

Middlesex University Research Repository

An open access repository of

Middlesex University research

<http://eprints.mdx.ac.uk>

Hansen, Susan ORCID logoORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4679-9116> (2017) Is it any wonder? On commissioning an 'uncommissioned' atmosphere: a reply to Hillary and Sumartojo. *Public Art Dialogue*, 7 (2) . pp. 242-256. ISSN 2150-2552 [Article] (doi:10.1080/21502552.2017.1343614)

Final accepted version (with author's formatting)

This version is available at: <https://eprints.mdx.ac.uk/22178/>

Copyright:

Middlesex University Research Repository makes the University's research available electronically.

Copyright and moral rights to this work are retained by the author and/or other copyright owners unless otherwise stated. The work is supplied on the understanding that any use for commercial gain is strictly forbidden. A copy may be downloaded for personal, non-commercial, research or study without prior permission and without charge.

Works, including theses and research projects, may not be reproduced in any format or medium, or extensive quotations taken from them, or their content changed in any way, without first obtaining permission in writing from the copyright holder(s). They may not be sold or exploited commercially in any format or medium without the prior written permission of the copyright holder(s).

Full bibliographic details must be given when referring to, or quoting from full items including the author's name, the title of the work, publication details where relevant (place, publisher, date), pagination, and for theses or dissertations the awarding institution, the degree type awarded, and the date of the award.

If you believe that any material held in the repository infringes copyright law, please contact the Repository Team at Middlesex University via the following email address:

eprints@mdx.ac.uk

The item will be removed from the repository while any claim is being investigated.

See also repository copyright: re-use policy: <http://eprints.mdx.ac.uk/policies.html#copy>

Revised article for *Public Art Dialogue*:

**Is it any wonder? On commissioning an ‘uncommissioned’ atmosphere:
A reply to Hillary and Sumartojo**

Author’s email and mailing address:

Susan Hansen
Department of Psychology
Middlesex University, The Burroughs, London NW4 4BT
s.hansen@mdx.ac.uk

Author bio:

Susan Hansen is Chair of the Forensic Psychology Research Group and Convenor of the Visual Methods Group in the Department of Psychology at Middlesex University, London. She has research interests in viewers’ material engagements with, and affective responses to, street art and graffiti; in the analysis of street art and graffiti as a form of visual dialogue; and in the promise of an archaeological approach to understanding uncommissioned independent public art.

Is it any wonder? On commissioning an ‘uncommissioned’ atmosphere: A reply to Hillary and Sumartojo

Abstract

This article is a reply to Fiona Hillary and Shanti Sumartojo’s “Empty-Nursery Blue: On Atmosphere, Meaning and Methodology in Melbourne Street Art”, published in *Public Art Dialogue* in October 2014.¹ Hillary and Sumartojo present a welcome addition to the literature on street art and graffiti in their sustained analytic focus on a particular work of street art and its place-based reception. However, their analysis of Adrian Doyle’s *Empty Nursery Blue* is compromised by their largely unacknowledged investment and involvement as commissioners and curators of the work. Further, Hillary and Sumartojo’s adoption of the concept of affective atmosphere and a positive sense of enchantment operates to discount viewers’ contradictory social-emotional responses to the work. While the authors’ attempt to incorporate autoethnographic methods appears promising, in practice this bears little in common with the critically reflexive practice of autoethnography, and is rather used as a circular rhetorical device to demonstrate the presence of the very notion of enchantment so central to the authors’ interpretation of *Empty Nursery Blue*. The liminal status of *Empty Nursery Blue* as apparently uncommissioned street art and as commissioned public art presents an unacknowledged tension at the core of this partial interpretation that may yet be ultimately productive of the very notion of wonder and enchantment. A critical expansion of the notion of enchantment to encompass a variety of affective responses and forms of material and ethical engagement is suggested.

Keywords: Atmosphere; Enchantment; Graffiti; Street Art.

The burgeoning literature on street art and graffiti tends to have a broader focus on a range of works in a particular area or on the works of a particular street artist. Seldom do scholars engage in detailed interpretation, or sustained analysis of the reception of a particular work of street art.² Fiona Hillary and Shanti Sumartojo are to be commended in presenting a rare example of a detailed analysis of a particular work of street art, and its place-based reception.³ However, whilst their article represents a promising sea change in terms of a clear shift in the focus of analysis in the literature, Hillary and Sumartojo's study of Adrian Doyle's *Empty Nursery Blue* is compromised by several factors, not least amongst which is the largely unacknowledged and unexamined investment and involvement of the authors as the commissioners and curators of the work. Further, Hillary and Sumartojo's uncritical adoption of the concept of affective atmosphere paradoxically operates to exclude contradictory responses to the work, as it cannot take account of the detailed particularities of viewers' social-emotional experiences. In addition, while the authors' self-described autoethnographic methods are laudable, in practice this seems to bear little resemblance to the established and critically reflexive practice of autoethnography as it is enacted in the social and human sciences and indeed, this 'autoethnography' appears to operate as a rhetorical device that enables the authorial animation of key concepts from the literature (e.g., political theorist Jane Bennett's notion of enchantment) central to the authors' interpretation of *Empty Nursery Blue*. It is argued that the liminal status of *Empty Nursery Blue* as apparently uncommissioned street art and as commissioned public art presents an unacknowledged yet potentially productive analytic tension at the heart of Hillary and Sumartojo's interpretation.

