



University of **HUDDERSFIELD**

University of Huddersfield Repository

Bradshaw, Alice

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

Original Citation

Bradshaw, Alice (2015) Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste. Masters thesis, University of Huddersfield.

This version is available at <http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/id/eprint/25012/>

The University Repository is a digital collection of the research output of the University, available on Open Access. Copyright and Moral Rights for the items on this site are retained by the individual author and/or other copyright owners. Users may access full items free of charge; copies of full text items generally can be reproduced, displayed or performed and given to third parties in any format or medium for personal research or study, educational or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided:

- The authors, title and full bibliographic details is credited in any copy;
- A hyperlink and/or URL is included for the original metadata page; and
- The content is not changed in any way.

For more information, including our policy and submission procedure, please contact the Repository Team at: E.mailbox@hud.ac.uk.

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

**Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt,
Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter,
Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit,
Shreds, Trash and Waste**

Investigating the relationship between value
and the use of rubbish in art practice

Author: Alice Bradshaw

Submission Date: April 2015

Supervisor: Steve Swindells

Co-Supervisor: Lisa Stansbie

MA by Research

Art Design & Architecture

University of Huddersfield

AHRC Bursary Funded

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the relationship between value and the use of rubbish in art practice through its defining terms. As practice based research, the project is a survey of 19 selected keyword synonymous rubbish categories variously used by artists which are analysed (compared/contrasted) in terms of value to the author's own practice. The project borrows from a range of rubbish-related disciplines and uses a participant-observational and bricolage approach to attempt to define the personal value of rubbish in art as a working definition for the purposes of this research.

The practice is presented as a Rubbish Newspaper, Rubbish Dictionary and connected public blogs which have developed from a notional literature review of artists using rubbish including artists' interviews and conversations. The survey findings have been divided into the Newspaper; simultaneously art evaluating the art works that are considered dissimilar, the Dictionary; comparing and contrasting, recognising a similarity in attributable values of the art works to the author's own practice and project blogs publicly documents the process as it happened.

This thesis as academic writing illustrates the practice-led research in a sequential order reflecting the project chronology. The thesis analyses the

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

project methodology against the methods of six selected key artists (two per chapter) within a project chronological structure: Collection; Display and Exchange. *Collection* analyses the data collection and categorisation of Mark Dion and Michael Landy's practice methodologies, *Display* analyses the Newspaper against David Shrigley and Maurice Carlin's display methodologies, and *Exchange* analyses the role and indeterminacy of language and exchange-value through various modes of exchange against Allan Kaprow and John O'Hare's work.

A critical analysis of the methods finds the indeterminacy of language and the fluidity/plasticity of value to be central components in the understanding of this complex research question. Definitions, categories, use- and exchange-values, and their various subjectivities and indeterminacies, are fundamental notions of the relationship between value and use of rubbish in art practice. By appropriating rubbish in art in specific ways, the boundaries of these fundamental notions are blurred and must be redefined, recategorised and analysed continuously, without a consistently determinate position. This ongoing process means that the specific research findings in relation to practice presented here are only applicable for the time and context they were created in, and may shift and change according to new information and analysis.

The new understandings of the role of indeterminacy in the relationship between value and rubbish objects and ideas has developed into a new

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

direction of practice; concerning dialogue exchange in (re)defining values of rubbish within art contexts. This conclusion to the project is the beginning of an extended research project into the dual value and meaning of “Talking Rubbish”.

CONTENTS

Preface: Artist Practice Overview	p.6
Introduction	p.11
Key Artists	p.16
Collection: Methodologies & Critical Dictionaries	p.19
Mark Dion - Tate Thames Dig (1999)	p.24
Tate Thames Dig	p.24
Collecting methodologies	p.26
Organisation in the field	p.30
Consequences	p.32
Michael Landy - Break Down (2001)	p.36
Break Down	p.36
Personal relationship to collection as self vs collection as critical framework of practice	p.38
Cataloguing as performance of self	p.41
Critical dictionaries	p.42
Inventory vs dictionary and blog as inventory	p.47
Display: Newspaper	p.49
Maurice Carlin - The Self Publisher (2009-2011)	p.52
The Self Publisher	p.52
Content	p.54
Reproduction	p.56
Self publishing and democratised sites of display	p.59
David Shrigley - Crap (2007)	p.61
Humour and throwaway aesthetics	p.61
Good art / poor images	p.64
Image and text	p.69
Everyday drawing	p.70
Exchange: Talking Rubbish	p.72
Allan Kaprow - Trading Dirt (1982)	p.76
Rubbish exchange-value	p.76
Blurring art/life: Nonart modes	p.80
Blurring art/life: Happenings	p.84
John O'Hare - Dumped (2012)	p.86
Dumped: Modes of exchange	p.86
First mode: Object-basis	p.88
Second mode: Language-based exchange	p.91
Third mode: Booklet/newspaper and online exchange	p.95
Conclusion	p.101
References	p.111
Bibliography	p.115
Appendices	p.120
1 Dictionary	p.121
2 Historical Overview: Timeline	p.144
3 Categorisation by Kaprow's Nonart Modes	p.145

Preface: Artist Practice Overview¹

The author's art practice of working with everyday objects and their inherent material qualities developed an interest in low value and mass-produced anonymous objects, which has led to rubbish becoming a major focus of an object-based broad sculptural practice. These objects were often rendered useless through specific, repetitive processes and resulted in the dual attributes of rubbish and art; they are dysfunctional objects denied their intended purpose and instead presented as art work, as can be summarised by George Dickie's Institutional Theory.

*"A work of art in the classificatory sense is 1) an artifact 2) upon which some person or persons acting on behalf of a certain social institution (the artworld) has conferred the status of candidate for appreciation."*²

The significance of institutional theory in deriving value in nominally devalued objects was brought to the fore with the development of the Museum of Contemporary Rubbish³ which collects, documents and exhibits everyday rubbish within art contexts. The Museum's 'Research Department' looked at

1 The footnotes throughout this thesis are references to the artist's practice and are separated from the main text, but remain on the same page, to give them a separate, parallel space.

2 Dickie, George. 1971. *Aesthetics, An Introduction*. Pegasus. p.101.

3 See the Museum of Contemporary Rubbish website for more information <http://museumofcontemporaryrubbish.blogspot.co.uk/>

other artists' work using rubbish and rubbish theory to compare and position it in a wider field⁴. From this preliminary informal research under the 'Research Department', this current project proposal was derived in order to academically research and articulate how this project and wider artistic practice connects and compares with contemporary (art) discourse.

Throughout the research process the project has actively engaged in practice; testing ideas and feeding into the research process. Before officially commencing the course in October 2012, the preliminary research notions were tested within the research field⁵. Alongside the practice, field research into the municipal waste industry was undertaken including a visit to a recycling centre and an interview with the local area coordinator in November 2012. This work has contributed to the focus on rubbish categories through an analysis of recycling categories used in the waste industry⁶.

4 A link section on the [Museum project blog](#) links to other artists' work and a '[Research](#)' page lists links to theory, articles and other rubbish-related content.

5 The preliminary research notions were presented at the [TRASH Conference](#) in September 2012 at the University of Sussex, which also introduced several academics working in the wider field of rubbish. Alongside the conference was the TRASH Exhibition where the Museum of Contemporary Rubbish presented work. The work presented included a typical series of photographs, the [Rubbish \(2011\)](#) video and a 'donations' bins generating a new site-specific collection; the [Brighton Collection](#). For this exhibition a new element was introduced which was a video interview with willing rubbish 'donors' comprising a short series of questions, along with paper acquisition forms filled in with each donation. This structured interview format was early development work for the Rubbish Conversations discussed in more depth in this thesis. The paper acquisition forms were continued in subsequent Museum of Contemporary Rubbish exhibitions, in [Lincoln](#), September 2012, and [Vantage Art Prize](#), Leeds, February 2013. These began to document more subjective notions of the object rubbish as defined by the person defining them as rubbish.

6 Categorising notions developed on a practice level with a piece made for [Black Dogs Quarterly #1 Losing It](#), published in January 2013, that entailed a selection of tick box rubbish categories with no other instruction or contextual information, intentionally ambiguous. Subsequent Black Dogs Quarterly Publications contributed to with rubbish submissions include July 2013: [Black Dogs Quarterly #2 Grim Up North, Shit Down South](#) (July 2013) presenting Museum of Contemporary Rubbish collection selections from the north and south of the UK and [Black Dogs Quarterly #3 Hope from Dead End Town](#) (also July 2013) comprising a narrative about cigarette end collecting Oldham circa 1999.

Public presentation of the research at various stages was a key part of the project development with reflexive critical analysis⁷. Research findings which explores the dual value of rubbish and art in this context were also published on social media⁸. If the value of rubbish in art is tested by institutional theory of value being context-dependent, the everyday contexts that are acknowledged as within, and peripheral to, the art institution may present different findings.

During the research, major projects were undertaken as part of art practice that fed into the research⁹, including collaborative and curatorial projects¹⁰ that are typically part of the author's wider art practice. Writing about other artists' work with rubbish continued and developed as a contributory practice based research element presenting summaries and

7 On invitation by Chol Theatre to present at the [Huddersfield PechaKucha Night](#) at the Media Centre in November 2012, the research to date was presented using the 20 slides x 20 seconds format prescribed to present 20 artists' works in 20 keywords categories. The PechaKucha format was also utilised to expand knowledge of the field through curation of [PechaKucha Night Wakefield](#) at The Hepworth, bringing speakers together to present on Leftovers from a local/regional open call.

8 #dailyrubbish published on social media (Twitter and Facebook synchronised) in January 2013 focussed on one keyword and tweeted links to the artworks and quotes linking back to the keyword page on the project blog. This tested the public reception of the findings to date and also asked for further contributions, concluding when each keyword category's blog content was publicised.

9 Such as [HOARD](#) (2012-2013) which collected, photographed and catalogued every item of waste from the author's art practice. This was a side project to the Museum of Contemporary Rubbish in that the Museum of Contemporary Rubbish collects other people's rubbish and HOARD focussed specifically on the artist's rubbish generated through practice. Paper material from HOARD was later exhibited in August 2013 in [Performing Paper #7: HOARD:PAPER](#) at Paper Gallery Manchester which again looked at categories of materials and waste.

10 HOARD preceded the [Rubbish Gallery](#) (2012-2014) collaboration with Advertising Exhibitions which developed from an invite to guest curate. A brief was set for the artists in respective networks to document an item of rubbish from their practices and discuss it through interview.

analysis of the work at various stages¹¹.

How rubbish ideas are translatable internationally has also been tested with presentation of art work¹² and also presentation of the research project itself¹³. Presenting ideas in written and spoken form¹⁴ as part of the research development has led to a major finding of the language-basis of determining the value of rubbish in art practice, which is discussed in this thesis.

The thesis articulates the process of the practice-led research which has manifested itself in the Newspaper, Dictionary and connected blogs. Practice and theory have developed along side each other, but the writing up of this thesis has been the final stage in the research process, after completion and dissemination of the practice portfolio. The thesis structure thus reflects the practice development process which tends towards a descriptive account with

- 11 [Axisweb Curated Selection](#), published in April 2013, involved artists interviews which have subsequently fed directly into this project. On invite to contribute to *Waste Less Live More Week 2013*, a guest blog [The Art of Food Waste](#) published September 2013, discussed the 2013 theme of food waste in the context of contemporary art.
- 12 Museum of Contemporary Rubbish merchandise which was first produced for Holmfirth Arts Festival 2011 was further developed for [Market Value](#) in Chicago, February - April 2013, as a new range of 'international' rubbish merchandise exploring the notion of rubbish provenance and international travel/translation. [Rubbish \(2011\)](#), often screened as part of Museum of Contemporary Rubbish exhibitions, has been shown as a stand alone piece in film festivals and exhibitions (Bradford, Wakefield, Buenos Aires, Sheffield, New York, Edmonton Canada) and also as a solo show in Melbourne a Berlin première at 9th Berlin International Directors Lounge in February 2013.
- 13 A conference paper on the research project was presented via video at the Canadian Association of Geographers 2013 AGM Special Session: [Waste and Indeterminacy](#) at the University of Newfoundland. The local/regional and international contrast was also tested in the presentation of the project outcome of the Rubbish Newspaper at [Supermarket Art Fair](#), Stockholm in February 2014, and at the [Museum of Contemporary Rubbish Blackpool](#) in March 2014, the latter receiving a review [Corridor 8](#) in March 2014.
- 14 Such as 'Rubbish Conversations' which piloted under this title at the Blackpool solo exhibition and have become increasingly present as referenced and documented exchanges throughout the project, such as [Rubbish Conversation with Lars Tharp](#), at The Hepworth Wakefield in January 2014.

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

critical post-practice analysis.

The practice is positioned by comparing and contrasting it with that of other artists through the Dictionary and Newspaper. This has dictated the thesis by focussing on the six key artists' work selected from the survey which are analysed in terms of similarities and differences. This comparative model creates an understanding of the relationship between value and rubbish in art practice, that is comparative to the status quo or *quotidien* of rubbish in art practice, and identifies both defining and unique values of this practice.

Introduction

This research project is a broad survey of contemporary artists using rubbish which seeks to understand the relationship between value and such practices, with the purpose of bringing new understanding of artists' rubbish practices generally and specifically to that of the author. The varied notions of what defines rubbish and its usage in art practice are at the centre of this research, however a basic definition of rubbish as low value or valueless objects and materials can be taken as a starting point. The analysis of 19 keyword, synonymous terms seeks definition of these terms and their attributable value to objects and materials that may be utilised in art practice in order to better understand the complexities of such practice.

The subjective notion of how rubbish is defined has developed as a research interest through the Museum of Contemporary Rubbish¹⁵. The irony of working with low value, hidden and overlooked, repugnant and marginalised materials in the field of art, which is traditionally high value, often glamourised and spectacular, deals with paradoxes that address these value judgements that are enacted through language. For the Museum of Contemporary Rubbish, the paradox of objects being defined as both rubbish and art has opened up a research interest which questions these everyday,

15 See the Museum of Contemporary Rubbish website for more information
<http://museumofcontemporaryrubbish.blogspot.co.uk/>

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

and often institutionally determined, values.

The thesis structure reflects some fundamental aspects of how rubbish and art are perceived and defined (Collections); how they are presented (Display) and discussed (Exchange); and what definitions are chosen as language evolves rapidly and globally in the advent of the internet. These terms offer different lenses or filters to perception and, through discussing rubbish in the context of contemporary art, may offer a platform for critical analysis of the subject through everyday concepts using language as the theoretical framework for analysis.

The Collection of found image and text presented as the research project is both the process and the resultant archive of previously uncollated material. Borrowing waste industry methodology of sorting similar material into categories for processing, particularly hand-picking sorting methods, the Collection has been sorted and categorised into 19 synonymous keywords, selected with a thesaurus based on their everyday language usage. Borrowing the notion of 'useful' from the waste/recycling industry, the artworks that are considered 'useful' or relevant when compared to the author's art practice have been selected for inclusion in the Dictionary¹⁶, that defines the 19 keyword categories in relation to art practice, and subsequently this thesis. Each synonymous keyword is defined by the image and text categorising it and therefore forms a dictionary of reference for the author's art practice¹⁷.

¹⁶ See Appendix 1.

¹⁷ This exists in full on the project blog <https://contemporaryrubbish.wordpress.com/> as a

The thesis uses selected quotes and references from the Collection, interwoven with the author's writing and footnotes, forming three interwoven strata of reference, theory and practice respectively. The remaining artworks, quotes and references that have less direct relevance have been 'discarded' from this process and 'recycled' in the Rubbish Newspaper by means of hand drawn studies and published as the 'waste product' of this research project.

This practice based research can be considered a notional literature review of artists working with rubbish and as such is embedded in the main body of this thesis together with the methodology. A multi-theoretical bricolage approach is used which accommodates (or 'litter-picks') the most relevant theories, such as Dickie's Institutional Theory and Kaprow's Nonart Modes which emphasise the relevance of context, from of the vast knowledge related to the research subject across various disciplines. Interpretative bricolage has allowed for the subjectivities and reflexivities of qualitative research data collection and critical analysis most appropriate to the complexities and pluralities of this practice based research.

Some major theories often used in art interpretation such as Freud's psychoanalytical theories have not been used, despite an obvious link to the abject/uncanny, a topical link to shit in Freud's theories of obsessive collecting deriving from anal-retentive behaviours, Freud himself being an obsessive collector and Freud's notion of psychoanalysis being an archaeology of the resource and reference point with the process annotated on the a-n blog <https://www.a-n.co.uk/blogs/rubbish>

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

mind: "The psychoanalyst, like the archaeologist in his excavations, must uncover layer after layer of the patient's psyche before coming to the deepest most valuable treasures"¹⁸.

Due to the limitations of this research project several important areas have been omitted, such as: the environmental sustainability debate intrinsically linked to rubbish that puts the base subject matter in the public eye, the psychoanalytical theories that Dada and Surrealism (of earlier rubbish-in-art practices) are often aligned with, and also the use of digital waste in art practice. In investigating the relationship between value and the use of rubbish in art practice, these areas can be considered as distinct strands of the vast landfill of information that may be useful to revisit at a later date in relation to the core concerns. The use of digital media is not completely omitted, with the project blog featuring documentation of artworks using rubbish, but artworks using digital waste have been excluded from this study which focuses on the materiality of rubbish as objects and matter.

Furthermore, an art historical context is also not excluded as it acknowledges how the present position of rubbish in art practices has been deduced, but the artworks studied are predominantly from recent decades¹⁹. The research focus on contemporary art and linguistics has been necessary to understand art practices from a contemporary perspective and how this research is relevant now and in the future. In defining value, the

¹⁸ Gay, Peter. 1989. Freud: A Life for Our Time. p.16.

¹⁹ The historical spread of the artworks featured in this study are illustrated in Appendix 2.

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

linguistic frameworks that create these definitions must be investigated in order to understand the contemporary currency of the work in question.

Key Artists

A selection of six key artists discussed in this thesis provide a framework for analysing how their diverse methods compare to the project in three sequential chapters; Collection, Display and Exchange. These chapters mirror the methodological chronology of the project and highlight the ideologies and cross-overs between practices, such as: classification systems and institutional critique (Dion); a collection's relationship to self and critical dictionaries (Landy); the use of newspapers to display findings and democratised sites of display (Carlin); notions of the everyday and throwaway aesthetics (Shrigley); exchange-values and blurring art and life (Kaprow); and modes of exchange and the duality of exchange-value (O'Hare).

In some way these chapters are superficial separations, as are the rubbish categories in the work itself. The artificiality of superimposed linguistic and institutional structures that define rubbish and artefact are at the centre of this work. The chapter headings are interrelated and, implicitly, fundamental notions of art and everyday commodities, but they are also useful as separated notions through which to analyse key art works and practices in detail as they map the methodological chronology. Any of the artists could be discussed in each of these chapters but, for the purposes of analysis, these artists have been selected for discussion in the chapters in particular ways

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

that resonate with the project methodology and findings.

Categories are themselves problematic.

*"We had thought to use a universal category [sculpture] to authenticate a group of particulars, but the category has now been forced to cover such a heterogeneity that it is, itself, in danger of collapsing."*²⁰

Krauss explains that the category of sculpture is historically bound and not a universal category. The art world, institutionally, now accepts that anything can be sculpture and anything can be art - the potential is wider than ever - but categories themselves are fluid things and never concrete. Just as objects in the categories of 'useful', 'in-use', 'dis-used' and 're-used' are in flux, the rubbish categories of this project are as temporary in nature, and as subjective, as the next categorisation system. The notions of Collection, Display and Exchange are also historically bound and in flux and as such can be considered as indeterminate as the value of rubbish in art practice itself.

Categories are also discussed in the chapter on Allan Kaprow's work and specifically his Nonart modes are borrowed to categorise the entire Collection of artists using rubbish²¹. The key artists discussed in this thesis are summarised by these categories as follows:

20 Krauss, Rosalind. 1979. *Sculpture in the Expanded Field*. October, (MIT Press) Vol. 8. p33.

21 See Appendix 3.

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

Key Artist / Artwork	Rubbish Category	Nonart Mode
Mark Dion - Tate Thames Dig (1999)	Remains	(2) Work in unrecognizable, i.e. nonart, modes but present the work in recognizable art contexts
Michael Landy - Break Down (2001)	Remains	(2) Work in unrecognizable, i.e. nonart, modes but present the work in recognizable art contexts or (4) Work in nonart modes but present the work as art in nonart contexts eg garbage collecting, etc (with proviso that the art world knows about it).
Maurice Carlin - The Self-Publisher (2009)	Discards	(1) Work within recognizable art modes and present work in recognizable art contexts.
David Shrigley - Crap (2007)	Crap	(1) Work within recognizable art modes and present work in recognizable art contexts.
Allan Kaprow - Trading Dirt (1982)	Dirt	(4) Work in nonart modes but present the work as art in nonart contexts eg garbage collecting, etc (with proviso that the art world knows about it).
John O'Hare - Dumped (2012)	Rubbish	(2) Work in unrecognizable, i.e. nonart, modes but present the work in recognizable art contexts or (4) Work in nonart modes but present the work as art in nonart contexts eg garbage collecting, etc (with proviso that the art world knows about it).

