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introduction
why?

This PhD was undertaken as an opportunity to address a practice situated in exhibitions and writing through an engagement with the discipline of interior design. Prior to undertaking this body of research, I had produced a series of exhibitions – each an experiment with the making of an exhibition. This practice drew on previous studies in art history, weaving and interior design that combined to produce a practice inflected with history and theory, art, craft and design techniques and knowledge. Exhibitions became a vehicle where this practice could be engaged with in a way that enabled experimentation.

I was particularly interested in the material, spatial, temporal dimensions of exhibitions – museums in particular – and how these produced knowledge in different ways to that of the art historian. I called myself an ‘interior designer’ rather than a ‘curator’ or ‘exhibition designer’. Like interior designs, exhibitions involve the arrangement of things and engage with the production of spatial and temporal conditions to mediate between people and their surroundings. Exhibition objects and subjects also implicate ideas of interior and interiority. *The Reposing Box* posed the reinvention of the museum through an attention to matter, surfaces, light and movement – techniques of interior design – in relation to what could be said and seen; what could be known. *The Collectors* proposed an exhibition for a gallery in Hobart, Tasmania to display the collections of four nineteenth-century Tasmanian colonists. Each was to be arranged according to a different mode of visuality – Cartesian perspectivalism, ‘the art of describing’, ‘the baroque’ – offered by the philosopher Martin Jay in his essay, ‘Scopic Regimes of Modernity’.

Projects by artist Fred Wilson were, and continue to be, an important reference for this practice. In particular his curatorial projects where he re-arranges

---

1. Prior to graduating in an undergraduate degree in Interior Design in 1991, I completed a Bachelor degree in Art History with Indian Studies (1983). At the conclusion of this degree, many of my colleagues went onto become curators (at this time there were no programs in Curatorial Studies); instead I decided I wanted to make things. I studied weaving and completed a Certificate in Applied Art at the Melbourne College of Textiles before deciding to study Interior Design.

2. This was difficult in some projects as the term ‘invited curator’ carries a certain level of prestige. ‘Exhibition designer’ implies showcases and a graphic overlay; ‘interior designer’ is generally equated with interior decoration and kitchens.


objects, labels, lighting and other design elements to produce different meanings. A New Yorker of African American and Caribbean descent, Wilson makes visible racial prejudices present in existing collections. His project, *Mining the Museum* (1992-3) rearranged collections of the Baltimore Historical Society. For example, Wilson selected various objects made from metal and placed them in a showcase with the label ‘metalware’ and dated eighteenth century. The arrangement, which included ornate silver tableware such as candelabras as well as slave shackles, produced a potent encounter.

Another rearrangement was *Frederick Serves Fruit* – an eighteenth century painting by Ernst G Fisher (1815–94) dated c1850 that depicted a wealthy Deep South American plantation family having a picnic lunch. Selected from the museum’s collection, Wilson hung the work and changed the title on the label from *Country Life of a Baltimore Family* to *Frederick Serves Fruit*. He also changed the lighting from a flood which focused on the central party to a spot light which illuminated an otherwise unnoticed figure in the background – a young black boy serving fruit to the leisurely party. The renaming and focusing of the light illuminated another aspect of the surface and through the process of selection changed the meaning produced in the encounter from a celebration of the wealthy to a moving portrayal of slavery. These rearrangements manifest the potency of curatorial and design practices in the production of meaning, objects and subjects; the objects are the same objects, but rearranged. Different meanings are produced. As noted in the catalogue for this exhibition, Wilson explores ‘not what objects mean but how they mean’.6

In 2000, I began a PhD candidature with the aim of making space for research to reinvent my practice. The desire for reinvention came from two directions – the increasing challenges within gallery-based infrastructure and resources when doing exhibitions as experiments and my recent appointment as an academic in the interior design program at RMIT University.7

Another aspiration of this PhD was, and continues to be, to contribute to the emerging discourse of interior design and through this to encourage different ways of thinking and designing interiors. My practice in exhibitions highlighted certain assumptions in ways of thinking about objects, subjects

---


7 Prior to 2000, I had been teaching sessionally within the RMIT interior design program (since 1992) and was the artistic director of Craft Victoria from 1996 to 1999 as well as an independent, freelance curator and writer.
and space that underpinned the discipline of interior design, its practice and discourse. I felt these were important to bring into question as a way of opening up the potential I saw in the practice of interior design.

Within the discipline of interior design, ‘interior’ is expressed as an entity – as ‘the interior’ – and interior is equated with space, usually described as ‘void’ or ‘negative’, and as enclosed space. Histories of interior design present a history of the inside of buildings and objects in space. From the introductory paragraphs to The History of Interior Design: ‘Interiors are an integral part of the structures that contain them – usually buildings. This means that interior design is inextricably linked to architecture and can only be studied within an architectural context’.9

The significance of this ‘inextricable link’ became apparent to me when I attended the Architectural Insites Symposium in 1999. The conference addressed the implications and potential of digital technologies in relation to architecture. Sitting in the audience I was overwhelmed by the depressing thought that digital architectural design, as a design of continuous surfaces, produced interiors in a way that made the practice of interior design superfluous; that to do what I had been taught as an undergraduate interior design student required me to become an architect.

Another given is the subject centred in the interior and the design – a conscious self and one inflected by phenomenology. I remember in 1989 as a 2nd year interior design student, one of the interior design lecturers presented us with a list of quotes from Gaston Bachelard’s Poetics of Space.10 This text is still one of the most cited texts by interior design students and staff – together with texts by phenomenologist and architectural theorist Juhani Pallassma. The strength of this underpinning is manifested now in the citing of the work of the

---
9 In 2011, the International Federation of Architects/Designers (the international body representing the profession) set up a major initiative titled the Global Interiors Entity to address a perceived identity crisis in interior design. The IFI website defines interior design/architecture in relation to negative space: ‘Firstly, that across all existing design fields – whether graphics, fashion, product design, architecture or other disciplines – interior design is the only one to have its end product grounded in the sculpting of “negative” space rather than the production of a “positive” object. Secondly, that at the core of interiors lies an understanding of the abstract qualities of shaping this negative space or “void”’. Shashi Caan, “IFI President’s Update”, September 15, 2010. Visit http://ifiworld.org/presidents_update/?p=20#Homepage.
10 Gaston Bachelard, The Poetics of Space, trans. Maria Jolas (Boston: Beacon Press, 1969). It is important to note that Bachelard is not a phenomenologist however his work has been used and cited within architecture and design as phenomenology. For example, extracts from The Poetics of Space are the key reference for phenomenology in Neil Leach, ed., Rethinking Architecture. A Reader in Cultural Theory (London: Routledge, 1997).
artist Olafur Eliasson as a precedent for many interior design student projects. Eliasson’s practice is defined as one which produces a phenomenological subject.\footnote{Claire Bishop, \textit{Installation Art. A Critical History} (London: Tate Publishing, 2005). 76.}

Another aspiration of this PhD was to engage with the thinking of the philosopher Gilles Deleuze. I have been reading Deleuze’s writing since 1984 – a friend in a shared household introduced me to Deleuze and other philosophers. Then, and since, I have found reading Deleuze inspires a different way of thinking about a project, a proposition, a problem – life. Engaging with his ideas produces a sense of lightness and ability to move; a sense of liberation I have not experienced reading other philosophers (who tend to imbue a feeling of right and wrong, of ‘should’ rather than ‘could’). An encounter with Deleuze’s writings generates ideas that produce ‘lines of flight’ in relation to my practice – whether it is exhibition design, writing, teaching.\footnote{In 1995 I was commissioned by the Jewellers and Metalsmiths Guild of Australia to design their members’ exhibition to be held as part of their national conference. The exhibition was called \textit{Production Reproduction} for Gallery 101, Melbourne. While working on the design, I read a text on Deleuze’s reversal of Platonism and the idea of the copy and simulacra. The ideas in this text generated ways of thinking about the curatorial proposition for the exhibition and hence how the exhibition design could work different manifestations of ideas of production and reproduction. The exhibition design was seen as revolutionary at the time and continues to be referenced by practitioners as an example of the value of exhibition design in relation to the display of jewellery and metalwork. The text was Paul Patton, “Anti-Platonism and Art,” in \textit{Gilles Deleuze and the Theatre of Philosophy}, ed. Constantin Boundas and Dorothea Olkowski (London: Routledge, 1994), 141–156.}

This affect and effect has kept me committed to the value of connecting with his writings despite the resistance encountered when referring to his work. This resistance comes from various directions: from those who privilege practice over theory and see references to French poststructuralist theory as merely fashionable\footnote{Deleuze is frequently singled out in such comments. This is due in part to his current popularity and frequency of reference within architecture and design. Comments have a dismissive tone; implying one is caught up in a trend. A curatorial colleague told me he wore Deleuze under a pith helmet when he was in public.} and from those well-versed in philosophy who wince when designers engage with philosophy. The approach taken here of bringing philosophy and interior design together seems necessary in a practice which attends to conditions of being, inhabitation and interior. It is also an approach that does not attempt to become a Deleuzian scholar so much as engage in a ‘nonphilosophical understanding of philosophy’.\footnote{John Rajchman, \textit{The Deleuze Connections} (USA: The MIT Press, 2000). 5. Deleuze also has a particular style in his engagement with the work of others that encourages one to experiment. The following expresses the way I would like to work: ‘While Deleuze and Guattari use many authors and concepts, this is never done in an academic fashion aimed at persuading the reader. Rather, they use these names and ideas as effects that traverse their analyses, generating ever new effects, as points of reference indeed, but also as points of intensity and signs pointing a way out: point-signs that offer a multiplicity of solutions and a variety of directions for a new style of politics. Such an approach carries much along with it,}
Deleuze’s writings pose a number of challenges to the discourse, practice and theories of interior design; in particular, his dismissal of both phenomenology and the concept of interior as an already constituted and independent entity. His position in relation to both of these is made clear through his expression of ‘a hatred of interiority’. Yet in reading Deleuze with an attention to the question of interior, words such as ‘in’, ‘internal’ and ‘inside’ infect through his thinking which positions interior and interiority as productions rather than givens. The potential here in relation to a practice of interior design as one of designing interiors – as a production of space and subject – was and continues to be exciting.

This PhD has been an engagement with these ideas – and those of others including Elizabeth Grosz and Michel Foucault – as ‘a box of tools’ for opening and thinking interior differently in relation to my practice and through this, to contribute to the discipline of interior design through a posing of the question of interior to open it up from current givens of enclosed space and centred subjects.

A theory is exactly like a box of tools. It has nothing to do with the signifier. It must be useful. It must function. And not for itself. If no one uses it, beginning with the theoretician himself (who then ceases to be a theoretician), then the theory is worthless or the moment is inappropriate. We don’t revise a theory, but construct new ones; we have no choice but to make others. It is strange that it was Proust, an author thought to be a pure intellectual, who said it so clearly: treat my book as a pair of

in the course of its flow, but it also leaves much behind. Chunks of Marx and Freud that cannot keep up with the fast current will be left behind, buried or forgotten, while everything in Marx and Freud that has to do with how things and people and desires actually flow will be kept ...’. Mark Seem, “Introduction,” in Anti-Oedipus. Capitalism and Schizophrenia, by Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, trans. Robert Hurley, Mark Seem, and Helen R Lane (London, New York: Continuum, 2004), xvii–xxvi. xxi.

15 Gilles Deleuze, “Letter to a Harsh Critic,” in Negotiations. 1972 - 1990, trans. Martin Joughin (New York: Columbia University Press, 1995), 3–12. ‘I belong to a generation, one of the last generations, that was more or less bludgeoned to death with the history of philosophy. The history of philosophy plays a patently repressive role in philosophy, it’s philosophy’s own version of the Oedipus complex: “You can’t seriously consider saying what you yourself think until you’ve read this and that, and that on this, and this on that.” ... I myself “did” history of philosophy for a long time, read books on this or that author. But I compensated in various ways: by concentrating, in the first place, on authors who challenged the rationalist tradition in this history (and I see a secret link between Lucretius, Hume, Spinoza and Nietzsche, constituted by their critique of negativity, their cultivation of joy, their hatred of interiority, the exteriority of forces and relations, the denunciation of power ... and so on).’ 5-6. [This text was first published in 1973]
glasses directed to the outside; if they don’t suit you, find another pair; I leave it to you to find your own instrument, which is necessarily an instrument for combat. A theory does not totalize; it is an instrument for multiplication and it also multiples itself. 16

what? how? which? where? when?

‘What’ is usually the key interrogative word used with research – ‘What are you researching?’ In one sense the response here is straightforward – the question of interior. However the question ‘What is an interior?’ has not been a useful one to pose and yet it keeps coming back, highlighting the challenges in moving from an understanding of interior as an entity.

‘What’ also produces a direction towards developing concepts – a new concept of interior. Led down this path several times during this PhD, one gets caught up in a process of defining and positioning interior beforehand – before doing; before practice. This creates a sense of having to respond to an idea that already exists – like a What question in search of an answer, a solution. The production of interiors then becomes a series of possibilities and examples of what could be done.

A second research question located the question of interior in relation to the specific interests of my practice: ‘if one shifts from Cartesian and phenomenological concepts of object/subject relations, then what kind of interior(s) become actualised?’ The research involved a move from thinking and addressing interior, space, objects and subjects as things to thinking about the production of objects and subjects, processes of interiorization, objectification, subjectification and spatialization.

Exhibitions and other projects were approached as experiments: as a process of production engaged in the world – materials, forces, chance, constraints – to see what happened, what could be said and seen.

Many of the new sports – surfing, windsurfing, hang gliding – take the form of entry into an existing wave. There’s no longer an origin as a starting point, but a sort of putting-into-orbit. The basic thing is how to get taken up in the movement of a big wave, a column of rising air, to “come between” rather than be the origin of an effort.\textsuperscript{17}

This idea of entering into the movement of an existing wave has become a key aspect of my practice and the posing of interior. Each project was like an existing wave and produced different momentums, directions, orientations and opportunities to come between to experiment with interior designing. Questions of how, which, when and where became more useful to pose than ‘what?’

This shift is expressed through a rearrangement of interior? to ?interior. Rather than focus on defining an interior through posing ‘what is an interior?’, moving ? before interior produces a pause, even a stumbling, before responding, before answering. ? before interior opens interior to the outside; to the current; to movement; and invites a response. Posing ?interior with each project creates ‘a new problem … new orientations’.\textsuperscript{18}

Each of the projects selected and presented in this document have posed ?interior, engaged practices of interiorization and produced interior designs. The writing is an arrangement of projects rather than a narrative organised around key themes which the projects then illustrate. Project titles are used to bring the project to the fore and make apparent the influence of the project on the research and thinking. I am resisting calling them chapters as each is like another arrangement within the arrangement of the PhD: an interiorization composed of projects, references, precedents and quotes. Presented as projects, the singularity of each project as a production of time, internal and external forces, constraints and chance is valued as research.

Repetition of ideas and practices are encountered in the writing as ?interior is posed in each project anew. This repetition is due to the foregrounding of


\textsuperscript{18} Claire Colebrook, “The Joy of Philosophy,” in \textit{Deleuze and the Contemporary World}, ed. Ian Buchanan and Adrian Parr (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2006), 214–227. This use of the question mark is another idea picked up from Deleuze and his posing of ‘being ‘to create a new problem … new orientations’. 225.
thinking and writing through practice where ideas are worked and reworked.

‘... to think while making or rather while doing: to think as doing.’

Practice as research produces this repetition, where what returns is a sign of value and of difference. These repetitions are like the repetitions in weight lifting; they build the strength of the practice. This is different to repetition as training to do the same time and time again. The development of the strength of my practice in posing ?interior to projects and to the discipline of interior design has been a valuable outcome of the PhD.

Like the exhibitions, the writing rearranges existing matter – the projects – through posing ?interior in relation to the practice now:

To think means to be embedded in the present-time stratum that serves as a limit: what can I see and what can I say today? But this involves thinking of the past as it is condensed in the inside, in the relation to oneself (there is a Greek in me, or a Christian, and so on). We will then think the past against the present and resist the latter, not in favour of a return but ‘in favour, I hope, of a time to come’ (Nietzsche), that is, by making the past active and present to the outside so that something new will finally come about, so that thinking, always, may reach thought. Thought thinks its own history (the past), but in order to free itself from what it thinks (the present) and be able finally to ‘think otherwise’ (the future).

The sequence of this rearrangement is broadly chronological. Three exhibitions compose the first half of this writing: SPACECRAFT 0701 (2001), a matter of time (2003-06) and making relations (2006). Each was a significant project in my practice and presented unforeseen opportunities to engage with the question of interior. These are followed by an essay titled Between

20 Gilles Deleuze, 'Foldings, or the Inside of Thought (Subjectivation)' in Foucault, trans. Sean Hand (New York, London: Continuum, 2010), 98.
21 The projects composing the PhD have been actual events and as creative projects have been assessed as research outcomes. The exhibitions have been held in public galleries with public programs involving forums, talks, educational activities. With the three major exhibitions of the PhD, I have been invited and commissioned as a guest ‘curator’ to produce an exhibition for the gallery. The exhibitions have also been large in the sense of exhibiting the work of a number of participants – usually more than twenty. The exhibitions
*Representation and the Mirror. Tactics for interiorization* (2008). Written in response to a call for papers from Interiors Forum Scotland, the essay as a conference paper presented the PhD research thinking and practice to the discipline of interior design. It is also placed here in this arrangement as a project where writing is approached as a practice of curation, selection and arrangement. *interiorist* is a collection of experiments (2003–2011) in the production of an interior design practitioner. *interiorist* is followed by *interiorizt*, a second published essay which presents the research. Commissioned for *The Handbook of Interior Architecture and Design*, it extends the PhD thinking and ideas to offer them up to the discipline of interior design and to invite the potential of interior design through posing ?interior. Written in 2011, with a publication date of 2013, this essay was approached as a concluding text and a contribution of this PhD. *interiorizt* is followed by *infection* – the conclusion of this writing – and an exhibition and verbal presentation of the PhD on 17 October 2012 at 10am as a further inflection of the gathered research directed to a future.

Each project – exhibition, writing, verbal presentation – poses ?interior to invite a practice of interiorization and the production of interior designs. This is the contribution of the PhD to my practice and the discipline of interior design. The givens of enclosed space and Cartesian/phenomenological concepts of object/subject relations have been opened up and interior has been brought to the fore as a creative problematic to pose in the current each time anew – to open up, invite, invoke the potential and uniqueness of the practice of interior design.

have been reviewed in newspapers and journals, and engaged with diverse and large audiences (*a matter of time* was viewed by 61,627 people according to the acquittal report prepared by the Tamworth Regional Gallery). Each exhibition has been accompanied by a catalogue and curatorial essay. There have also been a number of published essays, invited book chapters and peer-reviewed conference papers.

22 Interiors Forum Scotland (IFS) is a group of Scottish interior design university programs. The first IFS conference *Thinking Inside the Box. Interiors in the 21st Century - New Visions, New Horizons & New Challenges* held in Glasgow 1-2 March 2007 – drew people from across the world as there are very few dedicated interior design conferences. In the opening presentation, it was described like attending an AA (Alcoholics Anonymous) meeting where everyone was able to express their thoughts with people who knew where they were coming from and so were able to share their experiences rather than having to explain to people what interior design is and involves. The paper I presented at this conference was titled: ‘What’s in a Canon? The State of Interior Design at the Beginning of the 21st Century’. In 2008, the IFS convened another conference was called *Interior Tools. Interior Tactics* Interiors Forum Scotland, Edinburgh, (21–22 August 2008). The paper has been published: Suzie Attiwill, “Between Representation and the Mirror – Tactics of Interiorisation,” in *Interior Tools, Interior Tactics. Debates in Interior Theory and Practice*, ed. Joyce Fleming et al. (UK: Libri Publishing, 2011), 159–169. It has also been selected for publication in a four-volume reference work entitled *Interior Design and Architecture: Critical and Primary Sources*, edited by Mark Taylor, which will be published by Bloomsbury in 2013.

SPACECRAFT
At its inception in 2000, this PhD was described as ‘a study of spatial design in relation to concepts of movement and occupation; about insides and outsides; about internalising as part of internationalising; about the discipline of interior design’. I approached and understood the discipline of interior design at this time as one which was a spatial discipline; one which engaged with questions of space and spatial experience. This had been my education at RMIT University in the Interior Design program, a program which did not subscribe to the equation of interior design as a practice concerned primarily with the inside of buildings.

During the 1990s, my practice in exhibitions leading up to this PhD addressed spatial issues. I positioned this practice as interior design/exhibition design to make a deliberate distinction from curatorial practice. As a designer and curator of exhibitions I highlighted spatial design and spatial encounters between people, objects and space. The kinds of curatorial practices I challenged included the way objects were located in space that fixed them within an existing schema – the curatorial framework. An a priori approach where meaning pre-exists the encounter and the exhibition becomes a form of representation. In many instances, the work becomes reduced to an illustration of the idea where there is ‘a foregrounding of the theoretical insistence of works of art over their material register. Text over experience. Authority over response.’

Fellow curators referred to my practice as a spatial curatorial practice and me as a spatial curator. The exhibition adjacent is an example of this practice prior to undertaking this PhD. In 1997, I was invited to curate an exhibition of work by artists-in-residence at 200 Gertrude Street, a contemporary art space in Melbourne now called Gertrude. Each year a different curator is invited to curate an exhibition of the studio artists, who are resident in the first floor.

---

1 PhD proposal presented in May 2001 at the RMIT University’s School of Architecture and Design Graduate Research Conference.

2 Keynote lecture by Bruce Ferguson, an editor of the book Thinking about Exhibitions. This book is one of the few books dedicated to exhibitions rather than the art in exhibitions. His keynote was presented at The Banff Centre, 24 August 2000 and discussed in introduction by Melanie Townsend in: Melanie Townsend, "The Troubles with Curating," in Beyond the Box: Diverging Curatorial Practices (Banff: Banff Centre Press, 2003), xiii–xx. See also Germano Celant, "A Visual Machine. Art Installation and Its Modern Archetypes," in Thinking About Exhibitions, ed. Reesa Greenberg, Bruce W Ferguson, and Sandy Nairne (London & New York: Routledge, 1996), 371–386. ‘An a priori condition was sought, and once determined, was expressed in such a way as to mask differences and emphasize constants. A system of articulation was adopted, then, which depended almost exclusively on a preconceived notion and which organized the whole so as to demonstrate and exploit the interconnections among the individual elements’. 375.
studies above the gallery. That year, the studio artists decided to explore a different approach from inviting a curator and asked me, as a designer, to curate the exhibition. In the catalogue text I addressed this difference:

As a designer I am concerned with space so this became my point of reference, something from which to work. Rather than developing a subject-based theme for the exhibition as a curator might do, I decided to concentrate on the spatial relations evident in the project: the juxtaposition between the gallery space and the studio spaces; the location of the studios beside each other; the other spaces which accompany the production and presentation of the work. This focus has been maintained throughout the process from research to installation. It is intended that the spatial layout of the studios upstairs will decide where the work will be located in the gallery. This text which accompanies the exhibition is also to be read as a space adjacent to the work and the exhibition.¹

The layout of the exhibition in the two galleries was based on the first floor plan of the studios – so works from adjacent studios were hung beside each other and on opposite walls where studios sat across the corridor from each other. In a review of the exhibition, the effect of a spatial approach was observed as: ‘... an exhibition that challenges the usual arrangement of similar forms or ideas’.²

Whether or not the actual spatial tactic became apparent was not the intention so much as an attempt to open up the potential for the work and artists (as an audience of this exhibition) to see something in their work or others that they may not have seen before, for it to have multiple possibilities and to avoid the authorial and reductive effect of using work to illustrate or represent a theme.

Spacecraft

‘Spacecraft’ was an idea I ‘invented’ as a guest editor for the Craft Victoria magazine in 1996. For the issue, I invited texts which focused on the conjunction of space and craft, bringing my spatial interests from interior design to the context of Craft Victoria, an organisation dedicated to the presentation and advocacy of contemporary craft. Initially the working title for the issue was The Space of Craft, this then became Spacecraft. In the editorial for the magazine, I described this shift as one of losing the possessive ‘of’ and finding myself in the middle of ideas and things.

I had not intended to make a spacecraft but to investigate the space of craft. Now in the assembling of this issue, I find I have lost the ‘of’ and that my thoughts lead me to spacecraft. Singular sightings and unexpected encounters surface while reading the texts. … spacecraft is defined in dictionaries as a vehicle (or receptacle) which is capable of travelling in space. There are spacecrafts which are built to fly to the moon. There are those which appear on horizons or in the sky at unexpected times. With these latter craft there is a singularity about their appearance. Their visibility leads to speculation rather than identification. A UFO; a flying saucer; its intentions, flight paths, destinations, occupants, physical form, trajectories, language are unknown. As I mentioned at the beginning I have lost the ‘of’, the particle of possession, which sits between space and craft. In the process something unidentifiable has been assembled – a spacecraft. It emits different kinds of light and moves at different velocities, twirling and whirling, carving up space and pursuing invisible trajectories.5

The shift from the space of craft – where craft is placed in space – to one where space and craft become a conjunction space+craft became an important trajectory through this PhD research as did the positioning of my role as one located in the midst of ideas and things. I continued to use the term

---

‘spacecraft’ until 2006 for other exhibitions and presentations; using numerals to indicate the month and year as a way of distinguishing different projects. The word ‘spacecraft’ acted as a stimulus for various projects from exhibitions to writings and organised my thinking around two main threads: a re-positioning of the object from an knowable entity to phenomena and temporal event – as UFO – and the crafting of space. Its main aim however was to act as an on-going provocation to my practice situated in interior design.

**SPACECRAFT 0701**

In 2000, I received an invitation from Monash University Gallery to curate an exhibition of craft and design. This invitation opened up an opportunity to continue to work with the concept of spacecraft yet in a material and physically spatial way as distinct from the textual context of the magazine. **SPACECRAFT 0701** (launched/landed in July 2001) occupied the whole gallery consisting of three spaces for a duration of six weeks and exhibiting the work of eighteen practitioners. **SPACECRAFT 0701** was followed by **SPACECRAFT 1001** (October, 2001), a smaller, self-funded experiment where six objects from **SPACECRAFT 0701** were moved and re-arranged in a foyer-type gallery space flanked by architecture and design offices on top of a city car park. These two exhibitions were the first projects of the PhD and were an opportunity to extend on ideas that had been engaged with in *The Reposing Box*, *Production Reproduction* and *box*.

