed. Carlin, Kim. Chicago; Baltimore: Columbia College; MICA, 2005. 1-11. Print.

Goldberg, RoseLee. *Performance Art: From Futurism to the Present*. World of Art. Rev. i.e. 3rd ed. London: Thames & Hudson, 2001. Print.

Goldman, Alan. "The Aesthetic." *The Routledge Companion to Aesthetics*. Eds. Gaut, Berys and Dominic McIver Lopes. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge, 2005. 255-66. Print.

Gordon, Colin. "Governmental Rationality: An Introduction." *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*. Eds. Foucault, Michel, Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon and Peter Miller. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1991. 1-52. Print.

Gramsci, Antonio. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*. Trans. Hoare, Quintin and Geoffrey Nowell Smith. New York: International Publishers, 1971. Print.

Green, Charles. "Group Soul." *Third Text* 18.6 (2004): 595-608. Print.

Greenaway, Peter. *The Cook, the Thief, His Wife and Her Lover*. Universal Studios, 1989.

Gundry, Lucy. "Desconocida: Unknown: Lise Bjørne Linnert." *Textile: The Journal of Cloth and Culture* 7.3 (2009): 328-28. Print.

Haacke, Hans. *Shapolsky et al. Manhattan Real Estate Holdings, a Real-Time Social System*. 1971. Whitney Museum of American Art, New York.

Haaning, Jens. *Flag Production*. 1996. Installation. CAPC, Bordeaux, France.

---. *Middelburg Summer*. 1996. Installation. De Vleeshal, Middelburg, The Netherlands.

Habermas, Jürgen. *Lifeworld and System: A Critique of Functionalist Reason*. The Theory of Communicative Action. Vol. 2. 2 vols. Boston: Beacon, 1984. Print.

---. *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*. Cambridge: Polity, 1989. Print.

---. "Further Reflections on the Public Sphere." *Habermas and the Public Sphere*. Ed. Calhoun, Craig J. Studies in Contemporary German Social Thought. Cambridge, MA: MIT P, 1992. 421-61. Print.

---. *Europe: The Faltering Project*. English ed. Cambridge: Polity, 2009. Print.

Hall, John R., Mary Jo Neitz, and Marshall Anthony Battani. *Sociology on Culture*. London: Routledge, 2003. Print.

Hall, Michael D., E. W. Metcalf, and Roger Cardinal. *The Artist Outsider: Creativity and the Boundaries of Culture*. Washington: Smithsonian Institution, 1994. Print.

Hall, Stuart. "Political Belonging in a World of Multiple Identities." *Conceiving Cosmopolitanism: Theory, Context, Practice*. Eds. Vertovec, Steven and Robin Cohen. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2002. 25-31. Print.

Hall, Stuart, and Tony Jefferson, eds. *Resistance through Rituals: Youth Subcultures in Post-War Britain*. London: Hutchinson, 1976. Print.

Hall, Stuart, and Alan O'Shea. "Common-Sense Neoliberalism." *Soundings: A Journal of Politics and Culture* 55.Winter (2013): 8-24. Print.

Hanisch, Carol. "Personal Is Political [1970]." carolhanisch.org 2006. Web. 7 Feb 2015.

Hannerz, Ulf. "Cosmopolitans and Locals in World Culture." *Theory, Culture & Society* 7.2-3 (1990): 237-51. Print.

---. *Cultural Complexity: Studies in the Social Organization of Meaning*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1992. Print.

---. *Transnational Connections: Culture, People, Places*. London: Routledge, 1996. Print.

Hardt, Michael. "Affective Labor." *boundary 2* 26.2 (1999): 89-100. Print.

---. "Immaterial Labor and Artistic Production." *Rethinking Marxism* 17.2 (2005): 175-77, 331. Print.

Hardt, Michael, and Antonio Negri. *Empire*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 2000. Print.

Harvey, David. *Cosmopolitanism and the Geographies of Freedom*. New York: Columbia UP, 2009. Print.

Hauser, Gerard. *Vernacular Voices: The Rhetoric of Publics and Public Spheres*. Columbia, SC: U of South Carolina P, 1999. Print.

Held, David. "Culture and Political Community: National, Global and Cosmopolitan." *Conceiving Cosmopolitanism: Theory, Context, Practice.* Eds. Vertovec, Steven and Robin Cohen. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2002. 48-58. Print.