This article presents a detailed reply to Hillary and Sumartojo but also aims to engage in a more productive critical discussion of the affordances of the intersection between commissioned public art, uncommissioned street art, and graffiti exploited so effectively by *Empty Nursery Blue*. Key to this discussion is the interrogation of the claims made by contemporary public art to be able to regenerate and 'reset' problematic urban spaces, and specifically, in this case, the positioning of the site of *Empty Nursery Blue* as self-evidently in need of such intervention. Such claims are often made via reference to James Wilson and George Kelling's problematic broken windows theory, which highlights minor occurrences of civil disorder and antisocial behaviour within neighbourhoods as key indicators of the likelihood of future, more serious, crime. Despite a consistent lack of empirical support for this theory, it provides a commonsensical grounding to Hillary and Sumartojo's conclusion that uncommissioned work, and graffiti in particular, provokes an undesirable atmosphere of anxiety and danger which invites further criminal activity.⁴

Adrian Doyle's (2013) *Empty Nursery Blue* (see Figure 1, below) was commissioned by the Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology's Urban Laboratory project in conjunction with the City of Melbourne's Community Safety Team (arguably, the City is thus the ultimate patron of this work) as an installation that appeared in Melbourne's Rutledge Lane in August 2013. Rutledge Lane is an inner city street that is well known as a location for uncommissioned street art and graffiti, and the walls of this laneway are subject to continual reworking by street artists and graffiti writers. As such, this location is popular amongst tourists to the city, and indeed features (along with the

adjacent Hosier Lane) in government tourist brochures for the City of Melbourne. *Empty Nursery Blue* involved Doyle painting over (and thus effectively erasing all of the existent works of graffiti and street art) the visible surfaces of Rutledge Lane – not only the densely graffitied walls, but also the pavement and the road itself, and even the dumpster bins positioned along the lane – in a single shade of pastel blue he described as a “disturbing yet beautiful color” that referenced his childhood in suburbia.⁵ This work was ephemeral in that it was swiftly painted over by street artists and graffiti writers, and the laneway was restored to its former visually cacophonous state. Although not explored in any depth by Hillary and Sumartojo, the installation of *Empty Nursery Blue*, in its wholesale erasure of existing works of graffiti and street art with a single layer of paint, resembles the local council’s practice of negative curation, or the whitewashing – or ‘buffing’ – of uncommissioned graffiti and street art. It thus mirrors familiar existing practices of policing a hierarchy of worth of the works on city walls, however the pale blue colour of the paint applied by Doyle diverges from the beige/white/grey palette more often adopted by graffiti clean up crews.

PLEASE INSERT FIGURE 1 HERE

Figure 1. Adrian Doyle, *Empty Nursery Blue* 2013.
Installation. Rutledge Lane, Melbourne, Australia.
Photograph © Dean Sunshine (www.landofsunshine.com.au)

As Hillary and Sumartojo note, similar practices of erasure are regarded by the City of Melbourne as the appropriate response to unsightly and criminal graffiti, which should be subject to “rapid response removal.”⁶ However, the government appears more ambivalent towards more visually palatable street art, which as part of the “cultural fabric” of the city, is allowed to remain in specified locations when a permit has been obtained by the artist, but is not, save in certain cases where work has been commissioned, preserved against removal.⁷ Indeed, the work of street artists appears increasingly recognized as visually pleasing, if unauthorized – an aesthetic socio-moral judgment that gains strength from its opposition to the visual ‘blight’ of the criminal damage caused by graffiti, though both may be subject to removal (or negative curation) by local authorities. Further, an affective divide appears to exist for viewers, in that responses to graffiti appear more commonly marked by revulsion and outrage at work “forced onto others” and which diminishes the value of a community, whilst responses to street art are often more positive, with some describing it as an unexpected pleasure yielding “delight upon discovery” or as work that “brightens up the city”.⁸

Hillary and Sumartojo assert that the Urban Laboratory project’s aim, in commissioning *Empty Nursery Blue*, was to “use public art to activate the laneway and strengthen relationships among its users — thereby making it safer for all users — as an alternative to the installation of closed circuit TV cameras.”⁹ This was in response to the concerns of local businesses and property owners that the graffiti on the walls encouraged other criminal acts of theft, arson and criminal damage.¹⁰ Indeed, graffiti is often considered as a visible index of social deprivation and urban decay, and as a form

of abjection and territory marking akin to public urination, as dirt or filth, or “matter out of place”¹¹ and Hillary and Sumartojo acknowledge these connotations via their reference to graffitied sites as “sites of transgression and danger... edginess and urban character.”¹² It would thus appear that this public art intervention is based on a reading of the original environment as one that was inherently problematic in that it produced in viewers an atmosphere of anxiety and fear. In positioning *Empty Nursery Blue* as an installation that would ‘activate’ the laneway, Hillary and Sumartojo position Rutledge Lane as passive prior to this public art intervention, and appear to uncritically accept the empirically unsupported ‘broken windows’ rhetoric of graffiti as an index of danger and criminal activity, and as a form of mark making which is inherently productive of an atmosphere of anxiety and concern for personal safety.

