AAANZ

art association of australia & new zealand

CALL FOR PAPERS

IMAGE | SPACE | BODY *2015* **AAANZ** *Annual Conference*

The Annual Conference of the Art Association of Australia and New Zealand will be held in Brisbane, Queensland, 24-25 November 2015. The conference venue will be Queensland Art Gallery and Gallery of Modern Art (QAGOMA) and is hosted by The Brisbane Consortium for Visual Arts (a collaboration between art history/theory departments at The University of Queensland, Queensland University of Technology and Queensland College of Art, Griffith University and QAGOMA).

Sessions will run for one and a half hours, and will generally include three twenty-minute papers, each followed by ten minutes of questions and discussion. Session convenors will tailor the session to best address the concerns set out in the session abstract and with acknowledgement of the conference theme, *Image | Space | Body*.

Proposals for papers must be sent to the session convenors listed with each session abstract, <u>not</u> to the AAANZ, nor the Organising Committee. Where contact details are given for more than one convenor, proposals for that session and correspondence should be sent to all those listed.

<u>GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR SPEAKERS</u>

- Speakers and convenors are only able to take part in one session. This ensures that we hear from a diversity of speakers and helps to avoid timetabling problems.

- Acceptance in a session implies a commitment to attend that session, participate in person, and to pay the appropriate fees (which always includes conference registration and AAANZ membership).

- Acceptance in a session implies a commitment to present a 20-minute paper at that session.

- In order to present a paper in a session, individuals must complete and sign the Speaker Agreement Form, and return this form to their session convenor/s.

- A paper that has been published or presented previously may not be delivered at the AAANZ Annual Conference.

TIMELINE

Proposals for papers to Session Convenors

Due: 28th August 2015

Proposals for participation in sessions must be sent to the Session Convenor/s (not the conference convenors) whose contact details appear with the session abstract.

Proposals should consist of the following:

1. Completed session participation proposal form, or an email that provides the required information.
2. An abstract of the proposed paper, of no more than 400 words.
3. A brief biographical statement outlining any institutional affiliation/s and area/s of expertise.

Session Convenors respond to all applicants

Due: 11th September 2015

Convenor/s select participants for their sessions and contact all applicants, whether or not their proposal has been successful. Speakers whose papers have been accepted will be sent a copy of the Speaker Agreement form, which must be completed by the speaker and returned to Conference Administration.

Participants return Speaker Agreement form.

Due: 18th September 2015

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

Session Convenors supply details of speakers (name, affiliation, contact details, title of paper, abstract of paper) to the Conference Administration.

Due: 25th September 2015

Session convenors to forward all details of their session as Word.docx attachments to the AAANZ Organising Committee (conferenceaaanz15@gmail.com).

Art Association of Australia and New Zealand
Annual Conference, 24-25 November, Brisbane

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

1. *Materialities of art, histories of technology*
    Dr Grant Bollmer (University of Sydney)
    Email: grant.bollmer@sydney.edu.au

In recent years, there has been an increasing interest in 'Media Art Histories' revealed at the intersection of art and the emerging field of 'media archaeology'. The narratives produced from this encounter read the history of art in relation to the materiality of technology, often to examine the increasingly central role of digital media in shaping contemporary art beyond so-called 'new media' art. While placing art and visual culture in relation to technological materiality has been formative for a number of theories of visual culture (derived from the work of Jonathan Crary, for instance), recent studies of technology and art have often examined the practices of a new generation of artists who examine the role technology plays in mediating the expression and experience of images, bodies, space, and time. But these issues cannot be left entirely to an examination of digital media and contemporary art—the history of art and the history of technology have long been intertwined. This panel questions the relationship between art and the materiality of technology, examining points of intersection between the historical development of technologies that shape vision and embodiment, transformations in artistic and creative expression that question and make use of the materialities of media, and material techniques of inscribing sound, vision, and bodies in art. As such, the papers included in this session will reveal contemporary artistic interventions into contemporary media culture as well as counter-histories that bring together art and technology to question common understandings of medium and creativity.

2. *Casting new frames of reference: art historical slippages, 1850-1950*
    Rebecca Edwards (University of Melbourne)
    Email: rebeccalauraedwards@gmail.com
    Grace Carroll (Australian National University)
    Email: grace.carroll@anu.edu.au

This session aims to consider neglected aspects of art history between 1850 and 1950, examining the period through alternative figures, relationships, practices and contexts. Art history is traditionally written as a series of temporal moments, a chronological narrative that flows and collides from one major figure, movement, or period, to the next. Art created during the modern era has largely been characterized as a rupture from the artistic traditions which flourished in the years prior. Yet, what insights can be gained by resisting these established art historical trajectories? What aspects of art history are brought into focus and what factors saw them pushed to the periphery in the first place? If, after the many ends of art history we begin again, how might we revisit and rewrite existing narratives by taking into account the slippages of the past?

This panel invites papers addressing overlooked aspects of art history during the period 1850-1950. We are particularly interested in papers that suggest more nuanced perspectives on modernism or reassess existing histories through new and unconventional frameworks. Papers may discuss artists responding to their time in distinct or singular ways; minor movements and largely unknown themes; the so called 'lesser' modes of art production such as the decorative and applied arts, printmaking, illustration, craft, fashion or costume; and alternative sites of display and modes of visual communication such as reproduction and art of the private and domestic domain. We are also interested in papers which address the problems posed by the strict periodization of art movements – the Victorian, Edwardian and Modern eras for instance – and especially how our unique perspectives in Australia and New Zealand can further complicate these seemingly neat chronologies.

3. *Art after the future: Hito Steyerl and the global digital image.*
   Tara Cook (University of Melbourne) & Dylan Rainforth (Monash University)
   Email: taraelizabethcook@gmail.com

Hito Steyerl is one of the most interesting artistic practitioners and writers working today. Her speculations on the way everyday reality enmeshes with the Internet and digitisation have potent critical value for those seeking to understand the contemporary global moment. The first Australian survey of Steyerl's work, *Too Much World* – mounted in Brisbane at the IMA from 13 December 2014 to 22 March 2015 – reflected a profound and ongoing interest from antipodean practitioners seeking to understand their position within wider and ever-accelerating global image economies.

