

## **The Constellation that is Canada: Case by case arts policy and situated textuality**

Lynette Hunter

The transnational, as defined here, is an effect of globalization and has helped it drive a wedge between the nation-state and private individuals. In turn, this has had an impact on art in all media. The purpose of this paper is to explore the action of these effects and the implications of their impact, and to argue that Canada's constitutional focus on case by case law<sup>1</sup> offers thought-provoking analogues for a creative response to the changes.

Case by case law is in a sense a partial return to the idea of justice that operated prior to the modern period in the western world. Early sixteenth-century statues of 'Justice' depict a woman staring keenly at the world, but later statues blindfold justice. The phrase 'Justice is blind' comes from this later renaissance period, and describes a shift in concepts of equity from 'justice needs to know all the available details to be able to contextualize the issue' to 'justice treats all people equally no matter who they are'.<sup>2</sup> Clearly the former is as open to abuse as the latter, and the latter, for the emergent monied class of the sixteenth century who could afford to go to law, insisted in parity with the old aristocracy. What does this have to do with art-work or text-making? I would suggest that we operate with similar attitudes to aesthetic value. For the most part aesthetic value and arts policy funding is accorded to those objects that fit social and cultural notions of 'beauty', and beauty is linked to certain universals, one of which is that we all recognize it. Case by case aesthetics would focus more on the texts produced by a widely diverse range of people, making things that would not all be recognized as 'beautiful' or valuable, indeed may well not be recognized as art-work at all.

At present we have an aesthetic inheritance from the modern period that marginalizes many texts that do not contribute to sociocultural fit. While this may have been predictable under governments that excluded most of the populace from political and cultural power, today's democracies need to respond to the diversity that is now asserted. Art-work is central to the way people adjust their bodies to social and political change.<sup>3</sup> It is vital to a felt knowledge of the diverse views and different ways of life that have been exacerbated by transnational rhetorics. Not all people will be artists, but the possibility to engage in art-work is fundamental to participatory democracy, and one that does more to convey the ethics of a community than any other activity except perhaps

sport or religion.<sup>4</sup> A case by case approach to the support of art-work and textuality could be one way of extending these skills more widely, and, I would argue one that shifts the focus from the object made to the processes that produce it. This paper does not advocate for getting rid of texts, but for unfolding the work that happens before the object is realized in a representative form, and thinking about the implications for aesthetics.

\*

One of the effects of globalization is that ISAs (Institutional State Apparatuses<sup>5</sup>) no longer work in quite the same way. The social contract political theory of liberal humanism was based on a simultaneous acceptance of universals and of the autonomy of the individual citizen. G-SAs (Global-State Apparatuses<sup>6</sup>) support global economics which also simultaneously need yet deny claims to national universalism, and which recast the individual as a consumer in a niche-market group.<sup>7</sup> Art is no longer made only by the individual private artist, caught heroically between representation of the ideological subject and transgression or transcendence of that subject, but is part of niche art, caught ironically between commodity and simulacrum. These effects are complex. One of the elements carrying them is the shift in citizenship that occurs at the same time as early-twentieth century globalization: the enfranchisement of a broad national populace throughout western social contract democratic nations. It's even possible to argue that the enfranchisements were responsive to growing individual capitalization brought about by the need for a larger consumer base, ie a growing middle class.

Nations today have both ISA and G-SAs, and these have to be compatible to some extent. Yet if the individual has to relate to national ISAs as a subject, and to the global-national structures of G-SAs as part of a consumer group, what tensions arise? Does membership in a consumer group weaken subjectivity by giving you connections to concepts of subjectivity outside your national ISAs? Or does membership in a consumer group strengthen subjectivity by diminishing the alternatives to that subjectivity? Not all ISAs are compatible with G-SAs, there are, for example, trade embargoes. And even though ISAs and G-SAs are both based in capitalism, ISAs have a vested interest in capital projects that will benefit their own nations rather than others, hence there are bound to be differences of opinion and focus. ISAs are controlled to a greater or lesser extent by governments, and are therefore responsible to citizens; whereas G-SAs are relationships governments have with bodies that have no political responsibilities at all.

