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ABSTRACT

Habermas locates the distinction between the public and the private spheres in ancient Greece (Habermas, 1989, p.3). By the 1700s, the term home was commonly applied to the private sphere which was also seen as the domestic. This shift generated extensive critical debate during the 20th Century with the development of feminist discourse. In the 21st Century human migration and globalisation added a new dimension to the debate. As perceptions of home continue to shift, the two levels of debate are yet to be fully integrated. My research seeks to contribute towards bringing these two debates closer together by attempting to visualise home through my drawing practice. I appropriate methodologies utilised by feminist artists and theorists; specifically, the strategic use of autobiographic construct. A strategic autobiographic methodology allows me to address home within the context of globalisation and integrate both levels of debate.

In HOUSE, I utilise architectural drawing modes to test conceptions of home as housed by a physical building, only to find that I have no rest, retreat or home of my own within it.

In VIEW, I move around the interior, my defiantly time-consuming lines mapping household activities and tasks. These vision-based methods map the house but not home.

In BODY, I look for home through multi-sensory approaches and embodied inhabitation. What emerges is still the house.

In HOME, my drawings map the fluid experiential entity constituted by social interrelations and encounters. Familial obligations and responsibilities are presented textually and sorted repetitiously. In this way home is materialized as the ties, relations and duties today's woman carries with her.
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LITERATURE REVIEW

FLOW

In the purposeful shift from artist to researcher, creative profession to academic enquiry, artist studio to family house, my drawing ‘at’ home inadvertently becomes drawing ‘about’ home. Struggling to find time and space to work alongside familial responsibilities as a wife and mother foregrounds unexpected gender inequalities. Although my personal issues of difference are nothing compared to the power imbalances facing millions of homeless itinerants, they resonate with the same ingrained spatial distinctions. This practice-based research interrogates how disparate concepts of home currently define the way space is used, negotiated and shared from the local to global. In the context of today’s unprecedented migration, ease of international travel and technological invasion of privacy, contemporary living practices are connected and characterised by ‘flow’.

Interpreting 18th Century industrialised society, Jürgen Habermas articulated a distinction between the private and the public (Habermas, 1989, p.27). The term home was allocated to the private sphere also seen as the domestic, generating huge debate. 21st Century globalisation and human mobility adds new dimension to the debate as perceptions of home continue to shift. Geographer, Doreen Massey questions the spatial distinction in Habermas’s argument and problematises ‘readings of home, where there is imagined to the false security of a stability an apparently reassuring boundedness’ (Massey, 1994, p.169). As mobile living habits transform how spaces of inhabitation are imagined and experienced: traditional conceptual models of protection, privacy, retreat, intimacy and belonging are rendered inadequate. Massey pursues new interpretative categories with which to interrogate the changing nature of home and home-making. She summarises her book for space (2005) as ‘an essay on the challenge of space, the multiple ruses through which that challenge has been so persistently evaded, and the political implications of practising it differently’ (Massey, 2005, p.13). In it she writes, ‘understanding the social, the individual, the political, itself implies and requires both a strong dimension of spatiality and the conceptualisation of that spatiality in a particular way’ (Massey, 2005, p.188). Focused on the geopolitical sphere, she aims to create imaginative, progressive and effective possibilities for international socio-politics.¹

¹ Massey states, ‘It is part of my argument, not just that the spatial is political… but rather that thinking the spatial in a particular way can shake up the manner in which certain political questions are formulated, can contribute to political arguments already under way, and...can be an essential element in the imaginative structure which enables...an opening up to the very sphere of the political’ (Massey, 2005, p.9).
I am indebted to Massey’s reconceptualisation and application of space in understanding the world we inhabit and the organization of the societies in which we live (Massey, 2013). To her, the issues of contemporary life require us to ‘awaken space from the long sleep engendered by the inattention of the past’ (Massey, 2005, p.13). This highlights her persistent battle against the assumptions of space as empty, inert, flat and devoid of dynamism that she claims render it impotent and underutilised for socio-political critique.

Home gains emphasis over successive works as Massey expresses conviction that space is fluid and ongoing, so open to new improved social and political possibilities. She directs me towards recognising home as the spatial product of interrelations, ‘always under construction... never finished, never closed’ (Massey, 2005, p9). ‘Home is constructed out of movement, communication and social relations and as such is always subject to change’ states Massey (Massey, 1994, p.171). To James Tuedio, fluidity demands we leave materialised concepts of home behind and affirm more dynamic cultivations of identity (Tuedio, 2009, p.306). He guides my thinking away from the private sphere as a physical container that traditionally anchors familial relations, identities and histories, to conceiving home as an unbounded social ‘field of experience’ that allows for new creative, relational and transformative possibilities. Massey and Tuedio extend my interest in home beyond the confinement of women in the physical interior as addressed by second-wave feminism, to its adaptive possibilities for broader social critique. In Choosing the Margins (1990) bell hooks acknowledges the potential, thereby supporting my rationale:

"home is no longer just one place. It is locations. Home is that place which promotes varied and everchanging perspectives, a place where one discovers new ways of seeing reality, frontiers of difference. One confronts and accepts dispersal and fragmentation as part of the constructions of a new world order that reveals more fully where we are, who we can become (bell hooks, 1990, p.148)."

In Homes in Transformation: Dwelling, Moving, Belonging (2009), art historian Hanna Johansson and gender studies scholar Kirsi Saarikangas also call for urgent attention to home and its social processes. Their differentiation of house and home profoundly

---

2 Massey’s argument that space has been somehow held back in or by time, is raised on a wide-ranging literary critique of philosophical and theoretical spatial thinking that privileges ‘time’ over ‘space’.

3 Arguing for home as contemporary site of social critique builds on the Feminist philosophies of Iris Marion Young. She claims that to negate home as merely a site of women’s oppression and interiority is to undervalue the work that women do. She validates women’s creative home-making as ‘the activities of endowing things with living meaning, arranging them in space in order materially to facilitate the projects of those whom they belong, and activities of preserving these things, along with their meaning’ (Young, 2005, p.154).
informs my enquiry. They suggest, house is a physical construction and material basis for living, imbued with histories, narratives, meanings and cultural values through acts of human inhabiting,\(^4\) whereas home may overlap this notion of house as ‘a meeting place, building, culture, past and present – a multidimensional spatial and temporal intersection’ but is not confined to the interior (Johansson and Saarikangas, 2009, pp.10-11). To them, relational and social spatialities energise home to ‘stretch outside the physical borders of dwelling to the staircase, street, neighbourhood, region, country and even further to the other side of the world’ (Johansson & Saarikangas, 2009, p.9). The home I take from this is not merely a physical shelter, it is an ambiguous and spatially open structure that changes over time: an ephemeral entity defined by experiences, memories, emotions, imaginings, relations and encounters. Unlike the solid walls of a house, the boundaries of home are invisible and unstable.

Illusory and idealised, the desire for home can be impossible to reconcile. It ‘inclines us to draw sharp boundaries between inside and outside, forming walls of inclusion and exclusion’, ‘[yet at the same time] we sense a tacit awareness of the limiting constraints of the safe and settled mode of life and seek to expand our sense of home beyond these boundaries’ says Tuedio (Tuedio, 2009, p.287). To ‘find ourselves’, we commonly leave the places we grow up. Estranged and alienated, we may yearn for the home of our past or endlessly try to recreate it. As Massey demonstrates, pressing spatial problems lie with having ingrained memories, conceptions and expectations of home.

The need to establish new models of home is evidenced by the lengths people are going to find it. This research arises at a time of unmatched migration.\(^5\) Political, financial and ecological crises have set whole populations in motion. Reeling from global recession and continuing regional conflicts\(^6\), almost every country on Earth is somehow affected by irregular flows of people. Managing the transit, relocation and integration of itinerant

\(^4\) Notably, this does not necessarily make it a home. Instead of the security, belonging, intimacy and comfort associated with feeling ‘at home’, a house may encompass fear, oppression, imprisonment, violence and alienation (Blunt & Varley, 2004, p.3).
\(^5\) Statistical Yearbooks of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees monitoring forced international migration evidence increasing numbers. In 2016, detailed analysis of migratory patterns showed ‘the highest levels of displacement on record’ at 65.6 million forcibly uprooted worldwide (UNHCR, 2016, p.1). The head of the Australian Human Rights Commission, stated that ‘the movement of people internationally is absolutely unprecedented’ (Triggs, 2014). Of the 65.6 million, 22.5 million were registered refugees (half under 18) including 5.3 million Palestinians registered by UNRWA and 17.2 million under UNHCR mandate, of which 55% came from Syria, Afghanistan and South Sudan. Around 10 million were stateless people, denied nationality and access to basic rights of education, healthcare, employment and freedom of movement (UNHCR, 2016).
\(^6\) Around 11 million Syrians have been displaced by factional and civil warfare. Ongoing conflicts in Afghanistan, Iraq, Pakistan, Nigeria, Somalia, Burundi and Sudan/South Sudan account for the largest single-country displacements elsewhere (Fox, 2016, p.96).
communities is a worldwide concern. To Massey, ‘the dislocation of place, the pressures for and of long-distance migration, the flows of cultural influence and power’ prompt an ‘all is flow’ view of the world: ‘we live, we are constantly told, in an age of flow’ (Massey, 2008, pp.2-3). In *Liquid Modernity* (2000), sociologist and philosopher Zygmunt Bauman addresses ‘fluidity’ as the ‘leading metaphor for the present stage of the modern era’:

Fluids, so to speak, neither fix space nor bind time. [They] ‘travel easily…cannot easily hold their shape…and are not easily stopped… While solids have clear spatial dimensions…fluids do not keep to any shape for long…and so for them it is the flow that counts, more than the space they happen to occupy (Bauman, 2000, p.2)

Massey acknowledges how the social impact of flux differs: ‘some are more in charge of it than others; some initiate flows and movement, others don’t; some are more on the receiving-end of it than others; some are effectively imprisoned by it’ (Massey, 1994, p.149). ‘It is not merely the issue of who moves and who doesn’t… it is also about power in relation to the flows and the movement’ states Massey (Massey, 1994, p.149). In referencing the ‘disintegration of the social network’ and ‘falling apart of effective agencies of collective action’, Bauman accuses self-serving global powers of driving fluidity at the expense of irreversibly dismantling the relationships underpinning ordinary life. (Bauman, 2000, p.14). According to Bauman, dispersal is a purposeful objective of globalisation: ‘as much a condition as it is the outcome of the new technique of power, using disengagement and the art of escape as its major tools’ (Bauman, 2000, p.14). The dense territorial networks and tight social ties once holding us close to family for life, are breaking down precisely because they hinder globalization. Pressured to pursue opportunities beyond the stable space of the materialized home, individuals become dislocated from their familiar.

Human bonds and communities disperse, affected by the transnational movement and cross-cultural exchanges typical of globalization. Tuedio foregrounds the interruption, displacement and exilic dimension of familial relations, as traditional social networks that

---

7 The International Organisation for Migration, established in 1951 to resettle people displaced by WWII, is the principal intergovernmental organisation for migration. It aims to ensure humane and orderly management of: migration and development, facilitating migration, regulating migration, and addressing forced migration. Its 2005 report, stated, ‘all 190 or so sovereign states of the world are now either points of origin, transit or destination for migrants; often all three at once’ (IOM, 2015, p.13).

8 Massey argues against the prevalent ‘everything is flow’ approach of social, political and geographical theorists, accusing them of developing arguments on critique of an absolute opposite that never existed (Massey, 2008, p.2).
comprise a sense of home scatter. To combat the restlessness and unhappiness that results from flow, he calls for new dynamic home-making practices in the construction of personal and collective identities (Tuedio, 2009). This directs me towards active engagement with home as an unbounded, travelling, transformative and relational space.

Uprooted or not, day-to-day living experiences have involuntarily changed for billions. Migration has become associated with social instability, unemployment and terrorism whilst attention shifts away from the benefits of transnational diversity, towards its perceived threat to national safety. According to philosopher Étienne Balibar, the ‘War on Terror’ drives affluent nations to protect themselves in ways that leave ‘no realm of social life unaffected by its security requirements’ (Balibar, 2012, p.7). As artist, Ai Weiwei mentions, ‘there were only 17 border walls in the world 30 years ago — now you see over 70 nations have fences or border walls in between them’ (Ai in Karpan, 2017, p.1). Those displaced are met by ever-stricter border controls and immigration policies preventing them from settling or feeling ‘at home’ elsewhere. This opens my enquiry to consideration of the boundaries impacting on everyday life.

Astronauts on the International Space Station document a world being remapped by borders rising to defend the lands of the privileged from those less fortunate. Their photographs show dramatically contrasting terrains across Dominican Republic-Haiti, USA-Mexico and Israeli-Palestine divides, and winding paths of security lights guarding India-Pakistan frontiers at night. The images indicate fresh lines of cultural, economic and social difference being drawn, raising questions over establishing international geographies of safety, retreat and belonging, when it denies others of the same. In the context of irregular migratory patterns, the placement and displacement of home becomes problematically entwined with disparities of living spaces, practices and

---

10 See: Castles, de Haas, & Miller (2014) for a region by region analysis of voluntary and involuntary human mobility. Although largely unregulated prior to 1914, governments since have developed ever-stricter measures to control immigration. This is partly due to violence and terrorism involving immigrants causing transnational flow to be directly or indirectly linked to conflict (Castles, de Haas & Miller, 2014, p.6). Receiving nations often view foreigners as a threat to national security, resulting in the ‘hyper-securitization of migration’ and ‘a blurring of counter-terrorism measures with immigration policy measures’ (Castles, de Haas & Miller, 2014, p.201).
11 To Balibar, national and trans-national frontiers are both political and topological structures. (Balibar, 2011). He conceives borders functioning as different kinds of spatial ‘textures’ and constructions determining the pathways available to people in daily life (Balibar, 2011). These interconnected spatialities of border, texture and construction influence my thinking and motivations.
12 To Antoine Pécoud and Paul de Guchteneire ‘contemporary migration policies are increasingly characterized by a restrictive spirit’ (Pécoud & de Guchteneire, 2006, p.1). Conversely, irregular migration can be a result of tighter control measures, which have blocked earlier forms of spontaneous mobility’ (Castles, de Haas & Miller, 2014, p.6).
14 Michael Geyer and Charles Bright align effects of globalisation with ‘a new ordering of relations of domination and subordination among all regions of the world’ (Geyer and Bright, 1995).
experiences for those behind walls and those on the move.

Bauman points out how itinerants disregarding territorial boundaries are traditionally banded as villainous: inferior, primitive and ‘behind-time’ in terms of the evolutionary ladder (Bauman, 2000, p.12). Whilst such provincial assumptions cling on, globalization simultaneously forces the currents of goods, services, information and people ever faster. According to Bauman, it is not durability and reliability of product or place that brings profit anymore, but the ‘speed of circulation, of recycling, ageing, dumping and replacement’ (Bauman, 2000, p.14). He claims a new contemporary global elite ‘shaped after the pattern of the old-style absentee landlords’ rules on the move, gaining power from travelling light (Bauman, 2000, p.13)\(^\text{15}\). The era of this research is characterized by tensions between settled, sedentary ways of life and changing modes of nomadicism.

In August 2011 riots breaking out across UK cities and towns are attributed to widespread unrest over economic ‘austerity’ measures favouring the advantaged and exacerbating difficulties for social classes already vulnerable to financial instability and homelessness. One remorseful perpetrator explains in The Guardian, ‘I was living on the streets...I had lost my job, my home, and I was angry with the world’ (Phillips, 2015). Those involved lack the sense of home and security they feel they deserve. The country is literally being torn apart by differing ideas of the sort of home it should provide and for whom.

Over the research period, home remains at the forefront of current affairs. In the first four months of 2017, 49,164 people risk their lives to reach Europe by sea and around 1,344 die in search of safe-haven (COMPAS, 2017). According to Johansson & Saarikangas, ‘the distinguishing of familiar elements from strange ones and establishing borders between us and others, we and them, those who belong or do not belong’ continues (Johansson & Saarikangas, 2009, p.17). President Donald Trump proposes a 1,000-mile wall to stop Mexican nationals entering the US. The UK’s own geo-political landscape is shaped by ‘Brexiters’ pushing for stricter national lines and reduced immigration. Suddenly, hundreds of thousands of resident families are inferred to be homeless outsiders, as lines are drawn between those supposedly justified in calling the UK ‘home’ and those who aren’t.

\(^\text{15}\) ‘Traveling light’ as unburdened by ‘the chores of administration, management, welfare concerns’ (Bauman, 2000, p.13). Bauman refers to the ‘mobile, slippery, shifty, evasive and fugitive power’ of multinational corporations using cheap labour and avoiding taxes - for such ‘power to be free to flow, the world must be free of fences, barriers, fortified borders and checkpoints (Bauman, 2000, p.14).
Although these backgrounds alter during the research period, familial, regional and international delineations continue to widen between those with a place to call home and those without. The Department for Communities and Local Government reports a 52% rise to 58,000 (2010-2016) in English households becoming homeless (Yeung, 2016, p.1). The UNHCR estimates 65.3 million individuals ‘forcibly displaced worldwide as a result of persecution, conflict, generalized violence, or human rights violations’ (UNHCR, 2016, p.1). The unstoppable human flows these statistics represent, emphasise the need to reconceptualise home.

Connecting the terminology of flow to concepts of belonging, identity and home helps me develop drawings of personal spaces, relations and experiences that articulate parallels with bigger socio-political issues. Boundaries, gatherings, territories and winding paths emerge from the ink, burns, graphite and casts, documenting my frenetic movements in relation to the physical and social barriers imposed by the house. From Johansson and Saarikangas I gain a differentiation of the house as material and fixed, from home as emotional, invisible and relational. In Massey’s spatial reconceptualising, I find the words and ideas to express the nature of what it is I am trying to visualise. Consideration of my home as part of the greater flow to which Bauman refers, enables me to critique outputs as not only representational but indicative of wider forces. I am led to understand that it is not only the drawings produced but my spatial acts of drawing that usefully intervene in home. From this, I focus on how home operates as a space.
SPACE

Coming to space through research of flow helps me formulate a primary aim for my research: to try and move the concept of home towards a more active, mobile and universally accessible spatiality. Considering the impossibility of housing the world’s population, it doesn’t seem helpful to focus on a bounded building. However, whilst my drawings can represent the rooms, walls and windows of the house, the ephemeral dynamics governing everyday experiences and ideas of home are elusive. For me, home is first and foremost a sense of security and belonging but how do I draw that out? My relatively nomadic up-bringing underpins my conviction that identities and social relations can be negotiated and transformed on the move. Looking for useful models of home that might enable this, leads me to study Massey’s deconstructions of place and space.

Massey attempts to devise appropriate concepts and strategies to deal with the elusive, traveling nature of feeling at home and the resultant ‘loss of the possibility of home with which we live’ (Massey, 2005, p.150). In doing so, she contributes a relational approach to the disparate ways people experience and practice home, through differentiation of space and place.\footnote{Massey notes prevalent perceptions of ‘place’ as having specific boundaries, like a pavement, room, region or nation and of ‘space’ as a more abstract, unboundable product of interrelations and practices (Massey, 2005, p.5). She challenges contemporary thinkers to ‘resist these habits and assumptions; refuse to convene space and time; decline to distinguish between place (as meaningful, lived and everyday) and space (as what? the outside? the abstract? the meaningless?)’ (Massey, 2005, p.5).} According to Massey, idealisations ‘of place as closed, coherent, integrated as authentic, as “home”, a secure retreat; [and] of space as somehow originally regionalised, as always-already divided up’ encourage possessiveness of home for ‘haves’ and accentuates loss for ‘have-nots’ (Massey, 2005, p.6)\footnote{Massey suggests ‘such understandings of the identity of places require them to be enclosures, to have boundaries and to establish their identity through negative counterposition with the Other beyond the boundaries’ (Massey, 1994, p.169).}. She suggests that assigning a sense of home to the fixed house, land or neighbourhood, motivates people to protect it from difference or invasion, creating the sort of divisory parochialisms and nationalisms that deny multiplicity and equality and keep people moving (Massey, 1994, p.169).\footnote{Although a geographer, Massey’s emphasis is on social space as the fluid, shifting product of interrelations: a ‘simultaneous multiplicity of spaces: cross-cutting, intersecting, aligning with one another’ (Massey, 1994, p.3).} This research adopts her view that aligning family safety and happiness with a place-bounded home can make fluidity a more powerful and fearful problem.

Increasing mobility and insecurity causes a ‘retreat to place’: ‘a protective pulling-up of drawbridges and a building of walls against the new invasions’ says Massey (Massey, 2005, p.5). In turn, controls and demarcation exacerbate the kind of tensions and
vulnerabilities that uproot communities. In this way, Massey asserts ‘settledness and flow...[as] conditions for the existence of each other’ – the self-perpetuating and inextricably interrelated outcomes ‘of sedimented and unequal power relations’ (Massey, 2005, p.174). Calls for open borders and free-flowing transnationality now seem inadequate. Discourses opposing flux and containment promote problematic views of ‘space as a surface on which we are placed’ and the ‘separation of local place from the place out there’ suggests Massey (Massey, 2005, p.7). She guides me away from material assumptions of place, to seek integrated conceptions of space with which to constructively approach home-making in the context of migratory practices.

Along with ‘place’, Massey proposes integrating ‘time’ in developing a relevant and dynamic spatial dimension for affecting change. She criticises historians, philosophers, social scientists and spatial theorists for privileging time over space, so creating conceptual separations that undermine spatial multiplicity and heterogeneity (Massey, p.2, 2013). ‘If time is the dimension in which things happen one after the other... the dimension of succession, then space is [reduced to] the dimension of things being, existing at the same time: of simultaneity’ argues Massey (Massey, p.2, 2013). She claims that empowering spatial theory as an interpretive tool, and space as a productive site of socio-political critique, means accepting time and space as inextricable and equable (Massey, 2005, p.7). Developing the ideas of Martin Heidegger, Michel Foucault, Jacques Derrida, Guy Debord, Michel Foucault, Gilles Deleuze, Edward Soja and Henri Lefebvre, Massey revises their temporal emphasis to reach alternative propositions for space:

First, that we recognise space as the product of interrelations, as constituted through interactions, from the immensity of the global to the intimately tiny. Second, that we understand space as the sphere of possibility of the existence of multiplicity in the sense of contemporaneous plurality; as the sphere in which distinct trajectories coexist; as the sphere therefore of coexisting heterogeneity.

---

19 Massey often references how ‘enclosure prompts its philosophical opposite-mobility. Territory and flow, movement and rootedness, constantly require each other’ she states (Massey, 2008). She argues that in terms of enabling change and promoting diversity, migratory flow is no more open than a closed nation state – both are entwined products of control and power imbalances.

20 See International Migration, Border Controls and Human Rights for discussion around the pros and cons of free-flowing transnationality, fortification of borders and alternative measures for controlling human movement (Pécoud and Guchteneire, 2006).

21 I later take up these distinctions through drawing practice, linking place and house to traditional measured, scientific and representational drawing methods; and space to contemporaneous mobile spatialities of line.

22 ‘For example, the terminology of globalization ‘turns space into time’, implying ‘underdeveloped’ countries follow ‘developed’ countries on a temporal path: converting contemporaneous difference between countries into a single linear history’ (Massey, 2013).

23 Massey insists that what is at issue is not social phenomena in space but both social phenomena and space as constituted out of social relations, that the spatial is social relations “stretched out” (Massey, 1994, p.2)

24 I return later to how this connects my individual enquiry with the collective idealisations of home mobilising world populations.
Without space, no multiplicity; without multiplicity, no space. If space is indeed the product of interrelations, then it must be predicated upon the existence of plurality. Multiplicity and space as co-constitutive. Third, that we recognize space as always under construction: a product of relations-between...always in the process of being made...never finished, never closed (Massey, 2005, p.9).

Agreeing that time and place are best addressed through space, artist Patrick Keiller foregrounds discrepancy between ‘cultural and critical attention devoted to experience of mobility and displacement’, and ‘widespread tendency to hold on to formulations of dwelling that derive from a more settled, agricultural past’ (Keiller in Massey, 2008, p.3). The flows of globalisation render home ‘a point of departure rather than a locus of stability’ says Wyschogrod (Wyschogrod, 1996, p.108). Despite prevalent reluctance to stay in place for long, deeply nostalgic notions of ‘homeland’ drive the preservation of known and remembered retreats to return to.\(^{25}\) Massey suggests both voluntary and involuntary migrants imagine home ‘as it used to be’ connecting security and belonging to believing they can sometime ‘go back’ and fulfil their ‘longing’ for familiarity (Massey, 2005, p.124). Wendy Wheeler unpicks postmodernity as a ‘longing to come home’, suggesting ‘postmodern nostalgia’ holds communities in stasis, robbing them of progressive historical trajectories (Wheeler in Perryman 1994, pp.94-107). The desire to ‘stop history’ to enable a ‘going home’, effectively causes homelands to be held back in time and resist development.

Massey suggests instead, abandoning social, physical and temporal oppositions, through a ‘co-existing heterogeneity’ and ‘throwntogetherness’ of space as process (Massey, 2005, p.188). This builds on ‘social morphologies’ proposed by Lefebvre (Lefebvre, 1991, p.94).\(^{26}\) Critiquing Hegelian spatial theories, Lefebvre suggests that binary aspects of space (one socially generated, the other natural, absolute and physical) conjoin in spaces produced by social ideologies and values. His theories differentiate, connect and reconnect: spatial practices as the patterns and places of activities, goods and power; discursive representations of space as the plans, maps and designs of ‘scientists, planners, urbanists, technocratic subdividers and social engineers’; and representational space of imagined geographies, artists and spatial production (Lefebvre, 1991, p.41).

---

\(^{25}\) The meaning of nostalgia has altered over time from the Greek, algos: ‘pain’, ‘grief’, ‘distress’; and nosto: ‘homesickness’ to its modern reading as ‘wistful yearning for the past’.

\(^{26}\) This research does not address the influential spatial theories of GWF Hegel (1770-1831) however, a useful perspective is provided in Hegel’s Geographical Thought (Bond, 2014).
Lefebvre discards ‘representation’ of space as devoid of body, politics or society, in favour of ‘representational’ space ‘as directly lived through its associated images and symbols, and hence the space of inhabitants and users’ (Lefebvre, 1974, p.38). His contribution to my project was primarily literal, leading to layered drawings in which I trace activities and encounters over architectural plans using symbolic imagery.

Massey echoes Lefebvre’s opinion that academic and popular discourses reference ‘space’ without comprehending its full meaning: ‘we have inherited an imagination so deeply ingrained that it is often not actively thought’ (Massey, 2005, p.17). Like the ‘flat’ spatial conceptions Massey condemns, home is similarly ‘un-thought’ and idealised. Space ‘presents us with the question of the social’ and the ‘most fundamental of political questions which is how are we going to live together’ states Massey (Massey, 2013, p.2). According to Massey, this requires us to re-imagine home as the product of encounters, activities and practices shaped by everyday relations, memories and associations (Massey, 2005, p.5). I rethink the physically demarcated concept of home I set out with, as a fluid interplay of subjective and objective experiences and meanings that potentially connects bigger issues with my own.

Matthew Sparke probes Massey’s endeavours ‘to trace and indeed map the tensions between responsible geographical imaginations that are processual and irresponsible ones that are fixed’ (Sparke, 2007. p.4). He praises her re-working of the point that the personal is political in creating ‘accessible arguments that repeatedly remind readers of the real relations running through and thereby constituting space’ (Sparke, 2007, p.2). Massey tackles seemingly insurmountable global problems via examples of everyday spaces and singular encounters that readers relate to their own social accountability. Her sense of responsibility is ‘predicated on a profound and persistent questioning of the spatial relations through which the personal and the political are woven together’ says Sparke (Sparke, 2007. p.6). Massey elucidates:

If identities, spatial and otherwise, are indeed constructed relationally then that poses the question of the geography of those relations of construction. It raises

---

27 Massey uses an analogy on the importance of space for interpreting the social: ‘We’re sitting here, and it’s somewhere around midday in London. Well, at this moment it is already night in the Far East, my friends in Latin America are probably just stirring...space is that cut across all of those dimensions. Now what that means is that space is the dimension that presents us with the existence of the other; space is the dimension of multiplicity. It presents me with the existence of those friends in Latin America and that means it is space that presents us with the question of the social (Massey, 2013, p.2).
questions of the politics of those geographies and of our relationship to and responsibility for them; and it raises, conversely and perhaps less expectedly, the potential geographies of our social responsibility (Massey, 2005, p.10).

Massey’s conviction of interconnected culpability directs the emphasis of this research towards my own spatial assumptions, conceptions and practices. ‘The difficulties of analyzing the meanings articulated within home, dwelling, and habitation lie precisely in their multiplicity and ambiguity: in the constant encounter of private and communal and their multiple layers of meaning’ say Johansson and Saarikangas, (Johansson & Saarikangas, 2009, p.12). They suggest that home is where ‘the most intimate and global dimensions of meaning intersect, and inhabitants’ unique everyday life and personal histories meet the shared cultural meanings and norms (Johansson and Saarikangas, 2009, p.11). Linking intimate to communal, the shifting concept of home affects us all.

Massey claims that the ways we make ourselves feel at home are interlinked as spatially and politically embedded practices (Massey, 2005, p.10). She writes of London:28

Most formulations of the relation between ‘local place’ and globalisation imagine local places as products of globalisation (‘the global production of the local’). It is a formulation that easily slides into a conceptualisation of the local as victim of globalisation. Here globalisation figures as some sort of external agent that arrives to wreak havoc on local places. And often indeed it is so. The resulting politics in consequence often resolves into strategies for ‘defending’ local places against the global. Such strategies always tend to harbour a host of political ambiguities, but in the case of London...this simple story just cannot hold. For London is one of those places in which capitalist globalisation, with its deregulation, privatisation, ‘liberalisation’, is produced. Here we have also ‘the local production of the global (Massey, 2007, pp.65-66).29

This focusing in and out of scale between local and global, physical and social; contained and abstract, individual and collective validates personal enquiry as a potentially useful

---


29 To Massey, ‘the full recognition of contemporaneity implies a spatiality which is a multiplicity of stories-so far’ and requires ‘recognising the open and relational construction of the local’ through its ‘grounded connectedness’ in global politics (Massey, 2005, p.188). To raise the question of the spatiality (or spatialities) of politics, and the spatialities of responsibility, loyalty, care’, we must ‘take seriously the relational construction of identity (of ourselves, of the everyday, of places)’ (Massey, 2005, p.189).
approach to home. For human geographers Alison Blunt and Robyn Dowling, ‘writings about home reveal personal and often hidden stories that resonate over shared and more collective terrains’ (Blunt & Dowling, 2006, p.35). To communication theorists Corinna Peil and Jutta Röser, mediatization renders concepts of home more ‘closely connected to the transformation of various socio-cultural fields and...larger trends within society’ (Peil and Röser, 2014, p.234). Stating ‘the processes that are taking place at the macro level are reflected at the micro level of the household’, they argue for home as an increasingly significant site of questioning and negotiating cultures of participation and inclusion (Peil and Röser, 2014, p.234). Being a visual artist, social science is not my field but I develop rationale from these indications that singular experiences of home have wider relevance.

If individual acts of home-making become implicit in the attitudes and practices of communities and their international relations, how we each assign a sense of self, belonging and home really matters. Art practice might help articulate this interrelatedness. In Contemporary Art and the Cosmopolitan Imagination (2011) Marsha Meskimmon suggests that art can reach across geographical, cultural, economic and social divides. To her, visualization and materialization can ‘transcend the limits of current understanding by pushing the boundaries of imagination’ and ‘enable us to participate in, and potentially change, the parameters through which we negotiate the world’ (Meskimmon, 2011, p.6). Socially-conscious art is grounded in the communal doing and participating that it either encompasses in the process or stimulates through outputs. Expressing my knowledge of home through creative practice could enable valuable engagement.

Art theorist Angela Dimitrakaki argues for the fragmented, vibrant and deterritorialised flows of globalisation as production sites for contemporary artists, proposing a theoretical shift away from attending socio-political and economic ‘crises’ through making, critiquing and curating art, to a 21st Century ‘periodisation’ of art practices defined by capitalism (Dimitrakaki, 2013, p.6). Suggesting a rationale for practice-based research, Dimitrakaki implies that articulations of home must be immersive and generative of movement rather than merely representative of fluidity. Today’s mobilised societies need cultural concepts that are usable and reliable but freely move with the dispersed, displaced or transformed.

See also: (Meskimmon & Rowe, 2013, pp. 25-44).
To this end, Massey claims it productive to attend ‘ordinary space; the spaces and places through which, in the negotiation of relations within multiplicities, the social is constructed’ (Massey, 2005, p.13).\textsuperscript{31} Photographer Jo Spence once said, ‘I feel it is most useful to problematize power relations in the places where I find myself...I can best intervene in the everyday places with which I am familiar, not look outside to help others’ (Spence, 1986, p215)\textsuperscript{32}. Like Spence, I want to challenge stereotypes and promote empathy, awareness and dialogue through art practice. With the hope of somehow affecting issues of migration and homelessness, I set out to interrogate the ‘home’ I experience. I think of the house in which I live, the regions to which I attach personal stories, the country I culturally identify with. This starting point is precisely the habitual demarcation and placing of homeland Massey reproves. I wish to encompass active, mobile and socially inclusive processes of home-making relevant to the contemporary condition of moving in and out of place but I must first undo my own assumptions.

*Home: A Short History of an Idea* situates the emergence of ‘home’ as a separate concept to ‘house’ in the 17th Century (Rybczynski, 1986). Yet still we most often speak of home as a building, plot of land or nation. Home is more than a resting place of physical well-being, it is a social space of emotional comfort and identity. Most of the 34,000 people being displaced daily are mobilised by immediate threat (Howdon, D, 2017).\textsuperscript{33} It appears it is not just safe shelter they desire but a sense of what they think they know or remember. Studies reveal a multitude of socioeconomic, political, personal and collective concerns determining re-settlement, including cultural, historical, linguistic and familiar idealisations, connections and perceptions of home.\textsuperscript{34} These ephemeral conceptions arguably demand rigorous interrogation.

---

\textsuperscript{31} Massey states, ‘what is needed, I think, is to uproot ‘space’ from the constellation of concepts in which it has so unquestioningly so often been embedded (stasis; closure; representation) and to settle it among another set of ideas (heterogeneity; relationality; coevalness) ...where it releases a more challenging political landscape’ (Massey, 2005, p.13).

\textsuperscript{32} In *Putting Myself in the Picture* (1986), Jo Spence reflects upon ethnographic art practices and the difficulty of ‘trying to “speak visually” about what we see going on around us’ if it falls outside what we know first-hand: noting that her own social and cultural ‘construction’ limits her ability to accurately portray social frameworks (Spence, 1986, p.97-98). Hal Foster dissects the failures of any single human viewpoint to accurately comprehend the lived realities of another in *Artist as Ethnographer* (1995). At worst, ‘the artist, critic, or historian projects his or her practice onto the field of the other, where it is read not only as authentically indigenous but as innovatively political’ (Foster, 1995, p.307). To Foster, the artist-researcher must attend to power structures of visibility; who or what can be seen; under whose terms and in what light. Spence uses methodologies that place herself at the centre and expand upon her own sphere of social, cultural and experiential knowledge: ‘when you act in the light of knowledge which is in your own self-interest or in the interests of your group or class, this is not bravery but absolute necessity’ (Spence, 1986, p.215).

\textsuperscript{33} During 2016, professors from Harvard Business School, UCLA and Bogazici University conducted interviews with 1,120 refugees. Participants were diverse in terms of gender, age, profession, ethnicity, language, sect and region of origin. 92 percent of respondents cited “immediate danger” as the primary reason for leaving their country (Howdon, D, 2017).

\textsuperscript{34} Deduced from an article by Francois Crepeau included in a News Deeply collection of journalistic articles called Refugees Deeply. Available at: http://www.newsdeeply.com/refugees/community/ 2017/06/08. (Crepeau, F, 2017).
Home historically lacks the critical interest of public space, although inhabited space as a field of study has grown since the 90s. Human geographers and housing sociologists are now involved in quantitative analysis of interiors in relation to class, status and ethnicity. Qualitative research diversely arises from psychology, material culture, history, ethnology, sociology and consumer habits. However, material considerations of the house remain central. Research projects aimed at unravelling contemporary realities of home as both site and culmination of processes, feelings and cultural meanings are few but increasing.

Specifically, the changing notions of privacy, comfort, dwelling and domesticity are generating literature, including: *Homes in Transformation: Dwelling, Moving, Belonging* (Johansson and Saarikangas, 2009); *Home* (Blunt and Dowling, 2005); *Burning Down the House* (George, 1998); *Geography of Home: writings on where we live* (Busch, 1999); *Ideal Homes: Social Change and the Experience of Home* (Chapman and Hockey, 1999); *Home Truths* (Badcock and Beer, 2000); *Home Possessions: Material Culture Behind Closed Doors* (Miller, 2001); *Domesticity at War* (Colomina, 2007); and *Our House: The Representation of Domestic Space in Modern Culture* (Smyth and Croft, 2006). In addition, academic journals focused on home include *Home Cultures; Signs and Antipode, Cultural Geographies* and *n.paradoxa*. Whilst essays such as *The Body within Home and Domesticity – Gendered Diversity* focus on specificities (Blumen, Fenster & Misgav, 2013).

In *Playing at Home: The House in Contemporary Art* (2013) art historian Gill Perry surveys cultural geographers, feminists, historians and artists exploring the socio-political construction of domestic relations, roles and economies of home. Contemporary historian, Amanda Vickery uncovers hidden aspects of the private domestic in *Behind Closed Doors* (Vickery, 2009), *At Home with the Georgians* (BBC1, 2010), and *The History of Private Life* (Radio 4, 2013). Vickery usefully accesses gender differentiations in domestic and professional art practice at that time. Today’s artists and curators are determinedly examining relationships between contemporary art and home ‘without’ continual references to genderisation, the body or feminism: as demonstrated by Jane Allison with *The Surreal House* exhibition (Barbican, 2010). Artists, writers and theorists are variously interrogating: ‘homelessness’ (home as fixed place effectively lost or denied); ‘house’ (traditional, commodified and physical constructions of home); and humanitarian aspects (migration, mutability and displacement). As Peil and Röser point out, the emergence, pervasion and increased centrality of online media and mobile technologies, is directing such enquiries towards mobility, networks and fluidity (Peil and Röser, 2014, p.233).
I argue that these studies only partially articulate contemporary experiences, desires and practices of home.35 Home is most valued for stability, love, comfort, safety, familiarity and other elusive associations and emotions. Studying the physical geographies of houses, communities and countries or their loss, does not fully address positions of self, belonging and identity. The ‘idea’ of home needs prising open; but deeply entwined with everyday life, it is rarely confronted or even acknowledged as a separate entity. Mapping its complex abstraction of relationships, roles and desires over inanimate buildings and their contents is to some extent commercial. Property dealers and designers drive narratives of making houses into emotionally invested homes. Selling ideals, they exacerbate divisions between those with socio-economic freedom and those without.

In academic writing, ‘home’ often stands in for its material correlate ‘house’. Johansson and Saarikangas resist such reduction by unhitching the concepts in their social critique. For others, home overlaps or subsumes fixed place as opposed to being apart. Marie Hughes-Edwards claims home, as the principle arena of human emotions, ‘simply is society, is history, is life itself in all its contradictions and confusions of pain and sorrow, joy and fulfilment’ (Hughes-Edwards, 2006, p.25). Human geographers Orna Blumen, Tovi Fenster and Chen Misgav state, ‘home constitutes an intrinsic locus of meanings from where one’s self develops and stretches out to the immediate and furthermore, physical and human, environments’ (Blumen, Fenster & Misgav, 2013, p.9). However, these ‘all-encompassing’ approaches seem too vague to appropriate for my project.

Akiko Busch acknowledges home as separate from house but fixes it as ‘the private and necessary sanctuary, the place of nourishment and community, the area where things get made’ (Busch, 1999, p.24). To her, activities and time of day transform living space into home. This brought me back to the Massey’s temporal space: active, open, relational and becoming, as opposed to static or empty. Representation can be ‘understood as fixing things, taking the time out of them’ says Massey (Massey, 2005, p.23). ‘Over and over we tame the spatial into the textual and the conceptual; into representation’ as momentary slices of time, removed from the embodied experience

---

35 One factor directing research to ‘homelessness’ is that home is so strongly associated with women’s oppression, gendered labour and spatial distinctions, that many academics avoid it. Another is that some theorists suggest it is wrong to perpetuate a concept of home when so many are excluded and denied of what it stands for (Massey, 2005; Hardt & Negri, 2001; Keiller, 2010). Others argue that home has positive meaning to be reclaimed: individuation, safety, and shelter (Young, 1992; bell hooks, 1990). Closure on this argument is beyond the scope of my research but I take up alignment with Alison Weir’s position that changing ways of life make it imperative to reinstate home as a site for socio-political critique (Weir, 2008).
(Massey, 2005, p.20). In this I see a potentially active transformative and informative space for art-making in home.

To Massey, thinking of place as physically fixed to an object of some sort, and space as somehow emanating from activity ‘might legitimately provoke thoughts of Heidegger’ (Massey, 2005, p.12). Martin Heidegger’s philosophical and complex spatial developments are so extensive that a modest view suffices for this research. It is enough to locate Heidegger’s interest in place within his ongoing concern for consciousness, reality and the nature of being. This leads him to focus on house through a duality of ‘dwelling’ as physically located (as a building, house, shelter, etc.) and ‘dwelling’ as a concept (as building, home, individuation, etc.). ‘We do not dwell because we have built, but we build and have built because we dwell, that is, because we are dwellers’ he states (Heidegger, 1971, p.142). Heidegger marks out relations between people and house through ‘dwelling’ as the fundamental condition of human ‘being’, implying that it isn’t a building that generates identity and belonging but the drive to belong and create a sense of home that makes us build. This theory earns him a position in every study of home I read.

To Heidegger, a material dwelling (the noun) allows for a sense of place in which dwelling (the verb) can find the space or openness to occur (Heidegger, 1971, p.142). I take from him a sense of home as a spatial product of activity but remain at odds with Heidegger’s implication that home-making somehow depends on house or place. Like Massey, I find his formulation ‘remains too rooted, too little open to the externally relational’ (Massey, 2005, pp.183-184). If home-making is essential to human ‘being’ then more portable, adaptable modes of it are needed from my research. The question is finding them when it is my house I am looking at.

According to Massey, in Heideggerian thinking every groundedness, through that very
fact of emplacement, might be argued as meaningful, which is tantamount to abandoning space altogether for there is only place (Massey, 2003, p.7). She leads me to ponder on the fact of groundedness as based in phenomenological embodiment: a conscious and sensual experiencing of the world as it appears, rather than a reality of what is there. An ‘important dimension of the phenomenological position is that the meaningful relation to place is intimately bound up with the embodied nature of perception’ states Massey (Massey, 2003, p.7). This directs me from the ‘right here’, ‘here and now’ as the drawing encounter, to consider that encounter as ‘taking place’ here and now: a happening, appearance or experience of home rather than what ‘is’. I consider phenomenological drawing approaches as a means of bringing forth articulations of home from the house.

To operate as a coherent society, we accept an ontological doctrine of ‘being’ that organizes our lives without us really noticing as we simply agree to it as ‘the way to live’. As Heidegger demonstrates, philosophy acknowledges the difficulties of addressing the concepts, forces and spaces of everyday life. Derrida refers to gaps or intervals of possibility and ‘becoming-spaces’ (Derrida, 1982, p.17). Deleuze aligns the concept of such shifts in the underlying structures we live by as ‘folds’ (Deleuze, 1986, pp.96-97). To Walter Benjamin, it is only through reflecting on the everyday and brushing history against the grain, that we catch a glimpse of these systems and rethink that which usually passes us unnoticed (Benjamin, 1969, p.248). One rationale for their analyses is that simply accepting things as they are and failing to continually reflect and re-evaluate creates problems. This suggests I somehow repeat, look again, notice the inconsistencies in lived experiences of home, to create new spaces, views and understandings.

Rooted in the work of Edmund Husserl, the philosophy of phenomenology aspires to provide an ontological account of “lived” space, “lived” time and the “lived” world (Merleau-Ponty, 2012, p.xx). I revisit Gaston Bachelard’s Poetics of Space (1969), having previously disregarded its phenomenological analysis as specific to concepts of house not home. He studies the house as a site of ‘intimate values of inside space...its unity and complexity’ (Bachelard, 1969, p.3). His empathy for the need ‘to shelter, protect, cover or hide’ in an unstable postmodern world resonates with my research (Bachelard, 1969, p.151). To Bachelard, the house is ‘one of the greatest powers of integration for the

---

42 See: Memoirs of the Blind (Derrida, 1993); Writing and Difference (Derrida, 1978); The Fold-Leibniz and the Baroque (Deleuze, 1993).  
43 If Bachelard is seen as the great modern philosopher of ‘the house’, Martin Heidegger performs a similar function with regard to the related concept of ‘the home’ (Smyth & Croft, 2006, p15).
thoughts, memories and dreams of mankind’: a kind of ‘day-dreaming’ best accessed through poetry (Bachelard, 1969, p.28). Derived from individual poetic perspectives, Bachelard’s philosophical descriptions encompass both objective material reality of house and subjective ‘appearance’ of it. His systematic approach aims to unearth the house as consciously and bodily experienced in terms of how the poet thinks, perceives, imagines, remembers and comes into contact with it.

Since Bachelard, feminist critique has problematised the poetics and politics of home. As discussed by Kerstin Shands in Embracing Space: Spatial Metaphors in Feminist Discourse (1999), Bachelard alludes to connotations of birth, dwelling and protection, yet ‘he makes few explicit references to the maternal or feminine’ (Shands, 1999, p.113). In Bachelard, ‘confinement is positive and womblike…a warm, tactile, enveloping shelter’ suggests Shands (Shands, 1999, p.113). ‘Bachelard’s image of felicitous, curved space lacks awareness of the masculine connotations intrinsic to the idea that this space “wants you” to possess it’ she says (Shands, 1999, p.113). If ‘not open to just anybody’, then ‘are Bachelard’s felicitous spaces for men only?’ she asks (Shands, 1999, pp.113-114). Shand’s reproach gains substance in the context of feminist philosopher Luce Irigaray’s critique of a ‘linguistic home that man has managed to substitute even for his dwelling in a body, whether his own body or another’s, has used women as construction material’ (Irigaray, 1993a, p.107). Perhaps Bachelard’s embodied phenomenological philosophies were in some way a ‘thinking of himself as flesh, as one who has received his body as that primary home’: the sort of home Irigaray situates within women (Irigaray, 1993a, p.128).

Evaluating Bachelard from a feminist perspective shows that interrogating home necessarily involves what it means to do so as a woman.

Studying space through Massey’s developments of Heidegger and Lefebvre, allows a view of home as an inextricable interrelatedness of physical and social forces. Reading Perry, I learn how other artists struggle to move beyond the house to articulate ephemeral, emotional and relational aspects of home. From Bachelard’s phenomenological analysis, I develop embodied, sensual and spatial drawing approaches that point towards narratives and networks that flow through the house, connecting it with the outside. As my focus shifts from home as an object that ‘is’ to home as a space that ‘does’ and can ‘do’, Irigaray’s notion of woman perceived ‘as’ home leads me to question how cultural perceptions of home impact on women.
WOMEN

My spatial enquiries through Massey, Bachelard and Irigaray reveal an interrelationship between body, family, house and the activity of drawing as a woman artist. Carrying out my research in space assumed to be a private and familial retreat, expectations of my responsibility and availability arise in the content and form of my drawings. Defiantly focusing on paper and tool instead of rushing to fulfil family demands, my fastidious mark-making subtly grows from a central point, pushing its boundaries ever-outwards and establishing an expanding territory that is my own. By studying how the space of home affects women differently, I hope to use drawing practice to develop it as a concept capable of addressing issues of difference arising in the flows and boundaries of migration.

In Myth and Thought Among the Greeks (2006), Jean-Pierre Vernant explains how the goddess Hestia is seen to ‘represent the centre of the domestic sphere’ (Vernant, 2006, p.158). The myth suggests it a woman’s role to carry the fire from the mother’s hearth to a new dwelling, thereby creating a sense of home as ‘the node and starting point of the orientation and arrangement of human space’ (Vernant, 2006, p.158). The cultural centering of the comforts of home and family around women’s activities can be traced from ancient history through to the present day. Feminist studies have critiqued societal factors around this centrality and questioned the social construction of home as a place for women to be (Després, 1991, p.106). Voicing her partial agreement with the views of Irigaray and Simone de Beauvoir, feminist critic Iris Marion Young states,

The comforts and supports of house and home historically come at a woman’s expense. Women serve, nurture, and maintain so that the bodies and souls of men and children gain confidence and expansive subjectivity to make their mark on the world. This homey role deprives women of support for their own identity and projects (Young, 2005, p.123).

Home and its meanings are thus criticised as outcomes of an ideology that perpetually defines household functions and familial relations around women as homemakers. This causes many researchers to ‘reject home as a value’ and ‘toss the idea of home out of the

---

44 John Ruskin prescribed strict boundaries of private space as somewhere Victorian women were safely protected from the public eye. He referenced the myth saying ‘if a hostile society of the outer world is allowed...to cross the threshold, it ceases to be home: it is then only a part of that outer world which you have roofed over, and lighted fire in. But so far as it is a sacred place, a vestal temple of the hearth watched over by the Household Gods, before whose faces none may come but those whom they can receive with love...it vindicates the name, and fulfils the praise, of love’ (Ruskin, 1873, p.91).
larder of feminist values’ suggests Young (Young, 2005, p.123). Caran Kaplan states:

We must leave home, as it were, since our homes are often the sites of racism and other damaging practices. Where we come to locate ourselves in terms of our specific histories and differences must be a place with a room for what can be salvaged from the past and what can be made new. What we gain is reterritorialization; we rehabit a world of our making (Kaplan, 1987, p.194-195).

For Young home still ‘carries critical liberating potential because it expresses uniquely human values’ and to give up on home, is to deny the work women do within it (Young, 2005, p.123). Shands points out that:

“Home” carries associations to birth and dwelling, to the place where you were born, to foundations, emotions and affectivity (as in “home is where the heart is”). “Home” has protective associations (as when we talk about homes for orphans or the elderly). It also brings to mind beginnings and endings (as in baseball where “home” is where the action starts and ends), to conclusive argumentation (“driving a point home”) and to insight (“it was brought home to me”) (Shands, 1999, p.109).

Nevertheless, the most commonplace metaphors and meanings of home ‘associate to centre and interiority as opposed to marginality, expulsion or exile’ says Shands (Shands, 1999, p.109). She questions why ‘it is the latter end of the spectrum that has been most celebrated in contemporary feminist discourse’ (Shands, 1999, p.109). To her, the increasing focus on homelessness, mobility and exilic living means that other aspects of women’s experiences of home are neglected. In developing my research methods, notions of being central to the household influenced my thinking and subsequently arose in drawing outputs both conceptually and literally. Phrases such as ‘I am in the Middle’ were fastidiously written over and over in a reflexive process.

Feminist debates have changed. Our society does not confine women to an interior life of inhibited intellectual, creative and economic mobility. Yet the genderisation of home still poses as an issue. Amongst Massey’s concerns about the socio-political consequences of assigning home to house, is the persistent tendency ‘to equate the home with “woman”’ (Massey, 2005, p.174). Home arguably remains intrinsically
connected with ‘a woman’s place’. Present-day feminist writer, Chimamanda Ngozi Adichie demonstrates this through narrative in We Should All Be Feminists (2014):

I know a woman who has the same degree and same job as her husband. When they get back from work, she does most of the housework, which is true to many marriages, but what struck me was that whenever he changed the baby’s nappy, she said “thank you” to him (Adichie, 2014, p.37).

Adichie foregrounds how women and men are socialized into roles that burden them with a sense of obligation. ‘We are all social beings. We internalize ideas from our socialization’ and thus gendered distinctions are passed down through generations she suggests (Adichie, 2014, p.30). Men bear social pressures to be the principle provider, bread-winner and leader of the family but these are mostly centred on a workplace protected by legislative policy. Women on the other hand, suffer pernicious generalisations linking them with a largely unremunerated, unchallenged private realm.

Most now acknowledge that ‘an inclusive culture should recognize the work that is done at home’, says business consultant and academic Sarah Rutherford in Women’s Work, Men’s Culture (Rutherford, 2011, p. 102). To sociologists Moira Munro and Ruth Madigan, the modern family is presented as a ‘more democratic unit based on notions of a companionate marriage, joint decision-making, and greater labour market participation for women, rather than the hierarchical and overtly patriarchal structure of the earlier model’ (Munro & Madigan, 1999, p.107). Nevertheless, there remains what sociologist Arlie Hochschild calls a ‘second shift’ that is mostly done by women and often goes unacknowledged (Hochschild, 1990). A 2007 study by the London Business School reveals women team members to be 6 times more likely than men to perform domestic duties at home (Rutherford, 2011, p.105). Another 2007 survey of 30,000 people, derives that women going out to work are still primarily responsible for household chores. The same report compares men and women in full time employment and concludes that women average a 68-hour working week and men 55,
as women did 13 hours of additional housework (EFILWC, 2007). Furthermore, Rutherford suggests ‘uncritical acceptance by organisations and society, and women themselves, that a working woman carries a dual burden may be evidence enough that no real change in domestic responsibilities is expected’ (Rutherford, 2011, p. 102).

Alison Pearson points out that for a woman who wants ‘to have it all’ (i.e. have a family and work professionally) the reality is that she must be ‘doing it all’ (Pearson, 2002, p.10). I feel justified in deducing that men of today have more freedom than women.

Thanks to equal rights legislation, a married man and woman may do the same job and may even be paid the same income. Yet when they return home, the woman is more likely to do housework. Furthermore, if her male ‘partner’ does his share, she is often compelled to thank him. 48 ‘What it means to have a home, to feel at home, to be at home and the like, differs between women and men’ states Blumen, Fenster & Misgav (Blumen, Fenster & Misgav, 2013, p.9). There persists ‘a series of attitudes, responsibilities, tasks, feelings and understandings that structure the experiences of home as gendered’ they suggest (Blumen, Fenster & Misgav, 2013, p.9). The task of ensuring that everyday demands of running a household and caring for family are satisfied, is falling to more women than men.

Key to the concept of home is what it means for strengthening and securing relationships with the people one cares for. It remains the space of the family, dispersed as that is. Perceived and experienced as the facilitator of emotional connections, social understanding and individual acceptance, home is crucial in supporting human needs (Després, 1991, p.98). Architect, Carole Després calls for broader frameworks of research on the production and reproduction of the meaning and experience of home, stating ‘we need to confront and integrate existing knowledge on home...from different micro- and macro-perspectives’ (Després, 1991, p.108). In wishing to address the migration, displacement and homelessness ‘out there’, I must also attend the roles, duties and activities at the ‘centre’ of family and home.

Després proposes that interpretative theory for the meaning of home should include

48 In a 2009 working paper The Family Friendly Working Hours Taskforce states that a gender balance needs to be found between work, family and caring responsibilities - it quotes an EHRC report in which 62% of fathers say they should spend more time caring for their children (Rutherford, 2011, p.105). 33% of fathers are reported saying they would like to be there with their children at breakfast and 19% to be there at bedtime – yet ‘the reality is less than one in five’ (Rutherford, 2011, p.105).
understanding of home: first, as material reality; second, as a perceived and experienced reality; and third, as a societal and ideological entity (Després, 1991, p.108). I align the first two steps with my practice-based research with its initial focus on the physical building I inhabit, then its attempts to experience this space phenomenologically. Following the third then leads me to examine the social and cultural forces shaping the home I am familiar with, hoping to integrate what I learn within wider knowledge. Much of what is known about home and family life in the past is compiled from the memoiristic practices and fiction of women.\(^{49}\) To Shands, the most inexplicable, complex and intangible spatialities of home today are tied up in women’s experiences, so revisiting women’s historical writing offers valuable insight on the present (Shands, 1999, p.8).\(^{50}\) Hence, I consider the creative practices of women trying to understand and articulate home before me.

Some renowned and informative novels were written at the kitchen table, such as Elizabeth Gaskell’s *Mary Barton* (1848) and *Cranford* (1851-1853). As Griselda Pollock highlights in her essay, *Modernity and the Spaces of Femininity* (1988), women’s artistic production could ‘not represent the territory which their colleagues who were men so freely occupied and made use of in their works’ (Pollock, 1988, p.56). As Di Bello points out, Victorian homes were represented as private spaces of rest and leisure, physically and ideologically separated from the workplace (Di Bello, 2007, p.26). Respectable women were educated to attract husbands but once married, were not expected to apply their attainment professionally or domestically. Never leaving the house unchaperoned, ‘a range of places and subjects was closed to them’ says Pollock (Pollock, 1988, p.62). Women wrote about home as the only sphere they had access to.

According to Rutherford, social expectation for women to be home-makers took hold during the Industrial Revolution of the mid-1700s to mid-1800s (Rutherford, 2011, p. 99). Industrialisation marked a shift from manufacturing primarily done in people’s homes using hand tools or basic machines, to powered, special-purpose machinery, factories and mass production. Historian, Barrie Trinder describes society changing as fundamentally as the economy, as the flood of ‘rural humanity sweeping into

---

\(^{49}\) Theoretical writers on home heavily draw on both women’s writing of fiction and their diaries, household logs, journals and correspondence (Cieraad, 1999); (Flanders, 2014); (Vickery, 2009).

\(^{50}\) Arguing for analysis of women’s literature to date as a means of critiquing feminist metaphors of space, Shands’ says “Essentially” contemporary essentialist-constructivist debates are spatially conceived through hierarchizing polarisations of interiority and exteriority, concepts that are underwritten by often unexamined visions of home” (Shands, 1999, p.8).
industrializing towns in search of work’, caused ‘patterns of life as well as work to become tied to those of the machine’ (Trinder, 2013, p.1-4). Rutherford suggests the labour migrations and working day timeframe imposed, created spatial and temporal dislocations still evident in modern workplace cultures (Rutherford, 2011, p. 99). Mechanisation and the subsequent movement of male workers into city factories whilst women stayed behind caring for family, delineated a ‘masculine’ public working arena of men from a ‘feminine’ private space of home that has continued to marginalise women.

Influential philosophical writers such as Jean-Jacques Rousseau and John Ruskin endorsed the distinction, claiming that the moral health of society depended upon ‘a woman’s touch’ in the home. Birgitta Bergland suggests that the spatial imagery of novels by Ann Radcliff, Mary Wollstonecraft and Jane Austen, shows Victorian women wrote about home in order to purposefully establish it as a place of their own (Bergland, 1993, p.15). The protagonists of Austen’s novel *Pride and Prejudice* (1813), Charlotte Brontë’s *Villette* (1853) and *Jane Eyre* (1847), George Eliot’s (Mary Anne Evans) *Middlemarch* (1872) and Lucy Maud Montgomery’s *Anne of Green Gables* (1907) were all effectively homeless and searching for the security of home. Fear of an exilic life without house, family and therefore respectability, arguably drove women to volunteer in their confinement.

Gendered formulations of the Victorian era, to some extent explain its richness for women’s writing on home but also, women’s demand for art and literature focused on home and ‘the spaces of bourgeois recreation, display and those social rituals that constituted polite society’ (Pollock, 1988, p.56). Women novelists could be their most expressive, creative and imaginative when writing in and about the home. In this, I find impetus to get inside this concept and investigate its experiential spaces from within.

Since the 1960s, interest in the private as opposed to public histories of oppressed groups has resulted in closer analysis of women’s autobiographical practices and content. One proponent Estelle Jelinek, suggests that men’s autobiographies emphasise the ‘public aspect of their lives, whereas women’s treat as their focus ‘their personal lives’ (Jelinek in Siegel, 1999, p.16). Women writers are noted for using diaristic approaches as a mode of self-discovery, as opposed to writing about a self that has already been formed (Baer, 51 These divisory prescriptions are laid out in (Landes 1988, pp.66-92); and (Ruskin, 1873). To Rutherford, their veneration of a ‘woman’s touch’ resulted in the persistent pressure for ‘all-encompassing hands-on middle-class mothering’ (Rutherford, 2011, p. 103). 52 Discussed extensively in (Shands, 1999); (Bergland,1993).
Domna Stanton questions what ‘personal’ means: ‘a particular type of introspective and affective analysis?’ (Stanton, 1984, p.11). If it is so, then autobiographic methods are crucial to my research.

Kristi Siegel pinpoints this relevance for me in stating, ‘the central act of autobiography is revelation – making public what was private’ (Siegel, 1999, p.20). Women restricted to the private realm were exposed to the public via the lives of their husbands and children. Through presenting parts of their lives as autobiographies, they gained entry to the public sphere and a level of authorship over how others saw them. ‘The life narrator selectively engages aspects of her lived experience through modes of personal “storytelling”’ suggest Sidonie Smith and Julia Watson in their book *Interfaces: Women, Autobiography, Image, Performance* (Smith & Watson, 2012, p.9). To Ellis, Adams & Bochner, such methods allow choice over what the narrative ‘shows’, and permit an element of ‘adding’ elements as a means of accentuating what is ‘told’ (Ellis, Adams & Bochner, 2011, p.11). A self-referential practice can offer ‘occasions for negotiating the past, reflecting on identity, and critiquing cultural norms and narratives’ suggest Smith and Watson (Smith & Watson, 2012, p.9). Given autobiography’s subjectivity and ability to ‘rewrite’ personal histories and make them public, I argue for its potential to yield forms of knowledge about home.

Studying how women have handled the difficulties of home using autobiography, leads me to take it up as a method for materialising home to that I can see and reflect upon it. Rutherford demonstrates how present-day concepts of home remain hindered by the gendered spatial distinctions of industrialisation and the divisory prescriptions of Victorian living that Rousseau and Ruskin supported. From the analyses of women’s writing practices offered by Jelinek, Bergland and Shands, I learn that ‘non-traditional’ modes of autobiography are particularly useful indications of a specific time, society and situation. Hence, I adopt an autobiographic approach to my own visual research. From Smith and Watson’s examination of autobiographical practices in contemporary art, I learn I am not alone in this and am led to consider how artists use autobiography as a strategy with which to interrogate how home and family operates.

---

53 See: (Jelinek, 1986a); (Jelinek, 1986b); (Jelinek, 2004). Jelinek claims that women’s autobiographies differ from men’s: firstly, women focus on their personal lives, rather than wider public or historical issues of their times; secondly, women use irony, humor, understatement as opposed to an idealized, self-confident voice; and thirdly, women’s autobiographies are rarely chronological but tend to be fragmentary, disconnected and presented in sections (Baer, 1993).
STRATEGY

Louise Bourgeois’ use of first-person narrative induces me to unpick her strategy. Her intentional lack of differentiation between art and daily life, helps me understand how carrying out my drawing practice in shared familial space is productive. ‘Art is not about art. Art is about life, and that sums it up’ she tells Donald Kuspit (Bourgeois in Kuspit, 2003, p.1089). Of all the artistic practices I research, Bourgeois’ intersection with home is the most pointedly autobiographical. I want to collect, reorder and play with her endless self-representations to reveal new narratives, echoing Bourgeois’ repetitive method I Do, I Undo, I Redo (Louise Bourgeois, 2000). She states:

I ought to be doing something else instead of just having a good time. I ought to have a job. I ought to be doing something worthwhile like a man instead of always doing woman stuff. I ought to be “as good as” and if possible better than Robert... Maybe I ought to be something else, do or be something else, if not be, do – there is something wrong with what I do, maybe it means there is something wrong with what I am. To do, to do something else, to change the way I wish, do what I want my way, not their way, to change, to alter, to remake, to transform, to improve, to rebuild – I change the world around me since I cannot change myself (Bourgeois in Morris, 2007, p.130)

I frequently use documentation and classification in my creative process. Through Bourgeois I recognise social dialogue and even the conversations I have with myself, both verbal and textual, as collectibles. Bourgeois’ flowing autobiographic narratives entice an intimate engagement with her morphing bodies and the environments that house them within spiralling thoughts, dreams, sexuality, insomnia, creativity and more. According to theorist and artist Mieke Bal in her essay Autotopography: Louise Bourgeois as Builder (2002), the ‘primal sense of architecture’ of Cells55 for example, ‘introduces the element of “topos”: place. They are both building blocks and complete houses, body houses’ (Bal, 2012, pp.166-167). For Tate Modern director Frances Morris, they evidence Bourgeois’ ‘passion for hoarding, scavenging, collecting and mending, habits of economy central to her parent’s professional lives’ (Morris, 2007, p.15). Although eerily unhomely, I note these constructions are fundamentally private and domestic (Bourgeois, 1996, Fig.i).