Urban geographer Kurt Iveson argues that the control of graffiti is accomplished not just by its policing and erasure by authorities, but also via the discourses that portray graffiti as an indecipherable eyesore, or as a form of vandalism that invites more serious crime. He further notes that these discourses involve a level of social exclusion in that they reduce “graffiti writers to people who write but have nothing to say... [and thus have] no place/part in the city.”¹³ Paradoxically, the rushed and indecipherable aesthetic of visually offensive (and anxiety producing) graffiti appears to be, at least in part, produced in a response to the increased level of surveillance, risk, and punishment that graffiti writers, relative to street artists, are subject to. That is, the offensive and ‘dangerous’ aesthetic of graffiti tags is, in part, an effect of its very policing – in Michel Foucault’s sense, this is a form of productive ‘repression’.

Hillary and Sumartojo’s analysis of *Empty Nursery Blue* is based on two main arguments. The first is that two specific qualities of the work – its “immersive materiality” and its “urgent ephemerality” worked together to produce a particular affective atmospheric experience in viewers that may be characterized as an “embodied sense of wonder or enchantment.”¹⁴ However, as commissioners/analysts, Hillary and Sumartojo’s focus on, and interest in, the notion of atmosphere is twofold, and does not cohere simply in examining viewers’ experiences of affective atmosphere, but also in the ways in which particular atmospheres might be created, and further in providing a rare worked example of the application of this concept within the field of public art.

Commissioning is a process that has a central role in the mode of production of the majority of public artworks. However, as cultural geographers Martin Zebracki, Rob Van Der Vaart and Irina Van Aalst note, the claims made regarding what it is that is being commissioned have shifted since the latter half of the 20th century from a more traditional focus on creating objects to mark collective memory, to a raft of more ambitious claims based on the assumed social, cultural, physical, aesthetic and economic *effects* of public art – that it may, variously, enhance social cohesion, reduce vandalism and increase public safety, encourage different uses of public space (and thereby discourage problematic uses of public space), “upgrade the aesthetic quality of a place”, and provide economic benefits through place promotion, urban regeneration, and cultural tourism.¹⁵ It should be noted that many of these contemporary claims for

the effects of public art draw on older, romantic understandings of the transformative power of art that permit:

the sphere of the aesthetic to be thought of as a resource for harmonizing the person, bringing the conflicting aspects of his [sic] personality under some form of direction and regulation.¹⁶

However, these claims also align with more recent technologies for the regulation of moral conduct and neo-liberal self-governance identified by social theorist Nicholas Rose, and with Foucault's observations on the effects of designed environments on human conduct and self-regulation.¹⁷ In the case of *Empty Nursery Blue*, the central claims for the effects of this commissioned work on viewers appear to be that it would make Rutledge Lane feel more safe (or at least, less anxiety provoking) for local businesses and other laneway users, and as such would operate as a more positive alternative to the imposition of surveillance cameras by creating a shared atmosphere of enchantment and wonder.

The practice of commissioning effectively grants the artist the authority to execute a particular desired artistic production, for a particular desired effect, specific to a particular target site, often with some level of community consultation. Commissioning as a more formal process also invokes a state of mutual contract, and a series of terms and responsibilities understood by each party. However criminologist Alison Young argues that, by contrast, street art and graffiti is a form of art without such authority, as these forms of art are ordinarily uncommissioned and thus lack the sense of authority and permission inherent in commissioned works.¹⁸ As uncommissioned images, street art and graffiti offer a visible challenge to our commonsensical notions of public and private space, and to the rights of property owners and entities to alter our spatial environments. Indeed, for Young, viewers' responses to street art and graffiti, as unexpected and apparently magical alterations in the fabric of the city are not just a product of the 'enchanted nature' of the viewers' encounter, but rather this experience of 'captivation' is given life by its very unauthorized status, and its visual challenge both to established authorities and processes of authorization.¹⁹ Hillary and Sumartojo thus approach *Empty Nursery Blue*, not as street art, but as commissioned public art, though the work's location in Rutledge lane (a public laneway famous for uncommissioned street art and graffiti) positions it as apparent street art. The work's in situ location is thus key in the generation of the "unique atmospheres" of enchantment and wonder noted by Hillary and Sumartojo.²⁰

A traditional understanding of the ways in which viewers make sense of art assumes the reception of a transhistorical singular meaning identical with the artist's intention. Rancière refers to this as a model of stultification, which regards meaning as conveyed via the logic of cause and effect, with the transmission of the artist's intention to the spectator positioning viewers as passive recipients.²¹ Although outmoded in the literature on the reception of contemporary art, linguists Dagmar Joswig-Mehnert and George Yule argue that there is an unchallenged assumption in the graffiti literature that the meaning of graffiti is "relatively straightforward and shared by all" – even if the consensus is that it is meaningless and indecipherable.²² However, some have argued that graffiti and street art accord the viewer radically different possibilities in terms of their active participation and engagement with the work. Art historian Anne

