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Abstract

*Landscape and Land Art* focuses on so-called 'Land Art' in Britain in the period from the mid-1960s to the present day. The dissertation concentrates particularly on Richard Long who, it is argued, functions as the definitive index of British Land Art.

*Land Art Beginning* investigates how Land Art's earliest instances have shaped its subsequent discourse and introduces the methodological approaches employed in the dissertation. Land Art is then studied through a series of frames or milieux in the following chapters.

*Land Art Sculpture* defends the necessity of viewing Land Art in the context of the practice and theory of sculpture. *Land Art Repetition* examines repetition as one of the most prevalent and informing strategies of Land Art practice and theory. *Land Art Body* focuses on one of the most overlooked and yet crucial components of Land Art, the body. Through identifying and delineating the different kinds of bodies and representations of bodies included in (and excluded from) Land Art discourse and practice, this chapter considers the ways in which the body has been suppressed in Land Art and the possibilities for a bodily re-engagement. *Land Art Landscape* views critically the landscape aspect of British Land Art which serves to link it to past art and particularly to a British 'Landscape Tradition'. The final chapter considers Land Art in relation to gardening and laughter through the construct of the ha-ha.

The dissertation thus ends on a humorous note, but also an intensely serious one. Laughter and humour are powerful strategies against the most resistant orthodoxy, and British Land Art is perhaps best characterised in that way, as an orthodoxy, a dogma or an institution. This study aims to uncover and reveal the ways in which that orthodoxy has been constructed and is sustained, offering along the way some suggestions as to how it might be construed otherwise.
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**Land Art Beginning: A Beginning or Beginnings?**

This study is concerned with the connection between the words 'Land' and 'Art' that transforms two discrete words into the term 'Land Art' and with the connections between that term and the things in the category it names.

The function of this introduction, this beginning, is to introduce the term 'Land Art', indicate something of the breadth of its application and delineate some of the characteristics of Land Art as a discourse.

The words Land Art and the plenitude of meanings and associations that their coming together evokes and contains act as the refrain to this dissertation. The words Land Art are repeated in each chapter title, and each time a third term is added. Each additional term does not merely set up a triangular or three-way relation in place of the play of two words, but adds a level of complication and of multiplicity. In each of these chapters there is an accumulation or accretion of meaning onto the basic two-word term. The aim is to add to, to complicate or to problematise the term Land Art rather than to reduce it to some basic essence of 'Land Art' beneath the shimmer of added meanings. For there is no such 'essence'. Land Art (as a discourse, as a practice) is precisely that surface appearance, that accumulation.

**Beginning 1: Land Art**

What happens when the words 'Land' and 'Art' come together in 'Land Art'? What is put into motion by their (various) comings-together? I will begin with a founding instance of their union and dissemination, one of the first exhibitions that brought this term into the discourse of art criticism and art history. This was the exhibition *Land Art* organised by Gerry Schum in April 1969.

---

1. The idea of 'The Refrain' is Deleuze and Guattari's from *A Thousand Plateaus*: Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari. *A Thousand Plateaus*, trans. Brian Massumi (London: The Athlone Press, 1988.) It represents ways to make and mark space, to make order out of chaos. The term 'milieu' as used by Deleuze and Guattari is also a useful way of trying to explain the ambition of the chapters of this study. It would be necessary to quote their entire chapter to explain fully these ideas. The following brief extract gives some indication of the idea of a milieu: 'Every milieu is coded, a code being defined by periodic repetition: but each code is in a perpetual state of transcoding or transduction. Transcoding or transduction is the manner in which one milieu serves as the basis for another, or conversely is established atop another milieu, dissipates in it or is constituted in it. The notion of the milieu is not unitary: not only does the living thing continually pass from one milieu to another, but the milieus pass into one another: they are essentially communicating. The milieus are open to chaos, which threatens them with exhaustion or intrusion.' '1837: Of the Refrain', pp. 310-350, p. 313.

2. This is, of course, the precise manner in which so many terms have been inaugurated in art history, for example Post-Impressionism, Expressionism or Neue Sachlichkeit.
Figure 1. Cover of Land Art, 1969.
To be more precise, the ‘exhibition’ Land Art took the form of a television film of collective individual works conceived specifically for television. The film was the brainchild of gallerist Gerry Schum, whose Fernsehgalerie was more a conceptual idea than a physical gallery space, as he explains in the catalogue that documented the Land Art show: ‘The first situation which I have to explain is the fact that there is no real gallery room. The TV gallery only exists in a series of TV transmissions.’ Land Art was broadcast on nation-wide German television on 15 April 1969.5 [figure 1]

Schum’s Land Art is a useful point of departure. As well as being one of the first manifestations of Land Art, it is one that encapsulates many of the key concerns and features of Land Art that have been perpetuated in Land Art’s discourse. The exhibition is thus an ideal event through which to introduce these features. Secondly, the exhibition, its contents and its modes of dissemination provide an opportunity to introduce some of the dominant theoretical approaches used in this study.

Schum’s Land Art, in the fact of its first broadcast, is a precise moment, a ‘fact’ of discourse, an historically and geographically locatable instance of Land Art. Rather than define movements or artistic groupings and developments in terms of stylistic or theoretical analyses, many accounts in the late 1960s and early 1970s presented factual data, events, names and dates in a list or chronology form. One of the most well-known of these is Lucy R. Lippard’s Six Years (1973), which is, as its title suggests, a chronology of events over six years. The chronology does have a theme, ‘the dematerialization of the art object,’ and the subtitle of the book lists names that have been used to label the works, artists and events

---
she lists in the book. Lippard's book is self-consciously aware of the effect it will have on the history of the period she has documented, and aware of both the limitations and problems of using limiting terms to certain bits of art practice. As I will go on to discuss, Lippard's book could be seen as providing the very raw material required to constitute what Foucault calls 'a systematic history of discourses'. Lippard's book makes certain events available to subsequent histories. Whilst she does not in any sense claim this as an exhaustive account, its exclusions are of course not as readily visible as its inclusions. Lippard's book makes certain facts of discourse 'ready to hand', or as Foucault would describe the book's systematising enterprise: 'making them thereafter endlessly accessible to new discourses and open to the task of transforming them. The treatment of Land Art, Earth Art or Earthworks in Lippard's book is significant. In the list of categories in her subtitle she uses the name 'earth' art. The first mentions of 'earthworks' in Six Years are not exhibitions but individual works. For 1966 she states:

Among the early earthworks executed during this year were Richard Long's in England, Robert Morris's model for Project in Earth and Sod, and Robert Smithson's Tar Pool and Gravel Pit, a model shown at the Dwan Gallery in the Fall.

What has to be remembered is that Lippard's chronology is a retrospective listing, embodying the state of play when it was compiled and published in 1973. The connections made between these three works, and their linking under the category '(early) earthworks' is only possible once the category has been at least 'vaguely designated', to use Lippard's own term employed in her book title. Lippard's book, and others such as Germano Celant's Arte Povera (1969) might be described as 'source books'. They are books constructed with an awareness of the uses to which they will be put to as sources for historical accounts. As such they are both pleas for inclusions in history and an active making of history.

Lippard clearly makes use of institutional instances of naming, of which Gerry Schum's Land Art, however unconventional his Fernsehgalerie is as a physical institution, is a significant example. Naming gives the category substance as well as definition and institutional status. It launches the term into critical and historical discourse through entering arts and other periodicals in which the exhibition is reviewed and, with a slight time lapse, art bibliographies and indexes and of course the catalogues of the various libraries and archives into which the documentation, catalogue and reviews of the show become disseminated. Despite its unconventional source and format, Schum's Land Art registers some of the most typical features of Land Art and Land Art discourse. The selection of artists embodies the range

---

5 The full title of the book reads: Six Years: The dematerialization of the art object from 1966 to 1972: a cross-reference book of information on some esthetic boundaries: consisting of a bibliography into which are inserted a fragmented text, art works, documents, interviews, and symposia, arranged chronologically and focused on so-called conceptual or information or idea art with mentions of such vaguely designated areas as minimal, anti-form, systems, earth, or process art, occurring now in the Americas, Europe, England, Australia, and Asia (with occasional political overtones), edited and annotated by Lucy R. Lippard (London: Studio Vista, 1973).


of artists involved in the early occasions of Land Art, in the first accounts of Land Art, and those that play a highly prominent role in subsequent accounts. The artists are broadly speaking of three nationalities, or reside in three countries: the USA, the Netherlands and Britain. The balance of numbers, four Americans, two British and two from the Netherlands approximates the weight of many early accounts and of a number of recent accounts, although the American dominance is almost total in the most recent extensive account, and others have chosen to discuss one national variant.

The two British artists, Richard Long and Barry Flanagan, were both students in the Sculpture Department at St. Martin's School of Art and in addition one of the Dutch artists, Jan Dibbets, had studied at St. Martin's for one term. It is not surprising, but of some consequence that the British component in all the early Earth and Land Art exhibitions had a St. Martin's origin. It might merely suggest though, the international status of the school and its students rather than serve to link the school causally with British Land Art. Whether or not Land Art is sculpture is one of the questions that recurs throughout Land Art discourse. In this early instance of Land Art, Schum describes the works in the exhibition as 'film objects' thus avoiding that particular problem of categorisation. Schum was interested in promoting a completely new art form, and the role of film and video in relation to sculpture is still not entirely resolved in discussions in the mid-1990s.

Four of the artists, including all of the American artists, had previously been exhibited under the titles Earthworks or Earth Art - in the cases of Robert Smithson and Dennis Oppenheim, under both. Earthworks was an exhibition of exclusively American artists, but both Earthworks and Earth Art took place in the USA. This is an early pattern. It is not true to say that the 'Earth' designation applies to American work and the 'Land' to European, but rather that the term Earth was used for exhibitions held in the USA and Land for exhibitions held in Europe. Subsequently Land Art seems to be the

0 Gilles Tiberghien, _Land Art_.
1 For a discussion of the prominence of the Sculpture Department at St Martin's and its role in formulating what constituted sculpture or the profession of being a sculptor in Britain, see the chapter _Land Art Sculpture_. pp. 39-64.
3 Ithaca, New York: Andrew Dickson White Museum, Cornell University, _Earth Art_. February 1969. According to its catalogue introduction 'the “Earth Art” exhibition was conceived in the summer of 1967 as one of a series of four traveling exhibitions devoted to the elements of air, earth, fire and water.' _Earth Art_ was curated by Willoughby Sharp. _Air Art_ at the University Art Gallery, Berkeley was held just prior to _Earth Art_ at Cornell. The idea of holding exhibitions on the theme of the elements crops up elsewhere around the same time. An announcement appeared in the February 1969 issues of _Studio International_ requesting information from anyone interested in participating in an exhibition proposed for June that year entitled _Air, an international exhibition_ in the Building Centre, Store Street, WC1. London. _Studio International_ 177 (February 1969), p. 164. In 1971 an exhibition entitled _Earth, Air, Fire, Water Elements of Art_ was held in Boston at the Museum of Fine Art. In this context, Earth Art is just one of a series of related thematic curating exercises, but the only one whose name seems to have stuck and which has been elaborated into a more definitive framework for labelling art.
4 British exhibitions of this founding (1968-1969) period, and many since which have included Land Art works, have used the word ‘Landscape’ extensively in exhibition titles and literature, thus affirming the historical link to a British or English ‘Landscape Tradition’. Where this historical dimension is not directly reflected in historical works on display, it is often referred to in exhibition catalogues and
ascendant term, and, historically in these founding exhibitions it is the term that embraced the widest range of practitioners. Earthworks has come to signify a smaller and more precise group of works. For example, John Beardsley in his introduction to Earthworks and Beyond writes: ‘Only sculptures in earth and sod can properly be described as earthworks’. Since the exhibition was held in Germany, it seems strange that no German artists are included. The French writer Beatrice Parent manages to include one French artist, Bernard Borgeaud, in her account of Land Art. The German art centres, and particularly Düsseldorf where Schum was based for a time, are centres for international art. Joseph Beuys was professor at the Kunstkademie in Düsseldorf and his reputation certainly enhanced the international status of that city. One of the other most influential and innovatory gallerists was also based in Düsseldorf. Konrad Fischer. Fischer’s first exhibition was Carl Andre in November 1967. and over the next three years he showed work by several leading artists also shown in the context of Land Art and Earth Art, including Dibbets (August 1968), Long (September 1968), Smithson (January 1969) and Fulton (June 1969). The geographic location of the originating exhibitions and of the artists included in them is clearly important. The ‘national’ and ‘regional’ characteristics that are differentiated in subsequent accounts of Land Art are indistinct if not entirely absent in the founding instances. Many gallerists and curators such as Schum and Fischer are eager to emphasise the international dimension of the art movements they identify. They are keen to stress the similarities rather than distinguish the subtle differences. Later the distinction between an ‘English sensibility’ identified with Long and Fulton in particular, and specifically American and Dutch variants become more pronounced in the discourse of Land Art. In the late 1960s and early 1970s exhibitions, catalogues, books and articles seem suffused with the confident belief in an international, Hegelian Zeitgeist and with the anxiety of not wanting to

Information. The English Landscape Tradition in the twentieth century was the subject of an exhibition held at the Camden Arts Centre, London in February 1969 (the same month as the Earth Art exhibition at Cornell). it was entitled The English Landscape Tradition and included works by Wilson Steer, Augustus John, Sickert, Nash, Spencer, Hitchens, Moore, Hepworth, Nicholson, Piper, Sutherland, Lanyon, Frost, Scott, Heath, Hilton, Pasmore, Sutton, Wishaw, Inlander, Blow, Flanagan, Kenny, Clarke and Rugg. Information about this exhibition appears on the same page of Studio International as a notice for Willoughby Sharp’s Air Art at the University Art Gallery, Berkeley and the forthcoming Earth Art exhibition at Cornell University. Studio International 177 (February 1969), p. 164.


15 Germany is cited as one of the countries in which Earth Art originated in a comment by Neil Jenney in the Earth Symposium held to coincide with the Earth Art exhibition at Cornell University. He states: ‘I think the main reason this show happened was because people in England and Holland and Germany and different parts of America were doing it at the same time.’ Earth Symposium at White Museum, Cornell University. 1970. in The Writings of Robert Smithson, ed. Nancy Holt (New York. New York University Press, 1979). pp. 160-167. p. 164. Two of the artists in the Earth Art exhibition had German origins: Hans Haacke, born in Cologne in 1936, but living in the USA and Günther Uecker, born in Wendorf, Mecklenburg, Germany. Uecker attended the Düsseldorf art Academy from 1953-55 and with Heinz Mack and Otto Piene formed the Düsseldorf ‘Zero Group’ in 1958.


17 The role of Beuys and the international status of Düsseldorf’s institutions was brought out in two features in Flash Art International: Alison Jacques, ‘Cityscape: Düsseldorf’, Parts 1 and 2, Flash Art International 27 (May/June 1994). pp. 63-65. and 27 (Summer 1994). pp. 55-56.
limit its progress by naming it. Such a desire is seen clearly in Lippard’s long list of ‘vague designations’ in _Six Years_ and Anne Seymour’s comments in _The New Art_ (1972):

> That these artists belong to an international intellectual context is vital, but it is clearly a source of worry to some of them that it is easy to misconstrue that context by singling out parts of it for attention without recognizing that it represents a complete world-wide consciousness in time and space. (my emphasis)

What is glaringly obvious about Schum’s _Land Art_ exhibition, and yet often overlooked, is that the works included in it clearly couldn’t qualify under Beardsley’s narrow definition of Earthworks. Although they all relate to a specific land location (these are listed in the catalogue) and involve some kind of manipulation or presentation of the earth, their medium is television. They were conceived specifically in that form and for that particular technology. The fact that this founding exhibition took the form of a television programme demonstrates crucial aspects of Land Art. It reveals its relation with the most elemental and the most technologic, its concern with transparency and straightforward ‘no tricks’ presentation and yet its fascination with the most complex and seductive technology. Many of its sources are in film and television media. I have suggested a few in this dissertation, there are doubtless many more. Land Art is art of the TV age. This tension is demonstrated in the fact that Land Art has appeared in books and catalogues about Primitivism, for example the Museum of Modern Art, New York’s _“Primitivism” in 20th Century Art_ (1984) and high technology, for example Douglas Davis’s _Art and the Future_ (1973) and Frank Popper’s _Art of the Electronic Age_ (1993). As well being a feature of Land Art, this is a tension prevalent throughout much 20th century art.

---

18 Lucy R Lippard, _Six Years_, title page.
20 The locations and titles of film objects in _Land Art_ are given in Schum’s letter in the _Land Art_ catalogue as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of artist</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Location of realisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Richard Long</td>
<td>Walking a straight 10 Mile Line</td>
<td>Dartmoor/England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry Flanagan</td>
<td>Hole in the Sea</td>
<td>Scheveningen/Holland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Oppenheim</td>
<td>Time Track</td>
<td>Fort Kent, Timeborder USA/Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Smithson</td>
<td>Fossil Quarry Mirror</td>
<td>Cayuga Lake, State N.Y.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marinus Boeckem</td>
<td>Sandfountain</td>
<td>Camargue, South France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan Dibbets</td>
<td>12 Hours Tide Object</td>
<td>Dutch Coast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with Correction of Perspective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter de Maria</td>
<td>Two Lines Three Circles on the</td>
<td>Mojave Desert, California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Desert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Heizer</td>
<td>Coyote</td>
<td>Coyote Dry Lake, Calif.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questions of temporality and ephemerality are central to Schum's *Land Art*, or at least to his presentation of the project. Again this is a key element in Land Art discourse, the concern with the actual time of existence of the works. This inevitably raises questions about the future of the works: are they to be permanent or to decay? Do they exist in the here and now, perpetually present or are they temporally fixed in a particular time? How are they to be recorded, documented or preserved? Schum writes: '[... the TV exhibition LAND ART is no] documentation of an art event that exists in any way out of the exact time and place of transmission.' The perpetuation of the art object also highlights the role of the 'preservers' of art: the galleries, dealers, patrons, critics, historians and other art institutions.

Land Art, along with other manifestations of art in the late 1960s and early 1970s, engaged in an anti-arts establishment rhetoric. The ambition of such refusals of the gallery system, physical and economic, has been reconstructed in retrospect by some of its supporters as at best idealistic, at worst naive and misguided. As the arts establishment has successfully reclaimed its lost ground, it is perhaps less painful for those involved (and now often themselves part of the very establishment they attempted to overthrow) to represent the failure of the anti-arts establishment attempt as naïve idealism than portray it as a failed revolution. At the time, for the artists and other individuals involved it seemed both already under way and inevitable. Schum's tone in the *Land Art* catalogue is typical:

> Today more and more art objects are not created for art-dealers or art galleries or for any kind of private property. This specially occurs with the objects of the land-artists or the ideas of the "conceptual artists". I believe there is a general change from the realisation of objects to the publication of projects or ideas. This of course demands a fundamental change in dealing with art. [...] To cite Harald Szeman of Bern, the traditional triangle of studio, gallery and collector, in which art up [to] today took place will be destroyed.

The question of finance still remains however, and what Schum seems to suggest is the supplanting of the 'studio, gallery, collector' triangle with a model drawn from publishing. This obviously has its own problems, not least those of copyright. On which subject Schum writes:

> I cannot see a reason why any museum, gallery or similar institution, or in this special case a TV station should be allowed to show art objects without paying a fee to the author: the artist. In a time where publication of art by printing or transmitting becomes more and more important - besides selling of art objects - the artist should have the same rights, which every writer, actor, composer etc. naturally can demand for.

The exhibition thus raised important questions of copyright and artist's rights over property. This not only concerns the financial rights to a work, but also the artist's moral rights over the work and her/his

---

25 Gerry Schum, letter in *Land Art*.
26 See for example Richard Cork, Editorial to *Studio International* 193 (March/April 1977), p. 82.
27 *ibid*.
28 *ibid*.
rights to have the work shown in accordance with their requests. Both issues were highly contested in the period of the late 1960s and early 1970s, when the practices of for example 'conceptual' art challenged the existing machinery for ownership by purchaser or creator.\(^{29}\) Some of the problems, along with an attempt at a solution are found in Seth Siegelaub's 'The artist's reserved rights transfer and sale agreement.'\(^{30}\) Schum's projects were particularly dogged by funding problems. He was constantly trying to find a way of paying the artists and cover the expenditure involved in making the works. This was a problem he never adequately solved.\(^{31}\) As far as the issue of the artist's right to control the ways in which the works are shown, Richard Long's letter, printed in the catalogue, is revealing, and demonstrates the kind of attempts made by this artist carefully to police the conditions under which his work is shown. The letter concludes with the following statement:

The reasons I want you to stop using working photographs in connection with my part of the film are as follows: The whole walk was a precise unit, self contained, self-explanatory, with a particular design and purpose. Any attempt to use 'idle' photographs in connection with the film works in opposition to this, and demonstrates a complete misunderstanding of the real idea. One of the merits of the film was that it had things like artist on location, jumping a river designed out of it, so they should be kept out.\(^{32}\)

In this respect, Long was rigorous from the outset. Some of his requests were ignored by Schum as the catalogue demonstrates. Ultimately Long's endeavours seem to have produced a remarkably consistent and uniform body of work. The attempts of the artist, and of others acting on his behalf, to check any

\(^{29}\) See also the section 'Ideological Bases of the New Sculpture' in Willoughby Sharp, 'Notes Towards Understanding of Earth Art' in the Cornell Earth Art catalogue (unpaginated), included in appendix 2.

\(^{30}\) Seth Siegelaub, 'The artist's reserved rights transfer and sale agreement', Studio International 181 (April 1971), pp. 142-145 and 186-188. See also pp. 57 and 72 and notes 156 and 198.

\(^{31}\) At the time of his death, from an overdose of sleeping pills, in March 1973, obituary features in the magazines Studio International and Avalanche pointed out Schum's financial difficulties and leave their readers to speculate on the connection between Schum's death and his financial instability and his decision to close his Dusseldorf Video Gallery (the successor to his Fernsehgalerie). Georg Jappe wrote: 'Financially Schum was not covering his costs. Because of the low price of video cassettes (800-1800DM, and originally half this), and because of the inherent reproducibility of the medium, most private collectors held back, still taking a possessive attitude to original works and their increasing values. Various incentives, such as free original works with the cassettes, the issue of certificates, limited editions and regular price increases, were of no avail.' Georg Jappe, 'Gerry Schum', p. 236. Willoughby Sharp, 'Obituary. Gerry Schum: Video Pioneer'.

\(^{32}\) Long, Richard. Letter to Gerry Schum. reprinted in Fernsehgalerie Gerry Schum. Land Art (unpaginated). The full text of the letter is as follows: 'Dear Gerry. If I sent you a telegramm (sic) saying "Destroy all the Working Shots taken on Dartmoor so that all knowledge of the film becomes exclusive to seeing the film as it was intended to be seen." I hope you would do it, and I would be very happy, as that is what I want! But I have to write more than a telegramm. I think. I have been wondering about the film and the life it has been leading since we left Dartmoor. This letter is really a plea that the film doesn't (sic) deteriorate in a mess of 2nd rate journalism (I saw some) Who needs that type of publicity? No-one, and no work either. The reasons I want you to stop using working photographs in connection with my part of the film are as follows: The whole walk was a precise unit, self contained, self-explanatory, with a particular design and purpose. Any attempt to use 'idle' photographs in connection with the film works in opposition to this, and demonstrates a complete misunderstanding of the real idea. One of the merits of the film was that it had things like artist on location, jumping a river designed out of it, so they should be kept out.'
adverse or inconsistent presentation is borne out by the sheer difficulty of tracing any of the discrepancies that do occur. 11

There is a picture of Long in the Land Art book - just the sort of image Long was demanding Schum did not use, the artist 'on location'. [figure 2 (figures 3 & 4 are other shots from the film, from the Land Art catalogue)] It appears in a section consisting of stills from the Land Art films. At a first glance the inclusion of this illustration seems inconsistent not only with Long's requests expressed in his letter printed in the Land Art catalogue, but also with Schum's own ideas stated elsewhere in the same catalogue. Two parallel strategies/policies seem to be in operation here. The first concerns Schum's evident concern to present the Land Art catalogue as a collection of unedited and uncensored documentation about the show, and the second concerns the very definite and personal ideas of Schum (and Long) concerning the making of the film objects. The Land Art catalogue is a kind of source book of information about all aspects of the TV show, from background information on the artists included and their views: through the processes involved in the actual making of the films and documentation of the film objects themselves in the form of film stills: to the critical reaction to the television screening. It appears that the material, documentary, review or otherwise, is merely left to stand, contradictions intact. For example, newspaper reviews are in the form of cuttings reproduced directly from their sources, and letters (including Long's) appear in their original hand-written form. Criticisms of Schum's film are included as well as more positive reviews. This is clearly an important aspect of Schum's strategy and gives the impression of a certain transparency or non-selectivity in the documentation. On one level then, the inclusion of the picture of Long on location and his request that such images not be included has a certain validity. However, presumably Schum was responsible for selecting the still frames from the filmed material included in the book.

'I believe,' wrote Schum, 'regarding the ideas of the TV gallery Richard Long created the most consequent object in the LAND ART show. To mark his ten mile line he used neither chalk nor digged [sic] a trench. Only the camera filmed every half mile six seconds of landscape shooting in the direction he walked. Long himself was out of the cameraframe.' 34 This last comment is crucial and renders the jarring presence of the picture of the artist even more poignant when Schum goes on to add: 'In the LAND ART film none of the artists was to be seen as an acting person. I think this is another specific point of the TV gallery. The idea of the TV gallery is to show only art objects. I don't believe there is

34 Gerry Schum, letter in Land Art, (unpaginated).
RICHARD LONG

WALKING A STRAIGHT 10 MILE LINE
FORWARD AND BACK
SHOOTING EVERY HALF MILE
DARTMOOR ENGLAND JAN. 1969

photographs of the original TV film
Figure 4. Page from *Land Art*, 1969.
any sense in showing faces or hands of artists in close-ups or filming the "atmosphere" of a studio. The only thing to be seen is the work of art. And there is no commentary. Schum clearly is acting against the rhetoric of arts documentary films and television programmes, with their ponderous passages of hands at work and the slow panning around the artist's workspace as if to reveal or capture some of its creative energy. Schum's film style is much less mystified, more direct and straightforward. And yet the presence of such seemingly inappropriate documentation as the photograph of Long begs the question of what the intended function of this section of the documentation was. If not to appropriately represent the works and ideas contained in the film, what other intention could be at work here? Who does Schum suppose will be interested in a picture of the artist on location? Of course from the perspective of my own investigation it is fascinating, not only for the internal contradiction it points up in the film Land Art project but also for the image of the artist that is shown, another photograph of the artist to add to the other depictions that are discussed in the Land Art Body chapter of this study. In Schum's concern 'to show only art objects' he has inadvertently included a critical art object - the body of the artist - or more precisely, a representation of it.

All these aspects of Schum's Land Art are significant aspects of Land Art discourse and operative in constructing the category 'Land Art'. There is another reason for my exclusive emphasis on Schum's exhibition rather than any other early manifestation of the form, and this is not only the fact that it inaugurates and 'consecrates' the name I have chosen to use, 'Land Art', but that Land Art. Gerry Schum and Richard Long are synonymous from the outset in the discourse of Land Art. Schum affords Long definitive status in the Land Art exhibition when he writes that 'Long created the most consequent object in the LAND ART show.' In his obituary article on Gerry Schum in Studio International, Georg Jappe writes 'Gerry Schum's name was already recorded in the Neue Brockhaus, the leading German encyclopaedia, under the heading 'Land-Art'. The encyclopaedia entry affirms Schum's definitive connection with Land Art and Jappe's repetition of the connection reiterates that link in the context of the leading British art journal of the period. I make no apologies for the emphasis in this dissertation on Richard Long. It is not merely one of personal preference or availability of information. Richard Long is British Land Art and no definition of Land Art is complete or operative without some reference to him. Long's prominence is indisputable wherever one looks in texts about Land Art or in its exhibition. To afford Schum such prominence on the other hand requires something of a reinstatement. Despite his

\[\text{\ldots}\]
Schum dropped out of the picture following his unspectacular exit in 1973, so unlike the spectacular departure of Smithson that guaranteed his prominence in Earth and Land Art. Smithson’s highly public and tragic death at the height of his fame guaranteed him immortality in the discourse of art. Schum’s death, undiscovered for five days, only weeks before he had planned to wind down his gallery and without securing the firm museum contract he had been negotiating, left him as one of the footnotes in art history.  

Schum may have been left on the sidelines of Land Art discourse, but he is still present in that discourse, and that discourse open to transformation. Intervening in the discourse in order to open it up, to reconfigure it, or to render it into a state where it can be reconfigured, is one of the ambitions of writing this dissertation. This requires the use of a range of analytic and transformative theories that will render the existing edifice of discourse unstable and conspire with the existing discourse in order to create new facets to the discourse, other lines of flight or areas of inquiry. The initial questioning of Schum’s Land Art, detailed above, enabled the delineation of the dominant aspects of Land Art’s discourse. Asking the same question: ‘What is Gerry Schum’s Land Art?’ at a deeper level, facilitates the introduction and elaboration of the methodologies employed in this dissertation.

Beginning 2: Land Art: A Methodological Introduction

The first methodological approach returns to the very first observations about Schum’s Land Art, namely that it is an historical moment, an event, a fact of discourse. It is also a founding moment, an instance where the term ‘Land Art’ makes its entrance into the discourse of art, where it becomes both institutionalised and itself an institution. On both the founding of institutions as beginnings and on the elaboration of discourse as a system of discrete elements coming together to form a whole, the insights of Michel Foucault are exemplary. His theories of the ‘birth’ of certain ideas embodied in particular institutions (the clinic, the asylum, or the panoptican for example) and of a ‘systematic history of discourses’, a structural approach employed throughout Foucault’s ‘historical’ books, (that is, up to and including The Archaeology of Knowledge which acts as a kind of conclusion to this series), is perhaps most clearly stated in the preface to The Birth of the Clinic.

---

41 In the debate that ensued following the publication of Benjamin H. D. Buchloh’s essay on Conceptual Art (‘Conceptual Art 1962 - 1969: From the Aesthetic of Administration to the Critique of Institutions’, first published in L’art conceptuel: une perspective, (Paris: Musee d’art moderne de la Ville de Paris, 1989). reprinted (revised) in October, no. 55 (Winter 1990), pp. 105-143) Seth Siegelaub offered a ‘random list of some actors “missing in action” - dematerialized? - who contributed, in one way or another, to the formation of the art historical moment called, for lack of a better term, “Conceptual Art”.’ His list included Gerry Schum as well as the name “Land art” and the names of six of the eight artists included in Schum’s Land Art: Dibbets, Smithson, Flanagan, Long, Heizer and de Maria.


43 Michel Foucault, The Birth of the Clinic.
Beginnings are always problematic, and I am aware that in using that word I assume that there is one. There are many accounts of Land Art that seek to relate its practices to historical background. Particularly recurrent are relations to 18th century landscape gardening, landscape painting and poetry, or prehistoric 'art'. To trace such a genealogy, however fascinating, is to run the risk of constructing the very kind of historicist heresy that Rosalind Krauss denounced so famously in her essay 'Sculpture in the Expanded Field' (1979). One of the insights of the work of Michel Foucault is the significance of the emergence of institutions as beginnings. In his first 'history' book, *Madness and Civilisation*, Foucault dates the beginning of what he terms the 'great confinement' to the opening of the Hôpital General in 1657. Moreover, the notion of an institution, as Foucault demonstrates, need not be anything so physically substantial as a large building. The formulation of words or terminology and their passage into the specialist discourses of institutions or professional bodies constitutes a beginning. Thus one might trace the origins of psychiatry back to the mad doctors and alienists of previous generations, but they cannot be part of 'psychiatry' until that institution has been formulated, and thereby institutionalised, in words. Similarly, whilst one might trace the origins of Land Art back to chalk figures on the hillsides of the south of England or to the schemes of Capability Brown, the beginnings of these things as Land Art cannot pre-date the passing into the discourse of art or art history of the term 'Land Art'. Thus there is a beginning, and a beginning that finds its exemplary manifestation in Schum's *Land Art*, on 15 April 1969, on television, in Germany.

Foucault introduces his idea of a 'systematic history of discourses' in the preface to *The Birth of the Clinic* as follows:

To speak about the thought of others, to try to say what they have said has, by tradition, been to analyse the signified. But must the things said, elsewhere and by others, be treated exclusively in accordance with the play of signifier and signified, as a series of themes present more or less implicitly to one another? Is it not possible to make a structural analysis of discourses that would evade the fate of commentary by supposing no remainder, nothing in excess of what has been said, but only the fact of its historical appearance? The facts of discourse would then have to be treated not as autonomous nuclei of multiple significations, but as events and functional segments gradually coming together to form a system. The meaning of

---

15 It will be noted that my methodologies introduced in this introduction are themselves drawn, to a great extent, from the introductory and prefatory sections of other texts. They are beginnings derived from other beginnings. Deleuze and Guattari's 'Introduction: Rhizome' to *A Thousand Plateaus* and Foucault's preface to the *Birth of the Clinic* are two outstanding examples of this. The introduction or preface is highly useful because it 'reinscribes what will already have been written [...] And thus sufficiently read to be gathered up in its semantic tenor and proposed in advance. From the viewpoint of the fore-word, which recreates an intention-to-say after the fact, the text exists as something written - a past - which, under the false appearance of a present, a hidden omnipotent author (in full mastery of his product) is presenting to the reader as his future.' This introductory theory is the preface to Derrida's *Dissemination* which is itself both an analysis of what a preface is and also an exemplary model of being itself a preface.


a statement would be defined not by the treasure of intentions that it might contain, revealing and concealing it at the same time, but by the difference that articulates it upon the other real or possible statements, which are contemporary to it or to which it is opposed in the linear series of time. A systematic history of discourses would then become possible.

What counts in the things said by men is not so much what they may have thought or the extent to which these things represent their thoughts, as that which systematizes them from the outset, thus making them thereafter endlessly accessible to new discourses and open to the task of transforming them.

This seems the clearest and most concise statement of Foucault’s theory but it still remains to point out precisely how this system might be used for Land Art and to indicate some of its limitations. Again, to use the illustrative example of Schum’s Land Art, one might say that as a functional segment of discourse one would not be so concerned as to what Schum’s intentions were or what Land Art might ‘mean’ or signify, as with the fact of its historical appearance (on 15 April, on television, in Germany, documented in a catalogue, reviewed in magazines etc. etc.). The question would then be as to what difference the fact of this exhibition makes to an account of Land Art, or more broadly to an account of art. What difference does its appearance make to what is and can be said? This is very different from asking about its origins, motivations and so on. It asks rather about its future projection.

In order to become a ‘functional’ segment of discourse, Schum’s Land Art needs to be coded in such a way that it is made available in discourse. It needs to be disseminated. And in this process lies its systematization. How, in what form, in what places, sites and connections does Schum’s Land Art enter the professional discourse(s) of Art? Once entered it is both accessible and potentially transformative.

Widening this discussion out to other instances, events or ‘functional segments’ of Land Art discourse, one can then ask what difference does each addition to the discourse of Land Art make to what can be and is said about Land Art? What statements are facilitated and which ones blocked? How does each presentation rewrite its predecessors in such a way that the former texts appear to lead to the new one and yet are changed in and by the new text, not merely by nuances but in their entire thrust and meaning? The discourse on Long is a paradigmatic case of this shifting discourse that appears to sustain total internal consistency whilst perpetually rewriting and realigning the meanings of its contents.

This can be demonstrated by comparing the accounts of Long’s work contained in two ‘functional segments’ of discourse. The first is R. H. Fuch’s book Richard Long which accompanied a major exhibition of the artist’s work at the Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum in New York in 1986. It was published by Thames and Hudson, widely distributed and, until the advent of the other segment in this comparison, the most extensive account of the artist published. The other event/text/segment is Walking

---

46 Michel Foucault. The Birth of the Clinic, p. xvii.
47 ibid p. xix.
in Circles, published in 1991, again by Thames and Hudson, and this time to accompany a major exhibition at the Hayward Gallery, London.

The 1991 text, Walking in Circles, effectively shifts the overall conception of Long's oeuvre from one of a single direction, if not a strictly linear progress, a walk with stopping places (sculptures) as described in Fuchs' 1986 text, into a circular, encircling totality. This shift is embodied in the titles the respective authors use in their texts. The relevant section of Fuchs' text is entitled 'Walking the Line'. The major catalogue text by Anne Seymour in Walking in Circles is entitled 'Walking in Circles'. In making this reconfiguration of the discourse, Anne Seymour, the main author of the 1991 text, includes direct references to the former text and pre-existing segments of discourse from elsewhere on Long, and incorporates them into her reading of the works. Certain works, key ideas and theories are repeated. Particular works that were key works in the Fuchs text reappear but diminished in size and status within the text. For example The Line Made by Walking that Fuchs constructs as the founding work in Long's oeuvre, and through which he structures his text, is re-woven into Seymour's text as a small image, almost like a footnote in the text. It is there, but has slipped into the background whilst other works move into the foreground. Some works are relegated, others promoted, some disappear altogether. Her

---

50 The following extract from Fuchs' text encapsulates its linear character:

'The works are traces of staying and passing: each marks what was the centre of the world when he was there. The forms are forms of movement, like the straight line or the spiral, or forms of staying, like the circle and the cross. Many things come together in those forms. It is impossible to ascertain when and where a walk, moving lightly ahead, pauses for a while, curls up into a sculpture like a cat, and goes on its way again. In the end there is one giant work, stretched out across the world, crossing and overlapping, an epic of art. I shall have to unravel the slow growth of this work: how the walk crosses over the sculpture like water passing underneath the bridge like the footpath going over the mountain like the valley rolling through the mountains like water slipping into the sea, walking slipping into sculpture like a cloud drifting in the wind.'

51 Seymour's circular discourse and its realignment and shifting of the existing discourse are neatly summed up in the following extract from her essay 'Walking in Circles':

'For the purposes of this undertaking, the adventure begins and ends with mud, often thought to be the alpha and omega of existence. You cannot get more real than that, nor more abstract. The endpapers of this book reproduce works on paper made from that traditionally primeval, fertile and life-giving, fluid combination of stones, water and energy. Between these curtains, these waterfalls, these pages of the River Avon, the artist has arranged a number of sequences of his work, divided into two main sections. The first contains examples of the constantly expanding inner core of historical works underlying each new achievement. This in turn is broken down into different preoccupations - a kind of naming of parts. The second, or outer ring, presents a comprehensive record of Long's activity since his last major book, published in 1986, on the occasion of his exhibition at the Guggenheim Museum in New York. But there is no sense here of the finality of the retrospective. This is very much a report on work in progress; the ripple has much wider to spread. the hub at the centre of this 'wheel of becoming' will still turn for a long time yet. It is hard to believe that the artist is only 45 years old'.

Anne Seymour. 'Walking in Circles' in Richard Long. Walking in Circles, pp. 31-32.
own earlier contributions to the discourse on Long (in The New Art Catalogue (1972)) and in Old World New World (1988) for example) are reasserted with a different emphasis or direction.

There is another, more specific, interpretation of this shift from linear to circular discourse that is facilitated by ‘grafting’ a segment of discourse from Deleuze and Guattari’s A Thousand Plateaus:

Most modern methods for making series proliferate or a multiplicity grow are perfectly valid in one direction, for example, a linear direction, whereas a unity of totalization asserts itself even more firmly in another, circular or cyclic, dimension.

Seymour’s ‘Walking in Circles’ text brings things into the discourse, adds another functional segment, but does not make the claim to being a definitive ‘explanation’ or ‘meaning’, although it does suggest a total or all-encompassing interpretation. The elaboration of an authorised interpretative framework for Long’s work is left deliberately open-ended and unfixed. Despite this apparent fluidity and ability to be transformed, certain segments or ideas do become more fixed and permanent as they are repeated. Their mode of addition into the available segments of discourse ensures that they can as easily be discarded or disregarded as strengthened and (re)affirmed. Or, as Nietzsche puts it:

The form is fluid, but the meaning is even more so - even inside every individual organism the case is the same: with every genuine growth of the whole, the “function” of the individual organs becomes shifted. - in certain cases a partial perishing of these organs, a diminution of their numbers (for instance through annihilation of the connecting members). can be a symptom of growing strength and perfection.

The erasure of certain segments from the discourse can thus be interpreted as a strengthening, a nearing perfection, a refining. As the discourse develops processes of destruction, annihilation, removal, negation become as important and as ruthlessly carried out as any additions, or the creating of new segments. Long’s letter to Gerry Schum printed in the Land Art catalogue has a certain resonance in this connection: ‘If I sent you a telegramm [sic] saying “Destroy all the Working Shots taken on

---

52 Anne Seymour. Introduction to The New Art.
54 I’m sure they would not appreciate this ‘aborescent’ analogy to describe the attaching of their ideas into my discussion. Perhaps affiliating, or integrating or incorporating would be more appropriate.
57 Long’s behind-the-scenes scratching out of early works via discourse seems a pale shadow of the more total and ruthless acts of destruction carried out by, for example, John Baldessari. Baldessari cremated all his works made between May 1953 and March 1966 in his possession as of 24 July 1970. and had a notorized document published in the newspaper as a general affidavit. (Lucy R. Lippard. Six Years. pp. 179 and 191).
Dartmoor so that all knowledge of the film becomes exclusive to seeing the film as it was intended to be seen. I hope you would do it, and I would be very happy, as that is what I want!]

Foucault’s theory of a systematic history of discourse clearly owes something to these ideas of Nietzsche, and it is a provocative corrective to Foucault’s additive analysis of discourses, as proliferating and growing, to consider Nietzsche’s notions of removal and excision, or more famously his concept of ‘active forgetting’. Nietzsche argues that forgetfulness is an essential prerequisite of being, it is a necessary technique for survival:

active forgetfulness [...] is a very sentinel and nurse of psychic order, repose, etiquette; and this shows at once why it is that there can exist no happiness, no gladness, no hope, no pride, no real present, without forgetfulness.59

It is not that one fails to remember certain uncomfortable truths or, in the context of Land Art, fails to remember some aspect of pre-existing Land Art discourse that is incompatible with the present interpretation being forwarded. It is not a failure of memory but a process of deliberate forgetting. Land Art survives, as we all do according to Nietzsche, through forgetfulness.

The moment of Schum’s *Land Art* could also be seen as the achievement of a “plateau”. The idea is Deleuze and Guattari’s:

In Deleuze and Guattari’s thinking, a plateau is reached when circumstances combine to bring an activity to a pitch of intensity that is not automatically dissipated in a climax. The heightening of energies is sustained long enough to leave a kind of afterimage of its dynamism that can be reactivated or injected into other activities, creating a fabric of intensive states between which any number of connecting routes could exist.60

Schum’s *Land Art* is just such an intensity, the bringing together of disparate elements to create something with enough energy to leave a permanent trace, or to use the language of nuclear physics, the moment when it achieves its critical mass. The word ‘afterimage’ might suggest such images as the destroyed retina of an eye that saw the atomic explosion at Hiroshima, or the body image of Christ on the shroud of Turin reputedly caused by the intense power of the resurrection. On a more mundane level, the afterimage could be the image on the photographic film left by the exposure of the film to light, the process by which Schum’s *Land Art* was made. The resultant images were then dissipated into a television signal and received and reassembled on television screens throughout Germany. Introducing Deleuze and Guattari’s *A Thousand Plateaus*, the translator Brian Massumi also says this about the forming of a plateau:

---

58 Richard Long, letter to Gerry Schum in *Land Art*.
60 Brian Massumi. Translator’s Foreword to Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, p. xiv. 61 A photograph of an eye that had been burned out by seeing the atomic explosion at Hiroshima was shown in Jean Luc Vilmouth’s exhibition *Animal Public* at Camden Arts Centre, London, 1995.
Each "plateau" is an orchestration of crashing bricks extracted from a variety of disciplinary edifices. They carry traces of their former emplacements, which give them a spin defining the arc of their vector.62

It is useful to think of the Land Art plateau in this way. Land Art contains elements drawn from other areas of art practice as well as from other disciplines and areas of culture. For example, from Minimalism Land Art takes not only many of its presentation strategies and theoretical standpoints, but also several of Minimalism's protagonists in the forms of Robert Smithson and Robert Morris, who exhibited in the context of Minimal Art as well as in Earth Art and Land Art exhibitions, and also Carl Andre who was included in the Earthworks exhibition. Tiberghien constructs his history of Land Art63 in terms of its engagement with and transcendence of the problems raised by Minimalism. Attempting to make an exhaustive list of all the constituent parts of Land Art is an almost impossible task. They come from television, gardening, agriculture, theories of perspective, geography, anthropology, archaeology, engineering, and so on. In the succeeding chapters of this dissertation I examine some of these traces left on the plateau of Land Art, examining the consequences of these borrowings in the task of writing on and about Land Art. What 'spin' do they put on what is possible to say, on what direction it is possible to proceed? It is hoped that the initial movements made along each of the trajectories that each chapter begins can continue rather than coming to an abrupt full-stop.

Whilst the plateau of Land Art is sustained 'as an open equilibrium of moving parts each with its own trajectory,'64 the moment of the intensity that brought the plateau into being 'never lasts more than a flash, because the world rarely leaves room for uncommon intensity, being in large measure an entropic trashbin of outworn modes that refuse to die.'65 Land Art has persisted, and the evidence of that persistence is all around for everyone to see. Indeed it seems that Land Art has reached such a level of cultural saturation that its products find themselves on postage stamps.66 Land Art has become the justification for many public art commissions and the model for art and leisure projects throughout Britain. The intensity has been absorbed and incorporated into the very kind of institutions (the 'traditional triangle of studio, gallery and collector' for example) that Schum confidently stated 'will be destroyed.' (my emphasis). Land Art, and the initial intensity of its inaugural moment (Schum's Land Art) has become part of art and art history, that veritable 'trashbin of outworn modes that refuse to die.'

