

Project Anywhere: art, peer review and alternative approaches to validation at the outermost limits of location-specificity.

Sean Lowry and Nancy de Freitas

This text discusses the conception and development of a new global exhibition model dedicated to the validation and dissemination of art and research outside conventional exhibition environments. With much contemporary artistic activity manifestly ill-suited to the spatial and temporal limitations of traditional exhibition environments, and the figure of the curator as “cultural gate-keeper” still dominating more democratic models of selection and validation *Project Anywhere* was conceived as a potential solution for this double bind. *Project Anywhere* aims to meet the challenge of defining and implementing a new approach to the critique, peer review and documentation of artistic practices that fall outside of the forms and structures accommodated by conventional exhibition and publishing modes. Acting as a node to connect artistic activities in disparate locations, the *Project Anywhere* website¹ is not an “online gallery”. By contrast, the site becomes a contextualizing framework for an expanded project space encompasses the entire globe where the role of curator is replaced with an adaptation of the type of peer review model more typically associated with a refereed academic journal.

Historical context

Artistic practices which unfold outside of conventional exhibition circuits have become increasingly common in recent decades. Much of this often dematerialised² and post-object practice is concerned with critiquing traditional exhibition systems and the commodification of art objects. Historically, these practices have evolved

to challenge the idea that art only functions through its reification into an object such as a painting or sculpture. As a consequence, discrete paintings and sculptures, films screened in theatres, and conventionally staged theatrical performances are no longer necessarily a primary focus for many cultural practitioners. By contrast, many artists have attempted to transcend the discrete exhibited and distributable object by producing ephemeral works, using their bodies, or framing networks of social and political activity as sites for artistic expression. Importantly, this shift has also transformed relationships between spectator and artist. The spectator is no longer passive and detached but rather an intrinsic element within a *whole aesthetic experience* in which relationships between conditions of production and networks of reception are implicated. This reorientation of art's perceived purpose has had a profound (and still unfolding) impact. The roots of these developments can be traced back to the 1960s, when Situationist International (SI)³ and Fluxus⁴ began to challenge conceptions of the way in which viewers are involved in the process or "situation" of artistic production. Extending ideas that originated in early twentieth century avant-garde movements such as Dada, this "second horizon"⁵ of post war "neo-avant-garde"⁶ tendencies was more explicitly concerned with the creation of art experiences that offered active viewer participation. The outcomes of these interventions were not objects but rather *experiences*, resulting in a blurring of boundaries between art and life.

With aesthetic experience transformed from passive to active, both art and the conditions of its production and dissemination became increasingly politically focused, opening the way for even more radical challenges to the idea of place and spatial location. This tendency is perhaps most explicitly demonstrated in the institutional critique performed by artists such as Hans Haacke, Marcel Broodthaers and Andrea Fraser. For Miwon Kwon, one of the best reasons for expanding the idea of site specificity was an "epistemological challenge to relocate meaning from within the art object to the contingencies of its context; the radical restructuring of the subject from an old Cartesian model to a phenomenological one of lived bodily experience; and the self-conscious desire to resist the forces of the capitalist market economy."⁷ Accordingly, much advanced art practice now seeks to actively transcend the physical limitations of traditional exhibition contexts, and often includes work in remote geographical locations, technically specialized contexts, and even in imagined spaces. *Project Anywhere*, the subject of this text, is specifically dedicated to the validation and dissemination of art at the outermost limits of location-specificity. During the late 1990s, participatory practice was famously reframed by Nicolas Bourriaud, who argued that audience involvement made work political, since the space of interaction created fleeting communities whose inter-subjective relations and concrete communications could be politically affective. The political, he suggested, could emerge within and through the aesthetic experience without the art or the artist engaging directly with politics. However, Bourriaud's influential ideas were also criticized. Claire Bishop, in particular, critiqued the lack of critical antagonism, loss of aesthetic criteria, and assumption of democracy she saw as evidenced