This panel is directly focused on Steyerl's significant theoretical and artistic work as a platform to address the image under contemporary digital and global conditions. Interrelationships between body, space and image are central to Steyerl's practice and literature. Her artworks, such as *How Not to Be Seen. A F__king Didactic Educational*

.MOV File (2013) and *Liquidity Inc*. (2014), as well as essays such as "In Defence of the Poor Image" (2009) and "Too Much World: Is the Internet Dead?" (2014), offer poetic yet sharply pointed examinations of the ways bodily reality is produced – rather than merely reflected – by images and screens under accelerated digital capitalism. The panel will engage with topics such as:

- "circulationism" and networked image economies
- expanded essayistic film practices in the digital age
- "the poor image" and digital materiality
- interdisciplinary criticality (the artist as critical theorist or practice-led researcher)
- networked bodies and the place of the post-Fordist (creative) worker under digital capitalism
- the ends of art and art history – their digital afterlife.

4. ***Graduate Roundtable – The Future of Art History***
   Giles Fielke (University of Melbourne)
   Email: giles.fielke@unimelb.edu.au

'The Future of the History of Art' seeks to address the question of Art History in the present through a roundtable discussion of early career researchers and graduate students. The focus of this session will remain on the status of the discipline itself. The roundtable aims to accommodate 10-15 people before an open audience.

Drawing its theme from the recently inaugurated series published in *The Art Bulletin*, entitled 'Whither Art History?' this session seeks fresh perspectives for questioning the ends of the history of art. The proposal that Art History requires a future is directed towards the interdisciplinary atmosphere of contemporary art as it is perceived from within the condition of a globalised environment.

Recent proposals from within Art History, for the anachronism of the artwork against its historical specificity, for example, or the history of art in its objective genitive sense, have also served to undermine the coherence of the discipline. Whereas Hans Belting had recognised the history of art's relentless semantic oscillations by the early 1980s, Griselda Pollock's contribution to the March 2014 issue of *Art Bulletin*, stated that by 'rejecting the idea that whatever was thus named had anything *new* about it,' her work is ultimately identified by, she admits, an outmoded faith in history. However, the persistent demand for a perpetual self-reflection leads to further her suspicion that this compulsive anxiety over the status of the discipline 'might be closer to what our governments are effectively saying,' revealing the political instrumentalisation, perhaps, of a good critical discipline, or of imminent critique.

Is the perpetual concern for the present a threat to the disciplinary scope of Art History? Can the traditional idea of Art History be defended, or remain distinguished from Visual and Cultural Studies? If Art History is a framework for conceiving the artwork in a post-critical, post-conceptual, or even post-medium condition, has a corresponding flattening of the discipline created problems for the construction of cogent historical narratives? Do centrist histories preclude the peripheral, or produce them? What does this mean for the method of art historical research, for historians of the present, and for our approaches to the question of contemporaneity?

The Roundtable welcomes discussion on Art History as a diachronic, conflicting, and contradictory heuristic method. It aims to reflect the 2015 AAANZ conference on its own terms—Image, Space, Body—as well as addressing the ongoing historical conditions for art both regionally and globally.

5. ***The Violent Body - A History of Forgetting***
    Dr Mitch Goodwin (James Cook University)
    Email: oldmateo@gmail.com

The 20th century constitutes a rich historical archive of images imagined, constructed and documented. Artists, authors, photojournalists and citizens alike have contributed to a dark, troubled history of the human form compromised by violence in a world dominated by the ongoing repercussions of the technological accident. The end as it were, has a deep history and is presented in an endless stream of iconic images: the stricken body in war (Capa, 1936), the body in violent repose (Warhol, 1962), the body adrift in space (Kubrick, 1968) and the falling man (Drew, 2001) being obvious touchstones. These media objects are evidence of an ongoing Gothic tendency in contemporary image making that is reflective of not only an intensely visual culture but also a culture of visualization. It is the visualization of the body in particular that is the active operant here, acting as a buffer to the more violent components of our collective existence.

This virtual representation of the body as digital image promotes an absence of tangible violence – a complex mind trick that is indicative of our times. A time of endless war, of invisible weapons conducting invisible acts of violence, of software and of hardware that watch and listen and capture. As Slavoj Žižek has observed, it may be the "endlessness" of the present-future state that denies us the possibility of a new beginning. Does this also include the possibility of a new body in a new space in a different time? Have we become somehow enslaved to the violent body and its virtual history?

6. ***The Challenges and Opportunities of Digital Art History'***
    Dr Katrina Grant (EMAJ)

Email: kat.grant@gmail.com
Dr Susan Lowish (University of Melbourne)
Email: susan.lowish@unimelb.edu.au

This panel intends to investigate how the discipline of art history is changing in the face of new digital technologies. Has the digital world fundamentally changed the way we do art history? Or are we essentially conducting the same research but with better tools? New technologies have made a wide range of research materials more accessible than ever before and, arguably, have already begun to push research in directions it might not have otherwise taken. But, new digital technologies are also resource hungry, time intensive and high maintenance. There is often great enthusiasm to adopt and to celebrate new technologies, but there is also a lack of critical appraisal as to what is working and what is not. How is this battle currently being played out in the field of art research? The launch of new digital publications, including the *International Journal for Digital Art History* (2015), and new grant schemes such as the Getty Foundation's *Digital Art History* initiative (2014), provide new forums through which to present and explore the opportunities and challenges presented by these technologies.

We invite proposals that address the following:

- Digital technologies, institutional and international engagement, 'Apps' and research;
- Documentation, databases and archives;
- Sharing and networking, translating cultures and copyright, ownership and access;
- Policies, priorities and funding;
- Data visualisation, the limits and longevity of technology.