One of the great dangers is the temptation to construct Land Art as an institution or as a closed system. Explaining what the object of this study is constantly prompts definitions or categorical statements. However liberating a way of thinking Foucault's 'systematic history of discourses' is (in banishing the endless and frustrating task of always needing to interrogate intentions and motivations and the constant necessity of asking why someone did something and what did they mean when they said such and such)

63 Gilles A Tiberghien. Land Art.
64 Brian Massumi. Translator's Foreword to A Thousand Plateaus. p. xiv.
65 ibid.
66 Andy Goldsworthy was the first sculptor to design stamps for the Royal Mail. They were issued in April 1995.
it creates its own monsters. It does this by fooling one into thinking that a system can be constructed on
the basis of the historical facts of discourse and that that edifice can be interrogated and transformed
despite its finity. Deleuze and Guattari offer a valuable corrective to such false certainties, attacking
what they call 'arborescent thought,' and the constructing of tree-like genealogies, invoking instead a
'vegetal model of thought: the rhizome in opposition to the tree."

A study of Land Art conceived of on a tree model would look for 'roots': underlying conditions,
precursors, ancestors. The unitary trunk of the tree that takes nourishment from these roots and grows
strong and more defined is the solid bit of Land Art, the core elements that constitute Land Art. A
section through the trunk would reveal the familiar radiating rings, thick for the years when numerous
exhibitions and works were held, thinner when Land Art was not so prevalent. From there the branches
spread out, one would be the branch that Beardsley's Earthworks and Beyond follows, into large scale
permanent urban projects, another branch might be the sculpture parks and trails in Britain that took
their inspiration from Land Art, and so on. All are still fixed to the trunk of Land Art, but are separate
distinct strands. If one were to incorporate Foucault's systematic history of discourses one might avoid a
good deal of digging up roots. One would take the root system as a given and instead observe the
position of the trunk and existing branch growth and then, with some knowledge of the growth patterns
of this particular tree, predict where future branches and branch systems will spring from and in what
direction they will grow.

Deleuze and Guattari's methodology could hardly merit so fixed a term as a 'system'. Their idea of
nomadic thought is by its very nature unfixed, able to move, disperse, reform and generate from any
point."

---

to the English Edition. p. xvii. Rhizome is introduced in the introduction to Gilles Deleuze and Felix

" The important point is that the root-tree and canal-rhizome are not two opposed models: the first
operates as a transcendent model and tracing, even if it engenders its own escapes; the second operates
as an immanent process that overturns the model and outlines a map, even if it constitutes its own
hierarchies, even if it gives rise to a depotic channel. It is not a question of this or that place on earth, or
of a given moment in history, still less of this or that category of thought. It is a question of a model that
is perpetually in construction or collapsing, and of a process that is perpetually prolonging itself,
breaking off and starting up again. No, this is not a new or different dualism. The problem of writing: in
order to designate something exactly, an exact expression are utterly unavoidable. Not at all because it is
a necessary step, or because one can only advance by approximations: an exactitude is in no way an
approximation, on the contrary, it is the exact passage of that which is under way. We invoke one
dualism only in order to challenge another. We employ a dualism of models only in order to arrive at a
process that challenges all models. Each time, mental correctives are necessary to undo the dualisms we
had no wish to construct but through which we pass. Arrive at the magic formula we all seek -
PLURALISM = MONISM - via all the dualisms that are the enemy, an entirely necessary enemy, the
furniture we are forever rearranging.' Deleuze and Guattari, 'Introduction: Rhizome'. A Thousand
Plateaus, pp. 20-21.
Just as Schum's *Land Art* can be seen as a highpoint or intensity, conversely, the moment of Schum's *Land Art* can also be seen as a falling off, a beginning of a decline. All the elements that came together to form *Land Art* pre-exist this show, they are only gathered here in retrospect. As soon as they are named, labelled, institutionalised, some of that impetus is lost. Boundaries and limitations have already begun to be drawn. As well as opening onto potential opportunities for *Land Art* discourse, the exhibition closes down possibilities by choosing what to include and what to exclude. The advent of the word, the term *Land Art*, precludes the possibility of the thing existing as an actual reality. In a sense *Land Art* is a term or a word invented to fill the gap left by the absence of the thing it names. Or to put it another way, the word is invoked at the very moment when the possibility of the thing it names existing is ended. This is an idea developed in Heidegger's writing. It is useful in drawing attention to the violence of language. To put something into words is to do violence to it, to subjugate the complexity of lived experience under the tyranny of organised discourse, to impose upon it the strictures that govern language. Subsequently, the word and the complexity of things it has simplified in order to name are left vulnerable to be taken up and used by someone or some other ideology. This has clearly been the case with *Land Art* when, for example, its strategies of minimal intervention are usurped by green or environmental ideology to claim *Land Art* as bona fide Green Art. This is both a gross simplification of the motivation for its strategies, which came out of minimal art, conceptual art, process art as well as traditions of topographical depiction and geographic survey to name but a few, and a coercive realignment of the political complexity (and sometimes naivety) of the individual artists and projects subsumed under the term *Land Art*

In discussing Seymour's incorporative strategy for effecting a shift from one interpretation of Richard Long's work to another without seeming contradiction, one of the techniques mentioned was that of repetition. This involves the repeating of a number of pre-existing, more or less familiar elements in the new discourse to give the appearance of continuity, to affirm and legitimate. In order to introduce this idea as it is explored in this dissertation, one might consider repetition in relation to Schum's *Land Art*. Even if Schum's *Land Art* is a 'first' in the sense of being the first exhibition of that title, it is already a repetition. The film *Land Art*, by its very technologic and physical nature, is possible to repeat (endlessly, 'exactly')". There is often a moral or ethical dimension to theoretical views of repetition, especially in relation to the idea of copying. In most theories concerning copies, or simulacra, there is a notion of the original, or unique. In such theories, the copy or simulacra represents a moral fall, its untruth increasing with the distance of the copy from the original (Plato); or a nostalgic sense of loss being felt as each copy tries to capture a lost original, at the same time emptying out its meaning to become just empty simulation (Baudrillard)." Deleuze's ideas of repetition in his book *Difference and Repetition*" offer a provocative corrective on thinking about repetition. Deleuze notes how theories of

"Different strategies and interpretations of repetition are examined in *Land Art Repetition*, pp.65-120.


" Gilles Deleuze, *Difference and Repetition*. 

repetition are concerned with what is repeated rather than with repetition itself as a process, as a phenomenon, as an effect etc. He attempts to de-sever repetition from the concepts in which it is embedded. In Deleuze's theory, there is no original, repetition is the effect of differentiation in the first instance, and thus even the 'first' is already a copy and subsequent repetitions no more nor less 'authentic'. Deleuze's theory of repetition inaugurates a different moral or ethical interpretation of repetition and a non-hierarchical series of repetitions.

In most of these theoretical models I have been discussing it is assumed that there are connections between the elements involved in Land Art, whether they be intentional, the result of an intensity (Deleuze and Guattari); fixed by internal repetition or functional segments in a systematic history of discourse (Foucault). In each case Land Art is assumed to contain, at every level, multiple parts, that is to say, more than one idea, more than one interpretation, more than one source, even if as a discrete moment, as in Schum's Land Art it is a fixed, bounded unit. Underlying all this is the belief that Land Art is both a unit and a multiplicity, that it is highly complex and that it operates in some kind of a systematic or organic way. Before this line of thinking leads to the connection of elements causally or intentionally, and before the sheer proliferation of discourse completely obscures the object of enquiry, it is worth considering theories that might oppose these assumptions. What if Land Art were just one idea, or one set of ideas? What if the elements in it were assembled purely by chance?

On the question of chance, reading John Cage is enlightening.3 His choice of subject matter determined by throwing dice or considering arbitrary contingencies (such as the entries that are found next to each other in an alphabetically arranged dictionary) is at first disconcerting and then, once the chance factor is acknowledged, remarkably acceptable. Chance can seem to produce as reasonable connections as the most logical systems. And of course in a sense logic is Cage's subject matter, since the alphabet is not merely an arbitrary arrangement of letters but a powerful expression of civilisation and domination.4

On the question of Land Art as the product of one idea, or the project of one mind, consider Donald Judd's comments published almost exactly a year after Schum's Land Art:

---

2 Deleuze writes: "[...] But perhaps the majority of philosophers had subordinated difference to identity or to the Same, to the Similar, to the Opposed or to the Analogous: they had introduced difference into the identity of the concept, they had put difference into the concept itself, thereby reaching a conceptual difference, but not a concept of difference." Preface to the English Edition, ibid. p. xv.


But most of the so-called movements are only one person or maybe two really related. That's obvious by the work, by the initial development, by the fact that in two or three, ... the followers follow elsewhere."

Only two artists (Oppenheim and Smithson) appeared in all three exhibitions identified as 'founding' exhibitions. Richard Long is the only British artist who appears in two of these exhibitions and Barry Flanagan the only other British artist who appears in any of them. What would Earthworks be without Robert Smithson, who coined the term in this connection? Or Land Art without Gerry Schum? Or British Land Art without Richard Long? It is worth considering, if only as a corrective to thinking such categories as Land Art as constituted by several more or less equal components, that one element, person or idea may dominate, or moreover constitute the whole. Smithson was certainly the pivotal point if not the sole member of Earthworks. His death in 1973 did not 'end' the category but fixed it at a certain point, froze it at that defining moment, with Smithson's large scale work *Amarillo Ramp* in progress, mid-career, with the uncertainty of where he might have gone next. Had he lived and moved on, might those 'followers' have followed him to that elsewhere? All pointless speculation of course on one level, but what Smithson's death did represent, in the discourse of American Earth Art at least, was a fixed point, a stopping place. With Smithson's death he became 'pure' discourse, a fixed segment of discourse, a body of words and work onto which others could inscribe their own preoccupations, make into their own image. And Smithson's dense, rambling assemblage of ideas profound, provocative or just plain crazy, allowed and continue to allow maximum opportunity for such intervention."

---


"See appendix 1.

"'Earthworks' is the title of a novel by Brian Aldiss that Robert Smithson took on a trip to Passaic in 1967. The excursion was described in Smithson's famous magazine article/art work, 'The Monuments of Passaic' in *Artforum* 6 (December 1967), pp. 48-51. (Tiberghien's book wrongly gives the date as 1966 on p. 18.) Tiberghien suggests this source as the origin of the term. As a single word this may be the first occurrence of the term. However Smithson uses the two word term 'earth works' in an earlier article, 'Towards the Development of an Air Terminal Site', *Artforum* 5 (Summer 1967), pp. 36-39, p. 38. (The 'boring,' like other 'earth works,' is becoming more and more important to artists.) Rather than the term 'Earthworks' being drawn from the book as Tiberghien suggests, perhaps Smithson was drawn to the book because of its title. Earth works also refers to military applications of earth moving. There could be parallels between Smithson's practice and these applications. One example of a military earth work parallel would be the construction of earth jetties used for evacuations by sea (particularly at the end of the Second World War). The same construction technique was used by Smithson to build his *Spiral Jetty*.

"It is not only the moment of Smithson's death that is significant, but the manner of it. A comparison of Schum and Smithson's endings with regard to subsequent history needs to assess the cultural significance of assumed suicide with negotiations for future projects incomplete (Schum) with accidental death at the point of a perceived height of powers and influence (Smithson). It would be interesting to compare these with other famous or infamous deaths: Yves Klein, Monroe, Dean, Presley, Morrison, Joplin, Hendrix, Cobain et al.

"Roclof Louw described Smithson in the following terms, writing in 1977: 'Smithson was an original and exasperating artist, and perverse. He relished the role of an obfuscat polemician who messed around the ideas of his peers as much as his own. The rapid changes in his work are confusing, while his writings can bog one down in an awful morass of ideas. He took delight in annihilating one context in art with another, setting the ideal of beauty against the facts of death and decay, the abstract against the practical.' Roclof Louw, 'Sites/Non-Sites: Smithson's Influence on Recent Landscape Projects', *Tracks*.
Beginning 3: Land Art / Earth Art / Earthworks
This study is concerned with British Land Art, but it is revealing to consider the other most prevalent international terms, Earth Art and Earthworks and their similar origins to Land Art, inaugurated in exhibitions separated from Schum’s Land Art by only a few months. Equally, it is very difficult to discuss anything vaguely related to Land Art without some consideration of Smithson, whose work and influence affected British and European discourses immensely.

The Earth symposium, held to coincide with the Earth Art exhibition at the Andrew Dickson White Museum at Cornell University in 1968 [figure 5], is a particularly significant segment of discourse. It was the first attempt to debate this area of art practice publicly and formally. The proceedings (or extracts from them) were published widely and have become one of the most significant documents setting the agenda for Land Art and Earth Art discourse. Not only did most of the (then) key figures of Land Art and Earth Art take part, including Smithson and Long, but most of the central issues that have persisted in Land Art discourse were voiced at some point in the transcript. Reading this early discussion some 27 years after it was held reminds one of how consistent the discourse has been on certain aspects of Land Art. It also points out how arbitrary the grouping was perceived to be by at least one of the participants, Neil Jenney:

One of the really nice things about this show, I believe, is that it was like everybody that’s in earth is in it. Like I did something with earth in it and like that got me in the show. That’s like having a show compiled of everybody that was born in the spring.

Neil Jenney’s remarks serve as a warning against searching for too logical and profound a reasoning behind institutional shows and labels. And if the internal consistency of the grouping at any particular moment may be purely arbitrary or adventitious, how much more problematic is the quest to find some commonality between the various institutional events with the same or similar titles, or to trace some kind of development or elaboration of a consistent theory. As Nietzsche warns:

[...] the whole history of a “thing,” an organ, a custom, can [...] be regarded as a continuous “sign chain” of perpetually new interpretations and adjustments, whose causes, so far from needing to have even a mutual connection, sometimes follow and alternate with each other absolutely haphazard.

---

80 The symposium actually took place before the artists executed their works for the show, and thus they talked not only of their past work but of their projected projects for the Earth exhibition.
82 Nietzsche. The Genealogy of Morals, p. 90.
Figure 5. Cover to *Earth Art*, 1969.
Beyond the spatial unity of a particular exhibition or institutional definition, the grouping of exhibitions, ideas, artists and things together often has a pragmatic function. This is seen for example in the arrangement of entries under subject headings in *Art Index* or one of the other art bibliographies, or more recently in computer databases. These create an order which is necessarily, and self-consciously, approximate (or as Deleuze and Guattari might designate it 'anexact'), and yet is geared towards the use of the contained materials. It is a way of making the materials 'ready to hand'. Thus the logic of organisation of entries in a bibliography not only embodies the preferences, reasoning (and mistakes) of the individuals and organisations that compile them, but also gives an indication of the projected uses the compilers assume in their destined users. Thus the index not only reviews existing materials but previews projected analyses. If art magazines and journals can be seen as a first draft of art history, art bibliographies can perhaps be seen as some kind of editing stage between the first and subsequent drafts. Art bibliographies show the passing over of descriptive or characterising words into established terminology. They mark the institutionalisation of terms, the creation of functional segments of discourse, or of nodal points and convergences in the proliferating system of discourse.

For example, looking up the term 'Earthwork' or 'Earthworks' in *Art Index* proves to be a revealing endeavour. Prior to *Art Index* 17 (November 1968 - October 1969) the word 'Earthwork' refers exclusively to archaeology. Examples of entries from *Art Index* 16 (1967-1968) are 'Excavation of 2 long barrows in north Wiltshire' I F Smith and J G Evans Antiquity 42; 'Silbury Hill' R J C Atkinson Antiquity 41. The heading Earthwork is followed by 'See also Excavation'. One might expect to find articles on barrows, tumuli or other earth-constructed fortifications. From *Art Index* 17 onwards, separate archaeology (architecture) and art sub-heads are required. Thus under Earthwork in *Art Index* 17 one finds: 'Earth in Upheaval, earthworks and landscapes. P Hutchinson Arts 43: 19 + November 1968' and under Earthwork Architecture: 'E Kremser. Arch. Rev. 145: 241-3, April 1969'. The first reference refers to an article on art earthworks (land art), the second to an archaeological/architectural article.

Looking at a later Art Bibliography the distinction is clear. In *BHA Bibliography of the History of Art* 1990, Volume 1, section 450 is clearly divided up into 'Earthworks (archaeology)' and 'Earthworks (environmental art)'. Under the latter heading one is directed to 'See also related term Environment (art). Land art'.

---

83 Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, e.g. p. 20.
84 See Thomas McEvilley. 'Sweet Thoughts'. *Artforum* 32 (September 1993), 30th Anniversary Issue, pp. 178-179, p. 179. McEvilley writes: '[...] the first framing, analysis, contextualization, and evaluation of art takes place in the magazines, and that early formulation powerfully affects artworks' subsequent reception. The authors of the books that deal with contemporary artworks as they recede into the past, either to disappear there or to take their shadowy place in the museum and the enduring record, rely on various sources of information - notably exhibition catalogues, which are enormously influential records - but it is the magazines that stitch the history of their time in the most complete and seamless fabric.'
The archaelogic resonance of the term Earthworks could provide a useful means of contrasting the term with the term Land Art. Earthworks is a term with an American connection, according to Beardsley only referring correctly to large scale works in earth and sod, a term that originated in America and whose origin is connected with the American artist Robert Smithson. Land Art has a European origin, is the word most frequently associated with the British artists and, unlike Earth, has a connection with the environment (as demonstrated in the extract from BHA quoted above) and with the landscape. The contrast could be thought of as one of archaeologic to geographic. This comparison is quite productive.85

The archaeologic can characterise Smithson’s interest in spoiled industrial sites and the stratification of the earth such earth moving reveals, his interest in prehistoric remains (especially dinosaurs) and with his theory of ‘sedimentation’ developed in his writing. Smithson’s is a practice that probes beneath the surface of the earth and of language, it unsettles and unearths the layering of history beneath the seemingly fixed surface of the earth. The archaeologic in the broader American context is summed up in such titles as ‘Probing the Earth’ the title of Beardsley’s first text on the subject.86

The geographic on the other hand is concerned with the history of the land as it can be discerned mapped across its surface. The practice of British artists such as Long and Fulton (and latterly Andy Goldsworthy) is to make work with the minimum disturbance of the earth’s surface. The idea of excavation could not be further from their rhetoric which is summed up in such phrases as ‘to touch the earth lightly’. The phrase was used by Richard Long.87

It would certainly be tempting to construct Richard Long as the unitary and defining element of Land Art in a similar way to that in which Smithson can be constructed for Earthworks. At the time of writing this, Long is still alive, still adding to his own discourse, still producing things to be discussed in Land Art discourse. He offers no full-stop other than the temporary ones provided by such definitive texts and exhibitions as the 1986 Guggenheim exhibition and Fuchs’ Richard Long or Walking in Circles (1991) discussed above. These popular texts are central to my research, as crucial as any obscure detail dug up from the archives. For one thing an artist such as Richard Long has been scrupulous in clearing up any obscure scraps that might lurk undiscovered in an archive, and secondly because that public and popular image is Land Art. Land Art is that surface glitter, its presentation is its substance, its appearance its depth. The close attention this study pays to published texts that can be bought from any major bookstore and are published by the leading mainstream art publishers such as Thames and Hudson, is crucial. The most obvious is often the very thing that is overlooked, a message that is demonstrated in Edgar Allen

85 The setting up of this dualism is potentially dangerous and misleading as Deleuze and Guattari point out about all dualisms. (see note 68 above). It is nonetheless useful, if only to shatter other more misleading dualisms such as those which contrast British and American work in terms of scale, or in terms of land ownership and real estate.
Poe’s famous story of *The Purloined Letter.* The stolen letter is found exactly where it is least expected to be found in the possession of its thief, in the very place one *would* expect to find a letter - in the letter rack on the mantelpiece. The other changes that the stolen letter has undergone is that it has been re-addressed and re-posted. This might aptly describe the use of the most obvious sources and at the same time the desire to present something different and unfamiliar. The familiar needs to be re-addressed and re-directed. It needs a different destination written upon it, and it needs to be sent, directed elsewhere.

The most obvious is often overlooked or disregarded as unimportant. What is perhaps most obvious in any cursory review of Land Art texts is the apparent absence of theory, or, in places, its active disavowal or rejection. With a few exceptions, the theory of British Land Art is defiantly anti-theory. Accounts of Land Art often read as poetic ramblings or the recounting of historical ‘facts’ placing Land Art in relation to other movements with more theoretical credentials such as Minimalism, for example. Looking at the texts on Richard Long or Hamish Fulton for example, one finds a strategy of suggestion and denial of specific meaning or relevance. Possible ‘meanings’ for the work are put forward, only to be retracted almost immediately as groundless. The following example is by R. H. Fuchs writing in *Studio International*:

Among the manuscript notes of Leonardo there is a beautiful one concerning the ‘18 actions of man’: ‘repose. movement. running, standing, supported, sitting, leaning, kneeling, lying down. suspended. carrying or being carried, thrusting, pulling, striking, being struck, pressing down and lifting up.’ Of course this remark has nothing to do with Hamish Fulton’s concerns in a work like 10 Views of Brockmans Mount - or almost nothing. (my emphasis)

As well as such explicit avoidances, Land Art’s is a theory that doesn’t admit its theoretical dependences or is unaware of them. For example, Fuchs’ discussion of the origin of Richard Long’s *Line Made by Walking* as the founding work of Long’s oeuvre can be seen to follow the line of argument put forward in Heidegger’s *The Origin of the Work of Art,* although no reference is made to this, or indeed any philosophical or theoretical text. Compare for example Fuch’s explanation of the origin of Long’s *Line Made by Walking* with Heidegger’s account of *The Origin of the Work of Art.* Fuchs writes:

There are always art-historical links and other aesthetic considerations to be pointed out, but they serve only to define the independence and the autonomy of the new work. *Its present existence can never be deduced from what came before.* (my emphasis)

and Heidegger:

*The truth that discloses itself in the work can never be proved or derived from what went before.* What went before is refuted in its exclusive actuality by the work. What art founds can

---


90 R. H. Fuchs, *Richard Long.* p. 44.
therefore never be compensated and made up for by what is already at hand and available. (my emphasis)\textsuperscript{91}

The idea of the work's autonomy, the impossibility of accounting for the work of art in things that lead up to it is Heidggerian, whether Fuchs found it directly from Heidegger or from any one of a multitude of different sources. The other idea Fuchs forwards in relation to the Line Made by Walking also owes something to Heidegger's thought in The Origin of the Work of Art in its idea of the work as a moment in which history, or art history is cancelled: or a moment when the work escapes from history.\textsuperscript{92} Instead of citing a source for this line of argument, or even suggesting that it represents a theoretical point of view, this line of argument is presented in Fuchs' text as a simple matter of fact, a common sense observation. This use (or abuse) of the everyday or common sense mode of discourse permeates much of the discourse on Land Art and particularly that on Long. It is sophistication masked by the rhetoric of the obvious and straightforward, or as Long's own words would have it: 'I like sensibility without technique.'\textsuperscript{93}

There can be no sensibility without technique.\textsuperscript{94} The transparent presentation of sensibility untouched by artifice is itself a sophisticated technique. Land Art is a technique. It is a techne (a system of knowledge in action) that presents itself, or that pretends to be poiesis (a bringing forth, a revealing).

Fuchs is not far off the mark when he comments that

\[\textit{It is true that the Line Made by Walking looks like a carefully executed formal study, an essay in technique and procedure.}\textsuperscript{95}\]

One of the tasks of any attempt to unpick and reassemble the discourse of Land Art is to identify its theoretical underpinnings, however seemingly straightforward, however unacknowledged, and to bring them into the light, to reveal them. This requires cutting into the seemingly impenetrable canopy of the forest of words and things that is Land Art and making a clearing. The idea is Heidegger's. it is useful, and unlike many of the strategies of Land Art discourse it is, in this discourse, acknowledged.

I have begun with the words 'Land Art.' and introducing them has been the task of this introduction. By the conclusion I will again consider these two words, their coming together, and the effect and products of bringing them together with other words, with other discourses made of words and with other


\textsuperscript{92} see ibid. p. 201-202

\textsuperscript{93} Richard Long, Five. six. pick up sticks Seven, eight, lay them straight (London: The Curwen Press for Anthony d'Offay, September 1980 (unpaginated))

\textsuperscript{94} See for example the discussion in Peter Bürger. Theory of the Avant Garde (Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press. 1984). p. 18. Bürger quotes Adorno: 'the key to any and every content (Gehalt) of art lies in its technique'.

\textsuperscript{95} R. H. Fuchs, Richard Long. p. 46
contingencies in the main chapters of this dissertation. The process might be seen as that of rending the words and discourses apart, seeing what is hidden in the folds between them and then putting them back together, assessing the problems and liabilities of such a realignment.

The idea of a book (or of a thesis) has been a problem to me throughout the act of researching and writing this dissertation. Deleuze and Guattari offer a few words of advice, consolation, affirmation and possibility. I have selected three extracts that I think most appropriate in relation to the writing I present here in this dissertation.

1 Take William Burroughs’s cut-up method: the folding of one text onto another, which constitutes multiple and even adventitious roots (like a cutting), implies a supplementary dimension to that of the texts under consideration. In this supplementary dimension of folding, unity continues its spiritual labor. That is why the most resolutely fragmented work can also be presented as the Total Work or Magnum Opus. 96

2 The ideal for a book would be to lay everything out on a plane of exteriority [...]. on a single page, the same sheet: lived events, historical determinations, concepts, individuals, groups, social formations. 97

3 There is no difference between what a book talks about and how it is made. 98

I hope this beginning will have indicated something of how this book is made, and thereby something about what it talks about.

---

97 ibid., p 9
98 ibid., p 4
**Land Art Sculpture**

This chapter examines the proposition that the history of Land Art is implicated in and constituent of a history of sculpture. During the period under consideration, from the mid 1960s, this history is dominated by a key shift from an emphasis on *sculpture* to an emphasis on *sculptors*. That is to say a professional relocation. Evidence of such a shift is found in the examples of exhibitions and exhibition catalogues which, finding themselves unable to define their contents in any satisfactory way either stylistically or using existing definitions of the discipline, resorted to defining products in terms of the professional commitments/definitions of their producers. As the introduction to an exhibition at the Stedelijk Museum, Amsterdam puts it:

> for this exhibition a selection has been made of the work of twenty-two artists from western Europe and North America, they can hardly be said to share any one basic characteristic - such as style - in common, what they do all have in common is that they started out as sculptors and/or they consider themselves as sculptors.\(^9\)

---

\(^9\) Amsterdam Stedelijk Museum *made by sculptors* (exhibition catalogue to an exhibition held 14 September - 5 November 1978).
Figure 6. Cartoon reproduced in *Studio International* (January 1969).
'Sculpture then seemed a vast empty field, and we had just climbed over the gate' David Annesley, quoted in *Potlatch*.

A sheep stands before a four-barred gate, the date 1968 written on its body. A large question mark above its head.

But it is not only the sheep in the cartoon that has questions about the meaning of what is depicted in the fields. Who are the 'we' of Annesley's statement, and where precisely are 'we' standing? Is one to interpret the 'we' of the statement as the sculptors represented by the sculptures in the far field, most of which are identifiable. Do they occupy the field into which they have just climbed? In which case, it is no longer an empty field, but one full of objects of sculpture. One can read the image another way. Is the field into which 'we' (the sculptors) have just climbed the one 'we' the viewer(s) of the cartoon are placed in - a field empty but for ourselves, the sheep and a bit of the rope of Barry Flanagan's rope sculpture? Is the sheep's questioning directed towards sculpture's future - are these objects in the far field the future of sculpture after 1968? - or does the sheep's question mark indicate the sheep's questioning of sculpture's incomprehensible past before 1968? (all the sculptures depicted were made before or during 1968). Is the cartoon anticipatory or retrospective?

Either way, two aspects of the cartoon are important. One is the idea of some radical shift or change, of some overcoming in which sculpture has traversed a boundary into new territory. The second is the location of the cartoon - in the fields - a location that could relate to the name of the institution to which these sculptors belonged. St. Martin's, in the parish of St. Martin's in the Fields, and to the location of much of the artistic activity of sculptors from that institution in the later 1960s. It is easy to imagine Gilbert and George in their Sunday-best suits out for a picnic, David Tremlett recording the bird song and other noises of the countryside, or Richard Long walking up and down the field in a straight line making his *A Line Made by Walking England* 1967. The notion of a field also anticipates (or repeats in advance) the location of sculpture in Rosalind Krauss's famous essay of 1979, 'Sculpture in the Expanded Field'.

The image and quotation were reproduced in *Studio International* in January 1969 in a special issue focusing on 'some aspects of contemporary British Sculpture' which dealt almost exclusively with sculptors connected to St. Martin's School of Art. The image was also repeated in *A Quiet Revolution*, published to accompany an exhibition of British Sculpture since 1965 held at the Museum of

---

102 As they appeared in Gilbert & George, 'The Paintings' (with Us in the Nature) of Gilbert & George the human sculptors 1971 (Edinburgh: The Fruitmarket Gallery, 1986). Photographs of the paintings were taken in Stockwell Depot in 1971. The paintings were exhibited at the Stedelijk Museum Amsterdam in 1971.
103 See for example the description of a 45-minute tape piece made in 1971 in *The New Art*, pp. 115-117; and also 'The art of searching: an interview with David Tremlett', *Avalanche*, no. 3 (Fall 1971), pp. 10-17.
Contemporary Art in Chicago in 1987. The resonance of the cartoon image and the title of this latter publication attest to a familiar refrain in accounts of sculpture in this period. Something had changed. Sculpture wasn’t the same as it had been before. The precise dates of this change are disputed, and the characterisation of the nature of the change dependent on the theoretical standpoint and preferred historical model adopted by the person recounting the story. For example, some accounts posit a clear cut-off date for a radical break in a tradition. In 1981 in an essay in the catalogue to the exhibition British Sculpture in the Twentieth Century, Stuart Morgan wrote of sculpture in the period from The New Generation exhibition in 1965 to The New Art in 1972:

... no detailed art historical model for the art of this period has yet been proposed. Perhaps there are good reasons for this omission. Flavio Caroli can maintain that in order to defeat consumerism the Italian avant-garde committed tactical hara-kiri in 1968. Similarly, Robert Pincus-Witten can defend 1968 as the year which rivalled any in early modernism. In Britain no comparable annum mirabilis can be found. However, in 1988 Lynne Cooke defends 1968 as a cut-off point of relevance to British Sculpture. She too refers to Robert Pincus-Witten:

... 1968 [...] being seen by certain critics, such as Robert Pincus-Witten, as an annum mirabilis in the history of twentieth century art: a counterpoint in sculpture to 1907 in painting. [...] While schematic and simplistic in some respects, this designating of a caesura does have a certain validity, as well as an indisputable resonance - [...] No single subsequent year carries anything like this weight of art historical resonance and reference.

This could be seen to correspond to Foulke’s contemporary apprehension of the situation embodied in his cartoon image, and also to a whole range of ‘postmodern’ accounts such as those by Krauss or Owens which posit such an epistemological break, or end point to the modernist tradition.

Others posit an evolutionary or gradual adaptation to a changing social, economic and political situation. Such analyses ground themselves in the sometimes ecstatic accounts of the mythic ‘1960s’ (Hilary Gresty’s M Phil thesis does this to a certain extent) Others locate ‘moments’ with beginnings and ends, such as


106 Lynne Cooke. ‘British Sculpture in the Eighties: Questioning cultural myths confirming artistic conventions’ in Britannica: Trente Ans de Sculpture, pp. 49-68. p 49. Cooke goes on to posit 1981 as a further crucial turning point in British sculpture history - the year of Objects and Sculpture at the Arnolfini, and the Whitechapel British Sculpture in the Twentieth Century exhibition, from the catalogue of which my above quotation was taken.


that charted by the exhibition at Kettles Yard Cambridge in 1984: *When attitudes became form*.

This exhibition draws heavily on the research of its curator, Hilary Gresty, but its 'momental' analysis and clearly defined periodicity is typical of the theoretical approach of the author of one of the major catalogue essays - Charles Harrison. This strategy of identifying a moment, its cut-off beginning and endpoints, and then charting in detail the strategic and significant modifications within it, is typical of Harrison's approach in his writings on English modernism, British Sculpture in the period of his assistant editorship of *Studio International* and his writings on Art and Language.\(^{110}\) Other approaches posit originary beginning points - such as the *Quiet Revolution* book which presents sculpture since 1965 - although it could also be seen to have an implicit teleological endpoint in the current (when the book was published) situation, the past seeming justification for the 'highpoint' of the present.

To this already complex accumulation of stories, one can add: accounts that propose an increasing specialisation and/or investigation of the essential practices and properties of the discipline of sculpture:\(^{111}\) a move toward dematerialization and the rejection of the physical language of sculpture:\(^{112}\) a withdrawal from the limitations of sculptural convention and the embracing of new technologies:\(^{113}\) an expansion or extension of the field of practice:\(^{114}\) or the rejection of objects and fabrication in favour of procedure, ideas and attitudes.\(^{115}\)

Although some accounts deal with the structural changes rather than changes in the appearance of sculpture, most of these accounts begin by noting a change in the objects of sculpture and then attempt to account for the change. Explanations offered for change may be a change in consciousness, ideology, culture, economics, politics or theory; or change may be posited as the result of an immanent critique of


\(^{111}\) Formalist modernist approaches such as those of Greenberg and Fried, or the William Tucker of *The Language of Sculpture and What Sculpture is*. See the discussion of Tucker's writings from this period in my *William Tucker: The Language of a Sculptor* (Leeds: Henry Moore Centre for the Study of Sculpture, 1995)

\(^{112}\) See for example Lucy R. Lippard. *Six Years. The Dematerialization of the Art Object.*


\(^{114}\) Krauss particularly, see: Rosalind E. Krauss. 'Sculpture in the Expanded Field': but also the ideas of Beuys, see for example: Joseph Beuys. 'Not Just a Few Are Called, But Everyone' reprinted in *Art in Theory*, pp. 889-892.

\(^{115}\) Accounts of so-called conceptualism, exhibitions such as *When Attitudes Become Form. Live in your Head* (exhibition) (Berne: 1969 and Institute of Contemporary Arts, London: Autumn 1969); *Op Losse Shooveen*. Stedelijk Museum, Amsterdam, (1969); *Sonsbeek '71*. Sonsbeek Park, Holland, (1971) and *Art Povera* Germano Celant, 1969 (publication) exhibitions of this title were also held in 1967 and 1968.
sculpture or symptomatic of a gradual or persistent evolution in the discipline. Harrison, more than most, looks to systematic changes in the production of sculpture rather than simply to effects upon its products. This clearly is symptomatic of, and a product of, his engagement with the practice of Art & Language. This is by no means insignificant to the story I am attempting to detail here. I want to insist that the changes that occur, not only in sculpture practice but also in sculpture discourse - and I see these as inseparable from one another - necessitate the examination of sculpture as a techne, the critical examination of its techniques of practice, theoretical dissemination and professional and educational training. I want to avoid approaches that polarise or prioritise the producers and the products of sculpture. I intend to examine the production of sculptors as much as the production of sculpture.

I might claim to be a sculptor and do everything but sculpture. This is my dilemma. Barry Flanagan 1963 (1965)

A great deal of English art over the past two decades has been designated sculpture the more militantly as the designation is inappropriate. Charles Harrison 1986

In both of these quotations a separation is made between naming, designating or claiming something or some practice 'sculpture' and sculpture (thing or practice) per se. Underlying both it appears is an assumption that there is some inalienably essential sculptureness. In this sense 'sculpture' is the thing that Flanagan isn't doing, despite his claims to be a do-er of it, or some inalienable essence that sculpture has but a great deal of English art, according to Harrison's quotation doesn't have. On the other hand, sculpture is claimed by Flanagan as his 'profession' - a claim to being a sculptor: and in Harrison's observation a designation as sculpture is a claim by a particular area of art to its being sculpture. In both cases, that there is something that is essentially or inalienably 'sculpture' is disavowed, avoided or misused by the practitioners or objects subject to these claims.

Barry Flanagan, student and teacher at St. Martin's School of Art, often considered the first of, or the spokesperson of, the so-called 'New Art' or 'conceptual' strain of St. Martin's students, wrote the above comment in a letter to Anthony Caro, dated 1963 and published in the St. Martin's college magazine Flanagan co-edited between 1964 and 1965. Silans. Flanagan was the producer of two of the works illustrated in Foulke's 'St Martin's in the Fields' cartoon, including the rope that links the two fields. Charles Harrison, as assistant editor of the influential British art journal Studio International between 1967

---

118 Silans was the magazine of the St Martin's Vocational Sculpture course, it was edited by Barry Flanagan, Alastair Jackson and Rudy Leenders, 16 issues, September 1964 - June 1965. It was produced on very low-grade paper using a spirit duplicator. This does allow for hand-written sections as well as typed ones. The title is sometimes given in the magazine as 'Silence' rather than 'Silans'.
119 Charles Harrison gives the following account of his encounter with a rope piece by Flanagan: 'In the summer of 1967, on an assignment for Studio International, I met Barry Flanagan at the Rowan Gallery. He was accompanied by a sixty-foot rope in a hessian bag.' from: ‘The late sixties in London and elsewhere' in the catalogue to 1965 to 1972 - When attitudes became form. p. 9.
and 1971, had promoted the work of the ‘New Art’ St. Martin’s students. The name ‘New Art’ however, is apocryphal to Harrison’s period at Studio International, since the tag was assigned only after the exhibition of that title in 1972.\(^{120}\) At the time of Harrison’s writing, he refers to them as ‘younger sculptors’, in an article published in Studio International in 1969 making a distinction (with one exception - Brener) between those St Martin’s sculptors over and under thirty years of age.\(^{121}\) (This is the same issue of Studio International in which Foulke’s cartoon appeared). Harrison’s article discussed and illustrated works by Richard Long, Barry Flanagan, Roland Brener, Roelof Louw and Bruce McLean, some of which had been and subsequently would be designated as ‘land art’, all of which were, in this essay ‘militantly’ labelled as ‘sculpture’ - the entire discussion appearing under the general title ‘Sculpture’ and particularly noteworthy for the frequency of use of the word ‘sculpture’ in the captions describing the illustrations. For example, moveable sculpture (Long), sculpture 1968 (Brener), sculpture June 1968 (Louw). Floataway sculpture (McLean) Barry Flanagan’s writing also makes an appearance in this issue of Studio International, in the form of a short article ‘From notes ‘67/68’.\(^{122} 123\)

Harrison wrote about two of the same artists again in an article in Artscribe\(^{124}\) in 1986. In ‘Sculpture, Design and Three-Dimensional work’\(^{125}\) Harrison discusses Barry Flanagan’s ubiquitous ‘hares’ as examples of ‘this thoroughly traditional sculptural currency’ which ‘Barry Flanagan, for instance has made [...] his virtual stock-in-trade for some while’.\(^{126}\) Richard Long’s work is discussed too, along with other ‘landscape sculpture’ and ‘site-specific work’ (not so-called in the article). Here, the designation ‘sculpture’ for Long’s work is disputed. Indeed ‘Long’s’ coherence as a whole (ouvre) is brought into question. Designated by the highly genre un-specific term ‘aesthetic production’, Harrison signals the uneasiness of the theoretical (and economic) devices which organize Long’s outdoor activities, his indoor activities and his maps and photographs into one coherent career.\(^{127}\) Appropriately, the illustration of Long’s work which appears under the title at the beginning of Harrison’s article, unlike the insistent ‘sculpture’ titles of the 1969 Studio International essay, is captioned ‘Untitled 1986’.

It seems that in the intervening years the prevailing hegemony within which works could safely be gathered into an issue on ‘British Sculpture’ had been substantially undermined - at least for Harrison.

---

121 Charles Harrison. ‘Some recent sculpture in Britain’ Studio International 177 (January 1969), pp. 26-33, p. 32.
123 In 1971 Harrison referred to a group which included most of the ‘younger sculptors’ at St Martin’s mentioned in the above article along with some others, as ‘The British Avant-Garde’ in the May 1971 issue of Studio International which doubled as the catalogue to the exhibition of that name held at the New York Cultural Center in 1971, curated by Harrison. This exhibition showed works by: Keith Arnatt, Sue Arrowsmith, Terry Atkinson, David Bainbridge, Michael Baldwin, Victor Burgin, Colin Crumplin, Andrew Dippier, David Dye, Barry Flanagan, Gilbert & George, Harold Hurrell, Richard Long, Roelof Louw, Bruce McLean, Gerald Newman and David Tremlett.
124 The periodical Artscribe began publication in 1976.
125 Charles Harrison. ‘Sculpture, Design and Three-Dimensional Work’, pp. 60-64.
126 ibid., p 64.
127 ibid., p 63.
Now appearing under the title ‘Sculpture, Design and Three-Dimensional Work’, Harrison not only questions whether or not ‘sculpture’ is or ever was an appropriate designation for much of the work discussed under that head, his own writing included, but more fundamentally, he suspects the usefulness of the designation.

Harrison turns the question from ‘What is Sculpture?’ (and what is ‘Design’ or ‘Three-Dimensional Work’?) into ‘What use is the term ‘Sculpture’’, suggesting at the end of his essay:

> It may be that commitment to the practical and conceptual integrity of ‘sculpture’ is now inhibiting: that it serves to obscure some important lesson which might otherwise be learnable from the recent history of art.  

To raise the issue of usefulness is to beg the questions ‘useful for what?’ and ‘useful for whom?’. One might ask how useful it is for Harrison to shift the argument to the question of usefulness. What is so useful about seeing work as not sculpture? Problematic, obscuring or inhibiting as it may be, the claims have nonetheless been made. Whether or not the work is sculpture in any essential sense is only to impose another definition of ‘sculpture’ and to side-step the issues of how, why and with what consequence art productions have been termed sculpture. What needs to be considered is how ‘land art’ (and other ‘New Art’ productions) come to be considered as a part of sculpture discourse - the processes by which, and the modulations of definitions and justifications through which, things become known as sculpture - rather than seeking arguments for and against their being sculpture. Such an enquiry needs to look at when, where, how and by whom such claims are made.

The shift of terms in Flanagan’s quotation that sets up a contrast between (being a) ‘sculptor’ and (doing) ‘sculpture’ illustrates an important aspect of the persistence of these terms amongst the so-called ‘New Art’, ‘conceptual’ or ‘dematerialized’ artists and the sometimes seemingly perverse commitment to ‘sculpture’ as a discipline and the professional designation ‘sculptor’.

Central to the modernism of Clement Greenberg and his followers, Michael Fried in particular, was the belief that the continued vitality of the arts lay in the ability of disciplines to rid themselves of all that was inessential to them - an emptying out of all that was superfluous - and a re-entrenching of that particular discipline in the seed-bed of its own competence. This involved a self-criticism of that discipline - a questioning from within concurrent/co-temporal with its continued practice - an immanent critique. Thus it required an artist to be ‘in’ - committed to and entrenched in his/her discipline, and operating within it in a simultaneously practical, critical and self-reflexive way.

The staff and students at St. Martin’s were well acquainted with Greenberg’s theories, through Anthony Caro and directly from Greenberg’s lecture visit(s) to the school. Students also had access to such theories.

17 ibid., p. 64.
Charles Harrison asserts that ‘Modernism was better understood in the St. Martin’s sculpture department that anywhere else in the mid sixties’.[131] The ‘conceptual’, ‘New Art’ etc. artists (by whatever name they were called), at least those from St. Martin’s, were committed to sculpture by the fact of their being in the sculpture department. Weak though that argument may seem, it marks a certain commitment. (It’s not the same as being in the painting department for example).

St. Martin’s sculpture department was successful - in producing sculptors. According to Fried, its record ‘over more that a decade’ (written in 1971) speaks for itself. Indeed, it is ‘something of a legend’. In addition to this, it has, somewhere in its history during that period a time when, according to Harrison, modernism was better understood there than anywhere else. To be, to have been, part of that department during that period is to be in some way a part of that legend - or myth. It is to be engaged with sculpture in the sense of being ‘in’: being committed to the discipline in such a way that one’s activities, however ‘unsculptural’ or ‘unartistic’ they may appear if one labours under essential definitions of ‘sculpture’ and ‘art’, are directed from within and are thus self-critical.

Those ‘sculptors’, however removed from ‘traditional’ sculptural activity, were engaged with a critique of sculpture, moreover with a critique of modernist sculpture, and to push it still further, but with justification, with the very tradition of modernism. That increasingly the St. Martin’s sculpture students come to mistrust what the high priests of Greenbergian modernism claim as sculpture’s ‘essence’, that they seem to gravitate from interrogating sculpture’s core being to pushing at its straining edges, is not to say that they have ceased to be engaged with the culture of modernism. Indeed, an important impetus in this shift from the centre to the periphery of practice, even if he claims no responsibility for the most extreme products of such an enquiry, was the very sculptor held up by Greenberg and Fried as the exemplar and personification of modernist sculpture - Anthony Caro. Caro’s dictum ‘sculpture can be anything’ (to which he later supplemented ‘it doesn’t have to be bronze or stone’[132]) and the mode of enquiry and sculptural exploration he initiated and taught in the famous (vocational) evening classes, facilitated the shift of sculpture’s mode and object of enquiry in the sculpture department at St. Martin’s. Although of course this is not to say either that it caused or initiated such a change.

129 Hilary Gresty states that Ariforum was available in the St. Martin’s school library from March 1966. ‘From the New Generation to The New Art’, note 6 to chapter on John Hilliard.
130 Michael Fried, letter to Frank Martin (head of sculpture at St Martin’s) 10.8.71 quoted in Hilary Gresty, ‘From the New Generation to The New Art’, p. 11.
132 ‘Anthony Caro his work and his views: in discussion with Peter Fuller’, Art Monthly, no. 23 (1979) quoted in Hilary Gresty ‘From the New Generation to The New Art’, p. 34.
In fact, it is to Caro’s mode of teaching, and the attitudes of the St. Martin’s school that Barry Flanagan’s letter to Caro (from which the earlier quotation is taken) refers:

The set up at St Martins was admirable for me and I’ve drawn continuously from what I didn’t ‘learn’ in my short stay.

The paradox strikes me delirious as it strikes me mortified - - I speak of the invitation both to open up and develop. All of a sudden I see Mr Caro standing aback of the rush and shouting, “Hey fellas, your [sic]going the wrong way”! And because I didn’t develop in your college framework as I did not in any other. I’ve arrived at a similar conclusion for myself (using as many of your common sense methods as I managed to pick up - ).