---

6 The Monash University Gallery was located at the Monash Clayton campus. It is now called the Monash University Museum of Art (MUMA) and in 2010 moved to the Monash Caulfield campus. Their invitation was based on an objective to address the under-representation of craft and design in the gallery’s exhibition program. My role as artistic director of Craft Victoria from 1996 to 1999 together with my exhibition practice placed me in a position to receive such an invitation.

7 **SPACECRAFT 0701** – Monash University Museum of Art, Clayton from 17 July to 25 August 2001. Collected together within the three spaces of the gallery were objects by designers, craft practitioners, jewellers, interior designers, architects and visual artists. For a full list of participants in each exhibition please visit the Appendix.

8 **SPACECRAFT 1001**: Six objects from 0701 exhibition were moved to the gallery-foyer space of Level 11, Design Park, 522 Flinders Lane from 22 October to 21 December, 2001.

9 Suzie Attiwill, “The Reposing Box.” (Master of Arts, Research by Project, RMIT University, 1994).


11 Suzie Attiwill, “box” (Craft Victoria, 1996). *box* was composed of a collection of boxes by thirty-three people from different disciplines, arranged in a gallery dedicated to craft. Exhibited work included: graphic design by John Box; a magician’s box which was performed at the opening of the exhibition – magician Sam Angelico produced a white dove out of nowhere; a model of a house by architect Sean Godsell. The installation of the exhibition referenced a boxing ring with all the work arranged on the walls and the viewer invited to box – to grapple with the work, to try and box it (categorize it, know it, identify it).
The concept of spacecraft in *SPACECRAFT 0701* is very simple. It could be described as the difference between placing the object as something that is to be *recognised* and placing the object as something to be *encountered* in space. One could argue that this is no different to how any work is engaged with in the space of a gallery. And there have been many other experiments and arrangements between objects, space and viewers. There could be a genealogy of encounters written which would include the work and exhibitions of the Minimalists, Duchamp’s Readymades as well as others.

A double reading of the word ‘spacecraft’ is explored here – spacecraft as UFO and spacecraft as space that is crafted. This engages with space that exists but is in excess – extraspace, space beyond, virtual space. In this exhibition, the conjunction between the object, viewer and space is one which is not reduced. The moment of encounter becomes a creative moment of interiorisation. Rather than a neutral space where meaning resides either in the object being viewed or the viewer, a new meaning happens in the excess. Sensed rather than reflected, what the affect is can only be made intelligible after the encounter.¹²

Passing through a tunnel-like foyer space, *SPACECRAFT 0701* was entered via the middle gallery. Ahead in the corner of this dimly-lit space – at some distance – something, suspended high, gently rotated producing a soft whirring noise as it cast delicate shadows on adjacent walls. A series of intersecting transparent shapes, assembled on the ground beside and up a wall, became visible on approach; light refracting off edges of star-like forms. A large U-shaped form with an almost mirror-like surface glinted from afar through an opening to another gallery space. The colour of clothing caught and distorted on its surfaces. The illumination levels of this adjoining gallery made the white walls brighter; the wall to the immediate left on entering was covered in lines

---

which faded in and out of vision, a mix of clear plastic matter and grey shadow enticed examination of this peripheral glimpse. Long slender lines of timber articulated the wall opposite. At the end of the gallery, the surface of a screen detected movement making its moiré pattern unstoppable. In this gallery, a series of miniature works on slim tall pedestals waited. Approached from behind, these shell-like forms opened up as one moved around them to reveal an inside composed of intricately assembled matter. At the other end of the gallery, a group of poised containers – strangely animate. Returning to the middle gallery, a sightline connected with a gallery space on the opposite side – a partially visible, folded, round, internally-illuminated form hovered above head-height. In this space, a series of plinths needed inspection up close – a coat pocket stitched with intersecting lines, a pair of bumble-bee striped pantyhose cut off just below the crotch beside a photograph of someone wearing them on their head balaclava-like outside a place called Ducky Duck’s. Another corner invited one in close until a series of faint blue-line drawings of a corner, a portable corner in different situations, became visible. There were other things to see in the three spaces. Leaving this gallery, a porthole-like form wrapped around an external corner of wall – looking in, the middle gallery space was shifted – disorienting spatial relations. Exit and entrance to the exhibition were the same, back through the blue-lit foyer, passing/pausing at the Spacecraft visitors’ book.

... the difference between placing the object as something that is to be recognised and placing the object as something to be encountered in space.\textsuperscript{13}

This distinction between encounter and recognition was inspired by reading Deleuze’s \textit{Proust and Signs} and was the guiding idea in the making of \textit{SPACECRAFT 0701}.

To be sensitive to signs, to consider the world as an object to be deciphered, is doubtless a gift. But this gift risks remaining buried in us if we do not make the necessary encounters, and these encounters would remain ineffective if we failed to overcome stock notions. The first of these is to attribute to the object the sign it bears. Everything encourages us to do so: perception, passion, intelligence, even self-

\textsuperscript{13} Ibid.
esteem. We think that the ‘object’ itself has the secret of the signs it emits. We scrutinize the object, we return to it in order to decipher the sign. … We recognize things, but we never know them. What the sign signifies we identify with the person or object it designates. We miss our finest encounters, we avoid the imperatives that emanate from them: to the exploration of encounters we have preferred the facility of recognition.¹⁴

SPACECRAFT 0701 was an exhibition that foregrounded an ‘exploration of encounters’; encounters with things not already fixed in advance of the encounter to be discovered or recognised. The viewer was invited to spend time with the surface effects of objects affected by lighting and spatial qualities without the implication of something to be recognised and identified in the process. Close encounters were encouraged through the selection and arrangement of the objects where spatial proximities produced different views, information and ideas. Here the practice of placing worked spatial and material conditions, as distinct from a curatorial approach that places objects in relation to a curatorial theme or narrative.

The catalogue was also considered in terms of a spatial encounter. The curatorial text came after the work rather than before it so as to foreground an encounter with the works. Each photograph was hand-pasted into the catalogue like an album of collected UFO sightings. The curatorial text at the back did not offer an explanation of the work or the exhibition so much as a series of thoughts and orientations. Like the exhibition design, the writing did not attempt to possess and locate the work but to mobilize it, to interiorize in relation to an outside as one of contingency and forces.

There are many types of encounters in space. They are often quickly grounded by desires for certainty and gravity. The Cartesian grid is a common device. Objects and subjects are located in relation to each other; the excess of space is reduced and controlled in an effort to identify. Rather than site-specific objects, these objects in this exhibition move – moving between different spaces, their affect is also

moving. They make site specific wherever they land and rest – however momentarily. The gallery is passed through rather than occupied. Such encounters may be unexpected, disorientating, even alien, but they are creative propositions. *SPACECRAFT 0701* is sighted, sited and cited as an exhibition of encounters – because what comes out of the blue can be exciting.\(^{15}\)

---

**Spacecraft – objects / UFO**

The idea of spacecraft was deployed through the selection of objects: how they worked a dynamic relation between interior and exterior, inner and outer space, inside and outside. In this exhibition:

... each object engages with the concept of spacecraft as a mobile, non-site specific object which, when sited, affects the surrounding space, crafting it like a tangible material. Phenomena such as light, shadow, air, movement and gravity are part of the encounter. A word commonly used in spacecraft discussions, ‘extra’, can be used here. It means outside and beyond; examples include the extra-terrestrial or the extracorporeal. *SPACECRAFT 0701* is an exhibition of extra-objects where the extra of the object is encountered.\(^{16}\)

The idea of a UFO as an unidentified flying object – as something which is not already known and contextualised, that was mobile and phenomenal – was a technique used to shift the anticipation and approach to the objects as well as the projection of the viewer. Objects were placed spatially in a way to open them up as *things* first before they became objectified through identification. This was observed in a review of the exhibition by art critic, Robert Nelson:

---

\(^{15}\) Attiwill, “Sightings, Sitings, Citings.”

\(^{16}\) Ibid.
The works in the show thus acquire a kind of spacecraft status, because they are sighted as if from afar as impressively alien and unfathomable.\textsuperscript{17}

In \textit{SPACECRAFT 0701}, as one moved between the three galleries, sightlines were worked to destabilise the idea of a centrally-placed object – a key technique used in exhibition hangings where objects are placed centrally and in particular when viewed from one gallery into another, usually signalling a key work in the exhibition. Things were sited/sighted off-centre, sometimes with the back of the object facing the main approach – so people had to walk around to view the front or face of the object. Some invited/required people to walk up close to inspect; surfaces of some things became animated through movement producing moiré patterns, slipping from view, reflecting not only the viewer but surroundings. This shift from ‘a kind of frontal relation which continues to posit the work of art at the centre of all processes of producing meaning’\textsuperscript{18} was a deliberate tactic to rupture the privileging of a facial encounter that invokes a need to recognise.

Each thing before it became object produced multiple encounters and invited viewers to suspend the imperative to find meaning – even if only momentarily. As singular sightings, UFOs land and make site specific – as distinct from being site specific. In this way, the exhibition of \textit{Spacecraft} was composed of singular sightings where meaning is not produced in relation to an existing context but emerges through encounters over the duration of the exhibition – becoming singular, one-off.

Working in a white cube with questions of objects and space connects with precedents such as the Minimalists and their attempt to shift from the idea of an object as embodying meaning to an engagement with spatial and material conditions in relation to encounters with objects:

\begin{quote}
Minimalist sculptors began with a procedure for declaring the externality of meaning. ... these artists reacted against a sculptural illusionism which converted one material into the signifier of another: stone, for example, into flesh – an illusionism that withdraws the sculptural object from literal space
\end{quote}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{17} Robert Nelson, “Foreign Objects with Designs on Art,” \textit{The Age} (Melbourne, August 4, 2001), sec. Saturday Arts. 19.
\end{flushright}
and places it in a metaphorical one. These artists refused to use edges and planes to shape an object so that its external image would suggest an underlying principle of cohesion or order or tension. As with metaphor, the implication of this order is that it lies beyond the simple externals of the object – its shape or substances – endowing that object with a kind of intentional or private centre. This extraordinary dependence upon the facts of an object’s exterior, in order to determine what it is …

While the Minimalist challenge to the idea of an object as a container of meaning connects with the idea of spatial encounter engaged through the practice of Spacecraft, the exterior of Spacecraft was not only the exterior of the object to be encountered by the subject but an idea of an outside as unknown/outer space opened up a different space of inhabitation – even if momentarily – before the question ‘what is it’ is posed.

**Space, spatial design, spacecraft, interior design**

There was an on-going attempt in my practice at this time to shift the privileging of the object – to open up ‘the “empire of the object” beyond its immediate boundaries’ – through an emphasis on the spatial aspect of interior design rather than thinking of space as a void where objects are placed in empty space and displayed in an autonomous kind of way. The concept of ‘spacecraft’ as a verb highlighted the activity of crafting space. This was a tactic to shift from the design of space as one which might concentrate on the container and architectural features to one which engaged with and explored space as a medium, as matter, in the manner of craft as a practice concerned with materials, making and techniques. The homogeneous space of the white cube was a medium to be worked.

---


The pedestal melted away, leaving the spectator waist-deep in wall-to-wall space. As the frame dropped off, space slid across the wall, creating turbulence in the corners. ... The new god, extensive, homogenous space, flowed easily into every part of the gallery. All impediments except ‘art’ were removed. No longer confined to a zone around the artwork, and impregnated now with the memory of art, the new space pushed gently against its confining box.\textsuperscript{21}

As both an exhibition and a concept, ‘spacecraft’ engaged with the space of the white cube. The conjunction of ‘craft’ with space made space feel tangible and emphasised an idea of spatial production and space crafting in relation to interior design. Techniques included ways of working to activate the space. As a way of determining the arrangement of the exhibition, I continuously walked the gallery to actualise potentials and think through potential encounters and connections: along walls, across spaces, around corners, in and out of spaces, in and out of the gallery building. Spatial choreography was a term I used to describe my approach to making/designing exhibitions – a choreography involving things, people and objects working spatial encounters to shift from the expected engagement with an object.\textsuperscript{22}

In a review of \textit{SPACECRAFT 1001}, the second instalment of \textit{SPACECRAFT 0701}, design reviewer and critic Natalie Hill writes:

Typically in curatorial work, a collection of objects is placed within a theoretical grid or taxonomy of meaning. The spaces between are often rendered neutral, neglecting the opportunity for these spaces to construct a way of how things are understood –


\textsuperscript{22} The distinctiveness of this spatial practice as a curatorial approach received interest at the time and I was invited to give lectures and contribute to panels, including:

- ‘Spacecraft’, invited lecture as part of \textit{Curatorial Lab} A workshop for emerging curators organised by 200 Gertrude Street, Melbourne. 19 August 2001

- Presentation to Contemporary Craft and Design Curators national meeting, Sydney, 12–14 September 2001.


within and as part of the gallery…. Taking a spatial point of view rather than a thematic one, the exhibition endeavoured to work with the thoroughfare of its new location and the way in which the objects are brought together for a second time. In this way, the spatial potential of the gallery is re-examined and given a new vitality; the objects, mobile and non-site specific, affect the surrounding space, "crafting it like tangible material", says Attiwill. The viewer navigates through a constellation of objects seemingly connected by an invisible thread. Weaving through the space, the viewer is simultaneously engaged with aspects such as 'the corner' or 'the window' of the gallery.23

Hill’s reference to the craft practice of weaving – ‘weaving through space’ – made several connections with my thinking: in particular, to my previous practice as a weaver in the earlier 1980s as well as a quote from the philosopher Michel Foucault that I was working with at the time of the Spacecraft exhibitions:

The present epoch will perhaps be above all the epoch of space. We are in the epoch of simultaneity: we are in the epoch of juxtaposition, the epoch of the near and far, of the side-by-side, of the dispersed. We are at a moment, I believe, when our experience of the world is less that of a long life developing through time than that of a network that connects points and intersects with its own skein.24

A photograph I came across in O’Doherty’s book – Marcel Duchamp’s Mile of String – was another connection. While it was meant to be sixteen miles of string, Duchamp wove string through and across an exhibition of Surrealist art. Duchamp’s role in this exhibition – the International Exhibition of Surrealism in Paris, 1938 – was as ‘producer-referee’ (or in French ‘generateur-arbitre’)

and he was responsible for the overall installation of the exhibition.\textsuperscript{25} O’Doherty writes how Duchamp’s action was an example of ‘spacing and one of the main concerns of his practice: to highlight pictorial convention and the forces of the gallery space, that ‘... to paint something is to recess it in illusion, and dissolving the frame transferred that function to the gallery space. Boxing up space (or spacing up the box) is part of the central theme of Duchamp’s art: containment/inside/outside’.\textsuperscript{26}

Another precedent for thinking about the gallery as space in relation to questions of interior is the work of Melbourne-based artist Stephen Bram. In 1995, he was involved in an exhibition also at Monash University Gallery titled \textit{Fashion Décor Interior}.\textsuperscript{27} Working on \textit{SPACECRAFT 0701}, I remembered walking through Bram’s earlier installation in the same space – he was one of three artists and his work addressed the ‘interior’ part of the exhibition’s title. There was a series of small white geometric forms arranged on the floor. One had the sense of walking through an exploded perspective drawing – of being \textit{in} the work – as the forms were angled and created a series of connecting lines across the floor which activated the room.

The idea of interior in my work hasn’t been so much one which is related to design or architectural design, it’s been more related to fairly traditional ideas to do with subjectivity, the idea of a perceptual screen, or a visual screen. In a sense I’m interested in a less critical idea of design which emphasises the value of formal investigation, and with the proviso that ‘formal’, in that context, is not synonymous with morphological, to do with shape. It’s to do with conforming to a method of investigation that can be reduced to another language, an investigation that can be represented in plan form, or as a model, as a series of numbers, or as a set of conditions. In a sense I’m really

\textsuperscript{25} Bruce Altshuler, \textit{The Avant-Garde in Exhibition. New Art in the 20th Century} (New York: Harry N. Abrams, Inc, 1994). 118. This is how Duchamp was listed in the catalogue for the exhibition; so he was in the role of exhibition designer and curator. I often think about using the terms of generator/producer and arbitrator/referee instead of exhibition designer/maker and curator! And the potential of this take on curatorial practice and the production of knowledge.\textsuperscript{26} O’Doherty, \textit{Inside the White Cube: The Ideology of the Gallery Space}. 72-73.\textsuperscript{27} Natalie King, ed., \textit{Fashion Decor Interior} (Melbourne: Monash University Gallery, 1995).
interested in design as an antithesis to craft. ... design as intent or planning.\textsuperscript{28}

A number of years later I came across a review of Bram’s work that made even more explicit connections with interior design:

In essence, Bram makes reference to the kinds of space people inhabit. He has noted himself that the work is in essence an exploration of interiors – both the conceptual and the structural. In his new work he has acknowledged the notion of space in terms of length as well as depth creating, if you like, a kind of new interior design. ... One of the main themes of Bram’s work is the articulation of the relationship between the interior of the work and the space it is in.\textsuperscript{29}

In relation to interior design, \textit{SPACECRAFT 0701} was different in approach. While there was a sense of people being in space – a web of relations like Duchamp and Bram – the outside was critical in opening up a sense of an encounter with the unknown, an outside which was not defined and hence one where the viewer was also decentred from the position of knower.

As O’Doherty noted: ‘Most of us now “read” the [exhibition] hanging as we would chew gum – unconsciously and from habit’.\textsuperscript{30} I sought to disrupt the process of recognition and identification through not using central sightlines and horizon-line hangs – not to thwart the viewer like Duchamp – but to make them sensitive to placement, to the need for them to negotiate the object as distinct from positioning them face-to-face ready for a moment of recognition; to make apparent the tangibility of space, the here and now, ‘the turbulence in the corners’ and a sense of viewing as a dynamic and changing encounter.

\textsuperscript{28} Bram in ibid. 9.
\textsuperscript{30} O’Doherty, \textit{Inside the White Cube: The Ideology of the Gallery Space}. 15.
In *SPACECRAFT 0701* the relation between subject and object was played and teased with; objects perceptually changed as people moved through the exhibition. Things came out of the blue, the viewer walking through a blue-lit foyer into the exhibition, their expectation for an established context within which to read the work was challenged by the idea of spacecraft. Instead they were encouraged to feel comfortable about being ‘lost in space’, lost in the space of the white cube as desert where UFOs are spotted and occasionally land. Periphery vision was brought into play through the siting and sighting of objects; objects appearing and disappearing as one moved through the galleries. Eyes were thwarted as the mechanism for knowing. Physical movement through the gallery space became amplified as a technique: people had to walk around the space, between works, up close to some, in order to see them, read labels. Circulating through the three gallery spaces to see objects, one had to move around the gallery space – through it, around perimeters – as things were not placed in central sightlines. This ploy was to make viewers aware of movement and how this activated different positions and ideas about what was encountered through many different connections. In this way the viewer was not invited in as static entity but as a mobile maker moving through the space, encountering, gathering and assembling – as a visitor. ‘Visitor’ invites a different mode of subjectivization to one that positions the viewer as knower. The need to take possession of the object is stalled – even if only briefly – in favour of openness to not knowing and the temporariness of a visit.

This concern with the viewing subject in the making of an exhibition and the experiment to shift Cartesian and phenomenological concepts of object/subject relations made apparent an array of different viewers and exhibition subjects. O’Doherty identifies two white cube subjects: the Spectator (also called the Viewer, Observer, Perceiver – required to stand in front of each new work) and the disembodied Eye (‘the snobbish cousin’) who ‘is the only inhabitant of the sanitized installation shot’.\(^{31}\) Another white cube subject is that produced by Minimalist sculpture – a phenomenological subject referred to as ‘the situated spectator, whose self-conscious perception of the minimal object in relation to the site of its installation produced the work’s meaning’.\(^{32}\)

---

\(^{31}\) Ibid. The Spectator, see p. 39; The Eye, p. 42.

The diagrams of an exhibition viewer by the early twentieth-century exhibition designer Herbert Bayer have accompanied my exhibition practice and hence this PhD.\textsuperscript{33}

While they situate the viewer at the centre of production of meaning and as a huge eye – a different viewer from one encouraged in \textit{Spacecraft} – I am taken by the expression of the potential of design in the activation of space. There are very few diagrams of exhibition viewers in the history of exhibition-making that are not the standard diagram found in exhibition design manuals which demonstrate the conventional, ergonomic frontal horizontal, 1500mm eye-level hang. And despite Bayer’s experimentation this kind of ‘hang’ continues to be seen as natural.

For the first time Bayer presented his famous drawing of the exhibition viewer whose head has been replaced by an immense surreal eye tracking lines of vision to panels moving from the floor to forty-five-degree angles off the floor, standing before the wall, tilted at angles extending downward from the wall, indeed looking down from the ceiling. Never before had an exhibition-space designer recognised that the line of vision was not limited to the horizontal plane and determined to utilise the immense motility of the eye to focus angles that encouraged the eye to swivel, to rise, and to lower. ... Bayer had succeeded in totally shifting the emphasis from the display to the viewer. Since it had always been assumed that displays required a flat frontality, constraining space to its two-

\textsuperscript{33} Even longer – the first time I encountered Bayer’s diagram was in 1991 through Peter Cripps’s exhibition \textit{Another History for H.B and R.L} at Anna Schwartz’s City Gallery, Melbourne. This work was a 1:1 actualization of one of Bayer’s diagram – but rather than an exhibition of images, the planes were MDF boards and hence a non-reflective viewing surface.

Bayer’s diagrams of the exhibition viewer have accompanied this PhD since then and with surprising coincidences. In 2005, a fellow postgraduate candidate Simon Lloyd gave me a July 1947 copy of \textit{Interiors} that had an article on Herbert Bayer’s exhibition design and one of his exhibition viewer diagrams on the cover. It is also interesting to note that on this cover Bayer’s practice is referred to as industrial design rather than interior design. Historically, exhibition design has been a specialization of industrial design – emphasising the design of showcases and graphics. Exhibition design situated within the discipline of interior design highlights the spatial aspects of the exhibition.
dimensional wall surface in the service of that dumb, lazy, immobile viewer who stands grimly uncomprehending before the display-covered wall, nobody had undertaken to systematically break the plane.\textsuperscript{34}

In 1935, he produced the \textit{Diagram of 360 Degrees Field of Vision} that expanded on the previous diagram to include a platform raised above the ground enabling the viewer to scan the wall, ceiling and floor panels. It also suggests the mobility of the viewer along the platform as distinct from suggesting a static viewing position.\textsuperscript{35}

While the visitor of \textit{Spacecraft} was also mobilised, they were not privileged as either the producer of meaning or the translator of existing meaning. There was an attempt through the exhibition design to shift the centrality of the subject as knower through the production of encounters which invited the unknown.

\textbf{?interior, practices of interiorization, interior designs}

Art critic Thomas McEvilley in the introduction to \textit{Inside the White Cube} wrote:

The white cube was a transitional device that attempted to bleach out the past and at the same time control the future by appealing to supposedly transcendental modes of presence and power. But the problem with transcendental principles is that by definition they speak of another world, not this one. It is this other world, or access to it, that the white cube represents. It is like Plato’s vision of a higher metaphysical realm where form, shining attenuated and abstract like mathematics, is utterly disconnected from the life of human experience


\textsuperscript{35} Visit \url{http://archiveofaffinities.tumblr.com/post/1542315348/herbert-bayer-diagram-of-360-degrees-field-of}. This was the diagram on the cover of the 1947 \textit{Interiors} magazine.
here below. (Pure form would exist, Plato felt, even if this world did not).  

In the production of *SPACECRAFT 0701*, different forces were worked through the selection and valuing of craft – as object, as a mode of making, as UFO. Materiality, haptic encounters, phenomena, lighting, sightings, citings, sitings rendered experience ‘meaningful not by grounding empirical particulars in abstract universals but by experimentation’.  

As objects of encounter the dominant relationship of subject and object as knower and known was not privileged. The interior of the object as an embodiment of meaning and the interior of the subject as an autonomous independent sovereign entity (like the Cartesian subject of perspectival viewing) were side-lined even if temporality – to see what else might happen. Curiosity was encouraged.

... I like the word [curiosity]; it suggests something quite different to me. It evokes ‘care’; it evokes the care one takes of what exists and what might exist; a sharpened sense of reality; but one that is never immobilised before it; a readiness to find what surrounds us strange and odd; a certain determination to throw off familiar ways of thoughts and to look at the same things in a different way; a passion for seizing what is happening now and what is disappearing; a lack of respect for the traditional hierarchies of what is important and fundamental ... I dream of a new age of curiosity. We have the technical means; the desire is there; there is an infinity of things to know; the people capable of doing such work exist.

The objects selected were not alien objects but, as craft and design objects, had connections with the everyday. To pose these as objects of encounter – as unidentified flying objects – was to suspend the process of recognition and to open up the potential for the new, for something to surface, to come out of the blue. It was also to interrupt the arrival of the phenomenological subject where

---

'... the act of perception or cognition is a reflection of what is already “pre-” embedded in the world. ... [where] Every phenomenological event is like returning home.'

The objects have been gathered from a range of different and diverse disciplines, spaces (both cultural and historical), purposes, functions and intentions. Their collection and arrangement together for the first time in the gallery space highlights their mobility across boundaries and their affect on surroundings. I am reminded of the scene in the film *The Gods Must Be Crazy* when a coke bottle is thrown from an aeroplane flying over a desert – to those on the ground, the object appears to fall from the sky. The fact that the objects in this exhibition were not conceived specifically for the exhibition in response to a curatorial brief and have existed in other contexts is an integral part of the exhibition. It provides an opportunity to consider what is currently being made and to project from this rather than seek to establish a position of critique.