This panel is especially interested in contributions from emerging and early career researchers.

7. ***After the End of Identity: Post-Identity Art and Embodiment***
   Dr Katherine Guinness (University of New South Wales)
   Email: gakather@gmail.com

According to art historian Amelia Jones, although post-identity discourse has played a persistent and crucial role in shaping art trends for over two decades, we are not truly "post-identity." To relegate identity politics to art's past is not only naïve, but dangerous, as it sweeps decades of social progress under the rug and acts as if these enduring issues are resolved. This panel seeks to explore the contexts, politics, and theories of post-identity art, and whether or not art is or can be "post-identity." It is explicitly interested in

the intersection of post-identity art with issues of embodiment, medium, and appropriation. Oftentimes post-identity rhetoric assumes a fluidity in which identity can become completely detached from the physical body and its socio-cultural ties. Is this even possible? With the rise of digital and new media art, this break is more common. Works pushing the limits of appropriation and embodiment (such as Joe Scanlan's fictitious persona of the African American artist Donelle Woolford) present conditions in which identities are interchangeable at will—even though the politics of identity is still very much part of the conversation surrounding these seemingly post-identity works. This panel seeks papers that engage with these questions and others, such as: Are we or can we ever truly be post-identity – and what would that look like within art work? Can the body of the artist be separated out enough to erase the importance of or attachment to identity? What advantages and disadvantages would a post-identity art world present? Topics for this panel can include, but are not limited to, examples of post-identity art, embodiment and appropriation, digital drag, the role of identity in new media art, parafiction, genealogies and counter-histories of identity and art.

8. *Connoisseurial Spaces in Global Art*
   Dr Wes Hill (Southern Cross University)
   Email: wes.hill@scu.edu.au

This session will examine connoisseurship at a time when much contemporary art purports to be inclusive, seeking connection with audiences beyond the confines of a specialist art world. For Pamela M. Lee, any meaningful sense of social grounding that was once integral to the notion of an 'art world' has disappeared in the confluence of social, political, economic and aesthetic relations that comprise global art. Lee claims that globalisation presents itself as "a new 'allover' which seemingly trumps our collective efforts to give shape to its multivalent interests." In such a context we are supposedly witness to the democratisation of information, the politicisation and splintering of taste, and the negotiation of populism as key factors constituting the art of our times, all of which indicate a decline in connoisseurial value. Despite this, in light of the self-broadcast qualities of the Internet, it is hard to take seriously the notion of art as an open or democratic space, with inclusivity more an ideal than a reality. It is in this sense that connoisseurship might figure paradoxically today as at once a discerning image of contemporary culture and a claim for diversity – a condition described by Boris Groys as the illusion of infinite plurality underpinning art's quest for "the image of the perfect balance of power."

The panel invites submissions that address the ways in which an image of contemporary connoisseurship might take shape in the practices of artists, communities or institutions.

The panel is open to a variety of topics, including, but not limited to: populism in museum practice, art as fashion, post-critical aesthetics, curating the Internet, private collections/museums, non-Western models of connoisseurship, and the artist-as-hipster.

9. **Postmachine Vsion**
   Dr Ingrid Hoelzl (School of Creative Media, City University of Hong Kong)
   Email: ingrid.hoelzl@cityu.edu.hk

Today we are entering an era in which the question of the posthuman resonates with the question of the postmachine. This is because the very notion of the machine presupposes human presence. But now we might also have to consider the disappearance of the image, which is what this panel seeks to consider.

Why? Consider drones for example. While the debate on how drones should be regulated has gone viral, little attention is paid to the fact that these flying robots are also flying cameras. The image supposes a viewer and, if there is none, then only data is being exchanged. Drones are likely to become one of the major imaging technologies of the 21st Century, but with the consequence of transforming the image into a plethora of algorithms, sensors and actuators. We can legitimately pose the question of the disappearance of the image, all the more so since technically speaking, what we are dealing with are visual data/visuals. The current development of this new machine of vision will render human control obsolescent. Drones will be capable of intelligence, of communicating with each other and of making decisions without us.

But this question cannot be addressed only on the technical level, because, as Virilio (1994) put it, 'if we remove the image, not only Christ but the whole universe disappears'. The disappearance of the image in the age of the drone is also a philosophical and ethical debate, and if we are to open up this debate, we cannot forget that machines of vision - from the first optical devices to autonomous drones - are, before all, philosophical machines: systems of apprehending and acting upon/within the world, even if that world is (imagined to be) a posthuman world.

The panel Postmachine vision will explore the question of the image in the 21st century in the broadest sense, and it calls for participation from numerous intersecting fields such as art history, media history and theory, philosophy, visual studies, etc.

10. **Contemporary art and institutional critique**
    Helen Hughes (Discipline)

Email: helenrhughes@gmail.com

The global industry of contemporary art seems set to continue along its course of assimilation with the entertainment and tourism industries. Meanwhile, social media platforms provide us with more and more opportunities to present and network our practice (whether as artist, curator, gallerist, academic) as an extension of our personal lives. Within this environment, the actual 'institution' of contemporary art appears to adopt the form of a fluid, decentralised, moving target.

Put another way: Now that we have internalised many of contemporary art's mechanisms of display (through social media), and contemporary art has externalised many of its mechanisms of display (its dovetailing with the entertainment and tourism industries), what are the possibilities and limitations of institutional critique for contemporary art?

This panel welcomes papers that explore the strategies of boycotting and withdrawal, accelerationism, self-parody and reflexivity, and more.

11. *Re-enactment / Repetition / Reiteration / Re-performance as embodied research*
Dr Lucas Ihlein (University of Wollongong) and Louise Curham (University of Canberra)
Email: lucasi@uow.edu.au

This panel explores the widespread phenomenon of re-enactment as a tactic of embodied research in performance art history.