throughout much the work and ideas championed by Bourriaud. For Bishop, the aesthetic antagonisms presented in the work of artists such as Santiago Sierra and Artur Żmijewski potentially contain more critical potential. Bourriaud's ideas have also been critiqued by Owen Hatherley⁸ for their alleged ignorance of the persistent political ramifications of advancing neoliberalism, declining socialism, and an expanding mass media, and Adam Geczy for being a form of Situationism.⁹ At any rate, in the academic/research environment in which many artists are now working, this contested terrain and its inherent defiance of traditional location-specificity presents a new series of challenges. Here, it could again be argued that a political dynamic is inherent, since this kind of work sets up a distinctive ambiguity, particularly in terms of academic expectations for peer review and critique. Responses are often remarkably similar to the skepticism that earlier artists faced when they abandoned medium specificity.

Expanded exhibition circuits

Within an expanded approach to the idea of an exhibition, it is clearly no longer realistic to expect all art and research to fit within the physical and material constraints of established public art institutions or other public viewing spaces such as theatres, libraries, community centers, universities and art academies. Although some artists' work is specifically positioned to critique the institutional spaces in which they are expected to present their work and ideas, others are simply unable to appropriately present their work within such spaces. Consequently, and in divergent ways, many artists eschew conventional spaces in favour of dynamic exhibition environments, ever expanding in their physical and temporal parameters. An "exhibition" might now constitute anything from a "Silent Dinner Party"¹⁰ to the performative ascent of a mountain¹¹ or a modular eco structure in the Kalahari Desert.¹² Significantly, such practices invariably disrupt established critical processes of review insofar as they make direct access to the artwork difficult. Established models of validation typically require direct, physical access and a comprehension underpinned by full sensual experience of the physical work. Consequently, the challenge for artists who create work in defiance of location-specificity is that their work often sits outside of the quality assurance processes that typically define value within the academy. Critical peer validation of research output is fundamental for artist academics, but if the direct experience of an artwork is potentially inaccessible, what kind of assessment can be made? In the 1960s, when Michael Fried and Clement Greenberg famously argued for medium specificity, they were arguing from a modernist position that emphasised disciplinary integrity and the purity of the medium. The situation is very different today. Rosalind Krauss has recently described a "post-medium condition" that re-presents the idea of purity of the medium.¹³



Roisin Beirne, Clare Breen, Andreas Kindler Von Knobloch, David Lunney, John Ryan, Tom Watt, Winter Resort, 2012, Photo by Andreas Kindler Von Knobloch

Countering the presumption that a specific morphological instantiation or physical performance necessarily constitutes the primary condition for critique is the argument that the aesthetic object is finally something immaterial. In other words, it is something unfolding within a network of relations that includes both sensory and non-sensory information. By extension, this idea of a work as something inhabiting a network of material and immaterial forms (i.e. historical and social contexts, multiple forms of documentation, critiques and interpretations etc), suggests that being critiqued, discussed and experienced in a mediated form is still an aesthetic object insofar as it can still be distinguished from other forms of human cultural and intellectual expression and activity by virtue of its dependence upon the structural idiosyncrasies of the *art condition*. Moreover, with physical spaces and materials now inextricably intertwined with expanded structural conceptions of what constitutes an artwork, it no longer makes sense to pinpoint a single fixed and immovable location or moment for a creative work. Given that we cannot even behold a work as art without the surrounding historical, subjective and cultural contextualizing information bound up in this determination, an aesthetic object can therefore potentially be anything that directs aesthetic contemplation and interpretation toward this *idea* of network. For David Davies, the physical work is simply a vehicle or medium

through which the artistic performance is generated.¹⁴ Thus, the morphological instantiation or physical performance makes no exclusive claim to the art condition in itself, but represents the networked aesthetic experience.

Once we regard the supporting apparatuses of art history and the political, social and economic contexts that underpin the production and reception of art as aesthetic elements, it becomes possible to argue that the art condition, is something that is *always* dematerialized. This art condition, a structure that hosts aesthetic comprehension as distinct from other languages of human comprehension, is therefore something built in the mind of the interpreter via both direct experience and documentation, and moreover, that it is clearly problematic to separate these elements. Most of us, for example, did not directly experience the seminal performance works of the 1960s and 1970s that continue to inform our understanding of contemporary art. Although our understanding of the ideas carried within these works is dependent upon mediated documentation, these seminal works are nonetheless interpreted *aesthetically*; that is, they are interpreted in a manner that is fundamentally distinct to other forms of knowledge.

