

“Marking and Missing: memory-performance and the radical present”

Sarah Kanouse
Southern Illinois University, Carbondale

Abstract: The widespread impulse toward delimiting memorial space is often expressed through visible gestures of spatial marking: naming a street, building a monument, erecting a plaque. These practices frequently seek to “make the past present” by making visible some referent to a historic event. However, the *performance* of memory—understood both as vernacular practices and self-consciously artistic gestures—foregrounds the *act* of spatial marking in ways that rupture common Western assumptions about the linearity of time and contiguity of space. While cultural geographers have become increasingly sensitive to the role of performance and performativity in the production of space, artists have begun to explore space as a significant conceptual, aesthetic, and political ground for performative works. This paper examines three recent politically-engaged performative memorials from artists working at various scales—Jeremy Deller, John Malpede, and Ledia Carroll—to argue for performance’s ability to enact a spatio-temporal transposition that is simultaneously utopian *and* situated in present space, inhabitable, even producible, by real social actors.

In 2001, London artist Jeremy Deller conceived and coordinated “The English Civil War Part II,” a re-enactment of a brutal, police-instigated confrontation with striking miners that took place in Orgreave, South Yorkshire in 1984, at the height of the Thatcher government’s campaign to squash any vestige of trade union power.¹ Though Deller employed a re-enactment specialist and a number of professional re-enactors, scores of locals volunteered to portray miners and police in the epic event. Many of these residents had been involved in the original battle seventeen years earlier, and more than a few found themselves reconstructing the positions, movements and actions of people who had been on the other side of the confrontation. The re-enactment, colloquially called “The Battle of Orgreave,” provided an opportunity for collective reassessment of an event that had shattered the community—and the British labor movement—years before. Months of research, interviews, and rehearsals required examination of every aspect of that painful day, and local miners were enthusiastic participants in what they described as a deeply emotional experience.²

In September of 2004 Los Angeles artist John Malpede and Appalshop, a cultural center and filmmaking cooperative based in Appalachian Kentucky, organized a caravan across the state.³ The two-day drive was part of “RFK in EKY,” a restaging of Robert F. Kennedy’s historic “Poverty Tour” of 1968 designed to collect information about rural poverty and locals’ ideas for combating it. At stops and intervals corresponding to the siting and timing of Kennedy’s original route, Malpede and his collaborators recreated the marching bands, crowds, public officials, hearings, and testimonials based on news accounts, government documents, and four years of research and interviews with the original participants. Resonances between 1968 and 2004 were apparent to everyone:

both were major election years during an increasingly unpopular war; issues of poverty and malnutrition (hunger in 1968, obesity in 2004) plagued urban and rural communities; anxieties about the environment and the economy ran high; and the sense of a crisis in a fundamental understanding of what the United States meant was palpable.⁴ The project's afterlife has included ongoing work of sorting documentation and reunions to consider how the reenactment prompted critical thinking about present-day concerns through spatial and temporal articulations about a not-at-all distant past.

On October 22, 2006, San Francisco artist Ledia Carroll outlined a lake that doesn't exist anymore. Using a field chalk marker, she traced the outline of Lago Delores, site of the first Spanish mission in what would become San Francisco and part of a vast marshland long ago filled in as the city grew. "The Mission Lake Project" also involved an afternoon picnic barbecue and an "Alley Cat" bike race that included five stops at sites of historical significance along the "shoreline."⁵ Her commemoration of this vanished lake—which is also mentioned in passing in a California historical plaque—suggests that the ways in which the environment has been sculpted by the needs of "civilization," or capital, is an ongoing, never-complete project. After the events, the line haunted the pavement of Mission District streets with its elegant and impermanent meanderings that over time washed or blew away in puddles or plumes that restaged the long-ago disappearance in the present.⁶

What these three projects 'produced'—a battle, a collection of documents, and a vanishing line—are exemplary of an approach to commemoration that foregrounds the role of performance and gestuality in not only marking but actively *producing* memorial space. If the marking of space in the name of time is a significant part of most

commemorative strategies, these projects and others like them might be said to “transpose” spaces and times in ways that reorder the spatio-temporal parameters of memory work. In this paper, I want to talk about commemorative strategies drawn from the arts that intentionally and self-consciously complicate the governing spatial metaphors of memory in order to articulate memorial space as something dynamic, fluid, productive and critical. Transpositional strategies—whether spatial or temporal overlay, adjacency, or enactment—shift the commemorative emphasis from the ‘mark’ made to the action of ‘marking,’ from *representation* to *representing*. These gestures— which I describe as *performative* in the sense that they are imbued with a discursive, symbolic, and embodied significance beyond their instrumental effects—cut against the assumed consistency of space through time as well as the “common sense” linearity of history. They also tend to incorporate a social aspect where distinctions between spectator and participants blur to create a dynamic, if temporary, relation among history, space, and the social.