Performance re-enactment (or "re-performance") has emerged since the turn of the century as an arena of practice and scholarship, an embodied means of "doing" historical research as well as a way of critically reflecting on ephemeral artworks from the past. Recent texts have begun to unpick the multiple layers of mediation that produce, and emerge from, re-enactment practices (Jones and Heathfield 2012; Santone 2008). Re-enactment inevitably raises questions about authenticity and the primacy of "unmediated" experience versus the role of documentation. As Jonathan Walley writes, the motivation for carrying out a re-enactment may begin with a desire to access an "authentic" experience of a past work of ephemeral art, but the physical-material practice of actually executing a re-enactment can prove unpredictably generative of insights that go far beyond the historical (Walley 2013).

Contributions are invited for this panel involving (but not limited to):

- Description and analysis of specific re-enactment projects as creative practice-based research;
- Discussion of the phenomenon of re-enactment as it has developed in recent decades;
- Exploration of intergenerational connections in re-enactment processes;
- Analysis of the "event score" as a tool for codifying performance practices;
- Theoretical investigations into iteration, repetition and difference triggered by a consideration of re-enactment;
- Enquiry into the impact of and on archives when re-enactment is used as a tool for historical research;
- Exploration of specific contributions to this field from Australia and New Zealand.

We also invite non-traditional and performative presentations which physically enact or re-enact as their creative / scholarly contributions to this panel (pending technical feasibility and approval of the AAANZ conference convenors).

12. *Photography: Archiving, Collecting, Curating and Exhibiting*

Dr Martyn Jolly (Australian National University)
Email: Martyn.Jolly@anu.edu.au
Dr Daniel Palmer (Monash University)
Email: Daniel.Palmer@monash.edu

The acts of archiving, collecting, curating and exhibiting by galleries and museums are fundamental to the positioning of photography in art history. In Australia, major exhibitions from *Shades of Light* (Gael Newton, NGA, 1988) to *The Photograph and Australia* (Judy Annear, AGNSW 2015) have defined our understanding of the medium. However, as the latter exhibition suggested, in the age of digital image spaces and online media, the photograph is now more protean and ubiquitous than ever. This panel invites papers from historians, curators, artists and those with an interest in reflecting on the diversity and development of exhibition and curatorial histories to consider various encounters between the photograph and the institution. What can be learnt from the photograph's increasingly slippery presence across different institutional spaces? How are the different collecting and exhibiting paradigms of art galleries, social history museums, archives and libraries affecting each other? What is the significance of the photograph's relatively recently acquired status as an art object? How are institutions, curators and artists dealing with new forms of digital photography and database logics? What might a history of Australian photography curating tell us, and how is this history different from international and regional histories?

13. Virtual Corporealities

Sophie Knezic (University of Melbourne)
Email: sbknezic@unimelb.edu.au

In the mid 1990s Pierre Lévy defined the virtual as 'a kind of problematic complex, the knot of tendencies or forces that accompanies a situation, event, object or entity, and which invokes a process of resolution: actualization' (Lévy, 1998). At the start of the 21st century, following Foucault's notion of incorporeal materialism Brian Massumi delineated virtuality as a form of potential located in the bodily, the 'real but abstract incorporeality of the body' (Massumi, 2002). Roberto Diodato also foregrounded the correspondence between virtuality and corporeality through understanding the virtual body as 'an entity that is phenomenalized through interaction' (Diodato, 2012).

Taking its point of departure from these various ideas of the virtual as a force-field of activating tensions and constraints complexly linked to corporeality, temporal events and topographic displacements, this panel seeks to explore how different notions of virtuality animate and reconfigure bodies and space, and bodies *in* space. Not confining the virtual to the realm of the digital but exploring it as any visual paradigm which attempts to actualize the velocities, rhythms and interactivities of the contemporary world while acknowledging the simultaneously constitutive and deconstitutive processes at work in the production of intermingled subjects and spaces.

The panel seeks papers which investigate – through artists, philosophers and theoreticians – the way in which the corporeal is virtualised, or conversely, the virtual is actualised to achieve forms of embodiment, probing the interlinked aspects of the incorporeal, the potential and the distributive as inescapable dimensions of contemporary visual culture.

References

Pierre Lévy, *Becoming Virtual: Reality in the Digital Age*, (trans. by Robert Bononno), (New York and London: Plenum Trade, 1998), 24.
Brian Massumi, *Parables for the Virtual: Movement, Affect, Sensation*, (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2002), 21.
Roberto Diodato, *Aesthetics of the Virtual*, (trans. by Justin Harmon), (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2012), 6.

14. The Ends of Painting

Paris Lettau (University of Melbourne) and David Homewood (University of Melbourne)
Email: plettau@student.unimelb.edu.au

The 1960s is often remembered as a moment of radical artistic transformation. Strategies related to the readymade and installation became widespread. The Instamatic camera, Xerox copier and Portapak video became standard means of production. New artistic genres also emerged around this time: performances resembling everyday actions, ephemeral artworks located inside and outside the gallery, site-specific works, institutional critique and theoretical essays about art presented as artworks themselves.

Modernist interpretations of this period have generally framed it in negative terms: as a widespread abandonment of the traditional artistic media of painting and sculpture. This abandonment is often understood as a threat to the authenticity and value of art. However, for the artists, curators and critics committed to the new forms, traditional art was generally seen as restrictive, weighed down by its own history, over-determined by its commodity status, or incapable of any direct social or political effect. The solution was to adopt new forms not burdened with the 'look' of art, which might be capable of responding to the exigencies of their historical moment. Recent art-historical scholarship has focused on the novel forms, while their relation to painting is swept to one side.

Yet although less prominent, painting still played a role as one strategy among many in the new forms that emerged in post-1960s art, and which continue to shape contemporary art today. This panel therefore aims to consider two broad questions: What happened to the medium of painting in art after 1960, and how might this question be legitimately framed from within the contemporary situation? The panel welcomes submissions on a wide range of topics: How was painting mobilised in contexts outside of art? How was painting sustained as a critical form? How was painting integrated into mixed-media projects? What would it mean to understand painting as anachronistic?