In 2008, I visited an exhibition at the Barbican Art Gallery in London called the *Martian Museum of Terrestrial Art*. It was an exhibition of over one hundred works of contemporary art from the 1960s onwards. The works were presented as a collection made by extra-terrestrial anthropologists who had visited Earth and were now exhibiting this collection to a Martian audience. I became a Martian viewer for a couple of hours and encountered familiar works in unfamiliar ways.

In the Martian Museum, fictional interplanetary distance deliberately establishes the same gap in knowledge that the passing of time and cultural displacement generate between ancient and present civilisations. This gap creates a space for human

---

41 Attiwill, “Sightings, Sitings, Citings.”
visitors to be abducted from the interpretative structure in which they are normally immersed, and to see their own cultural products from an alien perspective.43

The approach taken in SPACECRAFT 0701 with an emphasis on materiality and exhibition design techniques to activate spatial relations of inside and outside where sightings, sitings and citings were produced through the event of the encounter was an attempt to work with forces as distinct from pre-existing meaning. As an interior design and through a process of selection, other forces were activated to open up the timeless white cube interior to an outside and encourage a process of interiorization in the midst of movement and phenomena where the impetus to make familiar and known was held off. The exhibition was an invitation to grapple with forces, to become curious and sensitive to material signs and to make connections with the unforeseen.

43 Francesco Manacorda, "Interplanetary Ethnography," Encyclopaedia of Terrestrial Life. Volume VIII. Art (London: Barbican Art Gallery in association with Merrell Publishers Ltd, 2008), 214. The curator Nicolas Bourriaud’s thesis in Postproduction is another reference in this context. He writes of art-making and curating in relation to sampling like a DJ; working with signs already in the world to produce new compositions. (Nicolas Bourriaud, Post Production (New York: Lukas & Sternberg, 2002). This approach, like the Martian Museum, foregrounds signs as meaning whereas the concept of spacecraft works with signs as symptoms produced by external and internal forces.
a matter of time
In 2002, I was invited to curate the 16th Tamworth Fibre Textile Biennial; an exhibition of Australian textiles and fibre which toured nationally for two years. When the biennial began in 1975, it was a survey show. In 1996, this changed to a process involving a guest curator who was invited to develop a curatorial proposition and exhibition with the view to engaging Australian textiles and fibre practice in a critical discourse addressing contemporary issues.¹

This invitation came ‘out of the blue’ and brought with it a series of potential connections which otherwise probably would not have been made with the PhD research. While there was ongoing focus on craft, the specificity of textiles picked up a number of loose threads from my past. During the mid-1980s, after completing a degree in art history, I decided I wanted to make things. I had received my grandmother’s table loom after her death and decided to learn how to weave. I completed a Certificate in Applied Art at the Melbourne College of Textiles and set up a studio in the city – with a much larger floor loom. Another connection was the artist Sophie Taeuber-Arp (1889-1943). Taeuber-Arp was the subject of my honours thesis in art history. The thesis research concentrated on the interiors she designed and produced as part of the Café Aubette commission in Strasbourg in 1928.² She was also a textile artist who produced works and taught weaving at the School of Applied Arts in Zurich. The decision to accept the invitation to curate the biennial was based on a gut feeling that this coincidence and connection with textiles again would be valuable in relation to this PhD.

To make connections one needs not knowledge, certainty, or even ontology but rather … a trust that something may come out, though one is not yet completely sure what.³

¹ In 2011, the format changed again and it became a triennial event.
² She collaborated with Jean Arp and Theo van Doesburg in the Café Aubette project. The focus of my thesis was a work of art – a low relief panel held by the National Gallery of Australia attributed to Taeuber-Arp. The NGA had just opened and there were a number of works which had been bought for the new collection and perhaps due to the rush involved in the opening, did not have a clear provenance. Through the advice of my thesis supervisor, Harriet Edquist (at that time fine arts lecturer at University of Melbourne), I worked with the NGA’s international art curator Michael Lloyd and researched available literature and works to determine the provenance. This research has been recognized by the NGA: ‘The connection between the Australian National Gallery’s panel and the stained-glass windows of Aubette has been convincingly established by Suzie Attiwill in ‘The Modern Fairytale. The Café Aubette, Strasbourg, 1928’, BA thesis, University of Melbourne 1983, cf. pp. 29–33. Michael Lloyd and Michael Desmond, European and American Paintings and Sculptures 1870–1970 in the Australian National Gallery (Australia: Australian National Gallery, 1992). 181, footnote 4. Also visit http://nga.gov.au/International/Catalogue/Detail.cfm?IRN=116207.
The commissioning brief specified the need to include textiles and fibre from around Australia, for the exhibition to make a critical contribution, to engage a diverse audience and for selected works to be able to tour. In this project, I was also clearly positioned as a curator who was responsible for the curatorial proposition, selection and arrangement of work, as well as loan agreements, condition reports and expert advice to gallery staff on correct curatorial processes and procedures.

The biennial was supported by substantial funding with a significant amount allocated to travel and to research current practice in Australia. In the preparation of the exhibition from 2003 to 2004, I travelled to Sydney, Brisbane, Hobart, Launceston, Perth, Fremantle, Adelaide, Elcho Island and Ramingining meeting with practitioners, visiting studios and homes, looking at work, discussing ideas, materials and techniques. This was a significant opportunity for me to research and engage with textile and fibre practice.

My curatorial provocation was not a theme nor a brief but a quote from an introductory essay by Sue Rowley in a book she edited called *Reinventing Textiles*: ‘It is useful to think of craft in terms of multiple temporalities’. Highlighting ‘thinking’ – a way of approaching craft – in relation to multiple temporalities and the potential usefulness of this approach produced an orientation which was open and available, engaged in seeing and listening, rather than one which sought to identify and locate. It was a proposition that I directed to myself as curator rather than others – as an idea through which to think, select work, make connections and produce the biennial. I carried this quote with me to different hotel rooms and studios, driving through rural landscapes, visiting townhouses in Australia Street, flying to Ramingining and Elcho Island in Arnhem Land.

The quote also made connections with interior and interior design for me at a time when I was bringing the question of time in to a discussion of the history of interior design. In the introduction to *Architecture from the Outside*, Elizabeth Grosz raises the question of time in relation to inhabitation and a different way of thinking space:

---
5 In 2000 I joined the interior design program at RMIT University in a continuing academic position. From 2000 to 2010, I coordinated history and theory in the program. During this time I invented a course which addressed a history and theory of interior design in relation to questions of interior and interior designing as spatial and temporal compositions.
How can we understand space differently, in order to organise, inhabit, and structure our living arrangements differently? [This book] proposes two directions in searching for an answer: first, in the direction of time, duration, or temporal flow, ... usually conceptualised as the other, the outside, or the counterpart to space. My central argument throughout is that architecture, geography, and urban planning have tended to neglect or ignore temporality or to reduce it to the measurable and the calculable, that is, to space. It is central to the future of architecture that the question of time, change and emergence become more integral to the process of design and construction.6

Grosz’s focus on the question of inhabitation and living arrangements made connections for me to the practice of interior design and the fact that then, and still now, interior design is referred to a spatial design discipline and the temporal, while acknowledged in terms of the performative and programming, is understood in relation to space as an existing condition rather than as Grosz suggests in the production of space.

So while the connection between textiles, craft and temporality was the main focus of the exhibition, a matter of time became a vehicle for engaging with ideas addressing time and thinking in relation to interior and interior designing. Time, temporality and duration are concepts frequently mentioned in relation to space and interior design yet they are difficult to articulate. The biennial was an opportunity to experience and experiment with these in a material and tangible way.

a matter of time has been the working title for the exhibition since May 2003. When Brian Langer invited me to curate the 16th biennial, the concept of time in relation to textiles and fibres came to mind. From the point of view of now, I can see how certain ideas have emerged to become important in shaping the exhibition. A curator’s text would usually address these as points or – to pick up on a

textile metaphor – curatorial threads. For many months, this is how I imagined I might organise and arrange the exhibition. At different points, I attempted to draw out threads to do with time from the work I had selected – for example ritual, history, memory, everyday, tradition, technique and so on. Each time, however, these attempts reduced the complexities of the work and this in turn deferred any endeavour to weave them back together as a way of making the exhibition. Instead I have found myself caught up in a process of metamorphosis; as the curator I have become implicated, enveloped and entangled. Like a blanket folded, unfolded, wrapped, de-threaded, re-woven, draped – the form of the exhibition has taken shape through various forces internal and external. It could have been held still so as to conform to a pre-determined curatorial structure but then it would not have been a matter of time so much about time.

... In the selection of work for the exhibition, I was keen to locate work that was not about time but was an experience of time. When pushed to articulate what I meant by this, it was difficult to explicate as it involved a fine balance that shifted the emphasis about idea and material. There has been in Western modernist culture a privileging of representational idea over matter and this has also been manifested in contemporary textile and fibre practice. My focus on time however was not as an abstract system or concept, but how craft practice privileges matter organising it through different techniques and in the process actualising time. The works and exhibition therefore become a matter of time. Hence the title of the exhibition a matter of time and not ‘it’s about time’ as some people had suggested as an alternative. These are two distinct and different relations to time.
This also opens up other possible ways of encountering the work and exhibition – one where material and process becomes content. The work then is not approached so much as something which is re-presenting an idea, as an illustration of an idea, but comes forward, envelops you, implicates you in the production of its meaning. It is still in process and produced by temporal and spatial relations and forces. People – artists, curator, writer, and audience – become participants in the production of a matter of time.  

Space

The SPACECRAFT exhibitions had hovered around a question of the movement of an exhibition – with the movement of objects from one space to another and the effects and affects produced through this process of movement and landings in different contexts. The potential to experiment with this further was presented with the invitation to curate a touring exhibition. The specific details of the tour such as where and when were not known in advance but developed during the two years of preparation. Prospective galleries were invited to submit expressions of interest in hosting the exhibition based on the curatorial proposition and a list of unconfirmed participants.  

a matter of time toured to nine metropolitan and regional public galleries from December 2004 to September 2006. Not only did the works tour but so did I to install the exhibition, attend and speak at openings and associated public

---

7 Suzie Attiwill, “a matter of time,” in a matter of time. 16th Tamworth Fibre Textile Biennial (Tamworth: Tamworth Regional Art Gallery, 2004), 5–7. 5-6. Working with the commissioning gallery’s expectations, the catalogue and its format followed standard conventions. For example, the catalogue text was published at the beginning of the catalogue to act as an introduction to the exhibition and position the works. (I prefer for the text to come after the work – as happened with the catalogue for SPACECRAFT 0701.) An opportunity to shift conventions was taken through inviting Linda Marie Walker to contribute a text as a work (rather a text about the work). Her essay ‘Brushing the Instant’ is a piece of text-ile – a X stitching.  

8 SPACECRAFT 0701 – Monash University Museum of Art, Clayton from 17 July to 25 August 2001. Six objects from this exhibition were moved to another space and became SPACECRAFT 1001, in the gallery-foyer space of Level 11, Design Park, 522 Flinders Lane from 22 October to 21 December, 2001.  

9 Tamworth Regional Gallery, RMIT Gallery, Gosford Regional Gallery, Jam Factory Craft and Design Gallery, Wagga Wagga Regional Gallery, Cairns Regional Gallery, Bunbury Regional Gallery, Object Gallery – Australian Centre for Design and Craft, Ballarat Art Gallery. See Appendix for specific dates of tour.
program activities such as floor talks. Linda Lou Murphy, one of the exhibitors, also toured and performed the actual installation of her work *drawing threads* at each opening.  

Usually the curator of a touring exhibition would do an installation plan prior to the tour. This would stipulate what and where works would be located according to the narrative of the exhibition. As such the configuration of the exhibition and arrangement of works is relatively fixed (unless there are things that are not visible on a plan but are encountered in actual elevation such as light switches and air vents). The local curator and installation technicians install the exhibition according to the prescribed arrangement and make adjustments where necessary, with the exhibition curator arriving the day of the opening for final adjustments. As the actual installation process is part of my exhibition practice, I was fortunate that Brian Langer, who was then director of Tamworth Regional Gallery, took this on board as part of the curatorial approach and worked the budget in a way to enable me to tour too.

For each installation, I arrived three to four days before the opening to work/walk out an arrangement for the exhibition. This process evaluated not only the particular spatial aspects of the gallery but also involved an experience with movements and sightlines through the galleries, the dynamics between the works in relation to the situation and how I was affected by the work over the duration of the tour as different works became amplified and different ideas surfaced through the conjunction with other works.

Each installation was a singular installation of the exhibition – an arrangement responding to spatial and temporal dynamics, external and internal forces, the works themselves as well as between them. The first installation of the exhibition – at the Tamworth Regional Gallery – happened in the brand new gallery. Nothing had ever been hung or pinned to the walls! A brand new white cube in its purist, most Ideal form. *a matter of time* was the first installation.

---

10 This project received a research award from the University of South Australia where Murphy was studying at the time. From the University of South Australia website: ‘The 2006 EAS Research Award for the ‘Highest Impact Publication/artefact by a PhD or Masters Student (Art, Architecture and Design) was won by Linda Patterson (aka Linda Lou Murphy), for her artefact (performance) *Drawing Threads* which attracted national attention to the possible new relations between performance art and new media with existing conventions of contemporary craft and visual art’. Visit http://w3.unisa.edu.au/easuresdeg/research/newsandevents/2006researchawards/researchawardsrecipients.asp.

11 I also needed to find a local hairdresser to do Linda Lou’s hair and make-up for each performance. We always found the best place for a steak and red wine. I remember the evening we headed out in Wagga Wagga – its wide-open streets and a sun-setting sky which seemed to cover us like a dome.
There was a sense of making the exhibition each time anew and of working spatial and temporal conditions of the situation in relation to dynamics and forces inclusive of works, people, spaces and circumstances. One had to grapple with these each time – the question of ‘which one is …’ brought the practice of selection and arrangement to the fore. There was a sense of working in the midst of forces; a palpable sense of dynamics and energy in the work when they came together each time. Arranging the works I encountered things I had not seen before and new ideas produced through different juxtapositions and contexts.

An education kit was commissioned by the Tamworth Gallery; something that was done for each biennial. This was done by someone else and was another arrangement of the exhibition. It presented an opportunity to appreciate the difference of my curatorial approach from an approach which employed a curatorial theme or narrative together with an awareness of my aspiration to keep everything in movement and mobile by not fixing and freezing what a work means or represents. The education kit was arranged around several themes: The Material Body; Time and Memory; Time and Identity; Material Time. The exhibition in contrast was not designed with or framed by a structure in advance of an encounter rather the approach was one which invited an expression of composing forces and energies in the production of meaning, time and time again.

Each arrangement of the exhibition began with the installation of Andrew Nicholl’s *Time after Time* – a light projection of a drawn textile. As I worked with the pieces, different things became actualized and the juxtaposition of things produced new ideas.

From a curatorial perspective, Attiwill has approached the exhibition as a type of choreographed event, which takes into consideration temporal and spatial aspects – such as how people move through the exhibition, spend time there, and the effects of lighting. a *matter of time* as an exhibition is itself a matter of time, as it tours to different venues and is performed and rearranged.12

---

This shifted the emphasis from the spatial medium of white cube (although there was still ‘turbulence in the corners!’). There was a sense of crafting and an actualization of time where each exhibition was like an arrested moment where movement was temporarily slowed down through the process of arranging into a temporary consistency.

The term ‘atmosphere’ came into a matter of time and was something that continued through the research and thinking of this PhD. Initially, it was introduced through an observation made by a colleague, Julieanna Preston, in relation to a matter of time at RMIT Gallery. Preston was embarking on a guest editorship of a special issue of Architectural Design – ‘Interior Atmospheres’. This prompted me to think about the idea of atmosphere and what Preston had seen or felt. Later in her introduction to the AD issue, she writes of atmosphere in relation to interiors in ways that suggest the theatrical, experiential and subjective. Situated within a journal of architectural design, Preston highlights ‘two contemporary sources’ that ‘standout as notable exceptions to the unchartered territory of atmospheres within architectural design’ – the book Atmospheres by the architect Peter Zumthor which details a crafting of space and matter in the production of atmosphere and architectural theorist Mark Wigley’s essay ‘The Architecture of Atmosphere’ which speaks about architecture as décor, as a craft of special effects and theatricality.¹³

Prompted by Preston’s observation, I was reminded of my visit to Arnhem Land during the research phase of a matter of time. In the bush, there was a fullness and thickness to the air; an immanent quality as though it was teeming, a yielding quality, a sense of proliferation. The colours of the bush and sky together with sounds of birds, insects, matter, invited a different mode of connection from my usual sense of space. One of the few photographs I took on this trip continues to provoke this same palpable sensation. I became aware of a sense of being in as distinct from on the land.

A sensation, which is experienced fleetingly and characterizes the space that we occupy, cannot be described as though it was an object that we, as subjects, relate to. Rather moods, or what Gernot Böhme refers to as atmosphere, unify what in

philosophy has traditionally been separated into objects and subjects.\textsuperscript{14}

This experience of Arnhem Land created a shift in orientation from a feeling of being an object on the ground and a subject looking at things to a sense of being interconnected and a sensation of composing forces that affected and effected everything: the light shaping/producing forms, the crocodiles I couldn’t see as I didn’t know to look for a slight ripple in the surface of water. There was a sense of every thing – my self included – being simultaneously produced as part of a weaving of forces, light, colour.

**Objectness and subjectivities**

I remember having a mental image of the exhibition during the curatorial selection phase – it was one of brownness. Thinking of the works I had selected to that point, I realised brown was everywhere and in the form of blankets or blanket-related works. This also meant that most works would be hung on the walls, like two-dimensional works. The white cube would be covered in brown blankets. I remember a feeling of concern/vague horror/panic – wondering if this would be a problem, whether it might look dull, whether there needed to be some intervening exhibition design strategy in terms of presentation. The sense of vague horror was due to a self-doubt as I had not worked on an exhibition of this scale before – and I was not really a curator. I wondered if the brownness might be due to a lack of curatorial expertise in terms of scoping a project from the beginning. Here towards the finalization of works – everything felt brown. I had an image of people walking into the exhibition and seeing nothing but brown. Yet I also appreciated that this is what the process of making the exhibition had led to and the idea of a brown fibre cube appealed.

This sensation of being surrounded by brown blankets made manifest a shift from *SPACECRAFT 0701* – from objects and spatial encounters to textiles and while still spatial encounters, this was a different encounter from that of a UFO, an unidentified flying object. There was subtlety here between the works as well as the exhibition overall which was different to the positioning of each object as unknown and extraordinary. There was a sensibility running through

the works and exhibition – a sensitivity evident in the making of the works and their encounter, a feeling of different temporalities as well as spaces. Event-object was a term I worked with during this time. Event-object was a shift from the extra-object of SPACECRAFT; from an approach that attended to ideas of beyond and outside the object to one which emphasised objects as temporal compositions in movement.

Textiles are not adequately defined as objects. Textiles invite the hand and touch, wearing and draping, a close encounter of the haptic-kind rather than an optical one.

This activity of making as a process of becoming is distinct from an activity of recognition and identification; here the hand is privileged over the face, process over outcome and event over object. In this sense everything is in constant process: the individual objects and the exhibition. a matter of time becomes a space of production and production as distinct from an exhibition model of production (commissioning and selection of works) and reception (by audience).¹⁵

There was a sense of being ‘in’ as distinct from an encounter with an object. There was a different kind of closeness/proximity from close encounters with Spacecraft.

Attiwill herself stays well away from the language of opposition that breaks complex histories and methodologies down into narrow binary oppositions. The important links in all of the works in the exhibition are articulated in the title. These works are matter, the material of time, produced in and over time. They are encountered sensually and have relationships with the bodies of the audience members and with each other. Attiwill is interested in orchestrating the exhibition as an event, a temporal experience for the viewer that is multilayered and communicated through a sensory

engagement with the works. The works are not presented as some kind of thesis or illustrations of a set of theories, their communication is tacit, they affect the viewer and bring the audience in to participate in the exhibition as active agents.¹⁶

Her comments about curating such a show are striking: ‘The materiality of fibre and textiles derails any concept of a blank canvas. Instead one is always in the midst of something and engaging with things already in process, making relations that are dynamic and changing’.¹⁷

The works in a *matter of time* changed over the duration of the exhibition. As the curator, one of my responsibilities was completing condition reports on every work before the opening and at the conclusion of each exhibition, every change had to be noted visually and in writing with follow-up actions in an attempt to keep the object in the condition it was at the beginning of the tour. I became aware of how all things are in continual movement, how change is not reversible and how the idea of sameness is privileged over difference. Any change is seen as a degradation of the work which is to be halted if possible. Yet this idea of the Ideal static object was challenged by many of the works – in some, deliberately; others, unexpectedly. The deliberately unfixed ochre pigment of the baskets from Bula’bula Arts Aboriginal Collective fell from the baskets during the tour and on to the floor of the gallery; the newspaper of *Silence* yellowed and became brittle. Flux and change were foregrounded rather than things as stable entities. (A number of years after a matter of time when I was following up a connection in relation to atmosphere, I came across a series of drawings by Herbert Bayer – the exhibition designer cited in *SPACECRAFT* – called ‘Moving Mountains’, these are diagrams of mountains as moving forces.¹⁸)

This appreciation of movement and change as a condition of things began before the exhibition. During my research visits to studios, the repetitive processes of weaving, dyeing and stitching and the process of making as a

---


dynamic in relation to people’s lives was a powerful encounter. A sense of production and process, of transformation and change continued into the exhibition where the works continued to work and to change both materially and in meaning. This sense of movement and formation – of transformation – was there also in relation to subjects. In SPACECRAFT 0701 the visitor was the subject, with a matter of time there was a sense of a process of making subjects and making one’s self. I used the term participants in the catalogue and invited all – makers, viewers, myself – to be participants in the production of the exhibition. Through the technique of tapestry weaving, Sara Lindsay materialised her mother’s history. Linda Lou Murphy performed her past through Drawing Threads at each opening. And as the curator, I wove a new exhibition time and time again.

As we ... weave and unweave our bodies ... from day to day, their molecules shuttled to and fro, so does the artist weave and unweave his image.¹⁹

---

**Time**

From the curatorial essay for a matter of time:

Some multiple temporalities encountered in a matter of time in no particular order:


---

While a *matter of time* was an experiment posed in time and attending to the actualization of time while resisting the forces of representation, time is difficult to think and articulate; one ends up talking *about* time using abstract concepts.

We ‘naturally’ think of time through the temporality of objects, through the temporality of space and matter, rather than in itself or on its own terms. This is why it cannot be present or present itself, why we cannot look at it directly, why it disappears the more we try to grasp its characteristics. We can think of it only in passing moments or ruptures, through ruptures, nicks, cuts, in instances of dislocation, though it contains no moments or ruptures and has no being or presence, functioning only as a continuous becoming.

During the research phase of the curatorial process, time was discussed with and through the work as a materialization and actualization of temporalities – of pasts, presents and futures. Not in a linear way where time has a sense of being extended out – plotted and spatialized – but in an intensive way through making.

*In our conversations, Sue described history as both distant and close, near and far; of linear notions of time collapsing and, how through a re-imaging of events, the past becomes tangibly, materially present and makes possible a re-imagining.*

---

20 Attiwill, “a matter of time.” 7.
22 Attiwill, “a matter of time.” 14. The texts for the labels attempted to resist the established approach of the curator positioning the work for the viewer. With the labels for *a matter of time* two texts accompanied each work – the voice of the exhibitor who spoke of the work
Georgina offered to finish this piece for a matter of time. I was moved by her offer – as it was something that had been in process over a long period of time evolving with and materialising events in her life – and now she was ready to finish it.

Silence has such volatility – not only is it the materialisation of an event but it continues to transform as different events occur. The newspaper material changes over the duration of its life and the various and diverse relations to ‘9/11’ also change depending on what happens locally and globally.

Sara described this piece as a ‘reweaving of the family history’. As she worked on the tapestry, there was a sense of history becoming – personal, tangible, actualised – through materials and techniques, five centimetres for every year.23

Sara wove this tapestry at home – her mother would visit and talk about her past as Sara wove and her daughter listened. Linda Lou’s performance of her life history at each opening made palpable and affective a present as a straddling between a past and a future becoming. Each performance was intense and immediate – spatially and temporally. During the opening event, a sound track would start and people were asked to gather near a blank wall. Linda Lou appeared and performed the installation of her work – Drawing Threads. Drawing thread from her mouth, she moved along the wall, removing the things she was wearing – pleated and pinned paper garments and bags – and installed them on the wall. While each performance was a repetition of the same actions and involving the same objects at nine different galleries – the work and Linda Lou transformed in time and each time was an intensive moment of actualization of her life. Linda Lou’s hair grew over the two years of the tour and then, in the final performance, she used the scissors to cut not only the drawn thread but also, this time, her hair.24

and my voice (in italics) which recounted vivid ideas/points that emerged during our conversations.

23 Ibid. 16, 20 & 21 respectively.

In a short piece titled ‘Time & Space’, the writer Michel Tournier says time ‘is the very fabric of life’ and notes time ‘is distinguishable from space by its irreversibility alone’. A matter of time made palpable time as this ‘very fabric of life’ and drew my attention to the powerful potential of posing an interior as a practice open to movement and in time.25

I convened a forum to coincide with the launch of a matter of time at the Tamworth Regional Gallery in December 2004. The forum was called telling time and invited speakers included Paul Carter (a writer and artist), Robyn Healy (a former curator of Textiles at the National Gallery of Victoria) and Louise Hamby (an Australian Research Council Postdoctoral Fellow at the Centre for Cross Cultural Research, Australian National University and someone who has worked extensively in Arnhem Land) as well as a number of people who were participating in the exhibition.

At the conclusion of forum, Carter observed how each person’s talk made apparent the process of making as one of materialising temporality and how this repositioned craft as ‘a primary mode of thinking about, and constructing, the life world we inhabit’.26 This sense of lives and environments as produced and made invoked for me the potential of an interior design practice as a practice of interior-making.