Much contemporary artistic activity is specifically framed to implicate structural relationships within the spaces (physical and cultural) in which it is situated. Working within the systems and symbolic languages of a host context, such work invariably produces meaning and experience that is contingent upon that host context. A creative work is a dynamic collection of signs, concepts, myths, traces, objects, sensations and contradictions. These are all intertwined with its surrounding contextualising apparatus of documentation and interpretation. Thus, comprehension of a creative work typically demands a combination of aesthetic experience *and* contextualising information. A central question at play within this paper is whether this relationship can be adequately extended across time and space via substantial documentation, facilitating “authentic” access to both aesthetic experience and critical comprehension. This, as we will discuss a little later in this text, is *Project Anywhere’s raison d’être*.

Institutional validation

Despite the radical transformations that have occurred over the last century of artistic practice, institutional agendas continue to have a disproportionate and conformist influence upon artist academics, many of whom are dependent upon university and residency programs for financial support in order to actually produce work. Some of these conditions and requirements have contributed to an environment in which particular, assumed limits are set on artistic processes and outcomes. Consider for example, the typical requirement for artistic research to include: documentation and analysis as research evidence; quality assurance through academic peer review; public program collateral for institutional use (museum or public gallery); media and social network friendly publications as well as public funding justifications.

Given the reality that much artistic activity is now concerned with the production of work that transcends physical location or evolves over extended periods of time, there is a commensurate likelihood that audiences will only experience works through mediated networks of documentation and interpretations. In the extreme, some artistic interventions are impossible to distinguish as art without a specifically designed, corresponding online presence. Broadly, audiences are now less likely to expect artworks and their corresponding documentation to exist in singular destinations, but rather, to be situated and understood within unfolding processes of formation. Adequate documentation for the task of communicating new knowledge clearly needs to be able to incorporate the kinds of open-endedness and contradiction that this kind of art itself experientially manifests. Without addressing this challenge, any understanding produced between the complexities of creative works and parallel, contextualizing elements will never hold.

Addressing the challenge of expanded exhibition circuits: the conception and development of Project Anywhere

Project Anywhere was conceived and developed as a possible solution to the challenges outlined above. Prior to the development of this system, and based initially upon the founding concept of Sean Lowry in 2011, *Project Anywhere's* Steering Committee (2012)¹⁵ was formed with a view to developing appropriate policy for the task of validating artistic research at the outermost limits of location-specificity.



Department of Biological Flow, Channel Surf, 2014-15, research-creation event,
Photo courtesy of Department of Biological Flow

After much consultation and debate, a two-stage peer review process was developed. It was decided that a blind peer review of project proposals would be used to determine which projects would be hosted, whereas an open peer review of project outcomes would better suit the task of deciding which projects would be finally archived as “Validated Research Outcomes”. As part of this undertaking, a comprehensive set of evaluation criteria was developed. Here, it was also emphasised that *Project Anywhere* should retain verification materials to demonstrate that all evaluation criteria are met (these materials are archived and backed up for external auditing). Once this two-stage peer-review policy was formulated, an Editorial Committee¹⁶ was then formed in order to review any proposals that had successfully navigated the peer-review process. Once these proposals had been returned to the candidate with peer comments for revision and then resubmitted for Committee for review, the Committee makes their final recommendation as which projects will be hosted. Meanwhile, an Advisory Committee¹⁷ was also formed to oversee the overall strategic direction of *Project Anywhere*.

Following the first round of evaluation and Committee review, a selection of four projects was made for hosting during 2013. With four projects and a live web presence, the site and its conceptual framework was finally open to the scrutiny of the *Project Anywhere* committees. The digital conditions of each art project’s web presence (text descriptions, image quality and links) became the focus of the committees’ attentions and evaluative discussions are continuing as to the potential value of: 1) higher quality visual and textual information on hosted works;



Mark Shorter, *Song for Glover*, 2012

2) more comprehensive artist statements; 3) supportive texts by invited writers and/or comments from external critics; and 4) advice for artists on quality documentation (writing style, web format, image choice and quality).