Hemmings, Clare. "Invoking Affect: Cultural Theory and the Ontological Turn." *Cultural Studies* 19.5 (2005): 548-67. Print.

Herbert, Martin. "Future Greats: Renzo Martens." *Art Review*. March (2009): 84. Print.

Herrera, Sonia, Laia Farrera, Marta Muixi, Dolors Sierra, and Xavier Giro. *Documentaries on Femicide in Ciudad Juarez*. Barcelona: Government of Catalonia, Ministry of Homa Affairs, Institutional Relations and Participations, 2010. Print.

Herzog, Werner. *Aguirre, the Wrath of God.* Dir. Werner Herzog. Perf. Klaus Kinski. Werner Herzog Filmproduktion, 1972. Film.

---. *Fitzcarraldo.* Dir. Werner Herzog. Perf. Klaus Kinski. Werner Herzog Filmproduktion, 1982. Film.

---. *Cobra Verde.* Dir. Werner Herzog. Perf. Klaus Kinski. Werner Herzog Filmproduktion, 1987. Film.

---. *My Best Fiend*. Dir. Werner Herzog. Perf. Klaus Kinski. Werner Herzog Filmproduktion, 1999. Film.

Hess, Thomas. "Pop and Public." *Art News* 62.7 (1963): 23. Print.

Highmore, Ben. *Michel De Certeau: Analysing Culture*. London: Continuum, 2006. Print.

Hirschhorn, Thomas. *Bataille Monument*. 2002. Installation. Documenta 11, Kassel, Germany.

---. "*Bataille Monument*: Artist's Statement." *Contemporary Art: From Studio to Situation*. Ed. Doherty, Claire. London: Black Dog, 2004. 133-47. Print.

---. *24h Foucault*. 2004. Installation. Palais de Tokyo, Paris, France.

---. "*24h Foucault*: Artist's Statement." *Participation*. 24h Foucault Journal (Paris: Palais de Tokyo, 2004). Ed. Bishop, Claire. London: Whitechapel, 2006. 154-57. Print.

---. *Gramsci Monument.* 2013. Installation. Bronx, New York.

Hochschild, Arlie Russell. "Introduction: An Emotions Lens on the World." *Theorizing Emotions: Sociological Explorations and Applications*. Ed. Hopkins, Debra. Frankfurt: Campus Verlag GmbH, 2009. 29-38. Print.

Horkheimer, Max. "Authority and the Family [1936]." *Critical Theory: Selected Essays*. New York: Continuum, 1982. 47-128. Print.

Horkheimer, Max, and Theodor Wiesengrund Adorno. *Dialectic of Enlightenment*. New York: Continuum, 1987. Print.

Hunter, Ian, and Celia Larner. "Littoral: About Us." 5 March 2006. Web. 17 March 2013.

Ignatieff, Michael. *Blood and Belonging: Journeys into the New Nationalism*. 1st American ed. New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 1994. Print.

Illich, Ivan. *Shadow Work*. Open Forum Series. Boston: M. Boyars, 1981. Print.

Institute for Human Activities. "Gentrification." humanactivities.org. Web. 9 Jun 2015.

Izard, Carroll E. *Human Emotions*. New York: Plenum, 1977. Print.

Jameson, Fredric. "Of Islands and Trenches: Naturalization and the Production of Utopian Discourse." *Diacritics* 7.2 (1977): 2-21. Print.

---. "Postmodernism, or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism." *New Left Review*.146 (1984): 53-92. Print.

Jauss, Hans Robert. *Toward an Aesthetic of Reception*. Trans. Bahti, Timothy. Theory and History of Literature. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1982. Print.

Jessop, Bob. "The Entrepreneurial City: Re-Imaging Localities, Re-Designing Economic Governance, or Re-Structuring Capital?" *Realising Cities: New Spatial Divisions and Social Transformation*. Eds. Jewson, N. and S. MacGregor. London: Routledge, 1997. 28-41. Print.

Jocks, Heinz-Norbert. "Liam Gillick [Interview]." Kunstforum 2009. Web. 17 Mar 2013.

Kant, Immanuel. *Critique of Pure Reason [1781]*. London: Macmillan, 1929. Print.

---. *The Critique of Judgement [1790]*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1952. Print.