He refers particularly to Caro’s evening classes:

The Friday evening evening classes at St Martins were good meat for my imagination. These classes prompted the writing of poetry, a play, film scripts, songs, the purchase of cine equipment, and work on a means to translate movement and atmosphere into music.

Hardly ‘essential’ sculpture activities one might add, and this section is followed immediately by the closing sentence quoted earlier: “I might claim to be a sculptor and do everything but sculpture. This is my dilemma.”

William Tucker, the most prolific writer of the so-called ‘New Generation’ sculptors - associated more closely with Caro stylistically and methodologically for their production of sculpture in painted and welded metal - may have baulked at the avant-garde excesses of the later St. Martin’s (New Art) generation, feeling that the (modernist) perpetual renewal of the discipline of sculpture was only to be effected in its own language which, for Tucker, was ‘the language of the physical’. For Tucker, sculpture would persist

1. A point moves to become a line. a line moves to become a plane, a plane moves to become a volume and a volume moves paradoxically to become a point again - make a sculpture.
2. My own kind of space. Try to express this in a sculpture. De Kooning said ‘The only kind of space I am interested in, is the space between my body and my outstretched hand’. [...]
3. Make a sculpture that seems to travel at 100mph.

Extracts from ‘Typescript material in the possession of Frank Martin and Tim Hilton’ in Gresty’s M.Phil dissertation.

Further examples of Caro’s sculpture projects are found in Gresty’s M.Phil dissertation. Appendix I and published in Studio International January 1969 in ‘Anthony Caro’s work: a symposium by four sculptors’ pp 21-24. The following examples of teaching projects set by Anthony Caro Gresty dates from c. 1960. These are amongst those included in her Appendix I:

‘Study of the Object World Project’
1. Drawing from the model: a) make a drawing as though you were a fly crawling on the model.
   [... ] b) make a drawing from a position where you cannot see the model according to the instructions given to you by another person.
3. Make a sculpture from the landscape outside the sculpture department.
4. Make a sculpture about the Charing Cross Road.

‘Personal Expression’
1. Make a sculpture from an experience you had last weekend.
2. Make a sculpture called yellow or blue without using colours.
3. Make a sculpture showing the point where a situation changes from being something familiar and real to something odd and unreal (to raise the distinction between reality and illusion in the minds of the students).

Study of the relations and articulations of form
1. A point moves to become a line. a line moves to become a plane, a plane moves to become a volume and a volume moves paradoxically to become a point again - make a sculpture.
2. My own kind of space. Try to express this in a sculpture. De Kooning said ‘The only kind of space I am interested in, is the space between my body and my outstretched hand’. [...]
7. Make a sculpture that seems to travel at 100mph.

Extracts from ‘Typescript material in the possession of Frank Martin and Tim Hilton’ in Gresty’s M.Phil dissertation.
only by 'stretching the medium itself, not by learning an alien language, or by attempting to invent a wholly new one'.

William Tucker, a former associate of Caro's, spent much of his time between 1969 and 1976 crusading on behalf of the values of the Caro Revolution in books, articles and exhibitions. He did so not against a new tendency or movement in sculpture, but against the dissolution of the medium altogether. "I have found it more or less impossible to persuade students at St. Martin's" he wrote, "to actually make anything at all. They have been so busy taking photographs, digging holes, or cavorting in the nude." In this situation, Tucker attempted to represent the values of early '60s formalist abstraction as holding "not merely for our time and place, but for any time and place" indeed as representing "the condition of sculpture." [5] As Tucker pointed out - before leaving, in some despair, for Canada last year - very few sculptors under 35 have done any work identifiable as sculpture.

Fried too, might have contested that many late 1960s 'sculpture' activities at St. Martin's were rather too 'theatrical', too immersed in the actuality of temporality to be 'authentic' art. Nevertheless, these bastard progenies were produced in just the way they themselves proscribed - via a self-criticism from within - even if they would not have agreed on what were the essentials of that discipline or precisely at which point of the edifice critical pressure was to be applied. 'Alien languages' inevitably come from elsewhere. Reading Anne Seymour's introduction to The New Art exhibition (1972) informs us of a few of the regions from which such alien tongues might have come - philosophy, photography or literature for example. An entirely new language - not sculpture, not architecture, not landscape and so on - is the kind of linguistic process demonstrated in Rosalind Krauss's 'Sculpture in the Expanded Field' (1979) which produces a field of (postmodern) practice in which sculpture is included, but which also contains new terms. Donald Judd's negative 'neither sculpture, nor painting' reasoning leads him to assert a new territory of 'Three-Dimensional Work'. Tucker's xenophobic fears of any intrusion into 'Sculpture' are expressed in a dogmatic rhetoric which seems to belie a fear at the level of his professional standing. These practices being allowed into sculpture jeopardise his position as representing the sculptural high ground. One can understand his sense of panic if not condone his method of dealing with it.

Sculpture is always in dialogue with other things. 'Fence building', a criticism levelled against Fried, could well apply to Tucker's activities here. Tucker is (over) concerned with the moments of sculpture's introspection: its assessing and reaffirming its very existence and asserting its autonomy. His attitude

---


136 Rosalind E. Krauss, 'Sculpture in the Expanded Field'.


138 Allan Kaprow's thinking is a good example - "Most humans, it seems, still put up fences around their acts and thoughts - " (Artforum, June, 1968.) Fried thinks he knows who has the "finest" fences around their art." Robert Smithson, 'A Sedimentation of the Mind: Earth Proposals', Artforum 7 (September 1968), p. 45-46.
overlooks and disregards the moments at which sculpture is represented as renewing itself in dialectical (or other) relations with other disciplines - with those at its boundaries. One might in such an analysis consider worth investigating the points at which sculpture interfaces with, for example, 'Three-Dimensional Work', and consider these territorial border skirmishes not as insignificant peripheral events but as events that have a profound bearing on the most sacred inner ground.

In curatorial terms, the shift from *The New Generation* exhibition of 1965 to *The New Art* exhibition of 1972 was marked by a change from saying new things in a conventional language - and thus the New Generation are unproblematically called sculptors - to saying new things in a new language, and thus 'The New Art' is most certainly 'Art' but the designation 'sculptor' is sufficiently problematised to be inapplicable.

This is not to say however, that many artists in *The New Art* exhibition did not continue to be sculptors, nor that 'sculpture' ceased to be the designation of their productions. One might characterise the shift as one from sculpture conceived of as a discipline to sculpture as a discourse (of course it was a discourse before, but not in so self-conscious a way). Or one might say that the term 'sculpture' proliferates at the very moment at which its actual existence (as an uncritical category) is sufficiently problematised that it can be no longer

However important the public galleries and their exhibits were in affixing and shifting terminology, the art schools too, particularly in Britain, and particularly St. Martin's (and the RCA) with its connections to international galleries, dealerships and critical circles, could profoundly influence disciplinary and/or

---

179 *The New Generation* exhibition of 1965 was part of an envisioned continuing series of exhibitions, funded by the Stuyvesant foundation and initiated by Bryan Robertson, then director of the Whitechapel Art Gallery. *The New Generation* painting exhibition had been held the previous year and included work by painters such as Bridget Riley and Jeremy Moon.

180 One could compare the format of the catalogues here. *The New Art's* information section containing artists' statements and approved interviews was quite innovative at the time and has been much imitated since. The *New Generation* catalogue was also innovative in its time, as were many catalogues published by the Whitechapel Art Gallery under the directorship of Bryan Robertson. Maurice de Saunarez writes in 1969: 'Within two years of taking over at Whitechapel, Robertson had launched his programme of comprehensive exhibitions of major international figures with the Mondrian exhibition, and had also introduced what soon became easily identifiable as 'Whitechapel-style' 9¼ x 8¼in. catalogues (which had a tonic effect on the prevailing standards of catalogue production in many of the smaller public galleries).' 'Bryan Robertson's achievement at the Whitechapel', *Studio International* 177 (February 1969), p. 58. The catalogue format of *The New Generation* 1965 includes a photograph of a work by each artist and a piece of critical writing accompanying each artist's name. Bryan Robertson's involvement in this project is crucial. He was instrumental in bringing about the *New Generation* exhibitions and promoting the cause of younger British artists. Some of the photographs of artists included in the catalogue to the *New Generation* 1965, including the one of William Tucker, are taken from *Private View*, a glossy publication made in collaboration with Lord Snowdon to record, publicise and attract funding for the art world in London. Bryan Robertson, John Russell and Charles Robert Armstrong-Jones, 1st Earl of Snowdon, *Private View* (London: Nelson, 1965). The book concludes with the line: 'All that our artists need now is an increase in direct patronage, and adventurous commissions from public sources to match the vitality of their ideas.' (p. 295).
critical designations, debates and agendas. This was perceived at the time, as Bryan Robertson observed
writing in 1965:

Apart from the new freedom for students, I should think the most remarkable event within the
context of English art schools has been the consolidation of the sculpture revolution, coming
directly from St Martin’s and to a lesser extent from the Royal College and one or two other
places. The teaching and the atmosphere of these centres have made it all possible, and if Caro is
the main hero of the movement, the heads of the various schools have allowed his influence to
flourish. 141

However ‘improbable’ it may seem for Harrison that the work of Anthony Caro and Richard Long can be
united ‘under the umbrella - or myth - of St. Martin’s School of Art’. 142 it is not through some kind of
attribute of their respective work (Harrison unites them under the description ‘abstract naturalism’) or even
some (Hegelian) shared consciousness (one of the links between the artists - and other international artists
- in Seymour’s introduction to The New Art), but through a commitment to the discipline of sculpture, by
being ‘in’

Later, of course, many artists, for differing reasons, wanted ‘out’. However, being ‘in’ was a professional
or an apprenticeship commitment. One of the models on which the sculpture department at St. Martin’s
was set up was the apprenticeship model. As Gresty states: ‘It was on this model of the student working
alongside the ‘professional’ sculptor in the studio atmosphere that the department was established’. 143 Such
an artisanal model is central to modernism (it was institutionalised in the Bauhaus). However much the
attitude of the later ‘New Art’ generation of St. Martin’s sculptors towards their work being ‘sculpture’
was tongue-in-cheek, and however pragmatic and/or cynical their commitment to being sculptors was, and
this does seem the verdict of Harrison’s more recent (and perhaps more embittered) revision of (sculpture)
history. 144 it is nonetheless a designation and a professional alliance that must be taken seriously as a fact
of historical discourse.

For Harrison to say that the important moves were made under the guise of ‘three-dimensional work’, for
example, or by artists who steadfastly avoided or elided the traditional discipline designations (of sculpture,
painting etc.) as he appears to imply in his later writings, 145 is to rewrite in and affirm his own
commitments (to Art & Language one assumes). But to give sculpture another name is also to rewrite the
history in such a way that the sheer importance of ‘sculpture’ as a designation, as a profession, as a
statement of faith and as a forum of debate and criticism is downplayed.

141 Bryan Robertson, Private View, p. 137.
144 summed up in Harrison’s words cited on p. 44 above: ‘A great deal of English art over the past two
decades has been designated sculpture the more militantly as the designation is inappropriate.’ Harrison
continues: ‘“Sculpture” as a modern art still seems insecure, the grounds of practical self-criticism
uncertain where they are not dogmatic.’ ‘Sculpture, Design and Three-Dimensional Work’, p. 64.
145 ibid.
Harrison’s account doesn’t seem useful in unpicking the myth or legend of St. Martin’s - a myth to which his account actively contributes. It seems that precisely the usefulness of ‘sculpture’ lies in considering its disciplinary and professional underpinnings, spoken in its use by Flanagan and enshrined and institutionalised in a St Martin’s that begins to resemble a medieval guild system. To enquire into ‘sculpture’ in this way is not to enquire into ‘what kinds of objects or what kinds of activity the designation “sculpture” properly single out’.\(^{146}\) It does not enquire into the nature of sculpture or into the appropriateness of calling something sculpture. Rather, it enquires into the operations of sculpture as a discipline and as a profession. This is where its usefulness resides.

Why has sculpture lasted so long, defying its noisy death knells and the perpetual bombardment of its theoretical underpinnings? Precisely because it was already dead in the sense in which it is used. Death couldn’t touch it, and because it didn’t rely on theoretical underpinnings, but on a dispersed, mythical guild system, like the knights of St George (or the Templars) that are found everywhere but exist nowhere. Similarly, were one to knock down the citadel of St. Martin’s nothing will be found, for its knights have left already.

*****

The discussion so far has considered sculpture as a discipline, the commitment to being ‘in’ that discipline, and the ramifications of such an involvement. As has already been noted, Flanagan sets up a relationship in his formulation between (doing) ‘sculpture’ and (being a) ‘sculptor’. It is this latter sense, the professional designation ‘sculptor’, that must now be considered especially where it bears on the history and myth of St. Martin’s School of Art. In the statement ‘I might claim to be a sculptor’. Flanagan makes the kind of declaration that he might have put on his passport in the days when it had a space to put one’s ‘occupation’. Declarations played an important role in the art of the 1960s and 1970s. For example, Bruce McLean’s declaration of giving up art - of not being an artist - was defended by Seymour in the introduction to *The New Art* in 1972: ‘Bruce McLean, [.....] has recently renounced his status as artist and he felt it would be inappropriate in the circumstances for him even to allow his previous work to be exhibited in an art context. (The designation was his, not mine)\(^{147}\) It is also important to note the curatorial ‘backing off’ this form of defence represents and the critical deference demonstrated in favour of the stated word (intention) of the artist (author). Thus Flanagan’s statement articulates two senses of the word ‘profession’, firstly an assertion or declaration (of being) and second the sense of profession as occupation - one’s trade or business. There are also subtle nuances to the turn of phrase that suggest or imply other possible meanings of ‘profession’. Flanagan’s profession could be a pretence, it could be merely empty words, it could also carry the sense of a profession of faith - as if being a sculptor went beyond any rational or concrete definitions of what ‘sculpture’ or being a sculptor is. One might in this

\(^{146}\) ibid., p. 60.

\(^{147}\) Anne Seymour, *The New Art*, p. 5.
sense commit oneself to the orthodoxy of 'sculpture' believing that its actual 'truth' lies beyond the merely sensible (on some transcendent level). An older (medieval) word for profession or trade was 'mystery'.

This retains some sense of the religious or 'mystical' dimension to belonging to a particular profession - or in the medieval sense to a guild. These protective - and prohibitive -models of artisanal organisation appear to have some relation to the modern sense of profession.

The adeptness of one-time St. Martin's sculpture students to find their way in the professional art world is often commented on. Michael Compton wrote of Richard Long in 1976: 'He has, in fact, a very clear insight into the art world in which he works and the certainty and the strength to deal with it.'

Many of the artists who studied on the 'vocational course' at St. Martin's became 'professional sculptors' in the sense that they made their profession - the making of sculpture - their occupation, not supplementing as former 'New Generation' artists did, and later artists have had to. by teaching. Fulton talks of Long's professional commitment to being a sculptor in the text he contributed to the 1991 *Walking in Circles* book.

... after leaving St. Martin's School of Art he did not look for a job. He made sculpture.

Long's work has been self-financing since he left college thus assuring his professional independence, a rare achievement for a 20th century artist - if for any artists of any period. Long's contemporaries at St. Martin's, Gilbert and George, went one stage further and declared themselves 'living sculptors' and thus every aspect of their lives 'sculpture'. To return to Flanagan's statement, Gilbert and George rewrite it, collapsing being a sculptor and doing sculpture, the discipline and the profession, into one, removing the doing in the sense of 'making' sculpture altogether and being sculpture as well as being a sculptor Gilbert and George's rewrite of Flanagan's assertion could read:

'I might claim to be a sculptor and everything I am sculpture.'

It seems no longer a dilemma.

Long's work has come to be the definitive index of British sculpture. New temples of art are consecrated by installing a 'Richard Long', in an inversion of the Duchampian gesture whereby the institutional space (the gallery, the artist) makes the chosen thing 'art'. The presence of Long's art in the space makes the space an art space, it imbues it with that meaning and resonance, it returns. It returns to fill the space it has been filled from, it repeats the circular movement of return, it is the hero returning to his homeland now recognised as who he truly is - artist as the hero. as Rasheed Araeen once said critically and
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148 a derivation which is still maintained in the Italian mestiere (trade or occupation).
149 Michael Compton. Some notes on the work of Richard Long (British Pavilion, XXXVII Venice Biennale. 1976) unpagedinated
perceptively about Long’s role. For example, the first ‘sculpture’ exhibition in the newly reopened Duveen Galleries at the Tate Gallery London was Richard Long (1990-91). The Henry Moore Studio at Dean Clough (Halifax) was filled with work by Richard Long for its official opening. The official photograph of this event which adorns the Henry Moore Institute’s publicity/information leaflet (figure 8), shows a fascinating conglomeration of personifications of power and significance worthy of comparison to (and surely a direct repetition of) the donor paintings of the Renaissance, for example the painting of *Michelangelo presenting his Model to Pope Paul IV* used for the posters and catalogue cover of the 1994 *Renaissance* exhibition in Venice (figure 7). The individuals present in the photograph: Robert Hopper, Alan Bowness, Prince Charles and Richard Long personify the Henry Moore Sculpture Trust and Henry Moore Foundation, Royalty and Art.

In a sense St. Martin’s sculpture department did not change anything in the arts establishment, but rather proved itself more adaptable and in a good position to make the best of opportunity. It combined assertive opportunism and a degree of ‘being in the right place at the right time’, under the astute guidance of individuals like Caro, who weren’t afraid to (and could afford to) eschew the mystiques of a British Art education and to concern themselves instead with the machinations of an increasingly fast moving international art world. Annesley said of Caro, again in the *Studio International* ‘symposium’:

> What he does is to talk about what he considers to be important causes - the cause of sculpture, the cause of modern art, the way we want our sculpture seen, what the British Council and people are up to, what’s the best art in the world. He’ll talk about these causes. He won’t talk about what is essential to him of real importance, which is how sculpture is thought of and made, and what other sculptors are up to and what they’re thinking and what he’s thinking. He doesn’t talk about that. He used to have a clear idea about what art was about. He sure as hell doesn’t any more.

Annesley’s observations suggest a shift of attitude on Caro’s part: from a concern with what art or particularly what sculpture is and should be to a concern with policing the professional interests of

---


152 followed by Richard Serra and then Anthony Caro - an interesting series worth pondering.


Figure 7. Domenico Cresti da Passignano, Michelangelo Presenting his Model to Pope Paul IV.
Figure 8. From an information leaflet published by the Henry Moore Sculpture Trust, Leeds, 1993.
sculpture and sculptors. It is a kind of pragmatism: a concern with the conditions of sculpture's reception, criticism and display, its production and consumption, a concern that stretches beyond - or maybe even begins at the margins of - the studio, beyond the 'making'. It was not enough, or rather, it was simply too important to Caro the professional sculptor to leave these jobs to the critics, curators and historians. The professional artist needed to be involved in these processes too.

This attempt to re-negotiate the artist's agency and involvement in the work beyond its 'completion' in a traditional sense, is seen for example, in the sale of work contract that Seth Siegelaub drew up with a New York lawyer in 1971, and which was published - ready for use - in the April 1971 issue of Studio International.

The following extract is from Potlatch, a magazine produced at St. Martin's in 1968, in an article entitled 'Possibilities for an artist' recounting the familiar story:

"There are for the artist at the moment two possible careers, in the first instance he simply gives up and usually becomes a mediocre teacher and has a well paid, fairly even existence [sic] or he can mobilize his friends in the press and the trade and mount a campaign to greatness."

The kind of shifting that occurred in the discipline and profession of sculpture, the folding of the practice of sculpture into the profession of sculptor (and the accompanying concern with how the work is seen and received as much as with what it looks like or how it is made) and the expansion of the practice and profession of sculpture into the territories of other professions and professionals - (notably) for example art critics, curators, dealer (in Siegelaub's contract: lawyers) is a significant feature of this era.

However, it is not only in the profession of artist that such an attempted expansion occurs. It becomes increasingly difficult to make the unified singular 'the press' and 'the trade' since these activities become (explicitly) dispersed, unfixed, ambitious. Moreover artists occupy these positions too (see above). Similarly the 'safe' option - teach - becomes problematised as well. During the period in which Charles Harrison was assistant editor of Studio International the shifting of professional roles, the uncertainty of professional boundaries and the expansionist tendencies/ambitions of many of them are addressed in the pages of that journal.
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15 Seth Siegelaub, 'The artist's reserved rights transfer and sale agreement' in Studio International 181 (April 1971), pp 142-143 and 186-188.
16 Potlatch, edited by Glynn Foulkes and Roger Bates. (London: St Martin's School of Art, 1968). The article was reprinted from the earlier St. Martin's publication Silons (see note 118 above). This issue of Potlatch also contained the sheep cartoon [figure 6] illustrated at the beginning of this chapter (p. 40): and an article by Charles Harrison entitled 'Criticism and Abstract Art: Random notes for an article', which contrasted the critical positions of Greenberg and Rosenberg.
17 This is perhaps the level on which expansion really does occur in the mid-late 1960s. Rosalind Krauss wrote in 1979 of the 'Expanded Field' of art practice. Perhaps one can more clearly see in this period an expanded field of professional engagement/involvelement: a klein group generated around the terms critic and curator could perhaps be envisaged - or historian, dealer, teacher. With some kind of artist occupying every position - the sculptor/artist in the expanded (professional) field.
Some of the professional tensions and role-shifting I have been referring to were highlighted in the 32nd 'Technology and Art' column by Jonathan Benthall in Studio International in January 1972. As his last instalment, Benthall proposed to write 'some reflections on the role of the art commentator'\textsuperscript{159} He begins the article with a quotation form the Times Literary Supplement of 26 November 1971: 'The lot of the art critic today is not a happy one ... Is he journalist or aestheteician, prophet or public-relations man, interpreter of tradition or adventurous iconoclast, fabricator of taste or follower of fashion?' Having thus signalled the very kind of professional questioning I have been suggesting is important to an understanding of art, and sculpture in particular, in the period from the mid 1960s to the mid 1970s, Benthall analyses the art world in terms of its being an industry - comparing it to other 'industrialised' professions such as science. This brand of industrialization is not - or not only - one of production (commodity capitalism) but a more sophisticated, technological industry whose practitioners assume roles of entrepreneurs, contractors and salesmen. Central to this analysis of the art world is the figure of the 'critic-promoter-organizer-curator-linkman', a fascinating conglomeration of terms drawing on 'traditional' art roles or functions and others from business, advertising, and importantly particularly with the last term - television.

The folding into each other of roles that Benthall’s conglomerate title demonstrates is precisely that process that I have been asserting as a key aspect of this period. Moreover, it encodes within it terms that show art’s close association with the ‘new’ technological media - of television and video in particular - which is, as I will argue, central to the practice of ‘Land Art’. It seems that Art - and sculpture in particular - is being abridged and adapted for television. As well as signalling the Greenbergian modernist aspect of this process: ‘Most intelligent art critics are going through a period of acute self-questioning (as are many artists too)\textsuperscript{160} and the analogies with science and other industrialised professions: ‘they (artists) are marketing their names, filing ideas like patent applications in art magazines, contracting with galleries and arts councils, tendering for grants and jobs’. Benthall’s article is suffused with the remnants of that other ‘modernist’ analogy - with medieval guild professional structures. Benthall refers to ‘the handful of serious critics and the larger guild of art reviewers and journalists.’ (my emphasis), revealing the ‘art world’ as at once highly ‘modern’ and technological, and archaic and romanticised.

Benthall’s article and the other examples I have quoted, suggest an understanding of art practice - of sculpture - conceived of as a profession - a techne (in the sense in which Heidegger uses the term).\textsuperscript{161} As a profession, the title ‘sculptor’ represents the right to ‘reveal’ work in that way, rather than to practice in that way. One is looking at sculpture as a Techne rather than sculpture as a system of knowledge, an episteme.

Robert Pincus-Witten’s book and term ‘Postminimalism’ reveals something of this shift of emphasis in discourse. However, looking back in the 30th anniversary issue of Artforum magazine, Pincus-Witten is


\textsuperscript{160} ibid.

\textsuperscript{161} See for example: Martin Heidegger, The Origin of the work of Art, in Basic Writings, p. 185; and The Question Concerning Technology, in Basic Writings, pp. 307-341.
rather too hasty, or perhaps too taken in by the sheer proliferation of the term/word ‘postmodernism’, to claim that his ‘Postminimalism’ was a term ‘upon which I sailed by the seat of my pants till “post-Modern” left it in the dust’. There was something valuable in his analysis of the situation, and something that is diluted, or even dissolved completely in his throwing his ‘postminimalism’ in with the ‘postmodern’ solution. This is a solution that by now contains so much and has been used to describe so many things by so many people, it has become so saturated with meaning as to be virtually meaningless. What Pincus-Witten’s term did was hold together epistemological (systems of knowledge) and ontological (being) strains of sculpture in relation to minimalism. What Pincus-Witten did was to posit a ‘break’ - an epistemological and ontological rupture - in his ‘annus mirabilis’, 1968, after which the hegemony of the modernist tradition of sculpture is ended and a split occurs between ‘epistemological’ and ‘ontological’ branches of sculpture. (This accords nicely with, and indeed probably is the model for, Gresty’s diagnosis of the split in St Martin’s sculpture practice - into an object-based and a conceptual strain. The problem with transferring the situation to Britain is that Britain didn’t have a ‘minimalism’. The solution is, for accounts such as Gresty’s, to identify Caro’s practice as having minimalist aspects, rather than it being Minimalism’s other, or opposite, as Fried had designated it, for example in his famous essay ‘Art and Objecthood’ in Artforum Summer 1967).

The fact that Pincus-Witten had indicated and argued for a rupture rendered his account ready to be taken up by the postmodernism of, for instance, Krauss and Owens, where the rupture of an epistemological break is the essential factor. Such theories of rupture have been seen as in direct opposition to the kind of continuity argued for in Greenberg’s ‘Modernist Painting’ of 1965:

And I cannot insist enough that Modernism has never meant anything like a break with the past. It may mean a devolution, an unravelling of anterior tradition, but it also means its continuation. Modernist art develops out of the past without gap or break, and wherever it ends up it will never stop being intelligible in terms of the continuity of art.

Perhaps not so far removed then in certain aspects, what Pincus-Witten’s account does is to identify two aspects or traits of sculpture that have been a part of its operation. It was not that these didn’t exist before minimalism - perhaps they couldn’t be so easily disentangled or exist supposedly independently in any given work (‘resolution’ in sculpture demanding the synthesis of these two aspects).

Minimalism is thus not a break but a ‘revealing’. A revealing of sculpture’s being, facilitating the separation of these two strands, freeing them from the necessity of synthesis. Minimalism revealed sculpture as a techne, as a mode of revealing (rather than as an episteme).

What I have been talking about might be characterised as the eclipsing of sculpture by the sculptor, or the coming-into-knowledge of the sculptor, his/her recognition that sculpture is a techne and that his/her professional activity exists rather than in the manufacturing of sculpture (objects) in the revealing (destining) of sculpture envisaged as completed. A text for this coming to knowledge might be the third position in Lawrence Weiner’s ‘declaration of intent’ (1968): ‘The piece need not be built’. Such knowledge might also be recognised in Andre’s sculptures using basic industrially-produced units ordered up by telephone. The task of the sculptor in these two instances is to gather and destine sculpture and thus to determine the manner of its construction (after all, all three positions in Weiner’s statement of intent are ‘consistent with the intent of the artist’). Such a position makes explicit what has historically been an implicit of sculpture, that is it not the sculptor’s job to actually manufacture the sculpture as a technician, although working as a technician - making sculpture - may well be one apprenticeship stage in the process of becoming a sculptor.

One of the debates frequently raised amongst sculptors in Britain in the late 1960s concerned the origin, destiny and process of making sculpture. In the symposium on Caro’s work the debate is characterised as being between perceptual and conceptual procedures for making sculpture. Such debates often attach themselves to much older technical debates in sculpture, for example arguing the relative merits of additive and subtractive processes: modelling or casting or between working from a plane or working in the round, or between conceiving the work as a whole: perhaps using drawings, maquettes or models or working directly with the finished product (indirect and direct: inductive or reductive?). The debates around so-called conceptual art point up the problematic relation between the epistemological and ontological issues that lie at the heart of these debates. The relation between the sculptural thought or idea and the sculptured object - the thing in the world and the thing. Whilst Tucker and the other Caro initiates were carrying on this debate, elsewhere the shift to being sculptors rather than talking about sculpture had left these characters in their scholastic symposium looking like the grown men with pipes walking round sculpture and mumbling that Bruce McLean had satirised them as. Or as Gilbert & George put it: ‘We played a

164 Lawrence Weiner, ‘declaration of intent’: ‘1. The artist may construct the Piece 2. The work may be fabricated 3. The piece need not be built. Each being equal and consistent with the intent of the artist the decision as to condition rests with the viewer upon the occasion of receivership.’
165 ‘The St Martin’s sculpture forum would avoid any broader issue, discussing for hours the position of one piece of metal in relation to another .... Twelve adult men with pipes would walk for hours around sculpture and mumble!’ Bruce McLean, quoted in Charles Harrison, ‘Sculpture’s Recent Past’, in A Quiet Revolution: British sculpture since 1965, pp. 10-33, p. 31.
Harrison’s footnote states that the comment was quoted by Nena Dimirjevic in Bruce McLean (London: Whitechapel Art Gallery, 1981).
large part in not talking about art in that way. We stopped discussing, even in the streets outside the school. We were not in favour of groups of people standing around talking about sculpture.\(^{16}\)

The tensions are apparent in the January 1969 issue of *Studio International* on 'Some aspects of contemporary British sculpture'. Examining it closely it more and more resembles the kind of internal struggle much discussed in relation to *Artforum*’s summer 1967 issue on American Sculpture. (An issue I would suggest *Studio International*’s British Sculpture issue was quite consciously and deliberately modelled on) Annesley, Louw, Scott and Tucker re-enact the St. Martin’s forum whilst elsewhere in the magazine Charles Harrison writes:

> Many of the younger sculptors have shown great reluctance to risk losing touch with an idea by developing it sculpturally: the idea has to be sculptural in the first place. By implication, once the artist has identified himself as a sculptor, whatever else he can identify himself with in honesty and without compromise becomes an aspect of sculpture.\(^{16'}\)

Harrison backs up his assertion with reference to Flanagan’s statement ‘... I might claim to be a sculptor and do everything else but sculpture ....’\(^{16''}\) It is the being-in, the being a sculptor, the profession of that techne that makes the work sculpture, not any appeal to some ‘essence’ of sculpture that can be otherwise defined - what sculpture is - as Tucker might put it. His definition of the condition of sculpture: subject to gravity, revealed by light, independent object in the world, is rather an analysis of *how* sculpture is in the world rather than what it essentially *is*. These are the conditions for its existence. This is not to say that such considerations of sculpture’s being are not interesting, but they can and do for Tucker cause great confusion and consternation when they are confused for definitions of what sculpture is, or is about, because they confuse so fundamentally *how* sculpture is with *what* it is. This leads to a whole catalogue of misapprehensions.

Tucker perceives that sculpture has only recently, in Rodin and Brancusi, won its independence - its free-standing (as object). This is a hard-won status and one Tucker feels honour-bound, as a sculptor, to defend, believing that any undermining of sculpture’s free-standing object status will threaten the continuance of sculpture. He might selfishly have been wise in this respect for it did threaten the unproblematic continuation of the sort of object sculpture he made. For Tucker, the younger sculptors were taking sculpture as a given and railing against its premises in the (for him) false belief that sculpture was as strong as a rock and wouldn’t be so easily shaken.

In Tucker’s sense they were right - if, as I have already suggested ‘sculpture’ in that sense was already long dead. Their actions did little or nothing to undermine sculpture as a techne. In fact their activities made explicit this essential being of sculpture. Moreover, ‘sculpture’ as a designation and as a promoted product persisted. It is still strong in Britain today - however removed this ‘sculpture’ is from Tucker’s notion of sculpture. And if this sculpture has a hollow ring, it is perhaps only that sculpture has been
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16 Gilbert & George, interview with Anne Seymour in *The New Art*, p. 92-95, p. 92.

16 Charles Harrison, ‘Some recent sculpture in Britain’, p. 30.

16 Barry Flanagan, see p. 44 and note 116 above.
emptied out at the same time as the sculptor has been filled - or invested - in. It has become impossible - if it was possible for Tucker even in 1975 - to mount ‘an exhibition of sculpture, not of sculptors’ as he claimed in his introduction to the exhibition *The Condition of Sculpture* that he selected for the Hayward Gallery in 1975. Even then, the Directors’ distanced themselves from Tucker’s endeavour in their preface to the catalogue, characterising Tucker’s views as partisan. Such categories of work as ‘land art, performance art, conceptual art, etc.’ are characterised by the Directors as extensions of sculpture and Tucker’s exhibition as showing work distinct from these extended practices, as his assertion of ‘the continuing vitality of sculpture’. It is worth considering Tucker’s intention to mount ‘an exhibition of sculpture, not of sculptors’ with the quotation with which I began, written in an exhibition catalogue to an exhibition only 3 years later: ‘what they do all have in common is that they started out as sculptors and/or they consider themselves as sculptors’.

Tucker’s introductory notes attempt to be an introduction to Sculpture *per se* rather than an introduction to a selection of works of sculpture or a group of sculptors. However, the effect is rather defeated in the catalogue by being proceeded by a list of sculptor’s names (those included in the exhibition), and is of course problematised by the very fact that the exhibition was an exhibition of works by sculptors, many of whom have subsequently become extremely well-known. Looking at the catalogue twenty years on, one is more likely to recognise sculptors (names) listed in the catalogue than individual works of sculpture that were on show. Moreover, the separation indicated in the Directors’ preface between works that continue, renew and presuppose the traditional centre or essence of sculpture and works that diverge from, extend or expand the understanding of sculpture, is unsustainable from the outset, as even the most cursory glance at the list of ‘sculptors’ whose ‘sculpture’ is included in the exhibition reveals. The first sculptor on the list, Carl Andre, had already shown work in the context of conceptual, minimal and Earth Art. He was a participant in the Dwan *Earthworks* exhibition in 1968, and thus was already allied with the ‘extended’ practices rather than the ‘essential’ ones with which Tucker’s inclusion of his work implies.

The catalogues to Tucker’s *The Condition of Sculpture* (1975) and the Stedelijk’s *made by sculptors* (1978) do more than point up a conflict in sculpture theory, practice and discourse, they attest to the almost total transformation - in terms of a technological rupture - that has occurred.

Tucker’s exhibition contained works by a number of artists who have shown work under the designation Earth or Land Art - *made by sculptors* does too. In Harrison’s *Artscribe* article ‘Sculpture, Design and Three-Dimensional Work’ (1986), quoted above, he asked whether it was useful to continue to call the kinds of work under discussion in this study, and elsewhere, as sculpture. It is not only useful but crucially
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2. Robin Campbell (Director of Art) and Joanna Drew (Director of Exhibitions), ‘Preface’. *The Condition of Sculpture*, p. 5.
3. Amsterdam, Stedelijk, *made by sculptors*. 
important historically. Such works are not sculpture through sheer wilful militancy nor ironic mis-use of the term, but through participating in and being actively involved in the discourse of sculpture.

Finally, the question that has been begged since this chapter began is now one that can be 'answered', because it can now be sufficiently and usefully framed: Is Land Art Sculpture? and what connection does British Land Art have to the sculpture department at St. Martin's School of Art?

In the founding instances of Land Art, in its first institutional showings which are discussed in my first chapter, the artists included were sculptors, and the British artists included in those exhibitions were sculptors from the Vocational Course at St. Martin's - Barry Flanagan and Richard Long, Jan Dibbets, who featured in Land Art (Fernsehgalerie Gerry Schum, 1969) and Earth Art (White Museum, Cornell, 1969) also studied for a term at St. Martin's (in 1967), and it was there that he met Long. Long and Flanagan, according to Harrison the leading 'younger sculptors' at St. Martin's, were the artists included in Gerry Schum's Film Land Art broadcast on German television on 15 April 1969. Whether or not British Land Art began at St. Martin's is another question, and one of origins, disputed dating and supposed intentions that is difficult to answer with any certainty and of questionable use. What does seem clear is that it was sculptors at St. Martin's that were among the first to be shown, considered and recognised as 'Land Artists'. Later in 1969, the Earth exhibition at the White Museum, Cornell University set the phenomenon open to debate, holding a symposium to discuss the work on show. (A transcript is reprinted in The Writings of Robert Smithson (1979)). This ranks as one of the earliest and most influential sets of statements on the subject. Richard Long was the only British sculptor/artist represented. The defining coherence of British Land Art: its relations to, and differences from, American and European trends, its concern with the (British) landscape and the few words of its reticent accompanying voice, were acted out by, and represented by, the body of work (in the Earth Art exhibition) and the body of Richard Long (at the symposium). British Land Art was embodied by and in the ex-St. Martin's sculptor, Richard Long.

Dibbets wrote 'The only place where I've ever learned anything was London, with Caro. He said: before you make something you must think about it. Then I stopped making sculptures. To get to the St. Martin's school I had to walk through the park for half an hour - I noticed that his meant much to me. I arrived at the idea to use nature as plastic material. Then I met a fellow who was occupied with the same thing, also sick of polyester. This began to grow, you got the feeling of being able to add something to the artistic resources'. The 'fellow' in Dibbets's account was Richard Long. Jan Dibbets, from Information from Galerie SWART, Amsterdam, reprinted in Land Art (unpaginated).

The transcript of this symposium was reprinted as 'Earth Symposium at White Museum. Cornell University, 1970.'
In Britain, Land Art did not attain a similar definitive exhibition or text as ‘Earthworks’ or ‘Earth Art’ in the US until the book A Sense of Place: Sculpture in Landscape (1984) and the exhibition and catalogue The Unpainted Landscape in 1987. In both texts the landscape is stressed - attesting to the geographic element in the British work. Land Art in its specifically British manifestation, is robbed of, or disavowed from its technologic foundations to enter what is undeniable a more romantic or nostalgic formulation, but more importantly to affirm a continuous national tradition which can incorporates British ‘modernist’ precursors such as Moore, Nash or Hepworth, or a more long standing British landscape tradition. The technologic aspect of European Land Art (seen particularly in the work of the Dutch proponents such as Dibbets, Boezem or Brown) is thus (conveniently) written out. To unpick and re-assert the centrality of the technologic (of technic) in British Land Art means going back to that founding episode of Gerry Schum’s Film Land Art, an exhibition whose claims to consisting of sculpture in any ‘essential’ sense is problematised by its media - television, and of sculptors by its mediated presentation of the body or the production of the Sculptor.

174 A Sense of Place: Sculpture in Landscape, eds. Peter Davies and Tony Knipe (Sunderland: Ceolfrith Press, Ceolfrith Gallery. Sunderland Arts Centre, 1984). In part, this book documents the Grizedale sculpture project which had been operative since 1977 and other sculpture projects in Britain.


176 See Land Art Beginning, pp.7-38; and Land Art Landscape, pp. 212-249.
Land Art Repetition

This chapter is in two parts. The first relates 'Richard Long' to two literary constructs. One which features in the discourse of Long: Samuel Beckett's Molloy (in The Trilogy) to whom the artist has been compared, and to whom the artist, in his published words, compares himself. The other, for whom no justification can be found other than that the comparison is useful is Oscar Wilde's Dorian Gray. Beckett's Molloy and Wilde’s Gray share preoccupations with time and ageing, with meaningless occupation, with the relation between art and life, and with repetition. These then are the themes of this chapter. The comparison, like the characters involved, offers nothing so clear as a conclusive meaning. The procedure, however, like its contents, offers insight into the operations, or the technique of repetition. That this technique rests at the heart of Long's practice and, more generally, is a key strategy in British art practice, history and theory, is explored in the second part of the chapter which deals exclusively with a single work of repetition by Richard Long: A Line Made by Walking England 1967.

Themes of 'repetition' and 'the everyday' or 'everyday life' have been prevalent in recent philosophical discourse. They are highly pertinent to a discussion of Land Art, both in their relation to each other, and in relation to a third term 'romance', or 'romantic'.

Since the publication of Paul de Man's The Rhetoric of Romanticism there has been much good work produced on Romanticism. Interesting and thought provoking though that work is, for my purposes here I need look no further than the Oxford English Dictionary. The Dictionary lists several meanings of the word 'romantic'. One of them - 'inclined towards or suggestive of romance in love' - I had already ruled out (Perhaps I shouldn't have. I didn't think I was being asked whether I thought the artists romantic in this sense - like heroes in romantic fiction - although having witnessed the histrionic outbursts these artists sometimes evoke from their most ardent admirers this might not be as far-fetched a description as one might imagine.) The other two meanings, and the ones between which my uncertainty seems best framed are:

- (1) of, characterized by, or suggestive of an idealized, sentimental, or fantastic view of reality. remote from experience.
- (4) a (of style in art, music, etc.) concerned more with feeling and emotion than with form and aesthetic qualities, preferring grandeur or picturesqueness to finish and proportion b (also Romantic) of or relating to the 18th-19th c. romantic movement or style in the European arts.
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Given that the question was asked in an ‘art’ context, I suppose I could have assumed with a degree of certainty that in fact the question asked whether I thought the artists ‘romantic’ in this second (4 a and b) sense of the word. Increasingly however as my research continued the first sense of the word (1) became increasingly pertinent, particularly in the last phrase of the definition which refers to its remoteness from experience. It was this actual remoteness, juxtaposed with the contrasting claims of and by the work to offer a genuine, accessible and realistic account/representation of experience, that highlighted the usefulness of this meaning of romantic. Turning to the OED’s definition of that related work ‘romance’, one finds the definition:

I an atmosphere or tendency characterized by a sense of remoteness from or idealization of everyday life. (my emphasis)

Through this term a relation is made with that contested notion ‘everyday life’. This relation is crucial to Land Art. It is indeed in this, and in the relationship thus highlighted between art more generally and everyday life, that investigating these interconnections becomes a revealing endeavour. If Land Art, and Long’s work in particular, is not ‘romantic’, it is, I would argue, a romance. It is a romance possessing that seductive quality, that ‘prevailing sense of wonder or mystery’178 that makes falling prey to it so easy.

‘A Romance’ is the subtitle of A. S. Byatt’s book Possession. In the series of quotations she presents at the beginning of her book, Byatt uses a preface by Nathaniel Hawthorne about the decision to designate a work a Romance.179 ‘Romance as a literary form allows a certain freedom from the strictures governing other forms of composition such as the novel. A Romance can depart from the ‘very minute fidelity, not merely to the possible, but to the probable and ordinary course of man’s experience.’ Romance is thus liberated from the need to serve the demands of ‘Truth’. The other aspect of Romance that Hawthorne’s quotation indicates in the ‘attempt to connect a bygone time with the very present that is flitting away from us.’ It may be that in the case of Richard Long, that ‘bygone time’ was as much a romantic or mythical construction as his present existence that he and his defenders claim as so straightforward and ordinary and yet is so far from being either. Romance is a complex construction that allows itself to break the rules, a liberty that makes uncovering its enterprise all the more difficult and perilous.

To investigate the strategies of romance is to lay bare some of the techniques of Land Art. This is one reason for beginning with Wilde’s cynical and acerbic observation on romance. That there are ‘techniques’ at work in the production of Land Art is one of the facts that the dominant discourse on Land Art has done its best to conceal under the appearance of a straightforward, unchanging and beguiling appearance. The other reason is more pragmatic. Its usefulness, as I hope will become clear is in the invaluable connection it draws and makes explicit between romance and repetition.

178 Oxford English Dictionary definition of ‘romance’ 2 a
Figure 9. A Line Made by Walking England 1967.
The Picture of Richard Long

Romance lives by repetition, and repetition converts an appetite into art. Besides, each time that one loves is the only time one has ever loved. Difference of object does not alter singleness of passion. It merely intensifies it. We can have in life but one great experience at best, and the secret of life is to reproduce that experience as often as possible.¹⁸⁰

Wilde's quotation makes an intimate connection between romance and repetition. Romance, or the tag 'romantic' has never been far from discussions of Long's work.¹⁸¹ 'My work is not urban, nor is it romantic' declare the words of Richard Long in an artist's statement from 1980, as if to repel the dread tag before it could even adhere, denouncing it in advance of anyone seemingly having forwarded the description.¹⁸² If romance is kept at bay, repetition rests at the very heart of Long's practice: the repetition of a very few geometric forms, the reproduction of the same or similar photographs in catalogues and books, the repetitive actions of walking the same distance over and over again at a regulated spatial remove in a single work, or the repeated placing of a stone at intervals along a walk. Such consistency begs the question: could it be, as Wilde suggests, that the 'secret' of this artistic 'life' is 'one great experience reproduced as often as possible'? Certainly the passion or delight on the part of the artist engaged in the act of repetition comes over clearly from Long's comments in conversation in 1985,

¹⁸¹ For example Robert Rosenblum who writes: 'An artist I would think of as still working within an older unbroken tradition of Romanticism is Richard Long. [...] If I had to have a candidate for somebody who perpetuated the imagery, the feelings, the emotions of someone like Constable or Wordsworth, I'd vote for him.' Robert Rosenblum, 'Towards a Definition of New Art', New Art: An International Survey. eds. Andreas Papadakis, Claire Farrow, and Nicola Hodges. (London: Academy Editions, 1991), p. 48. For a more critical appraisal of Long's work as romantic see Jean Clay, 'Aspects of bourgeois art: the world as it is'. Studio International 180 (December 1970), pp. 254-255. Clay writes: 'Now Richard Long, following interesting experiments in trick perspective, allusive space and intangible volumes [...], is increasingly excluding himself in a romanticism of the useless, of non significant activity such as the Kilimanjaro sculpture, [illustrated at figure 15] the main point of which is, he says, the somewhat laborious climb to the summit. But, above all, he directs his main efforts to creating images impregnated with nostalgia and vestiges in the process of disappearing. [...] The stroll, the long walk through the city of the tortured heroes of Cri or l'Avventura, the dismal trampling of the freshly-turned soil, the 'obsessional' inclusion of a remembered face in the rings of the pond, all make Richard Long the Caspar David Friedrich of Funk Art. It is a private art, a melancholy art whose contact with the pulse of the times, its urgent needs and perils, is as difficult to sense as is its attitude to our changing world.' (p. 255) The words of Clay's description could serve to strengthen the link made between Long and Beckett's Molloy.
¹⁸² Richard Long. Five, six, pick up sticks, seven, eight, lay them straight (London: Anthony d'Offay, 1980). Long's comments that his work is not romantic is rather refuted by his comments in conversation in 1986 talking about a work he made in 1982. A Three Day Bicycle Ride: 'With the cycle ride I mention the crossing places of other sculpture, old friendships, the source of a sculpture, of a flint sculpture that I made some years later, autobiographical things, my family. The use of Heathrow Airport is a very jarring... a difficult image which was deliberate. In a way I wanted to make a work which was absolutely equally modern and pastoral, and about the equality of places passed along a journey.' (my emphasis)

That was the first time I had made that work since 1967 .... It was very exciting to somehow have this idea which I could reuse. When I made it again it was just as fresh and dynamic and exciting to make and to look at.\(^{183}\)

Here the turn of phrase is interesting: 'That was the first time I had made that work since 1967 ....', stressing the novelty of the (re)enactment and casting the whole sentence in a positive light rather than saying for example 'I was re-making a work I first made in 1967' or 'I hadn't made that work since 1967'. In the phrase used it is as if every making of the work can be the first time, or as Wilde would have it 'each time [that one loves] is the only time [one has ever loved]'. This combination of novelty and uniqueness in inverse proportions to the actual antiquity and conventionality of the work/image is effected through making a connection in Long's words between the first and the (re)making of the work. The muting of these seeming differences and the bringing together of the distant and proximate gives some indication of one of the important operations of repetition. Such a manoeuvre can allow the seeming refutation of 'history' alluded to in Long's subsequent statement:

... in a strange way I feel that these works aren't ... just because I made them in 1967 or 1968 it does not mean to say that they belong in history, that they are past.\(^{184}\)

The apparent contradiction of every re-making of the work appearing as if a first time is revealed in the work's actual condition of or as repetition.