Given the dual schema of *Project Anywhere*, research practice and exhibition practice have become two interconnected frameworks under examination. *Project Anywhere* is a critical response to both of these problematic issues—art AS research (artistic research) and the notion of the exhibit or exhibition as the primary product of artistic practice. Many interesting and ongoing practical and theoretical challenges have arisen within the process of designing and managing the launch of this initiative, which in turn is providing a valuable testing ground for future approaches to research and experimental exhibition formats.

Looking ahead

Three lines of enquiry in particular will be drivers of research and development associated with the *Project Anywhere*. The first relates to the concept of distributed project documentation. This is the relationship between official and informal material and the opening out of archival and documentary environments and structures accessible as part of the aesthetic experience of contemporary work. There are implications for the maintenance of any digital archive that is expected to be true to the form and complexity of the work being produced. The second line of enquiry will focus on the quality of documentation produced by and for artists working in the new genre. *Project Anywhere* is poised to play a significant role in the development of new approaches to visual/textual documentation of contemporary practice. The third line of inquiry, and perhaps the most far-reaching, is a reconsideration of the function and impact of critique within this new environment.

In recent years, tertiary art education and the artwork associated with higher education programs (and graduates) have become products dominated by research paradigms and objectives with quantifiable, verifiable end results. The institutional requirement for documentation and evidence of research, and scientific models of peer validation, has undoubtedly introduced a political dimension and a homogenizing influence upon artistic activity. Distinctive parallels have emerged with marketing attitudes and productivity agendas as we witness the loss of unfettered, open-minded, value seeking creative action. Socially oriented, critical processes and work towards self-enlightenment or pure experimental, speculative thinking may be in decline. In 2012, an interesting examination of this phenomenon took place at the 1st Tbilisi Triennial, *Offside Effect*,¹⁸ which was focused on the conceptual development of educational platforms that challenge the current prescriptive influence of the Bologna process in Europe. Artists and lecturers, collaborating with groups of students from several selected experimental academies, attempted to open a window on their creative orientations and strategies for making work. Much of the visitor experience of these works entailed: encounters of a discursive, critical or archival nature; interpretations of artistic freedom; collective, experimental, bohemian and squatter action, and the idea of an exhibition functioning as a school in turn

framed as a work of art.¹⁹ In this context, the art is framed and understood within the immaterial context of social relations, expanding beyond the tangible object, fixed in time and place. *Project Anywhere* is also alive to idea that art can be understood as something immaterial within a network of social and political connections.

Much like the fictional world that we call art, cultural projections such as institutions only exist to the extent that people agree that they do. Art remains a fertile ground on which to stage a dynamic play between a literal register of information and spaces for the imagination to flourish. In asserting that the “art” itself is not directly presented on the *Project Anywhere* website, the idea that the art is to be somehow apprehended as existing elsewhere in space and time is implicated. To this end, the indexical information made available via the website functions to direct attention to a work existing somewhere else in space and time. The potential remoteness or transience of some hosted projects will invariably mean that it is difficult, and in some cases impossible, for all subjects in the intended audience to directly apprehend the work. This invariably raises the question of whether mediated apprehension of some works is somehow a “second-best” experience. Given the “post retinal” nature of much contemporary practice, these kinds of philosophical questions have arisen across a range of institutional contexts. In many cases, these theoretical uncertainties in themselves are developed into an artistic or curatorial premise. To cite one example, the artistic director of Documenta XIII (2012) Carolyn Christov-Bakargiev directly addressed the necessity of the relationship between aesthetic and sense perception: “What does it mean to know things that are not physically perceivable to us through our senses? What is the meaning of the exercise of orienting in thought toward these locations?”²⁰ Accordingly, some Documenta XIII “sites” included in the Kassel catalogue were actually located elsewhere on the globe.