Waklawek goes as far as to assert that the viewer of work on the street, in the act of encountering the work, achieves the work's "transitory completion", and that the authorship of street art is thus a "community affair."²³

Of course, the notion that the act of reception and interpretation implies a form of participatory authorship is not unique to street art and graffiti. Indeed, the literature on contemporary art also makes use of this notion, with Martha Buskirk arguing that a work of art is created through the viewer's "experience of the work as a series of unfolding encounters"; Howard Becker claiming that a work's completion is continually determined anew by its reception; and Pierre Bourdieu maintaining that the plurality of re-readings inherent in the reception of an art object engender its recurrent recreation.²⁴ Philosopher Jacques Rancière asserts that viewers are not passive and thus do not need to be encouraged to actively engage with work, as they are already involved in an active process of interpretation and appropriation:

being a spectator is not some passive condition that we should transform into activity. It is our normal situation... we have to recognize ... the activity peculiar to the spectator... (which) requires spectators who play the role of active interpreters, who develop their own translation in order to appropriate the 'story' and make it their own story.²⁵

Beyond this form of immaterial participation through reception, aesthetic experience and interpretation, it may be argued that street art offers viewers a more active role in prompting viewers to consider materially engaging with the work on the wall.²⁶ This too has a parallel in the contemporary art world, in the literature on audience participation and viewer interaction.²⁷ Art critic Nicolas Bourriaud's influential framework of relational aesthetics presents a utopic reading of the possibilities inherent in work that aims to encourage the interaction of viewers.²⁸ He asserts that this may provide for the formation of new micro-communities, novel social experiments and enriched interpersonal relations. However critics charge that the institutional context of the museum closes down the likelihood of such emancipatory principles translating into democratic practice, as these 'new micro-communities' are in fact dialogues occurring within the established networks of the communities of practice peculiar to the art world and further that such sweeping claims risk neglecting the site "specificity of local art and cultural production and political disputes within and between communities" – issues relevant to viewer interaction in museum-based contexts, but of particular pertinence to public art with participatory/interactive aims.

29

Hillary and Sumartojo reference art historian Claire Bishop's work, and in particular her notion of the double ontological status of participatory art in "using people as a medium" (and as a means to communicate to participants and to spectators) in their positioning of *Empty Nursery Blue* as a participatory art project, however this is couched in terms of the involvement of 'laneway user groups' who were 'invited to participate in and experience a suite of incidental works... in a considered articulation of the issues.'³⁰ However, this superficial and pragmatic reading of Bishop's work paradoxically positions these 'user groups' as inherently passive, requiring solicited invitation to participate and experience the work, in contrast to the contingent and

incidental participatory status of uncommissioned street art which arrests the passing viewer without prior consultation, involvement or forewarning.

Indeed, some have argued that graffiti and street art's distinct aesthetic of display encourages viewers to interact differently to the ways in which they might engage with art in institutional contexts. Philosopher Connell Vaughan notes that Derrida described graffiti's "aesthetic of the outside" as "an aesthetic of touching" which stands in contrast to the regulated interactions permitted in museums, where touching the exhibits is forbidden, or in the case of "interactive" works, highly circumscribed and monitored.³¹ For Derrida, graffiti breaks the "law of untouchability" in that it invites viewers to touch (and even to leave one's own trace on the wall).³² It could thus be argued that a measure of participation underutilized by Hillary and Sumartojo lies in the unsolicited marks subsequently made on the blank canvas provided by *Empty Nursery Blue* by the participant-spectators who encountered the work as an invitation to make marks of their own on the wall (see Figure 2).

Architect Mark Wigley notes that atmosphere is a widely used, yet underspecified concept that apparently refers to the 'feeling' generated by the presence of viewers in a particular space, as "some kind of sensuous emission... a swirling climate of intangible effects."³³ The social psychologist Margaret Wetherell goes further in arguing that the concept of affective atmosphere, whilst promising as a broad descriptor of 'context', is incapable of recognizing the details and particularities of our banal lived encounters with(in) the manifold environments, places and events that constitute emotional-social life.³⁴ In particular, the notion of atmosphere cannot register the privilege and inclusion/exclusion of particular subjects/viewers who are excluded and included from particular scenes, as 'not quite belonging'. Nor can it account for mixed or contrary affective responses (for example, anxiety *and* visual pleasure) or the reactions of viewers who may experience the same physical space in a markedly different affective fashion.