This form of classification is neither absolute nor fixed. It is subject to subjective interpretation, and is dependent as to what is considered recognisable art modes and contexts in that moment in time. However, there is a majority tendency in this selection of artists of working in nonart modes which may be a key in factor contributing to the indeterminacy of value considering Dickie's Institutional Theory. Ultimately, in determining the value of rubbish in art practice by comparing it with other artists' work, the linguistic frameworks and categorisation methods that are utilised in defining and exchanging value are found to be fluid, thus rendering value as indeterminate as the structures that create it.

Collection: Methodologies & Critical Dictionaries

“A social group is characterized just as much by what it rejects as by what it consumes and assimilates. The more economically developed a country is, the more gets thrown away, and the faster it gets thrown away. People are wasteful. In New York, in the promised land of free enterprise, the dustbins are enormous, and the more visible they are the more inefficient public services operate. In underdeveloped countries, nothing is thrown away. The smallest pieces of paper or string, the smallest tin is of use, and even excrement is gathered. What we are outlining here is a sociology of the dustbin.”²²

The 'sociology of the dustbin' is the starting point to this research interest through the work of the Museum of Contemporary Rubbish, and the research project itself is a collection of 'rubbish' content; consumed, assimilated and sometimes rejected. How people consume, assimilate and reject objects in everyday life has consistently been a major practice interest from the beginning, and the focus on rubbish addresses this interest directly. As the Museum of Contemporary Rubbish developed into a major and ongoing project, rubbish related content was increasingly noticed and sought out to

²² Lefebvre, Henry. 1961. *Clearing Ground*. Published in *Documents of Contemporary Art: The Everyday*, ed. Stephen Johnstone. 2008. *Whitechapel and The MIT Press*.

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

inform the practice. In borrowing the notional institutional structure of the museum, the project naturally aligned itself with academic enquiry in order to develop the polarity between institutional context and rubbish content. Thus, the sociology of the museum and the sociology of the dustbin began to merge through the collecting processes of practice-led enquiry.

Collecting processes and collections are key elements to several artists' practices, not limited to rubbish practices that are the study of many anthropologists and archaeologists. Collections more broadly are integral parts of both the museum and gallery institutions and waste management industries, as well as practices of everyday life.

*"Collecting is a powerful tactic for making sense out of the material world, of establishing traits of similarity through fields, of otherwise undifferentiated material."*²³

Cummings and Lewandowska note that collections inaugurated the desire to be encyclopaedic in the original sense of the word: to offer a 'complete circle' of learning.²⁴ Whilst this project does not intend to be comprehensive in an encyclopaedic sense, it does seek to analyse and share knowledge in a structure that has a encyclopaedic logic. Cummings and Lewandowska note too that "The collection relies on a related series of

23 Cummings, Neil & Lewandowska, Marysia. 2000. *The Value of Things*. August/Birkhauser. p.29/30.

24 Ibid.

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

technologies; ordered accumulation, cataloguing, classifying and arranging.”²⁵

These processes are essentially the first stages in the methodological process discussed in this chapter comparing against Mark Dion and Michael Landy's work.

In the preface to *The Order of Things*, Foucault attributes the book arising out of a passage in Borges²⁶ describing:

“A certain Chinese Encyclopedia, the Celestial Emporium of Benevolent Knowledge, in which it is written that animals are divided into: (a) those that belong to the Emperor, (b) embalmed ones, (c) tame, (d) suckling pigs, (e) sirens, (f) fabulous, (g) stray dogs, (h) included in the present classification, (i) frenzied, (j) innumerable, (k) those drawn with a very fine camelhair brush, (l) et cetera, (m) having just broken the water pitcher, (n) that from a long way off look like flies.”²⁷

Applying a similar typological categorisation method to the author's rubbish practice and its various collections demonstrates an overlap of categorises also:

25 Ibid.

26 Borges, Jorge Luis. 1942. *The Analytical Language of John Wilkins. Selected Non-Fictions*, Penguin Books, 1999.

27 Foucault, Michael. 1966. *The Order of Things: An archaeology of the human sciences*. Editions Gallimard, Paris. (English tr. 1970, Routledge, London and New York.)

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

1. Everyday, site-specific rubbish (MoCR)
2. Information about everyday rubbish (broad research)
3. Art practice rubbish (HOARD)
4. Information about art practice rubbish (HOARD inventory)
5. Other artists' art practice waste (AdEx Rubbish Gallery)
6. Information about other artists' art practice waste (Rubbish Gallery interviews)
7. Other artists' work using rubbish (the project blog, referred to in this chapter as The Collection)
8. Information about other artists' work using rubbish (the project blog, a-n blog newspaper and thesis)
9. Information about the project process (the a-n blog and this thesis)

With so many various collection categories that may overlap, categorisation itself may tell us nothing other than that these categories exist. However, the similarities and differences that categorisation establishes may lead to a better understanding of the position and relationships between the categorised elements. In categorising artworks into rubbish keyword categories that may signify value, the Newspaper and Dictionary aim to find the author's position and relationship to the artists studied.

The two artists' works examined in this chapter deal with collections in distinct, contrasting ways. For Mark Dion, the collection is the end point of a collecting process and the resulting exhibition. Michael Landy's collection is

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

his personal accumulation of things over his lifetime that is subject to the systematic destruction as the exhibition. Both the accumulation and destruction processes involve forms of analysis that are analysed here against the project Collection in terms of both *collecting* as methodological process and *collection* as the resultant work. Essentially, it is the categorisation processes themselves which have formed part of the analysis of the work and it's relation to other artists' work in the field.

Mark Dion - Tate Thames Dig (1999)

- **Tate Thames Dig**
- **Collecting methodologies**
- **Organisation in the field**
- **Consequences**

Tate Thames Dig

In this section, Dion's collection methodology and resultant collection in *Tate Thames Dig* are examined; his collection and classification systems, and underpinning critique of the museum are analysed. The reference for this specific work mainly comes from the publication *Mark Dion, 1999, Archaeology*, Black Dog Publishing although other relevant works and publications have been accessed, as well as a talk by the artist given at Manchester Museum in 2007.²⁸

28 Dion's rubbish collecting and museum-esque practice has become of significant interest through the work on the Museum of Contemporary Rubbish. It seems that some fundamental interests are shared, with the main differences in practices being in the post-collection classification processes and the level of engagement with existing institutions (Dion operating within Museum institutions as invited artist versus the Museum-as-project invited to exhibit within contemporary art exhibition contexts). With this research project collecting and analysing artworks using rubbish (as opposed to rubbish items themselves), the shift from simply collecting, to include categorising, sorting and analysing, bares more resemblance to Dion's work in its methodological approach but moves away from the rubbish-object focussed practice. This move away from working directly with objects is aligned more with the author's curatorial practice than practice as an artist. However, in the analysis phase of the project, the drawing and production of the Newspaper returns to the object-focussed artist side of practice that is the focus of the Display chapter.

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

Tate Thames Dig takes the model of an archaeological dig and collects fragments of objects and material from the River Thames at Millbank and Bankside, near Tate Britain. The resulting collection is then organised; sorted and categorised with a selection displayed in a cabinet at the Tate, then sold as an artwork. The publication cited provides the detail of his particular methodology with comment and analysis from industry professionals. The book chapters examining this process are titled *Phase 1: Collecting Methodology*, *Phase 2: Organisation in the Field* and *Phase 3: Consequences*. These chapter headings are borrowed here as the analysis framework, as the main source Dion's artwork has been encountered and analysed through.

Collecting Methodologies

Dion's team is instructed to use a 'scatter-gun' approach; collecting anything of interest (chasing the anomaly) – an approach used by antiquaries and early archaeologists. The collection method for this research project involved a bricolage, multi-methodological approach to a broad literature search; a non-scientific process that resonates with the 'scatter-gun' approach. Rubbish is a very broad, interdisciplinary field with information in abundance much like rubbish itself. It would be impossible for this research to be both exhaustive and contemporary, particularly within the time available. The relevance to practice is also a key defining characteristic in the limitations of the research field. Whilst this is quite broad in one sense, it is also very specific to what is at the centre of this research.

Fieldwalking as collecting method is cited in Dion's *Collecting Methodology* chapter. Within archaeological method this usually preludes a more detailed survey or excavation, which Dion uses exclusively in *Thames Dig*. The 'fieldwalking' within the project methodology is the literature search in books, magazines, exhibitions and the internet that identify sites of interest with 'artefacts' and references that are then extracted from the abundance of available information. It is also a prelude to a more detailed study. In archaeology, the fieldwalker will often note environmental aspects at the time of recovering an artefact and this is analogous to literature referencing in the project methodology as recorded on the project blogs.

Visual references to waste and discards were often the first mode of identification in the project literature search, with keywords later assigned and sometimes recategorised through further research such as interviews with artists. Artwork titles and media specification as well as artists' statements and interviews provided primary search and categorisation criteria, with other curators' and writers' classification and terminology being secondary. Online resources such as specialist databases Ubuweb and Axisweb were searched as well mainstream media; newspapers, TV, radio, Youtube, Vimeo, social media and Google.

Exhibition listings were searched and exhibition visits made where possible. Manifesta9 and dOCUMENTA(13) were visited to research how waste featured in these two major European art exhibitions in 2012. Whilst relevant works were uncovered in both of these exhibitions, the overarching curatorial themes were not directly related.²⁹ The selection of such artworks in a broader curatorial remit of international exhibitions of this scale suggests that the contemporary positioning of artworks utilising rubbish is in amongst the rest. It has an international stage to answer those curatorial questions and is neither marginalised nor revered over other works not derived from waste materials. This places a value on the art works using rubbish as similar to those which do not incorporate rubbish materials.

²⁹ See a-n blog for exhibition reviews from this perspective.

A survey of a discarded back-catalogue of MAP magazine was also conducted with all references to waste in artists' practices noted including exhibition listings, reviews and features. The fact that the MAP magazines were a discarded archive is particularly relevant, as opposed to online archives or library material, as this part of the literature search exemplifies the cross-over between research and practice. Again, art works utilising rubbish materials were not given higher or lower status than other works within the magazine structure. The fact the magazines were discarded was not to do with their content, but their temporal nature and archaic format – much like the rubbish materials found in the art works themselves.

Interviews, questionnaires, conversations and such exchanges with artists working with rubbish, and also with visitors to project exhibitions, provided key information collection which is discussed in more detail in the Exchange chapter. As part of art practice, a number of projects involved the collection and analysis of relevant knowledge. In December 2012, the curated project PechaKucha Night Wakefield at The Hepworth was utilised as a platform to bring selected speakers together to present on the topic of Leftovers in the quick-fire 20 slides at 20 seconds each format. The curatorial topic allowed exploration into the varied notions of 'leftovers' as a broad theme and the conversations with speakers and attendees further expanded this process. The various subjectivities and indeterminacies of what constitutes 'leftovers', and also makes them worthy of attention, was evident and the curatorial selection and ordering of the presentations made possible

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

through curatorial subjective notions of the ideas presented (rather than a randomised order).

Although some artworks and information were encountered first-hand, and interviews conducted directly with the artists, there are a substantial number of artworks and writings which have been accessed as documentation online or in books. In contrast to the information in the public domain readily available through keyword search terms, the specialist knowledge search could be likened to an archaeological dig, exhuming fragments of information from trails of footnotes and library references. A laborious and detailed process, the 'archaeological dig' collection of information did not in general recover anything more 'special' in value for being hidden in institutional mausoleums.

A key difference between Dion's search and the one for this project is that Dion's was geographically limited to the Thames River bank. This project literature search had no such geographical limitation, but instead was determined by what was accessible at the time (for example an exhibition being a time-specific event, and the MAP magazine back catalogue being discarded during the research process). However, there was a language dependency of keyword-searches meaning search results were always in English as original language or via translation, making a geographical tendency (although not exclusivity) towards Western contemporary art.

Organisation in the Field

In Dion's Field Centre (the tents on Tate's south lawn), fieldworkers sorted items into broad material categories e.g. ceramics, glass, bone, leather, shells, organic, plastic, metal. Dion and the Field Centre managers then subdivided the items into different 'species' of objects. The method of differentiation chose for this research project is based on language and the specific 'rubbish' definitions (or rubbish 'species') of material used in the artworks.

History Trash Dig (1995) and *History Trash Scan (Civitella Ranieri) (1996)*, also both superficially borrowed the method of archaeology³⁰. In fact, *Raiding Neptune's Vault: A Voyage to the Bottom of the Canals and Lagoon of Venice* - containing rubbish dredged from Canal Rio della Sensa - when shown in the Nordic Pavilion at the Venice Biennale had been subject to an anonymous reporting and subsequent confiscation by the Nucleo Speciale dei Carabinieri per la Protezione del Patrimonio Artistico Nazionale [Special Unit of the Italian Military Police for the Protection of National Artistic Heritage] due to being classified as containing pieces of priceless archaeological value.³¹

Dion's method is generic, but always context-specific. Where Dion borrows from archaeological methodology, this project has borrowed from the waste industry methodology, which is also context-specific. For example, the

³⁰ Dion, Mark. 1997. Mark Dion. Phaidon, London. p.25.

³¹ Fontana, Emi. 1999. Mark Dion: Archaeology: Loot. *Black Dog Publishing, London*.

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

field research at a recycling centre that led to the formation of the synonymous rubbish terms as the categories to order the collection. Dion's aesthetic leaning in his categorisation is highly appropriate to the found artefacts, with little or no information about the history or provenance. There was an aesthetic basis of initial categorisation of the Collection, then supported or re-evaluated by further investigation (artists interviews, publications, etc), but the language remains the basis of the Collection categories.

Dion is dealing with a collection of discarded objects and materials, whereas this project deals with a collection of artworks using discarded objects and materials. This means that the owner (artist) of the artworks in question is often contactable, or more information in art literature available as artworks often have this level of information attached to them in documentation. Ordinary discarded objects that Dion and his team collected have no such additional narrative. The material Dion collected might be so eroded and fragmented that the only information available to him and his team might be the material composition. The detective work was identifying the material in order to categorise. The artworks in this project Collection often had artwork details of title, artist, medium and size. These labels were important categorisation functions if a keyword appeared in the title or medium (being specified by the artist as primary keyword provider).

Through this project research process, language-based interviews,

dialogue and exchanges have begun to be considered not just as collection method but more as practice itself. Dion sees his fieldwork as performative and invites people to engage with the work on different levels. This ethnographic, participant-observation approach is central to this project and wider artistic practice, discussed more fully in terms of Exchange later on; and as a collection methodology it has proved invaluable to receive immediate feedback on ideas where there is active participation and engagement. As a collection methodology, the role of participant-observer places the researcher alongside the artist-subjects and introduces the notion of co-production of the research through the language-based methods.

Consequences

This chapter in Mark Dion's *Archaeology* noted that the site temporally linked undifferentiated materials as a collection (rather than chronology linked). In this project's survey of artists' using rubbish, the collection has been chronologically sorted³² as part of the process to analyse the historical spread, but the collection is not presented chronologically. Instead, 19 synonymous terms have been chosen to order and analyse the collection through language. Compared to Dion's physical material properties, the main difference with the collections here is that Dion's is dealing with physical objects and this project collected representations of artworks that exist

³² See Appendix 2.

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

physically elsewhere.

In Dion's book, Alex Coles references Robert Smithson's notion of Sites/Non Sites³³ in discussing *Thames Dig (1999)* transferring material from one site to another.³⁴ Considering the project blog as a non-site where the collected material is held, this blog acts both as the public online archives of the 'Museum of Contemporary Rubbish's Research Department' and temporary space where the research is in process of being analysed.

*"The museum needs to be turned inside out – the back rooms put on exhibition and the displays put in storage."*³⁵

Having worked in various museum institutions, Dion has seen the inner workings first hand and his art work tends to reflect this. This project's museum background on the other hand is more limited to the visitor experience and amateur/personal collections, which is reflected in the Museum of Contemporary Rubbish.

"As I see it, artists doing institutional critiques of museums tend to fall into two different camps. There are those who see the museum as an irredeemable reservoir of class ideology – the very notion of

33 Smithson, Robert. 1996. Unpublished Writings in Robert Smithson: The Collected Writings: A Provisional Theory of Non-Sites. ed. Flam, Jack. *University of California Press*.

34 Dion, Mark. 1999. Mark Dion: Archaeology. *Black Dog Publishing, London*. p.28.

35 Dion, Mark. 1997. Mark Dion. (Interviewing Michel von Praet who co-reorganised the Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle in Paris, 1990). *Phaidon, London*. p.18.

the museum is corrupt to them. Then there are those who are critical of the museum not because they want to blow it up but because they want to make a more interesting and effective cultural institution.”³⁶

It seems that Dion identifies with the latter. Specifically, he seems interested in the tension between the museum's position as an educational forum and an entertainment forum. In polarising artists' positions in this way and assuming a position of institutional critique, the Museum of Contemporary Rubbish identifies with the latter also. Furthermore, there is also a play with class ideology relating to institutional theory that takes into account the institutional and social context of an artefact in its valuation and object status.

A class ideology that affects the value of rubbish and art within an institutional context denotes that not all perceptions are equal; that some valuations are given more merit than others. The Museum of Contemporary Rubbish asks participants to value objects as simultaneous rubbish and art, through uncensored donation to the Museum – enabling the audience-participant to make that value judgement. In a traditional museum structure, an appointed 'expert' is called upon to make equivocal value judgements. This inequality in valuation systems based on class ideology may be a vast and important research field to explore in more depth.

36 Ibid. p.16.

Whilst institutional critique is not the overt 'point' to the project, it is still a major part of the critical framework. This overlaps with environmental concerns and a critique of capitalism as a key generating factor of modern waste.

*"I am generally pessimistic about the fact that the environmental movement has shied away from providing a more systematic critique of capitalism. It has become more corporate, divisive and collusive, missing an important opportunity to present a meaningful challenge to the juggernaut of world market economy. Environmentalism has become eco-chic, another gizmo, another category of commodities."*³⁷

However, the purpose of this work is not to critique capitalism or environmental activism, that is beyond the confines of this thesis, the focus is to investigate the relationship between value and the use of rubbish in art practice.

37 Ibid. p.33.

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

Michael Landy - Break Down (2001)

- **Break Down**
- **Personal relationship to collection as self vs collection as critical framework of practice**
- **Cataloguing as performance of self**
- **Critical dictionaries**
- **Inventory vs dictionary and blog as inventory**

Break Down

As with Dion's *Tate Thames Dig*, Michael Landy's *Break Down* also deals with the categorisation of similarly grouped objects. In contrast to Dion's *Tate Thames Dig* collection, Landy's collection is his total personal collection of things. This personal relationship to his stuff is a critical component of the work, and of the destructive, systematic process; the breaking down of everything into its constituent parts to a fundamental materialism, to the point of dematerialisation, is at the centre of this analysis.

The Art Angel commission involved Landy systematically cataloguing and then destroying all his 7000+ worldly possessions over a two week period in an empty shop unit on Oxford Street – London's busiest consumer street. Every item in *Break Down* was first categorised into ten categories such as *art*

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

work, electrical and motor vehicle. The granulated remains produced weighed in at 5.75 tonne and were buried in landfill in Essex. An inventory – an audit of his life as Landy describes it – remains as documentation along with photographs and film of the process.

“The basic idea [of Break Down] is to destroy every possession I own in a two-week period. The work is based on material reclamation facilities, in which materials that have value are reclaimed from the waste chain. ... Objects that have been classified into different categories – for instance, leisure, clothing, reading – are numbered, weighed and detailed on an inventory. ... Break Down draws on reclamation techniques (identifying, sorting and separating) but I'm not reclaiming or recycling anything. ... It's a production line of destruction which ends in the granulation of all the components.”³⁸

Landy talked about *Break Down* as dealing with emotions and value and at the time rationalised it as being to do with consumerism. He said the two weeks of *Break Down* were the happiest two weeks of his life – in complete elation – and also it was like witnessing his own death. He didn't make any work for a year after that and then he started drawing weeds (Mother's Purse) as they grew in waste land.³⁹

38 Landy Michael. 2001. Michael Landy: Break Down: 'A Production Line of Destruction': Parts of a Discussion between Michael Landy and Julian Stallabrass. November 2000. *Artangel, London*. p.107-8.

39 Landy, Michael. 2012. Michael Landy in conversation with Richard Calvocoressi. Henry Moore Lecture Theatre, Leeds Art Gallery.

