

Social Art Practices as Feminist Manifestos: Radical Hospitality in the Archive

Caroline Gausden

September 2016

Contents

Abstract	3
Acknowledgements	4
Introduction	5
Research Position	5
Personal Position	7
Aims and Objectives	8
Archive Structure	10
'Aboutness' and 'Witness' Knowledge	12
Contextual Review	13
Manifesto Definition	19
On Voice	24
A Minor Methodology	27
Conclusions	33
Chapter Summaries	40
The Archive Collection	
About Archives	
With Archives	41
The Hospitality Collection	42
About Hospitality	
With Hospitality	43
The Manifesto Collection	
About Manifesto	
With Manifesto	44
Bibliography	45
Appendices:	48
1. Research Timeline	
2. Research map	

Abstract

The research presents a practice-based examination of the politics and poetics of the manifesto form, drawing on feminist theoretical writing and activism alongside contemporary iterations of socially engaged art. It offers feminist manifestos as a lens through which to reconsider the form and intentions of socially engaged art, which is reframed in the light of these feminist insights as social art practice (Ross, 2000). To draw feminism alongside social art practice the research occupies the metaphorical territory of the manifesto in order to open up a dialogue with, and directly experience, unfolding forms of social art practice.

The thesis is structured in the form of an archive, consisting of three distinct but interrelated concepts – the manifesto, hospitality and archives. This structure sets out to highlight the relational and political nature of archives suggesting their potential to be reimagined as manifesto forms. In addition the structure reveals how both manifesto and archive function as explicit, politically radical forms of hospitality. These topics are discretely contained in physical form within three archival boxes, one for each concept, and in an online audio archive ‘giving voice’ to each of the concepts.

Taken as a whole the thesis articulates a missing feminist history within current critical discourse around social art practice - despite the early presence of important feminist artists like Lacy and Ukeles. This research explores the implications of this absence, seeking to acknowledge the effects it could have not only on feminism as a political and intellectual practice but on the criticality and depth of social art practice.

It is possible to encounter the archive as a cartography that can be laid out, navigated and read in any order. This movement between forms of knowledge mirrors the subjects it approaches which are conceived as interstitial forms, negotiating multiple perspectives to produce active subjectivity. Each section juxtaposes knowledge *about* practice, engaging with history to search for precedents, and knowledge *with* practice as a generative method, curating events and producing written contributions. Moving between these two methodologies the research sets out to find an appropriate voice to articulate the complexities of social art practice and its feminist histories.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my supervisors Anne Douglas and Alexandra Kokoli who contributed a difficult to achieve balance of critical clarity, openness, care and support to the research project. Their considerable guidance and commitment has made it possible to imagine the research.

I would also like to acknowledge all the artists and curators who have shared their practice with me in an open and generous way: Alana Jelinek, Jen Clarke, Tiffany Boyle and Jessica Carden, Emma Balkind and Laura Edbrook, Jonathan Baxter, Marysia Lewandowska, Althea Greenan, Chu Chu Yuan and Jay Koh, Dunja Kukovec, Adele Patrick, Merlyn Riggs, Tanja Ostojić and Laura Guy. And to Helen Smith for all the conversational support.

Alongside these voices thanks to the research community for offering a vital critical home for my developing thoughts: Melahat Nil Gulari, Munire Hilal Bugali, Jonathan Price, Nicola Chambury and Nuria Sánchez-León. And to Iain Irving and John Blackwood at Gray's School of Art.

Also much gratitude to Andy Sheridan for designing the Audio Archive and Maja Zeco for all the technical support throughout in sound, design and photography. Finally thanks to my brother, Andrew Cornwell, for contributing his editing expertise.

I would like to dedicate this to the pillars of personal support in my life: to my partner Lance Manak for all the carework. To my mum Christine MacFarlane who introduced me to feminism and my daughter Guyatri Manak who reminds me of its continuing necessity.

Introduction

Welcome to the feminist manifesto and social art practice archive. This archive consists of three archival boxes, Manifesto, Hospitality and Archive, containing documents that cohere around the subject of feminist manifesto and social art practice and one [online audio archive](#).¹ They do not present a complete history of the subject but instead, something necessarily selective, guided by the particular and embedded position of the researcher. The hard to shake subjectivity of the archive is supplemented, but not forgotten, by its openness to future encounters over time. Somewhat unusually the Introduction also contains a contextual review, methodology and conclusions. These elements sit outside the individual collections in order to help visitors navigate and approach different parts without limiting the experience to predefined beginning and ends.

This Introduction also contains a timeline of events, activities and conversations that have been significant moments in gathering together the archive. The timeline indicates where descriptions of each event or collaboration can be found in the main thesis. Along with the timeline is a layered diagram of the research, which similarly indicates where practices and theoretical texts are situated in the thesis, as well as acting to map out the relationships between each individual archive box. This diagram or cartography helps to guide the reader and takes the physical form of six acetates. Beginning with manifesto and working through to archive, each transparency provides a perspective that will be covered in the respective boxes, which in turn have two parts, in a repeating framework. Through each added layer it is possible to see where research themes reappear and repeat in the individual sections. Consequently, the research map illustrates a conversation, mapping a reoccurring structure or refrain that may be kept in mind when reading each individual part of the research. The refrain, like the research, begins with the manifesto layer. Consequently a more detailed explanation and summary of the research map can be found in the section of the Introduction that offers a definition for feminist manifesto. As the layers accumulate a list of practices and theoretical texts also populate the map. Gathered together in this way it is possible to understand how and where individual examples fit into overall theoretical perspective offered by the research.

¹ www.feministmanifesto.co.uk

Research Position

The archive is my response to four years of research in various feminist archival contexts and also to my situation within the On the Edge research community in Aberdeen. I have worked in a number of archive contexts including Re-Act Feminism in Berlin, The Women's Slide Library/MAKE archive in London and Glasgow Women's Library. I have also worked extensively within virtual archives, including the 1984 Dinners archive devised by artist and curator Sophie Hope and The Women's Audio Archive set up by artist Marysia Lewandowska. This last archive has had a significant impact, helping me to think through connections between feminist discourse and social art practice in relation to a diverse range of voices and providing an appropriate methodology for the research, over thirty years on from the original recording dates.

My situation within the research community in Aberdeen, with connections to other important networks, has also had a profound impact on the shape of the research. The research is positioned within a broader enquiry around 'the changing relationships of visual arts practice to wider cultural life' (Douglas, 2013, p.9). This enquiry includes practice-based contributions from a range of highly experienced artists who have directly influenced my thinking around social art practice, including Sophie Hope (2011) (see *With Archives*), Chu Chu Yuan (2013), Suzanne Lacy (2013) (see *About Hospitality*) and Helen Smith (2015) (see *With Manifestos*). These contributions intersect with Alexandra Kokoli's feminist critical perspective, which offers further insights, also generated within an extended network of experienced practitioners. Beyond written contributions I have had a chance to be in conversation with these and many others connected to the research environment. From these conversations the collaborations and curatorial interventions that will be detailed in the archive have emerged. It is in acknowledgement of this situated position that the archive's claims take shape. This decision to consciously write from a particular position follows on from Rosi Braidotti's assertion that we should 'begin from where we are' (2014). In *Transpositions* Braidotti defines this embedded feminist position as 'grounded, partial and accountable, according to the micro-political model also favoured by poststructuralism' (Braidotti, 2006, p.18).

Given the importance of position and the acknowledgment of the generative nature of embodied conversational knowledge, alongside written discourse, the research draws

equally from spoken and written contributions to the fields of knowledge that it engages with.

Personal Position

The original brief for the research, filtered as it is through my situation in the context of Aberdeen and the Gray's research community, is also inevitably filtered through past and personal experiences. Prior to the research studentship I was based in Glasgow, working in different capacities at the Centre for Contemporary Art (CCA), as an artist in the education department, as a researcher in the archive and also as a 'maintenance worker', managing different spaces in the building (Ukeles, 1969). I also worked somehow on the edge of these art world spaces. An interest in the carnivalesque and in ecological issues pushed me to make work in more marginal communities. This work culminated in becoming an artist founder for the Govanhill based ecological charity South Seeds, which was initiated to spark a 'guerrilla gardening' movement in the area.

The history of my experience lies between different worlds. I bring with me the increasing privilege of an art school education, combined with training in Art History, as well as considerable experience working outside of the white cube spaces. While the white cube has long been considered as the ideal destination to follow art education my career trajectory has involved considerable detour from this path. Despite living and working in areas that offer a rich array of minority experience I am not in a minority. I speak from the position of a white woman and consequently bring certain cultural privileges to the research. It is important, if difficult, to acknowledge that this is the case. At the same time that I do not speak from a minority cultural position I also have considerable experience within a less than comfortable majority. Through my work in the cultural sector I am part of what Gregory Sholette (2011) terms a class of dark matter. I am one of many intimately acquainted with the invisible, hospitable work it takes to run a cultural space. Coupled with this labour I am also familiar with the work it takes to be a mother. Inevitably these personal co-ordinates, as a mother, dark matter and still somehow as person on the edge, colour the choices made in this research and the methodologies employed.

Aims and Objectives

The aim of the research is to expand and problematize understandings of feminist manifestos and social art practice drawing current examples of practice alongside feminist history with a view to reconnecting social art practice to its feminist roots. The research develops and implements a framework of three perspectives that include the manifesto as a form and feminist practice, the archive and hospitality. These three perspectives function in dialogue with each other, the one forming the other dynamically. The research begins with the hypothesis that certain works of art function as feminist manifestos due to their intentions, reception and interpretation, using this starting point to explore social art practice through a different lens. In relation to this beginning the important issue of hospitality arises as a concern for both feminism and social art practice. In exploring this concern it is evident that hospitality is also an important if often hidden aspect to the manifesto form. Alongside hospitality the archival aspects of the research, which explored particular moments of feminist history in the UK, brought the politics of archive to the fore adding a third important perspective..

Research objectives include:

1. To create a form for the inquiry that resonates with/embodies the research issues (hence the thesis itself functions as an archive with a dialogic structure)
2. To create a methodological approach that draws on two ways of knowing as identified by social practice artist Chu Chu Yuan – knowing as information that exists outside of the experience of the researcher: aboutness knowing and knowing as experience, the researcher’s own curatorial and conversational practice: witness knowing (Shotter, 2005)
3. To test the hypothesis that certain works of art function as feminist manifestos through an exploration of relevant current and historical social and curatorial practices.
4. To raise the question of feminist history within discourses of socially engaged practice.
5. To provide a broad theoretical framework that critically engages with the three perspectives of the framework: hospitality (Ahmed, Derrida, Irigaray,), Archive (Eichhorn, Freeman, Withers) and Manifesto (Kristeva, Lyon, Pollock)

This approach has led to a number of insights:

The archive's open, multi-directional nature is both a vulnerability, producing an expanded and unruly form, but also a strength, suggesting multiple relationships between the included material. The aim to give three perspectives on the subject of feminist manifestos and social art, has produced expanded and generative definitions for both these areas of practice and suggests also that the subjects work in dialogue with each other. Through dialogue it is possible to reimagine particular social art practices as functioning manifestos. It is also possible to see moments of feminist commitment to dialogical and relational forms, equally evident in social art practice. This commitment has led to reimagining the manifesto genre as something that hides hospitable intentions beneath an angry surface. Tracing this movement between extremes of hostility and hospitality is a key component of the thesis. Significant feminist re-imaginings of the form are discussed and also seen as early precursors to social art practice. By staging an encounter between certain feminist histories and social art practice the intention is to critically evaluate the balance between the vital elements of hostility and hospitality. To acknowledge feminist understanding as part of social art practice is to remember the usefulness of criticality and some rage. In looking at this balance it is equally important to concede that there are histories and experiences of feminism that may unfold differently. Particularly in relation to the feminist archive it is important to acknowledge it as a profoundly contested space. In facing this contestation too much rage may lead to spaces that are less than open to encounters with difference. This difficulty, through which marginal and excluded communities can, in themselves, evolve into exclusionary spaces is also faced in different places in the archive.² It should be acknowledged that different forms of feminism are not immune to such slippages. In relation to this another aim of the work is to consider where carefully attuned social art practices may contribute insights, positing a form of hospitality that doesn't shy away from difficult meetings with other subjectivities that can inform feminist practice going forward.