The primacy of space and spatial encounters in relation to a practice of interior design engaged with in Spacecraft – addressing objects in space – shifted with a matter of time to a practice which was attentive to the dynamics of interior-making as a temporal practice open to movement. The textile quality of Duchamp’s Mile of String became highlighted again and yet with a different nuance from SPACECRAFT 0701 where it was an expression of spatial conditions. With a matter of time the web qualities of Duchamp’s installation as a weaving in and through movement came to the fore; stitching and actualizing time as ‘the very fabric of life’ – weaving a life as a practice of interiorization.

26 Carter’s book Material Thinking, The Theory and Practice of Creative Research had just been published and made a valuable connection with a matter of time as a research project and as a material thinking. Carter was the keynote speaker for Telling Time symposium and is someone who offered guidance in the early stages of this PhD.
Interior is a temporal condition for Deleuze:

It is not time that is interior to us, or at least it is not specifically interior to us; it is we who are interior to time, and for this reason time always separates us from what determines us by affecting it. Interiority constantly hollows us out, splits us in two, doubles us, even though our unity subsists. But because time has no end, this doubling never reaches its limit: time is constituted by a vertigo or oscillation ... 

Here interior is opened up from a substantive position – as space, objects and subjects – to movement in the production of subjects, objects and space. This idea of interiority as something that ‘constantly hollows us out’ and produces a split subject is a different relation from one which presupposes subjects and objects as given.

*a matter of time* was a process of production which engaged a practice of interior designing with the experiential world of materials, forces, chance, constraints to see what could happen, what I could do and what could be said and seen. It produced an awareness and appreciation of temporality and time in the production of interior and interiority: a shift from thinking interior in relation to objects in space to thinking interior designing in relation to time and how time affects and determines things, subjects and objects in an ongoing process of change.

Where movement stops, where time stops, where time stops moving, ‘passing’, there it starts to become. The passing present gives a false image of ‘real time’ as succession – as though the real of time could ever be clocked and captured by letting the camera run. Real time has nothing to do with the passing present, it starts when the present stops and we are thrust into its interior, the Milieu.

---


The experience in *a matter of time* – a milieu of brownness – produced a significant shift in my thinking from a practice of interior design as one addressing organized space and spatial relations to one which opened interior to movement and time – where movement is privileged and not subordinated to space as something that happens between established points in space.

During *a matter of time* I engaged the question of time more directly with interior design through conference and journal papers and posed the potential of thinking interior as affected by temporality as distinct from a focus on objects and built space as static form, and space as enclosure.

From an interior design position, this offers much to consider and rather than interior as always already inside something – inside a container – it suggests an interior as produced through the spatialization of matter by time: an event.29

This quote comes from a paper titled *Towards an Interior History* that I wrote in 2004. The paper has been referenced several times by interior design colleagues which in turn indicates both the prevalence of the equation of interior with space and the impact of inviting a consideration of the temporal. Through posing *interior in time* something new was offered up to the existing discourse.30

The practice – the ‘thinking as doing’31 – produced through making *a matter of time* rearranges the established practice of interior design from one which privileges organized space and hence an idea of interior as enclosure where time is understood in relation to movement in space – performance and program – to a practice which, through the posing of the question of interior, opens interior to movement and time.

---


making relations
making relations is the title of an exhibition I curated and designed for Contemporary Art Services of Tasmania (CAST). Invited as ‘an outsider’, the brief was to curate an exhibition of Tasmanian craft and design for CAST’s 2006 gallery program.

The advisory group determined that the critical perspective of a curator living and working outside of the state could provide unique insights into contemporary craft and design practice here. It is also hoped that the exhibitions will encourage critical discourse and exchange in the craft / design area within the state and beyond. These projects are, in a sense, an experiment in which the curators, approaching the Tasmanian scene as outsiders, are invited to travel throughout the state visiting artists and galleries and to then put together an exhibition of contemporary Tasmanian craft and design based on their findings. The advantage of this lies in both the fresh eye of the outsider and in the critical approach adopted by the curator. There was no particular brief for the project, except the recommendation that the work should be chosen from the established practice of the artists/designers rather than commissioned especially for the exhibition.¹

As with a matter of time, funding was allocated for the curator to research current practice and presented further opportunities to engage with craft and design through curatorial practice and exhibition design. The role of outsider made the brief compelling as a project to take on as part of the PhD. By extending an invitation to me, the CAST brief had created a curious subject – an outsider interior designer – and I was keen to be cast in this role. Coming from an outside, the established view of interior design as a practice of designing from the inside out comes into question. So was the reverse then implied – a designing from the outside in?

¹ Peter Hughes, “making relations: The Dialogue Between Objects in Tasmania,” ed. Kevin
I had been thinking about outsides and insides when I received CAST’s invitation to become an outsider. In April 2005, Gini Lee and I convened a symposium on behalf of the Interior Design/Interior Architecture Educators Association. Titled INSIDEOUT, the symposium brought interior design and landscape architecture together with the aim of encouraging ‘new thinking, research and teaching between interior and landscape discourse and practice’. Colleagues and friends for a number of years, the symposium was also another opportunity for us to do something together. Gini has a practice in both interior design and landscape architecture. And I was interested to see the potential for interior designing when two practices addressing spatial and temporal conditions were brought together without architecture as a pre-defining structure between them. Hence the title of the symposium – in side out – the siding of in and out.

I remember feeling a sense of mischievous glee at the idea of holding a conference where what is usually so dominant in the fields of landscape and interior and – in a literal sense, the middle bit between them – architecture – would be absent. I wondered what kinds of conversation might be had without a dominant voice and referent.

Elizabeth Grosz, invited as the keynote speaker, presented a paper titled *Chaos, Territory, Art. Deleuze and the Framing of the Earth* in which she proposed the concept of the frame as the condition of all the arts:

> The frame is what establishes territory from out of the chaos that is the earth. The frame is thus the first construction, the corners, of the plane of composition. Territories here may be understood as surfaces of variable curvature or inflection which bear upon them singularities, eruptions of events. … the constitution of territory is the fabrication of the space in which sensations may emerge, from which a rhythm, a tone, colouring, weight, texture may be

---


extracted. ... The frame separates. It cuts into a milieu or space. This cutting links it to the constitution of the plane of composition, to the provisional ordering of chaos through the laying down of a grid or order that entraps chaotic shards, chaoid states, to arrest or slow them into a space and a time, a structure and a form where they can affect bodies. This cutting of the space of the earth through the fabrication of a frame is the very gesture that composes both house and territory, inside and outside, interior and landscape at once, and as the points of maximal variation, the two sides, of the space of the earth.4

The concept of the frame brought architecture back into the conversation – so much for attempting to take the middle bit out! In the first session of the symposium, Grosz raised the question as to the very possibility and desirability of taking architecture out of the equation.5 This provoked me to rethink – and I realised that it was not architecture per se that was problematic but its associated concepts of permanency and, from an interior designer’s point of view, its already there-ness. For interior designers, architecture is a structure that exists in advance of interior designing. In relation to the symposium, I was keen to open the practice of interior design to other ways of thinking about the production of interiors than one located in an architectural frame as already enclosed space. I found this potential in the nuances of Grosz’s proposition where the frame is discussed not so much as a process of enclosing as one of separation, as a cutting that – to repeat from the quote above – composes both ‘inside and outside, interior and landscape at once’.

5 This discussion at INSIDEOUT was referred to by Mark Taylor and Julieanna Preston in their introduction to Intimus. Interior Design Theory Reader: ‘This is not to suggest that the interior as an inside is possible without architectural context or another form of enframing, particularly as Elizabeth Grosz has discussed the impossibility of having an inside without some form of demarcation that distinguishes the outer from the inner’. Julieanna Preston and Mark Taylor, eds. Intimus. Interior Design Theory Reader (England: Wiley-Academy, 2006).
6. Julieanna and Mark were participants in INSIDEOUT.
During the preparation phase of the symposium, I encountered a photograph which gave expression to hopes I had for INSIDEOUT. As an image it brought interior and landscape together without the middle bit as a defining presence. Curtains, club chairs and table frame an outside brought inside; sky and trees inflected in a circular glass table-top. A mood of tree-ness, textile-ness is expressed; a haptic quality; an arrested moment: Sunday 7:27am was in its self as well as me and also the previous Thursday of the pm 11:52.

I was reminded of Knight’s photograph during Ross Gibson’s endnote address. He began by showing the opening sequence of The Searchers: a series of shots of a cabin in the desert, cutting from inside to outside; inside out, outside in and in between. From outside, looking back to the cabin, the inside dark and unfathomable from which people emerged and disappeared; from inside, the outside light blasted the threshold and as it made its way further in, it lightly touched surfaces of textiles and ceramics making smudges of blue. While the film rolled, Gibson directed our attention to the screen as a force field: ‘a world of energy is harnessed, swirling around us and through us’.

Following INSIDEOUT and Grosz’s and Gibson’s papers, I now look at Knight’s photograph differently – rather than seeing it as an image that brings interior and landscape together, I see – to return to Grosz’s words above – ‘inside and outside, interior and landscape at once, and as the points of maximal variation …’ produced by a process of framing; as a process of separation which cuts, selects and arranges – making actual this point of maximal variation. In relation to practice, Grosz’s reference to the activity of the Scenopetes dentirostris, a bird of the Australian rainforest, made a strong

---

6 I saw this photograph by Australian artist Paul Knight in his solo exhibition at the Centre for Contemporary Photography in 2004. Because of the impact it had on me in relation to INSIDEOUT and my interests – in short, my practice – I bought it.

7 I can see the photograph from where I sit writing this text. It continues to affect me and make me think. Earlier this year – in January 2012 – I made contact with Paul to ask for copyright to use his photograph for my PhD presentations as it was and continues to be powerfully expressive for me. I also needed a digital copy to use and the correct way to reference the work, as I did not have a title. After 8 years, I thought it was simply ‘Untitled’ but through this email correspondence with Paul, I had the title again. (I am not sure why I had not remembered or recorded it.) So the title was not part of my ongoing relation with the photograph until recently and my connection with the work was further intensified given the temporal conditions in the title. Visit http://www.paulknight.com.au/interiors – this photograph is the one on the second row, first on the left.

8 Ross Gibson was invited to give an endnote address at the end of INSIDEOUT on Sunday April 24, 2005.

9 John Ford The Searchers 1956.

10 Ross Gibson, “The Searchers – Dismantled,” Rogue Press (2005), Visit http://www.rouge.com.au/7/searchers.html. This paper was not published as part of the symposium proceedings, however it presents many of the ideas Gibson discussed as part of his endnote address.
connection for me to curatorial practice and interior design. Sometimes referred to as the Brown Stagemaker, this bird cuts – separates – leaves from a branch, which fall to the forest floor where it then turns each over ‘so that the paler internal side contrasts with the earth’. After completing the arrangement, the bird returns to an overhead branch, fluffs out its neck feathers – which are pale gold at the roots – to sing ‘a complex song’. Working in an outside, the bird selects, highlights and rearranges to produce an interior through composing forces – a stage, a performance, a songster, a territory.

Gibson’s ‘changescaper’ contributes to this thinking. In the paper Changescape, he addressed another aspect of his endnote paper – and one Gini highlighted in her introduction to the papers – gardens. The paper focuses on a clearing in the Pilliga Scrub – ‘native forest gone feral in north-west New South Wales’ – where there used to be a timber mill. Referred to as Muller’s clearing, Gibson writes of his experience during an unannounced visit to meet Muller and encountering ‘… a clearing bounded on all sides by stacked short bolts of timber that were commercially useless but aesthetically breath-taking, with their knotty convolutions and sappy striations presenting all the colours of blood in sculptural arrays aligned in every which way as if to give shifting volume and spectral tone to the gloaming air’. Gibson presents the idea of the force field and harnessed energies here in relation to Muller’s clearing.


12 Later I came across a reference to this bird by Melbourne curator Stuart Koop: “Catalogue Essay, Persuasion Equation” (Linden Centre for Contemporary Arts, 2009), http://www.lindenarts.org/show/2009/0808/koop.php. ‘... concluding that “art is not the privilege of human beings”, but more like an aesthetic dimension of all species behaviour. Perhaps making exhibitions ... is not that far removed from the leaf-turning activity of the Brown Stagemaker.’ Another connection: Koop was in an exhibition I curated with Damon Moon – called Curated – at West Space in Footscray 16 October to 1 November 1997. Damon and I invited curators to display their curatorial practice – with the one stipulation only – ‘no original artworks were allowed’. Stuart presented an installation of oranges in two white boxes – market-style. His catalogue text is worth including as it connects with the ideas being discussed here in making relations – ‘A group of post grad students from Glasgow School of Art spend a week or two abroad in Italy visiting museums every day, looking at legendary works for the first time end on end on end. They are impressed but tired due to an unrelenting schedule. They leave the final museum of their tour (the trip culminating in Venice) to meet the coach-bus departing for Glasgow. Their teacher calls out to them suddenly from behind. They turn to look. He holds an orange up high against the bright blue sky. It’s the best thing they have seen; after all it’s why they’ve come.’ Suzie Attiwill and Damon Moon, Curated (Melbourne: West Space, 1997). n.p. Visit http://westspace.org.au/calendar/event/curated/


A changescaper is more concerned with systems than structures. A structure is founded on the permanence and solidity of its constituent parts and joints, whereas a system is a set of contingent relationships evolving, shifting yet persisting through time.15

In relation to my PhD research, INSIDEOUT posed the question of interior and inside to exterior and outside as a production of composing forces. At the beginning, I posed interior? in relation to landscape; after, I was left thinking about ?interior and the potential of practising inbetween – producing ‘inside and outside at once’ – interiorizing as a process of separation and arrangement in a generalised exterior. The invitation by CAST to be an outsider and to produce an exhibition made from existing works made connections with the activities of the rainforest bird and later, Gibson’s ‘changescaper’.

---

outsider

Already thinking about outsiders and the potential of interior design engaged and opened in relation to the exterior, the invitation from CAST posed different kinds of outsiders. There was the experience of feeling like an outsider during the research visit to Arnhem Land for a matter of time. This was due not only to the requirement to obtain permits to enter the country but also a self-consciousness that produced a self-imposed sense of restriction. I was sensitive to being part of a colonialist history. This was made clear in the negotiations that took place to meet with people and view their work – it was obvious that my visit to collect indigenous fibre and textile works continued a trajectory of white anthropologists. I did not take any photographs. When we walked outside of a cabin we shared with pilots and Dutch missionaries, the dogs would bark ferociously at us and hence curtail any sense of wandering around. The experience was difficult and transforming.

As an outsider in Tasmania, I was also sensitive to these colonizing forces. In 1991, as part of my undergraduate final year thesis in interior design, I spent time researching the Australian aboriginal and Pacific collection of the Tasmanian Museum and Art Gallery in Hobart – specifically, the collections of

15 Ibid. 201
four men who had come to Tasmania from England in the late nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{16} My research proposal involved an exhibition of objects selected from each collection and their arrangement according to the different modes of visuality proposed by Martin Jay in his essay ‘Scopic Regimes of Modernity’: Cartesian perspectivalism, Baroque and an empiricist/Baconian mode.\textsuperscript{17} I was interested in how different arrangements and relations between objects, and objects and viewers produced different encounters and ways of knowing. The Cartesian perspectivalism mode involving an autonomous sovereign subject was one I worked with as a colonialist mode of viewing. I remembered this project again – and the relations between knowledge and arrangements.

From the curatorial essay for making relations:

An outsider who enters a territory and attempts to survey and identify is one kind of approach. The fabrication of space in this instance involves a composition of a grid and the arrangement of things in relation to that grid in order to locate, identify and know. The similarities between a curatorial practice based on the production of a grid and colonial practices become apparent particularly in the practices of museums. Tasmania and its colonial history heighten this sensitivity for me.\textsuperscript{18}

This invitation from CAST was the first of three to be extended to outsider curators. The two others were Zara Stanhope and Peter Anderson.\textsuperscript{19} The difference between the approach of the three outsiders and their respective exhibitions offered up a way of seeing each curator’s approach and their sets

\textsuperscript{16} Julia Clarke, the curator of Anthropology at the TMAG, gave me a bench to work at and allowed me to go through the collections (with white gloves!). As she noted, the question of who collected and what was collected were related. Mainly men, the collections were composed of tools, spears and other weapons. The four collectors were: John Watt Beattie (1859-1930) – photographer, Government of Tasmania; Alfred Joseph Taylor (1949-1921), librarian, Tasmanian Public Library; Robert Henry Pulleine (1869-1935), physician and naturalist; James Chalmers (1841-1901), missionary.


\textsuperscript{19} The second outsider curator was Zara Stanhope, then senior curator and assistant director at Heidi Museum of Modern Art. She responded to the invitation with a project composed of two parts: a voluntary register and exhibition called Nourish held in 2007. Zara was interested to build networks and to involve people in the exhibition who might not have an opportunity to exhibit at CAST. In 2008, the third outsider was invited – Peter Anderson – an independent writer, curator, and research consultant. The exhibition he curated was called Repeat Business. Tasmanian Craft and Design. Peter was interested in cultural tourism, market conditions and business strategies. His exhibition included versions of new and used objects addressing issues of manufacturing and the financial importance of return custom.
of interests – what was selected, how the exhibition and catalogue worked, how things were arranged.

The first research trip to the island focused on Hobart galleries. I visited galleries as a way of seeing what was being done and by whom without having to directly approach people in the first instance. Craft and design galleries tend to be more like retail stores selling products and in Hobart, it became apparent that tourism and export are a strong focus of many practitioners. I felt overwhelmed during these visits. In these galleries, the work was presented as product and massed together covering every surface possible. Everything seemed homogenized and I felt like I was losing any ability to discern and select.

I revisited the Tasmanian Museum and Art Gallery where I was surprised to see that a diorama of an aboriginal family was still on display. I had seen it when I was there in 1991. There had been significant changes to museums in relation to questions of display during the past fifteen years – and especially in relation to the display of indigenous culture – so it was perplexing to see that this diorama remained even if as a historical artefact.

As part of the research for the CAST project, I also visited an historic collection of craft and design at the Allport Library and Museum of Fine Arts. The collection of the Allport family included books, pictures, furniture, ceramic, silver and glass and was on permanent display in a space annexed to the library. The furniture collection contained pieces made between 1680 and 1825 which Henry Allport had bought on various trips overseas and brought back to Hobart; it was not surprising to read that ‘collections of antique furniture such as this are not common in Australia’. In each bay was an arrangement of furniture, decorative art objects and paintings. Assembled together, I wondered about each as an interiorization within an exterior of Tasmania during the late nineteenth century.

On my research trips I did not carry a curatorial proposition with me preferring to take on the subject of the outsider interior designer and see where this led. Each time I crossed Bass Strait from mainland to island and as I travelled up, down and across Tasmania to visit people in their studios, there was a palpable sense of being in the midst of composing forces. The sensation of driving along the top of Tasmania on the way to Stanley is still vivid. The road

---

runs right up beside Bass Strait; a relatively narrow road flanked by this huge body of water and houses with vast windows looking out over the Strait. ‘inside and outside, ... at once’. It was ‘a day of edges, limits, tensions, constraints. driving along beside bass strait – the vastness of the sea, the shipwrecks dotted beside the coast, a dynamic line’. During these travels:

It became apparent to me as an outsider, how active a sense of the exterior was in many of the works and practices I encountered. It is a palpable and powerful force that manifests in many and diverse ways such as distance, wilderness, time. Much of the work I encountered was about making relations to this exterior in a way which did not rest on assumptions or clichés. Instead the work manifests a rigorous grappling with the actuality of exterior forces; a grappling to find relations to the exterior other than the conventional ones based on mastery and control where material and technique are in service of representing an idea. ... In these works, material and technique are not slaves to an idea or intention; instead the maker is caught up as a participant in the material and technique and as part of a process of formation and a constant making of relations.²²

making relations

making relations became the title of the exhibition as a way of drawing attention to making and matter in the production of relations. The work I was interested in made relations which actualised exterior forces. Such as a small stool made from a piece of horizontal *Anodopetalum biglandulosum*. A slow growing tree with a dense grain, it grows vertically until it becomes top heavy and then bends over and continues growing horizontally shooting up branches which then grow vertically and eventually bend over and the process is repeated. Cut, the tree becomes a seat and makes present this history. In his

²¹ From notes made on Saturday 10 December 2005 in a waterproof surveyor’s notebook I bought in Hobart on my first visit for the project.

workshop surrounded by wood-working tools, Kevin Perkins lifted the stool up, held it out and told me his work presents and makes present ‘a bit of history’ through ‘a bit of tree’. Each of the works selected for the exhibition had this sense of composing forces in their production. A necklace made by Lola Greeno composed of shells collected along a tidal shoreline at specific times; threaded in patterns which made relations with indigenous women, past and present. A trio of vases made of clay that Ben Richardson dug out from a lagoon and wood-fired in a kiln nearby – their surfaces produced by the local conditions of weather affecting clay and timber compositions. I found myself valuing the potential of craft qualities of materiality and making as actualizations of exterior forces and energies.

Craft is often defined in relation to skill and while many of the pieces were produced by people who had significant experience and hence skill, I responded to works which made relations in a way that was not about control but invited forces of contingency, chance and energies. The arrangement of the work in the exhibition attempted to highlight these qualities of the work situated within a space of contemporary art:

In the gallery space arranged on tables and plinths, these works inflect a space within which to think about craft and design practices. The use of MDF (medium density fibreboard) as the exhibition material is to highlight material qualities of the gallery space. MDF is plinth material – usually painted white; craft and design exhibitions are full of white plinths. In making relations, plinths become tables and, as though turned over, the material quality of the MDF is encountered. In this conjunction between MDF and the works it supports, the difference in relation to material and making between the space of art and the works of craft and design is made apparent. The MDF with its homogeneous character is kind of shocking in contrast to the material thinking it supports, particularly those pieces made from wood where the contrast in approach to the same material is extreme – from empathy with and care for old growth forest to a woodchip mentality. The use of tables on which to arrange the work is to invite
encounters where one sits down in the midst of the space and spends time with the work and reading this catalogue.\footnote{Ibid. n.p.}

Looking through the works, the relations between things – outside the objects – were intensified as distinct from their objectness. The table arrangements thwarted the ability to engage with them as objects as one could not walk around them. The arrangement of the works also activated relations between the works as well as the viewer and invited a making of relations where ‘and’ was invoked.

The catalogue accompanies the exhibition like a field notebook – as a tool to use. … As with the exhibition, a process of arranging was then required and I chose to invoke a craft taxonomy of materials – clay, glass, metal, textiles, wood and miscellaneous. It could have been an alphabetical arrangement or another invented taxonomy. I decided to negotiate a craft one and to locate the works in relation to this as a frame that highlights the effect of frame and how the works can jostle and move between categories. Miscellaneous is encountered first rather than last to highlight the problematic of any taxonomy. The emphasis on materials and not objects (for example – ceramics, glass, jewellery, furniture, metalware) is critical to making relations.\footnote{Ibid. n.p.}

relations made

In the funding acquittal report, CAST documented that making relations received 1,592 visitors over the twenty-six days it was installed at CAST Gallery in Hobart and 2,257 visitors during the 30 days it took place at Devonport Regional Gallery in Devonport. I have included excerpts from a review by Peter Hughes, curator of Decorative Arts at the Tasmanian Museum

\footnote{Ibid. n.p.}
and Art Gallery, published in the Craft Victoria journal *Craft Culture* as a relation made with the exhibition25:

... Suzie Attiwill, finding herself in the potentially uncomfortable position of professional outsider, approached the situation as one of establishing relationships. On one level these are relationships necessarily established between herself and the craftspeople / designers, on another they are the relations that need to be established between objects and practices that will produce a coherent and meaningful exhibition. More critically, however, she has taken the relations created, made, through making as the central proposition of the exhibition. In the exhibition this was manifested through various strategies adopted to focus the viewer’s attention on the materiality of the objects themselves and encouraging a non-prescriptive dialogue between the viewer and the objects and between the objects themselves. The works were placed on large unpainted MDF trestle tables and plinths in the centre of the room, arranged as much as possible as continuous flow surfaces of different heights. This strategy created a fluid conversation between objects rather than isolating them for discrete analytical consideration; it also, to some degree, undermined the conventional exhibition emphasis on the individual artist.

Another strategy, reflected in the raw MDF surfaces, was to focus on the materiality of the works, rather than accretion of expectations that appends itself to artists’ names, careers and individual practices. While these things cannot realistically be excluded they were, here, played down, allowing the works themselves to relate to one another, filling the room with conversations and encouraging the viewer to

---

speculate about the infinite relational possibilities of this contingent community of objects.

These conversations establish relationships on many levels, and they do so not simply through similarity but also through disjunction. These similarities and disjunctions function on many levels, refracting across the space and through the objects.

... relations between the works can be drawn endlessly, each eventually being caught up in a web with all of the others. This connecting and refracting, continually forming and dissolving relationships, creates a radically decentered and non-hierarchical order in the gallery that focuses the viewer’s attention not so much on the individual works as the ground that connects them.

making relations both explores and creates relations, generating a charged potential in the space, theoretical and actual, between objects and their making. The exhibition also reminds us that these relations stretch across space, within the gallery, across the island and beyond. They also stretch through time, through the history of the materials, the history of the artists and their practices, through the history of these particular objects and of all objects. In so doing making relations, while very much an exhibition of contemporary craft and design in Tasmania, dispels persistent notions that there is a tradition, a style, or a way of working peculiar to this island. It shows the works to be very much connected, even the most intensely locally engaged, to the broader concerns of making; making things and making relations through making.

Suzie Attiwill, by creating the ground for these relationships, some flickering and unstable and others seemingly opaque and immutable, has sidestepped many of the anxieties that inform
surveys of contemporary craft / design practice, such as the need to be contemporary itself and the distinction between art and craft or craft and design. The craft / design world that she has allowed to speak is a particular diverse ecosystem of interrelated objects, concerns and histories that cannot be captured in a single monumental theoretical or historical framework.

**?interior, practices of interiorization, interior designs**

In convening the symposium INSIDEOUT, I was keen to bring inside and outside, interior and exterior together without a determining structure between them as a way of opening the given interiors of enclosed space and buildings that underpin the discipline of interior design. However, rather than a discussion about insides and outsides side by side, the focus and emphasis was on processes of production – framing, selecting, arranging to produce interiors and exteriors within an immanent world of relations.