As an artist, the examples I use are drawn from visual, media, and performance art. While cultural geographers have become increasingly sensitive to the role of performance and performativity in the production of space, artists have begun to explore space as a significant conceptual, aesthetic, and political ground for performative works. Recent scholarship on public memory coming out of history, anthropology, architecture, performance studies, and, of course, cultural geography has increasingly been aware of the interrelations between space and “performance”—defined broadly as both gestures imbued with self-conscious, symbolic significance as well as normalizing and regulatory practices of everyday life—in commemorative practices.⁷ For its part, art history,

traditionally a discipline dedicated to temporalizing objects, has been asked to “change ‘landscape’ from a noun to a verb,” to quote W.J.T. Mitchell, develop discourse around site-specificity, and figure out how to write about artists whose work might produce no object and whose practices unfold in space just as much as in time.⁸ The projects I present here use space and time in layered ways, employing the ephemeral marking of existing space and the interpenetration of “different” places and times to propose alternate political imaginaries.

The critic Brian Holmes recently wrote, “The point [of political struggle] is to continue seeing...society exactly as it really is, and to succeed at the same time in creating the presence of another, sharable world which does not have such fatal characteristics.”⁹ This sort of ‘utopianism without illusions’ is hard to come by, and commemorative practices—by now widely understood to be more about shaping the past into a desired present and future—have been arenas where utopianism (and, more often, triumphalism) have had more than their share of nostalgic illusion. Yet memory work, as an intervention in the political imaginary, also provides a significant opportunity for the anti-nostalgic (or strategically nostalgic) but highly idealistic articulation of the past as a political field in a “radical present”—the doubled sense of “present” that incorporates both the spatial here and the temporal now.¹⁰ The gaps and sutures visible within the overlays of memorial transposition can produce a space that is simultaneously utopian *and* situated in present space, inhabitable, even producible, by real social actors.

The urge to commemorate is widely believed to have intensified in recent years.¹¹ While many “real social actors” self-commemorate at a fevered pitch enabled by cheaper and smaller consumer photographic and video products and free online distribution

systems such as YouTube, much of public memorial culture continues to rely on the marking of space: naming a street, building a monument, erecting a plaque, dedicating a park, or some combination of all these and more.¹² Often in governmental and organizational memorial efforts, spatial “marks” meant to commemorate an event sets up the space as something of a portal through which layers of time might be grasped in an almost archeological way, as Simon Schama suggests of landscape, or as a marker that provides some authoritative measure of the passage of time, the lessons of history, and the presence of memory, as asserted by inscriptions on memorial plaques worldwide.¹³ Karen Till points out that these practices of physical marking offer a reassuring material presence to a past whose ‘realness’ is unstable in light of the impossibility of assembling it through anything other than memory. Spatializing memory gives “shape to felt absences, fears, and desires that haunt contemporary society.”¹⁴

Underpinning the use of space to “anchor” memory are three related Western and Enlightenment-era assumptions: first, that “space” and “time” are different dimensions of human experience; second, that space is a constant on which human agency is enacted through the privileged dimension of time; and third, that although space is unavoidably socially and politically encoded, that those encodings are the residue of temporal actions, rather than both product and producer of spatio-temporal activities. Even among scholars, this point of view occasionally peeks through: Denis Cosgrove, who has been so instrumental in thinking critically about landscape as a cultural, economic, and political process, has occasionally slipped into describing it as a frame or “a stage for human action,” with action understood as temporal.¹⁵ This is peculiar since the opposition between space and time and the related binaries of stasis/dynamism and fixed/changeable

has been thoroughly discredited by the “spatial turn” in cultural theory in the years since Foucault admitted that “geography must indeed lie at the heart of” any archeology of power, and the apparent conflict between temporalizing and spatializing discourses has been addressed by Jonathan Boyarin’s “politics of dimensionality” and Ed Soja’s imperative to think through a “trialectics of historicity-sociality-spatiality.”^{16,17} Karen Till in particular has been highly critical of what she describes as “biography of a site” scholarship on public memory that fails to adequately problematize conventional thinking about monuments or to deal with the nuances of how sites, coalitions, and practices are never homogenous and always subject to change “resulting from particular social histories, interconnections to other places, and lasting human imprints [that] may surpass instrumental efforts to make selective pasts speak through them.”¹⁸ In other words, spatial memorials produce unexpectedly new spaces and temporalities as a result of the both the intentional and unselfconscious actions of human beings—they are far from palimpsests produced by time imprinting a succession of pasts on the substrate of the landscape.