Whilst Hillary and Sumartojo do attempt to encompass the experiences of a range of viewers, this is via a consultation framework that reduces these parties to 'laneway user groups', a form of language designed to facilitate communications with governmental funding bodies and user groups. Further, whilst they do briefly acknowledge that some viewers of *Empty Nursery Blue* exhibited conflicting responses (including some negative reactions which found the work "destructive and aggressive") in the introduction to their article, and that "the ephemeral nature of the installation meant that it was always changing and could never be experienced in the same way more than once", these contradictory responses do not figure in their subsequent analysis based on the foregrounding of a positive sense of 'wonder' and enchantment generated by the apparently singular atmosphere of the work.³⁵

The notion of enchantment has also been adopted by Alison Young in her analysis of viewers' responses to street art.³⁶ However, importantly, Young also acknowledges the variation in viewers' responses, from outrage and violation, to delight in discovery. For Young, viewers' apparently negative responses to street art in situ do not exceed Bennett's notion of enchantment, which for her cohere in the 'arresting' of the

spectator's passage through the city.³⁷ Conceived as a "tangle in the smooth spaces of the city out of which comes the potential for enchantment," this need not necessarily involve visual pleasure, but may indeed be experienced as troubling, unsettling or *unheimlich*.³⁸ Enchantment, for Young, may afford a moment of seeing other possible ways of being in the city that may fall outside of viewer's conventional expectations. The enchantment of uncommissioned street art, for Young, thus also provides a point of potential connection with others, or a sense of attachment within a potentially dehumanizing urban space. In this sense, she argues, a 'moment of enchantment' may afford the potential for ethical engagement.

Although Hillary and Sumartojo assert that they conducted "immersion style fieldwork and "autoethnography" in documenting their own, and others', reactions to *Empty Nursery Blue*, they do not make reference to the extensive literature on either ethnography or autoethnography in detailing their approach to the collection and analysis of this crucial data.³⁹ Indeed, the autoethnographic element of this research appears to have been limited to simply documenting the authors' own responses to the work in situ. These casual observations (presumably drawn from fieldnotes) are then used to ground Hillary and Sumartojo's links to the conceptual anchors for their interpretation of the work, and in particular as evidence of the operation of Bennett's notion of enchantment:

an early response by one of the authors... described an experience of immersion and enchantment: "I felt like I was walking into a wonderland" ... [and] immersed in a gently glowing space rendered magical and otherworldly by its transformation. Here, Bennett's notion of enchantment was clearly evident.⁴⁰

However, whilst this level of surface description certainly captures the unreflexive lived experience of the authors' reactions to *Empty Nursery Blue*, this rhetorical use of self-experience departs from the established autoethnographic practice of critical self-reflexivity. Autoethnography, as it is ordinarily practiced, involves the researcher analysing themselves in relation to others, by adopting the practices of ethnography in concert with a critical focus on the self (*auto*) and drawing on personal experience as one's primary data.⁴¹ As a research method then, autoethnography is reliant on the foregrounding of a level of critical self-reflexivity which requires an acute awareness of the "politics of positionality" or the need to identify and acknowledge the influence of one's own intersecting identities, privileges and marginalisations on our interpretations of our lived experience and the sense we make of our socio-emotional and aesthetic encounters in the world.⁴²

A more critical autoethnographic study of the authors' experience of *Empty Nursery Blue* would thus also highlight and critically examine the authors' own investments in this work, and particularly on their dual roles and responsibilities as commissioners *and* researchers, with clear identifications with the artist as an agent of the project of which this work was a part. Certainly, the notion of enchantment, and Hillary and Sumartojo's conclusion that this describes the affective atmosphere generated by the work, and the experience of other viewers, is potentially compromised via the circularity of the authors' stated intention (in commissioning the work) to transform the lived experience of the space it was located within in precisely this manner.

Hillary and Sumartojo present a welcome addition to the literature on street art and graffiti in their sustained analytic focus on a particular work of street art, and its place-based reception.⁴³ However, their interpretation of Adrian Doyle's *Empty Nursery Blue* is compromised by their largely unacknowledged and unexamined investment and involvement as commissioners and curators of the work. Further, Hillary and Sumartojo's adoption of the concept of affective atmosphere and a uniformly positive sense of enchantment operates to discount contradictory responses to the work, and to gloss over the particularities of viewers' social-emotional responses. Finally, while the authors' attempt to incorporate autoethnographic methods appears promising, in practice this seems to bear very little in common with the critically reflexive practice of autoethnography, and rather appears to be used by Hillary and Sumartojo as a circular rhetorical device to demonstrate the presence of the very notion of enchantment so central to the authors' interpretation of *Empty Nursery Blue*. The liminal status of *Empty Nursery Blue* as apparently uncommissioned street art and as commissioned public art presents an unacknowledged tension at the core of this partial interpretation that may yet be ultimately productive of the very notion of wonder and enchantment noted by Hillary and Sumartojo.