Other social experiences reinforce this notion that it is possible to build an aesthetic experience in the mind of an interpreter who does not directly sense a creative work. We sense many things vicariously, without direct experience. For example, many humans who have not experienced life in the wilderness may still hold strong political opinions about the value of an unvisited wilderness and have a personal attachment to the idea of it. In this sense, simply *knowing that it is there* offers an experience profoundly different to that of a theoretical proposition.²¹ There are of course many other lived examples of things that we can sense without resorting to direct experience. We do not, for example, necessarily need to directly witness events ranging from sexual *impropriety* to genocide in order to be reasonably convinced of their existence. Extra sensory information in the form of substantial documentation can provide forms of validation that are as convincing as direct sense experience. Continuing with this train of thought, one of the reasons that Tehching Hsieh’s work arguably remains compelling is the way in which systematic documentation has enabled interpreters who did not directly witness his five *One Year Performances* in New York between 1978 and 1986 to build his works in the mind. Hsieh’s *Time Clock Piece*, for example, is validated by 366 time cards,

366 filmstrips, signed witness statements, a record of missed punches, and a 16mm time-lapse film. Consequently, Hsieh's performances provide a profoundly *different kind of comprehension* of concepts central to the mechanics of capitalism, surveillance, production, control, discipline and submission than might be possible within a more traditional theoretical or philosophical argument.

In conclusion

The conditions under which *Project Anywhere* was conceived are underpinned by a series of now long standing debates concerning the paradoxical conditions of artistic production, display and consumption. From the historical avant-gardes through conceptualism and institutional critique, to new modes of exhibition, display and performance across the global contemporary art spectrum, artists have consistently demonstrated a self-reflexive awareness of what Sabine Folie recently described as “the paradoxical insight that total comprehension is impossible.”²² By extension, addressing this problem of incomprehensibility has also become a defining characteristic in the framing of artistic research. The ongoing challenge that faces *Project Anywhere* is the question of how the veracity of artistic documentation might accommodate these paradoxes in a way that is sympathetic to the contradictions characterizing much contemporary artistic practice, whilst also somehow being accountable to the institutional expectations of university-based research culture. In accepting that it no longer necessarily makes sense within an expanded conception of art (and by extension artistic research) to pinpoint a single fixed and immovable location or artefact as the primary text for a creative work, *Project Anywhere* encourages artists to push against the edges of artistic practice and the specificities of exhibition location whilst at the same time striving to maintain research accountability via the relatively democratizing processes of blind peer validation.²³ In doing so, *Project Anywhere* aims to connect the sensory experience of apprehending art with the communication of knowledge about and through art. As an exhibition platform, *Project Anywhere* promotes new and experimental art at the outermost limits of location-specificity. As a publishing platform, *Project Anywhere* facilitates processes of critique and validation for artistic practice. The extent to which the initiative serves the artistic and arts research communities of the future will invariably depend on careful management of these distinct yet intertwined objectives. Although the relatively democratizing process of blind peer review is arguably a more ethically robust alternative to the figure of the curator as a cultural gatekeeper, it is also clear that an alternative approach to committee selection may eventually need to be found to circumvent any perception of indirect influence in Editorial Committee member selection by the Executive Director. This, and many of the other challenges presented in this paper, will be addressed as time and funding permits (the Executive Director currently performs all administrative functions and covers most costs beyond small institutional contributions from partnered universities toward advertising).

It is clear that the challenge of institutionally validating research in which artistic practice is the significant medium is made even more difficult when the research activity is “out in the world” as opposed to within a traditional exhibition space such as a museum or gallery. This paper has examined the challenge of bringing new knowledge from discursive, speculative and experimental fields of artistic activity at the outermost limits of location-specificity into contexts that also meet expectations of clarity and relevance typically demanded of research. It has also discussed the challenge of documenting geographically remote or ephemeral contemporary artistic research in a format that can potentially facilitate meaningful dialogue under relatively stable conditions. The *Project Anywhere* team is currently working toward hosting a conference at the School of Art, Media, and Technology at Parsons The New School for Design, a division of The New School, New York, NY on Thursday November 13 and Friday November 14, 2014 that will feature presentations from international artist/researchers that have successfully navigated peer evaluation at the proposal stage within *Project Anywhere's* 2013 and 2014 program, together with a series of invited speakers also interested in the challenge of exhibiting, performing and conducting research outside traditional exhibition environments. It is envisaged that this conference will provide another opportunity to test the challenges discussed in this paper.