Performance offers one way of spatializing memory that does not rely on the supposed permanence of markers in space and is a form whose “material presence” consists of action as much as object and which engages spatial and temporal dimensions in simultaneous and roughly equal ways. In the “Mission Lake Project,” for instance, the poetic act of marking and the understated, almost calligraphic line Carroll left on the streets of the Mission District drew on traditions of spatial marking as a form of memorializing, but it complicates their spatio-temporal logic in several ways. Space is far from a substrate for memory in Carroll’s memorial; instead it is both the material form of memory and what is being remembered. There is no translation between temporal event

and its spatial commemoration: the lake is the both the place and object of memory, and the memorial takes up ‘exactly’ the same space as what it memorializes. On the surface, this correspondence seems very banal and terribly literal: the filling in of the lake punctuated no epoch, was the deed of no one great man, and was not even much of a feat for the technology of the day. However, what is radical about Carroll’s memorial is that it gives material form to an entire spatial regime rather than an event or series of events. By commemorating a vanished lake, Carroll exposes how the logic of capital has engaged space *through* time—as something to be sculpted, molded, and transformed into commodity and profit.

The material remnants of Carroll’s piece—the line and its documentation—have a very unstable existence as objects and even as space. The line vanishes in a couple of days of wind and San Francisco damp; the digital photographs are infinitely reproducible as data-objects and printed images, which disperse them spatially and temporally still farther. Carroll is clearly uninterested in designating a permanent memorial space, either via a built monument or some sort of preserved trace, and her gesture of spatial marking seems meant to produce a context for a commemorative sociality—the barbecue and bike races. In turn, these performative acts transform Carroll’s piece from a line designating a (past) space and into a vital, lived space in which the past mingles with present-day social life. Through her act of spatio-temporal transposition, Carroll not only gives meaning in the present to the loss of an obscure lagoon in San Francisco, but, for a short afternoon, she and those who attend her events do what Stéphane Mosès wrote of Walter Benjamin’s approach to history: “pretend that the past can be modified by the present,

this is what most deeply shakes the trust of modern man in the irreversible nature of historical time.”¹⁹

The sort of social and gestural commemorative action deployed by Carroll in the Mission Lake project has been richly addressed in the literature on the performative aspects of memory work. Some scholars, following Judith Butler’s work on performativity, emphasize that memory-performance is conventionally a process that articulates a subject into the nation-state, while others focus on the oppositional uses of performances that allow people to remake official monuments and commemorative ceremonies. Early in the development of the field of memory studies, Paul Connerton argued “commemorative ceremonies prove to be commemorative only in so far as they are performative” and pointing out that dominant social groups create rituals that articulate not simply the content of memory but also the relationships among different social actors and between these groups and the past.²⁰ While Connerton discussed the memory-performances of traditional societies or those explicitly supportive of the idea of a nation or a people, other scholars, such as John Bodnar and James Young have noted that uses and actions—what others might call performances—surrounding official monuments and commemorative ceremonies frequently remake their meanings in contradictory, opportunistic, and even openly oppositional ways.²¹ More recently and in more explicitly geographical terms, Nigel Thrift has embraced a more expansive notion of performance that encompasses a wide range of social practice as breathing new life into tired scholarly discourse that overemphasize text and representations over practice and experience: “performance asks the right questions in the right way, born out of an intense desire to work on the imagination in order to add something into the world.”²²

Thrift seems less interested in the hegemonic functions of performance or how performance can also be a way of asking the *wrong* questions in the right—and very seductive—ways.

This doubled sense of performances—as embodied, often libidinal but just as easily oppressive—is given extended and nuanced consideration in the work of performance studies scholar Diana Taylor. She distinguishes not between ‘spatial’ and ‘temporal’ memories but instead between the durational “archive” and the ephemeral “repertoire.”²³ For Taylor, “‘archival’ memory exists as documents, maps, literary texts, letters, archeological remains, videos, films, CDs, all those items supposedly resistant to change,” while “the repertoire, on the other hand, enacts embodied memory: performances, gestures, orality, movement, dance, singing—in short, all those acts usually thought of as ephemeral, nonreproducible knowledge.”²⁴ Her distinction is helpful because it sidesteps the tendency to consign space and time into separate, though overlapping, categories and re-orientates our thinking to how various forms of social memory are *used*. Although their epistemological underpinnings frequently exist in tension with one another, Taylor is emphatic that they are not locked in any kind of binary opposition: “The relationship between the archive and the repertoire...is certainly not sequential...Nor it is true versus false, mediated versus unmediated, primordial versus modern...Performance belongs to the strong as well as the weak,” while the archive can be mined to justify liberation as well as oppression.²⁵ Indeed, as she goes on to demonstrate in her study of the Madres de Plaza de Mayo and the H.I.J.O.S in Buenos Aires—activist groups of, respectively, the mothers and children of those disappeared in

Argentina's "Dirty War" of 1976-1983—that oppositional performance often draws on both the archive and the repertoire to achieve its political ends.