A critical expansion of the notion of enchantment (following Young's application of Bennett's work) to include a variation of positive and negative affective responses, identifications and disidentifications, would arguably augment the integrity of Hillary and Sumartojo's analysis, as would attention to the opportunities for ethical engagement potentially afforded by these diverse moments of enchantment – as productive fissures in our ordinary ways of seeing, and being with others, in the city. A focus on enchantment as a vehicle for ethical engagement would also cohere well with any exploration of the work's stated aim to "strengthen relationships" among laneway users. Similarly, a more critical reading of the broken windows rhetoric used to present the laneway as being (prior to *Empty Nursery Blue*) an anxiety provoking and dangerous public space, in need of a corrective commissioned work (or a new, upgraded atmosphere) may also be helpful in guarding against a reading of the impact of *Empty Nursery Blue* that reinforces the dominant hierarchy of worth of commissioned public art over uncommissioned street art and graffiti. Finally, rather than approaching *Empty Nursery Blue* as a single-authored and time-bound commissioned piece – to which viewers/laneway users will respond in a more or less predictable manner – expanding our notion of participation/reception to incorporate the series of uncommissioned marks subsequently made on the wall by responsive laneway users may yield a more nuanced and inclusive analysis that might be more attuned to Bishop's incisive critique of the closed communities of practice that so often define the contained dialogue of apparently participatory art, as it would seem that many regarded *Empty Nursery Blue*, not with passive wonder, but as an active invitation.⁴⁴

PLEASE INSERT FIGURE 2 HERE

Figure 2. Adrian Doyle, *Empty Nursery Blue* 2013.
Installation. Rutledge Lane, Melbourne, Australia.
Photograph © Matt Handby (www.ArtyGraffiti.com)

Notes

- ¹ Fiona Hillary and Shanti Sumartojo, "Empty-Nursery Blue: On Atmosphere, Meaning and Methodology in Melbourne Street Art," *Public Art Dialogue* 4:2, (2014): 201-220.
- ² Anne Waklawek, *Graffiti and Street Art* (London: Thames & Hudson, 2011), 17.
- ³ Fiona Hillary and Shanti Sumartojo, "Empty Nursery Blue," 201-220.
- ⁴ Bernard Harcourt, "Reflecting on the Subject: A critique of the social influence conception of deterrence, the broken windows theory, and order maintenance policing New York Style," *Michigan Law Review* 97, (1998): 292; James Wilson and George Kelling, "Broken Windows: The police and neighborhood safety," *The Atlantic* 249(3) (1982): 29.
- ⁵ Fiona Hillary and Shanti Sumartojo, "Empty Nursery Blue," 201.
- ⁶ City of Melbourne, "Council unveils four-year plan to tackle graffiti," (9 Oct. 2013): n.p.
- ⁷ City of Melbourne, "What is Street Art," (2015): n.p. Note, however, that Rutledge Lane and Hosier Lane exist in a 'gray area' that is neither a permit zone, nor (usually) as a site for commissioned work.
- ⁸ Anne Waclawek, *Graffiti and Street Art*, 17.
- ⁹ Fiona Hillary and Shanti Sumartojo, "Empty Nursery Blue," 203.
- ¹⁰ Hillary and Sumartojo note that CCTV was rejected as a response as it would arguably stifle the production of uncommissioned (and thus technically illegal) works on the walls of the laneway, and although this was favoured by the City of Melbourne, by the police and by local businesses, residents and property owners, it was resisted by street artists, graffiti writers, and their audiences.
- ¹¹ Mary Douglas, *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo* (London: Routledge, 2002), 27.
- ¹² Fiona Hillary and Shanti Sumartojo, "Empty Nursery Blue," 203.
- ¹³ Kurt Iveson, "Policing the City," in *Urban Politics: Critical Approaches*, ed. Mark Davidson and Deborah Martin (London: Sage, 2014), 96.
- ¹⁴ Fiona Hillary and Shanti Sumartojo, "Empty Nursery Blue," 202.
- ¹⁵ Martin Zebracki, Rob Van Der Vaart and Irina Van Aalst, "Deconstructing Public Artopia: Situating Public-Art Claims Within Practice," *Geoforum*, 41(5) (2010): 787.
- ¹⁶ Tony Bennett, "Regulated restlessness: Museums, liberal government and the historical sciences," *Economy and Society*, 26(2) (1997): 161-190.
- ¹⁷ Nicolas Rose, *Governing the Soul: The Shaping of the Private Self* (London: Free Association Books, 1999): 229; Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (New York: Vintage, 1975): 43.
- ¹⁸ Alison Young, *Street Art, Public City: Law, Crime and the Urban Imagination* (London: Routledge, 2014): 133.
- ¹⁹ Alison Young, *Street Art, Public City*, 133-134.
- ²⁰ Fiona Hillary and Shanti Sumartojo, "Empty Nursery Blue," 201.
- ²¹ Jacques Ranciere, *The Emancipated Spectator* (London: Verso, 2009): 12.
- ²² Dagmar Joswig-Mehnert and George Yule, "The Trouble with Graffiti," *Journal of English Linguistics* 24 (1996): 123-30.
- ²³ Anne Waklawek, *Graffiti and Street Art*, 36.
- ²⁴ Martha Buskirk, *The Contingent Object of Contemporary Art* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2003): 22; Howard Becker, *Art Worlds* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982): 214; Vera Zolberg, *Constructing a Sociology of the Arts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990): 82.
- ²⁵ Jacques Ranciere, *The Emancipated Spectator*, 17-22.
- ²⁶ Susan Hansen and Danny Flynn, "'This is not a Banksy!': Street art as aesthetic protest," *Continuum: Journal of Media & Culture*, 29(6) (2015): 1-15.
- ²⁷ E.g., Kathryn Brown, *Interactive Contemporary Art: Participation in Practice* (New York: I.B. Tauris & Co., 2014): 1-16.
- ²⁸ Nicolas Bourriaud, *Relational Aesthetics* (Paris: Presses du Reel, 2002): 61.
- ²⁹ Claire Bishop, "Antagonism and relational aesthetics," *October*, Fall, (2004): 51-79; Kester, Grant, *Conversation Pieces: Community and Communication in Modern Art* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004): 104.