This thinking continued with CAST’s invitation to be an outsider and through this – to become an outsider interior designer. Located outside required thinking about interior design practice differently from the established interior design approach of working from the inside out. The activities of the rainforest bird highlighted the potential of a curatorial practice, as an act of selection and arrangement, in the production of a composition, a territory, a system.

During this time – which included the experience of INSIDEOUT and making relations as well as the touring of a matter of time – my practice moved from an attention to working with objects in space and spatial encounters, as a spatial designer, where interior design practice was engaged through the design of exhibitions to one where curatorial practice became a way of thinking and practising interior design. Making relations became a focus of attention and experimentation. In making relations selected works were brought into an arrangement where the relations between them were worked and made; things that had not been brought together before, came together and produced something new.
What is a relation? It is what makes us pass from a given impression or idea to the idea of something that is not presently given.26

As an outsider interior designer, making relations as relations of making effected a shift from relations of ‘is’, which focus on what already exists and work from the inside out of intention and meaning embodied in the object, to relations of ‘and’ and:

... a world of exteriority, a world in which thought itself exists in a fundamental relationship with the Outside, a world in which terms are veritable atoms and relations veritable external passages; a world in which the conjunction ‘and’ dethrones the interiority of the verb ‘is’; a harlequin world of multicoloured patterns and non-totalizable fragments where communication takes place through external relations.27

To think ‘and, and, and’ in relation to the production of interior and interiority in a generalised exterior works with a different set of values from established relations of interior and exterior as fixed opposites such as that presented in Christine McCarthy’s essay ‘Towards a Definition of Interiority’ where interiority is defined as ‘that abstract quality that enables the recognition and definition of an interior. … it is “opposed in all sense and uses to exterior”’.28

During the time of making making relations, the curator Nicolas Bourriaud’s proposition/thesis of relational aesthetics pervaded discussions on contemporary art practice.29 He defines relational aesthetics as an ‘aesthetic theory consisting in judging artworks on the basis of the inter-human relations which they represent, produce or prompt’ and relational art as ‘a set of artistic practices which take as their theoretical and practical point of departure the

27 Ibid. 37.
whole of human relations and their social context, rather than an independent and private space’. In bringing attention to relations between things/humans and a critique of ‘independent and private space’, there are connections between Relational Aesthetics and making relations yet there are also differences. The experiments in making relations in an outside with an attention to craft, matter and material indicate a different set of interests from the inter-human and social concerns of Bourriaud.

By the opening of making relations in Hobart April 2006, I was fully involved in the touring of a matter of time and had installed the exhibition in Melbourne, Gosford, Adelaide, Wagga Wagga, Cairns and Bunbury. The affects and effects of this experience – rearranging the exhibition; constantly making relations and encountering new and unforeseen thoughts; experiencing the actualization of time – found expression in the exhibition design of making relations. The interior design worked with the outside of the objects – the energies and forces between them – to make relations to activate potentials and celebrated ‘the power of life to unfold itself differently’ and infinitely.  

---

30 Bourriaud, Relational Aesthetics. 113.
Between Representation and the Mirror:

tactics for interiorization
Between Representation and the Mirror: tactics for interiorization is the title of a paper I wrote for a conference called Interior Tools. Interior Tactics held in Edinburgh in August 2008 and organized by Interiors Forum Scotland (IFS). This was the second conference organised by IFS – the first was called Thinking Inside the Box and was held in Glasgow in March 2007. At the time of writing this paper, I felt it was a significant piece of writing in relation to my research. While the essay does not reference my exhibition projects specifically, it was a project that made connections between my research and IFS’s call for papers situated within the discipline of interior design. The paper was published as an essay in a book of the same title as the conference – Interior Tools. Interior Tactics. Debates in Interiors Theory and Practice and has also been selected for inclusion in Interior Design and Architecture: Critical and Primary Sources. The inclusion of the paper here in this arrangement of the PhD creates a change in orientation from the previous projects where there is a thinking through practice to one here which projects this thinking into the discipline of interior design. Sitting in the midst of this current text, temporal stammers may be felt and inconsistencies encountered in the writing. However as something that already exists in the world (in 2008 and again through re-publication in 2013), I have not wanted to re-arrange this text through a re-writing but to bring its particular energy into the PhD arrangement – its repetition of the practice and thinking, the internal and external forces of its production.

1 The conference paper was then published as Suzie Attiwill, “Between Representation and the Mirror: tactics for interiorisation,” in Interior Tools, Interior Tactics. Debates in Interior Theory and Practice, ed. Joyce Fleming et al. (UK: Libri Publishing, 2011), 159–169. I have author’s copyright for the publication of this essay as part of my PhD.


4 The Deleuze Dictionary was published in 2005 and is an example of an external force – the multiple references to this book throughout the paper is evidence of its effect on my thinking through Deleuze and his concepts. Adrian Parr, ed., The Deleuze Dictionary (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2005).
Abstract

This paper eddies around two concerns or ideas – a repositioning of interior design as a process of interiorization and a desire to open up the concept of interior from one of enclosure which equates interior design with the inside of something, such as buildings, bodies or other containers. The essentialist nature of contemporary interior design thinking is evident in the use of the term ‘The Interior’, with its implication of something inherent and immutable. In contrast, ‘an interior’ effects an opening up and hence, the potential for a multiplicity of interiors. Both terms can be understood as a process of interiorization. ‘The Interior’ is characterised by a container and space which frame an inside and outside; The Interior is either positioned as a holistic whole or located within the subject as Being. The Interior is an independent entity which is in a dialectical relation with the exterior. A different concept of interior as the production of many interiors highlights process – interiorization – and shifts the emphasis to time rather than space as a composing force. Interiors are always in the making and there is no privileging of The Interior as a subject or being who experiences or as a pre-existing container but rather the process of making/designing. Tactics and tools are therefore vital to think differently and to shift embedded concepts. The tactical move of this research is a focus on exhibitions as spaces of experimentation concerning the same kinds of issues as those raised in contemporary interior design discourse and practice, i.e. the relation(s) between people and environment. This paper considers tactics employed in three early twentieth century exhibitions which affirmed movement and transformation, as distinct from positioning and identification, to shift from dominant and dominating Cartesian and phenomenological models of representation and reflection; to open the potential for a different concept of interior in relation to exteriority and in the process, provide a platform for new thoughts and practice. The writings of philosopher Gilles Deleuze are used as a tool throughout to shape these ideas.
Introduction

The title of the paper ‘Between representation and the mirror’ refers to a tale – ‘The Legend of Painting’ in the book *The Midnight Love Feast*, a story about a couple who are separating and decide to celebrate their last night together with a feast and friends – each of whom is invited to tell a tale. ‘The Legend of Painting’ is one of the tales; it is about a Caliph of Baghda who desired to have the most wonderful painting in the world. He commissioned a Chinese painter and a Greek painter to do this in a room of his palace. Each was allocated a wall at either end of a room divided in two by a curtain. When the Caliph asked the painters how long it would take each of them, the Greek replied as long as it takes my Chinese friend, who then replied three months.

When the time came, the court gathered for the unveiling:

... a magnificent cortege in which nothing could be seen but embroidered robes, plumes of waving feathers, jewels of gold, engraved weapons. Everyone first assembled on the side of the wall painted by the Chinese. A unanimous cry of admiration went up. The fresco represented the garden of everyone’s dreams, with trees in blossom and little bean-shaped lakes spanned by graceful footbridges. A vision of Paradise that no one tired of looking at. So great was their delight that some wanted the Chinese to be declared the winner of the contest without so much as a glance at the work of the Greek. Soon however the Caliph ordered that the curtain dividing the room should be drawn aside, and the crowd turned round. And as they turned, an exclamation of amazement escaped them. What had the Greek done, then? He had painted nothing at all. He had contented himself with covering the entire surface of the wall, from floor to ceiling with a vast mirror. And naturally this mirror reflected the Chinese painter’s garden in the most minute detail. But then you will say, what made this image more beautiful and more stirring than its model? It was the fact that the Chinese painter’s garden was deserted and uninhabited, whereas the Greek’s garden was alive with a
magnificent throng in embroidered robes, plumes of waving feathers, jewels of gold, and engraved weapons. And all these people were moving and gesticulating, and recognised themselves with great delight. The Greek was unanimously declared the winner of the contest.  

Here is an example of interior tactics in terms of producing relations between people and their environment where surface becomes a site of meaning and events. Different kinds of surfaces are useful to distinguish. There is the surface of representation which places the viewer at the centre of the world, a rational and self-reflexive Cartesian subject (‘I think therefore I am’). The other – a reflection, a mirror which locates the viewer as the site of embodied perception. Both of these surfaces are familiar to interior design as a way of thinking and working. As models of Cartesian and phenomenological philosophy respectively, this kind of thinking is implicit and implicated in the processes of interiorization. Yet something else is occurring in this tale – where there is an engagement with composing forces beyond the states of representation and reflection. In between the two surfaces bursts life in all its glittering materiality and movement – the surfaces of representation, mirror, velvet, gold effect a folding which interiorizes and composes albeit momentarily the vitality of energies and forces. ‘Rather than human consciousness illuminating the world like a search light, it is the case that the world is “luminous” in itself’ and this is what is celebrated in the tale.

Two tactics are evident above which re-position the concept of interior. One is a focus on surface as distinct from space. Interior design is often referred to as a spatial discipline however this seems to amplify either the idea of containers or if it moves to relational conditions then, it becomes a kind of point thinking between things where there is a relation to something. This questioning of the primacy of space finds resonance with ecologist/psychologist James Jerome Gibson’s provocative claim: ‘We live in an environment consisting of...'
substances that are more or less substantial; of a medium, the gaseous atmosphere; and of the surfaces that separate the substances from the medium. We do not live in space.\textsuperscript{7} The shift to processes of interiorization involves surfaces, materialities, light and movement; there is a sense of a relation in as distinct from to. There is not something to have a relation to – which needs things to exist before the relation; rather we are already in the world.

Exhibitions as arrangements of relations between things – subjects and objects – offer up many examples to think these ideas and relations of ‘to’ and ‘in’ through and to experiment. Donald Preziosi, an art historian, writes: ‘What the subject sees in museological space, in the “picture” or in the “frame” of the museum, is a series of possible ways in which it can construct its own life as some kind of centred unity or perspective that draws together in a patterned and telling order all those diverse and contradictory experiences and desires. It is in this sense that the new museum can be seen as working to put all things into a perspectival system of new and clearly related positions’.\textsuperscript{8} Most exhibitions produce compositions which effect this kind of positioning – i.e. representation or reflection; relations of ‘to’.

However in this paper, and my research, I am interested in tactics where there is an attempt to experiment and question the self-given quality of The Interior of the subject – to question the privileging of identity and self through the emphasis of a stable interior which dominates interior design thinking and discourse. Shifting the concept of interior from Being to becoming, from ‘is’ to ‘and’, from subject to process as a tactic and how this then becomes a question of design not psychology. In contrast to Preziosi’s diagram, which focuses on an idea of centred unity and a subject who makes sense, is posed a different diagram where:

\begin{quote}
an element in experience … comes before the determinism of the subject and sense. Shown through a ‘diagram’ that one constructs to move about more freely rather than a space defined by an a priori ‘scheme’ into which one inserts oneself, it involves temporality that is always starting up again in the midst, and relations with others based not in
\end{quote}

identification or recognition, but encounter and new compositions.\textsuperscript{9}

This paper selects some exhibitions which do this – in contrast to Preziosi’s diagram where the self desires stability through centring and an identification of a fixed being, an emphasis on movement and transformation open up the interior to exterior forces in a process of constant becoming.

**Exhibition Tactics**

In turning to consider exhibitions, it is telling to observe how the concept of the gallery space as a white cube continues to be accepted as a space where there is minimal interference with the exhibition of art and the viewer’s engagement with it, i.e. there is no intervening mediation of the meaning. This subscribes to the idea that both the art object and viewing subject can have a direct, unmediated relation where the interior of the art object is experienced by the subject, or the viewing subject is privileged in terms of their experience of the work, or there is collaboration between the two. The gallery space as white cube is positioned as a neutral spatial container which does not interfere with the communion between art and viewer. A space with no exteriors! While this has been critiqued extensively – Brian O’Doherty’s *Inside the White Cube*\textsuperscript{10} and installation art since the 1960s have challenged and contested this concept – the desirability of the white cube as perceived neutral space for the viewer to engage with the artwork and the artist to present work continues to dominate the design of galleries and is evidence of how such ways of thinking continue to be both pervasive and persuasive.

Following are three exhibitions which attempted to shift the centrality of the viewer as a stable, centred ‘I’ to compositions which produce encounters via surfaces with processes of becoming and transformation as distinct from surface as representation or a reflection of one’s self-expression. These exhibitions took place in the early twentieth century during the 30s and 40s – Alexander Dorner’s atmosphere rooms at the Hannover Landesmuseum; El Lissitzky’s abstract cabinet, one of these atmosphere rooms and Frederick Kiesler’s Surrealist Gallery, part of the *Art of This Century*. During the


twentieth century, there have been many exhibitions which have also experimented with questions of what happens in the encounter between art and viewer. Claire Bishop’s book *Installation Art* is a stimulating account of contemporary art from the 1950s to present as one of experimentation with different kinds of viewer/art relations. Installation art, she writes, sought ‘to provide an alternative to the idea of the viewer that is implicit in Renaissance perspective: that is, instead of a rational, centred, coherent humanist subject’. Bishop’s four models of viewing subjects – psychological/psychoanalytical, phenomenological, Lacanian and political – offer up much to consider in terms of relational models for interior design. It is also interesting, and thought provoking, how this exposes much interior design discourse which implies, and relies upon, a subject as centred and stable in an unquestioned and implicit way.

While the models presented by Bishop are useful to work through in a re-conceptualisation of the concept of interior, the focus of this paper is on a process of interiorization as one of design and one of mediation involving design tactics with surfaces, materials, light and movement; a kind of in-between position, neither viewer nor artist, like the Tournier story; a process which constructs ‘a temporary and virtual arrangement according to causal, logical and temporal relations’.

**Alexander Dorner**

Contemporary curator, Hans Ulrich Obrist in an interview on curatorial practice drew my attention to the practice of Alexander Dorner. For Obrist, Dorner is someone who contributed to the transformation of exhibition practices and museums through making dynamic ‘the often too static museum and to transform the neutral white cube in order to assume a more heterogeneous space’. According to Obrist, Dorner used ‘the museum as a laboratory’, ‘as a locus of crossings for art and life’ and ‘as an oscillation between object and process’. Dorner, born in 1893, was the director of the Hannover Landesmuseum from 1922 to 1936. In 1937 he along with many others escaped Gestapo persecution and went to New York. From 1938 to

---

1941 he was the director of the Rhodes Island School of Design Museum and died in 1957. This paper will concentrate on his atmosphere rooms and a publication he wrote while in America titled *the way beyond “art”*, first published in 1947 and republished in 1958. Dorner described art as ‘an aggressive energy seeking to transform the visitor’\(^{14}\) and developed a theory which challenged the dominant ideology of art as a container of inherent, immutable, unchanging meaning which could be engaged with at different times. He believed that the viewer was also contingent rather than a stable, centred entity. He desired an engagement with the current – literally, in terms of energies – and dismissed Surrealism and Romanticism for their inward concerns with self-expression and symbolism.

*the way beyond “art”* is like a manifesto of his thinking and as he writes in the opening pages: ‘I have reached this conclusion not through theoretical speculation but through long practical experience’.\(^ {15}\) Dorner invited the pragmatist philosopher John Dewey to write the introduction. Dewey focused on the repositioning of the concept of ‘The Individual’ as a vital contribution of Dorner’s work and writings.

In the older view, a person as individual was thought to be a fixed element in a given larger whole: departure from this fixed place was heresy, in matters of belief; disloyalty in matters of overt action. Later what was called ‘The Individual’ was cut loose entirely, and was supposed to be fixed in himself – a synonym at the time for ‘by’ himself, or in isolation. The author [Dorner] effectively calls attention to something fundamentally important, but usually ignored: the assumption of immutability is common in both cases. In the first instance, the artist was ‘servant of absolute form’; in the second he was taken to be himself absolute and hence ‘spontaneous creator’. Against these fixations, Dr Dorner points to the personal individual as a partaker in the ‘general process of life’ and as a ‘special contributor to it’. This union of partaker and


contributor describes the enduring work of the artist.\textsuperscript{16}

These comments take us back to the gesticulating courtiers in the world where it is neither the surface of representation nor self projection – where the individual is fixed in a larger whole or a self-contained knower – but of participation and contribution. It is not a huge leap to position Dewey’s words within, and as a critique of, current interior design practice where a holistic approach to design and the human-centred approach continue to dominate contemporary practice.

Dorner was also critical of three-dimensional space: he referred to it as a ‘cage of certainty-giving space’. ‘In the place of static or semistatic causation we now find the dynamic ground of SELF TRANSFORMATION. ... There is only one way to cooperate with this energetic substratum: through a constant and active transformation of the life process’.\textsuperscript{17} Individuals and space were associated with the notion of Being; eternal, immutable and static conditions of identification and closure. In contrast Dorner advocated processes of becoming which engaged with life, growth, energies, time and hence were transforming rather than fixed and eternal.

\textbf{Atmosphere Rooms}\textsuperscript{18}

‘Only one point of view can be behind a museum’s arrangement as well as behind its activities: namely, how can it become, to all people, a source of understanding and a living force for active life?’\textsuperscript{19} Dorner’s tactic was to produce atmosphere rooms, which he distinguished from period rooms or representations of a specific style. There is a resonance here to \textit{The Legend of Painting} and its atmosphere. These atmosphere rooms were produced through an attention to design aspects of each room i.e. layout, sightlines, circulation, lighting, colour and arrangement i.e. tools of interior design. Often working against the interior architecture, Dorner attempted to actualise an encounter which was neither representational in terms of presenting the past as eternal

\textsuperscript{17} Dorner the way beyond “art”. 32-33.
\textsuperscript{18} This footnote was not part of original paper – but here a connection can be made to a matter of time and the reference to atmosphere. Coming across Dorner and his atmosphere rooms was a wonderful coincidence that offered up much to think through in relation to the research and matters of time, interior, history and encounter.
\textsuperscript{19} Cauman, \textit{The Living Museum. Experiences of an Art Historian and Museum Director}. 111.
and contained nor as an experience produced wholly by the viewer but as atmosphere, of life and energies which enfolded the present as part of an ongoing process of becoming. The interior of the room then is repositioned together with the viewer – where the encounter does not depend on either a fixed relation of representation or one of relativity i.e. from the viewer’s subjective position. Rather than a relation to something, a relation in a world as dynamic and transforming is fostered. (This distinction is a tool taken from Deleuze).

Different rooms from different times followed in chronological order, each evoking an atmosphere as distinct from representing styles. Cauman, Dorner’s biographer, takes one on a walk through the rooms in The Living Museum. Beginning with the Medieval rooms which were painted in dark colours as medieval churches did not have light interiors: ‘The rooms receded, permitting only the works of art to stand out and leaving the towering crucifixes and shining altars as the focal points of display. The gold ground and the mystical soft forms of late Gothic altarpieces swam in their particular “reality”. In contrast, the walls and ceilings of the Renaissance rooms beyond were a clear white or grey, ‘the new conception developed in this period was of clearly defined volumes of space – cubes and hemispheres – with structural elements forming the defining frame. Perspective in Renaissance painting was used to make this geometrical picture of reality plain to the senses. The clear, light walls of the Renaissance galleries emphasised the cubic character of the rooms. The pictures were like views lit into the walls; their frames played the part of window frames.’ In the Baroque galleries – backgrounds of red velvet, framed in gold, where ‘the picture of space lost its clear definition, becoming far deeper and assuming an active, levitational quality. The surrounding wall and ceiling structure, no longer defining the space so sharply, fused with it, creating a greater impression of unity than in the Renaissance galleries.20

**The Abstract Cabinet**

Dorner commissioned the Russian constructivist El Lissitzky (1890–1941) to actualise the atmosphere room which presented Abstract art. For Dorner, abstract art engaged with the energies of the current and did not retreat into individualism like Surrealism and Romanticism. Referred to as the most famous single room of twentieth century art in the world by Alfred H. Barr Jnr.,

20 Ibid. 89-90.
director of MoMA; Dorner claimed its significance was due to the fact that it was ‘the first attempt to overcome the fixity of the gallery and the semi-stasis of the period room, and to introduce modern dynamism into the museum by representing a vision of the respective reality of the style’.  

This was achieved by tactics which engaged with surfaces and movement as a process of composition and encounter. As Cauman noted ‘this room had the unprecedented ability of transforming itself, of changing its identity as the works changed theirs. There could hardly have been a more striking contrast than that between the dynamism of the new room on the one hand and, on the other, the balance and repose of the Renaissance galleries’.  

In *the way beyond “art”*, Dorner describes the room in all its vitality:  

The walls of that room were sheathed with narrow tin strips set at right angle to the wall plane. Since these strips were painted black on one side, grey on the other, and white on the edge, the wall changed its character with every move of the spectator. The sequence of tones varied in different parts of the room. This construction thus established a supraspatial milieu for the frameless composition. This visual mobility was further increased by placing a sculpture by Archipenko in front of a mirror. The mirror reflected the reversed side of the metal strips, not the side seen by the spectator. Thus the mirror effect extended the elusive wall construction in such a way that construction changed its identity in continuing. ... All display cases and picture mounts were made movable to reveal new compositions and diagrams. This room contained many more sensory images than could have been accommodated by a rigid room. Mobility exploded the room, as it were, and the result was a spiritual intensification, proportionate to the evolutionary content of the display cases which tried to demonstrate the growth of modern design in its urgent transforming power.  

---  

21 Ibid. 108.  
22 Ibid. 100.  
Frederick Kiesler (1890-1965) was an architect who worked in areas of exhibition and retail design. Continuity and transformation as temporal dynamics were also vital to his thinking about design:

The traditional art object, be it a painting, a sculpture, or a piece of architecture, is no longer seen as an isolated entity but must be considered within the context of this expanding environment. The environment becomes as equally as important as the object, if not more so, because the object breathes into the surroundings and also inhales the realities of the environment no matter in what space, close or wide apart, open air or indoor. 24

Kiesler left Europe for New York in 1926. In 1942, Peggy Guggenheim invited him to devise ‘a new exhibition method for objects’ for her Art of This Century gallery which involved four exhibition spaces: the Surrealist Gallery, the Abstract Gallery, the Kinetic Gallery and the Daylight Gallery. 25 Each of the exhibitions employed tactics to effect spatial continuity where the viewer was brought into contact with a dynamic. While Dorner arranged surfaces to produce atmosphere rooms and El Lissitzky made the surface dynamic, Kiesler removed the frame which produced boundaries, defined boxes and insides/outside. Kiesler’s main concept was the Endless House:

When the moment comes when we want to move a wall way out, to breathe more fully – yes, when we want the ceiling to be higher, or the whole area to change into another shape – that is where the Endless House comes in. Because it has twofold expression: first, it has the reality of the walls and the ceiling and the floor as they are ... but also a lighting system ... so that by changing the lights ...

one can expand or contract the interior in an illusionary way. You can’t do that with boxes.26

With the design of the Surrealist Gallery, Kiesler painted the surfaces of the interior architecture black and installed curved wooden walls. Unframed artworks were attached to these walls by adjustable arms made from baseball bats. Frames removed, the artworks became part of the environment and interior/exterior divisions were removed. He used the term ‘spatial-exhibition’. Seats within the gallery enabled different relations between the works and viewers. Part of the design, these seats were used in a multitude of configurations from sitting to display. The lighting was also critical to the encounter – with different lights switching on and off at different intervals, acting as attractors drawing viewers to different works at different times. There were also special sound effects.

In a review of the exhibition titled The Violent Art of Hanging Paintings, Edgar Kaufmann, critic and design curator, criticised the exhibition for preventing an engagement with what he positioned as the inherent qualities of the paintings:

A primary fact about every painting, whatever its quality or function, is that it is a focal point. In it, for whatever he’s worth, the artist has concentrated his vision, his emotions, his understanding, his craft. Whether pictures are assembled in a decorative scheme, in an intimate presentation, or an expository survey, this factor remains unchanged.

While Kauffman wrote approvingly of ‘the atmosphere of dynamics which [Kiesler] creates forcibly recalls the investigations of modern science, where gravity has no hold and matter and energy are interchangeable’, he lamented the fact that ‘works based on a human scale of vision and empathy must be lost’.27 For Kauffman, stability is what is at stake here and without it one is left with disorientation and violence.


Interiorization / The Interior / Interiority – a conclusion

These tactics and exhibitions offer up a way of thinking not just about exhibitions but questions of interiorization, interiority and interior. The experiments of Dorner, El Lissitzky and Kiesler challenged the concepts of an inherent, immutable, stable object or subject which could be engaged with via representation or as self-reflection/projection. For them, it was a question of design, of working with surfaces to engage a dynamic and transforming environment. Their practices and ideas offer up lines of thinking which one can pick up and use as a way of working through some problems in current conditions.

The other tool used throughout (albeit with little direct reference) is the thinking of French philosopher, Gilles Deleuze. Deleuze dismisses the concept of interiority as it ‘refers to the thought, dominant in Western philosophy since Plato, that things exist independently, and that their actions derive from the unfolding or embodying of this essential unity’. For Deleuze, one must not ‘look to the internal or intrinsic “meaning”, “structure” or “life” of the terms involved (whether they be people, a person and an animal, elements in a biological system, and so on). ... organised beings are not the embodiment of an essence or idea, but are the result of enormous numbers of relations between parts which have no significance on their own. In other words, specific beings are produced from within a generalised milieu of exteriority without reference to any guiding interiority’. For Deleuze, ‘the interior is only a selected exterior; the exterior, a projected interior’. These ideas challenge interior design and invite one to re-think ‘interior’ and in the process re-conceptualise the practice of interior design.