Both Jeremy Deller's "The Battle of Orgreave" and John Malpede's "RFK in EKY" are examples of performative projects that work with the archive in complex, layered, and occasionally contradictory ways. Both pieces utilized existing archival materials and produced their own exhaustive documentation, and each found flaws and holes in the extant archives as the projects developed. Both artists found the existing archival material on the events they were commemorating sadly lacking, and both undertook oral history projects in the months leading up to the reenactment performances. Each project asked living people—some of whom had been present at the original events—to bring the archive into the repertoire, to use Taylor's formulation, by bringing to life through their bodies the precise words, actions, and locations that had been (imperfectly) translated into archival form. Yet the archive was—and had to be—supplemented by much more personal and affective ways of remembering the past, such as that visible in the documentary film on "The English Civil War Part II" directed by Mike Figgis, while others are included in the book/CD set compiled after the event by Jeremy Deller.²⁶ The iterative nature of these projects—research, enactment, and archiving—seems to extend their life beyond the inherent ephemerality of "performance" (which Peggy Phelan, Amelia Jones and others caution is arrested and transformed through documentation) but also intervene in the formation of the archive, knowing that it will be engaged by future performative action.²⁷

Yet a reading of "The Battle of Orgreave" and "RFK in EKY" that so closely follows Taylor is bound to stumble over a few of her blindspots. As helpful as her

distinction is, there is something curiously a-spatial about it. Aside from a few notations about where certain performances happened, there is little sense in her writing that performances take—and make—*place*. Taylor discusses space mainly as architecture or ruins, which she consigns to the archive. While she advocates adding the notion of “scenario” to that of “narrative” in performance studies discourse, with the former including all the things Thrift finds so compelling about performance—gesture, embodiment, aurality—as well as “setting,” but there is little sense that Taylor sees space itself as an intimate part of Soja’s formulation of a mutually productive relationship among “historicality-spatiality-sociality.”²⁸ Shifting focus slightly from how Deller and Malpede engaged the archive in their performances to how they engaged space and time helps to tease out how their performances functioned as spatio-temporal interventions.

Both Malpede and Deller’s events transpose a past time onto present-day space. But because Malpede’s piece took place over a relatively long duration (48 hours) and quite a wide area (200 miles), it was impossible to absolutely designate the “set” of the performance. The boundaries of his transposition were porous and uneven. Rather than metaphorically excavating the past in present-day space, the project enacted a *reconstruction* of history in contemporary space, resulting in an uneven and disorienting coexistence of past and present. The project’s website includes information on fashion trends in 1968 Appalachia so that spectators can get in on the act, but photographic documentation of the event reveals that even in costume, the reality of the present bubbles to the surface of the reenactment.²⁹ This intertwining of past and present was very much Malpede’s intention: “I’ve been working historically to put a mirror up to the present moment with public documents and hearing transcripts, which creates a doubling:

normal citizens playing public figures in order to encourage civic involvement and critical examination of the relation of the citizenry to their government.”³⁰

By contrast, Deller’s event ruptured the continuity of its own reenactment less often than did Malpede’s. The Figgis documentary shows scenes of very believable violence between “miners” and “police,” and many of the strike veterans clearly enjoy considering the re-enactment as something of a rematch. Deller has been criticized for his reliance on a professional director and amateur re-enactment societies because of their tendencies to fetishize historical detail (and particularly details of historical violence) that tend toward celebrating not only “official” versions of history but also the subjectivity of those in the position to decide what those official versions would be.³¹ Deller was highly conscious of these limitations of re-enactors’ versions of “living history” and enjoyed the sight of re-enactment societies confronting their own media-fueled, prejudicial fear of the miners, who cannily played off these expectations.³² He also included a number of almost Brechtian gestures to rupture the believability of the reenactment, including the use of a narrator to describe the sequence of events to onlookers and, of course, the hours and hours of rehearsals that gave participants plenty of time to remember the past while preparing themselves to re-present it.