54 The three towers installed as the first of The Unilever Series at Tate Modern. 12 May-26 November 2000.
55 A series of installations from the late 1980s and 1990s, of which Spider is an example.
Louise Bourgeois
*Cells (Clothes)*, 1996
Mixed Media
83 cm x 174 cm x 144 cm
(Morris, 2007, p.21)
Louise Bourgeois

*Cells (Choisy)*, 1990-1993

Pink marble, metal and glass

306 cm x 170.2 cm x 241 cm

(Storr, Herkenhoff & Schwarzman, 2003, p.82)
To Bal, Bourgeois‘ viewer is rendered a ‘voyeur’, excluded and peering into spaces ‘filled with the artist’s gadgets, memorial objects, bedroom furniture, or body parts’ (Bal, 2012, pp.164). This surreptitious role, ‘suggests that the personal and intimate quality of the works “betrays” the subject’s self’ says Bal, ‘suggests, that is, that the memory permeating the work hides – and – if expertly read – reveals the artist’s own memories that could then be traced to build the story of her past’ (Bal, 2012, p.166). Bourgeois ambiguously backs this notion of believing what is seen but hints at her artifice: ‘the language of the eye, the intensity of the gaze and the steadiness of that gaze are more important than what one says’ (Bourgeois in: Storr, Herkenhoff & Schwartzman, p.8). She raised my attention to the verbal, textual and visual interplay of autobiography and its take up. ‘My work grows from the duel between the isolated individual and the shared awareness of the group’ says Bourgeois (Bourgeois, 2000, p. 171). Being ‘in the know’ about its self-referential content is a privilege she has the choice to grant or not.

Exerting palpable control over entry and exit to her personal thoughts, Bourgeois cages a diminutive pink marble sculpture of her family home beneath a poised guillotine in Cell (Choisy) (Bourgeois, 1990-3, Fig.ii). ‘It is a fantastic privilege to have access to the unconscious...and to exercise it’ Bourgeois suggests, ‘but there is no escape from it, and no escape from access once it is given to you’ (Bourgeois in Kuspit, 2003, p.1089). Critic Morwenna Ferrier observes the imprisoning of ‘dioramic, standalone sculptural forms using objects from Bourgeois’ childhood’ that enable the artist to ‘analyse and express her memory, anxiety, fear of abandonment and pain’ (Ferrier, 2016, p.2). ‘Cells is her autobiography, her catharsis and her personal therapy’ states Ferrier (Ferrier, 2016, p.2). Luring audiences across the thresholds of privacy into uncomfortably direct encounters with her innermost feelings and stories, Bourgeois demonstrates the power of autobiography as a means of attracting and engaging the viewer.

When questioned about Spiral Woman (1951-2) and Spiral Woman (1984) Bourgeois explains, ‘she hangs up in the air. She turns around and she doesn’t know her left from her right. Who do you think it represents? It represents Louise. This is the way I feel...she is herself, hanging, waiting for nobody knows what’ (Bourgeois, 1998, p.257-258). I find it disturbing to equate her emotions with being tightly bound by the strangulating grasp of the coiled brass cocoon, her legs dangling helplessly (Bourgeois, 1984, Fig.iii).
Louise Bourgeois
*Spiral Woman*, 1984
Bronze, hanging piece, with slate disc
48.3 cm x 10.2 cm x 14 cm (Bronze), 3.2 cm x 86.3 cm x 86.3 cm (Slate disc)
(Morris, 2003, p.281)
I note that Bourgeois’ slippage between first to third person, parallels a similar shift when I write artist statements. It is a form of autobiography in which I readily switch voices depending on the intended recipient and how I wish them to respond. I study Bourgeois’ differing autobiographic stances, from sculptural works on publicly display to her personal notebooks. ‘Reading through Louise Bourgeois’ diaries, I was struck by the proliferation of words naming feelings’ says Kuspit, ‘they recur over and over again’ (Kuspit, 2007, p.295). Suggesting the artist’s expressions range in intimacy and intensity but ‘are mostly negative: aggression, rage, anxiety, panic, vulnerability, self-defeat’, he describes the writing as ‘almost always legible’ (Kuspit, 2007, p.295). The coherence of these journals implies that Bourgeois remains conscious of presenting herself to an audience, even when supposedly writing in private. From this, a role emerges for my own scrappy sketches, notes, calendars and lists as I develop an autobiographic methodology. 

Bourgeois’ emotional outpourings are punctuated by a calm explanatory voice. ‘The Maison Vides (empty houses) are a metaphor for myself’ she tells Paulo Herkenhoff ‘life is organised around what is hollow’ (Herkenhoff et al., 2003. pp.24-25). Bal suggests that some of Bourgeois’ works ‘which are so architectural that they represent, seem to be, or envelop the viewer in homes – conjure up a narrativity that refuses to yield stories’ (Bal, 2012, p.166). I wonder if Bourgeois disrupts the autobiographic torrent intentionally. I try to reconcile my own outputs with concepts of home through varying flows and voices.

Whichever mode Bourgeois is in, there is a sense of something personal and often painful being revealed.

What modern art means is that you have to keep finding new ways to express yourself. This is a painful situation, and modern art is about having this painful situation of having no absolutely definite way of expressing yourself. This is why modern art will continue, because this condition remains: it is the modern human condition…it is about the hurt of not being able to express yourself properly, to express your intimate relations, your unconscious, to trust the world enough to express yourself directly in it…it is about the difficulty of being a self because one is neglected. Everywhere in the modern world there is neglect, the need to be recognized, which is not satisfied. Art is a way of recognising oneself (Bourgeois in Kuspit, 2003, p.1090).
In this, Bourgeois shows me the importance of autobiography for presenting self to oneself as a research method for coming to know, gaining new understanding and reflecting upon that embodied transformation. ‘Bourgeois almost always focused on the human form, whether supine, oversized, realistic or abstract...but all of her work was deeply personal’ says Ferrier (Ferrier, 2016, p2). According to Bourgeois’ assistant, Jerry Gorovoy, ‘she struggled with the burden of being a mother, a wife and an artist’ (Gorovoy in Ferrier, 2016, p.4). Sewing, weaving, drawing, painting; women have engaged in ‘accepted’ creative practices to carve out time and space for themselves without incurring conflict. In Bourgeois’ hands, the pastimes associative of a feminine domestic become overtly confrontational.

Following this, I defiantly spend my time sewing single socks into endless meters of rope instead of tending the family laundry. It echoes the obsession, repetition and catharsis attributed to Bourgeois’ practice. ‘She was very anxious’ suggests Gorovoy, ‘if she worked, she was OK. If she didn’t, she became anxious ... and when she was anxious she would attack. She would smash things, destroy her work’ (Gorovoy in Ferrier, 2016, p.4). He implies that anxiety drove Bourgeois to compulsively revisit memories, traumas and encounters. She has ‘a survival strategy in which the practice of art is her particular way – perhaps her only way – of negotiating the world in which she lives’ suggests Morris, ‘a means through which to respond to the emotions of everyday life and relationship, and to confront the haunting memories of childhood’ (Morris, 2007, p.12). I note how the sense of intimate exposure is reinforced by Bourgeois’ choice of old nightgowns, linens, beds and other materials inherently associated with privacy. Morris points out that her ‘repertory of symbols...often relate to the human body, to relationships, to family and home’ (Morris, 2007, p.16). For example, Passage Dangereux includes objects that are suggestive of personal significance as well as their own backstories and histories (Bourgeois, 1997, Fig.iv). This composite work demonstrates methods of building biographical narratives useful to my practice: a layering Bourgeois adds to with dialogue. As Morris notes, Bourgeois backs up her ‘most explicitly narrative and autobiographical works’ with ‘lengthy iconographical explanations of them and their contents’ (Morris, 2007, p.16). Referencing her Spiders, including the 4-metre bronze Maman (1999), the artist ‘recounts tottering between items of living room furniture higher than her head, encouraged by her mother’ says Meg Harris Williams (Harris Williams, 2012, p.3).
Louise Bourgeois
*Passage Dangereux*, 1997
Mixed Media
264 cm x 355.5 cm x 876.5 cm
(Storr, Herkenhoff & Schwarzman, 2003, p.107)
According to Bourgeois, the spider is her mother and its ‘white marble eggs are her siblings, the world’s babies’ (Harris Williams, 2012, p.3). Her commentary deepens the intrigue around the symbolic use of spiders but leaves the experiences encompassed by their protective and menacing duality for the viewer’s imagination to complete. I borrow from Bourgeois’ use of differing autobiographic formats as multiple strata of narrative.

Robert Storr references a specific ‘foregrounding of the autobiographical and literary dimension of Bourgeois’ work’ (Storr, 2007, p.21). It is an aspect of her practice highlighted by the publishing of notebooks, letters, diaries, journals, scattered notes, small objects and drawings arising from her everyday life. These documents have had impact when exhibited internationally and critiqued by theorists such as Storr and Kuspit. I derive that compiling an autobiography involves the insignificant, ubiquitous and mundane as usefully demonstrative of an individual life story. However, ‘once the autobiography is made public, it is no longer bound to one person’s history’ Bal points out (Bal, 2012, p.166). From this, I question what happens when Bourgeois opens up her private life, and inevitably something of other lives connected to it, to an audience. I ask whether the ‘reveal’ is an incidental outcome of her learning to cope with inner demons, or a purposeful ‘showing’ of the personal and its complex interrelations. This thinking directs my research towards second-wave feminist endeavours to politicise the shift between public and private.

‘My feminism expresses itself in an intense interest in what women do’ states Bourgeois, demonstrating her relationship with feminism to be an ambiguous one (Bourgeois in Kuspit, 2003, p.1089). ‘The feminists took me as a mother. It bothers me. I am not interested in being a mother. I am still a girl trying to understand myself’ she states (Bourgeois in Morris, 2007, p.130). Nevertheless, it was inclusion in the feminist movement that brought her work to prominence via exhibitions such as Eccentric Abstractions curated by Lucy Lippard (1971). Bourgeois is a woman artist who ‘despite her apparent fragility...survived almost 40 years of discrimination, struggle, intermittent success and neglect in New York’s gladiatorial art arenas’ suggests Lippard, and the ‘tensions which make her work unique are forged between just those poles of tenacity and vulnerability’ (Lippard in Deepwell, 1997, p.28). Despite Bourgeois’ resistance to labelling herself a feminist or the reading of her work as feminist statements, her methods heavily influence those who do.
I deduce that what my artwork ‘does’ in terms of the meanings audiences make from it, is more important than communicating a specific position or opinion about home and its gender relations. Writing in the feminist journal *n.paradoxa*, editor Katy Deepwell suggests that what matters is not whether Bourgeois is herself a feminist but the indication of her ‘political sympathy with feminist platforms in the seventies’ (Deepwell, 1997, p.30). ‘Recognition of her work as emanating from her specific experience as a woman is important to the context in which her work should be seen’ says Deepwell, ‘namely, that the personal in her work is always part of a broader set of political commitments’ (Deepwell, 1997, p.30). She questions interpretations of Bourgeois’ practice, asking ‘why is autobiography and the artists’ personal memories emphasized rather than a feminist reading of the personal as political?’ (Deepwell, 1997, p.35). This leads me to interrogate Bourgeois’ foregrounding of narratives as self-referential in nature. According to Robert Storr:

In the 1950s and 1960s much of what Bourgeois said about her work alluded to psychological tensions without identifying specific antagonists...in the 1970s, she started to describe her past in increasing detail...it was not until 1982...that the now scenario was laid out...Prior to this, Bourgeois kept silent in public and in private...[and] her work was generally interpreted by herself and others in metaphorical terms (Storr, 2007, p.21).

Written at the height of second-wave feminism, her illustrated text, *Child Abuse* (1982) states, ‘everything I do was inspired by my early life’ (Bourgeois in Morris, 2007, p.80). The timing fits with Storr’s notion of a shift towards the artist actively encouraging overtly autobiographical readings of her work. Bourgeois’ insistent recourse to first-person narrative and the richly ornamented myth of origins she embroiders, might make it ‘harder than ever to tell the dancer from the dance [but] one should not confuse the ‘I’ of the text with its author’ says Storr, (Storr, Herkenhoff & Schwartzman, 2002, p.33). ‘In effect, autobiographical telling is performative’ propose Smith and Watson, ‘it enacts the “self” that it claims has given rise to an “I.” And that the “I” is neither unified nor stable – it is fragmented, provisional, multiple, in process’ (Smith & Watson, 2012, p.9). These ideas help me recognise an intentionality in Bourgeois’ dislocated autobiographic statements, and the necessity of reading them in the context of the challenges facing her as a woman and artist. From this, the ‘I’ of my own practice-based research comes under scrutiny.
My enquiries lead me to *Old Mistresses: Women, Art & Ideology* (1981) in which Rozsika Parker and Griselda Pollock debate an historical reduction to the biographical that undervalues women’s art ‘as an extension of their domestic and refining role in society’ (Parker & Pollock, 1981, p.7). Noting the absence of a female equivalent for ‘Old Master’, they root the lack of credit this indicates within ingrained Victorian ideology: ‘men are the true artists. They have genius: women have only taste. Men are busy with serious works of the imagination on a grand scale but women are occupied in minor, delicate, personal pastimes’ (Parker & Pollock, 1981, p.10). Seeing someone as an ‘artist’, requires an understanding of that individual as being in control and capable of independent thought. Women restricted to being home-makers in the private realm, were viewed too inhibited and intellectually limited for public intervention. Rather, their creative output was explained as inherently biological or the product of personal biographical circumstances.

Art made by women was lastingly ‘characterized as the antithesis of cultural creativity, making the notion of a woman artist a contradiction in terms’ say Parker and Pollock (Parker & Pollock, 1981, p.4). As Laura Cottingham summarises in her video essay *Not for Sale: Feminism and Art in the 1970s* (1998) ‘art’s production, distribution and critical reception was embedded in sexism’ (Cottingham, 1998, 67:23). In *Why Have There Been No Great Women Artists?* (1971), Linda Nochlin addresses the forces at work in art history and claims the inadequacy of ‘the white Western male viewpoint’ (Nochlin, 1971, p.146). According to Nochlin, art history is predicated on ‘demonstrations of the inability of human beings with wombs rather than penises to create anything significant’ (Nochlin, 1971, p.147). In her view, women had not made ‘great’ art that had been disregarded, nor were they incapable of greatness (Nochlin, 1971, p.147). Rather Nochlin blames economical, educational and ethical inequities for women’s lack of content. She argues, ‘the so-called woman question, far from being a minor, peripheral sub-issue... can become a catalyst, an intellectual instrument, probing basic and “natural” assumptions’ (Nochlin, 1971, p.146). Female artists fight against the routine discrimination of art world institutions ‘to make art according to their own terms, values and experiences’ says Cottingham (Cottingham, 1998, 66:35). This implies that for women artists to address their persistent invisibility, they had to first obtain the right to make, exhibit and sell their art and have their work interpreted to greater depth than an assumed autobiography.

---

56 For example, official royal portraitist and a foremost woman artist of her age, Elisabeth Vigée Le Brun (1755-1842) had her work biographically generalized and her success put down to privilege and good looks rather than ability (Levey in May, 2005, pp.3-4).
However, I note that this thinking arose alongside a resurgence of autobiographic methods in feminist practices as a form of subversion. My research follows this thread to women artists of the 1970s seeking to rewrite more inclusive histories. Artists of second-wave feminism valued the personal and intimate for interrogating the representation of women and the social construction of ‘woman’.\(^{57}\) A feminist perspective introduces me to a duality of autobiography: that on the one hand it can usefully expose the ‘real’ lives of women and raise awareness to their plight; whilst on the other, the reductive presumption that women’s art is autobiographical sets them at a disadvantage.

I revisit Bourgeois’ insistent self-referencing in order to examine her motivations for making art that aligns with women’s everyday lives rather than the masculine values of the art system. According to her, ‘the inner necessity of the artist to be an artist has everything to do with gender...the frustration of the woman artist and her lack of immediate role as an artist in society is a consequence of this necessity’ (Bourgeois in Morris, 2007, p.50). The formal content of Bourgeois’ work is ‘deeply involved in a dialogue about Modern art and Bourgeois’ place within it, or absence from it’ observes Storr (Storr, Herkenhoff & Schwartzman, 2002, p.100). He alludes to her use of autobiographical indicators as a tactic for confronting the discriminatory mechanisms affecting the making and disseminating of her work. But Allan Schwartzman suggests there is more to Bourgeois’ methodology than a feminist displaying her own life and the sexist forces inhibiting it: ‘detractors have dismissed her work by characterizing it as simply a confessional kind of autobiography’ (Storr, Herkenhoff & Schwartzman, 2002, p.100). Although ‘deeply rooted in her experience...the content of Bourgeois’ art is not primarily autobiographical but archetypal’ says Storr (Storr, Herkenhoff & Schwartzman, 2002, p.33). I follow these implications that Bourgeois controls a more complex strategy.

‘I like to be a glass house... all I can share with other people is this transparency’, Bourgeois tells Herkenhoff (Bourgeois to Herkenhoff, 2003. p. 8). But what are we to believe from the ‘artist’s voice, so seductive and persuasive in all its registers’ asks Morris (Morris, 2007, p.11). ‘Interviews are a process of clarification of other people’s thoughts, not mine’ says Bourgeois (Bourgeois in: Storr, Herkenhoff & Schwartzman, p.8). Is she insinuating that the stories she builds are merely ‘suggestive’ of her past, rather than

---

\(^{57}\) For example: Mary Kelly, Nancy Spero, Jo Spence, Adrian Piper, Lynda Barry, Erika Lopez, Kiki Smith, Annette Messager, Carolee Schneeman, Orlan, Laurie Anderson, Nan Goldin, Eleanor Antin, Audrey Flack.
bonded to her personal history? Has this artist found more useful ways of approaching self-representation than ‘honesty’?

In art, as in literature, the notion of autobiography brings with it a sense of truth: the transformation of the artist’s own experience into an artistic experience for the viewer, is understood to be central. In visual self-representation, ‘the autobiographical is assumed as a mirror, a self-evident content to be “read”’ say Smith and Watson (Watson & Smith, 2012, p.8). Despite the range of collage, installation, sculpture, performance, costume, books and time-based media with which artists present their personal narratives, the viewer presumes a transparent mirroring or ‘likeness’ just as they might in traditional self-portraiture. Yet according to Smith and Watson, in the hands of modernist and contemporary artist women, ‘the autobiographical is not a transparent practice’ it is a performative act, encompassing the subjective, embodied and relational complexities of memory, narrative, creativity, identity, experience and intentionality (Smith & Watson, 2012, p.8). This develops my view of Bourgeois’ autobiographic conceptualisations as not only sculptural representations but theatrical performances.

I find support for this in Bal’s analysis. Noting that autobiographical readings of art are predicated on the presumption ‘that the work expresses the artist’s personality while at the same time narrating elements from her or his life’, Bal claims Bourgeois uses this premise as a guerrilla strategy (Bal, 2012, p.164). The artist repeatedly steers others into thinking that this or that work was ‘perhaps a self-portrait – one of many’ says Bal (Bal, 2012, p.166). She argues that Bourgeois presents herself and her work through a strategically constructed fiction of autobiography: a mode of deception designed to catch out those inclined to interpret women’s art in superficial ways (Bal, 2012, p.164). In other words, by enforcing her life and her work are one and the same, Bourgeois incites problematic assumptions that her art arises from something other than creative artistry, such as the natural, biological or circumstantial. She contrives to entrap viewers and expose their prejudicial ways of sentencing her and her art to inferiority.

The artist’s selection of intimate, domestic materials and her pushing of personal qualities ‘intensifies the critical tendency—it appears nearly irresistible— to read Bourgeois’ work

---

58 Examples of such practices include: Intervention: Jenny Holzer, Guerrilla Girls; Barbara Kruger, Painting: Elvira Bach, Jenny Savile, Frida Kahlo, Installation: Adrian Piper, Helen Chadwick, Annette Messager; Cartoons: Lynda Barry, Erika Lopez, Nicole Hollander; Photography: Cindy Sherman, Tina Modotti, Jo Spence; Performance: Bobby Baker, Annie Sprinkle, Hannah Wilke; etc.
as autobiographical’, says Bal (Bal, 2012, p.164). With her extensive knowledge of philosophy, psychoanalysis and cultural theory, Bourgeois was unquestionably aware of the cultural conditioning causing women’s art to be undervalued. I conclude that, if this intelligent and articulate artist leads her audience into making predictable, gendered biological and biographical reductions of her work, then she is knowingly manipulating them. In other words, Bourgeois purposefully obfuscates her own life behind a partially fictive narrative to reveal the tendency to collapse her artistry into autobiography, femininity and home.

The development of my research is indebted to Bourgeois’ demonstration of drawing on her personal experiential knowledge as a wife, mother and female artist, to create stories that address wider issues of social construction and identity in the public realm. Bourgeois ‘the yarn-spinner creates folktales for traumatized or disillusioned modern sensibilities’ says Storr (Storr, 2007, p.36). In interviews ‘each time she returns to some incident or character, her emphasis changes [...] crucial details are altered [or someone named] mutates into someone else’ (Storr, Herkenhoff & Schwartzman, 2002, p.33). Memorialising disparate fragments, traces and distant memories seems to be Bourgeois’ way of ‘staging’ daily life and taking ownership of it. As Smith and Watson point out ‘the past is not a static repository of experience but always engaged from a present moment, itself ever-changing’ (Smith & Watson, 2012, p.9). To Morris, Bourgeois’ ‘practice of constructing narrative from disparate parts, corralling opposites, playing on contrasts and reconciling differences...is open-ended: it leaves many doors ajar for further explanation’ Morris, 2007, p.11). To me, this parallels the fluid, diverse and unfinished space that Massey conceives, as it allows differing viewers to engage, question, meaning-make and continue the story-telling through their own cultural, social and experiential knowledge.

My research follows Bourgeois in trying to take autobiography beyond the boundaries of private space and into the public realm. It develops her performative approaches of constructing and accentuating autobiographical narratives as a lure. It adopts her layering of material, dialogue and associations to make elusive aspects of everyday life visible. It also borrows from the directness with which Bourgeois visually, textually and verbally juxtaposes autobiographic elements, for example in the painted Femme Maison that depicts the artist physically trapped inside the house (Bourgeois, 1946-7, Fig.v).
Louise Bourgeois
*Femme Maison, 1946-7*
Oil and ink on canvas
91.5 cm x 35.5 cm
(Storr, Herkenhoff & Schwartzman, 2003, p.50)
At the Tate retrospective (*Louise Bourgeois 1911-2010*, 2007), I read into this a woman limited by familial duties, the conditioning of her body and imposed notions of femininity: society presumes she lacks the capacity and intellect to escape home, so that is what she gives it. Playing with assumptions of art and autobiography as self-expression, Bourgeois resituates herself as an artist producer in a position of social and political responsibility. Painting or building stage sets, rooms and home-like environments for her sculptural figures to inhabit, she turns the restrictive contexts of her everyday life and work into palpable prisons. For Bourgeois whose career spans 1930-2010, ingrained gendered ideologies and the psychoanalysis reaffirming them, appear somewhat inescapable.

According to Lippard, autobiography is Bourgeois’ way of critiquing psychoanalytic theory: ‘rarely has an abstract art been so directly and honestly informed by its maker’s psyche’ (Lippard, 1975, p.27). ‘It is a constant characteristic of her work that it constructs a semi-fictitious author whose preoccupations and memories are inviting to a Freudian analysis’ says Kuspit (Kuspit, 2003, p.1088). I note that *Red Rooms* (1994) offers up fragments, echoes and hints of autobiography like psychoanalytic case studies. Bourgeois’ only pair of *Cells*, it consists of two circular chambers, a child’s the other parental (*Bourgeois*, 1994, Fig.vi & Fig.vii). Housing mostly red ephemera connoting blood, passion and visceral interrelations between the body, the stuff of home and curiously medicalised equipment, they expose strategic threads of autobiography and psychoanalysis.

As Morris describes, the smaller room ‘revolves around spiral motifs, from multiple spools of thread on spindle columns to towering hourglasses of coiled glass arranged haphazardly in disarray’ (Morris, 2007, p.236). The larger ‘establishes a cool domestic setting for intimate relations; a hard bed…and a medley of strangely erotic and ominously troubling objects, including an oval mirror placed to engage each viewer’s reflection’ (Morris, 2007, p.236). Bourgeois shows me how to create connections and dialogue by bringing strange, incongruous objects from a more public and masculine arena into domestic scenes. To Bal, ‘the objects and fragments are traps because the memories that inhabit the work cannot really be “read” as narratives’ (Bal, 2012, p.166). This implies that Bourgeois’ reiterative first-person presentations are not markers of her life; rather that her inconsistencies, reinventions and differing faces are meticulously contrived perspectives on Sigmund Freud’s interpretations of the psyche.
Louise Bourgeois

*Red Rooms (Child)* 1994

Mixed Media

210.8 cm x 353 cm x 274.3 cm

(Morris, 2007, p.237)
Louise Bourgeois
*Red Rooms (Parents)* 1994
Mixed Media
247.7 cm x 426.7 cm x 424.2 cm
(Morris, 2007, p.240)
The *Cells* militate against the predominant model in that art of the spirit of building; of the house as unified, idealised, symmetrical body. And they are, represent, or rather perform the house where the Freudian subject, whose own house it is, is not master. For figuratively, the *Cells* are houses of the mind, through the childhood memories they obviously house (Bal, 2012, p.165).

Reading Bal leads me to dig deeper into how this artist constructs a woman, artist and mother rendered powerless by society on the one hand; and takes creative control over her own dreams, imaginings and ideations on the other. In Bourgeois’ time, psychoanalysis had huge impact on experiences of everyday life and concepts of home. By critiquing her materialisations of Freudian theoretical frameworks, I hope to find ways of visualising the social structures governing home today.

‘That she spent 30-odd years in and out of psychoanalysis (Freudian, of course) is palpable’ says Gorovoy (Gorovoy in Ferrier, 2016, p.2). Since her death, the notes Bourgeois made during the analysis sessions begun when her father died, have been exhibited and published as *Louise Bourgeois: Return of the Repressed Psychoanalytic Writings* (Larratt-Smith, 2012, p.1). ‘What Bourgeois’ writings now make clear…is that her relationship to psychoanalysis was of a different order of magnitude’ says curator Philip Larratt-Smith, ‘probably no other artist has engaged more profoundly with psychology and psychoanalysis’ (Larratt-Smith, 2012, p.1). ‘Bourgeois was imbued with psychoanalysis, and understood it more than any other artist-thinker of her time’ says Kuspit, claiming her to be ‘the premier psychoanalytically oriented artist of modernity… because she understands the male as well as female psyche, and their inseparability’ (Kuspit, 2012, p.8). For Bourgeois, psychoanalytic theory is more than a preoccupation, it is a key ingredient of daily life requiring persistent interrogation.

Through research, I connect the centrality of psychoanalysis in Bourgeois’ autobiographic strategy to the marginalisation of women artists during her early career. To de Beauvoir, psychoanalytic theory is wholly responsible for women’s intentionality and mastery being
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59 For example, Georgia O’Keeffe’s abstract charcoal drawings begun in 1915 represented a radical break with convention towards pure abstraction but were read as suggestive of women’s bodies, although she always insisted they were extreme close-up flowers. Clement Greenberg declared ‘her work adds up to little more than tinted photography…that has less to do with art than with private worship and the embellishment of private fetishes with secret and arbitrary meanings’ (Greenberg, 1986, p.85). Her practice was highly theoretical and arose from philosophical, spiritual and scientific ideas but O’Keeffe was largely written off as a producer of decorative and commercial kitsch. Being a woman supposedly incapable of invention, ‘O’Keeffe has been very much reduced to one particular body of work, which tends to be read in one particular way,’ (Brochardt-Hume in Ellis-Peterson, 2016).
consistently underestimated by interpretations leaning towards their biological nature rather than social structure or artistic control. Laying the blame for presumptions that women lack capacity for invention, she states ‘it is impossible to detect a rivalry between the male and the female human that is specifically physiological. And so, their hostility is located on that ground that is intermediate between biology and psychology, namely, psychoanalysis’ (de Beauvoir, 2010, p.753). As Bourgeois demonstrates, considerations of Freud can offer insight on a range of ideas that underpin culture, particularly the historical myths that to him become part of society and explain identity. According to Laura Mulvey, Freudian theory provides an ‘exact rendering of the frustration experienced under the phallocentric order’ (Mulvey, 1999, p.834). Hence, psychoanalysis offers the structure through which Bourgeois interrogates the otherwise incomprehensible gender imbalances of her society.

I examine Freud’s background, looking for origins of the problematic idealisations still lingering around women and home. During the 1870s he studied medicine under Josef Breuer in Vienna, treating painful experiences recalled under hypnosis. He then became a student of neurologist Jean-Martin Charcot at the Salpêtrière Hospital in Paris. As captured in the documentary photographs and sketches (1875-1880) re-presented by George Didi-Huberman (2004), Charcot physically and mentally induced women to ‘hysteria’ as medical specimens for male students to study. Subsequently adopting Charcot’s principles, Freud moved from hypnosis into encouraging patients to talk freely and bring unconscious material to the surface for analysis. These sessions led him to theorise a three-part structure of personality: the id (unconscious biological and sexual drives), the superego (the conscience guided by morals) and the ego (mediating between the id and superego, guided by reality). It was a framework that prescribed very clear distinctions between men and women, cementing genderisation in all walks of society.

According to Freudian theory, a ‘normal’ male grows up with an inbuilt sense of social conventions and culture: men know right and wrong and are responsible, moral and
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60 De Beauvoir’s existential philosophy was extremely influential. The Second Sex is often regarded as the starting point of second-wave feminism. Written just after WW2, it reflected how home ceased to be taken for granted. Neither home nor obedient submission offered women anywhere to hide, rather they found themselves judged in ‘the battle of the family, the battle of sexuality, the battle for cleanliness, for hygiene’ states Beatrx Colomina (Colomina, 2007, p.296). The war partially dissolved the boundaries defining the interior but it also emphasized women’s obligations for home and familial well-being.

61 ‘Hysteria’ derives from the Greek hyster, meaning ‘uterus’. The ‘wandering of the uterus’ theory reflects the notion that the womb somehow moves or malfunctions, creating a specifically female disorder. The affliction was attributed to the ‘madness’ of women who denied their domestic obligations. ‘Women who did not know their place, and whose bodies traced a desire unsimilable within the masculine Symbolic, were often labelled hysterics, and more than once dispatched to the asylum’ (Newman, 1991, p.116).
autonomous social beings. By contrast, Freud claims that as a woman develops, her character ‘cannot attain the strength and independence which give it its cultural significance’ (Freud, 1973, p.163). To him, women can never gain the strength of mind or sense of justice for social autonomy. ‘Women oppose change, receive passively, and add nothing of their own’, he wrote in a 1925 paper The Psychical Consequences of the Anatomic Distinction Between the Sexes (Freud, 2001, p.250). This indicates precisely how women were seen to lack the content or capacity for the independent logical thought required of discovery. Freud’s influential ideas underpinned the way men’s activities and creativities were resolutely prioritised.

Elizabeth Grosz refers to a ‘mutual fascination between psychoanalysis and feminism’ arising as second-wave feminists brought attention to gender inequality (Grosz, 1990, p.4). She notes it ‘involves two antithetical meanings: ‘to attract irresistibly enchant, charm”, or “to deprive victim of the powers of escape or resistance by look or by presence” ...to fascinate is to entice and trap, seduce and contain’ (Grosz, 1990, p.6). For me, Bourgeois’ strategy does just this. Her in-depth understanding of psychoanalysis equips her to break down the boundaries of home, gender and art criticism, whilst contributing to broader commentary on social politics and interpersonal relations.

In her introduction to Art & Feminism (2001), Peggy Phelan suggests that psychoanalysis ‘forged a language to articulate sexual difference [and] feminists hoped it might provide an interpretive method for understanding the complexity’ of their situation (Phelan, 2001, pp.23-24). Although one of the most influential minds of the 1900s, Freud’s methods are mostly superseded in terms of therapy. Yet his writings retain relevance as descriptions of his time and its gendered, spatial and labour distinctions. According to Grosz, while ‘psychoanalysis itself is nevertheless phallocentric in its perspectives, methods, and assumptions’ it still provides ‘the most sophisticated and convincing account of subjectivity’ (Grosz, 1990, p.3). Hence its theories continue to interest those interrogating constructions of gender. However, it is notable that Bourgeois appropriates, investigates and materialises psychoanalytic theory in constructed autobiographies decades before feminists put either into service to address issues of difference.
Louise Bourgeois
*Quarantania* 1947-53
Bronze and paint
204.5 cm x 68.5 cm x 68.5 cm
(Storr, Herkenhoff & Schwarzman, 2003, p.55)
Bal describes Bourgeois turning ‘a place of the fictional self... into a stage for the viewer’s dreams’: psychoanalysis thereby supporting a dynamic that ‘affects the viewer by means of a fictional self’ (Bal, 2001, p.168). The artist is so well-informed, she can visualize and perform the stereotypes that Freud and Jacques Lacan attribute her. Rather than modelling societal expectations of wifely and maternal duties, Bourgeois reworks their evaluations of women as distracted, neurotic, pathological and inclined to hysteria62. By testing and playing with psychoanalytic theory to see if it works, she can get closer to the problem and articulate the oppression, reduction and marginalisation she experiences.

This leads my enquiry to the merging, opposing and pivoting of genders via which Bourgeois harnesses Freud’s divisive notions of male63 and female.64 Her Personages stand tall, often in carefully constructed rooms (Bourgeois, 1947-53, Fig.viii). Carrying titles including Observer (1947-9), Paddle Woman (1947) and Persistent Antagonism (1946-8), these composite, multi-textural beings are allied with the everyday ‘human activities and social relations’ of family and friends, says Morris (Morris, 2007, p.13). They ‘create a hybrid of human and architectural attributes, capable, through metaphor, of suggesting layers of complex and contradictory ideas around femininity and the home’ she suggests (Morris, 2007, p.13). Using a figurative vocabulary of psychoanalytic indicators, Bourgeois creates autobiographic forms in which buildings, bodies and familial relations are inextricably entwined. This directs my research to Freud’s theorising of home as not only fixed and physical but fluid and illusory.

In Family Romances (1909) Freud explains the family home as an imaginary ideal that develops when a child begins to gain familial independence. According to Freud, ‘parents are at first the only authority and the source of all belief’ but over time, repeated moments of feeling slighted or unjustly treated ‘afford him provocation for beginning to
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62 Hysteria and the revisiting of traumatic events were recurrent themes of Bourgeois’ practice. Freud suggests the hysteric does not ‘consciously represent to herself the intended actions, and she may perceive those actions with the detached feelings of an onlooker’, so has no autonomous control (Freud, 1985, p.52). By effectively miming past traumas she is ‘acting her part in the dramatic reproduction of some incident in her life’ (Freud, 1985, p.52). Hystera later became central to feminist debate as a key topic in the production and interpretation of women’s art. ‘The feminist critique of the patriarchal assumptions of psychoanalysis has involved a reassessment of the discourse of hysteria, and the plight of women who were its objects’ (Newman, 1991, p.125).

63 Outlining the Oedipal phase in his lecture Femininity (1933), Freud claims gender differentiation starts when a child realises not everyone has a penis. To Freud, boys learn ‘from the sight of the female genitals that the organ which they value so highly need not necessarily accompany the body’ and aware that he has something to lose, the boy then ‘falls under the influence of the fear of castration’ (Freud, 1973, p.154). Noticing his mother’s lack of a phallicus leads the boy fears losing her too, so competes with his father for her attentions until, at 3-5 years old ‘under the impression of the danger of losing his penis’ in the battle, the boy moves on and internalizes an idealisation of his father as a role model whilst inevitably growing away from his mother (Freud, 1973, p.163). Only when she becomes a mother can a woman ‘transfer to her son the ambition which she has been obliged to suppress in herself and...expect from him the satisfaction of all that has been left over in her of her masculinity complex’ (Freud, 1973, p.168).
criticize his parents’ (Freud, 1909, p.237). Deducing through socialization that ‘other parents are in some respects preferable to them’, the child’s imagination comes into play in the form of a fictional alter ego, suggests Freud (Freud, 1909, p.237). To him, the resultant fantasy or ‘familiar day-dreaming’ typically involves the idea of replacing one or both parents through tales of embellished heroism, wealth, romance and adoption (Freud, 1909, p.238). Freud affirms the ‘family romance’ as the child’s imaginative endeavour ‘to return to happier times’ of parental omnipotence, or even the womb (Freud, 1909, p.241).

I recall Massey’s comment that ‘closure of the imagined home is anyway impossible’ (Massey, 2005, p.174). A troubled dialogue with the unfixable and unattainable desire for home and family is deeply embedded in Bourgeois’ practice and outputs.

Bal describes Bourgeois’ Cell Spider (1997) as engaged in a theoretical debate with psychoanalysis that ‘turns the metaphor of the mind’s house, whose master does not master it, into a literal, embodied work of architecture [whilst] the chair inside it beckons you, as if it were the dreamer’s seat’ (Bal, 2012, p.167). Bourgeois excludes us from this caged retreat with its contents so personal they require a spider-mother’s protection. Through research, I know she has set this autobiographical trap, and is spider-poised to catch us bringing our presumptions to bear on her open-ended narratives (Bourgeois, 1997, Fig.ix). Yet even aware of her strategy, I can’t tell where the real artist starts or ends. Any fictive self-construction remains concealed beneath layers of believability and the artist’s own testaments of ‘truth’. As Bourgeois puts it, the key is just out of reach.65

For Bourgeois as with Freud, the theories of a ‘happy home’ are bound up in social ties and familial relations. According to Freud, the notion of ‘family romance’ creates desire that ‘takes over the topic of family relations’ and organises everything we do (Freud, 1909, p. 237). I accept that the nostalgia, expectations and imagined dreams to which he refers, are echoed in present-day human mobility and the fragmentation of traditional social groupings. This raises questions that progress my research. If the idealised familial home doesn’t exist: how does this daydream operate everyday contemporary life; why is it continually looked for in the house; and why do we experience such a strong sense of wanting to see it, touch it, feel it and get inside it?

65 A key hangs on a chain inside the cage of the Cells Spider (1997).
Louise Bourgeois

*Spider*, 1997

Steel, tapestry, wood, glass, fabric, rubber, silver, gold and bone

(Storr, Herkenhoff & Schwarzman, p.43)
Out of such queries, I draw parallels between Freud’s idealisation of home and those entering the flows of globalisation to pursue dreams of security, safety and a happy family. Although changeable and traveling, today’s concepts of home still carry some of the gendered roles, encounters and experiences of Freud’s theoretical narratives. Bourgeois sets her life within these fabricated structures as a means of making sense of the world and her place within it. In so doing, culture-specific moments become indistinguishable from private testimonials, and small stories trace bigger issues to confront ontological mechanisms. According to arts theoretician Patricia Leavy, constructed scenarios in the context of assumed authenticity have the capacity to stress certain perspectives, thereby ‘revealing social meanings, and linking the experiences of individuals to the larger cultural and institutional context in which social actors live’ (Leavy, 2009, p.40). She implies that partially fictive autobiographies have more scope than truthful versions in illuminating individual experience within the context of the shared and collective.

Hence, I follow Bourgeois in imparting an intentionality that prioritises the viewer’s reaction over historical fact to bring forth the unspoken complexities of home and its obligations. I take up her position of addressing the wider socio-political arena through the window of individual experience, enforcing the façade of real life evidence to create exemplars that can be analysed, questioned, reflected upon and used. Like Bourgeois, I write myself into the leading roles of my autobiographic mediations, hoping to articulate something of the cultural, political and social spaces of my time.

According to Rudy Fuchs, ‘we need artists to confront us with life, to show us that things do not have to remain as they are’ (Fuchs, 2005). Reworking the conventions of self-portraiture by fabricating autobiographies to interrogate the problems confronting her as an artist and women, Bourgeois articulated and to some extent altered women’s roles and responsibilities. However, circumstances have moved on and debates have changed, so I have a different rationale for using her strategy. Whilst she tried to expose forces that could never be visible, I wish to bring home into view through drawing practice.

Bourgeois demonstrates a method of storytelling that utilises personal knowledge and memories to emphasise and address socio-political issues. Recognising Bourgeois’ use of Freudian psychoanalysis through Bal’s interpretation, enables me to understand home as an imaginary construct and subsequently construct my own approach to it. Appropriating
her strategy, I fabricate a narrative with which to present the final drawing outcomes and structure the writing up of this thesis. The viewer sees shopping lists, to-do notes, diary entries, notifications, correspondence and a research journey supposedly indicative of my life as a 21\textsuperscript{st} Century women artist. They presume my self-representations are truthful because I offer them up as autobiographical. Nevertheless, it is not me that is portrayed, but the woman I want them to see. A person that suggests they question the distinctions, assumptions and imbalances affecting their everyday practices of home and the disparate notions of home-making that, as Massey points out, become implicit in the practices and attitudes of communities and their international relations.
METHODOLOGY
PRACTICE-BASED

Deeply invested in art-making as my way of learning about the world I inhabited and my place within it, I believed that creative practice could further understandings of home and make room for conclusions other than those arising theoretically. As Carole Gray and Julian Malins point out in *Visualizing research: A guide to the research process in art and design* (2004), creative practitioners learn ‘most effectively by doing – by active experience, and reflection on that experience’ (Gray & Malins, 2004. p.1). The diverse and shifting nature of home demanded just such an ‘experiential’ practice-based approach. Hence, I approached home as subject-object, trying to imitate what I saw using an objective methodology.

Throughout history, drawing has articulated space in preparation for design, painting and sculpture, and in creating place for architecture and urban planning. During the 20th Century it broke free from the page to gain primary status (Kovats, 2010, p.23). Simultaneously unbound and embodied, descriptive and performative, temporal and spatial, contemporary drawing both maps and creates space as the product of physical, social and active encounters. My mark-making habitually included installation, print, text, photography, traces, writing and objects: lines inherently mobile, spatial and independent. I hoped this expanded field of drawing would offer something richer and more informative about home than conventional representations and theories.

To some extent, drawing emerged from the map-making practices of Ancient Greece.66 Their calculations of land ownership led to linear ways of measuring the earth’s surface and Euclidian geometry. Combined with the Renaissance invention of one point perspective,67 the use of two-dimensional drawing to articulate three-dimensional space became embedded in European culture. Grids, squares and lattices applied to the depicted world, since organised real space in methods largely unchanged for centuries.

Katherine Harmon suggests that maps are so culturally, visually and politically entrenched in modern society that we have an inbuilt ‘cartographic consciousness’ (Harmon, 2011). Hence mapping dominates our operational metaphors: charting a position in; giving an
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66 The earliest forms of mapping are believed to be Babylonian and Egyptian but the draughtsmanship of Greek scientists put map-making on a sound mathematical footing – eg. Anaximander’s world map of c.600 BC depicting the earth as cylindrical (Dilke, 1998)
67 The Italian designer Filippo Brunelleschi is credited with developing the drawing technique of linear perspective in 1413.
outline of; offering a viewpoint on; laying out the field of; and so on (Watson, 2009). I often equated drawing practice with mapping as a methodical gathering and sorting of spatial information but my research put the centrality of mapping into question. Would calling on this conventional relationship merely bring forth reductions of physical space?

Arguably all maps are subjective distillations of information, inherently inaccurate and constantly needing revision. By presenting space ‘as a flat surface, a continuous surface, [...] as the completed product’, maps have ‘helped to pacify, to take the life out of, how most of us commonly think about space’ says Massey (Massey, 2005, p.106). I wanted acts of mapping to do more than represent land to conquer or routes to navigate and noted that traditional definitions of cartography had already given way to fresh applications and expectations. Mapping linguistics, anatomy, brainstorming, computing and countless other systems of daily life, visualisations created order out of confusion, documenting the ever-increasing networks, flows and connections between us.

The urge to establish ourselves in relation to what we know is increasingly compelling. Demanding more sophisticated interactive maps, we carry devices with us to deal with the sense of insecurity such technological advances create. Perhaps portable mapping possibilities could counter the ‘flattening’ reductions Massey condemned, and respond to her challenge to reconceptualise space ‘as always under construction [...] a product of relations between [...] never finished; never closed’ (Massey, 2005, p.9). The maps of contemporary art are not closed and coded systems; they are performative, embodied, generative and open to interpretation. As curator Hans Ulrich Obrist says, ‘maps enfold both the existing and the yet-to-be’ (Obrist, 2014, p.10). Opening the paths of my enquiry to uncertain futures, open ends and more questions, this research became an attempt to ‘map’ home through drawing practice.

Map-making and map-reading enable a sense of security and belonging on the move, which aligned it with contemporary home-making. Writing of the map as an endeavour ‘to grasp, to invent, a vision of the whole; to tame confusion and complexity’, Massey implies suitability for articulating home (Massey, 2005, p.109). In Art of Mapping (2011), Maggie Gray proposes that maps paradoxically widen horizons and turn the world in on an individual, ‘creating new personal, social and political territories in the process’ (Gray, 2011, p.27). I utilised mapping as a culmination of
experiential evidence translated into lines coherent and informative to others.

I argued that drawing as mapping made singular experiences of home readable to many: offering up personal perspectives to wider impact. In academic research, mapping is regarded as a means of visualising data alongside indexing and modelling. Such systematic and progressive ways of handling information are considered key to unearthing fresh ideas and connections during the research process. Theorist Chris Hart refers to ‘producing a map of knowledge on a phenomena, topic or problem’ to enable the necessary critical evaluation, analysis and synthesis of evidence (Hart, 2018, p.230). This made me re-think my methodologies as ‘mappable’ space, metaphorically linked to characteristics, interrelationships and boundaries of home in a layering that crossed theoretical and disciplinary thresholds.

According to Hart, ‘in mapping out work on a topic, you undertake the task of construction; putting together the different strands and elements of work that make up the corpus of knowledge on a topic’ (Hart, 2018, p.231). He claims, ‘all research is based on some sort of classificatory system’ (Hart, 2018, p.279). Collecting, sorting, grouping and labelling were key to my creative practice and allowed for reflective analysis and alternative views. Hence classification underpinned my rationale for mapping as a primary method and launched my understanding of drawing as driving ‘practice-based’ research of home.

The core requirement of a practice-based doctorate is that it ‘advances knowledge partly by means of practice’ says Sir Christopher Frayling (Frayling, 1997, p.14). In Art Practice as Research: Inquiry in Visual Arts (2010), Graeme Sullivan argues for ‘the significance of art making as a site for knowledge construction and meaning-making’ (Sullivan, 2010, p.83). He states, ‘part of what artists do is to search for what is not there, to find what is missing’ and thereby move ‘from the unknown to the known’ (Sullivan, 2010, p.86). Art practice was first accepted as a form of research in the early 1990s when creativity and innovation became regarded as mutually interrelated in the systematic production of
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68 See Doing a Literature Review for differing ways that knowledge can be mapped out for the purposes of research (Hart, 2018).
69 Differentiation is commonly made between ‘practice-led’ (usually understood as research about, into and for practice) and ‘practice-based’ research (in which practice is commonly both a research method and outcome).
70 The framework on which artistic research was based is theorised in The UK Council for Graduate Education report (Frayling, 1997).
71 The roots of art practice as research can be traced back to the writings of Jürgen Habermas (1971), Paul Ricoeur (1981); Egon Guba and Yvonna Lincoln (1998). They saw research as a socially grounded practice using imagination, experience and process-based enquiry. Useful overviews are offered in Denzin and Lincoln (1998); and Alvesson and Skoldberg (2000).
knowledge. Yet its fit within the construct, methodologies and language of conventional research remains troublesome. Exactly how art practice functions ‘as’ research’ and how research functions ‘through’ art practice is contentious: resolution hampered by traditional attitudes privileging theory over practice, thinking over emotion, intellect over intuition, cognition over perception, measurement over interpretation, etc.

The need to equate research across disciplines and institutions means visual arts research is judged on criteria embedded in humanities and the social and physical sciences. Approved definitions tend to determine ‘equivalence’ with tested methodologies, based on identifying common purposes whereby studio practices can be ‘seen to achieve common goals expected of any research activity’ (Sullivan, 2010, p.74). Practice-based researchers are required to shape the rationalisation, evaluation and reconciliation of their methods to these parameters. However, artists are not social scientists, so imposing terms and conditions founded in science arguably limits the possibilities of how art is viewed and used for creating new knowledge (Sullivan, 2010, p.75). Artistic research involves ‘a range of methods, mostly visual and mostly derived from practice, or adapted from other research paradigms to the practice-based research context’ (Gray and Malins, 2004, p. 31). This awkward ‘fit’ was notable as I tried to mould a purposeful and systematic practice-based enquiry to institutional constraints.

According to Sullivan, ‘the space between theory and practice becomes a site for making art and doing research and takes inquiry beyond discipline boundaries’ (Sullivan, 2010, p.166). He refers to the ‘rationality of intuition and the imagination of the intellect [as] the kind of mindful processes and liquid structures’ that artist researchers use (Sullivan, 2010, p.245). This implies that surprising, insightful and important outcomes arise from imprecise, uncertain methods. As Massey says, ‘loose ends and missing links’ give space its openness to alternative ways of being made: ‘for the future to be open, space must be open too’ (Massey, 2005, p.12). In researching what ‘is’, I must also attend the active, relational interconnectivities of what drawing and home ‘do’ together.

To Sullivan, ‘it is not necessary to assume that theories are neat, practices are prescribed, all outcomes can be predicted, or that meanings can be measured’ (Sullivan, 2010, p.245). As an artist, I work with topics of personal resonance but the outputs I value most are
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72 A framework of research equivalence is outlined in Frayling’s report to the Council for Graduate Education (Frayling, 1997).
new perspectives of public relevance and effect. For me, art isn’t an escapist, therapeutic or self-indulgent pastime, it was a forceful form of engagement. ‘The primary purpose of research is to increase awareness of ourselves and the world we live in’ says Sullivan, ‘the goal of any enquiry is to be able to act on the knowledge gained’ (Sullivan, 2010, p.97). I committed to bringing art practice and research together, and new ‘understandings’ of home that enabled individual and social transformation would constitute a significant outcome of this endeavour.
ETHNOGRAPHY

In their essay *Autoethnography is queer*, Tony Adams and Stacy Holman Jones discuss research in terms of an active and significant intervention (Adams and Holman Jones, 2008, p.373-390). They state, ‘a practice, a writing form or a particular perspective on knowledge and scholarship, hinges on the push and pull between and among analysis and evocation, personal experience and larger social, cultural, and political concerns’ (Adams & Holman Jones, 2008, p.374). The primary goal of this interplay between self and other is to produce analytical, accessible outputs that change us and the world we live in for the better (Holman Jones, 2005, p.764). I aligned this with my aims for artistic research as a socially-engaged and effective process.

During the early stages of this study, I considered whether to directly involve ‘others’ in the research process. I contemplated gathering comparative evidence from the community to analyse alongside my own by documenting ideas, stories, descriptions and desires of home as well as differing home ‘situations’. I deliberated drawing at borders or refugee camps and collecting newspaper articles, imagery and data about migrants as possible drawing materials. However, unlike those involuntarily caught in the flow, I was privileged with choices over mobility. These approaches rendered me an external observer rather than a fellow participant in problems of home. Was I equipped to take up the anthropology[^73] or ethnography[^74] such viewpoints implied?

Benjamin’s essay *The Author as Producer* (1934), questions whether the ‘tendency’ or ‘commitment’ of the bourgeois author who ‘places himself on the side of the proletariat’ is right or just (Benjamin, 1998, p.85). To Benjamin, it isn’t good enough to assume the role ‘of a benefactor, of an ideological patron’: this is an ‘impossible place’ because the author’s own interests, culture and class are inescapably served over those he attempted to support (Benjamin, 1998, p.85). Hal Foster develops Benjamin’s thinking in *The Artist...*[^73]

[^73]: Generally understood as the comparative study of people, their evolutionary history, how they behave, adapt to different environments, communicate and socialise with one another. Anthropology is concerned with both the biological features that make us human (such as physiology, genetic makeup, nutritional history and evolution) and with social aspects (such as language, culture, politics, family and religion) (Royal Anthropological Institute, 2018). Seen as the tool of missionaries imposing their thinking on indigenous/native cultures and societies, it was accused of being in the service of the white, masculine, heterosexual, middle/upper-classed, Christian and able-bodied male (Denzin, Lincoln & Smith, 2008, pp.145-147). Trying to avoid this ethnocentric subjugation, present-day anthropologists offer my research useful questioning of ‘what do we have in common?’ and ‘what makes us different’.

[^74]: Ethnography is ‘the study of groups of people and their social interactions with a focus on the meanings lying behind those interactions’ (Iphofen, 2013, p.72). ‘A field-based research method – not unique to anthropology’, ethnography uses a range of connected research methods focused on social practices and communications to produce descriptive data that requires qualitative data analysis (Iphofen, 2013, p.1). It emphasizes ‘reflexive awareness by the researcher of their effects on the people being studied’ and the necessity to maintain basic ethical principles of ‘doing good, not doing harm and protecting the autonomy, wellbeing, safety and dignity of all research participants’ (Iphofen, 2013, p.1). I needed to think carefully about how my research affected others.
as Ethnographer? (1995). He claims that artists wishing to articulate and assist in the lives of others, often unconsciously overlap the ‘self’ onto the ‘other’ in an ‘ethnographic self-fashioning’ that dominates the resulting representation, and prevents the intended ‘selving’, seeing and telling of the ‘other’ (Foster, 1995, p.304). According to Foster, a trending ‘quasi-anthropological paradigm’ means that ever more socially-motivated art practices, productions and events deploy anthropology and ethnographic methods in theorising and representing cultural difference (Foster, 1995, p.302). He demonstrated that many artists, writers and researchers lacked understanding of how their description and analysis impacted on others.

As Sullivan puts it, ‘exotic appeal’ often leads to ‘superficial encounters’ and hinders the capacity to see from another’s position (Sullivan, 2010, p.166). Situating themselves as (outside) researchers of (exotic) others, artists posing as cultural theorists can inadvertently end up as cultural tourists because they have insufficient knowledge of the close links between representation, politics, and power play (Sullivan, 2010, p.166)76. Criticisms of artistic creativity carried out ‘in the name of’ or ‘for the sake of’ a social, cultural, economic or ethnic other, made my ideas for involving others appear inadequate and intrusive.77 The transitional communities, boundaries and shelters materialising problems of migration, were no place for my enquiries.

If I could not explore home from the perspective of the subjects who prompted my study, perhaps I should avoid an ethnographic stance altogether. Foster suggests the difficulty of articulating another’s life can lead artists to assume the site of artistic transformation is ‘out there’ in the field’; or that the other is ‘always outside’, in subjugated ‘alterity’ (Foster, 1998, p.302). His writings warned me to avoid ‘these binary structures of otherness’, and to resist perceiving myself as either outside or inside the group but to instead explore relational modes of difference and ‘mixed border zones’ (Foster, 1998, p.303). Hence, I sought ways to position myself within my research to draw out what was interconnected of the home experience as opposed to what differed.

75 A sustained interest for anthropology in contemporary art arose from the problematisation of obtaining, representing and communicating ethnographic findings and insights. For example, artists such as Susan Hiller, Jimmy Durham, Lan Tuazon, Nikki S. Lee, Bill Viola and Francesco Clemente share anthropological concerns for the ‘politics of representation’ (Schneider & Wright, 2006, p.19). For discussion on ethnography in current art practice see (Rutten et al. 2013).
76 Arnd Schneider has extensively addressed critical discussions of representing the ‘other’ in art and culture (Schneider & Wright, 2008); (Schneider, 2008); (Schneider & Wright, 2010).
77 I am indebted to Lucy Lippard’s Further Afield (2010) for making me ask the question ‘Is the artist wanted there and by whom?’ (Lippard 2010, p.32). ‘Every artist (and anthropologist) should be required to answer this question in depth before launching what threatens to be intrusive or invasive projects (often called ‘interventions’)’ (Rutten, van Dienderen & Soetaert, 2013, p.464).
AUTOETHNOGRAPHY

Researchers do not live in isolation, they are connected to social networks. Likewise, home is extricable from family and community. Rather than offering an outsider’s view, I needed to bridge the micro and macro to reveal wider relations with culture. This suggested a space for home’s critique in the relational concerns of self and other at the hybridization of boundaries ‘between’ autobiography and ethnography, or via the autobiographical active ‘within’ an immersive ethnography.  

I contemplated combining autobiography and ethnography as ‘autoethnography’: utilising personal experience, activities, relations and encounters (‘auto’); to develop understandings of home as a cultural construct (‘ethno’); via experiential, written and drawn practices and my subsequent reflective analysis upon them (‘graphy’) (Ellis, 2004). As Carolyn Ellis discusses, autobiography and ethnography come together in the doing and writing of an integrated autoethnography that is both research process and product. Such a methodology would support a productive relationship between personal storytelling, creative practice and critical scholarship (Holman Jones, 2005). So, was an appropriately political, social and self-conscious framework for my research.

Autoethnography seeks ‘to describe and systematically analyze personal experience in order to understand cultural experience’ state Ellis, Tony Adams and Arthur Bochner in Autoethnography: An Overview (Ellis, Adams and Bochner, 2011, p.1). It attempts to ‘extract meaning from experience rather than to depict experience exactly as it was lived’ (Bochner, 2000, p.270). I took it that autoethnographic methods would help me use my experiences of home to illustrate facets of cultural experience, thereby making constructs

---

78 Dipti Desai states ‘at a time when globalization and technological advances rupture national and cultural boundaries, artists are increasingly called upon to work in different sites across the world’ (Desai, 2002, p.321). Pushed to be social interventionists, artists often enter communities only briefly: a lack of engagement Desai calls ‘pseudo-ethnography’ (Desai, 2002, p.310). Desai’s call for researchers to either fully engage with experiences or step back, led me toward integration with community rather than observation.

79 As Carolyn Ellis points out ‘relational concerns’ are a crucial dimension of social enquiry (Ellis, 2007, p.25).

80 According to Ellis, autoethnographic researchers work to ‘connect the autobiographical and personal to the cultural and social’ by privileging ‘concrete action, emotion, embodiment, self-consciousness, and introspection’ (Ellis, 2004, p. xix).

81 The breadth of this article largely falls outside my research but its insight is invaluable to my understanding of research methods. It raises that, as part ethnography, autoethnography can be dismissed for being insufficiently rigorous, theoretical, and analytical, and too aesthetic, emotional, and therapeutic (Ellis, 2009; hooks, 1994; keller, 1995). Also, as part autobiography, autoethnography can be dismissed as being insufficiently aesthetic and literary and not artful enough (Gingrich-Philbrook, 2005; Moro (2006). However, Ellis, Adams & Bochner demonstrate that autoethnographic research can be simultaneously rigorous, theoretical, analytical, emotional and inclusive of personal and social phenomena. Proposing important questions for autoethnographers they introduce me to consider: Who reads my work? How are they affected by it? How does it keep a conversation going? (Ellis, Adams & Bochner, 2011).

82 As Holman Jones points out, “the ‘critical’ in critical autoethnography reminds us that theory is not a static or autonomous set of ideas, objects, or practices. Instead, theorizing is an ongoing process that links the concrete and abstract, thinking and acting, aesthetics, and criticism’ (Holman Jones, 2016, p.228).
of home more widely visible without the risk of self-fashioning.\(^{83}\)

Holman Jones argues for autoethnography as a valid way of ‘doing’ social research that involves ‘setting a scene, telling a story, weaving intricate connections among life and art, experience and theory, evocation and explanation…and then letting go, hoping for readers who will bring the same careful attention to your words in the context of their own lives’ (Holman Jones, 2005, p. 765). Personal narratives are empowered as a meaningful, moral and ethical means of introducing new ways of seeing, thinking and making sense of oneself and others.\(^{84}\) Autoethnographers accept the impossibility of total objectivity and how the subjective, emotional and experiential status of the researcher impacts on research in useful and informative ways. Thus, autoethnography established a place for my singular perceptions of house and home in this research.

---

\(^{83}\) Autoethnographers widen meaningful engagement with personal and cultural experience by producing accessible, readable outcomes that reach more diverse audiences than traditional research methods: enabling personal and social ‘change’ for more people (Bochner, 1997); (Ellis, 1995); (Goodall, 2006); (hooks, 1994).

\(^{84}\) Autoethnographic research grounded in personal experience, aims to sensitise audiences to issues of identity politics, to experiences shrouded in silence, and to forms of representation that deepen the capacity to empathize with other people (Ellis & Bochner, 2000)
PHENOMENOLOGY

Looking at the house and drawing it objectively failed to provide new knowledge of home that could be acted upon. Home is a cultural concept resulting from human categorisation of the world. Its ‘meanings’ shift, depending on differing circumstances, perspectives and environments. I hoped to reveal the cultural through personal engagement with physical and social spaces. This aligned my methods with the philosophical notion of phenomenology. Focused on how we consciously perceive the world, its emphasis is on ‘appearances’ as the product of human processing, rather than on an existent reality.85 Experiences are viewed in the context of culture; and their meanings understood based on values and concepts embedded in that culture.

Phenomenology encompasses various developments and applications of Edmund Husserl’s 1936 propositions of a transcendental science concerned with the possibilities, rules and limits of consciousness (Husserl, 1965).86 The most relevant branch for me was Maurice Merleau-Ponty’s inclusion of rationalist, empiricist and embodied aspects in the considerations of everyday life and human subjectivity, as explained in his 1945 book, *Phenomenology of Perception* (Merleau-Ponty, 2012). Harnessing Heidegger’s active spatial ‘being in the world’, Merleau-Ponty attempts to provide a direct description of experience formed ‘in the recesses of the body’ (Merleau-Ponty, 2012, p.x). One’s body ‘continuously breathes life into the visible spectacle, animates it and nourishes it from within’ (Merleau-Ponty, 2012, p.209). Seeing, hearing, smelling or touching our environment, we are ‘being’ embodied perceivers, amassing perceptions that intermingle with our cultural and experiential ‘knowing’ from remembered experience. He allows for consideration of objects to include where we are coming from, how we interrelate with them and what makes us distinguish them from other objects: ‘to see is always to see from somewhere’ (Merleau-Ponty, 2012, p.xi). Pertinently, he uses the house to explain:

The house has its water pipes, its foundations, and perhaps its cracks growing secretly in the thickness of the ceilings. We never see them but it has them, together with the windows or chimneys that are visible for us...[To] our present perception of the house... we can compare our memories with the objects to which

---

85 By ‘phenomena’, I mean an appearance, event, happening, experience: a human process.
86 Heidegger drew on the transcendental components of phenomenology to articulate his concept of ‘dasein’ or ‘being-in-the-world’ (Heidegger, 1962); Feminist appropriation of phenomenology as associated with Irigaray, Young and Judith Butler both critiqued the neutrality of its assumptions of experiences and appearances, and utilised phenomenological texts and methods for feminist purposes.
they refer [and] base our memory upon an immense world-Memory in which the house figures...that grounds its current being...The positing of the object thus takes us beyond the limits of our actual experience... [and] draws from the object everything that experience itself teaches us (Merleau-Ponty, 2012, pp.72-73).

Rather than the world existing objectively ‘out there’ and accessed through subjective experiences ‘in here’, Merleau-Ponty suggests ‘that we are open onto to the world and that we are embedded in it’ through bodily experience (Carman in Merleau-Ponty, 2012, p.xi). To him, ‘embodied sensory messages or memories are only explicitly grasped or known by us given a general adhesion to the zone of our body and of our life that they concern’ (Merleau-Ponty, 2012, p.166). From Merleau-Ponty, I understood why my visual methodology fell short in addressing home: this space needed sensual, bodily approaches.

Previous studies, many of which emerged from human geography87, demonstrated possibilities for theorising what was meant by home as a space. They acknowledged its paradoxical span; from the house and material commodities, to home as an emotional and idealised ‘imaginary’ constructed out of experiences, memories, activities and associations. The home that interested me was not defined by the margins of a house, land or nation but was a shifting hub of connectivity and interrelations. Marked by associations and interactions rather than physicality, it required communicative, imaginative, and adaptable methods. I argued that spatial theorists developed their hypotheses from outside rather than within or ‘through’ human experience. At once subjective and objective; multiple and relational; personal and political; home to some extent eluded textual interpretations. Fluid, immersive and ‘lived’, this cultural construct needed to be spatialized and visualised alongside the theoretical. Hence, it did not surprise me that Bachelard used phenomenology to descriptively prise it open:

According to Bachelard, poetry is embedded with experiences from which phenomenological readings can derive meaning. He suggests the house is ‘more than an embodiment of home, it is also an embodiment of dreams’ and uses a phenomenological analysis of the ‘poetic image’ to develop descriptions that transcend its existence as a geometrical object. (Bachelard, 1969, p.15). ‘The poet speaks on the threshold of being’ states Bachelard, ‘in order to determine the being of an image, we shall have to

---

87 Such as: (Johansson & Saarikangas, 2009); (Busch, 1999); (Smyth & Croft, 2006); (Blunt & Dowling, 2006).
experience its reverberation in the manner of Minkowski’s phenomenology’ (Bachelard, 1969, p.xvi). Anna-Teresa Tymieniecka’s critique of phenomenologist Eugène Minkowski’s philosophical and psychological studies, provides insight on Bachelard’s thinking (Tymieniecka, 1962, pp.141-142). She suggests that, ‘to Minkowski, the essence of life is not a feeling of being, of existence but a feeling of participation in a flowing onwards, necessarily expressed in terms of time, and secondarily in terms of space’ (Tymieniecka, 1962, p.141). My methods shifted to encompass the temporal and spatial intermingling between object and subject; self and the world this inferred.