Personal relationship to collection as self vs collection as critical framework of practice

Landy's collection of everything he owned comprised a form of self-portrait. Through the selection and accumulation of material possessions over his lifetime, the collection of objects represented the materialistic notion of projected identity through the ownership of the objects. The choice of objects he kept in his possession represents an attached value, whether this is use-value, sentimental value or otherwise. The sum total of value-attributed objects in his collection represents a totality of his values, and therefore defines a notion of self through these values, but only those that can be ascribed to objects.

Landy says he was more consumed with the anti-consumerism aspect than the sentimentality:

*"[Break Down] was anti-consumerist but it was almost as much to do with people's love of things, and of different values and value systems. Because I was dealing with love letters and family photos and personal material like that, and they are very important to almost everyone."*⁴⁰

Landy's personal relationship to his stuff and the totality of his collection

40 Landy, Michael. 2008. *Everything Must Go. Ridinghouse, London.*

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

of worldly belongings makes *Break Down* unique in this aspect. In contrast, the personal connection to the artworks in the project's Collection is not on the same personal or physical level; however the selection for the Dictionary does define a practice based frame of reference. This Collection as critical framework is not itself physical. There was no acquisition of actual artworks, rather the online documentation and representations forms the Collection. The Collection takes on a physical reality through the publication of the newspaper, as does the Dictionary; similarly, Landy's inventory remains the documentation of *Break Down*'s process.

In contrast to the Collection of other artists' works, Landy did have several original artworks in his collection by other artists as well as his own. Discussing the inclusion of these artworks in the destruction with Julian Stallabrass, it seems this decision was problematic:

*"They were gifts and they were artworks and in some ways artworks are not in anyone's possession as such. They're just passing through people's hands. But what I think is you can't ever iron it all out, it's never going to be tidy. I couldn't keep the artworks because that would have been a cop-out. I thought that the artworks should be treated just like everything else and shouldn't be given any special kind of treatment."*⁴¹

41 Ibid.

One way Landy seemed to make sense of this problem is by drawing some of these artworks by way of memento⁴². These line drawings, some annotated, included 'Alarm clock' 'Loo brush present from Anya Gallacio' 'Gary Hume "Clown Painting" present (birthday)' 'I won a Chris Offli [sic] print in a TIME OUT competition The question was; Who won last year's turner prize'. Other un-annotated possessions include a knife, colander, cup, watch and filing cabinet. As Hawkins notes in *Visions of Excess*, the artworks are annotated and therefore valued as birthday presents of gifts as opposed to works of art by renowned artists.⁴³

This emphasis Landy puts on his personal relation to the artworks as gifts rather than describing them using the institutional art labels of artist, title, medium, size, etc, as chosen for the Collection, reinforces the notion of self in the valuation process of personal collection.

The choice to use the given artwork descriptors in the display of the Collection is not totally negating the notion of 'self'; however more emphasis is placed on the Collection as a whole to articulate a framework of reference that is relational rather than deeply personal. For example, an alternative label could have been chosen to label Song Dong's *Doing Nothing Garden* (2012) such as "one of my favourite art works at (d)OCUMENTA13 when I visited tired from pregnancy and in a heatwave". However, the chosen process

42 Landy, Michael. 2001. Break Down: 'Selected Possessions'. *Artangel, London*.

43 Hawkins, Harriet. 2010. Visions of Excess: Michael Landy's Break Down and the work of Georges Bataille. *Angelaki: Journal of Theoretical Humanities*. p.28.

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

was to categorise it under 'Dirt' and use a dictionary format to derive a critical framework of practice. This was not so much based on the autobiographical as with Landy's annotations, but as a set of references that may be used to begin to define practice.

Cataloguing as performance of self

*'The cataloguing of possessions as a performance of self has recently been tracked through different artistic registers that explore how even ridding ourselves of objects leaves their traces.'*⁴⁴

The inventory that Landy produced of every object he destroyed, published in *Michael Landy: Break Down*, is a critical component of the documentation that remains of the work. The process of systematically inventorising, or cataloguing objects in a collection that we consider a representation of self (possessions) forms a description and interpretation system that homogenises a collection. This process displays (performs) a layer of 'self' through the catalogue system.

Landy's inventory includes short descriptions of the objects he destroyed and, through the choice of words, shows us a little about what that object meant to him. Evaluating each object in this way in order to sum up its

⁴⁴ Crang, Michael. 2012. Negative images of consumption: cast offs and casts of self and society. *Environment and Planning A*, volume 44. p763.

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

Heideggerian *thingness* in a short inventory entry, according to the personal relation to it, is a reflexive process not just for each individual item but for the whole collection/self. The categories he chose for his inventory were A: Artworks, C: Clothes, E: Electrical, K: Kitchen, L: Leisure, MV: Motor Vehicle, P: Perishable, R: Reading Material and S: Studio Materials.

A systematic ordering is also utilised in the Collection with the 19 keyword categories that are dictionary synonyms in personal everyday usage. The classification or cataloguing system devised for the Collection is comparatively different to Landy's inventory of personal possessions, however both perform a systematic ordering that provides a critical self-reference framework of how each artist relates to each object or category respectively. This performance of self creates a self-reference framework: a critical framework for practice representing a desire to order and understand; to break down and group by likeness according to an internal logic that is based on language.

Critical dictionaries

Crang identifies his own critical framework of influence in the above quoted essay with reference to Michel de Certeau's consuming as appropriation⁴⁵, Georges Bataille's sense of destructive excess⁴⁶ and Robert

⁴⁵ de Certeau, Michel. 1984. *The Practice of Everyday Life*. University of California Press.

⁴⁶ Bataille, George. 1985. *Visions of Excess: Selected Writings (1927-1939)*. University of Minnesota Press.

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

Smithson argument that separate 'things', 'forms', 'objects', 'shapes' were mere convenient fictions⁴⁷ which all resonate with the research project.

Bataille's notion of destructive excess in particular has also previously been compared to *Break Down* by Dr Harriet Hawkins in detail. As Hawkins describes, Bataille's notion of excess is 'both necessary and generative', 'a natural condition of the world' and 'anything that is unproductive in a capitalist means-end economy.'⁴⁸

“Excess is cursed by a production-orientated society because it will never be productive. It sits alongside waste, the formless (l'imforme) and base materialism – “a materialism that implied no ontology” (Bataille, Visions of Excess 45, 50-51). [...] Landy's material excess does not easily equate to material meaningless. A more nuanced analysis of the “unbuildings” that the artwork operationalises can be developed through an attention to the two artist's texts which Landy produced to accompany the installation; Michael Landy/Break Down and Michael Landy/Inventory.”⁴⁹

It is these two artist's texts, along with online documentation⁵⁰ and a recent artist's talk that this analysis is based on, having not encountered the installation itself. The-text based nature of the analysis is important to note in

47 Smithson, Robert. 1996. The Collected Writings. *University of California Press*. p. 112.

48 Hawkins, Harriet. 2010. Visions of Excess: Michael Landy's Break Down and the work of Georges Bataille. *Angelaki: Journal of Theoretical Humanities*. p.20.

49 Ibid. p.19/20.

50 See http://www.artangel.org.uk/projects/2001/break_down/about_the_project/break_down

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

deriving meaning through language; that is semiotic analysis. Hawkins talks about *Breakdown* performing a semiotic breakdown:

*"It carries an overthrow of particular meanings not in order to establish others in their place but rather the overthrow of the stability of "meaning itself." Rubbish here disorders, and in so doing points to the understandings and orderings of objects, commodities, subjects and objects as an ongoing, uncertain process rather than things themselves."*⁵¹

The notions of excess that this project deals with are excess of material (rubbish) and also excess of information. The artists within this study have used the excess of material and waste productively through the use and re-use in their work, and this research process identifies and categorises these selected artworks from the global excess of information.

Art about ideas (and the dematerialisation⁵² of objects) becomes increasingly about language as the tool used to express, translate and represent ideas. Landy's destruction of physical objects into granules, while heavily documenting the process (and publishing printed publications about it) is a dematerialisation from object to language. The documentation of other artists' work in this project and its categorising within the Dictionary and

51 Hawkins, Harriet. 2010. Visions of Excess: Michael Landy's Break Down and the work of Georges Bataille. *Angelaki: Journal of Theoretical Humanities*. p.22.

52 Lippard, Lucy. 1997. Six Years: The Dematerialization of the Art Object from 1966 to 1972. *University of California Press*.

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

Newspaper can also be considered a dematerialisation from object to language.

Bataille's concern with dematerialisation, excess and formlessness, which sit alongside waste, has also been subject to a linguistic break down. Bataille's notion of the formless is documented in *Critical Dictionary*; originally published as a number of entries in *Documents* that Bataille co-produced with others.⁵³

“Formless: A dictionary would begin from the point at which it no longer rendered the meanings of words but rather their tasks. Thus formless is not only an adjective with a given meaning but a term which declassifies, generally requiring that each thing take on a form. That which it designates has no claim in any sense, and is always trampled upon like a spider or an earthworm. Indeed, for academics to be happy, the universe would have to take on form. The whole of philosophy has no other goal; to provide a frock coat for what is, a mathematical frock coat. To declare, on the contrary, that the universe is not like anything, and is simply formless, is tantamount to saying the universe is something like a spider or spittle.”⁵⁴

53 See Noys, Benjamin. 2000. *George Bataille: A Critical Introduction*, Chapter 1: The Subversive Image. *Pluto Press, London*.

54 Bataille, George. 1972. *Critical Dictionary Vol 1. No.7: Formless. Documents*.

Bataille's is considered a subversive dictionary; a critique on the dictionary. It is not alphabetical and is not so easily definitive. Where Hawkins articulates a critical relevance to Bataille's work in the analysis of Landy's *Break Down* through the notion of excess, the critical relevance to Bataille's work for this project lies more with the Critical Dictionary itself as a fragmentary lexicon.

*"The incompleteness of the critical dictionary was a critique of the tendency of dictionaries to try and define all the significant words in a language by freezing their irruptive energies into stable meanings."*⁵⁵

This instability is also true of this project's Dictionary. In contrast to the completeness of Landy's collection, the Dictionary produced through this project is a work in progress and subject to change over time, perhaps due to the oppositional methodological processes of "unbuildings" (as Hawkins describes of Landy's work) and the assemblage-bricolage nature of this project.

Other critical dictionaries exist, such as Gustave Flaubert's *Dictionary of Received Ideas* (1911-13), Raymond Williams' *Keywords* (1976) and Paul Eluard and Andre Breton (eds)'s *Dictionnaire abrégé du surréalisme* (1986), that in part may purport to establish order and meaning in heterogeneity, but

⁵⁵ Noys, Benjamin. 2000. Georges Bataille: A Critical Introduction, Chapter 1: The Subversive Image. *Pluto Press, London*.

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

as Bataille's *Formless* dictionary entry suggests, the terms' meanings only become clear through form and specific example that words are subjectively attributable to.

Inventory vs dictionary and blog as inventory

“Julian Stallabrass: Is the disposal of your possessions a way of taking apart your identity?”

Michael Landy: In a sense. The inventory is a material history of my life. All that's left at the end of the process will be my memory and the inventory.”⁵⁶

Landy's *Break Down* does not include a dictionary as such, but it includes an inventory of all the objects destroyed. The inventory format is one used for both the Museum of Contemporary Rubbish and also for HOARD which collected and exhibited a year's worth of practice-related rubbish. For a large and total collection, such as a lifetime's collection of worldly possessions, or these rubbish collections, the inventory is the key document.

For this project, the a-n blog acts as a chronological project inventory, a record of the research process and sources. Landy's inventory includes brief material descriptions of his objects before their break down. The a-n blog, as

⁵⁶ 'A Production Line of Destruction': Parts of a Discussion between Michael Landy and Julian Stallabrass in Michael Landy / Breakdown. 2001. *Artangel*, London. p. 107-16.

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

inventory, documents the research as it happens, with a similar 'material description' quality to it; a brief description of the research process and preliminary findings. The project blog is the public holding place for all the images and texts in the Collection. This is a hybrid dictionary-inventory; a work in progress until the work is published, and then it becomes an archive document. The Newspaper and Dictionary are counterparts to each other; the 'discarded' and the 'useful' according to practice. As a counterpart to the Dictionary, the Newspaper becomes a kind of anti-dictionary.

All these aspects of these project and their interconnectivities demonstrate that one alone is too limited and reductive; partly because of the media platform they are presented on but also because of the display mode itself.

Display: Newspaper

An excess of information on rubbish proliferates in our lives across the internet, newspapers, local council leaflets, television and radio. 'Eco-chic' trends in social media feeds with stylistic recycled and repurposed objects⁵⁷. Newspapers increasingly feature articles on small but effective ways we can reduce our waste⁵⁸ as well as larger scale innovative projects⁵⁹. Local councils issue bin collection information on printed leaflets that add to the household waste generated. TV is littered with cheaply produced documentary programmes on hoarding⁶⁰ the extremes of filth⁶¹ and turning scrap into cash⁶². Radio also airs programmes about rubbish and the environmental impact⁶³. Rubbish can easily be found in other popular programmes; one Masterchef challenge used kitchen scraps as the ingredients for competitors to cook up a restaurant standard dish as Michel Roux Junior announced enthusiastically "I love leftovers!"⁶⁴ Rubbish is all around us, infiltrating our daily consumption of information. The words used to describe this kind of minimal cost production and mass popular culture is trash, rubbish, crap, etc.

57 Eg [Reuse Connection](#) and [Rethink & reuse & recycle](#) Facebook pages.

58 [Wilson, Bee. \(2013\). BYO cutlery: why we should all carry our own knives and forks In China and Japan, a 'bring-your-own-chopsticks' movement has sprung up. Could a similar trend take off here, or are we too wedded to disposable plastic cutlery? The Guardian, 11 November 2013.](#)

59 [Webb, Flemmich. \(2012\). Plan to build UK's first building entirely out of waste: Grand Designs' model ecohouse to be rebuilt in Brighton city centre using local construction and industrial waste. The Guardian, 3 October 2012.](#)

60 [The Hoarder Next Door, BBC4.](#)

61 [Supersize Grime, Channel 5.](#)

62 [Getting Rich in the Recession. Channel4. 28 November 2013.](#)

63 Eg [Heap, Tom \(presenter\). Costing the Earth - The End of Plastic. \(2013\). BBC Radio 4](#) and [Don, Monty \(presenter\). Dawses, Andrew \(producer\). \(2013\). Shared Planet - Human Rubbish and Wildlife. BBC Radio 4. 11 November 2013.](#)

64 [MasterChef: The Professionals, Series 6 Episode 21, BBC 2, 9 December 2013.](#)

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

It is trash TV about trash. But as popular and surface level inquiry into rubbish, it represents the mainstream awareness of rubbish in our daily lives.

*"Each act of appropriation is a promise of transformation and each act of acquisition anticipates the supposed transubordination."*⁶⁵

Rubbish is omnipresent both in physical actuality and as meta-rubbish (e.g. information about rubbish, art using rubbish). How rubbish and meta-rubbish are displayed is crucial to our engagement and understanding of it; whether indeed we classify it as rubbish at all. The Newspaper, Dictionary, blogs and thesis provide different forms of representation, interpretation and analysis of the research; found and drawn (appropriated) information as collage in object form, selected and categorised information according to the author's practice, data in flux as it is found, categorised and annotated online and lastly selected information analysed in depth through language in relation to the author's art practice respectively.

This chapter focusses mainly on the Newspaper as artwork in terms of display, comparing it with two artists' choices of display modes: Maurice Carlin's appropriation and reproduction of found cultural matter and David Shrigley's throwaway aesthetics. The content and reproduction of rubbish and meta-rubbish, along with self-publishing and democratised sites of display, is analysed against Maurice's Carlin's work in the first chapter section. The

65 Buchloh, Benjamin H.D. 1982. Parody and Appropriation in Francis Picabia, Pop and Sigmur Polke.

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

second chapter section analyses the display aesthetics, notions of 'good art' and 'poor images', and subsequently everyday drawing practices are analysed against David Shrigley's work.

Maurice Carlin - The Self Publisher (2009-2011)

- **The Self Publisher**
- **Content**
- **Reproduction**
- **Self publishing and democratised sites of display**

The Self Publisher

Maurice Carlin collects discarded photocopies left behind at local copy shops which he then collates, reprints and distributes as the periodical entitled *The Self Publisher*. He publishes everything he collects within specific time-frames and locations, negating content hierarchies as he maps the leftover literary and visual ephemera of anonymous situations.

Carlin tries to keep editorial intervention to a minimum and re-publishes content as he finds it. The back stories of why each photocopy has been made and then discarded is unknown and for the reader to speculate upon, enticed by the process of making connections between articles the artist has happened to find.

Carlin disrupts the waste stream of these everyday contexts, making public the otherwise 'diminished usefulness of each discarded copy', and gives new

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

meaning and value to an array of cheaply reproduced articles, texts, adverts and signs.⁶⁶

"I collect failed and discarded photocopies left behind at copy shops and publish these in a periodical called The Self Publisher. While the specific context of this material is very narrow in that it only forms a snap shot of those who have needed to use a particular duplicating service on a particular day, the array of material is broad and speaks clearly about a people and a location, about motivation, action and work.

My practice seeks out the peripheral view, exploring things that have often been missed, left or lost. In some cases these are actual objects or materials, in others it is a situation or simply a moment. I find the anonymous histories and unknown back-stories of these situations interesting. Beyond the materials and circumstances themselves, I am often more interested in their provisional and transitory nature, the factors that have created their existence and what this could mean for the present.

I usually publish everything that I collect. The breadth and dissonance of the subject matter is 'equalised' by the action of sequencing the materials together into the pages of a magazine, this

⁶⁶ First published on Axisweb Curated Selection: Rubbish by Alice Bradshaw, February 2013. See <http://www.axisweb.org/features/profile/curated-selections/alice-bradshaw/>

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

combined with the black and white 'sameness' generated by the photocopying effect. Pages that have had no previous association start to 'communicate' with each other. I try to keep my intervention to a minimum and re-publish the work as I found it. Elements of unavoidable subtle ordering creep into the process, where I place one thing after another that might have some arbitrary connection.”⁶⁷

Content

The object newspaper⁶⁸ is an archaic form of communication; the content at the time of publication quickly outmoded. The Newspaper's throwaway nature identifies the object as rubbish itself. Carlin's publication is a more substantial and bound publication than the Newspaper, suggesting more longevity and permanence; however its periodic publication format and content tend towards the ephemeral too.

Carlin's publication content is anything found that has been discarded in the copy shop; surplus cultural leftovers of overprinted or misprinted photocopies. The content of the Newspaper is also found content but it is about discards rather than discards themselves (meta-rubbish rather than

⁶⁷ Interview with Carlin, 2012.

⁶⁸ Artistic interest in the object newspaper has previously manifested in the 2010 project *Blank Newspaper* which presented 100 sixteen-page blank newspapers at Red Gallery in Hull with invitation for visitors to take away and 'read' the newspaper. See <http://blanknewspaper.blogspot.com/>

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

rubbish). However, through the methodological process, the content published in the Newspaper has been 'discarded' as being not directly aligned with the author's practice. Carlin's content is indiscriminately selected based on chance geographic location in time, whereas the Newspaper content is sourced by keyword criteria, then sorted and processed. Both contents here are found material⁶⁹; found in copy shops or found online, in books and through academic and peer networks. The Newspaper's meta-rubbish content here takes on a dual quality of rubbish (from the methodological selection process) and meta-rubbish (as information about rubbish).

Carlin collates the leftover photocopies aiming for a non-hierarchical sequence - which is also aim of the Newspaper; the pages are the same but different and therefore amplify the inherent detail through the content difference rather than through editorial treatment. In order to achieve this, the Newspaper has the content arranged in 19 keyword categories presented alphabetically. This display method signifies a reference system with the content grouped under each category, as opposed to an arbitrary linear sequence from page to page. The contents page in the Newspaper shows the diagram structure of the keyword linkages based on the OED⁷⁰'s definitions using the synonymous terms. Both are methods of delineation and shift the power relation from collector/collator towards the reader to derive a narrative.

69 Scavenging and appropriation of found material and cultural detritus follows a long tradition of collage and assemblage from Dada and Kurt Schwitters.

70 [Oxford English Dictionary](#).

The Collection of found images and text has been somewhat unified through drawing and categorisation into the 19 keyword categories. Carlin's editorial process for his collection of found material is minimal, limiting his influence intentionally. Both are collations with minimal hierarchy and additional commentary – leaving any additional narrative or conclusions to be provided by the reader.

“It could be quite a surreal experience to read through from the front cover but I always want to find the narrative thread — that's a natural instinct. It's a bit like reading a newspaper, which has a design aesthetic but apart from that it's a jumble of different information, reports and trivia.”⁷¹

Reproduction

““There is no longer any system of objects” but rather a world governed entirely by reproduction (rather than production) and simulation of the real. ... For Baudrillard and others, the object is superseded because it has been surpassed as the dominant structural element in politico-economic commerce.”⁷²

71 Carlin, Maurice. 2011. [Ghosts in the Machine: Maurice Carlin's 'The Self Publishers', found art from photocopiers.](#) *Shrieking Violet*.