15. *Crowd management: Artists' choreography of the body en masse*
   Dr Chris McAuliffe (Australian National University)
   Email: Christopher.mcauliffe@anu.edu.au

Edgar Allan Poe saw the crowd as the embodiment of urban experience; a "tumultuous sea of human heads" propelled by "continuous tides of population." The crowd was fascinating, threatening and resistant. It absorbed the observer's attention, spawned the man of the crowd ("the type and genius of deep crime") and resisted interpretation—it was the book that "does not permit itself to be read." For historian George Rudé, the

crowd was one of the great drivers of modern history, manifesting the entry of the underclass onto history's stage and demanding the initiation of a "bottom up" reading of history.

The crowd in art is one potential product of the multipliers within the AAANZ conference theme: Image x Space x Body = Crowd. For centuries, the crowd has been used to model art's shifting aims and capacities, from the anatomical virtuosity of the academy through to the improvisational human assemblages of relational aesthetics. Manifestations of the crowd in art have delivered iconic works (*The Night Watch*), iconic motifs (the impressionist streetscape) and iconic spectatorial positions (the *flâneur*). Artists have developed distinctive crowd management specialisations, including the courtly pageant of the Renaissance, the choreographed political theatre of the revolutionary era, the manic televisual pageantry of Olympic Games ceremonies, and the social allegories of contemporary artists' parades.

This session invites reflection on the crowd in art's history—urban throng, ceremonial congregation, revolutionary mob, ranked army, mass audience, synecdochic invocation of the chosen, the fallen or the people—ranging from the early modern to the contemporary. Papers accepted for this session will be subjected to a peer review process.

16. *Transculturation in Indigenous art*
    Dr Ian McLean (University of Wollongong) & Margo Neale (National Museum of Australia)
    Email: imclean@uow.edu.au

Fernando Ortiz coined the term transculturation in order to emphasize the cross-cultural space of Cuban culture, which he said was poorly served by the anthropological concept of acculturation. Applying Ortiz's thesis to colonial cultures, in *Imperial Eyes* (1992) Mary Louise Pratt envisaged colonial cultures as a dissembling 'contact-zone' that, despite its 'radically asymmetrical relations of power,' has numerous 'interactive, improvisational dimensions.' We seek papers on examples of transculturation in Indigenous art practices (for example collaborations – whether overt or covert), institutional practices and curatorship, exhibition, marketing and patronage, and the consequences of the formation of Indigenous art centres.

17. *After 'Visulaity': Image, Body, and Perception*
    Dr Ann Stephen (Sydney University Museums), Harriet Field (University of New South Wales), Dr Meredith Morse (Yale-NUS College, Singapore)
    Email: meredithzmorse@gmail.com

From the late 1980s into the early 2000s, art history's theorization of the image was focused upon an interrogation of vision in modernity, the visual epistemic paradigm, and the production of commensurate forms of spectatorship. A paradoxical materiality of the image, and of vision, was treated in terms of the late-modern opposition of simulation and disembodiment to the literal and embodied. Carrie Lambert-Beatty has similarly described a dialectic in Yvonne Rainer's dance performances between representation and the live, performing body, under the conditions of spectacularised U.S. visual and media culture of the 1960s. But performance also operates through the tactile, the proximate, the textural (citing Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick) – all modalities of the body and of movement. What might attention to such *qualities* enable now, and what would this mean for the 'image'? This panel asks whether such emergent knowledges might change the way we understand the image in art. Might a consideration of movement and its modes of sensing re-form aesthetic 'form', and give rise to new approaches for the art history toolkit?

Ann Stephen's paper, "The Mirror Works of Jacky Redgate," treats the emergence of image through a serialised and possibly psychologised vision, in proximity to the sussurations or an almost-absent bodily presence in Jacky Redgate's mirror works. In "Perceiving Bodies: Alicia Frankovich's Body Language," Harriet Field examines the 'language', based in action between bodies, that features as subject and material of Alicia Frankovich's performances. Field traces the perceiving and perceptive possibilities of bodies, of performer and viewer. Meredith Morse's paper, "Disorientation and Proprioceptive Loss: Richard Serra, New York's 1970s Dance, and Process Art," considers in what ways the estranged and new bodily orientations and forms of perception of 1970s dance were instructive for Richard Serra's post-Minimalist sculpture.

18. *Revisionism in Australian art history*
    Victoria Perin (Independent Writer)
    Email: vicki.perin@gmail.com

A key action in the historical disciplines is the revision of an established narrative. Towards the end of the 20th century the scope of Australian art history was broadened to include the significant contributions made by Indigenous, women and immigrant artists in this country. Revisionism flourished across the western world during this specific time, but the activity of reassessing minority or oppressed artists and art-forms has no retrospective limit. Such moments of Australian revisionism can be sensational, like the discovery of Clarice Beckett's oeuvre in a mouldy shed in rural Melbourne; or institutional, such as the National Gallery of Australia's exhibition on émigré artists 'The Europeans', 1997. Other actions can be concerted and direct, such as the recent writing of Rex Butler and A.D.S. Donaldson.

Revisionist historians divine both past and future straight from the guts of history. However revisionism by its nature is a difficult task to record. Successful revisionism buries itself into the pages of history seamlessly, becoming orthodox (such examples can be found in Sasha Grishin's recent *Australian Art: a history*, 2014). But has Australian art history been challenged enough? Have the channels of discourse truly been widened as they've been deepened? This panel welcomes discussions of historical revisionism in Australian art history, particularly considerations of singular authors or actions, such as exhibitions or demonstrations.

19. *Plasmatic Transformation*
    Chris Denaro (Queensland University of Technology) and Dr Merri Randell
    (Visual Practitioner)
    Email: merri.randell@gmail.com

The session examines the role of the metaphysical and physical in art and animation and how this relates to natural spaces.