‘There is no need to have lived through the poet’s sufferings’ says Bachelard, ‘the image is there, the word speaks’ by way of ‘proceeding phenomenologically to images which have not been experienced, and which life does not prepare, but which the poet creates’ (Bachelard, 1969, p.xxx). Following Bachelard, I considered the layers of intention, culture, memory and embodied perception affecting the author, reader and viewer triangulation. I embraced bodily ways of experiencing the house and reflected on my drawings as embodying a multiplicity of experiential knowledge. Architect, Juhani Pallasmaa emphasises the importance of tacit wisdom in drawing out the complexities of inhabited space. For Pallasmaa, a phenomenological intermingling is essential to our interaction, integration and understanding of the physical world: ‘my perception is not a sum of visual, tactile and audible givens: I perceive in a total way with my whole being’ (Pallasmaa, J, 2005, p.21). Raising my concern for the mimetic learning process he states:

> Human consciousness is an embodied consciousness; the world is structured around a sensory and corporeal centre... we are connected with the world through our senses. Our senses and entire bodily being directly structure, produce and store silent existential knowledge. The human body is a knowing entity (Pallasmaa, J, 2009, p.14).

I related this to Salman Rushdie's recognition of integration between object and subject through artistic work: ‘literature made at the boundary between self and the world, and during the creative act this borderline softens, turns penetrable and allows the world to flow into the artist and the artist to flow into the world’ (Rushdie, 1996, p.8). I took it that the artist embedded in their work and its embodied phenomenological qualities,

---

8Tymieniecka is quoted in a footnote beneath Bachelard’s mention of Minkowski in the 1962 translation (Bachelard, 1969, p.xvi)
could thereby existentially engage with the human condition.

Phenomenology helped me develop my drawing practice as an active process of embodied learning: a movement towards tacit knowledge. As argued by Harold Bailey, drawing enables ‘us to clarify an area of our experience that we cannot reach through words or language’ (Bailey, 1982 p.20). We habitually describe and fix our experiences of the world verbally but as Philip Rawson points out, ‘a huge number of other genuine, valid ‘forms’ of experience...for which we have no conventionally associated words...lie atrophied inert in our minds, unless we can find ways of bringing them forward into consciousness’ (Rawson in Bailey, 1982 p.20). In this way, my drawing articulated embodied experiences of home that could then be bodily experienced by others.

I questioned whether academics who focused their studies of belonging and identity on exclusion and homelessness, did so because their methods were unable to fully grasp the nature of home as a physical and imaginative phenomenon. Their textual approaches did not reach beyond the descriptive to get inside home as an internalised feeling or ideal. My immersive processes of remembering, touching, listening, thinking, moving, talking and drawing became embodied in the drawing product in ways that could be experienced by others, or even affect their use and view of the space. Nevertheless, what I saw in these outcomes was the house and not home.

---

89 Such as: (Watson & Austerberry, 1986); (Hodgetts & Cullen, 2005); (Anderberg, 2011); (McCarthy, 2015).
AUTOBIOGRAPHY

My art practice was habitually immersed in personal experiences, relations and activities. It was appropriate to try and locate myself in this research with the same centrality. Moving between rooms, I explicitly interrogated the space with which I was most familiar and my drawing to some extent translated, visualised, discussed and analysed its multifarious, mobile and relational nature. As outcomes accumulated, autobiographical narratives and representations emerged which I subsequently examined for traces of home or changes in my understanding of it.

In Developing Autobiographical Accounts as a Starting Point in Research (2013), Juana Sancho and Fernando Hernández-Hernández’ describe how research focused on the researcher pays attention to their relationships, identifies where they place themselves, and makes their contribution understandable in order to construct meaning from experience (Sancho & Hernández-Hernández, 2013, p.2). Despite such usefulness, in the context of research autobiographical approaches are often disregarded as insufficiently scientific, analytical and rigorous or too aesthetic, emotional, and therapeutic (Ellis, Adams & Bochner, 2011, p.36)\(^90\). This put into question whether my first-person perspectives would withstand accusations of confessional self-interest and self-indulgence\(^91\).

Social researchers demonstrating critical and objective methods previously avoided the (auto)biographical, presenting themselves as invisible in their texts. However, according to Patricia Leavy in Method Meets Art: Arts-Based Research Practice (2009), most present-day qualitative research practitioners agree that ‘the personal is always, to some extent, embedded within research practice and resulting knowledge’ (Leavy, 2009, p.37). I took it that, even if a researcher tries to write themselves out, their own position, understanding, impressions, associations and experiences are implicit in their final representations. Recognizing that true objectivity is impossible, researchers are increasingly driven to ‘expose that which factual representation conceals by its very implication’ says Leavy (Leavy, 2009, p.43). This raised my interest in the purposeful foregrounding of subjective positionality within research structures and processes.

\(^90\)See also: (hooks, 1994); (Keller, 1995).
\(^91\)In the context of research, autobiography is accused of being ‘irreverant, self-absorbed, sentimental and romantic’ (Ellis & Bochner, 2000). Sparkes engages interrogates negative critiques of autobiographical accounts arising from traditional understandings of the researcher’s role being outside, objective, neutral, rational, and invisible (Sparkes, 2002).
Recent academic discussions of developing methodologies in which the researcher forms the subject of their own enquiries reveal that self-study in which the researcher is ‘viewed as a viable data source’ is now commonplace (Leavy, 2009, p.37). Such approaches not only accept how the identity of the researcher can be negotiated, rewritten or irrevocably transformed by the research process but utilise this transformation in the research process. Leavy warns that personal evidence emerging from such research designs should not be mistaken for ‘a truth that has been discovered’, as such a reading can ‘render invisible those interpretations not put forth by the researcher’ (Leavy, 2009, p.43). Rather, if autobiographic narrative is to be successfully incorporated into research methodology it must ‘juxtapose systemic thinking with personal knowledge’ claims Walker (Walker, 2017, p.1). I became concerned with how personal stories could carry out and present my research whilst fulfilling scholarly obligations of hypothesising, analysing, and theorising.

According to Ellis, ‘autobiographers can offer aesthetic and evocative insights using techniques of ‘showing’ designed to bring ‘readers into the scene’—particularly into thoughts, emotions, and actions’ (Ellis, 2004, p.142). In this way, autobiography engages the reader/viewer in dialogue that allows them to ‘experience an experience’ (Ellis, 1993, p.711). This enabled a view of my drawing practice as a mode of ‘showing’ events, experiences, understandings and findings to others in accentuated or abstracted ways. To Bud Goodall, autobiography illustrates new perspectives on personal experience—on epiphanies—by finding and filling a ‘gap’ in existing, related storylines (Goodall, 2001, p.92) 93. Remembered moments or self-claimed ‘epiphanies’ supposedly direct the researcher to attend and analyse the shifts of everyday life, those happenings after which things don’t seem quite the same. 94 These epiphanies have ‘effects that linger—recollections, memories, images, feelings—long after a crucial incident is supposedly finished’ suggests Bochner (Bochner, 1984, p.595). In this notion of epiphany, I saw how the transformative experience of the autobiographer (in my case the move from not knowing to knowing something about home) could be shared, communicated, relived, understood or acted upon by others.

92 Autobiographical strategies that employ the ‘self’ as a key device of research are explored in relation to narrative enquiry and art-based research in (Ellis & Bochner, 2000); (Freeman, 2007); (Walker, 2017); (Sancho & Hernández-Hernández, 2013).
93 For discussion equating epiphany and experience (Zaner, 2004).
94 The ‘epiphany’ is variously discussed as the autobiography’s primary contribution to research projects (Goodall, 2001); (Couser, 1997); (Atkinson, 1997); (Denzin, 1989).
As mentioned, women’s personal writing about their day-to-day problems have informed us about home as a social, cultural and political space. Autobiographies written by men (recently understood as ‘traditional’ autobiography\(^95\)) have mainly been directed outwards, at professional, philosophical and political events.\(^96\) According to Rutherford, men tended to see home in terms of ownership and the desire to ‘feel at home’ when choosing to take time out of the public realm (Rutherford, 2011, p. 101). The linear histories of men’s autobiographies focus primarily on power and achievement in the public sphere, indicating that for them, home has not been a major issue\(^97\).

Until recently, the memoirs, house-keeping records, correspondence and diaries representing women’s real-life narratives weren’t considered part of the genre of autobiography.\(^98\) Similarly, scholars rarely deemed women’s self-representations worthy of ‘study’ as they didn’t attend to accomplishments regarded worthy of the title (Baer, 1993, p.1). According to literary critic Norinne Voss, in ‘no other literary genre as in autobiography have women produced such a varied and rich canon, yet received so little recognition for their achievements’ (Voss, 1986, p.218). Nevertheless, these ‘non-traditional’ autobiographies ground our knowledge of home and the oppressive, inescapable sense of duty it has meant to many women.

Employing autobiographic strategies and a female stance for my research meant contextualising my methodology within second-wave feminist debates connecting women, home and critical practices. According to Young, the concept of home is strongly associated with women’s interiority that many reject its value for social critique (Young, 2005, p.123). In rallying against the inequality and marginalisation suffered by women, feminist theory firmly positions home as a mechanism of oppression and exclusion (Weir, 2008, p.7). Gendering has so undermined home as a site of intellectual or creative rigour that theorists, researchers and artists often distance themselves from it for fear of their work being read as trivial or insignificant.

\(^95\) To Siegel ‘the assumptions of traditional autobiography mime many of the beliefs embedded in Western culture, eg. the centrality of white males, the privileging of mind over body, the importance of public versus private sphere, and so forth’ (Siegel, 1999, p.6).

\(^96\) ‘Autobiography has traditionally been a phallic discourse... a genre written by, controlled by, and defined by men’ (Siegel, 1999, p.10).

\(^97\) The most well-known and highly critiqued autobiographies are those of men such as Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Henry Adams, Jean-Paul Sartre, Henry James and Benjamin Franklin. Hence the genre is arguably shaped by focus on the public, professional and spiritual achievements of men.

\(^98\) Estelle Jelinek examines how women’s autobiography differs from men’s autobiography in content, narrative form, and projected self-image. (Jelinek, 2004).

\(^99\) For discussions on the extreme lack of women’s autobiographical material and scholarly criticism on it, see: (Voss, 1986); (Jelinek, 1986); and (Stanton, 1984).
Massey points out that certain spatial theorists claim it unhelpful to perpetuate a concept of home when so many are denied what it stands for (Massey, 2005, p.174). However, sociologist Alison Weir states, ‘in a world where millions of people are homeless, and millions more are refugees or immigrants whose displacement from home has emphatically not been chosen’ the idea that home is unworthy of academic consideration is ‘vaguely ridiculous’ (Weir, 2008, p.7). She claims that home requires urgent attention and must be reclaimed ‘as a space where we are able to recognize and confront power’ (Weir, 2008, p.7). I argued that understanding the complexity of practices and beliefs concealed within home was key to tackling global instability and socio-political difference. As Smyth and Croft point out, home is ‘a location wherein the dialectical nature of modern life’ can be ‘recognized and interrogated’ (Smyth & Croft, 2006, p.21). Whilst convinced that home was a worthy topic of academic enquiry, as a female artist-researcher, working in, at and about the home, I knew my drawing practice risked being folded inside it, hidden and disregarded.

In theorizing historical differences between men and women’s autobiographical writing, Patricia Meyer Spacks suggests women historically reacted to the confining limitations of home by circumventing them, operating so smoothly within limits that their subversions had no hampering effect (Spacks, 1973, p.27). Finding themselves inextricably immersed in home, women often challenged their difficulties creatively and imperceptibly. This directed my research to the function of women’s autobiographic practices as a means of both materializing home and altering its roles, relations and responsibilities from within.

I noted that women’s personal narratives and creativities were persistently embodied in the concept of home and vice versa. This led me to feminist philosopher Luce Irigaray’s view that an historical assimilation of women and home rendered women a kind of ‘place’ men returned to, but also left women somehow homeless: ‘instead of having a room of her own, woman is the home’ says Irigaray (Irigaray, 1993a, p. 41). According to Irigaray,

---

98 See: (Hardt & Negri, 2001); (Keiller, 2010); and (Donald, 1999) for discussion around ‘the (more or less conscious) loss of the possibility of home with which we live’ (Donald, 1999, p.150).

100 I refer to Deleuze’s concept of ‘The Fold’ that he visualises as a ‘sheet of paper divided into infinite folds or separated into bending movements, each one determined by the consistent or conspiring surrounding’ (Deleuze 1993, p.18). He describes an evolving space produced in relation to happenings and activities of which ‘the outside is not a fixed limit but a moving matter animated by peristaltic movements, folds and foldings that together make up an inside: they are not something other than the outside, but precisely the inside of the outside’ (Deleuze, 1986, pp.96-97). For Deleuze, the fold was a way of enmeshing different subjectivities: the effect of self on the self or the production of the self. To me, it is a way of thinking about home and women collapsing in on each other, indivisible and invisible. I also drew conceptual parallels with how the values of the public realm obscure private space.
‘the bodily-fleshly values’ of women and home have been conceptually interchangeable (Irigaray, 1993a, p.144). Suggesting that ‘woman’ has been made into the material support for man’s subjectivity, Irigaray assigns a similar transference to the relationship between mother and daughter. In her essay, *Gesture in Psychoanalysis* (1993b), she warns against either woman using the other to ‘house’ or protect herself, calling for their attention to the space that enables the other to breathe freely. Her poetic inferences of flowing embodied interrelations between the self and the other, and the self and the space of dwelling, informed my phenomenological notions of a social, physical and active intermingling of bodily self with the familial home, helping me to develop drawing practice as a cultivated ‘housekeeping’ or ‘home-making’ activity that shaped, organised, merged and created mobile spaces of home.\(^{101}\)

Irigaray’s notion that an active bodily space of mediation is created in reciprocal relation to another is taken up by art historian Vivian Sheng as a productive model of how an artwork mediates the space between artist and viewer, enabling possibilities of their encountering and interacting with each other (Sheng, 2016, p.34). According to Hilary Robinson, ‘in the site where it is, a spacing between body and signification’, Irigaray’s ‘morphology’\(^{102}\) offers a space of intersubjective play and identity offering potential for reading art practice (Robinson, 2006, p.100).\(^{103}\) I deduced that my autobiographical drawings of home, created an experiential space in which I and the viewer participated.

The mounting connections I was making between my body, autobiography and drawing caused me to revisit the problematic way women were commonly seen as embodied subjects, connected and represented by their biological nature and biorhythmic cycles (Felski, 1999, pp.15-31). To de Beauvoir\(^{104}\), the assumed reduction of woman to the biological body condemned her to repetition and immanence: ‘giving birth and suckling are not “activities”’, they are natural functions; no project is involved; and that is why woman found in them no reason for a lofty affirmation of her existence – she submitted passively to her biologic fate’ (de Beauvoir, 1997, p.94). De Beauvoir talks of woman as

---

\(^{101}\) The notions of ‘home-making’ put forward by Irigaray and those building on them such as Young and Weir were instructive to my methodology throughout (Irigaray, 2002); (Weir, 2008); (Young, 2005).

\(^{102}\) See: (Irigaray, 1993b, pp.97-98).

\(^{103}\) The argument that an artwork can function as a means of mediation for intersubjective communication in this way is discussed extensively by (Robinson, 2006, pp.97-124).

\(^{104}\) The traditional understanding of de Beauvoir is that her philosophical notions were rooted in the writing of Jean-Paul Sartre. More recently, her thinking has been connected to Martin Heidegger’s work. However, it is argued that *The Second Sex* builds on the phenomenology of the body put forward by Husserl and later developed by Merleau-Ponty (Heinämaa, 1999).
being both other and tied to bodily nature as a kind of biological ‘soul of the house, of the family, of the home’, reasoning that she was devoid of content precisely because society saw her like this (de Beauvoir, 1997, pp.208-210). Woman accepts ‘a philosophy at once so material and so spiritual’ that ‘she is not allowed to act; she is therefore subject to the given’ (de Beauvoir, 1997, p.631). Assumed to be trivial and limited to bodily materiality, her output is interpreted the same way.105

Importantly for my research, de Beauvoir calls on autobiography as a strategic means of confronting such marginalisation. Encouraging women to reinvent themselves, she said ‘the truth itself is ambiguity, abys, mystery: once stated, it must be thoughtfully reconsidered, re-created. It is all very well not to be duped [into being the woman society expects] but at that point all else begins’ (de Beauvoir in Reckitt & Phelan, 2001, pp.193-194). Rather than hiding talents behind a compliant feminine façade attentive to housework and family, de Beauvoir wanted women to distinguish themselves from home and be who they wanted to be.106 This strengthened my rationale to use autobiography as a means of articulating everyday experiences of home and moving beyond them.

Prior to de Beauvoir’s era, the content and dissemination of women’s autobiographical writing was effectively restricted to the private realm, so could only map the home in a limited way.107 However, theorist Marina Warner credits another historical form of women’s autobiography with greater reach: the nineteenth century family album.108 As laid out by Patrizia di Bello in Women’s Albums and Photography in Victorian England (2007), the domestic pastime of collecting, exchanging and displaying diverse materials in family albums arguably had a lasting effect on social conventions and visual sensibilities. I drew on her challenge to assumptions that personal imagery is only important to those for whom it has personal meaning.

Di Bello examines how women interrogated family life through creatively combining photography, writing, drawing and other memoiristic items in albums. Diarising familial narratives from their own perspectives, they reconstructed pictorial versions of everyday

---

105 Di Bello offers historical discussion around associations with biological, innate sensitivities ‘situating women’s experiences in the cyclical patterns of natural processes rather than in the historical self-consciousness of modernity’ (Di Bello, 2007, pp.151-152).
106 De Beauvoir subsequently demonstrated how this might be done through her own autobiographies (Curthoys, 2000).
107 For historical overviews of women literary autobiographers including Harriet Martineau, Margaret Oliphant, Annie Besant, Sara Coleridge, see: (Sanders, 1989); and (Peterson, 2001).
108 See also: (Warner, 1992) and (Brittain, 1999, pp.220-225); for discussion on the effective gender politics of Victorian women’s photo-collaged albums.
experiences in highly personalised ways. The events, encounters and relations documented therein, articulated home as ‘the central space for the production of the cultural norms and social meanings associated with the feminine and the family’ says Di Bello (Di Bello, 2007, p.26). Displayed in busy areas of the house, women’s albums were seen by men and women of their social groups. Unlike personal journals or literature written by and for women of the time, this subtly mediated autobiographical process strategically made public what was private. Portraying their lives as they chose, women manipulated opinions, relations and dynamics affecting home.

I aligned this museological handling of mixed media with the sort of gathering, sorting and presenting of spatial information in map-making. Women album-makers purposefully and artistically integrated the visual and textual, to not only record daily life but generate new social interactions and negotiate the normative of female spaces. Their orchestration of evocative familial material underpinned my use of diaries, lists and correspondence. Reworking their methods in the context of post-feminism, migration and contemporary drawing, I hoped to reveal new perspectives of home.

Autobiographical approaches were deemed relevant in other recent studies of home. To Smyth and Croft, ‘[home] impacts on the lives of everybody (including the researcher) in ways, and to a degree, that other phenomena do not’, so ‘there is always going to be a strong autobiographical impulse’ attending to its analysis (Smyth & Croft, 2006, p.21).

Blunt and Dowling suggest that when home and family are addressed through autobiography, meanings are made known that reach ‘far beyond an individual subject [or] a singular, static and bounded location’ (Blunt & Dowling, 2006, p.34). Mary Gordon discusses how changing concepts of home and the increasingly dispersed nature of family can ‘only’ be accessed and understood through the analysis of personal autobiography (Gordon, 2010). Thus, the autobiographical basis of my methodology was affirmed.

---

109 Di Bello’s PhD thesis and subsequent book primarily used the practices of Anna Birkbeck (Lady Waterlow) and Lady Mary Filmer as exemplars of Victorian album-making for analysis.

110 Consider only a narrow social group here as wider information on home is limited for the period. Rybczynski points out ‘that historical discussion about domestic life includes an important caveat: it cannot refer to most of the population’ (Rybczynski, 1986, p.23). The poor were often badly housed, in hovels without water or sanitation and with little furniture or possessions. So according to some historians, the concepts of ‘home’ and ‘family’ simply did not exist for them (Rybczynski, 1986, p.23).

111 The selected essays in their book derive from diverse disciplines such as literary criticism, sociology, cultural studies, history, music and architecture; and autobiography is a common thread (Smyth & Croft, 2006).
FICTION

My personal, emotional and experiential perspective necessarily impacted on this research. Intended or not, using myself as a data source meant the unavoidable involvement of other persons or groups; specifically, family members whose narratives of home entwined with my own. As Ellis, Adams and Bochner state, the researcher must ‘be able to continue to live in the world of relationships in which their research is embedded after the research is completed’ (Ellis, Adams and Bochner, 2011, p.29). An attendance to integrity and protecting the interests of anyone the research process might affect was key.

As Andrew Clark points out, no autobiography is wholly individual, personal or divisible from others, as the autobiography of others is always implicated in one’s own (Clark, 2011, p.13). ‘From the perspective of the other’s autobiography, one’s own autobiography is counted as the other’s autobiography’ so there is ‘in a strange way no such thing as one’s own autobiography’ he suggests (Clark, 2011, p.13). If ownership is always shared, then opening my autobiographical diaries, lists and personal exchanges to be viewed, would publicise the details of other lives. Such a position was unacceptable for an enquiry conducted in accordance with the ethical principles of academic research.

I questioned how other autobiographers dealt with those moments that were too difficult to claim, or potentially exposed them or others in unfavourable ways. This directed me to other women creatively addressing the intimacies of their homes and families through art practice\(^\text{112}\). In the context of feminist efforts for equality and inclusivity, artists of the 1970s and 80s brought attention to women’s everyday life, work and relationships. This focus on the personal as political saw autobiography put into service as a strategy\(^\text{113}\).

Considering how these inward studies of self and home led to intelligent and useful outward gazes that altered women’s position in wider society, revealed problems with theorists, audiences, critics and historians interpreting women’s art biographically.

Domna Stanton argues that the identification of ‘woman’ with the ‘autobiographical’ has had negative connotations when imposed on women’s creative practices (Stanton, 1984, p.6). According to Smith and Watson, critics analysing women’s art often ‘place the emphasis on bios, the biographical life, to ‘explain’ the artist’s history: conversely, the

\(^\text{112}\) See Women (in Literature Review) for details of these artists.
\(^\text{113}\) See Strategy (in Literature Review) for discussion around feminist art practices critiquing the home and the personal as political.
artist’s life history is invoked to elucidate the work’ (Smith & Watson, 2002, p.8). Whether women’s output comes from a position of emancipation or not, their private backgrounds are frequently taken as implicit in the work and given more consideration than artistic skill, qualities or contexts. To Stanton, the autobiographical reading is thus ‘wielded as a weapon to denigrate’ (Stanton, 1984, p.6). Making assumptive connections between women’s creativity and their home or family life, effectively denies their artistry and replaces it with the incidental or biological.

I attempted to devise methods that utilised, exposed or circumvented these issues. Those women confronting cultural and spatial limitations through creative activities such as album-making, depended on their mediations being disregarded as trivial and meaningless feminine pastimes. Had their practices been regarded as subversive or challenging at the time, the products of their endeavours would no doubt have been removed from public display and their influence defeated. Women album-makers utilised the invisibility that an assumed ineffectuality and biographical basis afforded their practice, to deploy constructed narratives and intervene in social relations without upsetting the strict boundaries of privacy, family and morality they lived by.

In contrast to the interiority imposed on women in the past, the borders of my home were porous, fluid and indistinct. Rather than a confined and static place, the space that confronted me was a hub of changeable networks: familial, professional, infinitely social, and inextricably linked to the public world. Yet despite having lost some of its fixed and physical grounding, the contemporary home was still to some extent characterised by privacy and invisibility. I was aware that bringing authentic personal experiences of home into the public realm to be read, would mean these experiences were no longer seen in the context of privacy. If I was to offer up my own life ‘truthfully’, people would frame it within their own social and cultural terms of reality.

Researching artists strategically constructing autobiographical narratives such as Tracey Emin and Mary Kelly, I learnt more about concealing artistry and accentuation behind the
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114 Griselda Pollock critiques the similar tendency of art histories to ‘index’ works of art ‘directly to experience’ (Pollock, 1999, p.97).
115 See Women (in Literature Review) for discussion of how women were seen to lack the content, independence or artistic control to create art other than that which ‘naturally’ arose from their personal and biological circumstances. Establishing a methodological position for my research in relation to this and avoiding my drawings being viewed as biologically determined has been a key concern.
116 For example, if a woman is presented cooking, ingrained ideas of women’s roles define how she is seen, not her ability to cook. Furthermore, the moment it becomes apparent that women are autonomous, explicit and active, then home arguably becomes something else as a place or node of interaction or node of external networks.
validity and truth presumed by the notion of autobiography. I considered deploying a fictional persona to act out the research journey in my stead. However, this would return to the false objectivity of traditional research methods and incur new difficulties of distinguishing between an avatar’s point of view and my own. Ellis, Adams and Bochner claim that ‘adding some ‘telling’ to a story that ‘shows’ is an efficient way to convey information needed to appreciate what is going on’ (Ellis, Adams & Bochner, 2011, p.11). Embedding the results of my research in a fabricated narrative and timeline to some extent detached from lived reality would adequately serve my purpose. Hence, Bourgeois became my methodological guide. From her, I learnt ways to present my research with honesty whilst using an appropriately protective device. I settled on an autobiography that told of personal experience through a partially fictionalised construct.
BRICOLAGE

As I wrote up my research and reflected upon all the drawings made and the methods used, it was apparent that no specific methodology had dominated throughout. Rather, I utilised different methods at different times and in different ways. From an ethnographic starting point, it seemed my methodological considerations took on the kind of hybrid intermingling of creative visual arts practice, writing and autobiography that di Bello identified in the collaging of women’s albums. As an artistic process of sticking various materials onto a surface, the term collage aptly described the practical, conceptual and methodological ways in which I pieced together disparate elements and techniques.

Collaging is an effective practice of making do with materials immediately to hand. To Leavy, it engages with and disrupts the debris of the everyday, remixing and re-altering it in ways that cut across disciplinary boundaries (Leavy, 2017, p.359)\textsuperscript{117}. Hence when collage and related terms such as ‘montage’, ‘métissage’ or ‘bricolage’ are used in discussions of research praxis, they refer not just to artistic techniques but to larger philosophical issues in qualitative and art-based research (Leavy, 2017, pp.358-359). According to Chambers, they imply cross-breeding or construction that aligns with a commitment to ‘the blurring of genres, texts and identities’ (Chambers et al., 2008, p.142). The academic ‘bricoleur’ (or ‘tinkerer’ translated from French) handles a complex interpretative, narrative, theoretical, political and practice-based methodological bricolage derived from differing fields.

Denzin and Lincoln spoke of researchers merging multiple methods to add depth, complexity, and rigor as they ‘put slices of reality together [to create] psychological and emotional unity’ to produce ‘a reflexive collage or montage: as set of fluid, interconnected images and representations connecting the parts to the whole’ (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011, p.5-6). Ainslie Yardley discusses how present-day research bricoleurs embrace transparency and reflexivity as they integrate disparate stories and research findings within a narrative (Yardley, 2008). To Weinstein and Weinstein, a bricolated methodology is an ‘emergent construction’ of textual and visual forms that continually reconfigures in response to changing contexts of research (Weinstein & Weinstein, 1991, 117

\textsuperscript{117} Drawing on Gerstenblatt (2013), Leavy points out that collage as a technique ‘signaled the postmodern turn because it was a cultural practice that, through the deconstruction of an object’s previous intent and the resulting shifting interplay of multiple additional meanings, challenged the idea of objectivity or of a singular reality (Leavy, 2017, p.359).
Through these connections, I came to see my role of researcher as that of a maker and assembler of evolving visual, textual and experiential stories.

So, the methodological considerations that finally culminated in the research design herein were not strictly definable as ethnographic, autobiographic, or even autoethnographic. Instead it turned out that home required a fluid, spatial, mobile and evolving bricolage of methods. Nevertheless, drawing practice remained the primary means of creating new knowledge about home, as an ‘emotional, social and cultural experience that could not otherwise easily be articulated’\textsuperscript{118} (Leavy, 2009, p.42). Out of my lengthy reflexive deliberations, I developed a way to use the personal experiences, observations, relations and encounters articulated through my drawing processes and outcomes as legitimate research data. Spatialised, visualised and mapped, the conceptual spaces of home I presented, ranged from observations of the place that housed me, to constructed diaries, calendars, lists and correspondence.

The story that framed these results was necessarily told as a woman, as neither home nor the ‘non-traditional’ autobiographic formats I used were quite the same for men. The engagement with artists and theoretical materials of all kinds throughout the project, was reflected upon from a mediated and strategic point of view. Articulations of the building with which my drawing practice intermingled did not accurately correlate with that I inhabited, but tested how contemporary concepts of home stretched from dwellings to day-dreams. The subsequent ‘showing’ of daily life did not directly recount my personal histories but was an inextricable mix of experience and artistic imagination. Dialogue and exchanges supposedly recorded through drawing practice, were merely re-presentations of the way my family functioned. Although suggestive of private conversations, the mass of textual demands and obligations written up for viewers to read, purposefully emphasised home as an internalized and mobile sense of duty. Ultimately the re-conceptualisations of home that materialized through artwork, debate and analysis was laid out for myself and others to see via an overarching narrative: a story that could best ‘tell’ how my understandings of home had transformed.

\textsuperscript{118} I note that this was a sentence used to describe an autoethnographic research methodology.
THE NARRATIVE

Since childhood, I readily moved from house to house developing little attachment to any. Habitually privileging opportunity over community, I preferred mobility to settling and was rewarded by a successful career. Until now, I guiltily passed on the responsibilities of homemaking and hands-on mothering to others. Finally, I was leaving the city job and nanny behind and heading out of the city to turn the dilapidated coastal property my husband and I had fallen for, into the perfect family ‘home’ for us and our teenage son.

My design skills resurfaced in drawing layouts of every measurement, material and detail of the Georgian interior. I gained respect adapting spaces originally defined by 19th Century notions of morality to open-plan living. Yet once the holiday let, recording studio and family areas were realised, I didn’t feel ‘at home’. As project managing gave way to household duties, I lacked the metaphorical and physical space of independence Virginia Woolf described as a ‘room of one’s own’ (Woolf, 1929, p.3). The home I had imagined was a place of relaxation, retreat and choice. What was wrong?

I faced the house I had redrawn with accusation. Why hadn’t it relinquished the home I desired? People referred to their houses as ‘homes’ but what did they actually feel? What sort of homely connection was I looking for? Perhaps home was merely a fantasy in my head. If so, then why did I allow its daydream to operate my life? Why did I feel so strongly about wanting to see it, touch it and feel it? Perhaps the drawing practice that sustained me during the refurbishment could be extended to reveal more of home than its measured representations had to date. I formulated some research questions to guide me: ‘Can drawing methods articulate contemporary expectations of ‘home’? Is it possible to make house into home through drawing practice? Can the 21st Century line usefully interrogate diverse experiences and concepts of home?

Starting out from a practice anchored in the architectural methods and perspectives of Renaissance conventions, I founded my opening methodology on vision. I then followed the historical development of spatial drawing towards an expanded field of contemporary line. By progressing through different methods of articulating my living and working space, I hoped to bring home into view. Searching for time and space to draw, the quiet

---

119 The modernisation of dwellings as ‘based on ideals aimed at separating the sexes and domesticating women while solidifying the border of female domestic space (Ruckenstein, 2009, p.246).
and uncontested cellar became my studio. Yet is wasn’t isolation but familial interruptions and encounters that generated drawings. So, I began moving between rooms in a ritualistic preparation of site, allowing the space and those sharing it to impact on my lines. Focused on the house and its objects, I learnt how narratives, participants and time invested in a thing increased its value for exchange. Using plans as ground, drawing mapped its own acts of looking and line-making as flowing inks, oscillating stitches and threading paths.

Conflicts arose from carrying out drawing in this private, familial safe-haven, raising unexpected gender imbalances. I tracked ingrained assumptions to the temporal and spatial impositions of Industrialisation and Victorian morality. Facing the political ‘backlash’ against feminist severity, I appropriated autobiographical strategies of feminist artists previously confronting women’s interiority and marginalisation.

Heeding Wassily Kandinsky’s call for the ‘transference of line into a free environment’, I captured bodily movements using a pinhole camera (Kandinsky in Lindsay & Vergo, 1994, p. 425). I followed Paul Klee taking his dot for a walk to trace household tasks as burns, dust and graphite pools (Klee, 1920, p.103). Recalling artists Peter Fischli and David Weiss wasting, spending and playing with time, I avoided chores by laboriously sampling liquids, typing lists, stuffing bandages with objects, and sewing metres of rope from single socks.

Drawn out between viewer and the viewed, my lines primarily portrayed physical acts and materials bounded by the house. Immanuel Kant wrote of vision leading ‘the subject, by reflection, to know the object as a thing outside him’, suggesting the distant observer was prevented ‘from arriving at a concept of the object’, (Kant in Foster, 2010, p.132). Was the gap between subject and object why home still eluded me?

Through artist’s eyes, I observed the space from differing viewpoints but could not articulate all its textures and materials. Instead of drawing out a sense of home, I could only stand back and rethink the house from afar. To Irigaray, the cultural ‘predominance of the look over smell, taste, touch and hearing has brought about an impoverishment of

---

For discussion of whether a ‘major political backlash’ arose in response to the extremes of 1970s and 80s feminist activism, see (Oakley & Mitchell, 1997). Rutherford points out that after any war there is a ‘backlash’, she suggests ‘feminism is not a word that is used in organisational life...relentless media attacks on feminists and feminism...resulted in a wholesale rejection of the term despite its aim being to end gender inequalities (Rutherford, 2011, p.13).
bodily relations’ (Irigaray in Jay, 1994, p.493). Placing myself at angles to this physical shelter, did not satisfy the visceral and emotional yearning within. Visual methods had familiarised me with the house but not home.

Seeing the house from different perspectives did not ‘grasp the unity of the object without the mediation of bodily experience’ (Merleau-Ponty, 2012, p.209). As a child on the move, I individuated dens and unfamiliar spaces with my hands, bodily creating imaginary identities of belonging. Bachelard conceived the house as ‘built by and for the body, taking form from the inside, like a shell, in an intimacy that works physically’ (Bachelard, 1969, p.101). Moving to a new ‘shell’ required realigning the body with its spaces. Wanting this intermingling corporeal interrelationship, I shifted to sensorial, phenomenological methods. My lived experiential body became the metaphorical and physical centre of embodied investigative drawing.

To Merleau-Ponty, ‘a single embodied subject could successively see from different positions, only if the ‘seen from here or as seen from over there’ incorporated an awareness of the viewer’s body movement relative to the space it inhabited (Merleau-Ponty, 2012, p.209). Feeling my way around, I manipulated, enacted and pressed up against the house, conceiving it as another living, breathing and pulsating body. I imagined flows of data, electricity and water connecting inside to outside, rendering its skin porous. I sculpted the speaker wire pervading its walls into branching vascular systems that hung intrusively.

I touched, inhaled, listened and moved through rooms taking in lines I hadn’t noticed before, from woodworm bores beneath my toes, to planes of cold air in the hall. I questioned which lines constituted drawing and decided that my bodily intervention made a swathe of dust, or indent in a cushion ‘drawn’. To Tim Ingold, human beings continually generate lines by walking, talking and gesticulating, so the process of drawing subsumes speaking, gesturing and moving around (Ingold, 2007, p.1). These thoughts joined overheard dialogue in the fastidiously drawn words formed by my hand.

Fastidious documentation became intricate spirals that cracked and faltered. Marking time like tree rings, they captured familial interdependencies and tensions with those accustomed to my availability. Hearing distant music foregrounded how conversations,
activities, movements, involuntary bodily functions and the outside were aurally interconnected. Soundwaves didn’t fix the space or get confined by its configurations but responded to the environment and thereby embodied it. Deleuze stated ‘art is not a matter of reproducing or inventing forms, but of capturing forces’ (Deleuze, 1981, p.57). Applying this to my drawing, I recorded noise floors, layers, voices and sounds turning the resultant audio files into visual waves. Although this software output was another’s interpretation, I valued its playback of familial conversations and the growing tolerance for drawing it revealed.

Contest for space faded and my repetitive replacing became centred on the once-formal drawing room. A workspace took ownership amongst the antiques, punctuated by my recurrent honing down and re-arranging of collected objects, drawings and evidence. As I moved in plan chests, books, drawings and equipment, the limitations of my embodied methodology became clear. According to Young, phenomenology ‘describes the feelings, motives, and reactions of subjects as they affect and are affected by the context in which they are situated’ (Young, 1990a, p.13). I had gained insight on practices, happenings and performances but my study remained restricted to ‘one’s own corner in the world’ (Bachelard, 1984, p.24). ‘For any lived body [the world] appears to be populated with opacities and resistances correlative to its own limits and frustrations’ (Young, 1990a, p.149). Either my body was too dumb to discover how home operated in the world, or the house was holding it back.

I concluded that the family abode could not provide the sense of belonging I wanted. Unless my research was recognised within broader discourses and debates, it risked being confined to the interior and disregarded. The space I sought was one of significance and academic status: of professional artist researcher. As conference papers, lectures and research groups drew my attentions elsewhere, I kept in touch via my phone. So, the final shift in my methodology was characterised by leaving the house in search of home. My project entered a world marked by human migration, where having a fixed building, community or geographical location of belonging was increasingly a privilege. Whether suffering forcible transnational displacement or moving for a new lifestyle, identity was evermore fluid and mobile. New modes of travel and communication incurred physical and social dislocation of space. Information technologies rendered the boundaries of privacy flexible and porous (Rutherford, 2011, p.99). Work invaded personal time and
space\textsuperscript{121}, whilst household duties were frequently fulfilled remotely via mobile devices.

Male or female, employed or not, those responsible for meeting domestic needs, now carried the burden with them\textsuperscript{122}. As my phones message showed, familial expectations once confined to the interior were internalised and travelling. In abandoning housebound drawing methods, all I took with me were the stored calendars, lists, contacts, maps, photographs and correspondence with which I managed everyday relations and obligations. It occurred to me that should the house burn down, I would save my phone before anything. If this technology was more important to me than houses and objects, perhaps home was somehow bound up in its amassing archive. I recalled Young saying, ‘people exert pressure on one another to conform to expected behaviours, and they want others to act in ways that further specific ends and purposes’ (Young, 2005, p.163). Might home be a zone of influence shaped by what I ‘owed’ people to whom I anchored a sense of self and belonging? Did similar ties, trades, contracts and dialogue then negotiate international spaces of home?

The daily demands of interchanging domestic, creative and professional roles were laid out in the arrangements and conversations archived in my phones memory. If home was an inter-relational space constituted by social interdependencies and negotiations, then here it was being mapped without my even trying. Communications theorist, Adriana de Souza e Silva commented, ‘the feeling of belonging to one’s communicative network is no longer dependent on a specific place or physical presence, but on space and message exchange’ (Kavouri & Arcenaux, 2006, p. 30). As flows dissolve spatial boundaries, the residual desire for privacy and home is in part being met by the intimate and unmediated spaces of phones.

I hadn’t put pencil to paper since looking away from the physical house. However, by my own bodily measure of the drawn line, I had been drawing all the time as I thumbed, typed and pointed. In this way, the phone records recording my daily life were drawings. After reading Pallasmaa, I viewed ‘thinking through drawing’ as dependent on the pencil

\textsuperscript{121} According to Rutherford, ‘there was an assumption that technology would free people up to spend more time at home with their families or in leisure, as work became more efficient’ (Rutherford, 2011, p. 99). Instead it has meant longer working hours and an expectation of availability that has pervaded personal time and space.

\textsuperscript{122} Prior to portable communications technologies being ubiquitous, if the “keeper” of the house was travelling, at work, or simply away, they were unlikely to be called upon to deal with minor occurrences and petty familial demands. Their absence would probably be covered by delegating another in their place.
becoming effectively conjoined with the hand, to the point of being automatic (Pallasmaa, 2009, p.17). This related to Sylva’s description of computers, phones and tablets as transparent interfaces ‘that do not show because they are functional, and their use is already embedded in our everyday lives’ (Kavouri & Arcenaux, 2006, p.26). I argued that touch screens and keyboards were invisible, mimetic drawing tools and that the resulting lines of text articulated the home I carried with me.

Despite the global connectivity enabled, I perceived my portable devices as hidden, personal and private spaces. Yet it took just minutes to download an application\textsuperscript{123} and access the extraordinarily comprehensive autobiographies they held. Converted to spreadsheets, the chronologies were easily sorted, read and manipulated. These data flows spanned the research process, mapping the transformation of my experiential and conceptual knowledge of home.

Five years of material originally discarded in an instant, was re-read for weeks then reduced to wallpaper. Alphabetically sorted and centred, repetitious blocks of tasks, deliveries, orders and appointments resembled soundwaves, their patterns accentuated through repetition, selection and manipulation. Suggestion and communication were privileged over authenticity in constructing affective autobiographical narratives.

Reflecting on my spatial reconceptualization affirmed the irrelevance of old interpretative models assigned to physically fixed places of safety and retreat. The thousands of lines in my drawings traced back through printers, computers, keyboards, screens and the touch of a hand to individual lines of thought. From these visualisations, home emerged as a mobile, flexible and interrelated multiplicity of diverse perspectives and collective voices.

\textsuperscript{123} The SMS Export application converts backed up phone data to TEXT, CSV, HTML, EXCEL enabling browsing/editing (Farenga, 2015)
HOUSE

I have always loved the idea of home. For as long as I can remember, I wanted a home of my own where I could relax, be myself and spend time with the people and objects of my choosing. Unlike those living with violence, poverty or forcible displacement, mine was the sort of comfortable, unremarkable life in which it was assumed I had a home to retreat to. Yet somehow the home I had in mind was always just out of reach. From being a small child moving around every couple of years to a music manager on the road, the yearning for a more settled safe-haven was swept along in a string of houses and communities with which I made little attachment. Why did none of these very habitable places seem to yield the sense of self and belonging I was looking for? What was it about the seemingly fundamental concept of home that made it so hard to pin down? Perhaps I had simply not found the right house yet or put enough effort in to grow roots?

When my husband and I had our son, the pressures of city living kept us both hard at work and I found nannies and cleaners to fill in for me. As Massey points out, there is a tendency ‘to equate the home with ‘woman’ and to a certain extent I felt it was my responsibility to be the homemaker (Massey, 2005, p.174). Wherever I went, I carried with me the sense of guilt for not being a hands-on mother. There was always a nagging feeling I should be more ‘present’. When my son hit teenage and seemed to need more guidance and security, the pressure to come up with the ideal home for the three of us became unbearable. It was time to change our lifestyle and move to the country so we could spend more time together as a family. All we needed was to find the right house.

Once the decision had been made, we quickly fell in love with an imposing and needy thatched property, miles away from the hub of the industry in which I had plotted long and hard to belong. Gazing at the seascape from its elevated position, our perspective on the world shifted. As my son navigated the corridors and staircases chanting ‘Can we live here? Can we live here?’ we decided this would be the sort of home to stay in the family for generations. Four months later we had crossed the line, handed over the keys to our townhouse and taken a grip on the run-down and neglected old pile. With our possessions in storage and a small two-room wing demarcated as family territory, I began tentatively project-managing the refurbishment whilst my husband worked away.
I had a diverse background in creative industries. Originally graduating with a design degree, I began my career in animation. Drawing meandered with me as I moved through film and photography touching up stills. In retrospect, I became gradually distanced from the hand-drawn line as film production and music management came to the fore. My digital graphic skills were called on for publicity material, album covers and videos but long-term, I found myself pushing a different sort of pencil, one occupied by accounts, contracts, budgets and travel itineraries. An artist friend of mine believed that creativity ate you up from the inside if it wasn’t given an outlet. Perhaps the sudden decision to realign my living and working situation traced back to the empty page left when drawing got lost in the background. Whatever the reason for the reconfiguration, I severed connections with my line of work and dropped out of the music business without regret.

In surveying the project of renovating the house, I needed to figure out our needs and reorganise the space accordingly. The designer in me came back into play as I drew up electrical, plumbing and building blueprints. I measured areas, drafted ground plans, scanned for problems, detailed intricate works and plotted positions of sockets, light fittings, pipes, masonry and carpentry. Each trade was marked out in layers then printed onto large sheets of paper hung on the walls around the house to be studied, amended and sometimes just frustratingly disregarded [Fig.1].

As local workmen stripped, scraped, scrubbed, poisoned, sprayed, sanded and dug, I went from room to room seeking a way forward. In hatching out my ideas I defaced the blueprints, my lines and notes growing beyond the confines of the paper and onto the crumbling plaster beyond. Every floor was raised, every wire and pipe replaced, every wall and ceiling re-plastered, as I outlined projections for the house to encompass a family abode, a holiday let and my husband’s recording studio. Drawing absorbed my every spare minute in one way or another. Studying the physical minutiae of corners, edges and surfaces of the house, I felt connected to the future of these rooms but also to the histories that defined them. Even the cavities behind walls and the voids beneath floorboards came under the scrutiny of my observations and representations.

Engrossed in drawing out the house, I caught glimpses of past configurations and practices. As positions and directives were penciled onto walls, I noticed the layers of paint and dated wallpapers of prior occupants expressing themselves.
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In many parts, the artisan construction beneath was laid bare. Hand-riven oak, horsehair, 
flint, clay and a mixture of stones that had come to the cobber’s hand were exposed. As I 
etched my own aspirations into the fabric of the house, I wondered what practical, 
aesthetic and social objectives these original craftsmen fulfilled.

Although structurally sound, the once impressive house was depressing to behold when 
we took it on. A Grade 2 Listed building and a landmark on the local map, it arguably 
needed substantial restoration but I set out with an aim of chiefly recovering its façade 
and reinstating utility. However, as I evaluated and redefined its areas I was increasingly 
immersed in contemplating its interior. Fixated by the long-overlooked spaces, I 
examined them from all possible angles and viewpoints. I looked again and again until I 
came to know the contours, features and imperfections in intimate detail throughout. 
This intent observation of the physical building drew me into deeper consideration of its 
past. An indent on a doorframe; a bubble in the glass; a curve of a wall; or a gash across a 
floorboard led me to envision tableaus of inhabitants, objects and activities. The house 
was an immersive landscape for my creative imagination as I followed its scenes to other 
planes of thinking, often rendered oblivious to the frenetic activities around me.

I recalled focusing intently on marks in a fireplace, then being jolted back to reality by a 
carpenter wanting his measure back. I was poring over the decision whether to smooth 
over these irregularities in the slate, or let them lie. I wanted to picture what event had 
caused them. Heavy tongs might have been dropped on the hearth from a height but I 
wasn’t sure. Maybe another time I would look again at the same spot and see differently. 
Perhaps it would dawn on me what gesture and implement had left such a signature. The 
need to explore this surface again made me put the sandpaper aside. Increasingly 
intrigued by my historical surroundings, I watched out for the abstract markers and 
forgotten traces of lives that were no longer visible in other ways. After closer inspection, 
I usually ensured these peculiarities remained intact.

There were many grounded aspects to deal with, including the negative listed buildings 
officers who detected problematic details and laid down lines that weren’t to be crossed. 
At one point their patchy insubstantial knowledge led to withholding planning permission 
to take a wall down that they had marked as a founding boundary of a 1600s structure.
The local museum offered documents establishing that it was merely part of an added Victorian male privy but the council flatly refused to review their decision.

The earliest visual representation of the house that I knew of, indicated a large site cut into steeply sloping land on the tithe map dated 1841 and drawn up around 1820. According to a museum historian, there was record of tax being paid on the land around 1822 but no prior details were traceable. His colleague dated the construction of the house around 1820 and pointed out Gothic revival drip window mouldings and the Georgian hardwood handrail to support his estimates. The museum lacked imagery of these locally distinctive architectural features, so I repaid their scrutiny with illustrations sketching external details, taking rubbings of cornices and cutting profiles of architraves.

According to the records, the house was conceived and commissioned by four sisters. This contrasted with normal social and economic parameters of the time. Evidently these women were exceptions to the norm and must have remained unmarried, as their wealth and property would have passed immediately to the male relative. Documentation placed them previously at a picturesque but unremarkable cottage on the lower boundary of the seven-acre plot over which our house originally surveyed. The museum staff were familiar with the older residence and suggested a resemblance with its principal features. They concluded that the architect probably didn’t have a blank page for his designs but instead reconfigured elements the sisters liked in the former house: redrawing them to please the Georgian eye for lighter and more spacious living. Now drawing the spaces that emerged from their visions, I wondered if these women ever put pencil to paper in transforming their ambitions into the house I now studied.

I pictured the original family taking in the spectacle of the raging sea cliffs and transcribing it through the limited creative activities considered appropriate for women at that time. Drawing was encouraged alongside needlework, dancing and music as female attributes considered attractive to prospective suitors. The sisters may have avoided being married off into subservience but in a house of such social standing it was realistic to assume they learnt the skills to visually articulate their ideas in two-dimensional lines.

As I conjured up a course of action to insert doorways and erase walls, I relied principally on visible sensibilities. My decisions about what was important arose from the eye. It wasn’t design trends, fashionable décor or the creation of scenes to impress others that
underlined my directions. My paths were guided by deeply riven perceptions of how things should look and fit, just as lines composed a drawing on a page. Symmetry and balance were alluring, as were neutral paints sinking into the surface of the house as if they always belonged, subtly throwing up different tones at different times of day.

Hatching out plans for the building’s development, I imagined them mapped over those anticipated by the sisters. When the original house came into being, it would have projected very different sensitivities than my own. The historians suggested the separate staircases, designated staff areas and clearly delineated public and private reception rooms, indicated the era’s tendency to section off public or semi-public space from the private household. Each room was assigned a definite function to emphasise social hierarchies. One end of the house had impressively high ceilings, ornate plasterwork and awe-inspiring vistas of the coast. It was suggested that around eight staff would have lived in the markedly more modest elevation of the west wing.

Tracing its histories, I learnt that the house had tended to be concurrently both a restful familial retreat for some and primarily a workplace for others. An elderly neighbour, who lived in what was once the walled vegetable garden of the original property, recalled how the main house took on a range of guises as a restaurant, a nursery school and even a small hotel. In her house hung a penned sketch of ours, which had been copied as the basis of restaurant menus and business cards. My mother’s friend came to see how the house had changed since she lived in it as a child. Describing croquet lawns, tennis courts and rose gardens, she left me with an afterimage of her father happily living out his dying days upstairs as he drew the view. The owner of the converted stable block was born in the house. Elaborating on his memories, he told me his parents altered its layout in the 1960s. Until he was 15 it was divided as North House, South House and The Coach House.

As I layered up mental images of the house from different perspectives, I saw it had rarely if ever been the sort of private family home I had initially assumed of it. Instead the activities it witnessed over the centuries had tended to encompass the public alongside the familial. Furthermore, drawing in one form or another had often characterised the house and was imprinted on the memories of those who lived here, from the embellished signatures on land registry documents exchanging hands to my son’s school friends who attended the nursery and remembered art classes in the garden.
Once preliminary structural layouts for the workmen were less in demand, I detailed shapes and images on ground plans, plotting furniture configurations throughout the house. Balancing more luxuriant familial requests against justifiable essentials, I perused how the house interior had been designed and adapted to fulfil differing economic and social aspirations. The dining room had most likely delineated the centre of social relations and dialogue during the 1800s. My family on the other hand, had never seen the need for a formal dining space. We generally ate casually at the kitchen table or on the sofa with trays. Yet I found myself aligning with convention and resisting the idea of incorporating the dining space into the multifunctional adaptations affecting the rest of the house. Perhaps it was the sense of ritual and tradition that urged me to defend this room against change and to depict a large table within its printed outline on the plans.

Social historian Amanda Vickery articulated an intimate perspective on the ideologies that were shaping British society and defining domestic life during the early years of our house. In her book *Behind Closed Doors* (2009), she referenced historical evidence such as household accounts, legal records, correspondence, literature and imagery to show how socially gendered separations were manifested in the physical fabric and structure of a Georgian house. According to Vickery, ‘architecture, fixtures and furniture created only the framework of an interior on which settled a layer of objects crafted by women’ (Vickery, 2009, p.231). Rooms of the time were individuated by women’s creative output as ‘hand-wrought hangings, screens, bed curtains, cot covers, chair seats, stools, pictures, frames and boxes, clothed the noble, genteel and middling interior, the very fabric of home’ (Vickery, 2009, p.231). Anne Bermingham observed that women used the decorative arts ‘to transform the home into an aestheticised space of commodity display’, implying their material culture focused on exhibition and social status (Bermingham, 1995, p.509). To Rozsika Parker however, ‘such creative work was to exhibit not a powerful artistic personality but a feminine presence’ (Parker, 2010, p.81). For one reason or other, the drawings of these women became materially embedded in the houses they inhabited.

Historian, John Brewer suggested that whether sketched, stitched, painted or quilted, at the time these handiworks heralded ‘modern’ culture, regarded by the Georgians as ‘an indication that their society and way of life was changing [and embracing] dynamism,
variety and exuberance’ (Brewer, 2013, p.522).  

Retrospective interpretations tended to be more negative, at least since rewriting art history became a focus for second-wave feminists.  

Not only were the decorative arts associated with confinement of women, it was argued that women’s rising creative accomplishments cemented their interiority.  

Furthermore, controversies lingered over gendered separation of a category for critique, as doing so risked perpetuating the hierarchical values that marginalised it.

Vickery also took measure of how the layouts and designs of Georgian houses underlined persistent ideas of privacy as synonymous with home and family (Vickery, 2009, p.26). This brought into view how historical visions of ‘the right way to live’ had been incorporated into the lines of the house I now observed.  

Could such ingrained idealisations somehow impact on the lives of my own family, either consciously or subconsciously? Represented by permanent physical separations and room configurations, could such affectations and moral impositions be taken up in some way by subsequent occupants? Or might such histories be rubbed out in my redrawing of its functionality and decor? I homed in on the way changing views about privacy and familial roles were embodied in the perceived characteristics and structure of the house.

In discerning wallpapers and pencilling arrangements for fireplaces and shelving, I was reliant on visual responses to my surroundings. Choosing one line of decor or fitting over another, was projecting an expression of my ocular sensibilities. This susceptibility to viewable stimuli seemed deeply connected to a sense of identity and self. Extending my line of thought into the substance of the building reminded me of a chapter I read in The Thinking Hand (2009) by Finnish architect Juhani Pallasmaa. To Pallasmaa, modern

---

124 For historical overview of the commodification, public-facing contrivance and traditionally positive interpretations of women’s decorative arts, see: (Brewer, 1994-5). See also: (Bermingham, 1995, pp.489-513). Marcia Pointon offers a more positive standpoint, suggesting that such creative practices should be viewed as evidence of women being active participants in the process of representation as a part of the gender system’ (Pointon, 1993, p.5).  

125 Parker examines how the decorative arts became re-categorised as women’s work and associated with their domestic confinement (Parker, 2010). She implicates this shift in struggles for recognition of women’s art, challenging the critical privileging of fine art over decorative, domestic or craft-based creativities.  

126 For example, Bermingham argues that increased artistic skill made women attractive to prospective suitors and strengthened the rationale that a woman’s place was in the home (Bermingham, 2000).  

127 Pollock has written extensively on the complications of recovering women’s art previously omitted from art histories ‘without a theorised framework through which to discern the particularity of women’s work’ (Pollock, 1988, p.55). For to do so risks embracing ‘the feminine stereotype which homogenizes women’s work as determined by natural gender’, so it is necessary to ‘stress the heterogeneity of women’s art work’ the specificity of individual producers and products’ says Pollock (Pollock, 1988, p.55). When looking for appropriate frameworks with which to critique women’s creative outputs, I have also been informed by (Nochlin, 1971); and (Pollock & Parker, 1989, pp58-59). Although debates have arguably changed since these texts, they remind me to be vigilant of the ingrained distinctions and structural sexisms of art history.  

128 This refers to the notable separations of servants’ quarters, kitchens and male privy from the main house in order to respect the privacy of primary women in the household. Rousseau (as portrayed in Landes 1988, pp.66-92) prescribed a strong moral code focused on asserting separate spheres between men and women; public and private; nature and culture. To him, gendered distinctions were essential in preventing women losing their morals and men becoming soft and effeminate. He believed a woman’s place was in the private interior of the family house and that they should not abandon their natural reproductive duties for fashionable society.
architecture predominantly designed and formed using computers, embodied nothing that truly mattered to the people who ultimately lived there (Pallasmaa, 2009, p.21).

Pallasmaa implied that the diminished use of hands and bodies in creating, building and individuating the physical places we inhabited, caused us to lose our sensitivity to the environment and become experientially disengaged from it. In Pallasmaa’s notions of the relationship between hand and building, I caught sight of a mutual, sensual reciprocity emerging from my intensely visual study of the house.

Taking another angle on Pallasmaa, I saw myself as inheriting an embodied understanding of the four sisters’ view of the world. In drawing up the home I wanted to see, the perceptions that historically shaped the house were ever-present. It stood as a vision of what society expected of those women: a kind of moral framework implicit in the spaces now presented to me 200 years later. What felt like detailed individuation and an outpouring of my visualisations, was circumscribed by plans for living established long before me. As I figured out the limitations of these parameters and how my lines mapped over those previously drawn out, I saw other connections tracing back in time. Something had drawn my eye to the house in the first place. Perhaps what I saw on that first viewing in some way linked me to all the others for whom looking at the house had conjured up the romantic desire to dwell within it.

With rarely less than ten workmen on site at any time, there was no retreating from view for me whilst work was going on. Teams of craftsmen were inscribing their skills and visions into the building. Between every joist and behind every wall, a growing systemic structure of conduits increasingly converged, diverged and crossed over one another to carry water, electricity, data, TV and music into every corner of the house. As pipes and wires were grafted in and concealed beneath boards and plaster, I sketched their outlines for those coming later with shelves or pictures. The mass of pencil marks charting these networks on every wall led me to think about how the boundaries of the house had been redrawn by technology. Walls were no longer finite solid demarcations of private space but had been made porous by the flows we aligned with everyday needs. This house didn’t present any prospect of rest and retreat.

---

129 Ruskin voiced formulations of public (men) and private (women) and clear disapproval of female academic education, independence or self-realisation. He inferred that the moral health of society depended on women caring for the home and family have persistently shaped perceptions of home as a working environment for women and a space of retreat and relaxation for men. The layouts of houses were prudishly designed to keep the ‘proper’ woman’s respectability protected from exposure to anything related to the body, the opposite sex, manual labour, cooking, washing, etc. (Ruskin, 1873).
The architect and theorist Witold Rybczynski discussed the historical distinctions of public and private space in his book, *Home* (1986), implying that the idea of the house as a family territory separate from the workplace was a relatively recent concept. He pointed out how everybody shared large communal spaces until at least the tenth century and the first houses were in the ‘bourgeois’\(^\text{130}\) free towns of the 14\(^{th}\) Century (Rybczynski, 1986, p. 18). Yet even these were not private safe-havens. The shop or workshop overseen by a family who entertained, cooked, ate and slept in a single room overhead, was in marked contrast to idealisations of privacy hatched since (Rybczynski, 1986, p. 18). According to Rybczynski, perceptions of a family home only came about in the 18\(^{th}\) Century as houses were built to meet the demand of a growing professional middle class known as the ‘Bourgeoisie’\(^\text{131}\). Houses then started to include private areas where people could retreat to (Rybczynski, 1986, p. 18). Considerations of comfort and supposed ‘homeliness’ did not become a priority of interior spatial arrangements for centuries.

Slightly outside my focal point I found references to distinctions between living and working spaces in Sarah Rutherford’s book *Women’s Work, Men’s Culture* (Rutherford, 2011). ‘The two worlds of work and home have been spatially and temporally dislocated since the Industrial Revolution’ says Sarah Rutherford in *Women’s Work, Men’s Culture* (Rutherford, 2011, p.99). Rutherford’s critique of how modern workplace cultures marginalise women, suggests that the domestic and urban were primarily demarcated by the labour migrations and working day timeframe of industrialisation (Rutherford, 2011, p. 99). Technological advances forced eighteenth century men to travel to city factories where machinery was centred. At the same time, this set down limitations on women, tying them to bearing and caring for the children. Male and female spaces were marked out with women situated in the house (seen as the private) and men at the workplace (seen as public). I had begun to build up a picture of how gendered delineations of space and labour became ingrained in the interior space I was attempting to navigate.

I invariably regarded genderised labour and definitive spatial boundaries as a problem but hadn’t fully acknowledged their lineage. Now with a clearer view of where modern assumptions of feminine roles derived, I realized why women’s work and creative activities were so pointedly associated with the interior. I noticed Vickery suggesting that

\(^{130}\) The term bourgeois originally denoted the communities of merchants and tradesmen living in Medieval walled towns.

\(^{131}\) The European Bourgeoisie, aroused by education and relative affluence, were attributed with owning and acquiring property; imitating their social superiors; and exerting their superiority over proletariat workers and peasants.
activities were so pointedly associated with the interior. I noticed Vickery suggesting that attending to women’s craft processes could problematically reinforce the hierarchy of values that marginalised them in the first place (Vickery, 2009, p.231). It seemed pertinent that I was surrounded by men who relied on my lines on a daily basis, to provide a framework for their own skills.

I recalled an email from the local museum outlining major alterations undertaken around 1850. The researchers pinpointed a radical spatial revision as the house was ‘villarised’ in line with ever-stricter Victorian rules of respectability (Davies & Wells, 2013). Apparently, the building was extended to incorporate a butchery, laundry, water closet and additional staff quarters and kitchens (Davies & Wells, 2013). The modifications marked a time when the superiors of a household were encouraged to disassociate themselves from anything pertaining to manual labour or the body. According to Vickery, notions of morality created a pressure to construct visible and physical boundaries between family areas and rooms designated for public visitation (Vickery, 2009, p.26). A virtuous family presented a public face of decency to the world and this image depended on drawing a clear line of privacy behind which women of status could take retreat and be hidden from prying eyes. I had come across historical literature prescribing social codes and had previously disregarded it as sexist propaganda. Taking another measure, I now felt a line could be drawn between the moral impositions of literature and the revisions assigned to the house I inhabited.

Between 1736 and 1782 Rousseau’s prominent and detailed studies of social propriety outlined his views on women’s roles and enforced the delineations of interior space that emerged from industrialisation. As mapped out in Landes’ Women and the Public Sphere in the Age of the French Revolution, Rousseau propositioned women to immerse themselves in the house and thereby take up the position of representing the moral health of society (Landes, 1988, pp.67). Such ideas led women to confine themselves to the limitations of the private realm. Ruskin’s Sesame and Lilies (1873) offered similarly divisory formulations of public and private life for men and women through his prescriptive illustrations of acceptable appearances and condemnation of female academic education, independence or self-realisation (Ruskin, 1873, p.90-91).
were hidden from sight. As Ruskin saw it ‘a man has a personal work or duty, relating to his own work or duty...relating to the state. So a woman has a personal work or duty, relating to her own home’ (Ruskin, 1873, p.108-109). Which was, according to Ruskin, ‘to secure its order, comfort, and loveliness’ (Ruskin, 1873, p.109). From my point of view, the Victorian revisions of the house illustrated the compliance of its occupants to these restrictive regards of the day (Ruskin, 1873, p.90). Its inhabitants seemed to have fallen in line with the notions of moral respectability and resulting spatial demarcation protecting women of the time from the public eye\(^{132}\). Whatever the aspirations of women who lived here then, it was highly unlikely they had professional or independent status. Overseeing domestic staff and monitoring household accounts most likely formed the top line. In 1870, John Stuart Mill wrote of women’s situation at the time saying,

Society has so ordered things that public consideration is, in all ordinary cases, only attainable by her through the consideration of her husband or of her male relations, while her private consideration is forfeited by making herself individually prominent, or appearing in any other character than that of an appendage to men\(^{133}\)...society has ordained that all her duties should be to them, and has contrived that all her comforts should depend on them (Mill, 1870, p.141).

I imagined the days of these women to be planned around demure feminine pastimes such as drawing. It came to me that this activity might have offered those women an acceptable way through the front door. Did they head out with a sketchbook in hand to observe details, catch the light or see cliffs from another angle? As I perused the situation of women long dead, I wondered if their lines of spatial negotiation stretched into the present. Inescapably permanent separations in the template of the building I had inherited, defined the material house I could see with my eyes and my imaginary envisioning of home. There was an increasingly complex portfolio of images being stored in my visual memory. However, I erased my concern by assuming my family’s open-mindedness and modern way of life would mark a change of direction in the lineage of the house in making it a home to be proud of.

\(^{132}\) John Stuart Mill writes of the expectation for women to stay out of the public eye: ‘the access which fame gives all objects of ambition’ for men, ‘while to women themselves all these objects are closed, and the desire of fame itself daring and unfeminine’ (Mill, 1870, p.141). Mill was one of the first philosophers to argue for a conception of gender equality.

\(^{133}\) Mill recognises in the influence and habit of this ‘domestic and social position’ a ‘complete explanation of nearly all the apparent differences between women and men, including the whole of those which imply any inferiority (Mill, 1870, p.141).
mindedness and modern way of life would mark a change of direction in the lineage of the house in making it a home to be proud of.