72 Baudrillard, Jean. Cited by Wills, Brian. 1994. *Damaged Goods: A Product you could Kill For.* *New Museum of Contemporary Art, New York.*

Contemporary culture continually copies, recopies and appropriates, and both Carlin's publication and the Newspaper reproduce contemporary culture. Carlin makes his copies mechanically from the discarded electro-mechanically made copies, whereas the Newspaper images are drawn freehand from the found jpg representations, then scanned to become jpgs themselves. Sometimes the artworks have been seen in the real before, but mostly not.

*"I'm interested in the photocopier as a format as it's democratic — it reduces everything to a black and white image and flattens it all out. Even glossy magazine articles are reduced to a bit of text. ... It is accidental publishing. It would be quite different if I collected all the material I found on the street like scraps of paper — it is found in a place of publication and reproduction. Even if it is being reproduced for one person it is still being reproduced and published."*⁷³

Production and consumption are no longer binary in the Derridean sense, Bourriard asserts.

"Starting with the language imposed upon us (the system of production), we construct our own sentences (acts of everyday life), thereby reappropriating for ourselves, through these clandestine

⁷³ Carlin, Maurice. 2011. [Ghosts in the Machine: Maurice Carlin's 'The Self Publishers', found art from photocopiers.](#) *Shrieking Violet*.

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

microbricolages, the last word in the productive chain. Production thus becomes a lexicon of practice, which is to say, the intermediary material from which new utterances can be articulated, instead of representing the end result of anything.”⁷⁴

Reproduction is a form of recycling; of consuming and appropriating in a productive sense. The representations of the originals in both art works are signifiers of original value but, through the reproduction processes, have new value generated as well. The reproduction, recycling, representation and contextualisation mean a revaluing of the original content whilst retaining the signified original value, thus providing a dual reading of value.

In the context of contemporary digital sharing and copying, archaic forms of reproduction (photocopying and hand drawing) utilise almost outmoded technology in both art works. Carlin reproduces everyday cultural material using everyday cultural methods; and the Newspaper reproduces specialised artists-using-rubbish cultural materials using quotation and drawing that are traditional academic and art world specific methods. Both these appropriation methods are appropriate to the content and display context, and are therefore content- and context-specific. The appropriation methodologies of the Newspaper, akin dually to recycling aligned with the waste industry and to academic quotation, also generate indeterminacy of use- and exchange-value.

⁷⁴ Bourriaud, Nicolas. 2000. Postproduction: Culture as Screenplay: How art reprograms the world. Lukas & Sternberg. p.24.

Self-publishing and democratised sites of display

Carlin's work centres around the democracy of display as well as (re)production. The self-published nature of the two works discussed here occupy an alternative space to the mainstream art/literature institution distribution networks, however they both operate within the art institution contexts in terms of display.

The display/distribution sites chosen are more often than not artist-run spaces and the Newspaper is also online, which may be considered a democratised virtual space, whilst Carlin's *Self-Publisher* is not available online. Castlefield Gallery in Manchester, where Carlin's *Self-Publisher* was exhibited, is artist-run as are Supermarket Art Fair in Stockholm, and Venn Projects in Blackpool, where the Newspaper was displayed and distributed. (These sites of display are discussed in more depth in exchange chapter.) The artist-run nature of these sites is important, both so that the work is not co-opted or institutionalised, for the purposes of another agenda, and so that the reading experience remains as democratised as possible.

The democratised reading experience is important for the reproduction and appropriation of content to be considered as art work and not as a function of their original purpose. An open reading of the work, not exclusively predefined, allows for the reader to attribute new value to the work, thus creating further value indeterminacy through reader contribution.

“It is the socius, i.e. all the channels that distribute information and products, that is the true exhibition site for artists of the current generation.”⁷⁵

Artist-run spaces may often be more democratic exhibition spaces than a typical hierarchical institution, but may still not provide total autonomy for artist or reader as they are still politicised spaces in other ways of personal rather than institutional nature. Perhaps the internet as democratic space provides an exhibition context which is most open and indeterminate. This area of research requires further testing. However, a conclusion may be reached thus far that appropriation, that is both content- and context-specific, find that certain display sites that are considered to some degree democratic, including the internet, create less-predefined expectation and therefore less determinant value. This finding has led to an identified area of further research in internet based practice based research in this area.

The level of predetermination or expectation of value from sites of display has a significant role, but may not always be a major factor in value accreditation or consistently so. There are additional content-specific notions of display influencing value to be considered that may be more widely applicable when evaluating art that utilises rubbish, which are discussed in the next section.

⁷⁵ Ibid. p.70.

David Shrigley - Untitled (Crap) (2007)

- **Humour and throwaway aesthetics**
- **Good art / poor images**
- **Image and text**
- **Everyday drawing**

Humour and throwaway aesthetics

David Shrigley's practice is best-known for his 'humorous, deadpan, deliberately cack-handed drawings'⁷⁶⁷⁷. Shrigley derives humour from the mundane by taking something familiar and (re)presenting it in such a way that it is absurd, uncanny or ironic. His throwaway aesthetics disarm and signify the world of low culture comic strips within a high culture contemporary art context with different value systems. 'The comic transcends the reality of the ordinary, everyday existence'⁷⁸ Berger noted (cited by Whiteley).

*"For centuries, art has employed humour as a political tool. The
"comedy of waste" occurs in the oscillation between its drawing our
attention to its commonality and familiarity and simultaneously, to its*

76 Higgins, Charlotte. 2013. [Not an artist? You can still have an artwork in the Turner prize exhibition](#). *The Guardian*.

77 Whilst his drawing *Untitled (Crap)* is the specific work that features in the Collection, it is his wider practice that is the subject of this chapter and in particular his printed/published/book works.

78 Berger, Peter. 1997. Redeeming Laughter: The Comic Dimension of Human Experience. *De Gruyter*. p.205. Cited in Whiteley, Gillian. 2005. JUNK: Art and the Politics of Trash: Chapter 4: The Comedy of Waste. *I.B. Taurus and Co. Ltd*

strangeness.”⁷⁹

As a display tactic, humour can engage an audience in a subject that might be otherwise be overlooked, such as rubbish and waste. Waste may be considered intrinsically humorous in its subversive nature, but the chosen throwaway aesthetics exaggerate this.

What is described as 'humour' is of course subjective, and certainly not universally applicable, and might be what other artists/writers call 'interesting' or a plethora of synonyms; playful, witty, amusing, etc. As Whiteley articulates: “Like art, humour is open to multiplicity of readings depending on hermeneutics and the subjectivity of its audience.”⁸⁰ Considering that humour is a value factor with a multiplicity of readings, leads to further value indeterminacy at the juncture of display.

“I've never been the class clown, but I think that humor is very important in life. Humor is just the sugar that you put on top of the message to make it sweeter. Things are so much more accessible if they are funny. It's a good starting point. If you can amuse yourself, that's the best thing. Always, when I create my own work, I'm alone, or at least nobody is looking at what I'm doing, so I'm just speaking

79 Alloway, Lawrence. 1981. *Junk Culture*. Cited by in Whiteley, Gillian. 2005. *JUNK: Art and the Politics of Trash: Chapter 4: The Comedy of Waste: A Load of British Rubbish: Counterworlds and Mirth*. I.B. Taurus and Co. Ltd p.80.

80 Whiteley, Gillian. 2005. *JUNK: Art and the Politics of Trash: Chapter 4: The Comedy of Waste: A Load of British Rubbish: Counterworlds and Mirth*. I.B. Taurus and Co. Ltd. p.84

to myself most of the time. ... I think the best kind of humor is the kind of humor where you don't quite understand what you're laughing at - you intuitively know that there's something there that's both funny and 'other.' Everything should be humorous on some level. Every part of our understanding of the world needs to be a humorous one.”⁸¹

Shrigley's is a more overt display of humour to the subtlety of the Newspaper. The latter is largely dependent on the repetition and excessiveness, whereas there is evident humour within a single drawing by Shrigley. There may be humour in the original artists' work that have been drawn in the Newspaper, but rather than the content explicitly it is the collation and juxtaposition in excess which becomes ridiculous. The display context is also important for the Newspaper, whereas Shrigley's work functions as stand-alone pieces across various media.

“The odd thing for me is that I am kind of a real cartoonist, as well as being a real fine artist, in the sense that my work is filed under humour in the bookshop, sometimes as well as being filed under art. And also a lot of people who look at the work think I'm just one of those comic-book type dudes. Which is nice, but I've got a foot in either camp, as it were. To be honest, in terms of the way my work is received, I feel like I'm taken far more seriously than I should be

81 Shrigley, David. 2005. [King of Books - David Shrigley Interview by Maxwell Williams](#).

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

anyway."⁸²

Shrigley's use of humour and throwaway aesthetics appropriates low culture ideology into high culture, but does not sit exclusively or firmly in either vague, and fluid, category. This crude distinction of what belongs to the somewhat archaic terms 'low' and 'high' culture may be less and less significant in contemporary art debates; however in a wider art historical and social context it seems as stuck as the idea of rubbish-as-art being an outrageously radical gesture. However antiquated these notions, they are still important to the display tactics in terms of the historical context they draw upon to derive humour, meaning and ultimately value.

Good art / poor images

Grayson Perry has a test for identifying 'good art':

"Right the next test I have here, the next boundary post on our trawl around the boundary, is the rubbish dump test. Now this is one of my tutors at college. He had this one. He said, "If you want to test a work of art," he said, "Throw it onto a rubbish dump. And if people walking by notice that it's there and say "Oh what's that artwork doing on that rubbish dump", it's passed. But of course many good

82 Shrigley, David. 2013. David Shrigley: interviewed by Dave Eggers. *Time Out*, London.

artworks would fail that because the rubbish dump itself might be the artwork. Jean Tinguely in 1960 made a piece called Homage to New York, which was this big metal mechanical sculpture that self-destructed itself into a load of scrap. And many artists have used destruction. So that's not a particularly reliable test, the rubbish dump test, but I do like it.”⁸³

This test is perhaps the antithesis of the project's methodological criteria for selecting artworks; if rubbish is 'thrown' into an art context and it is noticed as art, then it is ultimately valid. It's not just the exception to Perry's rule of good artwork - the flaw he identifies - but the reversing of display modes. Furthermore, it is also poignant that this area of research should be the flaw in Perry's logic and a reoccurring schema for a wider art and non-art audience too.

In response to Shrigley's comment; *“I think [HOW ARE YOU FEELING?, 2012, Manchester] is a good exhibition. I don't necessarily think it's good art work.”* he was asked in interview what makes a 'good art work' and responded:

“AB: What do you think makes a good art work? What are the criteria?

DS: Well I don't know what makes a good art work really. I suppose

⁸³ Perry, Grayson. 2013. Reith Lectures 2013: Playing to the Gallery by Grayson Perry. Lecture 2: Beating The Bounds. Recorded at St George's Hall, Liverpool. Broadcast 22/10/13, Radio4.

for me it's that it's interesting and relative to the work I've done before. I don't think you can make brilliant art work, in a way, or at least at the time you've made it you don't know if it's brilliant. I just try and make art works that are good enough to show. I think this show is good enough. The art work is good enough. I think it's a good exhibition because of the context - there's a theme to it. I haven't done that before and I think that makes it better exhibition, albeit not necessarily great art work. A lot of it is dependent on the audience as well.”⁸⁴

The notion of 'good' and 'good enough' reoccurs. Shrigley's style involves exaggerated, often anatomically inaccurate, representations of people and things, whereas the aesthetics in the Newspaper recreate the original proportions approximately, intending to be representational copies; but degraded/reduced copies much like a photocopier produces, would only reproduce some of the visual information received. They are both intentional 'poor' in their respective aesthetics that would have historically questioned the notion of 'good art'.

The notion of 'poor art' is historically linked to the Arte Povera movement:

“The term 'Arte Povera' initially referred not to the use of 'poor'

⁸⁴ [Interview: David Shrigley, Corridor8, October 2012.](#)

*materials, nor to a sociological critique of consumer society, but to the concept of 'impoverishing' each person's experience of the world; this implies gradually freeing one's consciousness from layers of ideological and theoretical preconceptions as well as from the norms and rules of the language of representation and fiction."*⁸⁵

Impoverished experience here is the internet as material source - with information in abundance and riddled layers of ideological and theoretical preconceptions, yet impoverished images. The found images featured in the Newspaper were varied sizes and resolution but were always drawn from the screen. The pixellation, however high, was already a limitation of the image and was further reduced in definition. They are poor images, made poorer by hand and returned to digital.

*"The poor image is a copy in motion. ... The poor image is a rag or rip; an avi or a jpg. ... The poor image has been uploaded, downloaded, shared, reformatted, and reedited. ... The poor image is an illicit fifth generation bastard of the original image. ... Only digital technology could produce such a dilapidated image in the first place. ... Poor images are the contemporary Wretched of the Screen, the debris of audiovisual production, the trash that washes up the digital economies' shores."*⁸⁶

85 Christov-Bakargiev, Carolyn. 1991. *Arte Povera*. Phaidon, London. p.16 p.22

86 Steyerl, Hito. 2012. Wretched of the Screen: In Defence of the Poor Image. *eflux Journal*, Sternberg Press. p.32.

The selection of artworks featured in the Newspaper has been rendered as simple greyscale drawings. This process removed a layer of reality of the filth and mess of the rubbish evident in the photographic documentation of many of the artworks and standardises them. It rendered the often detailed images of rubbish-as-art as flat blocks of grey as if to 'sanitise' the rubbish. Barthes famously said "When written shit does not smell"⁸⁷ and when drawn shit does not smell either.

On the one hand 'sanitising' the rubbish in the images to flat blocks of grey (the filled areas are rubbish are not necessarily true to original image tonality) 'cleans' the image of its rubbish detail, on the other hand it degrades the image further. As photographic representations of rubbish, the original images have already had one layer of the abject reality of rubbish removed and as drawn representations they take this 'cleaning' and impoverishing further.⁸⁸ Due to this impoverishment of the found images, the associated value must be determined through other means.

87 Barthes, Roland. 1971. Sade, Fourier, Loyola. *Editions du Seuil, Paris*. p.140. Cited in Laporte, Dominique, 1978. *History of Shit*. MIT Press. p.10.

88 At the beginning of the drawing process, a lot of time was spent 'cleaning' up the scanned digital versions in the graphics package; smoothing the lines, widening a line here, narrowing it a little there. A line of a square extending past a vertex would have the extra bit of line removed. It was a very laborious process and it wasn't adding anything to the finished image so this 'cleaning' post-editing was ceased. It was a small way into completing the drawings that all the laborious work was lost in a hard drive failure so they were remade from scratch with a new, ever so slightly scrappier aesthetic.

Image and text

“AB: What was the process of making the book and the chapter structure?

DS: I decided on the theme and made a lot of drawings around that theme, then once I felt like I had enough stuff I wrote 10,000 words and whittled it down to 3,000 words and put it together. I don't want things to be contrived and once you have a starting point for book it inevitably is going to contrived to a certain extent. But I tried to avoid that by making texts that didn't describe the images and images that didn't illustrate the text, so there's still an ambiguity to the book and it doesn't quite make any narrative sense. I think in a way the exhibition is a lot more cohesive in terms of an idea than the book. It's my idea of what therapy should be to a large extent.”⁸⁹

Shrigley often combines text into the image itself whereas the Newspaper image-text combinations are more differentiated and relational; more like traditional newspaper column image-text relation. Where Shrigley's text and image sometimes obviously relate, there seems an intentional obscurity to their relationship.

The relationship between the texts and image on each of the Newspaper pages is primarily through the keyword category. Sometimes the text has no

⁸⁹ [Shrigley, David. 2012. Interview: David Shrigley, Corridor8.](#)

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

previous relationship to the images, sometimes the text is interview quotes from the artists whose works are depicted. This variance is a display tactic also employed by Shrigley in his work. There is a lack of consistent text-image relationship which asks the viewer to pay attention to this relational narrative.

The Newspaper also has a variation of framed/non-framed drawings, where the frames are hand drawn as part of the image. However, there is a consistency in aesthetic style which allows the viewer to focus on the other elements of the drawings rather than the aesthetic representation being the main focus. This renders the respective aesthetics 'everyday' or commonplace through repetition and in their excess they become throwaway, and of indeterminate value.

Everyday Drawing

The everyday, throwaway aesthetics embodied in Shrigley's drawings and the Newspaper drawings are the results of everyday drawing practices that can be likened to other everyday practices such as eating, sleeping and defecating. Drawing is a way of processing visual information; of studying it. The visual information is consumed and excreted as drawing; appropriated in

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

a daily practice.⁹⁰⁹¹

“AB: On drawing; is this a ritual for you and what is the best environment for drawing?

DS: It's something I like doing. I find it easy and very enjoyable. In a way my life would be much easier if I just made drawings but when you start making big exhibitions like this it gets complicated and stressful. I don't get stressed when I'm drawing. I don't do it all the time because I don't want to get bored with it. I like to go back to it and be really enthusiastic about it. The last group of drawings was probably in May/June. Next week I'll sit down for about 5 weeks because I've got an exhibition coming up and that's something I really look forward to. Being at home is very pleasurable and it feels very efficient as well.”⁹²

This daily practice of drawing, performed in the home environment as ordinary, does not so much devalue the practice as throwaway through its ordinariness but instead contributes to the value of drawing through the perspective of the everyday. As something assimilated into the realm of the

90 Drawing all the images for the Newspaper became a ritual. 137 drawings in total were made over a few months. They were drawn in a sketchbook from the screen in fine liner pen, scanned and minimally edited in the graphics package making the pen lines solid and 'filling in' the areas in the various greys. The images were drawn in the day, then scanned and 'processed' in the evening, everyday.

91 Around the same time as the rubbish drawings were produced (January 2013), #dailyrubbish was piloted which published some of research findings on social media (Twitter and Facebook synchronised). Each day focussed on one keyword and tweeted links to the artworks and quotes linking back to the keyword page on the project blog. This tested the public reception of the findings to date, also asking for further contributions, and continued until each keyword and blog content was publicised. A surface-level interaction of 'likes' and 'retweets' was observed as well as some people signposting me to other artists' work (including their own sometimes) and rubbish-related articles.

92 [Interview: David Shrigley, Corridor8, October 2012.](#)

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

everyday, its value is that of the everyday; it is neither exclusive nor valueless, but has the potential to become ritual and sacred or throwaway and meaningless. This dichotomy of potential value is signified through the repetitiveness and volume of the drawings displayed. The use of 'poor images' and humour combined with everyday drawing practice complicate a clear definition and therefore easily determinable value.

Exchange: Talking Rubbish

Exchange Theory and Social Exchange Theory are defined in terms of cost-benefit analysis of worth and value:

“Exchange theory includes two approaches to social interaction and relationships. The first approach views people, and individuals in particular, as rationally trying to get what they want or need by exchanging valued resources with others. The second approach focuses on exchanges between groups or social systems as a whole and believes that by participating in a social system based on loyalty and sharing, individuals may contribute and derive benefits from their overall participation in the system.”⁹³

“Social exchange theory proposes that social behavior is the result of an exchange process. The purpose of this exchange is to maximize benefits and minimize costs. According to this theory, people weigh the potential benefits and risks of social relationships. When the risks outweigh the rewards, people will terminate or abandon that relationship. Costs involves things that are seen as negatives to the individual such as having to put money, time and effort into a relationship. The benefits are thing things that the individual gets

⁹³ [Sociology Dictionary](http://sociology.about.com), sociology.about.com

out the relationship such as fun, friendship, companionship and social support. Social exchange theory suggests that we essentially take the benefits and minus the costs in order to determine how much a relationship is worth. Positive relationships are those in which the benefits outweigh the costs, while negative relationships occur when the costs are greater than the benefits.”⁹⁴

These theories underpin social interaction and social exchanges that define exchange-value. Exchange processes continually renegotiate object value, therefore the exchange-value of an object is not a stable thing.

“Modern exchange is not materialistic. It is not objects that people really desire, but their lush coating of images and dreams. Exchange helps to animate objects with value.”⁹⁵

The exchanges discussed here are materialistic in their origins, but ultimately address the abstract notion of value within a social framework. Allan Kaprow's work deals with the exchange of rubbish material (dirt) itself and exchange-value in his wider practice and philosophies of nonart, performance/participation and blurring of art/life. John O'Hare's work deals with social exchanges involving rubbish objects, with their object/language-basis determining value attribution.

⁹⁴ [Psychology Glossary](http://psychology.about.com), psychology.about.com

⁹⁵ Cummings, Neil & Lewandowska, Marysia. 2000. *The Value of Things*. August/Birkhauser. p.76.

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

Kaprow's *Trading Dirt* has a specific relevance to this research project in regards to both the notions of exchange and value when discussing rubbish/dirt in art and also his work and legacy bares a wider significance to this project, so both are discussed in this section. In particular, Kaprow's nonart modes and Happenings are discussed as important influences relevant to this project and beyond.