Soviet Russian film director and theorist Sergei Eisenstein saw animation as possessing an ability called "plasmaticity", the capacity for a being to assume any conceivable form dynamically. He saw each being as "primordial protoplasm, not yet possessing a 'stable' form, but capable of assuming any form" (Eisenstein 1989, 21). He was enamoured by the capacity of animation to transform and be liberated, of being able to escape from a fixed and static identity—to embody a "rejection of the once-and-forever allotted form" in which we are held (Eisenstein 1989, 21).

Czech Surrealist animator Jan Švankmajer uses a metaphysical approach based on a belief in animism to art and animation. He believes that objects possess a conscious life or spirit, he says 'Objects conceal within themselves the events they've witnessed. I don't actually animate objects. I coerce their inner life out of them.' (Švankmajer in Imre 2009, 214) In this animistic world there are no boundaries or rules, no physical or conceptual restrictions; anything is possible, with inanimate objects and places able to become animate and transact in a conscious relationship with humans and each other.

This session invites artists, animators and theorists to discuss their conceptions and approaches to using visuals to promote and provoke transformation.

20. *Practice Led Research: Translating bodies*
    Charles Robb (Queensland University of Technology)

Email: c.robb@qut.edu.au

The interplay of space and body is for many artists the fulcrum of their studio practice. In these contexts, the work of art can be seen as a recording of the embodied encounter between the artist and her material. Translating such indeterminate, intuitive and frequently incoherent processes into the written word, and establishing their claim to new knowledge, is one of the chief challenges of Practice Led Research. This panel invites papers from artist-researchers interested in sharing their insights into how they have navigated the uneasy tension between practice and exegesis, the methods and methodologies that have been useful in this endeavour and the way images and text have been deployed - and perhaps reconceptualised - as part of the research process.

By extension, this panel welcomes papers from postgraduate students, emerging and established artist-researchers on the topic of the body as a subject, a material or an agent within the contemporary art studio. Topics may include, but are not limited to corporeality, phenomenology, performance, affect, studio methodologies/ontologies, speculative realism, new materialisms, new pedagogies and paradigms for dealing with the social, political and/or cultural implications of contemporary art practices.

21. Art and Democracy: the lessons of Jacques Rancière

Dr Toni Ross (University of New South Wales)
Email: t.ross@unsw.edu.au

Although philosopher Jacques Rancière began directly addressing the political import of artistic modernity in the early 1990s, it is only in the last decade that his thought has gained traction in English language art theory and international art world circles. By the time *Artforum* devoted a special issue to his work in 2007, Rancière was being heralded as an exciting new voice in debates about art's political potentials, and for political theory seeking alternatives to neoliberal ideas of democracy. The last decade has not only seen many English translations of Rancière's essays and books published, but also a multitude of commentaries on his work. Moreover, a recent generation of prominent art theorists, including Claire Bishop, Vered Maimon and T.J. Demos, have deployed his ideas to interpret various practices and trends in contemporary art.

This panel calls for a rigorous assessment of Rancière's thinking, with a particular focus on his conception of democratic politics. The panel welcomes submissions that apply or extend Rancière's formulations, as well as papers that revise or question aspects of his discourse. For example, philosopher Paul Patton has recently queried the strategic efficacy of Rancière's thinking of democratic politics for projects seeking to install and

maintain changes to the socio-political landscape (Patton, 2012). This panel calls for papers that affirm, revise or question Rancière's significant and ongoing contribution to debates on democracy and politics in contemporary art. Papers focussed on the broader issue of art and democracy will also considered.

References
Paul Patton, 'Rancière's Utopian Politics,' in Jean-Philippe Deranty and Alison Ross (eds), *Jacques Rancière and the Contemporary Scene: The Philosophy of Radical Equality*, London and New York: Continuum, 2012.

22. **Postcards from a traumascape: Communication topographies in the post-trauma landscape.**
    Sean Coyle (University of Tasmania), April Krause (University of Tasmania) & Emma Sheppard-Simms (University of Tasmania)
    Email: emma.sheppardsimms@utas.edu.au

Questions of trauma, both personal and cultural, lie at the centre of the contemporary, postmodern condition. Recent work has examined the spatial dimensions of trauma, examining the significance of human experience 'in-place' as a means of negotiating the meanings generated around violent, disturbing and abject events. Here, the role of visual representation in both generating, and resisting, cultural modes of meaning within post-traumatic landscapes has been seen as increasingly important in the contemporary era of mass media and communication.

Building upon this premise, each of the panellists seek to address the manner in which different modes of representation – image, performance and film – offers up the visual traces of trauma as inscribed upon the landscape

23. *Spaces and traces of artist-activism: the politics of the institution from 1968 to today*
    Caroline Wallace (The University of Melbourne)
    Email: wcv@unimelb.edu.au

Between 1968 and 1975, artists besieged museums and art events across the world: with forcible removal of artworks from the 1968 Venice Biennale, sit-ins at New York's MoMA in 1969, occupation of the Tower of Sun at Osaka Expo'70 and mass protest in Melbourne's NGV in 1975. These events saw artists hijack these rarefied spaces and transform them into a platform for their politics. Above all else, these protests provided a stage where artist-activists outlined alternative visions for art institutions. These included

representation of artists on the organisational bodies of institutions, decentralised museum sites which physically and socially engaged with diverse communities, and increased representation of women and artists of colour.

This session will explore the institutional critique of artist-activists, including but not limited to:

- Research into artist-activism both local and global
- New perspectives on issues explored within sixties and seventies artist-activism: such as the role of race and gender within the museum, and the role of organisational structures.
- Studies into museums and art spaces to see whether the issues raised by artist-activists have had an impact on contemporary institutions.
- Examinations of the alternative art movement of the seventies and eighties, as a natural heir to these ideals.