The conceptual work done by the research is to suggest that feminist manifestos are a kind of hospitality, delivered by sometimes unwelcome guests, and so is social practice. It is also to argue that the outsider perspective offered by feminism is of considerable consequence to praxis as it develops. Through considerations of hospitality the work

² Not least through my discussions with curatorial team Mother Tongue, whose interventions bring to light the exclusionary nature of the 'Glasgow Miracle' narrative, tracing the movement of a tightly woven group of artists from margins to mainstream.

also approaches questions of the home and archive offering the further suggestion that the archive too, in feminist hands, may become both a social practice and a manifesto.

In offering these different metaphorical and conceptual frames for social art practice and feminist manifestos the research aims to produce a layered critical framework. It works to provide an alternative pedagogical discourse for artists, educators and curators in the field, offering a feminist voice and history to an area of practice which is expanding rapidly, within an institutional support system set up to accommodate a very different conception of art practice.³ It is argued that as a historical outsider to these systems feminist discourse not only offers precedents for social art practice, but also tools for resisting the constraints in a given system and imagining alternative ways of working. One of the working methods explored is that suggested by art historian Griselda Pollock, as a reading across disciplines. In relation to this type of reading, across history, politics and contemporary art practice, the research asks: can we express and pass on practice better when we understand its function as a kind of politics and poetics? Equally, could we be in a better position to produce feminist manifestos when we understand them as art practices, exhibiting an ambivalent form of hospitality? Finally, what are the consequences of reimagining the archive as a place of hospitality, a home, which is not simply a container of pre-existing knowledge but a relational space that produces new ways of knowing and feeds activist praxis? How can we work with the archive form as a political and poetic space, a dwelling place for art(chiv)ists with social practices?

Archive Structure

The three boxes that make up the archive are listed here in alphabetical order as Archives, Hospitality and Manifesto. The boxes can be accessed in any order. The audio recordings in the online archive are also catalogued according to these concepts and are discussed at different places within the narrative. Physical copies of these recordings are included in the three boxes along with other appendices. By taking this form the research offers an archival experience, so that it is possible not only to think *about* the function of archives, but *with* the archive and its materials. As an archive, the documents

³ The institutional support system I am referring to in this case is a combination of art education, the intersecting public and private gallery systems and art history which have all been set up structurally to think about artists as singular individuals that operate outwith social networks.

become a cartography that you can lay out and navigate through, according to your position, negotiating a relationship. In being a cartography they also take up space. The expanded size of the research is a result of the form, which in places requires some repetition.⁴ In order to open up the possibility for a negotiated relationship, which is distinct from one that is decided in advanced and fixed, it is necessary to break with the conventions of linear narrative. This break accounts for the repeating forms and size of the archive, enabling users to approach the archive from different beginnings. Rather than one thing after the other, time in the archive is layered, like a kind of compost (Withers, 2015) and multi-voiced. Each element in the archive should inform and add perspectives onto other elements. It is possible for different events in a given chronology to be extracted and placed alongside each other. In this way we are not divided by the times we live in but are in conversation with other times. It is through these conversations, back and forth, that it becomes possible to imagine different futures. In this way an argument is made for the relational nature of the archive, viewed in parallel to the relational art works that it contains. Both social practice and the feminist archive provide hosting spaces, gathering together different elements to offer alternative methods of resistance and inspiration for different possible worlds. By offering de/re constructions these hospitable places are manifesto-like, retooling participants for social change.

This partial break with the linear not only attempts to imagine time as a conversation but also as a form of radical hospitality, handing over the keys to knowledge and allowing the guest to become a kind of host. This is not to say that you, the guest becoming host, will have to face a chaos of voices without support. The research also acknowledges the archive is a kind of home, a shelter in difficult times and a ritual performed to balance forces of chaos, holding things in tension. In the archive things are brought to a precarious, fallible kind of order. The ritual of putting things in order works towards survival in an uncertain place, creating a safe space so that it is possible to move forwards. As Kate Eichhorn (2013) asserts, it is necessary to put our 'outrage in order' to gather momentum for action in the present moment. Consequently, each box provides a thread of narrative through two folders, approaching its subject from different perspectives, two interrelated yet distinct ways of knowing, described below.

⁴ For example each collection has its own bibliography so that they stand alone, despite the inevitable repetition of some sources this produces throughout the whole thesis.

'Aboutness' and 'Witness' Knowledge

Once inside each box the narrative thread is split into two folders. The first folder provides knowledge *about* the subject whilst the second offers knowledge *with* the subject.

In the conceptual framework to her PhD thesis Chu Chu Yuan draws a distinction between two forms of knowledge. She defines these terms as 'witness' and 'aboutness' knowledge in relation to the writings of intercommunication theorist John Shotter. Shotter offers a critique of Cartesian dualism, which, he argues, leads to a form of knowledge that works from outside of a subject, describing 'a world to which we are related only as spectators at a distance, not as involved participants' (Shotter, 2005, p.134). He contrasts this way of knowing *about* a subject to a way of knowing that is a kind of 'becoming' *with* as a result of embodied experiential meetings with others and otherness around us' (Ibid, p.132). *Witness* knowledge has responsive and anticipatory qualities that move us towards action, Shotter writes:

'In short, we are spontaneously "moved," bodily, toward specific possibilities for action in this kind of thinking. They provide us with both an evaluative sense of "where" we are placed in relation to our surroundings, as well as an anticipatory sense of where next we might move.' (Ibid, p.146)

The possibilities for action and movement are important considerations in relation to the topic of feminist manifestos. In movement there is also friction. Chu points out that friction is 'the condition for realising the sense of difference' when we come 'into contact with other persons' utterances, bodily expressions, words and works' (Chu, 2013, p.33). Friction is a kind of ethics that enables us to perceive difference and move with it. Understanding and acting ethically in relation to these encounters with others and otherness is at the heart of social practice.

Chu offers two important additions to Shotter's writing that have directly influenced my use of this conceptual framework to structure the archive. First, she draws his insights alongside Taoist thought using the traditional Chinese saying 'to cross a river by feeling its bed' as an evocative analogy to describe *witness* knowledge. She interprets this within her practice as the idea that 'one needs to become immersed in the river before one can figure out how to cross it' (Chu, 2013, p.32). This embodied example converts

an abstract conceptual proposition into something I can relate to through my own experiential memories. It also acknowledges that other systems of thought, outside the western philosophical tradition that Shotter locates himself in, have contributed theories of embodied understanding.

Second, Chu offers an important modification. Where Shotter prioritises *witness* over *aboutness* thinking, simply reversing the perceived hierarchy in the Cartesian tradition, Chu argues for a movement between these ways of knowing. She states 'I think both *witness* and *aboutness* positions are important, and are both operative within immersive involvement' (Ibid, p.42). *Aboutness* knowledge is not excluded from an immersed perspective. Finally, it is possible to say that I arrive at this framework through a combination of these ways of knowing. I know *about* Chu's work from a distance, having read both her own account and from the critical perspectives of others (Kester, 2011; Koh, 2015). I also know *with* Chu, through conversations within the research environment that we both shared.

In relation to this conceptual framework I also propose a movement between these forms of knowledge. Each archive box begins with a folder that contains knowledge *about* the subject and continues into a second folder that describes a journey made *with* that subject. The sequential nature of these folders produces the thread of argument, moving through the subject to arrive at a position. It is also possible, while reading, to place sections from each folder alongside each other, in order to read across the sections picking up relational nuance. To reflect this possibility titles often repeat between sections adding layers of meaning. It is my argument that this kind of relational movement back and forth through the archive is not only how artists learn and an ethical form of hospitality, but also a way of moving through the archive.

Contextual Review

Writing on the counter cultural, citizen's rights and feminist movements in the US in the 1960s, Tom Finkelparl (2013) locates the beginnings of a movement in art to embrace the social, directly inspired by political activities outwith the field of art. He writes:

‘artists were adopting, adapting and translating this sort of collectively imagined, cooperatively created political theater in the aesthetic realm, even as the aesthetics began to blur with social action.’ (Ibid, p.19)

In this vein artist Suzanne Lacy is described by Finkelppearl as having developed a form of political theatre out of communicative structures evident in the women’s movement, including consciousness-raising. Lacy acknowledges this debt and contribution to feminist forms also crediting art world figure Alan Kaprow as an important precedent for her work through his blurring of art and life categories. In this way she is one of a number of artists to cross the line between politics and art in a tradition that could arguably be drawn back to the Suffragettes, who still struggle to be defined by history as existing in both categories.⁵ In the UK context the community arts movement extracted itself from art world discourse in order to work in more directly collaborative and interventionist ways with different communities, providing important histories for practitioners like Sophie Hope and Lorraine Leeson, two generations of artists with an interest in art as a social form. In parallel to this Barbara Steveni and John Latham of the Artist Placement Group were working more formally within art world discourse, negotiating artists’ placements in industrial and political contexts. Like Lacy many artists with contemporary social practices draw inspiration from genealogies that are more or less accepted within art historical narratives. Beyond the much discussed geography of the US and contextually significant work in the UK many histories could be added to this short account to arrive at the conclusion that for some time now artists have been working against and moving the boundaries of art discourse, redefining the practice along social lines. Helen Smith writes:

‘it no longer seems acceptable or even interesting for the unique contribution artists make to society to be purely symbolic.’ (Smith, 2015, p.9)

Instead, as an artist, she feels motivated to be embedded in social contexts, intervening in operating systems *as well as* offering a symbolic response.⁶

⁵ Janet Lyon (1999) writes extensively on this issue in *Manifestoes: Provocations of the Modern*, offering an account of the Suffragettes’ reception within high modernist artistic circles. Despite producing what Lyon describes as ‘public and discursive art’ Suffragettes were defined in the political field as bad artists and in the artistic field as simple militants lacking aesthetic lucidity (Lyon, 1999, pp. 104–109).