The specific object and language bases of exchange are analysed, comparing John O'Hare's modes of exchange with the various modes of exchange of the research project. How these modes affect definition and value is explored, with further research areas identified for exploration.

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

Allan Kaprow - Trading Dirt (1985)

- **Rubbish exchange-value**
- **Blurring art/life: Happenings**
- **Blurring art/life: Nonart modes**

“Allan Kaprow spoke of the origins of Trading Dirt: “I woke up one day and had an idea. I would dig a bucket of dirt from the garden, and I'd put the bucket of dirt and a shovel in my truck. On some future day, I'd trade my dirt for someone else's dirt.” He later exchanged it with a bucket of dirt from underneath the teacher's chair at the Buddhist Zen Center in San Diego.”⁹⁶

Rubbish exchange-value

“The use of debris, waste products ... has, of course, a clear range of allusions with obvious sociological implications, the simplest being the artist's positive involvement, on the one hand with an everyday world, and on the other with a group of objects – which, being expendable, might suggest that corresponding lack of status which is supposed to be the fate of anything creative today. These choices

96 Kaprow, Allan. 1997. Allan Kaprow - Just Doing. TDR (1988-) Vol. 41, No. 3, Autumn, 1997. p.101-106.

*must not be ignored, for they reveal what in our surroundings charges the imagination as well as what is the larger issue of reality understood as constant metamorphosis. The viewpoint, the metaphysics, is more fundamental than our "throwaway" culture. The latter is the topical vehicle for the former and, while important, should become something else in time."*⁹⁷

The human condition is fundamental to defining waste and therefore its value. It is our compulsive need to classify and order stuff and things according to use- and exchange-value that ultimately creates rubbish and this classification process is highly subjective. Rubbish is a human construct and no object or material is intrinsically rubbish.

How stuff and things move through categories of in-use, rubbish, recycled and re-used is detailed in Thompsons' Rubbish Theory⁹⁸: Rubbish is not a fixed state – rather it is fluid, and objects and materials do not have the same use-value for everyone. As objects change hands, are recycled, reused, remade or otherwise made useful and valuable, they go through states of production, circulation and consumption. For example; from raw material (production), to what Thompson calls 'transient' (circulation), to in-use (consumption), back to 'transient' (circulation), to rubbish and sometimes to durable (circulation) and back to one of the consumptive states.

⁹⁷ Kaprow, Allan. 1980. Allan Kaprow: Art As Life. Getty Research Institute, LA. p.23.

⁹⁸ Parsons, Liz. 2007. Thompson's Rubbish Theory: Exploring the Practices of Value Creation. Association for Consumer Research.

“He puts forth the idea that value is in fact on a continuum. He puts it in a triangle of how things move from being valued to being rubbish to being in a transitional stage in between being worthless and being valuable.”⁹⁹

This transient nature of things constantly in flux means that value attached to objects and materials is unstable. Through exchange, value is renegotiated and may be only temporarily determined for any given context.

Art and rubbish share common denominators; they are both manmade constructs, have physical manifestations and are commodities with exchange-value. Whilst art tends to be considered high value, rubbish is low value and generally only valued in terms of potential re-usability or as weigh-in scrap. Art that involves the use of waste materials renegotiates the value system and hierarchy of materials, playing with the instability of value.

Gillian Whiteley cites Kaprow's comments on his preference for using the debris of mass culture – 'the medium of refuse' – as part of a purposeful attempt to 'abandon craftsmanship and permanence':

“The use of obviously perishable materials such as newspaper, string, adhesive tape, growing grass or real food... so... no-one can

⁹⁹ Nagle, Robin. 2007. 'Modernity and Waste' roundtable discussion with Jennifer Gabrys, William Kupinse, Robin Nagle, Elizabeth Royte, and Susan Strasser. *Philoctetes Center, New York*.

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

mistake the fact the work will pass into dust or garbage quickly.”¹⁰⁰

This shift away from the readily saleable art object with a pre-determined exchange-value towards valuing everyday exchanges as art not only draws attention to how we (de)value rubbish itself but also the instability of art institutional systems that dictates the value of art. George Dickie's Institutional Theory is particularly relevant here, as summarised by Upper Crust Auction House for the exhibition *Market Value* which the Museum of Contemporary Rubbish participated in:

“George Dickie, an analytical philosopher, challenges traditional theories of aesthetic value, perception and experience. He is most well known for his controversial “institutional theory of art.” Simply put, this theory proposes that an object can only be called “art” within the institution known as the “artworld”. In other words, an object is not “art” in and of itself and can only achieve such valuation within a very specific context. Bradshaw's aesthetic practice can be seen as an active engagement with Dickie's institutional theory as the value of neglected cultural objects is transformed from what we call “trash” into what we call “art.””¹⁰¹

This positions rubbish in the context of art as highly unstable, it's value

100 Kaprow, Allan. 1960. *New Forms - New Media* exhibition catalogue, New York. p.33. Cited in Whiteley, Gillian. 2005. *JUNK: Art and the Politics of Trash*. I.B. Taurus and Co. Ltd

101 [George Dickie: An Analytical Philosopher](#). 2012. *Upper Crust Auction House: Market Value*. Chicago.

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

not easily defined and thus indeterminate. Kaprow's work deals directly with the indeterminate exchange-value of rubbish, which is a key finding of this research.

Blurring art/life: Nonart modes

*"Experimentation also involves attention to the normally unnoticed. I scratch my ear when it itches. I notice the itch, notice my scratching, and notice when the itching stops, if it does. I attend to my raised arm and my fingers pulling at my ear (it's the left one), while discussing politics. But mostly, I scratch itches without noticing.. I learned as a child not to scratch an itch in public, and now that I intentionally notice that I do so anyway, the whole action looms large. It's a little strange, and my conversation about politics loses interest as itching and scratching shine brighter. In other words, attention alters what is attended. Playing with everyday life often is just paying attention to what is conventionally hidden."*¹⁰²

Kaprow's notion of drawing attention to the otherwise hidden or overlooked is particularly resonant in regards to rubbish as a conventionally hidden part of everyday life. To work with rubbish as art is to displace rubbish from its lowly place in society. 'Dirt is matter out of place'¹⁰³ and to

102 Kaprow, Allan. 1997. Allan Kaprow - Just Doing. *TDR* (1988-) Vol. 41, No. 3, Autumn, 1997.

103 Douglas, Mary. 1966. *Purity and Danger*. Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

recontextualises it as art blurs the boundaries of what defines dirt (and its synonymous terms) in the first place as valueless or of low cultural value. This displacement or recontextualisation is something Kaprow addresses in his 'nonart modes' system:

“(1) Work within recognizable art modes and present work in recognizable art contexts.

(2) Work in unrecognizable, i.e. nonart, modes but present the work in recognizable art contexts

(3) Work in recognizable art modes but present the work in nonart contexts.

(4) Work in nonart modes but present the work as art in nonart contexts eg garbage collecting, etc (with proviso that the art world knows about it).

(5) Work in nonart modes and nonart contexts but cease to call the work art, retaining instead the private consciousness that sometime it may be art, too.”¹⁰⁴

However, the idea of rubbish being art is no longer radical. “We no longer find a roomful of dirt ... to be a dubious sculptural gesture.”¹⁰⁵ Rosalind Krauss noted back in 1978, discussing the shift from medium specificity to material specificity, from talking about sculpture to talking about its

104 Kaprow, Allan. 1993. *Essays on the Blurring of Art and Life* (ed. Jeff Kelley). Nontheatrical Performances. University of California Press. p.175.

105 Ellegood, Anne. 2009. Vitamin 3-D: New Perspectives in Sculpture and Installation. *Phaidon* (eds.), London. p.012.

constituent parts.

The material specificity of rubbish in art is relevant to this project particularly for its categorisation as previously discussed, however there is much context-dependency of rubbish-as-art in considering value and exchange-value. Kaprow's nonart modes deal with this notion of context-dependency and have been applied to the artists categorised as 'relevant to practice' featuring in the Dictionary¹⁰⁶.

The results were a majority of 20 out of 35¹⁰⁷ were '(1) Work within recognizable art modes and present work in recognizable art contexts' (with some works categorised as nonart mode 1 or 2).¹⁰⁸ Interestingly, the key artists were less in the majority nonart category of (1) and are categorised as follows:

106 See Appendix 3.

107 For the purposes of this exercise, this analysis presumes all the works to be nonart simply because they work with rubbish materials.

108 Anything has the potential to be considered a recognisable art mode if it is in a recognisable art context; anything in the art gallery is potentially art, more so now than when the nonart modes were published. To be an unrecognisable art mode it need to be novel and rubbish as art is no longer novel and accepted it can be a work of art, dependent on context. Kaprow defined art contexts through his examples as the gallery, the book and the concert hall but now art in the public realm is a much more recognisable art context too.

Key Artist / Artwork	Rubbish Category	Nonart Mode
Mark Dion - Tate Thames Dig (1999)	Remains	(2) Work in unrecognizable, i.e. nonart, modes but present the work in recognizable art contexts
Michael Landy - Break Down (2001)	Remains	(2) Work in unrecognizable, i.e. nonart, modes but present the work in recognizable art contexts or (4) Work in nonart modes but present the work as art in nonart contexts eg garbage collecting, etc (with proviso that the art world knows about it).
Maurice Carlin - The Self-Publisher (2009)	Discards	(1) Work within recognizable art modes and present work in recognizable art contexts.
David Shrigley - Crap (2007)	Crap	(1) Work within recognizable art modes and present work in recognizable art contexts.
Allan Kaprow - Trading Dirt (1982)	Dirt	(4) Work in nonart modes but present the work as art in nonart contexts eg garbage collecting, etc (with proviso that the art world knows about it).
John O'Hare - Dumped (2012)	Rubbish	(2) Work in unrecognizable, i.e. nonart, modes but present the work in recognizable art contexts or (4) Work in nonart modes but present the work as art in nonart contexts eg garbage collecting, etc (with proviso that the art world knows about it).

There is more of a tendency towards nonart modes (2) and nonart contexts (4) for this key artist selection, compared to the overall selection of artists featuring in the Dictionary. However, the project as a whole would fall into Kaprow's first category '(1) Work within recognizable art modes and present work in recognizable art contexts' which aligns with the notion of exchange-value being largely determined by context.

Blurring art/life: Happenings

“Nothing happens or exists in this social world unless it is framed by human performative activity.”¹⁰⁹

Working in nonart modes and nonart contexts often involves a level of everyday social interaction. Without the structures and signifiers of recognisable art modes and contexts, the modes and contexts are variously 'everyday'. In these everyday contexts, social interaction may be framed as performance or participation; an artist performing an action for an audience or participants engaging in exchanges¹¹⁰. The latter in particular is the conceptual foundation for Kaprow's *Happenings* as non-linear participatory performances.¹¹¹

“The line between the Happening and daily life should be kept as fluid, and perhaps indistinct, as possible. The reciprocation between the handmade and the readymade will be at its maximum power this way.”¹¹²

109 Harré, Rom; cited in Hawkins, Harriet. 2010. Visions of Excess: Michael Landy's Break Down and the work of Georges Bataille. *Angelaki: Journal of Theoretical Humanities*.

110 An evolution of practice over the years is noted from process-orientated sculpture which is less publicly performative to more participatory work engaging directly with an audience in the making of the work or as the work. Some earlier work, for example Odd Socks (2003) involved a level of participation asking for odd sock donations from family and friends to use in the work, but historically the work showed was often the 'aftermath' of a process which documents or reveals often labourious and repetitive actions. With more performance-orientated practice emerging in 2009 with £5 Change, where a hole-punched £5 note was exchanged with something of 'equal value', direct object-exchange became a significant area of practice with the Museum of Contemporary Rubbish.

111 The blurring between conversational exchange as performance and everyday conversation is an exciting new area for development that has arisen from this project, with Kaprow's *Happenings* a major historical reference.

112 Kaprow, Allan. 1993. *Essays on the Blurring of Art and Life: The Happenings Are Dead: Long Live the Happenings* (1966). University of California Press.

The conversational exchange involved in the distribution of the Newspaper was an important part of the research process in gaining direct feedback at both Supermarket Art Fair in Stockholm and the Blackpool Museum of Contemporary Rubbish exhibition.¹¹³ The findings of these exchanges were that value can be derived in the exchange itself as opposed to exchange purely being a determinate of value of the object.

Everyday conversation has expectations from each person involved and also context-derived structures, but arguably less so than more formally (institutionally) structured 'artists conversations'. Spontaneous conversation with minimal structure is informal and maintaining such a conversation could be casually (dismissively) deemed 'talking rubbish'. 'Talking rubbish' specifically about the subject rubbish is particularly relevant now precisely for the informality and everyday nature of such an exchange, with minimal art-context structures determining participant expectation and derived value;¹¹⁴ keeping "the line between the Happening and daily life as fluid, and perhaps indistinct, as possible."

113 Conversational exchanges that weren't primarily for this purpose included the Rubbish Conversation with Lars Tharp at The Hepworth Wakefield, January 2014, and a meeting with Professor Maite Zubuairre in July 2012, visiting for her own rubbish research. Again these conversations about artwork and rubbish in general had purposes; a valuation of the rubbish collections sought from Lars Tharp and discussing my work with Prof Zubuairre for her research. These exchanges were more idea exchanges and even less structured from this research project perspective than the newspaper-conversation exchanges, however Tharp and Zubuairre will have had their own structures for object-valuation and research respectively.

114 A foreseeable problem with this area of work will be appropriate documentation.

John O'Hare - Dumped (2012)

- **Dumped: Modes of exchange**
- **First mode: Object-basis**
- **Second mode: Language-based exchange**
- **Third mode: Booklet/newspaper and online exchange**

Dumped: Modes of exchange

Dumped was a project that involved self-selecting participants of various professions, skills and talents¹¹⁵ who were invited to analyse, examine and interpret a list of unusual items of rubbish found deposited anonymously in people's bicycle baskets in Cambridge. Their written analyses sometimes obviously drew upon their accredited knowledge specialisms and ranged from focussing on the rubbish objectively to imaging fictional narratives about the previous owners' identities and the circumstances of the rubbish deposited from the evidence provided. O'Hare made a booklet documenting photographs of the baskets of rubbish along with the participants' narratives, and distributed them through cycling shops as part of Text&Content Cambridge 2012.¹¹⁶

115 ,Participants' professions and skills/interests listed included amateur astrologist, forensic scientist, electrician, patent and trademark secretary/internet addict, archivist, Graphic Design BA student, MPhil Latin American Studies [student], shop assistant, librarian, office worker, post-doctoral researcher, teacher/lecturer economics, politics and international business.

116 The information accessed about Dumped for this research project includes this booklet, the Dumped project blog and an email conversation with O'Hare in August 2013.

Three key modes of exchange are presented here: Firstly there is the object/rubbish exchange (object basis); secondly there is the exchange O'Hare has with his participants resulting in their analyses (language-based); and thirdly the exchange of the booklet and blog as documentation (dual object- and language-based). There are other integral exchanges that take place, for example between the photographer and O'Hare, but these three outlined areas will be the focus of this analysis.

There is a simplistic comparison between the research project and *Dumped* in terms of methodology as both projects sought out specific rubbish materials, analysed them and presented them back to a public in printed format. However, it is the exchanges modes within the methodology that are the specific focus of this chapter.

The variation of object- and language-based exchange methods and the shift within the author's practice from object- to language-based methods will also be discussed. This research project is grounded in the materiality of art made from rubbish as objects, but focusses largely on language-based exchanges: from the defining titles and material specifications of art works, including interviews and conversations with artists and exhibition visitors, to this thesis itself. The shift can be exemplified with two exhibitions that took place at the beginning of the research process¹¹⁷ and then later on, after the

¹¹⁷ Much previous work with rubbish has also incorporated exchange. The Museum of Contemporary Rubbish undertook rubbish exchanges (for example the Ruhr Valley-Calder Valley Exchange; collecting rubbish from the

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

newspaper publication: Museum of Contemporary Rubbish at the Trash Art Exhibition¹¹⁸ in Brighton, September 2012 and the Museum of Contemporary Rubbish solo exhibition¹¹⁹ in Blackpool, March 2014 that will be discussed in this chapter.

First mode: Object basis

The primary focus of the Museum of Contemporary Rubbish is the collected object rubbish. The exchange that takes place when participants 'donate' an item of rubbish changes the status of object from possession to rubbish to Museum Collection Item.

For the Trash Art Exhibition in Brighton, a semi-structured video interview with 10 willing participants was introduced, along with a paper acquisition form that logged basic details about the rubbish item donated (item description, origin, what it was used for and reason for discarding). This information provided participant-defined characteristics of the donated rubbish which shares similarities with O'Hare's participants' anthropological study of rubbish (rubbish which O'Hare considers a socio-geographic anomaly of Cambridge).

Ruhr Valley in Germany, photographing and printing as postcards, to use in exchange for rubbish from the Calder Valley which was then photographed and printed s postcard to send back to the Ruhr Valley) as well as conversational exchange often being part of the performative/participation element of the work - engaging visitors with conversation and inviting them to make 'donations' to the Museum Collections.

118 [Part of the TRASH Conference at the University of Sussex that the Museum of Contemporary Rubbish also presented a paper at.](#)

119 [Rubbish Conversations](#), Blackpool, March 2014.

“Objects are hieroglyphs in whose dark prism social relations lay congealed and in fragments. They are nodes, in which the tensions of a historical moment materialize in a flash of awareness or twist grotesquely into the commodity fetish. In this perspective, a thing is never just an object, but a fossil in which a constellation of forces are petrified. Things are never just inert objects, passive items, or lifeless shucks, but consist of tensions, forces, hidden powers, all being constantly exchanged.”¹²⁰

The object rubbish is not intrinsically rubbish and it requires a socio-anthropological framework to define it as such. Exchange processes highlight this defining framework, or these 'tensions, forces, hidden powers' as Steyerl describes.

One key area that O'Hare's participants tend to focus on is the imagining of how the items became rubbish; how the rubbish has been transformed from object-in-use to object-discarded. The participants of the Museum of Contemporary Rubbish at the TRASH Art Exhibition were asked to describe and define how their possession was rubbish. This process connects the rubbish object with a narrative and renders the object as signifier to an experience, imagined or real.

120 Steyerl, Hito. 2010. A Thing Like You and Me. *eflux Journal* no.15.

*"In contrast to the souvenir, the collection offers example rather than sample, metaphor rather than metonymy. ... Souvenirs act as surrogate experiences, second-hand experiences. The souvenir is always a referent hence always incomplete, and the narrative of the souvenir is not related to the object but to the possessor. Objects can be viewed as indexical of collective memory or as agent of imagined community but the subject rather than the object provide the narrative."*¹²¹

Whiteley's notion of the souvenir can be applied to the rubbish in O'Hare's *Dumped* and the rubbish collected by the Museum of Contemporary Rubbish, as they take on souvenir-characteristic imagined narratives. The referent nature of the souvenir that Whiteley notes is particularly relevant when applied to the art works collected for this research project as "a thing that is kept as a reminder of a person, place, or event."¹²²

The object-base of practice has inspired this whole research project and continues to ground it in material reality, however the language-based exchanges that have been developed into further analysis of the object-based exchange.

121 Whiteley, Gillian. 2005. JUNK: Art and the Politics of Trash: Chapter 4: The Comedy of Waste: A Load of British Rubbish: Counterworlds and Mirth. *I.B. Taurus and Co. Ltd.* p.151.

122 Oxford English Dictionary definition of 'souvenir'.

Second mode: Language-based exchange

*"All contents are good, provided they do not consist of interpretations but concern the use of the book, that they multiply its use, that they make another language within a language."*¹²³

Language is key to the determinacy of rubbish, especially in the broad definition of language including visual communication. Focussing specifically on verbal and written language, however, language-based exchange begins to unpick the nature of rubbish from the basis of how it is defined. Both O'Hare's and this research project are participant-centric with the focus on others' definitions as well the artist's. This ethnographic participant-observer method in language-based exchange leads to a co-production of meaning and therefore value through the derived definitions.

O'Hare's participants were given written accounts of the rubbish found in the bicycle baskets, as opposed to access to the physical objects themselves, from which to make their written analyses. Individual variation in the backgrounds and knowledge of participants brought different perspectives and narratives. For this research project, the language-based exchanges included similarly unscientific, semi-structured interviews, with a variation of face-to-face, email/online and telephone conversations.

¹²³ Deleuze, Gilles. Cited in Bourriaud, Nicolas. Postproduction. 2000. Lukas & Sternberg, New York. p.69.

O'Hare's participants were asked to provide written analyses which were then published in the booklet. The interviews made with artists for this research project informed the analysis and defining criteria for the rubbish categories: The keyword analysis was sought directly from artists with the question, 'Do you have a preferred term for those materials?' and keywords appearing in other correspondence were also factored in¹²⁴. It was important for the artists to define the materials of their own work in these rubbish terms and not a secondary source.