Sean Lowry is a Sydney-based artist, an academic at The University of Newcastle, Australia, and Executive Director of projectanywhere.net. Lowry's conceptually driven artistic practice employs strategies of concealed quotation designed to evoke ghostly feelings of familiarity. From August to December 2014, Lowry will be Visiting Scholar/Artist at the School of Art, Media, and Technology at Parsons The New School for Design in New York.

Nancy de Freitas is an artist and academic based at Auckland University of Technology, New Zealand. She has lectured widely on art and design research practice and material thinking methodology and is currently Editor-in-Chief of the international journal 'Studies in Material Thinking'.

Endnotes

1 “*Project Anywhere*: a global peer reviewed space for art at the outermost limits of location-specificity,” accessed May 10 2014, <http://projectanywhere.net/>

2 See Lucy Lippard and John Chandler, “The Dematerialization of Art,” *Art International* (February 1968): 31–6. 10.

3 The power of mass media was the target of Guy Debord and the Situationist International. In *The Society of the Spectacle* (1967), Debord characterises the reified “spectacular” image as symptomatic of capitalistic alienation and, moreover, that the spectacle actually conceals this estrangement. (Guy Debord, *The Society of the Spectacle*, trans. Donald Nicholson-Smith (New York: Zone Books, 1994), § 10). For a comprehensive introduction to SI, see Tom McDonough, ed., *Guy Debord and the Situationist International: Texts and Documents* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2004).

4 In the late 1960s, George Maciunas's insistence upon "concretism" (materiality) in fluxworks and his criticism of "illusionism" (representation) aimed to problematise the spectacular reification of reality. For Maciunas, the irreproducibility of material contextual conditions marks out all representation as inexorably illusory. For an introduction to Fluxus, see Ken Friedman, ed., *The Fluxus Reader* (Chichester, West Sussex and New York: Academy Editions, 1998).

5 See Peter Bürger, *Theory of the Avant-garde*, trans. Michael Shaw (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984).

6 See Hal Foster, *The Return of the Real* (Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, 1996), xi.

7 Miwon Kwon, "One Place after Another: Notes on Site Specificity," *October*, 80 (1997): 91.

8 See Owen Hatherley, "Post-Postmodernism?," *New Left Review* 59 (Sep/Oct 2009): 160.

9 See Adam Geczy, "Sanitised Situationism," *Broadsheet: Contemporary Art + Culture* 37:2 (2006): 127-127.

10 See Honi Ryan, "Silent Dinner Party" (from *Project Anywhere's* pilot program, 2012), accessed May 10 2014 <http://projectanywhere.net/archived/silent-dinner-party>.

11 See Mark Shorter, "Schleimgurgeln: Song For Glover" (from *Project Anywhere's* pilot program, 2012), accessed May 10 2014, <http://projectanywhere.net/archived/schleimgurgeln-song-for-glover>.

12 See Hans Kalliwoda, "WiaS (The World in a Shell)" (from *Project Anywhere's* 2013 program), accessed May 10 2014, <http://projectanywhere.net/project/wias>.

13 Rosalind Krauss, *A Voyage on the North Sea: Art in the Age of the Post-Medium Condition* (London: Thames & Hudson, 2000), 56.