While the reunions between old picket-line friends were clearly emotional and very affecting, Deller was not interested in positioning “The English Civil War Part II” as a communal project of redemption. In the film, he explains, “This isn’t about healing wounds. It’s going to take more than an art project to heal wounds. But was definitely about confronting something and not being afraid to look at it again and discuss it.”³³ Indeed, the title itself implies that Margaret Thatcher’s campaign to break organized

labor in the 1980s continued the conflict, begun in the 17th century, between royal, authoritarian rule and parliamentary process—hardly a conciliatory suggestion. Rather, the empowerment that some participants felt may have emerged from the distanced consideration of the specific events of the battle and the gaining and performing of new information. The role reversal that had former miners playing police was not a carefully considered casting decision: some people were simply asked to put on blue uniforms because too many people wanted to play miners. Playing the part of someone “on the other side” was more a question of expediency—much as the former (and embittered) police officer interviewed in the film explained of his decision to become a cop to begin with—than an intentional gesture of post-partisan reconciliation. Regardless of the role performed, the re-enactment became a way of putting to work in the body new and potentially empowering information about a political event that transcended the individual memory of it.

Coming from a community arts background places greater emphasis on process, assessment, and even healing, Malpede was quite conscientious about every detail of the project and worked carefully with local residents to choose roles during the reenactment.³⁴ Community organizers of 2004, who had been high school activists in 1968, played members of their parents’ generation who once lived two or three towns over and testified in the Senate Subcommittee on Manpower, Employment and Poverty, a well-documented key event in Kennedy’s tour that Malpede re-enacted down to every word of the three and a half hour session. Present-day high school students, in turn, played the generation of older activists who had first started combating rural environmental problems (not to mention the Vietnam War) as high school students

themselves.³⁵ By re-enacting the entirety of the drive—rather than just one or two well-known stops along it—the project also foregrounds how the notion of the Appalachian region itself was produced not only for the popular imagination of outsiders but for those who lived there as well. Malpede’s temporal transposition sets up complex relations among generations and places; he enacted past time in present space as well as past space in present time.

It’s possible to begin thematizing some aspects of transpositional memorial practice by considering the work of Ledia Carroll, Jeremy Deller, and John Malpede together. First, the spatial mark or trace common to most commemorations is transformed from a noun to a verb, with the act of marking, tracing, or enacting more significant—or at least qualitatively different—than the mark made. Second, these gestures spatialize the archive of historical knowledge on which they draw and, in so doing, produce forms of social memory forged through a dynamic relation between historicity, spatiality, and sociability. Third, the transposition of past/present spaces and times seems to mediate among different generations and spatial and political positionings, less to permit personal identifications to form—though that doubtlessly did occur—but more for the critical information, insights, and tools that such encounters can offer. And, finally, all three projects display some degree impermanence, imprecision, and instability that they welcome within their tightly planned events. Carroll’s chalk outline almost immediately began to dissipate in the wind and under the tires of the anarchic, festive bike riders; Deller’s battle proceeded in highly artificial fits and starts to allow camera crews and observers to move among the sites; and the present always threatened to erupt within Malpede’s restaging, either through details of costuming or the resonances with present-

day politics. What might distinguish transposition from conventional re-enactment, then, is that it lets the seams suturing here and now, there and then to show and finally to split, rather than making a fetish of the perfect construction of the past in the present. Malpede called “RFK in EKY” simultaneously “reconstruction and deconstruction,” and I think this can be said of all projects, that embraces mediation, inexactness, irresolution and absence even when seemingly predicated on immediacy, precision, and presence.³⁶

While my examples throughout this paper have been taken from commemorations of events that are commonly understood to be somehow historic, it’s worth noting that transpositional strategies can be used to “commemorate” events that are not temporally past but which are spatially distant. If news is the first draft of history, then artists interested in fostering a critical memorial culture might not want to walk so far behind the reporters. The Iraq war has prompted a number of artists to produce spatial overlays of Baghdad on a number of US cities: Paula Levine in San Francisco in 2003, Mushon Zer-Aviv in New York in 2006, and Alyssa Wright in Boston in 2007. While these projects differ greatly in their performance strategies and tone, all use GPS technologies—originally developed for military purposes—to transpose sites related to the Iraq war into the lived space of the familiar city. Paula Levine explains her motivation for “Shadows from Another Place: San Francisco-Baghdad, Baghdad-San Francisco, “How do you make bridges to address the horror that would be one of the most significant traumas of your life if you were there, but which are abstract and removed because you are sheltered by distance?”³⁷ Levine suggests that attempting to understand the present—and not exclusively through the selective reanimation of the past—is an ethical imperative that must not be confined by existing and taken-for-granted

experiences of space. Just as temporal transpositions allow that fleeting but necessary pretense that present action can actually produce a different past, spatial transpositions remind us of the doubled sense of the word “present” as meaning “here, with us.” As Jonathan Boyarin argues, the spatial and temporal aspects of memory work are deeply imbricated well beyond the level of metaphor. Spatio-temporal transpositions produce a ‘radical present,’ one situated temporally, spatially, and socially or, to return to Holmes’s charge, “another, sharable world which does not have such fatal characteristics” as the one we encounter squarely each day.