⁶ Italics here indicate the importance of stressing the realisation that it is not necessary to divide artists into symbolic and non-symbolic categories but instead acknowledge the possibility that artist might work between these categories. This assertion was reiterated by artist Rick Lowe in

It is also evident from the growing pool of theory on collaborative, relational, site-specific and participatory art that discourse is responding. In responding the first struggle is with naming. I recently wrote to artist Jay Koh who had given me a copy of his book *Art-Led Participative Processes* (2015). I asked him why he offered a new name, *Art-Led Participative Processes* (2015). This name emerges in a field that already has so many ways of referring to art embedded in social relations: including New Genre Public Art (Lacy et al., 1995), Relational Aesthetics (Bourriaud et al., 2002), Dialogical Practice (Kester, 2004), Art with Communities (Leeson, 2009), Social Co-operation (Finklepearl, 2012), Participatory Art (Bishop, 2012) and Socially Engaged Art as well as the less fashionable Community Art (Kelly, 1984).⁷ He replied that the existing names were ‘too general and don’t point to the critical differences in the concepts of the practitioners’ (Koh, personal communication by email, June 2015). His own practice was more engaged with shared authorship than artist led projects and with a greater ‘concern for accountability to others and nonspecific human relationships’ (Ibid) than practices developed from ‘modernist’ trajectories. For Koh the language in which to narrate a practice is important and affects its form. A name can suggest a different history affecting its reception in the present moment and its future. Language and practice co-exist and shape each other continuously. Writing earlier, Lorraine Leeson remembers a moment in the UK when artists, working in the social sphere, were vilified by the ‘art establishment’ leaving them in an extremely precarious position (Leeson, 2009, p.106). The fallout from this establishment disapproval can still be seen around the term community art, which, detached from its association as a radical political response, has become shorthand for weak practice in the margins of the art world.⁸ For Leeson a change in discourse that could accommodate her practice was a matter of survival.

response to Tanja Bruguera’s sentiment that she wants her art ‘to be the thing rather than point at the thing’ with Lowe asserting his art is both a practical intervention and a poetic gesture that draws from symbolic traditions (Creative time summit, 2013, 23.00 - 26.45 mins).

⁷ Socially engaged art is particularly ubiquitous in a European context and consequently difficult to accredit to one particular artist, curator or critic. Beyond this authors like Claire Bishop quite often switch between terms making citation or attachment of one term to one specific writer difficult. Bishop in fact offers her own list to illustrate the diversity of names accumulating around practice: ‘This expanded field of relational practices currently goes by a variety of names: socially engaged art, community-based art, experimental communities, dialogic art, littoral art, participatory, interventionist, research-based, or collaborative art’ (Bishop, 2006).

⁸ To hear Leeson in more detail on this subject listen to category ten within the London Dinner as part of Hope’s 1984 Dinner archive. For an interesting perspective on the gentrifying process from community art to current models of socially engaged practice see Larne Abse Gogarty (2014).

It is with a similar awareness of language, history and survival that I choose the term social art practice to refer to art practices throughout this thesis. This term is not a new addition to the above list but one that has some traction in art discourse, particularly in the US and UK contexts where it is possible to undertake an MFA in Social Practice.⁹

However I have chosen the name with a different genealogy in mind, referencing the work of performance artist Monica Ross. Ross used both these terms to highlight a missing history of practice, a feminist past that you can see if you look carefully in 'the social art practices of artists and curators now' (Ross, 2000, p.7). In pointing out a missing history her performance becomes a manifesto suggesting an important knowledge gap. The term social art practice signifies a particular history that has not been articulated. It is also a name that will be recognisable to an expanded field of practice and enable participation in the conversation. This difficult balance between unthought and recognisable language helps to accommodate a missing voice in the language of an established discourse. It is also the task set out by the manifesto, to speak within a tradition that has failed to recognise it, to play with language, to reproduce it but with a difference.

For Ross social art is a matter of making 'artwork as communication not as commodity' (Ibid, p.5). This definition, which she cites as an aim for feminist practitioners in the UK from the 1970s onwards, falls in line with histories like Lucy Lippard's *Dematerialization of the Art Object* (Lippard, 1997). Where Lippard's account registers an engagement with context and a resistance to art's commodification, her curatorial practice, developing exhibitions like *Social Strategies by Women Artists* (1980), also acknowledges art as a social strategy. This important intersection between resistance to market forces and an interest in the communicative and social qualities of art meets in Ross' analysis of art's work and equally in her practice as an artist. Her politically engaged and radical practice joins many narratives, beginning as early as Michael Fried's *Art and Objecthood* (1963), that challenge ideas of passive spectatorship, offering art that moves towards relationships, encounters and public affairs. Through these developments marginalised feminist voices offered consistent political reminders of the consequences these challenges could have: more than simply new trends within a system that remains resolutely market driven, making art work for Ross meant working

⁹ In the US there is an MFA in social practice at Queens College, New York and an MA in Social Practice and Public Forms at California College of Arts whilst as of 2016/2017 Middlesex University will be offering a course in Art and Social Practice headed by Leeson.

on consciousness in a revolutionary way. Without losing its personal, expressive and subjective qualities, art, in feminist hands, had become a political and social act.

This move not only suggests art's changing relationship to spectatorship but also a fierce debate around questions of authorship and autonomy. At the heart of this debate are the critical voices of Grant Kester and Claire Bishop. Kester writes supportively on artists in more facilitative roles, suggesting their technique is a finely calibrated oscillation between self-loss and self-expression. Bishop, on the other hand, remains wary of more collaborative work and keen to lament a loss of aesthetic quality in the histories of shared authorship she selects. In Bishop's more traditional art historical stance, autonomy is elided into individualism, keeping art's relationship to neoliberal economics intact. For artists like Leeson this is unacceptable, she writes:

'the individualism that has emerged over the last five hundred years of visual art in western society has not encompassed the tools and processes required for effective social intervention, since its economic role was to create capital.'

(Leeson, 2009, p.98)

Through these debates a binary is set up between utility and aesthetics in an ouroboros like argument around autonomy that all social art practices must try to answer anew, in seeking evaluation of their practice.

In relation to this binary, this thesis is concerned with a feminist position, not adequately represented in either side of the debate. It suggests knowledge of feminist theory, which often works to show invisible elements obscured by binary representations, could move us past the deadlock.¹⁰ While Kester posits an oscillating position for artists that could balance aesthetics and utility, feminism has a more radical solution. It suggests the possibility and necessity of collectivity without self-loss, removing the assumed contradiction between artistic (written in art history as individual) and political (collective foregoing individualism) ways of being in the world. It argues self-expression is enhanced by collectivity, and that all artists draw on invisible networks of support to sustain their practices. Feminist art historians like Griselda Pollock, Lisa Tickner and Carol Duncan assert that all art is socially produced, a condition that is largely obscured by art history's emphasis on a few canonical artists.

¹⁰ In feminist theory Irigaray's (1985) writing is an exemplary example of thinking beyond binary positions.

Within this discourse loss of self is an everyday condition for the many, who work to sustain the recognition of a few creative individuals. Where feminist critique seeks to make this condition visible social art practice also announces and aspires towards a visible collectivity in the name of social change. It tries to think of a world where other forms of work can be valued and where invisible support systems can be acknowledged. This collectivity goes against the grain of many potent supporting myths around art history and capital, becoming an autonomous and extremely precarious activity.

In acknowledging feminism I join Shannon Jackson (2011) and Greg Sholette (2011) who have both written on the activist and performative aspects of social art practice that relate to feminist questions around labour and support. Through analysis of feminist manifesto forms in relation to social art practice I propose that these feminist questions are not only the content of certain activist practices but also more broadly they can be related to the form of practice as it has developed. Feminist manifestos are a metaphorical tool in the research that enables me to describe the particular sociality that is part of a feminist critical framework. The innovations feminism makes to the manifesto form can also be seen as innovations to the shape of art now as a social form. The focus on performance and archive in Jackson and Sholette's work respectively is expanded in this research through a consideration of feminist manifestos to think of the archive as a performative and hospitable political strategy in feminist hands. In this way feminist positions on archives and hospitality can become critical frameworks in order to reconsider the form of social practice.

Finally, besides Jackson and Sholette, Tom Finkelpearl (2013) also writes that feminist activists, working with techniques like consciousness-raising, were 'pioneers in American Cooperative Art' (Ibid, p.20). He credits feminism with 'surviving relentlessly' where other communal experiments failed (Ibid). In this he seems to suggest Lucy Lippard's assertion:

'The fact that feminism has something to offer the left that the left needs badly is as inarguable in art as it is in political organization. The transformation of society, at the heart of both feminism and socialism, will not take place until feminist strategies are acknowledged and fully integrated into the struggle.'
(Lippard, 2004, p.115 in Ed. Harris)

In describing the different forms of social practice for the *Encyclopaedia of Aesthetics* (2014) Finkelpearl lays out a taxonomy with three categories of social art: relational, activist and antagonistic. In this way the binary set up by Bishop and Kester is expanded to include an explicitly political genealogy for some categories of practice. Though Finkelpearl's analysis is invaluable the specific lens of feminist manifestos offers another suggestion. It argues that when social art practice functions as a manifesto it does away with this taxonomy by being relational, activist and antagonistic in equal measure. The metaphor of manifesto offers a different way to evaluate a social practice that is neither exclusively concerned with its utility or its aesthetics. Instead the critical model suggests that we may read social practice evocatively and supportively through analysis of it as a poetic form which may be compelling enough to encourage us to reimagine the world.

Manifesto Definition

The opening premise tested by this research is that certain works of art may be considered as feminist manifestos in terms of their function, reception and interpretation. As such they can become a lens through which to view social art practices differently. Given this, the first move is to establish a definition for the feminist manifesto, drawn from pivotal feminist examples and theoretical perspectives on the manifesto form. This acts as a lens or guiding metaphor through which to reconsider social art practice. In this way the research is not a definitive guide to feminist manifestos but a way to inhabit manifesto as a metaphor, teasing out the radical political potential of social art practice and its feminist histories. Given the focus on social art practice I was interested in exploring manifesto as a conversational form that emerges from social relations, as well as producing new ones. I argue that it can also be perceived to be in dialogue with accepted historical narratives, voicing missing histories of oppression. The research is not simply about these dialogues. It also initiates one itself in as much as it aims to voice a missing feminist history in critical narratives of social art practice. Through this dialogue the thesis offers its own form of 'witness' knowledge, being a manifesto performance as much as a definition (Shotter, 2005). The conceptual work to situate manifesto as a metaphorical lens appears primarily in the About Manifesto section, which works as a poetic score for the rest of the archive, with motifs developed reoccurring elsewhere in different forms to produce a layered cartography and research methodology. This territory, beginning with feminist manifestos, can be

approached from different directions and is included in this Introduction as a number of transparent configurations (acetates) that map onto each other to form a complex geography (p.38). This research map relates directly to the manifesto definition explored here. With this cartography and description in mind the reader is asked to consider the manifesto form and by extension the thesis as a kind of poetics, keeping the whole in mind while looking at the individual parts.

At the heart of the manifesto definition or score is the understanding that manifestos are interstitial forms, holding a number of seemingly contradictory things in tension. For example, as can be seen in the first layer of the research map, in relation to time there is a balance of myth and history. Manifestos are historical to the extent that they are embedded in their particular contexts and demand change now, often signifying missing or repressed histories, which erupt into their contexts. Yet they are also, in a way, outside of historical time linking up with other moments through repetition of the form and representing a kind of timeless myth making. It is through poetry, defined recently by feminist art historian Angela Dimitrakaki as a collective intervention (not 'a thing done to you')(Dimitrakaki, 2013, p.5), that the manifesto holds these things in balance evocatively presenting bundles of related events, repeating motifs. Poetry is like myth. It plays with time, drawing together events that are somehow generatively interconnected with each other. These poetic myths spill into the social world affecting its form.