The constant repetition (of forms) in Long's body of work is seen by his commentators as its strength. For them it marks a consistency of vision and is the perpetual demonstration of the strength and potency of the initial idea. Conversely, it is precisely on this same point that Long's detractors attack his work for declining into self-parody or for its reliance on empty rhetorical gestures. Repetition has this ambivalent status, having both the sense of imitation: copying, with overtones of the fraudulent (of one's own work this earns the term self-parody); and the sense of affirmation which gestures toward the genuine, the consistent or the demonstrable. Interestingly, repeating another's work or ideas also has this ambivalence: its positive form, emulation, being a self-declared aspiration for the good which brings credit to that which is emulated as much as to the work of emulation. In its negative sense, copying another's work, (usually without the admission of having done so) is labelled forgery or plagiarism.\(^{185}\)

Wilde's work is informative on the contentious aspects of repetition. Wilde was often accused of self-parody and repetition, the editor of the Penguin Classic edition of Wilde's *The Picture of Dorian Gray* writes in a footnote: 'Wilde was never afraid to repeat himself: indeed he turned it into an art'. On the


\(^{184}\) ibid., p 4

\(^{185}\) The legal ramifications of repetition in these two examples is revealing also. Internal consistency (in evidence for example) being the mark of truth. and fraudulent copying constituting a positive minefield of legal convolutions. Photocopying and photographic copyright being just two familiar examples that art historians find themselves having to deal with.
other aspect of repetition, perhaps it is more the case that 'originality is the art of concealing one's source'...

Perpetual repetition can only have its good, affirmative (moral) standing if the repeater owns the prototype or model, that is, only if they are the originators (or if one has in fact successfully concealed one's sources) thus for an artist, constructed as Long is, on the basis of a constantly affirmed and repeated novelty, the issue of precursors, sources, or 'influences' is, and must remain, taboo. Hence R.H Fuchs dismisses the subject, despite a suggested roll call of honourable potential artistic ancestry which includes Malevich and Picasso, stating:

There are always art-historical links and other aesthetic considerations to be pointed out, but they serve only to define the independence and the autonomy of the new work. Its present existence can never be deduced from what came before.187

Nancy Foote looks outside of 'art' for potential precursors and influences, and after a perusal of Neolithic stone circles, medieval pilgrimages, eighteenth century landscape gardening and the 'Blue Guide' books, states that

In trying to attach any of this to Long, however, one inevitably comes a cropper, it has everything - and nothing - to do with him.188

Such speculations bring things to the work, they add 'functional segments' (to use Foucault's term)189 to the discourse on Richard Long, making such relations available to subsequent accounts through the commentary's authorised appearance, in a catalogue, book or magazine article, under the name of (and thus in the name of) Richard Long. That this process does more than merely change the interpretation of the work is referred to in an article by Charles Harrison in 1970:

... the spectator's experience of the work of art will come to include information imposed upon the art work by writers and others. Mud does stick.190

It is by incorporation as well as by imposition that the work becomes what it is described as. Repetition in the terms of its description acts to reinforce and embed all the more deeply such interpretations. Internal consistency in the body of critical evidence as much as in the evidence of the body of work becomes the apparent guarantor of truth.

The continued repetition of key ideas and words occurs as they are re-used by each subsequent author, whose research inevitably begins with a review or at least a perusal or existing texts on the artist. Such a process can be traced through the repetition or near repetition of key words and phrases. One example is

---

186 Peter Ackroyd, editor's note to Wilde's The Picture of Dorian Gray, p 267.
187 R.H Fuchs, Richard Long, p 44.
188 Nancy Foote, 'Long Walks', Artforum 18 (Summer 1980), pp. 42-47. This strategy of avoiding or denying specific meaning is discussed in Land Art Beginning. See p. 36 above.
189 Michel Foucault, The Birth of the Clinic, Preface, p xviii
190 Charles Harrison, 'Notes towards art work', Studio International 179 (February 1970), p. 43.
the use of the word 'Chthonic' in relation to Long's work. Wherever it's first or original use - and this need not concern us so much as its status as a repeated term - the word appears in Michael Compton's Some notes on the work of Richard Long which accompanied the artist's exhibit at the 1976 Venice Biennale. Richard Long's work is ancestral, secret and chthonic, in the catalogue to 1965 to 1972 - when attitudes became form (1984): 'man's attempts at the creation of order are juxtaposed with chthonic patterns', and in John T Paoletti's account of Long's work in the catalogue to the show The Critical Eye I, Yale Centre for British Art New Haven, Connecticut (1984): 'The earth is important to Long, not only for the current natural experiences which it affords him, but for the chthonic powers resident there which extend time for us into the uncharted reaches of the past.' A similar observation can be made by comparing the similar descriptions of A Line Made by Walking.

The Line, its accompanying discourse on originality and its existence as a photograph (a reproduction), highlights the apparent incongruity of repetition and uniqueness. Chateaubriand's comments on writers might equally well have been said of other artistic creators:

'The original writer is not he who refrains from imitating others. But he who can be imitated by none.'

In this sense originality, by necessity, involves a projection forward in time - an original is something that cannot be repeated in the future. This has, of course, ramifications for the commodification and value of works of art. As easily reproduced a work as a photograph needs some additional guarantor of its uniqueness. This problem is addressed, in relation to the work of Long, by Harrison in Studio International in January 1972.

The status of the primary art object is culturally entrenched by a long tradition of financial and transubstantiating transactions which involve recognition of that object's uniqueness - its non-reproducibility. The 'documentary record' - photograph-plus-signature or whatever - of the otherwise evanescent or non-material 'work' has no such inherent historicity, no consequent

191 Chthonic. 'of, relating to, or inhabiting the underworld.' (OED) This seems a strange epithet to apply to Long's work which seems far more concerned with the surface of the world and anxious to distance itself from the mystical and magical tags that such an adjective conjures up.

192 Michael Compton. Some notes on the work of Richard Long. unpaginated. first sentence of text. The use of the word 'secret' is unsettling and useful here. Texts such as those by Anne Seymour and R. H. Fuchs frequently stress the straightforward, pragmatic and uncomplicated approach and attitude of Richard Long. Compton's text, beginning with this jarring series of adjectives suggests an alternative interpretation is already available within the discourse on Long. The chthonic is taken and used by subsequent commentators whilst the 'secret' appears to be dropped. Secrecy is a potent ingredient of Romance.


The problem had in fact already been recognised and moreover an attempt had been made to provide a legal framework to deal with such transactions. It actually appeared in the pages of the self-same journal in which Harrison's words were published - and some 9 months previously - in the April 1971 issue - which included (and feature on its cover) 'The artist's reserved rights transfer and sale agreement.' In retrospect it seems naive to believe that the mechanisms of the market could not easily be adjusted to accommodate the most ephemeral or immaterial work of art. Nevertheless the issue of intellectual property was, and remains a contested and murky area.

One strategy for avoiding the worst excesses of speculative meaning is to allow as little as possible in the way of explanatory or discursive material to infect the work's presentation. Long's appearance in the catalogue to the 1972 exhibition The New Art at the Hayward Gallery, London is consistent with such a procedure, denying the concretising of sources, influences or precursors. In the catalogue the work of Long and of Hamish Fulton stands without the textual material included for other artists in the exhibition. Whilst affirming and legitimating Long and Fulton's request for such a situation in her introduction, Anne Seymour, the exhibition's curator does forge one linkage for Long's work which has remained close to it, the link between Long and Beckett's character Molloy.

Seymour writes of Long's work:

For all its complexity, it has that concentrated inconsequential conviction of the man in the Samuel Beckett story who has six stones in his pocket and simply moves them round inside the pocket, it seems the right thing to do.

---

198 Seth Siegelaub, 'The artist's reserved rights transfer and sale agreement'. Siegelaub's discussion of the background to the agreement (dated February 24, 1971) begins as follows: 'The 3-page Agreement form in this issue [...] has been drafted by Bob Projansky, a New York lawyer, after my extensive discussions and correspondence with over 500 artists, dealers, lawyers, collectors, museum people, critics and other concerned people involved in the day-to-day working of the international art world. The agreement has been designed to remedy some generally acknowledged inequities in the art world, particularly artists' lack of control over the use of their work and participation in its economics after they no longer own it.' The discussion ends with the paragraph:

'We have done this for no recompense, for just the pleasure and challenge of the problem, feeling that should there ever be a question about artists' rights in reference to their art, the artist is more right than anyone else.'

199 Not least among the problems is the fact that under existing copyright law ideas cannot be copyrighted since copyright is dependent on a medium. The idea must exist in some material form. If reproduction involves a change of medium, copyright has not been infringed. This has consequences for a broad range of art practices, particularly those designated 'Conceptual Art'. It has particular ramifications in the case of Long's A Line Made by Walking discussed later in this chapter. Repeating the Line, p. 104.
200 Anne Seymour, introduction to The New Art, p. 6.
AGREEMENT OF ORIGINAL TRANSFER OF WORK

This agreement made this __________ day of _________________________ (hereinafter),

SEEPAGES 142-145
and 186-188
at ___________________________ (hereinafter),

WITNESSETH:
WHEREAS the Artist has created that certain work of art;
Title: ___________________________________ Identification #: ___________
Date: __________________________ Material: __________________________
Dimensions: __________________________ Description: __________________________
(hereinafter "the Work"); and
WHEREAS Artist is willing to sell the Work to Collector and Collector is willing to buy the Work from Artist, subject to mutual obligations, covenants, and conditions herein; and WHEREAS Collector and Artist recognize that the value of the Work, unlike that of other works of art, will be affected by each and every other work of art the Artist has created and that the parties expect the value of the Work to increase hereafter; and WHEREAS Collector and Artist recognize that it is fitting and proper that Artista value which may thus be created in the Work; and WHEREAS the parties wish the integrity and clarity of the Artist’s ideas and style to be maintained and subject in part to the will or advice of the creator of the Work, and WHEREAS the parties agree to this in consideration of the foregoing premises and the mutual obligations and other valuable considerations the parties hereto agree as follows:

PURCHASE AND SALE. ARTICLE ONE: The Artist hereby sells to Collector and Collector hereby buys the Work from Artist, subject to all the covenants herein set forth (for the price of __________, receipt of which is hereby acknowledged) (at the agreed valuation for the pure

FUTURE TRANSFERS: ARTICLE TWO: Collector covenants that in the event Collector gives, grants, barter, exchanges, assigns, transfers, conveys or alienates the Work in whole or in part, the Work shall pass by inheritance or bequest or by operation of law, or if the Work shall pass by inheritance or bequest or by operation of law, or if
From the way in which it is written, and given the accompanying caveat that Long did not permit explanatory material to be published in the context of this catalogue, one might assume that this analogy is one drawn by Seymour herself. However, in the book accompanying the 1991 Hayward exhibition of Long’s work she returns to the Beckett analogy recounting:

When I first talked to him about his work he compared it to Beckett’s character, Molloy, who kept his sixteen sucking stones in his pocket and just moved them around because it seemed the right thing to do.

This sheds a different light on the story. Firstly, in this later account Seymour claims that the analogy was drawn by Long, and secondly, she asserts that the conversation in which this analogy was made was when she first talked to Long. Presumably then the comment was made before or actually in the ‘series of interviews during the early part of this year’ (1972) of which Seymour makes mention in her introduction and upon which the second part of The New Art catalogue was based. Presumably some kind of ‘interview’ did take place, but the information was not allowed into the relevant section of the catalogue. Information from this ‘interview’ was not entirely excluded, since Seymour managed to include this detail from it, under her name in the introduction. In the later account the analogy is given validity and authenticity by asserting its issuing from the artist and its dating from a formative early engagement between the writer and the artist. Repetition of the story is here acting in the sense of affirmation. However, important differences occur.

The first account mentions ‘six stones’, the second ‘sixteen’, and the first omits the important word ‘sucking’. This seems important, not merely to the accuracy of the account of Beckett’s story, but in the possibilities the analogy offers. Both accounts emphasise the purposeless nature of the activity: it just ‘seemed’ (1991) ‘seems’ (1972) the right thing to do’. However, whilst the activity might be said to be without purpose (in any ‘useful’ or productive sense), it is not pointless. The actions have an internal logic within the story, and this cannot be thought without the allied action of sucking. Molloy only sucks one stone at a time. He wants to suck all the stones equally and in rotation. He can tell which stone has just been removed from his mouth to his pocket because it is still wet, however he cannot know which stones were sucked prior to that one, or in what sequence. His anxiety to regulate and control the sequence of sucking leads him to attempt the ordered distribution of the stones in his pocket. Having accepted the initial situation out of which the need for actions occur, the ensuing actions become a

---

74

---


In an interview in 1986, Long was asked about the comparison of his practice to Beckett’s writing:

Q. And on Beckett’s writings? She [Anne Seymour] also refers to Molloy.

A. Well, I like that comparison! I have read a few bits and pieces of Beckett’s work and things that have been written about him. Obviously .... he does use things like country lanes and bicycles and stones and doing nothing .... like an incredible minimal view of life, which is very attractive and powerful.


703 It could of course be the case that sometime between 1972 and 1991 Seymour actually read Beckett’s story rather than relying on her or Long’s remembered account of the story. It seems unlikely given her account of Molloy’s activities.
matter of necessity. Similarly in Long’s work, the walking, moving stones or the regulating of speeds, directions and activities has no ‘purpose’ or ‘use’. There is no functional ‘for the sake of which’ these activities are undertaken. But, like Molloy, reason rather than necessity rules the activity. The works have a strict internal logic which is not governed by any purpose external to the activity itself. The analogy is apt and perhaps far more revealing than Long anticipated. These activities of Molloy’s and Long’s locate such repetitive activities, with their unflinching internal logic to the point of exasperation or incomprehensibility (obsessive), to a discourse on existentialism and a theme repeated in Beckett’s work:

The new rules [that govern Beckett’s work] are those insinuating rituals invented by Beckett to dramatize basic human processes and states: Murphy desiring, Molloy travelling, Moran searching, Malone writing, the Unnamable talking, Estragon waiting, Hamm acting, Krapp listening, and dozens of others falling, crawling, fleeing, dying.

One might add ‘Molloy sucking’ and, of course, ‘Long walking’. There is a discussion of ritual in Paoletti’s account of Long’s work. He refers to a book by Mircea Eliade, Patterns in Comparative Religion (Cleveland/New York 1965) and writes:

Ritual acts, in order to be effective must be the same as acts in the past, not mere replications of them, thus time collapses in ritual and myth so that it is simultaneously present, past and future; it becomes “transhistoric.” The satisfaction of these ritual necessities can occur only in an environment which is free of time-specific or site-specific anecdote and which provides the requisite formal means to initiate the participant into Eliade’s “eternal present.”

Repetition taken to the point of compulsion is also indicative of the over-arching ordering mentality of rationality and of course its inescapable double: madness (or Foucault’s ‘unreason’ in Madness and Civilization).

Another provocative line of enquiry follows from the suppression - or ignorance - of the activity of ‘sucking’ in Seymour’s first account of Beckett’s Molloy in her introduction to The New Art. Merely moving the stones in one’s pockets lacks the bodily internalisation of sucking. The sucked pebbles enter and are removed from the body. Even without further exploration of the oral/sexual connotations one might draw from this activity, the visceral experience of the activity is completely excluded from an account which misses out this crucially important term. Elsewhere, in this study I deal specifically with the denial of the visceral body in Long’s work. In this context it is sufficient to observe its non-appearance in the earlier account, and the possibilities for its (re)appearance in the terms of the

---

204 Maybe this is the reason for his attempted concealment of information thus imparted, or for his distancing himself as the authorial source of the connection.


207 Michel Foucault. Madness and Civilization.
subsequent repetition of the story. In this story of the return of the repressed, the artificial ‘orifice’ - or rather the analogy/symbol of an orifice - the pocket - remains.

Seymour also attests to the way in which, for artists such as Gilbert and George, Fulton and Long (her examples), art and life have merged in their practice. In her explanation this means that these artists’ work has expanded and extended in time and space, outside of the ‘usual’ or traditional preserves of ‘art’ or the art world and into ‘the public domain’. Seymour also draws a connection between Long and Beckett through the temporal coincidence of Beckett’s *Imagination Dead Imagine* appearing around the same time as Long’s first pieces out of doors, in a time when, for Seymour, ‘the whole world suddenly became open to work with’. For Seymour one of the most significant things enabled by this ‘New Art’ is ‘to open the field to history again’. Her notion of ‘history’ here seems one in which art operates in a broader historical continuum, no longer closed and separate from the praxis of life. Thus the linkages drawn are more than mere comparisons that elucidate, illustrate or draw interesting parallels with the work. ‘It has become possible’, she states

to consider not simply as reference, connections between Terry Atkinson and Hegel, Richard Long and Beckett, Keith Milow and Rauschenberg, Gerald Newman and John Cage, to consider matters of current interest outside art (as well as inside it) in terms of mathematics, logic, information theory, and so forth.

The catalogue and its introduction, as the title suggests, is suffused with the concept or concepts of ‘The New’; ‘firsts’, being ‘at the front’, ‘peculiarity’, (one might add, although Seymour avoids it, ‘Avant Garde’). Whilst some of the methods or modes of ‘extending’ art practice and criticism might be claimed as ‘new’, the idea of collapsing art into life has a longer, maybe more disreputable than distinguished history. Perhaps for this reason the philosophical and ethical straightforwardness, the ‘eschewal of aesthetic mumbo-jumbo’, claimed for Long, Fulton or Gilbert and George’s art into life methods would be undermined by parallels with such dissolute forebears as Baudelaire or Oscar Wilde. Wilde’s making an art of life - ‘Aestheticism’ - is precisely the type of over-cultivated dilettantism that Seymour’s characterisation appears to oppose. Long’s and Fulton’s is

an approach ... which repudiates not only aesthetic discussion of art, but emphasises that it is necessary to work according to no preconceived philosophies, as far as possible from the great art history machine.

No aesthetics, no philosophy, no *art* history. Whereas, for Wilde, life becomes aesthetics, philosophy and art history. Long takes art, repudiates its history, philosophy and aesthetics to become ‘ordinary’ (or ‘everyday’) life. However these two solutions cannot easily occupy oppositional positions since the relations of art and life in many traditional, recent and contemporary analyses are viewed neither as oppositional nor as mirror images, but as complex interrelations and interminglings. The separation of

---

208 Anne Seymour, *New Art*, p. 7
209 Ibid., p. 6.
210 Ibid., p. 5.
211 Ibid., p. 6.
art and life (in all but the most rigorous formalist accounts) seeming more a contradiction than their fusion. However, Long and Wilde's Dorian Gray share an important obsession with time: its passing; its moving, and its stilling/stopping. A clue to this connection lies in Seymour's analysis of the sort of art that is or becomes a way of life. In her account, the extension of 'art' into the real time of life outside of the 'presentness' or transcendental time of art which constitutes its embracing 'real life', means a confrontation or an embracing of ephemerality. Much of the early work of the St. Martin's 'New Art' 'vocational' course artists - McLean, Long, Fulton, Gilbert and George, Flanagan - was typified by its ephemerality: actions, interventions; events recorded by crude documentation, by scratchy, badly exposed or out-of-focus photographs with hand-written captions, tacky diagrams or word of mouth. In Long's (and Fulton's) case this emphasis has declined, perhaps all but disappeared, replaced by glossy, highly finished, framed photographs and silk-screened posters with lasting and evident 'quality'. A similar inversion of ephemerality and fixity is presented by Dorian Gray's exchange: he remains young, the picture ages. The play on time scales: life and work, their inversion, interchangability and synonymity characterises Wilde's Dorian Gray and offers a revealing perspective on the same components in Long's practice. Earlier on in Long's career the desire, if not the actual realisation of ephemerality is exhibited in the fragile and ill-considered remnants of a practice legitimised in practical actions: going for a walk (a 'walking sculpture'), cycling, placing stones which are not photographed, or walking (with other students) from the art school door to Radlett Airport. At this stage one could well imagine Long being the recipient of Lord Henry's words to Dorian Gray:

I am so glad that you have never done anything, never carved a statue, or painted a picture, or produced anything outside of yourself! Life has been your art. You have set yourself to music, your days are your sonnets. In a fragment of an interview published in 1991, Long seems to express (albeit masked by humour) a desire for such a state of grace, to have done nothing that has left a mark:

I am not naive enough to think it's possible to make a work in the same state of divine grace, or whatever it was Rudi [Fuchs] said, as it was twenty years ago. More and more I keep intersecting my own past walks, all across England. There is no way I can go down to Dartmoor now and not be aware of what I've done before. It's full of memories (one walk leads to another). I am aware of my own history now, and also other people's expectations, and how they receive what I'm doing now through knowing what I've done in the past.212

Hilar' Gresty gives an account of 'the Radlett Walk' - a group project whose participants included Peter Hide, Hamish Fulton and George. Such group projects were initiated under the tuition of Peter Atkins. The walk was in two parts. In the first the participants were, to quote Gresty: 'positioned around the corner from the school with the instruction to walk back to the front entrance in the Charing Cross Road in a specific amount of time. The distance was short and the given time relatively long, so they were tied together to force them to walk more slowly. On arriving at St. Martin's they were given the instruction to walk as far as possible along a given route until dusk. The majority arrived at Radlett airport at approximately the same time. An interesting opposition had been set up between prescribed time and movement in the first half and acknowledgment of natural self adjusting speed of movement in the second.' Hilary Gresty, 'From The New Generation 1965 to The New Art 1972', p. 158.

212 Hilary Gresty gives an account of 'the Radlett Walk' - a group project whose participants included Peter Hide, Hamish Fulton and George. Such group projects were initiated under the tuition of Peter Atkins. The walk was in two parts. In the first the participants were, to quote Gresty: 'positioned around the corner from the school with the instruction to walk back to the front entrance in the Charing Cross Road in a specific amount of time. The distance was short and the given time relatively long, so they were tied together to force them to walk more slowly. On arriving at St. Martin's they were given the instruction to walk as far as possible along a given route until dusk. The majority arrived at Radlett airport at approximately the same time. An interesting opposition had been set up between prescribed time and movement in the first half and acknowledgment of natural self adjusting speed of movement in the second.' Hilary Gresty, 'From The New Generation 1965 to The New Art 1972', p. 158.

213 Oscar Wilde, Picture of Dorian Gray, p. 256.

214 In Long's case perhaps the music is Country and Western and the poetry form Haiku rather than sonnet.
I'm quite envious of people who don't have any notches on their sticks!
No responsibilities - you could just walk off into the distance.
Yes, pass through life without leaving a trace.\(^{215}\)

(An existential longing for nothingness perhaps.) Long gave the following account of the blending of life and art in his work in an interview in 1986:

I think art is a meeting place of [...] the unconscious ... an instinctive doing, doing what comes naturally. It's half that and half a kind of intellectual excitement, of dreaming up original ideas. It is like a sort of chemistry of your instinct and the intellect. Because for me, as a kid I was often climbing in the Avon Gorge or cycling. I used to go youth hostelling with my parents on my bike. I used to have holidays in Devon on the moors and on the coast. I had a love for the English landscape through my childhood. But I had a love of art and drawing and painting as well, which, I suppose, are the more sort of conscious interests.

Did you make paintings?
Well, I used to, I mean. I always think that I spent the first sixteen years of my life drawing and painting.

You are still drawing and painting
No, I don't. Well, in another way perhaps.
I think when I grew up that I put the two parts of my personality together. I suppose I made art out of what I enjoyed doing. I made the walking into art.\(^{216}\)

Not only are 'art' and 'life' collapsed into one another, but a seeming paradox is created by Long's inversion of 'art' (in traditional terms of 'drawing and painting') and 'life'. Long suggests that his mode of existence was 'art' up to age sixteen and 'life' ever after. This is a particularly striking inversion.

Contrasting his own self-image with that 20th Century doyen of life-as-art philosophy. Joseph Beuys,\(^{217}\) Long states:

compared to him I am an anonymous artist who puts the work into the world without the backup of my personality or how I look like or how I act. So there is a big difference. It was necessary for Beuys to be recognized. He had to wear certain clothes, how he acted and what he said was important. With me, I can be anonymous as a person but the work is everything.\(^{218}\)

Whilst Long's figure has not been entirely absent from his work - he appeared in it unproblematically up until the beginning of the 1970s - the unpeopled, silent landscape 'signifying presence by its absence' became the archetypal 'Richard Long' work for most of the 1970s and 1980s. As Beatrice Parent noted in her 1971 discussion of Land Art: 'The work shown in a photo is a set proposition where all life is absent.'\(^{219}\) Long's re-appearance from the mid-1980s, in advertisements,\(^{220}\) [figure 11] on publicity (for

---

\(^{215}\) 'Fragments of a Conversation VI', *Walking in Circles*, p. 104.

\(^{216}\) ibid., p. 18.

\(^{217}\) Long was a 'neighbour' to Beuys in the 1976 Venice Biennale, when Long's work occupied the British pavilion near the German one that housed Beuys' work 'Tramstop'. In the 1994 exhibition *The Romantic Spirit in German Art 1790-1990*, at the Hayward Gallery, London. Beuys' work featured as the terminus of the exhibition display, positing him as the legitimate heir of the German Romantic tradition in Germany, and its most recent highpoint.


\(^{219}\) Beatrice Parent. 'Land Art', p. 68.

\(^{220}\) *Art in America* 70 (Summer 1982), back cover.
example the leaflet for the Henry Moore Institute, figure 7 above) and most notably in the Arts Council video *Stones and Flies,* together with the emergence (or re-emergence) of works where the body touching - hand prints, foot prints, finger marks [figure 12] - seem to signal a shift toward a more embodied practice, in which the artist's physical body becomes both the origin of the work and the sign of the work's presence.

The body of the artist has re-entered the stage of action: but what sort of a body is it? Young, or at least youthful: '... this wheel of becoming will still turn for a long time yet. It is hard to believe that the artist is only 45 years old.' In his *Stones and Flies* video he looks and sounds young. Welcoming criticisms of his work as childish pursuits he comments: 'I don't think that you can separate childhood from adulthood. I think you are the same person all through your life.' Here, as in Long's account of his early life, the artist bears out a famous quotation from Wordsworth: 'The child is father of the man.' Through his art Long has made a pact with eternal youth: 'Richard Long has not only managed to stave off the dead hand of custom which, as we age, falls upon our shoulders like heavy frost, as Wordsworth describes in his Ode on Intimations of Immortality, *his art helps defend him against it.' (my emphasis) Dorian Gray too makes a pact with art: the art will age, he will remain young. At first Gray takes pleasure in the contrast between the ageing image on the canvas and his youthful beauty. 'He mocked the misshapen body and the failing limbs.' But eventually there is a price to pay for such a bargain.

Whilst commentators have often dwelled upon the Wordsworth parallel, the parallel with Becket's Molloy is perhaps even more provocative for our knowing that the parallel is one drawn by the artist himself. Molloy, like Long sets out on his travels. Unlike Long, he is lame, disturbed, 'the tramp with...'

---


22 Anne Seymour, 'Walking in Circles'. p. 32.

23 Richard Long, quoted in Anne Seymour, ‘Walking in Circles’. p. 34. Notice the contrast with the above quotation about life and art. p. 78, note 216.


25 Seymour, ‘Walking in Circles.’ p. 34. The relevant lines from the poem she paraphrases are: 'And custom lie upon thee with a weight, / Heavy as frost, and deep almost as life!' Wordsworth. 'Ode. Intimations of Immortality.' *Poetical Works.* p. 461.

26 Oscar Wilde, Picture of Dorian Gray, p. 159.

27 Both Long's and Fulton's work has been compared to Wordsworth. Andrew Causey compares a photograph by Fulton to Wordsworth's *The Prelude* at the beginning of Causey's essay 'Space and Time in British Land Art'. *Studio International* 193 (March/April 1977) pp. 122-130, p. 122. Michael Archer compares Long, Fulton and Constable during a summer when all three featured in exhibitions in London: Michael Archer, 'A Walk in the Endless Summer from Duncansby Head to the Place of the Camel Dropping', *Art Monthly,* no. 149 (September 1991), pp. 7-10.
Figure 11. Advertisement on the back cover of Art in America (Summer 1982).
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Figure 12. Richard Long.
crutches, a mixture of simplicity, hurt and lunatic energy. He has dragged his body around all his life, and it follows him like some ignorant valet.

It is tempting to see Molloy as some kind of 'Anti-Long': some unconscious, raving and incapacitated demon haunting the fit, attuned, reasoned exterior. Age, ageing, decay and infirmity: are these the repressed fears of a practice so dependent on an active, fit and youthful body that is rarely glimpsed in its entirety in the work and yet upon whose perfect completeness the work is predicated? The review of Beckett's Trilogies from which the above quotations were taken was published in the New Statesman in 1960, at the dawning of that mythic decade that saw the 'invention' of youth culture and an unprecedented emphasis on being young. The author's comments on Beckett's obsession with age and decay are striking:

... it is strange that in a generation which has put all its stress on youth and achievement, he alone should have written about old age, loneliness and decrepitude, a subject which arouses perhaps our deepest repressed guilt and fears. He is the product of a civilisation which has become suddenly old.

Thus fate - to become suddenly old - is the ultimate price of Dorian Gray's age-defying wager. It is one of the themes that haunts Long's otherwise seemingly endless 'walking in circles'. the '... something made of almost nothing, containing both end and beginning simultaneously....'

Along the way there are hints of the precariousness of life - intimations of mortality one might say - a photograph from a sequence taken on 'A TWENTY FIVE DAY WALK IN NEPAL' 1975 captioned 'Days 15 and 23 Passing the impact mark of a falling rock'. Long's story of a re-routed walk resulting from natural phenomena (in this case the early onset of the monsoon, blocking the intended route with snow) and Fulton's account of Long and himself discussing the film of English cycle racer Tommy Simpson 'falling from his cycle, to die where he fell.' during the 1967 Tour de France. Later that year (1989), alone, Fulton recounts, 'by chance I came across the roadside memorial to Tommy Simpson. A plaque and a cairn of cyclists' caps.

---

229 ibid., p. 196
230 ibid.
231 ibid., p. 197
232 Anne Seymour. 'Walking in Circles'. p.25.
234 Richard Long. Richard Long in Conversation, Part Two', p. 13. Long is talking about a walk in Nepal that resulted in the book work Countless Stones, (Richard Long, Eindhoven: Van Abbemuseum and Openbaar Kunstbezit, 1983). ' [...] the original ideal was to walk all the way around the Annapurna Massif, like a circular walk. To do that you have to go over a high pass right at the back of the mountains and just the day before were due to go over this pass, which is the key to the whole place, the monsoon came early and blocked it with snow.'
235 Hamish Fulton. 'Old Muddy'. p. 245.
The body of the artist Richard Long is perpetually active, preserved on film or repeated agelessly in books and exhibitions. It is no longer *A Line Made by Walking* (passive) but Richard Long is *Walking the Line* (active) in an ever-present, gestural re-enactment, constantly repeated - and repeatable - on film, on photographic paper or in print. The work, as Long emphasised in his statement quoted above, may be everything, but how is it recognised as the work of Richard Long? By some signatory mark or presence surely, since there is and can be in the modern world no such thing as an anonymous work of art. What relation does it bear to the artist who rearranges the work and represents it, now older, yet still unchanged? Perhaps, as in the denouement of Wilde’s story of Dorian Gray, the servants behold the unrecognisably aged and disfigured body of Gray beside the restored painted image now returned to youth. In this re-inversion of ‘art’ and ‘life’ the former is restored to timelessness and the latter to the natural state of decay and decline (mortality). Gray’s suddenly changed body is impossible to recognize physically. ‘It was not until they had examined the rings that they recognized who it was.’

The young, tall, short-haired and frequently rucksack-laden figure of Long was in the beginning, and is again more recently, the signifier of his work: the figure juxtaposed with the long man chalk drawing in *Climbing Mt Kilimanjaro, Africa 1969.27* [figure 14] or with the walking party about to climb Kilimanjaro in 'Nineteen stills.28' [figure 15] the shadow on the desert floor at the beginning of *Walking in Circles* or the figure about to disappear round a curve in the road at the end of the same book.29 In exhibitions however, ‘Long’ is more immediately recognisable by the forms of his sculptures: the lines and circles (rings?) he has made his trademark. These will not change, age or date in the same way as the body depicted in images. ‘My work is a portrait of myself in the world,’ Long commented in an interview in 1991.30 almost repeating one of his own earliest statements about his work being ‘a portrait of the artist touching the earth.’31 (itself repeating or echoing Joyce’s *A portrait of the artist as a young man*32)

---

30. ibid., p. 247.
Figure 14. Richard Long.
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Figure 15. Richard Long. From ‘Nineteen stills from the work of Richard Long’, 1970.
Figure 16. Photograph of Long by Fulton, from *Walking in Circles*.
The quotation from Wilde with which I began, linked romance and repetition. Now the question as to whether Long's work in 'romantic' can be stated differently, and an answer might then be framed in terms of Wilde's analysis of romance. By perpetuating an experience through differing repetitions of a finite number of basic forms the romance is sustained, but, as in romantic literature and film, it is always just out of reach, sealed on celluloid or closed within the pages of a book. It is a simulacra, removed from the 'everyday life' to which it purports to bear relation, promising a prior reality which cannot in fact be accessed through the medium of the works, and whose loss is attested to in every monument to its passing. 'not memory itself (mneme), only monuments (hypomnemata), inventories, citations, copies, accounts, lists, notes, duplicates, chronicles, genealogies, references.' A litany which itemises the very stuff and essence of Long's work. As simulacra the possibility of any original or 'first' work is denied. There is only repetition, and this is a key to one of the most important techniques of Long's work, and a clue to its seductive allure (prompting such questions as 'What is it that is repeated?' or 'Where is the site of its repetition?'). The next section of this chapter explores further the role and operations of repetition through a close examination of one of the most repeated images in Long's oeuvre, and one most clearly constructed as an originary or founding work. *A Line Made by Walking England 1965*.

---

Repeating the Line


Richard Long's *A Line Made by Walking England 1967* is one of the artist's most famous and familiar works. It is reproduced in the two standard (Thames and Hudson) texts on Long as well as in numerous catalogues of both personal and group exhibitions, and books on Land Art, sculpture and contemporary art in general. The two seemingly most straightforward questions one might ask about this work: What is it? and Where is it? proved surprisingly difficult to answer adequately. For so frequently reproduced a work, the Line Made by Walking is extraordinarily elusive.

A framed photograph of Long's *A Line Made by Walking England 1967* was shown in the exhibition *Richard Long Walking in Circles* at the Hayward Gallery London in 1991. The Gallery Guide for the exhibition lists 'Works in the Exhibition'. The line is listed under the heading 'Framed Works' as follows:

```
A LINE MADE BY WALKING. England 1967.
Photography and text. Public freehold; collection Tate
```

That seems fairly straightforward. The medium of the work is photography and text and, since it is listed under the heading 'framed works' it is also framed. The evidence of the work in the exhibition bore out that assumption. Apart from the rather unexplained designation 'public freehold' and the absence of any dimensions for the work, everything seems in order. The work was purchased by the Tate Gallery in 1976, information enough to locate it in the Biennial 'Catalogue of Acquisitions' and in the Tate Gallery archive. Or so I thought.

On further investigation none of these assumptions turned out to be straightforward at all. A visit to the Tate Gallery Archive turned up an unexpected absence. Not only was Long's *A Line Made by Walking England 1967* not listed in the relevant Biennial Catalogue of Acquisitions, but when I asked for details on this work I was told first that it was contained in a file requiring at least two weeks' notice for...
consultation and then that the file was empty save for an unanswered questionnaire from a Tate Gallery archivist seeking information from the artist about the work.248

Generally speaking the documentation for sculptural works by Richard Long consists of a certificate with instructions for assembling the sculpture. The details of these instructions vary from work to work, but generally include a sketch of the layout of the work, detailed written instructions, and the artist's signature and stamp. The Tate Gallery has a policy of consulting with artists as to the display and conservation issues that affect their work. For example, if a part is broken, can it be replaced with a similar component? These records are kept in the Tate Gallery's Conservation Record. The standard record form used to store conservation information was redesigned during the period 1976 to 1978, the same period in which Long's A Line Made by Walking was (supposedly) purchased.249

A clue to the problematic ownership of the work A Line Made by Walking England 1967 lies in its designation, 'public freehold.'

The following definition is from the book on Long which accompanied his major exhibition at the Solomon Guggenheim Museum in 1986:

'Public Freehold' signifies a work independent of ownership. If recorded by a photograph, it may or may not exist as a framed work, it may be recorded by more than one view, the size may vary, it may exist as more than one print, but never as an edition.250

All this assumes however that the work. A Line Made by Walking England 1967 is a framed work consisting of photograph and text. Looking back over the history of the Line this is clearly not the case. To uncover its former identity one needs to go back to earlier texts on Long and to a debate about sculpture, photography and documentation.

As far as Charles Harrison is concerned, writing about the work in 1969, it is most definitely a sculpture.251 The photograph illustrated in Harrison's article that seems to record the Line Made by

---

248 The file for another work owned by the Tate Gallery, Slate Circle 1979, catalogue number T.3027, contains a certificate with details on how to set up the work, and a questionnaire asking the artist such questions as how to set the work up and whether it is site-specific. Other documentation and information about works is available in the archive and can be accessed via a card index. Without asking for details on the documentation of all works by Long I cannot be certain how unusual the empty state of the file for A Line Made by Walking is. What can be stated however is that other works owned by the Tate Gallery are much easier to get information about. The following statement accompanies the entries for Long's works in the Biennial Illustrated Catalogue of Acquisitions 1976-8 (p. 108): 'This [Ben Nevis Hitch-Hike 1967] and the next three catalogue entries [see list in note 247 above], which have been approved and edited by the artist, were prepared from a brief questionnaire annotated by him in June 1978.' This is presumably the same or a similar questionnaire to the unanswered one for A Line Made by Walking England 1967.


251 Charles Harrison. 'Some recent sculpture in Britain', pp. 26-33.
Walking shows the same or a similar line photographed from some distance and height, the line appearing diagonally across the image and occupying only a small area of the image [figure 18]. The work is captioned 'Richard Long sculpture March 1967' and Harrison’s text makes reference to a work by Long which consisted of 'a path trodden in a field.' This discussion of the work takes place in an article entitled 'Some recent sculpture in Britain' in an issue of Studio International devoted to 'some aspects of contemporary British Sculpture' in January 1969. Charles Harrison was at that time the assistant editor of the magazine.

Willoughby Sharp, writing in Avalanche magazine in 1970 designates Long’s line a ‘Body Work.’ Sharp also states that '[i]n 1967 Richard Long began a series of works by pacing up and down a straight line in an English meadow.' (my emphasis). Particularly interesting in this statement are the reference to a series and the implication that the Line Made by Walking is, as its established title could easily imply, only A line rather than The Line. These early observations have important repercussions for subsequent accounts of A Line Made by Walking England 1967. In both Harrison’s and Sharp’s accounts the actual work discussed is the line trodden in the grass and not the photograph that merely records the work. The photograph at this stage seems to be documentary material and not the medium of the actual work called A Line Made by Walking England 1967.

These accounts are just two of the many and varied mentions of A Line Made by Walking England 1967. Each occurrence of the work in discourse constitutes a separate fact or segment of discourse. The system that they constitute is the discourse of Richard Long’s A Line Made by Walking England 1967. This is where the line is to be found. In discourse, in its many repetitions and reproductions in words and photographic reproduction. Like Poe’s purloined letter it is not to be found buried in some musty archive box but where it is most obvious and thus least expected to be found: in the most popular books and numerous catalogues, endlessly reproduced and reproducible. The Line Made by Walking England 1967 is an effect of discourse, produced by the institutions and texts that assign it a position in art discourse: a product familiar by its repetition, without an origin, pure simulacra. or pure repetition.

Viewing the Line in this way avoids the worst pitfall of searching for the ‘real’ line, the problem of origins or beginnings. Several moments or events could be put forward as potential origins for A Line

255 Many of Long’s works from this early period (i.e. the late 1960s) are a number of views of the same sculpture or landscape intervention. For example, one work illustrated in the Land Art catalogue is sculpture 1969 STONE CROSS photographed from 9 positions moving towards the object: Dartmoor, England. The Tate Gallery own two versions of a later work by Richard Long: A Line in Bolivia - Kicked Stones, 1981, which exists in two versions. However, as the Tate’s catalogue of acquisitions states: ‘A Line in Bolivia - Kicked Stones’ exists in two main version, a vertical and a horizontal view photographed from slightly different angles. The two panels are part of the same work but they are intended to be exhibition separately, not as a pair.’ The Tate Gallery Illustrated Catalogue of Acquisitions 1980-82 (London: The Tate Gallery, 1982)
Made by Walking England 1967. Its beginning could be construed as the moment of Long’s making the ephemeral mark, by walking up and down a field in a straight line, somewhere in England, sometime in 1967. It could be argued that its origins as an art work lie in its first institutional appearance in an art exhibition, catalogue or book, or in the knowledge of the work by other people who will confirm its existence (as a work of art, at that point). Thirdly, one could argue that the work does not exist as A Line Made by Walking England 1967 until it is definitively named as such. The Line does not appear in the definitive form in which it now appears until around 1974, some eight years after the beginning of the work in the first sense.

26 The issue of dating the origin of a work was discussed in the dispute between Joseph Kosuth and Benjamin Buchloh over Kosuth’s Proto-Investigations that took place in October magazine, numbers 55 (Winter 1990) and 57 (Summer 1991). In Buchloh’s essay, ‘Conceptual Art 1962-1969’, October, no. 55 (Winter 1990), p. 122, Buchloh refers to Kosuth’s Proto-Investigations in a footnote:

’in the preparation of this essay, I have not been able to find a single source or document that would confirm with definite credibility Kosuth’s claim that these works of the Proto-Investigations were actually produced and existed physically in 1965 or 1966, when he (at that time twenty years old) was still a student at the School of Visual Arts in New York. Nor was Kosuth able to provide any documents to make the claims verifiable. By contrast these claims were explicitly contextualized by all the artists I interviewed who knew Kosuth at that time, none of them remembering seeing any of the Proto-Investigations before February 1967’.

Kosuth’s reply, published in October, no. 57 (Summer 1991), p. 153, stated:

‘these works [the Proto-Investigations] existed only in notes or drawings and were fabricated after I had the financial resources due to interest in the somewhat later work. Of course I was asked “what did you do before?” notably by Gian Enzo Sperone, among some other critics and gallerists. Again, this is all known, if not by Mr. Buchloh. I simply had no funds at that age to fabricate works, and frankly, with no hope to exhibit them at the time - and with the nature of the work being what it was - there really was no point. This work is titled Proto-Investigations, clearly from the vantage point of the Investigations. Is the physically exhibited presence of a work the only criterion for its existence? It isn’t. If you know anything about Conceptual Art.’

27 In 1974 A Line Made by Walking England 1967 appeared in the catalogue to an exhibition of work by Richard Long at the Scottish National Gallery of Modern Art in Edinburgh. The exhibition was entitled Inca Rock Campfire Ash. The work of that title appeared on the cover of the catalogue and the Line is the first work inside. A position one can see echoed (or repeated) in Fuchs’ 1986 text. It was published by Robert Self. It has the now familiar caption in Gill Sans Serif face centred beneath the image. See illustration [figure 22] Earlier appearances of the Line in print have different titles. For example: in Studio International in January 1969 the caption gives the title ‘Richard Long: sculpture March 1967’ [figure 18]; in the Land Art catalogue in 1969 the work appears as ‘Sculpture 1967 / track in grass / made by walking / England’ [figures 19 and 20] (both these occurrences show the line running diagonally across the photograph, in Studio International photographed from a distance, in Land Art a close up similar in scale to the ‘classic’ vertical line). The diagonal line also appears in Barry Flanagan’s ‘Conceptual Art’ portfolio (1969): Tate Gallery Archive, reference no. 747 (folder containing 8 large sheets of photographs and typewritten information. Richard Long’s work occupies 2 sheets: reference no. 74-7/2). In Interfunctionen in September 1971 the work is titled ‘Sculpture by walking (67)’; and in The New Art catalogue in 1972 it is titled ‘Walking’ [figure 21]. These variations seem to suggest that the descriptive nature of the title was more important in these early instances than the sparing use of words that typify Long’s practice according to, for example, Graham Beal who writes in 1987: ‘Words have always been important in Long’s work. Whether under his own photographs or arranged in a geometric composition. They are used with characteristic care: that is to say, sparsely and sans-serif.’ Richard Long “The simplicity of walking, the simplicity of stones” in A Quiet Revolution: British Sculpture since 1965. pp. 110-114, p. 114.
What systematises *A Line Made by Walking England 1967* in discourse from the outset? The Line is systematised as repetition - by the very fact that it can be repeated. Further to this it is construed in subsequent discourse as an originator, as a founding work. This is demonstrated in the fact that other works, and the words of commentators and the artist himself refer to the Line. Long has produced a whole series of lines made by walking in various locations\(^{258}\) and, in 1985, he compared his (several) straight hundred mile walks to *A Line Made by Walking England 1967*, commenting in an interview:

> In a way each one [straight hundred mile walk] is an extension of my Line made by Walking .... walking up and down a straight line, except the walking distance is a hundred miles each time. It’s sort of the same work, a hundred mile walk, only the landscapes change.\(^{259}\)

*A Line Made by Walking England 1967* is, to quote Fuchs: ‘his [Long’s] basic work’, a ‘sculpture [which] became somewhat of a prototype, or a matrix, [...] a clarification, even a revelation of how to make sculpture. [...] The Line Made by Walking became classic the moment it was done: ...’.\(^{260}\) No other work by Long is afforded such attention in Fuchs’ book, indeed to support his thesis no other work could possibly occupy such a position.