Given that art has been recognized socially and nationally in the modern period of liberal humanism only when produced by people defined as citizen-subjects, the widening of the franchise and the doubling up of subject and consumer, has had a broad impact on artistic production and consumption and on support provided by arts policy. However, transnational impact, which is not only that of global financial and capital economies, but also that of greater movement geographically, economic/ political/ cultural migration, has also thrown forward a particular aspect of aesthetic work which has always been present: situated textuality.

Situated textuality as a way of thinking rhetorically about art, derives from situated epistemology or partial knowledge theory developed by Bahktin, Wittgenstein and others, through social studies in science and technology, and makes connection with for example, black feminist theory, and First Nations traditional knowledge rhetoric, and has surfaced more recently in visual arts culture and performance studies.<sup>8</sup> It is not individualistic, nor libertarian, because it is inextricably engaged with the people and sociopolitical conditions in which it takes place, and asks its participants to respect and value difference. It's environmentally sensitive and ecologically formed. It explores the process of aesthetic labour by individual(s) in their working contexts, as it leads to installation<sup>9</sup> – the moment that the labouring process installs itself into an event recognized in society, the moment it appears/ erupts/ materializes in culture. It also explores the interaction of others not involved in the initial labour/process, but involved in the labour/process of (re)cognition, as Benjamin and then Brecht put it: the constellation of responders.<sup>10</sup>

With transnational movements and greater enfranchisement, there is an enormous diversity of lived experience that cannot be represented in the same way as the universal subject (aka usually propertied, white, religion of the book, and male). Indeed the 'transnational' could be a word to describe the differentiated voices marked by globalization, or it could be, like 'transculturalism' both compromised in the G-SAs and resistant to them. I would suggest that it releases all three positions and would like to talk in a little more detail about how that wedge between the ISAs and the private individual takes effect.

\*

Transnationalism has been part of the challenge to representative government that has led to theories of deliberative government, advocacy, proportional representation and other ways of engaging with diversity.<sup>11</sup> It has had an impact on the questioning of liberal humanism that has led to theories of democratic humanism. It is inextricable from the formation of G-SAs, through which international corporations and transnationals have an impact on nations, citizens and workers. It has helped shift the focus from citizenship as symmetrical subjectivity, to asymmetrical and multilayered models<sup>12</sup> of postmodern pluralisms/ responsive universalism/ differentiated public spaces.<sup>13</sup> And it has thrown forward a tension between the artist as hero, the artist as commodity, and artistic value as a processual event of particular individuals collaborating.

Transnationalism has realised this agency partly through the curious effect of its ability to undermine nation-state claims to universalism, and if the nation-state cannot maintain that claim, it can also no longer guarantee the autonomy of the individual. The result: the doublethink necessary to capitalism (that one is socially mobile but also constrained to social status – see political commentators from Francis Bacon to George Orwell) cannot be maintained, it becomes suddenly visible and obvious. Under G-SAs national universals are often ironised, even satirized. But most often they are commodified into the simulacra, that ambivalent knowingness that allows us to live alongside ideology while still inflected by it, which has replaced the repressions of doublethink. Another effect of this undermining is that the private becomes porous, because the private is dependent on the individual autonomy promised by the state to its citizens, guaranteed through capital and private ownership. A third effect is the breakdown in the modern definition of the artist as the citizen who is the licensed transgressor of representative subjectivity. Because the private becomes porous, the limitations of that transgression are exposed as being confined to liberal humanist subjects, a very small proportion of the population who identify with liberal concepts of representation, and who value art when it achieves cultural ‘fit’.<sup>14</sup> Fit does not simply imply ‘predictable’. It is more related to the experience of something that disrupts the shape of ideology just at the moment that it needs to re-form. Fit delivers the adrenaline surge of possibility and the endorphins of satisfaction at the same time, and ranges from the fulfillment of cliché to a subtle and ambiguous pleasure.