Literature Cited

- Bal, Mieke, Jonathan Crewe, and Leo Spitzer, eds. *Acts of Memory: Cultural Recall in the Present*. Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 1999.
- Beech, Dave. "Jeremy Deller: Orgreave, South Yorkshire " *Art Monthly* 248 (2001): 37-39.
- . "'the Reign of the Workers and Peasants Will Never End': Politics and Politicisation, Art and the Politics of Political Art." *Third Text* 16, no. 4 (2002): 387-98.
- Bishop, Claire. "The Social Turn: Collaboration and Its Discontents." *ArtForum*, February 2006, 178-83.
- Bodnar, John. *Remaking America: Public Memory, Commemoration, and Patriotism in the Twentieth Century*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1992.
- Boyarin, Jonathan. "Space, Time, and the Politics of Memory." In *Remapping Memory: The Politics of Timespace*, edited by Jonathan Boyarin. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994.
- Boyer, M. Christine. *The City of Collective Memory: Its Historical Imagery and Architectural Entertainments*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1994.
- Buck, Louisa. "Leaving Los Angeles: Louisa Buck on Mike Figgis's Battle of Orgreave - Film - Brief Article." *Artforum*, January 2002, 31.
- Burnham, Linda Frye. "When Kennedy Came to Kentucky." *American Theater*, July 2004, 32-35.
- Carroll, Ledia. "Mission Lake." <http://lediacarroll.com/projects/missionlake/>.
- Connerton, Paul. *How Societies Remember*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Cosgrove, Denis. *The Palladian Landscape: Geographical Change and Its Cultural Representations in Sixteenth Century Italy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

- Covell, Adge. "Reviews: The English Civil War Part II." http://www.minersadvice.co.uk/reviews_english_civil_war.htm.
- Deller, Jeremy. "The Battle of Orgreave//2002." In *Participation*, edited by Claire Bishop, 146-47. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 2006.
- Deller, Jeremy, and Mike Figgis. "The Battle of Orgreave." 62:37. United Kingdom: Artangel Media, 2006.
- Exposure, Southern. "Mission Lake "Alleycat" Bike Race & "Lakeside" Barbecue." <http://upcoming.org/event/114833/>.
- Foucault, Michel. *Power/Knowledge*. New York: Pantheon, 1980.
- Hirshberg, Jane. "Rfk in Eky: Maximum Feasible Participation." Community Arts Network, http://www.communityarts.net/readingroom/archivefiles/2004/11/rfk_in_eky_mai.php.
- Holmes, Brian. January 30 2007.
- Huysen, Andreas. *Twilight Memories: Marking Time in a Culture of Amnesia*. London: Routledge, 1995.
- Kihm, Christophe. "Jeremy Deller, Penser Avec Le Populaire / Jeremy Deller: Thinking with the People." *Art Press* 310 (2005): 47-51.
- Lefebvre, Henri. *The Production of Space*. Translated by Donald Nicholson-Smith. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 1991.
- Levine, Paula. Telephone conversation, March 5 2007.
- Levinson, Sanford. *Written in Stone: Public Monuments in Changing Societies*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1998.
- Malpede, John. "Art and Citizenship." <http://www.rfkineky.org/project/malpede.htm>.
- — —. "Styling Yourself for Rfk in Eky." <http://www.appalshop.org/kennedy/project/performance/styling.htm>.
- Mitchell, W.J.T. *Landscape and Power*. Second ed. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2002.
- Phelan, Peggy. *Unmarked: The Politics of Performance*. London: Routledge, 1993.
- Schama, Simon. *Landscape and Memory*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1995.
- Schirmir, Jennifer. "The Claiming of Space and the Body Politic within National-Security States." In *Remapping Memory: The Politics of Timespace*, edited by Jonathan Boyarin, 185-220. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994.
- Schwarzman, Matt. "Mat Schwarzman's Initial Documentation/ Evaluation." <http://www.appalshop.org/kennedy/library/assessment/schwarzman-initial.htm>.
- Slyce, John. "Jeremy Deller: Fables of the Reconstruction." *Flash Art*, January-February 2003, 74-77.
- Soja, Edward W. *Postmodern Geographies*. New York: Verso, 1989.
- — —. *Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angeles and Other Real-and-Imagined Places*. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 1996.
- Spitzer, Leo. "Back through the Future: Nostalgic Memory and Critical Memory in a Refuge from Nazism." In *Acts of Memory: Cultural Recall in the Present*, edited by Mieke Bal, Jonathan Crewe and Leo Spitzer, 87-104. Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 1999.
- Sturken, Marita. *Tangled Memories: The Vietnam War, the Aids Epidemic, and the Politics of Remembering*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1997.