14 David Davies, *Art as Performance* (Oxford: Blackwells, 2004), 59.

15 *Project Anywhere* Steering Committee (2012): Professor Brad Buckley, Associate Dean (Research), Sydney College of the Arts, The University of Sydney, Australia; Professor Su Baker, Director, Victorian College of the Arts, Faculty of the VCA & Music, University of Melbourne, Australia; Professor Richard Vella, Head of School, Drama, Fine Art & Music, University of Newcastle, Australia; Dr. Sean Lowry, School of Drama, Fine Arts & Music, The University of Newcastle, Australia; Associate Professor Nancy de Freitas, School of Art and Design, AUT University, Auckland, New Zealand; Mr. Ilmar Taimre, Executive Consultant, Independent Researcher/Virtual Musician, Brisbane, Australia. Dr. Jocelyn McKinnon, School of Drama, Fine Arts & Music, The University of Newcastle, Australia; Dr. Andre Brodyk, School of Drama, Fine Arts & Music, The University of Newcastle, Australia; Dr. Angela Philp, Deputy Head of School—Research, Drama, Fine Arts & Music, The University of Newcastle, Australia; Dr. Tony Schwensen, School of the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, U.S.A.

16 *Project Anywhere* Editorial Committee (2014): Dr. Sean Lowry School of Creative Arts, The University of Newcastle; Professor Brad Buckley, Professor of Contemporary Art and Culture, Sydney College of the Arts, The University of Sydney; Professor Bruce Barber, Director MFA, School of Graduate Studies, Nova Scotia College of Art and Design; Associate Professor, Simone Douglas, Director, MFA Fine Arts, Parsons The New School for Design, New York; Dr. Adam Geczy, Sydney College of the Arts, The University of Sydney; Professor Steve Dutton, Professor in Contemporary Art Practice, The School of Art and Design, College of Arts, The University of Lincoln; Dr. Les Joynes, Visiting Associate Professor of Art, Renmin University of China, Beijing.

17 *Project Anywhere* Advisory Committee (2014): Professor Su Baker, Director, Victorian College of the Arts, Faculty of the VCA & Music, University of Melbourne; Mr. Ilmar Taimre, Executive Consultant, Independent Researcher/Virtual Musician; Dr. Jocelyn McKinnon, School of Creative Arts, The University of Newcastle; Associate Professor Nancy de Freitas, School of Art and Design, Auck-

land University of Technology, New Zealand; Dr. Sean Lowry, School of Creative Arts, The University of Newcastle, Australia; Professor Brad Buckley, Professor of Contemporary Art and Culture, Sydney College of the Arts, The University of Sydney, Australia.

18 1st Tbilisi Triennial, *Offside Effect*, curated by Henk Slager and Wato Tsereteli, Center of Contemporary Art, 10 Dodo Abashidze Street, 0102 Tbilisi, Georgia, October 19 – November 20, 2012.

Contact: tbilisitriennial2012@gmail.com.

19 The Triennial exhibition included documentation from *Unitednationsplaza*, by Anton Vidokle and Martha Rosler, an “exhibition as school” project intended to start as a biennial (*Manifesta 6*, 2006), but eventually realised as an independent temporary school in Berlin (October, 2006). The work had a later reincarnation under the name *Night School* at the New Museum in New York, 2008-9.

20 Carolyn Christov-Bakargiev, “Introduction”, *The Guidebook*, dOCUMENTA (13), Catalogue 3/3 (Kassel: Hatje Cantz, 2012), 7.

21 Consider, for example, the description of the six hundred thousand hectares of wilderness that constitute Southwest National Park (part of the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area) provided on the Tasmania Parks and Wildlife website: “The park, the largest in Tasmania, epitomises the grandeur and spirit of wilderness in its truest sense. Much of the park is remote and far removed from the hustle and bustle of the modern world. For many, just the fact that such a place still exists brings solace.” Southwest National Park: Introduction, Tasmania Parks and Wildlife, accessed November 14, 2012, <http://www.parks.tas.gov.au/index.aspx?base=3801>.

22 Sabine Folie, “unExhibit-Display and the Paradoxes of Showing by Concealing”, *unExhibit*, exhibition catalogue, trans. Gerrit Jackson (Wien: Generali Foundation, 2011), 169. Folie concludes this catalogue essay with a claim toward art that restitutes “imaginative space by a concealment that paradoxically ‘shows’ while leaving behind a vestige that cannot be differentiated, that is neither entirely transparent and comprehensible nor utterly opaque and comprehensible.”, 173.

23 *Project Anywhere* “Peer Evaluation Policy,” accessed May 10, 2014, <http://projectanywhere.net/peer-review>.