G-SAs de-emphasise the subject/citizen, and focus instead on the niche identity of the consumer. They encourage the artist as a brand-creator, corporate team-worker, who feeds the simulacrum, constructs the iconicity of an enfranchised population. This work is different from popular culture, because popular culture was never supported by those in power, never recognized as claiming universal values, representation, or the aesthetic value of 'fit'. Consumer culture claims niche-brands that ally it to the ideological 'fit' of G-SA economics in surprisingly knowing ways. The 'star' system, which originated in women's journals of the nineteenth century when they became an illustrated mass media in the 1880s, is one response to the demand for wider representation and static fit from a broader public that is aware of what it desires.

Transnationalism not only foregrounds the limitations of nation-state universals under liberal social contract ideology, but it also provides a wide range of alternatives. Under early globalization this variety is initially contained by relativism and toleration. But the sheer diversity of alternatives proposed by people newly marked as 'citizens' has been leading to forms of government that can recognize and value difference, such as for example, deliberative governance, proportional representation or community representatives such as the MTAs in Nunavut.<sup>15</sup> Hence transnationalism is one element that creates the conditions for the recognition of differentiated public voices, and the possibility of a move toward democratic humanism, a humanism not solely confined to liberal subjects.

Under relativism, the one form of valued aesthetic difference is resistance to the universals anchoring that relative. Another form is mimicry. A relativist understanding of masking and mimicry in postcolonial art emphasizes the underlying similarities and the toleration of difference. And of course, under a tolerant governance, artists may turn their own alternatives into universals. But with governance that is genuinely attempting to recognize and value diversity, people have often turned to focus on the situated, the negotiations among people that *make* difference. Art in these conditions has moved past the 'post' to neocolonialism,<sup>16</sup> and a mimicry of traumatic difference.

Difference doesn't exist on its own, it is made, it's a rhetorical artefact. Universalism assumes a priori that difference exists. Difference is constructed by hegemonic understanding, constituted by hegemonic compromise, commodified by economic desire – all strategies that ideologically constrain the individual within

difference. But difference can also be thought of as being made by individuals in the more immediate work of installation, in which it is formed in the process of working with others, or of constellation, in which it is formed in the process of participation and recognition. Both involve a collaboration that co-exists with the particular individual. This particular/collaborative whole is not confined to human beings but to the ecology of the activity, the interactive netting of geography, time, space, place, food, shelter, plants and animals, and while we're at it, probably stars too.

Difference that is made by individuals in collaboration with others is not private, not based on capital ownership, but also not niche, not based on consumption. Neither is it resistant nor mimic. In the particular/collaborative making of recent kinds of site-based art,<sup>17</sup> or of computer-aided blog interaction (premised in the structure of Frank Davey and Fred Wah's SwiftCurrent experiment of the 1980s<sup>18</sup>), of responsive hypertext,<sup>19</sup> of some zines,<sup>20</sup> and throughout many other current media, people have been developing strategies for integration and de-integration rather than production and consumption,<sup>21</sup> processes that highlight the differences that are made rather than the authorities and ownerships/copyrights of art, and the resulting affiliations and aesthetic/cultural needs that are addressed.<sup>22</sup> With installation, aesthetic value is less in the product and more in the work of making that creates the difference defined by the object. As such, documentation has become an integral part of this kind of art-work, because the object produced is not separable from the process producing it. Constellation involves strategies of disagreement, trust, *verfremdungseffekt*, that focus on how difference has been made and how it is recognized. In the process of recognition/ constellation, moral choices get made with ethical implications, but these do not represent difference, rather they advocate for it.