- — —. "The Aesthetics of Absence: Rebuilding Ground Zero." *American Ethnologist* 31, no. 3 (2004): 311-25.
- Taylor, Diana. "Performance and/as History." *The Drama Review* 50, no. 1 (2006): 67-86.
- — —. *The Archive and the Repertoire: Performing Cultural Memory in the Americas*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2003.
- Thrift, Nigel. "Performance and Performativity." In *A Companion to Cultural Geography*, edited by James S. Duncan, Nuala C. Johnson and Richard H. Schein, 121-26. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2004.
- Till, Karen. "Memory Studies." *History Workshop Journal* 62, no. 1 (2006): 325-41.
- — —. *The New Berlin: Memory, Politics, Place*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2005.
- Young, James E. *The Texture of Memory*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1993.

¹ This summary of "The English Civil War Part II" is taken largely from Dave Beech, "Jeremy Deller: Orgreave, South Yorkshire" *Art Monthly* 248 (2001), Louisa Buck, "Leaving Los Angeles: Louisa Buck on Mike Figgis's Battle of Orgreave - Film - Brief Article," *Artforum*, January 2002, Adge Covell, "Reviews: The English Civil War Part II," http://www.minersadvice.co.uk/reviews_english_civil_war.htm, Jeremy Deller, "The Battle of Orgreave//2002," in *Participation*, ed. Claire Bishop (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 2006), Christophe Kihm, "Jeremy Deller, Penser Avec Le Populaire / Jeremy Deller: Thinking with the People," *Art Press* 310 (2005).

² In the documentary film about the project, local residents often tear up during interviews while describing the original events or explaining what the project meant to them. Jeremy Deller and Mike Figgis, "The Battle of Orgreave," (United Kingdom: Artangel Media, 2006).

³ The bulk of information about this project is taken from its web site: <http://www.rfkineky.org>

⁴ John Malpede, "Art and Citizenship," <http://www.rfkineky.org/project/malpede.htm>, Jane Hirshberg, "Rfk in Eky: Maximum Feasible Participation," Community Arts Network, http://www.communityarts.net/readingroom/archivefiles/2004/11/rfk_in_eky_maxi.php.

⁵ Southern Exposure, "Mission Lake "Alleycat" Bike Race & "Lakeside" Barbecue," <http://upcoming.org/event/114833/>. An "alleycat" is an unpermitted urban bike race in which participants gain points for visiting and completing actions at a number of sites listed on a "manifest" as well as having the best time or highest number of laps. The races, considered an underground or punk culture phenomenon, attract mostly bike messengers and the more devoted critical mass participants.

⁶ Ledia Carroll, "Mission Lake," <http://lediacarroll.com/projects/missionlake/>.

⁷ See Paul Connerton, *How Societies Remember* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), M. Christine Boyer, *The City of Collective Memory: Its Historical Imagery and Architectural Entertainments* (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1994), Jennifer Schirmir, "The Claiming of Space and the Body Politic within National-Security States," in *Remapping Memory: The Politics of Timespace*, ed. Jonathan Boyarin (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994), Mieke Bal, Jonathan Crewe, and Leo Spitzer, eds., *Acts of Memory: Cultural Recall in the Present* (Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 1999), Diana Taylor, "Performance and/as History," *The Drama Review* 50, no. 1 (2006).

⁸ W.J.T. Mitchell, *Landscape and Power*, Second ed. (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2002). p. 1.

⁹ Brian Holmes, January 30 2007.

¹⁰ Nostalgia has a bad name among people critical of the hegemonic uses of public memorial culture. However, Spitzer has argued that nostalgia in memory is not universally suspect but can be "a manifestation of *cultural resistance* and *cultural survival*" in the face of political persecution (emphasis original). Leo Spitzer, "Back through the Future: Nostalgic Memory and Critical Memory in a Refuge from Nazism," in *Acts of Memory: Cultural Recall in the Present*, ed. Mieke Bal, Jonathan Crewe, and Leo Spitzer (Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 1999). p. 96.

¹¹ Andreas Huyssen, *Twilight Memories: Marking Time in a Culture of Amnesia* (London: Routledge, 1995), Marita Sturken, *Tangled Memories: The Vietnam War, the Aids Epidemic, and the Politics of Remembering* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1997).

¹² For a discussion of the politics and aesthetics of the "rush to memorialize" characteristic of the United States in the early twentieth-first century, see Marita Sturken, "The Aesthetics of Absence: Rebuilding Ground Zero," *American Ethnologist* 31, no. 3 (2004).