---. *Religion within the Limits of Reason Alone [1793]*. New York: Harper, 1960. Print.

---. "Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals [1785]." *Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals*. Ed. Wood, Allen W. Rethinking the Western Tradition. New Haven, CT: Yale UP, 2002. 20-98. Print.

---. *Perpetual Peace [1795]*. New York: Cosimo Classics, 2010. Print.

Keane, John. "Introduction." *Civil Society and the State: New European Perspectives*. Ed. Keane, John. London: Verso, 1988. Print.

Kelly, Mary. "Mea Culpa: On Residual Culture and the Turn to Ethics." *Visual Worlds*. Eds. Hall, John R., Blake Stimson and Lisa Tamiris Becker. New York: Routledge, 2005. 236-42. Print.

Kenning, Dean. "Art Relations and the Presence of Absence." *Third Text* 23.4 (2009): 435-46. Print.

Kester, Grant H. "Aesthetic Evangelists: Conversion and Empowerment in Contemporary Community Art." *Afterimage* (1995): 5-11. Print.

---. "Dialogical Aesthetics: A Critical Framework for Littoral Art." *Critical Sites: Issues in Critical Art Practice and Pedagogy*. 9.Winter (1999). Web. 8 Oct 2008.

---. *Conversation Pieces: Community and Communication in Modern Art*. Berkeley: U of California P, 2004. Print.

---. *The One and the Many*. Durham, NC: Duke UP, 2011. Print.

Kleingold, Pauline, and Eric Brown. "Cosmopolitanism." *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Ed. Zalta, Edward N. Stanford: The Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford U, 2008. Web. 13 Jan 2012.

Kosuth, Joseph. "Art after Philosophy." *Conceptual Art: A Critical Anthology*. Studio International 1969. Eds. Alberro, Alexander and Blake Stimson. Boston, MA: MIT P, 1969. 158-77. Print.

---. "The Artist as Anthropologist." *The Everyday*. The Fox, No 1. (1975). Ed. Johnstone, Stephen. Documents of Contemporary Art. London: Whitechapel, 2008. 182-84. Print.

Kwon, Miwon. *One Place after Another: Site-Specific Art and Locational Identity*. Cambridge, MA: MIT P, 2002. Print.

Laclau, Ernesto, and Chantal Mouffe. *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*. 1985. Trans. Moore, Winston. 2nd ed. London: Verso, 2001. Print.

Lacy, Suzanne. *Mapping the Terrain: New Genre Public Art*. Seattle, WA: Bay, 1995. Print.

Laertius, Diogenes. "Diogenes Laertius." *Lives of the Eminent Philosophers*. Vol. 2. Harvard: Harvard University Press, 1925. Print.

Larsen, Lars Bang. "Jens Haaning: Review of De Vleeshal." *Frieze* Nov/Dec.31 (1996): 70-71. Print.

---. "Social Aesthetics: 11 Examples to Begin with, in the Light of Parallel History." *Afterall: A Journal of Art, Context, and Enquiry*.1 (1999): 76-87. Print.

Latour, Bruno. *We Have Never Been Modern*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1993. Print.

Layoun, Mary N. "A Small Reflection on a Dream Thrice Removed of Hope from a Refugee Camp." *Not Yet: Reconsidering Ernst Bloch*. Eds. Daniel, Jamie Owen and Tom Moylan. London: Verso, 1997. 224-31. Print.

Lefebvre, Henri. *Critique of Everyday Life*. Trans. Moore, John. 2nd ed. Vol. II. London: Verso, 1991. Print.

Levi-Strauss, Claude. *The Savage Mind*. The Nature of Human Society Series. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1966. Print.

Levitas, Ruth. "Educated Hope: Ernst Bloch on Abstract and Concrete Utopia." *Not Yet: Reconsidering Ernst Bloch*. Eds. Daniel, Jamie Owen and Tom Moylan. London: Verso, 1997. 65-79. Print.

Linnert, Lise Bjørne. *Desconocida Unknown Ukjent*. 2006-ongoing. Installation. Artist's Own Collection, Oslo, Norway.

---. *Threading Voices*. 2008. Artist's Own Collection, Oslo, Norway. Film.

---. *Fences*. 2009-ongoing. Installation. Artist's Own Collection, Oslo, Norway.