As well as myth and history manifestos also sit between critique and affirmation. Jenny Holzer explores this quality in her *Inflammatory Essay* (1979-82) series as a balance of rage and utopia, which appear on the first manifesto layer of the research map. Holzer's recognition of this in-between status is fundamental to the manifesto score that plays throughout the thesis. The research expands the balancing act she evokes to include, amongst other things deconstruction/reconstruction and hospitality/hostility through a consideration of the interstitial territory that joins them. Holzer's manifestos stage a deconstruction of political domination through language and then on the broken ground invite us to consider the endless relational possibilities for different futures that could emerge from this uncertainty. The logic around the unexpected potential of uncertain positioning is repeated elsewhere in the thesis: when all is lost all is possible. Here and elsewhere the holding in tension of uncertainty and relational possibility overturns the perceived order of things, reversing the hierarchical understanding of uncertainty as a weak position. On the first layer of the research map this overlapping territory, where oppositional concepts meet, is marked out as the space of dissensus. As I move into

encounters with practice, the second layer of the map records this knowledge *with* signalling the contents of the With Manifestos collection. Artists like Smith, Jelinek and Sollfrank are marked for the different ways they navigate this broken ground, creating shared time and dialogue.

Besides the interstitial nature of manifestos, the score describes them as taking up a non-exclusive, moving position. This position, on the move, is at the heart of many iconic feminist manifestos, reoccurring through time, in contributions from Monique Wittig (1969), Donna Haraway (1991) and Jenny Holzer (1979-82) who identifies the invisible movement of power and ideology. Holzer's response to this pervasive threat is to keep moving. In this, her tactic echoes art historian Griselda Pollock's writing around the Women's Movement (Pollock, 1999). For Pollock movement across discourses and historical texts, identifying repetitions and repressions in different discourses, is essential feminist work. For this reason movement is marked out at the centre of the research map and symbolised by the soundwave, which expresses the important movement of voices between bodies. The collection also moves back and forth between an exploration of pivotal feminist manifestos, feminist history and contemporary social practice – threading numerous lines of connection between the apparently discrete topics. These different areas are expressed as a triangle framing the circular areas of tension on the research map with the various practices that become important appearing at relevant co-ordinates on each layer. Pivotal practices like Mierle Laderman Ukeles in Manifesto and later, in hospitality, Marysia Lewandowska (WAA) and Monica Ross (Valentine), are on the move between each point of the triangle. Through this configuration of topics and practices the map provides the basis for readers to make a perceptual shift, to start to read feminist theory in contemporary social practice and *visa versa*. Equally, feminist manifestos are reflected in both spheres as a theoretical and performative praxis. By moving between discreet areas a response is offered to Pollock's deconstructive impulse, a set of relational possibilities.

The feminist manifesto's deployment of movement as a guerrilla tactic is seen in relation to Julia Kristeva's theory of the dialogic, which draws on Bakhtin, to describe a poetic paradigm that offers a multiplicity of meaning, expressed by the mathematics 'that extends from zero to two' (Kristeva et al., 1981, p.69). This ambiguous poetic strategy rewrites monological understanding, framed by Kristeva, as an unequal binary relationship between one (God) and zero. In the face of this oppressive equation that fixes the giver (1) and receiver (0) of knowledge in place, poetry replies with an active,

moving reading of the world that is always at least double. Kristeva's analysis of poetry as a kind of doubling links in with the research definition of the manifesto as a doubled structure, symbolised on the map as the two interlinked but opposed circles of action. It also forms the basis for the double structure of the research, which lies between affirmation and critique. Growing from this doubled structure the layers of the map attest to the multiplicity created within a dialogic paradigm. Through poetic recoding, which often works as mimesis, one of many doubling strategies, the feminist manifesto finds a way to accommodate a multiplicity of numerous, often isolated, outsider positions. These positions, on the margins, in spaces defined by traditional rhetoric as outside of political possibility, are brought together through poetics to produce a collective politics that does not reduce the complexity of multiple voices.

In approaching movement I also discuss Jacques Rancière's definition of the politics of *dissensus* (2015). He describes *dissensus* as the placing of one world in another and relates this particularly to early feminist tactics of moving private space into public view. This placing of one world in another is also Rancière's definition of political action, which reimagines 'the distribution of the sensible' through the inclusion of voices that have been confined to places outside of accepted institutional discourse (Rancière, 2006, p.7). The space of Dissensus is marked out as part of the interstitial territory occupied by the artists that begin to populate the research map as we move between sections of the archive.

The question of outsider voices raised by Rancière's consideration of politics reverberates elsewhere through an examination of the domestic sphere as an excluding and excluded space. The Hospitality section plays these questions of home alongside perspectives on the move, through the important reversal suggested by Jacques Derrida: perhaps it is only one who has endured the experience of being deprived a home – the refugee/guest/outsider - can offer hospitality. This kind of reversal again defies fixed positioning, this time of the guest and host, bringing into question the model where the head of the household, owning space, permits people to cross the threshold. The move suggests another doubling. The manifesto (and by extension artist with a social practice) is simultaneously a guest, making strange, disruptive proclamations AND a host setting up safe spaces for disaffected subjectivities. By doubling up as guests and hosts feminist manifesto performances create a space and time of radical hospitality, this is signified by the red hospitality layer on the interstitial space of the research map. This unorthodox claim to hospitality in the definition acknowledges that while the manifesto is clearly

against a number of things it also gathers strength by hosting a broad array of supporters, moving between different subjectivities in a compelling yet barely visible way.¹¹ Consequently where the score includes a rewriting of hospitality it also exposes it as a significant internal secret, suggesting that acknowledging the support it offers could lead to a more vulnerable, fundamentally interdependent view of ourselves.

This view is approached through a consideration of practices like Marysia Lewandowska's Women's Audio Archive (WAA). Through the archive Lewandowska insists on a kind of imperfect communication, including moments of loss and failure, as an important alternative to the violence of absolute coherence. Twenty years on Lewandowska's methodology is seen besides durational social art performances, particularly the practice of Chu Chu Yuan and Jay Koh who also move through unfamiliar territories, embracing the possibility of being at a loss yet, like Lewandowska, endeavouring to create shared time in encounters with difference. This poetic doubling of guest/host created through a sense of movement, a kind of hospitality practiced by strange guests, seamlessly links up marginalised subjectivities to create a common sense of struggle.

By defining the manifesto as a movement between, the thesis also draws on Braidotti's notion of transposition (2006). Using the metaphor of music she writes:

'Transposition indicates variations and shifts of scale in a discontinuous but harmonious pattern. It is thus created as an in-between space of zigzagging and of crossing: non-linear, but not chaotic; nomadic, yet accountable and committed; creative but also cognitively valid; discursive and also materially embedded.' (Braidotti, 2006, p.5)

This metaphor, that draws on the notion of in-between space, is useful in relation to the three collections in the archive, it resonates with the movement between and across different, interlinked but singular perspectives on a subject that the archive requires. This movement in-between is both an action employed in the labour of hospitality and by the manifesto that links up different subjectivities in order to produce 'a prolific in-

¹¹ The association of manifesto with hospitality flies in the face of much manifesto theory, which emphasises the loud, madness inherent in the form. For example in her study of manifestos written, almost exclusively by men, within the modernist *avant-garde*, Mary Ann Caws writes 'stripped to the bare bones, clean as a whistle and as piercing the manifesto immodest and forceful, exuberant and vivid, attention grabbing' (Caws, 2001, xxi).

between space' (Ibid, p.6). By placing the manifesto in dialogue with hospitality the research moves into new territory, complicating the common perception of manifesto as simply a loud unwanted guest to focus on its less visible hosting qualities. This different perspective develops in the hospitality section by offering a combination of feminist critique of existing modes of hospitality and suggestions of affirmative alternatives. On the research Map layer signifying *With* hospitality practices like Jonathan Baxter's meet the rage of Tanja Ostojic's critique to produce a space of radical hospitality within the larger framework of the SCAN events. These curatorial strategies are seen alongside Maria Hlavajova's suggestion of a new institutional paradigm.

The final green layers of the map relates this basis for a paradigm shift, which complicates the fixed positioning of guest and host, to the archive. Conceptual work around hospitality is used to reimagine the impossibly constrained space of the archive laid out by deconstructive analysis as an open activist space. In the *About* layer various feminist theoretical voices are added to be joined in the final layer by the examples of archival practice exemplified by artists like Hope and Lewandowska as well as institutions like the Women Slide Library and Glasgow Women's Library.

On Voice

It is no coincidence that this form of outsider politics, producing and practicing in a generative in-between space, is often described as voice. Working in this space, the poetics of manifesto are seen as resounding, when written they are perceived as texts on the verge of speech, close to action and embodied. Consequently two important theoretical explorations of the acoustic sphere and the spoken word by Adriana Cavarero and Mladen Dolar are important in relation to the thesis' definition of manifesto. In *For More Than One Voice* (Cavarero, 2005) and *A Voice and Nothing More* (Dolar, 2006), both writers chart an extensive consideration of voice, suggesting it as a medium that derives radical political potential from its occupation of a space in-between. Journeying through linguistics, metaphysics, ethics and politics, Dolar charts a poetic course for voice that parallels Freud's developments in psychoanalysis and Kafka's in literature. In relation to linguistics Dolar notes the dramatic tension between the word, part of symbolic order, and the voice, which is linked to various pre-symbolic sounds and in excess of meaning. As opposed to the logic of structural difference in semantics, the excess offered by voice works through similarities and reverberations, producing a poetic fold in language. This focus on repetition and resonance takes us not

only into psychoanalysis, but also into manifesto territory. This in turn is bound up with the science and politics of remembering in response to contextual adversity.

Arguably it is these folds in language that Pollock also suggests we search for, a subversive undercurrent of unconscious voices that may tell other histories. Similarly, Cavarero writes on these unconscious folds provided by voice. She relates a history from Aristotle to Habermas where the vocal has been consistently marginalised by western philosophical traditions and their interest in eternal, immovable categories. The vocal becomes a minor form in this history. In response Cavarero takes up Arendt's (1958) critique of philosophy as failing to deal with the contingent and relational world of politics. She anchors Arendt's critique to a consideration of voice, which unlike the fixed world of sight is always moving, changing becoming. She asserts:

‘for a radical rethinking of the classical connection between speech and politics, especially from a feminist perspective, recuperating the theme of the voice is therefore an obligatory strategic gesture.’ (Cavarero, 2005, p.207)

Like Dolar, Cavarero argues that voice is usefully ambiguous, crossing between body, the territory of the feminine in western metaphysics, and language. She asserts we must hold this tension, neither sacrificing voice to the universal laws of semantics nor semantics to the animal pleasures of pure voice. The former sacrifice of voice risks the loss of poetics with all its political potential, whilst the latter disregard for meaning leaves us outside of political systems. Cavarero asserts that through maintenance of this tension the minor poetics of voice offer an outsider politics both foundational and disruptive. Her argument also holds a tension between two important aspects of voice: its relatedness and its uniqueness.