When collecting rubbish for the Museum of Contemporary Rubbish, the exchanges seek a defining statement of the objects, for example: Reason for discarding (eg for the Trash Art Exhibition), or why the object is no longer needed (Ad Ex Rubbish Gallery¹²⁵). For the Rubbish Gallery, this anecdotal narrative is displayed alongside the image of the object. The written anecdotes here provide insight into the history, provenance and value of what is initially labelled as rubbish and valueless.

“Exchange is the mechanism by which objects are acquired, classified and displayed; it is the means via which economies are made visible and, simultaneously, gain a emotional, monetary or material texture. Exchange is also the means by which values are distributed within a society. Although value is an abstract concept,

124 Some parts of these interviews are published in the Newspaper as well as on the project blog; the select quotes which define the artworks discussed according to the keyword categories.

125 [Rubbish Gallery collaboration with Advertising Exhibitions](#).

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

*the slippery nature of terms like 'beautiful,' 'delicate,' 'expensive' or 'disgusting' can be given form by material things. Unlike colour, weight, texture or, occasionally, function, these qualities are not properties of the things themselves, but judgement given form through the objects."*¹²⁶

How the artists surveyed in this project define the materials they work with compares to the keyword terms detailed within the Dictionary section of this project - which was the initial main objective of the research project to define rubbish. The Dictionary as a document is a useful reference tool, but is flawed in that language and values are in constant flux so the Dictionary is only accurate at the time of compiling and quickly outdated. Through the process of language-based exchanges with artists, academics and visitors, it is the exchanges themselves that have become significant as fluid and flexible defining frameworks, rather than a singular definition or set of definitions derived at any one time.

The shift from quite a targeted singular definition focussed exchange to a more open and fluid exchange about rubbish was piloted at the Museum of Contemporary Rubbish Blackpool exhibition in March 2014 with Rubbish Conversations¹²⁷. The opening night was advertised across peer networks and art listing platforms as Rubbish Conversations:

¹²⁶ Cummings, Neil & Lewandowska, Marysia. 2000. *The Value of Things*. August/Birkhauser. p.66.

¹²⁷ [Rubbish Conversations in Blackpool, March 2014](#).

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

“Join Alice Bradshaw for Rubbish Conversations at the opening of the new Museum of Contemporary Rubbish exhibition at Venn Projects, Blackpool, on Friday 14 March 6-8pm.

Rubbish Conversations is a platform specifically designed to facilitate talking rubbish, with complimentary refreshments available.

Guests can drop in at any time over the course of the evening to contribute on any topic concerning crap, debris, detritus, dirt, discards, garbage, junk, leftovers, litter, refuse, rejects, remains, rubbish, ruins, scrap, shit, shreds, trash and waste.

Alice has recently been talking rubbish with Antique's Roadshow's [Lars Tharp at the The Hepworth, Wakefield](#) as well as previous interviews with several artists working with rubbish, discards and detritus.

Further information can be found on Alice's Artists Talking Rubbish blog http://www.a-n.co.uk/artists_talking/projects/single/2334120”

Findings from the opening night highlighted the value of the opportunity to talk rubbish; exchanging information directly between visitor and artist about the work. The semi-structured nature of the conversations created a

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

specific framework that staged the informal discussions. Unlike 'artists talks' which have a certain formality and seriousness in the main, or general opening night conversation that is at the same time open yet still conformative to art institutional norms, the Rubbish Conversations were something of a blend of the two.¹²⁸

Third mode: Booklet/newspaper and online exchange

The exchange of ideas through publications is a key part of both O'Hare's and this research project. These exchanges return to an object-basis through the physical booklet and Newspaper respectively as objects that have exchange-value, but also have object- and language-derived content. This dual object- and language-base of the content presented as image and text is previously discussed in the Display chapter, however it is the knowledge exchange through both physical object exchange as well as online exchanges that is explored next.

Both O'Hare's booklet and the Newspaper were free at the point of distribution and were small (limited) print editions. To place a monetary value on the work devalues it in that the price tag becomes the predetermined one-dimensional value overriding any further (de)valuing. To have no marked monetary price tag leaves its value more open and indeterminate. Exchanging

¹²⁸ Rubbish Conversations continues to be a major interest that needs further exploration in practice including methods of documentation as this is something not yet explored in any depth at this preliminary stage.

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

the newspaper for money would have compromised the work. Pragmatically it would have hindered distribution, but also for the Newspaper particularly the potential for it to become rubbish itself (i.e. thrown away, recycled) is potentially lower than if it had a pre-determined monetary value.

Avoiding monetary exchange-value means that other exchange-values can be considered without this burden. There is greater value placed on the newspaper/booklet as documentation of a process and as starting point for conversation (social exchange) and even potential use-value for others with a research interest in this field. The gift economy¹²⁹ at play with the exchange of a physical newspaper/booklet is also something to be explored further with its relationship to conversation.

There were little means to track where the Newspapers went and what people did with them; whether they ended up in the paper recycling bin, in archives or degrading in wasteland. O'Hare's booklet is plastic bound and a more physically substantial document, possibly with greater potential to become part of a library or archive, whereas the Newspaper is thin newsprint that will rip, tear, fade and deteriorate over time. For the Newspapers to ultimately end up as rubbish and be recycled completes a cycle of being derived from and ending up as rubbish as well as highlighting the impermanent nature of the content as being 'accurate as the time of publication'.

129 Moore, Gerald. 2011. *Politics of the Gift: Exchanges in Post-Structuralism. Speech, Sacrifice and Shit: Three Orders of Giving in the Thought of Jacques Lacan.* Edinburgh University Press.

Both O'Hare's publication and the Newspaper were distributed in a way that enabled people to actively choose to take a copy from selected locations, rather than unsolicited 'littering' through junk mail shots, for example, that is more akin to the littering that O'Hare studies in his work.

The two distribution locations selected for the Newspaper were Supermarket Art Fair in Stockholm¹³⁰ (approximately 80 copies) and the Museum of Contemporary Rubbish solo exhibition at Venn Projects in Blackpool (approximately 30 copies). O'Hare distributed his booklets through independent bike shops in Cambridge and the largest second hand book store.

The two contrasting Newspaper distribution locations of a large, independent international contemporary art fair in a capital city and a small artist-run project space in a Northern seaside town sought contrasting responses to the Newspaper. As art institutions, it was anticipated the audience would have some knowledge of contemporary art. O'Hare chose to seek audiences familiar with the subject matter of bicycles as accidental rubbish receptacles instead as the thematically appropriate context.

At the Supermarket Art Fair, a few different exchange approaches were tested when distributing the newspaper.¹³¹ The findings were an active self-

¹³⁰ Presented by Paper Gallery, Manchester, February 2014.

¹³¹ The Newspapers were presented stacked on the floor at Paper Gallery's stand with a small label "Alice Bradshaw – Rubbish Newspaper (2014) FREE". Visitors picked up the newspaper, flicked through it and often laughed, before deciding to either placing back on the pile or taking it away with them. This passive participant-led exchange

instigated exchange approach was most effective in determining the value of the work, although a mixed approach allowed for various recipient responses to be evaluated.

One of the key findings from the Supermarket Art Fair was the comparison between Shrigley's work and the Newspaper drawings. The drawing of Shrigley's work features in the first CRAP section (alphabetical) so is often one of the first images people see. As one of the better-known artists, people would identify with this work quickly and make a comparison with the simplistic drawing style. This response to the Newspaper and ensuing conversational exchange prompted the decision to include Shrigley as one of the key artists in this thesis.

A second key finding was the notion of excess as people conveyed their impression of it being a substantial, bordering on obsessive, piece of work - as opposed to being frivolous or throwaway idea - which almost contradicts the throwaway nature of the Newspaper. Again this was a key input into this thesis with the discussion of Landy and Bataille's excesses.

The third key finding was that in order to develop in depth exchanges involving the Newspaper, a smaller and more dedicated exhibition would be

approach wasn't very successful other than to see people find the newspaper humorous. Another approach adopted was to take copies to exhibitors who were representing artists that had a connection with the work (working with rubbish materials). This more targeted approach promoted a more active exchange and two-way process of disseminating the work and finding more about other artists' work. Taking on this role of newspaper distributor to the largely stand-bound exhibitors proved a useful method to instigate exchanges and in retrospect might have benefited being a more staged performance with newspaper bag or other signifying props.

required and Rubbish Conversations was developed for the Blackpool show.¹³²

Lastly, the online exchange involved in this research project is a valuable contribution. Unlike the booklet/newspaper, online exchange is potentially instantly world-wide and unlimited. O'Hare's blog similarly has documentation of his process but does not have an online version of his booklet available to view/download. The online documentation O'Hare provides is content not included in the booklet and provides another dimension to the project, in a similar way that the project blogs are constituent parts, and is most like the a-n blog providing additional process narrative.

As previously mentioned, the project blog and a-n blog form part of this project portfolio and there is also the Museum of Contemporary Rubbish blog which this project grew from. In addition, social media has been utilised with regular updates and links back to the blogs as well as the #dailyrubbish exercise¹³³. Types of exchanges that took place online include Facebook 'likes' of posts, Twitter retweets and sometimes people discussing other related

¹³² The Blackpool was the pilot of the Rubbish Conversations which took place in March shortly after Supermarket Art Fair. The installation involved photographic and video work and the newspapers were displayed in a stand with a waiting room style seating area designed to encourage people to take a seat and read the newspaper in situ and/or engage in conversation. This part of the exhibition proved popular with plenty of conversational exchange taking place. As the show was dedicated to rubbish and Rubbish Conversations advertised beforehand, people had more time and inclination to offer their own rubbish stories and anecdotes in exchange for finding out more about the rubbish work. This model has great potential to develop further as practice based research on this subject.

¹³³ #dailyrubbish was an exercise undertaken in January 2013 publishing some of the research findings on social media (Twitter and Facebook synchronised) as #dailyrubbish. Each day focussed on one keyword and tweeted links to the artworks and quotes linking back to the keyword page on the project blog. This tested the public reception of the preliminary findings to date and also asked for further contributions and continued until each keyword and blog content was publicised. Visitor statistic provided by wordpress for the project blog: 932 visitors and 2578 view in 2013, 1001 visitors and 2038 views in 2014, 360 visitors and 878 views in 2015 as of April 2015.

works and sending links to news articles concerning rubbish; spontaneously engaging in the research process sharing related information. The Newspaper pdf link has also been shared across social media¹³⁴ which provides more information about who has accessed a copy over people taking paper copies at the exhibitions, but reveals equally little about how it has been received in any qualitative sense.

Discussed also in the Display chapter, this online presence spans both Display and Exchange as viewers engage in exchange through blogs and social media. The potential for viewer interaction and exchange with online media is huge and underdeveloped within the context of this project. Time has been the main constraint in utilising online networking. Such limits included #dailyrubbish running only for a limited period only and blogs being updated weekly/fortnightly on average. Again, social media context was found to be a great potential to be explored further with the relationship between the subject rubbish and the ephemeral nature of online communication. This finding comes full circle from where this research project started as the online-based Museum of Contemporary Rubbish, concluding that online exchange is a potentially valuable method for further investigation into the relationship between value and the use of rubbish in art practice.

134 65 downloads: 62% UK, 15% US, 5% Ireland, 3% Romania, 3% New Zealand, 2% Israel, 2% Spain, 2% Australia, 2% Turkey, 2% Germany, 2% Serbia, 2% Greece, 2%France. Statistics provided by bit.ly, April 2015.

Conclusion

Findings: Overview

The research question attempts to understand the relationship between value and the use of rubbish in art practice. Through analysis of the selected Collection, Display and Exchange methodologies, the findings show that definitions are fluid, and value indeterminate, and are often determined by context and personal subjectivities.

Our evaluations of what is 'rubbish' and 'art' or 'useful/non-useful' and 'good/bad' is both content and context dependent and are not fixed values. Apparent polar opposites of 'rubbish' and 'art' are blurred notions that are explored in many art works using rubbish materials. Indeed, temporal value judgements of 'rubbish' and 'art' are often at the core of such art works.

This research began through a desire to understand more about the subject of rubbish in art practice. One of the earlier conclusions drawn was the enormity of the field of rubbish in general. As an academic subject the existing research is multidisciplinary, often existing within disparate disciplines, and the resultant body of research is therefore interdisciplinary in its potential use. In the field of contemporary art it is widely relevant with

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

diverse applications evidenced in the practice overview. However, the application of this research is not limited to the field of contemporary art and has potential use in related fields such the environmental awareness campaign *Waste Less Live More* which introduces contemporary art ideas of rubbish in a non-art context. This could be applied to various scenarios outside of the contemporary art field.

Findings: Collection

The Collection methodology utilises a bricolage approach and appropriates elements of both archaeological and waste industry methodologies and terms in the research process. Institutional theory forms part of the critical framework of the research and an ethnographic participant-observer research position allows for direct exchange in practice based research.

Collection as critical framework of practice and cataloguing as a performance of self finds that language is a central component to the research. The Dictionary derived from the 19 keyword categories of the Collection attempts to provide understanding through definition as per the research question, but finds that critical dictionaries are not definitive and therefore incomplete as stand alone components of understanding. Therefore the research has manifested itself as interconnected outcomes of the

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

Dictionary, Newspaper, and project blogs.

The Dictionary, Newspaper, and project blogs elements of the Collection as a whole highlight that one form is not complete enough to fulfil the research function. Additionally, in seeking definitions of rubbish synonymous terms and art works that resonate with the author's work through a Dictionary format, it was found that the opposite form of the Newspaper that presented the non-similar 'discarded' material was actually more revealing in seeking definition and value of these terms.

Findings: Display

As a Display function, the Newspaper is impermanent and throwaway, unlike the Dictionary which suggests a definitive function. The Newspaper has a dual quality of being potential rubbish and meta-rubbish which develops an indeterminate reading and therefore value. As an artwork, it is therefore dually rubbish and art which positions it comparably to the content it studies in terms of use and value.

The appropriation methodologies, akin dually to recycling aligned with the waste industry and academic quotation, generate indeterminacy of use- and exchange-value. Appropriation that is both content- and context-specific finds that certain display sites that are considered to some degree democratic,

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

including the internet, create less-predefined expectation and therefore less determinant value. This has led to further research in this area being identified.

Humour and throwaway aesthetics as display tactics find that antiquated notions of 'high' and 'low' culture are still relevant in deriving meaning and value in contemporary art due to historical context. Notions of 'good art' are still very much debated as a crucial element in understanding subjective value. The relationship between value judgements of 'good art' and 'rubbish' is muddled here and the use of 'poor images' combined with everyday drawing practice complicates a clear definition and determinate value.

Findings: Exchange

Through investigating the relationship between value and use of of rubbish in art practice, exchange is found to be a key value-system. However, the exchange-value of everyday rubbish generally is indeterminate, making its value within art practice often subject to institutional valuation systems such as aesthetic value. Despite this, the indeterminacy of rubbish remains an intrinsic part of value as an inescapable reality of the everyday context of the material.

Allan Kaprow's nonart modes are used to analyse this recontextualising or displacement of everyday rubbish in art which finds exchange-value is largely determined by context. The duality of exchange in terms of object and language exchange analysed here is a key finding regarding the indeterminacy of exchange-value and is identified as a further research area to be explored.

The details of this indeterminacy need further exploration to analyse key influencing variables applicable to the relationship between value and rubbish in art. This is something that may be achieved through practice based research that provides specific example to study as opposed to generalised theory in the abstract.

Omissions

The initial reduction of the research scope leaves potentially much more relevant work to be done. Certain major avenues have not been discussed in depth, not because they are irrelevant, but because there simply has not been time or space to explore them in sufficient detail and some reduction in scope has been necessary to be specific in such a wide field.

For example, virtual/digital rubbish-as-art was specifically omitted in this project due to the object/material-basis of the enquiry. However, through

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

the project development, the informal language basis of exchange in understanding the value of rubbish-as-art has proven fundamental and a further area to develop, which will most likely include in the virtual/digital realm. The question of whether there still needs to be a material/object basis of this further investigation is yet to be answered.

The focus on material waste in art in this study has also largely omitted waste of other non-material things such as time. Wasting time as art and the relationship to labour and value is another significant area of exploration. The relationship between wasting time and material waste as documentation that is evident in some studied art works has not been developed in this thesis. Again, there is much potential for further work in this area and also links in with notions of value of online exchange also as 'wasting time'.

What Next?

"We really ought to free ourselves from the significance of words!"¹³⁵

Perhaps the focus on language is a misnomer in investigating the relationship between value and rubbish in art practice and a 'misleading insignificance' in defining original things of different but similar values, as Nietzsche would argue. However, such inherent flaws of language may

135 Nietzsche, Friedrich Wilhelm. 1909-13. *Beyond Good and Evil*. Gutenberg Press.

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

provide fruitful material for art practice that explores these inconsistencies.

The language-basis development of defining the value of rubbish in art practice has shifted from seeking a fixed notion to a more fluid notion that is changing and adapting in every social interaction. The indeterminacy of language and attributable value has been the key finding of the current research, and further research is necessary to understand the implications more fully.

The move towards conversational practice as artistic exchange is a key practice development with conversational practice about rubbish identified as an area for further development.¹³⁶ Having utilised conversation as part of art practice previously, especially in development, this aspect is now much more in the foreground (for example framed as Rubbish Conversations) and is documented and presented as a key part of the process. The notion of conversational practice as dialogical process appears expansive in existing research, but not as much in (current) knowledge when talking specifically about rubbish. From the preliminary work undertaken, there is evidence of interdisciplinary theory around conversation as practice, as well as other artists who utilise conversation in practice, but not specifically with the subject rubbish.

This new direction of practice based research proposes to use a

¹³⁶ Earlier audio and print work *Blah Blah Blah* (2010) took an earlier notion of talking rubbish to an extreme of incoherence through repetition, using words as material compositionally.

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

dialogical method¹³⁷ to develop an understanding of the fluid language-based value of rubbish in art practice.

“The definition of conversation (that is, the most simple description of the most simple conversation) might be the following: when two people speak together, they speak not together, but each in turn: one says something, then stops, the other something else (or the same thing), then stops. The coherent discourse they carry on is composed of sequences that are interrupted when the conversation moves from partner to partner, even if adjustments are made so that they correspond to one another. The fact that speech needs to pass from one interlocutor to another in order to be confirmed, contradicted, or developed shows the necessity of interval. The power of speaking interrupts itself, and this interruption plays a role that appears to be minor—precisely the role of a subordinated alteration. This role, nonetheless, is so enigmatic that it can be interpreted as bearing the very enigma of language: pause between sentences, pause from one interlocutor to another, and pause of attention, the hearing that doubles the force of locution.”¹³⁸

Everyday conversation has expectations from each participant involved and context-derived structures also, but less so than formal structured 'artists

137 E.g. Mikhail Bakhtin.

138 Blanchot, Maurice. 1993. *The Infinite Conversation: Plural Speech: (the speech of writing)*. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis and London.

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

conversations' which may predetermine meaning and value to a greater extent. Spontaneous conversation with minimal structure is informal and maintaining such a conversation could be casually (dismissively) deemed 'talking rubbish'. 'Talking rubbish' specifically about the subject rubbish is particularly interesting precisely for the informality, ephemerality and everyday nature of the subject and the exchange itself, with minimal art-context structures determining participant expectation and value.

Engaging with ideas through conversation as participation is a fundamentally pedagogical concept of experiential learning. In blurring the distinction between artist and participant(s), both/all are participants in the conversation with no/less hierarchy and each person bringing something (knowledge and value) to the process (collaboration)¹³⁹. The notion of co-production of research in conversation as collaboration (online and offline) is also currently underdeveloped in this thesis and therefore has further research potential.¹⁴⁰

A potential problem with this proposed area of work will be appropriate

139 This collaborative pedagogy has previously been investigated in practice in the form of the University of Incidental Knowledge, see <https://universityincidentalknowledge.wordpress.com/> for more information.

140 As an artist with a practice very much grounded in the material world, describing practice as object-based, the emphasis of art practice has largely been on objects and materials. However as a curator, a previously considered separate role, the focus of that side of practice was largely on the human perception and particularly interaction with objects and materials. Both aspects of practice informed each other and had previously merged to some degree. However, through this project it is clearer now how much more blurred this artificial distinction between the roles has become, along with the roles of researcher and writer. This project hasn't been about the heavily problematised notions of 'artist' and 'curator' and so on that are subject to endless debate, but it is worth noting that through this project, perspective on applying these terms to art practice has shifted. As an artist who also curates sometimes, the role as a peer to the other artists on collaborations is important. The institutional hierarchy that can exist is of little benefit in the projects undertaken and this non-hierarchical approach with participants in potential collaborations will be equally important in the further research.

documentation. Another key area of development arising through this research has been the role of drawing in practice. Drawing has featured in previous work¹⁴¹, but has mainly been limited to developmental drawing that is not included in the finished exhibited work. This area of work is something that has begun to be further developed.¹⁴² The relationship between image and text that has been briefly discussed in this thesis has potential for further work investigating the relationship between language-based exchange and drawing, although this may possibly be a tangential line of enquiry.