---. *Still Lives. Distant Faces*. 2012. Installation. Artist's Own Collection, Oslo, Norway.

---. *Cruelty has a Human Heart*. 2013-14. Installation. Artist's Own Collection, Oslo, Norway.

---. "*Desconocida Unknown Ukjent*: Artist's Statement." lisebjorne.com 2013. Web. 23 May 2015.

---. "*Fences*: Artist's Statement." lisebjorne.com 2013. Web. 23 May 2015.

---. "*Still Lives, Distant Faces*: Artist's Statement." lisebjorne.com 2013. Web. 23 Nov 2014.

---. "*Threading Voices*: Artist's Statement." lisebjorne.com 2013. Web. 23 Nov 2014.

Liu, Andrea. "Artist Organisations International Conference [Review]." *Afterimage* 42.6 (2015): 2-3. Print.

Liu, Catherine. "Art Escapes Criticism, or Adorno's Museum." *Cultural Critique* 60 (2005): 217-44. Print.

Maffesoli, Michel. "Utopia or Utopias in the Gaps: From the Political to the 'Domestic'." *Diogenes* 52.2 (2005): 25-28. Print.

Mannheim, Karl. *Ideology and Utopia: An Introduction to the Sociology of Knowledge [1936]*. Routledge Sociology Classics. 2nd ed. London: Routledge, 1991. Print.

Margolles, Teresa. "Interview with Santiago Sierra." *Bomb Magazine* 86.Winter (2004): 64. Print.

Martens, Renzo. *Episode 1*. 2003. Film.

---. *Episode Ill: Enjoy Poverty*. 2009. Inti Films, Amsterdam. Film.

---. "Open Letter to the Artistic Director." renzomartens.com 2014. Web. 29 Mar 2014.

---. "News." renzomartens.com Aug 2014. Web. 20 Jan 2015.

---. "Artist's Talk: Renzo Martens and the Institute for Human Activities." Online Video Clip. *Walker Art Center*. YouTube, 12 Feb 2015. Web. 4 Apr 2015.

Marx, Karl, and Frederick Engels. "The Communist Manifesto [1848]." *The Communist Manifesto: A Modern Edition*. Ed. Hobsbawm, Eric. London: Verso, 2012. 31-78. Print.

Massumi, Brian. "The Thinking-Feeling of What Happens." *Inflexions*. 1.1 (2008): 1-40. Web. May.

Matta-Clark, Gordon. *Food*. 1972. 16 mm film on video. Estate of Gordon Matta-Clark, New York.

Matloff, Judith. "Six Women Murdered Each Day as Femicide in Mexico Nears a Pandemic." *Al Jazeera America*.4 Jan 2015. Web. 10 Jan 2015.

McRobbie, Angela. "Vulnerability, Violence and (Cosmopolitan) Ethics: Butler's Precarious Life." *British Journal of Sociology* 57.1 (2006): 69-86. Print.

---. "Reflections on Feminism, Immaterial Labour and the Post-Fordist Regime." *New Formations* 70 (2010): 60-76,189. Print.

Meerzon, Yana. *Performing Exile, Performing Self: Drama, Theatre, Film*. Studies in International Performance. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011. Print.

Mehta, Uday Singh. *Liberalism and Empire: A Study in Nineteenth-Century British Liberal Thought*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1999. Print.

Mendieta, Eduardo. "From Imperial to Dialogical Cosmopolitanism." *Ethics and Global Politics* 2.3 (2009): 241-58. Print.

Meskimmon, Marsha. *Contemporary Art and the Cosmopolitan Imagination: Politics, Ethics, Affect*. Hoboken, NJ: Taylor & Francis, 2010. Print.

Miller, Toby. *The Well-Tempered Self: Citizenship, Culture and the Postmodern Subject*. Baltimore: John Hopkins UP, 1993. Print.

Molz, Jennie Germann. "Cosmopolitan Bodies: Fit to Travel and Travelling to Fit." *Body & Society* 12.3 (2006): 1-21. Print.

Möntmann, Nina "Community Service." *Frieze*.102 (2006). Web. 8 Feb 2013.

Morris, William. *News from Nowhere, or, an Epoch of Rest: Being Some Chapters from a Utopian Romance [1891]*. Oxford World's Classics. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2003. Print.