A year after I started the refurbishment, my convoluted scribining of hidden wires and pipes was obscured behind several coats of paint, and the blueprints blurred by endless revisions had been thrown out. The high walls were smooth as paper; the ornate woodwork was glossy and reflective; the decorative plaster cornicing had been redefined; and the floorboards were sanded back and stained with a dark inky wash. Despite pressure to restore the house to traditional guidelines, the urge to relieve it from the distortions of floral wallpapers, stained patterned carpets, cracked sanitary-ware and unevenly faded curtains had led me to use minimalist approaches wherever possible.

With the notable exception of two log burners, sleek Italian light fittings and a huge flat screen TV hung, the ground floor had little to determine it from a public gallery space. The only drawings now evident were formally framed and hung with measured precision against the stark walls. Offsetting this expansive flatness, our furniture had returned from storage to give depth to the corners and shadows. Its arrival on the scene had incurred much frenetic placing, arranging and fastidious rearranging. Mapping our old life onto this freshly wiped page wasn’t easy. Once again, I relied on a visual testing of lines and structures, and an overall sense of what looked right. Links were made between one object and another based on observations of physical characteristics. Often colour prevailed but as each area of the house developed individuality, disparate things were grouped through simple likenesses, a diagonal line or a complimentary curve.

I recollected that when I had been making videos and films in my early career, I had tended to ‘see’ in stills. My methods revolved around designing sets then constructing meticulous storyboards. The filming process that followed was then aimed at linking these frames as a narrative. I also evaluated the resultant imagery in photographic ways, critiquing the compositions as if they were photographs. When confronted by moving images, lost critical objectivity and became swept up in the narratives being played out. Whether an animated drawing, fast-moving video or three-dimensional space I needed to figure out, the basis of my adjustments and choices was a two-dimensional picture plane. This way of looking often rendered me stationary in a doorway or window bay staring into the room, scanning the scene for things that didn’t somehow fit the picture. Once
these repetitive processes of placing, connecting, observing and realigning had mostly subsided, I set down to inhabit the house I had drawn up and reviewed my journey.

I felt the way I looked at the physical space laid out in front of me had shifted. I had observed every minute detail of its textures, lines and surfaces. I had drawn images in my mind and realised them as physical realities. I had charted physical adaptations and followed tangents into social depths that shaped both the house itself and my views of it. Looking and relooking I had noticed traces and marks etched into the very material of the house by events and encounters that I would never know or experience. Drawing out its physical spaces had made me notice so many aspects I would never have seen otherwise.

Surveying the results of my activities, I was able to see the lines reaching out from the past. It was apparent on reflection how when dividing up the house, I had taken inspiration from envisioning the histories and lives played out before me. The lesser servants’ quarters had become a holiday flat. The family bedrooms were those the four sisters would have shared. The thick cob walls laid down by local craftsmen to define sculleries and laundries now housed the recording studio. It occurred to me that the coded entry lock of the studio presented the most significant separation of the present-day house. In the past, this area would have been prudishly regarded as out of bounds for the residing women and children of the family. Looking at the thick soundproofed door I wondered if these historical notions of spatial, gendered and labour delineations were still partially at work in my husband’s desire to exclude the rest of us from moving freely into his workplace environment where he and his primarily male colleagues spent their long days. It certainly wasn’t merely security that drove him to demarcate his own area and barricade himself in behind the alarm system.

Now that I had brought the pictures in my mind into being, there was no pressing daily need for my drawing and observational skills. Instead of being absorbed by the scratches and imperfections of the house, I could designate my time to caring for the family, walking the dog along the sand or maintaining the garden. Yet even though I had longed to reach this point, there was something absent from the composition. It suddenly came into view that when I had assigned the rooms in the house different purposes, I had not marked out an area for myself. Despite being principally responsible for keeping the household in line, responding to post and plotting the finances, I hadn’t seen the need to
delineate a workspace of my own. What struck me with force was that I had failed to set aside anywhere in this large, multifunctional living and working space to draw. The house was yet to meet my expectations of a home.

Perhaps the stark contemporary feel I had imposed on the rooms was just not homely enough, or maybe we had simply chosen the wrong house? I looked at the building around me accusatorily. The past year as its interior designer had shown me that looking and line-making brought forth much more than mere physical measurements on paper. In some small way, I had remapped the status of women’s drawing at the house. Once a disregarded pastime it had become a facilitating respectful contribution in the construction of inhabited space. However, now that phase was over, I felt the burden of mundane household tasks even more heavily. There seemed to be no remuneration or reward for anything I did, just repetition.

At university, I had read Virginia Woolf’s A Room of One’s Own (1929). Her idea that a woman’s intellectual and creative freedom depended on her having a ‘room of her own’ seemed far removed to me then (Woolf, 1929, p.3). Full of enthusiasm for a professional life ahead, I couldn’t equate my experiences with Woolf’s gendered differentiations of ‘safety and prosperity of the one sex and of the poverty and insecurity of the other’ (Woolf, 1929, p.21). Now I recalled her contemplating ‘how unpleasant it is to be locked out’ but ‘how it is worse perhaps to be locked in’ (Woolf, 1929, p.21). In my headlong pursuit of a sense of self, belonging and home, I had lost my metaphorical, financial and physical space of independence.

Buried away in the back of my mind, was a nagging memory of Freud’s reductive assessment of home and the happy family as an idealised dream that could never be realised. I had read Family Romances (1909) years ago, long before moving to the country in putting family and home first. Freud’s theories interested me as indicators of a certain time and social structure that still influenced modern life. I felt I had been driven by the same daydreaming of home Freud suggests ‘takes over the topic of family relations’ and organises everything we do (Freud, 1909, p. 237). To Freud, the imaginary construct could serve ‘as the fulfilment of wishes and as a correction of actual life’ (Freud, 1909, p. 238). Perhaps I had been happy with merely the 'idea' of home in the past but somehow the fixity of this house had undermined any romantic notion of home I had once had in
my head. I had taken up my pencil and started drawing precisely because I wanted to see, touch and feel home, not just dream about it.

I had lunch with a friend of mine whose research in human geography examines the realities of life in newly built housing estates that imposed restrictions on people individuating their houses. I told her about the high expectations I’d had for our house and admitted that even though I now had a beautiful and impressive place to live, I felt somewhat bereft. She asked if I now thought I’d been wrong to assume the house could become a home in the first place. When I couldn’t answer, she told me that assuming house and home to be conjoined was currently a major concern of spatial discourse and gave me a book by Doreen Massey to read.

'We live, we are constantly told, in an age of flow' and unprecedented human migration, states Massey (Massey, 2008, p.2). She suggests the insecurities and uncertain futures imposed by mobility and globalisation cause people to increasingly pursue nostalgic imaginaries of 'home' as a safe-haven, retreat and 'the place they used to be, as it used to be' (Massey, 2005, p.123). She argues that idealisations of home as a fixed place or community to hold close and protect from the unknown ‘out there’ encourage ‘nationalisms and parochialisms and localisms of all sorts’ (Massey, 2005, p.65). I could see such attitudes materialising in the boundaries continuously arising around the world in ‘a protective pulling-up of drawbridges and a building of walls' (Massey, 2005, p.6). As millions are forcibly displaced by social, economic and political crises, they are simultaneously being rejected from settling elsewhere by those privileged with places to call home guarding them from the invasion of difference and the unfamiliar.

Massey got me thinking about how problematic ideas of home as a house, physical shelter or area to be protected were interconnected from the local to the global. She pointed out that ‘from quotidian negotiations to global strategizing, these implicit engagements of space feed back into and sustain wider understandings of the world' (Massey, 2005, p.8). Individual home-making practices were implicit in the attitudes and practices of communities and their international relations. If the personal and communal ways we made ourselves feel at home were so interconnected, then even my confusions over the house and what constituted home really mattered.
Massey opened up my thinking about home as not merely a fixed place or house, but a space of our active being, constituted through interactions: ‘a product of relations-between’ (Massey, 2005, p.9). I wondered if the drawing practice that had sustained me during the refurbishment could reveal more about the problematic ideas of house and home than my measured representations to date. I wanted to question my own expectations of the house and how, as a result of pursuing a romantic ideal of home, my life had instead become defined by edges and limitations. In order to really see the world around me, I felt I had to keep on drawing. I was sure there was more to be seen in the house through creative practice. Perhaps my lines would be able to show my how my everyday life was structured? Maybe it could help me see how my familial relations operated? If drawing did not seek to visually represent the house, what sort of relationship would it have to that space?

Looking for contemporary artists interrogating home, I came across Perry's investigation of the same and noted her comment that ‘the house and home are recurring motifs of the complex contemporaneity of the art reviewed’ (Perry, 2013, p. 14). According to Perry, 'the house and the associated idea of home are popular themes in visual representation in the late twentieth century and the early twenty-first' (Perry, 2013, p. 9). However, the more I looked, the more I found house rather than home. As Perry pointed out, in art 'the house can fly, collide, explode, fall, break in half, turn inside-out, shrink, travel on wheels, migrate, metamorphose and act as both playground and stage' (Perry, 2013, p.221). However, she also mentioned how the 'concept of home carries heavy ideological baggage' (Perry, 2013, p.221). Perhaps this was partly to blame for artists sticking to the physicality of what Perry referred to as its 'correlate', the house.

I didn't find any sign of creative approaches to home to tie in with Massey's revisionist concept of space ‘as always under construction: a product of relations-between, never finished, never closed’ (Massey, 2005, p.9). What I saw were shelters, houses and objects and an artistic home typified by physical materialisation as exemplified by Rachel Whiteread’s casts that permanently entombed the house interior in concrete never to be entered again (Whiteread, House, 1993, Fig.x). It seemed to me that the increasingly fluid and mobile concept of home affecting us all was somehow lacking critical attention. I took up my lines from where I had left off at the end of the house refurbishment.
Rachel Whiteread
*Untitled (House)*, 1993
Building materials and plaster
Height approximately 10 m
(Furlong, 2010, p.120)
There was in fact ‘plenty of room’ for me to draw amongst the five reception rooms, six bedrooms, three cellar spaces and several outhouses that the house encompassed, so what was my issue? Why did I feel so dislocated? Why was I still reluctant to allocate a certain room to drawing? What was it about this house that I had invested so much of my time and attention in, that made me feel as if I couldn’t delineate space for myself? Perhaps my relationship with the house had become so extremely visual that I was held back by the desire to keep it precisely the way it ‘looked’.

I could have rented a studio somewhere nearby but being no longer professionally employed it would be an additional financial pressure on my husband. Anyway, we had established that I was now the stay-at-home parent providing a constant figure in the picture for our son. Having both cut our regional ties from familial communities as teenagers, we had paid for childcare when I worked. However, as costs of schooling and auxiliary help increasingly countered my lesser financial contribution, we had identified that it would have to be my career put on hold. Finding a balance had always meant prioritising his creative practice whilst I played the supportive role. Working or not, I concurrently met household demands whilst he focused primarily on music. I was the contact for schools, doctors and other institutions and did virtually all the cooking, shopping and washing. When I couldn’t meet my maternal expectations, I ensured there was a trail of nannies and cleaners to draw upon as required.

Today I was more hands-on but then I didn't have a full-time job so my daily burden was substantially reduced. Somehow it didn't feel that way. Maybe this was part of why I craved to be engrossed in drawing practice again; to be focused on the lines of visual curiosity and thoughtful observation that came from it. However, I couldn’t reconcile the sense of duty for the wellbeing of the household with pencilling sketches elsewhere in a studio. If I were to continue practicing along similar lines, drawing would have to fit in with my other roles and activities in the house. It would need to delineate time and space to exist amongst everyday life as a wife and mother of a teenage boy.

Taking this point and intending to run with it, I set out to draw. But even before pencil met paper again, I was immersed in spatial negotiations and confronted by differing
claims on the rooms for purposes considered more ‘homely’. I hunted for an uncontested space that would not incur an upheaval of the norm, but all the main rooms in our house had been set up with assigned functions in mind. I homed in on the cellars and hatched a plan amidst the remainder of unpacked boxes. Surveying the situation, I determined that one room had daylight and a radiator, so I cleared it and set down a large table acquired from the recycling shop as a swift and resolute gesture of my territorial intentions.

For the following couple of weeks, I drew together books, tools, paper and everything I envisaged needing amongst our possessions that could frame this space for the drawing activity. Using discarded offcuts of carpet and leftover emulsion, I drew out a studio around the appropriated equipment until it blended together in a practical space. Finally, here in the margins of the house, I had defined an area of my own in which to contemplate and extend the line of thought into visual drawing product. The only problem was, I had no idea what I was going to draw.

I sat undisturbed, doodling fine lines into the table wood grain. At some point my husband came down to ask me about something and I made a pretence of changing paper. After he’d gone I looked at its emptiness and wondered what to do with it. I penned a slanting line from one side of the sheet to the other and then fastidiously copied it, attempting to imitate the original as accurately as possible. On reflection, I could see there were perceptible differences between the two. I attempted another mimetic line alongside, doing my utmost to focus my eyes and hold my hand steady.

My mind cleared of all but the reflexive drawing process, pared down to its basics of observation and imitation. With all else pushed aside, I became more conscious of decisions, such as whether to look at the line I was copying or the one being drawn. They were but a millimetre or so apart but if I tried to look at them equally both became blurred. Also, what was I to do with the occasional aberrations? Should I accept the change of form in an unintentional waver of the hand and follow it in the next line, then the next? Or should I deny the deviation ever happened and subsequently smooth it out? It occurred to me that unless I knew why I was repeating my lines, the decision to take one tack over the other was an arbitrary one.
I needed to figure out whether I wanted to simply draw a straight line. Or did I want to study the drawing process itself, in terms of decision-making, repetition or error? Taking the lead in my questioning was ‘why did I feel the need to draw at all?’ In attempting to articulate a response to my perusals, all I could bring to view was the sense of being circumscribed by the monotonous rhythms of daily life in the house. I knew from my role in redesigning the house that drawing could create respite from the relentless duties that home encompassed. If it was distance from household obligations I desired, then surely I had it in this peaceful flat-line environment configured precisely with drawing practice in mind? Why was it then that even separated and hidden away, I had made no marked advancement? Why could I invoke no more impetus for propelling the pencil over the paper than a reaction to seeing its blankness in front of me, or the need to look busy when a family member tracked a path into the space I’d spent so long marking out?

Having drawn a line under the only act of drawing I had so far executed since inhabiting the cellars, I was at another dead end. One unfruitful session resulted in heading upstairs for coffee. On route to the kettle, I gathered up the usual debris of family life that entered my field of vision on the way, including dirty mugs and discarded clothing. I never felt compelled to clean but I hated to see things looking out of place. Habitually tracing the rooms with my eyes, I spotted a crumpled sock under the edge of a chair. Picking it up I continued my journey to the kitchen. Taking my coffee back downstairs I felt the bulge in my jumper pocket. For want of an alternative path, I pulled it out, laid it on the paper and began to draw the details of what I saw in front of me [Fig.2].

Trying to make my drawing look like the sock gave me purpose. I took in every detail, following the fine lines of knitted cotton, the raised profile of the seams and the parallel ridges at the ankle. I attempted to copy the way light fell and to define the folds with dense shading. I became oblivious to the world and allowed my thinking to be guided by the line being put down on the paper. It wasn’t a case of drawing direct conclusions, just connecting fragments that came to the fore through concentrated observation. A line of enquiry opened up as to why I was focused on the dirty underwear of my offspring. Was I making some point by giving my fastidious attentions to this insignificant object, stiff with dried teenage sweat? What was it drawing out about my role as a mother if anything? I wondered if the whole idea was just a cliché of some sort.
Sock 1
2012
Pencil on paper
210 mm x 297 mm
At some point, I had exhausted examining the sock. I can’t recall exactly what indicated the end of the line and made me take my hand from the paper but when I finally decided I had finished my drawing I noticed a palpable level of satisfaction. But surveying my output I was disappointed it wasn’t a better likeness. It also hadn’t defined a way forward for my practice. What would I do next? I came across another grubby unpaired sock stuffed between cushions in the sofa that evening. Without a defined direction to lead me elsewhere, I took it as my study for the next day.

Gazing on a discernibly different configuration of threads, the contrasts of light and shade seemed less pronounced on the tighter smoother surface of this sock compared to the last [Fig.3]. It was a superficial observation and didn’t hold my interest for long. However, paying such close attention to the visual elements of the object somehow cleared my mind of its usual frenetic lines of thought. Looking intently at details had a pleasurable cathartic effect. I felt a sense of calm absorption and almost belonging inside this process as I attempted to turn what I saw before my eyes into physical lines and marked areas on the paper. Whilst so engaged, I forgot the washing basket, shopping list and stripped beds awaiting me. Taking such a laboriously fastidious approach, felt like I was defiantly marking out time and space for myself, even if I was only delaying the inevitable.

My pencil progressed its imitative endeavours but my eyes drifted away before the two-dimensional rendition was completed. I wanted to join up all the lines and represent the whole object, as well as its shadow cast on the paper beneath. I began to feel delineating the sock was itself a chore and wanted a straighter line to the sense of satisfaction at its finish. I wouldn’t be drawing any more socks.

I didn’t peruse the image for long when it was finally done to a level I could justify. Instead I contentedly busied myself in tidying up the space. Even though I didn’t have a pencil in hand, I was reluctant to stop what I was doing when the doorbell went. It was a friend dropping off my son’s sailing kit. Assuming I wasn’t doing anything particular, she stayed for a cup of tea. I appreciated her company but wanted to get back to my table. As soon as she left my neighbour popped in about hedge trimming and I made more tea. I don’t even drink tea.
Sock 2
2012
Pencil on paper
210 mm x 297 mm
When alone again, I quickly cleared the kitchen but something stopped me from discarding the teabags. Perhaps because I'd been looking so intently at the socks, I took a moment to examine these soggy brown objects then decided to take them down with me. Once back at my drawing table, I placed each on a piece of paper to catch drips. Laid out under the lamp I became immersed in their intricate folds and tones. What struck me was how very different they were. I saw these unremarkable ubiquitous objects every day but now it seemed I had never really seen them. Staring closely now, I became fascinated by the miniature tonal landscapes they presented. I took up a pencil and started to draw an image of a tea bag on the paper beside it.

Over the following days, the tea bags mounted up as a series of drawings documenting the ongoing interruptions of visitors [Fig.4-6]. These usually disregarded waste objects were effectively giving me time away from my household tasks. It dawned on me that it was disruption of my drawing practice that gave rise to them. This generated a line of thought about how social encounters taking place in the house might not just be irritating breaks in what was otherwise a continual line of drawing. The way these drawings came into being, or came to be a ‘representation’, was not merely through their figurative portrayal of tea bags. The process of observational drawing was triggered by experience – in this case social intrusions. The final outcomes thereby symbolized those events for me. As Philip Rawson points out, the drawing’s sense is conveyed to oneself and others not ‘by a general similarity of surface but by a structure of symbolic elements which are formulated as method’ (Rawson, 1979, p24). In focusing on the teabags, I had revealed their inconsistencies but also the importance of the chance disruption. I recognized the generative capacity of disturbance as something to develop in my evolving methodology.

This marked the way for me to leave the cellars. The space I needed for drawing was not tucked away from the busy household out of the line of sight. Instead I should probably be observing the daily scenes played out within it. It came to me that the importance of spending time on drawing practice wasn’t the protective line it drew between my space and the demands of others. Rather, I had an inkling that acts of drawing could map out the relations of our household. It might even actually affect them. I recalled that moving my drawing around the house during its refurbishment had somehow redrawn my status in the eyes of others so that I was able to operate differently.
Fig. 4
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So, I gave up the cellar to my son and swapped the table at the recycling shop for a Snooker table. I secreted all but essential drawing equipment away amongst boxes of toys and recording equipment. Papers were rolled, propped and layered under and behind the antique furniture in the rarely used but aptly named ‘drawing room’. At the same time, I began to pay attention to the idea that my drawing practice was inextricably interrelated to the physical and social landscape of the house, even though I was no longer looking to redesign it. I followed this line of thought to the library and gathered up books I felt would offer relevant perspectives on the house. Flicking through them for the first time, I was struck by the confusing way the terms house and home were at times differentiated and at others used synonymously, often on the same page.

Of course, when I casually referred to 'going home' or 'at home' or 'my home', it was understood as the house, but recent experiences and reading Massey had heightened my awareness to the conceptual differences underlining these terms. I noticed that in *Homes in Transformation: Dwelling, Moving, Belonging* (2009) Hanna Johansson and Kirsi Saarikangas remarked ‘the notion of home as a site of identity often overlaps with the notion of house as a physical construction for human habitation’ (Johansson & Saarikangas, 2009, p.10). 'Overlap' seemed an appropriate word and allowed for the way Massey had me thinking of the house as the visible building and home as a less tangible, emotional 'product of interrelations, as constituted through interactions' (Massey, 2005, p.9). However, further on in the book Johansson and Saarikangas seemed to forget they had assigned the house with physicality and not the home. They spoke of how ‘the walls of home demarcate a space where habitation can occur, which involves not just a domestic building but also people functioning inside’ (Johansson & Saarikangas, 2009, p.12). To me, the main complexity with the 'overlap' was its fluidity.

Blunt and Dowling observed that ‘some may speak of the physical structure of their house or dwelling [whilst] others may refer to relationships or connections over space and time’ (Blunt & Dowling, 2009. p.1). However, through the book they progressed an argument that 'home is a "relation" between material and imaginative realms and processes, whereby physical location and materiality, feelings and ideas, are bound together and influence each other, rather than separate and distinct' (Blunt & Dowling, 2009. p.254). In this way, they seemed to subsume house into home as a mere element. 'Home is both a place or physical location and a set of feelings' state Blunt and Dowling (Blunt & Dowling,
The implication that home was more than just house sat well with me but I questioned whether it was always 'both'. Did home have to be physical at all?

May be addressing the house and trying to decipher whether a home could be drawn from it, was going at things the wrong way around. However, my drawing skills were rooted in conventional architectural methods and so necessarily articulated the house I could observe. I settled on a personal 'working' definition of the house as a fixed physical dwelling commonly delineated by walls and placed on a plot of land over which some sort of proprietorial right was felt. I drew the conclusion that although home commonly referred to the building where we lived, there were lines that went out from it that indicated so much more than what I saw with the eye.

I took a measure of the dualities in home as a concept encompassing both a fixed tangible place and a ‘spatially fluid locus of the everyday life of its occupants laden with memories and emotional meanings’ (Johansson & Saarikangas, 2009, p.10). This offered a guideline for me to conceive an alternative view of home as an active sense of self we carried with us: a generative mode of being that came into view when we moved around or were displaced. As Blunt and Dowling marked out, notions of home include idealisations and spatial imaginaries that can ‘travel across different times, places and scales’ (Blunt & Dowling, 2009. p.1). As I started to take my drawing practice around the house again, I paid closer attention to the marks and traces it left behind.

During the redesign of the building, I had tracked from area to area making plans in different spaces and literally drawing in, into and on the physical stuff of the building as I marked up its boundaries, configurations and flows. The territorialising of this space echoed again as drawing materially individuated rooms, if only as brief adaptations. I repeatedly set down workplaces, appropriated tables and laid out drawing materials on the empty ground of household surfaces. I saw a connection with Simon Unwin’s essay Constructing Places...on the Beach and his observations of the boundaries that people mark out around themselves on beaches using windbreaks, inflatables and bags (Unwin, 2003 p.77-86). Unwin suggests that ‘the organizational patterns of the day-camps they make may be read as evidence of the ways in which people intuitively situate themselves in the world’ (Unwin, 2003 p.79). To Unwin the makeshift demarcations showed ‘the means they employ to modify a small part of the world to their own advantage, and the
factors and relationships they take into account when doing so' (Unwin, 2003 p.79). In a similar way to these temporary forts, my mobile studio set-ups defined momentary places of belonging. Perhaps they and the dashed lines of objects strategically set down in the sand were ephemeral delineations of home. Or did they just stand in for the safety and security of the shelter or house in its absence?

Unwin’s ideas about the lines that arose in response to uncharted terrains on the beach led me to review my habitual rearranging of hotel room or apartment furniture when my husband and I had journeyed together more. Looking back, I saw that whenever I was divided from my familiar surroundings, I tended to construct a sense of homeliness through personalising the space and objects in immediate view. I recalled being an infant designating a derelict pigpen at the end of the garden as my haven. After repairing and painting it to my visual satisfaction, I drew whatever I could see on its walls. As I remembered it, any emotional attachment retained with subsequent properties I lived at was bound up in their propensity for me to demarcate such spaces of retreat. I recalled spending day after day individuating dens, tracing boundaries in the soil, weaving branches to form walls and peeling bark from tree trunks to make smooth ground for lines to be carved into, as my hands drew out intimate sanctuaries.

When I went away to school these inherently visual and tactile processes of trying to conjure up home continued. I recalled reconfiguring rooms and secretly drawing on the undersides of beds and furniture. I later left my mark all over the walls of my university digs in abstract sketches. Looking back, the act of aligning myself in relation to the environment through drawing recurrently orientated a sense of belonging. Maybe the hunger for these processes explained the seemingly unusual ease with which I left one place for the next, and my urge to map new ground of home in this house. It seemed that articulating daily life and intervening in the physical spaces where I found myself had always involved the inextricably interrelated activities of looking, drawing and line-making. Whether arranging my paraphernalia so it looked just right or putting lines on paper, my ritualistic territorial processes marked out a sense of fit and belonging.

Drawing these blurred unfocused conclusions brought me back to looking at the plans which encompassed my first visualisations of the house with which I tried to make it a home. As Unwin observed, ‘places mediate between us and the world; they provide
frames in which we exist and act’ (Unwin, 2003, p.78). He pointed out that ‘when they work they make sense of the world for us’ so we are always placing ourselves according to our views of being in the ‘wrong’ or the ‘right’ situation at any one time (Unwin, 2003 p.78). If I felt displaced I tried to literally make or draw out the space of psychological comfort I was dreaming of: the ‘romance’ as Freud would have it.

Looking around for the ‘right’ place to draw in the house, I took a view on practical configurations but also on ambient aspects in my line of sight. The sense of being in the ‘wrong’ place was partly associated with the presence of others. If someone was around, I took it as a sign to move elsewhere. Nevertheless, there was frequent voicing of annoyance at the sight of my drawing equipment occupying a specific site. Perhaps they still regarded my creative practice as an invasion of their private safe-haven. As I carried my boards, paper and tools into different rooms, I wondered if they perceived my activities as threatening to their expectations of what a home is and should be.

I was surprised at how this multifarious space of blurred, indeterminable lines between living and working practices laid down such conventional resistance. Did my drawing somehow step over the boundaries that demarcated the way they imagined home? I didn’t see the modernised spaces of our house as harbouring narrow views or obstructive idealisations, but perhaps its stark spaces disguised traditional notions of a private familial space to be protected and preserved against change. And it wasn’t just the others who were reluctant about change. Alterations and distortions of the interior setting made me anxious too, as my repetitive clearing and tidying illustrated.

In an early book, Space, Place & Gender (1994) Massey had argued against ‘readings of home, where there is imagined to be the [false] security of a stability and an apparently reassuring boundedness’ (Massey, 1994, p.169). Was our house an example of the sort of retreat to place she later developed in for space (2006)? ‘Such understandings of the identity of places require them to be enclosures, to have boundaries and to establish their identity through negative counterposition with the Other beyond the boundaries’ stated Massey (Massey, 1994, p.169). Did I have in front of me precisely the sort of contested political space she problematised?
Scrutinising this apparent need to keep the house in line with an established (and quite possibly parochial) mental image of it, I visualised an exhibition I had seen some years earlier at the Barbican, *The Surreal House: Architecture of Desire* (2010). I recalled how the strange objects and eerie views of the house it presented offered glimpses of dreamlike slants and alternative picturings of home that felt odd in a way I couldn’t put my finger on. The information at hand repeatedly referenced the 'unhomely'. Perhaps it was simply that drawing disturbed our imaginary ideal of home that was troubling us.

In the exhibition catalogue, Raoul Ubac outlined the curatorial concept for the gallery space as a view of a house within a house through which the visitor could take an experiential journey (Ubac, 2010, p.11). I saw a way forward in the path of experience Ubac suggested, and gathered my drawing tools and materials together as a mobile studio. My intention was to become immersed in a consciously experiential investigation of the house and see what homely or unhomely lines might emerge, both physically and metaphorically. However, the methods with which I would do this were still unclear. I considered the perspective drawings, elevations, scale drawings, component sketches, floor plans, details drawings and working plans I used as a designer. However, after the initial measuring and assessment of the house, these ways of drawing were mostly carried out at a drawing board, away from the space they referred to. There were other possibilities that involved taking photographs. I could perhaps draw from them, project them or use the grid method\textsuperscript{134} to scale them up through drawing. However, not unlike the design process, these too involved only brief engagement with the space. Questioning my methods in terms of spending time with the house and observing it, led me to Jonathan Crary’s essay, *Techniques of the Observer* (1988), which opened with the following excerpt from Johann Wolfgang von Goethe’s *Colour Theory* (1810):

> Let a room be made as dark as possible; let there be a circular opening in the window shutter about three inches in diameter, which may be closed or not at pleasure. The sun being suffered to shine through this on a white surface, let the spectator from some little distance fix his eyes on this bright circle thus admitted (Goethe in Crary, 1988, p.2).

\textsuperscript{134} This method involves drawing a grid over the reference photograph, then drawing a larger grid of equal proportions onto the chosen ground of paper, canvas, panel, etc. The image is then copied one square at a time.
From this, I got the sense of a spotlight effect: a deeper looking and focusing in on detail. According to Crary, the darkened room became a feature of Newton’s experiments ‘where it established categorical relations between interior and exterior, between light source, aperture, and screen, and between observer and representation’ (Crary, 1988, p.7). The analogy of the camera and eye was then taken up in the writings of Locke, Descartes, Kepler, Leonardo, Leibniz and others, to firmly establish the camera obscura as the ‘dominant metaphor for human vision and ubiquitous representation of the relation of a perceiving subject to an external world’ (Batchen, 1999, p.82). As Geoffrey Batchen’s studies of photography demonstrate, ‘subject and world were understood as pregiven, separate and distinct entities’ (Batchen, 1999, p.82). This implied that if I stood back and observed, viewing the world through a lens as it were, I could reveal a certain truth about it.

Heading for the kitchen table as a prospective viewpoint, I noticed the *Surreal House* catalogue still laid out with its introduction on display. Glancing over it again, I read curator Jane Alison referencing the house as ‘both a real space and a visualized space. It is both the contained and the container, concept and experience, space and object – inside and out’ (Alison, 2010, p.17). By offering this insight into the materiality of the house, Alison gave me a definitive angle with which to approach the space. Observing the building as primarily an object enabled me compare it to a family heirloom or treasured trinket. It set up new lines of contemplation about how we imagine physical things to be invested with our histories and cultural narratives. It was precisely this sort of view of the house as holding images and stories of the past within it that had emerged from my earlier design work. Alison’s interpretation of the house enabled me to draw parallels between the building and the affective objects that I had so exactingly placed in its container-like rooms.

Thinking about the strength of feeling connecting us to objects, I recalled the way artist Ai Weiwei repeatedly painted onto ancient urns thousands of years old (Ai, 2010). When I first saw such works, I was shocked. By changing these things from past dynasties and making them something of the present, I wondered if Ai had nullified their narratives and worth. We were used to seeing items of such age behind glass in a museum, not

---

135 In 1994, the artist Ai Weiwei protested against the Chinese state’s cultural and historical vandalism with *Colored Vases* (2009-10). Shown at the Lisson Gallery (26 May-16 July 2011) it is thought the work caused the artist’s imprisonment in China at that time.
spattered with multi-coloured twenty-first century paint. However, by altering these artefacts, Ai revealed an attachment to objects that ran far deeper than their consumer value. I was taking on a house full of past lives, encounters and relations, yet I wanted to change it into a home for my family. I wondered if an ingrained desire to preserve the historical partly explained why laying my drawing equipment over the stuff and surfaces of the house generated such negative reactions. By the same measure though, I was investing new storylines in the things that I studied and used in my drawing.

In Geography of Home: writings on where we live (1999), Akiko Busch, aligns the perceived value of the object with the way people view their lives and personal histories to be wrapped up in their houses. She points out that we live in a culture that distinguishes itself in terms of what it owns, and tends ‘to define home by the accumulation of possessions’ (Busch, 1999, p.75). Busch marked the way for my thinking about how drawing amongst the trinkets, photos, furniture and heirlooms, impacted on the sense of cultural history embedded in these objects. Furthermore, the house itself was emerging as the predominant object in these lines of narrative.

Looking on from another discipline, I had little prior knowledge with which to decipher the landscape presented by the interrogatory discipline of material culture. In a seminar on Material Culture, Nicola Foster mentioned the exchange of goods regarded as ‘The Kula Cycle’ whereby ornate gifts were passed between island tribes in ceremonial encounters (Foster, 2014). The intrinsic worth of these presents was embellished through narrative and exchange. Pursuing this, it occurred to me that whether a work of art or a house, the effective value of an object derived directly from the imaginings, images and stories it intrinsically carried.

Significant Objects, an art project by Rob Walker and Joshua Glenn (Glenn & Walker, 2012) set out to measure the increase in objective value through the addition of narrative by asking writers to invent stories to transform insignificant objects into significant ones. The 100 items originally acquired from junk shops were depicted on EBay alongside their respective fictional narratives, and sold at 2,700% of their purchase cost. In showing how suggestive imaginaries raised perception of worth, the project aligned itself with the notion that: ‘just as people are collectors of things, things are also collectors of meanings’
Our attachment to objects is more complex than consumerism or personal histories can explain.

Citing the French philosopher and anthropologist, Bruno Latour as 'one possible exception', Glenn argues that studies of the quotidian object tend to focus on the context of capitalism (Glenn, 2007, p.16). Latour insistently regards objects as not merely ‘matters of fact’, but as ‘matters of concern’ (Latour, 2005, p.114-115). Glenn suggests this debunks 'the notion that things have meaning that can be discovered' for a more interrogatory attitude that 'every object as an association, a network, a gathering' (Glenn, 2007, p.17). As I considered the house as the primary object of the desire for home, this reading of Latour enabled me to view my intervention as an additional layer on its histories as opposed to a destruction of the past. Glen and Walker joined a multifarious enquiry of 'how many participants are gathered in a thing to make it exist and to maintain its existence' (Glenn, 2007, p.17). Mapping my own project over these ideas was an assumptive leap, but I linked my practice-based enquiry of the house as an object loaded with intrinsic value to his revisionist view of material worth assigned to participation.

In her book, *Art and the Home: Comfort, Alienation and the Everyday* (2015), Imogen Racz acknowledged the objecthood of the house 'as the place where we are most ourselves, and 'at home' (Racz, 2015, p.11). She suggested that physical interaction as 'we walk around, anticipating distances and obstacles' enables us to reflect on past experiences (Racz, 2015, p.11). Racz linked the subconscious navigation of the house and its contents to Maurice Merleau-Ponty’s theories of phenomenology. She referred to 'how we project thoughts and feelings into objects [...] making our internal mental life integral with the world beyond' (Racz, 2015, p.11). As Racz pointed out, Merleau-Ponty contends the topography of household objects we live amongst are the 'homeland of our thoughts' (Merleau-Ponty in Racz, 2015, p.11). This comment made me think of everyday things in a more meaningful way. I no longer saw the furniture configuration where I set up to draw as merely a functional choice. Although still addressing my environment in a predominantly visual way, I took more notice of implied origins and backstories. So,
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116 La taur states, ‘a natural world made up of matters of fact does not look quite the same as a world consisting of matters of concern and thus cannot be used so easily as a foil for the symbolic-human-intentional...It is still real and objective, but it is livelier, more talkative, active, pluralistic, and more mediated than the other’ (Latour, 2005, p.114-115). ‘To be treated like things’ says Latour, ‘is not to be reduced to mere matters of fact, but allowed to live a life as multifarious as that of matters of concern’ (Latour, 2005, p.255). 117 As Latour points out, in ‘all the disciplines from geography to anthropology, from accounting to political science, from linguistics to economics... the ingredients of the collective are first juxtaposed and then turned into some coherent whole’ (Latour, 2005, p.257).
when drawn into the dining room by sun reflecting off gleaming varnish, it wasn’t the arrangement of tools and materials that drew my attention but the table beneath them.

Not having had a dining room before we moved here, I had trekked off to a liquidation auction and bought this old boardroom table to fill the space. I had no idea of its lineage. I went down on my knees beneath it looking for any sign or mark with which I could map out some sense of origin, exchange or connectivity. I found a Heltborg Møbler stamp on the leg that I traced to an identical table up for sale in Pasadena for 30 times the price I’d paid. It was described as a ‘Dining Conference Table’ made in Copenhagen during the 1960s by a designer called John Mortensen of the Danish Modern movement. Heltborg Møbler was part of a post-war group of seven factories who had combined their expertise to furnish entire houses and offer total design solutions for modern multifunctional living. It seemed fitting that the table was intended by its maker to encompass the demands of house and workplace in one. It was also pertinent given the musical orientation of the household\textsuperscript{138}, that the Brazilian Rosewood on which I laid my drawing paper was favoured for Steinway pianos and Les Paul guitars. An abstract revealed how this wood now fell under a restrictive category of endangered species that made it illegal for any product made from it to cross national borders.

I connected the international journeys of the table and its raw material in a literal and pictorial way to the Kula valuables shipped between islands in Papua New Guinea and the movements of my drawing practice through the house. I began marking out the table’s travels simplistically using disposable drinks coasters as ground because I associated them with social dialogue generated at the table, from boardroom issues to family trivia [Fig.7-15]. The emphasis on value foregrounded what was most precious to me in the house – time and space. My drawing assigned an inordinate amount of attention to ubiquitous items and in this way contributed to their narrative and emotive significance.

\textsuperscript{138} My husband is a music producer and we have a recording studio in the house. Musicians and sound engineers are ‘part of the family’ in many respects.
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I recalled Alison’s point that ‘the house can be thought of as a special kind of object...the container object’ (Alison, 2010, p.17). The socks, teabags and tables embodied the sort of brief exchanges and unremarkable sketches of daily life that often go by unnoticed. It came to mind that spending time with something ordinary could increase its appeal to such an extent that it eventually became worthy of being preserved for posterity. For this reason, the old was often rendered untouchable behind glass in a museum. From this point on, time became an integral and conscious aspect of my looking and drawing.

Moving from room to room I sought out areas in which to draw, constantly setting up a workplace then taking it down again. I remembered artist Tony Bevan’s constructions of temporary tabletop studios. For Bevan, these ephemeral sites were so important to his creative practice that they often took central stage as the subject of his drawings (Bevan, 2006, Fig.xi). Taking a view on my activities, I detected parallels between the lack of drawing product and my focus on objects. I had the perception of creatively processing tangents and observations but I wasn’t actually drawing any two-dimensional lines on the paper I carried about. My daily practice encompassed a lot of reiterative moving and arranging of equipment but little else to show for itself.

For want of a clearer lead, I took up the line of Alison’s perusals on the house as a vessel. My eyes rested upon her claim of ‘an art-historical line to be drawn from the box assemblage to the installation and the house itself’ (Alison, 2010, p.17). It suggested my ritualistic preparations of site were a sort of museological drawing process mapping over the physical house. ‘What is a house if not a box assemblage, the rooms like the compartments of a trinket box – microcosmic worlds in themselves – like cells of the mind’ detailed Alison (Alison, 2010, p.21). This enabled a view of my ephemeral studio installations as anthropological collections contained in rooms of the house. They were evidence of drawing’s occupation rather than a product of its gestures.
Tony Bevan  
Table Top PC069, 2006  
Charcoal and Acrylic on Canvas  
169 cm x 204 cm  
(Bevan, 2006)
Marcel Duchamp

*Boîte, Series B, Boîte-en-valise*, 1942-54

Box containing miniature replicas of the artist's work

38 x 35 x 8 cm

(Osborne, 2002, p.53)
I likened my mobile collection of boards, cloths, papers and implements to Marcel Duchamp’s *Boîte-en-Valise* (1930-40) and *Boîte, Series B* (Duchamp, 1942-54, Fig.xii): disparate utilitarian artefacts presented as portable suitcase museums in intricate feasts of curiosity. I photographed the morphing rooms that I took over and wrote descriptions documenting scenes before I moved elsewhere [Fig.16]. As the resultant documentation showed, my adaptations imposed increasingly extensive dioramas [Fig.17-21].

Trying to realign my meandering concerns, I saw that out of the material stuff of the house emerged an intense interest in the wider performances that drawing entailed. Leafing through pages of the books that followed me around, I noticed a pertinent comment. Busch makes the point that ‘people who work at home often devise - consciously or unconsciously - deeply personal rituals, eccentric habits, and uncommon ways to use their time that keep them concentrated on the task at hand’ (Busch, 1999, p.85). For me, such repetitive routines included the frenetic placing and replacing of myself within the physical areas of the house.

According to Busch ‘eccentric rituals or any other activities that return us to sensory experience can enliven and enrich the way we work’ (Busch, 1999, p.86). This linked up with my earlier notions of drawing as a form of home-making derived from both the eye and the hand. It suggested to me that the placing of drawing equipment was a form of drawing practice itself. I had been looking at my setups in terms of the still life or scenic image. I looked again at these conglomerations of objects, searching for opportunities to extend their forms and interrelate them in more active ways.
11th November 2013

Piles of papers, drawings, disparate household objects and the tools of my professions, both managerial and creative overlap on every surface in the sitting room. I have been here a lot during the winter, it has a log burner and big shutters that can block out the sea wind. Desks, tables, sofas and floors are layered up with the disparate stuff of the multiple roles and activities that absorb my days. Disposable drinks mats dry on a piece of the trendy grey rubber flooring that has a grid of raised circles across it that hold the odd title or note that had no home. The undersides of the mats have grey ink blots soaking through that are now linked by red ‘trade routes’ which I relate to the to-ings and fro-ings of the house. Many have the impression of ‘middle men’ where the direct routes between ‘blots’ has not been taken but instead the paths visit other ports or cultures that communicate with both sides. A pile of blank 6” vinyl record sleeves sits on the table. They reach back through my music business career to a time of potential, excitement and possibility. White and clean, the circle cut out of their centres is both an issue and an asset, but I haven’t been able to work with it yet. I thought I had connected them to the design history of the conference dining table, but when I printed the paragraphs on some sleeves, it didn’t hold together. Still, they aren’t quite ready to be discarded. Frosted arch lever files sit around empty but promising. It is the hole in the spine that fascinates me. A peep hole for a film, a sound or a smell to be accessed. Or perhaps it will be a collection filed away that will ultimately be housed inside and which the viewer will try and decipher with their eye to the hole. It could even be the finger it was intended for, feeling its way around the file’s interior, sensorially taking up the textures of the space, one-by-one, each file to the next. The mountains of chopping boards are still piled up on the floor. Now they are pushed up against the shutters just where the rainwater sometimes invades, depending on the direction of the sea storms that hit the South-East aspect of the house. Somehow it feels fitting to allow the house to work on them as I have come to a standstill as far as these boards are concerned. The whole room has far too much furniture in it, like a recycling shop or antiques emporium. It too has a sense of being themed or curated as, unlike most other areas of the house, the objects in this room connect closely to the traditional. The two large sofas and foot rests are covered by opulent woven materials in wine reds sporting shapes reminiscent of hieroglyphs on one, colonial elephants and branches of leaves on the other. On one there are hollow cardboard rolls with drawings protruding from the ends, on the other are two plastic washing baskets. They contain rags and socks, the latter of which are in the process of being twisted and hand-sewed into extremes of tension. Some are joined into wishbones or groups of protrusions like the villi on the stomach lining but the collective has yet to a find form or coral-like unity.
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Aware that I had set out with an intensely observational emphasis, I started making tracks towards more tactile contact with the things in eyeshot. Working in the kitchen at the time, these included a teapot, books and even a disregarded drum pedal as well as some basic drawing tools. I attempted to bring the different ways they moved into alignment as imaginary line-making machines. Although I only photographed a handful of these passing ‘conversations’ between disparate things, it became another ritual of settling into different spaces to draw [Fig.22–27]. I regarded the playful constructions as preliminary sketches indicative of interrelations between narratives, objects, journeys and intrinsic values. In hindsight, these three-dimensional kinetic drawings appeared derivative of the precariously balanced sculptures of the series, *A Quiet Afternoon* (1985) by Peter Fischli & David Weiss that I had seen at Tate Modern but at the time I wasn’t aware of replaying a visual memory. However, it did occur to me that although I had momentarily held the objects in my hands, the way I ultimately addressed them as flattened photographs was purely visual and failed to deal with my thinking about home.

The design-orientated practice I had initially brought into the frame had been grounded in long-established methods of spatial drawing and the visual physicality of the house. Since then, the prolonged scrutiny of my gaze had brought into the sight a fluid, interactive and social space. Visualising these different perspectives made me think of Italo Calvino’s *Invisible Cities* (1997). Although structured as short stories of Marco Polo describing the different lands he explored, the detailed and extraordinary cities he portrayed, were distilled observations of Venice. The imaginaries of Calvino’s narratives conceptually mapped over one another, emphasising decentredness, interrelatedness and multiplicity. By breaking down the complexities of the city living experience into singular articulations, he made it visible and imaginable to a much greater depth than any account of an urban landscape I had come across. Calvino gave me the idea to break down the house I saw and try to map it instead as conceptual layers.
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The problem was, how to adapt my relatively conventional drawing approaches to extract distinct aspects of the house and articulate them? I glanced back at the plans with which I had first laid out the house through line. If I was looking to offer up varied maps, then these were the primary layer. Regarding them as 'ground level' I wondered how I could build on them to draw out the space in other ways much as the same outline in an atlas can encompass different information of the same terrain. As mapping processes came to the fore, I recalled taking my son to the British Museum and looking at ancient types of maps including the Babylonian’s clay diagrammatic of Mesopotamia (Imago Mundi, C.500 BC). I was struck by how people across millennia had conflated drawing and space in mapping processes. I traced the use of line as a means of demarcating land and depicted inhabited environments back to Greek Euclidian geometry, the technical diagrams of Rome and the depictions of everyday life in Egyptian temples. It seemed the desire to orientate our immediate experiences and to venture beyond them was an ingrained part of being human. In her introduction to Vitamin D (2005) Emma Dexter says, ‘drawing is part of our interrelation to our physical environment, recording in and on it, the presence of the human’ (Dexter, 2005, p.6). My own drawing project was another attempt to map out how the world operates and to understand a place within it.

Throughout history, line has been valued for its ability to articulate space in the work of artists, cartographers, architects, designers and planners. I knew that Renaissance drawing methods of perspective were encompassed in the measured approaches I used as a designer to create an illusion of three-dimensional space on a two-dimensional picture surface. In 1413, Filippo Brunelleschi outlined the structure of a Florentine building on a mirror, then extended his lines to converge on the horizon. Out of this developed the mathematical construction of the 'single point' system of linear perspective. As receding parallel lines appear to converge towards each other, eventually meeting at the vanishing point, objects in the foreground appear larger than those at the back: just as is seen in the architectural drawings that bring physical places into being today139. I drew on these conventions as I viewed objects in real space and transcribed them onto an imaginary plane.

---

139 It is argued that the combining of this Italian system of linear perspective with existing methods of empirical delineation defined a relationship between drawing and physical space that dominated European art and design for centuries (Rose, 1982, p.10), (de Zegher, 2010, p.23). There are notable exceptions including the Netherlandish painters of the early 1400s who created convincing illusions of three-dimensional space using a different system. Also, the Japanese developed a very different approach to Western geometrical perspective, since the 1200s they have combined a tactile close range with the visual, distant range, whilst a middle range is obscured. This kind of composition was supposedly taken up by the Western world to influence the basic composition of landscape photography today (Sasaki, 2013, p.1).
Acknowledging how lines prepare our ideas and desires to become the lived environments we inhabit, indicated that the long-standing relationship between drawing and space was more important than what met the eye. It dawned on me that if spatial drawing depicted the buildings and settings I associated with self and belonging, then it played a formative role in the construction of the community and society with which I identified myself. Using the plans had more relevance to the house than mere measured representation. As I set out to survey, detect and describe different aspects, I felt justified in using these layouts as basis for experimental approaches yet to be realised.

Looking at this underlining layer, it appeared to encompass conventional drawing methods and an equally typical view of the house. Moving my project on required taking steps away from these historically grounded positions. Perhaps I could progress by appropriating drawing methods that had since been used to give visible form to space. Maybe I would be able to follow this lead to fresh means of seeing and drawing the house. Having looked at the art in the Tate and National Galleries many times, I knew that the way drawing depicted space had changed irrevocably over time, especially during the twentieth century. I imagined this evolving lineage could lead me through different ways of accessing the house and in doing so, hopefully elucidate home. I decided to try and follow the historical relationship of drawing and space that underpinned the practices of contemporary artists arising from the culture most familiar to me, with the idea of gradually transforming my own observations of the house and the lines that resulted along the way. In extending the spaces of drawing towards the more performative, embodied and generative mapping processes drawn out in twenty-first century, I hoped to move the house on towards the active, interrelational spatiality of home.

I was aware that drawing methods had radically expanded during the twentieth century but I didn’t know enough about their articulations of space to utilise them. I gathered together surveys and catalogues spanning the development of contemporary drawing and focused on the spatiality of line, then set out on a methodological journey from

---

140 For example: On Line: Drawing through the 20th Century (Butler & de Zegher, 2010); Contemporary Drawing: Key Concepts and Techniques (Davidson, 2011); The Stage of Drawing: Gesture and Act, (de Zegher & Newman, 2003); Vitamin D: New Perspectives in Drawing (Dexter et al, 2005); Vitamin D2: New Perspectives in Drawing (Perry, Cashdan & Krause, 2013); Drawing Now: Between the Lines of Contemporary Art (Downs, 2007); Drawing on Space (Doyle, MacFarlane & Stout, 2002); The Modern Drawing - 100 Works on paper from the Museum of Modern Art (Elderfield, 1993); Drawing Now: Eight Propositions (Hopman, 2002); The Drawing Book (Kovats, 2008); The Primacy of Drawing - An Artists View (Petherbridge, 1991); Drawing Now. (Rose, 1976); A Century of Modern Drawing from the Museum of Modern Art New York (Rose, 1982); Allegories of Modernism - Contemporary Drawing (Rose, 1992); The Body of Drawing: Drawings by Sculptors (South Bank Centre, 1993).
drawing in the tradition to the present-day. As house plans had laid down the first layer, my starting point was the Renaissance, when measured drawing enabled line to convey every physical space of life: from landscapes, urban areas and buildings to the complexities of the body itself. In the catalogue for the exhibition On Line: Drawing through the 20th Century co-curator Catherine de Zegher pointed out that the principles of Renaissance academic drawing ‘effectively constituted a highly conceptual system – a symbolic, philosophical system of convention and practice, pretending to something akin to scientific objectivity’ (Butler & De Zegher, 2010, p.23). From Brunelleschi’s demonstrations of perspective arose prescriptive guidelines for anatomy and geometry that formed the foundation of academic training in all visual arts and aesthetic practices.

At some point in the past, out of the corner of my eye I had spotted a little book standing out amongst the multifarious colours on the shelves like a blank page. Leafing through White (2007) by graphic designer Kenya Hara, I was led into seeing paper differently through the eyes of Japanese culture. According to Hara, paper’s uniform whiteness was not regarded as ‘empty’ but as presenting the onlooker with a productive space for their imagination to fill and thereby stimulating creativity (Hara, 2007, p.16). Hara’s principal message was that the introduction of paper had changed societies by extending their dialogue and enriching their capacity to express themselves (Hara, 2007, pp.16-18). Absorbed at the time in drawing up different configurations of rooms on huge sheets of A0 paper, I had then taken a measure of Hara’s views in terms of visualising designs rather than identifying connections with specific drawing methods.

However, now I recalled that Hara pointed out how paper became widely available in Europe during the fifteenth century around the same time that new lines of perspective were being drawn. It made sense that the conventions of line were anchored in the surface of paper as the status of drawing grew, and the most compatible tools of pencil, graphite, ink and charcoal were established as standard materials of the medium. I could see that the grounded drawing methods I utilised in the plans were testament to just how resistant to innovation and extension drawing had remained in the years to follow.

Evaluating drawings through the centuries in the Prints and Drawings room at the Victoria and Albert Museum, I saw that the lines of artists and designers continued to be predominantly marked by the prescriptive parameters of measured drawing until the late
1800s. Searching for exceptions and subversions to these persistent spatial rules as possible leads, brought me to a notable watershed for line when photography became commercially available in the 1870s. MoMA curator Bernice Rose put together several key exhibitions spanning the development of contemporary drawing including Drawing Now (Rose, 1976), A Century of Modern Drawing from the Museum of Modern Art New York (Rose, 1982) and Allegories of Modernism - Contemporary Drawing (Rose, 1992). According to Rose, drawing was redefined in terms of ‘the two-dimensionality of the surface, the material in relation to that of the surface, the process by which the material is applied, and the mark left by the process’ as a direct response to the way photography undermined it as the primary means to visually record events, places or people for posterity (Rose, 1976, p.12). I was not wholly convinced by the argument that a general veer away from the figurative towards abstraction directly resulted from commerciality of photography. Other factors were most likely involved, including the ease of transnational communication and travel that enable better networking - as implied by the MoMa exhibition Inventing Abstraction (2012) which ‘traces the development of abstraction as it moved through a network of modern artists, from Marsden Hartley and Marcel Duchamp to Piet Mondrian and Kazimir Malevich, sweeping across nations and across media’ (MoMA, 2012). Nevertheless, the transition Rose implied offered a helpful departure point for fresh approaches in my own drawing.

Investigating the spatial lines that emerged from the challenge photography imposed, Rose traced contemporary drawing back to the Impressionists. According to Rose, during the late 1800s Paul Cézanne, Vincent van Gogh, Paul Gauguin and George Pierre Seurat interrogated and eroded the conventions of one-point linear perspective in ways that ‘created a more dynamic, compressed space’ and ‘arrived at a new perspective, a perspective of seeing’ (Rose, 1982, p.12). I was interested in the implication that a different way of looking was instigated but Rose Cézanne’s view that ‘bodies seen in space are all convexes’ (Cézanne in Rose, 1982, p.12). It appeared to me that the methods she foregrounded were still predominantly representational, so I initially assumed this era of drawing had little relevance in advancing the spaces of my own.

---

141 As Rawson points out, ‘it is well known that the photographic process was developed between the sixteenth and nineteenth centuries as an aid to painters, via drawing machines, the pinhole Camera Obscura, glass and lens and chemicals technology, this was largely as a result of prevailing academic and salon belief that the task of all art was to “reproduce” the “natural” view of “reality” that everyone could see in common’ (Rawson, 2005, p.133). The 1800s brought about fresh understanding of how the physiology of the eye mediated what was seen, so the concurrent turn towards abstraction should be considered within the broader context of how representation was moved on from the mimesis of lens or mirror as truth, to creatively encompass the body and artistry of the observer (Crary, 1988), (Betchen, 1999, pp.82-85).
However, I likened the simplistic outlines of the house plans I used with Rose’s critique of Gauguin’s woodcuts achieved by ‘cutting away areas between, creating the line as a line of containment or enclosure’ (Rose, 1982, p.17). According to Rose, ‘the carving away of matter to create line may have provided the means for circumventing the strictures surrounding contour drawing’ (Rose, 1982, p.17). This visual concept mapped over my reductive lines delineating walls that imposed physical and perceptual boundaries on the active spaces of home. The prominent aspect of Rose’s view seemed to be that the outline came first and was ‘the reality to which the three dimensional would be accommodated’ (Rose, 1982, p.18). It linked with my earlier perception of the house as a ‘container object’ and suggested to me that I should use plans as not only a first mapping but a governing under-drawing for new lines.

I distilled the features of the original designs back to the most simplistic forms in order to make room for other layers and elements to appear. In this way both the conventional drawing and the physicality of the house it represented were pared down to a framework for my lines to set out from. The container-like presence of the building was reduced to individual shapes corresponding to the rooms I favoured for drawing. I picked up a bradawl and worked into a sheet of paper. All the reception rooms under focus had full-length French windows and the placing of bays in the outlines respectively identified the various rooms. The furniture and objects of my mobile studio set-ups were similarly reduced to minimal silhouettes to indicate the table I was working on. As my location moved it gave rise to another room and table combination [Fig.28].

I moved on to tracing paper as ground because it connected back to the blueprints, plotting my occupations of different areas using graphite [Fig.29-31]. Examining the resultant composite drawing a month later, I saw it detailed a physical overview of the way my practice inhabited the house but also a temporal one. My lines were not only translating the observations I made with my eyes but logging my room preferences and the days I spent arranging, drawing and sitting at certain tables. It seemed I had differing reciprocal relationships with the spaces in which I settled to draw but the multiple images I’d drafted did not distinguish those that drew me in for longer inspections.
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This line of reflection resulted in other graphite works utilising disjointed overviews of the house, exploring its limits with a frustrated and persistent hand pushing deeper into the paper [Fig.32-33]. Where my eyes lingered became the reiterative movements in my hand, intensifying the pools of graphite that resulted. As I pictured it, drawing was literally mapping its own observational progress through prolonged and concentrated mark-making. Warping the translucent paper, the active spaces became shining blocks and textured indentations that glimmered like precious metal, emphasising the value of the time I invested in looking and drawing.

As the landscape of the house perceived by my eyes now included constant visual analysis of the drawings themselves, I saw my investigation as reflexive. Rather than primarily looking at the house, I was spending time looking at the lines that in one way or another stood in for it. I felt as if the hand and eye were involved in a looping interrogation of the drawing process. Although an object observed at a distance, the house was a facilitator, mediator and participant in an active and thoughtful relationship between sight and line. In the process, different aspects of the house were rising from the paper to be scrutinised. For example, as my time and attention on a room resulted in heavier areas on the page, the two-dimensional surface of the paper transformed into an undulating relief. Between these depressions of graphite, pronounced borders formed that spoke of the material boundedness of the house and the physical limitations it imposed.
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Analysing these drawings, I determined that they mapped a layer of observational activity taking place that neither a measured drawing nor an imitative figuration of the house and its objects could show. I wondered if perhaps the feelings of home were somewhere in the fluid surfaces but if so, they were still as trapped as I was by the house. I looked for a way to emphasise the active aspects these images exposed and placed secondary layers beneath the paper sheets on which the graphite was building. Capturing the indentations created by the movement of the tool in my drawing hand, this seemed to record the process separately from product [Fig.34-35]. Ephemeral streams of drawing practice occupied the outlines: a fluidity that enabled visions of the house as not only a fixed area demarcated by walls, doors and windows but a place where activity and encounters were constantly unfolding. Having demarcated the physical borders and edges of the building I inherited as a baseline, I was now revealing ways to address the house and map out its layers of spatial occupation, temporality, activity and flow.

To extend this idea, I used ink and water as a medium for drawing. I first under-painted the room shapes with water to establish their recognisable features, outlines and windows. As the absorbent paper buckled, I mapped what caught my eye in the space with a touch of an inked brush in the corresponding area in the pooling water. The results encapsulated looking at both the room and the developing lines themselves. The black shadows spread into drifts and at times ventured out of the frame, breaking free from the confines of the house. Reflecting on the results, the room was apparent but the predominant marks indicated my prolonged or repetitive focus on the drawing as it was coming into being on the table [Fig.36-41].

It was apparent to me that both conventional marks and contemporary applications of line now shared the same page with a dialogue developing between them. The layouts fulfilled the role of a preparatory drawing for more gestural lines to inhabit. I recalled how the Impressionists stopped using sketches in the arrangement of compositions, and painted directly onto canvas instead. The Expressionists, Cubists and Fauvists also engaged with materials rather than preliminary drawing to construct space. I understood this shift instigated a changing utility of line on paper and a disassociation of drawing from the lofty academic and cerebral intentionality of the fine arts.
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This assumption was confirmed by historical information on The Museum of Modern Art website. When it moved into larger premises in 1939, director Alfred H. Barr established drawing as collectable in the ‘broader scope of design’, although not as a primary medium (MoMA, 1992). Early 20th Century drawing was concretely anchored in the technical requirements of architects and designers. As Rose pointed out, it was taken for granted as a skilled craft and conventional ‘language for imitation’ (Rose, 1982, p.16). Yet the more I read, the more I came across inferences that photographic and film technologies did not irrevocably detach drawing from art but resulted in more innovative methods.

I researched how photographic ways of seeing were the prelude to expanding spatialities of line. Cornelia Butler’s essay *Walkaround Time* offered productive observations on the changing spaces of line following Impressionism. Butler revealed how expressive and gestural modes of drawing entered the twentieth century alongside motion pictures, motor vehicles and Louie Fuller’s exploratory dance techniques (Butler & De Zegher, 2010, p. 25). As movement, velocity and temporal spatiality increasingly came to the fore of everyday life, blurred, diagrammatic and repetitious lines articulated it (Butler & De Zegher, 2010, p. 25). I took up the idea of mobility and gesture being expressively encompassed by drawn lines as another layer of my mapping methodology.

Rather than shapes and silhouettes marking out viewpoints from static positions, my lines became led by movement through the house as I went to the kettle or answered the door. Still using plans as a guideline, my pencil wandered from outlined room to room. Instead of intensively worked graphite or inked pools, drawing sites were marked up as looping trails that built up in areas where I got engrossed. The results appeared as repetitive oscillations: resembling knitting stitches they inhabited the interior [Fig.42-44].

Alongside movement, these methods captured spatial negotiations playing out in my line of sight. The ongoing battle to get the time and space to draw made me highly sensitive to others present in the space. When the house was a blank page, I monopolised the dining room, kitchen or formal drawing room. If a band was there using areas as their workplace or my son was back from school demanding territory of his own, my drawing sites shrank evasively away from busy areas to hide in quiet corners. Hence, the tracking of my lines was to some extent articulating social interaction within the house.
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I thought again about the house embodying social space as well as physical, and recalled comments in Massey. 'Space can never be that completed simultaneity in which all interconnections have been established, and in which everywhere is already linked with everywhere else' stated Massey in her attempts to reconceptualise space as open and fluid (Massey, 2005, p.11-12). To Massey, an idea of space that was 'neither a container for always-already constituted identities nor a completed closure of holism' was desirable, 'This is a space of loose ends and missing links' she suggests (Massey, 2015, p.12). I thought about the links I was still missing in my drawings and noticed that it was not only acts of looking and line-making that were being tracked but the interchanging roles I fulfilled. Whether cooking, writing, talking, putting the kettle on or answering the door, household activities became playful threads and paths reaching out across the space.

On an active day when the house was full, I found myself plotting the reiterative meetings and multiple conversations I was unavoidably engaged in, as frenetically drawn figures on the page [Fig.45]. Corresponding to points of contact, the approach didn’t seem to expose fresh lines to follow or suggest additional mappings to open up new spaces. Perhaps the drawing gesture was too literal to align with the social encounters it portrayed, or maybe in such graphic renditions I had simply lost sight of the house.

I noticed that once the stencil of the plan was removed, there were no boundaries for the figures to align with and the house was effectively lost from the picture. It made me think about the spatial delineation of territory happening around me. These spaces were not defined by walls but through lines being drawn during the social interactivity of people. On a hectic day when I could find no space to draw, such territorial borders seemed frustratingly porous and indistinct. At some point, I screwed up a piece of damaged tracing paper and threw for the bin. I missed and so I retrieved it, but rather than just placing it by hand amongst the waste, I lined up my eye to throw again and noticed the creases had left white lines in the paper. Opening it up, I used a pencil to fill in the areas that the boundaries of my temperamental scrunching had marked out [Fig.46].
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Following these lines a bit further, I attempted to manipulate the paper in my hands as a method of drawing out the spaces I occupied [Fig.47]. Viewing the oddly shaped reliefs reminded me of another aspect of drawing’s spatial development. Aligning with historical methods once again, I related these images to the subversions of the picture plane demonstrated by Henri Matisse, Georges Braque and Pablo Picasso when they took up the evolving line in the early 1900s. ‘Literally grinding through the spaces of the paper and plane in search of the sensorial and tangible, Picasso and Braque extended the act of drawing’ stated Butler (Butler, 2010, p. 168-9). Viewing the papier collés myself, I was intrigued by how the cut, torn and overlaid demarcations created the lines of drawing merely by defining edges and contrasts (Picasso, 1913, Fig.xiii). Rose pointed out how the Cubists used filmic ways of seeing as ‘dissolves, close-ups, multiple exposures, parallels and crosscuts’ in their methods; enabling multiple perspectives of time and space to be viewed at once (Rose, 2007 p.41). It gave me the idea of disrupting the two-dimensional surfaces underlining my own visual language.