Situated work opens art/text-making up to a very large number of participants, and this is where strategies such as advocacy become important. Because there are no universal criteria for aesthetic value, or obligations to commodify, textuality can be valued aesthetically even if it is not undertaken by those designated as citizens or consumers. However this raises the problem of how it can be supported, in a capitalist society, how it can be funded. I'm setting aside the background to art-work which indicates that it has usually been in need of some kind of financial support, and assuming that it needs funding. Funding any kind of art-work has traditionally been based

on assessing the likelihood that the made object will achieve some kind of 'fit'. But if there are many and diverse experiences engaged in the work of making a text/art-work, then it is unlikely that the made object will be recognized as fitting into dominant expectations. Situated textuality focuses on the process of the work undertaken by quite different individuals, at times with quite different beliefs but working collaboratively with and across them, making possible strategies of advocacy.

Advocacy is a rhetoric that can argue for positions that are not made up of unified agreements – a gaggle of differences. And central to advocacy is the ability to argue on a case by case basis for the value of a specific project. This means being able to argue for funding for projects based on the particular/collaborative interactions that may happen, rather than the made text that will result. The made object, once released into culture may find itself constellated into another process but it may also be commodified or even defined as representation. What becomes important is the possibility for engagement among the makers and among those participating in constellation, that art becomes not an end but a way to communicate among human beings, to recognize the differences that are made, and value them in the knowledge we have made them.

I think artists/text-makers have usually worked this way, but what we see happening is a marking of the activity by the wider public as aesthetically significant in itself. Poetics, especially through the genre of allegory, has found ways of delineating what goes on before, during and after installation, in the situated and partial place, the ephemeral.<sup>23</sup> It is part of the deep enigmatic experience of partial knowledge, and in installation/ constellation it becomes the work of allegorical recognition that forms the not-said of both subjectivity and of niche-identification as well as the not-yet-said of installation. It's why we go to the theatre more than once to see the same show, because the interactions will be different. And it's why so many young people want to be involved in performance. It's also why we read the same poem more than once, because the interrelations and negotiations will be different. Although some would say that the re-reading is a constellation, I'd argue, and elaborate on this in the case study below, that writers install their words in different ways, sometimes to insist on a participation in the installation procedures, through grammar, verse form, layout. Readers are perfectly capable of responding as subjects, constituted subjectivities, consumers, objects/victims, but also as particular elements in a collaboration that never ceases. It's why so many

young people try their hand at poetry. One could also argue that the proliferation of literary criticism is a response to this need.

Yet make no mistake: We are all still subjects, and can be represented in government and called into being – eg to fight for our country. We are all still consumers, and are commodified into niche brands – eg as a double-income empty-nester who likes to read. Yet we are also all situated, and can be advocated on behalf of, can advocate on behalf of, yet remain partially known and that only in the process of making and valuing our differences.

\*

But there is a problem: there is no specific set of poetic forms or rhetorical strategies that will guarantee that an art object is representative, resistant, commodified, mimic, constellated, installed. Both ISAs and G-SAs use stabilizing strategies, but for different reasons since ISAs attempt to build unique national-state identities while G-SAs need to blend them in order to maximize markets. Artists devoted to representation or resistance, to commodification or ironisation still need those stabilizing strategies to work with/against, and they will inflect issues of advocacy to a greater or lesser extent. And given the varieties of difference noted above, and these are only some among many, devices and techniques for difference may overlap and result in unintended effects. For example, partial knowledge may contribute to particular/ collaborative interaction that feeds directly into niche-marketing consumer groups. The movement could go the other way, in theory.

Representative strategies, geared to putting stable identities into place, are usually explanatory, closed, analytical, synthetic and descriptive, leaving common grounds unexamined, dependent on a priori agreement, corporate in argumentative structure, and tend to the authoritative. They operate in ways parallel to case law, and draw strength from universalism. Corollary resistant strategies often highlight heroic individual subjectivity, focusing on their compromised autonomy, issues of relative empowerment, lack, absence, mimicry, the work of transgression and transcendence, and desire.