---. "The Socialist Ideal: Art." *Art and Social Change*. Eds. Bradley, Will and Charles Esche. London: Tate, 2007. 47-53. Print.

Moylan, Tom, and Raffaella Baccolini. *Utopia Method Vision: The Use Value of Social Dreaming*. Oxford: Peter Lang, 2007. Print.

Nathanson, Donald L. "Prologue: Affect Imagery Consciousness." *Affect Imagery Consciousness: The Complete Edition*. Ed. Tomkins, Silvan. New York: Springer, 2008. xi-xxvi. Print.

Nava, Mica. "Domestic Cosmopolitanism and Structures of Feeling: The Specificity of London." *The Situated Politics of Belonging*. Eds. Yuval-Davis, Nira, Kalpana Kannabiran and Ulrike Vieten. London: Sage, 2006. 42-53. Print.

Nesbit, Molly, Hans Ulrich Obrist, and Rirkrit Tiravanija. "What Is a Station?: Utopia Station Curatorial Statement for the 50th Venice Biennale." (2003). Web. 2003.

---. *Utopia Station*. 2003. Installation. Venice Biennale, Venice.

Nielsen, Palle. *Untitled*. Installation. Festival 200, Copenhagen, Denmark.

Notopoulos, Katie. "Marina Abramović Made Me Cry." *Marina Abramović Made Me Cry*. Ed. Notopoulos, Katie. New York: tmblr.com, 2010. Vol. 2013. Print.

Nussbaum, Martha C. "Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism." *The Boston Review* 19.5 (1994): 2-17. Print.

O'Sullivan, Simon. "The Aesthetic of Affect: Thinking Art Beyond Representation." *Angelaki: Journal of the Theoretical Humanities* 6.5 (2001): 125-36. Print.

Observatorio Ciudadano Nacional del Feminicidio (OCNF). *Femicide and Impunity in Mexico: A Context of Structural and Generalized Violence*. New York: Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW), 2012. Print.

Oxford English Dictionary. "Emotion." (2011). *oed.com*. Web. 3 Feb 2013.

Papastergiadis, Nikos. "Glimpses of Cosmopolitanism in the Hospitality of Art." *European Journal of Social Theory* 10.1 (2007): 139-52. Print.

---. *Cosmopolitanism and Culture*. Cambridge; Malden, MA: Polity, 2012. Print.

Peterson, Richard A., and Roger M. Kern. "Changing Highbrow Taste: From Snob to Omnivore." *American Sociological Review* 61.5 (1996): 900-7. Print.

Phillips, Patricia C. "Christo: An Interview." *Flash Art* 151 (1990). 135-36. Print.

Pollock, Sheldon, Homi K. Bhabha, Carol A. Breckenridge and Dipesh Chakrabarty. "Cosmopolitanisms." *Public Culture* 12.3 (2000): 577-89. Print.

Rainer, Yvonne. "Looking Myself in the Mouth." *A Woman Who...: Essay, Interviews, Scripts*. Baltimore: John Hopkins UP, 1999. 85-97. Print.

---. "Final Letter to Jeffrey Deitch and Moca Regarding Annual Gala." *Artforum International* (2011). Web. 12 Feb 2014.

Rancière, Jacques. *On the Shores of Politics*. Phronesis. London New York: Verso, 1995. Print.

---. "The Emancipated Spectator." *Artforum* 45.7 (2007): 271-72,74-75,77-80. Print.

Rifkin, Jeremy. *The Age of Access: The New Culture of Hypercapitalism*. New York: Putnam, 2000. Print.

---. *The Empathic Civilization: The Race to Global Consciousness in a World in Crisis*. Cambridge: Polity, 2010. Print.

Robbins, Bruce. *Secular Vocations: Intellectuals, Professionalism, Culture*. London: Verso, 1993. Print.

Roman, Richard, and Edur Velasco. "The North American Free Trade Agreement (Nafta) and the Rights of Mexican Workers." *Global Research*. 11 May 2014. Web. 23 May 2015.

Rose, Nikolas. *Inventing Our Selves: Psychology, Power, and Personhood*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1996. Print.

---. *Powers of Freedom: Reframing Political Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1999. Print.

---. "Inventiveness in Politics." *Economy and Society* 28.2 (1999): 467-93. Print.