As in my discussion of the repeating involved in rewriting previous texts in a way that the former ones are changed by the later one and the later one seems constant and inevitable,\(^{261}\) the repetition of the image of the Line functions in a similar way. It is supported by a discourse of words that also consistently reaffirms the work’s status, its originary position and its importance. Constant realigning of meaning is masked by the (apparently) exact reproduction of the same work in each new context. The notion of series, mentioned by Sharp in his ‘Body Works’ article and recognised as one of the key strategies of minimalism,\(^{262}\) can be seen to have a relation to Deleuze’s notion of repetition, particularly in the way in which a series can be non-hierarchical. Other theories of repetition (Plato’s or Baudrillard’s for example) involve a moral or aesthetic fall from the ‘original’.\(^{263}\)

Following the technique used by Deleuze and Guattari for ‘dating’ the chapters in their book *A Thousand Plateaus*, Richard Long’s *A Line Made by Walking England 1967* could be dated 1986. For it is at that date, and more specifically in the exhibition at the Solomon Guggenheim Museum in New York and in the catalogue and text by R. H. Fuchs that accompanied it, that the Line assumes its position as originary, as the first, as pure anteriority, or, one could argue as pure repetition. Long’s *A Line Made by Walking England 1967* is the work that structures Fuchs’ text. An illustration of the work

---


\(^{260}\) R. H. Fuchs, *Richard Long*, p. 44.

\(^{261}\) See *Land Art Beginning* above, pp. 21-26.


\(^{263}\) For a more detailed discussion of this see *Land Art Beginning*, p. 24.
appears at the very beginning of the book/exhibition catalogue (entitled, somewhat definitively, *Richard Long*). On the facing page is the text ‘My art is in the nature of things’ [figure 27] The work *A Line Made by Walking England 1967* and this statement provide anchoring points for the presentation that follows. 1986 is the moment at which the Line becomes an intensity. It is an intensity that can be recaptured in works that succeed it by referring, directly or indirectly, to this founding work. It is also an intensity projected backwards to all its previous appearances, imbuing them retrospectively with weight and significance. In this way the Line in 1986 creates a situation in which all the previous occurrences appear to repeat in advance the momentous 1986 incarnation.

*A Line Made by Walking England 1967* is not the very first work in a chronological sense that is illustrated in Fuchs’ book. The works *Snowball Track 1964*, *A Sculpture in Bristol 1965*, *An Irish Harbour 1966* and *A Square of Ground The Downs Bristol 1966* and *Turf Circle England 1966* all predate the Line but are placed after the line in the sequence of images in the book. The Line’s position as the first is established through its appearance as the first image in the book and through Fuchs’ text. The presence of these earlier works, particularly the ones made before late 1966, validates Fuchs’ (and others’) claim that Long was making such interventions in the landscape before he arrived at St. Martin’s in 1966. Fuchs writes:

... coming to London in September 1966 he had already brought a certain artistic formation, even a certain ‘style’ with him from his native Bristol.

It is important for the story that Long arrives in London with sensibility already formed and remains consistent to that sensibility. As Seymour writes in her 1991 text, ‘Walking in Circles’:

He has said, ‘I don’t think you can separate childhood from adulthood. I think that you are the same person all through your life.’

Whilst Seymour continues and restates this idea of the internal consistency of the work maintained through the unchanging sensibility of the unique author, the latter text does not afford so prominent a position for *A Line Made by Walking England 1967* in the story.

The moment of *A Line Made by Walking England 1967* as an intensity, as the definitive work, was short-lived. By 1991 the Line’s originary and teleological form was deemed inappropriate to make an art practice seem central and relevant in an art world that promoted different values and an altered self-image. The certainty of 1986 was both impossible and anathema in 1991. The Long of 1991 needed to

---

266 *ibid.*, p. 11.
267 *ibid.*, p. 12.
268 *ibid.*, p. 13.
269 *ibid.*, p. 44.
270 Anne Seymour, ‘Walking in Circles’, p. 34.
be suitably open-ended, rambling, journeying, contemplative, enchanted even. Walking in Circles seemed more appropriate than Walking the Line. Seymour extends the idea of the circle to encompass Long’s practice in its entirety as represented in the book. Explaining the logic of the book she writes:

[The artist has arranged a number of sequences of his work, divided into two main sections. The first contains examples of the constantly expanding inner core of historical works underlying each new achievement. This in turn is broken down into different preoccupations - a kind of naming of parts. The second, or outer ring, presents a comprehensive record of Long’s activity since his last major book, published in 1986, on the occasion of his exhibition at the Guggenheim Museum in New York. But there is no sense here of the finality of the retrospective. This is very much a report on work in progress; the ripple has much wider to spread, the hub at the centre of this 'wheel of becoming' will still turn for a long time yet.]

In the 1991 book, the Line itself was relegated to a small-scale signpost or footnote in the text, one small part of 'the constantly expanding inner core of historical works'. [figure 29] Its format and titling repeats almost exactly that established in the Fuchs’ text, with one small, yet significant alteration. In the Fuchs book, the photograph was bordered by a fine yet definite black line which securely separated it from the page. In the 1991 book, the border line is gone. The differentiation between page and photograph is lost and, particularly in the sky region in the upper part of the photograph, there is hardly a colour change between sky and page. There is no place for a containing line here at all. As Hamish Fulton says at the beginning of his text in the 1991 book ‘Well these are the straight facts but they don’t come in a straight line’.

The Line is still present, it cannot it seems be completely erased or removed, particularly given its prominence in the mass-circulation Fuchs text. What Seymour does is to shift the Line from the foreground into the background. These subtle shifts are as effective in policing the discourse as the more drastic step of destroying a work, but both actions can be seen to make the discourse stronger, a process that has as much to do with omissions as additions. As Nietzsche pointed out, the diminution of parts can act as a strengthening of the whole. In the construction of Long and the discourse on Long there are acts of destruction as well as creation. Fuchs makes a deliberate attempt to create the Line as ‘Richard Long degree Zero’, as Jasper Johns did with Flag, as Baldessari did in incinerating all his unsold production up to a given date. In Long’s case, previous works are not (necessarily) destroyed, but re-made or altered. A cache of 'historical' works that have never, or infrequently been shown are drawn upon in order to back up any new works. There are numerous examples of this. For example the series of photographs that make up the work A Sculpture in Bristol, taken in 1965, but only mounted

---

271 This change can be traced for example between Suzi Gablik’s 1984 book Has Modernism Failed? and her later (1991) The Re-enchantment of Art. (Both published by Thames and Hudson.) Four years later the suggestion of her 1995 title: Conversations before the end of time. Dialogues on Art, Life and Spiritual Renewal (London: Thames and Hudson, 1995) is even more apocalyptic and esoteric.


275 Friedrich Nietzsche. The Genealogy of Morals, p. 91.

276 See Lucy R. Lippard. Six Years, pp. 179 and 191; also note 57 above.
and shown in an exhibition at the Arnolfini Gallery in Bristol in 1983:*** or Snowball Tracks, again a photograph taken in 1964:*^ but not published until 1986. Perhaps most disconcerting of these reappearances is the decorated pot/vase from Long’s period at the West of England College in Bristol prior to his time at St Martins. [figure 17] It appeared in the catalogue to the exhibition 1965-1972: when attitudes became form at Kettles Yard Cambridge in 1984.** Long’s œuvre gains works from the past as well as additions made through making new works. Works are ‘lost’ as well as added. A Line Made by Walking England 1967 loses things as well as gaining them. For example it loses the word ‘sculpture’ from its title and the accompanying argument that it is sculpture; it loses the month it was made and any indication of exact location, removing the specifics in order to present a more generic picture of ‘England’.

A Line Made by Walking England 1967 has undergone a series of losses that amount to far more than just the ‘loss’ of the work in the Tate archive.

The photograph of the line has ‘lost’ a section - through cropping.*** Although the photograph is not the print, and the photographic process enables ‘framing’ to take place at the stage of developing the photograph from the negative as well as in the action of framing the shot in exposing the film using the camera. darkroom manipulation of the photographic image seems to go against the rhetoric of the photographic image in Long’s words and those of other commentators. Long himself said that:

All my photographs are straightforward, usually taken from eye level, with a standard lens. I want them to be matters of fact, not technique, with the art in the subject and its caption.****

---

***The work is now owned by the Tate Gallery London and is listed as: ‘A Sculpture in Bristol (1965/83)’ in the Concise Catalogue of the Tate Gallery Collection (London: Tate Gallery, 1991), p. 237.

*^ Long refers to this work in conversation with Martina Giezen in 1985 (Long’s words are in bold):

The first circle was in 1966, a turf circle. Which is in the Van Abbemuseum catalogue?

Yes.

And that was your first landscape work?

No, my first landscape work was in 1964, which is a snowball drawing. You know, when you make a snowball and as it gets bigger and bigger it picks up the snow and leaves a trail. That was really my first work.

Made when you were still at Art School in Bristol? And do you have photographs of it?

Yes, I have, one photograph.

But never published?

It will be published, maybe in the next book.


**9 Kettles Yard. Cambridge 1965 to 1972 - when attitudes became form.

*** To see this compare the Line in The New Art (1972) [figure 21] to the Line in Inca Rock Campfire Ash (1974) [figure 22]. It is interesting, if these are indeed the same photograph (i.e. made from the same negative), that the ‘complete’ photograph appears in the information section of a catalogue and the cropped version as the framed work.

**** Richard Long. ‘Richard Long replies to a critic’.
Figure 17. From 1965 to 1972 - when attitudes became form, 1984.
The final phrase is revealing: ‘with the art in the subject and its caption.’ In *A Line Made by Walking England 1967* what is the subject? Long’s comment makes a connection between the subject and the caption that implies that the caption refers directly to the subject, and that this is where the ‘art’ lies. Since the caption has changed does this mean that the subject has changed? Does this mean that once the subject was sculpture, that the subject has not always been England, and not always walking?

In discussing his lack of photographic ‘technique’ Long has gone as far as saying ‘I am really quite a stupid photographer.’ On the straightforwardness of his photography he comments: ‘[....] I always use the same camera (Nikkormat) and the same lens. It is just to keep everything simple and straightforward. There is always the emphasis on the art and not really on the technique. It should look good but it should not look designed or special.... the aesthetics should not get in front of the art.’

There is a particularly intriguing sequence in the 1987 video ‘Stones and Flies’. Long has made a sculpture in the desert. He steps back, looks at the work through his camera and presses the shutter. He then moves away. A single shot. The sequence is clearly effected for the film, but nonetheless reinforces notions of both the simplicity of the photographic technique and the uniqueness of the work of art. There is also an element of risk and chance evoked in this sequence - the idea of travelling to the Sahara, braving the heat and flies, labouring in this inhospitable terrain to make a work of art and then only recording it with a single photograph, maybe consigning it to oblivion, maybe surviving, maybe not. The photograph is still prone to misadventure, possessing a potential ephemerality that the actual work, destined to be reclaimed by its surroundings, is certain of. The fact of the photograph as an after-image of action and as a momentary fixing and framing is also reinforced by this filmic episode. This is one stage in its framing. The next will occur back at home, in the studio or darkroom, when the image is developed and mounted and named. This naming represents a different kind of framing, one in a whole series of framings. By the time this process takes place the actual work in the desert is probably long gone. Arguably the name appears at the very moment the thing it names disappears. Once named ‘A circle in the Sahara’ or whatever it is fixed, ready to list in an inventory with medium (photography, framed print or whatever) with fixed dimensions and date. The potentialities of the thing or event in the desert have been successively narrowed down, forced through the framing lenses of the camera, studio, darkroom, gallery, dealer, purchaser and so on, each framing and fixing repeating some element of the work with a different filter.

The use of repetition shows up the effects of differentiation (in the original/origin). Repetition is used to normalise, naturalise, deny or destroy difference; to reduce to universal sameness, conquer or dispel the historical or of history; producing the appearance of constants reassuring that ‘some things don’t change’. This is the reassurance offered by Land Art, a counterpart to the way in which, in the past and elsewhere in the present, this reassurance is offered by Landscape. This is seen for example in the ‘restoration’ of gardens by the National Trust, the construction of England and ‘Englishness’ through

---

products aimed at a domestic and foreign market (traditional English teas, authentic English products in retail outlets such as the ‘Past Times’ chain of shops). These are closely aligned to a notion of Home, which as Doreen Massey points out, is often construed as a place that does not change. The powerful notion of the ‘home’, homeland or heimat is familiar from the rhetoric of conservative ideology in all its manifestations. This is one aspect that unites Landscape and Land Art, the two categories in my title. They are both used to create the myth of unchanging certainties, palliatives in an uncertain and changing world and are both, in this sense, deeply conservative. They mask ‘real’ differences, they don’t allow processes of alteration to be seen. They try to obliterate the joins, the links, the connections.

The public freehold status claimed for A Line Made by Walking England 1967 legitimates alteration and allows for repetition. This actual liberty is often at odds with the idealistic ambitions of repetition linked with public freehold status which, in its earliest incarnations (by Long and more particularly by Lawrence Weiner), represent attempts to free the unique from its value, to displace value across a range of undifferentiated simulacra (repetitions). My attempts to locate the work A Line Made by Walking England 1967 in the Tate archive or Illustrated catalogue of acquisitions were in part hindered by the disruption of the conventions of established provenance that the public freehold status creates.

A thorough authenticating provenance for a work would include the date it was first exhibited. subsequent showings. texts and books on the work. scholarly mentions. a complete list of owners. and its current owner. In the case of works held ‘public freehold’ there are evidently problems with certain aspects of this provenance. especially those relating to the ownership history of the work. In instances of ‘public freehold’. the work is ‘given’ or there is an attempt to give it. outside of the norms of this system. Long was certainly not alone in his adoption of this strategy. According to the text of a 1972 exhibition of Lawrence Weiner’s work. Weiner ‘has declared most of his work a public freehold.’ According to this account. even works in private or public collections can be ‘public freehold’ ‘because they were constantly published in books. magazines and on invitation cards.’ Proliferation through mediation is thus claimed as a challenge to the status of the unique. possessable art object. The catalogue states: ‘Knowing of such work is at the same time a taking into possession’ and in Weiner’s own words on his work. ‘They (‘people’) don’t have to buy it to have it - they can have it just by knowing it.’ These observations seem echoed (or repeated?) in Long’s published statement of 1982: ‘[...] The knowledge of my actions. in whatever form. is the art.’ The intimate connection of ownership and knowledge is

* In the job description for the post of cataloguer of the modern collection at the Tate Gallery the following information is given for preparing catalogue entries for unique works: ‘These entries should seek to establish how. why. when and where each work was made. and also set out the work’s history. from the time of completion to the present day. including who has owned it. and where and when it has been exhibited and reproduced. For this work it will be necessary to draw on information from individuals with special knowledge of the work. as well as that provided by labels attached to it. inscriptions. letters. photographs and published information.’ April 1994.


crucial here, although one should be precise about what art forms are being discussed here. Weiner’s work consists of text, usually applied directly to the wall. For this reason I should complete the sentence from the Weiner catalogue that I quoted above: ‘Knowing of such work is at the same time a taking into possession, which is actually the only legitimate acquisition of a written piece, because this can only be done through mental incorporation’ (my emphasis).

In this, the realm of so-called ‘Conceptual Art’, it is the idea that is important - or perhaps more accurately, and certainly more sculpturally - the mental construct. One of Weiner’s text works has become a set text on this relation of mental and physical fabrication:

1. The artist may construct the piece
2. The work may be fabricated
3. The piece need not be built

Each being equal and consistent with the intent of the artist the decision as to condition rests with the viewer upon the occasion of receivership declaration of intent 1968.288

In the case of Weiner’s written text pieces, the claim for ownership as knowledge is related to a notion of comprehension: the work needs to be ‘incorporated mentally’, that is to say, understood or made meaningful by the viewer/owner. Richard Long’s statement takes the ownership/knowledge claim one step further by stating that ‘(t)he knowledge of my actions, in whatever form is the art’ (my emphasis). This then is not only knowledge in a linguistic form, but action in any form in Long’s work: ‘A sculpture, a map, a text, [or] a photograph.’289 However, all these forms cannot be comprehended, or mentally incorporated in the same way. This is not to deny that all these forms can be ‘read’, although I would claim a difference in the possible comprehensive precision of those readings. but more importantly that the type of ‘knowledge’ offered to us here is different. For whilst with Weiner’s writing on the wall comprehension and understanding constitute the mental incorporation and ownership of the work, in the case of Long’s work the type of intuitive recognition of the work is an intuiting of essences as opposed to an understanding of concepts. Long’s work doesn’t assume the final position in Weiner’s famous text: ‘the piece need not be built’. For Long the building or making is crucial, the Line must be, and is, made. Long said of Weiner in 1986: ‘Lawrence’s idea that art need not be made is great. I can accept it although it is not my way.’290

The ‘public freehold’ status for Long’s work does not mean that anyone can own or make the work, it becomes a loophole whereby the artist can remake the work differently or for allowing more than one image of it to exist simultaneously. (It reopens the successively narrowing fixing and framing processes initiated once the work is ‘made’ detailed above) Weiner’s notion of public freehold guarantees (or claims to guarantee) freedom from ownership. In relation to Long’s work, public freehold guarantees

289 Richard Long, Words after the fact.
freedom (for the artist) to repeat. This final freedom is not granted either to the public or even to the owner of the work. 'It is not my intention' said Long in 1991, 'that they [the public] should actually repeat the walks, because not only do they belong to a certain place, but they also belong to a certain time. You can never repeat the time [...]'.291 The notion of ownership by time is an acknowledgement of history that refutes Long's earlier statements about the Line when he discussed remaking it for the television film.292 The question is begged: What precisely is it that is repeated? In the case of A Line Made by Walking England 1967, given the title's insistence on both place and date, one might assume that the possibilities for repetition are now far more rigorously defined. A distinction is being forged between the work: the line walked in 1967, and the photograph of the line. Long's later comments and this apparently shifted status of the Line, severely problematise the often quoted statement Long published in 1982:

A sculpture, a map, a text, a photograph: all the forms of my work are equal and complementary.293

This is in marked contrast to Long's Dutch contemporary Jan Dibbets, whom Long met when Dibbets spent a term studying at St. Martin's in 1967, and through whom Long made his early important European contacts. Dibbets, like Long, made 'adjustments' to the landscape which were then photographed. Unlike Long there was not a point at which he claimed that the intervention in the landscape was the work of art, as Long's early commentators (such as Harrison and Sharp) claim, or his early titles suggest. Dibbets' comments, published in 1968 are interesting, not only for the light they shed on his practice, but for the contrast they make with the claims made by, and on behalf of, Long:

I make most of these works with ephemeral materials: sand, growing grass, etc. These are demonstrations. I do not make them to keep, but to photograph. The work of art is the photo. Anyone ought to be able to reproduce my work. [...] My works are not exactly made to be seen. They are more there so that you are given the fleeting feeling that something isn't right in the landscape. Sell my work? To sell isn't part of the art, maybe there will be people idiotic enough to buy what they could make themselves. So much the worse for them!'294

Dibbets' statement is in keeping with the Dutch documentary tradition in film and photography, as is revealed in comments by Chris Dercon interviewed in 1994:

I have always been fascinated by the Dutch tradition in documentary film and photography, in the relationship between art and reality developed in terms of constructing an image. The Dutch documentary tradition is a great inspiration because it confronts us with the question, "When does documentation become a work of art?"295

---

292 'That was the first time I had made that work since 1967 ... It was very exciting to somehow have this idea which I could reuse. When I made it again it was just as fresh and dynamic and exciting to make and to look at.' Richard Long in Conversation, Part One, p. 4. See above (The Picture of Richard Long) p.69.
293 From Richard Long, Words after the fact.
294 Jan Dibbets, Statement, Robho, no 4 (Fall 1968), quoted in Lucy Lippard, Six Years, pp. 58-59.
In Long’s work, and that of other British sculptors who have used photography, it is not so much that
this dilemma does not exist - it clearly does - but that it is not explicitly stated as such.\(^{296}\) The point at
which documentation becomes a work of art is left deliberately, and usefully, fuzzy. This area between
zones, the no-man’s land between documentation and art work, is an area inhabited by a vast array of
artistic production, particularly in the late 1960s, the period of Long’s *A Line Made by Walking England
1967*.

When Long makes claims for the non-hierarchical status of all his activities, the distinction between
image/work and documentation seems to be straining. One is left with the perplexing questions, Where
is the work? What is it that can be repeated? Is the photograph merely a copy or simulation?. This
problem is certainly exacerbated by Long’s use of ‘public freehold’ status for certain of his works. Gresty
gives the following account of the public freehold status in Long’s work:

> Early works such as *Line Made by Walking England* 1967 remain what he calls public freehold
> works, copies of which he gives away as he chooses. They were made without the realisation
> that they would become marketable commodities and it therefore seemed wrong to change the
> status of them by limiting their editions in order to sell them.\(^{297}\)

Gresty’s account is clearly unsatisfactory, it presents Long’s motives for invoking and subsequently not
revoking the ‘public freehold’ status rather naively. Contrary to Gresty’s claim, it is not only ‘early
works’ that bear the designation ‘public freehold’. In the ‘Index of Works’ in Fuchs’ 1986 book, some
18 works indexed are so designated, the earliest dating from 1964 and the latest 1985. The majority (10
of the 18 works) bear dates in the 1970s. This does not seem to bear out Gresty’s statement. It seems
incredible that the artist could not have realised that a work made in 1985 would become a marketable
commodity. Indeed, as is often given in support of Long’s enterprise, his work has been entirely self-
funding (i.e. supported by sales of work and funded invitations to exhibit) since Long left St. Martin’s in
1968.\(^{298}\)

The survival of the public freehold designation in Long’s work is clearly pragmatic: it is useful. It has
lost its connection with the idealistic anti-gallery and anti-commodification rhetoric in which it
originated. In the case of *A Line Made by Walking England 1967* these origins have left inconsistencies
that have been ironed out elsewhere in Long’s oeuvre. The Tate Gallery claim to own the work, but its
status suggests it cannot be owned.\(^{299}\) In the early days of the so-called ‘New Art’ or informal art in the

\(^{296}\) Charles Harrison did raise this issue in relation to Long’s work in a review of ‘Richard Long at the
Whitechapel 9 November - 21 November’, *Studio International* 183 (January 1972), pp. 33-34.
However, here as elsewhere, the question of when does documentation become a work of art is tied to
questions of value, commodification and the gallery system. It is not, as in the Dutch tradition a
dilemma clearly framed in theoretical and aesthetic terms.


\(^{298}\) Long sold his first work in 1968 (through Konrad Fischer), ibid., p. 176.

\(^{299}\) The contradictions in the status of the Line’s ownership are demonstrated by its appearance in the
documentation of two exhibitions in which the work featured. Both were held at the Hayward Gallery:
Richard Long *Walking in Circles* in 1991 and *Gravity and Grace* in 1993. In the gallery guide to the
Long exhibition the work is listed, as quoted above, as ‘A LINE MADE BY WALKING. England 1967.'
1960s works were deliberately ephemeral, casually recorded, arbitrarily photographed and documented. This was not merely carelessness, but a deliberate assault on the perceived inflated value of art in the art market and the whole gallery system perceived by many to be corrupt and limiting. As these artists have become successful and established (and establishment) there has been an attempt to shore up value, to claw works back into ownership, and to re-tie the tethers to secure the work’s meaning, dispersal and value. This is rather like Daedalus’s moveable statues discussed by Plato in *Meno.* Daedalus’s statues, ‘if no one ties them down, run away and escape […]’ If you have one of his works untethered, it is not worth much; it gives you the slip like a runaway slave. But a tethered specimen is very valuable, for they are magnificent creations. Plato uses these statues to demonstrate the superiority of knowledge over right opinions. It is all very well to have true opinions, but unless they are secured in their place they escape from one’s mind ‘[T]hey are not worth much until you tether them by working out the reason.’

According to Plato that process of ‘working out the reason’ is recollection. Knowledge is possessed by all, it has to be remembered, learning is remembering.

This idea of Plato’s is a famous one, and the question of knowledge in terms of memory and forgetting is a crucial one in Western philosophy. Rather than a theory of memory as a conscious act, Nietzsche develops his idea of active forgetting. Ideas of memory and forgetting are a useful way of thinking about the repetition of the image of *A Line Made by Walking England 1967.* When it appears (in an exhibition, in a book) we remember that we have seen it before (thus remembering that it has been repeated, constituting a memory of repetition) and forget that it was different (an active forgetting, one forgets the differences). It is thus a mistake to confuse our memory with knowledge (with truth, with fact). A revealing of what has been forgotten, i.e. the actual differentiation and changes inherent in the Line demonstrated by displaying the different versions of the image simultaneously, reveals the elaborate construct that makes up knowledge and memory. One is left with the perplexing questions: ‘Was it the same line?’ and ‘What is it that is repeated?’ Is all that is repeated merely a memory of the Line?

If one starts ‘from the beginning’ the Line has clearly changed. Not merely in its photographic print appearance as a result of cropping, nor merely in its text/captioning, or in its title, but also in its medium: from a sculpture made of ephemeral materials, recorded by a ‘casual’ photograph, to a framed work made of photography and text. Long has repeated both the making of the line in grass and the

Photography and text. Public freehold; collection Tate Gallery, London; purchased 1976’. In the catalogue to the Gravity and Grace show the work is captioned: ‘Richard Long / A line made by walking / England 1967 / Framed work: photography and text / Public freehold / 84 x 115 cm / Courtesy Anthony d’Offay Gallery, London.’

302 See for example Gerry Schum’s comments in his letter published in the *Land Art* catalogue.


304 Ibid., p. 381.

305 Ibid.

306 See *Land Art Beginning,* p. 26 above.

307 The medium given for the work in the Tate Gallery concise catalogue is ‘monoprint on paper’.
Legal and aesthetic issues are at stake here. Copyright cannot be independent of a medium. One cannot copyright ideas. If the work is the actual line then the photograph is not subject to copyright. If the work is the photograph then the photograph is. The public freehold status places a certain liberty on the reproduction of the image, but it is unclear precisely how far this 'freehold' can extend.

If one begins from the end as it were, or from the highpoint when Long's Line assumes its most prominent and significant position, in Fuchs' text and in the exhibition at the Guggenheim in 1986, the impression given is that the Line is a fixed point, a reference point for subsequent works. Its status however is still problematic. Fuchs refers to the photograph of A Line Made by Walking England 1967 as 'the photograph which recorded the artwork ...' inferring, by the use of the word 'recorded' that the photograph is documentation rather than the 'actual work'. In the 'Index of Works' in the same publication the medium for the Line is given as 'Photography'. Clearly here in the index, the 'actual work' is the (framed) photograph illustrated in the book, and not the 'actual line' the 'sculpture' that Harrison described in 1969 as consisting of 'a path trodden in a field' or Sharp described as a 'Body Work' in 1970.

The 1986 Guggenheim exhibition thus represents the work at both its apogee of importance and at its most problematic. It is at its most secure as a fixed point of discourse and at its most unstable, as the text by Fuchs and the information given elsewhere in the book sets up an internal contradiction as to where exactly the work is and what it is. The Line in 1986 is at the same time a highpoint, an endpoint and the beginning of a decline. The Line is at its most prominent at the very moment it becomes most insecure in discourse.

The unstable existence of A Line Made by Walking England 1967 was brought home to me in a lecture I attended in 1995. It was by Howard Caygill and was entitled 'Giving Art back to Nature'. He mentioned A Line Made by Walking England 1967 but commented that he couldn't find a slide of it to use in his lecture. The event demonstrated so well the contradictions of this work. Always there but never possible to possess. Seen everywhere but everywhere disappearing. Its only 'solid' existence is as repetition, and that repetition is often in the form of words, relying on the memory of readers or listeners as to what the work actually looks like. And that, as I hope this section has demonstrated, is not always exactly the same.

The repeated work is differentiated in its conception. The only thing that links these different works together apart from their formal similarity or the similarity of their title, is the thinking, writing subject...

---

"For the BBC TV Omnibus programme (1982), an event Long discusses in Richard Long in Conversation, Part One, p. 4. See also above in The Picture of Richard Long, p. 69 and note 183.

R. H. Fuchs, Richard Long, p. 44.

Ibid., p. 239.

Charles Harrison, 'Some recent sculpture in Britain', p. 32.

Willoughby Sharp, 'Body Works'.

Public lecture at The Slade School of Fine Art, London, 1994."
that has brought them together in this discourse, in this piece of writing, myself. My own position in relation to the works discussed and the work herein constructed is one of the problems I attempt to deal with in the next chapter.
Figure 18. From Studio International (January 1969).
sculpture 1967
wooden sticks

The half of the sculpture constructed by Paul Menz. The other half was constructed at the same time by Richard Long near Bristol in an outdoor location, the same shape a size (gallery perimeter) and a similar components.

Ausstellung
multimedia Ereignis
alles alles Herzen wird einmal
gedoren."

Zu den Ausstellungen von Paul Menz:
Valerie Loehr, Frankfurt, 1967
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Figure 19. From Land Art, 1969.
Figure 21. From The New Art, 1972.
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Figure 22, 1974.
A Line Made by Walking  England 1967

Figure 23. From Michael Compton, Some Notes on the work of Richard Long. 1976.
Figure 24. From *British Sculpture in the Twentieth Century*, 1981.

Figure 25. From 1965 to 1972 - When attitudes became form, 1984.

Figure 26. From *British Art in the 20th Century*, 1985.
Figure 27. From R. H. Fuchs, *Richard Long*, 1986.
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Pl. 63 (cat. no. 28)

Figure 28. From *A Quiet Revolution: British Sculpture Since 1965*. 1987.
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Figure 29. From Richard Long: Walking in Circles, 1991.
Richard Long
A line made by walking
England 1967
Framed work: photography and text
Public freehold
84 × 115 cm
Courtesy Anthony d’Offay Gallery, London

Figure 30. From Gravity and Grace, 1993.
Figure 31. From Gilles Tiberghien, *Land Art*, 1993.
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Figure 32. From Richard Long, 1994.
Land Art Body

Fear of crime threatens to turn the new forests now being created around Britain's major cities into no-go areas. To combat it the forests will have to be made "safe" - the equivalent in landscape terms of squaring the circle. [....] The fear of attack, especially among women, appears impervious to reason or statistics, which show that crime in parks and open space is rare by comparison with that in built-up areas and suggest that sex crimes "are no more nor less common than in previous decades". [....] Yet the three features that people find the "most frightening and dangerous aspects" of cities - darkness, a sense of being trapped, and potential hiding places for attackers - are also intrinsic qualities of woods and forests. Dr Burgess comments. [....]

Most people interviewed said how much they had enjoyed walking in the woods with other people yet individuals also needed the "space to be by themselves". According to Dr Burgess, "white adult males are the only group to have an unequivocal freedom of choice to do this". Even for men, however, "a fear of crime is increasing" 312

During the time I spent as a full-time student in Leeds I was made very aware of the dangers of the city. In particular, during 1993, there were a series of increasingly violent attacks on women in an area very close to the University and to where I was living at the time. An incident room was set up at the corner of Woodhouse Moor, a few hundred yards from my house, and rape alarms were issued to all women students by the University Union. The genuine fear of attack was exacerbated by extensive media coverage - particularly on local television - and the constant invoking of the area's most notorious rapist, the so-called 'Yorkshire Ripper'. Peter Sutcliffe, one of whose attacks took place in the very locality where the current attacks were then taking place.

I don't think I'm exaggerating when I say that I have never been more frightened on a day to day basis about crime, attack and especially burglary, as I was during the time I lived in Leeds. Moving to the last house I lived in in Leeds, in the Royal Park area of the city, a police woman called round to take some details about a previous break-in that occurred just before I moved in. Insensitively, the policewoman suggested that they knew full well who the culprits were, but due to their youth, were unable to do anything about them, and then added, reassuringly, that we should be thankful our experience was not as bad as that of some people a few streets away who were broken into one night whilst they were sat in the front room watching television, by a group of youths who had masked themselves up (presumably in balaclavas or similar), threatened the residents and then proceeded to steal things from under the noses of the shocked victims. What has to be borne in mind is the nature of the housing, including the house I was then living in, which are 19th century back-to-back houses, one room deep, accessed directly from the street or via a small front yard, and where the back wall of the house is shared with the house behind in the next street. Thus there is only one entrance to - and exit from - the house.

I include all this autobiographical detail because it became inseparable from my research. For while my reading and research was concerned with 'a sense of place,' with people's relation to and interaction with their environment, and with the meanings, mythologies and memories of geographic locations, this

whole endeavour became tied up with my own experiences of my environment. my responses to it and
my relation with it. In particular. the claims made for the idyllic freedom of walking began to ring a
little hollow. On several occasions on planning visits further afield. to forest sculpture trails or remote
locations. I became aware of - or perhaps only imagined in my over-awareness of traditions - the air of
disapproval and apprehension at my planning such expeditions alone as a woman. Similarly. I
questioned at times the absolute security of writing to or phoning up artists I knew only from their
works. books or articles on them. and then arranging to go and visit them. on my own in their homes or
working places. Of course. I was never in any real danger. but the prohibitions on such activities outside
of the remit of ‘academic research’ might have been looked on less favourably. How many of my male
colleagues ever stopped to consider such questions? Perhaps I had just become over-sensitive. and of
course I had. for that was exactly the effect of intensively studying this area. it made me super-aware of
all the connotations. meanings. unspoken prohibitions. histories of decorum and propriety that exist.
however unaware one is of them in every day life. in our use of space.

Our every move is coded by learned procedures and culturally conditioned disciplines. Our speed of
progress along a busy street. our selecting appropriate places to sit down or stop. our moving - or not
moving - to one side when walking into someone else’s path: our behaviour in someone else’s house. or
in our own. the uses of various rooms in our houses and so on.

At the height of the publicity about the attacks on Woodhouse Moor I was scheduled to give a paper in
the Fine Art Department. It was to be about space and gender. but the concurrent events gave the paper a
timeliness that is difficult to capture when re-writing this part of my research into dissertation form.
Nevertheless. I feel the form and tone of the argument is as much a part of what I was trying to say as
the content of the paper. In particular. I struggled over. and continue to struggle with. combining the
personal. autobiographical details of the process of research. which are generally written out of the final
work. and the need for a theoretical stand-off from one’s area of research.

Heidegger’s distinctions between the everyday. theoretical and authentic being of dasein may be of some
use in analysing this. and understanding the different modes of our understanding the world in our
different dealings with it. 313 One enters into an every day common-sense relation to the world when. for
example going to buy some food at the corner shop. and into an analytic relation to the world when
considering journeys in theoretical terms. Finally. Heidegger’s third position - what he terms an
authentic mode of being - is a mode of relating to the world in full awareness of our historical stretch. of
our thrownness and projection. It is easy to see how one could clearly differentiate the different modes of
being experienced in ‘being a post-graduate student researching British Land Art at Leeds University’.
However. in my experience these ‘modes of being’ impinged upon one another. as surely they always do
to some extent. but in a poignant and. I felt. unavoidable way. I sought to find a way to combine my own

313 These ideas recur throughout Heidegger’s work and particularly in Being and Time. A thorough and
extremely useful analysis of these ideas is John Richardson. Existential Epistemology A Heideggerian
voice with the theoretical analysis of my subject matter - my ‘everyday’ voice with my ‘theoretical’ one - and perhaps thereby give voice to an ‘authentic’ (in Heidegger’s sense) sense of my being.

My attempted solution seems rather clumsy and awkward, particularly when written down. This was very much written and intended to be spoken and enacted. Nevertheless, I think the problems of experiencing the world as a temporal and spatial body in relation to one’s engagement with a body of theoretical learning that resists sounding that dimension, are particularly pertinent to my area of study. The idea of Land Art somehow offering a more ‘authentic’ or ‘realistic’ communion with the world; of its being a medium through which the world can be experienced and in which such relations are both reflected upon and actually made manifest, runs through much of the literature on Land Art, whetherphrased in the phenomenological language (which I have been using to an extent) particularly of Merleau-Ponty (see for example writings by David Reason): in the language of a new spiritualism, for example projects and writing by curator Rupert Martin, instigator of the Forest of Dean sculpture trail; or artist Garry Fabian Miller, both of whom have a professed religious commitment; or ‘enchantment’, for example in Suzi Gablik’s book The Re-enchantment of Art; or the more windy excesses of some of the less thorough commentators. For example this extract from Wendy Beckett’s essay for the exhibition catalogue Shared Earth:

When Francisco Infante and Andy Goldsworthy play with the landscape, working their magic on it, transfiguring it, holding it in short-lived (but long-loved) extravaganzas of shape and colour, we delight with them because we too can understand that God gave us the world for our respectful play. The deep reverence every artist in this show feels for the landscape allows them their creative freedom, and in their freedom, we enter into a new freedom, sharing theirs.

The problem is how to combine the production of ‘research which fulfils the need for a more critical appraisal of art relating to land or landscape with an adequate appraisal of my own personal experience of the work and its study. How to have the best of all worlds: the insights of critical theories of subjectivity and meaning, the insights and analyses of Barthes, Deleuze, Derrida, Foucault, Kristeva.

---


315 For Martin’s involvement in setting up the Forest of Dean Sculpture Trail see Rupert Martin. The Sculpted Forest (Bristol: Redcliffe Press, 1990). Martin was Gallery Co-ordinator at the Arnolfini Gallery in Bristol and in 1989 he began studying for ordination at Trinity College, Bristol (biographical information is from The Journey: p 126) see also: Rupert Martin, ‘The Journey as Pilgrimage’ in The Journey: A Search for the Role of Contemporary Art in Religious and Spiritual Life (Lincoln: Usher Gallery in association with Redcliffe Press, c. 1990). Another exhibition which featured Landscape and Land Art type works and a new ‘spiritual’ rhetoric was Shared Earth A Contemporary Exhibition of Anglo-Soviet Landscapes, organised by Sarah Winfrey and shown in Peterborough, Aberdeen, Blackpool, Wakefield, York, Salford, Lincoln and Moscow between May 1991 and August 1992.

316 see for example Garry Fabian Miller’s contribution to The Journey entitled ‘The Journey’ or his paper, ‘For the Healing’ in Transcripts of the Landscape and Sculpture Symposium, pp. 87-94. Held at Manchester Polytechnic, Grosvenor Building, Oxford Road, Manchester M15 6BH, 1-3 September 1989. Director: Ian Hunter, Symposium co-ordinated by Projects Environment.


and all those others beloved of ‘advanced’ theory courses in the History and Theory of Art: the evidence of traditional academic archival research: books, articles, letters, notes and so on; and the actual experiencing of the work at first hand, in ‘real’ time and space. My experiences in this latter field of investigation have been both unexpected and revealing. My feeling is that this information is no more nor less ‘factual’ or ‘subjective’ than my investigations in the other two areas I mentioned, and yet it is the most difficult to write about because it seems to lack the rigorous theoretical framework that the other ‘approaches’ have acquired.

My dilemma is how to incorporate my experience of being in this research with the inherited language, format and accepted theoretical framework of such a study. Sometimes I envisage the process as some hopeless anachronism, feeling I’m engaged in producing an archaic form of discourse, as irrelevant as learning to set moveable type in the age of desk-top publishing. Incidentally such archaism is not lost on the works in this study which often invoke the ‘spirits of the forest’ or of the underworld (the ‘Chthonic’, a term beloved of writers on Land Art) with sophisticated audio-visual equipment. Such contradictions are inherent in art as in academia, and since I’ve signed up to produce this work in this form, unavoidable. The kind and tolerant friends who have suffered to listen to or read parts of this work have often commented that they can envisage it as a film rather than as a piece of academic writing. I think the film and television industry has probably been spared in my not attempting to adapt this study for the screen, but there is a serious point at issue here. Our experience of the world has certainly been profoundly influenced by our experience of film and television, and the narrative structure, format and time-scale of filmic texts is perhaps closer and certainly more familiar to us than more traditional written conventions. They are however no less sophisticated or effective, and in that respect I take the characterisation of my approach as being like a film not as a denigration but as a possibility.

All this explanation is, then, offered as justification for my letting stand, in as close a form as is possible within the layout and illustrative possibilities of this thesis, the text of my paper on space, gender and the body in relation to Land Art which was first presented in the Fine Art department of the University of Leeds on 10 February 1993. Following this are some observations further to this research and some more conventional analysis.

Making Time for Space
Some Possibilities for an Analysis of Space, Gender and the Body in the Histories and Journeys of Land Art.

I would like to begin with a group of quotations. They are from two sources: Richard Long’s statements from 1980 entitled Five six pick up sticks seven eight lay them straight and from the ‘femail’ section of The Mail on Sunday newspaper of January 17 1993.

My art is about working in the wide world, wherever, on the surface of the earth. .... My outdoor sculptures and walking locations are not subject to possession and ownership. I like the
fact that roads and mountains are common public land. ... My talent as an artist is to walk
across a moor, or place a stone on the ground.
Richard Long Five six pick up sticks seven eight lay them straight 1980

It's a brisk ten-minute walk - but ten minutes of fear to the lone woman making her way home
from the university library after dark, and with no money for a taxi. It's so easy to assume you
are safe. Traffic streams down busy Woodhouse Moor Road to the right: the comforting lights
of the campus cast shadows at the top. But, to the left is a sinister darkness so dense it's
impossible to see an arms-length in front. A deafening silence hangs over the eerie and
seemingly never-ending stretch of grass, trees and hillocks that provide perfect cover for a man
intent on rape. He can see you, but you would never see him - until it was too late.'
The Mail on Sunday January 17 1993

A walk expresses space and freedom and the knowledge of it can live in the imagination of
anyone, and that is another space too.
Richard Long Five six pick up sticks seven eight lay them straight 1980

I have spent the last eighteen months at Leeds University working on 'land art' - whatever that might
be. It is at least, with some justification, the art practice Richard Long has been particularly identified
with, and I have spent a part of almost every day of that time crossing or walking beside Woodhouse
Moor.

I have become aware in the process of this research and in the preparation of this [paper] of the necessity
of locating myself clearly in relation to these spaces. I thought of saying 'locating myself within the text'
here, but I hesitated. I hesitated long enough to realise the significance of my change of phrase. Long
enough to make time for space, because that is precisely the point. Texts enable us to collapse time and
space so that Woodhouse Moor and every place on this earth can be present to us in this text [in this
room].

The often repeated images of works by Richard Long, displayed to best effect in pristine gallery spaces
and reproduced in the glossy books and catalogues of the artist's work, seem so unthreatening and so
under control. How unproblematic Richard Long's work seemed in the newly refurbished Duveen
Galleries at the Tate Gallery, London in 1990 [figure 33]. This art which uses '...the vocabulary of
universal and common means: walking, placing, stones, sticks, water, circles, lines, days, nights,
roads.'320 Just the kind of 'poor' art materials that were included in a show at the Hayward Gallery,
London (showing concurrently with the first presentation of this paper).321 How empowering that it
'represents a clear shifting of the locus of authority, away from the artist to an authority of interpretation
invested in and by the viewer, through their direct engagement with the work of art'. At least so we are
told by the text of the exhibition catalogue. 'Thus it is' Jon Thompson tells us, 'that the process of
'empowerment' which began with David Smith emptying out the solid sculptural form and using formal
dislocation as a way of encouraging the act of reading, reaches its conclusion with Post-Minimalism

320 Richard Long, Words after the fact 1982 first published in Arnolfini Gallery, Bristol Touchstones:
The South Bank Centre, 1993).
Figure 33. Richard Long. From *Walking in Circles*, 1991.
and Arte Povcra. ‘Poverty’ had finally turned the viewer into the one who ‘acts’.322

The world becomes text and we become readers. The act of reading empowers us.

I stand in the gallery or here in this room - contemplating these images. If it is I who am empowered to bring meaning to these works, what meaning shall I bring? I can’t help thinking that my experience of seeing ‘A Line in Bolivia’ [figure 34] in a photograph or in a gallery, is rather a ‘poor’ equivalent for the experience Richard Long enjoyed producing it. His space was different to mine. But I should not be dismayed for, the artist tells us, ‘all the forms of my work are equal and complementary. The knowledge of my actions in whatever form, is the art. My art is the essence of my experience, not a representation of it’.323 So I can experience the kind of direct engagement with the work of art that Thompson’s text promised, because the work of art is that essence. Relieved that I don’t have to travel to Bolivia (how tedious) somehow I don’t feel reassured.

These works constantly present experiences which seem to offer the possibility of participation, after all what did Long say, ‘I live in a time where it is possible for normal people to get on an aeroplane and end up a few days later in a different continent, in a different culture, in a different landscape.’324 (Do I live in the same time in history I wonder, I don’t seem to live in the same space). Yet at the same time they act to deny the possibility of experiencing the work in the same space. I can experience it in my imagination ‘and that,’ said Long, ‘is another space too’.325 I can experience it visually, but I am denied the possibility of physical occupation of that space.