In contrast, consumer strategies are constrained rather than heroic, highly responsive to peer pressure, group solidarity and collectivism, branding, bonding, cult-formation, wish-fulfillment, and deferred power. Niche strategies tend to be explanatory but aimed at plausibility, pluralist/relativist, focused on pleasure, on associative



similarities, on knowledge based in the simulacrum, and on the constitution of stable but self-consciously foregrounded identities. Because of the non-responsible status of globalised corporations, plausibility replaces notions of case.

Advocative strategies at present in constellation emphasise particular/ collaborative interrelations, documentation of ongoing process, devices from happenings, improvisation, yin-yang, making choices generated by need, and treat both materiality and presence as continually re-negotiated in case by case situations. Situated installations are potentiary, today using techniques such as collage, allusion, allegory, analogy, partial knowledge moving to probable grounds, engaged and enacted agreement.

None of these devices, techniques, tactics, strategies, arguments is in itself a guarantee of the poetic it serves. They are each and all historically specific, and may be more or less appropriate in other contexts.

Possibly more important to remember: whom do these activities exclude? The representative notoriously excludes anyone who isn't a subject/citizen, simply doesn't acknowledge them, and resistant work frequently comes from those only partially disempowered, so that a large proportion of people in the nation-state such as workers or the unemployed or voteless home-makers, are disenfranchised from the aesthetic work or value. Both commodified and niche aesthetics also excludes labourers whose work for those in the west is usually at a distance, outside the relations of global power with nation-states and easily obscured from awareness – all too often niche art ironises such exclusions into commodities in themselves. And situated work can easily exclude those without education (of all kinds), access, or unrecognizable difference. Other people's installations and constellations can be boring, unintelligible, awkward, simply not understood as process.

However, situated work can enable a much wider embrace of art and the importance of aesthetic practice. Case by case arts policy tied to an appreciation of situated textuality could facilitate much more diverse participation of people in cultural and social action. Art-work/ text-making is open to kinds and intensities of analysis and knowledge that are different to those found elsewhere. In particular, situated textuality offers somatic and affective engagement with difference that can be central to transnational cultural recognition – situated thinking is not possible without aesthetics. So I'd argue that we need an arts policy that can maintain the potential for situated

articulation when under the institutional pressures of ISAs and G-SAs. Publishers, curators, artistic directors, should be encouraged to do more than nod to diversity, and take up the far more substantial challenge of advocating for processual art that is at the moment opening up aesthetics to a far more diverse public.

\*

The art world has tended to use the word ‘installation’ to define the piece that ends up in a gallery or on a site, whereas my use of it here broadens the word to also focus on the process of textualising. In other words, it’s a noun that refers both to an object and a process. Constellation is in many ways the process of textualising with the installed piece. Perhaps it is on a continuum with it, but I’d like to use a brief documentation of a recent installation to explore these relations more carefully, particularly the differences between live performance and reading – which is another kind of performance.

In August 2007 I brought a performance to the conference ‘Beyond the Book’ held in Birmingham, England. The performance resulted from a decade of text-work that began when I was taken over by a passion for one of my students. This happens from time to time as most teachers know, and it’s irresponsible to pursue because of the power relations involved. Instead I wrote a long poem over a two year period that eventually became a place to examine passion in itself and subsequently turned into something else. All the performances that I have worked on have as their central energy the need to open up a particular vulnerability to those participating, either by taking part in the installation or by responding to it. So the task of the installing, over the following ten years, was to make a form that insisted on its own vulnerability. This time however, I the performer was not vulnerable, it was the book the poem had turned into, because it was the book that was the place of engaged process.