The practices of Dorner, El Lissitzky, Kiesler and Deleuze challenge dominant and dominating concepts of interior which come from Cartesian, phenomenological and humanist underpinnings. Their ideas cannot be easily dismissed as abstract philosophical concepts because as ways of thinking they shaped tactics and tools which can be used in practice. The re-conceptualisation of the concept of interior evident in their practices involve a shift from an essentialist, self-given, a priori position as either inside of a box


(architecture) or the inside of a person (subjectivity). It is apparent that in the twenty-first century, the concept of interior is in crisis; stability is no longer assured or even desired; enclosures and dialectical divisions between inside/outside, interior/exterior disputed. The concept of ‘interior’ is critical at the beginning of the twenty-first century and therefore we are poised at a moment of potential for interior design. This tends to effect a reactive reinforcement of existing ideas of enclosure, certainty, identity and stability. The search for identity within the discipline of interior design pursues this direction. It also invites the possibility of thinking differently – finding tactics and tools which open up the concept of interior beyond representation and reflection, engaging interior as a dynamic process of making, of interiorization, of interior design.
interiorist
making relations concluded at Devonport Regional Gallery on 30 June 2006 and a matter of time at the Ballarat Fine Art Gallery on 4 November 2006. And while I continued to be involved in exhibitions as a curator and/or designer, there was a noticeable shift in my practice and its relation to the discipline of interior design. In 2005, I became the program director of Interior Design at RMIT University and in 2006, chair of the Interior Design/Interior Architecture Educators Association (IDEA). My involvement with IDEA gave me insight into interior design education and research within Australian and New Zealand universities. From 2007 onwards, as chair of IDEA I have participated in an international conversation regarding interior design education and practice. Initiated by the International Federation of Interior Architects/Designers (IFI), I have been invited to moderate a roundtable on education (Singapore 2007), to facilitate a workshop on identity as part of the IFI Global Symposium (New York City, 2011) and lead a workshop as part of IFI’s Global Interiors Education Open Forum (Taipei, 2011). Through these events, I have engaged with interior design practitioners and educators from around the world including the UK, China, Sweden, South Africa, Turkey, Mexico, Columbia, Japan and Indonesia. IFI describes itself as the UN of interiors.

One of the key issues in these conversations has been the identity of the profession. There is a perception that the profession has an identity crisis and hence the IFI initiatives to identify and position what interior design is and what interior designers do. The invitation to be a ‘concept investigator’ for a workshop on identity placed me in the middle of this conversation and concern. There were two concept investigators per workshop and the role was to start the workshop with an introduction on the concept of identity as a way of teasing out the issues for those in the workshop to consider. I made a short presentation which attempted to draw people’s attention to the implications of identity as a search for the essence of something which could be pinned down and how this desire for identifying and recognising had the potential to effect stasis; that identity implied substance and entities rather than a practice. I opened up the potential of identity as a temporal unity which allowed for variation, movement and change and how this was critical to a creative practice such as interior design. I suggested it was more important to attend to a way of thinking through practice, rather than identifying an essence, and to pose interior as a contemporary problematic – as a spatial and temporal practice.¹ It was a challenging workshop that exposed the extent to which the concept of identity is entrenched and implicated in everyday thought.

¹ The value of this approach became apparent in a forum I convened called What’s in a canon? The state of Interior Design at the beginning of the 21st century – held as part of the
Identity was one of seven ‘core concepts’ workshopped that day. Others were: value, relevance, responsibility, culture, business and knowledge. The outcome of the global symposium was the IFI Interiors Declaration composed of a preamble followed by a statement for each concept. The statement for identity read: ‘Interior designers and interior architects determine the relationship of people to spaces based on psychological and physical parameters, to improve the quality of life’. The next stage of this initiative is to implement the declaration through education and from there into the profession. Another current IFI project is to decide on the proper name for the profession – currently IFI refers to interior architects/designers. By 2013, IFI aims to use one title and advocate for its global adoption. There is much debate. As a program director, teacher and supervisor, I am aware of the need to address these issues with students who are in the process of becoming interior designers. The PhD has been a vehicle for thinking through and responding to these complexities in my attempt to keep the question of interior open and mobile.

The effects of these forces and roles have nuanced my practice. From 2000 to 2006, the projects are mainly exhibitions and practices of curation, writing and exhibition design. In these projects, I practised as an interior designer. The tools and interest of an interior designer inflected these exhibitions – through an attention to subject/object relations, space, time, interior and exterior relations. From 2005 onwards, there was a flip in the practice where this exhibition and curatorial practice was brought into the discipline of interior design as a way of addressing these issues of identity, essence, subjects/objects, interior, interiority. This change has also involved different audiences and participants. From 2007, the projects through which this PhD

State of Design Festival at Storey Hall, RMIT University, Melbourne, 17 October 2006. This in turn became a paper presented at the Interiors Forum Scotland in Glasgow see p. 68, footnote 2 of this document.


3 The use of a slash between architecture and design after interior is common as the terms interior architecture and interior design are seen as interchangeable despite the fact that in most countries around the world (except for five or so in Northern Europe) one can only use the term ‘architect’ if they are a qualified architect. In Australian programs called interior architecture, the graduates of these programs cannot legally call themselves interior architects. Many people feel that interior design is not an appropriate title for what they do, particularly as it is usually equated with interior decoration. Each time I come across the use of a slash, I am taken back to a moment in an auditorium at a conference called ‘Occupations: Negotiations with Constructed Space’, in July 2009, at the University of Brighton in the UK and a presentation by the president of the European Council of Interior Architects/Designers. Julieanna Preston, a colleague from New Zealand who was in the audience, asked the president why the ECIA used a slash between architects and designers, and followed on to say that she did not like coming after a slash. This comment was followed by an uproar of laughter; it was pointed out to Julieanna that in the UK, a slash also means to urinate.
thread of writing continues to be spun invited me to situate my practice in the discipline as interior design.

pantheon Sunday 18 February 2007

This was a small project, an experiment with a visit to the Pantheon in Rome where I attempted to ‘get taken up in the movement … to “come between”’ to an already organized Pantheon of my preconceptions – as an object of recognition – and encounter an immediate present. The decision to film this movement was not pre-mediated but happened as the doors opened and I was caught in a sea of heads and movement. Writing about this project now, I see connections with the previous exhibitions in the desire to harness the forces and energies of temporal complexity; to make relations with time as an outside and an historic past in a present experienced as contingent and in flux; where the unforeseen is invited; and trying to keep this open and inclusive.

Later that year I was invited to participate in an exhibition titled Strangely Familiar [working title]. This was the third in a series that brought the research of interior design and architecture academics from RMIT and University of South Australia together. I decided to make an installation working with the video

The following is from the text written in 2007 for the catalogue text:

1. It should be clarified at the beginning that there is no text to which these footnotes serve as references. Footnotes seemed the most useful kind of text in this situation – in that they are of the work – extensions and trajectories – rather than a text about the work. Footnotes have an empirical quality about them – referencing sources, noting observations – and sidestep the tendency of body text to explain or tell a story. Footnotes are also kind of liberating in the sense that they don’t have to build a structure like body text; there can be many pages of text between one footnote and the next.


5 Strangely Familiar [working title], SASA Gallery, University of South Australia, 8 May–1 June 2007. Curator: Gini Lee. Exhibitors were designers and artists from RMIT School of Architecture and Design and the Louis Laybourne-Smith School of Architecture and Design, University of South Australia. Paul Carter was invited as the SASA Gallery external scholar.

They don’t have to make sense in a linear way and make connections to critical bits of information and connections.

2. In Strangely Familiar, four DVDs were shown and composed pantheon. One piece titled pantheon sunday 18 february 2007 was video footage taken during a visit to the Pantheon in Rome at 11am on Sunday 18 February 2007. The 2.05 minutes of footage was looped and projected onto a window of the SASA Gallery which was covered in trace paper to make visible the moving image. It could be seen during day and night, from inside and outside. Another three DVDs were shown on small monitors on pedestals within the space of the exhibition. One of the videos was also pantheon sunday 18 february 2007 – encountered in the space of the exhibition on a pedestal it was open to the forces of the gallery which render things as artworks and artefacts and encourage an art-viewing subject. The other two from the same footage which had been edited and looped. These were produced by Ramesh Ayyar. Ramesh had selected two scenes – each about 40 secs long – and looped these. One focused on the crowd entering the Pantheon just as the doors opened; the other on the opening in the dome and the circular movement of the video.

3. A visit to Rome, to an idea, an image, a building I had known by image only – the Pantheon. An image I have projected many times to students – usually an image of an etching or of a painting by Giovanni Paolo Panini (18th century). These representations of the interior of the Pantheon read like a slice through or a section in order to amplify the interior and the shaft of light pouring in through the oculus. Sometimes I found myself stuttering in a history/theory lecture, unsure if the hole was actually open or in fact covered; alarmed as to why I did not know even though I had probably read about this many times.

4. I found myself in a crowd gathered in front of the enormous bronze doors. And then they began to open, slowly. I pulled out my digital camera and hurriedly checked to see if it had video function. I wanted to record what happened materially, spatially, temporally – to gather the excess of the encounter; to expose myself to sensations as distinct from my preconceptions; to strangeness as distinct from the familiar.

5. I was aware of the narrative dominance of videoing – a self conscious making of a story of encounter. I didn’t want this to be the outcome – preferring a documenting, gathering, attention which was not about centring my self and my
experience but something which could be collected and expose qualities and conditions about the encounter.

6. This action was part of an experiment in empiricism. The word ‘empiricism’ is used with reference to the writings of Gilles Deleuze and his concept of transcendental empiricism – ‘As such, he presumes no being or subject who experiences. Deleuze finds that the ‘I’ only ever refers to contingent effects of interactions between events, responses, memory functions, social forces, chance happenings, belief systems, economic conditions and so on that together make up a life. … Deleuze shifts the philosophical forces from determining a foundation of likeness amongst humans to revealing and celebrating the contingency, dissimilarity and variety of individual life’. Cliff Stagoll ‘Transcendental Empiricism’ in Adrian Parr (ed), The Deleuze Dictionary Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh, 2005, p. 283.

7. The relation between empiricism and experience is critical within the field of my research – interior design and exhibitions. In these practices, experience is often equated with the individual placed at the centre of the composition, a phenomenological positioning. …

13. As research it has been important for me to keep the footage open and expansive, receptive, and try to resist filling it with meaning, making it an artefact of my own projection. This filling with meaning is inevitable – eventually; however it is not necessarily inevitable immediately. …

15. My practice is curatorial, working spatial and temporal conditions. I don’t make artefacts; instead I make arrangements.

16. Over a number of years, my research has been framed by the idea of a UFO / spacecraft and the potential/possibility of an encounter with the unknown; the relation between subjects and objects, or more precisely things before they become subjects and objects, is where this experimentation takes place. This experimentation has occurred through a practice of making exhibitions. In the catalogue for the exhibition spacecraft 0701 (Monash University Museum of Art, July 2001) I wrote: ‘the conjunction between things and the making of relations has been the focus of an ongoing body of research titled ‘spacecraft’. A double reading of the word ‘spacecraft’ is engaged: spacecraft as UFO and spacecraft as a practice of crafting space. This research has been conducted through curatorial practice and exhibitions with an emphasis on spatial, temporal and material conditions’ …
19. In the invitation to participate in *strangely familiar*, I found I wanted to separate strange from familiar and to loosen the privileged position of familiar. This relates to a desire to make possible encounters with UFO as distinct from the familiar; to shift the centrality of the viewer and their projection onto what they are viewing; to explore the possibilities of a different kind of encounter which resists – even if momentarily – the impetus to make the strange familiar or to search for the familiar; to explore other kinds of relations produced by encounters than that which seeks intimacy and comfort through a repetition of the same. It is in part due to a desire to explore other possibilities of the design of interiors where the exterior rather than the interior is taken as the impetus and force. Rather than working from inside out, projecting onto the world, privileging an interiority – it is to consider the forces of an outside in relation to the production of an interior, producing subjects and objects …

*between itineraries: wall walk 2002*

*between itineraries: wall walk* was part of an earlier collaborative project with Gini Lee produced for *On the Premises. Spatial Ideas and Interior Projects.* While this project was produced five years earlier than *pantheon*, I now see several connections and coincidences between them. Both were part of a series of exhibitions involving RMIT and University of South Australia academics, and Gini was involved in both – here as a collaborator and as a curator/collaborator in *Strangely Familiar*. In both, there is an attempt to come up close and work with the immanent world of relations, ‘in’ rather than ‘to’, and to interiorize without enclosing or representing.

Gini and I were in Istanbul together for a conference called *Mind the Map.* We decided to walk the Byzantine land-walls of Istanbul together, to see what

---

7 Suzie Attiwill and Gini Lee, *Wall Walk*, 2002. Part of the exhibition *On the Premises. Spatial Ideas and Interior Projects*, Goya Galleries, Southbank, 25/9 to 25/10/2002. Curator: Patricia Pringle. (This exhibition was the earlier reciprocal exhibition of *Strangely Familiar* – and hence exhibitors were designers and artists from RMIT School of Architecture and Design and the Louis Laybourne-Smith School of Architecture and Design, University of South Australia. Paul Carter was also involved here – as a guest speaker at the opening).

8 *Mind the Map. The Third International Conference on Design History and Design Studies* Istanbul, Turkey, 9 to 12 July 2002. From call for papers: ‘How does the writing of history affect how we understand the present and how we envision the future? Much design history has seemed to only look backwards, but what are the possibilities for a design history that is engaged with the present and is oriented to the future that affects our self-understanding of who we are and where we might go’ (quoting Clive Dilnot). I presented a paper titled: *An Interior History / Spacecraft* – which was revised and published in the *IDEA Journal* 2004 –
happened and with the aim of producing something for the exhibition. We started off with a guidebook on Istanbul – *Strolling Through Istanbul. A Guide to the City* – a chapter titled ‘Along the Land Walls’ gave us historical information about the walls and also details and drawings on where they could be found. Over 2,500 years, new walls were built to defend the city as it expanded. The wall we walked was constructed during the reign of Theodosius II in the first half of the fifth century and at that time ran for 6.5 kilometres from the Sea of Marmara to the Golden Horn. Once 12 metres high and 5 metres deep, the wall was in various stages of collapse, restoration and use. Many parts have been transformed over the centuries and adapted to become parts of houses and shops, blasted to allow traffic to pass through, and restored as historic monuments.

Gini and I walked together and differently. Gini took photographs and I walked up close to the wall. The title of Gini’s work was *spacing itineraries: wall walking* and the title of my work *between itineraries: wall walk*. For the exhibition, we wove our two walks together – line-by-line – different fonts, written material and visual images.

```
between itineraries: wall walk
spacing itineraries: wall walking
Together we walked the Wall; to gather we walked the Wall
Reading the book led me along the Wall into a most specific itinerary; one of historical narrative
I walked close to the Wall. I wanted to wander beside it, enticing divergent excursions into other spaces; places off the Wall
lean against it, flirt with it – to tease its past in the present
Now, in absentia, other matter emerges to infer lines of displacement and a
These temporal encounters grappled with ideas of history and interior moving away from the published story.
This wall work in Melbourne writes the Wall walk in Istanbul
My most recent record, just travel stories perhaps, alludes to points of departure and
Near the Wall, I found a kite caught in a tree. It is small and made of
an incorporeal itinerary. One of lives within the Wall, of lives contingent on the Wall,
a page torn from a maths book. While an artefact, its action
of lives which may just brush the Wall momentarily.
was collected – the movement of kiting rather than grounding
suzie attiwill

*Gini* lee
```


between itineraries: wall walk – like pantheon – was an experiment in becoming caught up in movement and time, an attempt to collapse the distance and distinction between subject and object; to foreground tactile, haptic, material qualities; to make relations ‘in’; to select, bring in and intensify in a way which attempted to work with movement, forces and energies, and an outside as time: 2500 years, a past present, an immediate present, a future.

I bought loose sections of an old book in an Istanbul market. Attracted by its material qualities and colour, I could find out little more about it from the bookseller. Once I returned to Melbourne, I organised for parts of it to be translated and found it was most likely from between the fourteenth and sixteenth century, from Turkey or Syria and written in a Naskh-based variant of the cursive Riq’a style – and was a book of Islamic law. The book was actually composed of several books including the Book of Contracts and Reconciliation, the Book of Warranty and Assignment, the Book of Acknowledgement, of Detention, of Pre-emption, of Division, of Coercion, of Usurpation, of Hunting and Slaughtered Animals, of Crimes, of Wills – in this order.

I pinned the pages along the length of a gallery wall (approximately six metres) at 1550mm high, that is, the standard height for hanging works on a gallery way and the horizon line in perspectives. In the line of pages, placed at irregular intervals, were pages which at a distance looked like the other pages in terms of colouring but up close one encountered typewriter type rather than calligraphy, English rather than Arabic and a collection of quotes about the walls and their history; space and temporality; differences between speaking and writing; Islamic views on conservation and history where a believer is considered to be outside history. The line of pages had a material and temporal complexity like the walls but different. The pages were another wall walk; a walk along a white gallery wall. Like the wall walk, this arrangement invited a close attention – to come up close, to walk beside and make relations in movement.

Both projects – between itineraries: wall walk and pantheon – were not consciously linked together until the writing of this text for the PhD and yet as creative works chosen to display my research as an interior design academic,

---

10 Ali Darwish was the translator; he was teaching Arabic at RMIT University during this time.
they have contributed to the production of an interiorist and an interior design practice. Both experiment with entering into movement, open to an outside and encounters with the unforeseen. Both produce an interiorization which is open and inclusive, which gathers temporal and material qualities, making a different space-time composition to one already organised through history and guidebooks, and invites a different engagement and subject position.

A subject who orients himself with respect to movements, rather than a retrospectively created construct of space, experiences space not in terms of a totality to which it is connected (I walk across the snow five miles from the centre of town), but rather in terms of pure relations of speed and slowness (snow moving under feet as wind lifts hair) that evokes powers to affect and be affected, both actual and potential (pushing feet against ground, could also jump and run.  

Urban Interiorist

In 2008, I started using the word ‘interiorist’. This naming was as much a provocation to my practice as it was a description of what I did: an interiorist interiorizes! This happened at a time when there was a change in my practice from one involving curatorial roles in exhibitions and the selection of objects to one of interiorizing, attentive to interiorization as a practice of arrangement. Becoming apparent during making relations and the tour of a matter of time, this shift became more pronounced through my involvement with the research group Urban Interior.

*Urban Interior* was formed in 2007. RMIT academics from the disciplines of interior design, architecture, landscape architecture, industrial design, fashion, sound and performance-based practices were curated/brought together by Professor Leon van Schaik, leader of the Customising Space stream in the Design Research Institute at RMIT University. He called this group, *Urban Interior*. Coming from the interior design program with a strong trajectory of using the city of Melbourne as a laboratory for interior design projects, I was

excited about this conjunction between urban and interior and the potential this invoked for further research.\textsuperscript{12} The rationale for the group’s formation was to generate research outcomes and we defined our area of research as:

\textit{Urban Interior \{}UI\textit{}} investigates the relation between people and the urban condition. The urban fabric and in turn people’s lives will change significantly as density increases and issues of security and sustainability become fore-grounded. ... The questions posed by \textit{\{}UI\textit{}} include: What might be the contribution of design disciplines to new modes of urban inhabitation? How can temporary inter-related design actions in urban conditions mediate the kinds of qualities needed to sustain and enrich the increasing inhabitation of urban areas?\textsuperscript{13}

\textit{Urban Interior} events include annual colloquia, exhibitions and publications. While each event has been a collective project, it has been composed of individual contributions. In September 2008, an \textit{Urban Interior Occupation} took place over two weeks with people occupying the galleries of Craft Victoria, Melbourne in different ways, at different times and through different occupations/practice.

Questioning/ignoring the conventional 10am to 5pm opening hours and white cube display of artefacts on plinths, \textit{Urban Interior} takes over Craft Victoria through performances, actions, changes, sound, smell, thoughts, image, discussions, presentations, night and day; redistributing and enfolding outside and insides, individuals and collectives. Craft Victoria becomes arranged by acts of crafting as distinct from craft artefacts, by process rather than outcomes; a space of work and worked space. ... Over the duration of ten days, the gallery space as enclosure and site will be tested, ignored and transformed. Spatial and temporal conditions of the surrounding urban environment will be

\textsuperscript{12} Melbourne is known as an interior city due to the many laneways and covered arcades that run across the city. In 2000, the program published \textit{Interior Cities} (edited by Ross McLeod) a book on the program’s design studios, electives and pedagogy 1990–2000.

\textsuperscript{13} This paragraph is from an Urban Interior funding application.
activated, incorporated, selected, projected, recomposed and transformed.\textsuperscript{14}

Situated within a gallery of craft, the expectation of an exhibition as a static display of objects and works over the duration of the exhibition was challenged by the concept of a changing series of occupations and performance. For the opening we decided there would be no works/artefacts displayed. In a space dedicated to the exhibition of craft where craft is usually understood as objects, this and the possibility that people might come to the gallery to see something and there may be nothing happening confronted people’s expectations.

We played the word ‘occupation’ as both inhabitation and also work/occupation/practice. A set of business cards was produced for each Urban Interior member. This is when I came up with the term ‘interiorist’ for my ‘occupation’ and described this practice in relation to \textit{Urban Interior} as one of:

- gathering / collecting / considering – concepts/ideas of urban interior, customising space, urban room, individuals, collectives, exhibition as research / publication / dissemination, text, relations of in / to.

Over the duration of UI’s inhabitation of Craft Victoria, my occupation as interiorist involves processes of making publicity, of collecting to produce collectivity and communities of practice in the consideration of new kinds of infrastructure and governance which enable creative engagements and encounters.\textsuperscript{15}

The \textit{Urban Interior Occupation} connected my practice with craft again.\textsuperscript{16} To be working in a space dedicated to craft was an interesting shift from the previous exhibition projects where I was invited to work present craft in contemporary art spaces. This had the effect of making me aware of and sensitive to the value of craft in my practice as an interiorist – my occupation of Craft Victoria as well as those of my Urban Interior colleagues. By this I am

\textsuperscript{14} Suzie Attiwill, “Urban Interior Occupation Catalogue” (Craft Victoria, 2008).
\textsuperscript{15} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{16} This was coincidental as a colleague, Rochus Urban Hinkel, established the relation with Craft Victoria. The organisation I worked for from 1996 to 1999 was now in a different location and with different people.
not referring necessarily to an idea of craft as skill so much as a kind of attention and care; an attention to making and a level of care and the potential this has then to unfold in encounters.

This awareness and sensitivity came to the fore when it was proposed that the gallery space remain empty of artefacts for the opening and also in between the different occupations. The emptiness had a sense of neglect and lack of attention; the architectural space was too strong. The forces and energies were stale and dormant. I felt the need for an interiorization that could activate the gallery and in a way that gave people a sense of expectation and stirred interest to return. I painted the words URBAN INTERIOR floor to ceiling height on a long wall that ran the length of the gallery using a low sheen white paint on a matt white wall. As people walked into the gallery, light coming in through the windows and from the lighting track was reflected differently on the painted wall. From different angles and at different times of the day, the words URBAN INTERIOR appeared and disappeared. The scale and softness of the letters made a tactile, haptic relation with people as they walked along and beside the wall. Qualities of light and movement were crafted and actualised; the vacant emptiness of the gallery was transformed into an interior of expectation. A poster which gathered proposed occupations and their timings was another interiorist project – the poster was distributed before and during the occupations, outside in the city on bollards, in shops, on walls as publicity, public city, inviting an audience. Each day the interiorist would occupy the gallery to gather what happened – pausing in the movement of the project to note and think.17

These practices of interiorization find connection with threads from earlier projects: City Provoked (1997)18 and Tramjatra (Kolkata and Melbourne 2001).19 In City Provoked, my role was as ‘an exhibitionist’ (a termed I used); my brief was to connect participants’ projects installed at different locations around the intersection of Flinders and Swanston Street, Melbourne and to make tangible and accessible the overall project addressing public art in the urban realm. In Tramjatra, my role was as ‘a critical passenger’ (a term coined

by Mick Douglas). This project also addressed the production of art in the urban environment – in this case, the cities of Kolkata and Melbourne. As a critical passenger, part of my role – together with my Indian counterpart Jogi Panghaal – was also to make an exhibition of the project.

Located at one of the busiest intersections in Melbourne and, at the time, composed of different conditions from heritage to a construction site for the new Federation Square, *City Provoked* was made present through the placement of a large sign visible from the intersection. A point of gathering for the project both physically and visually; the individual works were collected as images and distributed as a set of postcards for people to pick up at the train station, church, hoarding and pub on each of the intersection’s corners – an invitation to take them and arrange in a different space – at home or work. An exhibition of the project documentation was also held at RMIT Gallery in 1998 together with a series of forums as part of an installation in a gallery.

While there were also exhibitions with the *Tramjatra* project – an exhibition in a tram (Kolkata, February 2001) and a gallery (Melbourne, October, 2001), my role found its expression in a daily column I wrote for *The Statesman*, India’s largest selling English-speaking newspaper from 20 February to 31 March 2001. This column – sometimes a slim rectangle, other times a box of columns, usually p.2 or p.3 – gathered the project in a way which opened it up to many people and invited them to come in. As a practice of interiorization it involved a process of gathering and selecting events of interest and value to the project; inviting readers to come into the project on a daily basis and through the writing inhabit its aspirations, actualizations and transformations.

As collective projects, I was involved in the midst of process and change, working with things and people in production situated in the dynamic movements and flows of cities with a brief to make an exhibition of works dispersed through the urban environment so they could be encountered together and within the context of the overall project. There were many challenges with these projects and the process of interiorization – as a fabrication of a space which gathered and arranged these projects – required both a lightness in relation to the work as well as working with the forces of each city. They produced me as much as I produced them.