Rose suggested that under Cubism ‘drawing itself changed from a system of making a flat surface into a three-dimensional world, to one with which the artist was free to reconstruct the world as he saw fit’ (Rose, 1982, p.13). De Zegher pointed out how the papier collés emphasised ‘both the flatness of the two-dimensional plane and the literal construction of reality, the several dimensions of the everyday (that is, the movement of life)’ (de Zegher, 2010, p. 27). According to Butler, Cubist methods of extending the picture plane ‘into the space of experience beyond the visual, and the deployment of line as the instrument of spatiality’ were to be a recurrent focus of contemporary drawing (Butler, 2010, p. 168). Rose and Butler’s differing interpretations of Cubism’s disrupted planes turned my attention towards the paper supporting my lines.
Pablo Picasso

Guitar, 1913

cut-and-pasted paper, printed paper, charcoal, ink and chalf on colored paper on board
66.4 cm x 49.6 cm

(Butler & De Zegher, 2010, p.29)
My first attempt at interrogating ground and plane involved folding the paper before I drew on it. I used room plans as the structural basis for pencil drawings on tracing paper and then disrupted the conventions of the blueprint by allowing the concertinas to unfold [Fig.48-49]. I then tried using both sides of the paper. Firstly, by following some woodworm bores on the floor but as this didn't hold my interest, I went back to try this technique on the plans [Fig.50]. Unexpected elements entered the frame as heavily working into the paper caused an encounter between the undulations on each side. I started responding to the 'challenge' each side posed to the other, and adding on imaginary rooms. Although still tied to a two-dimensional sheet of paper, my marks were no longer directly referential of the house. There was a notable shift between the act of looking and drawing the line itself, although the sense of buildings and physical construction were ever-present [Fig.51-52].

One morning I laid down my drawing equipment in the kitchen, then needed the sewing machine to repair my son’s split trousers in a hurry before school. Once mended and he had made tracks, it occurred to me that I could fold or disrupt the paper plane through stitch. I fetched a coffee then returned to map out the path I had taken to the kettle and back with a sewn line. When the thread ran out I didn’t stop the machine as drawings were appearing in the tracing paper using movements of the needle alone [Fig.53].
Uncertain Boundaries
2012
Pencil on tracing paper
420 mm x 297 mm
Foldings 2
2012
Pencil on tracing paper
420 mm x 297 mm
Bores
2012
Pencil on tracing paper
210 mm x 165 mm
Side A
2013
Pencil on tracing paper
297 mm x 210 mm
Side B
2013
Pencil on tracing paper
297 mm x 210 mm
Fig. 53

*Untitled*

2012

Cotton thread and tracing paper

297 mm x 210 mm
Here
2010
Punctured tracing paper
210 mm x 210 mm
With puncture marks I built up a simple room plan of where I was sitting as I worked [Fig.54]. Then more lines sketched out by piercings and threads emerged. The waxy paper was folded and layered, sometimes bound together by merely the impact of the needle itself as it pierced several sheets at once [Fig.55-62]. I related these lines rendered inseparable by the invasive movements and interruptions of a drawing process, to the way my articulations of the house were mounting up. Perhaps it was too simplistic to keep envisaging these maps as separate sheets of paper, laid one on top of the other with the plan beneath. There was a more complex connectivity emerging that could be likened to the pages of an atlas.

I looked at the gestural creases forming drawings in front of me and something jogged my memory about Deleuze’s philosophical idea of The Fold (Deleuze 1993, p.18). A simplistic description the concept was as a ‘sheet of paper divided into infinite folds or separated into bending movements, each one determined by the consistent or conspiring surrounding’ (Deleuze 1993, p.18). However, I recalled that in reading Francis Bacon: The Logic of Sensation and What is Philosophy it seemed that Deleuze understood these folds as warped, diminished forms of everyday life. To Deleuze, life is as spatial as it is temporal but we are not conscious of the meaning of the word space when we use it, as our inherited imaginations and assumptions are so ingrained that we do not actively think it out (Deleuze, 2003, p.17). Deleuze implied that space was made up of continuously flowing interstitial intervals or ‘folds’ that were ‘a simple extremity of the line’ (Deleuze 1993, p.18). To me, the concept had similarities with the way minutes help us grasp a concept of time, albeit in a limited and linear way. The conceptualization seemed to map onto the folds and subtle lines generated by repetitive activity marking the paper in front of me, so I kept the idea in sight as a relational way of perceiving spatiality going forward.

Surveying my position, I felt I had followed many meandering lines and gained ground towards the contemporary methods of drawing I remembered reading about in The Drawing Book (2010) as ‘a field co-extensive with real space, no longer subject to the illusion of an object marked off from the rest of the world’ (Rose in Kovats, 2010, p.23). I now saw the house differently and searched out movements, interactions and encounters to generate ideas. The Bauhaus teachings came into my field of vision as another resonant point in drawing’s spatial history.
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De Zegher described the Bauhaus lecturers Klee, Kandinsky and Johannes Itten as ‘deeply concerned with the process by which a point becomes a line, a line becomes a plane, and a plane becomes a body’ (Butler & De Zegher, 2010, p.38). This line of critique directed me to their writings, including Klee’s *Pedagogical Sketchbook* (1925) and Kandinsky’s essays *On Line* (1919-20) and *Point and Line to Plane* (1926). It seemed that teachings at the Bauhaus School of Art played an important role in liberating the line from the page and establishing how a trace of an activity or a mere gesture could constitute drawing. I noticed Kandinsky called for the ‘transference of line into a free environment’ (Kandinsky, 1919, p. 425). On reflection, I saw my lines had markedly moved on from what I regarded as traditional and representational measured designs, yet they were still firmly bound to the paper beneath them.

Perhaps all drawing was in some way representational. I had been using the term indiscriminately but did I know precisely what it meant or really understand its implication for my drawing? What place had the representational line in my project if any? Did I draw a distinction between the line that was imitative, figurative, realistic or merely indicative? Bauhaus students were purposefully discouraged from visually reproducing the reality they saw around them.

Itten defined practical strategies to break down established views of drawing as primarily imitating or ‘looking like’. As outlined in *Design and Form: The Basic Course at the Bauhaus and Later* during the early 1920s, Itten emphasised a visual approach to the world as a series of contrasts. Referring to these contrasts, he suggested that ‘to experience them with their senses, objectivise them intellectually, and realise them synthetically’ required the use of the whole body in the drawing of feelings, ideas and emotions (Itten, 1963, p.12). I tried to imagine the sort of line Bauhaus artists would have laid down in response to the house I was looking at. How might they detail what Blunt and Dowling aptly referred to as both a physical space and ‘an imaginary set of intersecting and variable ideas and feelings’, intrinsically relational and constructive (Blunt & Dowling, 2006, p. 2)? Perhaps I had focused too much on reading and let the balance tip away from visual sensibilities as I felt somehow detached from the practice that usually led me. I wanted to pick up my pencil but I wasn’t sure where I’d left off.
So, I took up a new line of approach derived from Itten’s observations of the world in contrasts and Kandinsky’s free environment for line. I brought them together in a process I regarded as drawing but which utilised light to create optical marks and distinctions. Setting down a pinhole camera I started to draw out the ongoing movements and activities taking place in the house over time [Fig.63-68].

Deleuze referred to the task of the artist 'as the attempt to render visible forces that are not themselves visible' (Deleuze, 1981, p.56). He distinguished between 'imaginings and the 'real, physical, and effective' of 'sensations' Deleuze, 1981, p.19). Deleuze seemed to describe the problem I was having with drawing the house and being stuck in conventional visual ways of seeing. 'In art, and in painting as in music, it is not a matter of reproducing or inventing forms, but of capturing forces' he claimed (Deleuze, 1981, p.56). To Deleuze, we need to escape our ingrained ways of taking in the world and become sensible to 'insensible forces' (Deleuze, 1981, p.57). ‘Can life, can time, be rendered sensible, rendered visible?’ asked Deleuze. He looked for an answer in Bacon’s paintings, whereas I was expanding my own practice to try and draw out such intangible sensations from the house and thereby articulate home.

The blurred, temporal motion caught by the pinhole camera resulted in observational images made when I wasn’t even present. Instead of merely being the viewer, I could be the viewed actor on the other side. Rather than offering inherently static viewpoints bound up in sectional experiences of time, these drawings caught a more complex spatial arena that was constantly changing and moving. I related this to the way drawing had reinvented itself when photography took over the role of visually representing space. Appropriating filmic processes as a form of drawing activity seemed a kind of subversive approach to the contemporary line. The pinhole camera could observe the world in a way that wasn’t so limited to a pictorial happening or the instant. Deleuze implied that static observation and imitative depiction fell short of embodying the mobile fluidity of the body and the space around it: ‘art can indeed be figurative, that figuration is only a result’ (Deleuze, 2003, p.126). I wanted to understand what he meant and how drawing that did not seek to visually imitate the space it inhabited actually related to that space.
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In trying to decipher Deleuze’s writing I came across another philosophical view of drawing. In his essay, *Memoirs of the Blind* published in conjunction with the drawing exhibition at the Louvre in 1991, Derrida undermined the pursuit of likeness through the use of line by relating drawing to blindness. He claimed there to be an inherent disparity between what is seen and what is drawn because the draughtsman is reliant on memory in the translation of one to the other, even if only for a moment (Derrida, 1993, p.1). To Derrida, the blind hand was led by a mind’s eye that ‘guides the tracing or outline’ and ‘coordinates the possibilities of seeing, touching, and moving’ (Derrida, 1993, pp.3-4). By proposing the primary characteristics of drawing as searching, groping and exploratory, Derrida rendered any resultant figuration subservient to the movement the line implied (Derrida, 1993, pp.3-4). Although it was probably hiding in plain sight, it came to me that representation resulting from drawing was of secondary importance to the act of drawing. I connected this privileging of drawing and research process over product back to the itinerant lines established at the Bauhaus that sought to offer a visual expression or sense of the world as opposed to a reproduction.

I recalled the often-cited line that was created as a trace left behind when Klee took his dot for a walk (Klee, 1925, Fig.xiv). In a translation of his instructive *Pedagogical Sketchbook* (1968) the free line that had been relieved of imitative purpose by photography, was described by Klee as ‘an active line on a walk, moving freely, without goal [...] a walk for walk’s sake [...] the mobility agent is a point, shifting its position forward’ (Klee, 1968, p.16). If a drawn line could be the mere trace of a body or hand moving through space, then walking, dancing and even the relentless housework that often consumed me, could be regarded as forms of drawing.

Thinking about drawing in this way offered a guideline to consider movement and activity but also ‘intentionality’. I started to interrogate the incidental marks of human presence in the house as ‘drawn’. To me, the line that emerged from the Bauhaus was no longer expected to depict the world with any visual accuracy but was energised, mobile and more immediately responsive to the active body and its physical occupation of space. Klee’s reduction of the line to the track of movement through time appeared to reveal an

---

142 The same could be said of the research process. Sullivan refers to a reflexive, evolving and transformative research ‘practice’, suggesting that ‘knowledge creation in visual arts is recursive and constantly undergoes change as new experiences “talk back” through the process and progress of making art’ (Sullivan, 2010 p.110).
An active line on a walk, moving freely, without goal. A walk for a walk's sake. The mobility agent is a point, shifting its position forward (Fig. 1):

![Fig. 1](image)

The same line, accompanied by complementary forms (Figs. 2 and 3):

![Fig. 2](image)

![Fig. 3](image)
expressive potential for drawing to articulate far beyond what could be seen, even though the ultimate result was a visible line readable by the eye.

I recognised the development of research methods in the headway I had made in understanding drawing as inherently representational. I returned to Crary and Batchen’s discussions around acts of seeing being historically conceived as separate from the physical body of the observer. Crary referred to a significant shift in the 1800s when ‘the individual as observer became an object of investigation’ (Crary, 1988, p.15). Using Goethe’s discussions of the spots of light and additional colours seen by the eye for a few seconds after looking away from the subject, Crary describes how ‘the corporal subjectivity of the observer, which was a priori excluded from the camera obscura, suddenly becomes the site on which an observer is possible’ (Crary, 1999, p.4). ‘The human body, in all its contingency and specificity, generates "the spectrum of another color,，“ and thus becomes the active producer of optical experience’ states Crary (Crary, 1999, p.4). With the physiology of the eye considered, ‘sight was no longer trusted’ says Betchen. What was seen through mirrors and lenses was now recognised as mediated by the observer. To Crary, this marked the onset of a new creativity image-making beyond the mimetic.

My way of looking at the space had been altered through carrying out my creative practice within it. I no longer saw the house as a physical scene or image to be merely visually repeated. Instead I portrayed it in terms of the ebbs and flows of active interrelationships I perceived it to encompass. In expanding my methods of mark-making, I had viewed the house from different angles and become aware of markers indicative of its historical inhabitation. Drawing out the ideas and beliefs that affected daily life in this space had stretched beyond the paper and the lines generated by my hand as a response to what I saw before me. Rather my lines were now intermingling with the formative attitudes and relations of home drawn into its textures and forms.

I went back and investigated the stains, scratches and signs of utility that had surfaced during the redesign and discovered many more I had previously not noticed. As I emptied the dishwasher I saw all the marks at the bottom of the bowls from the repeated spooning of morning cereals. Instead of seeing the view beyond the window, the rippled imperfections in the old handmade glass and the scratches of decorators’ blades sketched
around the edges caught my eye. Rather than noticing the dirt on the slate slabs in the kitchen, I spotted landscapes implied in their flaking surfaces and years of detritus collecting in the grooves between them. Although not independently documented, found drawings embedded in the house were logged as a mental sketchbook of imagery.

Openness to the visual had hatched out an acute awareness to the presence of line in everyday household life. When I mentioned this, a friend directed me to Tim Ingold’s book *Lines* (2007) described by the author as a ‘comparative anthropology of line’ and its production and significance to daily life (Ingold, 2007, p.1). Ingold pointed out that by walking, talking and gesticulating, human beings generated lines wherever they went (Ingold, 2007, p.1). According to his way of seeing the world, line-making subsumed the everyday human activities of speaking, gesturing and moving around (Ingold, 2007, p.1). His ubiquitous lines linked in with my mounting affirmations of drawing as an active participant in the house as opposed to the mere means of creating a readable image of it. In the back of my mind, I started to wonder what really constituted a drawing to me.

Ingold pertinently asks, 'What is a line? For there to be lines, do there have to be surfaces, or can lines exist without any surfaces at all?' (Ingold, 2007, p.39). He suggested 'the way a line was understood depended critically on whether the plain surface was compared to a landscape to be travelled or a space to be colonized' (Ingold, 2007, p.39). Massey's words echoed in my mind about 'the imagination of space as a surface on which we are placed, the turning of space into time, the sharp separation of local place from the space out there' (Massey, 2005, p.7). According to Massey, these spatial imaginaries are 'ways of taming the challenge that the inherent spatiality of the world presents' (Massey, 2005, p.7). Connections I made between Massey and Ingold in terms of line, space and surface got me thinking about how my drawing territorialised the house and its surfaces.

Whatever household, professional or creative line of activity I was involved in and whichever area of the house was in focus at the time, I began to see lines everywhere. Ingold differentiated between traces that were 'additive' when graphite, charcoal or chalk form an extra layer on the substrate; and 'reductive' as in 'lines that are scratched, scored or etched into a surface' (Ingold, 2007, p.43). As well as found drawings, I took more notice of the traces being inadvertently 'added' or 'subtracted'. I became attracted to watermarks old and new. I took prints by pressing paper soaked with water into the grain.
Where the varnish had been erased by the original burn or dampness beneath the vase or cup, the wood gave up its ingrained dirt and stain as an almost imperceptible shadow on the paper. Drawn in closer to examine these rings, I began filling them in with my pencil. I hadn’t born witness to the object or careless moment from which the original marks had derived, so I sought to acknowledge them somehow [Fig.69-75]. Nobody noticed the subtle changes of tone and the shimmers of the graphite but me.

As several philosophers later developed\(^{143}\), Klee claimed that ‘art does not reproduce the visible; rather, it makes visible’ (Klee, 1920, p.103). In small and quiet ways, my lines reached into disregarded corners and revealed rarely viewed perspectives. I read former MoMA Director John Elderfield interpreting Klee’s statement in an archived page on the museum’s website. ‘Klee seems to have meant that art does (or should) not reproduce what we see, but, rather, that it manufactures what we see’ suggested Elderfield, ‘[it is] not a sort of mechanism that captures and displays existing visible data, but an engine to create a way of looking’ (Elderfield, 2013). Tracing out the house through the eyes of drawing practice was generating new lines of thinking but I also ‘saw’ differently.

Joseph Beuys outlined his drawings in terms of visibility. The show *Drawings by Sculptors*, documented Beuys as having ‘described his drawings as doorways to a state where the invisible could be seen’ (The South Bank, 1993, p.10). Extending this line of thought, he laid down how ‘they attempt to get hold of that state, attempt to visualize how forces hang together, give shape to invisible configurations, but also relate to visible ones’ (Beuys in The South Bank, 1993, p.10). His depiction of drawing pinpointed the way that my increasing sensitivity to line was exposing a house that I had not ‘seen’ before. In drawing interim conclusions, it seemed to me that depicting the visible house only caught the surface of home, hinting at the existence of its imaginary dream world but no more. However, the processes of drawing such as looking, thinking and line-making had brought more aspects of everyday life into view. The interruptions, movements and activities productive of lines both physical and social in the house were being drawn out. I saw the house as ground, object, participant and an archive of traces. As I looked at the lines going out from my practice, I saw space being affected and even created by drawing.

\(^{143}\) A 2012 exhibition text states, ‘Klee recognized that art and philosophy have, despite their basic difference, a certain affinity. In a diary entry from 1917, he writes: “Philosophy has an inclination toward art; at the beginning I was astonished at what all they saw” (Tagebucher 1, p.81) Indeed many of the most original philosophers from the 1920s on came to see Klee’s work as presenting in the guise of art certain of the most fundamental issues with which they, as philosophers, were engaged. The list includes a wide range of thinkers: Benjamin, Adorno, Heidegger, Blanchot, Derrida, Foucault, Gadamer, Deleuze, Merleau-Ponty, and others’ (Sallis, 2012).
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To re-evaluate my position, I revisited the developmental timeline that was guiding my passage through differing methods of articulating space. Aleksandr Rodchenko wrote in 1918 that ‘the line is the first and last, both in painting and in any construction at all. The line is the path of passing through, movement, collision, edge, attachment, joining, sectioning’ (Rodchenko in Butler & De Zegher, 2010, p. 41-42). De Zegher used the Russian Constructivists as an example of how line became a primary consideration, consciously privileged over concerns with the object, individual or space. She referred to their ‘conviction that the artist’s purpose was to transform the two-dimensional into the three-dimensional, not only in the viewer’s imagination but also in reality’ (Butler & De Zegher, 2010, p.42). I researched how the utilitarian art of Russia fed the public with visual material, thereby dissolving perceived demarcations between utilitarian functions of the architect’s line and its academic cerebral correlate in Fine Art.

In 1921 Rodchenko wrote, ‘in the line a new worldview became clear: to build in essence, and not depict (objectify or non-objectify); build new, expedient, constructive structures in life, and not from life and outside of life’ (Rodchenko in Butler & De Zegher, 2010, p.42). According to MoMA curator Magadalena Dabrowski’s interpretation, the focus of artist Luibov Popova’s work was ‘a systematic experimentation with pictorial construction and thus an exploration of the possibilities inherent in line’ (Dabrowski, 1991, p.22). ‘Having become construction, line now named and created a new world of objects and possibilities’ states de Zegher (Butler & De Zegher, 2010, p.42). Popova herself is quoted as saying, ‘transformation for the sake of painterly or sculptural construction is a revelation of our artistic revolution. What is of importance now is the form or part of a form, line, color, or texture that takes an immediate part in the painterly construction’ (Popova in Dabrowski, 1991, p.23). The practices of these artists reflect the ideals of a post-revolutionary Soviet society ‘involved with three-dimensional constructions using real industrial materials’ (Dabrowski, 1991, p.23). Constructivists saw their functional line as the ultimate facilitator, builder and component for the structure of a new daily life.

This got me thinking about how the art I appreciated most was simple and direct, drawing out the time and culture from which it arose. Notions of traces led me to view everyday household activities as a making of lines and the house itself as a collection of lines. I was
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144 MoMA name Constructivist artist Liubob Popova along with Kazimir Malevich, Vladimir Tatlin, Alexander Rodchenko as the most important original artists of the Russian avant-garde (Dabrowski, 1991, p.7).
looking at an abundance of material encompassing visual and physical experiences: readymade drawings that were self-explanatory and directly indicative of the space.

Butler pointedly remarks how drawing offers a ‘direct engagement with the space of the real, with the everyday, and with life itself’ (Butler, 2011, p. 139). I looked at such spaces of reality, the everyday and daily life itself ‘as’ drawing. I noted that the 1920s saw the conventional surface and ground of drawing disappear, ‘much as if the background paper of a drawing had been cut away leaving only the lines’ suggests MoMA curator James Johnson Sweeney (Sweeney, 1951, p.20). According to de Zegher, ‘the line that had indicated motion now actually initiated it, embodying it in time and space’ (de Zegher, 2010, p.51). String and wire were drawn out as free-flowing lines occupying real space. For example, Alexander Calder’s floating spatial ‘drawings’ became independently kinetic; responsive to air currents and touch. ‘These figures were no longer merely toys wittily contrived from chance materials’ says Sweeney, ‘they were now three dimensional forms drawn in space by wire lines’ (Sweeney, 1951, p.20)145. Liberated from the notion of the artwork as a static object, they inextricably interrelated to their spatial environments.

De Zegher states, ‘as line comes to focus on the corporeal, it is increasingly corporealisated’ (De Zegher, 2010, p.50). At the First Papers of Surrealism (1942) exhibition in New York, the materialised lines of Marcel Duchamp’s Sixteen Miles of String rendered the gallery impassable for those wishing to move around the artworks (Duchamp, 1942, Fig.xv). Visitors to the opening were not only disorientated by the installation, but also ‘by the presence of a group of children who, at Duchamp’s instigation, bounced balls and played hopscotch among them’ with Duchamp nowhere in sight (Hopkins, 2014, p.1). Duchamp scholars have tended to see the work as alluding to the displacement of the surrealist group at the time (Hopkins, 2014, p.2). However, the fact that it was a family apartment not a gallery that Duchamp chose to transform, suggests he intended the viewer to join the children and engage in an experience of ‘play’. Kurt Schwitters also used string to draw out intangible interrelations between objects and interpersonal encounters in his house. The tunnels and voids of the Merzbau (1923-1937) marked a living transformative environment of connective lines that were ceaselessly redrawn (Schwitters, c.1932, Fig.xvi). It was this fluid reciprocity of inhabited space and line that I sought.

145 Calder was previously a toy-maker.
Marcel Duchamp
*Sixteen Miles of String* (installation view), 1942
First Papers of Surrealism Exhibition, New York
(Butler & De Zegher, 2010, p.161)
Kurt Schwitters
*Merzbau*, c.1932
5 Walhausenstrasse, Hanover
(Bishop, 2005, p.40)
The physical lines these artists drew, actively intervened in lived social space. Somebody passing through my house both impacted on the form my lines took and participated in their reverberations. Such lines were not drawn up by one artist but were completed by engagement with others. I perused the shifts between artist and viewer: how they were variously marked out by hand drawn lines, the lines of social negotiation and the found lines of traces. I hatched a plan to taken note of points where intentional, participatory and incidental lines converged in the context of the house. This brought forth the questions lurking in my mind about what constituted a line drawn by me. Must I have a hand in its production or could I be absent, as when the light drew out the hours onto film in the pinhole camera? I decided that in the current frame, I could not presume to know. To gain ground, I needed to investigate what drawing and the house could do when negotiating space on the same page.

I had taken inspiration from following the developing lineage of spatial drawing through time. Rather than being fixed in the Renaissance perspective, my methods had been transformed along new lines towards the mobile independent spaces of mid-1900s drawing ‘as a medium of and on its own’ (de Zegher, 2011, p.68). Rosalind Krauss depicted artists of this period productively ‘problematizing the set of oppositions’ imposed by the strict parameters of Modernism in ways that irrevocably extended the possibilities for creative practices (Krauss, 1979a, p.38-42). Nevertheless, this is the point in history when I left the chronology of drawing to take a more conceptual path. Instead of tracking a pre-existing timeline, I needed to look more closely at the divergent, convergent and connective marks of the spatial layers being mapped.

Rose described a fundamental re-evaluation of the medium and its discipline that resulted in ‘an expanded field of drawing’ being explored during the second half of the 20th Century (Rose, 1976, p.9). This expanded field was my methodological reference as I continued to visually deconstruct the physical house. I saw the drawing I was taking forward as: inherently spatial, performative and embodied; a reflexive, analytical and self-referential way of thinking; related to looking, seeing and observing; able to affect, create and occupy space; intrinsically temporal in its becoming, value and take up; a visual language able to translate, communicate and articulate; a process of mapping active, emotional and temporal space in ways that could make it visible, readable and even real.
Having begun to test these attributes of line, I felt confident in entering an expanded field of twenty-first century drawing that was able to interrogate its own functional, representational and spatial traditions as possibilities. The contemporary line I took up could be writing, dance, trace or object and had an inherent mobility and independence. Simultaneously unbound and embodied, descriptive and performative, temporal and spatial: line could map as well as create the everyday spaces of our active being. For me, it had earned its centrality as I continued to experientially navigate the house and the way I saw my everyday household operating.

Glancing back over my notes and drawings, I saw repeats and overlaps. My project was characterised by repetitive approaches such as reflecting, reiterating, re-enacting, appropriating and revisiting. I recalled a seminar on research processes which described ‘re-search’ as passing over the same ground over and over; seeking out the new in the old; re-examining in order to discover; going through another time; seeing things differently; and trying to ‘find’ through repetition (Inglis, 2010). In my daily life, I walked along the corridors of my house countless times. I passed through the same doors over and over. I entered, left and re-entered the rooms, often without registering my actions unless I saw a change. When drawing, I tended to repeat my activities again and again.

I aligned my acts of drawing with housekeeping and home-making through time and repetition. This enabled a view of my restless rearrangements as symptomatic of drawing’s homelessness in a house where it had yet to fully ‘belong’. I viewed drawing as an integral part of everyday activities: a condition or ‘syndrome’ of my household roles. I remembered reading the transcript of an interview in which artist Bourgeois told Herkenhoff about the lack of delineation she made between art and life. She described her practice as a syndrome of the everyday: ‘syndrome is a very, very good word. It is the concurrence of a set of symptoms, a repetition…that shows a pathology’ (Bourgeois, 2003, p23). A retrospective at Tate Modern (2007) presented recurrent threads of time, gender and family running seamlessly through her conjoined living and working practices. A tangible lack of demarcation between my own creative, familial and professional roles was visible as the preparations of site and my fastidious lines exemplified the repetitive performances of commonplace household tasks.

For a time, I regarded my performative drawing activities as ‘creative housekeeping’. This
brought to the fore how women’s housework was often viewed as completely lacking any creative aspects. In *The Second Sex* (1949), de Beauvoir claimed that ‘few tasks are more like the torture of Sisyphus than housework, with its endless repetition...the housewife wears herself out marking time: she makes nothing, simply perpetuates the present’ (de Beauvoir, 2010, p.226). In this way housekeeping was not a fitting term for the productive relationship I perceived between lines and the house. However, repetition pointed to an inextricable correlation between my laborious drawing methods and the everyday roles I fulfilled. I wanted to draw out these elements ‘repetitively’.

The idea reminded me of the way in which Bourgeois’ work was understood to be deeply entwined with psychoanalytic theory in her repetitive addressing of the past. Her work has been aligned with a perpetual revisiting of her childhood memories in a kind of Freudian process of remembering, repeating and reworking trauma. For example, introducing her book of psychoanalytic writings, Philip Larratt-Smith suggests Bourgeois ‘maintained that although the process of making art offers the artist no permanent cure, it does at least grant him a momentary reprieve or exorcism of past trauma’ (Larratt-Smith, 2011). ‘She was very anxious’ suggests her assistant Gorovoy, ‘anxiety is a continual thread through her work, from the arched figures (representative of hysteria) to the cupping cups she used to nurse her ailing mother, associated with her father’s infidelity’ (Gorovy in Ferrier, 2016). ‘That she spent 30-odd years in and out of psychoanalysis (Freudian, of course) is palpable’ says Gorovy (Gorovy in Ferrier, 2016). In the notes made in these session, Bourgeois spoke of ‘a masochistic impulse to repeat a frustrating ritualistic experience’ (Bourgeois, 1957). As I focused on drawing out the house, I saw my practice of repetitively looking again, little by little, redrawing the past activities, ingrained assumptions and societal expectations that shaped it.

Derrida wrote about the sense of time passing being reliant on a reflective awareness of changes occurring through repeated action. In his article *Différance* (1968), he used concepts of temporality to transform traditional notions of space as a unified object into a poststructuralist understanding of space as characterised by gaps or differences (Derrida, 1973). He stated, ‘an interval, a distance, spacing, must be produced between

---


147 This quote is from a paper dated 13 November, 1957, (Larratt-Smith & Bronfen, 2012).

148 This essay appeared originally in the bulletin of the Société française de philosophie, LXII/11 no.3 July-September 1968, pp.73-101. It was reprinted in English in *Speech and Phenomena and other Essays* in 1973.
the elements other, and be produced with a certain perseverance in repetition (Derrida, 1982 p.8). According to Derrida ‘in constituting itself, in dividing itself dynamically, this interval is what might be called spacing, the becoming-time of space or the becoming-space of time’ (Derrida, 1982, p.8). I took his concept of repetition to mean that if I looked again, paid closer attention or chose a fresh viewpoint, out of the corner of my eye I might be able to catch sight of these variances. Furthermore, in revealing these shifts and changes that were at first imperceptible, it was apparent that even the most repetitious events (as in copying a line or housework) were always unique.

Benjamin offered an interesting view on attending to the gaps and differences occurring in everyday life. The implication was that we lived within a particular structure in order to operate as a society: an ontological doctrine of ‘being’ that organized our lives without us realising, and that we simply understand as ‘the way to live’. Benjamin suggested that it is only on reflection and when we ‘brush history against the grain’, that we catch a glimpse of the shifts in these ubiquitous systems (Benjamin, 1969, p.248). This enabled a view of repetition, temporality and gaps as connective lines between drawing and space.

The most prominent repetitive tendency as the house and drawing mutually impacted on one another, was perhaps my re-enactment of past activities. Standing at the big butlers sink in the kitchen, I soaked large sheets of porous watercolour paper as if they were table linens. Once soft and pliable, I laid them over indentations and cracks in the worn slate flagstones. Kneeling on the cold floor, I rubbed and pressed the soggy pulp into the uneven surfaces picking up traces of dirt. Returning to repeat the tactile process until the paper had fixed its shape, my position replicated that of other women who had got down and scrubbed, picked and wiped the dirt from those crevices year after year. It evoked a past in which domestic staff would have carried out such labours according to the strict social hierarchies delineating the house as a private space for some and a workplace for others. Creative and household activities merged across generational and class divides through my replications, as I invested my time and attention to bringing these supposedly insignificant acts into view [Fig.76-79].
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Paper and dirt
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Fig. 78

Floorscapes 7
2012
Paper and dirt
380 mm x 280 mm
Floorscapes 2
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I regarded the resultant images as monuments to the effectively unseen activities of the house. The revisiting of disregarded deeds and past lives was a recurrent theme in Susan Hiller’s work. The revival of lost identities in *Monument* (1980-1981) involved Hiller using sound and photographic images in an installation centred on a series of plaques honouring forgotten acts of heroism (Hiller, 1980-81, Fig.xvii). According to critic Colin Herd, the piece created the intimate and private in a public space in a way that hadn’t been done before (Herd, 2011). I was commemorating everyday labours precisely because they were never regarded as heroic but perhaps deserved to be. The historical house I had inherited embodied countless unseen women’s activities. I was familiar with Rachel Whiteread’s casts of houses and the negative spaces of beds, chairs and baths (Whiteread, 1996, Fig.xviii). I presumed she intentionally brought attention to the way the interior was persistently disregarded.

In an interview with Whiteread, Michael Archer described her plaster and concrete casts as ‘conjuring forms out of the invisible corners of the domestic world, her allusive work transforms absence, loss and memory into solid materiality’ (Archer in Furlong, 2010, p.121). It led me to read her sculptures as memorials, entombing past identities and functions of intimate life. Our house embodied individual experiences and historical scenes I could never truly visualise. Whiteread’s casts made the spaces inaccessible, so emphasised the persistent tendency of the interior to remain marginalised and hidden. I wanted to draw out these unnoticed aspects of the house by making its everyday spaces tangible and readable.

Reflecting on my moulded drawings, I now saw the monumentality that arose when they were inverted. The negative shapes became substantial boundaries standing proud and divisory from the paper. It not only gave form to the unnoticed but demonstrated how the mark related to the surface in ways that delineated areas from each other. Seen in this way, drawing was not a passive act but an offensive differentiation. Watching the news reporting issues of immigration and refugees involved in riots over rising borders, I visualised all the lines appearing across the world in the proliferation of fortifications increasingly dividing our planet.

---

149 For example, The Guardian reported refugees blocking roads in Greece over the closing of EU borders, and fears that migrants were to be deported back to Turkey causing ‘rioting and rebellion by thousands of entrapped refugees across Greece’ (Smith, 2016).
Susan Hiller
*Monument*, 1980-81
41 photographs, colour, on paper, bench, tape player, headphone and audio
Unconfirmed 4572 x 6856 mm, duration: 14 min., 23 sec.
Tate (Hiller, 1980-81)
Rachel Whiteread
*Untitled (Black Bath)*, 1996
Urethane resin
800 x 2065 x 1100 mm
(Ubac, 2010, p.104)
Anna Barriball
*Shutters with Fire Red*, 2011
Pencil on paper, acrylic spray paint on board
82.3 x 96.5 cm
Frith Street Gallery (Barriball, 2011)
Anna Barriball
*Door*, 2004
Pencil on paper
208.5 x 88 x 6 cm
Frith Street Gallery (Barriball, 2004)
In the compendium of writings *city a-z*, I read a short piece on *Boundaries* by Iain Borden (Pile & Thrift, 2000). He described urban space as a series of ‘opportunity constraints’ allowing or denying horizontal movement: boundaries ‘which extend their zone of influence on either side’ (Borden, 2000, p.21). I thought about walls, lines and space coming into play by enclosing and excluding, whether imposed by the single line traversing the page or the myriad of fortifications, walls, barriers and fences that obstruct us in our daily lives. Borden pointed out how boundaries were ‘the product of social relations and their control’ (Borden, 2000, p.21). His concept seemed to map over both the physical house and the fluid lines of social interplay it increasingly encompassed.

Looking at the hairs, dirt and crumbling grout embedded in the paper fibres of my recent drawings, it occurred to me that when I was drawing the space in which I lived, I tended to forget that the house also drew me. Like the wrinkles of our skin, the objects and spaces of dwelling accumulate traces of inhabitation: marks that are indicative of the roles and responsibilities of daily life. Shown at the Frith Street Gallery (2004), Anna Barriball’s work captured the physical traces of utility on doors, windows, walls and wardrobes through laborious graphite rubbings (Barriball, 2011, Fig.xix). In *Door* the scratches and indents that told of the object’s previous usage had become scars sketched into a reflective sensual surface (Barriball, 2004, Fig.xx). However, in Barriball’s work I did not recognise the autobiographical layer of detritus I picked up in my own.

It seemed important to encapsulate the shift between past and present, self and other, the familiar and unknown. I brought my graphite drawings and paper prints onto the same sheet of paper as frottage and observed the temporal gap ‘in-between’ the house I saw and the presence of others occupying it before me. To me, they were lingering just out of sight in the lines and traces that I spotted in the corner of my eye. I started laborious rubbings of pre-owned wooden chopping boards [Fig.80-93]. By spending my time looking and drawing, I was asserting them worthy of attention.

Time and repetition seemed to play central roles in philosophy, geography, history and social science but the questioning of time was also prominent in contemporary art. As art critic Amelia Groom pointed out ‘wasting and waiting; regression and repetition; non-consummation and counter-productivity; the belated and the obsolete; the disjointed and the out of synch’ were familiar tropes in art (Groom, 2013, p.12).
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I first viewed time as a tool for creative practice in the practices of artists, Fischli and Weiss. I was particularly struck by their work’s temporality at the exhibition, *Flowers & Questions* (Tate Modern, 2006). One room appeared to be full of their studio equipment, including sinks, tables, materials and tools (Fischli & Weiss, 1992, Fig.xx). It was a turning point for me when I saw it was all carved and painted by hand. They had used ‘time-wasting’ as a subversive device to effectively undermine the concept of the readymade.

I have since observed an attentiveness to laborious creative practices and the handmade in artists’ work. In *Art & Today* (2008), Eleanor Heartney wrote that ‘art today draws on the changes to our physiological and psychological perception of time created by advances in science and technology’ (Heartney, 2008, p.11). She claimed that ‘virtual reality, instant replay, slow and fast motion, and the Internet are a few of the elements in artworks that mirror this shifting temporal relationship to the world’ (Heartney, 2008, p.11). I thought perhaps this fast-paced technological age of art was being countered by time-consuming hand-based creative practices such as drawing.

Fischli and Weiss’ Sisyphean misuse of time intentionally added value to something by simply spending time with it. Searching for references to temporality in art, I came across the essay *Creative Practice: The time of grace* (2010) by Andrew Metcalfe and Ann Game. It examined the repetitive temporality of creative practice and transformations brought about by activities as ‘the discipline of ascetic practice allows the emergence of gift, that is, that it allows things to happen through rituals rather than the will of participants’ (Metcalfe & Game, 2010, p.165). They implied that time spent creating was bound up alongside narrative and exchange in the intrinsic worth of the art object.

I recalled artists whose drawings conveyed an astounding amount of time in their making. When standing in front of the extraordinarily detailed and laborious practices of Paul Noble (Noble, 2000, Fig.xxii) or Gary Lawrence (Lawrence, 2011, Fig.xxiii) for example, I was in awe. Harnessing the devices of technical drawing and maps to create multiple viewpoints, these works offered a duality of subjective and objective experience. Immersed as an insignificant speck in the seemingly infinite, enormous worlds they portrayed, I was at the same time hovering above them, able to encompass the whole in a grasp no longer contained by mortal physicality.
Fischli & Weiss
1992-ongoing
Carved polyurethane objects, painted, life-size
(Fleck, Sontgen, Danto, 2005, p.87)
Paul Noble
_Lidonob_, 2000
Pencil on paper
300 cm x 450 cm
(Dexter, 2005, p.221)
Gary Lawrence
*Homage to Anonymous*, 2011
Ballpoint pen on paper
115 cm x 175 cm
(Taylor, 2011, p.43)
I increasingly regarded my own fastidious processes as underpinned by the temporality of drawing: how my acts of drawing carried and manipulated time; how my drawing processes variously mapped time made, lost and wasted; and how my time added value to the drawing product. I drew out these lines of enquiry as I proceeded with my project, from finding time to draw and the duration of creating a line, to accentuating time as reduced or extended in the viewing experience. I perused these aspects of my drawing practice in relation to repetitive temporal tendencies of the household. As I spent hour upon hour focusing my gaze on the damaged surfaces of chopping boards emerging through the paper surface, the absorption of my time affected the household.

Continuing to draw with temporality at the fore revealed how my time and that of other family members was not necessarily being viewed on equal terms. The value of time as intrinsic to my drawing brought forth the cliché of ‘time means money’ but no such remuneration existed for work done in the house. I was well-aware that my husband could not work or earn as he did without my support. Indeed, as Silvia Federici points out, ‘capitalism is built on such unpaid labour (Federici, 2010). However, the income imbalance between my husband and I had long ensured that his work remained of principal importance to the family. This was the norm for us but my drawing practice was making me look at things differently and showed up how my largely unpaid activities were subservient to his. In fact, of all my obligations drawing was regarded by the family as the least important demand on my time, commanding no more status or respect than a frivolous pastime.

A layer of home was surfacing as a site of spatial and temporal negotiation between contradictory familial and gendered ideologies. As a wife and mother, I was the key figure in facilitating a familial picture of wellbeing and security. My primary responsibility was fulfilling the expectations that the family, society and I assigned to these roles. However, the time I attributed to mark-making, created conflict and insecurities amongst those accustomed to my availability. The family were showing themselves to be dismissive of my creative priorities, unashamedly obscuring my needs with theirs.

---

150 Silvia Federici discusses ‘affective labour’, drawing attention to ‘the redefinition of work, and the recognition of women’s unpaid reproductive labor as a key source of capitalist accumulation’ (Federici, 2010). She claims that by accepting how housework actually contributes to the accumulation of capital, it can be ‘established that capitalism is built on an immense amount of unpaid labor, that it is not built exclusively or primarily on contractual relations; that the wage relation hides the unpaid, slave-like nature of so much of the work upon which capital accumulation is premised’ (Federici, 2010).
In Irene Cieraad’s *At Home: An Anthropology of Domestic Space* (1999), I read an essay by Munro and Madigan entitled *Negotiating Space in the Family Home* (Cieraad, 1999). The authors claimed that ‘in the light of a woman’s role in the home, it is important to recognize that women need time as well as space’ (Cieraad, 1999, p.115). It seemed a pertinent observation considering my lack of entitlement to either in the house. Immersed in one rubbing after another, I avidly watched the knife cuts emerging on the paper overlays in thick textured layers of graphite and conté. Wearing down sticks and pencils, this fastidious process stood for more than the drawing product.

I contemplated doing a pile of such rubbings, layering them up to the same height as me. Surely after that long drawing, I could confidently present myself as an artist deserving of time for my practice. Envisaging the mounting drawings, I wondered if they would convey the hours they represented. Or perhaps my time spent drawing would be more apparent at the point where it was missed elsewhere – in running the house and caring for the family. This reminded me of Luis Alberto Oliveira’s comments on continuous transformation in the *Spaces of Transformation* lectures on topology (Tate, 2012) He pointed out that when you make something you take away elsewhere: for example, making a chair left a marker or tension behind in the world, at the point where wood was extracted (Oliveira, 2012). To Oliveira, the product and the resultant gap remained interconnected as one. Topologically speaking, my neglected household responsibilities were the reiterative drawings, the overflowing bin was the pencil line on the paper.

Avoiding my expectations as wife, mother and manager of the household in this way would have shocked early occupants of the house. Such neglectful behaviour might have been aligned with the path to ‘hysteria’: that feminine madness historically thought to stem from the uterus and which supposedly rendered women incapable or unwilling to fulfil their ‘womanly’ duties and social expectations. The idea of being diagnosed a hysterical seemed far removed from my experience. I was not articulating women’s historical repression but simply looking at the house and mapping how it operated.

The Prinzhorn Collection collated by art historian and physician Hans Prinzhorn in around 1920, sought to reveal the mind by getting psychiatric patients to draw (Brand-Claussen et al, 1996). One patient Emma Hauck, pleaded to be taken home by layering the same sentence over and over in a form of love letter to her husband. Prinzhorn referred to her intense repetitive words as a ‘progenital form of drawing’ (Hauck, 1909, Fig.xxiv).
Emma Hauck
_Sweetheart come (letter to her husband), 1909_
Pencil on writing paper
20 cm x 16 cm
(Kovats, 2007, p.258)
It reminded me of *The Yellow Wallpaper* written by Charlotte Perkins Gilman in 1892, which vividly described a woman’s descent into madness from her own point of view (Gilman, 1997, pp.1-15). Convalescing and deprived of a creative outlet, her imagination fixes on lurid images in the wallpaper of the room where she was confined. Her visceral descriptions of its decay, symbolised the destructive effect of an oppressive patriarchal society (Golden, 2004). Her hold on the fine line of reality was gradually lost.

I saw such connections between women’s madness, creativity and social expectations as derived from a different world than I was looking at. Yet I observed women’s creative practices often discussed in terms of compulsion and repetition. Perhaps it related to the influence of psychoanalysis on art and philosophy. Certainly, residual notions of women being biologically unable to control their obsessive tendencies have persisted. De Beauvoir claimed that women were doomed to repetition and enslavement in the ordinary (de Beauvoir, 2010, p.610). In *The Invention of Everyday Life*, Rita Felski implied that as a result of such affirmations, women were commonly seen as embodied subjects, connected and even represented by their biological nature and biorhythmic cycles (Felski, 1999, pp.15 – 31). I had aligned my interest in repetition with temporality and the hand, I now saw it was a loaded concept.

I recalled the dialectical rhythms and temporalities structuring Bourgeois’ cathartic methodologies. To her, the recurrent spirals reflected the limits of winding a clock and stood as metaphors for the consistencies of the everyday (Bourgeois, 2003, p.12). Her ghostly towers, *I Do, I Undo, I Redo* (2000) installed in the Turbine Hall at Tate Modern as the first in *The Unilever Series* were not merely constraining places of a life history but offered new embodied and experiential spaces (Bourgeois, 2000, Fig.xxv). After queuing, watching, contemplating others and eventually climbing up one of the three steel towers to a platform, it felt right to stand awhile to look down at those below or on other platforms before descending again and navigating others climbing to do the same.

The ongoing flow of repetitive yet unique encounters between viewer, artwork and building, were reflected in mirrors suspended over the platforms. The whole self-conscious performance of entering Bourgeois’ world if only for a few minutes, brought the usually disregarded everyday negotiations of space, body and society to the fore.
Louise Bourgeois
*I Do, I Undo, I Redo* 1994
Streel, stainless, steel, fabric, wood, glass, marble, wood
11.4 cm x 31.1 cm x 6.7 cm
(Storr, Herkenhoff & Schwarzman, 2003, p.15)
Louise Bourgeois
Femme Maison, 1994
White Marble
11.4 cm x 31.1 cm x 6.7 cm
(Morris, 2007, p.139)
In mapping my house, I did not see time and repetition as restrictive aspects but tools to intervene in the space and its social relations. As Cieraad stated, ‘today’s housewife may not claim a room of their own but they have created their own privacy conditions in an effective combination of space and time zoning’ (Cieraad, 1999, p.7). For me, drawing actively negotiated these spatial and temporal territories in the house.

In dealing with what life was like as a woman, Bourgeois demonstrated how the materiality of location and the abstraction of a gendered embodiment inseparably entwined in her ideas of home. The conjoined houses and torsos in her Femme Maison paintings (1945-7), repeated later as a white marble sculpture of the same name (1994), simultaneously depicted the artist’s imprisonment and her persona, or perhaps her creativity unable to be contained (Bourgeois, 1994, Fig.xxvi). She appeared stuck between public and private worlds, at once both invisible and visible. This image stayed with me as I questioned my own living practices. I did not see in my house the sort of confinement Bourgeois expressed but some sense of being imprisoned inside it without a creative outlet had led me to explore my ideas of home through drawing.

Bourgeois brought me face to face with the feminist issues from which I had been trying to avert my gaze. I found myself on the same page as women artists appropriating repetition in order to revise life stories and reveal patterns of personal experience as consequences of wider socio-political structures. It was time to examine how my gender and views on feminism defined the landscape under scrutiny. When I looked at the house, I could not pretend my lines fell on an empty page. I had inherited a pre-existing image of the house in its physicality and social history. However, I also saw it through a map drawn by my own culture and experience.

Arguably motivated by personal self-examination and self-reflection, Bourgeois maintained an acute awareness of sexual politics and ‘an intense interest in what women do’ (Bourgeois in Morris, 2007, p.134). Nevertheless, she consistently rallied against being called a ‘female artist’ or a ‘feminist artist’ (Gorovy in Ferrier, 2016). Bourgeois also refuted the alignment of her work with Lucy Lippard’s concept of Eccentric

151 Bourgeois said, ‘my work deals with problems that are pre-gender. For example, jealousy is not male or female. I do not believe that there is a feminist aesthetic’ (Bourgeois in Palmer, 2015). According to Gorovy, Bourgeois was a strong feminist, but never called herself a ‘female artist’ or a ‘feminist artist’: ‘you wouldn’t be able to place her gender from looking at a lot of the work. To call her a ‘female artist’ or a ‘feminist artist’ is reductive. It was simply autobiographical – she was dealing with universal emotions: jealousy, rejection, and so on. These are pre-gender’ (Gorovy in Ferrier, 2016).
Abstraction and ‘feminist core imagery’ (Lippard, 1971, pp.101-102)\textsuperscript{152}. Lippard’s idea of a supposedly inherent female aesthetic that artists such as Judy Chicago and Miriam Schapiro also explored, was criticised for being reductive, essentialist and even racist (Walker, 1983, p.383-384). In this context, Lippard’s identification of typical characteristics as being ‘repetitive or detailed to the point of obsession’ appeared a problematic lineage to be evidencing in my own practice (Lippard, 1976, p. 49). I questioned if a ‘feminist’ reading of my drawing was limiting and counterproductive.

For me, feminism involved acceptance that gender inequalities have and continue to exist, and movement towards equality which seem like values impossible to argue against. However, it has been suggested that a ‘backlash’ against second-wave feminism, has left the term ‘feminist’ loaded with negative connotations (Oakley & Mitchell 1997).\textsuperscript{153} Unfair labelling of men as oppressors had armed feminism with the potential to be as damaging to men as patriarchy had been to women (Pereira, 2003). Hence, ‘women have often been punished for identifying themselves as feminists’ says Rutherford, ‘which means that even now when speaking on issues of inequality and wanting to be accepted and heard, it is necessary to start with “I’m not a feminist but...”’ (Rutherford, 2011, p.13). Perhaps this was why I didn’t readily accept its description. Moreover, some feminists ‘reject equality as a covert attempt to force women to become like men’ says Toril Moi (Moi, 1985, p.98). Yet in my mind equality did not mean ‘sameness’.

From what I saw, derogatory views of feminism cause many to either attack it or avoid it: or in my husband’s case, retreat into defensive ill-humour at its mere mention. Apparently, the everyday assumption was that feminism was simply too severe and vitriolic to take up. Yet when I looked up the seven demands of the Women’s Liberation Movement as key to second-wave feminism, there seemed no question of their enduring relevance and validity for debate in today’s society. The main tenet was the personal is political and as Lippard later argued, in the context of art feminism was ‘neither a style

\textsuperscript{152} Since the late forties, Louise Bourgeois has been working in manners relatable to eccentric abstraction’ claims Lippard (Lippard, 1971, p.101). She identifies ‘several small, earth or flesh-colored latex molds which, in their single flexible form, indirectly erotic or scatological allusions, and emphasis on the unbeautiful side of art, prefigured the work of other artists today. Often labially slit, or turned so that the smooth, yellow-pink-brown lining of the mold as well as the highly tactile outer shell is visible, her mounds, eruptions, concave-convex reliefs, and knottlike accretions are internally directed, with a suggestion of voyeurism’ (Lippard, 1971, pp.101-102). She states, ‘such mindless, near-visceral identification with form, for which the psychological term, “body-ego” or Bachelard’s “muscular consciousness” seems perfectly adaptable, is characteristic of eccentric abstraction’ (Lippard, 1966, p.102).

\textsuperscript{153} See: (Oakley & Mitchell 1997); and (Rutherford, 2011, pp.101-103).
nor a movement’ but rather ‘a value system a way of life’ (Lippard, 1908, p.362).\textsuperscript{154} As a woman artist utilising drawing practice to address a family house, its historical interiority and the isolation of feminine creativity, contextualizing my research in relation to feminism seemed increasingly important: especially as the resulting drawings were visually associative of the decorative arts Vickery identified in Georgian houses.

Whilst figuring out the threads connecting my lines to feminism, new drawing arose from the formations of dust and fluff gathered from hard to see places in the house [Fig.94]. Initiated by notions of time and repetition, the softly blurred reliefs suggested a reverence for the dust itself and a defiance of housework. Intended or not, both drawing process and product displayed connotations of a space affected by conventional notions of the house as a woman’s realm. I liked to assume that our house had thrown off the gendered imbalances and tensions of its past. Were there more connections than I cared to admit between my drawing and the creative practices of the Victorian women who had lived here?

I came across Bello’s description of the private house constructed as a space ‘touched by women, whose closeness to nature made it a redemptive refuge from the negative influences of civilization’ (di Bello, 2007, p.152). Di Bello brought my attention to instructive books that encouraged women to be compliant and embrace housework as fashionable, desirable and even heroic because the care of a loving hand is better than a hired hand (di Bello, 2007, p.63). One called \textit{A Young Ladies Book: A Manual of Elegant Recreations, Exercises and Pursuits}, stated that ‘home has justly been called [a woman’s] empire, and it is certain that to her it is a hallowed circle, in which she may diffuse the greatest earthly happiness’ (Anonymous, 1829, p.23). Apparently, a young woman’s learning should focus on home-making: ‘mental improvement should always be made conducive to moral advancement: to render a young woman wise and good, to prepare her mind for the duties and trials of life, is the great purpose of education’ (Anonymous, 1829, p.23). Sarah Ellis, wrote a series of conduct books to similar effect between 1839

\textsuperscript{154} Devised at Women’s Liberation Movement national conferences 1970-1978: The Seven Demands were finalised as:
The women’s liberation movement asserts a woman’s right to define her own sexuality, and demands:
1. Equal pay for equal work
2. Equal education and job opportunities
3. Free contraception
4. Free 24-hour community-controlled childcare
5. Legal and financial independence for women
6. An end to discrimination against lesbians
7. Freedom for all women from intimidation by the threat or use of male violence. An end to the laws, assumptions and institutions which perpetuate male dominance and men’s aggression towards women
Fig. 94

*Hard to reach places*
2012
Dust on Paper
280 mm x 280 mm
and 1853 collectively known as *The Women of England* (Ellis, 2010). In them, Ellis warns women against ‘notions of refinement that are rendering them less influential, less useful, and less happy than they were’ and claims it to be ‘rather an honour than a degradation to be permitted to add to the sum of human happiness, by diffusing the embellishments of mind and manners over the homely and familiar aspects of everyday existence’ (Ellis, 2010, p.11). To Ellis, families and indeed the nation depended on cultivating domestic happiness through women’s endeavours.\(^{155}\) I pictured men pursuing a public life without challenges or competition from women, whilst women were repeatedly advised that the morality and harmony of home and family needed their undivided attention. The implication was that a house could not be a home without their care and creative input.

Although not in the direct field of vision, the marks left by these demarcations were still defining my role as wife and mother. I could see that divisions of femininity from paid professional activities, and the imposed ideal of a ‘woman’s touch’ for hands-on mothering and home-making, still underlined social pressures on me to ‘stay at home’. How was it that such ingrained notions still lingered in an inclusive society that saw fit to legislate the degenderisation of professional roles and incomes? From what I could see, the endeavours to enforce women’s equality had tended to focus on their economic independence and employment status. However, the opportunity for women to access the workplace was not balanced by an increase in men’s household responsibilities. Looking at the media, urban space as a more politically and economically prominent environment, attracted far more critical interest than the unremunerated private sphere. It seemed to me that the latter was mostly considered of lesser significance, so tended to lag behind the dialectics of change.

In their book *Our House: The Representation of Domestic Space in Modern Culture* (2006), Gerry Smyth and Jo Croft pointed out that the domestic space impacts on the lives of everybody but this very ubiquity had seemingly militated against its serious critical engagement (Smyth & Croft, 2006, p.16). Following this line into the critical arena at my focal point, I revealed prominent contributions addressing the invisibility of home were made by artists during the 1960s and 70s bringing attention to the labours of women that had been previously undervalued and excluded from history and intellectual discourse.

\(^{155}\) According to Caroline Austin-Bolt, ‘although Ellis is often-cited as a popular cultural and social influence on nineteenth-century British women readers, little has been written on the contexts of her texts...these omissions are especially surprising because Ellis’s conduct books explicitly link the production of happiness to the performance of gender (Austin-Bolt, 2015, p.1).
Looking at women’s creative practices that specifically interrelated with the house, I came across second-wave feminist artists focused on the generation of professional and social networks as a means of confronting the marginalisation of women and their creative practices. This was marked by the forming of various women’s art organizations including the Art Worker’s Coalition (1969), Women Artists in Revolution or WAR (1969) and the AIR Gallery (1972), to address women’s rights and their equal representation in art institutions and the art community. In 1970, a college-level art course for women in Fresno, the Feminist Art Program (FAP) made a radical departure from traditional art pedagogy. Instead of pursuing assignments in a specified medium, such as oil painting or metal sculpture, students created artwork organized around a given concept or social issue (Meyer & Wilding, 2010, p.40). The studio that housed it was the first in a historic lineage of Californian feminist art spaces: Womanhouse, Womanspace, The Woman’s Building, The Feminist Studio Workshop that influenced other artists to collaborate, take over spaces and support each other’s practices.

One of the first openly feminist public art exhibitions, the month-long Womanhouse, took place in an old mansion in 1972 and included ongoing installations, performances and sculptures by Faith Wilding, Schapiro, Chicago and students of the Feminist Art Program. Transforming, subverting and corrupting the concept of ‘women's spaces’ through hard physical labour, ‘the age-old female activity of homemaking was taken to fantasy proportions. Womanhouse became the repository of the daydreams women have as they wash, bake, cook, sew, clean and iron their lives away’ stated the catalogue essay (Chicago & Schapiro, 1972). Exhibiting in a domestic space and presenting aspects of women’s lives that society viewed as utterly taboo and personal (eg. used tampons, underwear, cosmetics), these feminist artists politicized the boundaries between public and private.

Following this line of networking prompted me to look at how my own practice was confined. Obscuring my view were the day-to-day chores I fulfilled and the culmination

---

156 The original FAP was opened in Fresno by Chicago in 1970. In 1971, Chicago and Schapiro brought the FAP to the newly formed California Institute of the Arts (CalArts), leaving Rita Yokoi to run the Fresno FAP until 1992.

157 In 1973, Chicago with graphic designer Sheila Levant de Bretteville, and art historian Arlene Raven created the Feminist Studio Workshop (FSW) in the Woman's Building in Los Angeles. It taught women Feminist studio practice, theory and criticism. Established in Fresno, the pedagogical principles of CalArts FAP and Womanhouse were ‘conceptualizing and producing artwork collectively, and developing “female” imagery and production techniques to communicate female content’ (Meyer & Wilding, 2010, p.40).

of time, objects, activities and demands building up the sense of burden and everyday
tedium that troubled me about household tasks. All the aspects I had been considering to
date suddenly seemed encompassed by the overflowing basket of single socks that had
been mounting up from endless familial laundering. I’d been trying to ignore it but now I
emptied the whole lot onto the dining room table and took out any matching pairs that
arose. I then sorted the hundreds that were left into tones from light to dark.

Starting with the black socks I began to hand stitch the contents of each basket together
one by one with great care and attention. I even took pains to match the thread to suit
the join. For two months, I sewed socks everywhere: in front of the TV; in bed: in the car
when waiting for my son; and even by the pool on holiday. Once the extraordinary
lengths were completed, I draped them through the kitchen and out into the garden
using kitchen chairs as supports. Tying one end to a drill I twisted them, stopping
intermittently to move the oscillations along until the coiling became so tight that tension
took over, reminding me of Bourgeois’ overwound clocks [Fig.95-98].

According Munro and Madigan ‘women often create social space, and ease conflict, by
using their role as ‘housewife’ or ‘carer’ to distance themselves, or subordinate
themselves, to others in the household’ (Munro & Madigan, 1999, p.115). They suggest
‘this busy-ness creates a [private] space, without the very pointed separation that would
be indicated by deliberately leaving the room’ (Munro & Madigan, 1999, p.115). Sitting
down to sew every day, I re-enacted the nightly knitting I my mother and grandmother
did when I was a child. It occurred to me that focusing on these tactile activities provided
a separation from the relentless duties and responsibilities of home. Furthermore, it did
so without familial confrontation as it took on the invisibility of a ubiquitous housewifely
activity. Somehow this 60-foot rope of socks, tension and hours connected me to others
and, despite the size and the amount of my time absorbed, it was the first of my drawing
methods that raised no objection from the family. I wasn’t wholly sure if this made it
subversive or complicit on my part.
Uncontested activity (in the making)
2014
Sewn and twisted single socks
19300 mm x 200 mm
Uncontested activity (in the making)
2014
Sewn and twisted single socks
19300 mm x 200 mm
Uncontested activity
2014
Sewn and twisted single socks
19300 mm x 200 mm
Uncontested activity (Detail)
2014
Sewn and twisted single socks
19300 mm x 200 mm
I began researching the work of artists subverting the hidden and gendered living and working practices of women in the house. Phelan proposed how feminist creative practices in the US and Britain forged an ‘alert to the movement at the edge of the frame, across the hybrid border that marked the distinction between the visible and the invisible, the known and the unknown’ (Reckitt & Phelan, 2001, p. 17). Second-wave feminist art has often been described in terms of space and visibility. Invisible/Visible was the title of the first Feminist Artists Conference at Cal Arts held in conjunction with an exhibition Twenty-One Artists: Invisible/Visible (1972). The title reflected concern for women’s ‘invisible’ labours and their ‘invisibility’ in art histories as well as wider discourses of power. As indicated by the title of the art exhibition Inside the visible: an elliptical traverse of 20th century art in, of, and from the feminine (1996) curated by de Zegher, the terminology has continued to exemplify feminist challenges to spatial, temporal and gendered separations (de Zegher, 1996).159

I gradually built up an overview of the last 70 years and how artists had sought to bring women’s lives into view through interrogations of home that placed emphasis on the everyday, the familiar and the emotional. I admired Identical Lunch (1969) for what I regarded as a particularly effective and direct approach. It involved Fluxus artist Alison Knowles eating the same food at the same time and place every day, disrupted by chance interruptions and familial demands. The piece made me wish I had documented interruptions to my drawing from the start.

Works in which the artist was present in the house drew me in. In her film Climbing around My Room (1993), artist Lucy Gunning was dressed in red and exploring interior space, childishly stepping barefoot around the walls from window sill to mantel piece (Gunning, 1993). In feeling her way around the confines of the house, it was both prison and playground. I likened this to how drawing altered the normative of our house and my role within it. I was reminded of a work by German artist Marie Von Heyl that I’d seen (Heyl, 2012, Fig.xxvii). In her video drawing, Heyl used her body to physically examine all the incidental lines of the house, articulating the ‘symmetries and interconnectivities between the human body and its artificial environment’ (Heyl in Taylor, 2013, p.86). This fluid reciprocal relationship between artist and interior through line fascinated me.

159 Reflecting the feminist drive to rewrite more inclusive art histories, the exhibition ‘presents a gendered reading of more than thirty women artists of vastly different background and experience. The work of important yet previous “invisible” figures is highlighted alongside the work of established artists to create a retheorized interpretation of the art of this century’ (de Zegher, 1996).
Maria von Heyl  
*Interior (Utopia)*, 2012  
Video, 7 minutes: 25 seconds (still illustrated)  
(Taylor, 2013, p.86)
Mona Hatoum
*Recollection*, 1995
Hair balls, strands of hair hung from the ceiling, wooden loom with woven hair, table
Dimensions variable
(Archer, Brett & De Zegher, 1997, p.98)
In other works, the objectified feminine body was intentionally absent. Mona Hatoum conjured embodied experiences from the sense of the missing woman, using bed bases, empty swings and furniture wired up to an electrical current. In Recollection, Hatoum’s hair was being woven on a loom. Balled clumps moved freely over the floor and single hairs hung from the ceiling that couldn’t be avoided (Hatoum, 1995, Fig.xxviii). The representation of her body was being reconfigured through its dead, waste product (Warr & Jones, 2000, pp.177). I wondered what sort of line would stand in for my presence.

I felt the varied successes and failures of these feminist artists were now implicit in the shifting boundaries of the living and working space of my house. I fully appreciated the immeasurable improvements to women’s freedom and rights feminist efforts had brought about. However, the more I looked, the more I saw my familial landscape was a long way from the dissolution of frontiers, degenderisation of roles and free flowing equalized opportunities these feminists envisaged for me. As I moved my drawing onto the cooker and used the rings to burn sodden paper, negative aspects came through. The singed images inextricably bonding the fibres of paper, connected directly to the repetitive cooking and feeding the family that threatened my time and space for drawing. Behind the beguiling curves was an underlying sense of entropy and decay [Fig.99-102].
Cooking Time 3
2012
Burn mark on watercolour paper
280 mm x 280 mm
Cooking Time 1
2012
Burn mark on watercolour paper
280 mm x 280 mm
Cooking Time 4
2012
Burn mark on watercolour paper
280 mm x 280 mm
Cooking Time 6
2012
Burn mark on watercolour paper
280 mm x 280 mm
I wondered if these drawings indicated the repetitive housework that de Beauvoir condemned as lacking any creativity. On further reflection, I wondered if I inverted her implications, by utilising cooking as a form of interrogatory drawing. As Perry pointed out, some artists literally and metaphorically turned inhabited spaces inside out or upside down as they undermined the idea that ‘there’s no place like home’ (Perry, 2013, p. 20). For example, Do Ho Suh (Do, 2010, Fig.xxix) and Vito Acconci (Acconci, 1984, Fig.xxx). Perry’s observation enabled me to view some of my earlier works as subversions, or ‘inversions’ of the house, such as the moulds that made worn indentations into prominent boundaries; the negative prints of water stains; and the drawings using both sides of the paper. Maybe my lines were investigating the house, and the expectations, relations and activities that operated it, from the inside out.

In the video piece *Semiotics of a Kitchen* (1975), Martha Rosler deployed everyday utensils in a kitchen setting to critique the commodified versions of conventional women’s roles in modern society (Rosler, 1975, Fig.xxxi). One after the other, she stated the object’s common name aloud then brandished it in a way representing its meaning rather than normal utility. Hurling a ladle or stabbing the work surface with a paring knife, her frustrations as a selfless taken-for-granted housewife were conveyed as each object (as signifier) was given a literal version of what it meant to her (the signified). I wasn’t confined to the kitchen in the way Rosler articulated. My house was a productive hub of social and professional connectivity. Nevertheless, I was still responsible for fulfilling its day-to-day requirements of cooking, washing and cleaning.