In Richard Long’s words in conversation in 1985:

... the work comes from one person being on his own in nature and the spirit of the work is about that one to one relationship. If many people came to that place it would destroy the spirit of that place. So, for that work it is much better, it is appropriate for that work to be known through a photograph and not by many people going there.326

So there are spirits to be disturbed too, an incorporeal prohibition to further deny my access.

The world made text makes us all readers. To read is to act? But is this not merely an illusion of action, an evocation? In this textualised world differences are collapsed, places become contiguous, distance and proximity become identical. Time is the time of reading, of the words and the traces. Sight becomes the privileged sense. Space, and particularly the space of the body is denied. In the form of words, gallery sculpture and photography the body in Land Art is absent. The effect of this denial of space and its accompanying denial of the body is to render the discussion of real bodies - gendered bodies - problematic, if not impossible.

322 Jon Thompson. ‘New times, new thoughts, new sculpture’, Gravity and Grace. pp.11-34, p. 34.
323 Richard Long. Five six pick up sticks seven eight lay them straight.
325 Richard Long. Five six pick up sticks seven eight lay them straight.
A LINE IN BOLIVIA
1981

Figure 34. Richard Long.
What if I don't want to be present in the text? a reader, a writer, a speaker? What if I want to be a real body acting in the world? Making the world text is one way of making the world 'safe' and we are living in dangerous times. In these dangerous times there must be some time for space.

[I have been given a space to speak. if only to a select few. I have very little time. but I hope to use it to begin to make a space for the discussion of the space of the body in Land Art discourse and in so doing open perhaps a little more space for my own body and for others.] I hope to show how the constructions of Land Art discourses and the lack of any discussion of space or the body act to encode deeply conservative notions of gender roles and to police mind and body.

In order to experience this type of work I need a mediator, the work presented through a photograph, or a text, in a space designated and made safe by an institution. (gallery, publishing house, university). That mediation ensures that I experience the work in its most ambient space, the one in which it is shown to its best advantage in order to communicate its meaning. Who negotiates this meeting of body and text? Am I made present to the work or even through it to some 'artist' behind the text? It seems to offer the possibility of communion. The mediator or mediating space offers empowerment, through reading, through 'direct engagement with the work of art'. But on whose terms?

Compliance with the terms of encounter - its time and space are decided for me - promises revelation, through initiation, trial and self-denial. Deviance promises certain death - the fall from the precipice, the step off the path into the 'sinister darkness so dense its impossible to see an arm's length in front'. And now that metaphor of distance occurs to me as significant. How odd that we should measure visual distances in such bodily terms. but how effective here. What would be the effect if the report had said 'so dense its impossible to see half a metre in front'? It would absent the body, it would fail to evoke the proximity of body and the unseen and thus unknowable, the closeness of body and darkness. body and body. body and cold metal. .... An arm's length away and that unknown is already touching the outstretched finger tips, touching the body. The distance between the body of the outstretched arm and the unknowable. The distance between my body and the text or photograph on the wall. my hands held down as I have been taught that this is the right place for them to be when I stand in front of a 'Work of Art'. To outstretch my arm would be sure to invoke disapproval or even reprimand. I know the rules of encounter.

These are spatial relationships between the body and someone or something other. They are evoked and negotiated through words spoken or unspoken. through text. It is my concern here to examine such relationships encountered in the text of Land Art, to consider the spaces they occupy. By restoring or reasserting space in the text I hope to be able to restore the body to the text, and make discussions of its physicality a possibility. What relationships are permitted in the discourse of 'Land Art'? What

127 The Mail on Sunday 17 January 1993, p. 25.
relationships can we see and 'read'? What might these mean in terms of their representations, abstractions or negotiations of space, and thus of the body?

I propose to use a series of images and words from the work of Richard Long to examine the spatial and physical relationships they contain or evoke. I intend to consider them under a set of headings, namely: 'body and land', 'body and text' and 'body and body'.

The body made text - the only body that can exist in the world made text - is a discourse on bodies. The body becomes a body of knowledge. Social space, that is to say the space in which the body acts: the space of action; and physical space, that is to say the space in which the body is: the space of being, are collapsed into mental space: epistemological space. All that can be known and spoken about bodies exists in this mental and epistemological realm, in this discourse. Any traces of physicality are figured as voice (evocation), gesture, or trace. The voice, or the voice as closely approximated as possible by electronic or textual representation. The trace of the body, hand print, foot print, sweep of the hand across the wall. The photograph of the body or an object standing in for the body. A work made to human scale.

The body made text is an abstracted body, in an abstract mental space, and herein lies the usefulness to this investigation of Henri Lefebvre’s key distinction, made in his book The Production of Space. Lefebvre’s distinction is between ‘this abstract body, understood simply as a mediation between ‘subject’ and ‘object’, and a practical and fleshy body conceived of as a totality complete with spatial qualities (symmetries, asymmetries) and energetic properties (discharges, economies, waste). It is this spatial and energetic body which is absent from Land Art, and it is its figured absence which any analysis of space, gender and the body needs take account of before one can begin to make sense of the meaning of that absence, to reassert the body in its wholeness or to re-negotiate the possibilities of the body’s restoration to the field of action, to the world.

These two images [figures 35 and 36] showing two rucksacks in the landscape appear in the book OLD WORLD NEW WORLD jointly published by Anthony d’Offay Gallery, London and Walther Konig, Cologne in 1988. Each is related to a walk, their accompanying texts read:

Richard Long’s words: A 12 DAY WALK FROM LAMAYURU TO DRAS IN THE ZANSKAR MOUNTAINS LADAKH NORTHERN INDIA 1984

and THIRTY SEVEN CAMPFIRES TWO FRIENDS ON A THIRTEEN DAY WALK IN THE SIERRA TARA HUMARA WALKING UP THE RIO URIQUE IN THE BARRANCE DEL COBRE FOR SIX DAYS ALONG THE WAY MEXICO 1987

---

329 Richard Long, Old World New World.
Figure 35. Richard Long. From Old World New World, 1988.
Figure 36. Thirty Seven Campfires, 1987, from Old World New World, 1988.
My words: Are these ‘two friends’ about to leave, or have they just arrived here? And what of those ‘two friends’? I see only two rucksacks. how do I read them? Side by side, now resting against the wayside cairn. now propped against this pathside shelter. They seem obviously placed, they have not been thrown down casually. Their waist belts are loosened and left undone, their carriers liberated. Did they sit down first side by side, release their arms one by one, unfasten the buckle at the waist, stand up, move away, or did they unHarness themselves some distance from the place where the rucksacks stand now and did they place them here? What did they say to each other as they took off their rucksacks? Did they discuss the setting up of the image for the camera, was the camera in one of the rucksacks? And where are these two friends now? One of them surely is taking the photograph, but where is the other, so superfluous to the action of photography yet so noticeably absent in the photograph? Is he standing beside the photographer? Is he inside this shelter? What is his role?

Indeed, what makes me say he is a he? Is there something gender specific about the word ‘friend’? It doesn’t seem to say anything about this person’s identity elsewhere in the book. I look through the accompanying text in the book - it’s by Anne Seymour.330 No clues here. Then I notice that her text was first published in 1985, three years before this particular publication. It has been revised but not to give any indication of the identity of this mystery friend. Of course Richard Long aficionados - to whom this book is no doubt addressed - those empowered readers who bring the meaning to the text seem to have no place here - will know that Long’s walking companion is his long-time college friend from his student days at St Martin’s School of Art in London, fellow artist, Hamish Fulton.

I turn to the text Fulton contributed to the book accompanying Richard Long’s exhibition at the Hayward Gallery in 1991.331 ‘Old Muddy’ it’s called: six pages of quotations, observations, truisms, anecdotes and diary entries. And here are diary entries relating to the walks in Ladakh in 1984 and Mexico in 1987.

Hamish Fulton’s words:

Diary entry: 22 February 1987. Tarahumara, Sierra, Mexico.
This morning while sitting around the campfire I related to Richard how, when I was a kid, with friends, we used to cook potatoes in my father’s wheelbarrow. Gazing silently into the flames for some moments, Richard then said, ‘Meals on wheels.’ We laughed. He then continued, ‘Wheels on fire’ (after the C&W song). Laughter. To which I replied: ‘This me-al will ex-plode’. 332

My words: I look back at the images. now I can’t help seeing two men sitting laughing beside this fire, before or after this photograph, their juvenile humour, the fireside camaraderie. Do I feel any more included now that I ‘know’ more? I feel the work has altered for me given this new information, and perhaps it wasn’t so exclusive. even if it’s an interpretation which has only been available since 1991,

330 Anne Seymour. ‘Old World New World’.
and was not made available with the work in 1988. This shows on one hand the dependency on other forms of communication and information for the 'meaning' or interpretation of such works - some authority, some mediator or institution, but also how malleable they are, how susceptible to subsequent incursions into the text.

But where is the body? The rucksacks evoke the body, or stand as metonyms for it. In 1985 in the published conversation with Martina Giezen Richard Long said of the image of the two rucksacks in the Mexico work: 'That's sort of a typical and symbolic image, one of a thousand resting places! We always seem to have terrific trips ...'. In this work the words 'two friends' intimate a relationship. Long's comments in the published conversation and Fulton's text add more detail, more fuel for my imagination. They are fragments of a bodily experience rendered in various kinds of texts. These are evoked bodies, images, things, words, my mental picture of them stands in for the real bodies.

Body and space: these bodies exist beyond the margins of the text, outside the frame of the photography, prior to and implicit in the action of photography, reducing space to representational space. Mexico for a photograph of Mexico. Part for whole, absence for presence, gesture and evocation for body.

Body and text: these bodies are made text and reduced to it, real bodies are made bodies of knowledge. I can only know them through the text.

Body and body: one can only speculate on the proximity of that which stands for the body. There are other bodies in Fulton's story: his father, his childhood friends, they all participate in their absence in the narrative. They are relationships figured in the text, and even there they cannot touch one another.

The next series of photographs (figure 37) is from the artist's book COUNTLESS STONES from 1983. A limited edition book, a format considered as one form among others in Long's oeuvre. I quote his words in conversation in 1985:

... I always say that my task as an artist is to put a stone on the ground. to walk. a straight line across a mountain side. to put my hand on the wall with some mud. That really is the making of my art. Making a book is a completely different procedure. I don't deny that part of my work as an artist is making books, but it is very clear to me that there is a fantastic difference between the art of walking across a mountain and the craft and aesthetics of making a book. And I only made the books because I walked across the mountain side. And I have to do both to be an artist but I very ....

(At this point he was interrupted by the interviewer. or was there a long silence ..... the transcript is not clear - one of the problems of a transcript of a recorded interview. Such a format is often used to convey some kind of truth or authority - the privileging of the spoken over the written word as being somehow more authentic. Speaker and spoken to are present to its utterances, the kind of logocentric assumption
Figure 37. Richard Long, from Countless Stones 1983.
that one's thoughts are identical or present to speech, that it is at once more straightforward and unmediated. The transcript, particularly if the edits, non-sequiturs, ends of tapes and false starts are left in presents itself the closest to unmediated speech possible in a written form. The illusion is alluring if unsustainable.

This book is designed to be handled, it is suitably hand sized and handleable, it relates to the body of the reader. What kind of reader might this be? Is this the empowered reader? But there are no 'poor' materials here, this is an expensively produced, limited edition book, difficult to get hold of, redolent with the accumulation of meaning books and book owning carries with it. Is this reader a book collector perhaps. I think of Benjamin's 'Unpacking my Library':

The most profound enchantment for the collector is the locking of individual items within a magic circle in which they are fixed as the final thrill of acquisition, passes over them. Everything remembered and thought, everything conscious, becomes the pedestal, the frame, the base, the lock of his property 335 [...] ownership is the most intimate relationship that one can have to objects. 336

I am intrigued that in this account the book acquires material and extrinsic attributes, in the consciousness of the book owner, which signify it as 'art' (in a traditional sense): frame, pedestal, base, two of which relate directly to sculpture. The book seemingly becomes sculpture. This seems appropriate to an artist (Long) whose work is often considered sculpture in its entirety.

Or is this perhaps the reader in the library? Sat at a library table. anxious about the protocols of handling the book?

Richard Long's words, on the title page facing a photograph [figure 38]: COUNTLESS STONES A 21 DAY FOOTPATH WALK CENTRAL NEPAL 1983 VIEWS LOOKING FORWARD. IN SEQUENCE.

My words: Some children playing a game that looks very like hopscotch; surely it involves throwing stones and counting. How very appropriate to the title of this book. Immediately the strange is made familiar. the distant close. Little girls play this game all over the world, people are the same whether it's Nepal or Bristol. The reader is reassured, this is familiar territory, safe in a book. A 21 day walk is available to us in a few minutes in the comfort of our own home.

But if we as the reader don't have to engage with the other, what of the maker of this walk. the maker of the text: "Richard Long"? A quick look through the series of images reveals a predominance of empty path. When figures are present, they don't meet our gaze, there's no engagement. They go on their way, they remain unobserved and Long, or the reader, observer. Distance is maintained.

335 Walter Benjamin, Illuminations, p 62.
336 ibid. p. 69.
Figure 38. Richard Long. From Countless Stones, 1983.
WALKING WITH THE RIVER'S ROAR
GREAT HIMALAYAN TIME   A LINE OF MOMENTS
MY FATHER   STARLIT SNOW
HUMAN TIME    FROZEN BOOTS
BREAKING TRAIL   CIRCLES OF A GREAT BIRD
COUNTLESS STONES    HAPPY ALERT BALANCED
PATHS OF SHARED FOOTMARKS    ATOMIC SILENCE
SLEEPING BY THE RIVER'S ROAR

Figure 39. Richard Long, 1983.
A THREE DAY BICYCLE RIDE

BIRTHPLACE BRIDGE THE FAST YEARS
1977 CROSSING PLACE FOSS WAY CHALK VALLEY
FELLOW TRAVELLERS ON THE SAME ROAD FLINT SOURCE FRIEND
HEATHROW AIRPORT HERE THERE
DEAD STOAT ALDERMASTON BORROWED TIME
SILBURY HILL 316 MILES FAMILY

ENGLAND 1982
Body and Land: the artist’s feet are on the path, but he doesn’t leave it in this text to engage with those whose lives exist on its margins.

The title of this book, Countless Stones, reappears in a word work from 1983 entitled *Walking with the River’s Roar* [figure 39]. In *A Three Day Bicycle Ride* [figure 40], another word piece made ‘closer to home’—that is to say closer to the home of the person Richard Long. (These two works alone would provide material enough for a paper and I haven’t enough time here fully to explore the complex negotiations, representations and strategies of space and time operating in these apparently ‘straightforward’ works. But for my purposes here, a few observations, a few more of my words.)

I was first drawn to these two works when looking for representations of human relationships present in Long’s work. I was particularly struck by the words ‘MY FATHER’ in the work made in the Himalayas. It provoked a whole series of questions: if these words are ‘found, just as stones are found along the way’ as R. H. Fuchs suggests in his 1986 text on the artist,\(^{337}\) how do we read these words? Of course if we take Long’s own observations to which I referred earlier, that these works are the essence of Long’s experience, not a representation of it, then they appear somewhat differently. That this relationship is alluded to (is it an earthly or heavenly father I wonder?), surely offers the possibility of an investigation of this relationship and its spatial (and temporal) occurrence. Such work is yet to be done. It is stalled by the kinds of texts which usually consider Long’s work, shying away from such direct and problematic works which appear to have so much potential for specific, that is to say site-specific as well as culturally specific meaning. Such possibilities are not to be silenced by Long and his authorised defenders’ insistence that such works are ‘Not Typical of My Work’, or that any discussion of ‘intellectual ideas’ or content are merely ‘words after the fact’.

Indeed Long’s own commentary on the THREE DAY BICYCLE RIDE piece in the 1985 conversation is particularly interesting for the light it sheds on the possibility of there being specific meanings for these words, that they precisely are not just ‘found along the way’ for the viewer, in this case more clearly the reader, to bring meaning to.

Richard Long’s words:

‘Flint source’ means that in the chalk country I actually found ... by chance, I passed a chalk quarry which had fantastic flint. A couple of years later I got flint for an exhibition, a sculpture that I found in that quarry.

‘Friend’, I stayed with a friend. I slept one night at a friend’s house.

‘Heathrow Airport’ means, I just passed Heathrow Airport. I am cycling very slowly and I see all these jets taking off to go around the world. You have this very strange crossing place of different speeds. And I was here and they were there. ‘Here There’ just means the difference between being at a place and being in an aeroplane going somewhere else, anywhere in the world.

‘Dead Stoat’ means I passed a dead stoat in the gutter.

‘Aldermaston’ is where all the nuclear research is done. Again it has a sort of ..., it has many associations with the nuclear situation. Which also is ‘borrowed time’, that also has a

---

connection with the nuclear threat.

'Silbury Hill' is a very old. it is the largest man-made earthwork in Europe. I think it is one of the biggest earth pyramids. On the very same road I passed Aldermaston in the morning which is a very powerful and symbolic place because that's where they design missiles which could blow the world up .... so we are living on borrowed time. And Silbury Hill is a place which for people living in England a thousand years ago was the most powerful village site, for reasons that have been lost.

So. in the same day in 1982 I passed these two places which are very powerful in different ways, known and unknown.

'Miles' is just the amount of miles. And 'Family', well. I cycled back home. I started where I was born and ended up where I am living."

His matter of fact statements of 'This means This', 'This means That', the closest to a piece of contemporary iconography, or perhaps a Richard Long 'Iconologia'? Word pieces seem to express the clearest example of the body made text, the least spatial in a sculptural or 3-dimensional respect, the most open to the act of 'reading', and yet if Long's statements in conversation are taken into account they are both the most specific in meaning and in a way the most exclusive.

Another possibility for an analysis of spaces is suggested by the reference to, and embodiment of, images of 'home' in Long's work. His allusion to two aspects of the space of the home in the THREE DAY BICYCLE RIDE piece: 'Birthplace' and 'Home', as the place of birth or origin - physical and psychic - perhaps in the sense of Bachelard's notion of the psychic house339 as well as the site of birth, and as the container of the family, the site of the plural self: the location of reproduction and immortality to which Long often makes reference. for example in his commentary in the Phillip Haas film, Stones and Flies.340

home as the site of renewal, of recharging, as the place one leaves and to which one returns. The constant that defines one as not homeless. not nomadic. as rooted and affirmed.

The images (figures 41 and 42) show two 'homes': the home in the work and the work in the home. Two aspects of that complex spatial relationships centred around the notion of home. The problematic of home describes and designates a site for an investigation of space and gender in Land Art. 'The Question of "Home"' was the title of an edition of the journal New Formations in summer 1992341. In an essay entitled 'A place called home?' Doreen Massey addressed the issue of home and its possibilities as a site for further investigations.

Her words:

It is interesting to note how frequently the characterization of place as home comes from those who have left, and it would be fascinating to explore how often this characterization is framed around those who - perforce - stayed behind: and how often the former was male, setting out to discover and change the world, and the latter female, most particularly a mother, assigned to the role of personifying a place which did not change.342


\[340\] Richard Long. Stones and Flies.

\[341\] Doreen Massey. 'A Place Called Home?', New Formations no. 17 (Summer 1992). pp. 3-15.

\[342\] ibid., p. 11.
Figure 41. Richard Long.
Figure 42. Richard Long.
The space of the home is one encompassing questions of personal identity, national identity and gender difference. Home offers a mental, ideological and physical space in which to negotiate just the kind of gender and body questions I have tried to frame in this investigation of Land Art. Doreen Massey also makes another point later in her essay which is relevant here in this space when she indicates arguments that women have often appeared less daunted by city life than have men. Whatever the resonances of such a statement it seems arguable that: firstly, the countryside in general has been seen to uphold traditional values and that unlike urban life, rural life still appears to offer little challenge to patriarchy. and secondly, to bring us back to Woodhouse Moor and attacks on women, it is striking that even in the city it is the most ‘rural’ areas which are seen as the most dangerous to women.\(^{343}\)

The presence of female bodies in my words here and their absence in much of Land Art discourse brings us back to the question of those bodies and those bodily and body/space relationships which figure as absences.

The distinction between the evoked body and the body made flesh can be seen as a continuation and a perpetuation of the Cartesian mind/body distinction. Richard Long has stated of his work and of his mental and bodily commitment to it: ‘My work is about my senses, my instinct, my own scale and my own physical commitment’\(^{344}\) and ‘My work has become a simple metaphor of life. A figure walking down his road, making his mark. It is an affirmation of my human scale and senses .... ’ \(^{345}\)

I would like to issue a challenge to Richard Long on this point. If his human scale and commitment are so central, why measure the world in geometries derived form abstract calculations not the human body? A brief glance through a few titles confirms this: A 24 HOUR WALK (1977), A LINE OF GROUND 226 MILES LONG (1980), A HUNDRED TORS IN A HUNDRED HOURS (1976). Such terms are not neutral, universally shared or body specific. Have you ever measured time in resonant heartbeats, space in anxious footsteps, distance in arm’s lengths, the times of ingestion and digestion? What kind of a commitment might that represent? In Long’s work the fleshy body is absent. Can it be restored, made whole?

The world made text, generally, and specifically in Land Art, makes for silences - things unspoken and impossible to speak about. There is a blank space of white paper in the transcript of Long’s 1985 conversation with Martina Giezen. Below it the following exchange takes place:

RL Next question!
MG I like silences in a conversation.
RL It means people are thinking. Silences are when people are making coffee, putting a log on

---

\(^{343}\) This view is confirmed in the more recent article quoted from at the beginning of this chapter, from the Independent - see note 308 above.

\(^{344}\) Richard Long. Five six pick up sticks seven eight lay them straight.

\(^{345}\) Richard Long. Words after the fact.
the fire or watching it burn. They are part of the outtakes. Do you know what outtakes are?

MG When people make a film (or interview!) they leave out the best parts.

Another blank space in the text ....

There is silence in the text when the body acts. the fleshy body. when it has to pause for refreshment - a cup of tea - a sip of water - or to fulfil other bodily functions. go for a piss - moments when the demands of the fleshy body interrupt the flow of the evoked body of text. One can look to these silences not as moments when the body fails to act but where it does and must act. When it must act to negotiate the vast tract of evoked mental space between the 'Deafening silence of the moor'. the known (the body) and not known (the moor. the land). or the physical proximity of those very same spaces: only an arm's length away.

I hope this paper will have indicated a few fissures in the seemingly seamless. genderless. flesh-free surface of land art. as represented by the construction 'Richard Long'. If these preliminaries offer sites for incursions into the spaces of one of the most canonical figures of so-called British Land Art - and of British sculpture in general. with all the masculinist and institutional import these designations contain - what possibilities might there be for an analysis of space. gender and the body in the histories and journeys of Land Art whether undertaken by female or male artists. viewers or writers? What possibilities for intervening in the text and in the world as a body. as a gendered body.

What kind of body is the body in Land Art?
What kind of body is the body in Land Art? It is not the fleshy body of Lefebvre's analysis but a gestural or evoked body. a body that means and represents. a body that stands for something else. It does not invite other bodies to share or similarly experience the world with it. but merely to be onlookers.

Before going on to examine what body or bodies. what representations or evocations of bodies. do appear in Land Art. and what those bodies might mean. or be made to mean. I first want to signal a fundamental contradiction in the earliest accounts of Land Art which presents problems to any examination of the relation between the bodies in the work. or the body of work. and the body of the spectator/viewer. the receiving body.

If one identifies Land Art with a 'tradition' coming out of minimalism and other 'informal' art. as many commentators do. one inevitably places Land Art on the theatrical side of Fried's famous distinction between Theatrical and Authentic art in his essay 'Art and Objecthood'. One of the central premises of 'theatrical' art is that it exists only for an audience. that it needs an audience. Given a positive gloss. this interpretation of the necessity of the viewer and of the completion of the work residing in the act of reception by the viewer. occurs frequently throughout the period under discussion. for example. in the writings of Germano Celant. in Lawrence Weiner's 'Declaration of Intent'. and in Jon Thompson's

34 Henri Lefebvre. The Production of Space. pp. 61-62.
Gravity and Grace introduction. The viewer is variously: empowered, the one who acts, engaged in the act of creativity, or implicated from the outset in the completion of the work. The work 'works' through this relation and in its anticipation or expectation. The contradictory voice is heard for example, speaking directly about Land Art, in Beatrice Parent's 1971 essay on the subject. She claims that in Land Art:

The work has no real existence in relation to the spectator but is independent in the sense that it is temporal and has its own life. The spectator becomes a simple witness; his presence is no longer necessary as it was for classical art. 348

The lack of engagement between artwork/artist and viewer is also expressed in terms of introversion or an inability to communicate in the category 'Landscape as Self-Exploration' under which Ian Hamilton Finlay and Richard Long were listed in 'Modern Movements in British Art', published in Art and Design in February 1987. The category was defined as 'A new secular confessional, and form of solace for tragic solitude of artist among ordinary people.' 349 Parent points out that 'Unfortunately, whatever the object of these artists may be, whatever intention they may have, there is always a barrier situated on the communications level, between them and the public.' The failure of communication may be of the artist's own making, of a deliberate obstruction at the level of relation with the public, as much as through any inherent difficulty in the work itself. In 1983, Kate Blacker, who had selected Long as one of the key artists in her selection for The Sculpture Show, commented:

Richard Long, of course, as perceived through the work, is not a man but an embodiment of work in disparate, contributory media. There is absence in this, certainly, enforced by his editing the sequence of events before a sculpture comes into being. But it is the result of inevitable punctuation: as a spiritual man he knows he cannot share his experiences fully. Nor (I suspect) does he want to. 350

It is then with these two contradictory views of the relation between the artwork and the viewer in mind, of a reciprocal engagement versus a withdrawal from the terms of engagement and experience with either the viewer as superfluous or the artist as alienated from his (and it is his) audience, that the following considerations of the bodies that do appear in Land Art are framed.

**Body as the Walker, Trekker or Explorer**

At the end of the 1991 Walking in Circles book, Long thanks Hamish Fulton 'for being a good friend and fellow-traveller, and for taking the photograph of me on the road in Peru.' 351 This photograph (figure 16 above) is the last image in the book. It shows Long the walker or hiker, rucksack on back, striding out about to round a corner on the road ahead. Whereas in the images I discussed above

---

showing the two rucksacks the rucksacks stand in for the body. here the rucksack is united with a body to become the hiker or the walker. The complete body of this figure is the body plus rucksack. In the abandoned rucksacks images, the rucksacks can be seen to stand for the body (metonymically), an unexpected substitution, or they could be seen to stand in a synecdochic relation to the specific figure of the hiker or walker who is not whole, one or complete without this part of its being. Rather like the attribute of a mythical god or virtue, the rucksack makes this body mean something more specific than just 'any body'.

The figure of the walker recurs frequently in the discourse of British Land Art. Inferring it, John Beardsley titles his chapter on British work in his book *Earthworks and Beyond* 'The Ramble'. A peregrination no doubt peopled with many walker, hiker or rambler figures. This is one type of body that does find a place in British Land Art and it is one that is loaded with meaning and coded in complex ways as regards politics, gender or the body.

Reviewing the exhibition of Fulton's work at the Serpentine Gallery in London (running concurrently with Long's *Walking in Circles* show at the Hayward) in 1991. Michael Corris described Fulton as 'presenting his walks as though they were Adamic field trips'. 'Indeed,' writes Corris 'if Fulton is not careful to skirt this romantic rhetoric, his work may well be mistaken for a send-up of another great British trekker, W. A. Wainwright.'

Alfred Wainwright is the author of the Pictorial Guides to the Lakeland Fells, compiled between 1952 and 1966, and forty other guidebooks and volumes of drawings. The established format of his books including maps of routes, description and drawings make them, for many walkers, indispensable guides for walking in Britain. However, Wainwright's books do more than merely guide, they actively produce a certain vision and interpretation of the British Landscape and the type and mode of experience proper to it. Underlying Wainwright's apparently straightforward, if subjective, vision are a whole set of assumptions, theories and prejudices that are never far from the rhetoric of hillwalking, trekking, rambling or walking. Some of these formative opinions are expressed rather naively, but also boldly, in a very early text by Wainwright, the account of *A Pennine Journey* made on the eve of the Second World War in 1938, when Wainwright was 31 years old. It was not published until 1986, when, according to Wainwright's Foreword to the book, he 'dug it out of hiding and brushed off the dust.' Little else

---

apparently was expurgated. 'Not a word has been changed, not a word omitted or inserted. It is printed exactly as I penned it. nearly fifty years ago.' [figure 43]

As an historical document then the book is a fragment of a past era, a microcosm perhaps of society at that particular moment. It is also however an exposé of a whole set of prejudices that surround a particular society, but also more specifically that accompany a particular social activity - walking. One might speculate to what degree these are outdated and disregarded opinions and to what extent they persist, however implicitly or submerged, in the present day image of such activities. After all, its publication in unexpurgated form in 1986 by so mainstream a publisher as Penguin, surely says something of that later era, however much the book distances itself from the views contained in the text by claiming them as belonging to the earlier period.

Ostensibly the subject matter of Wainwright’s book is a walk to Hadrian’s wall and back set against the background of immediately pre-war Britain. Looking back at the text, Wainwright himself sees the implicit narrative as one of personal escapism in ‘that blissful interlude of freedom’. It is evidently a document of social historical interest. It also encodes an implicit discourse on the body which is particularly revealing when read against the works, claims and rhetoric of British Land Art.

What kind of bodies or representations of bodies figure in Wainwright’s text and how might they compare with the bodies, absent, represented or otherwise in the discourse of Land Art?

The body in Wainwright’s Journey is male. young (or made youthful by the process of walking), solitary (or in the company of one, well chosen male companion). Female bodies feature only in reflection or fantasies, or represented by other inanimate objects such as a hotwater bottle (!). Women figure as the subject of Wainwright’s walker’s musings, the ideal woman features as the implicit object of his pursuits, like the knight’s lady for whom his acts of chivalric duty are performed. To a contemporary reader, Wainwright’s views on women are prejudiced if not misogynist, or perhaps merely naive. His views on companions make interesting reading next to the text by Fulton.

---

356 ibid.
357 ibid., p. 7: ‘Adventures such as these make men boys again: the enthusiasm of youth returns.’
358 ibid., pp. 186-187: ‘You may want a companion on your walking tour. Most walkers are initiated into the joys of walking in the company of others: a few of them, later on, strike into the hills alone. To feel completely free, to enjoy yourself to the uttermost, you must be alone. Solitude brings its responsibilities: dangers are magnified a hundredfold if you have nobody to back you up: you learn to depend on yourself: you have to keep your wits about you. But only alone can you develop your philosophy.
   It is good to have a companion on occasion. Choose well, since the one you choose must of necessity be part of every scene, part of every minute of every day. […] The best friend is the man who can walk along with you mile after mile and say not a word; in fact, silence is the great test of companionship.
359 ibid., p. 195: ‘I had a warm bedmate to gather to my breast, to confide in, to put my feet on or to make love to, as I willed. I always think of a hot-water bottle as being of feminine gender, though I could not really say why, …’
360 Hamish Fulton ‘Old Muddy’.
Figure 43. Cover of Alfred Wainwright, *A Pennine Journey*, 1987.
Wainwright’s observations seem resonant with some of Long’s statements, for example ‘There is only one way to know a hill and that is to put your feet on it and walk’. This idea of gaining knowledge through experience resonates in Long’s statement from 1982: ‘a walk marks time with an accumulation of footsteps. It defines the form of the land. Walking the roads and paths is to trace a portrait of the country.’ These similarities are not merely coincidental, they form part of a tradition, a way of relating to, using and conceptualising walking and one’s relation with the countryside. The following extract is from a conversation with Richard Long published in 1986:

M G: It is very popular in England to walk.
R L: It is part of the tradition, the life. The postwar society, people in the fifties went youth hostelling, had bicycles and things, walking holidays. That was the life in those years, for my parents.

As well as indicating a more sociable aspect to walking, Long’s comments demonstrate the inheriting and learning of a tradition, the way a certain attitude towards the countryside is imbibed through the experiences of one’s upbringing. Such traditions, personal such as this comment, or as popularised in Wainwright’s walking guides, form the background to Long’s and Fulton’s construction as the trekker or walker. Leisured, reasonably affluent, male, solitary (or with one (male) companion), seeking solace. However much one might search for more exotic or esoteric comparisons, and these have been found in the haiku poetry of Basho and in Zen philosophy, or with the Native Australian songlines, these can only be embellishments or perhaps interesting parallels to provoke more speculative thought.

The kind of walking represented in Long’s and Fulton’s work seems to come out of an indigenous tradition, formed and nurtured through Britain’s particular social and political history and afforded a particular representation in the culture of that country. ‘To walk in a named place is generally to walk where others have gone before’ observed David Reason in his text in the catalogue/book The Unpainted Landscape. It is also in the context of Britain, armed with map, the right clothing and accessories, including the ubiquitous well-packed rucksack (since ‘[a] Bulging rucksack speaks of inexperience rather than of a stout heart’), to walk in the way others have walked before. To re-enact a particular behaviour. Recording walks, whether in text, on maps or in photographs inevitably attests to

---

361 ibid., p. 16.
362 Richard Long, Words After the Fact.
364 Long also stated in ‘An interview with Richard Long by Richard Cork’: ‘Just by being English, in my childhood, having my grandparents living on Dartmoor, in Devon, or going on cycling holidays with my father when I was a boy. I think all those things were much more important than this so-called tradition of English landscape art.’ p. 252.
365 see for example writings on Long by Anne Seymour, for example ‘Old World New World’.
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the history of the places walked in and on. The walks themselves narrate and conduct a discourse on politics, warfare and the limits of free movement. The foreign places to which Long and Fulton first ventured were following in the footsteps of other Britons. They voyaged to the ‘pink bits’ on the map of the world to places resonant in Britain with a colonial or imperial past, or with an imaginative construction of ourselves in the reflection of our ‘others’ in such countries as Africa or India: and practically they visited places that were open to tourism. On one level Long’s and Fulton’s walks constitute a history of the limits of adventurous tourism.

Ironically, given Wainwright’s views that women lack the necessary enthusiasm or character to enjoy climbing and walking as men do, it was through his guides that the photographer Fay Godwin first discovered walking in the landscape, and that provided the inspiration and necessary information behind the remarkable photographic documentation of the British landscape that she has produced. Elsewhere (in Land Art Landscape below) I discuss the representation of landscape that appears in Godwin’s images. but as far as the discussion of bodies is concerned, Godwin’s photographs, particularly in her book Our Forbidden Land (1990) are a provocative source, particularly when juxtaposed with those of Fulton or Long. There are similarities between Godwin’s and Long’s photographs. However, I think that rather than looking for actual connections between the two oeuvres it is rather that they share a common ancestry in a particular way of visualising and documenting the landscape, inherited perhaps from the guidebooks and maps that both by necessity must have referred to on their journeys, or to a certain way of viewing the British landscape that is actually orchestrated physically on the land, by the imposition of view points (often with display boards or markers) or by the accumulation of many walkers producing stopping places marked by Cairns of stones or wayside clearings, or suggested by more ‘natural’ features such as peak summits, ridgeways or cross-roads. What Godwin shares with Long is the frequent presentation of landscapes without figures in them. [figures 45 and 46] Her unpeopled images differ from those of Long in that she makes explicit the means of exclusion, often by highlighting human impediments to a free and unrestricted enjoyment of the landscape. That we know this is the ‘same’ landscape attests to the difference that resides in the subject that arranges this vision and the effective discourse that holds them together as ‘complete’ or comprehensible visions.

368 In a similar vein, Simon Schama writes of the imaginative voyages of his childhood: ‘I was too busy watching the ships move purposefully out to sea toward all those places colored pink on our wall map at school, where bales of kapok or sisal or cocoa beans waited on some tropical dock so that the Commonwealth (as we had been told to call it) might pretend to live up to its name.’ Simon Schama. Landscape and Memory (London: HarperCollins Publishers, 1995), p. 5.

Figure 45. Fay Godwin. From *Our Forbidden Land*, 1990.
In Long's landscape the only limit to experiencing the landscape is one's own physical capabilities and natural limitations such as hours of daylight. In Godwin's landscape there are more palpable physical obstacles, barbed wire, dangerous dogs, prohibitive signs and symbols of ownership.

My own experience on the Land Art trail, particularly in visits to Wales (to visit David Nash) and to the South Coast, (along some of the routes of Fulton's walks and to the Portland Sculpture Park on the Isle of Portland) resounds strongly with images of the military use of areas of rural Britain. I spent a long section of my journey to Weymouth behind a convoy of army vans and equipment (presumably on training manoeuvres). In Wales, on my journey to Weymouth and along the A1 on my way to Edinburgh, I became familiar with the sound and image of low flying jets, practising for flying beneath radar limits. I must admit I thought this spectacle quite exciting although I was rather alarmed by the low flight of these powerful pieces of military equipment. I was not reassured to read in Fay Godwin's book that 'Only Britain, of the European NATO allies, allows jets to fly as low as 100 feet in some areas.'

The figure of the walker, hiker or rambler then is one permitted a certain visibility in British Land Art. Long adopts this persona in photographs such as the one taken by Fulton. The accoutrements of the more international back-packer/hiker appear in the images of the two rucksacks, in a number of images that show Long's pitched tent or the mark left by his overnight stay in tent or sleeping bag. [figure 47] As well as the rucksack, the hiking boots - that other symbol of the serious hiker - also feature strongly in the Arts' Council Video Stones and Flies and in statements by the artist, such as this one from 1980:

Fording a river. Have a good look. sit down, take off boots and socks, tie socks to rucksack, put on boots. wade across. sit down. empty boots. put on socks and boots. It's a new walk again.

Headgear and sunglasses have also featured in some of Long's images: cap, (baseball cap in more recent images) sunglasses and bandanna (in the desert), and again these are familiar forms of dress for the serious walker. The illustration shows an early image of Long in more exuberant dress. [figure 48] Although Long's walks have ventured into more professional adventuring territory, the Himalayas or the Sahara for example, Long's image has resolutely accorded with the straightforward, sensible hiker. No expensive back-up team or transport for equipment is shown. The fact that a camera crew, or at least one well-equipped camera operator, must have followed Long on his Sahara trip documented in Stones and Flies is carefully concealed to present an image of solitary endeavour. The walker is sensible but adventurous, courageous and bold and yet slightly eccentric.

In an essay published in 1991 discussing 'The Britishness of Postwar British Sculpture', Paul Overy identifies a powerful image of the British character with the symbols used in one of the pavilions at the 1951 Festival of Britain: The Lion and the Unicorn. Overy claims that these symbols were used to

---


371 Richard Long, Five six pick up sticks, seven eight lay them straight.
Figure 47. Richard Long.
Figure 48. 'Richard Long standing near his walk', from Studio International (May 1971).
express two complementary aspects of the British character. The Lion: ‘extrovert, discoverer, explorer, imperialist (the last not stated as such’): The Unicorn: ‘eccentric, thoughtful, fay, sensitive, intelligent and intellectual’\textsuperscript{1}\textsuperscript{2} and that these stereotypes are still relevant in British sculpture and its promotion today.

It is not merely one’s hiking equipment that is open to scrutiny and the accusation of weak discipline. there is a determined attempt to police the body in hiking rhetoric. the familiar linkage is forged between a healthy mind in a healthy body. Walking, and other organised outdoor pursuits present the spectacle of the disciplined body, and this rhetoric and imagery has been used to great effect by many different political regimes. The most obvious examples are perhaps the use of the Olympic Games by the Nazis, both as a live spectacle and captured in Leni Riefenstahl’s memorable film imagery. However, before one begins to identify such imagery exclusively with extremist or fascist politics. Alex Potts in his essay ‘‘Constable Country’’ between the wars’ points out the difficulty in ascribing a particular political colour to the outdoor life, writing in his conclusion:

Trying to make sense of the efficacy and pervasiveness of the use of rural landscape in modern British culture. I found myself involved in situations where the most blatant myths of conservative and liberal ideology featured alongside tendencies that were undeniably intriguing and compelling.\textsuperscript{3}\textsuperscript{3}

Although the Hitler Youth movement and Mussolini’s youth camps are some of the most infamous examples, such activities were also organised by left-wing (not just communist) organisations. The Woodcraft Folk in Britain for example was organised by the Co-operative movement, and this is one organisation indicated by Potts.\textsuperscript{3}\textsuperscript{3}\textsuperscript{4} The following is an extract from their handbook. The Way to Camp by S H Walker, first published in 1946. It appears in a chapter on hiking entitled ‘The Call of the Road’ under the sub-heading ‘How to Walk': [figure 49]

Few townfolk know how to walk. Proper walking demands a little thought and training. [...]

This kind of walking [the Townsman’s walk] is badly poised because the weight falls sharply on one heel at a time; it does not take much to throw the townsman off his balance. The “townie slouch” is even worse. hands in pockets and head sunk forward. This is the result of under-

---


\textsuperscript{3}\textsuperscript{4} The following statement, the first item under the heading ‘Programme’ at the beginning of the publication \textit{Folk Law. Policy. Organisation and Rules [of] The Woodcraft Folk (Revised and Amended 1951. published London: 1951) gives some indication of the stated aims of this organisation:

‘The Woodcraft Folk is a movement for all children who can benefit physically and mentally from its activities.

It seeks to enlist the enthusiasm and energy of youth for the great task of our generation - the building, out of our unequal and disorderly age, a civilisation worthy of mankind.

To achieve this end the Woodcraft Folk seeks to forge a powerful educational instrument which shall inculcate those habits of mind and body necessary to bring Man to a devotion to world peace and a new world order.’
nourishment, living in slum conditions, and of overworked parents, who have no time to bring up children properly - another of the evil results of capitalism.

How different is the gait of men who are born and bred in the great outdoors. The Red Indian, the Zulu, the cowboy, the Cossack and sailor express in their walk manliness and natural grace.\textsuperscript{3,5}

Walker's text encodes a semiotics and a politics of walking. The descriptions mention different parts of the body not merely the feet. This finely attuned body is gendered - or rather it expresses 'manliness' - since the passage goes on to describe Soviet Women walking in a favourable light.

The figure of the walker or hiker, like the image of the British Sculptor, exemplified for Overy in the work and image of Richard Long, could be seen as the Lion and Unicorn conjoined. Overy indicates three 'visual critiques on Long's work', by Tony Cragg (\textit{New Stones, Newtons Tones}) in 1978 [figure 50]; by Bill Woodrow (polystyrene rocks entitled 'Sleeping Sheep Rocks') in 1970; and Rasheed Araeen's exhibition at the Showroom in 1988, \textit{When the Innocent Begins to Walk the World}, that included two floor pieces entitled \textit{Arctic Circle} and \textit{White Line Through Africa} [figure 51]. In addition to these visual critiques, Overy quotes from Araeen's letter to \textit{Art Monthly} in 1983 where he characterises the symbolic body of the artist as:

\begin{quote}
the presence of the only one person, the romantic survivor (artist the hero!), a white man walking alone all over the 'uninhabited' world and marking his presence. To mark the world is to own it!\textsuperscript{3,5}
\end{quote}

The debate of which this outburst was the culmination had begun in May 1983 when Lynne Cooke reviewed Richard Long's exhibitions at the Arnolfini Gallery in Bristol (March 26-May 7 1983) and at Anthony d'Offay, London (March 30-May 14 1983). This ranks as one of the very few negative reviews

\textsuperscript{3,5} S. H. Walker, \textit{The Way to Camp: Illustrated Handbook of Camplore, Woodcraft and Hiking} (London: The Pilot Press, 1946, a second edition, 1947), pp. 131-132. The section on 'How to Walk' also includes the following observations on the walking and on the marching styles adopted by different militias:

'The Indian walks with a springy step with the trunk leaning slightly forward; this poise is well balanced and easy to adjust. The toes point straight forward or even a trifle inwards, bringing the small toes and the outside of the ball of the foot to do their share in securing balance. Also the red man rolls the hips a little when he walks, swaying to the stepping side. This helps to lengthen the stride. He swings the arms diagonally across the body. If at all. The diagonal swing helps lung expansion better than the forward and back arm swing. I noticed this type of walking developed into marching in a film of Red Army women. The Soviet women were swinging along in fine style, they rolled the hips, pointed toes forward, and swung the arms diagonally across the body. It struck me how much more natural and sensible was the Red Army women's comfortable stride than the stiff marching practised in the British Army. Most of the European armies have copied the Prussian methods developed about 1870, stiff marching and heel-clicking included.

During the 1939-1945 war many people had an opportunity of seeing American Rangers using their adaptation of the woodsman's glide.'

\textsuperscript{3,5} Rasheed Araeen, 'Long walks round the world'. Correspondence. \textit{Art Monthly}, no. 69 (September 1983), p. 25, this extract was also quoted in Paul Overy's article 'Lions and Unicorns. The Britishness of Postwar British Sculpture'.

sait and water is a solution of a table- 
spoonful of alum or potassium permanganate dissolved in a gallon of water, or 
the soles of the feet can be rubbed with 
methylated spirits to harden them.

Cut toenails straight across

If you suffer from slodd skin be- 
tween the toes, get a box of Whitfield 
ointment. Dry the feet between the 
toes before applying the ointment. If 
the bad condition does not heal up 
quickly, consult a doctor, because it 
is liable to become chronic.

Tender heels need the application of 
a bread poultice at night; felt in the 
shoes will usually ease them.

After washing the feet remember to 
dry carefully between the toes, and dust 
with boracic powder to absorb moisture.

**TOE EXERCISES**

The test of good feet is not so much 
the shape, but the suppleness and flexi-
bility of the toes. Exercise them regu-
larly and develop the muscles.

Here are three simple exercises:-

1. Stand on a book, and curl the toes 
on the edge. (a) Practise picking up 
small objects off the floor with the toes.

2. Australian bushmen stalk kangaroos, at 
the same time carrying a spear with the 
big toe. (3) Use the hands to push and 
stretch the toes and feet in all directions, 
like kneading dough. These exercises 
may seem too easy, but if they are per-
severed with they will give you supple 
feet and ankles.

Chief Long Lance, the Blackfoot 
Indian, tells in his autobiography an 
 amusing Blackfoot legend about the 
care of the feet. An Indian was being

chased by the enemy, when suddenly 
his feet began to quicken speed. As he 
ran the Indian addressed his feet, and 
told them that unless they helped him 
he would be killed. His feet replied: 
"Talk to your head. You always anoint 
your head after every meal and take 
good care of it, but you never anoint us ; 
you neglect us."