Like Braidotti, Cavarero explores the embodied and embedded politics of voice partially through the metaphor of music, describing a subversive, rhythmic undercurrent to language that also pervades written texts. Through Kristeva's materialist critique Cavarero relates a connection between the history of voice and the mother, who offers a first voice. This mother tongue opens up the relational joy of passing pre-symbolic sounds back and forth, making generative connections. This play of sound occurs prior to becoming an individual within symbolic systems of language. The acoustic sphere of primary care, normally performed by the mother, consequently offers a first experience of relational proximity, delivered through voice and rooted in the rhythmic drives of the

body. This experience is defined by Kristeva with reference to Plato's term *chora* in *Timaeus*. While for Plato the term functions as a kind of negative space to the positives of the masculine realms of the father and the son, in Kristeva's *Revolutions in Poetic Language* (1984) the semiotic *chora* is both a foundational, unconscious support for systems of language and a disruptive excess that can be traced through the pleasure of reverberating sounds in poetic texts. In these poetic spaces 'voice and writing come together against a certain systemic and normative concept of language' (Cavarero, 2005, p.132). The invisible work performed by Plato's *chora*, a primal form of hospitality, finds voice in Kristeva's analysis. Sounds emerging from the semiotic *chora* remind us that we are more than isolated individuals and this reminder disrupts fixed systems of power. We are related, our voices meet and sound off of each other to create an ethics of proximity. This memory is of significant importance to the politics of manifestos, which also attempt to engender collective resistance to oppressive systems and change.

Despite the call to belonging and collectivity offered by poetic texts Cavarero insists meaning is altered by each voice and by each location. Though the unconscious rhythms of voice suggest we are more than ourselves the specific sounds of voice, travelling through specific bodies, ensure we remain unique. Cavarero frames voice as the medium for a politics that avoids the abstract and universal categories of western metaphysical thought. This politics is conceptualised by Arendt as a field of action (1958). Arendt argues that while thought is solitary, speech occurs between particular bodies. Speech consequently requires a non-generalisable ethics that is responsive to the particular context and individuals within a field of action. This conceptualisation reframes the *polis* less as a territory and more as a moving contingent space, generated by interaction. This space is described in Italian feminism as an absolutely local, embodied community of women (Dominijanni, 2000).¹² It is an in-between space, differently voiced by Lewandowska, who, in WAA, sounds out a community of women around questions delivered in a 'crippled voice', which speaks of her particular history and context.

The plurality of voices, encountered at different moments by the research, speaks of a situated and relational politics that resonate well with key principles in social art practice. Given this resonance and the generative nature of embodied conversational knowledge, voice presents itself as an important medium within the thesis with

¹² Cavarero acknowledges Italian Feminism as a broad tradition of thought and quotes particularly from Ida Dominijanni 'La parola e nostra political' in *Duemilaeuna: Donne che cambiano l'Italia*, ed. Annarosa Buttarelli, Luisa Murano and Liliana Rampello (Milan: Practiche, 2000, p. 210).

research drawing equally from spoken and written forms throughout. Finally, the significance of conversation as an unacknowledged cultural form emerges through the online audio component of the research archive, which draws inspiration from Lewandowska's earlier methodology.

For Cavarero, Hélène Cixous meets Kristeva's conception of the semiotic *chora* producing a writing that 'reverberates' in the drive of speech and countering an oppositional economy that privileges the semantic (Cavarero, 2005, p.143). Comparing Cixous to Derrida, Cavarero describes two writers who speak their native language as guests or outsiders. Her description recalls Deleuze and Guattari's assertion in *Kafka Towards a Minor Literature* (1986):

'a minor literature doesn't come from a minor language; it is rather that which a minority constructs within a major language.' (p.16)

Accordingly Cixous subverts and penetrates the dominant language performing a 'dynamic contamination' (Cavarero, 2005, p.147). Deleuze and Guattari assert the political and collective nature of what they identify as a minor literature:

'It is literature that produces an active solidarity in spite of scepticism, and if the writer is in the margins or completely outside his or her fragile community, this situation allows the writer all the more possibility to express another possible community and to forge the means for another possible consciousness and another sensibility.' (Deleuze and Guattari, 1986, p.19)

These characteristics of a minor literature suggest it as an important conceptualisation to consider in a discussion on manifestos. Not all 'minor literature' performs as a manifesto but as the example of Cixous, placed within a history of voice itself as a minor form, proves, there is fertile ground between Deleuze and Guattari's description and the research topic.

A Minor Methodology

The definition of manifesto used in this thesis is a moving, poetic form that performs the politics of voice, holding a number of things in tension to create a generative, relational in-between space constructed through contingent and interactive forms. The definition

situates feminist manifestos within the realm of Kristeva's analysis of poetics asserting that feminist manifestos are dialogical forms that are always at least doubled. They are forms that demand to be spoken and play host to multiple outsider voices. Finally, as hosts to these outsiders, that exist in the cracks, they can also be considered to work as a minor literature. By associating these theoretical perspectives with feminist manifestos the research offers an expansive view, opening up a path to imagine new forms of political action.

More than an immovable description what is offered in this summary is the beginning of a methodology that functions less as a definition, more of a becoming. My practice has involved inhabiting the metaphorical forms of manifesto, archive and hospitality suggested by the initial generative premise; that certain works of art may be considered as feminist manifestos thanks to their reception function and interpretation. The research tested this premise against the field of social art, looking for examples of practice that resonated with the manifesto score I had created. Given the importance of Braidotti's assertion that knowledge should 'begin from where you are' the choices of social practice were determined by my situated position, which nevertheless offered a rich resource of carefully considered work (2014). Through knowledge of specific social practices that I encountered within the research environment I identified two distinct ways of knowing, *about* and *with*, through which to proceed. Consequently where knowledge about manifestos contributed to the score detailed above my choices of practices to consider were very much based on 'witness' knowledge. It was important to arrive, like the social practice artist, without knowing in advance, to enter into conversation with artists, opening a dialogue between feminist manifestos and their work, without offering answers. In this way I negotiated a path in unfamiliar territories through the same question Lewandowska asked in her recorded conversations – what is missing (WAA. 013)? In approaching artists and curators this key question of missing history was often a common concern that offered a point of departure. From this point, to use Arendt's terms, a local community of action opened up around the research.

The interactions with contemporary practice formed the basis of an improvisational strategy that matched the form and the content of the research. In writing on Helen Mayer and Newton Harrison's lifelong ecological art practice Anne Douglas and Chris Fremantle describe a poetic process of directed attention practiced by the artists in order to create stimulus towards the 'improvising of new futures' (Douglas & Fremantle, 2016, p.455). In discussing seminal works by the artist duo, Douglas and Fremantle

approach the idea of improvisation not as a specialist art practice, but in life, as a form of 'conversational drift' (Ibid, 457). They write:

'The drift references the unplanned journey and emphasizes that as authors of the artwork, while they do not know where or how, it is their intention that the work or its lessons will be taken up by others.' (Ibid)

The improvisation of new futures is drawn from attention to a particular moment of experience and, importantly as in my research, from using the materials at hand. In the case of the Harrisons this improvisation grows from a careful balance of words, images and conceptual storytelling, meant to be read out loud, like a 'chant', that will stay with participants in the work for a long time (Ibid, p.456). The form hosts in a fundamental way, offering space also for breath. This breathing space provides time to change positions. On writing of the Harrisons' hospitable poetics, Douglas and Fremantle reference Gary Peters' (2009) conception of improvisation as an engagement with the past that imagines it not as something closed, that simply repeats itself, but as something the improviser re-opens and reimagines in the present. This opening is a conversation that invites multiple voices around a shared issue, without resolving the tensions between perspectives. Instead tension is reimagined as a generative force, a point of departure. The holding in tension is the work's poetics.

This form of improvisation, a working with the materials to hand, plays out again and again in the feminist histories I have encountered. In *Feministo* (1975-77) it manifests as the imperfect aesthetic of household items strung together, falling apart. Or elsewhere Holzer creates space for improvisation from everyday words and expressions, recognising the tensions and contradictions in oppressive language systems. Finally, with Mierle Laderman Ukeles, whose work represents a fertile meeting point between social art practice and manifesto, the tension between the positions of maintenance and development work becomes the starting point for a lifelong project to counter cultural amnesia around maintenance work, inhabiting it to reimagine conceptions of time and waste in contemporary culture.

Alongside these significant historical examples I was interested in experiencing contemporary practices that work with improvisation and looking for points of connection with the manifesto score. I used the score to draw out similarities and differences between a given practice and my definition of feminist manifesto. Rather

than being a rigid framework I worked with it in a way that was responsive to the context allowing it to enter specific conversations with artists where and when it was relevant whilst always drawing on concerns that arose from larger debates in feminist discourse. Through this improvisational process I was searching in practice for moments of resonance and found them in work that approached history, memory and the ethics of relationships.

While dialogues with practice involved improvising around a score the written thesis sought to represent poetics as a kind of intransitive writing, on the move between different moments to tease out and share common attributes. Replaying Holzer's formula of rage and utopia the methodology has sought out these elements where they occur in feminism and social art practice, not only holding a tension between affirmation and critique but between historical moments that recall each other. Through the methodology an underlying question arises and repeats: what is different between now and then? What is the same? Not only did I ask these questions of historical practice but I also found others similarly searching, from Sophie Hope's work in the Archives to Balkind and Edbrooks' reading group in Manifesto, artists were looking backwards to move forward. Their methodologies improvised with past materials and memories in a similar way to Peters' description. Consequently this improvised strategy presented itself as an extremely relevant and generative methodology.

As well as playing the score alongside social art it also played out in my own practice. Beginning as guest in the manifesto section by initiating conversations with artists like Jelinek, Smith, Sollfrank, Balkind and Edbrook I aimed to be present in the wider conversations their practices provoke and also to raise the question of missing feminist histories. Through theoretical work to make the connection between guest and host positions the research journey also evolved to see me take on a hosting role in the Scottish Contemporary Art (SCAN) events that appear in the hospitality and archive sections.¹³ In line with the development of a theory of radical hospitality the curatorial work is not only to host but to make hospitality visible, announcing it as the framework for the event series and acting also as a guest to the North East.

As a guest/host to the region I occupied a space on the edge of mainstream discourse in many respects. In this way my forms of improvisation were also practiced from the

¹³ www.sca-net.org

minor position sketched out by Deleuze and Guattari, which emerged as another facet in the curatorial methodology described by the thesis. My first point of call in thinking about curatorial practice was to initiate a conversation with the curatorial team Mother Tongue whose work is detailed in the opening With Hospitality section. Their practice raised urgent questions around missing history and the imperatives of hospitality from the perspectives of those excluded so fitted well into manifesto territory. Conversations with the duo brought up important questions around the ethics of curatorial work, which formed the groundwork to my own practice and helped link me to a wider network.