---

20 As part of this invitation, a hotmail address was set up for readers so they could make contact with me.
interior designs in the urban environment

... I am interested in the conjunction ‘urban and interior’ in relation to the design of interiors and what a practice of interior design has to contribute to the contemporary city. The conjunction ‘urban and interior’ highlights the relation between interior and exterior conditions without the implication of an existing frame between the two conditions. The idea of urban interior challenges an assumption that interior design necessarily has to take place inside a building and shifts the focus to a relational condition – here the ‘and’ between urban and interior as a question of designing and making the relation. This invites other possibilities for thinking and designing interiors – and the practice of interior design – as well as brings the sensibility and techniques of interior design to the urban environment. The character of the urban interiorist is introduced as a propositional figure to focus on questions of practice, techniques and constraints.²¹

The idea of an urban room was the focus of a design studio offered to second and third year undergraduate interior design students in 2009. Titled Urban Room, the studio brief asked students to design interiors within the urban environment of Melbourne.²² Different practices of interiorization were presented including the concept of site specificity and working with built environment of cities. The 1748 Map of Rome by Giambattista Nolli and Camillo Sitte’s theories in the City Planning According to Artistic Principles (1889)²³ were references in how a city’s built fabric can be reframed as a spatial assemblage of enclosures and openings. The square, forum and agora become re-programmed as interior spaces; pre-existing structures are used to produce interior as enclosed space. Another practice posed working with...

²² With Roger Kemp. Part of the 2009 State of Design Festival project – 2040 City.
conditions rather than a site – rather than site specific, this practice makes site specific. Beginning with movement rather than structure, conditions rather than the built environment, situations rather than sites, students were asked to document lighting and light, shadows; materials and immateriality; movements and flows, densities of circulation and stillness; behaviour; sound; historical layering; urban/city character; programs and activities such as eating, sleeping, meeting, selling, performing, shopping, public intimacies; seasons and weather; 24 hours and 7 days.

They were then asked to produce interior plans that did not rely on the built fabric to define the condition of interior in relation to interior/exterior boundaries. A student, Alice Kohler, observed a street vendor selling photographs who drew chalk lines to organise movement – an interior plan. She mapped movement where confluences of speeds and slowness produce densities and intensifications; interiorizations – like eddies in a stream.

Student projects addressed the flow/stream of people, goods, capital; a perceived anonymity of the city; the seeming disengagement of people in their habitual occupation of the city. Interior-making came between these flows and forces to produce interiors through processes of intensification. A proposition by another student, Sarah Jamieson, for an intersection made use of existing infrastructure such as public seating and trams and rearranged thermal forces to produce a warm interior: passing trams provided energy to heat water running through existing pipes and infrastructure; stopping trams become walls which periodically contain the heat.

Following the Urban Room studio, I offered a interior design elective called Temporal Occupations which involved a trip to Berlin, Germany; Brighton, UK and Melbourne, Australia. The brief to produce a temporal occupation was addressed in each city by the participating students. Temporal occupation invoked a different approach to an occupation of space defined through built form. Instead of approaching the city through a spatial framework – such as maps and itineraries which map out space in advance – students were invited to spend time in the city, document a temporal occupation and consider what was being worked and transformed through the occupation, shifts in program,

---

24 The trip also included participation in the University of Brighton’s conference Occupations. Negotiations with constructed space. As part of the conference, students also participated in a student project addressing the conference topic – the project was based on addressing existing conditions and students were given an itinerary of landmark buildings to visit as part of the initial stages. The difference in approach from ‘temporal occupations’ was highlighted and useful in distinguishing our orientation as different from one of constructed space.
how this was happening (materially, spatially, temporally); to observe historical, social and cultural forces; to be in the complexity of time, of an immediate present and a sense of pasts; how one can return to the same point in space but not time; the effects of the irreversibility of time. They were asked to consider how, through a provisional composition (an exhibition), they could design an interior that came between and proposed a different way of inhabitation of the city. An exhibition was described as a temporal arrangement and an interior as a temporal consistency into which participants/viewers were connected.

In Berlin, Alice cut into street posters as a process of temporal occupation – an interior-making which presented a past. Through the idea of arrangement and re-arrangement as an act of highlighting, Sarah transformed the experience of an ordered space of the Berlin subway through the insertion of a yellow banana; an act of highlighting and arrangement which heightened the yellow tiles, producing an encounter with yellowness.

?interior, practices of interiorization, interior designs

wall walk and pantheon were experiments in the production of encounters that attempted to rearrange the organised space-time compositions already in place; to open up a way of ‘seeing and thinking this world differently’. Movement as continuous variation – like a river – was important in both projects; movement in time and composed of time – thousands of years – encountered in a passing present. To collapse distance by coming up close, loosening and losing the stationary viewing points of the Cartesian viewer where movement is reduced to points on a grid. Matter was also important. The experiments were not an attempt to overlook or dismiss the past and privilege the present, so much as engage with the complexity of time and the production of relations with and in time. As with the exhibitions, these projects involved working with things already in the world, to move outside their given interior (their is-ness) and in to the immanent world of relations, to attend to the production of interior.

My involvement with Urban Interior, and the earlier projects of Tramjatra and City Provoked, invited practices of interiorization in a different way as there

were no given interiors to open up. Each project brought into question inside and outside in relation to the spaces of the gallery and art in the public, urban realm. With these projects, the practice of an interiorist was invoked and produced as one of making relations between the disparate works to enable an encounter with the overall project. In the case of the Urban Interior Occupation, the projects occupied the same space and were gathered spatially yet occurring at different times; with Tramjatra and City Provoked, the projects happened simultaneously more or less, but were spatially dispersed. While the interiorist subject was launched at the opening of the Urban Interior Occupation in September 2008, one can see glimpses of her interiorizing the walls of Istanbul in July 2002, in the Pantheon on the 18th of February 2007 and enveloped in the brown cube of a matter of time for two years.

Sitting each day in the Craft Victoria gallery, the role of the Urban Interior interiorist was one of gathering and ‘collecting to produce collectivity’ – activities which happening during the occupation. A similar process happened with Tramjatra and City Provoked; and as with a matter of time one was always in the midst of the project. To bring in and repeat from the Introduction:

... how to get taken up in the movement of a big wave, a column of rising air, to ‘come between’ rather than be the origin of an effort.

This coming between as being in the middle could be understood as a practice of the ‘middleman’. An interiorist as a middleman? This term is used with reference to curators and a practice which mediates between objects and viewers. In short, a middleman is seen as coming between the one-to-one relation between work and viewer. There was a lot of discussion and criticism of this process of curatorial mediation in the late 1990s and early 2000s when the practice of curating was emerging in contemporary art as a practice concerned not just with the care and expertise of particular categories of objects but in the curation of exhibitions. The privileging of intentionality and the idea that it can be directly communicated has been the focus of critique and experimentation by artists and curators.

26 Visit http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=h0R3lV_pDg
27 Deleuze, “Mediators.” 284.
The notion of intentionality is often used as a way of establishing an identity between the structure of the world and the structure of the subject in the world. The insistence on such an identity is a tacit assumption of a divide. An objective-subjective split is backhandedly enshrined in this way of thinking. A mediating instance is then required to bring the two realms back into harmony.\textsuperscript{29}

This process of mediation also describes the role of the interior designer – to return to the IFI Declaration: ‘Interior designers and interior architects determine the relationship of people to spaces based on psychological and physical parameters, to improve the quality of life’.\textsuperscript{30} The subject of the interiorist proposes a different role for interior designers than one of mediation. An interiorist is situated in the midst – both producing and being produced by the project. An activator and a subject-in-making. This was experienced during \textit{a matter of time} and the dissolution of the subject and object divide in the midst of energies and forces where I was produced by the project as much as the producer of the project; while travelling, making relations and posing \textit{interior} each time anew; and the production of interior as a singular and unique time-space composition.

Like the rainforest bird and its ability to perform and sing is produced through the light that reflects from the paler side of the leaf onto the bird’s exposed pale gold neck feathers.

... the individual is not just a result, but an environment of individuation.\textsuperscript{31}

... to understand the individual from the perspective of the process of individuation rather than the process of individuation by means of the individual \textsuperscript{32}

This shifts the focus from objects and subjects to process and productions. An interiorist is caught in the process, affected and effecting, making relations which produce new arrangements and passages to the not yet known. The subject of an interiorist as ‘a result and an environment of individuation’ enables a different way of thinking about my practice and the role of an interior designer as well as the potential of an interior-making within the urban environment: working within movement as an arrangement of forces, flows and energies to produce a temporary consistency which enables a different inhabitation.

From interiorist to interiorizt – the essay that follows – was commissioned for a book called The Handbook of Interior Architecture and Design. This essay was written in 2011 towards the end of this PhD and with a sense of its potential to become a conclusion; as a movement from arranging the research to produce the PhD to an arrangement which offers the research up to the discipline. Gathering threads that run through the research, interiorizt weaves them again and through a repetition of making as a rearrangement produced a new subject: an interiorizt.

As a conclusion, the following essay poses ?interior; the question mark coming before, to produce a pause and open up interior in time, as a contemporary problematic, to be addressed each time anew.
A note about how ‘s’s and ‘z’s have moved around in this writing.

You may have noticed that interiorist is spelt with an s and yet practices of interiorization with a z. Interiorization can also be spelt with an ‘s’ – and the title of *Between Representation and the Mirror: tactics for interiorization* was automatically changed to interiorisation as part of general conformity to the publication’s choice of language. This shows how the world cannot be closed off and controlled; how words move, letters change, inconsistencies arise.

However I prefer ‘z’ for interiorization as there is a sense of activity with z; in contrast, s seems rather placid and in an uninteresting way. It’s funny, as I write this a thought enters about my name; how I write my name with a ‘z’ – a fabrication by a 15 year old girl called Susie living in France which produced a Suzie.

Interiorist with an ‘s’ was used during the *Urban Interior Occupation* as interiorizt is not a word in any language; interiorizt only came about through writing the following essay.
interioritz
a provocation\textsuperscript{1}

Interioritz! A new word for a 21\textsuperscript{st} century practice! This statement however claims too much as ‘interioritz’ is quite like the Spanish word for interior designer – interiorista. Perhaps what is new though is the emphasis on interior not as an adjective of another practice such as interior design, interior architecture and interior decoration but as interior doing, making, designing. Interioritz brings ‘interior’ to the fore as a primary activity; as a focus on practise, interiorization, techniques and tactics. ‘Interioritz’ is a proposition for practising, a way of seeing and saying, thinking and doing, attending to the question and making of interior(s) in the midst of contemporary forces which transform ideas of inside, outside and ways of inhabiting.

Interioritzs draw upon an array of precedents and strata to test, and experiment with, the possibilities of interior-making while celebrating and foregrounding interior design’s concern with the designing of interiors which includes the inside of buildings (interior architecture and interior decoration) as well as other practices of interior-making such as events and installation art. In this sense, interioritzs could be seen as the next phase (or perhaps more of a bifurcation) of interior design. However interioritzs also make a radical shift to question and attend to ideas of ‘interior’ which underpin contemporary interior design practice, education and research. Interioritzs address ‘interior’ as a creative problematic through design.

This essay will invoke the potential of ‘interioritzs’, their connection with interior design and how the concept of ‘interior’ becomes a critical design proposition. Located in the middle between past and future, this text is manifesto-like to address here and now. A series of interior designs will be sketched-in as a proposed genealogy to intervene in the present moment and to invoke a current and future-becoming ‘interioritz’.

\textsuperscript{1} interioritz is an essay commissioned for The Handbook of Interior Architecture and Design, ed. Graeme Brooker and Lois Weinthal (London: Bloomsbury) – forthcoming 2013. Permission to include this essay as part of my PhD has been approved by Bloomsbury (Final email confirmation regarding permission to print received on 27 February 2013.)

\textsuperscript{2} Ed Hollis et al., eds., Thinking Inside the Box. A Reader in Interiors for the 21st Century
Relation to Interior Design

Interior design emerged from the discipline of interior design partly because of the dynamics that surround the term ‘interior design’ and the continual negotiations between interior decoration and interior architecture. Over the past century, interior design became defined through a process of distinction from both interior decoration and architecture. While interior design and interior decoration are now recognised as two distinct professions, there continues to be confusion about the term ‘interior design’. This has led to an increase in the use of ‘interior architecture’ as a term to clarify and articulate interior design as a practice concerned with the design of spaces and not their decoration. However the term ‘interior architecture’ cannot be legally used in most countries in the world unless the practitioner is a qualified architect. Yet the Library of Congress – an international cataloguing system – has interior architecture and interior decoration as the main subject headings used in the classification of all bibliographic material. Interior design is a sub-heading of interior decoration. It would seem that ‘interior design’ as a term is becoming increasingly fraught and difficult to use in a way which makes a connection to a particular practice.

‘Interiors’ is often used to overcome this issue of terminology and to bring focus to the practice as one which addresses interiors. Yet this hasn’t seemed to resolve the issue of clarifying the practice. Thinking Inside the Box – a conference convened by Interiors Forum Scotland in Glasgow in 2007 – addressed ‘interiors’ and in the call for papers described interiors as an ‘evolving and slippery discipline. Whilst the interior is everywhere, it is nevertheless ephemeral and difficult to define’. The problem of identity is continually raised within the discipline and frequently seen as a crisis in need of resolution. The International Federation of Interior Architects/Designers (IFI), a body representing professional organizations, initiated a series of global symposiums and workshops in 2011 under the title Design Frontiers. The Interiors Entity to address this identity issue.

Whether interiors, interior design, interior architecture or interior decoration, the word ‘interior’ is generally understood as a given enclosed three-dimensional space and as a practice of the built environment. The word ‘space’ is often interchangeable with ‘interior’. An understanding of interior – usually referred to as ‘the interior’ – in relation to existing space, form and

---

structure is reiterated through the dominant narratives of interior design practice, histories and theories. An example can be found in the introductory paragraphs to The History of Interior Design where ‘Interiors are [defined as] an integral part of the structures that contain them – usually buildings. This means that interior design is inextricably linked to architecture and can only be studied within an architectural context’. The IFI website defines interior design/interior architecture in relation to negative space: ‘Firstly, that across all existing design fields – whether graphics, fashion, product design, architecture or other disciplines – interior design is the only one to have its end product grounded in the sculpting of “negative” space rather than the production of a “positive” object. Secondly, that at the core of interiors lies an understanding of the abstract qualities of shaping this negative space or “void”’. Defined in this way, the move to interior architecture as a term to describe this practice of interior designing seems logical. However it is important to note that this positioning of interior as necessarily inside a pre-existing thing and/or as enclosed space privileges an idea of interior as an entity or artefact where structure defines inside and outside. This reduces the potential of interior design in a contemporary world where forces and technologies challenge the idea of physical structures and materiality in relation to the production of insides and outsides.

In terms of ‘interior’ what is highlighted in this re-positioning is ‘interior’ no longer as a given inside as implied by interior architecture and interior decoration; instead the question of interior is posed. This could be: ‘interior?’ – a what-question which implicates a noun as an answer. It could also be posed as ‘?interior’. Shifting the ? to before ‘interior’ produces a pause which opens up ‘interior’ in time and invites a designing. In questioning ‘interior’ as ?interior, the invitation is not to provide an answer through redefining the concept of interior but to attend to it as a design, as a question in relation to practise – a ‘how’ question which as a creative problematic needs to be addressed each time anew. It is to suspend the assumption of the middle bit – the wall, boundary which already defines an inside – to place the question of ?interior in the world; to open it up to the exterior/outside.

The proposition and invocation of ‘interiorizt’ is to invite a practice that affirms and highlights, draws attention to, extends, amps up, delights in interior design’s potential to pose the question of interior through designing where

---

interior becomes a process of interiorization before it becomes a space and entity. In connecting with interior design, interiorizt practice acknowledges the value of design as a creative activity and the conjunction with interior. Interior without ‘design’ become a type, an entity, a noun as distinct from a practice, an outcome as distinct from a process. Unlike interior architecture and interior decoration, interior design has the potential to keep the question of ‘interior’ open – open to an outside – as a creative, critical, contemporary proposition. For this reason, interiorizt practice is invoked as a trajectory of interior design and one which will engage and extend the discipline of interior design as a critical contemporary practice.

In the following section, a collection of writings which pose interior as a contemporary problematic are arranged to encourage and support a future interiorizt practice. Each addresses practise, interior-making, different approaches, strategies and techniques in relation to designing interior(s). Each makes explicit connections with interior design as a discipline and practice. The diversity and heterogeneity in this collection celebrates the creative potential of posing ?interior and challenges any attempt to achieve one answer or solution. This variation invites and incites interioriztsts to connect, invent, experiment and manifest the potential of interior design as practise addressing the question of interior through designing. An abundance of theoretical threads already present in interior design practice and history becomes apparent and the potential for these to be engaged with practice, research, scholarship and education becomes tangible. As a proposed genealogy they offer an opportunity to grasp the potential of posing ?interior as a design proposition

?interior, practices of interiorization, interior designs

Walter Benjamin, an early twentieth-century German philosopher, positions ‘the interior’ as a retreat from an exterior world of industrializing forces. For Benjamin, the collector is ‘the true resident’ of this interior. The process of collecting engages an interior/exterior dynamic where the outside is collected through a process of selection and is brought inside into an organisation and system of relations. Benjamin notes: ‘the true method of making things present

---

is to represent them in our space (not to represent ourselves in their space). The dynamics between interior and exterior, inside and outside are critical in the production of inhabitation both physically and mentally. The collector who selects things from the exterior and brings them inside engages in a process of domestication in the sense of taming, possession and mastery. Benjamin writes of the collector’s need to remove all functional references from the collected objects as part of a process of idealisation to enable inhabitation:

For the private individual, the place of dwelling is for the first time opposed to the place of work. The former constitutes itself as the interior. Its complement is the office. The private individual, who in the office has to deal with reality, needs the domestic interior to sustain him in his illusions. … From this arise the phantasmagorias of the interior – which for the private man, represents the universe. In the interior, he brings together the far away and the long ago. His living room is a box in the theatre of the world.

‘The interior’ is thus an art of genre where ‘the fictional framework for the individual’s life is constituted in the private home...’ as distinct from an art of tectonics.

Movement becomes a critical aspect in the production of this interior which enables both physical and mental inhabitation. The collector’s motivation is described as ‘a struggle against dispersion’ where interior-making involves a slowing down as a process of stabilization – sometimes to the point of stasis – to make possible this inhabitation.

... To live in these interiors was to have woven a dense fabric about oneself, to have secluded oneself in a spider’s web, in whose toils world events hang
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6 Ibid. 206.
7 Ibid. 8-9.
8 Ibid. 20.
9 Ibid. 211.
loosely suspended like so many insect bodies sucked dry.\textsuperscript{10}

The connection made between interior and movement where movement is highlighted as implicated in interior-making is a powerful concept which re- orients the way one might think about interior design – for example, ideas of inhabitation in relation to comfort through a connection with movement and slowing down becomes a question of stabilizing movement to produce a temporal consistency as distinct from comfort as a form of intimacy between things.

Architectural historian Charles Rice refers to Benjamin’s writing as the moment of ‘the emergence of the interior’ in modernity. Rice positions ‘the interior’ as one produced relationally and as ‘a conceptual apparatus’. He distinguishes this from an idea of interior as defined by architectural structure.\textsuperscript{11} In relation to the question of interior and interiorizt interests – this concept offers up different ways of thinking about interior-making. Interior conceived as ‘apparatus’ highlights modes of organisation, operations and dynamics of interior-making and as a relation with an exterior. With reference to the writings of Benjamin, Rice observes that:

\[\ldots\text{this interior is produced through an infolding,}\ldots\]
\[This\text{ surface does not produce a hermetic seal against the external world, but rather is activated through the inhabitant’s relation to the city and its world of publicness, business and commerce, and enables a subjectivity and social identity marked ‘bourgeois’ to be supported artefactually.}\ldots\text{The indefatigable collector understands that such a fabrication of the interior is a continual process, a set of techniques and practices that ensure the ongoing viability of a self.}\textsuperscript{12}

The collaborative writings of Graeme Brooker and Sally Stone also position the concept of interior in relation to an exterior but it is a different kind of exterior

\textsuperscript{10} Ibid. 216.


and relation from the one posed by Benjamin. Brooker and Stone write of the exterior as an existing condition within which an interior is designed. This exterior includes the building as well as other contexts both spatial and temporal for example history and previous patterns of occupation. ‘... the interior is bound to its situation; it is enclosed within a building, which is, in turn, contained within its context’. The interior designer responds ‘to the particular place that the interior inhabits’. Interior-making becomes a process of interpretation and representation where the exterior is understood as a space of existing meaning and the past as ‘a package of sense’. Interior design here involves the re-presentation of this existing meaning so that it can be physically and mentally inhabited, occupied and experienced.

This concept of exterior as an existing condition to which the interior designer responds is a familiar concept within interior design discourse. There is a sense of a structure here that is both architectural and contextual. Brooker and Stone identify a range of practices, strategies and tactics that can be used – such as insertion, intervention and installation. The ‘in-ness’ of each of these actions – in-sertion, in-tervention, in-stallation – conjures a sense of how each happens in a context and implies a degree of stability and fixity of the exterior context so as to enable such an action to intervene, insert or install to make an interior. From a certain angle it would seem similar to the idea of privileging the architectural context as the space within which interior design happens however what is active here is not an assumption that interior equates with already enclosed, three-dimensional space. Instead it positions the practice of interior design, of interior-making in relation to exterior as an existing condition and poses ?interior within this existing order.

The act of creating interior space is a strategy that is naturally transgressive, it is an act that interprets, conforms to, or even disobeys existing orders. An addition to this collection is the concept of interiorist (with an ‘s’) presented by Michael Benedikt, a professor in architecture and urbanism, in a self-described polemic titled ‘Environmental Stoicism and Place Machismo’. He claims there has been ‘a hundred year war against interiority [which] rages

and calls for an interiorist way of attending to the world which values and places ‘environmental experience ahead of form-making and tectonics’. This statement offers a contrasting definition of interior design from those of Pile and IFI. For Benedikt the practice of interior design is an interiorist practice and he is critical of interior design educators and practitioners who rebrand the discipline as interior architecture saying they have misunderstood their practice through a focus on the architectural. Along similar lines, he dismisses the definition of interior design as a practice of shaping space.

... to conceive space as ‘shape-able’ by design is to treat it as a sculptor would. It is to transform space from something oceanic or atmospheric, from something fecund, field-like, and interiorly structured, into something with an exterior to which one could apply a tool. ... thus has an opportunity been lost to read the world as ‘endless interiority’ and densely relational ... .

For Benedikt, the feeling of interiority is one ‘of being immersed, surrounded, enclosed’ transcends the experience of rooms and other indoor enclosures and extends to the out-of-doors. In this concept of interior – this interior design – there is no exterior but an endless interiority where interior designing becomes a way of seeing and thinking which he distinguishes from an exteriorist approach and attitude. Benedikt uses the metaphors of Russian Babushka dolls and an onion to describe the difference between the two approaches. The interiorist works from the inside out, seeing and attending to surroundings as though embedded within several concaved layers. Here there is a sense of proximity, of closeness, where surfaces, textures, colour, touch becomes heightened. In contrast, the exteriorist attends to form, the exterior of the object. Benedikt notes however that this is not a question of subjectivity and objectivity as there are subjective and objective interiorists as well as exteriorists. He aligns many qualities, practices and people with each attitude and approach – for example, phenomenologists and Einstein are interiorists whereas behaviourists and Plato are exteriorists.

In relation to the provocation ‘interior and interior-making, Benedikt’s ideas introduce an idea of interior and interiority as an endless and oceanic
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condition which emanates and projects from the subject who experiences and practises. He calls for interior design to develop its own vocabulary through ‘articulating the interiorist world view and all its sensitivities – sensitivities to texture, pattern, colour, style, touch, nearness, arrangement, personality, and domesticity, to “charged” objects (the life in inanimate things), to class, and to the power of people themselves – of their clothed, warm, breathing bodies – to transform any environment by their presence’.  

Like Benjamin, Andrea Branzi, designer and academic, places the question of interior in relation to the city. However Branzi’s city is the twenty-first century city with different forces of urbanization from that of the early twentieth-century industrial city. Branzi challenges the concept of the built environment. The twenty-first century city, he claims, ‘is no longer just a bunch of “architectural boxes”, having transformed itself into a territory of commodities, exchanges, information and services’.  

This city is not posed as exterior to an interior-making, as with Benjamin, instead the city itself has become a continuous interior; an interior where there is no exterior side. This continuous interior highlights a shift from thinking about cities and urbanization in relation to architectural form and structure to one approaching them as composed of networks, relations and movement between people, information, infrastructure, economies, agriculture and meteorology. Space is also displaced by an idea of territory where movement is implicated in the production of modes of inhabitation, occupation and use.

The city’s architectural structures, once conceived for specialised functions on the basis of rational and sectional patterns, are now used in a disparate, improper, temporary fashion: it is tendentially possible to carry out ‘any activity anywhere’. This observation represents a brand-new subject for the Interior Design culture and opens a new season of design experimentation and deeper inspection into the new frontiers of an urban reality that not only needs to be continuously ‘re-functionalised’ in order to give hospitality to unexpected activities, but also

---

20 Ibid. 4.


witnesses a contamination of the same business, residential and cultural activities. No more as separated environmental realities, but rather as active elements of an enzymatic territory, always changing its function and form.23

Juxtaposed here is another diagram for thinking and practising interior-making from a symposium called INSIDEOUT which brought together the practices of interior design and landscape architecture to see what could be said and thought if the middle bit between them – architecture – was taken out of the composition and questions of insides and outsiders were brought to the fore.24 The philosopher Elizabeth Grosz presented the keynote paper – titled ‘Chaos, Territory, Art: Deleuze and the Framing of the Earth’. Grosz proposed an idea of framing as a process of producing inside within an outside:

The frame is what establishes territory out of the chaos that is the earth. … the constitution of territory is the fabrication of the space in which sensations may emerge, from which a rhythm, a tone, colouring, weight, texture may be extracted and moved elsewhere, may function for its own sake, may resonate for the sake of intensity alone.25

Woven through Grosz’s presentation were references to the philosophy of Gilles Deleuze including the concept of a generalised exteriority within which territories (interiors) are produced. While a frame may be a structure of enclosure, the emphasis here was on process – framing. The division of interior and exterior as first and foremost form and structure was shifted through a foregrounding of process and movement. Space comes after – as an outcome of framing. The concepts of interior and interiority become a question of making in an outside which is conceived as fleeting and transitory as distinct from pre-existing. Framing here is a process which separates, organises, slows down and arranges these dynamic forces into a temporal and spatial composition. While Grosz used the concept of framing, Deleuze writes of the constitution of an inside and interiority as a fold of the outside.26

23 Branzi, “Retailing in the Globalisation Era.” 96.
26 See in particular, the chapter ‘Foldings, or the Inside of Thought (Subjectivation) in Gilles Deleuze, Foucault, trans. Sean Hand (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1988).
An interior-making through the production of a temporal consistency in relation to an outside becomes a composition of movement – ‘a rhythm’ – which creates a space-time that enables inhabitation physically and mentally.