Rose, Nikolas, and Nicholas Gane. "Governing the Social." *The Future of Social Theory*. Ed. Gane, Nicholas. London: Continuum, 2004. 167-85. Print.

Ross, Andrew. "The Mental Labor Problem." *Social Text* 18.2 (2000): 1-31. Print.

Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. "The Social Contract [1762]." *The Social Contract; and the First and Second Discourses*. Ed. Dunn, Susan. New Haven: Yale UP, 2002. 149-255. Print.

Rubert de Ventós, Xavier. "Urbanisation against Urbanity?" *Ciutat Real, Ciutat Ideal. Significat I Funció a L'espai Urbà Modern [Real City, Ideal City. Signification and Function in Modern Space]*. 7 ed. Urbanits. Barcelona: Centre de Cultura Contemporània de Barcelona, 1998. Print.

Said, Edward. "Reflections on Exile." *Out There: Marginalization and Contemporary Cultures*. Eds. Ferguson, Russell, Martha Gever, Trinh T. Minh-Ha and Cornel West. Cambridge, MA: MIT P, 1992. 357-66. Print.

---. *Orientalism*. London: Penguin, 1995. Print.

Shklovsky, Viktor. "Art as Technique [1917]." Trans. Lemon, Lee and Marion J. Reis. *Russian Formalist Criticism: Four Essays*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1965. 3-24. Print.

Shusterman, Richard. "The Urban Aesthetics of Absence: Pragmatist Reflections in Berlin." *New Literary History, suppl. Special Issue: Philosophical Thoughts* 28.4 (1997): 739-55. Print.

Sierra, Santiago. *Line of 30 cm Tattooed on a Remunerated Person*. 1998. Performance Installation. Mexico City, Mexico.

---. *Ten People Paid To Masturbate*. 2000. Performance Installation. Havana, Cuba.

---. *Workers Who Cannot be Paid, Remunerated to Remain Inside Cardboard Boxes*. 2000. Performance Installation. Kunst Werke, Berlin, Germany.

---. *The Wall of a Gallery Pulled Out, Inclined Sixty Degrees from the Ground and Sustained by Five People*. 2000. Performance Installation. Acceso A, Mexico City, Mexico.

---. *Polyurethane Sprayed on the Backs of Ten* Workers. 2004. Performance Installation. Lisson Gallery, London. July.

---. *Burial of Ten Workers*. 2010. Performance Installation. Calambrone, Italy.

Simonds, Wendy. "All Consuming Selves: Self-Help Literature and Women's Identities." *Constructing the Self in a Mediated World*. Eds. Grodin, Debra and Thomas R. Lindlof. Thousand Oaks: Sage, 1996. 15-29. Print.

Smart, Barry. "Foucault, Levinas and the Subject of Responsibility." *The Later Foucault: Politics and Philosophy*. Ed. Moss, Jeremy. London: Sage, 1998. 78-92. Print.

Stepanova, Varvara. "A General Theory of Constructivism [1921]." *Art and Social Change*. Eds. Bradley, Will and Charles Esche. London: Tate, 2007. 69-73. Print.

Stevenson, Nick. "Cultural Citizenship in the 'Cultural' Society: A Cosmopolitan Approach." *Journal of Citizenship Studies* 7.3 (2003): 331-48. Print.

Szerszynski, Bronislaw, and John Urry. "Cultures of Cosmopolitanism." *Sociological Review* 50.4 (2002): 461-81. Print.

---. "Visuality, Mobility and the Cosmopolitan: Inhabiting the World from Afar." *The British Journal of Sociology* 57.1 (2006): 113-31. Print.

Thybo, Finn and Per Bille. *The Oslo Trip*. 1970. Performance Installation. Young Nordic Biennial, Copenhagen, Denmark.

Tiravanija, Rirkrit. *Untitled (Free/Still)*. 1992/1995/2007/2011-. Performance Installation. Collection of New York, MoMA.

---. *Untitled*. 1995. Performance Installation. Carnegie Museum of Art, New York.

---. *Rirkrit Tiravanija: Secession, 5. Juli-1. September 2002*. New York: D.A.P., 2003. Print.

---. *Soup/No Soup*. 2012. Performance Installation. La Triennale, Paris.

Tiravanija, Rirkrit, and Kamin Lertchaiprasert. *The Land Foundation*. 1998-ongoing. Installation. Chiang Mai, Thailand.