24. **Image, space and body in early-modern art and design**
Dr Petra Kayser (National Gallery of Victoria)
Email: Petra.Kayser@ngv.vic.gov.au
Dr Robert Wellington (Australian National University)
Email: robert.wellington@anu.edu.au

The papers in this session will explore the complex relationships between image, space, body (or materiality) and meaning in early modern objects made of metal, ivory and other precious materials. Collectors and artists in the early modern period (1400–1800 CE) were fascinated by rare and curious objects from the natural world, distant lands and ancient cultures. These would be incorporated into decorative schemes in spaces created in the collector's image. Many objects were transformed by artists into decorative artifacts to enhance their aesthetic appeal and to stimulate an intellectual response. These collectibles were status symbols that represented the owners' wealth, power, piety and knowledge. However, the meanings attributed to them were subject to change, as they came into different hands, moving through space and time. The ways in which artifacts were reinterpreted, but still remained relevant in a new cultural context, reveal a fascinating history.

We invite proposals for papers that investigate concepts of image, space and materiality in early modern objects. Papers might explore the relationship between substance, iconography and meanings in any aspect of early modern art and design in a global context. Those that identify shifting interpretations of material forms as they move into new cultural and historical contexts are especially welcome.

25. **Mad, Bad, Dangerous To Know: when art history goes wrong, sickens, or**

turns evil.
Dr Amelia Barikin (University of Queensland)
Email: a.barikin@uq.edu.au
Dr Edward Colless (University of Melbourne)
Email: ecolless@unimelb.edu.au

Mistakes and fallacies; counter-factual and fantastical inventions; perverse follies and pathological errors: where are the Atlantises and Lemurias of art history, where is its Hollow Earth or its Flat Earth, its Elysian Fields and its Hades? What of the images, spaces and bodies not immediately produced, consumable, accessible and affordable – made transparent – in the operative fictions of "contemporaneity"? In the neo-liberal cultural economy of world art are there any hidden zones, lost worlds, relics of black magic, delusion, folly, or danger? This session will dive into the dumpster dust bin of art history to mine the rotten, the decadent, the eclipsed and the damned.

26. *Space, Affect and Embodiment in Performance Art in Southeast Asia*
Dr Francis Maravillas (University of Technology Sydney) & Dr Michelle Antoinette (Australian National University)
Email: francis.maravillas@uts.edu.au

In recent times there has been a growing critical and curatorial interest in performance art in and from Southeast Asia. The emergence of performance art in the region has expanded the range of bodily practice across new affective, sensory and semiotic terrains, as well as cultural and geographic territories. Indeed, it is more than just a passing coincidence that the questions of space, affect and embodiment have been recurring motifs in performance art in the region, ones anchored in figurations of the body as a quotidian index of identity (variously coded in cultural, gendered and racialised ways) in a region deeply marked by multiple and overlapping colonial and postcolonial histories, and by contemporary processes of globalisation. This panel seeks to explore the diverse ways in which performing bodies inhabit the world, present themselves, carry meaning, and move us within and across diverse spaces in Southeast Asia. In seeking to open up new ways of thinking about space, affect and embodiment in performance art in the region, we welcome papers exploring (but not limited to) the following areas of inquiry:

- Performance and identity in Southeast Asia: how ideologies of race, gender, and class are embodied in performance art
- Performance and space in Southeast Asia: how performing bodies enact and produce spaces through processes of action and reception

- Performance and affect in Southeast Asia: how performing bodies engender affective and sensuous forms of connection with others in the world

27. *Micro-practices and micro-aesthetics: domestic labour, gender, and the body*

Associate Professor Naomi Stead (University of Queensland)
Email: n.stead@uq.edu.au
Dr Kelly Greenop (University of Queensland)
Email: k.greenop1@uq.edu.au
Dr Allison Holland (University of Queensland)
Email: a.holland1@uq.edu.au

This session calls for papers exploring domestic micropractices – minute examinations of housework, in and through art, and in the study of art. Such intimate studies of everyday domestic acts, of the banal and quotidian work of maintaining a household, open onto questions of the body in space; the presentation of an image of propriety, normality, and social acceptability; gendered labour; everyday sustainability; and an anthropology of art and design. Beyond the 'micropolitics' of such gendered domestic labour (Bennett 2010, xii), we also seek to explore a kind of micro-aesthetics of housework: everyday aesthetics (Saito 2007); ordinary affect (Stewart 2007); and the role of art and design in everyday life (Shove et al 2009).

Discourses around housework often frame it in terms of drudgery – slavery to the washing machine or sink or vacuum cleaner, chores marked by endless, deadening repetition. Such accounts manifest the conceptual tension between routine, habit, and volition: Richard Wilk asks why 'we sometimes experience routines and habits as functional, relaxing, comforting and time-saving, while at other times they are annoying, restrictive, and even intolerable' (Wilk 2009, 147) But using Wilks' terms, it is also possible to see in some individuals' domestic practices a certain *cultivation* – a deliberate pushing forward of the habitual chore into a conscious and deliberate action – a *practice*, a bodily ritual, an image, a spatial performance – an 'art' in both the formal and technical senses. At other times, and still using Wilks' terms, such practices are entirely *naturalized* – not considered, not social, nothing more than 'submerged' physical experiences (Wilk 2009, 150). The question is not only when and why a particular routine chore might take on these two distinct modes, but what that might mean – for art, and its study.

References

Jane Bennett, *Vibrant Matter: a political ecology of things*, Duke University Press, Durham and London, 2010
Yuriko Saito, *Everyday Aesthetics*, Oxford University Press, 2007
Elizabeth Shove, Matthew Watson, Martin Hand, and Jack Ingram, *The Design of Everyday Life,* Berg, Oxford and New York, 2007.
Kathleen Stewart, *Ordinary Affects,* Duke University Press, 2007.
Richard Wilk, 'The Edge of Agency: Routines, Habits and Volition,' in Elizabeth Shove, Frank Trentmann and Richard Wilk (eds), *Time, Consumption and Everyday Life: Practice, Materiality and Culture,* Bloomsbury, London and New York, 2009.