The men and women I knew generally agreed that the gendered stereotypes laid down by patriarchal traditions were obsolete. Yet as Rutherford detailed, boundaries constructed according to male-centred assumptions have remained problematic, such as the implication that ‘when a male worker is not at work he is at play’ whereas for the female professional, there is still work to do when they get home (Rutherford, 2011, p. 101). The majority may acknowledge that ‘an inclusive culture should recognize the work that is done at home’ but work in the private sphere continues to be largely unremunerated (Rutherford, 2011, p. 102). I fully acknowledged the truth in Rutherford’s words, but also knew I was probably complicit in such delineations being drawn out in our house.
Fig. xxix

Do Ho Suh
*Staircase III*, 2010
Polyester and stainless steel
Tate (Do, 2010)
Vito Acconci
*Bad Dream House*, 1984
Wood, brickface, shingles, Plexiglass, screen
(Perry, 2013, p.91)
Martha Rosler
*Semiotics of the Kitchen*, 1975
Video
(Butler & De Zegher, 2010, p.87)
I went along with the imbalances Rutherford outlined and did little to assuage the assumption that for the working woman to have it all, she must also do it all. In fact, I prided myself on being capable, and covering the myriad of tasks expected of me. Now my eyes had been rubbed, I saw men still had greater freedom than women, and persistently gendered duties still underpinned ideas of what constituted a ‘proper’ family home. In my middle-class British family, we liked to assume we were modern and forward thinking, yet we rarely questioned the roles we drew out for ourselves to inhabit. I ensured the day-to-day demands of running the house were satisfied whilst my husband bore the brunt of financially providing for the family. Neither of us saw this as particularly problematic. Perhaps, as Rutherford implied, this was because we met such everyday conflicts with apathetic acceptance and little expectation for change (Rutherford, 2011, p. 99). When we drew our curtains and retreated ‘behind closed doors’, did we prefer to view a scene of embedded distinctions rather than hatch out the harsh tenets of feminism? However, it was quite another matter for our somewhat antiquated and gendered practices to be revealed through my research.

Fresh demarcations of responsibility had come to the fore. Connecting my lines with those drawn by feminist artists before me, forced me to look at how the public and social world were partly a product of norms and agreements established in family space. If the house was a site where fundamental notions of self and belonging were established, then there was no avoiding culpability behind its doors. I connected this notion to Julia Kristeva’s *Women’s Time* (1981) in which she suggested that combatting discrimination as a society needed to be addressed at the level of the individual. She confronted second-wave feminism for setting up divisory criticisms and proposed instead that everyone was ‘at once the attacker and the victim, the same and the other, identical and foreign’ (Kristeva, 1981, p. 223). As Noëlle McAfee aptly outlined, Kristeva calls on us to muster a sense of personal accountability and ‘to put our own house in order first’ (McAfee, 2004, p. 102). I had not set out to observe imbalances or to renegotiate my status in the family, yet my lines had to some extent mapped out my frustration and lack of entitlement to time and space. Moreover, it marked out that I was as culpable as anyone. Whilst this wasn’t something I could immediately redraw, it did lead me to consider how I inadvertently reinforced problematic relations. I came across an interesting take on the familial home described as ‘a segregated subworld’ in which the family have ‘a strong and relatively unmediated influence on
each other’ (Ling, 2006, p.64). According to Rich Ling, ‘the intense and close nature of the family means that [attitudes, norms and rituals] are perhaps more elaborated and internalised than in other social groups’ and are more likely to be passed on between individuals (Ling, 2006, p.82). It painted a picture of the need to be vigilant of how I acted in the house.

Raising this amongst a group of artists led to a discussion of ‘acts’. John L. Austin claimed that speaking was a consequential act: ‘by simply being spoken, the word act leaves an immediate trace’ (Austin, 1976, p5). To Austin the idea becomes to some extent real through the utterance itself; the uptake of a message; the questions it raises; and the commitments inferred (Austin, 1975, pp.9-12). John Searle prominently built on these linguistic forces of illocution and intention in Speech Acts (1969). To Searle, the concept revolved around utterances: acts of promising, stating, commanding and questioning which had limited relevance for my drawing practice. However, his notion of sentence structures carrying intent, directive, denial, ambiguity and metaphor were taken up by Judith Butler in the context of gender studies. In Gender Trouble (1988) Butler examined how daily activities of walking talking and gesticulating construct social realities through voicing but also enactment (Butler, 2004, p.171.) According to Butler merely being seen to do something could be an inference that enabled a fictional notion to be accepted as ‘real’ (Butler, 2004, p.199). Butler got me questioning how my performative acts of drawing affected the house and might bring forth home.

These blurred and undefined lines of thinking became entwined in a rising sense of duty to take up the opportunities that feminists had worked so hard to put down for my generation. I wanted my project to have connection and impact beyond the personal. I had academic and professional ambitions to confront the boundaries of home at the edge of the frame: aspirations that might not be met if my range of vision was restricted to the house and the interior. I had a mounting urge to make my mark in the public realm: an arena I had come to see was led by patriarchy. According to Phelan, ‘feminism is the conviction that gender has been, and continues to be, a fundamental category for the organization of culture [and that] the pattern of that organization usually favours men over women’ (Reckitt & Phelan, 2001, p. 17). In line with this view, I was ready to picture myself as a feminist artist and was proud for my drawing to encompass implicit debts to the mutual, dynamic and continuing dialogue between contemporary art and feminism.
However, I had a nagging concern about the connotations of developing associations with ‘female imagery’ or have what might be read as a womanly aesthetic defining my drawings (Meyer & Wilding, 2010). By drawing out my lines within the house, they shared the paper with creative practices of women before me. It was difficult to visually disassociate my chopping boards and stitches from Victorian ideas of a ‘woman’s touch’ or the uptake of domestic crafts, processes and materials by second-wave feminists wishing to expose women’s interiority. I didn’t question the validity of these approaches but as a twenty-first century female artist, I pictured both as negatively impacting on my lines. Simply using similar materials or subject matter could mean connections being drawn with the didacticism and essentialism of which feminism was charged.

I sought ways to position my work in relation to the persistently critical and indistinct image of women’s arts situated in the house. I looked at artists reusing women’s household activities with the purpose of creating a more positive afterimage. The subversive feminist application of women’s crafts in *femmage* was engaged in social and performative critiques of activities such as weaving, stitching, knitting and quilting, harnessing them as social processes of collective empowerment, action, expression and negotiation. Perry suggested an exemplar was Faith Wilding’s *Crocheted Environment* (Wilding, 1972, Fig.xxxii). According to Perry it inverted patriarchal constructions as a ‘roughly knitted space in which stitching had been redefined as the external, structural frame of the house, as opposed to the intimate activity of its interior life’ (Perry, 2013, p18). Although Perry regarded it as installation, Wilding’s crochet was indicative of the tactile three-dimensional approaches and spatial freedoms of drawing at the time.

I came across the strips of fabric, wire, surgical hose and steel tubing with which Eva Hesse tied, linked and bonded her material lines into reliefs (Hesse, 1969, Fig.xxxiii). In her use of connective, curative materials, I caught a glimpse of embodied lines created through sensorial materials of the everyday. I recalled Pierette Bloch’s ‘drawings’ that subtly contrasted meshes of hair, ribbon, string and wool by weaving, sewing and knitting them together (Bloch, 1976, Fig.xxxiv). These artists handled the stuff and processes associated with women’s roles, to literally ‘draw out’ experiential and relational information of their socio-political spaces.
Faith Wilding
_Crocheted Environment (Womb Room), 1972_
Woolworth's Sweetheart acrylic yarn and sisal rope
Approximately 108 x 108 x 108 inches
(Perry, 2013, p.19)
Eva Hesse
*Contingent*, 1969
Cheesecloth, latex, fibreglass
8 units, dimensions variable
(Reckitt & Phelan, 2001, p.58)
Pierette Bloch
*Grande maille* (Large mesh), 1976
Rope, string and ribbon
(Butler & De Zegher, 2010, p.187)
Di Bello informed me that nineteenth century artists weren’t the first to use women’s crafts subversively. Examining the creative practices of Lady Mary Filmer and Anna Birkbeck (Lady Waterlow), di Bello shows how some Victorian women used photography, writing and drawing in family albums as a means of interrogating their social relations and household responsibilities. These women carried out their practices in the house without overstepping the exacting parameters of social acceptability but the resultant albums documented daily life from women’s perspective. Displayed for others to see, the albums both enabled feminine expression and intervened in social interactions, thereby subtly altering the normative of female spaces and challenging distinctions of private and public. Di Bello claimed the albums also had lasting effect on modern sensibilities as part of the process ‘whereby vision was modernized into a fragmented, subjective experience by new technologies or visual entertainment’ (di Bello, 2007, p.140). Di Bello argued that the format of magazines, the internet and mobile phone interfaces have their roots in these creative practices (di Bello, 2007, p.3). The conclusion I drew was that there was a healthy potential for confronting the boundaries of the house through line. This positive outlook was underlined by the views Juliette Macdonald expressed in her essay *Concepts of Craft* (2005). Macdonald challenged the inferior image of women’s household creativities and argued that craft practices had the same cerebral and conceptual value basis as contemporary fine art but suffered prejudices merely due to the ‘lack of serious critical theory and writing’ that related to it (McDonald, 2005, p. 39). As I saw it, attending to ‘homely’ creativities might be precisely what was needed.

Discussing this, I was directed to Roszika Parker who also sought to raise the contemporary profile of household creative practices in *The Subversive Stitch* (2010). Parker accused ‘the historical hierarchical division of the arts into fine arts and craft as a major force in the marginalization of women’s work’ (Parker, 2010, p.xiii). She identified a subtle refocus of theoretical considerations towards women’s traditional crafts in art such as Tracey Emin’s embroidered words that ‘re-inforce the tension between the message and the medium’ (Parker, 2010, p.xv). To me, Parker suggested new layers of meaning could arise from questioning the positioning of my work in the house. The viewpoint I took forward was that an immersive creative practice that intervened in the interior could be an important form of social dialogue in the present-day. As I sat down to draw, conflict was no longer in the foreground but instead new lines of mapping were being drawn out, centred on events, encounters and social relations.
I saw an active and relational home, and wanted to record it as I found it. I began looking for new ways to access evidence of the everyday domestic spaces I experienced, extending my lines to include writing and dialogue. Bachelard’s *The Poetics of Space* (1958) was mentioned in almost every literary reference on home. I now turned to this phenomenological study in seeking experiential approaches to the house. According to Bachelard, the ‘ubiquitous, personal nature of the house rendered it incapable of being ‘experienced from day to day [and that] only on the thread of a narrative, or in the telling of a story can we access its true nature (Bachelard, 1994, p6). He stressed that the social aspects of its imaginary spaces of belonging were best accessed through representations in poetry, as a product of emotive experiential knowledge. To me, poetry seemed too distant from everyday life; too contrived for the direct way I was looking at contemporary living and working practices. I needed drawing processes that would align with the ubiquity of the house and impose the least mediation. In critiquing the album-making practices of high society Victorian women within the broader feminine culture of collecting, exchanging and displaying photographic images, di Bello revealed connections with the illustrated magazines periodicals of other social contexts and times (di Bello, 2007). Her study indicated to me that understandings about the way home physically and socially operated today could potentially be unearthed through revisiting and reflecting upon the ordinariness of daily life both past and present. My acts of drawing began to play a more liminal and passive part in my research methods.

Stepping back from intentionally creative depictions, I sought out more straightforward and direct methods of documentation. Like the housekeeping records I had seen on display in stately homes, I listed utensils, tools, liquids, chores, objects and materials used over time. As I laboriously typed onto lengthy paper rolls put through a typewriter, I saw a new kind of map emerging [Fig.103-105]. Since setting out on my drawing journey I had taken on part-time work to support it, tutoring at university alongside book-keeping and administration for my husband, the studio and holiday let. The studio was busy and bands or artists frequently stayed. One musician gave me some Japanese calligraphy paper and I used it to write down the dialogue in the house at the time [Fig.106]. I was responsible for turning around the accommodation and ensuring cleaning, washing, ironing and gardening were kept on top of. The picture of home drawn out in my lists encompassed the breadth of interchanging familial, creative and professional obligations I concurrently fulfilled.
Fig. 103

*Untitled*

2014

Digital photograph

114 mm x 152 mm
In my hand
2014
Type on Japanese calligraphy paper
2410 mm x 30 mm
Fig. 105

*Untitled*
2014
Digital photograph
152 mm x 114 mm
Collecting words
2014
Pencil on Japanese calligraphy paper
2410 mm x 30 mm
To be organised, I tended to print calendars from my computer and hang them on the fridge for everyone to amend at will. Feeling overloaded one day, I overprinted layers of monthly diaries until the free space on the paper became as obliterated as my spare time [Fig.107]. Printing out countless labels for the studio led to lists and outpourings on record sleeves [Fig.108]. I also logged the endless deliveries and post I attended to on discarded envelopes [Fig.109].

Other lists mapping my merged living and working practices included a gathering and sorting of the tools I used for differing activities. Giving every object a moment of undivided visual and tactile attention, I threaded each individually into metres upon metres of tubular finger bandages [Fig.110-114]. Pencils, keys, plectrums, rubbers, paperclips, cutlery, screws, pens, brushes, sharpeners and many other office, household, drawing and music related items came to hand. Another utilitarian diary included all the liquids I used one day, each marked on a washing powder block and laboriously labelled like precious artefacts in a museum [Fig.115-118]. Reflecting on the product of my labours, I was reminded of feminist artists simply laying open their everyday work for others to see, such as that presented by Mierle Laderman Ukeles in her 1968 piece, Manifesto for Maintenance Art.

I am an artist. I am a woman. I am a wife. I am a mother. (Random order). I do a hell of a lot of washing, cleaning, cooking, renewing, supporting, preserving, etc. Also, (up to now separately) I “do” Art. Now, I will simply do these maintenance everyday things, and flush them up to consciousness, exhibit them, as Art. I will live in the museum and I customarily do at home with my husband and my baby, for the duration of the exhibition. (Right? or if you don’t want me around at night I would come in every day) and do all these things as public Art activities: I will sweep and wax the floors, dust everything, wash the walls (i.e. “floor paintings, dust works, soap-sculpture, wall-paintings”) cook, invite people to eat, make agglomerations and dispositions of all functional refuse. The exhibition area might look “empty” of art, but it will be maintained in full public view.

Carrying out activities generally understood to be private in the public space of the gallery, Ukeles broke down ingrained spatial and gendered boundaries. Compared to this direct and effective articulation of home, my drawings to date fell short.
Overload
2014
Inkjet print on royalty statement
210 mm x 297 mm
Fig. 108

**Tools of the day**

2014

Typed text on record sleeve

180 mm x 180 mm
*Between deliveries*

2014
Typed text on envelope
324 mm x 229 mm
Interchanging Roles (Hanging section)
2013
Miscellaneous everyday objects in tubular bandage
14500 mm x 50 mm
*Interchanging Roles* (Detail)
2013
Miscellaneous everyday objects in tubular bandage
14500 mm x 50 mm
Interchanging Roles (Gathered section)
2013
Miscellaneous everyday objects in tubular bandage
14500 mm x 50 mm
Interchanging Roles (Detail)
2013
Miscellaneous everyday objects in tubular bandage
14500 mm x 50 mm
**Interchanging Roles** (Detail)
2013
Miscellaneous everyday objects in tubular bandage
14500 mm x 50 mm
All the liquids in one day
2014
Household liquids on soap powder blocks
500 mm x 500 mm
All the liquids in one day (Detail)
2014
Household liquids on soap powder blocks
500 mm x 500 mm
All the liquids in one day (Single)
2014
Household liquids on soap powder blocks
50mm x 20 mm
All the liquids in one day (Label setup)
2014
Household liquids on soap powder blocks and labels
2000 mm x 200 mm
I reflected on my journey since it dawned on me I had redesigned the house with no room to draw. Unsure why this came about, I had taken up drawing practice as a means of seeing the space I inhabited from different perspectives. Adopting historical methods of articulating space through line, I deconstructed the physical house into conceptual layers. The resultant maps brought into view an active social space shaped by narratives, boundaries, relations and assumptions constituting familial idealisations of home. In repeatedly looking and looking again at the house, what I saw seemed to have shifted. Had the house been affected by my activities? What had I actually done through the observation, line-making and reflections of my drawing practice? Although something was tangibly different, the transition from the material object of the building into a home remained unresolved. Perhaps it was that I still hadn’t clearly delineated the physical and metaphorical room of my own that might enable a sense of belonging. It suddenly came to me that what had changed was not so much the way the house operated but my viewpoint. When I looked at the complex living and working space I inhabited, I now did so through the eyes of an artist. The walls of the house no longer obscured my line of sight but enabled academic and critical connections to flow.

The conventional architectural skills with which I set out to draw home objectively had been transformed. Instead of drawing the house visually, what I had done was to rethink it. In realising the limitations and tensions of visual representation, I had defined a drawing practice that responded to all sorts of social and cultural currents in a cerebral and conceptual way. I had set in motion a reflexive flow between lines and thoughts that had revealed a mounting sense of responsibility for how my sense of home was performed. Ultimately, I had formed the conviction, I had work to do as a contemporary artist in aligning my drawing processes with acts of home-making, if only to discover that home was an unreachable, fictitious entity. Perry describes the familial space as a site where ideals and opinions about gender, race, class and sexuality productively overlapped and interacted, suggesting ‘it is through these relationships that we usually distinguish an idea of home from that of the house’ (Perry, 2013, p. 10). Had I yet done this? I didn't feel as if I had. Having accused other artists of dealing with home in a 'housebound' way, I was still drawing the house I saw. As I turned back to address the space that had housed the shift of my practice into the contemporary, I began searching for ways to connect house and home to the practices, ideas and thinking of others beyond its walls.
Bachelard empathised with human attempts to find security in an unstable postmodern world by seeking ‘to shelter, protect, cover or hide’, and claimed that ‘the imagination sympathizes with the being that inhabits the protected space’ (Bachelard, 1969, p.132). His systematic study of the house as the locus of intimate life and ‘one’s own corner in the world’ was key to many projects creatively addressing home (Bachelard, 1969, p.24). However, such building of a retreat ‘from old models and life’ would have had little relevance to my project were it not for his analogies of ‘the way the shellfish constructs its shell’ (Bachelard, 1969, p.113). To Bachelard the house was primarily ‘built by and for the body, taking form from the inside, like a shell, in an intimacy that works physically’ (Bachelard, 1969, p.101). So, despite the implications of interiority that initially led me to pass by The Poetics of Space as too ‘housebound’, his phenomenological examination of the house got under my skin.

In his methods, Bachelard helped develop a common understanding of phenomenology as the philosophical study of the structures of experience and consciousness. I was attracted by it as a means of handling and dissecting the concept of home out of the physical house. Having predominantly viewed the house from afar, I had objectively mapped what I could see when placing myself at different physical, metaphorical and conceptual angles to it. By picking up Bachelard’s methodology perhaps I could gain better knowledge of not only phenomenology but also the space I inhabited. So, taking hold of his multi-sensorial approaches I settled in to try and map home in an embodied way through the materiality of the house, my body and the accumulated stuff of drawing.

Bachelard’s concept of the shell that ‘grows with its inmate’ opened me up to more experiential concerns and sensorial interactions with the space I inhabited (Bachelard, 1969, p.118). He acknowledged finding hundreds of literary references to snails carrying their homes with them and feeling at home wherever they travelled (Bachelard, 1969, p.121). At the same time, Bachelard suggested the shell was incapable of change or movement on its own: once abandoned it must await the claim of another occupant or ‘hermit crab’ (Bachelard, 1969, p. 126). As I had established, the concept of home was commonly mapped over the house as the site wherein we station our bodies, yet having experienced countless moves between houses, I felt the provision of physical shelter did
not satisfy the deeply visceral sense of self and belonging I desired for home.

The summary on the outer cover of Racz’s book led with the sentence ‘our homes contain us, but they are also within us’ (Racz, 2015). As previously noted, the concept of house brought with it negative associations of historical confinement and interiority. However, it seemed that feelings of being at home were generally embraced with open arms and internalised at every opportunity. In order to feel safe moving through the everyday environments of contemporary life, perhaps we needed to feel umbilically attached to our familiar. If so, then what did this complex vascular chord that sustained us consist of?

Bachelard led me to think about the house as merely a shell I moved in and out of, and the home as an unbounded space of emotions, ideas and relations that could be carried with me. Each time I moved my body into a different shell I was required to remap, readjust and realign the social space with the many limitations of this physical space. Such realignments occurred continuously as the children grew, professional roles changed and the house was addressed to match differing encounters and activities. I wondered if the organic and evolving entity of my project was putting pressure on these spatial realignments to be more fluid and responsive.

I could still see the ‘shell’ of the house demarcated by the boundaries of the building around me but the bricks and mortar no longer defined the edges of home for me. Feeling my way around a more nebular space that lacked tangible corporality, I imagined Bachelard’s snail without its rigid support. Although fleshy and vulnerable, it had all the vital organs and everything it needed to survive independently. Furthermore, it had gained a flexibility that life in the shell had denied. I lost sight of what it might look like but instead began to think of it in terms of other sensorial imaginaries. Would it feel impressible or resistant to the touch, slip through the fingers or squirm with muscular tension? Would you hear it move? Did it pick up dirt and debris on its travels? What trails did it leave behind? Where would it choose to go? Would it stay liberated, find a new shell or return to its old one in the hope it still fitted?

I followed the snail into a rethinking of the house as a living pulsating system, a hub of connectivity and the site of interrelating activities, networks and arterial flows. I likened it to a body, comparable experientially, physically, socially and imaginatively to our own.
This complex network of orifices, passages, conduits, walls and chambers was a living system consuming what was outside, processing it, and then exhaling its breath of influence way beyond the individual. Adorned, marked and aging, both the house and the body encompassed self and community within a form that was at once fluid, unique and connected to an unimaginably extensive network of people, places and encounters. Perhaps the most pertinent analogy with the house and the body was that as a mother of two, my body had itself been inhabited. Did that make me the gestational shell? Had giving birth transformed me into the vulnerable, emotional and associative space of house, home or both? Maybe this was why I felt that the familial circulatory system depended on my energy and commitment for its flows to be maintained.

According to Bachelard the house could not be understood through ocular perception alone but required a more holistically embodied and experiential approach: ‘that is to say, consideration of the "onset of the image" in an individual consciousness’ (Bachelard, 1969, p. xix). Bachelard implicated the body as he united the physical and emotional in his phenomenological considerations of how ‘the image comes before thought’ (Bachelard, 1969, p. xx). Until now, I had predominantly stood back and viewed the house from a distance. Turning inwards to attend to my bodily sensations and responses, I hoped to break down the lines between subject and object and embrace the space as an emotional and social imaginary. The house that I was feeling, touching, smelling and creating could somehow be felt 'here' with me.

In his text, *Cartesian Meditations* (1929), Husserl suggested ‘phenomenological explication does nothing but explicate the sense this world has for us all, prior to any philosophising, and obviously gets solely from our experience’ (Husserl, 1991, p.151). In relation to Husserl’s thinking, by trying to articulate the house as a first-hand sensation that I was ingesting, manipulating, enacting and pressing up against, I was jumping into a phenomenological investigation of its materiality.

As Judith Butler pointed out in her essay, *Performative Acts and Gender Constitution: An Essay in Phenomenology and Feminist Theory* (1988), Husserl, Maurice Merleau-Ponty and George Herbert Mead underpinned a phenomenological theory of ‘acts’ that ‘seeks to explain the mundane way in which social agents constitute social reality through language, gesture, and all manner of symbolic social sign’ (Butler, 1988, p.519). As I set
out to get a ‘sense’ of home as opposed to a visible interpretation of the house, I was aware of a bodily enactment being played out that was bound up in ‘the meanings that embodied existence assumes in the context of lived experience’ (Butler, 1988, p.520). This made me wary of getting too immersed in notions of my social existence being somehow derived from my physiology as embodying female sexuality.

It seemed enough to acknowledge that the body at the centre of my phenomenological study was mine and it was female. What seemed most important was that this body was feeling its way around the spaces of house and home: spaces that were at once inside and outside, flowing through the house and those inhabiting it. After all, I thought, it wasn't my body that would ultimately present the experiential evidence gathered, as any ‘embodied knowledge’ that arose would be made explicit through drawing. Yet the moment I made this distinction in my mind between drawing and the body, it seemed contradictory to my intentions. I felt I had fallen at the first hurdle as it was far too soon to say whether the movement of my body through the space would constitute all or part of the drawing product. Marie Von Heyl’s performative video drawings used her physiology to engage with her environment through touch. In her Jerwood Drawing Prize 2013 winning piece, *Interior (Utopia)* (2012), the artist physically investigates the limited space of her city flat, straightening herself up against the sharp vertical lines of a cupboard door or crouching and curled beneath the hinged table. The catalogue entry states, ‘Marie von Heyl discovers symmetries and interconnectivities between the human body and its artificial environment’...in movements...’reminiscent of esoteric rituals’ (Von Heyl in Taylor & Kneale, 2013).\(^{160}\) I took it in hand to be more mindful of keeping body and line inextricably interrelated as I moved on.

Gathering up my equipment another time, I heard the pencils knocking together in the bottom of the bag and was alerted to a rough edge of the drawing board by a scratch on the arm. Deciding where to sit next, I thought about how drawing practice activated the house. I considered the rarely entered corners that my ritualistic preparations of site

\(^{160}\) I acknowledge the body itself as the most meaningful and intimate nucleus of home: the site where a primary sense of self and feeling at home dwell. However, in the interests of focusing on drawing the home, I have consciously omitted two significant strands of embodied phenomenological concern. First, how spatial bodily acts are understood to communicate power relations such as gender, as inferred by Judith Butler’s theory of performativity (Butler 1988); (Butler, 1993). Second, the way typical bodily characteristics of disabled, disadvantaged and minoritised groups can be manipulated as tools in the power relations and exclusionary practices of social systems. Such corporeal embodiment of Otherness that constructs the body as a home of interiority and confinement is discussed by human geographers (Nast & Pile, 1998); and (Sibley, 1995). My omissions reflect the impossibility of attending all the significant contributions of second-wave feminism.
didn’t reach. Should I move myself into these uninhabited areas and set up? Would this draw them out in some way? I related my performances to ‘finding the logical order of things [and] assembling these aggregates of experience in a way that makes sense’ and as Busch asserted ‘a room, like a page, offers us the space to do this’ (Busch, 1999, p.25). To me, clearing my physical and mental space had become as much part of the drawing process as a line traversing a page.

Originally induced by the compulsion to keep the house ‘as it should be’ my settlements were transient and minimal. However, they were growing over time as resistance to the invasion waned. Sometimes they reached claustrophobic proportions and I found myself hunched up, hemmed in and full of tension. Busch states, ‘the way words are arranged on the page [or] the way objects have been assembled in a room... are ways of finding those arrangements with which we can live’ (Busch, 1999, p.25). I wondered if by ‘can live’ she referred to comfort or relaxation because when my paraphernalia became 'unliveable' with, the discomfort built up in the tightness of shoulders, a grinding jaw and gritted teeth. Occasionally everything seized up and my practice stopped in its tracks before I took things in hand. In these blocks, the juncture of scooping things up and painstakingly reorganising everything was like an intensive muscle workout for body and mind. Perhaps my fingers got pent up too, as clearing away was often preceded by frenetically typing up descriptive lists of every item encroaching on my space [Fig.119]

Eventually the combination of using an old typewriter, writing more, and needing to have a phone and printer always at hand, required a different set-up than my former mobile drawing spaces. A more permanent desk and workspace gradually moulded to my requirements in the corner of the aptly named ‘drawing room’. Yet, despite greater tolerance for my presence, the ritualistic cycle of gathering and sorting continued. Finished drawings shared surfaces with household bills, royalty accounts, rental bookings, lipsticks and letters from school. The stuff of the studio, office, handbag and house all came together and built up until I felt I couldn’t see, hear or think. Then standing up and manually reconfiguring my immediate environment served as an effective renewal, clearing space in the room and my mind to let new experiences in.
On the larger footrest and spread over the floor at its sides, unruly piles of magazines are sorted into publication and date. Some are art-based such as Frieze and Art Monthly, whilst others are music trade magazines. On the coffee table in the fore, they become conjoined. Single pages overlapped one by one to meld them together. Different forms are beginning to grow but as yet fail to carry the sense of inexplicably merged roles and activities that underpin the processes they are subjected to. Sewing machines, table-cloths, candles, frames, plastic storage boxes and wicker baskets mark a periphery around a clearing in the centre of the room. An odd incongruous beast presides over the reproduction mahogany leather-topped desk. It might be taking the position of an old angle-poise lamp but it has an uncanny presence.

My husband found it in a junk shop. Apparently, it is supposed to be for tapestry work as it combines a stand with a light and magnifying glass. I have doctored it and it currently examines my writing on dental floss that may become a net of sorts. On the mantelpiece are individual crystalline containers. They are daily contact lens pots with various drawing materials added to them. The crystals they’ve formed contain graphite, inks, paints, shavings, charcoal or chalk. A Florentine side-table lies ‘wounded’ and permanently deformed under the protection of the larger G-plan table smothered in the obsessive hair markings of previous drawing practice. On the large square desk are a laptop, hard drives, my camera, glasses cases, piles of exhibition leaflets from the Venice Biennale and lots of bindfolds from complimentary flight packs that I have ready for a drawing workshop tomorrow. A basket of household accounts and administration paperwork sit on the bureau desk by the door, as near to being ousted from the space as possible in demonstration of the threat they pose to moving forward with my more pressing and inviting work. Around the largest table are materials. Victorian lace pieces, piles of opened envelopes that have come into the house over the last fortnight, every different sort of tape that is used here, from tape for strapping damaged fingers together after rugby, to the gaffer used in the recording studio. Maps and sheets of music, brown and frayed beyond repair are unusually prominent in the room.

Our house deeds are also out on the surfaces with various copies of the yellowed Conveyance papers with red seals in different states of disfigurement and deconstruction. Some are sliced into rows of text mounted one over the other so that they can never be read again. The handwritten names of these previous owners stand out: the hand of those who have gone before, who have touched this house and been forgotten. I copy their signatures, try to learn them, to gather something of their lives through the mimetic processes of repeating their movements. On the footrest is a tray of white tablets, each with a differing growth on its upper side. These are the marks of the liquids used or consumed in the house, from the car oil and toilet cleaner, to printer inks and ketchup. Ranging from vivid unnatural greens to white effervescence, they bubble up like skin reactions but have then been laid out, sorted into rows in a square on a tray to await my further attention. In the busiest corner gather a myriad of objects, tools and papers from past and present, art and home, work and leisure.

At this minute from my desk I can see old nurses dictionaries, a heavy levered embossing stamp, glove stretchers, a tatty but shining box with a bone handle and a piece of leather nailed to its back as a hinge, piles of little candles with many taken out of their metal casings, turned over and pushed together like cells (they smell of sickly vanilla); a dismantled drum pedal and hammer, a stiff wire brush, contemporary steel napkin rings, an old melamine Chinese toy of a market trader sitting in front of a box of fish; drum sticks, old film canisters, cutlery, barbecue sticks, a wooden lattices soap tray that is marbled with mildew, rubber-coated green garden wire, carved bone birds, post-it notes, pen nibs, luggage labels, an empty glass spice mill, filthy house plans that were stuck on the wall five years ago as reference during the house refurbishment; enormous vitamin tablets, some in a bowl others in foil sheets; used guest soaps, small jewellery boxes, an old ivory clothes brush; a butter pat, some dismantled costume jewellery, a garlic plait with just flaking leaves left protruding from the folds; a starch spray, a hole puncher, a stapler, a tape measure; a bottle of ink; a box of drawing sticks and pencils; and many, many books.
Talking about this repetitive surgery on my workspace, I was directed to Heidegger’s essay *Art and Space* (1969) in which he examined the active space of a sculpture ‘coming to be’ in relation to dwelling, locality and place. Heidegger referred to how a ‘clearing-away brings forth the free, the openness for man’s settling and dwelling’ (Heidegger, 1969, p.5). ‘How does clearing-away happen? Is it not making-room...as granting and arranging?’ asked Heidegger as he chewed over what he called the ‘release of places’ (Heidegger, 1969, p.6). My tactile ways of reconfiguring a space were in some ways analogous to his terminology. To Heidegger, a 'clearing' was a breaking up of obscurities and concealments to give a clear view of understanding. Even though he was referring to a philosophical ‘unconcealment’ as it were, the concept allowed me to think of my activity as more than just the tidying of physical space around me. I recognized in what occurred the potential that Heidegger attributed to a ‘clearing’ as field of social and cultural experience that could be entered by myself and others: at once a material space, a field of consciousness and an interrelation of activities.

So, as I bridged the gap between physical and conceptual, house and home, I likened Heidegger’s ideas of creating a productive openness through ‘clearing away’ to the incidental spaces allowing the arms to swing and the boredom giving rise to roaming thoughts. I assigned his ‘making room’ for a sense of ‘belonging’ to a sense of mental and physical comfort or wellbeing. His ‘place yielding to space’ in opening a region for things to belong together, generated thoughts of textural, sensual and ergonomic fit. His ‘gathering’ as a preparatory act of ‘inhabiting’, seemed akin to ensuring that functional apparatus was at hand for activities (Heidegger, 1969, pp.5-9). To Heidegger sculptural practice involved ‘an embodying bringing-into-the-work of places’ (Heidegger, 1969, p.6). Was I perhaps engaged in ‘an embodying bringing-into-the-drawing of home’?

Picking up one of the books from the pile currently smothering my desk, I read that ‘dwellings are transformed into homes by the acts of inhabiting’ (Johansson & Saarikangas, 2009, p.9). What came to mind were the activities of individuating the house as senses work together to create a second skin to live in: one that the occupant tends to have more choice over than with the first. Heidegger claimed creative acts could ‘open a region’ for belonging (Heidegger, 1969, p.5). Whether arranging furniture, lining up books or creating a line on the page, all my faculties fed a drawing practice that was intrinsically connected to both body and mind feeling at home.
In her essay *To Draw is To Be Human* (2005), Dexter pointed out that contemporary artist interventions ‘reveal the earth as a surface or ground to be marked, etched and scarred by the body as the instrument of walking, taking the role of pencil or pen’ (Dexter, 2005, p.7). In this way, she implied that everyone was an embodied artist when walking, dancing or throwing out the rubbish. ‘It is a short step to understanding body movement as the drawing of invisible lines in space’, stated Dexter, ‘our lives are a series of maps of lines between points as we move from point A to point B’ (Dexter, 2005, p.7). As I stepped over the collection of drawings, objects, tools and books that compiled the museological evidence of my project, I was struck by it as constituting a mass of drawing materials and products marking the tracks and shadows of my activities.

Since setting out from a position of stricture in the house engaged with primarily familial expectations of limited reward, more stimulating creative, academic and professional roles had been running through the veins of my project. Stretched across the table were the diverse lists logging the deliveries, events, materials, tools and processes indicative of the burden of responsibilities I fulfilled. Elsewhere, the limbs of my living and working practices conjoined: nestled in the plush cushions; fatly wrapped in bubble wrap bulging under the sofas; hanging like disembodied intestines from the shutters; and layered up like pelts left to dry.

This flesh and blood of my practice reminded me of David Duncan Douglas’ photographic post mortem of *Picasso’s Studio* (1976). The inner workings of the artist’s mind were laid bare: propped, rested or draped over the bones of his personal life (Duncan, 1976, Fig.xxxv). Although I had injected practical tables, filing cabinets, plan chests and desks, the underlying skeleton of the formal Georgian drawing room as a public social space was still evident. To me, these creative sinews, arterial flows and synapses of my practice living within the body of the house formed an experiential catalogue akin to the highly-individualised taxonomies of the Pitt Rivers (Oxford) and Russell Cotes (Bournemouth) museums. The sheer weight of these accumulations demonstrated the impossibility of including everything and the need for selectivity in any body of work struggling to map the world we inhabit.
Picasso’s Studio photographed by Duncan Douglas
*The Silent Studio*, 1976
(Duncan, 1976)
Poking into my thoughts about selectivity was a comment made by James Faure Walker in *Drawing – The Process* (Duff & Davies, 2005, pp.15-28). Walker claimed that drawing did not just involve ‘looking and making marks, but analysing, editing, discriminating, excluding, judging’ (Walker in Duff & Davies, 2005, p.17). Although I recoiled from Walker’s relatively heavy-handed and strictly literal views on the constituents of drawing, there was some attraction in his grounding of the line and call for its definitive limits. He posed a challenge in asking ‘can you really care about drawing without making value judgements, without some intolerance?’ (Walker in Duff & Davies, 2005, p.17). When initially confronted by this push to outline the parameters of drawing, I turned away to examine what I could do with line in terms of articulating my experience of the house. However, Walker’s thinking seemed to pack more of a punch in the current context, which led me to face whether an all-inclusive approach to the drawn line was helpful to my project.

I wanted an open mind towards line’s possibilities but perhaps I needed to thrash out where my subjective edges of drawing lay. On the other hand, there was Tim Ingold’s convincing argument of lines being generated in the form of sounds, words, images and the traces of our moving bodies everywhere and anywhere. Did it really matter whether I defined my own boundaries for drawing? In the end, Ingold gave me the shove to take on the challenge, by listing the characteristics he felt distinguished writing and drawing: ‘First, writing is in a *notation*; drawing is not. Secondly, drawing is an *art*; writing is not. Thirdly, writing is a *technology*; drawing is not. Fourthly, writing is *linear*; drawing is not’ (Ingold, 2007, p.120). Ingold claimed these differentiations were not ‘trustworthy’, yet his voicing of them made me realise how strongly I disagreed with such absolute divisions of art and language, drawing and text, the hand-drawn line and that born of technology.

Forced into the need to stand up and state my position, I decided my absolute bottom line for what constituted a drawing was the human body. For me, a person had to be somehow physically involved in the creative process of a line coming into being. So, releasing a camera shutter, stepping in the sand, typing on a computer, making bread or moving a cursor with merely the blink of an eye were all forms of drawing. Whereas the grain in the dining room table, the woodworm bores in the floor and the deer paths across the garden, seemed to require further intervention to be *drawn*. The immersive *Tate Sensorium* exhibition led me to consider this bodily engagement further (Tate
Sensorium, 2015). Challenging the terms of creation, perception and manipulation, it enabled haptic interpretations of artwork through taste, smell, hearing and touch: physiological responses that were themselves recorded and ‘fed back’ to the viewer. It suggested greater possibilities for ‘air-born’ modes of drawing for my research.

In some ways, pushing my own definitions of drawing in this way seemed overtly forceful. However, I felt the discipline of drawing was identified by its immediacy and intrinsic ability to extend both the cerebral line of thought and the corporeal line of the body in motion. I could hear Dexter’s statement that ‘drawing is part of what it means to be human’ echoing in my ears, shortly followed by her argument that ‘indeed, it would be ridiculous to apply this statement to other, more specialised media, such as painting, sculpture or collage’ (Dexter, 2005, p.6). It seemed to me that the attraction of contemporary drawing as a primary medium was its freedom from prescriptive academic imposition and its scope even when wholly untutored and de-skilled. Often judged in a way that implied the more individualised, unmediated and directly expressive the better, the flow of drawing from, by and as the body was frequently understood as a direct line to the unique and complex personality within.

Perhaps this openness to the individual take on drawing was the rationale behind the U.K.’s most prestigious open submission drawing exhibition, the **Jerwood Drawing Prize** enlisting three different judges every year. ‘Through the selection process panellists are encouraged to collectively establish criteria and to consider the nature and boundaries of drawing’ stated curator Anita Taylor in the 2012 catalogue (Taylor, 2012, p.6). As Taylor pointed out, ‘a dialogue arises between them about what is of value in drawing as a field’ based on their unique ideas of what an act of drawing should incorporate and produce (Taylor, 2012, p.6). Maybe this kind of invitation for personal perspectives on line arose because drawing was a relatively young discipline.

The first drawings to be international renowned as finished artworks were those of the pastels of Venetia portraitist, Rosalba Carriera (1673-1757). However, prescriptive technical parameters laid down during the Renaissance had resulted in a resistance to innovation and extension that rendered drawing ‘a skilled craft, taken for granted and reduced to ‘a language for imitation’ for centuries (Rose, 1982, p.16). In her seminal essay for the 1976 **Drawing Now** exhibition, Rose acknowledged a transformation of
drawing from its traditions to a contemporaneous spatiality. In doing so, she set the first serious investigations of drawing and the ‘fundamental re-evaluation of the nature of the medium, its disciplines, and its uses’ within the 1950s (Rose, 1976, p.9). Another defining moment of drawing coming into its own as a separate discipline, was the creation of a separate Department of Drawings in 1971 at the Museum of Modern Art, New York. The opening of The Drawing Centre New York (1977) also raised the profile of drawing and provided focus, support, dissemination and debate for drawing practitioners. The field of drawing that emerged was an unusually broad, speculative and open-ended art form, and so possibly justified an individual stand more than any other.

Digging deeper into how twenty-first century artists saw drawing, I found my opinions sat comfortably with those expressed by a former Jerwood judge, Tania Kovats in The Drawing Book (2007). According to Kovats ‘it is now possible to adopt a personal subjective stance, especially as this is not perceived to be mutually exclusive with a conceptual approach’ (Kovats, 2007, p.16). Kovats and I discussed in person how drawing developed its freedom to be so individuated in reaction to Modernist and Postmodernist attempts to constrict the discipline (Kovats, personal communication, April 2015). Interestingly, in collecting other artists’ work for the book, she said that labour intensive processes were an important and integral component in fleshing out her choices (Kovats, 2007, p.16). In leaning towards methods that embraced the artist’s touch it seemed that Kovats also tended to intrinsically connect contemporary drawing with the body (Kovats, 2007, p.16). I chewed on the idea that the drawings most directly embodying my creative sensibilities and lines of thought over this project, were not only formed in bodily acts but specifically brought forth by the hand. Digesting my drawings again, the methods from which they derived were all in one way or another generated by the hand and reliant on touch. Thinking about texture as the correlate of touch I remembered the feminist artists who manipulated textural knowledge of tactile materials in their embodiments of women’s everyday experiences. Groping amongst literature handling the interaction of hand and mind, I found that Derrida’s concept of différance as outlined in Margins of Philosophy (1982) lay at the heart of discourses on touch. Derrida stirred up the concept of touch and the condition

161 This refers to Rosalind Krauss’s proposition that artists productively ‘problematizing the set of oppositions’ presented by Modernism actually expanded the field of possibility for creative practices (Krauss, 1979a, p.38-42).
of touching, claiming it wasn’t an actuality in itself but the experience of an intervention between objects: ‘what is a contact if it always intervenes between $x$ and $x’$ (Derrida, 2000, p.2)? According to Derrida, there is always a slippage or gap between the real surface and the tactile perception of it: ‘an interval, a distance’ so that the limit itself remains untouchable (Derrida, 1982 p.8). In this way, touch is the experience of boundaries of bodies and surfaces ‘we can only touch on a surface, which is to say the skin or thin peel of a limit’ (Derrida, 2000, p.6). This seemed immediately problematic to me in the context of an embodied phenomenological approach to the house, especially as Derrida went on to say ‘by definition, limit, limit itself, seems deprived of a body. Limit is not to be touched and does not touch itself’ (Derrida, 2000, p.6). However, as I made pains to absorb his ideas I recalled how philosophy held shifts and differences ‘between’ to be productive spaces for new knowledge. It occurred to me that whether applied to time or bodily senses, the principle of revealing difference through repetition was the same.

Reviving Derrida brought me back to housework as a form of drawing and how doing, making and drawing with my hands got blood flowing to my mind. For me, home-making and line-making came together in the body. Whether folding washing, typing emails, dripping inks or stuffing peristaltic finger bandages with objects, I felt justified in nursing my movements and performances as drawing. What had perhaps changed was how the lines of my practice were no longer skin deep but part of a bodily spatialized constitution. I recalled Pallasmaa saying ‘all our senses ‘think’ and structure our relationship with the world’ (Pallasmaa, 2009, p.17). It reminded me that knowledge was not limited to the cognitive, visual or verbal but resided in the body itself. The concept of sensory thought was nearby when I rifled through the objects and materials threatening to swallow me up.

According to de Zegher, the line was ‘set free’ when Duchamp moved to adopt everyday household materials such as string and the rubber bathing hats of Sculpture for Traveling (Duchamp, 1918, Fig.xxxvi). Duchamp used stuff ‘ready to hand, and unencumbered by the illusionistic associations of traditional art materials’ claims de Zegher (Butler & de Zegher, 2010, p. 32). I wondered what ubiquitous things might stand for the interactions between self and other, identity and mobility, being and becoming that constituted my sense of home.
Marcel Duchamp
*Sculpture for traveling*, 1918
as reproduced in *Boîte-en-valise*
32.1 cm x 24.8 cm
(Butler & De Zegher, 2010, p.138)
The enticing day-to-day material within reach at the time was a large roll of copper speaker wire. Whether shouting across the house to call a teenager to dinner, playing video games or recording music in the studio, sound emanated from us in abundance and characterised our daily life. This kind of wire also silently occupied the boundaries of the house itself and enabled its occupants to noisily project themselves from one space to another in various ways. Every room was served by aural wiring buried beneath its epidermis. Just as the flows of water and power were carried beneath floors, behind walls and into the roof spaces and cellars of the house, so too was sound. I stripped, twisted, divided and worked the copper filaments with my hands into three-dimensional drawings hanging from an old coat stand. Rolling it between my fingertips and running it between my hands I moulded, separated and entwined progressively thinner branching capillaries. The more I handled it, the more the wire echoed with visual associations of blood vessels and bronchial passages [Fig.120-123].

The double housing on the wire leant the emerging forms to symmetry, so as they grew their resemblance to lungs and vascular systems strengthened. I explored possibilities of connecting these fine metal filaments to an amp to find out if they would still convey sound or light, but the currents had become weakened by being so infinitely divided. I rigged up a Theremin instrument that audibly reacted to people nearby moving through its electrical field and tried unsuccessfully to link its current with the sculptural framework. Live sound interaction would have accentuated the way the house itself responded to human presence – how it ‘breathed’.

Before long I was standing up in order to work on the wires. When they reached my height the personification they commanded was reinforced. As these developing organisms eventually outgrew their armature and trailed on the floor, I hung boat rigging tension wires across the ornately corniced ceiling of the dining room to support them. Barely anyone passed comment. It seemed the family had become immune to the invasions of my drawing and were feeling at ease with it. Subtly to start and then more determinedly, the arterial systems overran the room. Eventually they affected navigation of the space. If anyone walking through wasn’t considered about their route and inadvertently came near to the feathery pliant structures, they readily swayed and bent.
Breathe (Installation Detail)
2014
Speaker Wire
4100 mm x 3250 mm
Breathe (Installation Detail)
2014
Speaker Wire
4100 mm x 3250 mm
Breathe (Installation Detail)
2014
Speaker Wire
4100 mm x 3250 mm
Breathe (Installation Detail)
2014
Speaker Wire
4100 mm x 3250 mm
There was an expressive mutuality between the control exerted by the drawing over a body moving around the room and the nervous responses of the suspended wires. It seemed to be a mode of drawing that could experientially articulate how the body and the house interrelated. Derrida’s concept of ‘touch’ as an experience\(^\text{162}\) came to mind again as the slightest air movement of a nearby body in motion sent ripples along the fine branches (Derrida, 2000).\(^\text{163}\) In some ways, the movements of these wires resonated with the sort of reverberations and flows we rarely see beneath the boundaries of our skins. This led me to consider the different limits of matter, place, body and time that come into play without us really noticing. I thought about the connectivities between inside and outside, the junctures where the house, the object and the fixed gave way to reciprocity and intervention. I became conscious of the different flows that linked the house and its inhabitants to others beyond the limits of skin or walls, such as waste, information, food, speech, music, power, water, memory, knowledge, money and bodily fluids: some visible, others hidden. I focused my attention on the idea of home as the hub or heart of these networked systems simultaneously within, beside and beyond the body of the house.

Chatting about this on Skype with a friend, her partner leaned over her shoulder to say, ‘the word network has no life left in it’. I knew what he meant. Network was a well-worn description now securely embedded in the Internet, digital information technologies and virtual worlds. In this way, the term was far removed from my anatomical analogies of bodily fluids and vessels or the sensorial tactility of the speaker wire I metaphorically pulled through its floorboards. Reading Busch, I read ‘as we learn to manoeuvre ourselves digitally through the immaterial world, [...] we simultaneously cultivate more physical, tangible experiences that demand we use our abilities to see, smell, hold, and touch in a real and visceral way’ (Busch, 1999, p.44). Perhaps it was more of an entangled, enmeshed or tangential connectivity than a network I was fumbling with, but Busch’s comment suggested I give more thought to the analogous similarities between the body and those of digital communications and information.

Regardless of class, gender, race or economic origin, our social and professional relations increasingly operate out of households as opposed to the public workplace. To me, this

\(^{162}\) Derrida speaks extensively on touch, referring to it as an experience and a translation. He states, ‘experience in general would start there: it would begin by feeling itself touching a limit, feeling touched by a limit, and its own limit’ (Derrida, 2005, p.111). Through Derrida, I rethink touch as more about interaction than physical contact—there is always a gap between the toucher and the touched.\(^{163}\) Also relevant is de Zegher’s interpretations of drawings interrogating material, body and space through the use of ‘connective, curative materials, summoning line as string and as a link within the sensual realms of touch and gaze’ (de Zegher, 2011, p.73).
changing nature of community most likely stemmed from increasingly pervasive technologies. The limits of what is typically understood as private familial space has been rendered porous as the public world seeps in both physically and temporally (Rutherford, 2011, p. 99). Information technologies have enabled work to invade our personal time and space, and a vast range of occupations to be fulfilled from the house by both men and women. As Johansson and Saarikangas put it, portable communications have ‘transferred the boundaries of home by bringing the outside world into the domestic space’ (Johansson & Saarikangas, 2009, p.11). We remain constantly linked to other cultures and communities both known and strange to us via our phones, computers, video games and satellite dishes. It wasn’t just cables, tubes and pipes permeating the dermal layers of my house but information and dialogue.

I had been thinking of the house as a personified body delineated by skin-like walls without grasping that I was still stuck within the snail shell. Suddenly the house became the organ that was pumping, transforming and generating the flows: an intersection of connectivities in continual interaction with the outside. Furthermore, artificial conduits and frames had been inserted into it that the original bodily structure had grown to accept and support as its own flesh and blood. These alien prostheses kept the system fluid and active day and night. The house had ceased to be a place of rest and leisure for either sex. No space offered up the sort of privacy idealised as a familial or relaxing safe-haven. Perhaps the bathrooms allowed family members to feel justified in having sole control over their immediate environment and bodily functions. Yet thanks to Wi-Fi and social media, it didn’t mean being alone with one’s thoughts. There was usually a smartphone or radio on hand even when in the bath.

Maybe it wasn’t just the lack of a designated drawing space that had hit me when I’d finished designing the house, but the realisation that there was no guarantee of being undisturbed anywhere in this modernised and well-equipped arena. It wasn’t only the white gallery-like walls that made the house ‘unhomely’ but the frenetic system of communications and technologies in which we participated. Even though I had finally established a room in which to draw, it didn’t stop everyone phoning, messaging or calling for me whenever they felt the need. Neither was it simply a question of opening or shutting a door that would allow or deny access to me. It occurred to me that our notions of embodiment and the boundaries we perceive between the physical and non-
physical, have been completely altered by digital technologies. Portable computers and mobile phones have changed the way we interact and communicate with each other, even in our houses. There was a multitude of means by which my family could attract my attention if they wanted to. In order to ignore their requests and expectations, I had to consciously resist leaping to my feet in response to their calls and calm the butterflies in my stomach. To stay put I had to wrestle with my own sense of guilt in shutting them out, loosen my shoulder muscles from involuntary contractions and breathe deeply.

My drawing practice had yet to address the finer nuances of familial reliance in my roles and to interrogate the level of my availability supporting both their sense of security and my own. I decided to try and examine these interdependencies in more detail through my practice. I wondered if I could somehow incorporate the demands on my time in the lists I drew. Perhaps there was a way of documenting the endless obligations and my emotional, physical and verbal reactions to them. Should I log requests and duties as they happened and if so, how would I record responses ranging from laughs and smiles to the churning stomachs, muscular tension and gritted teeth I wrestled with when I felt unwilling to perform?

To get some clarity on how to proceed, I needed to grapple with the clutter again and make some room to move around. This time it wasn’t just the physical stuff engulfing me I felt I needed to tackle, but all the dried-up tangents and investigations of my project as a whole. In presenting my ideas and showing my drawings to others I was becoming aware of the mounting need to re-evaluate my purpose and reset my aspirations. Feeling the weight of the accumulation bearing down on me, I braced to do battle and hone it down.

In digesting Heidegger’s Art and Space, I took from it that we understood the world through shared concepts but sometimes a ‘clearing’ must be made: a standing back to rethink about what we needed these concepts to actually do or say (Heidegger, 1969, p.5). I carried out a radical ‘spring clean’ of the house finding hideaways and fitting spaces for all my books, drawings and equipment. I pared down my equipment to the bare minimum of a pad, some paper, a few pencils, a mobile phone and the dog. As I sat down to draw at my desk, I hoped to begin figuring out exactly what I was going to do with the upsurging sensitivity.
Turning the pad over to use as a drawing board, a plan fell out that I’d previously disembowelled to make a stencil. In the same breath, my son and his friend burst through the door full of energy. I’d forgotten they had a half-day. Determined not to be distracted and be sucked into making food, driving or any other menial activity, I avoided eye contact, gave them a tepid welcome and hunched over the table supposedly in deep concentration. Pressing the stencil down onto a clean sheet of paper and picking up a propelling pencil, I placed a tiny blemish in the corresponding position to where I sat. Too self-interested to pay much attention once I failed to engage with them, they rushed around being loud, bouncy and jovially combative. Their presence in the house was like an adrenalin shot but I did my best to turn my back, shut my ears and control my body from reacting to the threat when footsteps came near. To release the tension, I chose flight as opposed to fight and set out from the spot in a laborious spiralling of tiny words.

Once I’d nicked the skin the flow was unstoppable and I just went on writing everything that came into my head. The resistant thoughts about not having time, being disturbed, the noise and even when I felt cold from sitting still too long. It all spurted forth in the coiling outpour. I heard my husband and son chattering as they grabbed their own food from the fridge and settled into a video game. They didn’t know their words merged with the stream of my own thoughts on the paper. When the risk of being distracted had passed, I kept fastidiously adding the minute letters millimetre by millimetre. Moving on from the frenetic invasion, it ran into circulating reflections on the drawing process, looping away from the tightly wound spiral and incorporating random ideas about lines, with pinches of philosophy [Fig.124].

More of these written drawings were born out of the everyday hustle and bustle over the following weeks, from stressful throbblings of annoyance to tickling humorous voices in my head. They included my indignation at being disturbed by requests from family or guests for me to do things for them and my unformed contemplations about how body, space and home were mutually and sensorially interconnected. When I was forcibly removed from the time-consuming process, I would come back to the drawing board and exhume my frustrations by writing phrases about these contests over time and space, ‘HOW TO FIND TIME’, ‘WHAT TIME IS LEFT’, ‘IS THERE TIME?’, ‘WHERE IS THE SPACE?’. As the intricate sentences were drawn out, questions came to mind about why I had stopped what I was doing at all. Why did I allow myself to be diverted by familial demands?
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Nobody walked into the recording studio in the middle of a session and asked my husband why there wasn’t any milk. He wouldn’t get pulled away from writing a song to spread butter on a roll, dig through the washing for a lost item of clothing or drop a forgotten bag off at school. Why did I allow such trivia to halt me in my tracks whereas my husband didn’t? However reluctant, I still mostly did what I was asked, and we all knew I would. It came to me that more than just familial or even societal expectations drove me to do so, as I could just say no and refuse to move. Perhaps I acted out of guilt and my own internal expectations of the maternal role and a woman’s responsibility. I recalled something I read Bourgeois saying during an interview in 1956:

I ought to be doing something else instead of just having a good time. I ought to have a job. I ought to be doing something worthwhile like a man instead of always doing woman stuff. I ought to be “as good as” and if possible better than Robert [...] Maybe I ought to be something else, do or be something else, if not be, do – there is something wrong with what I do, maybe it means there is something wrong with what I am (Bourgeois in Morris, 2007, p.130).

The steps of my progress were characterised by a similar twisting, turning, doubting and cross-examining of my own thoughts, actions and deep-seated sense of the part I should perform. The arduously pencilled words territorialised room-like shapes and indicated the movements of looping threads or knitted yarn as before, until one day the body of the room fell away into winding veins that threaded and entwined [Fig.125-126]. Whether I was conscious of it at the time, in retrospect the meandering utterances evidenced a move away from the physical encounter towards more social interrelations of home.

Since pinning down my subjective understanding of what should be considered drawing for my project, my textual lists had become arterial flows of thoughts and dialogue. However, there was no doubt in my mind that the painstakingly shaped text was anything but the drawn line. To me, it exemplified the directness and immediacy that has led to drawing being picked up by contemporary artists as somehow corresponding to the line of thought. As Taylor says, ‘through the act of drawing we are not only left with a trace of the physical act but a trace of the thinking process’ (Taylor, 2008, p.10). When grappling with conceptual approaches, writing and drawing can be powerfully interconnected tools.
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I had read several doctoral theses in which researchers delved drawing ‘as a mode of thinking’. For example, in *The Drawing Activity: A Phenomenological Investigation* (1982), Geoffrey Bailey states that ‘experiencing a drawing we are moving in an area of thinking and understanding that cannot be reached through any other means’ (Bailey, 1982, p.21). The line is ‘not only a means to the articulation of experience; in an important sense, it becomes experience’ says Bailey, ‘drawing is not simply the vehicle for the expression of thinking, as though thinking were elsewhere [...] drawing is the very embodiment of thinking’ (Bailey, 1982, p.21). I imagined thinking and drawing as inextricably entwined but Bailey’s use of the term ‘embodiment’ somehow lacked substance and corporeality.

I tried to imagine what being embodied meant to me in the context of a body immersed in the cognitive and active process of drawing. I envisaged a superficial facade of imitative representational types of drawing, the sort that most people seemed happy to pass their eyes over and judge on the basis of ‘looking like’ something. In peeling back this tired thin aesthetically-pleasing skin and the insubstantial ambiguous tissue behind it, I felt there was the possibility of exposing something far more visceral and vital.

To me, thinking about drawing in this flesh and blood kind of way did not necessarily exclude the two-dimensional line on paper, as even such a product has the propensity to arise interwoven with embodied modes of thinking. De Zegher has a solid grip on artists wielding lines that were both drawn and written, picking up on Mira Schendel’s ‘language-infused works’ upon semi-transparent rice paper that hung between Plexiglass and exerted control over moving through the gallery space (de Zegher, 2010, p.103). I was particularly struck by Luis Pérez-Oramas’ critique of Schendel’s drawing, ‘The drawing in fact shines through’ says Pérez-Oramas, ‘its body precisely inhabits the paper’s transparency; its traits lie in the trace, the physical gesture, the muscular weight that produced it, as well as in the paper’s intensified presence’ (Pérez-Oramas in de Zegher, 2010, p.103). What Pérez-Oramas embraced was how the reverberations of the artist’s body and mind in the motion of creating line, travel through every layer of the drawing and are ultimately ‘felt’ by the viewer, rather than merely observed. When drawing gets it right, the beating heart of its maker sends a pulse far beyond what can be seen.

---

164 See (Cain, 2006), (Harty, 2009); (MacDonald, 2010).
Sketching the discarded socks at the outset was the last time I had set myself an observational drawing and simply executed it exactly as planned, without diverging from the mental and physical operation I set out to exercise. Embarking on drawing now, it no longer promised such cathartic escapism but generally meant heading into unknown cerebral and corporeal territory. I often felt led by the mind in the sort of blind forward groping that Derrida referred to in *Memoirs of the Blind* (Derrida, 1993, p.1). The privileging of process over product this implied had become embedded in my creative practice. Nevertheless, when drawing felt most in touch with the home it was the hand that guided me. Drawing had moved me on from the quantitative measurements of the architect, designer and illustrator to seeing the world as an artist. As an artist, all my senses had stepped in and guided my body 'hand-first' into drawing out home from house. At the times when I was saturated by reading, observing and contemplating the house that I could see but not feel, I lost my way again and fell back into illustrative visual responses. At these points, I grappled to get body and mind pulsing, connecting, pumping, flowing, cognising and moving together by letting a more productive generative practice take the lead once more.

My drawing no longer represented what was out there and distant, but was engaged in an experiential and multi-sensorial interaction with the house. Perhaps little had changed from what others could see but through my phenomenological study of the space, I was coming to know things differently. To me, it felt like a massive realignment of body and mind but the changes were beneath the surface and internalised. Trying to verbalise this transformation to others was hard. Comparing my initial approach to the socks with my current understanding of drawing, I understood it had partly come about through a gathering momentum of line-making and reflexive thinking, until the two had flowed together, experiential and embodied. In trying to present my project I mapped it out as 'reflection in action', borrowing the familiar phrase now a tenet in contemporary theories of education. Its originator, Donald A. Schön described how drawing as a means of 'reflecting in action' can thereby become a 'conversation with the situation' (Schön, 1982, p.76). It was precisely this sort of rambling discursive thinking that underpinned my textual lines as the documentation of ubiquitous interruptions, dialogue and responses gradually grew into unexpected forms on the paper.
Starting in the centre of large empty sheets, I worked outwards in more arduously pencilled spirals. After a while, repeating the same short sentences over and over, ‘FINDING TIME, ‘I DON’T HAVE TIME FOR THIS’, ‘ALL OUT OF TIME’, I became less careful at forming the miniscule letters. Mistakes were inevitable and words often faltered, momentarily changing to a different and often opposing meaning. The breach would be taken up in the flow as a change in direction, a shift in pressure from the hand or an open wound. On occasion the vein of words would simply take flight from the main body of text and head out of the frame [Fig.127-128].

Painfully slowly, the drawings expanded their dermal layers little by little to occupy the clean surface surrounding them. Deviations and slips became scars, cuts and scabs. Incidental connotations of tree rings emerged, encapsulating the imperceptible growth of the drawings and the inordinate amount of time I spent on them. I thought of how, in taking up my time, these works also gave me time and pushed others away. When the family came to find me, I was increasingly resistant. The drawings themselves seemed to be quietly but determinedly pushing against the invisible boundaries of the household demands and expectations that threatened to take me away from them, cracking and faltering in the process. When I let my guard down and the phrases or meaning changed, as when I DON’T HAVE TIME inadvertently became I HAVE TIME, the drawing responded with defiantly heavier borders. Although many such drawings bled forth as the sap of an amputated tree trunk, they were intricately differentiated as temporal documents: punctuated by knots, cuts and splits that penetrated the bark. It wasn’t until the onlooker stepped in, screwed up their eyes and read a few lines that they recognised what these drawings embodied: a home that was relentless and repetitive but never the same twice [Fig.129-132].

I saw in the fissures and shifts, the sort of intervals and discrepancies through which Derrida claimed a reflective awareness of everyday life could be gained (Derrida, 1982, p.17). These formations epitomized Schön’s model of new knowledge arising through repeating day-to-day acts: ‘on occasion a familiar routine produces an unexpected result; an error stubbornly resists correction; or although the usual actions produce the usual outcomes […] for some reason we have begun to look at them in a new way’ (Schön, 1982, p.32). It seemed to me that the reiterative, temporal aspects of my practice I’d identified earlier on, were still beating within it, ever-present and productive of a pulse.
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Wrapping myself around my drawings and withholding my attentions from the family provoked doubts in their minds that ended up in the lines of text: AM I WELCOME HERE? IS MY MUM STILL THERE? AM I NEEDED? WHERE IS MY SPACE NOW? [Fig.133-138]. These self-perpetuating doubts and vulnerabilities absorbed me in further drawing and so bred more tension. As limits were touched, boundaries shifted and interdependencies exposed, there was an ever-greater pressure in the contact between my space and theirs. The space of home was morphing and taking on new form.

The spiralling drawings led me to think about how physical, social and relational spaces emanated from me as the centre of home and family. Throughout history, home was conceived as a hearth around which communities pivoted. I knew that Hestia was the goddess of the hearth in mythology and that she had great social, religious and political importance in ancient Greece. Hestia’s flame was taken from the central hearth of the mother city to new lands when setting up a colony. Similarly, if a family moved, fire was taken from the mother’s hearth to light one in that of the new dwelling.

I read Jean-Pierre Vernant’s description, ‘Hestia does not only represent the centre of the domestic sphere’ claimed Vernant, ‘fixed in the ground the circular hearth is the navel that ties the house to the earth...the symbol and pledge of fixity, immutability, and permanence’ (Vernant, 2006, p.158). According to Vernant, when a woman was married and carried the flame of Hestia to a new house, there she stayed ‘the node and starting point of the orientation and arrangement of human space’ (Vernant, 2006, p.159). To me, Hestia being understood as never leaving her abode problematically aligned with the sense of imprisonment in the house I had at the start (Vernant, 2006, p.159). However, thinking about Hestia exposed that I still hadn’t actually left the building.