The installation was initially textualised in the late 90s simply as an opened-book, a book cut to open in flexible ways. Then, when a printing-press became available in 2003, and because I’d taught printing for many years and was obsessed at the time with the semantic field in Shakespeare overlaying printing with passionate sexuality, the installation shifted. It was to be realized in the well of a library that held a printing press, and the performance would involve people by making and handing round keepsakes from Shakespearean references, and by demonstrating the embossing of pages of the poem’s text with unseen words that created a tactile textuality, the folding, sewing, gathering and

binding of the text, and then by cutting it in unexpected ways. The performer had to be highly sexualized. But the library I wanted to work in refused permission despite appeals over three years. So when I was invited to the conference in Birmingham, I hoped to perform this version there.

In the meantime I had got a lot older. I thought about dying my hair. I thought about Shakespearean sonnets and age and passion, and how this shifts. And I thought about the relation between installation and constellation, something not on the horizon when the textualising began.

Birmingham could not in the end offer me a printing press, which turned the performance into something quite different. I realized that 1) the performance was documenting a reading and 2) the readers needed to be involved – not only in the reading but in the documentation of process, and in the process itself. If the reading involved engaging with an opened-book, then where did the reading begin? It could begin simply by sitting down reading a series of ‘opened’ books, but I decided to begin with the single printed sheet and engage the reader into the folding, sewing, gathering, binding and opening that the early version of the performance had only been going to demonstrate, and encouraging them to drop into the activity at any stage of construction.

This is what happened. As an improvised event involving a range of quite different people in installing text as they worked on tables doing different activities, my performance action was ‘collaboration’. Among the participants were four people who had seen some of my previous performance work, but I was unsure how they would react because in that work there has always been a central vulnerable body, and this was here laid aside, displaced into the book. The performing body was instead interacting in a fairly mundane, low-key way, trying to establish lines of connection, discussion, negotiation. A lot of qi-work was used to build energy around the four-square table, and an arc of space was created by the presence of someone videoing the installation. Except for five or six minutes at the start, the video person maintained the same position, and the radius of the camera line laid up an invisible semicircular screen that bounced the energy back into the performance space.

Each table had a card sign announcing what activity took place on it, and three cards scattered throughout said ‘please help me’. Some people felt they were participating in a classic ‘this is how you make a book’ activity. These had usually some

kind of book history or librarianship background, and most of them hadn't 'read' the various opened/cut books that had been prepared in advance, so they were not aware of the flexibility in the material object that underlay the reading installation. Those who did look at the books first responded by making their own in very different ways, folding the sheet only to find that the pages weren't consecutive because the folds weren't regular, and either enjoying or being frustrated by the experience. One person carefully ripped the sheet into 60 pages, severed the excess, collated the leaves and stabbed a single hole through to ensure consecutive reading.

The sewing was fraught with problems. There were two activities. The first consisted of machine-sewing the folds to anchor them, and the second of stabbing the sewn fold to hand-sew the gatherings into a binding. Most participants were women, some despairing and saying they hadn't sewn 'for years', and many bypassing the activity altogether redolent as it is with women's suppression. The two men who started binding the gatherings with large stitches gave up in embarrassment – it was the most difficult physical activity in the installation yet they seemed to assume that it was their gender that defined their skill.

And the opening: the cutting of the pages, or tearing, or twisting, or rearranging despite and because of the sewn backbone of gatherings: this was, with the folding, the place that people engaged the most. Some resisted using knives to cut except along the edges of the consecutive pages, even saying it was too painful to do. Others produced origami-like engineering, or released the text into loose leaf so that it could be re-arranged, or tucked into other pages.

A few people then sat down to read their books, or some of the others that had been pre-prepared. Even fewer read aloud, as I had hoped they might and had indicated on the card on the reading table. But people gathered. They talked to each other about the problems they were having, and ways of doing the activities. They helped each other out, became proprietorial about 'their' copy, or simply left it for others to read. They formed their own particular/ collaborative installation. What they didn't do, on the whole, is move on to constellation. The other people in the room were eating lunch, buffet style, and food is, like dogs and children, a difficult presence to negotiate alongside. Many came up to the tables, looked on briefly, and then passed by. It's hard to know what they got out of it if anything at all, and I suspect very little. But many of those involved in the

installation didn't move on to engage with the reading, constellate the text into their own process. Perhaps they needed more time. The temporal is a factor difficult to know beforehand and this was a time-bound performance different from placing a book on a shelf where the reader makes the time they need.