The important thing is to understand life, each living individuality, not as form or as a development of form but as a complex relation between differential velocities, between deceleration and acceleration of particles. [...] So an animal, a thing is never separable from its relations with the world. The interior is only a selected exterior, and the exterior, a projected interior. The speed or slowness of metabolisms, perceptions, actions and reactions link together to constitute a particular individual in the world.27

an invitation / invocation

‘The interior is only a selected exterior, and the exterior, a projected interior’: this statement could become an interiorizt motto. The five interior propositions presented above – Benjamin/Rice, Brooker & Stone, Benedikt, Branzi, Grosz/Deleuze – offer up different internal and external forces in relation to posing ?interior. One encounters an array of selected exteriors and projected interiors: the collected exterior and the mimetic interior, the existing exterior and the re-presented interior, the bracketed exterior and the phenomenological interior, the impotent exterior and the continuous interior, the generalised exterior and the provisional interior. Processes of interiorization such as collecting, inserting, framing and folding become apparent. While there could be other references and connections (and perhaps more that do not start with a B!), this series becomes a genealogy that makes apparent the potential in posing the question of interior as ?interior.

Projected interiors and selected exteriors proliferate, enticing interiorizts to experiment while invoking interior design as a critical, creative practice in the

midst of current and contemporary forces. In contrast to concerns about slipperiness and lack of definition, this diversity becomes ‘differential vistas of experimentation’ and the potential of interior design as a practice of interior-making emerges. Fundamentals and foundations presented as unquestionable self-givens and defining elements of a discipline are not dismissed but become particular kinds of interiorizations.

Posing the question of ?interior in time, contemporary concerns are amplified and highlighted as ones of interior and interior-making. The potential here for the question of interior to be posed in, and engage with, contemporary forces such as urban inhabitation and subjectivity is both challenging and exciting. Interioriztsts with their understanding of interior-making and techniques of interiorization have a different way of seeing and responding to current forces and situations. In continually posing the question of interior as ?interior and in relation with an exterior, interioriztsts bring with them an orientation which enables a critical engagement with, and transformation, of contemporary environments. The potential for ?interior to be posed, engaged and experimented with in relation to questions of inhabitation, physically and mentally, where interior-making makes spaces and subjects – interior spaces and interiority – through processes of interiorization invites and invokes an interiorizt practice across many scales.

If we pick up the idea of the exterior as a projected interior and the interior as a selected exterior in relation to the proposition of/provocation for interiorizt practice in the twenty-first century, what can be said and seen now? Forces such as globalisation, capitalism, contemporary technologies, urban density and war challenge existing ideas and modes of inhabitation – of place, belonging, subjectivity – and invite the production of new interiors and exteriors. For example, urbanization and inhabitation continue to be connected with questions of interior. The twenty-first century has been flagged as ‘the century of the city’ as the number of people living in cities reaches unprecedented levels and density becomes a critical issue affecting how people live, lifestyles and modes of inhabitation.

Through posing ?interior, ‘individualism’ and ‘the individual’ become apparent as interior designs which privilege an idea of enclosed form and an idea of
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interior as an internalised and independent entity. The phenomena of ‘the intimate metropolis’\(^\text{30}\) where subjectivity and individualism of contemporary society are brought to the fore could become a focus for interiorizt practice, The psychoanalyst and social theorist, Félix Guattari’s call for a re-singularization of subjectivity through attending to physical, social and mental ecologies\(^\text{31}\) invites an interiorizt practice where interior-making becomes a practice attending to the invention of new modes of subjectivization and inhabitation.

Interior design as a discipline already offers up the potential for this interiorizt practice however there needs to be a shift from defining interior as necessarily defined by organized space, form and structure so that the question of interior can be opened and posed in an outside. This then leads to questions not only of ‘interior?’ but also ‘?interior’ where the production of interior as a creative problematic is posed in relation to processes of interiorization. Organized space, whether enclosed or negative, and structure become potential outcomes of interiorizations as distinct from the pre-defining elements of an interiorizt practice. What if space and structure are products of twentieth-century thinking and not so useful to a twenty-first century practice and context where contingency and change are dominant forces?

Shifts from spatial to temporal thinking in relation to design and inhabitation can be mapped in the concept of Gesamtkunstwerk. This concept of a total environment connects with the question of interior as a unified and singular condition. The story of ‘The Poor Little Rich Man’ written and published in 1900 by architect and critic, Adolf Loos\(^\text{32}\) is a wonderful example of a total spatial environment with no relation to movement, contingency or an outside. Here Loos tells the story of a wealthy man who engaged an architect to design his entire house in the contemporary manner as a total work of art, Gesamtkunstwerk. The design was completed; the client was thrilled. On his birthday he received presents from family and friends and realised he wasn’t sure where to place them, so he called the architect to come and advise him. The architect let out a scream of horror upon arrival as the man opened the front door wearing the wrong slippers for the entrance hall. The slippers were


not designed for the carpet of that space and hence destroyed the whole environment.

In a more recent discussion about this idea of the total environment and its presence in twenty-first century design, a shift can be noted from a spatial emphasis to one of temporality where the concept of Gesamtkunstwerk as a total work of art continues but becomes one of ‘... temporary totalities, nomadic encampments or natural environments composed of aggregated assemblies’. A distinction becomes apparent between two modes of total design in relation to different process of making cohesive and interiorizing: one privileges organized space to the extent where change and exterior forces – such as birthday presents and slippers – become intrusive as they move across spatial boundaries; and another which achieves a sense of unity and cohesion which is provisional and dynamic, enabling an engagement with contingency, temporality and change.

The intention here is not to claim one over the other as the right or correct mode for interior designing in the twenty-first century; instead it is to highlight the effects of different ideas expressed through practice and to affirm these differences and variations as an expression of a creative practice engaged with contemporary conditions. The series of propositions presented above show how different ideas of interior implicate ways of seeing, thinking and doing which affect and produce insides and outsides.

interior is a question posed in a continually changing and dynamic outside and as such invites the potential for the new. This is one reason why there is a ‘z’ rather than an ‘s’ in this interiorizt and interiorization. The use of ‘z’ in words can be described as ‘an active s’; shaped like a lightening strike, a ‘z’ brings energy and movement to a word, its reading and meaning. While interiorizt practice includes interiorists it cannot become equated with interiorism as the ‘z’ is like a bolt out of the blue.

---

inflection
inflection plays with reflection and the expectations a writer and reader bring to a conclusion – especially a conclusion of postgraduate research in the ‘by project’ mode.

inflection also seems an appropriate conclusion for a PhD which presents a body of work over a ten-year period that has continually posed the question of interior and produced an interioritz who can’t resist but continue to pose ?interior and highlight the potential of interior design even in this moment of conclusion.

inflection also helps bend the problems with reflection which have been problematized from the very beginning of this PhD. The question posed to the projects is also relevant to pose to the PhD as a research project: ‘if one shifts from Cartesian and phenomenological concepts of object/subject relations, then what kind of interior(s) become actualised?’ These concepts of object/subject relation confront one when doing research as both are established subjects of research – the rational subject and the reflective subject – and research a relation of ‘to’, of recognition and identification. This is where reflection becomes problematic as it suggests a reflection on what one already knows.

The first experiment of the PhD, SPACECRAFT 0701, shifted this one-to-one correspondence between subject and object as knower and known and the impulse to recognize through rearranging ‘sightings, sitings and citings’ to invite people to be curious and encounter the unforeseen and unknown. The quote from Foucault cited in SPACECRAFT is worth repeating here:

... (Curiosity) evokes ‘care’; it evokes the care one takes of what exists and what might exist; a sharpened sense of reality; but one that is never immobilised before it; to find what surrounds us
strange and odd; a certain determination to throw off familiar ways of thoughts and to look at the same things in a different way; a passion for seizing what is happening now and what is disappearing; a lack of respect for the traditional hierarchies of what is important and fundamental ...¹

Like the magnificent throng of gesticulating court attendants swept up in the composing forces and energies of life, ?interior has been posed in an immanent world of relations. Each project has experimented with inflecting internal and external forces to actualize other interiors than those produced by Cartesian/phenomenological arrangements.

The projects as research each posed ?interior in relation to an invitation from the outside – pausing to open the question of interior. The projects were like an apprenticeship in learning to ‘become sensitive’ to matter, forces, energies, time and movement; to experiment with processes and practices of interiorization, objectification, subjectification and spatialization.²

These experiments affirmed the value of posing ?interior: in the specific projects (exhibition, conference, undergraduate design studio), in my practice, in the discipline of interior design and as doctoral research. Posing the question of ?interior and the potential of rearranging relations to see what other interiors become actualized opened up the givens of interior design as a practice of enclosed space and entities to one open to an outside, to movement and time. Questions of selection and arrangement came to the fore – which one? where? when? how?; questions of evaluation and ethics. The question of what? and its imperative to answer and know ‘what is’ seems to miss – or at the very least, misdirect – the potential of research through practice.


² Gilles Deleuze, Proust & Signs, Theory Out of Bounds (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2000). 4. ‘Learning is essentially concerned with signs. Signs are the object of a temporal apprenticeship, not of an abstract knowledge. To learn is first of all to consider a substance, an object, a being as if it emitted signs to be deciphered, interpreted. There is no apprentice who is not “the Egyptologist” of something. One becomes a carpenter only by becoming sensitive to the signs of wood, a physician by becoming sensitive to the signs of disease. Vocation is always predestination with regard to signs. Everything that teaches us emits signs; every act of learning is an interpretation of signs or hieroglyphs. Proust’s work is based not on the exposition of memory, but on the apprenticeship to signs.’
The arrangement of this PhD inflects the projects to make another project – the project and production of a PhD. As another project, it is also an engagement with the practice that has been produced through the research. The exhibitions worked with things in the world to bring them together as an arrangement.

Practice is the utilisation of that which already is (what else is there?) but in the production of new and specifically different combinations. Always affirm the eternal return.³

The composition of this writing also comes between internal and external forces to pose ?interior. Like the exhibitions which worked with things already in the world, this line of writing becomes a vein of colour that runs through the projects picking up flecks which inflect its movement and produce a PhD. It writes the practice as distinct from writing about the practice. The energies and composing forces of each project are brought to the fore in this rearrangement – like the works in each exhibition – rather than organising them according to themes and a dominant narrative structure.

This PhD is one of many PhDs that could be produced from this collection of projects; each rearrangement producing a different inflection. As experienced in a *matter of time* and Wilson’s rearrangement of an eighteenth century painting in the Baltimore Museum. Posing ? beforehand is to pause and appreciate there are things we don’t know; to open interior to movement and time. This is not a question mark in search of an answer or a set of principles which would preclude posing ?interior again and again, rather it is a question mark that invites practise. This is celebrated in *interioritzt* where interior becomes a singular unique production in time and space – a temporal consistency – each time anew, producing a multiplicity.

This poses a challenge when doing a PhD, defined as an original contribution to knowledge. As does the posing ?interior as an opening and an invitation to produce without a guaranteed way of measuring beforehand. The research has questioned both the idea of pre-existing context and the value of establishing a structure beforehand in relation to interior designing, and also here in relation to the production of knowledge. The idea of identifying gaps in knowledge and filling them in is like the act of stamp collecting and filling an album – the given structure and closed set of relations provide validation.

The twisting of the threads of research in relation to ‘interior’ and subject/object relations surface in the weave here and knot the PhD.

Deleuze is useful here as he encourages a move from knowledge to thinking. He is critical of knowledge as a knowing that comes beforehand as it produces an object of recognition – a reflection – and method as a process that ‘protects thought from error’.4 For Deleuze, thinking happens through a shock that comes from the outside that causes one to think – to open up. This also involves a different idea of truth from ones based on coherence between propositions (like the stamp collection) or correspondence to objective facts. Deleuze uses the word ‘vivify’ in discussing truth.

Thus, to say something is true is not to say something verifiable in some way, but to say something that vivifies and alters a situation.5

The evaluation of this practice of interior design in relation to whether it ‘vivifies and alters a situation’ – whether it animates and brings to life – makes apparent its contribution and potential. A search for evidence so something can be identified, verified and repeated in a consistent way effects a closure of ?interior.

The challenge has been how to open up these ideas in a way which does not require one to be a philosopher. The key here has been to experiment through practise and work with the writings of Deleuze and others as a box of tools.

This thinking has produced a philosophy; a way of engaging thought in practice; a philosophy defined through the practice of interior design: ‘... to think while making or rather while doing: to think as doing.’6 This is different to a theorization of interior design practice.7
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7 Kent Kleinman, Joanna Merwood-Salisbury, and Lois Weinthal, eds., After Taste. Expanded Practice in Interior Design (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 2012). This book is divided into chapters: those written by theorists and historians who write about practice and the discipline; and a series of interviews with practitioners. It is a great book that addresses some exciting issues however this division is problematic.
The valuing of thinking engages with an interior design practice as a temporal consistency produced in time, open to movement, making anew each time. The research has produced a capability to think – to pause and open up to the outside. This has enabled a way of positioning creative research that values experimentation, experience and expression.

As a reinvention of a practice – a future practice – and a contribution to the future of the discipline of interior design, each project, including this PhD, has involved thinking ‘its own history (the past), but in order to free itself from what it thinks (the present) and be able finally to ‘think otherwise (the future).’

Over the past ten years, there has been an increase in publications and conferences dedicated to interior design and interior architecture: addressing many different aspects of interiors including spatial and temporal conditions, bodies, materiality and performativity. However reading through these texts, the expression ‘the interior’ operates like a given; slipping off tongues and pages without a second thought. ‘interior’ is rarely opened up and addressed, even though interior design is a practice of designing interior. ‘Interior’ is assumed as enclosed space; a relation defined in advance by a structure; the subjectivity of an individual.

Posing ?interior within this emerging discourse and practice provokes an opening of interior to thinking differently. This happened at FLOW 2, a symposium held in 2012 which brought the disciplines of landscape and interior together. In many ways, another INSIDEOUT – which was interesting for me as ideas from 2005 and 2012 were brought close together. Speeds, slowness, temporal consistencies and interior-making – the title of my paper – presented ?interior as an invitation to think and practise interior differently:

The orientation of this paper is towards practice and in particular, interior design and the question of
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8 Gilles Deleuze, ‘Foldings, or the Inside of Thought (Subjectivation)’ in Foucault, trans. Sean Hand (New York, London: Continuum, 2010), 98.


10 Flow 2, conveners: Gini Lee and Mark Taylor (Australia), Penny Sparke (Modern Interiors Research Centre, UK) and Patricia Brown (University of Kingston). Held at University of Melbourne, 8-10 February 2012.
interior-making, interior and interiority. It poses the idea of beginning with flows as distinct from approaching flow as a state of movement between points, insides and outsides, things. … interior design as a practice taking place in flows, working with velocities, speeds and slowness; a process of interiorization as individuation and becoming.\textsuperscript{11}

I have also invited students to pose \textquote{interior through design} - the \textit{Urban Room} studio posed \textquote{interior} within the urban environment and invited students to design interiors and in 2012, I was invited as a \textquote{visiting interiorist} to the Interior Design program in Parsons The New School of Design, New York City, where \textquote{interior} was posed to Masters students in a charrette to produce an installation for an evening event involving the interior design profession of New York.\textsuperscript{12} Students were asked to consider extracts from \textit{interiorizt} and the provocation: \textquote{opened to the exterior/outside, interior becomes amplified as a relational condition and interior design a practice addressing inside-outside, interior-exterior, interiority-exteriority}.\textsuperscript{13} \textquote{interior} was the title of the public lecture I presented as part of this visit.\textsuperscript{14}

\textit{Beyond Building} is a research project which has posed \textquote{interior} through a series of undergraduate studios and will be a focus of continuing research.\textsuperscript{15} The project addresses residential care houses for young people who have been removed from their family home and placed in state protective care. A consultant psychologist working with these houses – Gregory Nicolau – contacted the interior design program at RMIT to see if students could be involved in a project to make the spaces more suitable as a therapeutic environment for these young people many of who suffer from trauma. As interior designers, a number of given interiors were apparent: the physical interior and the psychological interior. Both were fixed in a way that produced

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item[11] Suzie Attiwill, from abstract \textit{Speeds, slowness, temporal consistencies and interior-making} submitted to \textit{FLOW 2}.
\item[12] From the flyer for the evening event: \textquote{Launched in 2009, the new MFA Interior Design program was established to provoke progressive change in the field by asking questions, challenging ideas, and speculating on presumptions. By redefining approaches to interior design, expanding the scope of the discipline and bringing new thinking to old knowledge the program intends to build robust research that will influence and enhance the Interior Design discipline and the education of the Interior Designer for the 21\textsuperscript{st} century.}.
\item[13] From the brief I presented for the Parson’s Masters charrette.
\item[14] Visit \url{http://vimeo.com/42073752} for the recording of this lecture.
\item[15] This project involves a partnership with Australian Childhood Trauma Group. Undergraduate studios have been offered in 2008, 2010 and 2011. Collaborators include: Gregory Nicolau (director, ACT Group) and Rosamund Scott, interior designer. Visit \url{http://www.theactgroup.com.au/partners-rmit.html}
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
a sense of stasis and enclosure. The centring of the young people in the arrangement as psychological subjects reflects current established thinking in the discipline of interior design. In posing ?interior, Beyond Building poses interior to an outside and opens it to movement: beyond building, beyond ‘I’. Questions of which? when? where? how? become active and engage with potential for change; to come between and alter a situation. The value of posing ?interior in this project is that it opens up to other ways of thinking and doing interior design than one centred on the given individual and attends to ‘an environment of individuation’;16 to come between, rearrange and make relations which ‘makes us pass from a given impression or idea to the idea of something that is not presently given’17 – open to an outside, to movement and change, to something new.

Posing ?interior is the significant contribution of this PhD – to my practice and the discipline of interior design. It is a simple yet powerful gesture that poses the question of interior – opens it up to an outside of contingency, chance and variation – and invites an interior designing each time anew. This research places the question of ?interior in the world.

---


http://www.ifiworld.org/#Homepage.


http://www.thing.net/eyebeam/msg00373.html


http://theater.kein.org/node/95.


List of PhD-related projects 2001 to 2013

2013


2012


Invited visiting scholar, Parsons The New School of Design, New York City: a public lecture titled interior (Wednesday March 21); postgraduate project reviews; a conversation with faculty on teaching expanded practice in interior design; and a conceptual proposition for a charrette which culminated in a full-scale installation for an industry event (Thursday March 22, 2012). Visit http://vimeo.com/42073752

2011


*Beyond Building* undergraduate design studio addressing residential care house for young people placed in State care. Design studio collaborators: Rosamund Scott & Gregory Nicolau, Semester 2, 2011


Invited lecture to Interior Design program, ‘In the Midst’ Swinburne University 2011.


2010


2009


*Urban Room*, Building 45, RMIT University, An exhibition of the outcomes from the Interior Design undergraduate studio ‘Urban Room’, studio leaders:


Invited speaker Production of Space and Place Monash Interior Architecture panel discussion, Monash University, May 2009.


2008


Invited guest lecture, Atmosphere Rooms, Victoria University, Wellington, 13 August 2008; invited as part of the launch of Interior Atmospheres, edited by Julieanna Preston, published by Wiley, AD.


2007


2006

Convenor and Chair What’s in a Canon? The state of interior design at the beginning of the 21st century Invited panellists: David Clark (editor, Vogue Living), Cameron Bruhn (editor, Artichoke), Eliza Downes (RMIT Interior Design graduate), Andrew Mackenzie (editor-in-chief, (inside) and Architectural Review Australia), Leon van Schaik (academic, curator and author: Design City Melbourne), Peter Geyer (strategic director, Geyer) and Caroline Vains (interior designer). 17 October 2006.

a matter of time, Exhibition of Tamworth 16th Tamworth Fibre Textile Biennial, Ballarat Art Gallery, 8 September to 4 November 2006.

Co-convenor with Liz Williamson (CoFA, Sydney) in time, a symposium held in conjunction with the opening of a matter of time at Object Gallery. Guest speakers included: Diana Wood-Conroy, and exhibitors, 15 July 2006.

a matter of time, Exhibition of Tamworth 16th Tamworth Fibre Textile Biennial, Object Gallery, Sydney, 15 July to 27 August 2006.

making relations Exhibition of Tasmanian craft and design. Devonport Regional Gallery, 1 to 30 July 2006.


22 April to 21 May 2006. Lecture presented at School of Art, University of Tasmania – 21 April.


*a matter of time*, 16th Tamworth Fibre Textile Biennial, Bunbury Regional Art Gallery, 28 April to 4 June 2006.


*a matter of time*, 16th Tamworth Fibre Textile Biennial, Cairns Regional Art Gallery, 2 February to 2 April 2006.


2005


*a matter of time*, 16th Tamworth Fibre Textile Biennial. Jam Factory Craft and Design Centre, Adelaide, 23 September to 13 November 2005


*a matter of time*, 16th Tamworth Fibre Textile Biennial. Gosford Regional Gallery, 15 July to 4 September 2005

Convenor *Exhibition as Research Forum*, – with John Barbour, Lesley Duxbury, Lyndal Jones, Robyn Healy, Leon van Schaik. RMIT Gallery 18 May 2005. This event was part of the public program associated with *a matter of time* at RMIT Gallery.

*a matter of time*, 16th Tamworth Fibre Textile Biennial. RMIT Gallery, Melbourne, 12 May to 25 June 2005


‘Research in an undisciplined world’ *Research on Research Conference*, University of South Australia, Adelaide, February 2005

2004

*a matter of time*, invited curator, 16th Tamworth Fibre Textile Biennial. Participants: John Barbour, Sue Blanchfield, Bula’bula Arts Aboriginal Corporation, Georgina Cresswell, India Flint, Mavis Warnngila Ganambarr, Desley Henry, Meredith Hughes, Sara Lindsay, Paull McKee, Sebastian Di Mauro, Linda Lou Murphy, Andrew Nicholls, Monique van Nieuwland, Rosemary O’Rourke, Sue Pedley, Sharon Peoples, Julie Ryder, Sue Saxon and Anne Zahalka, SIX, Holly Story, Christian Bumberra Thompson, Linda Marie Walker, Liz Williamson, and Louiseann Zahra, 10 December 2004 to 13 March 2005.

Convenor *telling time*, a symposium held in conjunction with the inaugural opening of *a matter of time* at Tamworth Regional Gallery. Guest speakers included: Paul Carter, Louise Hamby and Robyn Healy, 11 December 2004.


Untitled Craft Australia forum ‘interact’ – online and seminar at Craft Victoria 8 July 2004.


Encounters, undergraduate design studio addressing the former Remand Centre, Russell Street, Melbourne. A project working in collaboration with the National Trust.

2003


*Doing Time* Undergraduate design history and theory specialization addressing the former City Watch House, Russell Street, Melbourne. A project working in collaboration with the National Trust.

‘Di-vision, double vision’ *Between Excess and Austerity* IDEA (Interior Design Educators Association) Conference, Sydney, 8 to 12 August 2003.


‘spatial encounters’, invited speaker, Art Museums: sites of communication

2002

‘Spacecraft 061202’ as part of the NETS Curating Craft and Design Workshop

‘We are in need of a new interior/Nous avons besoin d’un nouvel intérieur’,
The House in the Suburbs/La Maison de Banlieue. Heidi Wood, Espace d’Art
Contemporain Camille Lambert, Juvisy-sur-Orge, Paris, France, 28 September
to 26 October 2002 and Bologna, Italy, November 2002.

‘between itineraries. wall walk’, Exhibition of collaborative project with Gini
Lee On the Premises. Spatial Ideas and Interior Projects Goya Galleries,

Invited catalogue text ‘A Bit of Embroidery’, Material Witness, 15th Tamworth
Fibre Textile Biennial, Tamworth City Gallery, curator: Robyn Daw.

An Interior History / spacecraft’, conference paper, Mind the Map. The Third
International Conference on Design History and Design Studies Istanbul,
Turkey. 9 to 12 July 2002.

Mobility An open forum discussion on issues and ideas of mobility with Lucy
Orta – Paris based artist whose work explores relationships between clothing,
architecture and social exclusion. She was City of Melbourne artist-in-
residence early 2002. Other speakers: Karen Burns, Nikos Papastergiadis, Mick

INTERsection. Interior Design Masters projects 1993 to 2000 Editor (with Ross

2001

Trace, Commissioned catalogue text for exhibition of ceramic, felt and iron

The Passenger, writer/editor of 3 weekly newspaper broad sheets for Tramjatra

Tramjatra, Critical passenger. Interdisciplinary public art project on tramways
and their infrastructure in two cities, Kolkata and Melbourne. Melbourne,

‘Critical Passengers’, convenor and chair of forum held as part of Tramjatra,
First Site Gallery, 14 November 2001. Participants: Stuart Koop, Nikos
Papastergiadis, Fazal Rizvi and Jogi Panghaal.

spacecraft 1001, Curator/exhibition designer. Level 11 Gallery, Flinders Lane,
Melbourne. 15 October to December 2001. Susan Cohn, Penny Gebhardt,
Heather Hesterman, Simone LeAmon, Le Klint, Shelley Penn and Danielle
Thompson.

‘Spacecraft’, invited talk as part of Curatorial Lab A workshop for emerging
curators organised by 200 Gertrude Street, Melbourne. 19 August 2001.

‘Tramjatra’ Daily column, The Statesman, India’s largest selling English newspaper, 20 February to 31 March 2001