In the opening event of the Hospitality series this question of curating was approached obliquely. In the series it was important to work with artists emerging from, or connected to, the specific community in Aberdeen. To curate the series I moved through this process of conversational drift described by The Harrison's work. Improvising 'with the materials to hand' I turned the question of missing narrative to face the context of Aberdeen. Although artists were invited to speak from many other contexts in one way or another, each had links with Aberdeenshire and the artists and cultural activists working here. The speculative conversational process that led up to the events carried through into the public moments. These were organised as intentionally open spaces, in support of unexpected conversational encounters. This curatorial process both spoke to the situated and relational politics described above, aiming to create that generative in-between space that Arendt imagines, and it was a matter of necessity given the demands of the SCAN brief and my own relatively powerless position in relation to institutional networks. Both Alana Jelinek and David Blyth, artists who participated in the first SCAN event I curated, offered different, strange perspectives on the process of gathering together and creating collections. Blyth's work favoured the imperfect and acknowledged that his creative acts were contingent and often emerged as a result of chance occurrence, while Jelinek offered a critique of the act of collecting from the position of those collected. I felt that their work met around a preoccupation with exploring other perspectives and meeting with difference. It also combined to offer a critique of curating as a process that implements a certain hierarchy by cherry picking the 'best' examples under conceptual headings that say more about the power of the authoring curator than the environments they find themselves in.

From this beginning the series offered conversations from the margins that emerged from the specific community I found myself in. Through SCAN I was able to explore the

art of curating as a minor form, a kind of improvisation that grows from careful attention to the available materials, seeking out generative connections between practices around the increasingly urgent shared concern presented to us by questions of hospitality.

I also witnessed this form of curating play out in the archives that I visited. Early on at a conference on archives that I attended in order to hear more about Mother Tongue's curatorial practice – Edinburgh based curator Richard Demarco asked a room full of archivists – who here is an artist? His critical provocation attempted to illustrate something missing from the room and possibly the discourse. Contrary to his belief that archivists were not artists, my experience offered a different perspective. The archivist quite literally works with the materials to hand, shaping the particular form of the archive from the contents that present themselves and drawing out its rich potential in the process. Given this realisation the SCAN series also approached archiving as a curatorial methodology and social practice, which is all too often invisible. Where time, history and memory revealed themselves as important concerns for many artists in social practice rich parallels between archival methodologies and artistic ones began to open up as the research progressed, suggesting new possibilities for the thesis. More than simply presenting itself as a home for feminist manifestos it seemed important to consider the archive itself as an alternative political space that would also offer unique perspectives on the art of hospitality. These realisations, again developed through being with various relevant archives and radical archivists, created the final research imperative to bring attention not only to the contents of the archive but to interrogate the possible political potential of its forms.

In summary the methodology involved bringing the theoretical underpinning in Kristeva, Pollock and others and the resulting definition for feminist manifesto into conversation with social art practice. I did this in private and personal conversations with social practice artists like Helen Smith and in public talks and workshops. The crossing between private and public was an important part of my strategy. As mentioned the basis of my selection revolved around my situated position within the research community in Aberdeen and the wider connections it offered. Furthermore I was looking for practices that embodied a balance between criticality and hospitality highlighted by the theoretical framework. My curatorial strategy also developed out of this definition. Again, working from a situated position, I paired up critical and utopic practices in an attempt to find ways for events to embody manifesto spaces. In relation

to the work on hospitality I was also interested in an exchange between home and other perspectives that blurred these boundaries.

The final form of the thesis developed out of Marysia Lewandowska's conversational model that made use of the archive as a hosting space. As well as the form the methodology draws from Lewandowska's careful distinction between an interview and a conversation; whilst an interview is initiated to find out something a conversation is a method to find out how to be with, an improvised and personal way to understand context and to create a community of support. It is a method to create and explore common ground. This definition underpins my methodological choice of conversation as a means to find out how and if the feminist theoretical and historical work I was committed to could sit within a contemporary community of practice. In this way the form became another way to test the possibilities of practice (in this case archive as art work) as a manifesto performance: something open and generative, creating political consciousness within its group of users.

Conclusions

'When I write I have a sense that there is a perfect way to express what you want to express but fortunately you never achieve it.'

Marlene Nourbese Philip in WAA 05

At the core of my aims and objectives is the intention to offer three conceptual perspectives on social art practice as a feminist manifesto and, through staging an encounter between these perspectives, to reach an expanded and generative definition of both areas of practice. This chosen framework, of three perspectives that cross cut each other, is not the only way to look at the relationship of manifestos to archives and to rethink the roots of socially engaged practice. In fact it is a highly idiosyncratic approach. It is important first to acknowledge the relativity of how the research has been undertaken, which is only one of other possible approaches to the subject.

The thesis explores encounter as a minor form and returns the conclusion that there is little doubt as to its generative nature as a methodology. It also tests the hypothesis that certain social art practices function as feminist manifestos, creating a score, which can

be played in encounters with practice. Through conversations, presentations and curated events the hypothesis has presented itself as an important and missing critical frame for social practice soliciting positive responses and continued dialogue from many artists and curators in the field. The hypothesis urges us to remember the critical edge provided by the rage of a manifesto and offers a new pedagogical perspective on social practice centred on its politics and poetics. This reading is not only expansive but creates movement within a critical discourse polarised around issue of aesthetics and utility.

In this way, like a manifesto, it offers a missing history or perspective, it does not, however, provide an extensive survey of the history of social art practice. An alternative more conventional historical review would have offered the reader a different kind of foundation from which to arrive at a position. Consequently the research is limited in terms of what it offers as a comprehensive survey and what it may say about the whole field of socially engaged practice. In some senses by pointing to what is missing it questions the very idea that a comprehensive survey and offers instead something partial and situated, running the risk that other positions fail to identify. The research uses the lens of feminist manifesto to look carefully at a number of practices from within, this perspective is offered instead of a view of the whole field.

This feminist lens on practice also suggests a closer look at the politics of hospitality. Raising the question of hospitality in encounters with social practice has revealed a nuanced approach that sees experienced artists adopt a double posture as guests and hosts in conflicted terrain. Knowledge of these guest/host strategies gained through the research methodologies feeds back into discourse around manifestos suggesting their hidden hospitable aspects and consequently enriching discourse on the subject. Furthermore these strategies offer possible methodologies with which to navigate the contested terrain of feminist archives going forward. Finally, the thesis tests the possibility of archive as a place of encounter by adopting it as a form. This move is a practice-based response, following the impulse expressed by social practice artists to know by being immersed within a context. As with the field of social art practice this immersed perspective also has limitations. The research does not present an exhaustive account of feminist archives or complete survey of feminist contributions to the manifesto genre. Consequently, there are other research projects that would compliment the thesis and offer a broader view of feminism's many and varied

contribution to the manifesto genre.¹⁴ What it offers instead is a view from an intersection of two subject areas, and work to unearth historical connections between them, which combine to shed new insights on each other in the present moment.

Beyond this meeting between feminist manifesto and social art practice, and the limitations of scope the methodological position presents, each part also represents its own configuration of the different perspectives, staging its own encounter. In returning to the archive I have tried to assess how this main encounter works, where it fails and also how the smaller configurations represented inside each collection play out. I am struck by the differences between each part and the difficulty these differences present going forward in relation to the coherence of the whole. I think of the collections in relation to specific readers, often one collection seems to be most relevant. There is an impulse to share or hand it over in small parts, to break up the whole. This impulse recognises the complexity and volume of materials created by an approach that foregrounds encounter. Conversational approaches tend to produce a volume of material and a lot of loose ends. The staging of encounter produces the kind of complexity that is arguably inherent to the 'layered critical framework' aimed at and is, as noted above, a testimony to the generative nature of encounter. Yet this layering is also a limitation. It poses the risk that visitors may find the archive difficult to navigate due to its volume and complexity. My work has been in thinking through the connection between parts of the research yet some of the navigational difficulty could be countered by a different index or contents system, which could enable readers to simply select a relevant part. The need for an index is partially answered by the timeline and research map, which are colour coded to indicate different parts of the archive, yet a more complete index would provide the building blocks of an alternative pedagogical discourse, focusing less on the journey or connection between parts. By considering navigation there is a return to the question of hospitality, also raised in the aims and objectives. Undoubtedly the writing suggests a different kind of hospitality but does it also enact it? The possibility of handing over the keys to knowledge are limited by the size and complexity of the form.

¹⁴ One hugely interesting example of a different approach is Laura Guy's PhD Thesis *Manifestos: Aesthetics and politics in queer times* (2017) which focuses on the temporalities of the manifesto form in order to map intersections between aesthetics and politics in histories of queer social movements since 1960s. Despite a similar subject area Guy's approach pulls out many other interesting examples of manifesto forms not covered in this research.

Tracing back to the earlier section that lays out a score for becoming feminist manifesto, it is also the work of the conclusion to consider how effective this guiding metaphor has been. The research has aimed to use this metaphor to live with and enact the social practices it encounters, producing a kind of ghosting, which goes between *witnness* and *aboutness* knowledge. Already, in going between these two ways of knowing, the research plays out the movement of a manifesto and a social art practice. The thesis, as archive, represents a number of crossings, between feminist history and contemporary practice, between hostility and hospitality, affirmation and critique, between time frames and differing conceptions of history. In crossing, the aim of the work is to balance hostility and hospitality. The thesis also archives a number of pivotal feminist crossings, the small back and forth movements of letters in the post, recording shared meals and hardships. As well as this it records the larger movement of worlds, turning houses and housework inside out to become public displays of resistance. These gestures are by nature frequently multiple and fragmented, small threads that link isolated subjectivities. In recognition of this Deborah Withers suggests feminism itself is an earthquake territory (2015). Rather than seeking to smooth over this broken ground, or occupy a singular position, the artists included often embrace multiplicity, creating as Holzer does, an urgent gathering of words on the move, asking for multiple responses. It is through this multiplicity, that the form of the archive suggests itself, reframed by historian Carolyn Steedman (2002), as a place of fragments offering endless possibilities for reconfiguration. Does the form hold this multiplicity together without reducing the necessary complexity of each part? Where above I have considered the danger of lack of coherence between parts another limitation is centred around the opposite effect; that manifesto might be too dominant a metaphor, in danger of over determining the connections between different elements.

Riffing off of multiple displays of affirmation and resistance the research derives its poetry from the resonances produced between different gestures. It suggests that this poetry is a revolutionary praxis. Yet the imperative to hold things in tension requires dissonance as well as resonance. Althea Greenan's exploration of the Women's Art Slide Library asserts that it should be possible to feel the fabric of place in a political archive and for each example to offer some traction to the overriding ideas of the whole. In crossing it is important not to erase the differences between elements. The form moves through friction, which is also a form of critical reflexivity. Equally, critical reflexivity is needed in relation to individual parts. Dissonance is created not only in noticing where the guiding metaphor fails but also in being able to balance the affirmation in each

example with critical reflection. Is there enough critical reflection on where individual examples fail to fit with the metaphor? Equally, where the research has most often focused on affirmative examples of feminist and social praxis this focus is only one position and cannot speak for all experiences of feminism or social practice. In recognising the significance of feminism as a missing history there is a danger that the research offers a utopic vision of feminism as a unified terrain. To focus on manifesto is to focus on what Withers describes as a bridge (2015). The limitation of this focus is that it risks simplifying or forgetting the earthquake territory it crosses.