141Most notably the A6 zine collaboration with Bob Milner, e.g. A6 Part 4
<https://aliceandbobcurate.wordpress.com/2012/08/27/a6-part-4/>

142Recent work developing this notion includes a micro-artists' residency at South Square in Bradford, Residual Projects, where the residue/remains of previous exhibitions are drawn and developed throughout the residency period affected by 'rubbish conversations' with gallery visitors.
<http://www.southsquarecentre.co.uk/index.php?/centre/dec-14/>

References

- Alloway, Lawrence (1961)
Junk Culture
Architectural Design 31, no 3
- Barthes, Roland (1971)
Sade, Fourier, Loyola
Editions du Seuil, Paris. p.140
- Bataille, George (1972)
Critical Dictionary Vol 1. No.7: Formless
Documents
- Bataille, George (1985)
Visions of Excess: Selected Writings (1927-1939)
University of Minnesota Press
- Berger, Peter (1997)
Redeeming Laughter: The Comic Dimension of Human Experience
De Gruyter, p.205
- Blanchot, Maurice (1993)
The Infinite Conversation: Plural Speech: (the speech of writing)
University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis and London
- Borges, Jorge Luis (1942)
The Analytical Language of John Wilkins
Selected Non-Fictions, Penguin Books, 1999
- Bourriaud, Nicolas (2000)
Postproduction: Culture as Screenplay: How art reprograms the world
Lukas & Sternberg, p.24, 69
- Buchloh, Benjamin H.D. (1982)
Parody and Appropriation
Francis Picabia, Pop and Sigmur Polke
- Carlin, Maurice (2011)
Ghosts in the Machine: Maurice Carlin's 'The Self Publishers', found art from photocopiers
Shrieking Violet
- Christov-Bakargiev, Carolyn (1991)
Arte Povera
Phaidon, London, p.16, 22
- Crang, Michael (2012)
Negative images of consumption: cast offs and casts of self and society
Environment and Planning A, volume 44, p763.

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

Cummings, Neil & Lewandowska, Marysia (2000)
The Value of Things
August/Birkhauser, p.29, 30, 66, 76

de Certeau, Michel (1984)
The Practice of Everyday Life
University of California Press

Dion, Mark (1997)
Mark Dion
Phaidon, London, p.16, 18, 25, 33

Dion, Mark (1999)
Mark Dion: Archaeology
Black Dog Publishing, London, p.28

Douglas, Mary (1966)
Purity and Danger
Routledge & Kegan Paul, London

Ellegood, Anne (2009)
Vitamin 3-D: New Perspectives in Sculpture and Installation
Phaidon (eds.), London, p.012

Foucault, Michael (1966)
The Order of Things: An archaeology of the human sciences
Editions Gallimard, Paris. (English tr. 1970, Routledge, London and New York.)

Hawkins, Harriet (2010)
Visions of Excess: Michael Landy's Break Down and the work of Georges Bataille
Angelaki: Journal of Theoretical Humanities, p.19, 20, 22, 28

Higgins, Charlotte (2013)
Not an artist? You can still have an artwork in the Turner prize exhibition
The Guardian

Kaprow, Allan (1997)
Allan Kaprow - Just Doing
TDR (1988-) Vol. 41, No. 3, p.101-106

Kaprow, Allan (1960)
New Forms - New Media exhibition catalogue, New York. p.33

Kaprow, Allan (1980)
Allan Kaprow: Art As Life
Getty Research Institute, LA, p.23

Kaprow, Allan (1993)
Essays on the Blurring of Art and Life
University of California Press. ed. Jeff Kelley

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

Landy Michael (2001)

Michael Landy: Break Down: 'A Production Line of Destruction': Parts of a Discussion between Michael Landy and Julian Stallabrass, November 2000
Artangel, London, p.107-8

Landy, Michael (2008)

Everything Must Go
Ridinghouse, London

Landy, Michael (2012)

Michael Landy in conversation with Richard Calvocoressi
Henry Moore Lecture Theatre, Leeds Art Gallery

Lefebvre, Henry (1961)

Clearing Ground
Documents of Contemporary Art: The Everyday, ed. Stephen Johnstone (2008)
Whitechapel and The MIT Press

Lippard, Lucy (1997)

Six Years: The Dematerialization of the Art Object from 1966 to 1972
University of California Press

Moore, Gerald (2011)

Politics of the Gift: Exchanges in Post-Structuralism. Speech, Sacrifice and Shit: Three Orders of Giving in the Thought of Jacques Lacan
Edinburgh University Press

Nagle, Robin (2007)

'Modernity and Waste' roundtable discussion with Jennifer Gabrys, William Kupinse, Robin Nagle, Elizabeth Royte, and Susan Strasser
Philoctetes Center, New York

Nietzsche, Friedrich Wilhelm (1909-13)

Beyond Good and Evil
Gutenberg Press

Noys, Benjamin (2000)

George Bataille: A Critical Introduction, Chapter 1: The Subversive Image
Pluto Press, London

Parsons, Liz (2007)

Thompson's Rubbish Theory: Exploring the Practices of Value Creation
Association for Consumer Research

Perry, Grayson (2013)

Reith Lectures 2013: Playing to the Gallery by Grayson Perry. Lecture 2: Beating The Bounds
Recorded at St George's Hall, Liverpool. Broadcast 22/10/13, Radio4

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

Shrigley, David (2012)

David Shrigley interviewed by Alice Bradshaw
Corridor8

Shrigley, David (2005)

King of Books - David Shrigley Interview by Maxwell Williams
New York

Shrigley, David (2013)

David Shrigley: interviewed by Dave Eggers
Time Out, London

Smithson, Robert (1996)

The Collected Writings
University of California Press, p.112

Steyerl, Hito (2010)

A Thing Like You and Me
eflux Journal no.15

Steyerl, Hito (2012)

Wretched of the Screen: In Defence of the Poor Image
eflux Journal, Sternberg Press, p.32.

Whiteley, Gillian (2005)

JUNK: Art and the Politics of Trash: Chapter 4: The Comedy of Waste: A Load of British Rubbish: Counterworlds and Mirth
I.B. Taurus and Co. Ltd, p.80,84, 151

Wills, Brian (1994)

Damaged Goods: A Product you could Kill For
New Museum of Contemporary Art, New York

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

Bibliography

Appadurai, Arjun (ed.), 1986

The social life of things: Commodities in cultural perspective
Cambridge University Press, New York

Attlee, James & le Feuvre, Lisa, 2003

Gordon Matta-Clark: The Space Between
Nazraeli Press.

Bataille, George, 1972

Critical Dictionary Vol 1. No.7
Documents

Bataille, George, 1985

Visions of Excess: Selected Writings (1927-1939)
University of Minnesota Press

Botha, Ted, 2004

Mongo: Adventures in Trash
Bloomsbury

Bourriaud, Nicolas, 2000

Postproduction: Culture as Screenplay: How art reprograms the world
Lukas & Sternberg

Brady, Candida, 2012

Trashed
Blenheim Films

de Certeau, Michel, 1984

The Practice of Everyday Life
University of California Press

Carlin, Maurice, 2011

Ghosts in the Machine: Maurice Carlin's 'The Self Publishers', found art from photocopiers
Shrieking Violet

Christov-Bakargiev, Carloyn (ed.), 1991

Arte Povera
Phaidon, London

Collins, Jeff; Mayblin, Bill, 2005

Introducing Derrida
Icon Books, London

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

Costello, Diarmuid & Vickery, Jonathan, 2007
Art: Key Contemporary Thinkers
Berg, Oxford.

Crang, Michael, 2012
Negative images of consumption: cast offs and casts of self and society
Environment and Planning A, volume 44

Cummings, Neil & Lewandowska, Marysia, 2000
The Value of Things
August/Birkhauser

Dickie, George, 2001
Art and Value
Blackwell Publishers, UK

Dion, Mark, 1999
Mark Dion: Archaeology.
Black Dog Publishing, London

Dion, Mark, 1997
Mark Dion
Phaidon, London

Ellegood, Anne, 2009
Vitamin 3-D: new Perspectives in Sculpture and Installation
Phaidon, London

Evans, David (ed.), 2009
Documents of Contemporary Art: Appropriation
Whitechapel/The MIT Press

Fer, Briony, 2005
Part Object Part Sculpture: The Scatter: Objects as Leftovers
Pennsylvania State University Press

Foster, Hal, 1996
Return of the Real: The Artist as Ethnographer?
MIT Press

Foucault, Michael, 1966
The Order of Things: An archaeology of the human sciences
Editions Gallimard, Paris
English tr. 1970, Routledge, London and New York

Fiennes, Sophie (dir), 2010
Over Your Cities Grass Will Grow
Amoeba Film, Ksander & Sciapode Production

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

Haggith, Mandy, 2008

Paper Trails: Trees to Trash – The True Cost of Paper
Virgin Books, London

Hawkins, Harriet, 2010

Turn your trash into . . . Rubbish, art and politics. Richard Wentworth's geographical imagination
Social & Cultural Geography, Vol. 11, No. 8

Hawkins, Harriet, 2010

Visions of Excess: Michael Landy's Break Down and the work of Georges Bataille
Angelaki: Journal of Theoretical Humanities.

Hodge, Oliver (dir), 2007

Garbage Warrior
Open Eye Media UK, ITVS International & Sundance Channel

Johnstone, Stephen (ed.), 2008

Documents of Contemporary Art: The Everyday
Whitechapel, UK

Kaprow, Allan, 1980

Art As Life
Getty Research Institute, LA

Kaprow, Allan, 1993/2003

Essays on the Blurring of Art and Life
University of California Press.

Kelley, Mike, 2004

The Uncanny
Verlag der Buchhandlung WalterKönig._

Krauss, Rosalind, 1978

Sculpture in the Expanded Field
October/MIT Press

Kuspit, Donald, 2008

The Triumph of Shit
Artnet

Laporte, Dominique, 1978

History of Shit
MIT Press

Landy, Michael, 2001

Break Down
Artangel, London

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

Landy, Michael, 2001
Break Down
Illuminations Media

Lippard, Lucy, 1966
Pop Art
Thames and Hudson

Lippard, Lucy, 1997
Six Years: The dematerialization of the art object
University of California Press

Merewether, Charles (ed.), 2006
Documents of Contemporary Art: The Archive
Whitechapel / The MIT Press

Moore, Sarah. A, 2000
Garbage Matters: Concepts in new geographies of waste
Progress in Human Geography

Muniz, Vik, 2010
Waste Land
Lucy Walker (dir), Almega Projects and O2 Films Production

Noble, Tim & Webster, Sue, 2011
British Rubbish
Skira Rizzoli

Orozco, Gabriel, 2012
Asterisms
Guggenheim Museum Publications, New York

Pavitt, Jane (ed.), 2002
Brand.New
V&A Publications, London

Perry, Grayson, 2013
Reith Lectures 2013: Playing to the Gallery
BBC

Parsons, Liz, 2007
Thompson's Rubbish Theory: Exploring the Practices of Value Creation
Association for Consumer Research

Rogers, Heather, 2005
Gone Tomorrow: The Hidden Life of Garbage
The New Press

Shrigley, David, 2012
Brain Activity
Hayward Gallery Publishing, London

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

Shrigley, David, 2012
How Are You Feeling?
Canongate Books, Edinburgh

Shrigley, David, 2012
What The Hell Are You Doing? The Essential David Shrigley
Canongate Books, Edinburgh

Steyerl, Hito, 2012
Wretched of the Screen
eflux Journal, Sternberg Press

Strasser, Susan, 1992
Waste and Want: The Other Side of Consumption
German Historical Institute

Varda, Agnès, 2000
Les gGaneurs et la Glaneuse [The Gleaners and I]
Zeitgeist Films, New York

Vergine, Lea, 2007
When Trash Becomes Art
Skira Rizzoli

Viney, William, 2012
Mark Dion and the Arts and Archaeologies of Waste
Material World

Whiteley, Gillian, 2005
Junk: Art and the Politics of Trash
I.B. Taurus and Co. Ltd

Williams, Raymond, 1976
Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society
Oxford University Press, New York

Wills, Brian, 1994
Damaged Goods: A Product you could Kill For
New Museum of Contemporary Art, New York

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

Appendices

Appendix 1: Dictionary

Appendix 2: Historical Overview: Timeline

Appendix 3: Categorisation by Kaprow's Nonart Modes

Appendix 1: Dictionary

Introduction

19 synonymous keywords have been identified as being in current and common usage and act as catalysts to better understand my own work and work of others. Through the categorisation of works into the 19 keyword categories and subsequent analysis, the comparative and defining features of these works can be identified and discussed.

The OED definitions of each of these 19 keywords feature various synonyms, referring to each other as mapped out in the diagram (overleaf). The direction arrow indicates which way the definition refers; i.e. the definition of “ruins” refers to “remains”, but “remains” doesn't use any of these synonymous terms, whereas “debris” is defined using the terms “remains” and “rubbish.” “Dirt” and “shreds” are exceptions in that they don't directly refer, or are referred, to any other terms but have been casually linked through additional definition terms.


There is no hierarchy of the keywords or static linear order, but for the purposes of this thesis the categories are discussed alphabetically as they appear in the dictionary.

Each Dictionary entry has the following structure:

- **Keyword**
- *Pronunciation*
- *OED definition*
- *Origin (from OED)*
- Defined by which other keywords (see overleaf diagram)
- Key artworks
- Author's notes

In each entry, the italicised pronunciation, definition, origin and also the keyword definition are borrowed from the OED. The selected key artworks are those that have been deemed similar in some way to the author's own work and therefore eligible for comparative grouping according to the author's practice. The author's notes expand on the definition with some subjective ideas about the meaning and value of each keyword.

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste



Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

CRAP

Pronunciation: /krap/

Noun [mass noun]: 1 something of extremely poor quality; nonsense; unwanted articles; rubbish. 2 excrement. [in singular] an act of defecation. Verb (craps, crapping, crapped) [no object]: 1 defecate. 2 (crap on) talk at length in a foolish or boring way. Adjective (British): extremely poor in quality.

Origin: Middle English: related to Dutch krappe, from krappen 'pluck or cut off', and perhaps also to Old French crappe 'siftings', Anglo-Latin crappa 'chaff'. The original sense was 'chaff', later 'residue from rendering fat', also 'dregs of beer'. Current senses date from the late 19th century.

Defined by: rubbish
Key artworks: none

Crap is something substandard like a really badly made plastic toy or electronic device that doesn't function properly or at all; crap TV when you flick through every channel several times, hoping that something new has started on another channel since last time you looked, but it hasn't; a crap situation - "This is just crap"; something that is irredeemably crap - the toy cannot be remade, the situation cannot be remedied.

Crap in its physical form is related to excrement, but it can also be something made (particularly handmade) without skill or knowledge; a crap cake for example. A crap cake is not literally made from excrement, but it has failed somehow. It's not risen, sugar has been forgotten, too much raising agent has caused it to expand and flow out of the tin like volcanic lava all over the oven bottom. It's not just a rubbish cake that might be misshapen or a bit dry, it's a complete failure and inedible.

Art can be said to be crap. Following from the cake analogy, art made without much skill or knowledge will often be deemed crap. Crap art can be made by anyone. It doesn't need an amateur artist to produce an unskilled and naïve work, famous artists can produce crap art too. A lot of crap art produced, not just produced but exhibited too. The crappiest art personally encountered was an anatomically malformed woman wielding a sword, naked except for boots and a bit of armour, riding an equally anatomically malformed horse with a psychotic expression. It was in a series submitted to an open salon and exceptionally crap. But in it's extreme crapness, it was really quite special, so special that it deserves a mention in this Dictionary.

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

There's a fine line between crap and genius. Something can have crap qualities but actually be brilliant. This is an age old dichotomy documented throughout art history and 'crap' can actually just be outside of an art establishment consensual norm.

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

DEBRIS

Pronunciation: /ˈdeɪbriː, ˈdeɪbriː/

Noun [mass noun]: scattered pieces of rubbish or remains; loose natural material consisting especially of broken pieces of rock

Origin: early 18th century: from French débris, from obsolete débriser 'break down'

Defined by: rubbish or remains, but smaller parts

Key Artworks: Gabriel Orozco - Astroturf Constellation (2012)

Debris is a quantity of rubbish made of smaller constituent parts. Debris is the remaining fragments of or from something bigger or whole. In terms of natural materials such as rocks, debris is smaller broken pieces of rock, broken away from a larger rock for example, before the smaller pieces are worn down and eroded into sand particles. Therefore debris is the interstitial stage of stuff between being part of a solid whole thing (like a large rock) and being part of a loose whole thing (like sand). In its interstitial state, debris, like dirt, is temporarily matter out of place (Mary Douglas).

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

DETRITUS

Pronunciation: /dɪ'trɪtəs/

Noun [mass noun]: waste or debris of any kind: gravel, sand, silt, or other material produced by erosion; organic matter produced by the decomposition of organisms.

Origin: late 18th century (in the sense 'detrition'): from French détritus, from Latin detritus, from deterere 'wear away'

Defined by: waste and debris
Key Artworks: Amanda Ross-Ho – Restraining Order (2005)
Richard Dupont – Assisted Head (2011)

Detritus is connected strongly to the everyday/quotidien and is ordinary. Its probably collections made daily or over a specific period of time, in a bin or usual waste receptacle, or is specific to a location such as beach detritus or studio detritus.

Detritus surrounds us. It is present in hoards and large quantities and maybe on industrial scales. Its multiplicity is not unique to this category. Detritus is both generic and specific.

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

DIRT

Pronunciation: /də:t/

Noun [mass noun]: 1 a substance, such as mud or dust, that soils someone or something: soil or earth; informal excrement; a state or quality of uncleanliness. 2 informal information about someone's activities or private life that could prove damaging if revealed

Origin: Middle English: from Old Norse drit 'excrement', an early sense in English

Defined by: casual link with shit (excrement).
Key Artworks: Allan Kaprow – Trading Dirt (1985)

Dirt is connected to poverty and poor materials. As often organic matter that has decomposed to the point of being unidentifiable by eye, the unknown contents can make it can be dark, sinister and immoral or have such connotations; the unseen 'horrors' are the threat of death from disease.

Dirt is actually useful and has value as compost. It has use and exchange value, but is marginalised by society as low value and undesirable.

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

DISCARDS

Pronunciation: /di'ska:dz/

Noun plural: things rejected as no longer useful or desirable

Origin: late 16th century (originally in the sense 'reject (a playing card)': from dis- (expressing removal) + the noun card

Defined by: rejects

Key Artworks: Daniel Bass – Lost Shoes (2006 – 2012)
Hayley Newman – Domestique (2010-13)
Jonathan Callan – The Defrauder (2006)
Hiroshi Fuji – Central Kaeru Station – Where have all these toys come from? (2012)
Richard Wentworth – Questions of Taste (1997)
Martin Soto Climent – Impulsive Chorus (2010)
Christian Boltanski – No Man's Land (2010)
Maurice Carlin – The Self Publisher (2009-2011)

The use of the term *discards* implies knowledge of the discarding process; either through undertaking that process yourself or having evidence of that process. Other synonymous terms such as rubbish or litter may have accidentally found themselves as such as the lost item. This assumes that it is not possible to accidentally discard something.

Discarding is the decision that the object is no longer of use; a decision the Museum of Contemporary Rubbish asks people to make when donating items a Collection. “Have you got any items of rubbish on you that you no longer have a use for, and would like to donate to the Museum?” as people are asked to root through their pockets and bags and discard items; temporarily assign them as rubbish before the Museum acquires them to the collection. This discarding process is as varied as much as the objects but can be loosely categorised into two types: The first is a relatively quick discard where the donor has already considered the item rubbish and happens to still have item on their person – usually intending to take the item home to recycle or waiting to find a nearby bin. The decision part of the process has already occurred and the physical act of discarding remains. The second is when the item has not previously been categorised as rubbish and the discard process must involve the decision of whether the item is still of use.

Discards are generally small and fragmentary. The process of discarding is a physical act and related to the body. Throwing, dropping and pushing away

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

require the discards to be manoeuvrable with human force. Plural in definition, discards are numerous, perhaps to incalculable extremes. Discards share common features. Whether it is through their origins, discarding process or through post-discarding affinities.

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

GARBAGE

Pronunciation: /'gɑːbɪdʒ/

Noun [mass noun] chiefly North American: rubbish or waste, especially domestic refuse; worthless or meaningless material or ideas; unwanted data in a computer's memory.

Origin: late Middle English (in the sense 'offal'): from Anglo-Norman French, of unknown ultimate origin

Defined by: rubbish, waste and refuse.
Key Artworks: Silvio Giordano – Packaging's Life (2009)
Justin Gignac – NYC Garbage (2001-present)
Mike Kelley – Garbage Drawing #59 (from 'Seventy-Four Garbage Drawings and One Bush') (1998)

Garbage is domestic. It is household rubbish put out in wheelie bins and accumulating in landfill. It is unsorted, mixed general waste. Garbage is generic. In its domesticity it is non-threatening, regular garbage.