I've come to realize that although the installation doubled itself as a documentation of reading, it didn't offer enough documentation of the installation of the book, the passion let loose into the folds, cuts, openings, torques, arrangements, of the affected paper and ink. The textual performance of the vulnerability of the body taken over by a foreign biochemistry that would have made it a point of improvisation for the reader. Writing is so often thought of as individual, with the particular/collaborative happening in some kind of interpretive event after the words on the page are there. Book art/ artist's books are a good example of material collaboration, as are hypertexts,<sup>24</sup> in their ability to suggest that the reader read not only for the story on the page but to constellate the text into their own process. The opened books are points of departure for other processes, but the work of situated textuality that led to them in the first place has to be performed in an appropriate medium. The reader could constellate this for themselves over time, but the audience of a time-bound live performance needs it devised into the performed activity. Both reading and live performance are aesthetic, somatic and affective activities, but quite different temporally and spatially. My failure to recognize this before the performance is a good indication of the lack of training institutionally available for the processual elements in reading as constellation. I intend to work the piece more particularly toward another sense of temporality.

This makes me suggest that in amidst this long-vision argument for case by case arts policy, we could begin where all social change usually begins, by diversifying education. Either in primary schools where there is often more disciplinary flexibility, or in universities which should respond to the combination of new research and pedagogy, there could be specific learning about processual textuality. A movement toward this has been happening at tertiary level in the UK, Europe and Australasia, called 'practice as research'.<sup>25</sup> And there are a few, very few, places in North America which have begun to pursue it.....