Tomkins, Silvan. "Affect Theory." *Emotion in the Human Face*. Eds. Ekman, Paul, Wallace V. Friesen and Phoebe Ellsworth. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1982. 355-95. Print.

---. "Script Theory." *Exploring Affect: The Selected Writings of Silvan S. Tomkins*. Ed. Demos, E. Virginia. New York: Cambridge UP, 1995. 312-88. Print.

Tonkiss, Fran. "The Ethics of Indifference: Community and Solitude in the City." *International Journal of Cultural Studies* 6.3 (2003): 297-311. Print.

Tulloch, John. *Performing Culture: Stories of Expertise and the Everyday*. London: Sage, 1999. Print.

Turner, Bryan S., and June Edmunds. "The Distaste of Taste: Bourdieu, Cultural Capital and the Australian Postwar Elite." *Journal of Consumer Culture* 2.2 (2002): 219-39. Print.

Turner, Carolyn. "Film 'Enjoy Poverty'" Online Video Clip. *TV2 Africa*. YouTube, 13 May 2010. Web. 13 Jun 2015.

Urry, John. *Consuming Places*. New York: Routledge, 1995. Print.

---. *Sociology Beyond Societies: Mobilities for the Twenty First Century*. New York: Routledge, 2000. Print.

van der Kroef, Saskia. "Renzo Martens: Stedelijk Museum Bureau Amsterdam [Review]." *Artforum* 47.7 (2009): 260-61. Print.

Vertovec, Steven, and Robin Cohen. *Conceiving Cosmopolitanism: Theory, Context and Practice*. New York: Oxford UP, 2002. Print.

Vizcarrondo, Sara. "At the Present Time: Matthew Akers on 'Marina Abramović." *documentary.org*. June (2012). Web. 10 Jan 2013.

Wagley, Catherine. "Marina Abramović's Moca Gala Controversy: Jeffrey Deitch Confronted and the Performers Speak Out." *LA Weekly* 19 Dec 2011, sec. Arts. Web. 12 Feb 2014.

Waithe, Marcus. *William Morris's Utopia of Strangers: Victorian Medievalism and the Ideal of Hospitality*. Woodbridge, UK: D.S. Brewer, 2006. Print.

Weintraub, Linda. *Art on the Edge and Over*. Litchfield, CT: Art Insights, 1996. Print.

White, Edmund. *The Flaneur: A Stroll through the Paradoxes of Paris*. London: Bloomsbury, 2008. Print.

Willats, Stephen *Pat Purdy and the Glue Sniffers Camp*. 1981. Gallery of New South Wales, Sydney.

---. Willats, Stephen. *Between Buildings and People*. London: Academy Editions, 1996. Print.

Williams, Raymond. *The Long Revolution*. London: Chatto and Windus, 1961. Print.

---. *Drama from Ibsen to Brecht*. London: Chatto and Windus, 1968. Print.

---. *The Country and the City*. London: Chatto and Windus, 1973. Print.

---. *Marxism and Literature*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1977. Print.

---. *Politics and Letters: Interviews with 'New Left Review'*. London: NLB, 1979. Print.

---. *Problems in Materialism and Culture: Selected Essays*. London: Verso, 1980. Print.

---. *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society*. 2nd ed. New York: Oxford UP, 1983. Print.

---. *Resources of Hope: Culture, Democracy, Socialism*. London: Verso, 1989. Print.

Wilson, Mick. "Autonomy, Agonism, and Activist Art: An Interview with Grant Kester." *Art Journal* 66.3 (2007): 107-18. Print.

Warner, Michael. "Publics and Counterpublics." *Public Culture* 14.1 (2002): 49-90. Print.

Wu, Chin-Tao. *Privatising Culture: Corporate Art Intervention since the 1980s*. London: Verso, 2002. Print.

Young, Iris Marion. *Inclusion and Democracy*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2000. Print.

Yúdice, George. The Expediency of Culture: Uses of Culture in the Global Era. Durham, NC: Duke UP, 2003. Print.

Żmijewski, Artur. "Artists Come to Create Beauty and Kindness: In Conversation with Renzo Martens." *Forget Fear: 7th Berlin Biennale for Contemporary Art*. (2012). Web. 17 Mar 2013.