- ³⁰ Fiona Hillary and Shanti Sumartojo, "Empty Nursery Blue," 210.
- ³¹ Connell Vaughan, "Institutional change, the concept of the Avant-Garde and the example of graffiti," *Proceedings of the European Society for Aesthetics*, Vol. 3 (2011): 281-293.
- ³² Jacques Derrida, "Le Toucher: Touch/to touch him," *Paragraph; A Journal of Modern Critical Theory*, 16:2 (1993): 122-57.
- ³³ Mark Wigley, "The Architecture of Atmosphere," *Daidalos* 68 June (1998) 18-27.
- ³⁴ Margaret Wetherell, "Feeling rules, atmospheres and affective practice: Some reflections on the analysis of emotional episodes," in *Privilege, Agency and Affect*, eds. Claire Maxwell and Peter Aggleton (Basingstoke: Palgrave/Macmillan, 2013): 221-239.
- ³⁵ Fiona Hillary and Shanti Sumartojo, "Empty Nursery Blue," 202.
- ³⁶ Alison Young, *Street Art, Public City*, 45-48.
- ³⁷ Jane Bennett, *The Enchantment of Modern Life: Attachments, Crossings and Ethics* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2001): 43.
- ³⁸ Alison Young, *Street Art, Public City*, 45.
- ³⁹ Fiona Hillary and Shanti Sumartojo, "Empty Nursery Blue," 210.
- ⁴⁰ Fiona Hillary and Shanti Sumartojo, "Empty Nursery Blue," 210.
- ⁴¹ Norman Denzin, *Interpretive ethnography: Ethnographic practices for the 21st century* (Thousand Oaks, California: Sage, 1997): 227.
- ⁴² D. Soyini Madison, *Critical Ethnography: Method, Ethics and Performance* (Los Angeles: Sage, 2012): 5; Robin Boylorn and Mark Orbe, *Critical autoethnography: Intersecting cultural identities in everyday life* (California: Left Coast Press, 2014):15.
- ⁴³ Fiona Hillary and Shanti Sumartojo, "Empty Nursery Blue," 201-220.
- ⁴⁴ Claire Bishop, *Artificial Hells: Participatory Art and the Politics of Spectatorship* (London: Verso. 2012): 32.

Bibliography

- Anderson, Ben. "Affective Atmospheres." *Emotion, Space and Society* 2: (2009) 77–81.
- Anderson, Ben. & Wiley, John. "On Geography and Materiality." *Environment and Planning A* 41.2: (2009) 318–335.
- Becker, Howard. *Art Worlds*. Berkeley: University of California Press. 1982.
- Bennett, Jane. *The Enchantment of Modern Life: Attachments, Crossings and Ethics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. 2001.
- Bennett, Tony. Regulated restlessness: Museums, liberal government and the historical sciences. *Economy and Society*, 26(2) (1997) 161-190.
- Bishop, Claire. *Artificial Hells: Participatory Art and the Politics of Spectatorship*. London: Verso. 2012.
- Bishop, Claire. "Antagonism and relational aesthetics." *October, Fall*, 2004: 51-79.
- Böhme, Gernot. "Atmosphere as the fundamental concept of a new aesthetics", in: *Thesis Eleven* 33, MIT Press, (1993) pp. 113-126
- Böhme, Gernot. "Staged materiality", in: *Magic of Materials, Daidalos* n56, June 1995, 36-43.
- Böhme, Gernot. "Atmosphere as the subject matter of architecture", in: Ursprung, P. (ed.). Herzog & de Meuron. *Natural History*, Zurich: Canadian Center for Architecture and Lars Müller Publishers, (2005). pp. 388-406
- Bourriaud, Nicolas. *Relational Aesthetics*. Paris: Presses du Reel. 2002.
- Boylorn, Robin & Orbe, Mark. *Critical autoethnography: Intersecting cultural identities in everyday life*. California: Left Coast Press. 2014.
- Brown, Kathryn. Introduction. In K. Brown (Ed.) *Interactive Contemporary Art:*