¹³ Simon Schama, *Landscape and Memory* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1995). p. 16-17. See also Sanford Levinson's bemused commentary on the conciliatory language added in the 1980s to a plaque on a monument commemorating the victory of a white insurgency that insisted that some kind of moral lesson might be drawn from the site, but hesitated to suggest its content. Sanford Levinson, *Written in Stone: Public Monuments in Changing Societies* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1998). p. 77.

¹⁴ Karen Till, *The New Berlin: Memory, Politics, Place* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2005). p. 9.

¹⁵ Denis Cosgrove, *The Palladian Landscape: Geographical Change and Its Cultural Representations in Sixteenth Century Italy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993). p. 1.

¹⁶ Michel Foucault, *Power/Knowledge* (New York: Pantheon, 1980). p.77. See also Edward W. Soja, *Postmodern Geographies* (New York: Verso, 1989), Henri Lefebvre, *The Production of Space*, trans. Donald Nicholson-Smith (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 1991), Jonathan Boyarin, "Space, Time, and the Politics of Memory," in *Remapping Memory: The Politics of Timespace*, ed. Jonathan Boyarin (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994), Edward W. Soja, *Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angeles and Other Real-and-Imagined Places* (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 1996).

¹⁷ Boyarin, "Space, Time, and the Politics of Memory." p. 8, Soja, *Thirdspace*. p. 16.

¹⁸ Karen Till, "Memory Studies," *History Workshop Journal* 62, no. 1 (2006). p. 330.

¹⁹ Stéphane Mosès in Boyarin, "Space, Time, and the Politics of Memory." p. 13.

²⁰ Connerton, *How Societies Remember*. p. 5.

²¹ John Bodnar, *Remaking America: Public Memory, Commemoration, and Patriotism in the Twentieth Century* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1992), James E. Young, *The Texture of Memory* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1993).

²² Nigel Thrift, "Performance and Performativity," in *A Companion to Cultural Geography*, ed. James S. Duncan, Nuala C. Johnson, and Richard H. Schein (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2004).

²³ Diana Taylor, *The Archive and the Repertoire: Performing Cultural Memory in the Americas* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2003). p. 19

²⁴ *Ibid.* pp. 19-20.

²⁵ *Ibid.* p. 22. Taylor describes the repertoire in terms of non-textual forms of knowledge that do not exist exclusively in a preliterate past but represent a distinct way of receiving, perceiving, and transmitting information. The textual and archival bias of Western epistemology, which undergirded colonial efforts to exterminate indigenous ways of knowing and which persists in contemporary scholarship's preoccupation with 'texts' and 'narratives,' appears in her account largely responsible for the antagonism between the archive and repertoire.

²⁶ To some degree, it may be helpful to consider the event, the film, and the book as different projects altogether, since the film—the primarily documentary evidence of the event—bears as much the marks of Mike Figgis's authorship as Jeremy Deller's. Each component of the project, while intimately related, functions in very different ways. I

have not dealt with the book at all in this paper or explored the differences between the film's goals and those of the event. For a brief discussion of these differences, see Claire Bishop, "The Social Turn: Collaboration and Its Discontents," *ArtForum*, February 2006.

²⁷ Peggy Phelan, *Unmarked: The Politics of Performance* (London: Routledge, 1993). p. 146.

²⁸ Taylor, *The Archive and the Repertoire*. p. 28.

²⁹ John Malpede, "Styling Yourself for Rfk in Eky," <http://www.appalshop.org/kennedy/project/performance/styling.htm>. See photographs of the various tour stops online at <http://www.appalshop.org/kennedy/project/performance/performance.htm>.

³⁰ Malpede quoted in Linda Frye Burnham, "When Kennedy Came to Kentucky," *American Theater*, July 2004.

³¹ Dave Beech, "'the Reign of the Workers and Peasants Will Never End': Politics and Politicisation, Art and the Politics of Political Art," *Third Text* 16, no. 4 (2002). p 396.

³² John Slyce, "Jeremy Deller: Fables of the Reconstruction," *Flash Art*, January-February 2003.

³³ Deller and Figgis, "The Battle of Orgreave."

³⁴Information on the assessment of "RFK in EKY" is still forthcoming. Initial reports are available on the website: Matt Schwarzman, "Mat Schwarzman's Initial Documentation/Evaluation," <http://www.appalshop.org/kennedy/library/assessment/schwarzman-initial.htm>. Malpede is known as a pioneer of community based art for his work with the Los Angeles Poverty Department, a performance troupe of homeless and formerly homeless men active in the 1980s and early 1990s.

³⁵ Burnham, "When Kennedy Came to Kentucky."

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷ Paula Levine, Telephone conversation, March 5 2007.