The Indian explained to his feet that 
the enemy would kill him and rejoice 
with his scalp-lock, doing it great honour, whereas his feet would only be 
chopped off and the camp dogs would 
gnaw them. At this the Indian's feet 
wake up and put on a great spur and so 
 saved his life.

Indians massage their feet, and warm 
them before the camp fire at night to 
relax them when tired, after a long 
tramp.

**HOW TO WALK**

Few townfolk know how to walk. 
Proper walking demands a little thought 
and training. The pavement walker's 
stride is an up-and-down knee lifting 
gait, with hips held firm and toes point-
ing outwards. The body is held stiffly 
erect and the arms swing hard and 
back, like a soldier marching. When 
walking in this way the heels strike the 
ground first; this produces a jarring

action on the legs. This kind of walking is 
badly poised because the weight falls 
sharply on one heel at a time; it does 
not take much to throw the townswoman off 
his balance. The "townie slouch" is 
even worse, hands in pockets and head

sunk forward. This is the result of 
under-nourishment, living in slum con-
ditions, and of overworked parents, 
who have no time to bring up children 
properly—another of the evil results of 
capitalism.

Many different is the gait of men who 
are born and bred in the great outdoors. 
The Red Indian, the Zulu, the cowboy, 
the Cossack and sailor express in their 
walk manliness and natural grace. 
Kethart, in his book, Woodcraft, writes: 
"It is said of the Indian ' he does not 
walk, he glides,' . . . put him in moc-
casins and the word does not express

his silent, rhythmical, tireless, sure-
footed progress, an admirable example 
of precision of movement and economy 
of effort."

The woodman and the sailor both 
walk in a manner suited to their 
environment. The woodman walks on 
rough, uneven ground, and the sailor 
on a continually rolling deck of a ship. 
These men have to adjust every stride, 
either longer or shorter, to balance on 
the uneven surfaces they walk on. The 
road walker takes strides of exactly the 
same length for every step. Uneven 
ground, and continual change of surface 
grass, rocks, tree stumps, alternated with 
patches of soft ground and bog, will

break the strongest man unless he learns 
the woodman's walk.

The Indian walks with a springy step, 
with the trunk leaning slightly forward ; 
this poise is well balanced and easily 
adjust. The toes point straight forward, 
or even a trifle inwards, bringing the 
small toes and the outside of the ball of 
the foot to do their share in securing 
balance. Also the red man rolls the hips 
a little when he walks, swaying to the 
stepping side. This helps to lengthen 
the stride. He swings the arms diagonally 
across the body, if at all. The diagonal 
swing helps lung expansion better than 
the forward and back arm swing. I 
noticed this type of walking developed 
into marching in a film of Red Army 
women. The Soviet women were swing-
along in fine style, they rolled the 
hips, pointed toes forward, and swung 
the arms diagonally across the body. It 
struck me how much more natural and 
sensible was the Red Army women's 
comfortable stride than the stiff march-
ing practised in the British Army. Most 
of the European armies have copied the 
Prussian method developed about 1790, 
stiff marching and heel-clicking in-
cluded.

During the 1939-1945 war many people 
had an opportunity of seeing 
American Rangers using their adaptation 
of the woodman's glide.

**"GRUB" FOR THE HIKE**

Heavy meals are no good on the road, 
and in any case you do not want to 
carry too much food. For winter hiking 
the best foods to carry are sandwiches 
and cheese-salads made from bread, butter, Marmite, and 
raisins when obtainable—fruit and 
wholemeal biscuits.

Many people suggest taking chocolate 
on a hike. Personally I always ban 
chocolate and cocoa. Both are sickly 
and carry too much food. For winter hiking 
the best foods to carry are sandwiches 
and cheese-salads made from bread, butter, Marmite, and 
raisins when obtainable—fruit and 
wholemeal biscuits.
Figure 50. Tony Cragg, *New Stones: Newton's Tones*, 1978.
Cooke divides Long’s career into three distinct periods: Early Work, Works of the mid-to late 1970s and Recent Works.

If one looks closely at the descriptive words Cooke uses of the work in these three periods one finds, of the Early Work the words ‘euphoria’ and ‘idealism’, ‘portentous’ and ‘shallow’: of the Works of the mid-to late 1970s, ‘fey’, ‘poetic’, ‘hackneyed’ ‘stereotypical’ and ‘coy’ but also, ‘grander’ and ‘monumental’; and in connection with the Recent Works one finds ‘traditional’, ‘more conventional’, ‘elegance’, ‘reticence’ and ‘sensitive’ along with the identification of Long’s floor sculptures as ‘amongst Long’s strongest recent works’ (my emphasis). Reduced like this (which is admittedly rather unfair to the differing ways these words function in Cooke’s text) the twin aspects of the extrovert strength of the Lion and the sensitive Unicorn are apparent in each period of work Cooke distinguishes.

In fact, Cooke actually uses two of Overy’s ‘Unicorn’ words - ‘fey’ and ‘sensitive’ - in her descriptions.

The other reason for picking out the descriptive words in Cooke’s text in this way is because this is precisely one of the tactics Long uses in his ‘reply to a critic’ in the July/August 1983 issue of *Art Monthly*. He states:

> First I would like to disagree with such descriptive words as ‘discretion’, ‘fey’, ‘poetic’, ‘reverie’, ‘reserve’, as I think they misunderstand the real issues of my work. I believe both radical and robust art can be shown in a simple, quiet way, which is something different.379

Looking more closely at the words Long suggests as replacements: ‘radical’, ‘robust’ and ‘simple’ and ‘quiet’. They are different words, but they encode a similar kind of duality.

Whilst the majority of Cooke’s descriptive terms are applied to the work, they could also be seen to delineate the artistic sensibility that produces the work. This shift from describing the discrete products of an artistic oeuvre to a delineation of the character and commitment of the producer is effected in Long’s reply. Long’s own physical commitment to his art practice is stressed throughout his letter.

Long begins by isolating the words that he disagrees with as descriptive of his work. He then attempts to explain the ‘real’ concerns of his work. He does this both by emphasising the particular motivations for

---

379 One of the only other negative reviews was published in *Artscribe*, no. 26 (December 1980), pp. 46-47, by Simon Vaughan Winter. Winter was then the Assistant Editor of *Artscribe* and Lynne Cooke was a contributing editor. The final two paragraphs (some 300 of the 1000 words) of the review, ostensibly about Long’s show at Anthony d’Offay, are devoted to a diatribe about the difficult activity of reviewing and of the responses to reviews. It ends with the observation: ‘Anyhow, Richard Long is fair game as an Aunt Sally; an inflated reputation can take a good number of pin-pricks. Sticks and stones may break his bones (as well as filling any number of art galleries), but words are unlikely to hurt him.’377 Prophetic words indeed.

378 Since Overy is clearly a part of this debate from the beginning, Aareen mentions him in his *Art Monthly* letter, it could be that these kind of descriptive words prompted Overy’s description in his later article, or he could be using them in deliberate repetition of Cooke’s words, or she of his at an earlier point. (See my discussion of Land Art as a systematic discourse in *Land Art Beginning* pp. 10, 21-30.

his practice for example: 'a feeling in the sixties', 'an interest in a more thoughtful view of art and nature', or questions of the visibility and invisibility of art. He stresses the human and physical aspect of his work using such phrases as 'human scale' and 'personal physical commitment' and emphasises this aspect of his work by contrasting it with 'so-called American 'Land Art'. The contrasts are in the realms of the body and of politics. Whilst Long's work involves the robust, personal, physical involvement of his body, the American artists' work is cerebral - they make 'plans' - and executed by machines - 'made by bulldozers'. In terms of politics Long makes an overt political stance in declaring his position as that of the Greens, whilst he admonishes the Americans' work as 'True capitalist art' declaring that 'I admire the spirit of the American Indian more than its contemporary land artists.' A view which seems strangely resonant with the critique of capitalism in Walker's exposition of 'How to Walk' in the 1946 camping handbook, which also expresses admiration for the native Americans through an appreciation of their deportment.

Throughout his reply Long is at pains to stress the straightforward practicality of his approach to his work - it is how it is because that is the best way for it to be. In the last paragraph he sums up this approach with the statement: 'My work is spare and simple because it is not necessary to give any more than is sufficient for the purposes of each piece.' The appeal to necessary and sufficient conditions seems strangely resonant with other approaches examined in this study. The answer to 'necessary and sufficient for what?' is rather unsatisfactorily given as 'for the purposes of each piece', although it is precisely with what those purposes actually are that Araeen takes issue in his response to Long in the next issue of Art Monthly (69, September 1983). Araeen points out that the purposes to which art work is put are not necessarily identical with the purposes that the artist declares them to be. Nor are claims to simplicity and straightforwardness adequate defence against complicity in a system of representation that needs such images for its more devious purposes, e.g. 'Nostalgia is good for bad days! The Union Jack must keep flying everywhere!' ..... 'He is in fact part of a vast and complex international system that sees the world also his way.' and 'His work is reinforcement to this world view.'

Where Long sees himself as the Unicorn. Araeen sees only the Lion, or rather he sees that the two are indivisible - the Lion in Unicorn's clothing - a mask. That appearances and reality differ is given away in two phrases near the beginning of his letter: 'his work is not simplistic even though it may appear simple.' and 'Behind the facade of simplicity and innocence there exist complex layers of representation and meaning.' The implication being that Long's simple vision is always more or other than what it seems.

Araeen is particularly critical of Long's attitude towards his global hiking and the unpeopled vision of it he presents. Araeen's concern is with the civilisations of these apparently 'empty' spaces that Long

---


381 Rasheed Araeen. 'Long walks round the world.'
walks through and documents and with the ‘white man’s’ legacy in such places. This opinion is most clearly expressed in the following extracts from his letter:

The nostalgia of Empire now conspires with the grand vision of international monopoly capital, whose tentacles have now reached, literally and symbolically even the remote areas of the Kilimanjaro, the Himalayas, Alaska, the Andes ..., while high technology makes people leave the land and move to the shanties of the cities in search of food and shelter, the romantics of the affluent metropolis wearing the cloaks of humanism move out with their cameras into the ‘wilderness’ to claim the Earth again, and for themselves; and they do so in such a way that the act of the former is properly covered up. The world is thus touched again, ordered, depoliticised and reclaimed! [...] We are left in the end with the presence of only one person, the romantic survivor (artist the hero!), a white man walking alone all over the ‘uninhabited’ world and marking his presence. To mark the world is to own it!

Is it possible to make a positive connection between Long’s freedom to go to Alaska, for example and the condition of the indigenous people of Alaska? What freedom have they themselves? These are not impertinent questions. The very existence of these people has been threatened by the white man’s presence there. How is Long’s presence there now different? The comparison here may appear unfair. But doesn’t Long’s work symbolise, even when he may not be consciously aware of this - and I don’t think he is - the continuous and ‘unquestionable’ right of the white man to be anywhere in the world.

It was the legacy of the white man that Araeen’s exhibition at the Showroom highlighted in 1988, using a circle of wine bottles to refer to the alcoholism that stands as testimony to that legacy in North America and a line of white bones *White Line through Africa* to mark the deathly effect on that continent. The dialogue between Araeen and Paul Overy clearly dates back at least to this episode in the pages of *Art Monthly*, since Araeen refers to Overy in his letter: ‘It has been suggested (Paul Overy) that Long’s activity is in line with the tradition of western colonial explorers.’ 382 That this tradition no doubt would lead us back to the great explorers of the 19th Century that inhabit the world of encyclopaedias need not discourage us from finding closer brethren in the post second world war era. With two particular modern day hikers and explorers - the professional mountaineer and the astronaut.

Hamish Fulton begins his text ‘Old Muddy’ with a series of four events and dates. (encyclopaedia like):

Roll over Beethoven 1956.
North Face Eiger Direct 1966.
‘A LINE MADE BY WALKING ENGLAND 1967.’
First moon walk 1969.

The third item - the classic Long work - I discuss extensively elsewhere in this study, the first I’ll return to (in *Land Art Ha Ha Ha* below). The two events that surround it, before and after it in the

--

382 Araeen does not mention any particular article in which this analogy is made but it appears in at least two of Overy’s magazine articles: Paul Overy, ‘Richard Long’, review of an exhibition at the Whitechapel Art Gallery, London, *Art Monthly*, no. 4 (February 1977), p. 21; and Paul Overy, ‘The Britishness of Sculpture’ (1987). In the 1977 review Overy writes ‘Richard Long’s long marches across apparently empty continents could be construed as an impotent shadow of nineteenth century imperialism.’ and asks ‘Is Long a latter day version of those Victorian explorer/artist or explorer/photographers?’ In the 1987 article as well as the colonial analogies, Overy makes a comparison between Long and Baden-Powell’s Boy Scouts, characterising Long as ‘a highly sensitive boy scout.’ (p. 12).
chronological listing, are a mountaineering adventure and a space adventure. Two contemporary explorations.

In March 1970 Richard Long presented a series of photographs in Studio International.\textsuperscript{363} (He is credited as the author of this piece in the table of contents) The series was titled ‘Nineteen stills from the work of Richard Long’ and it is simply that - a series of still photographs, maps, diagrams and descriptive captions. The first two images on the first page of the article appear directly one above the other with no gap between them. The upper photograph is entitled A SCULPTURE AT 19,340 FT. MT. KILIMANJARO AFRICA 10-8-69. [figure 52] The caption is hand written in upper case letters on a white strip across the photograph towards its lower edge. The photograph beneath this is particularly interesting to a discussion of bodies and representations of bodies because it actually depicts five individuals, one of whom is the artist, presumably the team that Long climbed Kilimanjaro with. The figures stand in a line in front of a wooden building with a patched together corrugated metal roof. Underneath each figure, on the white margin of the photograph, is the name of each person, written in Long’s distinctive hand in upper and lower case letters. To the left of the group sits the ubiquitous rucksack.

Paul Overy is no doubt touching on a uncomfortable linkage when he suggests a connection between Long’s activity and ‘the tradition of western colonial explorers’. In the introduction to his later article (Lions and Unicorns) the indictment is both more specific and more general:

Britain’s energetic promotion at home and abroad of its contemporary sculpture is here seen as an effort to substitute cultural power for a now vanished economic power. The author discusses several generations of postwar sculptors in the context of his country’s transformed political situation \textsuperscript{364}

Fulton’s enigmatic list highlights three particular areas of activity that were promoted in the postwar era to compensate for declining economic prowess and to detract from domestic issues: Rock and Roll and popular music, Mountaineering (and other expeditions) and the space race.

One of the most energetic promotions of terrestrial exploration in Britain was during the 1950s, the era of Long’s parents’ cycling and hiking holidays. Two outstanding examples of this were the Crossing of Antarctica and the Ascent of Everest [figures 53 and 54] both documented in popular paperback books during the 1950s. Both featured the New Zealand explorer Edmund Hillary. Overy highlights the honours bestowed on British sculptors as evidence of the recognised value of their contribution to Britain’s cultural prestige. (He gives as examples Sir Jacob Epstein, Henry Moore OM, Dame Barbara Hepworth, Dame Elizabeth Frink, Sir Anthony Caro, Sir Eduardo Paolozzi) Hillary too was knighted,
Figure 52. From 'Nineteen Stills from the work of Richard Long', 1970.
Figure 53. Cover of John Hunt, *The Ascent of Everest*, 1953.
Figure 54. Cover of Vivian Fuchs and Edmund Hillary, *The Crossing of Antarctica*, 1960.
and returning to the cultural fields Fulton highlighted it is also worth remembering that The Beatles, that quintessential British pop group, were also knighted for their cultural contribution.

Co-operation between Nations and the new post war order were crucial issues in the explorations of the 1950s. The cover of the book documenting The Crossing of Antarctica\textsuperscript{385} although authored by Vivian Fuchs and Edmund Hillary, is subtitled ‘The Commonwealth Trans-Antarctic Expedition’ (my emphasis). The wide use and resonance of ‘The Commonwealth’ in the 1950s is testament to the kind of ethos promoted during that era, and the positive resonance that term held by comparison with its rather problematic status today. The Third Edition of John Hunt’s book The Ascent of Everest\textsuperscript{386} has the following exaltation/recommendation by none other than the BBC (Nation shall speak peace unto Nation) on its cover:

\begin{quote}
This is surely a book that ought to be in every British home
Books to Read, B.B.C.
\end{quote}

This concatenation of the space of the highest peak on the surface of the Earth and the spaces of ‘every British Home’ is particularly provocative. For it is in the latter that the cultural significance of the adventure resides, in its dispersal (to saturation). Whilst a thorough history of such expeditions would no doubt consider the scientific advances that made such missions feasible (some of which skills were surely the by product of the war effort, advances in mapping, air surveillance etc.), the possibility of going to such places was only opened in the relative peace of the era and the agreement between the Western nations at least to co-operate in such endeavours, whilst competition and national prestige were clearly part of the impetus and excitement.

The possibility of travel and the limits of the ‘free world’ is also evident from a summary list of the destinations of Long and Fulton’s walks. Many bear the resonant memories of the former Colonies or bear witness to the fragile relation between certain nations. Long’s first foreign adventure in 1969, financed with money from his first sale from his exhibition at Konrad Fischer’s gallery in Düsseldorf in the previous year, was to East Africa (a former British colony), where his brother was on VSO. (His continued connection with that organisation is suggested by his donating a work to an auction in aid of VSO in 1990).\textsuperscript{387} It was on this trip that the images in ‘Nineteen Stills’\textsuperscript{388} discussed above were made, as were a number of more familiar and more frequently reproduced images such as the work that juxtaposes two figures - HILL FIGURE ENGLAND 600 CLIMBING MOUNT KILIMANJARO AFRICA 1969 [figure 14 above] - the former the chalk figure known as The Long Man.

\textsuperscript{387} Talking to the Leeds MA in Sculpture Studies students at his home in Bristol in June 1991. Long pointed out that there were ‘non-art’ reasons for the locations of his walks. For example he was familiar with Dartmoor because that is where his grandparents lived and he used to go and stay with them. He mentioned that his brother was on VSO in Africa when he visited there in 1969.
\textsuperscript{388} Richard Long. ‘Nineteen stils from the work of Richard Long’.
2 lines walked through dust-covered grass, by the roadside. AFRICA 1969

A sculpture made by removing the daisy heads. ENGLAND 1968
Figure 56. Richard Long. Postcard used for an exhibition at Konrad Fischer's gallery, Düsseldorf, 1969.
of Wilmington and the latter the artist himself with his rucksack on his back. The work 2 LINES WALKED THROUGH DUST-COVERED GRASS, BY THE ROADSIDE. AFRICA 1969 was also made on this trip. In the series ‘Nineteen Stills’ this work is shown next to A SCULPTURE MADE BY REMOVING THE DAISY HEADS. ENGLAND 1968. [figure 55] The images show almost identical cross forms, their similarity emphasising the differences - of terrain, time and place - that separate them. Both of these works made on the trip to Africa in 1969 were reproduced in the catalogue to Long’s exhibition in Rome in 1994, an exhibition organised by the British Council and the centrepiece of their cultural extravaganza the British Festival. an event that clearly demonstrates the kind of cultural export Overy was discussing in 1991.

The photograph of the Kilimanjaro climbing team [figure 52] has not been reproduced, at least not in any of the major publications on the artist, although a cropped version of the upper image - the SCULPTURE ON KILIMANJARO 19.340 FT 10-8-69 - has appeared elsewhere, for example on a private view card for Long’s second exhibition at Konrad Fischer’s gallery in 1969. [figure 56] reproduced in an exhibition catalogue from an exhibition in Bordeaux in 1982 entitled Postcards.

Reflecting on the Ascent of Everest in the last section of his book. John Hunt attests to the territorial and political impediments to such endeavours, as well as the technical and physical ones:

Some day Everest will be climbed again. It may well be attempted without oxygen, although I do not rate the chances of success very high at present. Let us hope for the opening of the frontier dividing Nepal and Tibet to climbers from both sides of that political barrier. For the route to the top of the mountain by the North Face remains to be completed.

There are political barriers to the presence of bodies - particularly foreign bodies - in certain landscapes. There are also other bodies that have been excluded for reasons such as their gender.

In May 1995 Alison Hargreaves climbed Everest by the North Face route, reaching the summit alone and without oxygen. The event and its media coverage demonstrate that Everest continues to be a symbol of acquisition and achievement. Women are absent from the earlier mountaineering expeditions and in the article documenting Hargreaves’ ascent of Everest there is an emphasis on her physical body in a way that differs radically from the descriptions of male bodies in similar expeditions, for example in Hunt’s book. Peter Gillman the author of an article on Hargreaves’ climb in the Independent newspaper writes:

---

392 Hunt details the criteria by which the selection of the Everest team was made in a chapter on ‘Preparations’: ‘I was looking for four qualifications. They were those of age : temperament : experience : physique.’ The question of gender does not enter into his discussion. he continues, ‘As regards age, I was looking for men within a bracket of between twenty-five and forty’ (ibid., p. 35). However it is not necessarily the assumption that women’s bodies are unsuitable for the task, in fact their bodies might
A sturdy 5ft 4in. with endearingly fresh-faced features. Hargreaves should have been a media gift. She has two children - Tom, aged six, and Kate, four - who have been accustomed to wait for her at the foot of her climbs, and she ascended the most notorious north face of the Eiger when she was five months pregnant.\textsuperscript{393}

There is an emphasis in the article on the ordinariness of this woman and particularly that she is a wife and mother and not a manly travesty of womanhood. The world’s highest mountain top and its conquest is again manoeuvred to speak of current social and political concerns.

My reasons for drawing parallels between Long and Fulton’s expeditions and expeditions to the Antarctic or Everest is not to claim that Long’s and Fulton’s work owes something to these missions, although Fulton’s ‘Old Muddy’ text is peppered with extracts from such popular accounts as I have been referring too and these clearly are the kind of reading matter that Fulton, at least, is familiar with. In keeping with the ‘every British home’ endorsement it is worth pointing out the sheer proliferation and saturation of such texts in the 1950s and 1960s. Hunt’s The Ascent of Everest ends on an even more prophetic note when he writes in his final paragraph:

And there are many other opportunities for adventure, whether they be sought among the hills, in the air, upon the sea, in the bowels of the earth, or on the ocean bed: and there is always the moon to reach. (my emphasis)\textsuperscript{394}

Mountain climbing and Moon walking have many points of contact. Everest and the Moon are two resonant mythic places conquered since the Second World War. They haunt the early works of Land Art. they give it a raison d’être, they suggest the possibilities, they shift consciousness from a contemplation of the body at the centre of the universe (the traditional anthropocentric and humanist vision) to one that views humanity as a tiny part of a vast universe. This vision features prominently in the early discourse on Land Art and Earth Art, although it is voiced by the two leading American proponents of Land Art, Robert Smithson and Dennis Oppenheim. For example, in Smithson’s comments on geologic time:

I think most of us are very aware of time on a geologic scale, of the great extent of time which has gone into the sculpting of matter. [...] I think in terms of millions of years, including times when humans weren’t around.\textsuperscript{395}

more easily meet some of the physical criteria detailed in Hunt’s account, for example weight and build in proportion to their height. It is more likely that Hunt would have considered women less likely to “fit in”, an important consideration for his building of a good climbing team. (although again this is superfluous to his discussion). However the most likely criteria for exclusion, and one that features across so many professional exclusions for women, is that of experience. Women were unlikely to have such experience. It is interesting to note that a newspaper article on Hargreaves emphasises parental influence in her mountaineering career: ‘Hargreaves was inducted into the mountains at the age of six. Her parents - both Oxford maths graduates - took her walking near their home in Derbyshire and during holidays in Scotland and the Lakes’: and the ongoing support of her husband, who shares her climbing profession. Peter Gillman, ‘Everest and now the highlife calls for Alison’ in the \textit{Independent on Sunday}, 21 May 1995. p 11

\textsuperscript{392} ibid.

\textsuperscript{394} ibid.

Or in Oppenheim's comments in the 'Earth' symposium:

I'm to the point now where I see the earth as a sculpture - where flying over the earth is like viewing existing painted areas or pictorial painterly surfaces. [...] The limit you have to refer to in this case is always the sphere - it's always the globe - so when you dig a hole in the ground your periphery becomes the spherical shape. Now the spherical shape, of course, is relational to the cosmos.  

Man is belittled, as well as providing according to some the impetus for the ecology movement, such achievements were also marked by a blatant disregard for the body and for the bodies of individuals. The race for space was not won without the loss of life, and it was only in its most confident moment when all was to be made public through the mass media of television that the real cost was brought so graphically home when the shuttle disaster was witnessed live by millions. The horror on the faces of the spectators was also surely instrumental in the winding down of the American space programme and particularly of the quietening down of the space programme as a mass televisual spectacle.

The British experience of the space programme was via this important medium of the television, and it was clearly influential on British artists as well as their American contemporaries. For example, in 1969, the same year as the Moon Landing, Long used an aerial (space) image on a card for an exhibition at the Galerie Yvon Lambert, Paris. [figure 57]

My discussion of connections between British Land Art and Mountaineering expeditions in the context of an art historical enquiry would not be complete without some mention of the visual as well as textual representations of mountaineering. Here John Hunt's Ascent of Everest is particularly interesting. The illustrations are in a glossy paper insert in the middle of the book. One double-page spread has portraits of all those involved in the expedition. [figure 58] Hunt and Hillary appear top left, first as it were. Hillary with an elaborate piece of headgear that makes him look remarkably like Lawrence of Arabia as portrayed by Peter O'Toole in David Lean's epic film. Alfred Gregory, the photographer is depicted in the central row of portraits at the right hand side. He is staring upwards as if planning a shot. His camera poised on a tripod with its telephoto lens pointing upwards. The remaining pages in this section shows scenes from the expedition, some with named members of the team.

The black and white images with their sparing captions such as 'THE MARCH-OUT Crossing rivers' or 'THE LHOTSE FACE Crossing a steep ice slope' [figures 59 and 60] are not unlike the titles of some of Long's photograph works. Even more striking for a contemporary viewer is that the captions on the photographs in the Everest book are in almost exactly the same sans serif typeface as that which has now become standard in the publications by Long. That the typeface was thought suitable for both texts is revealing at least of a certain similarity in the envisaged image that is being projected in each case. The text has come to signify a certain attitude toward modernity or towards being modern that makes it interesting to consider the decision for its use each time it appears.

---

Richard Long - Sculpture
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Figure 58. Photographs from John Hunt, The Ascent of Everest, 1953.
Figure 59. Photographs from John Hunt, *The Ascent of Everest*, 1953.
Figure 60. Photographs from John Hunt, *The Ascent of Everest*, 1953.
A line made by walking, by Richard Long.

A track sited on a notch from A. Watkins.

Figure 61. From Bette Spektorov, 'The Impact of Megalithic Landscapes on Contemporary Art', Studio International (April/May 1983).
In comparison with such documents, the work of Long and Fulton can be seen to share a certain vision of the landscape and its proper experience, a certain implicit cultural agenda in its promotion and a visual similarity perhaps the result of an unconscious and long standing familiarity with such presentations rather than being a deliberate imitation or emulation.

One could suggest that Long and these mountaineers, trekkers and explorers share a certain vision, a certain approach to the land. This is the line I took when I first compared Long’s photograph and map works to those in The Old Straight Track, a book first published in 1925 written by the rather eccentric ‘inventor’ of ley lines and author of this fascinating guide to their discernment, Alfred Watkins. Lucy Lippard in her book Overlay concluded that ‘If the ley lines don’t exist, then Alfred Watkins was a very good conceptual artist.’ Bette Spectorov had juxtaposed a photograph by Watkins with one of Long’s (rather misleadingly printed exactly the same size) [figure 61] in her article on ‘The impact of megalithic landscapes on contemporary art’ in 1983. What I think I would add now, perhaps rather along the lines of Potts’ argument in ‘“Constable Country” between the wars’, is that a specific vision of the landscape is mobilised in particular ways in response to political and social efficacy. Potts points out how a particular rural idyll of England’s green and pleasant land as depicted by Constable ‘has been incorporated into a national mythology mobilised at times of political tension to figure some essence of true Englishness.’ Potts points to moments when the ‘outside’ world appeared particularly threatening, during two world wars, and in the 1930s with the rise of Fascism when this imagery had been particularly manoeuvred. Such strategies have a much longer history, as Stephen Daniels demonstrates in his essay ‘The political iconography of woodland’ where he discusses the utilisation of picturesque landscapes and symbols of enduring Englishness such as the oak tree, in Britain during the Napoleonic Wars. The more heroic image of the British explorer/hiker abroad in a foreign landscape is called upon in different circumstances, particularly when domestic problems threaten the peace on the home front, or where political or economic impotence is suspected or publicised. Thus these images were

397 Alfred Watkins. The Old Straight Track (London: Abacus, 1974, first published 1925). In summing up my comparisons of Long and Watkins I wrote: ‘What I do not wish to conclude from these comparisons is that Long was aware of Watkins’ text (although it is not particularly obscure and has been influential in fields other than art), or in some way copied him, but that both Watkins book and Long’s work constitute a way of seeing or perceiving the landscape. Watkins deliberately and consciously tries to recreate a ‘lost’ way of seeing the landscape. Long, however unconsciously reactivates or enters into this kind of mode of perception.’ Approaches to the Land, BA dissertation, University College London, 1990. Long is adamant that he didn’t know about Watkins until someone mentioned him to Long when he had his show at the Whitechapel gallery in 1971. (Long, in Conversation Part Two, 1986 op. cit. p 25) although Fulton seems to have been familiar with Watkins’s work.


400 Alex Potts. ““Constable Country” Between the Wars”. p. 160.

401 ibid., p. 162.

particularly promoted in the cold war era as the British economy faltered in its attempt to recover from the massive expenditure of the war effort. In the late 1970s such imagery appealed, particularly in the so-called ‘winter of discontent’ as litter piled up in the streets and strikes threatened to reveal the country’s crumbling infrastructure. However, a more contemporary attempt at diverting attention from domestic issues through a bold foreign adventure was no doubt in the minds of Araeen and Overy as they wrote about British Sculpture or about Long’s global hiking. It burbles beneath the surface of the 1983 episode in Art Monthly (for example in Araeen’s reference to the jingoistic attitude invoked in the phrase he quotes: ‘The Union Jack must keep flying everywhere’), and manages to surface more explicitly at the end of Overy’s 1991 article:

The British lion may be dead his last dying roar having echoed over the South Atlantic in 1982. But from his corpse is manufactured the cultural honey of sweetness and light.

The landscape vision depicted in paintings by Constable or Stubbs in images such as The Reapers (1783) [figure 62] which Daniels discusses, is, importantly a peopled landscape. It shows people engaged in useful activity within a flourishing and ordered landscape. This is in marked contrast to the unpeopled vision of the majority of images by Long and Fulton. When bodies do appear in these images they are generally engaged in private activity, solitary or detached. They do not, as I pointed out earlier, engage with one another.

According to Daniels the social image of the landscape was one of the key issues around which the debates between the landscape idioms of Capability Brown and of the radicals Uvedale Price and Richard Payne Knight revolved.

Price argued that a more painterly style of landscaping, especially one modelled on Dutch or Flemish painting, implied a more humane one. For ‘the lover of painting considers the dwellings, the inhabitants, and the marks of their intercourse, as ornaments to the landscape’. The moral landscape was an intimate one. For Price ‘persons not conversant in pictures and drawings’ were ‘much more attentive to distant objects than to near ones’. [76] This echoes Burke who emphasized the moral indifference of ‘geometricians’ in politics whose ‘long views’ were drawn towards the vanishing point of linear perspective: ‘their humanity is at their horizon - and like the horizon it always flies before them’. [77]

Price and Knight’s visions of a peopled, humane landscape is juxtaposed with Brown’s ‘improving’ operations that swept away all before them in a blatant demonstration of sheer power and dominance. 105

---

103 Rasheed Araeen, ‘Long walks round the world’.
105 Another connection can be made between the landscape depictions utilised during the period of Daniel’s discussion (Georgian, 18th C) and those considered by Potts (images motivated during the interwar 1918-1939 period). One of the images Daniels discusses is Stubbs 1783 version of The Reapers, it is in the National Trust Bearsted Collection, Upton House, Oxfordshire (Daniels, footnote 42, p. 76). The Bearsted collection was assembled in the period under discussion in Potts’ essay. The Bearsted family began the Shell oil company and Walter Samuel 2nd Viscount Bearsted whose collection is housed at Upton, was Chairman of Shell as well as a Chairman of the National Gallery, a Trustee of the Tate Gallery and from 1944 Chairman of the Whitechapel Art Gallery. The collection has many Dutch landscapes of the type referred to in Daniels’ quotation. The following quotation is from the National
The critique Daniels constructs from Price and Burke might equally be levelled at Long's images, especially bearing in mind Long's observations on how he takes his photographs and particularly his comments on photographing lines:

"Usually, after I have made the work, I kind of walk around it and somehow find the best place to take the photograph. A line usually has the characteristic of pointing out of or beyond itself, maybe to the horizon, so often the alignment of the viewer, the line and something a long way off is important."  

Having observed that, in general, Long's images do not depict acts of social intercourse or show the dwellings or inhabitants of the landscapes. (Araeen's critique) this seems to render even more significant the occasions on which Long does depict such social aspects and the moments of their appearance in his work. (such as in the Countless Stones book and other works discussed above in the 'Making time for Space' section)

Long's is a civilised landscape represented as nature, or where the landscape has been returned to nature. It is a social landscape whose society has departed long ago, and in many instances the remains that are left have been reabsorbed into the fabric of the landscape to such an extent that they become difficult to see as the products of humankind. [figure 63].

Venturing further afield, the landscape of the explorer is uninhabited, unpeopled save for the team of bold explorers that attempt to conquer it, or better still the single lone figure pitched man against the elements in a battle of wills in which man ultimately triumphs. The flag is planted, the territory owned '10 mark the world is to own it' as Araeen observed. The body of the hiker is symbolic, it is also masked, and impregnable, protected from the world, well-equipped. It is the body made ready for its particular function, fit, attuned, perfected. The mountaineer or astronaut is attuned to his venture as Long is to his. He is no professional mountaineer, or else his work would be in a very different category. He is "Long, the artist as walker."^407 concerned with 'ways of life which exist predominantly outside art confines."^408 he is not an intellectual. neither is Long a mountaineer, a climber or an athlete. He is simply an ordinary very fit person, a first-class walker and countryman. He is at home in this element: walking a precise compass reading is normal and practical for him."^409

---

'It is a reflection of Walter Samuel's interests that almost all the pictures at Upton are concerned with human beings and their relationship with each other as well as to the world around them.' p 8.


^407 Stuart Morgan. 'Loose talk'. p. 93.

^408 ibid.

^409 Seymour. Anne 'Old World, New World'. p. 58.
Figure 62. George Stubbs, The Reapers, 1783.
Evoked bodies, representations of bodies

Long’s reply to Cooke’s review is a particularly significant document because it demonstrates the potential power of critical discourse. That Long feels compelled to break what was up to then, with the exception of two collections of sparse statements (in 1980 and 1982), a loudly defended silence, is testament to some shift in his position vis-à-vis speaking of or about his artistic practice. Clearly Long felt he and his work had been misrepresented and that he needed to put the record straight. His response seems to contradict Winter’s opinions of 1980 that ‘words are unlikely ever to hurt him’. There also seems further evidence of Long taking note of Cooke’s and Araeen’s criticisms in his art practice. Although he defends the specific use of captions in his reply to Cooke he does nothing to defend the presence of multiples or variants within his photographic oeuvre. This is answered to an extent in the Guggenheim catalogue/book of 1986 where the designation ‘public freehold’ is spelled out as a strategy to contain or at least manage some of the anomalies of this kind. There also seems to have been an attempt to limit the circulation of the most problematic images of this kind, a process that makes the tracking down of some of the most outstanding examples rather torturous for the researcher.

This episode of criticism coincides with the production of one of the most ‘peopled’ of Long’s ‘works’ - the book ‘Countless Stones’, discussed above, which features girls playing a game with stones at the very beginning of the book and a number of images of people along the path. Similarly, the word work Cooke refers to in her review, also of 1983, Walking with the River’s Roar, contains references to people (representations, evocations of people): ‘My Father’, ‘Human Time’ and ‘Paths of Shared Footsteps’. Over the next few years the works I have been discussing that represent the body in words, symbolic substitutions or signs of presence, shadows cast by the body, the rucksack(s) or tent, fireplace or, sleeping place, appear and become more numerous.

In the book Walking in Circles (1991) the work SHADOWS AND WATERMARKS appears juxtaposed with the text work WALKING WITH THE RIVER’S ROAR. (Figure 64) Across these two pages are more evoked bodies than in any other passage in Long’s work. On the right-hand page in the text work, bodies are evoked in words such as ‘Human Time’, ‘Paths of Shared Footmarks’ and ‘My Father’.

The photograph piece on the left-hand page reveals more evoked body presences as one looks more closely. The watermarks referred to in the title are a row of splashes in a line across the mud wall. They look a little as if somebody or bodies have urinated against the wall to create these marks. I would perhaps reconsider my assertion that the fleshy body of such functions is excluded from Long’s work were it not that the title of the work refers to these markings as ‘Watermarks’ with no indication as to how they were made. Long discusses his use of captions in his letter to Art Monthly, indicating that


discussed above, see pp. 140 and 186.
WALKING WITH THE RIVER'S ROAR
GREAT HIMALAYAN TIME  A LINE OF MOMENTS
MY FATHER  STARLIT SNOW
HUMAN TIME  FROZEN BOOTS
BREAKING TRAIL  CIRCLES OF A GREAT BIRD
COUNTLESS STONES  HAPPY ALERT BALANCED
PATHS OF SHARED FOOTMARKS  ATOMIC SILENCE
SLEEPING BY THE RIVER'S ROAR
The titles and captions in the framed works do a specific job for each work and that all information necessary to that work is given. Following this rationale, were the process of making the watermarks intrinsic to this piece it would, presumably, have been included in the title. The point is demonstrated by comparing SHADOWS AND WATERMARKS with a work shown two pages later in the book - WATERLINES [figure 65] - in which the process of making the lines in the title is described in the caption: 'Each day a waterline / poured from my water bottle / along the walking line'. Watermarks then, but what of the shadows? The shadow to the bottom right of the photograph seems to be the shadow of the photographer, a head with the right hand holding the camera to the face. The other shadows are more vague - perhaps a large tree with some hanging leaves. The shadow of the body of the artist appears at the very beginning of this book, opposite the title page, a photograph described in the book as 'Richard Long walking in the Sahara 1988'[figure 66]. The image shows only the ground, no sky or horizon. The figure whose shadow appears in the image does not appear to be holding a camera as in the Shadows and Watermarks work. More of the figure can be discerned, enough to make out the rucksack with rolled-up sleeping mat attached and a brimmed hat, reminiscent of Beuys's signature fedora, a resonance that may not be coincidental. Shadows had been used in Long's work before, for example in the case of the photowork that accompanies the walk in Mexico (PICO DE ORIZABA) in 1979 [figure 67] although in this case the shadow is of an object, a mountain peak.

The work SHADOWS AND WATERMARKS indicates other types of bodies that are present in Long's oeuvre: bodies evoked by gesture, impermanent mark or trace. It is necessary at this point to distinguish between two very different types of evocations of the body that manifest themselves through marking in Long's work: firstly the precise or recognisable print of hand or foot, outside on the ground surface or indoors in mud on the floor or wall or pressed into clay, as in FOOTPRINT SPIRAL ANTHONY D'OFFAY GALLERY LONDON 1993 [figure 68]; and secondly, the more gestural mark which may show traces of the hand or indicate the movement of the body as the mark is made. The first was present early in Long's work, the precise mark, particularly the footprint. Often in strict geometric arrangement, these marks are traces of fragments of the body, the expressive parts of the body - hands and feet. They were performed indoors and outside. In 1970 Willoughby Sharp made the following comments in his article 'Bodyworks' under the sub-heading 'The Body as Tool':

Hands have traditionally been used to make sculpture. Recently feet have come into their own. In 1967 Richard Long began a series of works by pacing up and down a straight line in an English meadow. In later walking works like the recent one in Wiltshire, Long walked four increasingly large concentric squares noting the time taken to complete each. In the first piece, photographs documented the line on the ground. In the second, a map was used to indicated the content of the work. For Place and Process, Long contributed a photograph of footprints in the dusty Kenya ground. 413

412 Richard Long. 'Richard Long replies to a critic'.
413 Willoughby Sharp. 'Bodyworks A pre-critical, non-definitive survey of very recent works using the human body or parts thereof' Avalanche, no 1 (Fall 1970), pp. 14-17, p. 15.
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EACH DAY A WATERLINE
POURED FROM MY WATER BOTTLE
ALONG THE WALKING LINE

FROM THE ATLANTIC SHORE TO THE MEDITERRANEAN SHORE
A 560 MILE WALK IN 20½ DAYS ACROSS PORTUGAL AND SPAIN

1989
Figure 66. Frontispiece to Walking in Circles: ‘Richard Long in the Sahara, 1988’.
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Figure 67. Richard Long.
FOOTPRINT SPIRAL

ANTHONY D'OFFAY GALLERY
LONDON 1993

Figure 68. From Richard Long, 1994.
The three kinds of feet works that Sharp describes all appeared in the 'Nineteen stills' article in Studio International in March 1970. Sharp identifies the now iconic Line Made by Walking as a work that began a series of works. Another in this series appears in Studio International, this one rather more elaborate consisting of four parallel lines in the grass, shown in a diagram and photograph. The title of the work is "After Walk Sculpture 1969" [figure 69] The varying visibility of the lines is a result of the number of times the 50 yard line is walked, ranging from 8 times (¼ mile) to 32 times (1 mile). A year later Long made his A LINE THE LENGTH OF A STRAIGHT WALK FROM THE BOTTOM TO THE TOP OF SILbury HILL (1970) in the Whitechapel Art Gallery, London in 1971 [figure 70]. a work that inspired many considerations of the transference of an experience from the landscape to the gallery space and the resulting meditation on context, site and installation. It is revealing to compare the footprint and handprint works of Long with Yves Klein's body imprints, his Anthropometries [figures 1 and 2]. In Klein's Anthropometries it is precisely these parts - the hands and feet and heads that these representations of bodies lack - the expressive parts of the body. Klein's imprints represent what for him, was the essential body - the trunk and thighs. He is still the expressive agent, they are the mute signs of his authority and authorship. Both Long's and Klein's imprints remain as the trace of a bodily action, although in Klein's case the action was an elaborate performance, to which an audience was invited, accompanied by a specially composed monotone symphony played by an orchestra, and documented for posterity on film. The actions which produce Long's gallery imprint pieces is private, intended to be unseen. Long is keen to state that his works are not performances, as the following extract from an interview with Richard Cork in 1988 reveals:

RC: But it is surely significant that you would never, by choice, make your work outdoors with people looking on while you were doing it.
RL: No, it is never a performance. It is usually a very private, quiet activity. I am happy to make it in solitude.

However, the making of his outdoor works have, on at least three occasions, been filmed. The bodies actually employed are different. Long using his own body, Klein the bodies of others.

The other type of evocation is the more expressive and effusive gestural mark. The swirls of mud applied to the walls with the fingers, the splashes of water from the waterbottle onto the earth (for example the rivers in Stones and Flies) or the baroque splashes and serpentine flourishes of Long's works in china clay, mud and white water performed on gallery floors and walls. In the book that accompanied the Guggenheim show in 1986, the work SHADOWS AND WATERMARKS is shown next to a gallery work MUDDY WATER FALLS LONDON 1986 [figure 73], connecting the outdoor water splashes with these more gestural indoor works. This comparison, unlike the 1991 juxtaposition, places the emphasis on the residue of the action - the splashes - creating the familiar indoor-outdoor dialectic that is so central to many accounts of Long's work. Fulton saw the development of the splashed floor pieces as a breakthrough in Long's work that recaptured for him the excitement of the early works.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Walks</th>
<th>Total Distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>55 yards</td>
<td>32 times</td>
<td>1 mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>55 yards</td>
<td>24 times</td>
<td>1 mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>55 yards</td>
<td>16 times</td>
<td>1 mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>55 yards</td>
<td>8 times</td>
<td>1 mile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 69. From 'Nineteen stills from the work of Richard Long', 1970.
A LINE THE LENGTH OF A STRAIGHT WALK FROM THE BOTTOM TO THE TOP OF SILBURY HILL
LONDON 1971

Figure 70. From R. H. Fuchs, Richard Long, 1986.
Figure 71. Yves Klein, 'Untitled anthropometry with male and female figures', 1960.
Figure 73. From R. H. Fuchs, Richard Long, 1986.
The early sculptures of Richard Long had a strong impact on me. Disarming simplicity - a whole new way of thinking (since childhood). Lightness - contemporary art with no history. This year (1990), I clapped eyes on a new work that immediately reminded me of the student days of the sixties' sculptures. In the small back room of a London gallery was a powerful work (Dragon), embodying that unique sense of risk - spirit - nature. A small zigzag line of white china clay splashed across the clean floor (go with the flow - earth's gravity).

I have already noted how Long's shadow is reminiscent of Beuys's appearance. In 1984-5 Long was careful to distance himself from Beuys, commenting in conversation in 1986:

Compared to him [Beuys] I am an anonymous artist who puts the work into the world without the backup of my personality or how I look like or how I act. So there is a big difference. It was necessary for Beuys to be recognized. He had to wear certain clothes, how he acted and what he said was important. With me, I can be anonymous as a person but the work is everything.