The extent to which the research achieves the necessary balance of affirmation and critique is a pertinent question to consider in the conclusion. The methodology has been essentially dialogic. Contemporary artists and voices from feminist history have suggested that consciousness-raising is not a polished monologue. Rather it is a back and forth *process*, a restless, uncertain conversation on different possibilities for living together. In the face of these questions it could be important to refer to the writing of Mikhail Bahktin whose work is also a kind of bridge between the 'paranoid' territories of Julia Kristeva and the reconstructive approach Grant Kester associates with the work of socially engaged practice (2011). In writing on Dostoyevsky's poetics Bahktin introduces the concept of the 'unfinalizable' in order to describe a quality of dialogue, an unending relationship between individuals, artworks and communities (Bahktin, 1984, p.58). To answer this question of how the research holds things in tension it is necessary to offer more questions and listen for the voices that are returned. This suggestion adds an element of uncertainty to my concluding statements. In looking for responses, both from those included and others, the work of the research continues. This dialogical facet is compelling to the extent that it works on my own consciousness as a researcher and practitioner, moving the work forward and taking a risk by probing for failures as well as moments of success. By remembering Bahktin in the conclusion I approach the idea not only of limitation but of failure.

As noted the archive texts spin out in multiple directions consciously crossing the borders between taxonomies. This play in multiple directions creates navigational challenges that relate to the archives' important function as a holding space, a place of gathering and shelter (Derrida, 1996; Eichhorn, 2013). To be an effective shelter an archive must hold its form. Kristeva (1982) and Holzer (1979-82) remind us that failure to maintain any borders is to slip into abjection.

These failures of maintenance are a central preoccupation for Mierle Laderman Ukeles, who offers the research archive a novel way to consider this balance between multiplicity, inclusion and safe space. To understand something about this maintaining aspect of archiving we have to return, enacting an archival impulse, to a moment before the artist produced the *Maintenance Manifesto* (1969). Prior to the moment of writing the manifesto Ukeles was involved in the process of producing other holding spaces, inflatable forms and tightly wrapped cloth works, energy pods that spoke of unencumbered creativity and forward momentum. These forms failed to hold. Their leaking borders tell a story similarly told by work in feminist archives. Ukeles relates a minimalist art that forgets a whole culture of maintenance labour that contributes to its forms. To work with feminist archives is to differently remember this leaking. Rather than cover over these gaps the feminist archives I have worked in start, like Antigone, from this place of loss. They are engaged with the politics of memory reminding us that the archive begins at the point where memory fails, it is supplementary to but not identical to, spontaneous living memory. In this way the archive that follows is no different, it offers one view of the past that may be very different to other living memories of feminism and contemporary practice. The possibility of this difference is a limitation, a risk that this gathering of knowledge will not hang together or relate to the lived experiences that it approaches. Yet feminist archival theory suggests that in the archive it is possible to create a productive dissensus this way. One world into another becomes one time, dragged into another, in order to trouble us with the questions it asks. Many may not agree with the feminist pasts on offer but the challenge is to make it possible for them to stay despite these differences, to disagree productively by conceding failures as well as successes.

If maintenance is also a 'drag', Ukeles both acknowledges the drudgery in this work and embraces it as a repetitive process that keeps us alive (Ukeles, 1969). In living the drag she turns the process of archiving and collecting on its head, interrupting the unequal binary between what is collected and what is thrown away. Her work suggests that even this simple and essential hierarchy can be recoded, that it is possible to move between the apparent opposites of waste and art, revealing them as interconnected, one leaking into the other. Acknowledging this the artist offers her own unfinalizable poetics and vision of productive failure. This moment of leakage is troubling, yet Ukeles chooses not to sew it up. Instead, she remains on the threshold converting cold fury into energy and creative potential through small, carefully considered and repeated rituals of encounter that begin with a handshake. Her work is key to this research because it moves between

the three points noted on the layered diagram – feminist manifesto, contemporary social practice and feminist theoretical writing. As well as creating linking threads she also offers a reminder that is useful in approaching the research limitations; that the ability to acknowledge failure can in itself be a generative act.

This question of where the archive leaks is also a question of how it hosts and what it fails to include. The balance is between creating a place of safety and allowing for openings. These elements combine to host in a certain way, cultivating and testing the resilience of various guests who also exist on the edges of larger systems. Steedman writes of the archive as 'Memory's potential space' (Steedman, 2002, p.83). She relates this potential space, between the individual and the environment, to Donald Winnicott's analysis of play, as a vital and paradoxical state of being alone in the presence of someone. This someone is 'available and continues to be available after being forgotten. This person is felt to reflect back what happens in playing' (Winnicott, 1971, pp.112-21). Equally, Jonathan Baxter refers to Winnicott, associating the social practice of the 'good enough mother' with that of his own practice as an artist, creating a holding space where uncertainty is possible (in personal correspondence by email, October 2015). The research has offered an extensive exploration of what this hosting might look like, arguing that this holding is also, in places, a loosening or failure to grasp. Through being at a loss hosting becomes a radical form, working through moments of failure as well as success. In that way hospitality is fundamentally a movement between the guest and host positions, a transfer or, to use Ukeles' symbolism, a handover of knowledge and power. As Dufourmantelle notes in *Of Hospitality*, to make time there have to be two of you (2000, p.76).

In relation to this Art(chiv)ist Adele Patrick asserts she has no intention of being alone in the archive commanding all aspects. Her position derives from a struggle to be recognised by mainstream cultural narratives, consequently she brings a view of hospitality from the outside. Practicing from this different consciousness is a matter of both repeating institutional forms of power, as imperfect copies, and recoding them so that power becomes a form of responsibility to the other. Chantal Mouffe sees this recoding as a radical political project that admits to its own failures to include and limitations (Laclau and Mouffe, 1985). Being in process it offers a horizon of possible communities. Arguably this perspective that defines limitations also offers us a different, more vulnerable view of ourselves. To return to Philip this works as a kind of call and response:

'I know what I want to say and then I give the words a chance to say what they want to say and its not always what I think I want to say – there is a tension and out of that process the poem comes for me.' (Philips, WAA.05)

This different view of the thesis hopes to acknowledge where it fails, either to include, or to hold a balance, or to provide a suitably hospitable territory. The hope is that notwithstanding these failures the work is 'good enough' (Winnicott, 1971). To conclude and also continue I am required to hand over the keys in the hope that by doing so I add a 'little' history and small contribution towards the poetry of a different future (Pia Arke, 2012).

Chapter Summaries

The Archive Collection

About Archives

This section begins by considering Jacques Derrida's theory of archives, arguing for a feminist performance of the archive that both draws on his deconstructive insights and reimagines the archival form for activist politics. Central to this reimagining is Kate Eichhorn's account of the *Archival Turn in Feminism* (2013). This account describes the relational and generative functions of feminist archives, which provide a place of shelter in difficult political times. Importantly, Eichhorn argues for a dialogical rather than competitive, linear historical imagination played out in the archive, which becomes a space for unlikely encounters and new political collectivities through time. As a shelter and gathering space the archive offers a radical form of hospitality.

Eichhorn draws on Elizabeth Freeman's (2010) concept of temporal drag, which sets up a non-linear, non-teleological way of being in time. Freeman describes a form of queer archiving that thrives on the unresolved and discarded moments of the past, dragging them into the present moment to create productive friction. These theoretical perceptions of the past are nuanced by contributions by Sam McBean (2015) and Griselda Pollock (2007), among others, who contribute to a particular understanding of archiving as a poetic encounter with the past that is suggestively similar to encounters set up by social art practice. Deborah Withers (2015) and Victoria Browne (2014) both

describe a way of being *with* the archive that is open to listening carefully and being surprised by the complexities that emerge. Withers' description is also the most clearly a manifesto, conveying the feminist archive as a bridge between generations and geographies of feminism, and as fertile ground for a movement whose time has come. By overlaying ideas on archives, manifestos, and social practice the writing in this section suggests not only coincidental similarities between the forms but also a core political intent, all three forms expressing a desire to negotiate a precarious collectivity and to initiate change in the present moment.

With Archives

This second section details examples of archival interventions from my own experiences. The focus is on four collections: Glasgow Women's Library (GWL), the Women's Art Library (WAL), the Women's Audio Archive (WAA) and Sophie Hope's 1984 Dinners archive. Initially, I approached these archives to search for traces of feminist history that could be related to current practices in social art and to discover examples of feminist manifestos from the UK context. Archives like WAL in Goldsmiths, London, and GWL offered documentation of important early feminist examples of social art practice, like *Castlemilk Womenhouse* (1990) and *Feministo* (1975-77) which were also expanded conceptions of the manifesto form. These early works focused on redrawing the home through acknowledgement of its more oppressive aspects. In thinking on the labour of home-making this section voices concerns raised in the Hospitality Collection and also draws the home close to the archive which is similarly perceived as a domicile or shelter.

The Women's Audio Archive (1983-92) also appeared as a kind of shelter constructed by artist Marysia Lewandowska to support herself in alienating cultural circumstances. Next to this Sophie Hope's, also travelling, 1984 Dinners archive takes a form associated with home and hospitality, constructing safe spaces within which to host memories of resistance and movements for social change. Hope and Lewandowska's moving archives not only challenge conceptions of the form as static depository but also conceptions of the host, who in both cases becomes a kind of guest in different cultural narratives. The immediacy of voice in the audio archives spoke to me suggesting persistent conditions and the possibility of political collectivity through time, enabled by encounters in the archive. The possibility of a shared responses generated within these four collections

suggested the archive itself as a manifesto, working through a catalogue of marginalised histories to produce situated interventions in the present moment.

The Hospitality Collection

About Hospitality

This section begins with the proposition put forward by Jacques Derrida and Anne Dufourmantelle that it is only those who have been deprived a home that are in the position to offer hospitality (Derrida and Dufourmantelle, 2000). Through this lens on hospitality it is possible to see the feminist manifesto as a hosting space, offering shelter to outsider subjectivities whilst also entering mainstream cultural and political space as a stranger, bringing these spaces into question. In this vein the feminist theoretical positions of Judith Butler (1993) and Luce Irigaray (1985) are positioned as hostile guests within the western philosophical tradition, repeating its forms in order to highlight gaps in its narratives and places where it fails to accommodate difference. The section goes on to define these theoretical definitions of hospitality in relation to social art practice revealing a similar play with mimesis, simultaneous and different, in Chu Chu Yuan and Jay Koh's performative practice. Moving between theoretical and artistic positions the section describes a number of subjects in motion, performing the roles of guest *and* host simultaneously, balancing hostile and hospitable intentions. The revolutionary potential of this balancing act is made explicit in Monica Ross' artistic and theoretical praxis. Through Ross' work hospitality is reimagined as a particular moment of shared time that has affirmative relational effects.

From affirmation to critique the writing moves between two visions of hospitality, placing affirmative social practices next to feminist critique in the art practices of Tanja Ostojić, Lucy Beech and Suzanne Lacy. Through examination of these practices it becomes possible to define and then redraw the material labour involved in hospitality, imagining a series of unspectacular acts around consumption and expectation that combine to produce indomitable structures of organisation to be honoured and destroyed.

With Hospitality

This section outlines a conversational methodology and a curatorial strategy, which works through a number of events loosely framed around the question of hospitality. The conversational approach adopted by the research is derived from engagement with the Women's Audio Archive, which is identified as a significant early form of social practice. Here conversation is a distinct form, that lacking a pre-decided agenda allows for a certain relational navigation towards definitions in alien circumstances. Using Lewandowska's question of missing histories I approached curatorial duo Mother Tongue to discuss their practice in relation to the politics of hospitality and collective memory. Our conversation generated a number of events beginning in Aberdeen with an acknowledgement, to undergraduate students, of invisible curatorial labour. I also travelled to Glasgow to be part of a larger collaborative project involving Maria Hlavajova among other guests. Speaking as a guest in the CCA space in Glasgow, Hlavajova brought up the possibility of reimagining the institution as a hosting space for various precarious subjectivities, a kind of go-between that could connect care to power.