Garbage is an American term but much more widely used in the UK nowadays. Garbage has come across the Atlantic through our TV and cinema screens presented as neat little bags of domestic garbage that the husband (usually male and married) puts out as their household chore. As it is on the screen, the smell of garbage is an imagined sense. The rotting, repugnant stench of garbage does not translate well through audio-visual means. The screen has sanitised garbage as it has brought the term over from America.

Garbage and garbled have the same root word, neither which have anything to do with garb (clothing). Language can be garbage; talking garbage, speaking garbage, uttering garbage - like gibberish.

You can feel like garbage. How to empathise with garbage? Garbage is sick, but not dying. It's going to be around for a while longer but right now, temporarily, it is in a bad way.

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

JUNK

Pronunciation: /dʒʌŋk/

Noun [mass noun]: 1 informal old or discarded articles that are considered useless or of little value; worthless writing, talk, or ideas; a person's belongings; US vulgar slang a man's genitals. 2 informal heroin. 3 the lump of oily fibrous tissue in a sperm whale's head, containing spermaceti. Verb [with object] informal: discard or abandon unceremoniously

Origin: late Middle English (denoting an old or inferior rope): of unknown origin. junk1 (sense 1 of the noun) dates from the mid 19th century.

Defined by: discards

Key artworks: none

Junk is useless, often obsolete items. It may be poor functioning tat or low value items such as plastic junk or junk food. Junk can also unknown potential value, the fine line between junk and antiques noted by Robert Hughes in *Shock of the New: The Threshold of Liberty* (1980): "That was in the good old days before they started calling junk antiques." It is miscellaneous and ended up together in quantity through coincidence.

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

LEFTOVERS

Pronunciation: /'leftəʊvə/

Noun: something, especially food, remaining after the rest has been used

Adjective [attributive]: remaining; surplus

Origin: left + over: Middle English leven, Old English lǣfan (from base of lāf remainder; Old High German leiban (bleiben to remain)

Defined by: remains

Key Artworks: Breuk Iversen - Offal (2003)

David Shapiro - Consumed (2003)

Tom Friedman - Untitled (Eraser Shavings) (1990)

Leftovers are things that did not quite get finished or used up and are put into little boxes, packets and jars for later.

Leftover food always tastes better the next day. There is a fine line between batch cooking from which you eat one portion as soon as it's done, saving the rest for subsequent meals, and cooking primarily for one meal where any leftovers will be eaten at another meal.

Some people don't save leftovers. There is a big trend now for cooking with leftovers (e.g. Masterchef and Guardian column).

Whilst leftovers often refers to food stuffs, it can also widely be applied to creative (craft) processes where materials are being used in an initially unknown quantity: The leftover bit of wool from a knitting project; the leftover paint squeezed from the tube but not applied to the surface.

In sculpture, traditionally two main processes apply; addition and subtraction. Addition involves starting with nothing and building up with the raw material(s). Subtraction starts with the raw material(s) and takes away. Both processes often produce leftovers. Addition leftovers have never been used - they have been gathered, prepared or set aside for use but not yet used. Subtraction leftovers have at one time been part of the object/sculpture; the original whole. They have, through the sculpting process, been removed and left over. Both these types of leftovers have reuse potential but they are, at the time of sculpting, the leftovers of that process.

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

LITTER

Pronunciation: /'lɪtə/

Noun 1 [mass noun]: rubbish such as paper, tins, and bottles left lying in an open or public place; [in singular]: an untidy collection of things lying about; 2 a number of young animals born to an animal at one time; 3 (also cat litter) [mass noun]: granular absorbent material lining a tray in which a cat can urinate and defecate when indoors; 4 [mass noun]: straw or other plant matter used as bedding for animals; (also leaf litter) decomposing but recognizable leaves and other debris forming a layer on top of the soil, especially in forests; 5 historical: a structure used to transport people, containing a bed or seat enclosed by curtains and carried on men's shoulders or by animals; a framework with a couch for transporting the sick and wounded.

Verb [with object]: 1 make (a place or area) untidy with rubbish or a large number of objects left lying about; [with object and adverbial] leave (rubbish or a number of objects) lying untidily in a place; (usually be littered with) fill with examples of a particular thing, typically something bad or unpleasant; 2 archaic provide (a horse or other animal) with litter as bedding.

*Origin: Middle English (in litter (sense 5 of the noun)): from Old French *litiere*, from medieval Latin *lectaria*, from Latin *lectus* 'bed'. Sense 1 dates from the mid 18th century*

Defined by: rubbish

Key artworks: Yuken Teruya – Golden Arch Parkway McDonalds (2005)
Giuliana Sommantico – Repeated / Differential Icons (2009)

Litter is untidy. It is regular, common and everyday in our exterior environment. It is a few items, in the plural, but not so many to create heaps and mountains. It is scattered and subject to the elements; blown in the wind, bleached by sunlight and drenched by rain. It is unsightly and disrupting natural or manmade lines and spaces.

Litter might also be organic matter out of place like dirt (Douglas) such as twigs, leaves, especially in a manmade space.

Litter is dropped and left. Much of litter is from eating food on the go, and also smoking; consuming as we navigate the landscape. Litter is careless and lazy. Litter is unnecessary: It is unnecessary packaging unnecessarily dropped a couple of metres from the bin.

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

REFUSE

Pronunciation: /ri'fyʊz/

Verb [no object]: indicate or show that one is not willing to do something; [with object] indicate that one is not willing to accept or grant (something offered or requested); informal (of a thing) fail to perform a required action; [with object] decline to accept an offer of marriage from (someone); [with object] (of a horse) stop short or run alongside (a fence or other obstacle) instead of jumping it.

Origin: Middle English: from Old French refuser, probably an alteration of Latin recusare 'to refuse', influenced by refutare 'refute'

Pronunciation: /'ref,yʊs, -,yʊz/

Noun: matter thrown away or rejected as worthless; trash

Origin: late Middle English: perhaps from Old French refusé 'refused', past participle of refuser

Defined by: rejects and trash

Key artworks: none

Refuse as the noun, by association to refuse as the verb, tends to be consciously and definitively rejected as useless. It is not accidental litter or casual trash, but systematically discarded material. Refuse is general, non-specific and often domestic but it could extend to the industrial. Refuse may be aggregate and tend to merge into one whole as opposed to identifiable constituent parts, for example when decomposition has begun and refuse has become a sludge like consistency. Refuse is destined for the tip or landfill and is found in bin liners, piles or trucks being moved around or transported. It has no owner, except for the municipal waste management, and paradoxical to being in constant movement, is considered in a final end-state after useful life.

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

REJECTS

Pronunciation: /ri'jektz/

Verb [with object]: dismiss as inadequate, inappropriate, or not to one's taste; refuse to agree to (a request); fail to show due affection or concern for (someone); rebuff; medicine show an immune response to (a transplanted organ or tissue) so that it fails to survive.

Pronunciation: /'rējekt/

Noun: a person or thing dismissed as failing to meet standards or satisfy tastes

Origin: late Middle English: from Latin reject- 'thrown back', from the verb reicere, from re- 'back' + jacere 'to throw'

Defined by: refuse

Key Artworks: Michael Landy – Art Bin (2010)

Sarah Nicole Phillips – Curbside Object Status Tags (2010)

Rejects have a specific history of human rejection. This process can be performative and focusses on the subjective decision and power to render the object rejected. There is often an anthropomorphic tendency to empathise with the inanimate reject and consider emotively the inherent 'sadness'. The unwanted, orphaned rejects resonate with the working conditions of artists - actual, perceived or imagined – as rejected social/institutional outcasts.

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

REMAINS

Pronunciation: /ri'mānz/

Noun plural: the parts left over after other parts have been removed, used, or destroyed; historical or archaeological relics; a person's body after death.

Origin: late Middle English (occasionally treated as singular): from Old French remain, from remaindre, from an informal form of Latin remanere (see remain)

Defined by: leftovers

Key Artworks: Michael Landy – Break Down (2001)
Mark Dion – Tate Thames Dig (1999)
Hans Schabus – Remains of the Day (2011)

Remains are leftover from a process of destruction or consumption. The aftermath of an event or lifespan; they are the dead. They speak mainly about the absence of the destroyed or consumed as evidence of that process.

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

RUBBISH

Pronunciation: /'rəbiSH/

Noun: waste material; refuse or litter; material that is considered unimportant or valueless; absurd, nonsensical, or worthless talk or ideas

Verb [with object] British informal: criticize severely and reject as worthless

Adjective British informal: very bad; worthless or useless

Origin: late Middle English: from Anglo-Norman French rubbous; perhaps related to Old French robe 'spoils'; compare with rubble. The change in the ending was due to association with -ish. The verb (1950s) was originally Australian and New Zealand slang

Defined by: waste, refuse and litter

Key Artworks: Marcel Duchamp – Fountain (1917)

Fran Crowe – A Present From... (2007)

John O'Hare – Dumped (2012)

Rubbish is the default category of all things wasted and lacking in value. Rubbishing ideas or objects is part of the daily selection processes that everybody participates in. By selecting one thing over the others, everything else in that particular context is rubbish. It is everyday/quotidien nature because it is everywhere and part of everything. It is domestic and personal or global and generic.

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

RUINS

Pronunciation: /'rʊɪnz/

Noun: the physical destruction or disintegration of something or the state of disintegrating or being destroyed; the remains of a building, typically an old one, that has suffered much damage or disintegration; the disastrous disintegration of someone's life; the cause of the disintegration of a person's life or loss of their assets; the complete loss of one's money and other assets
Verb 1 [with object]: reduce (a building or place) to a state of decay, collapse, or disintegration; cause great and usually irreparable damage or harm to; have a disastrous effect on; reduce to a state of poverty. 2 [no object] literary fall headlong or with a crash

Origin: Middle English (in the sense 'collapse of a building'): from Old French ruine, from Latin ruina, from ruere 'to fall'

Defined by: remains
Key artworks: none

Ruins are closely related to buildings and archaeology as well as monuments. The key defining factor of ruins is that they are manmade and have degraded over time by nature or war usually. They are beyond repair and have been neglected and not maintained somehow in history. There is violence associated with ruins; they are products of war and destruction.

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

SCRAP

Pronunciation: /skrap/

*Noun: 1 a small piece or amount of something, especially one that is left over after the greater part has been used; bits of uneaten food left after a meal, especially when fed to animals; used to emphasize the lack or smallness of something; (informal) a small person or animal, especially one regarded with affection or sympathy; a particularly small thing of its kind. 2 (also scrap metal) discarded metal for reprocessing; [often as modifier] any waste articles or discarded material, especially that which can be put to another purpose
Verb [with object]: discard or remove from service (a retired, old, or inoperative vehicle, vessel, or machine), especially so as to convert it to scrap metal; abolish or cancel (something, especially a plan, policy, or law) that is now regarded as unnecessary, unwanted, or unsuitable*

Origin: late Middle English (as a plural noun denoting fragments of uneaten food): from Old Norse skrap 'scraps'; related to skrapa 'to scrape'. The verb dates from the late 19th century

Defined by: leftovers and discards
Key Artworks: John Chamberlain (1958)
 César - Three Compressions (1968)

Scrap is strongly associated with scrap metal but not limited to metals alone. Scrap maintains economical value but minimally with little or no use or exchange value. They are fragments, irregular, scruffy and untidy.

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

SHIT

Pronunciation: /SHit/

Noun (vulgar slang): 1 faeces [in singular] an act of defecating. 2a contemptible or worthless person. 3 something worthless; garbage; nonsense; unpleasant experiences or treatment. 4 personal belongings; stuff. 5 any psychoactive drug, especially marijuana.

Verb: 1 [no object] expel faeces from the body; soil one's clothes as a result of expelling faeces accidentally; be very frightened. 2 [with object] tease or try to deceive (someone)

Exclamation: an exclamation of disgust, anger, or annoyance.

Origin: Old English scitte 'diarrhea', of Germanic origin; related to Dutch schijten, German scheissen (verb). The term was originally neutral and used without vulgar connotation

Defined by: garbage

Key artworks: none

Shit is mainly excrement and stinks, but can be generally derisive and casual. It's worthless and at the bottom of the value hierarchy.

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

SHREDS

Pronunciation: /SHredz/

Noun: a strip of some material, such as paper, cloth, or food, that has been torn, cut, or scraped from something larger; [often with negative] a very small amount

Verb: 1 [with object] tear or cut into shreds. 2 [no object] play a very fast, intricate style of rock lead guitar

Origin: late Old English scrēad 'piece cut off', scrēadian 'trim, prune'; related to shroud

Defined by: linked to scrap

Key Artworks: Ni Haifeng - Paraproduct (2008)

Jeannie Driver - Rising Tides of Bureaucracy (2010)

Mark Wagner - Dollar Broom (2011)

Shreds are fragments and often strips of paper or fabric/textiles. The shredding process can be violent and mostly deliberate and systematic. Shreds are specific in shape/form as well as material (shreddable such as paper or fabric) and are therefore the most specific category in terms of material and form. The material is not durable and is easily manipulated, however is labour intensive to produce and then quickly destroyed.

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

TRASH

Pronunciation: /traSH/

Noun: discarded matter; refuse; cultural items, ideas, or objects of poor quality; a person or people regarded as being of very low social standing

Verb [with object]: 1 informal damage or wreck; discard; (computing) kill (a file or process) or wipe (a disk); criticize severely; intoxicated with alcohol or drugs. 2 strip (sugar cane) of its outer leaves to ripen it faster.

Origin: late Middle English: of unknown origin. The verb is first recorded (mid 18th century) in trash (sense 2 of the verb); the other senses have arisen in the 20th century

Defined by: discards and refuse.

Key Artworks: Max Liboiron – New York Trash Exchange (2010)

Trash is the American version of rubbish in that it's everyday/quotidien. It is generic and mainly domestic.

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

WASTE

Pronunciation: /wāst/

Verb: 1 [with object] use or expend carelessly, extravagantly, or to no purpose; bestow or expend on an unappreciative recipient; fail to make full or good use of. 2 [no object] (of a person or a part of the body) become progressively weaker and more emaciated; [with object] archaic cause to do this. 3 [with object] literary devastate or ruin (a place); informal kill or severely injure (someone). 4 [no object] literary (of time) pass away; be spent.

Adjective: 1 (of a material, substance, or byproduct) eliminated or discarded as no longer useful or required after the completion of a process. 2 (of an area of land, typically in a city or town) not used, cultivated, or built on.

Noun: 1 an act or instance of using or expending something carelessly, extravagantly, or to no purpose; (archaic) the gradual loss or diminution of something. 2 material that is not wanted; the unusable remains or byproducts of something. 3 a large area of barren, typically uninhabited land. 4 (Law) damage to an estate caused by an act or by neglect, especially by a life-tenant.

Origin: Middle English: from Old Northern French wast(e) (noun), waster (verb), based on Latin vastus 'unoccupied, uncultivated'; compare with vast

Defined by: discards and remains.

Key Artworks: Song Dong – Waste Not (2010)

Waste is generic and can be domestic or industrial, organic or toxic. There are many subcategories. It is a clinical/industrial term almost removing the human element from the production process. Wasted implies it could have had an alternative use.

Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

Appendix 2: Historical Overview: Timeline



Rubbish and other Crap, Debris, Detritus, Dirt, Discards, Garbage, Junk, Leftovers, Litter, Refuse, Rejects, Remains, Ruins, Scrap, Shit, Shreds, Trash and Waste

Appendix 3: Categorisation by Kaprow's Nonart Modes

Category	Date	Artist/Title	Nonart Mode	Nonart mode categorisation notes
DEBRIS	2012	Gabriel Orozco – Astroturf Constellation	1 & 2	Debris from the field and photographs presenting in gallery context (arguable that the debris from the field is (2) as on a plinth and conforming to art object presentation norms)
DETRITUS	2005	Amanda Ross-Ho – Restraining Order	1	Sculpture including studio detritus in gallery context
DETRITUS	2011	Richard Dupont – Assisted Head	1	Detritus cast in resin (easily recognisable art mode) presented in gallery context, on plinth
DIRT	1982	Allan Kaprow – Trading Dirt	4	Dirt from garden to under chair of Buddhist teacher's chair, and subsequent trading, then later 're-enactments' by others
DISCARDS	1997	Richard Wentworth – Questions of Taste	4	Collected contemporary discards, presented in museum context (proviso that contemporary rubbish is distinguished from old rubbish and museum context is not gallery context)
DISCARDS	2006	Jonathan Callan – The Defrauder	1	Sculpture from discarded books in gallery contexts
DISCARDS	2006	Daniel Bass – Lost Shoes	1	Photographs of discarded shoes in gallery contexts
DISCARDS	2009	Maurice Carlin – The Self Publisher	1	Discarded photocopies, collating, in gallery contexts
DISCARDS	2010	Christian Boltanski – No Man's Land	1	30 tons of discarded clothing, presented at The Armoury, NY; an industrial shed turned art venue. Although the industrial nature of the installation blurs the boundaries of 1 and 2, piles of clothing are not novel (see Pistoletto, 1967)
DISCARDS	2010	Martin Soto Climent – Impulsive Chorus	1	Discarded beer cans arranged in a particular formation, presented in gallery contexts
DISCARDS	2010	Hayley Newman – Domestique	1	Altered discarded dish cloths, presented in gallery contexts
DISCARDS	2012	Hiroshi Fuji – Central Kaeru Station – Where have all these toys come from?	2	50,000 toys, presented in gallery contexts, although toys in galleries is not novel, singularly or in large quantities, the sheer volume may be novel
GARBAGE	1998	Mike Kelley – Garbage Drawing #59 (from 'Seventy-Four Garbage Drawings and One Bush')	1	Drawings in gallery contexts
GARBAGE	2001	Justin Gignac – NYC Garbage	3	Packaged garbage selections presented as tourist souvenirs
GARBAGE	2011	Silvio Giordano – Packaging's Life	1	Art video in gallery/festival context
LEFTOVERS	1990	Tom Friedman – Untitled (Eraser Shavings)	1 or 2	An arrangement of eraser shavings in gallery contexts with the usual identifications of art work. Similar to Boltanski and Fuji that that quantity of material might not have been seen in an art context before so is novel, and similar to Climent that the careful arrangement 'gives aay' the art mode status
LEFTOVERS	2003	Breuk Iversen – Offal	1	Art world leftovers, presented back in art contexts
LEFTOVERS	2003	David Shapiro – Consumed	2	Leftovers installed with retail shelving but in gallery context
LITTER	2005	Yuken Teruya – Golden Arch Parkway McDonalds (Red Yellow)	1	Sculptured paper bag presented in gallery contexts
LITTER	2009	Giuliana Sommantico – Repeated / Differential Icons	1	Photographs of litter presented in gallery contexts
REFUSE	2010	Nicola Dale – Down	1	Sculpted refuse book pages in gallery contexts
REJECTS	2010	Michael Landy – Art Bin	1	Vitrine set up in gallery context
REJECTS	2010	Sarah Nicole Phillips – Curbside Object Status Tags	4	Non-art mode more akin the museum/archaeology, presented on the curbside (but documented and subsequently presented as art)
REMAINS	1999	Mark Dion – Tate Thames Dig	2	Non-art mode more akin to archaeology, presented in gallery contexts
REMAINS	2001	Michael Landy – Break Down	2 or 4	Industrial conveyor belt break down process in a disused Oxford St shop, but labelled up as art exhibition
REMAINS	2011	Hans Schabus – Remains of the Day	2	Collected everyday remains presented in gallery contexts, laid out in categories/rows a little archaeological
RUBBISH	2007	Fran Crowe – A Present From...	3	Packaged beach rubbish presented as souvenirs
RUBBISH	2012	John O'Hare – Dumped	2 or 4	Participants analyse, examine and interpret rubbish found deposited in people's bicycle baskets in Cambridge
SCRAP	1958	John Chamberlain – Nutcracker	2 (at the time)	Crushed scrap car
SCRAP	1968	César – Three Compressions	2 (at the time)	Crushed scrap car parts
SHREDS	2008	Ni Haifeng – Paraproducton	1 or 2	Textile shred sewing factory set up (participatory) with large scale hanging, art contexts
SHREDS	2010	Jeannie Driver – Rising Tides of Bureaucracy	3 or 4	Shredded paper (in excess) in ground floor, street view office.
SHREDS	2011	Mark Wagner – Dollar Broom	1	Rolled and cut dollar bills replacing broom bristles, in art contexts
TRASH	2010	Max Liboiron – New York Trash Exchange	1	Trash-model landmark participant exchange (contextualised via invitation/instruction) in art context
WASTE	2012	Song Dong – Waste Not	2	His mother's waste hoard, displayed in some form of category order, in art contexts