- <sup>1</sup> Case-by-case law was foregrounded after the 1982 repatriation of the constitution of Canada, initially particularly in First Nations/aboriginal legal issues.
- <sup>2</sup> A. Majeske, *Equity in English Renaissance Literature: Thomas More and Edmund Spenser* (London: Routledge, 2006).
- <sup>3</sup> During Margaret Thatcher's prime ministership in the 1980s, one of the responses to her cutbacks in the arts was a study of the support for the arts in Germany which demonstrated that access to art led to less psychological disturbance in the general populace.
- <sup>4</sup> For one among many detailed discussions of the way art and sensibility connect with democracy, see J. Ranciere, *The Politics of Aesthetics* (Continuum International, 2006).
- <sup>5</sup> L. Althusser, 'Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses (Notes towards an Investigation)' in *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*, trans B. Brewster (London: New Left Books, 1971).
- <sup>6</sup> L. Hunter, 'Unruly Fugues', in *Interrogating Cultural Studies: Theory, politics and practice*, ed P. Bowman (London: Routledge, 2003) 233-52.
- <sup>7</sup> I have written about this elsewhere (for example, L. Hunter, 'What is an Honest Man and Can There Be an Honest Woman? The Poetics of Daphne Marlatt in context of global economic pressure' *Open Letter* 12:8 (Winter 2006) 156-83), and the history consists of a number of shifts. For example, nations are less economically authoritative but still the legally and ethically responsible bodies for maintaining financial systems and issues such as corporate social responsibility and governance (L. Hunter, 'The Rhetoric and Reality of Codes', *The New Academy Review*, 1:1 (Spring 2002) 29-36). Nations need 'identities' to operate in global terms culturally/economically/politically. These identities are performed (L. Hunter, 'Ideology as the Ethos of the Nation State' *Rhetorica*, XIV, 2 (Spring, 1996) 197-229). Nation-state ethos used to be addressed to subjects and identity-formation of universals, as well as to difference-making functions with respect to other nation-states. Now it has to respond to transnational similitudes as well (L. Hunter, 'Listening to Situated Textuality: Working on differentiated public voices', *Feminist Theory* Special issue: Gendering Ethics/ The Ethics of Gender, eds L. Hogan and S. Roseneil, 2:2 (August 2001) 205-218). Whereas the subject of ISAs was 'subjected', the citizen today is invited to collude with the nation-state in producing identities recognizable to the global, ie the simulacrum, and that citizen is commodified into brand identities of consumer groups. Whereas the worker/non-citizen of ISAs could always aspire to be a citizen, workers now are 'elsewhere' in a state of on-going financial poverty and increasingly looking to other economies for capital, eg religious economies.
- <sup>8</sup> For a brief history see L. Hunter, *Critiques of Knowing*, Routledge 1999, especially chapters 5 and 6.
- <sup>9</sup> From N. Brossard, *Installations (with and without pronouns)*, trans E. Mouré and R. Majzels (The Muses Company, 2000/1984), developed further in L. Hunter, 'Installations and Constellations', in *The Scope of Performance*, eds B. Reynolds and J. Rowse, forthcoming.
- <sup>10</sup> For one discussion of these issues see E. Diamond, *Unmaking Mimesis: Essays on Feminism and Theater* (London: Routledge, 1997).
- <sup>11</sup> L. Hunter, 'Video Cicero: The problem of peace for modern political rhetoric' in eds C. Reid and M. Edwards, *Oratory in Action* (Manchester University Press, 2004) 186-209.
- <sup>12</sup> See for example, S. Kamboureli, *Scandalous Bodies: Diasporic Literature in English Canada* (Toronto: Oxford UP, 2000); or Diana Brydon's contribution to the last TransCanada conference in June 2005, and her elaboration of multilayered citizenship; or Marjorie Stone's presentation to the Tenth International Metropolis Conference, October 2005.
- <sup>13</sup> S. Benhabib ed, *Democracy and Difference: Contesting the Boundaries of the Political* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996).
- <sup>14</sup> Cultural 'fit' is another way of thinking about 'beauty'. See L. Hunter, 'The *Inédit* in writing by Nicole Brossard: Breathing the skin of language' in ed L. Forsyth, *Nicole Brossard: Essays on her works* (Montreal: Guernica, 2005) 209-38.
- <sup>15</sup> L. Hunter 'Equality as Difference: Storytelling in/of Nunavut', *International Journal of Canadian Studies* (Fall 2005) 51-81.
- <sup>16</sup> Thanks to Jill LeBihan, Sheffield Hallam University, for this.
- <sup>17</sup> See G. Kester, *Conversation Pieces: Community + Communication in Modern Art* (University of California Press, 2004), and replies by M. Kwon, *One Place After Another: Site-specific art and locational identity* (MIT Press, 2004).
- <sup>18</sup> F. Davey and F. Wah, eds, *The Swift Current Anthology* (Toronto: Coach House Press, 1986).
- <sup>19</sup> L. Hunter, *Critiques of Knowing* (London: Routledge, 1999), especially chapter 4.
- <sup>20</sup> J. Radway, plenary to the 'Beyond the Book' conference, University of Birmingham, 2007.
- <sup>21</sup> D. Marlatt, *Readings from the Labyrinth* (Edmonton: NeWest Press, 1998).
- <sup>22</sup> R. A. Ghosh ed, *Code: Collaborative Ownership & the Digital Economy* (MIT, 2005).
- <sup>23</sup> L. Hunter, 'Allegory Happens: Allegorical Opportunities in late twentieth- and early twenty-first century arts', in *The Cambridge Guide to Allegory* (forthcoming 2008).
- <sup>24</sup> In my experience, younger people trained in these devices are far more able to engage in their flexibility.
- <sup>25</sup> L. Hunter, 'Art/ Practice as Research: explorations, questions and suggestions', *UCIRA State of the Arts* Vol 1 (2007) 54-66.