- Participation in Practice*. I.B. Tauris & Co: New York. 2014.
- Buskirk, Martha. *The Contingent Object of Contemporary Art*. MIT Press: Cambridge. 2003.
- City Of Melbourne media release, "Council unveils four-year plan to tackle graffiti," (9 Oct. 2013) https://ehq-v2-production.s3.amazonaws.com/documents/attachments/000/000/488/original/W131009_Media_Release_Council_unveils_fouryear_plan_to_tackle_graffiti.pdf?AWSAccessKeyId¼AKIAJ5RCMFNBMS7MWVA&Expires¼1382407691&Signature¼SK0jWViyxDYxxuff0s%2BF749R5RY%3D (accessed 22 Feb. 2016).
- City of Melbourne "What is Street Art," (2015) <http://www.melbourne.vic.gov.au/ForResidents/StreetCleaningandGraffiti/GraffitiStreetArt/Pages/Whatisstreetart.aspx> (accessed 27 Feb. 2016).
- Denzin, Norman. *Interpretive ethnography: Ethnographic practices for the 21st century*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage. 1997.
- Derrida, Jacques. "Le Toucher: Touch/to touch him", *Paragraph; a Journal of Modern Critical Theory* 16 No.2, (1993) 122-57.
- Douglas, Mary. *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo*. London: Routledge. 2002.
- Duff, Cameron. "On the Role of Affect and Practice in the Production of Place." *Environment and Planning D* 28: (2010) 881–895.
- Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. New York: Vintage. 1975.
- Hansen, Susan & Flynn, Danny. "This is not a Banksy!": street art as aesthetic protest. *Continuum: Journal of Media & Culture*, 29(6): (2015) 1-15.
- Harcourt, Bernard. Reflecting on the Subject: A critique of the social influence conception of deterrence, the broken windows theory, and order maintenance policing New York Style. *Michigan Law Review*, 97: (1998) 291-389.
- Hillary, Fiona & Sumartojo, Shanti. "Empty-Nursery Blue: On Atmosphere, Meaning and Methodology in Melbourne Street Art", *Public Art Dialogue*, 4:2, (2014) 201-220.
- Hollingsworth, Mary. *Patronage in Renaissance Italy*. London: John Murray. 1994.
- Iveson, Kurt. Policing the City. In M. Davidson & D. Martin (Eds.) *Urban Politics: Critical Approaches*. London: Sage. 2014.
- Joswig-Mehnert, Dagmar. and Yule, George. "The Trouble with Graffiti." *Journal of English Linguistics* 24: (1996) 123–30.
- Kester, Grant. *Conversation Pieces: Community and Communication in Modern Art*. Berkeley: University of California Press. 2004.
- Madison, D. Soyini. *Critical Ethnography: Method, Ethics and Performance*. Los Angeles: Sage. 2012.
- McManus, L. "Adrian Doyle Paints A Melbourne Street Art Hotspot Completely Blue." (2013) <http://blog.vandalog.com/2013/09/adrian-doyle-paints-a-melbourne-adriandoyle-paints-a-melbourne-street-art-hotspot-completely-blue/> (accessed 24 Feb. 2016).
- Rancière, Jacques. *The Emancipated Spectator*. London: Verso. 2009.
- Rose, Nicholas. *Governing the Soul: The Shaping of the Private Self*. London: Free Association Books. 1999.
- The Age. "Graffiti Uproar as City Laneway Turns Blue." 26 Aug. 2013.

- <http://media.theage.com.au/news/national-news/graffiti-uproar-as-city-laneway-turns-blue-4693761.html> (accessed 24 Feb. 2015).
- Thibaud, Jean-Paul. "The Sensory Fabric of Urban Ambiances." *Senses and Society* 6.2: (2011) 203–215.
- Thrift, Nigel. "Intensities of Feeling: Towards a Spatial Politics of Affect." *Geografiska Annaler* 86 B.1: (2004) 57–78.
- Vaughan, Connell. "Institutional change, the concept of the Avant-Garde and the example of graffiti." *Proceedings of the European Society for Aesthetics, Vol. 3*, (2011) 281-293.
- Waclawek, Anne. *Graffiti and Street Art*. Thames & Hudson: London. 2011.
- Waldner, Lisa. & Dobratz, Betty. "Graffiti as a Form of Contentious Political Participation." *Sociology Compass* 7/5: (2013) 377–389
- Wetherell, Margaret. "Feeling rules, atmospheres and affective practice: Some reflections on the analysis of emotional episodes." In: Maxwell C and Aggleton P (eds) *Privilege, Agency and Affect*. Basingstoke: Palgrave/Macmillan. (2013) 221-239.
- Wetherell, Margaret. "Affect and discourse – What’s the problem? From affect as excess to affective/discursive practice." *Subjectivity Vol. 6, 4*, (2013) 349–368.
- Wetherell, Margaret. "Trends in the Turn to Affect: A Social Psychological Critique." *Body & Society*. (2014) doi: 10.1177/1357034X14539020.
- Wigley, Mark. "The Architecture of Atmosphere," in: *Constructing Atmospheres, Daidalos* 68, June (1998):18-27.
- Wilson, James & Kelling, George. "Broken Windows: The police and neighborhood safety," *The Atlantic*, 249(3) (1982): 29-38.
- Young, Alison. *Street Art, Public City: Law, Crime and the Urban Imagination*. London: Routledge. 2014.
- Zebracki, Martin, Van Der Vaart, Rob, and Van Aalst, Irena. "Deconstructing Public Artopia: Situating Public-Art claims within practice," *Geoforum*, 41(5) (2010):786-795.
- Zolberg, Vera. *Constructing a Sociology of the Arts*. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press. 1990.