28. Physiognomy and phrenology in Australia and New Zealand
Professor Ross Woodrow (Griffith University)
Email: r.woodrow@griffith.edu.au

This session will explore the range and scope of the impact of phrenology and physiognomy on visual culture in Australia and New Zealand. It will examine how these two related areas influenced the arts or culture more widely and how the ideas and theories surrounding a person's outer appearance affected image making. It seems timely and in keeping with the themes of this conference to re-examine the impact of phrenology and physiognomy in the Antipodes in light of the scholarship that has emerged in recent years. Mary Cowling's important book *The Artist as Anthropologist: The Representation of Type and Character in Victorian Art* (1989) is long out of print; however, Sharona Pearl has recently presented a strong case for re-evaluating the role of physiognomy in Britain in the nineteenth century *About Faces: Physiognomy in Nineteenth-Century Britain* (2011). This followed the 2004 radical reconsideration of phrenology in the USA by Stephen Tomlinson, *Head Masters: Phrenology, Secular Education, and Nineteenth-Century Social Thought*.

Presenters might investigate questions related to popular illustrations and head reading; the circulation of illustrated phrenology or physiognomy texts in art schools or art education; the phrenology shop, wax museum or lecture; the artist's innate "physiognomic perception" as Gombrich defined it; physiognomy and caricature.

29. Dislocated – Exploring art and affinity beyond geographical constructs
Adriel Luis (Smithsonian Asian Pacific American Center), Anida Yoeu Ali (artist) & Alexandra Chang (A/P/A Institute, New York University)
Email: luisa@si.edu

In her recent remarks at the Whitney Museum's re-opening, United States First Lady Michelle Obama noted her childhood impressions that cultural institutions such as museums were not places in which she belonged. Indeed, her upbringing as a working-class African American woman counters the expected participant of the museum and fine arts world. Her statement aligns with a growing concern among artists and thinkers worldwide – a recognition that cultural institutions remain mired in the legacies of privileging the art and visitorship of specific demographics over others.

While regions such as the Asia Pacific have made great strides in exploring post-colonial discourse in art, the approach remains in the colonial constraints of a geographic scope. Singapore, South Korea, China and Japan are among the nations that seek to be voices for the cultural heritage of their respective regions, a framing that reminisces on the 20th Century notion of culture as a nation-based phenomenon, rather than the more complex, affinity-based formations of culture that drive conversations and art today.

This panel will explore the emergent cultures that arise in response to our post-locational era of complex diasporas and digital communication. It will address how a truly post-colonial/postmodern approach to art creation, curation and criticism must confront intangible dynamics such as the othering of identities, unfair burdens of representation and the militarization of ideals (i.e. the War on Terror); as well as tangible dilemmas such as widening wealth gaps, gentrification of communities and deportation of bodies.

The panelists all identify as Asian American, but share different experiences of diaspora as first and second generation-born, refugee, expat and third-culture. By confronting their otherness-identities amidst upbringings in the United States, they begin to unpack how a post-colonial framing of art discourse must transcend mere nationality and locale.

30. *The embodied environment: new media technologies*
Dr Andrew Yip (Art Gallery of New South Wales) & Professor Sarah Kenderdine (University of New South Wales)
Email: andrew.yip@ag.nsw.gov.au

The emergence of experimental new media technologies, platforms and artworks has given rise to new modalities for considering the relationship between images, bodies and spaces. In particular, embodied new media environments such as interactive cinemas and virtual and augmented reality systems have become places for a new kind of dramaturgy where traditional Cartesian principles (mind-body, nature-culture, human-object, self-other, real-virtual) become mediated, entangled and co-created.

Experimental artworks are being driven by innovative forms of digital data collection and augmentation, such as motion capture, drone imaging, object and landscape photogrammetry and the ultra high-resolution scanning of art works and environments. Importantly, these forms allow for the capture, interpretation, preservation and

presentation of intangible cultural heritages from ritual performances and religious rites to performative works involving the spectator in physical space.

The development of these innovative modalities gives society new ways of seeing and creating meaning, as well as fostering new opportunities for the dissemination and interrogation of cultural histories and the writing of new histories of art. Proposals are sought for papers that examine work by artists and researchers in this emerging and diverse field that complicates traditional modes of human-object and object-space interaction.

31. *The role of university art museums*
    Dr Campbell Gray (University of Queensland Art Museum)
    Email: campbell.gray@uq.edu.au

The contributions that university art museums are making to the academic life of their host institutions are changing. Their roles as university social and engagement centres is deepening, but more significantly, their contributions to research and teaching and their role in "publishing" research through exhibitions and publications is strengthening quickly. One can begin to find some equivalence between the outputs of university art museums and those of university presses. At the same time, these outputs are measured quite poorly in formal contexts (ERA and staff rank advancement systems). The University Art Museum Association has begun to work with leaders of the ARC to research these outputs in an effort to clarify their significance to research and elevate their status in formal systems. This panel will discuss the substance of the university art museum exhibition and publication as research outputs and arguments for elevating their recognition in these systems. It will also explore the impact that a positive outcome in these arenas will have upon the relationship between university art museums and their academic community.

32. *Wölfflin's Principles*
    Professor John Macarthur (University of Queensland)
    Email: j.macarthur@uq.edu.au

On the centenary of the publication of Heinrich Wölfflin's *Kunstgeschichtliche Grundbegriffe* and the occasion of the Getty Research Institute's new translation this session calls for papers on Wölfflin and his principles. Of interest will be: consideration of Wölfflin's thought on the bodily relation to images and his concept of space in art and architecture; how the editors and translator position Wölfflin with the 2015 edition (The

Getty Research Institute); and role of the *Principles* in establishing the discipline of art history in Australia and New Zealand.