As the stable stay-at-home parent in the family, I was aware of being metaphorically in the middle of my household. Whether caring, cooking or engrossed in fastidious drawing processes, I felt obliged to create the sense of a hearth around which the family gathered. Even when feeling trapped by the house I hadn’t got up and headed out to find a job and establish my independence in the public world. What I had done is stayed put and surveyed the visible boundaries imposing my entrapment in detail, until finally I had rolled up my sleeves, stuck my hands deep into its intestines and begun fumbling, stroking, exploring and following the connective tissues and fluidities of home.
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Through drawing practice, house and home seemed to be taking on some differing spatial characteristics. The house was delineated by physical linear margins that I could see and touch. Having borrowed an essentially phenomenological methodology from Bachelard, home had become as squelchy, aqueous and slippery as his naked snail. Not long into my project I had acknowledged conceptual differences being made between house and home at every turn. The books that informed me at that time were primarily born out of social science. I found they often discussed Bachelard and Heidegger in tandem, and in ways that inferred Heidegger’s philosophies moved beyond the physicality of the house when Bachelard’s did not. Smyth and Croft stated ‘if Bachelard is the great modern philosopher for the house, Martin Heidegger performs a similar function with regard to the related concept of the home’ (Smyth & Croft, 2006, p.15). Their reductive interpretation of Heidegger suggested he had an interest in place and space, which enabled a view of ‘the house as both physical location (dwelling, signifying a building) and concept (dwelling, signifying home)’ (Smyth & Croft, 2006, p.15). It gave me the idea that philosophical and theoretical distinctions made between place and space might help me identify and get my hands on the ambiguous spatialities of house and home.

Once the terms space and place ceased to be synonymous to me, they leaped from the pages I fingered. When mentioned in relation to home, they were frequently utilised to express its extreme expanse being at one end fixed in place both perceptually and physically as a house or community, and at the other end falling out of materiality into an imagined, idealised and emotional space. My gut response was that such ideas implied a separation and distance that I was uncomfortable with. It seemed better to think of space and place as overlapped and mapping onto one another rather than positioned at opposing poles.

Considering the historical spatial and gendered delineations of the interior, I felt it was counterproductive to align my research with any divisory assumption of home. I wondered if the dualities assigned to house and home by human geographers and sociologists were in some ways burdening it further. Rather than enforcing differences between public and private, interior and exterior, feminine and masculine, I felt contemporary critiques of home should deny these distinctions and work towards unity. As an individual, I liked to think of myself as consciously striving for equality, integration

---

165 For example: (Johansson & Saarikangas, 2009), (Smyth & Croft, 2006); Cieraad, 2014); (Blunt & Dowling, 2006).
and diversity but my project had already unearthed an apathetic acceptance of ongoing imbalances of the household. Now alerted, it felt important to promote spatial heterogeneity and genderisation whenever possible.

So, I eased myself gently into an armchair with writings by contemporary spatial theorists\(^{166}\). The word place ‘implies an indication of stability [whereas] space exists when one takes into consideration vectors of direction, velocities, and time variables...thus space is composed of intersections of mobile elements’ claimed Michel de Certeau in *The Practice of Everyday Life* (de Certeau, 1984, p.117). This tasted of the ideas I had been chewing over that fixed the house in place and enabled home to be more fluid and unbounded. De Certeau also described the joint that enabled their mutual flexibility by saying ‘space is a practiced place...in relation to place, space is like the word when it is spoken...caught in the ambiguity of an actualisation’ (de Certeau, 1984, p.117). It was disorientating and didn’t seem to offer a sense of space that was any easier to catch hold of at first.

However, when I thought more closely on de Certeau’s comment, I did feel my recent textual drawings embodied experiences that I could relate to his 'space' of home as analogous of a performance, conversation or spoken act that couldn’t quite be pinned down. It was a small step but using my inner dialogue as an associative material had in some way made the home space visible without anchoring it to house and ‘place’. What sat awkwardly with me was de Certeau’s implication that space (which I tentatively aligned with home) was an active practicing of place (respectively the house). Whilst I appreciated the effort to keep space and place intervening, I would have said that the making of home was the primary force at play, not the house. I was confident that I would keep living and breathing if devoid of the house but would I want to carry on without a sense of home? Did we need a concept of home to survive?

This brought me back around to Heidegger’s differentiations of place and space and his stress on dwelling as an ‘act’ as opposed to an object. Over the course of my research, I had learnt that Heidegger’s philosophies were sometimes discredited by his associations with arguably the most extreme of divisor spatial forces to ever impact on the world, the

\(^{166}\) For example, (Lefebvre, 1991); (Massey, 2005); (Pile & Thrift, 2000); (Bauman, 2000); (Balibar, 2012); (Augé, 1995).
Nazi regime (Leadbetter, 2016). In 1933-4 Heidegger spent 12 months as the first Nazi rector of the University of Freiburg and, although this was the extent of his active involvement he never publicly denounced the fascist state. Whilst I didn’t presume to understand this alignment through his writing, I had reservations in taking up the notions of dwelling he devised during the prior decade in his cabin on the Black Forest Mountains. And yet, his distinctions of space and place were so formative in contemporary spatial thinking that I could not reasonably turn my back on them.

To Heidegger, a building or dwelling (the noun) was what allowed for a sense of place in which dwelling (the verb) could find the space or openness to occur (Heidegger, 1971, p.142). From Heidegger’s essay Being and Time written in 1926, he appeared to conceive space as a ‘mode’ of existence and saw us as existing spatially rather than existing in space: to Heidegger space was a product of our active being and contained inherent references to the ‘self’ (Heidegger, 1962, p.248). This idea of place as physically fixed to an object of some sort, and space as somehow emanating from activity was later repeated in Art & Space (Heidegger, 1969, p.6). Although resonating with my understandings of house and home respectively, Heidegger’s philosophies of our active ‘Being-in-the-world’ tended to delineate space and place rather than marry them (Heidegger, 1962, p.248). However, in Heidegger I found a pertinent emphasis on the activity of making home. In his 1951 essay Building Dwelling Thinking, he determined the relations between people and the house through ‘dwelling’ as the fundamental condition of human ‘being’: ‘we do not dwell because we have built, but we build and have built because we dwell, that is, because we are dwellers’ (Heidegger, 1971, p.142). He implied that it wasn’t a house that generated identity and belonging but the drive to belong that made us build houses.

If house was merely an incidental product of an overriding desire to create a sense of home, then I decided I could conceptually bring house/place ‘inside’ home/place and

---

167 Charles Leadbetter describes the issue and explains why studying Heidegger still matters: ‘Home matters so much just now because so many people feel the tether coming loose. The philosopher who understood this search best is controversial: Martin Heidegger. A member of the Nazi Party, Heidegger never expressed remorse for the Holocaust...Some critics argue that his philosophy is too contaminated by racism to admit rescue. His ideas are often dismissed as parochial, nostalgic and regressive. Even his advocates acknowledge that his prose is deliberately dense. Yet...studying Heidegger helps to explain why we are now so preoccupied by feelings of displacement that are triggering a search for home. Given Heidegger’s Nazi leanings and the rise of the populist Right in many parts of the developed world, his work could repay study’ (Leadbetter, 2016).

168 Heidegger explains the ontological state of ‘Being’ through the term Dasein (‘being there’): ‘to Dasein, Being in a world is something that belongs essentially. Thus, Dasein’s understanding of Being pertains with equal priority both to an understanding of something like a ‘world’, and to the understanding of the Being of those entities which become accessible within the world’ (Heidegger, 1962, p.33).
engulf it as a multi-layered concept of home-making. This idea seemed to assume the nature of The Fold that Deleuze described in his critique *Foucault* (1986): ‘the outside is not a fixed limit but a moving matter animated by peristaltic movements, folds and foldings’ (Deleuze, 2006, p.96-97). In this way, the house was ‘the inside as an operation of the outside’ of home (Deleuze, 2006, p.97). Home was an active, fluid and mobile entity able to overlap or exist independently of house, fixed place or community.

I returned to Massey to help me flesh out this primary spatiality of home in a way that made sense in terms of my everyday experiences. Rather than describing a duality of extremities, Massey asserted home as simultaneously ‘a physical, walled place or community and an imaginative space of our active being, constituted through interactions and encounters’ (Massey, 2005, p.9). With none of the ambiguity of Heidegger’s theory, Massey argued for space and place to be dealt with as mutual, inextricable and actively interrelated in our conceptions of home.

This was a recurrent theme for Massey. She stripped bare the prevalent distinctions of ‘place’ and ‘space’, accusing these delineations of being implicit in the denial of equality and multiplicity in the world (Massey, 2005, p.6-7). She reasoned that thinking of ‘place (as meaningful, lived and everyday) and space (as what? the outside? the abstract? the meaningless?)’ caused space to be assumed as a surface or area to be conquered and place to be regarded as a home or retreat to be protected from difference and ‘The Other’ as the stranger ‘out there’ (Massey, 2005, p.5). Viewing home as a safe haven goes hand in hand with defending it from change and the invasion of others (Massey, 2005, p.9). I had read that dominant concepts of home tended to involve the physical ‘separation of the security, comfort and cleanliness of home from the outside world full of dangers’ (Johansson & Saarikangas, 2009, p.17). From Massey, I had learnt that thinking and enacting home in terms of a fixed place could encourage negativity and fear for mobile or different living practices. In this way, our idealisations of home and the ways we make ourselves feel at home, were tied up in a range of social constructions.

If the urge to protect our houses or communities often resulted in divisory parochialisms that seriously impacted on others, then to usefully rethink current living and working practices, perhaps the demarcations of territory and the differentiations between space and place should be broken down. To Massey, accepting and understanding truly
multifarious lived experiences required bringing everyday spatial concepts of personal and political, individual and mass, private and public together to see how they entwined and interrelated as mutually reciprocal flows.

My project had set out from a position that actually reinforced the dichotomies Massey condemned. Despite its modern intentions, my affluent living and working space was shown to be a rarefied retreat resistant to change. By negotiating a time and space to draw, I had viewed the house as a land to be conquered. At the same time my family had rallied against the invasion of their private refuge but now more unifying embodied relations of home were coming into play through drawing. Appropriating Bachelard’s phenomenological methodology had brought house and home closer together in embodied and experiential simultaneities of space and place.

Massey’s challenge to the oppositions of place and space became the framework for reconceptualising the home I was handling as concurrently fixed and fluid: with boundaries constituted through interactions: a product of relations-between’ (Massey, 2005, p.9). However, the drawing product had yet to become anything but material, visible and two-dimensional. What sort of drawing could embody both the physical and non-physical aspects of home and its interrelations, experiences and encounters? How could the muscles, tissues and vital organs buried in the darkest conceptual recesses of home be drawn out? What could simultaneously move beyond the house, catch its outward breaths, its leaking fluids and the shape of its relations and influences? I dropped my head in my arms and sank onto the paper. What sort of line could reverberate, penetrate and reach where I couldn’t: air, liquid, sound?

Somewhere a heavy door slammed shut and I tensed momentarily as a shock wave shook the house and resonated through the table. A far-off shout followed. Perhaps the careless action of a teenager leaving a door ajar in the wind had interrupted a take and inadvertently been recorded on the track in the studio. Just as I relaxed, another startle took me as it suddenly occurred to me I could use sound. I could literally reach through the walls and into the voids if I documented the home aurally. I sat and listened. I heard my breathing, the dog shuffling, a radiator tapping, the washing machine vibrating, distant music from the studio, guests talking upstairs, the window giving in the wind, a car
on a wet road. Conversations, activities, movements, involuntary bodily functions and the outside were interconnected vibrations of noise.

Ingold addresses language, music, writing and drawing as interwoven. Returning to *Lines* (2008), I read ‘sound permeates the awareness of listeners, it gives shape or form to their very perception of the world’ (Ingold, 2008, p.6). Sounds were affected by physical surroundings and thereby embodied a sense of the space they passed through, yet they didn’t fix that space or become confined by its physical configurations. Sound waves reflected, infiltrated, shaped and drew out the active nature of the space they inhabited. A pair of headphones demarcated the boundary of personal space. A megaphone enabled the individual to overrun public space. Speakers could broadcast tones, beats and rhythms that united crowds and communities in movement. Danger could often be heard before it was seen or felt. Through sound, I could bring space and place together and home might overlap house without being restricted by it.

As Caleb Kelly pointed out, ‘since entering the twenty-first century, artists and theorists have demonstrated an increased interest and awareness of sound in culture. We have been prompted to re-listen and rethink our audio world and ‘how we come to know the world through listening’ (Kelly, 2011, p.14). Whether layered, overlapped, bent or absorbed, sound activated space whilst at the same time stretching beyond it. Just as the line drew out connectivity by recording and mapping the spaces it occupied, so did sound. Sound can articulate the immersive experiences, common ground and shifts of everyday life and so has attracted substantial interest as an integral part of critiquing The Everyday.

In his 1973 essay *Approaches to What?* Georges Perec asked ‘how should we take account of, question, describe what happens every day and recurs every day: the banal, the quotidian, the obvious, the common, the ordinary, the infra-ordinary, the background noise, the habitual’ (Perec, 1974, p.210)? Now facing this head on, I found contemporary art to be saturated with notions of attending to the trivial, repetitive acts we usually disregard. Artists and writers have directed us to rethink how we come to know our world and to look again, notice, listen and attend to the mundane. As Stephen Johnstone pointed out in *The Everyday* (2008), in pursuit of ‘a desire to bring uneventful and overlooked aspects of lived experience into visibility’, The Everyday has been established as a site of enquiry and transformation (Johnstone, 2008, p.12). In his 1961 essay *Critique
of Everyday Life the Marxist philosopher, Henri Lefebvre asked ‘how can everyday life be defined? It surrounds us, it besieges us, on all sides and from all directions’ (Lefebvre, 2002, p.41). According to Johnstone, Lefebvre suggested that to investigate the everyday where repetition and creativity confront each other was to grasp a certain quality, to get inside it (Johnstone, 2008, pp.14-15). In the case of sound, the relationship was a mutual one, as vibrations flowed through me in all directions.

I began recording the ambient noise floors in each room of the house. The thin Victorian windowpanes were only a perceptual barrier and recordings picked up the building yard down the hill; neighbours’ mowers; the birds; distant dogs; and cars. I wondered what would happen if these ubiquitous sounds moved out of place. I played recordings back across the garden and in those quiet corners of the house but it didn’t prove to be the activation of these spaces I had expected. My interventions unnoticed by family members moving through the rooms, and even when settled nearby they largely disregarded the incongruous sounds. Perhaps we were all so accustomed to hearing multiple sounds that the incongruities of background noise were lost. I thought about the impossibilities of finding silence. In the dead space of the soundproofed studio it was possible to only hear the body itself. As Kelly reminded me ‘we cannot close our ears’ (Kelly, 2011, pp.13-14). As a result, we are used to being selective in the way we aurally filter the world around us.

I recorded the aural impact of my body carrying out this research as typing, drawing on paper, making rubbings, turning book pages, footsteps, or simply voices talking. I mixed the tracks together and overlapped them using sound production software. It gave each recording a visual wave correlate. Editing and moving pieces of sound around in computer programmes was time-consuming and labour intensive. The attention I invested was manipulated by the software and reduced to output quickly taken in as a visual wave. This enabled me to make connections between this process and my laborious methods using pencil and paper for documenting household activities I overheard. Both extremes of ‘drawing’ involved the body bent in concentration and the hand carrying out repetitive tasks of translating sound, time and space into a readable form, a map [Fig.139-146].
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I became engrossed in the wave imagery and its pulsing structures. I turned down the audio and worked purely with the visuals. They reminded me of the monitors picking up the heartbeats of my unborn son. I wondered if forgotten voids could be inhabited by just the visual manifestations of live sounds from elsewhere as I stretched out both the sound and its matching wave. I became interested in the narrowed peaks that remained through transformation. Visually I could compress a whole day’s recording into a single wave on the computer screen so that disturbances became regularities. The extreme highs and lows marked the sort of sounds that made me jump or tense up: a teenager shouting, the doorbell going, the dog suddenly barking or the phone ringing. There was a range of sounds that made me immediately stop what I was doing to respond. Reflecting on the patterns of these sporadic disruptions, it became apparent that the most nagging and invasive noises arose from the alerts of communication technologies.

Chatting with a friend, we talked about how such aural disturbances triggered a chemical reaction inside us. We are physically and psychologically programmed to react to a phone call, an email notification or a message alert. Our bodies have a ‘what’s wrong’ reaction that fires a tiny shot of adrenalin when the baby cries, the doorbell rings or a notification pops up on our portable devices. The friend mentioned that the visual sound waves were somebody else’s interpretation of what I was hearing: effectively not my own drawings but another’s design. I had not previously considered this interim level of mediation. It was not in keeping with how I saw my lines. Patricia Cain put her finger on drawing for me when she said ‘there is little in the medium that intervenes between the artist and the marks that are made (Cain, 2010, p.28). I felt the lack of mediation drawing imposed, was its most vital characteristic and precisely the reason why I and other researchers had chosen it as an investigative tool. I was convinced that maintaining the distillation, directness and honesty of the lines I drew was essential to articulating home.

Dissatisfied with the visual representation of the sound, I returned to the audio files and listened again with headphones. I noticed that many had caught the muffled guitar-based rock that habitually escaped through the soundproofing of the recording studio. We were used to this music being the backdrop of daily life, both in terms of sound and how we prioritised our days to accommodate the needs of whatever and whoever came with the session in progress. It was part of the rhythmic beats and breaths of our house.
It came to me that the studio stood as the most resistant area of the house to drawing. Locked behind a number-coded entry system and double-thickness walls, it remained untouched by my pervasive practice. Although occupying the old utility rooms and laundry, the studio didn't feel like part of my home. It was next to the kitchen but I did not clean it, work in it, sit in it or draw in it. I might not be actively excluded but despite a previous career in music and knowledge of the equipment, I didn’t generally go in unless asked. What would happen if I streamed the everyday sounds of the house or the recordings of my drawing processes into the studio? How would those working in the space (who were predominantly male) feel about the separations between the familial space and this primarily public workplace being broken down? What would my husband’s reaction be to me stepping over the line into his domain? What would I hear being said if I recorded their reactions? It dawned on me that the attitudes and assumptions governing our familial space were laid open by such spontaneous dialogue. These everyday verbal interactions embodied social relations that constructed home.

Over my project, I had come across philosophers, human geographers and spatial theorists variously approaching space as inherently caught up in social relations. Trying to get a grasp of the concept I found Lefebvre referred to space as a ‘social morphology’ and put forward the idea that binary aspects of space (one socially produced and the other natural, absolute and physical) conjoined in spaces that were produced by social ideologies and values’ such as home (Lefebvre, 1974, p.94). To me, Lefebvre’s statement suggested that space and place were bridged by social relations. My sense of feeling at home depended on familial relations: relations expressed in day-to-day conversation.

I thought about how space and language were both created by the community. What seemed increasingly important was the meaning of home as a shared social experience. I needed to focus on concepts of home that were products of active encounters between people: where they had been, who they had contact with, the dialogue and narratives that constructed both the individual and the collective society. I wondered what sort of drawing would enable the embodied space of home I experienced to be navigated experientially by others: a line that would share rather than show. I could continue recording the sound but as yet, I had not managed to incorporate a productive shift between the real sound and its being played back: that hearing again of everyday life that might reveal a new sense of its ontological structures.
A pertinent interpretation of experiential space jumped out at me from Phil Hubbard, Rob Kitchin and Gill Valentine’s introduction to Key Thinkers on Space and Place (Hubbard, Kitchin & Valentine, 2004). They critiqued the writings of Yi-Fu Tuan as ‘reminding geographers that people do not live in a framework of geometric relationships but a world of meaning’ defined by conceptual boundaries they described as a ‘field of care’ (Hubbard, Kitchin & Valentine, 2004, p.5). Reading this conceptualisation of relational space, it hit me that the space of home was not as unbound as I thought. Its limits might not be visible or physical but they nevertheless existed and were socially defined by the sense of self and belonging we carried with us. Home as a ‘field of care’ had a shape, albeit fluid, traveling and individuated. What defined its boundaries were the people at its heart and the web of expectations, responsibilities and social ties that connected them: feelings which emanated from within and without, that were to some extent both voluntary and involuntary, culturally enforced and self-imposed.

Gathering myself together I tried to get a feel for where my study of home now stood. Nestled into the ‘room of my own’, the familial interdependencies and relations that were becoming the lifeblood of my project were not evident in what I could see, touch, taste or hear. Sat at a desk in isolation, even the conversational interplay had subsided and friends, family and colleagues rarely disturbed me in person anymore. Interruptions to my concentration mostly occurred as alerts on the computer. Instead of phoning, popping in or waiting for me to get around to picking up my emails, the usual mode of communicating with me was via brief textual messages.

Drawing practice had affected the normative of home and my role within it. Now accepted as an everyday activity by those around me, my practice had become a subversive method of addressing the way home operated. In deriving drawings from familial conflict and encounters, I had in some ways reversed the socially sanctioned role of the mother as serving the family interests to the point where the family served the mother: a reversal that Di Bello also claimed for the Victorian women album-makers (Di Bello, 2007, p.117). And yet as the continuing inaccessibility of the recording studio demonstrated, my creative practice remained somehow subservient to my husband’s. Whilst my situation in the house had to some extent shifted, I was still carrying out all my creative, familial and professional activities in a position of subordination to his highly respected and well-connected career. The networks that governed rank and prestige...
were relatively tangible in urban and public environments where professional and social roles were clearly defined. Those relating to work carried out in the house were far less obvious. Although my endeavours had revealed many hidden aspects of home that I had not previously been aware of, there was a layer of invisibility I had yet to tackle.

Even though my drawing had ceased to focus on the physicality of the house I saw around me and had become sensorial, embodied and fluid, it was yet to take into consideration much beyond my immediate experience. Unless my enquiry was recognised and connected within broader discourses and debates, it risked being confined to the interior and disregarded. My drawings would have little impact beyond the personal unless they somehow addressed the expectations of the professional, academic and critical world.

What suddenly seemed most important was to connect the layers of home I had revealed with the outside: to situate my project amongst the social, political and theoretical considerations of home as a concept that affected all our lives. Perhaps the space of belonging and identity I was looking for was not one allocated by the family but one that enabled me to operate in a different way. What I wanted to forge out of the familial, professional and creative roles I fulfilled was a new sense of significance and content: that of the professional artist researcher.

So, there was another layer of home needing my attention that involved the purposeful generation of creative, social and professional networks for my research. I was reminded of the feminist initiatives in the 1960s and 70s that addressed the invisibility of women’s creative practices by connecting their work to public realms via dissemination and theoretical engagement. I wanted to build an academic and critical framework to support my research, establish its relevance and extend its reach into other disciplines. I found myself pursuing a completely different kind of space: one with status.

It occurred to me that I should also try to map this development through drawing. Map-making and map-reading activities help us to attain a sense of self, security and connection to the world around us. Utilising drawing to map the home I experienced in relation to the norms and agreements of the public and social world, could enable my research to gain importance and impact beyond the personal. The question was, what methods of mapping would attend to these professional and academic relations as they
developed. I had already found visual approaches fell short. Then I had tried to feel my way around the spaces of my everyday life through the body and the material of the house. Yet even these experiential and phenomenological methods lacked the ability to map the sort of relations and feelings that constituted home. Although embodied and sensorial, my lines missed the responsibilities, aspirations and feelings of accountability that were in my mind and which continually connected me to the family, the home and the world outside. How was I to map and make visible and readable to others all these intangible obligations that I carried with me?
HOME

I had redesigned, observed, touched, enacted, documented and heard my house. I had taken my concepts of drawing and home on a transformative journey and revealed new perspectives and shifting boundaries of both. I had drawn out the physical house I could see around me but found my viewpoint too distant. I had felt the spaces of home rising inside me but my body was too dumb to articulate them. Although useful in showing how everyday life was experienced and carried out, the methods I had tried fell short. I had yet to discover why home operated as it did and to find the line that articulated it.

Once again, a honing down of my accumulations felt like the right thing to do. I set myself the job of clearing away anything that no longer had place. I felt compelled to keep only that which had an obligatory reason to stay. It reminded me of the move here when we reduced our material world to a carload. It was so liberating we didn’t care if the storage containers went up in smoke. Now ruthlessly paring things down, I tried to imagine what I would save if only a handful of ideas could go forward.

Metaphorically speaking, if the house was burning down what valuables ought I take for posterity? Would I feel duty-bound to grab objects, photographs or artwork? I reckoned that once the family was cared for, the only thing that would force me to brave the heat was my mobile phone. The data it held was essential to my everyday life and much of it wasn’t transferable. To me, it was an irreplaceable store of notes, numbers, calendars, addresses, lists and messages related to those I felt most bound to. So, I used this analogy as a guide for the task I was dealt and left the wreckage of my deconstructed house empty-handed. The only possession I commanded was the phone in my pocket and the relations, identities, temporalities and responsibilities it encompassed. This was the home I carried with me as I sought to map my project over wider discourses and a global landscape.

Since reading Rutherford, I had become conscious of how portable communication equipment rendered the burdens of work utterly mobile and inescapable. Since personal computers became commercially available, the house had ceased to offer the sort of temporal and spatial limits able to withstand the onslaught of the outside world. However, as Johansson and Saarikangas pointed out ‘new information and
communication technologies not only connect different public and private spaces with each other, but also transfer parts of home to shared public spaces such as work, streets, and public transportation’ (Johansson & Saarikangas, 2009, p.11). In the twenty-first century, we commonly managed familial needs and domestic responsibilities remotely using personal communication devices and computers. In this way, the social ties and expectations generally associated with home were no longer assigned to the physical building of a house. It didn’t seem to matter whether the carer of the family was male or female, employed or not: for those who felt it was their duty, their familial relations and household duties travelled with them wherever they went. Whether I was lecturing, in a meeting or at a conference, the information, notifications and communications flowing through my phone were a constant reminder of the roles I was under obligation to fulfil.

Despite leaving the visible and physical dwelling behind me and reducing my drawing equipment to a touch screen, I remained committed to line and its relationship with space as a means of interrogating home. The interdependencies that constituted the field of home to which I was beholden, were no longer confined to the private interior. As I considered the flexibility and contemporary transformability of home and moved to connect my project to the public realm, my familial burdens came with me. I wanted to find a way to map the social bonds and negotiations constructing my home through drawing. Since the land divisions of Ancient Greece, drawing organised real space and delineated the ground beneath us. Twenty-first century concepts of drawing encompassed the trace of the human body in motion and accounted for how the spaces we moved through drew us. Like the wrinkles on our skin, the dwellings and landscapes around us accumulated the marks of our demands upon them.

Throughout history drawing as mapping has enabled us to place ourselves in the world we inhabit. Line has made explorers of us all. Knowledge is often referred to in terms of spatial territory explored, terrain mapped or gaps filled and I saw it as no coincidence that drawing and home were given this terminology. Regarded as a mode of enquiry, a wayfaring and an exploration of space, drawing was a means of attainment that did ‘not just involve knowing with the head, but thinking through the body’ (Cain, 2010, p.27). As my own phenomenological approaches to home showed, drawing was not simply productive of knowledge about space but also embodied spatial knowledge.
I thought about how the applications on my smartphone empowered me to establish a secure relationship with the spaces around me wherever I went in the world. Were these interactive maps a traveling form of homemaking? Did they conjure up a sense of self and belonging on the move? Could they encompass the lines I was looking for to map the relational spaces of home? It seemed to me that whilst these technologies were connected to feeling at home, they added little to my visual and embodied approaches to date and were still unable to deal with the intangibility of a home shaped by the interplay of social pressures and obligations.

How did drawing as mapping actually ‘add’ to knowledge – what shape did it take? Jo Spence once commented that ‘we do not come to know by plucking random experiences from the world, but through expanding our own sphere’ (Spence, 1986, p.215). Spence showed me the value of turning one’s critical attentions on the self and the familiar. As Busch stated, ‘any definition of home today must consider how new attitudes and values come up against the familiar; how our needs are served by what we know, as well as by what we remember’ (Busch, 1999, p.20). Busch seemed to imply a layering or adding.

It reminded me of a conversation about pedagogic theory I had with a teacher Sarah Thorrington, in October 2011, when she described a student as metaphorically placed in the centre of their understanding, gradually attained widening concentric circles of knowledge around them. The resultant visualizations of ‘coming to know’ as a process of expanding on the known rather than leaping into the unknown, stayed with me. So, despite moving away from the house, I felt bound to focus on the home with which I was most knowledgeable, my own. In order to find new practical methods, I had to progressively enlarge my field of drawing and find ways to extend the taxonomies of dialogues, prints, lines, sounds and words.

I picked up Racz’s, Art and the Home: Comfort, Alienation and the Everyday (2015) hopeful that it might have something to offer my practice. However, Racz leant towards sculptural treatments and the material object mostly dominated her concerns. I felt it was arguable that regardless of the title, it was essentially 'house' rather than 'home' that Racz was addressing, as her investigation rarely moved beyond its walls. To me, the recent decades of art-making just didn’t fully acknowledge the transformation of home into a delocalised nebular entity we take around with us.
What methods could I revise or extend to do justice to the mobile, communicative and duty-bound spaces of home and family that were pressing in on me? I took another look at artists interrogating home and concluded that even when mobility and homelessness were being dealt with, the artworks were predominantly related to the house and inextricably embedded in the physical.169 Whether portable survival pods rolling down the street in New York or ghostly woven houses hanging upside down in the gallery, the emphasis was on associative materials and changes of context rather than the dematerialized contract of home I was carrying about.

I felt that the violent, oppressive or unhomely 'house that was not a home' had been prominently approached by Surrealism, Feminism and others. Yet despite the traveling nature of home now being experienced, it seemed that creative practices had yet to deeply interrogate the relational interactions and dutiful feelings bound up in a 'home that is not a house'. Or for that matter, a sense of 'homelessness' that was not merely 'an absence of house' but an equally complex obligatory space characterised by a sense of failure to meet social and personal expectations.

Many critically interested in home had steered away from private space completely, to focus on homelessness, exile and diaspora170. In my mind, to centre dialogue on homelessness and other predominantly physical groundings of dwelling and belonging was likely to reinforce rather than dissolve deep-rooted assumptions of home as a fixed place or community. Furthermore, singling out homelessness from home failed to fully acknowledge the interplay of idealisations and obligations defining them both.

I was still to come up with more useful methodologies when the news became saturated with reports of refugees taking life-threatening risks to leave their home countries. The latest UNHCR 2016 mid-year trends estimated that more than 5.3 million Syrian’s (33% of the total population) had left their country for neighbouring territories and millions more displaced within Syria itself poised to do the same (UNHCR, 2016). During the years that spanned my project, I had seen the planet set into unprecedented motion by a relentless

169 Playing at Home: The House in Contemporary Art (Perry, 2013) surveys artists dealing with home, exile and homelessness through reconstructions of the physical house, including Mike Kelley (Mobile Homestead, 2010); Krystoff Wodiczko (Homeless Vehicles, 1988); Antonia Dewhurst (Gimme Shelter, 2010); Lisa Kirk (Maison des Cartes, 2009); and Karen McLean (Post-Colonial Now, 2012).
170 See: For examination of global contemporary art and documentary practices in the context of homelessness, exile and migration (Demos, 2013); For a feminist perspective (Watson & Austerberry, 1986); For collections of essays by theoreticians specifically focused on homelessness (Kennet & Marsh, 1999); and (Wolch & Dear, 1993); See also: artists Yin Xiuzhen (Portable Cities, 2008) and Siân Bowen (Collapsible Spaces, 2018) that interrogate homelessness through moving, building and rebuilding spaces of inhabitation.
on onslaught of political, financial and ecological crises. We were living in an age of human flow and migration beyond anything I had ever known before.

In June 2015, the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees reported that over sixty million people worldwide were suffering forcible transnational displacement (UNHCR, 2015). Having a fixed house, community or geographical location to call home was becoming increasingly a privilege. For the refugees, nomadic migrants and asylum seekers separated from their communities, shelters and the familiar, home-making involved ever more fluid, mobile and ephemeral practices. Equivalent in number to the twenty-fourth largest ‘country’ in the world, these itinerants were very often perceived as a threat to the identity and security of nations they arrived at.

Globalisation and technological change were responsible for the paradoxical effects of diminishing cultural, physical and economic divides and simultaneously creating them. Depending on the hand that twenty-first century extremities of wealth and opportunity had dealt us, we could find ourselves accountable to protect, share or mobilise our homes. As Massey established, assigning identity and safety to a specific area or community tended to encourage divisory practices on behalf of the ‘haves’ and exacerbate feelings of loss for the ‘have-nots’ (Massey, 2005, p.9). Blunt and Dowling pointed out that ‘movement may necessitate or be precipitated by a disruption to a sense of home’ but part of the process is ‘establishing home, as senses of belonging and identity move over space and are created’ (Blunt & Dowling, 2006, p.2). Whether mobile or not, ascertaining a place of comfort and security frequently incurred the creation of borders and separating familiar elements from strange ones. Furthermore, there was something about the concept of home that enabled people to put their own first without feeling responsible for those less fortunate being shut out.

Seeing images of the walls between Israel and Palestine filled me with horror at its imposition and the lack of accountability in the conflict it stood for. I went to the Spaces of Transformation: Borders Tate lecture series in which the philosopher Etienne Balibar foregrounded the growing proliferation of borders that could be seen from space: such as those between USA and Mexico; North Korea and China; Haiti and the Dominican Republic (Balibar, 2011, 0:26). These manifestations of exclusion and power were literally drawing dividing lines across the world. As millions became alienated from their familiar,
nationalisms and fortifications emerged to reject them from settling elsewhere. Surely if such parochialisms were left unchecked, more places and communities would succumb to the same destructive forces.

To me, we urgently needed to muster up a sense of culpability for our home-making practices and take on board the trade-off home implied. I came away from Balibar's talk with more awareness of the ethical issues tied up in the house I returned to. It was easy to make judgments on oppressive assertions of home from afar but did concluding these defensive practices as ‘wrong’ and the pursuit of a borderless world as ‘right’, mean that home was itself a device for domination that should be denied? Was I mistaken in using home as the focus for academic enquiry? Should I feel guilty for having a house?

In her deconstructions of the meaning of home Young suggested there were ‘dangers in turning our backs on home’ (Young, 2005, p.154). Although she admitted that ‘without a doubt ideas and images of home serve multiple ideological functions that ought to be criticized’, Young claimed the concept of home was an important ‘materialization of personal, and sometimes group, identity’ (Young, 2005, p.156). To Young, ‘the idea of home and the practice of home-making support personal and collective identity’ and so should be interrogated as opposed to dismissed. She claimed that ‘recognizing this value entails also recognizing the creative value to the often unnoticed work that many women do’ (Young, 2005, p.154). I found Young’s failure to include both sexes as beneficiaries of her argument frustrating. However, my thinking mapped over her evaluation of home-making as a creative arena for socio-political discourse and reassured me that my project had worth beyond the personal.

In order to claim home as a valuable concept, some theorists sought to circumnavigate its negative associations of borders, parochialisms and exclusivity by approaching home as a social construction separate from the physical. Weir suggested that the ability to withstand our rapidly changing world and its dominant political structures required a sense of home as an uninhibited discursive space ‘beyond the full reach of those structures where different, more humane, social relations can be lived and imagined’

For example: (Martin & Mohanty, 1986); (Lauretis, 1990); and (Honig, 1994). According to Young, these feminists reject the idea of home by arguing ‘that longing for home expresses an oppressive search for certainty and attachment to privilege’ (Young, 1997, p.135). To Weir, some ‘reduce the ideal of home to the maintenance of exclusion and oppression’ and others focus on home as a site of resistance (Weir, 2008, p.159). All such approaches to home focus on the social as opposed to physical aspects of the house.
In this way, Weir usefully established the sort of ephemeral traveling space of home I was interested in as a valid and accessible site for social critique. ‘In a world where millions of people are homeless, and millions more are refugees or immigrants whose displacement from home has emphatically not been chosen’ stated Weir ‘the argument that home can be understood only as a mechanism of oppression and exclusion can sound vaguely obscene’ (Weir, 2008, p.7). To me, the importance of Weir’s argument was that the home she brought forth for questioning was not fixed or limited to any specific place or culture.

To Weir, home should be regarded as a space of ‘engagement in dialogue, in arguments, in struggles, in openness to vulnerability, to critique and self-critique, and to change, with a commitment to solidarity with each other that mediates our commitment to our shared struggles’ (Weir, 2008, p.8). The home I took away from this was an important and open space where different ideals, practices and concepts connected. Weir also made me look more closely at dialogue and conversation as an interactive relational tool for accessing experiences and manifestations of home that were not visible or physical but relational.

As I began to focus on home as a fulcrum of transaction between haves and have-nots, receipt and obligation, responsibility and demand, right and wrong, I started to link my project with concepts of home beyond my immediate experience. Young claimed that home should be asserted as a set of normative values accessible to all and for which societies should be held accountable (Young, 1997, p.161). Her benchmarks were safety, privacy, individuation and preservation. Whilst I couldn’t realistically reconcile Young’s goals with the increasingly segregated world I saw in media representations, I felt her values might be beneficially revised to pin down the most important considerations of home for me. Instead of implicating individuality, security and shelter, I decided the desirable norms of home I would pursue were diversity, mobility, communication, creativity, connectivity and human relationships. To me, these were the primary characteristics of home which could be used as accessible categories to address it from differing perspectives, whether as a nation or an individual artist researcher.

By finally stepping outside the door of my house, I had become concerned with the national boundaries and fortifications guarding homes of the fortunate from those on the move. The tensions between such diverse notions of home and homelessness evidently
ran through contemporary living practices from the global to the local. It wasn’t just the forcibly alienated that experienced home as ever more mobile, ephemeral and separate from the fixed place or community. The super-rich travelling internationally with ease between palatial properties without establishing emotional attachments were forming ‘a nation unto themselves’ says Chrystia Freeland in *Plutocrats: The Rise of the New Global Super-Rich* (Freeland, 2012, p.5). Large numbers of retirees were taking to the road in motorhomes, hoping to live out their lives travelling Australia: ‘so many that a collective term, ”Grey Nomads”, has evolved to describe [them]’, said Roger Tavener in the *Telegraph* (Tavener, 2010). For others, responding to increasing competition for paid work meant that the locus of intimate life could move between hotel rooms, caravans or dormitories shared with other labourers.

Even those of us who thought of home in more settled terms, were far more likely to move houses and sever ties with our familiar communities than other generations in recent history (Wyschogrod, 1996, p.108). As the myriad of lifestyle television programmes showed; buying, selling and setting up home elsewhere was not only an accepted norm but for many, a habitual pastime. Regardless of political, social or economic background, it seemed people were ever more accustomed to conjuring a sense of home out of unfamiliar material. How we responded to the challenges this shift of home towards movement and transformation created, was likely to define our time.

Reading Massey, I had developed an understanding that cross-cultural exchange and peaceful co-existence depended on countering persistent inequalities and prejudices with multiplicity. Whether a powerful nation or family unit, the different ways of making ourselves ‘feel at home’ were inextricably interrelated and impacted on one another. However, I wasn’t seeking justification for my endeavours, nor was I hoping to formulate opinions or judgments to later brandish in a gallery. In fact, I was increasingly cautious of addressing a pressing international issue through my own limited cultural standpoint.

Hal Foster’s essay *Artist as Ethnographer?* references realist assumptions and primitive fantasies in relation to ‘social processes from which the white (petit) bourgeois subject is blocked’ (Foster, 1996, p.172). I had picked out that an artist should be wary of approaching the social and political phenomena of others, as the interpretation would be inherently framed by the artist’s own experience. In this way, I was restricted to offering
a singular interpretation of home and couldn’t presume to understand its experience for others. In order to contribute to the connectivity and heterogeneity of home, I needed a model for ‘using’ rather than merely ‘viewing’.

This thinking fed a growing sense of personal culpability for how I articulated and practiced home in my project and the assumptions I thereby reinforced. As a middle class British woman, I was privileged with having conventional materials of home through which to anchor my memories, emotions and relations. But what if I were forcibly removed from my cultural, physical and social familiar? What could my concept of home offer me apart from a sense of loss? What would I call upon to relieve the sense of homelessness? In our material culture we tend to assume that our narratives, relations and histories are somehow embodied in the objects we live with but what if we find ourselves alone, on the move and without any personal effects? Although hypothetical in terms of my personal experience, these questions reflected a hastening global reality.

Massey reconceptualised space as the product of interrelations ‘constituted through interactions, from the immensity of the global to the intimately tiny’ (Massey, 2005, p.9). As I refocused on my own ‘tiny’ intervention in these interrelations, I was mindful of the loaded actions and interactive expectations around which contests over space pivoted. The home coming to the fore of my enquiry was a social space. One partially constructed by those seeking advantageous positions whereby another is obligated to them, and so marked by fluid boundaries constantly being redrawn by ‘giving’ in the hope to ‘receive’.

In the context of international relations, the trades, relations and material exchanges that negotiated space were more visible than the pacts and commitments shaping intimate familial space. However Young described the social construction of home in a way that was equally applicable to these extremes. She argued that ‘people exert pressure on one another to conform to expected behaviours, and they want others to act in ways that further specific ends and purposes’ (Young, 2005, p.163). In her critique of Ferdinand Schoeman’s ideas about ‘social freedom’, Young referred to ‘the sense of autonomy and comfort people have and feel in relation to the expectations and actions of others’ (Young, 2005, p.163). She suggested that although people entered into such engagements cooperatively in order to maintain positive bonds, ‘everyday social interactions and relations have a tendency to overreach their appropriate limits’ (Young, 2005, p.163).
seemed that Young described the fluid way my home operated. What is more, she implicated creative practice and personal expression as a means of keeping these expectations and pressures of home in check when they were ‘overreached’.

At last I felt I had identified the fundamental structure of home. I suspected I’d also found the reason why I’d turned to drawing to address home in the first place but I certainly had a good reason to utilise it now. However, it dawned on me how far from my practice these conceptual travels had taken me. Contextualising my concept and experiences of home within broader socio-political considerations had enabled me to situate my project amongst key critical discourses. Although primarily derived from the familiar, I had come to see my local project as intrinsically connected to global issues. In doing so, I had concluded that home could no longer be reduced to an outmoded concept but was instead a useful and heterogeneous site of contemporary social critique. The problem was, I still hadn’t progressed my drawing in ways that might usefully address it.

I felt sure that a hand engaged in an expanded field of drawing practice could do more in dealing with the familial ties and responsibilities that shaped my sense of self and belonging. I had perceived a shortage of art approaching the social concepts of home as opposed to its physical presence or the absence of house. There was also a notable lack of contemporary drawing on the sort of home I had in mind. Whether calling on its measured traditions or occupying an active space free of the page, line still lagged behind the social, political and technological change we experienced and struggled to convey the increasingly complex spatiality of home in a society orientated on information. Whilst contemporary drawing was able to map, enact and embody inhabited space, it missed the hidden connectivities of home that travelled and stretched through physical space as a product of relations. It seemed imperative to reunite line and space in a concept of home that didn’t just fix it into place. If the age-old relationship between drawing and space slid into obsolescence, I felt we would lack the vital means of addressing everyday living practices and risk the most intimate workings of home sinking further into invisibility and insignificance.

I wondered if the type of line required to draw out the interrelations and expectations of home would have to be somehow ‘disembodied’ from the physical. The idea appeared to be mirrored by de Zegher’s inference that although line was increasingly becoming ‘a
moving trace in time and space, stressing interreliance and transsubjectivity’, in order for this freed mobile mode of drawing to fully articulate and affect social space, the relation of line and support must be reconfigured (de Zegher, 2011, p.119). In accepting that de Zegher’s comment applied to a metaphorical support, a context and a social background of sorts, I took it to mean that the act of drawing could move away from the grounded material towards an 'unbound' process or social relation. As de Zegher argued ‘if line can articulate and alter the background, which is to say, the order of our social reality, potentially – then drawing allows a rare open space for the conscious formation and critical development of subjectivity and so for social change’ (de Zegher, 2011, p.113). In the course of my research, I had come across many such references to a fundamental alignment of drawing with the lived experience that allowed it to alter perception and affect society, yet I still hadn’t found the line to help me.

In the 1950s artists such as Agnes Martin, Sol LeWitt and Luciano Fabro used grids, webs and networks as a supposed function of the nature of drawing to reach into space itself and organise it. The idea of an act of drawing progressing through space and in some way systemizing it was described by Cornelia Butler as the line in ‘pursuit of connectivity, of an order, organising experience and information’ (Butler, 2011, p.187). It was not so much an intentional act of drawing or mapping that was needed but a way of ordering the information I had. What were the key aspects I ought to bring into view...obligations, expectations, tensions, actions, negotiations? Where did these characteristics already appear together or intersect...diaries, lists, correspondence? How should I present and sort this sort of autobiographical information to accentuate the characteristics of home?

As Allan Kaprow said, ‘any moment taken at random from life may have differently accented components’ (Kaprow, 1993, p.11). We may be primarily aware one thing over another and that depends on where we are looking at it from, our training, our culture, our personal perspective. Initially a painter, Kaprow became a pioneer of ‘happenings’, a form of spontaneous, non-linear action, revolutionized the practice of performance art in the 1960s. His interest turned to the theoretical, based primarily on the shifting concepts of space as subjectively experienced by the viewer. Art was no longer an object for us to look ‘at’ on a wall or pedestal. Rather to engage, ‘we simply enter, are surrounded, and become part of what surrounds us, passively or actively according to our talents for “engagement”, in much the same way that we have moved “out” of the totality of the
street or our home where we also played a part’ said Kaprow (Kaprow, 1993, p.11). Kaprow’s conceptual art practice dealing with the ‘The Everyday’ informed my research, enabling me to seek more straightforward ways of opening up home to be experienced.

It brought me back to thinking about the artists Fischli and Weiss. I recalled how Jörg Heiser had summarised their approach to The Everyday as a kind of systemising, ordering and finding a methodology to reconcile the evidence they had gathered. Heiser identified ‘La Methode de Fischli and Weiss’ as four recurrent stages: first the artists collected material around banal activities and interests; then they introduced an order or inverted an existing hierarchy; the third step used time, from laborious hand-based processes to speeding up film; finally they presented it all in an artistic form that exaggerated and exposed the first three processes (Heiser, 2006, p. 314). What interested me particularly, was how the artists constantly reconnected with the nature and meaning of the original material in order to guide subsequent processes and modes of presentation. In this way, the layers in their work always appeared to be reconciled with the concept, whilst the role of the artist was not heavy-handed and obvious but merely the facilitator.

Fischli stated that they preferred ‘passivity as opposed to actively producing’ and aimed ‘simply to go out into the world without wanting to interpret something, or seeking to make a commentary on what they saw’ (Fischli in Fleck, Söntgen & Danto, 2005, p.31). For example, an interest in amateur pastimes led them to take ordinary tourist-type photos wherever they went with what Weiss called ‘no deviation from normality’ (Weiss in Fleck, Sontgen & Danto, 2005, p.29). The 3,000 photographs ultimately selected for Visible World were not arranged according to their chronology or the place they depicted as one might have expected (Fischli & Weiss, 1987-2001, Fig.xxxvii). Set into a 28-metre-long lightbox table, they were presented according to similarities of shape and colour such as of mountains or skies. This carefully considered regrouping and the impossibility of viewing all at once, lent the banal photos to individual viewing in a way that incurred a questioning of everyday life.

I sensed a comparable lack of contrivance and reconciliation in the works of Susan Hiller. Hiller often brought together unremarkable ubiquitous objects with dialogue and text in ways derivative of her anthropological background. Witness was an installation of hundreds of small car stereo speakers hung from wires picked out by lights in a darkened
room (Hiller, 2000, Fig.xxxviii). At head height, they resembled a night sky as I walked amongst them listening to overlapping whispers of people recounting their UFO sightings. *From the Freud Museum* was a series of collections of everyday items presented in archival boxes (Hiller, 1991-6, Fig.xxxix. According to curator and theorist Alexandra Kokoli, Hiller’s work was ‘in constant dialogue, both critically and sympathetically, with psychoanalysis’ (Kokoli, 2017, p.2). She suggested this dimension inflects on the way the artist and viewer relate through a collaborative ‘transference’ of psychic energy that mines the ‘cultural unconscious’ (Kokoli, 2017, p.2)\(^1\). The implication was that instead of trying to ‘tell’ her audience something with an object, Hiller’s intention was to share a psychic space as a means of provocation\(^2\). For me, it wasn’t Hiller’s visual aesthetic or technical ability that came to the fore but her gathering, selecting, preserving and accentuating of the everyday for others to experience.

I wondered how I might play a similarly ‘passive’ role and offer up a discursive space of home. I respected how these artists didn’t impose their ideas but simply revealed their often-unremarkable findings. I had already related their museological methods with the repetitive gathering and clearing away processes that characterised my project. Could I somehow extend my own methods into reconciled modes of sorting and presenting? But what amassed evidence on home should be utilised for such an approach? How could I move on my previous drawings based on streams of thoughts, dialogue, sounds and lists?

Armed only with my mobile phone, I hadn’t put pencil to paper since I began to think of home as a predominantly social space of interrelations and responsibilities. By my own measure of the drawn line as derived from the hand, the nearest I had come to drawing was thumbing into my mobile phone the textual entries that kept on top of my various tasks and responsibilities. As an alert informed me of a pending appointment, I abruptly recognized the collection of associative material right in front of me. The interchanging roles and obligations I fulfilled were laid out in all the plans and conversations collecting in the memory of my mobile phone. The familial cooperation, interdependency and expectations that constituted my home had been mapped without my even trying.

---

\(^1\) Kokoli describes transference as the ‘process of actualisation of unconscious wishes’ during which the analysand forms an attachment to the analyst that guarantees their commitment to therapy even when the going gets tough; this constitutes ‘the terrain on which all the basic problems of a given analysis play themselves out: the establishment, modalities, interpretation and resolution of the transference are in fact what define the cure’ (Kokoli, 2017, p.2). See also: (Laplanche & Pontalis, 1973, p.455).

\(^2\) ‘Far more important than bringing the culturally repressed to light is the act of taking the viewer to the site of repression and provoking its recognition as such’ says Kokoli (Kokoli, 2017, p.2).
Fischli & Weiss

Visible World, 1987-2001

15 light tables with 3,000 small-format photographs

2805 cm x 69 cm x 83 cm

(Fleck, Sontgen, Danto, 2005, p.26)
Susan Hiller
*Witness*, 2000
Approximately 400 speakers, 10 audio tracks, each with multiple recordings; wires, lights
Tate (Hiller, 2000)
Susan Hiller
*From the Freud Museum*, 1991-6
Glass, 50 cardboard boxes, paper, video, slide, light bulbs and other materials
Displayed: 2200 x 10000 x 600 mm
Tate (Hiller, 1991-6)
For me, being constantly available through the phone enabled me to retain a sense of control even when absent. Knowing I could still arbitrate the relations of home and household matters from wherever I was and whatever I was doing, gave the family a sense of security. I thought about how my habitual list-making, note-taking and messaging helped me to manage my practical requirements but also to assuage the sense of guilt that arose within me when I was ‘unable’ to parent in person. Feeling conflicted about leaving the house, I tended to judge and select the activities that took me away from it quite ruthlessly. Nevertheless, I often found myself elsewhere and feeling I was somehow undermining the contract I had with my husband and son, even letting them down. It was becoming increasingly apparent that the precarious balance between social interdependence and self-interest was under continual negotiation and structured everything I did, both in and out of the house.

Specific social impositions, emotional experiences and personal aspirations had culminated in the sense that it was my job to run the family home. What is more, I felt responsible even when I was away from the house and on the move. As the thousands of obligations and intentions amassing on my phone showed, the boundaries of home were no longer defined by walls or fences but were internalised and travelling. Massey theorised that ‘what is at issue is not social phenomena in space but both social phenomena and space as constituted out of social relations’ space as ‘social relations stretched out’ (Massey, 1994, p.2). My response to the extensive zone of influence that home exerted was tied up in what I thought I ‘owed’ the people with whom I anchored my feelings of self and belonging. The spaces of home that emanated from these individuals as expectations, bonds and generosities were inadvertently being mapped on my phone.

Since the invention of the train or even as far back as the first letter, new technologies incurred a physical and to some extent social dislocation of home. Built into the extreme technological delocalization and non-fixity of networked digital space were uncertain futures. We seemed to be caught in a self-perpetuating cycle of demand for portable interactive mapping devices, in order to deal with the sense of insecurity such advances created. I argued that my personal narratives and relations were not intrinsically held in the value of objects I possessed but in the data and connectivities I carried. I read a comment by De Souza e Silva that ‘the feeling of belonging to one’s communicative
network is no longer dependent on a specific place or physical presence, but on space and message exchange’ (Kavouri & Arcenaux, 2006, p. 30). As I moved through the outside world, my phone was the space of home I carried with me.

I was pondering on the correlation between home and mobile phone when I visited the Venice Biennale in 2015. Wandering amongst the pavilions, I was struck by how much work was of a documentary nature. I saw collections of letters, ration slips, shopping vouchers and tickets presented with minimal artistic intervention or artifice. Having left my son at home alone over two nights for the first time, I was also hypersensitive to phone sounds. As the ever-ready mother mentally preparing to deal with any eventuality from afar, I was responsive to the alerts of a message or call arriving, whether it came from my own phone or not. It occurred to me that irrespective of nationality, gender or age, we were all responding to the same generic ringtones and notifications calling us to attend our responsibilities and contracts with others. It dawned on me that in my case, all these negotiations were directly accessible in the information stored on my smartphone.

Whether via voice calls, emails, images or social media networks, we used our phones in countless ways to maintain daily life. For me, controlling the flow of everyday encounters and interrelations mostly depended upon textual dialogue. My family, friends and colleagues generally communicated with me through word-based message applications of one sort or another. We found it a better way to keep in touch than voice calls as texts were relatively non-invasive and easy to respond to even when busy. To some extent, the repetitive demands and calls for attention encapsulated in this quick and direct form of correspondence were indicative of my domestic and professional practices but such applications did not readily fit the parameters of home I was interested in as an internalised, personal space I carried with me.

However, I noticed that alongside the chats and arrangements made with others, the phone supported similar word-based conversations with myself. The textual material in diaries, notes, lists and reminders constantly amassing on my phone encompassed how time and space interchanged between the multiple roles I fulfilled. All my plans and objectives were plotted on the calendars to pop up as notifications. The things I needed to do, get and remember were listed for me to refer to. Details of every individual,
company, place or service provider that really mattered were logged in contact records to access as required. If I wanted to remember something important for the next day, I even sometimes sent a message to myself as I went to bed so it would be on the screen when I got up.

I wondered if the fluid and active bartering of the obligations documented in this kind of diaristic autobiographic wording could offer a more direct, personal and private insight on my home-making activities than message exchange. Perhaps here, within what might be considered the most trivial of textual material on my phone, there was a hidden and discursive fold of self upon self: an unmediated space where nobody was looking or judging my decisions and actions, and in which my own subjective ideas of home-making had the upper hand. If so, then maybe those smartphone applications through which I effectively carried out discussions with myself over household and familial activities, might best help me visualise the elusive concept of home I pursued.

I thought about how the formats of smartphone applications codified and mapped distinct relations and practices. I wondered if this meant that the diverse typologies of its contents were thereby somehow flattened out, homogenised by external interpretation174, as this had happened with the way my visual sound waves had 'represented' rather than 'presented' sounds I questioned the different aspects of mediated and unmediated presence in the data on my phone and realised I couldn’t avoid the issue any longer...would it really constitute a form of drawing? Was the frenetic thumbing of letters on a touchscreen an act of drawing a line? Could the multiple voices of stored textual data on my phone be a drawing medium? If so, then was my mobile phone a ground, a tool and an archive?

Cornelia Butler claims that twenty-first century artists had showed a renewed interest in ‘analogue’ drawing conventions and were returning to pencil, paper and plane driven by the desire to connect with the ordinary (Butler, 2011, p. 191). In my experience, the multitude of drawing exhibitions and prevalence of hand-drawn works in recent years confirmed that twenty-five years of the World Wide Web and digital saturation had revived interest in drawing traditions. As Butler stated, ‘though not directly reacting to

174 This refers to Massey’s critique of space and representation in maps: ‘spatial layout as a way of containing the temporal - both its terrors and its creative delights. Spatialisation, on this view, flattens the life out of time’ (Massey, 2005, p.26).
digital page attention deficits, these artists are formulating a practice of the everyday that refigures the consciousness of the viewer, focusing on line, time, space – a radical return’ (Butler, 2011, p. 191). Could the now very ordinary line, time and space of textual data on my phone bridge both? ‘As long as cell phones are ubiquitous, they can also be regarded as tools, since they turn out to be so natural that one does not even perceive they are being used’ stated Joshua Meyrowitz in his book *No Sense of Place: The Impact of the Electronic Media on Social Behavior* (Meyrowitz, 1985, p.109). De Souza e Sylva similarly claimed mobile phones to be ‘transparent’ interfaces ‘that do not show because they are functional, and their use is already embedded in our everyday lives’ (Kavouri & Arcenaux, 2006, p.26). For me using a touchscreen was so routine that I completely forgot about the intervening medium of the phone.

Over the course of my research, I had come across numerous alignments of drawing and thinking that had led me to setting the hand as my boundary of definition for the 'drawn'. I recalled that in ‘*What calls for thinking*’ Heidegger stated, ‘every motion of the hand in every one of its works carries itself through the element of thinking, every bearing of the hand bears itself in that element’ (Heidegger, 1977, p.357). Had the phone become a hand-held drawing tool that could finally give the body a voice and explain how and why home operated as it did? To Juhani Pallasmaa, the ‘hand is a bridge between the imagining mind and the image…the draughtsman forgets both his hand and the pencil, and the image emerges as if it were an automatic projection of the imagining mind’ (Pallasmaa, 2009, p.17). He suggested that the process of 'thinking through drawing' depended on the tool becoming effectively conjoined with the hand, to the point of being automatic. In this way, the perpetual mimetic activity of typing or thumbing out text was for me a direct mode of thinking and drawing out the home I carried with me. Various descriptions of drawing readily mapped over the way I saw writing through keyboards or touchscreens, such as Michael Craig-Martin’s often-cited parameters for the discipline:

Spontaneity, creative speculation, experimentation, directness, simplicity, abbreviation, expressiveness, immediacy, personal vision, technical diversity, modesty of means, rawness, fragmentation, discontinuity, unfinishedness, and open-endedness. These have always been the characteristics of drawing (Craig-Martin, 1995, p.10).
Craig-Martin’s terminology, and its ubiquitous, direct and unmediated implications for drawing, bore notable similarities to that with which social scientists described mobile phone use. It felt as though I had mustered enough links to justify interrogating the banal textual information on my portable device as a form of drawing home. However, it dawned on me that I knew little about the digital medium I intended to investigate. With no experience of software development or programming, currently my only way in was through the consumer interface of smartphone applications.

I sought out possible technical, academic and conceptual entry points. I noted that our increased dependency on textual data sharing and storage was frequently discussed as a cultural phenomenon. The Telegraph pointed out how portable communication devices were revolutionising the way we socialised, worked and networked (O’Mahony, 2012). The production of digital textual information on smartphones had speeded up daily life for millions, as briefly typed notes, reminders and messages were endlessly written, absorbed then discarded in a few moments. The everyday portability of databases and internet access allowed individuals to document and manage both their own lives and those of others on the move. Person-to-person textual dialogue could be maintained as easily with those travelling across the world as with someone sitting on the same sofa. Application-to-person liaison with banks, supermarkets, travel agents and social networks could be accessed at will. It was possible to vote, donate to charities, advertise, play games, enter quiz shows, buy tickets, receive news, arrange couriers, confirm hospital appointments and obtain bank balances by entering a few characters on a touchscreen175.

Every second, millions of people around the world, of all ages, social status, technical ability and languages were thumbing away frenetically176. In the context of such commerciality, it seemed surprising that mobile phones hadn’t lost their character of informal intimacy177. I wondered if it was because we tended to accredit phone applications with an assumed level of protection and privacy. The fact that the very nature of communications technologies meant that information flowing through them

175 At the time of writing, it took around 15-30 seconds to order for an Uber taxi on my phone; it was the norm to hold ones phone against underground barriers and retailers card machines to pay; phone voting was attributed with the fall of the Philippine president (Gordon, 2006, p.52); Comic Relief made over £7million from text message donations February 2011 (Doward, & Ascherson, 2011).; Within hours of launching phone voting for the Britain’s Got Talent TV show, the app had been downloaded over 500,000 times; 176 In March 2017, the Express Newspaper published results of a mobile phone usage survey as follows: Text (88%), Email (70%), Facebook (62%), Camera (61%), Reading news (58%), Online shopping (56%), Checking the weather (54%), WhatsApp (51%), Banking (45%); Watching YouTube (42%) (Express, 2017).; 177 Mobile phone users worldwide were estimated at 4.43 billion in 2017, with predicted figures for 2020 at 4.78 billion (Statista, 2018). In 2018, 52.2% of all worldwide online traffic was generated through mobile phones, with consumers spending an average of 5 hours a day them (Statista, 2018). According to Ofcom, 94% of UK adults owned a mobile phone in 2017 (Ofcom, 2017).
was infinitely retrievable, appeared to elude us. Instead, we trusted these everyday objects in our hands with our most confidential visual and textual material. As a result, bullying, and grooming thrived in this supposedly secretive arena (Snowden, 2006, p.113). Many romantic relationships lived and died via the swapping of textual data (Snowden, 2006, p.107). Furthermore, as I had discovered through examining the data from my own mobile phone, the interrelations and organisation of my family and home were being played out amongst these virtual libraries and networks.

I had previously argued that we were losing any sense of personal time or space through the technological living and working practices of the multifunctional house. Our residual desire for privacy had in some ways been met within the intimate spaces of portable personal communication devices. In The Cell Phone Reader: Essays in Social Transformation (2006), Anandam Kavoori and Noah Arceneaux called for a rethinking of the mobile phone ‘as a cultural technology, simultaneously technological and political, personal and sociological’ (Kavoori & Arceneaux, 2006, p.2). I questioned if it was the sheer ubiquity of the mobile phone that enabled it to carry a social space within it that somehow correlated with the contemporary home. The dissolution of public and private boundaries, the changing structure of family and the fluid mobility of home-making were laid bare in the simplistic unguarded phrases of its textual entries. Kavoori and Arceneaux suggested that mobile phones were a rapidly changing sociological landscape, referring to ‘the shape, structure, and form of the cultural order’ that emerged from them (Kavoori & Arceneaux, 2006, pp.1-2). This implied the sort of ontological structures and everyday systems I had recurrently revisited in relation to philosophical ideas of gaps and folds as productive of new knowledge. Could these sorts of shifts be revealed through the archive of textual data held on my phone?

Communication and information technologies are fully integrated in contemporary life and have transformed the way in which home is lived and experienced. I tried to find out if others were equating the textual spaces of technology with the portability of home, as an entwined social phenomenon. In the abstract of his doctoral thesis Domestic spaces in the information era: architectural design, images and life in a technological age (2013)

---

178 See also: (Colman, 2004).
179 In April 2005, the Vatican press office sent a text notification to thousands of media representatives about the death of Pope John Paul II (Snowden, 2006, p.107).
Paolo Sustersic described his purpose as ‘analyzing the transformations that domestic space has experienced within the framework of the Information Society’ (Sustersic, 2013, p.1). He claimed that technological advancements rendered former conceptual models of home as a site of protection, intimacy, privacy and reproduction of consolidated family structures obsolete. He called for ‘new interpretative categories with respect to private space and the activities developed there, such as connectivity, flexibility, ubiquitousness, transformability and mobile domesticity’ (Sustersic, 2013, p.1). In my research, I had already made the interpretative shift he advocated and these categories seemed apt methodological parameters to take forward as I took up my phone and began reading the textual information stored on it from a fresh perspective.

As I did so, I felt my life was laid out before me in this diverse and constantly changing archive. The range of documentation echoed the variety of autobiographic material historians analysed as a means of understanding everyday life in the past180. It seemed to me that the diaries, household logs, letters and lists of Victorian women had direct correlations in the smartphone applications of the twenty-first century. Once again, I was struck by the notion that this portable digital realm offered a kind of modern day parallel to the private domain. It had the capacity to link its user to the workplace and the infinite professional networks of the public sphere but at least for me, the space my phone facilitated was far more intimate.

I was mindful that I needed to access home as internalised, private and personal. To do so any other way would be to change it. For this reason, I avoided data involving direct dialogue with others. Instead, I focused on those areas I decided were most likely to reveal the inner most thoughts, emotions and actions that underpinned my own sense of home. Specifically, I wanted to visualise the obligations and home-making practices that impacted on me as a wife, mother and female artist. So, I began by opening up my shopping lists, as these most obviously resonated with the monotonous confrontations and responsibilities I connected with home. Formatted as individual records, I could only look at one list at a time. Mostly, they built up for a week or so, then once I had been to the supermarket I would move on to a blank page and start another. Even in the few lines on the screen, it was apparent that variations between the weeks when bands or
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180 See: (Cieraad, 1999); (Flanders, 2014); (Vickery, 2009). In writing about the history of home and its meanings, these writers make it clear that they draw heavily on women’s autobiographical documents such as diaries, household logs, journals and correspondence.
guests were staying and those when only my son and I were around, were documented in the extent and types of items listed. I was aware that each list was only a minute snippet of the hundreds stowed away in the memory of the phone, especially as the data on its hard drive had been passed down at least one or two devices. I wrote a few out by hand, thinking it would invert the temporal aspects of the smartphone medium in which text was so quickly executed, taken in then dispensed with. However, I felt the transition did not add anything useful or generate further curiosity. I attempted to anchor the lists in the space of home by mounting them on windows but this proved too contrived for my liking. Moreover, it undermined how I saw my shopping lists functioning as a traveling site of home [Fig.147-148].