The second half of the section involves a consideration of my own work as both a guest and host in the unfamiliar territory of the North East of Scotland, detailing curatorial interventions commissioned by the Scottish Contemporary Art Network, in which I set up encounters between feminism, social practice and other forms of institutional critique. These interventions approach the labour of hospitality as it plays out in particular social practices and in my own work where I move between the role of hostile guest and supportive host in order to try and create events that act with and on the contexts they enter. The work tests the possibility of reimagining the manifesto as a discursive, participatory space of exchange, where other histories can be tentatively shared.

The Manifesto Collection

About Manifesto

About Manifesto presents a dialogue between important theoretical writing on the manifesto form and examples of social art practice, both contemporary and historical, that I have not experienced directly. This section seeks to weave together three

discourses: writing on feminist manifestos, social art practice and feminist history, suggesting an interrelation not previously accounted for. By moving between discourses I set up examples to suggest certain practices function like manifestos, sharing similarities in form and intention. The section considers the important question of language, which presents a difficulty for both feminism and social practice. Through language it is possible to uncover hidden theoretical genealogies in social practice, including the work of Kristeva who not only wrote extensively on the poetics of dialogue and its revolutionary potential but also practiced a dialogical kind of theory. The chapter ends with a meeting between feminist manifesto and social art practice in the work of Mierle Laderman Ukeles who wrote the pivotal *Manifesto for Maintenance Art* in 1969. Ukeles' framing of maintenance as a baseline for her practice allowed her to produce over forty years of situated dialogical interventions. More than the manifesto as frame for practice though, the suggestion is that each ritual she performs is itself a manifesto, suggesting both rage and utopia, or rage becoming utopia through social interaction that remakes the world.

With Manifesto

Using the score of manifesto characteristics written on in *About Manifesto*, *With Manifesto* tests this framework against a broad range of social art practices that I have experienced directly. Being *with* social art practice takes a number of forms throughout the section. I move between participation, collaboration, and conversation following the intention to be *with* practice, producing events in an activist vein. I begin by detailing my collaboration with artist Alana Jelinek, interrogating her practice over a number of events to question the extent to which it enacts Rancière's definition of dissensus and equally where it plays out as a form of prefigurative politics. In bringing to light parallels with feminist practice the section grapples with the question of core orientation leading the artist to think through how feminist politics could be voiced as a dynamic and influential part of her art practice.

While the *About Manifesto* section approaches the question of language, *With Manifesto* parallels this interest through my participation in a feminist reading group, reassessing questions of personal subjectivity in relation to institutional discourse. Through the lens of feminist writing my participation enables a view on social practice as something similarly radical, turning given hierarchies upside down to negotiate space and

acknowledging collectivity as a creative source. Through these practices the section approaches the idea of support either as a community of readers or as a place of refuge and safety. Support is seen as a kind of gathering together and a form of hospitality.

Finally, the section deals with the artist's relationship to, and interest in, wider operating systems, which plays out in feminist hacking cultures and in Helen Smith's organisational interventions. Through a durational dialogue with Smith the section ends on a consideration of time and memory as important tactics, materials used by both manifestos and social praxis, asking: how we can share time, and the memories we bring with us into encounters? Touching on memory, the section ends where hospitality and archives begin, raising memories of home and questions of social memory and their joint relationship with political control.

Bibliography

- ARKE, P. in Kurator Aktion eds. 2012. *Tupilakosaurus: An Incomplete(able) Survey of Pia Arke's Artistic Work and Research*. Denmark, Den Frie Centre of Contemporary Art + The National Museum of Denmark, Copenhagen.
- AHMED, S. 2000. *Strange Encounters: Embodied Others in Post-Coloniality*. London ; New York: Routledge.
- ARENDT, H. 1958. *The Human Condition*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- BAHKTIN, M. 1984. *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- BISHOP, C. 2012. *Artificial Hells: Participatory Art and the Politics of Spectatorship*. London: Verso.
- BOURRIAUD, N., PLEASANCE, S., WOODS, F. & COPELAND, M. 2002. *Relational Aesthetics*. Dijon: Les presses du réel.
- BRAIDOTTI, R. 2006. *Transpositions: On Nomadic Ethics*. Cambridge: Polity.
- BRAIDOTTI, R. 2014 Thinking as a Nomadic Subject. (online video). Available from: <https://www.ici-berlin.org/events/rosi-braidotti/>(Accessed 20 March 2017).
- BROWNE, V. 2014. *Feminism, Time, and Nonlinear History*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- BUTLER, J. P. 1993. *Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of "Sex"*. New York: Routledge.
- CAVARERO, A. 2005. *For More Than One Voice*. California: Stanford University Press.
- CAWS, M. A. 2001. The Poetics of the Manifesto: Nowness and Newness. *Manifesto: A century of isms*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- CERTEAU, M. D. 1984. *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- CHU, C. Y. 2013. *Negotiation-as-active-knowing*. (Online). PhD Thesis, Robert Gordon University. Available from: <https://openair.rgu.ac.uk/handle/10059/917> (Accessed 9 September 2016).
- DELEUZE, G. & GUATTARI, F. 1986. *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

- DERRIDA, J. & DUFOURMANTELLE, A. 2000. *Of Hospitality*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- DERRIDA, J. & PRENOWITZ, E. 1996. *Archive Fever: a Freudian Impression*. Chicago; London: University of Chicago Press.
- DIMITRAKAKI, A. 2013. The Avant Garde Horizon: Socially Engaged Art, Capitalism and Contradiction. In: ECONOMY Exhibition, *Socially Engaged Practice: ethics, aesthetics, politics or economics*. 2 February 2013. Glasgow: CCA. Available: https://www.academia.edu/5773181/The_Avant_Garde_Horizon_Socially_Engaged_Art_Capitalism_and_Contradiction
- DOLAR, M. 2006. *A Voice and Nothing More*. Cambridge, MA ; London: MIT Press.
- DOUGLAS, A. FREMANTLE, C. 2016. What Poetry Does Best. In: RESCHKE, P. K. K. (ed.) *The Time of The Force Majeure*. Munich: Prestel.
- EICHHORN, K. 2013. *The Archival Turn in Feminism: Outrage in Order*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- FINKELPEARL, T. 2013. *What We Made. Conversations on Art and Social Cooperation*. Durham; London: Duke University Press.
- FREEMAN, E. 2010. *Time Binds: Queer Temporalities, Queer Histories*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- GOGARTY, L. 2014. Art & Gentrification. *Art Monthly*, 373, 7-10.
- GUY, L. 2016. *Manifestos: Aesthetics and politics in queer times*. PhD Thesis, Manchester School of Art.
- HARAWAY, D. J. 1991. *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women: The Reinvention of Nature*. London: Free Association Books.
- HOPE, C. S. 2011. *Participating in the 'Wrong' Way? Practice Based Research into Cultural Democracy and the Commissioning of Art to Effect Social Change*. (Online). PhD Thesis, Birkbeck University of London. Available from: http://sophiehope.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/SH_PhD_Final.pdf (accessed 9 September 2016)
- IRIGARAY, L. 1985. *This Sex Which is Not One*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- JACKSON, S. 2011. *Social Works: The Infrastructural Politics of Performance*. London: Routledge.
- KELLY, O. & KILLING, D. 1984. Community, Art and the State. Comedia.
- KESTER, G. H. 2004. *Conversation Pieces : Community and Communication in Modern Art*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- KESTER, G. H. 2011. *The One and The Many*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- KOH, J. 2015. *Art-Led Participative Processes*. Helsinki: Academy of Fine Arts, University of the Arts Helsinki.
- KRISTEVA, J. 1984. *Revolutions in Poetic Language*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- KRISTEVA, J. & ROUDIEZ, L. S. 1982. *Powers of horror: an Essay on Abjection*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- KRISTEVA, J. 1981 Translated by ROUDIEZ, L. S., GORA, T. & JARDINE, A. *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- LACLAU, E. & MOUFFE, C. 1985. *Hegemony & Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*. London: Verso.
- LACY, S. 2013. *Imperfect Art: Working in Public A Case Study of the Oakland Projects (1991–2001)* PhD. Robert Gordon University, Aberdeen.
- LACY, S., JACOB, M. J., PHILLIPS, P. C., GABLIK, S., MÁJOZO, E. C., GÓMEZ-PEÑA, G., LIPPARD, L. R., BACA, J. F., KELLEY, J. & KAPROW, A. 1995. *Mapping the Terrain: New Genre Public Art*. Indiana: Bay Press.
- LEESON, L. 2009. *Towards an Aesthetics of Social Change*. PhD. University of Ulster Faculty of Art and Design and Built Environment.
- LEWANDOWSKA, M. 1983-92. Women's Audio Archive. (Online). London: ICA. Available: <http://www.marysialewandowska.com/waa/> (Accessed 12 September 2016)

- LIPPARD, L. R. 1997. *Six Years: The Dematerialization of the Art Object from 1966 to 1972*. University of California Press.
- LIPPARD, L. in HARRIS, J. (eds) 2004. *The New Art History*. London ; New York: Routledge.
- LYON, J. 1999. *Manifestoes: Provocations of the Modern*. Ithaca & London: Cornell University Press.
- MCBEAN, S. 2015. *Feminism's Queer Temporalities*. New York: Routledge.
- POLLOCK, G. 1999. *Differencing the Canon: Feminist Desire and the Writing of Art's Histories*. London ; New York: Routledge.
- POLLOCK, G. 2007. *Encounters in The Virtual Feminist Museum: Time, Space and the Archive*. London ; New York: Routledge.
- RANCIERE, J. 2015. Translated by CORCORAN, S. *Dissensus: on Politics and Aesthetics*. London: Bloomsbury.
- RANCIERE, J. 2006 with Introduction by ROCKHILL, G. & ZIZEK, S. *The Politics of Aesthetics*. London: Continuum.
- ROSS, M. 2000. History or not? Performance script ed. Goldsmiths: MAKE Archive/ Women's Art Library.
- SHOLETTE, G. 2011. *Dark Matter: Art and Politics in the Age of Enterprise Culture*. London: Pluto Press.
- SHOTTER, J. 2005. Goethe and the Refiguring of Intellectual Inquiry: From 'Aboutness' Thinking to 'Witness' Thinking in Everyday Life. *Janus Head*, 8, 26.
- SMITH, H. 2015. *The Artist as Navigator: Understanding How the Social Qualities of Art Influence Organisational Change*. PhD. Robert Gordon University, Aberdeen.
- STEEDMAN, C. 2002. *Dust: The Archive and Cultural History*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- UKELES, M. L. 1969. Manifesto for Maintenance Art. New York: Ronaldfeldman Gallery.
- WINNICOTT, D. W. 1971. *Playing and Reality*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- WITHERS, D. 2015. *Feminism, Digital Culture and the Politics of Transmission: Theory, Practice and Cultural Heritage*. London: Rowman and Littlefield International Ltd.
- WITTIG, M. 1969. *Les Guérillères*. Paris: Éditions de Minuit.
- WOOLF, V. 1943. *To the Lighthouse*. London: The Hogarth Press.