Nevertheless, as I laboriously went through list after list I felt sure I was on the right track. Even glancing over them individually, it was apparent that each one documented much more than an inventory of things to buy. In reading one back, it was possible to get an impression of the household dynamic the week it was compiled. Working a lot created a need for more salads and convenience foods, teenagers around meant fizzy drinks and junk food, a band in residence required large amounts of wine, beer, meat and veg to be bought, old friends and special occasions were usually honoured with smoked salmon, steak and Prosecco. Hidden between the lines was an affluent lifestyle full of choices and social interactions. Buried a little deeper, were hints of the complex way professional and domestic spaces overlap in the home I experienced.

It seemed that even the simplistic form of the ubiquitous shopping list was suggestive of differing contemporary living and working practices. However, when viewing a single list, the nuances and shifts were probably only apparent to me. It came to me that the subtleties I had noticed might be emphasised if the lists were seen in multiples – as an archive. I needed to bring back the thousands of shop-bought items lost by their sheer volume within the memory of my phone. I wanted to get inside them, look at them again and try to reveal their repetitions and irregularities. Thinking of shopping lists in terms of a museological collection made me question how they might be most usefully catalogued, classified and displayed. The sorting methods of artists Fischli and Weiss penetrated and exposed the nature of materials they amassed. My daily life, the lists and my drawing practice shared a sense of ‘order’ and ontology. I wanted to play with this structure, to subvert it, highlight it and undermine it.
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When backing up the phone on my laptop, its applications and databases of music, videos, photos, emails and contacts could all be seen. However, the notes, lists and diaries I constantly relied on and most strongly associated with home were not accessible. Maybe this was because they were the least profitable aspects of communications technologies and as such were deemed relatively insignificant by phone companies or those building operating systems. Perhaps like the interior, the textual data of daily household life was rendered invisible by its ubiquity and lack of remuneration. I learnt from a friend that whenever a phone was backed up or restored, the ‘peripheral’ information was transferred with the rest, it just wasn’t important enough to warrant visibility within the work-orientated space of computers.

Making a more determined effort I eventually found a software application\textsuperscript{181} that could extract years of hidden textual data backed up from my phone onto the laptop hard drive. This software offered various download formats but, as I was doing lots of accounting work at the time, I chose spreadsheets as a way of initially storing the information. It seemed appropriate to use a programme that was so much part of my everyday life but which also had little impact on the actual text. These simulations of paper worksheets literally acted as storage units for data and formed the basis of the bookkeeping I was doing for music royalties, household budgets, the holiday let and recording studio as well as our self-employed accounts. After only about 10 minutes of experimenting, I had successfully started downloading textual entries from my phone. A mass of reminders, lists and diary entries were being compiled in columns and rows on the screen. Amounting to hundreds of virtual spreadsheet pages, I now had copious amounts of home-related autobiographic material to be selected, sorted and subverted at will.

Suddenly I had moved from only being able to see one shopping list at a time, to being swamped with an unfathomable quantity of data. I couldn’t have felt further from pencil and paper, yet I was ever more convinced that the mass of textual data effectively derived from conversing with myself, could constitute a drawing of home. I had little idea of how to handle such an archive but recalled a talk given by artist and writer Neil Cummings as part of the Art in the City (2011) Lecture Series at the University of the West of England. Cummings proposed the public archives he dealt with were rich creative sites

\textsuperscript{181} SMS Export is a Mac application that transfers data on an iPhone directly to the computer. The software is then able to convert the resulting database on the computer to EXCEL, TEXT, CSV and HTML formats, thereby allowing for the possibility to browse them on the via Microsoft Excel spreadsheets (Farenga, 2015)
of artistic intervention. He saw the archives as territories rather than cultural narratives because the connections contained within them were not someone’s interpretation, exhibition or property but a documentary terrain where differing readings and meanings were invited (Cummings 2011). I argued that no archive was wholly unmediated in the way he implied. Even the storage structure itself is someone’s design. However, Cummings gave me the idea to approach all the data I had gathered with an impartiality that I related back to the demonstrations of artistic passivity I so respected. My job was simply to open up my archive to create an affective site for discursive engagement and meaning-making.

Now in the role of archivist, I began to research the ways museums, data banks and individuals preserved digital images, sounds and information in the 21st Century. Traditionally, archivists and historians appraise or assign value, influencing what we keep or access, and how we do it. Today ‘we have promiscuous habits of self-documentation’ says Anais Borja, ‘Facebook hosts more than 40 billion of our photos and threads, Twitter publishes more than 50 million of our aperçus each day’ (Borja, 2010). Eric Schmidt, CEO of Google is quoted as saying ‘every two days now we create as much information as we did from the dawn of civilization up until 2003’ (Schmidt in Borja, 2010). Striving to keep up with this production of information, governments apparently catalogue our blogs, ejournals, Tweets, virtual worlds and Facebook threads exhaustively, as the boundaries between public and private evolve.

In Archive Fever: A Freudian Impression (1995), Derrida claimed to have diagnosed the accelerating production of archives as a virulent infection or ‘mal d’archive’ (Derrida & Prenowitz, 1995). The essay examined the transformation of Freud’s house into a museum as an example of how archives took place in the remnants of the everyday domicile (Derrida & Prenowitz, 1995, p.10). The implication was that an archive bridged the public and private, the visible and invisible, the dwelling and the institution, crossing from one institution to another (Derrida & Prenowitz, 1995, p.10). We tend to assume that archives are a public entity but Derrida argued that they were intrinsically linked to personal and intimate private life in both content and nature. The meaning of ‘archive’ came from the Greek 'arkheion', which referred to the house, domicile or residence of

---

182 For the government guidelines laid down by the National Archives, see (Morley, 2015) For a comprehensive overview on 21st Century museums and their practices, see (Levitt, 2015).
the archon magistrates who represented the law. As Derrida pointed out, ‘on account of their publicly recognized authority, it is at their home, in that place which is their house (private house, family house, or employee’s house), that official documents are filed’ (Derrida & Prenowitz, 1995, p.10). It is within ‘this domiciliation, in this house arrest, that archives take place’ stated Derrida (Derrida & Prenowitz, 1995, p.10). Released from the phone, I could see that the textual archive before me, offered multiple connections and flows between the private individual and the public world.

Faced with the gargantuan task of tackling the endless lines of data, I started reading them methodically as I would with sheets of accounts. Almost without thinking, I began filtering and altering them as I went. For some reason, the possibility of publication made me want to manipulate the items I had bought and alter the appointments. I realised it wasn’t because there was anything written that pertained to the personal or sensitive. There was nothing in the archive that I would want to delete or cover up for this reason. In fact, it was the opposite. The material was so boring, innocuous and ordinary that it could have been anybody’s daily life being mapped. There was nothing characterising about it, rather it revealed precisely how generic and unremarkable my daily life was. Apparently, this did not sit well with my sense of self and identity as an artist because I instinctively turned to artifice and artistry to try and make myself appear more unique and special.

Derrida stated that the ‘principle of an archive is also a principle of consignation, that is, of gathering together’ and I questioned if my individuation was appropriate considering my intentions of passivity (Derrida & Prenowitz, 1995, p.10). Derrida’s writing suggested that I should approach my own collection as a series of lines already drawn as opposed to a material for drawing. In other words, my process should be to make visible what was already there rather than try to invent, explain or convey. Metaphorically the lists, times, dates and comments I had made on my phone were already drawn in space and I simply needed to establish their relationship with the social and physical support.

One of the most useful pieces of advice I was given in the early days of my research was not to attempt difficult literature by trying to read from cover-to-cover but rather to dip into its pages every few months to see what stood out as relevant at the time. Nicolas Bourriaud’s Relational Aesthetics (2002) was one of those books that had been hanging
around and as I leafed through it once more, what resonated now was the comment ‘art is made of the same material as the social exchange’ (Bourriaud, 2002, p.41). Bourriaud philosophically unpicked what he saw as ‘relational’ aspects of contemporary art: the creative practising of ‘human relations and their social context, rather than an independent and private space’ (Bourriaud, 2002. p.113). According to his definition ‘art is an activity consisting in producing relationships with the world’ (Bourriaud, 2002. p.107). ‘The most common denominator shared by all artists is that they show something’ stated Bourriaud, ‘the act of showing suffices to define the artist’ (Bourriaud, 2002. p.108). As I read this, I was viewing my role getting nearer and nearer to the bottom line Bourriaud described. My diaristic phone entries stood as drawings of home and I simply needed to show them without contrivance.

I decided that selective editing and deleting were not honest to the material and restored my collection back to the original download. I set out on a path of least intervention and tried to think how I could best handle the body of data as a whole. I looked at the different ways Cummings worked within archives of museums, galleries and organisations. His practice tended to extend existing museological processes in order to expose previously unnoticed traces of history and their relationship to wider cultural, societal and technological developments. Sorting, categorising and grouping data, he utilised the nature of archiving as a transformative process. For me, the first step was to come to terms with the reductive effect of the spreadsheet format. The colours, bubbles, boxes and pages into which I had thumbed my original text on the phone screen were lost in the functional table. Did it matter?

I thought about the intensively engineered smartphone applications. Apple disguised the complexity of their interfaces behind pseudo-casual, user-friendly designs derived from comic books, most probably to counteract any sense of technological intimidation. The basic no frills spreadsheet software didn’t manipulate the onlooker in the same way. I was glad to be rid of the somewhat patronising overlay and to see the raw text but if the original viewing format wasn’t important, then what was? As Cummings and Fischli and Weiss had done before me, I looked at the archive for an existing pattern, order or hierarchy to play with. Rather than being grouped according to application, the records had been fragmented by the chronology imposed in the download, losing their flow and functionality to the structure of time.
Looking at the confusion of date-ordered text, it dawned on me that the collection spanned five years and corresponded with the duration of my research project, from when the redesign of the house was reaching its conclusion to the writing up of this thesis. To some extent, the archive documented how relations, expectations and obligations of home had changed in this time. Here were autobiographical records of my transformation from a woman trapped in the house, deprived of creative outlet or room of my own, to an artist researcher with public, academic and professional status. Hence, the first products to come out of working with the archive pushed the chronological.

Running several smaller downloads allowed me to select the data I wanted via specific criteria such as calendars, to-do, notes, shopping lists, reminders. Of the options within the extraction software, I chose to include only two columns, one for the textual input itself and another for the date and time it was originally entered on the phone. It seemed a minimalist framework but still created tables containing thousands of records. Beginning with the shopping lists, I sorted the lines into chronological order then took out the borders, columns and date information to leave just the written lists. The spreadsheet format meant the boxes expanded vertically and were initially unreadable but altering the column on the spreadsheets to maximum width, laid them out across mostly single lines [Fig.149]. I noted this enabled a comparison between those that were shorter - probably for weeks when there was just a couple of us in the house - and those that were so extensive that we must have been inundated with visitors at the time.

To make these differences more obvious, I reduced the point size of the text until I could fit as many items as possible across the spreadsheet table. This meant the words were far too tiny to be legible if printed on standard paper. Experimenting with larger format printing onto rolls of 900mm wide, I found a balance with the column and font sizes, so the writing could just about be read but the extremes between different lists were still apparent. In preparing the image files for the specialist printer, I viewed on its screen all the shopping lists at once for the first time. Their structure en masse echoed my earlier images of sound waves. To accentuate this likeness with visualised audio waves, I centred the lines of text. In this way, they echoed the symmetrical readings of decibels over time as shown on the music production software I used. I felt the temporality of the textual material was also emphasised in the way that the lists could be viewed at once alongside thousands of others or re-read individually at length [Fig.150-152].
Fig. 149

Shopping Lists (Spreadsheet work in progress)
2017
Digital pdf file
124 mm x 156 mm
Back to Back
2017
Digital image
297 mm x 210 mm
Shopping Lists
2017
Digital print on paper
1800 mm x 610 mm
The spreadsheet software allowed for different ways of sorting the data. I started to think about ways of dealing with the other diaristic evidence. I noticed that the download process was quite inaccurate and there were many cross-overs, dropouts and random words included. I felt obliged to go through every single line to check it belonged. In the intensive re-reading, the full weight of the duties and relations I fulfilled became apparent. The data evidenced the commonplace ebbs and flows of my days. Grouped together they captured the mundane activities and trivial demands of family life but were also suggestive of the familial bonds that underpinned it. The specific combination of privacy, immediacy and lack of self-consciousness in my use of the phone, offered an unusually raw and uncontrived insight into familial contracts of obligation. A family photo album contained largely posed and superficial images that could act as triggers for remembering events and relations. In a certain way, I felt the textual archive I now handled, offered a more direct and honest picture of home.

I started working with the diary entries. They included work arrangements, meetings, lectures, parties, trips, sport sessions, birthdays, guest visits, service calls, school dates, holiday lets, studio bookings and hundreds of appointments with vets, doctors, dentists, hairdressers, tutors and so on. I imagined that arranged chronologically, they would evidence the changing focus from my son’s activities to more work-related events over the last few years. However, even though I knew that familial interdependencies had been realigned as I increasingly prioritised my own practice, research and professional activities, I had to admit it was imperceptible in the thousands of diary entries laid out on consecutive lines. It was important that relations between mother and son or husband and wife had changed over the period of the archive, I just didn’t know how to draw it out.

I thought of other artistic interpretations of the mother and son bond, Mary Kelly’s *Post-Partum Document* (1973-79). Focused on her son’s development from birth to age five, Kelly’s archival collection included stained nappy liners, feeding charts, transcripts and recordings of his speech, handprint casts and slates of early writing (Kelly, 1973-79, xxxiii & xxxiv). One aspect of this piece relied on scientific and taxonomic conventions to record the child’s unfolding sense of self and individual identity by plotting his everyday activities on diagrams and charts. I felt that somewhere in the textual material of my own archive, was a similarly descriptive analysis of relational development. Just for me, the visual traces of everyday connectivity and commitment were carried in mobile phone
data. Cornelia Butler claimed Kelly’s work was not merely an investigation of childhood development, but of the mother’s stake in the process of motherhood (Butler, 2007, p.253). What was at stake for me? What did I risk in allowing my project to give me distance? What were the familial rewards I was unwilling to give up by going out to work full time or just turning my phone off?

According to Phelan ‘familiar love is an important and underappreciated force in the production of art’ (Reckitt & Phelan, 2001, p. 39). She claimed that ‘by focusing on her experience as a mother, Kelly pointed to the dearth of artworks exploring the mother/son relationship undertaken by mothers themselves’ (Reckitt & Phelan, 2001, p. 39). This implied that motherhood was a neglected subject of artistic enquiry which is perhaps surprising considering how, regardless of gender or economic status, parent/child relations presented the main source of identity in our society. Nevertheless, a quick survey of current art practices confirmed Phelan’s opinion. I also couldn’t find any significant artworks that examined the complex gift and reward structure of family relationships through everyday digital data.

Although perceived to be personal and private, my research showed the information on my phone to be anything but a singular experience of home. Instead, it was indicative of broader living practices and contemporary familial life. I couldn’t find accurate figures of precisely how many briefly thumbed texts, calendars, lists and notes were shared between the mobile phones of UK families daily. By 2003, Ofetl estimated that over 90 percent of teenagers in the UK were communicating with their parents and siblings regularly during the day through their fingertips (Gordon, 2003, p.49)\(^\text{183}\). As De Souza e Silva pointed out, parents felt it was a way of monitoring their youngsters and keeping them safe, whilst for teenagers it was actually the technology of freedom: they could always lie about where they were and what they were doing (Kavoori & Arceneaux, p. 33). However, as my experience showed, textual information passing between mobile phones was key to the way modern households operated. Furthermore, through their smart screens a family could enter a communicative space that they viewed to be as intimate and hidden as the interior of Victorian houses. So, despite the banal generic nature of the material, there was still a sense of a private space being unveiled when I hung the resultant artworks in a public situation at the Royal West of England Academy exhibition,

\(^{183}\) See also: (Ofetl, 2003).
**Drawn 2015.** I had thought the work would present a concept, model and approach that would interest others. However, I noted that at a busy opening night in the gallery, people contorted into positions to actually read the tiny text. What is more, they didn’t always just read a few words or lines but on occasion attempted the whole work from one end to the other. Reflecting on why this might have happened, I compared it with the abject attraction of reality TV.

Although I never intentionally put it on, I often found myself drawn in by shows that offered insights into other people’s personal lives. As programming and ratings indicated, current audiences were attracted to ‘real life’ or ‘true stories’ and appeared to ignore the artifice of the media. Channel 4’s Gogglebox showed how we liked to observe relations played out by families sitting in their own front rooms talking about television programmes; perhaps even more than watching and discussing them ourselves. Even so, I hadn’t expected the level of intense concentration and interest in the diarising I offered up. Unlike correspondence, which was constructed with the recipient in mind, the textual entries I handled involved no forethought, consideration or preparation. After all, they weren’t ever intended for the eyes of others. Comprised of single words, short phrases or lists, they were totally to the point, conveying self-orientated actions and thoughts as direct perfunctory information. The ‘act’ of thumbing out notes and reminders to oneself, was nothing if not inconsequential and produced only the most mundane and repetitive wording. So, to me it had no real life narrative value beyond being suggestive of activities that were generally associated with motherhood and home.

Perhaps the implication of the work being about home made the viewer look for something private or sensitive within it. If so, why did they carry on reading when it would be clear in a few moments there was nothing scandalous and revealing to find? What made them follow the dull and blandly routine words further? Were they looking for something specifically private? Or did they get comfort from seeing the familiar ordinariness of their own home reflected in the reiterative tedium of my own? Wanting to test this thinking, I considered how to reorganise or present my data in ways that would make more of privacy or repetition. I wondered if making the text unreadable would strengthen its perceived connection to the private space of home. Would it suggest that held within the printed words was something inherently personal, hidden and restricted even though there wasn’t?
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I turned to the notes section of my archive. Rotating lines and running them in opposing directions I sought to make their consecutive reading more awkward. Looking for ways to imply concealment of intimate autobiographic information led me to redacting. This intentional obscuring of words and sentences was usually done for legal or security purposes by prisons, governments or the military. I had seen artists such as Jenny Holzer184 and Jill Magid185 calling upon redaction processes as a means of obfuscating and emphasising, or simply to reference an issue with censorship itself.

In Kathy Prendergast’s *Black Map Series* (2009) in which she inked out complete country maps leaving only small circles clear around populated areas of towns and cities. In doing so she revealed unexpected demographic differences and connections between countries that were rarely compared (Prendergast, 2000, Fig.xl). In *Freedom of Information* (2005), Louise Hopkins used redaction to open up new possibilities for reading, rereading and misreading printed text (Hopkins, 2002, Fig.xlii). According to curator Fiona Bradley, Hopkins masked out large areas of text leaving only certain words as a way of taking control and imposing an additional system on the flow of information (Bradley, 2005, p.16). In the catalogue Greg Hilty stated, ‘day to day we are obsessed with the details, the minute adjustments to daily data that help us conduct our lives [...], by evacuating this specific content Hopkins focuses our attention on the wider currents at play’ (Hilty, 2005, p.42). I related this control and manipulation of everyday life through redaction with the pressure to hide the ordinariness of my daily life and relationships. I tried ink, gouache and markers, but eventually it seemed fitting to use my son’s worn down school pencils to create the indented pools and threads of shining graphite [Fig.153-160]. According to Hilty, Hopkins’s redactions expressed an intention to counter the speed of modern living. ‘It is specifically our rate of visual consumption that she wants to slow down: our too-ready acceptance of the face value of images, our speed-reading of the signs of daily life’ stated Hilty (Hilty, 2005, p.39). Bradley suggested that the artist ‘works to replace space with time – her own time, and the time the viewer takes to understand what she has done’ (Bradley, 2005, p.16). In using textual data that spanned a five-year period, reading the thousands of words, notes and lists again myself and then spending weeks working within the archive they formed, I felt temporality was intrinsic to the products that resulted.

---

184 See: Jenny Holzer’s *War Paintings* (Kellein, 2015)
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The time that had been taken away from familial demands to focus on my practice had been reinvested elsewhere. I extended the archive with a list of all the things I didn’t do when I was busy working with it for a day or two [Fig.161]. The viewer too was required to give their time and decide what aspect of my unexceptional everyday life to ‘waste their time’ on. Faced with thousands of lines of commonplace wording in minute hard-to-read font, would they resist the obligation to engage and simply pass over them with the eye as one? Or would they slow right down, look closely and spend seconds, minutes and hours with the humdrum space of home I carried with me? I recalled Bourriaud stating that ‘the exhibition does not deny the social relationship in effect, but it does distort them and project them into a space-time frame encoded by the art system, and by the artist’ (Bourriaud, 2002, p.82). The manipulation of time ran between the quickly thumbed text, the laborious months of reading and sorting, and the choice of a lengthy reading or a fleeting glance in taking up the work.

In reviewing the reminders and to do lists as visual waves of data, what stood out from the mass were the repetitions. It gave me the thought to use repetition as a means of ordering. I abandoned the original chronology and began sorting a year of extracts alphabetically. They became grouped in areas of commonly reiterated phrases such as those beginning with words such as Tutor, Tennis, Band, Delivery, Dentist, etc. In justifying to the left-hand side of the page, the rhythmic patterns became more noticeable. They resembled the rise and fall of graphic equalizer LEDs and I found that printing white on black accentuated these similarities [Fig.162-165]. Standing back, I recognised the results as the burden of ongoing obligations of home. As an artist, I felt the greatest problem I had with the duty of home-making was its repetitive nature. I reflected on the way the alphabetical format undermined the ability to make sense of the information and its original order but at the same time made the relentless monotony of home more obvious. Going back to the archive, I alphabeticised the notifications to make more of repetition. Centrally justifying the lines into a symmetrical wave formation once again, the alphabetical contrivance faded but blocks of similar lines stood out. Patterns and structures were thrown up as thinned stretches of single words of a few characters contrasted with densely persistent blocks. Supermarket orders, courier deliveries, NHS appointments and bank notifications drew attention to themselves as reverberations in the flows of everyday life [Fig.166-171]. The most common and ordinary rhythms of home that usually passed us by disregarded were brought into view.
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Call Mum and see how her back is today.

Call the accountant about the missing invoices to see if he received them yet.

Call in to the bank and pay in the cheques.

Call about the tumble dryer rubber.

Call up and find out what day the next board meeting is scheduled for.

Call the computer repair centre and ask if the USB port can be mended easily or not.

Call the locksmith about mending the garden door lock.

Call around the local garages for prices of tyres to see who is the cheapest.

Call to see if the farm shop can order larger tubs of ice cream from the wholesalers for the party.

Call about getting the sewing machine serviced.

Call to chase late royalties.

Call the holiday let company about what time tomorrow's guests arrive.

Call the tree surgeon about the hedges.

Call the council to order another recycling box.

Call the plumber about the gas certificate.

Call into the lighting shop on the way back to get the long bulb.

Call school about the lost computer case.

Call the plumbing wholesalers to see if the shower seal has come in yet or if they can send it direct.

Call to see about parking at the hotel in Paris.

Call the auctioneers about selling the cupboard.

Call to ask where the letting payment is this month as it is a week late.

Call the travel agent to see if she can get any better deals on the hotels for the biennale and if there is a better area of Venice to stay in that is a bit less busy during the summer.

Call about moving the container.

Call the barbers to make appointments before the wedding.

Call pest control about the wasp nest on the drive.

Call to get a purchase number.

Call the groomers and ask if they can have the dog in a week early as she is so furry and getting really hot all the time.

Call to say I will be working but there should be someone here anyway.

Call up to book the monitors in for a service and ask about the crackle on the left side.

Call the ferry company and move the booking by two days if possible but try to keep the cabins next to each other - don't forget to check the roof rack height was correct as it didn't come up as 2.7 on the booking sheet even though it was charged for.

Call to ask how the scan went yesterday.

Call in the order for the session consumables.

Call to check if we have the right arrival time for the train and if they need meeting at the station or have ordered their own taxi.

Call up for a purchase order number.

Call to see what the paint colour was.

Call to let them know when the band arrive.

Call the council to ask if we should get the hogweed sprayed by someone specialised or if we or the gardener can do it.

Call in the next order into the paper mill.

Call Cridgeport Art Centre and warn them that a parcel will arrive between 2 and 3 for us and needs to be kept somewhere safe until the install.

Call to see if they found my jumper.

Call up for a couple of ideas about what the little ones might like for Christmas.

Call the farm shop.

Call about getting a new grill rack.

Call round to the neighbour with the skewers we borrowed.

Call the listed buildings officer and ask about the process we need to go through with changing the fireplace over.

Call in to the army surplus store and get all his hiking stuff for Ten Tors including a good pair of leather boots. Don't forget to ask if they have any recommendations for sleeping bags and mats that are light but comfortable and warm enough.

Call the gardener about doing a bonfire next week.

Call in to let the neighbours know about the hedge trimming.

Call to order microphone leads.

Call and ask the nurse if he should fetch some more dressings.

Call the builder about the window in the studio that seems to be leaking.

Call the library and ask if I can renew the books I have for another week.

Call the B&B to see if they can take the overflow.

Call and ask if we can stay on the following weekend instead now that we have to go to rugby.

Call pest control.

Call the cleaner about moving her day next week.

Call to book catering for the band next month.

Call in for engine oil.

Call and see if I can get into the university on Sunday evening.

Call Trainline.

Call to order the school photo.

Call about them coming earlier as it starts at 7:15 not 7.45.

Call vet for price breakdown.

Call about missing squash.

Call phone company about USA roaming charges.

Call about picking up early from school.

Call and ask if we can stay on in London now that we go up to London.
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Call Mum and see how her back is today.

Call the accountant about the missing invoices to see if he received copies.

Call the plumber about the window in the studio that seems to be leaking.

Call the electrician about the bathroom light.

Call to see if we left our spare keys in the restaurant on Saturday.

Call to order new front tyres for the Land Rover.

Call to book the eye test.

Call the orthodontist and ask if we need anything else for J's braces. Call to arrange some dates for us to have everyone around here for a meeting.

Call the locksmith about mending the garden door lock.

Call the computer repair centre and ask if the USB port can be mended easily or not.

Call the smokery and order the smoked salmon.

Call about getting the cooker door mended.

Call the manager for the next week's session about arrival times.

Call a courier to arrange the log delivery.

Call to find out what I should take as a contribution to the dinner party next week.

Call around and see where I can stay for the night of 8th.

Call to arrange the lawn cutting.

Call and order some crabmeat.

Call in with a bottle to say thank you to the tutor.

Call to get back on the school parent mail.

Call and book the Maths tutor.

Call about them coming earlier as it starts at 7:15 not 7.45.

Call to order the school photo.

Call to say sorry about not getting to the party.

Call the builder about the hedge trimming.

Call the accountant to let them know about the hedge trimming.

Call to book in for the dog food.

Call the gardener and ask if he can bring a hedgetrimmer and ladders next week to do the fuschia hedge.

Call and get the number for the club secretary.

Call the barbers to make appointments before the wedding.

Call the tour manager and ask where they are going to be the day before so that I can go in the flat to collect everyone's tickets and passes in advance.

Call sweep for a date.

Call for article deadline.

Call in the water meter readings.

Call about upgrading the broadband.

Call to get the breakdown cover extended to Europe.

Call pet insurance company about the new bills.

Call to check what time we are all meeting at the gallery on Tuesday.

Call the travel agent to see if she can get any better deals on the hotels for the biennale and if there is a better area which might be slightly quieter.

Call to see about parking at the hotel in Paris.

Call school about ordering the class hoodies for the trip.

Call the auctioneers about selling the cupboard.

Call to check if anyone is allergic to anything or have any dietary requirements.

Call to cancel the booking at the shooting range.

Call about moving the container.

Call the travel agent to see if she can get any better deals on the hotels for the biennale and if there is a better area which might be slightly quieter.

Call school about ordering the class hoodies for the trip.

Call the government office to check we aren't being charged twice.

Call the council to ask if we should get the hogweed sprayed by someone specialised or if we or the gardener can do it.

Call school to arrange a meeting about results.

Call to see how the private view went.

Call the framers to confirm exact dimensions of the different frames for the exhibition and also agree on wall fixings and exact dates for collection of artwork and delivery of framed works to the gallery.

Call about tennis lessons.

Call about crack in windscreen on car.

Call holiday company and ask about next year and confirm the situation on bin collections, sorting out recycling, cleaning the sheets weekly, the key safe code, the public liability insurance, owner booking dates that we want kept free, etc.

Call up to ask if we get the deposit back on the ferry.

Call about leaving the keys.

Call in for engine oil.

Call around to get the band next month.

Call about the lawn cutting.

Call and order some crabmeat.

Call in with a bottle to say thank you to the tutor.

Call to arrange sharing journeys to the rugby matches over the next three Sundays and see if someone else can do the one on the 8th that I can't.

Call to see if the security company is coming to change the locks.

Call to see the fish can drop off after 15:30.

Call about the care appointments at the GP.

Call to see what the pantalones are.

Call to check for a prototype recall number.

Call about whether the staff are wanted on Saturday.

Call about the security as well as checking whether they want me to do a mock interview with her on day three.

Call to check with the local authority to see if they will make us some gluten free bread for her.

Call the gym company and ask if it is possible to get the time from the door to the studio on the second floor.

Call to get the smokers to confirm the exact dimensions of the different frames for the exhibition and also agree on wall fixings and exact dates for collection of artwork and delivery of framed works to the gallery.

Call about the tennis lessons.

Call the manager about the catering.

Call the staff about the weeks dates.

Call the accountant to let him know that the financial advisor is sending through the paperwork and to call him to let him know about the financial advisor appointments.

Call to book in for the wedding and ask about thecradle on the sail site.

Call the gallery and ask about a commission and whether I can put a few students threfishday over the next week or two.

Call the travel agent to get the insurance for the trip.

Call about the job offer.

Call the travel agent to get the breakdown cover extended to Europe.

Call the tour manager and ask where they are going to be the day before so that I can go in the flat to collect everyone's tickets and passes in advance.

Call the travel agent to get the insurance for the trip.

Call the gallery and ask about a commission and whether I can put a few students threfishday over the next week or two.

Call the travel agent to get the breakdown cover extended to Europe.

Call the tour manager and ask where they are going to be the day before so that I can go in the flat to collect everyone's tickets and passes in advance.

Call the travel agent to get the insurance for the trip.

Call the gallery and ask about a commission and whether I can put a few students threfishday over the next week or two.

Call the travel agent to get the breakdown cover extended to Europe.

Call the tour manager and ask where they are going to be the day before so that I can go in the flat to collect everyone's tickets and passes in advance.

Call the travel agent to get the insurance for the trip.

Call the gallery and ask about a commission and whether I can put a few students threfishday over the next week or two.

Call the travel agent to get the breakdown cover extended to Europe.

Call the tour manager and ask where they are going to be the day before so that I can go in the flat to collect everyone's tickets and passes in advance.

Call the travel agent to get the insurance for the trip.

Call the gallery and ask about a commission and whether I can put a few students threfishday over the next week or two.

Call the travel agent to get the breakdown cover extended to Europe.

Call the tour manager and ask where they are going to be the day before so that I can go in the flat to collect everyone's tickets and passes in advance.
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I had it in mind that I would exhibit the final works in the house where my project had been carried out. When chatting to a friend about the best way to accommodate the printed lengths, I voiced worries about the walls getting damaged. She pointed out it would be no worse than decorating or replacing the wallpaper. It seemed like a pertinent link back to the refurbishment in which my project was rooted, so I considered printing the whole archive alphabetically as a series of wallpaper drops. Having repetitively collected, sorted and re-sorted my evidence on home, it seemed pertinent to print the end results of my findings onto a surface known for its reiterative patterns. I recalled Mark Lombardi’s huge diagrammatic drawings that exemplified how combinations of text and line could order information into a single field of connectivity that articulated socio-political systems (Lombardi, 1970-79, Fig.xlii). I aligned this with my intentions for the wallpaper: drawing out the relational structures of home through thousands of lines of textual data consisting of over half a million words [Fig.172-174].

I wondered if it was a problem that the walls of home were assumed to demarcate the interior, and that its coverings were strongly associated with ingrained and problematic notions of a ‘woman’s touch’. ‘Wallpaper has long been the interior skin applied to the cocoon of space surrounding a house’s occupants, which also encapsulates and frames their aspirations, social class and personalities’ stated Imogen Racz (Racz, 2015, p.20). My wallpaper was not designed to impress anyone or convey good taste and status. Instead it displayed the humbling ordinariness of my life. Racz claimed that artists were using wallpaper as not just a background element but as a foil for exploring home and identity (Racz, 2015, p.20). According to Racz, artists’ wallpaper often suggested ‘the influence on the mind of the public world, which is then brought back into the home’ (Racz, 2015, p.24). This didn’t describe my project but Racz alerted me to the problem of bringing my newly mobile sense of home back into the interior. I was also wary of taking it into the gallery space. I had seen artists using this contextual shift and re-creating private space in the public arena in order to emphasise the issue of persistent spatial distinctions. The home I articulated was characterised by mobility and connectivity not separation.
Mark Lombardi
*World Finance Corporation, Miami, 1970-79*
Graphite on paper
75.2 cm x 150.4 cm
(Dexter, 2005, p.177)
The Home I Carry With Me (Detail)
2015
Printed Phototex wallpaper
2350 mm x 4200 mm
The Home I Carry With Me
2015
Printed Phototex wallpaper
2350 mm x 4200 mm
Fig. 174

*The ‘Archive’* (Installation View)
2015
Printed Phototex wallpaper with graphite
Printing up the archive in the form of wallpaper would mean picking the site more carefully. I decided the space should not be either public or private but ideally ought to fall between. It seemed important not to situate my project definitively within either the private realm or the arena of contemporary art. To avoid such assumptions interfering with the work’s reading, I needed a space where dialogue, negotiation and interaction between the public gallery and the private home were implied. The space that came to mind had been key to my practice years before this enquiry was conceived: The Centre for Drawing at Wimbledon College of Arts. It was a Victorian house that was adapted to facilitate a platform for talks, exhibitions, residencies and publications specifically focused on drawing. Ansuya Blom was one of the first artists in residence on the site. Seeing the resultant series House of Invertebrates sparked my fascination with what Blom called ‘the lines that go out from drawing’ (Kingston, 2001. p.57). The negative photographic prints of the building’s interior were inhabited by streaming disembodied veins of gouache that initially drew me into thinking about the relations of drawing and space (Blom, 2001, Fig.xliii & Fig.xliv). Blom’s flattened images and ghostly lines stood for the artist’s inhabitation of the building that was both her dwelling and studio during the residency.

I arranged my own residency in this merging of gallery and house that marked a distant source of my project. I gathered together all I might need in my house, from the paint, tools, paper, computer and printer I had used in its redesign to the mobile phone on which I now relied. I then moved into the space that was to provide my temporary home and began to make room for something to happen. It was the first time since I had conceived my son that I had walked away from my maternal responsibilities and left the family to fend for itself. Two weeks later I had pasted my archive onto the walls and time finally stood still as I reviewed five years of my life in diaristic mobile phone entries presented as wallpaper. The reminders, lists, encounters, logistics and activities mapped the roles I carried out but also revealed the relations, obligations and negotiations that drove me to do it. At last, I had discovered the means to articulate the internalised and traveling sense of The Home I Carry With Me.
Ansuya Blom

*House of invertebrates X, 2001*

Gouache pen on ink-jet photographic prints

88 cm x 57 cm

(Kingston 2001, p.73)
Ansuya Blom
*House of invertebrates II*, 2001
Gouache pen on inket photographic prints
57 cm x 88 cm
(Kingston, 2001, p.65)
My hand-drawn line and the space it inhabited had been on a transformative journey. As Ingold stated ‘every trace left by a dextrous movement of the hand is itself a line’ (Ingold, 2007, p.151). The thousands upon thousands of lines constituting the drawings on these walls, could be traced back through a printer, computer, mobile phone and the touch of a hand all the way to the line of thought from which they arose. The home they brought forth was characterized by mobility, flexibility, ubiquity and connectivity. Furthermore, it wasn't merely the artist’s line or the invested object that it represented but many multifarious voices, and a language derived by community as opposed to the individual.

I had set out viewing home as a fixed, objectified space within the house. Through drawing, I had gathered visual and embodied knowledge of the physical space I experienced. I had followed lines of thought from my drawing processes and products to understanding home differently. The concept of home was a traveling internalised space constituted by social relations and obligations. Finding my drawing methods were unable to articulate this home that I carried with me, I had taken my mobile phone and headed outside to connect with the public world and what I thought of as the Other.

Massey argued that many imaginings of home relied on a reassuring stability and sense of security that required it to be demarcated and protected from difference. The inhabitants of such rarefied retreats and isolated communities often ‘establish their identity through negative counter position with the Other beyond the boundaries’ and in doing so can resort to divisory parochialisms and racisms (Massey, 1994, p.169). Massey opened my eyes to the spatial, social and political implications of how our concepts of home are inextricably interrelated from the local to the global, the individual to the collective, the family house to the vast itinerant population flowing across the planet.

I wondered if I had managed to do service to Massey’s three propositions: that space ‘be recognized as the product of interrelations, as constituted through interactions’; that space is understood as ‘the sphere of possibility of the existence of multiplicity... and coexisting heterogeneity’; and that space be accepted ‘as always under construction: a product of relations-between, never finished, never closed’ (Massey, 2005, p.9). As I stood back and observed the way people engaged with my work, I knew that such a conclusion was out of my hands.
As Bourriaud pointed out, ‘meaning and sense are the outcome of an interaction between artist and beholder’ (Bourriaud, 2002, p.80). To me, a successful work of art tells something of the time and context of its becoming in the hands of the artist, but its interpretation and completion ought to be with the viewer. I would say that an exceptional work of art remains unfinished and open through time, acting as an idea for others to engage with and use in a larger social and critical process.

As well as offering up different perspectives of home through drawing, I wanted to find ‘un-thought of’ ways for line to map, enact and create the spaces of home: an innovative model for usefully interrogating home as a complex, diverse and travelling concept. I was reminded of Perry’s reference to Marsha Meskimmon’s notions of home as an aesthetic dialogue. Following this up, in Contemporary Art and the Cosmopolitan Imagination (2011), Meskimmon proposed art as a vital form of articulation that could visualize and materialize differing experiences of home and homelessness without reducing them to sameness (Meskimmon, 2011, p. 25). She claimed art as a form of home-making that could alter how we imagined, understood and engaged beyond our immediate experience and developed ‘our ability to respond to very different spaces, meanings and others’ (Meskimmon, 2011, p.8). In revising the boundaries of contemporary drawing to include the thumbing of notes, lists and diary entries on my mobile phone, line and space had been reunited as an active social dialogue of home.

In Weir, I had found home reconceptualised as a discursive space and ‘a site of the risk of connection, of sustaining relationship through conflict’ (Weir, 2008, p.8). I had taken the exchanges, generosities and responsibilities that operated my everyday life and opened them up as a space of home as just such a site of critical engagement. In using the ubiquitous social spaces of portable communication technologies, I had suggested new ways in which diverse and mobile experiences of home might be further addressed across social, physical and cultural divides.

To me, the relational conversational and ordinary space of home that I had created revealed a productive ontological shift of home between ‘exchange’ as initially assigned to the physical object of house valued for its intrinsic histories, to ‘exchange’ in terms of familial obligation. It occurred to me that I could never have foreseen this outcome at the start of my project but then artistic endeavour was defined by its ability to explore

‘There’s a future which is predictable, programmed, scheduled, foreseeable. But there is a future, l’avenir (to come) which refers to someone who comes whose arrival is totally unexpected. For me, that is the real future. That which is totally unpredictable. The Other who comes without my being able to anticipate their arrival’ (Derrida in Dick & Kofman, 2002). The idea of the Other as difference, time and the unexpected in the creation of new knowledge had given me a name for the outside, unexpected, invisible and untouchable beyond the boundary of the house. Now this outside space had folded in on itself to become the inside, as self and Other, familiar and difference, fixed place and unbounded interrelational space conjoined in a fluid, peristaltic space of home.
CONCLUSION

REFLECTION

Although often idealistically placed in the house, home is an imaginary desire we may spend our lives trying to see but which never fully materializes. Oppositional notions of home can cause national borders to rise, millions to migrate and the responsibilities of everyday family care to fall primarily on women. Whether forcibly displaced or mobilised by opportunities of globalisation, home and family have become increasingly detached from their geographies, dispersed in the unprecedented human flows. In an age of political, economic and ecological crises our home-making practices really matter. However, attempts to access home via the critical methodologies of public space either miss it or alter it. So, home remains partially hidden, folded into ubiquity, privacy and historical femininity.

To enter these folds as an autonomous professional and academic was to change them. To critique them as ethnographer, risked exclusion to the superficiality of cultural tourism. So, I took up the strategy of feminist artists before me and deployed an autobiographical construct. Hence it is from within, through the spatialisation and visualisation of personal experience, that my drawing practice has mapped the home.

I loved the idea of making a home. Rearranging possessions and individuating rooms roused the tactile processes, visual sensibilities and drawing skills of my design training. The urge to create new spaces of psychological and physical comfort out of unfamiliar material spurred me into relocating more than once. It wasn’t until my son was off to Secondary School that I questioned my wanderlust. If I was so easily uprooted, maybe I was yet to make a proper home. Perhaps home was only an idea in my head: a daydream of familial happiness as Freud dubbed the ‘family romance’ (Freud, 1909, p. 237). In pursuit of something more concrete, the three of us headed for the coast and the kind of house that promised to be a family home for generations.

Yet as soon as the house was ready for us to live in and there was no more need for my drawing skills, I felt bereft. Having left my job behind in London, there was nothing to relieve the burden and lack of reward for my mundane roles and activities. I turned to the drawing practice that had sustained me for the previous year, only to find I had
redesigned the house with no room of my own in which to draw. In the hope of understanding the concept of home, how it operated and whether it might offer a more substantial reward as an academic and theoretical stimulus, I gave it centrality in a research project guided by the questions: Can drawing practices map and articulate ‘home’? Might my drawing practice turn the house into a home? No sooner had I set out on my journey to turn ‘house’ into ‘home’ than I found these overlapping concepts were considered highly problematic in current spatial discourse.

Massey identified the prevalent assumptions ‘of place as closed, coherent, integrated as authentic, as ’home’, a secure retreat; of space as somehow originally regionalised, always-already divided up’ (Massey, 2005, p.6). She pointed out that thinking of home as a place to hold close and protect from the unknown ‘out there’, ‘encouraged nationalisms and parochialisms and localisms of all sorts’ (Massey, 2005, p.65). Massey opened my eyes to how individual acts of home-making were implicit in the attitudes and practices of communities and their international relations. Even ‘ordinary notions - persistent and everyday – that ‘place’, or locality (or even ‘home’) provides a safe haven to which one can retreat’ denied multiplicity and diversity (Massey, 2005, p.65). Massey talked of ‘the opening of borders, of the ‘new; space of flows, of the transgressing of every boundary in sight’ (Massey, 2005, p.65). As I took in Massey’s ideas, the UNHCR reported that over 60 million people were suffering forcible transnational displacement (UNHCR 2015). At the same time views from space showed the divisor lines of international boundaries rising to guard the homes of the privileged from those on the move. Massey called for ‘a positivity and aliveness to the world beyond one’s own turf, whether that be one’s self, one’s city, or the particular parts of the planet in which one lives and works’ (Massey, 2005, p.15). As Massey points out, personal and collective understandings of home really matter.

I searched for artists interrogating home as ‘the product of interrelations; as constituted through interactions’ that Massey described (Massey, 2005, p.9). Associations with oppression and interiority had led many ‘to reject home as a value’ for critique (Young, 2005, p.123). However, although ‘home’ was regaining prominence in contemporary art, it was firmly ‘placed’ in the physicality of ‘house’. Even those concerned with mobility and homelessness addressed it primarily in terms of an ‘absence of house’. It seemed the fluid relational concept of home Massey was calling for, needed creative attention.
Throughout history drawing had brought the places we inhabit into being. I suspected that embodied, performative and descriptive lines of contemporary drawing could articulate the sort of intangible connectivities of home Massey referred to as an ‘open space of loose ends and missing links’ (Massey, 2005, p.12). If I could follow the historical development of spatial drawing and free my methods from convention, perhaps I could map these active spaces of, as Heidegger put it, our ‘Being-in-the-World’ (Heidegger, 1962, p.248). I took up my pencil from where I had left it in the established perspectives of design and began moving around the house trying to bring home into view.

View

I founded my opening methodology on vision. Drawing and the space impacted on one another as I went between rooms carrying out ritualistic preparations of site. Unexpected conflicts arose with those who felt I was invading their safe-haven. I traced this contested space back to the gendered labour distinctions of industrialisation and Victorian moralities, then followed the subversion of such marginalisation through women’s crafts and feminist art. I focused on the house and its contents as objects invested with intrinsic values of time, narrative and participants. I used the ground plans with which I had first tried to make the house into a home and mapped my looking and line-making as flowing inks, oscillating stitches and looping threaded paths. I captured the lines of bodily movements in the house with a pinhole camera and interned household tasks in paper as burns, dust and graphite pools. The researcher’s defiantly time-consuming practice mapped everyday tasks as lists of typed words, liquid samples, bandages full of objects and a sixty-foot rope made from single socks. But when I reflected on these lines I did not see the home I was looking for. The gap between viewer and viewed, subject and object had prevented me ‘from arriving at a concept of the object’ (Kant in Foster, 2010, p.132). In mapping these layers, I had found the lines of an artist but not of home.

Body

Bachelard’s house was ‘built by and for the body, taking form from the inside, like a shell, in an intimacy that works physically’ (Bachelard, 1969, p.101). I shifted my methodology towards his phenomenological approaches in the hope that a multi-sensory intermingling with the materials of house, body and drawing equipment might feel out home. I heard,
touched and inhaled the body of the house as I sculpted the speaker wire from its walls into branching vascular systems. I found lines embedded ‘as path[s] traced through the terrain of lived experience’ and set my benchmark for the drawn as bodily intervention. I documented dialogue in intricately pencilled text, marking out familial tensions and time like tree rings. I recorded the noise floors, sounds and voices of the house and turned the audio into visual sound waves. These lines were ‘not a matter of reproducing or inventing forms, but of capturing forces’ (Deleuze, 1981, p.56). On extricating myself from these embodied interactions, I found my drawing had affected both the social and physical space that housed me, and I had a room of my own. However, the body had reached the ‘opacities and resistances correlative to its own limits and frustrations’ (Young, 1990a, p.149). It was too dumb and corporeally bound to articulate the space conceptualised by Massey as a social construction derived from ‘interactions with ‘the outside’ (Massey, 1994, p.169). Although more familiar and ‘homely’ the house was still not a home.

Home
The final phase of my methodology was characterised by moving ‘a space of places to a space of flows’ as I left the house in search of home (Massey, 2005, p.174). Taking only my mobile devices, I went outside as a professional artist researcher in search of connecting my project to theoretical discourses and debates. I found a world set in motion by human migration, professional mobility and ‘social relations stretched out’ (Massey, 1994, p.2). I saw boundaries of space rendered flexible and porous by information technologies. As work invaded personal time and space, familial relations and obligations were sustained on the move via portable computers or phones. ‘The feeling of belonging […] was no longer dependent on a specific place or physical presence, but on space and message exchange’ (Kavourl & Arcenaux, 2006, p. 30). The concept of home assigned to the fixed house, location or community seemed to be dematerialising, and in its wake intimate spaces were forming in the private, unmediated areas of my digital diaries, correspondence, notifications and everyday lists. Home as a space of identity and belonging constructed by social ties and responsibilities was increasingly internalised and traveling as a ‘space that presents us with the social in the widest sense’ (Massey, 2005, p.195). In this way, all the social obligations, expectations and negotiations that constructed daily life were being mapped without my even trying. The home I carried with me was continually being stored on my laptop, phone and tablet.
Wherever I was, I managed my familial relations, demands and logistics via digital communications. By my own measure of the drawn as derived from the body, this textual thumbing or typing was an example of hand and mind coming together to draw. Once downloaded, the archive of notifications, diary entries, shopping lists and to-do notes spanned the whole transformative journey I had made with drawing and home. Time was extended and compressed as five years of material, originally written and discarded in an instant, was re-read for weeks then reduced into wallpaper to be pored over at length. Alphabetically sorted and centred, the repetitious nature of my unremarkable ordinary life stood out as blocks of appointments, supermarket orders and courier deliveries.

The thousands of lines in these drawings traced back through a printer, computer, mobile phone and the touch of a hand to the line of thought. Through the eyes of the researcher, they were revealed to be a landscape of home that was ‘not closed down into a familiar satisfaction but opened up to reinterpretation’ (Massey, 2008, p. 8). Mobile, flexible and in continuous interaction with the outside world, this home was a culmination of different voices speaking the language of ‘a larger landscape, which we are cumulatively enabled to construct (Massey, 2008, p. 10). Whether differing in nationality, gender or age, more of us respond to the same generic ringtones and notifications calling us to attend to the ties and relations of home.
CONTRIBUTION TO KNOWLEDGE

We are living in an age of fluidity, typified by the dislocation of place; the pressures for and of migration; the globalisation of cultural influence, power and commerce; and a range of economic, political and ecological crises (Massey, 2008, pp.2-3). Accelerating numbers continue to voluntarily and involuntarily join the unprecedented human flows. In leaving behind the physical places of birth that once might have supported generations, families are dispersed and traditional social networks disintegrate. At the same time, rapidly changing living and working practices cause notions of belonging and identity to be removed from their geographies. The resultant instability, insecurity and inequality affecting everyday lives, is at the forefront of global discourse.

Historically a familial space of privacy and retreat, ‘home’ is now a complex and shifting issue. Moreover, the differing ways people are making themselves feel at home often divides, excludes or impacts on others. Questions are being raised as to whether it is appropriate or even possible to hold on to a concept of home in the context of current intransience. The enquiries of flow thus generated, make a positive contribution to discussions but have arguably failed to fully address the problem with its inextricable interrelations of home and family. Hence, I joined those attempting to deal with the matter, by bringing it together in a different way: through the mobile phone. I argued for the digital archives of communication, relations and obligations therein, as a potential site of social critique in which the contemporary spaces of home and family flowed.

This research was predicated on the conviction that individual ways of making home become implicit in the attitudes and relations of communities and nations. The experience of engaging with new perspectives of home through drawing practice and reflection upon that drawing practice, transformed my understanding of home. It therefore seems reasonable to view the understandings of home gained and articulated, in terms of their potential as an instrument for change. The primary aim of this enquiry was to create new knowledge with the capacity to usefully transform individual experience or understanding; thereby having impact of collective relevance. I propose that the drawing and writing resulting from my own transformation can ‘increase awareness of ourselves and the world we live in’ in ways that enable myself and others to

---

186 For example, those put forward in Hardt & Negri, Empire, (2001); Keiller, The Future of Landscape, (2010).
187 Such as those presented by Massey, for space (2005) and Landscape/space/politics: an essay (2008); Bauman, Liquid Modernity (2000); and Groys, In the Flow (2017);
‘act on the knowledge gained’ (Sullivan, 2010, p.97). Ideas of ‘knowledge’, ‘experience’ and ‘understanding’ drove my drawing activities and remain key to how this research now performs and is concluded.

Some doctoral artist researchers substantiate their original contributions to knowledge on the basis that their drawing outputs are to some extent accepted ‘as’ knowledge (Macdonald, 2010), (Cain, 2006), (Bailey, 2982). However, such ideas don’t map easily onto a study focused on what drawing ‘does’ as opposed to what it ‘is’. For me, the interrelated progression of theory and practice is always methodical, reliant on developing a rationale for every step through continual testing and evaluation. I set out with an idea, concept or issue I wish to address, then learn about and from the differing ways to do so ‘en route’. A series of drawn outcomes result, the meaning of which is completed differently by viewers according to the knowledge and experiences they bring to it. The notion that my drawings could somehow be a pre-specified kind of knowledge seems limiting in this context. I do not assume my drawings act autonomously or ‘speak for themselves’ as this belies the fluid, multiple and changeable layers of human activation that go into ‘making’ an artwork from inception to reception and beyond. It would also be at odds with an expanded field of contemporary drawing rooted in a conceptual belief that the knowledge and thinking processes of artistic production matter more than the final product.

In this study, the construction of knowledge took place within a dynamic, intimate and spatial dimension of home through a contextualised drawing practice that was analytical, critical, reflective and rigorous. Existing knowledge was used to seek out additional knowledge. This knowledge was then integrated through visual and textual drawing practice, and ongoing reflection on that practice. The expanded field of knowledge that resulted was then used to seek out additional knowledge, and so on. This ongoing repetitious process of gathering, synthesis and utilization of knowledge occasionally threw up unexpected results that advanced my understanding of home. In this way,
knowledge was continually formed and reformed as I learnt about the spatial concepts of home ‘in action’.188

The culmination of research methods I used in addressing spaces of home reflects the diversity of practice-based research. The umbrella concept for a practice-based doctorate is that it ‘advances knowledge partly by means of practice’ (Frayling, 1997, p.14).

Multiple differentiations are made between types of artistic research, such as whether it is ‘practice-led’ and ‘practice-based’.189 Drawing practice led me and my research was practice-centred throughout. However, I tended to refer to what I was doing as practice-based research, as this seemed sufficient to reference how drawing was both the foundation stone and the evolving structure on which my research built.

Artistic research can also be differentiated around whether it is carried out ‘for’, ‘into’ or ‘through’ art practice.190 In my case, the latter offered an accurate descriptor of how I used drawing to learn about the world I inhabited. I gathered evidence from my encounters through drawing, and created responses to my experiences through drawing, but I also reflect on what I found out and again acted upon it through drawing. This fitted with the well-known theories laid down by David Kolb about how artists learnt ‘experientially’ through doing, reflecting, summarising and testing.191 In my attempts to interrogate, articulate and advance home, the parameters of the ‘drawn’ were kept wide and included images, prints, photographs, handwriting, typing or a thumbed text.

Throughout the course of my research, I was aware of moving from the ‘unknown’ to the ‘known’ through the processes of making, interpreting and viewing drawings. I mapped

188 The idea of leaning ‘in action’ derives from the influential texts of Donald Schön, The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action (1987) and Educating the Reflective Practitioner: Toward a New Design for Teaching and Learning in the Professions (1987). Schön’s well-known learning theories and his concept of ‘knowing-in-action’ have become key ideas of practice-based research. He refers to the tacit know-how and problem-solving capacity artistic processes bring to an enquiry, implying that creative and intuitive approaches enable unexpected results that can constitute new knowledge. In drawing, a mark-making action is often repeated without conscious thought. However, as Schön suggest, occasionally I would notice a change or shift that made me question, look again and see something in a different or surprising way.

189 Most notably the terms ‘practice-led’ and ‘practice-based’ arise. My research has been ‘practice-centred’ throughout. However, I tend to refer to what I do through drawing as practice-based research as it implies how my project was founded in drawing practice and that I built on this in the process of my investigations.

190 This refers to the framework for artistic research that Dr Christopher Frayling originally theorised and adapted for The UK Council for Graduate Education report (1997). For Frayling, art practice could be used ‘for’ the purposes of interpreting or capturing meanings; it could enable investigations ‘into’ art to expand the field, or it could be used ‘through’ media and technologies to expand knowledge of art. My approach differs somewhat in trying to expand knowledge ‘through’ the use of art practice as a tool for investigating, visualising, theorising, spatialising, etc.

191 Gray and Mallins summarise Kolb’s Experiential Learning Cycle as four stages: the learner’s immersion in a concrete experience, followed by reflection on that experience, followed by conceptualization (making meaning), and finally a stage of planning new actions/experiences. (Gray and Mallins, 2004, p.8). Experiential learning relates directly to the theory of constructive learning. Constructivism is based on three key principles; the first being that learning is constructed as a response to every individual’s experience and prior knowledge; the second is that learning occurs through active exploration; and the third principle is that learning occurs within a social context – interaction between learners (Gray and Mallins, 2004, p.2).
what was there but also created spaces of home that hadn’t previously existed. Acts of drawing involved looking, touching, documenting and affecting the physical, social and imaginary spaces of home. Drawing in shared spaces generated new tensions, relations and boundaries of home. Spatialising and visualising these social transformations as drawings in turn generated interconnected flows of shared experience and relational knowledge. These tacit and emotional shifts of understanding were largely imperceptible or unquantifiable. They nevertheless fed back into the evolving drawing practice. In this way, understanding what emerges from my process-based drawing activities was articulated by the resultant artwork and reflection on that artwork.

Part of the knowledge creation occurred in thinking back over what I and my drawings were doing or had done. Reflecting, either during the uninterrupted flow of making a drawing or later once I had stopped and stepped away, led to moments of recognition or understanding that an unexpected or new outcome had occurred through my practice. As Anne Douglas states, ‘one of the essential characteristics of practitioner research is that it is one’s own practice that is reflected upon’ (Douglas, 1994, p. 45). This leads to a dynamic experiential kind of ‘knowing’ – a knowing ‘how’ rather than a knowing ‘what’. Such reflexivity continually reshaped the decisions, paths, strategies and understandings with which I progressed my research.

Communication of what was learnt in the process of drawing occurred through active, reflexive participation by the researcher, audience and reader. In this way, knowledge of home as personal experiences of coming to know were extended into collective discussions, relations and interpretations of communities: academic, social, political, scientific, etc. Whether text, image or a combination of the two, the drawing output was not so much the knowledge itself as an ‘indicator’ of personal knowledge gained during the experience of drawing. At the same time, it was a stimulus for further questioning by myself and others, so was an ‘indicator’ of further collective knowledge to be gained. De Zegher offers a description of line as indicator that fitted my thinking:

---

192 Notably different outputs than those expected of traditional ‘quantitative’ research, generally understood to involve experiment, measuring outcomes, then testing to establish results that become fact and are proven to be capable of consistent replication. Instead, my research is ‘qualitative’ in that it this is concerned with how the social world is interpreted, understood, experienced and produced.

193 According to Schön, ‘reflection-in-action’ or ‘reflection-on-art’ practice as a production of knowledge happens after the fact when we discover how our previous ‘knowing-in-action’ has contributed an unexpected outcome (Schön, 1983, p.78).

194 I viewed the learning process and the knowledge produced in this way as ‘experiential’. Artists ‘learn most effectively by doing – by active experience, and reflection on that experience’ (Gray & Malins, 2004, p.1). I learn through practice-based research, and through reflection ‘in’ and ‘on’ it. It results in a partially intuitive, personal and indescribable kind of knowledge. So, when written articulation is required for academic research, it tends to fall short because the transfer of knowledge as ‘understanding’ is itself ‘experiential’.
If, for linguistics, naming with the word was the act of consciousness through which we begin to know, for the artists the rendering of form in drawing transformed perception into naming, and so was the process through which they came to know. Cognition thus proceeds from creation, with line as indicator of a cognitive process (de Zegher, 2010, p.24).

De Zegher points out that ‘the drawn line has always corresponded in some way to the line of thought’ (de Zegher, 2011, p.103). In the context of this study, lines of writing, image and data were all understood as explicit evidence of the reflective knowledge forming process (as opposed to ‘being’ the knowledge). John Dewey’s influential theories about *Art as Experience* (1936) formed part of the rationale for this. According to Dewey, knowledge is brought about through art as ‘different acts, episodes, occurrences, melt and fuse into unity’ (Dewey, 1934, p.36). When ‘we say of an experience of thinking that we reach or draw a conclusion’, Dewey suggests there is a ‘similarity of “conclusion” to the consummating phase of every developing integral experience’ (Dewey, 1934, p.37). I see the practice and thesis I present as a ‘conclusion’ of knowledge accumulation. As Dewey put it, coming to know occurs through experience in the flow from something to something, ‘as one part leads to another, and one part carries on what went before, each gains distinctness in itself’ (Dewey, p.36). This experiential formation of new knowledge seemed particularly pertinent in relation to drawing: an act commonly defined as a mark made by movement from one point to another.

The process of my coming to know was grounded in the active experiences of drawing, reflecting and interpreting as ways of moving on my ‘understanding’ of home. I now align new knowledge with that furthering of understanding and reason that, as a research outcome, understanding is as important as any explanation or measurement. According to Sullivan, if the purpose of research is to raise awareness about an issue of personal and public relevance and/or to provide knowledge that can be acted upon, then ‘understanding is a viable outcome of inquiry’ (Sullivan, 2010, p.97). The understanding I pursued was that of individual or social transformation. By interrogating and articulating the spatial concepts of home through drawing practice, I hoped to generate the sort of thinking, questioning and acting that could bring about change. As Sullivan discusses:
The process of making art and interpreting art adds to our understanding as new ideas are presented that help us to see in new ways. These creative insights have the potential to transform our understanding by expanding the various descriptive, explanatory and immersive systems of knowledge that frame individual and community awareness. These forms of understanding are grounded in human experiences and interactions and yield outcomes that can be individually liberating and culturally enlightening (Sullivan, 2010, p.97).

On this basis, I would suggest that the doctoral requirement of an original contribution to knowledge is embodied in the practice, reflections and arguments documented within this thesis. I would also argue that the multifarious ‘drawings’ herein offer up differing perspectives and understandings of home that can continue to be used by myself and others for transformation and change.

Through presenting my transformed understanding, there is potential for it to be theorised, analysed or utilised as evidence by researchers in other disciplines. According to Douglas, ‘to look at one’s own creative practice means taking on both a creative and a reflective role, in a sense creating a new research model which may use other models but will inevitably have its own distinct identity’ (Douglas, 1994, p. 45). In the context of social science for example, different types of readings and conclusions are likely to arise from critical engagement with the manipulated archives of my text-based drawings.

This research responds to the need for new methods with which to visualise home in the context of rapidly evolving technologies, which are accelerating the changes taking place our world. It also suggests new possibilities for using personal archives from portable communications devices as a site of social critique. There is potential to build on the findings of home it presents and the emphasis of repetitions it exposes, collectively and comparatively. Using data from the mobile phones of other individuals in the same way as I have my own, would enable both singular and multiple visualisations of home to be constructed, compared, merged and archived. Participants might include those from varied cultural backgrounds and whose daily life ranges in levels of mobility. By drawing

195 According to Frayling, in general ‘practice-based doctoral submissions include an original/creative piece of work in the submission for examination as well as a substantial contextualisation of this creative work. The critical appraisal or analysis is expected to clarify the basis of the claim for the originality and location of the original work, it also provides the basis for a judgement as to whether general scholarly requirements are met (Frayling, 1997, p. 14).
out the commonalities and differences across geographical, economic, social and political divides in this way, the outputs could generate new connections and relations of home.

The hybrid methodology used in this research has the potential to be broken down into formulaic structures and usefully appropriated by other artists. For example, I have begun to create artworks based on the orderliness of methods identified through further reflection on my practice-based approach to research. One such output is based on the museological processes involved in transforming a collection of personal evidence into an output of public relevance and important. Laid out as the sequential formula below, it demonstrates a model of rigorous, reflexive and critical reciprocity between practice and theory. Moreover, the same steps can be applied across a range of creative disciplines, and to interrogate an unlimited array of topics and interests. Such methodological exemplars may be particularly useful to students and those in the early stages of learning about and applying practice-based research.
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IN THEORY...

BEFORE YOU START
Identify a problematic issue of interest (social, political, ecological, philosophical, cultural...) Outline the bigger picture of how this problem potentially affects the world and those within it Does it have any specific impact or connection personally? Is there potential for individual research to have broader impact on the wider issue?

SKILLS AND EQUIPMENT
What disciplines currently attend to this topic? What activities, processes or movements are in some way linked to it? Are there any tools or equipment of particular relevance to this issue? What creative practices might best intervene, explore, interrogate or expand on the problem?

INGREDIENTS
Gather visual imagery related to the topic of enquiry Collect associative objects and materials Amass textual evidence around the problem Record any relevant dialogue

PREPARATION
Appropriately document all the evidence gathered Label all items individually Group into obvious collections Sort the collections hierarchically

SELECTION
Do any groups align with traditional ideas, history, ingrained assumptions, memory Which convey the key social relations Can any parallels be drawn with the original problem What collections or hierarchies most directly seem to associate with the concept or problem

TRANSFORMATION
Get physically immersed in the archival material of choice and ‘play’ Intermingle and juxtapose collections, applying one to another Re-work, re-order, re-group, re-sort Reflect on any fresh connections, associations and meanings that may have arisen What has been found out?

PRESENTATION
Present the collection in a way that makes these new narratives, connectivities and perspectives visible. Devise a mode of display in keeping with the topic Use museological labelling to highlight what you have ‘found out’ in your investigations What unanswered questions or unexplored paths are indicated?


NB. two different translations are used (see below) as they offer different inflections.


NB. two different translations are used (see above) as they offer different inflections.
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