However, the evidence of Long's work from around 1983 presents a rather different image and demonstrates the increasing importance of the appearance, albeit brief and snatched only in a shadow, a glimpse, a trace, in Long's work. He is far more present in the Walking in Circles book than in the book that accompanied the Guggenheim exhibition in 1986. and in the catalogue to the British Festival exhibition in Rome in 1994 there are far more bodies, of visitors to the exhibitions in installation views, as well as representations and evocations of the artist's own body. There seems a conscious attempt to locate practice in the shadow of the great figures of twentieth century modernism. Following Long's comments on his differences from Beuys in the 1986 conversation quoted from above, Long said that his work 'is much closer to the work of Carl Andre or Lawrence Weiner, in philosophy and attitude.' However, in 1991 Long identified three 'like minds' in Carl Andre, Joseph Beuys and Daniel Buren. In identifying with the enigmatic, serious and shamanistic Beuys, Long connects himself to a figure who was after all publicly engaged to a political agenda that embraced Green politics, the very order of thought to which Long had pledged his allegiance in his letter to Art Monthly in 1983. ('My position is that of the Greens.') This marks a more emphatic political engagement. Engagement with the great figures of modernism can be detected in the work as well as in statements by the artist. It is easy to see a coded re-enactment of the famous drip paintings of Jackson Pollock in some of Long's more exuberant floor pieces. One is put in mind of the famous film and photographs of Pollock's painting performance.

Long acknowledges this connection, commenting at the time of his show at the Hayward in 1991 'I feel very close in spirit to Jackson Pollock.'

Evidently the making of the work is not intended as part of the viewing experience, although this is somewhat problematized by the existence of films of Long making the work. Clearly the enjoyment in the physical engagement with the materials and the physical effort of making the work is crucial for Long, as he commented in interview in 1988:

315 Hamish Fulton 'Old Muddy', p. 244.
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Part of the pleasure actually comes from the physical side of things. It is very important for me to make my work, you know, the actual physical making - standing the stones up, the long walking, the physical toil, the sweating and the getting tired, or the getting covered in mud in a gallery throwing mud around a circle. Although I would say that as well as my work being about ideas, it is also about that physical enjoyment.

Although Long's earlier statements (1980 and 1982) or earlier commentaries on his work do not deny this physical involvement they, and the works, seem to be less concerned with this more visceral activity. Compare the precise measurements, perhaps represented mathematically as in 'a hundred Tors in a hundred hours' where there seems no indication of physical tiredness or limitation being a consideration. The early works are also a lot more 'clean', less likely to involve the artist 'getting covered in mud', except on his boots. The exuberant exhibitionism demonstrated in Long's more recent gallery works could be interpreted along the lines of Hal Foster's writings on 'The Expressive Fallacy' as empty, desperate gestures. However, Long is at pains to distance himself from the kind of existential or emotion-ridden aspects of expressionism, commenting, just before the above comments in interview:

... usually I am happy and relaxed. I would say that the way I make my work is from the things that give me pleasure and the materials that I like using - my work doesn't come from a kind of angst or discontent.

Where the 'Expressive Fallacy' comes into fuller effect is in the critical interpretation of these works and of their relation with the spectator. Many commentaries, even, or perhaps especially, the more critically engaged ones, emphasise the possibility of experiencing something of this pleasure, this physical enjoyment and engagement through contemplation of the residue of these activities in the gallery, whether these residues are gallery sculptures, photographs, maps or text pieces. The claim is for some unmediated direct experience in front of the work of art, a certain transparency. In Long's own commentary on his work this is hinted at, for example in his comments against technique and for the directness and simplicity of the work. Although he points out that those experiences are different, but none the less valid. The materials of Long's work may be very simple but its staging strategies are highly complex, as Foster says of expressionism, 'it speaks a language, but a language so obvious that we may forget its conventionality and must enquire again how it encodes the natural and simulates the immediate.'

David Reason's writing exemplifies the critical position on the more revelatory approaches to British Land Art. He makes particular explicit and implicit reference to the phenomenology of Merleau Ponty

---

423 Hal Foster, *Recodings*, p. 60.
(serious enough philosophy) and his idea of the primacy of perception. In an essay on Fulton's text work *Rock Fall Echo Dust*. Reason writes:

Contemplating such work, I am persuaded metaphorically to re-enact Fulton's relationship with the landscape, for I can enter into the dialectic of this art and yet must come away from it with nothing, acquiring only the promise of an access route not to his but to my world.

What one encounters in front of the work of art is not the artist behind it, but oneself. Experiencing the work is to experience self-knowledge. It is revealing to read amidst this rhetoric, on the page before the one on which the above quotation appears, the sentence 'A work by Fulton has that sense of inevitable rightness to it' - a line that wouldn't seem out of place in Fried's 'Art and Objecthood' phase of modernist criticism. In the following quotation, again from Reason's writing on Fulton, but this time in an exhibition catalogue essay, Reason shifts from the use of the first person 'I' to using 'we'. a familiar strategy in this kind of criticism, and one that implies the universality or at least commonality of the experience offered by the work:

Characteristically each work suggests the charisma of the intensely inward. A quality of tender self-sufficiency, almost of indifference, evokes that same threshold of almost-knowing that comes with the memory of having dreamt. I have noticed the same spectral grace in exponents of 'the new circus' (I have specifically in mind Le Cirque Imaginaire) where a similar mesmeric quality derives from everything being in the open and above board. Nothing is hidden, there are no tricks, nothing conspires to deceive the eye or heart. Instead, we are captivated by our willing participation in the circus magic. We allow our most secret wish to be fulfilled, the wish to be entranced by things as they are. Here there is no 'back stage,' no preparation beforehand for the covert manipulation of an audience, nothing but the sly disclosure that the magical is not a product of magic.

The use of the extended metaphor too is typical of Reason's writing. There is no space in Reason's writing for critical distance, for disbelief, or for non-conviction. He writes of 'what for me is a basic rule: to write only about an art which moves me': in short, his approach demands nothing less than conviction, a term which again echoes the heights of modernist critical dogma. This seems to represent an attempt to rescue a conservative and elitist (and critically bankrupt) idea, to give it rigorous credentials and to rescue it from the clutches of 'conservative' criticism. In writings that make appeals to such notions as conviction one detects religious or quasi-religious overtones. It is not surprising therefore to find that some of the initiators, commentators (and practitioners) of British Land Art do profess religious beliefs. Whether or not such spiritual inspiration is invoked, as regards the body, such

---


427 David Reason, 'Echo and Reflections', p. 162. Reason continues: 'Only when I am engaged by the work, only when it challenges and shifts my understanding, can I write and speak with the focused tentativeness and the disciplined passion that I believe can best serve to establish a fruitful ground between my reader or listener and the work at issue.' - more mediation.
accounts demand or at least privilege a far from visceral self-knowledge, a desire for a transcendence of the body rather than for an accommodation of the body made flesh.

Merleau-Ponty’s essay ‘Eye and Mind’ seems particularly relevant to Reason’s approach. In it Merleau-Ponty makes a direct analogy between the body and the earth, to the extent of saying they are one and the same thing: ‘Visible and mobile, my body is a thing among things; it is caught in the fabric of the world, and its cohesion is that of a thing. But because it moves itself and sees, it holds things in a circle around itself; they are incrusted into its flesh, they are part of its full definition; the world is made of the same stuff as the body.’ (my emphasis). It is easy to see why this appeals to Reason in order to argue for a presence of the body in the world and in the image of the world in words and photographs of the earth, even if the body is not figured. I think, however, it is possible to read Merleau-Ponty’s ideas against the practice of Land Art rather than as a justification of it. After all, to invoke Lefebvre’s distinction, all these bodies in Merleau-Ponty’s essay (betrayed by its title ‘Eye and Mind’) are evoked or gestural bodies. Merleau-Ponty states: ‘It is by lending his body to the world that the artist changes the world into paintings. To understand these transubstantiations we must go back to the working, actual body - not the body as a chunk of space or a bundle of functions but that body which is an intertwining of vision and movement.’

Reason’s analogy of Fulton’s no tricks approach with ‘the new circus’ might also characterise the film/video of Long’s work Stones and Flies. It purports to show Long at work and is strangely compulsive viewing, appearing to answer the kind of ‘How did he do that?’ questions. Added to this is the fascination of voyeurism to those who have seen many of Long’s works in galleries and books and know of Long’s secretive attitude towards his ideas, methods and life. Long’s first attempt at video (television) work, as part of Gerry Schum’s Land Art in 1969, was well received critically and praised for its appropriate use of the television medium. As well as arguably being Land Art’s ideal and most successful medium, film and television is also one of its crucial sources. Much has been made of Smithson’s fascination with film, watching films at the cinema and his ventures into film making. The British influence is much more domestic than the wide screen of cinema - the small screen of the television. Land Art seems in thrall especially to the live transmission of adventurous missions. Whilst
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431 For example by Charles Harrison who wrote: ‘The works in the ‘Land Art’ film vary in quality. but the best are considerable works of art which bear witness to the artists’ extraordinary ability to come to terms with the possibilities of a new medium. Richard Long’s 10 mile walk, out and back, with the camera shooting six seconds of the landscape ahead at each half-mile interval, or Jan Dibbet’s superb play upon the relationship between flat (vertical) screen and flat (horizontal) beach could only have been realised in this form; they are marvellously precise in their use of the medium.’ Charles Harrison, ‘Art on TV’, p. 30.
Fulton acknowledges the significance to him (and implicitly to Long since it is in a text in a book on Long) of the first moonwalk, inevitably witnessed through the medium of television, and whilst the moon landing was one of the most spectacular and memorable live, international television events, the heroic efforts of the BBC’s outside broadcast unit closer to home were, for viewers in the 1960s, similarly compulsive viewing. The temporal immediacy, and the fact that television is broadcast directly into the home rather than relayed to the cinema makes it an ideal medium for ‘real time’ documentary. Two examples seem of particular relevance to Richard Long. Both were shown over a number of days with daily updates and much publicity.

The first is the climbing of The Old Man of Hoy in 1967. The opening graphics of this documentary, with its bold white plain unserifed lettering superimposed over images of the towering rock and the surrounding inhospitable landscape [figure 74] share a certain similarity with the early presentation of Long’s images. Especially the early commercial postcards with Long’s name superimposed. [figures 75 and 76] These super-imposed graphics give way to the centred caption, neatly beneath the image. Perhaps after the experience of making a number of artist’s books. Generally the works with superimposed captions began as private view cards, other cards or posters. for example ROISIN DUBH A Slow Air. A THOUSAND STONES MOVED ONE STEP FORWARD ALONG A SEVENTY FOUR MILE WALK IN COUNTY CLARE IRELAND 1974 - a printed poster for the Arts Council of Great Britain 1976.434

The second was broadcast in the earliest days of BBC2 and was again shown over a number of days. This event was the archaeological excavation of Silbury Hill. It is remarkable for its finding absolutely nothing and yet being compelling television. Television has become much more sophisticated and its techniques less intrusive, but it is difficult still to capture the immediacy and frankness of these early ‘live’ films because people are now so television literate and so much more aware of how they will look and the potential for such ephemeral documentaries to become archive footage, kept for posterity.

Figure 7.4. From The Old Man of Hoy, BBC Television, 1967.
The body in Land Art: The body that went away and returned
Some North American parallels

Land Art and Body Art are two 'movements' with a similar moment of birth. The first issue of Avalanche Magazine contained references to Land Art in 'Discussions with Heizer, Oppenheim and Smithson'; an interview with Carl Andre; and in an essay on body art by Willoughby Sharp. This article is credited as the first use of the term 'Body Works'. Long's works are referred to in this article. Many of the early Land Art works, for example Oppenheim’s film piece for the Schum Land Art television film, used the body in relation to the land. Sharp comments near the beginning of his article how many artists making 'bodyworks' had previously made Earthworks and how some of the concerns carried over. (This is not surprising since he wrote the definitive accounts of both - he was responsible for assembling the artists in the Cornell Earth Art show, and wrote one of the catalogue essays.)

Aesthetic considerations aside, it is not surprising that under the present repressive socio-economic situation young artists have turned to their most readily available source, themselves, for sculptural material with almost unlimited potential, capable of doing exactly what the artist wants, without the obduracy of inanimate matter. In this respect it is significant that many of the artists under discussion have made earth works, a fact which may partially explain the emphasis on the physical manipulation of preexisting materials. some of these artists have turned from cutting into the land to cutting into their own bodies.

In the American case, as well as the British instance of Long’s work, along the way the close connection of Land Art and Body Art seems to have gone away, been lost or submerged. As I have pointed out, the body is almost entirely absent from Long’s works from the early 1970s to the early 1980s. British works focus on the landscape and objects in it rather than on the body itself. The body seems to be rediscovered in relation to Land Art in the late 1980s and 1990s. John Beardsley’s essay in the catalogue to the American Art in the Twentieth Century Exhibition at the Royal Academy in 1993, discusses the relation of the body in Land Art through a comparison of the works of Ana Mendieta and Charles Simonds.

As well as moving to the use of 'Land Art' as the over all category heading, rather than his previous ‘Earthworks’, the emphasis on the body in Beardsley’s catalogue essay is also something of a departure from his earlier text. Although Beardsley discusses Simond’s work in his earlier Earthworks book, Mendieta doesn’t get a mention either in the first edition (1984) or in the revised edition of 1989.

Why this shift of emphasis? Why does the body reappear? What is the connection between Land Art and Body Art, is it just a coincidence of its 'origins'? They were certainly labels hovering around at the same time, some of which have stuck, become established, others have disappeared. The cover of the issue of Opus International published in March 1971, for example, has six titles on it: Land Art, Minimal Art, Arte Povera, Funk Art, Earth Art and Art Conceptuel, all of which are now familiar except perhaps ‘Funk Art’ a label for West Coast USA assemblage-type work, a designation which also appears as the

435 Avalanche, no 1 (Fall 1970).
Figure 75. Postcard used as a private view card for an exhibition at Konrad Fischer, 1970.
Figure 76. Postcard for an exhibition at the Lisson Gallery, London, 1973.
title of an article in the famous summer 1967 special issue of *Artforum* on American Sculpture, perhaps it's due for a revival. Books such as Lippard's *Overlay* (1983) would seem to suggest that it is something more "primitive" more an expression of a basic human desire for harmony with the earth. This is a bit too "hippy" for the majority of British artists and commentators, who have steered clear of these more "New Age" interpretations of Land Art, preferring those more straightforward, everyday or common-sense responses to the environment.

* * *

In summarising my examination of the body in British Land Art, having looked at the potential for bodies in Land Art and at the bodies that are permitted to make an appearance, I think I could do no better than to restate the observations I made back in 1993 when I first wrote and presented the earlier section of this chapter. Any traces of physicality are figured as voice (evocation), gesture, or trace. The voice, or the voice as closely approximated as possible by electronic or textual representation. The trace of the body, hand print, foot print, sweep of the hand across the wall. The photograph of the body or in object standing in for the body. A work made to human scale.

Having examined the sorts of bodies that are represented I think it is also important to look closely at precisely what kinds of bodies are visible. They are almost exclusively male, representations of the body as the hiker, trekker or explorer. symbolic bodies that make connections with past bodies or the lone figure in the landscape. These bodies, like the body in fragments, trace or evocation, are bodies in the past tense, bodies that have been there but are now absent. The difficulty in experiencing the works as a viewer, and one of the deepest flaws in accounts that claim some kind of unmediated experience of the work, is that the viewer is inevitably in the here and now, and however aware of his or her own thrownness (past) and projection (future) cannot be other than where they are in their body in the world. Without a concept of transcendence, the fleshy encumbrance of the body is always there. I would suggest that its reappearance in the 1994 catalogue of Long's work, bodies of both gender, in a highly varied assortment of shapes and sizes (by no means immaculate specimens of humanity) [figures 77 and 78] is an indication that this presence has been acknowledged. Such a reappearance makes the previous absence all the more poignant, and demands further questioning as to why it was not allowed in the first

---

130 Jean Clay, attempting to delineate the main trends of the 'so-called avant garde' in December 1970 comes up with an interesting variation on the application of terminology to current artistic practices. He uses the term 'Funk Art' but rather than using it to designate the West-Coast American artists that it did in *Artforum*'s article in summer 1967 (James Monte, "Making It" with Funk", *Artforum* Vol. 5 (Summer 1967). pp. 56-59). Clay claims that Beuys and Richard Long are "at the centre of the Funk Art movement". Jean Clay, 'Aspects of bourgeois art: the world as it is', *Studio International* 180 (December 1970), pp. 254-255. p. 255.

140 Presented as 'Making time for space: some possibilities for an analysis of space, gender and the body in the histories and journeys of land art'. see pp. 124-145 above.

place and what have been the consequences of such exclusion. What has been the cost of ignoring the body for so long?

The question is also, inevitably, a political one. It is hardly coincidental that when the talk turns to bodies, or to their exclusion, it turns to politics. Araeen's, Overy's and in a less explicit way, Cooke's critiques of Long's works are highly politicised. As one considers the absence of bodies in British Land Art, and before moving on to discuss landscape in more detail in the next chapter, it is worth considering that the high-point of British landscape gardening, the golden age of Capability Brown, only afforded its uncluttered views at the expense of many real and fleshy bodies, uprooted from their villages as they too were swept away, to give way to the contemplation of distant horizons and long perspectives.
Figure 77. From Richard Long, 1994.
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Figure 78. From Richard Long, 1994.
Land Art Landscape

‘Our landscape-island’

Thus Anna Seward described Britain in a letter to Dr Johnson at the end of the 18th Century. It could be argued that the greatest piece of British Land Art is in fact Britain itself, a conclusion that is confirmed in comments made by Carl Andre and Richard Long in the late 1960s. The following is an extract from an interview with Andre in December 1968 (published in Avalanche, Fall 1970).

A [...]. One of the greatest influences of my own development was the English countryside, for instance, which is one vast earthwork, apart from the explicit earthworks of the various cultures that have occupied it.

Q What parts of England did you visit?

A Oh, from London to Monmouth and Wales, stopping off at Stonehenge.

Q When was that?

A In 1954 and I was very much impressed by it.

Q More than by the American landscape?

A Well, there’s a tremendous difference because the English countryside has been literally cultivated, in every sense of that complex word, and it has been moulded very slowly over at least three thousand years. And its been plastically dealt with by the cultivators and it reflects this kind of softening and curving and rounding, in a way it’s a vast garden.

In the symposium held at Cornell University in conjunction with the Earth exhibition at the Andrew Dickson White Museum of Art at Cornell in 1969, in response to a question about ancient constructions, Richard Long made the following comments, which seem consistent with Andre’s vision of England:

Well, England is covered with huge mounds and converted hills and probably you know Stonehenge, although that is one of the least impressive of all the things. In fact, most of England has had its shape changed - practically the whole place, because it has been ploughed over for centuries - rounded off.

The idea of Britain, particularly England, (and it needs noting that both Long and Andre refer only to England in their remarks) as a vast earthwork, or created landscape is an important feature of British tourism and tourist promotion. Both British travellers and visitors from overseas are wooed with details of the historic significance, past inhabitants and sheer antiquity of the land. The Ordnance Survey map clearly indicates this lived, worked and altered landscape, literally marked on its surface, in for example the crossed swords and date that indicate a battle site, the tower, cross or house symbols that indicate churches, manor houses, stately homes; the earthworks, remains of castles and sites of lost villages. The origins of the Ordnance Survey map were, as the name suggests part of Britain’s defensive military strategy and were first developed during the Napoleonic era. Such details were added to Ordnance Survey maps by the mid-19th century, and from the early 1920s relatively inexpensive ‘Popular and

117 Quoted in Stephen Daniels, ‘The political iconography of woodland’, p. 66.


Tourist Editions' of the Ordnance Survey maps were produced. Although the great nationalistic personifications of Britannia ruling the waves have subsided in post-Empire Britain, such total (and totalitarian?) visions have been replaced with an idea of Britain as some grand scale *gesamtkunstwerk*. A vision that is nowhere more apparent than in the myriad films and television series that use British locations as the site for enacting elaborate set pieces of Englishness.

Land Art has featured strongly in the promotion of Britain and of the British landscape as a place worth visiting and experiencing for oneself. Andy Goldsworthy's work was, for instance, featured in beautiful colourful images in an in-flight magazine for one of the major international airlines. This seems the perfect location for viewing Land Art, in that limbo nowhere of air travel, cramped on a long distance flight, flicking through images that conjure up a powerful image of the often overlooked beauties of the world down there, perhaps reassuring by familiarity, or enticing the traveller to visit such natural sites.

Long and Andre’s comments and the enormous scope of the terms ‘Earth’ and ‘Land’ suggest a total vision of landscape that re-enacts pre-existing modes of viewing. It was the great insight of the English landscape gardeners of the 18th century to extend their vision beyond the confines of the garden and recognise, as William Kent is reputed to have done as he ‘leapt the fence’, that all nature was a garden. The effect was both revelatory and revolutionary, as Geoffrey Jellicoe puts it: ‘Overnight the remnants of the old enclosed paradise garden vanished, and in its place the whole environment became a paradise.’

A total vision of the land is also found in Alfred Watkins’ idiosyncratic but highly influential book *The Old Straight Track* which was first published in 1925. In it, Watkins elaborates his theory that the whole of Britain was traversed by a complex network of paths and tracks, or what he terms ‘ ley lines’. Although the discernment of these ancient ways involved many years of research, he claimed to have stumbled upon his total vision in a single moment of revelation. Although this anecdote does not appear in his book, it was a story he often told in lectures and in conversation, and it is retold in the introduction to the 1974 edition of Watkins’ book in the words of John Michell:

Riding across the hills near Brodwardine in his native country, he pulled up his horse to look out over the landscape below. At that moment he became aware of a network of lines, standing out like glowing wires all over the surface of the country, intersecting at the sites of churches, old stones and other spots of traditional sanctity.

---

11 For a discussion of the leisure use of the Ordnance Survey maps see David Mattless, *The English Outlook: A Mapping of Leisure, 1918–1939* in Nicholas Alfrey and Stephen Daniels, *Mapping the Landscape* (Nottingham: University Art Gallery. Castle Museum, 1990), pp. 28-32, pp. 28-29. The origins of the Ordnance Survey map were, as the name suggests part of Britain’s defensive military strategy and were first developed during the Napoleonic era, for a brief history of the Ordnance Survey see *The Ordnance Survey: Atlas of Great Britain* (The Hamlyn Publishing Group, 1982).


Watkins advocates the use of the one-inch (to the mile) Ordnance Survey map for ley line hunting since it shows the very features that indicate the presence of such a track, its intersections with other tracks and its termination. Stephen Daniels suggested that Watkins' 'vision' may have been much more contemporary and actual, pointing out that Watkins' vision is contemporary with the construction of the national electricity grid. The image of 'glowing wires' in Watkins story seems to add weight to such a supposition. Watkins' vision, whatever its basis in fact, is strangely compelling. Lucy Lippard was clearly impressed and inspired by it during her stay in Britain that resulted in her book Overlay. As well as her mention of Watkins in her book, its title seems to have come from Watkins' description of the British landscape as one containing 'lingering fragments of fact disguised by an overlay of generations of imaginings.'

The book that accompanied Goldsworthy’s exhibition, _Ice and snow drawings and throws_, at the FruitMarket Gallery, Edinburgh in 1992, makes explicit reference to the natural and human development of the landscape in terms of its geography, geology and topography. It is clear from this account that the British landscape and certain regions in particular underwent vast changes at particular points in the past, often moments of political, social and economic upheaval. The Enclosures that followed farming technique innovation and the landscaping of parks in the 18th century are two of the most well-known examples. The extent of such changes is indicated in the claim that 'In his over 200 parks. Capability Brown “redesigned” almost the whole of southern and central England.' Less well-known and talked of, in England at least, is the devastating effect of the clearances in Scotland, and of the deforestation of much of the North of England and Scotland. A work by hermann de vries, on show in his exhibition at the Royal Botanic Garden Edinburgh in 1992 and an artist’s book both entitled

---

449 Conversation with Stephen Daniels, Leeds, 10.5.93
451 Alfred Watkins, Watson’s introduction to _The Old Straight Track_ (1st published 1925) ibid. p. xix.
453 Paul Nesbitt explains hermann de vries’ rejection of capital letters, quoting the artist himself:

> His view of our relationship with nature is beautifully expressed by his rejection of capital letters, which he has not used for over twenty years "it is a kind of anti-hierarchic expression, it’s the same in nature: every part of it has its own function, so why should a tree be more important that a diatom?"

from the introduction to hermann de vries, exhibition catalogue published by the Royal Botanic Garden Edinburgh on the occasion of the exhibition ‘documents of a stream, the real works 1970-1992’, Inverleith House, 16 August - 27 September, and the conference ‘Order, Chaos and Creativity’ 29 and 30 August 1992. Edinburgh 1992 (unpaginated). In keeping with this, the entire catalogue is printed without the use of capital letters, including the following quotation. Whilst de vries’ explanation may appeal to Nesbitt, de vries is not alone in this strategy. it is often seen in art publications from the Netherlands, for example the exhibition catalogue _Made by Sculptors_, quoted at the beginning of my chapter _Land Art Sculpture_, p. 39.
in memory of the scottish forests poignantly bore witness to some of these changes by listing the forests that had disappeared. In a published conversation in 1991 de vries said of this work:

after the occupation of scotland by the english many forests were felled for their wood, and for charcoal with which to smelt iron ore. I believe that near loch marcc there were three furnaces which used 150 hectares of mature forest each year. when I came to scotland for the first time I saw on the maps the names of many forests, but when I visited these places. I found not forest, but moorland, or grazing land. realizing the impoverishment of this landscape, I studied all the topographical maps and made the text of a book ‘in memory of the scottish forests’, containing the names of all those lost forests.

A similar story is told in the book documenting the Grizedale Forest project. The opening paragraphs of lain McLean’s ‘The Grizedale Experience’ attest to changes in the Lake District landscape that are both surprisingly ancient, and thought-provokingly recent:

If this story were simply about landmarks in history, like so many notches on a stick, it would begin when Norsemen settled in “Pig-valley” (or “Grize-Dale”), in the 9th century AD. For it was then that great tracts of virgin forest were cleared to make way for agriculture. Later, the effects of charcoal burning, iron smelting and the timber industry, would leave only 1200 acres of woodland from a forest that once covered the entire Furness peninsula between Lake Windermere and Coniston Water.

If this were an account of reafforestation of the area, it would not begin until 1936, the year the Forestry Commission first acquired the Grizedale Estate from Harold Brocklebank - the Liverpool ship owner and Cunard tycoon.

McLean’s potted history is typical of the kind of complex succession of land use and ownership that has shaped the appearance of Britain. Britain’s is an evidently worked landscape, an historical landscape, and books such as Watkins’ Old Straight Track have tried to bring some of this out. On the subject of the recentness of the appreciation of the rural landscape and its benefits. Martin J Weiner’s book English Culture and the Decline of the Industrial Spirit 1850-1980 offers some fascinating insights. He contrasts the growing ‘myth of an England essentially rural and essentially unchanging’ with the vision it supplanted of Britain as ‘the Workshop of the World’. He argues that the popularisation of the rural myth has corresponded with Britain’s decline as an industrial super power. The political efficacy of a vision that crosses political lines is also identified by Wiener as one of the appealing features of this myth. The shift in vision is clearly demonstrated in McLean’s quotation above, but it is also worth noting the powerful ambivalence of the image of the forest, at once ancient, unchanging and rural and by contrast the driving force of industry, Empire and manufacture. This duality is also visible to visitors to the other major forest sculpture trail in Britain in the Forest of Dean. There, one is as likely

---

154 The work included in the exhibition was in memory of the scottish forests 1986-1992 (wall installation) (charcoal on wall) 420 x 600 cm. ‘list of works in the exhibition’ in herman de vries. ibid.
158 ibid p. 55
159 ibid. p. 58
to come across the site of old mining activities, iron or charcoal workings or the routes of railway lines as the more rural and natural things one expects to find in a forest.

The connection of forest or woodland and shipping in McLean's account is also not untypical, as Stephen Daniel's essay on 'The political iconography of woodland' brings out, a text I will return to below. The British Landscape has also featured dominantly at times of war and international conflict During the Napoleonic Wars and during the World Wars of the 20th century in particular, travel and tourism in Britain were particularly encouraged and promoted. Despite the removal of road signs and other indications of location that might have helped foreign invaders, tourist maps appear to have been published throughout the Second World War for a domestic audience.642

Travel writings are also abundant from the 18th century up to the present day. The landscape of the imagination, to be read from the pages of a book in the comfort of your own home is as important a construction of the British landscape as its physical and economic manipulation. This continues into the age of television where trips to 'Heartbeat Country', 'Lovejoy Country' or 'Emmerdale Country' are advertised by coach firms offering real encounters to match the ones seen in the television series of these names. Whilst an influx of tourists is desirable from the point of view of the local economy, particularly in places where local industry has declined or disappeared, there is also a degree of snobbery that surrounds these new-found identifications of previously relatively 'unspoilt' or less visited beautyspots. (It is surprisingly difficult to write even the most cursory account of this phenomenon without finding oneself using the evocative and problematic language of aesthetics and its accompanying moral imperative. Terms like 'beauty' and 'unspoilt' are redolent with centuries of aesthetic debate and the weight of subjective judgement) There is clearly still a class system of landscapes, even in the new television locations, that resonates with the observations of that quintessential British landscape designer/revealer, William Wordsworth. Two letters from 1844 expressing Wordsworth's concerns for the Lake District when an extension of the railway into the area was proposed are discussed in an essay by John Frow in October in 1991. Frow quotes from one of them:

[...]
good is not to be obtained by transferring at once uneducated persons in large bodies to particular spots, where the combinations of natural objects are such as would afford the greatest pleasure to those who have been in the habit of observing and studying the peculiar character of such scenes, and how they differ one from another. Instead of tempting artisans and laborers, and the humbler classes of shopkeepers, to ramble to a distance, let us rather look with lively sympathy upon persons in that condition, when, upon a holiday, or on the Sunday after having attended divine worship, they make little excursions with their wives and children among neighboring fields, whither the whole of each family might stroll, or be conveyed at much less cost than would be required to take a single individual of the number to the shores of Windermere by the cheapest conveyance. It is in some such way as this only, that persons who much labor daily with their hands for bread in large towns, or are subject to confinement

642 The 3 miles to 1 inch Road Atlas of Great Britain (for Motoring, Cycling and Hiking), published by W. and A. K. Johnston and G. W. Bacon Ltd., Edinburgh and London was first published in 1940 and reprinted three times in 1941; and in 1942, 1943, 1944 and 1945. (This information is from the fifth edition reprint of 1965).
through the week, can be trained to a profitable intercourse with nature where she is the most

After discussing the concept of cultural capital (‘taste’) that makes itself apparent in these letters, Frow goes on to observe:

The irony is, however, that it is Wordsworth himself who had issued the invitation, who has already educated the vulgar crowd to the beauties of the Lake District, and whose poems have acted as a sort of tourist brochure | ... | Touristic shame and the opposition of an authentic to an inauthentic gaze work to repress an understanding of the investments (both financial and moral) that the circulation of cultural capital makes possible.\footnote{John Frow, ibid., p. 149. Frow’s October essay examines the rhetoric of tourism. Its discussion of the problems of identifying and distinguishing ‘radical’ from ‘conservative’ critiques or appreciation of tourism highlights a similar dilemma to the one identified by Alex Potts in attempting to analyse a politics of landscape ideology and use in his essay ‘Constable Country between the Wars.’ The problem as Frow perceives it is that a critique of tourism easily becomes complicit with the snobbery it condemns.}

Popularisation and education is thus a double-edged sword, and it is no doubt one that British Land Art turns upon. On the one hand there is the quintessential landscape vision whose familiarity and longevity give an aura of authenticity to the work, and at the same time the desire to hold this work up as radical and vanguard art, as something elite and difficult to understand. There is always an awareness of the delicate balance between the public and educational role of such organisations as Grizedale Forest and their potential to ‘fall’ into being merely a branch of the leisure industry. This is an observation that was made in the introduction to The Unpainted Landscape, a book and exhibition that was insistent in its attempt to be a ‘highbrow’ intellectual art event.

We wanted to suggest an underlying theoretical approach, a hardness of purpose, and with such intention we invited these writers and critics. Recent crops of exhibitions and essays have done very little to examine the procedural basis from which the work of many of these artists arises. Often they have failed to differentiate the approach of various artists, and have preferred instead the cultural tokenism of the presence of artists in general. The aspirations of the ecology movement may do almost nothing to lift this work from the coffee-table or to prevent its association with aspects of the leisure industry.\footnote{Simon Cutts, ‘Notes on The Unpainted Landscape’, in The Unpainted Landscape (Coracle Press, London; Graeme Murray Gallery, Edinburgh; Scottish Arts Council, Edinburgh: 1987), pp. 9-10.}

The overt popularity of Goldsworthy’s work in particular has proved a stumbling block in getting recognition for the less sublime and beautiful of its products (and perhaps the more interesting of the works). This seems to have led to an emphasis on the validation of the unique or rare pieces of the work, the signed and certified unique prints and certified sculptures, that can be possessed. When anyone can own a Goldsworthy on a postage stamp, greeting card or postcard, or a copy of a large run artists’ book by Richard Long, the real ‘cultural capital’ lies in possessing the most limited items. The ‘public freehold’ and ‘art owned by anyone who can perceive it’ rhetoric of the early days of Long and Fulton’s
work has long gone from Land Art’s vocabulary. A shift that seems matched by one away from works and walks exclusively in public, open land to works began, focused upon or executed exclusively on privately owned land.

The content and presentation of Goldsworthy’s ICE and SNOW drawings and THROWS was unlike much of the work which has made Goldsworthy extremely popular. In spite of, or perhaps because of this, this event provides a useful site for an investigation of some of the enduring themes of British Land Art and of a British tradition of involvement in the landscape. In addition to the exhibition itself, the accompanying events raised many provocative issues. Above all the book that accompanied the show approached the work from the point of viewing the landscape as a temporal process and accumulation rather than as a ‘natural’ given. In some ways this is a body of British Land Art that most closely shares interests with the work of the seminal figure of American Earth Art, Robert Smithson, particularly in its concerns with sedimentation, with processes that aren’t necessarily pleasing to look at, and with Time. Goldsworthy’s work is both a demonstration of and a departure from some of the key tenets of British Land Art. It emphasises the dominance of aesthetic concerns, despite its protestations of practicality and simplicity. The appeal of much of this work has lain in its often unacknowledged play with picturesque and sublime effects, the way it mimics and repeats representations of landscape which are already familiar and legitimated in other contexts. Goldsworthy’s show demonstrated the importance of the packaging and presentation of the work, the way it is explained and validated. Goldsworthy has picked up his credentials by a much more populist route than Long. In some circles Goldsworthy was known as ‘the artist who was on ‘Blue Peter’’. He has also gained a more public image than Long through his appearances in public workshops and in public places such as his ‘residency’ on Hampstead Heath jointly organised by Common Ground and the Artangel Trust from December 1985 to January 1986.

The account of this residency by Sue Clifford and Angela King of Common Ground points out some of the prohibitions against the unrestricted freedom of the countryside that is so dominant in Long’s work and statements. Clifford and King write: ‘[....] Andy himself was surprised to discover that his feeling of freedom there [on Hampstead Heath] far outstripped that of working in ‘open country’ where the territoriality of land holders and gamekeepers often impose demanding constraints.’ On Hampstead Heath Goldsworthy made a number of works using ice, photographs documenting the work in the 1990 Hand to Earth catalogue show the construction and untimely collapse of an ice arch [figure 79]. Ice also featured strongly in the 1992 exhibition at the Fruit Market gallery, although here it was the residue of the ice melting that produced the work.

465 This is how he was described to me when I enquired about information on his work in the shop at the Royal Botanic Gardens in Edinburgh in March 1992.
Ice workshop Collapsing

Figure 79.
Figure 80. Andy Goldsworthy. From *Ice and Snow Drawings*, 1992.
Hazel stick throws.
There were two sets of works on show in the Fruit Market exhibition. The first, the Ice and Snow drawings were made by various meltings of ice and snow mixed with natural components such as soil, fruit juices or animal blood. [figure 80] The second group were photographs of the artist throwing quantities of various things: leaves, sticks, stones, sand, photographed after the artist had propelled them into the air so that they appear in mid-air in the photographs. [figure 81] The show was part of the Edinburgh International Festival and there were accompanying events, including lectures at the FruitMarket gallery, a film produced as a French and British collaboration, on show as part of the Film Festival at the Filmhouse, another art exhibition along ‘Land Art’ lines of the work of herman de vries and a conference on complementary themes organised by Interalia, at the Royal Botanic Garden Edinburgh, at which Andy Goldsworthy spoke about his work.

For those acquainted with the kind of work for which Goldsworthy has become famous, the colourful and elegant arrangements of petals, stones, leaves, twigs or other natural objects, photographed and framed, or in coffee table books and on greetings cards, the Ice and Snow Drawings and Throws must have seemed anomalous or disconcerting. They have an uneasy messiness about them, and clearly the intellectual idea and the execution are crucial to understanding what one is looking at. Many of Goldsworthy’s more decorative pieces are instantly legible or reveal the secret of their making on closer scrutiny of the image and this decoding is part of their popular appeal. These works however, the ice and snow drawings in particular, seem stubbornly illegible, only intelligible with more (written or spoken) information. What seems lacking in these works is the organising logic of geometry or form. The marks appear irrational, chaotic, and it is to this aspect and the ideas of chaos that one of the authors of the exhibition catalogue (and organiser of the Interalia conference on ‘Order, Chaos and Creativity’ held at the Royal Botanic Gardens, Edinburgh) turns to give an account of the work. Richard Bright’s essay ‘The Energy of Chaos’. As well as writing by Goldsworthy, the catalogue includes an essay by Paul Nesbitt entitled ‘The Making of Landscape’, which compares the natural geologic, climatic and human processes that have played a part in the making of the landscape with the processes involved in the making of Goldsworthy’s works. His Ice and Snow drawings are construed as landscapes. Nesbitt describes the way in which the meltwaters of the snowballs buckle and indent the paper into contours, valleys and rises. The description of the landscape becomes an extended metaphor for a description of Goldsworthy’s drawings. Goldsworthy is making landscapes.

The inversion implied in this extended metaphor, that Goldsworthy produces landscapes rather than produces work from the landscape, offers a useful insight into one of the key strategies of Land Art. Land Art draws attention to the landscape from which and/or in which it is made. The work calls the landscape into being. And since landscape is a human construction derived from the natural world, the activity of the Land Artists is precisely this, fabricating landscapes. What is produced is not so much the Art - although that is what one first perceives - but the Land or Landscape. As Jonathan Williams observes in the title of his essay for The Unpainted Landscape book, ‘Nature Knows Nothing of What
We Call Landscape'. Landscape is a human and humanised construction. He might have added that what he assumed a prior reality - 'Nature' - is too a human construction.

Land Art is a technique of revealing, a means of drawing attention to and rendering present aspects of natural phenomena which are called upon to form landscape or nature. In this way, Lucy Lippard’s book Overlay could itself be designated a key work of Land Art, since the vision that allows the landscape to appear as (or be transformed into) Land Art is facilitated by just this kind of rhetoric. Land Art depends on being able to motivate landscape (a pre-existing construction of worked, cultivated and visualised nature) and its pleasurable and practical use into the service of (vanguard, high, important, gallery) Art. Its subsequent success in broader cultural, social and economic terms, depends upon its ability to refer back to things outside of the sequestered world of art and to be motivated for other purposes. It has to be seen as conferring status on its source and origin, not merely the British artist who produced it, but the British Landscape and culture that inspired it.

Many definitions of Land Art seek to define it, and its differences from sculpture in the landscape, in terms of its materials or methods. A common formula is that landscape sculpture is in the landscape whereas Land Art is both in and of the landscape, using its physical components. The formula proposed above avoids this distinction by proposing an art that foregrounds the natural or the landscape rather than uses them as a backdrop or setting. Henry Moore is famous for claiming that he felt the best location for his sculptures was in the open air in the landscape. commenting:

Sculpture is an art of the open air daylight. Sunlight is necessary to it and for me it’s best setting and complement is nature. I would rather have a piece of my sculpture in a landscape, almost any landscape than in or at the most beautiful building I know.467

Nevertheless, Moore’s sculptures are never the occasion for a landscape, the sculpture, its form and subject matter, is always foregrounded. The foregrounding of the (British) landscape is one of the dominant features of British Land Art, particularly when it is used for foreign or domestic promotional purposes.

There appear to be two strands of Land Art promotion that could be seen to correspond to what I shall refer to as Foreign and Domestic policies. As far as Land Art Foreign policy is concerned the aim is (via such organisations as the British Council, Arts Council and private charitable trusts such as the Henry Moore Trust) to promote internationally the continued vitality of British Art and by association Britain more generally, as Paul Overy describes in his article ‘Lions and Unicorns: The Britishness of Postwar British Sculpture’, Art in America (September 1991), p. 106. This imperative is clearly stated in the words of a reviewer writing in 1946:

---

It may be that we shall shed within the next decade or two some of the political commitments of a great world power, but I believe that culturally we may well come to hold a position of leadership we have never previously known, as the artistic centre of the world.

Domestic Land Art has a much less explicit and more sinister function (through such bodies as Common Ground, commissioning organisations, individual galleries and individuals). However democratic and populist its stated agenda, the impetus behind such projects seems to be to console and control.

The commissioning organisations that specialise in commissioning outdoor sculptures and sculpture projects often have a green or environmental agenda. Sustrans (Sustainable Transport) has been active in opening up stretches of disused railway line as cycle tracks. It has also commissioned a number of major works of sculpture for sites along the tracks. The most well-known artists who have produced works are perhaps Andy Goldsworthy and David Kemp. Although an admirable agenda, it is clear that making a few cycle tracks is not going to seriously alter government policy on transport, and that, even if it did it would take more than education and a few interesting sculptures to change the whole cultural and social investment in the motor car. The car has become a symbol of freedom, individuality and, rather ironically, access to the landscape and countryside. It was the motoring industry, and particularly its allied industries such as the fuel industry that promoted the connection of enjoyment of landscape and the motor car, most famously Shell Oil who commissioned leading British vanguard artists to design their maps and guide books from the 1930s. Undoing this amount of cultural baggage is probably a far more difficult task than lobbying governments to adopt a more ‘green’ agenda.

Common Ground, another leading ‘environmental’ arts commissioning body has initiated a range of community and public art works in the landscape. Many of Common Ground’s projects are sited in rural areas of economic deprivation. John Maine’s project on the Island of Portland for example made use of

---


603 Sustrans is based in Bristol and was founded in 1980.

604 Richard Long was mentioned in a newspaper article about sculpture along Sustrans’ cycle trails. The last paragraph of which reads: ‘One artist she [Katy Hallett, responsible for the Bristol cycle route] is unlikely to persuade to sculpt for the path is Richard Long. The British sculptor, who lives in Bristol and uses mud from the Avon to create the busy circles of hand-prints in his compositions, is, coincidentally, a regular cyclist along the route. While happily freewheeling down a track built over years by Sustrans’ volunteers on their hands and knees, Long declined the invitation to sculpt a piece for it. The path itself is a sculpture, was his comment.’ Dayle Alberge. ‘Where sculpture is good for you’. The Independent, 11 February 1992.

605 Fay Godwin neatly analyses the adoption of Green credentials by the Tory government between 1981 and 1989 by quoting three statements made by Margaret Thatcher at the beginning of Godwin’s book Our Forbidden Land (London: Jonathan Cape, 1990):

‘When you’ve spent half your political life dealing with humdrum issues like the environment, it’s exciting to have a real crisis on your hands.’ Margaret Thatcher, 1981, at the time of the Falklands War.

‘The core of Tory philosophy and the case for protecting the environment are the same: no generation has a freehold on this earth; all we have is a life tenancy with a full repairing lease and this Government intends to meet the terms of that lease in full.’ Margaret Thatcher, 1988 Conservative Party Conference.

‘We Conservatives are not merely friends of the earth, we are its guardians and trustees.’ Margaret Thatcher, 1989, being interviewed by Michael Buerk on Nature, BBC2.

It is clear that the adoption of such policies was motivated by pragmatism rather than principle.
local school children and people doing community service to help with the project, officially. How much these people actually contributed and how much this was actually a public-relations exercise to ensure the acceptance of the sculpture is impossible accurately to ascertain. What was clear from the artist's own account of the project is the shadow of the silent quarries on the island from which the stones for the piece were found and which provided work for generations of people living in the area. Maine had previously worked for sustained periods at Portland.\footnote{In 1980 Bryan Robertson wrote: 'For the past five years Maine has worked for long periods with the masons at the Portland stone quarries in Dorset.' 'The Idea of a Sculpture Park' in \textit{Yorkshire Sculpture Park. Bretton Hall College} (Wakefield: Yorkshire Sculpture Park, 1980) (unpaginated).} He recounted in a gallery talk given in 1992\footnote{at the Mead Gallery, University of Warwick, Coventry, in conjunction with the South Bank (London) touring exhibition \textit{From Art to Archaeology}, that included works by Maine.} how the old quarrymen could tell by looking at each fragment of stone exactly where in the quarry it had come from as well as naming it according to a rich vocabulary of terms for the various cuts and types of stones. This worked landscape that provided the stones to build buildings that symbolise Britain such as Westminster Abbey, is now empty of productive industry. The Portland Sculpture Project and individual commissioned works like Maine's are no substitute for such activity. They seem to be projects to pacify and appease the public, ease the consciences of the more affluent and make life in Britain more palatable.

Cynical as this sounds, such strategies share similarities with two theses about older landscape art. The vision of Barrell's \textit{Dark Side of the Landscape}, is a visualising of rural poverty exhibited for the wealthy, idealising poverty as an aspect of the picturesque and thereby making it more palatable and easier to ignore. Images of peaceable poverty offered reassurance in a time when a land owning elite was threatened by growing unrest and social upheaval. Andrew Hemingway's tracing of the Norwich School of painters through their cosmopolitan exhibition and display in London posits Landscape art as a city art. In the contemporary situation, Land Art clearly had a role to play both in Thatcher's vision of a more open and self-motivated society and Major's 'classless society', as well as in the less (but increasingly) mainstream politics of environmental and green movements. Whereas Norwich School landscape art was city art, contemporary British Land Art is regional art or art of the regions. It reinforces a strong regionalist agenda. A similar agenda seems at work in Land Art's regional promotion as in the supplanting of 'BBC English' by local accents on television.

Consider for example the list of principal group exhibitions listed in the biography of the catalogue accompanying Richard Long's exhibition in Rome in 1994. Of the 66 exhibitions listed that were staged in the British Isles, 15 had a 'Land Art' or landscape agenda or title, the remainder were mainly group exhibitions of British Sculpture or sculpture in a particular collection, (for example \textit{Starlit Waters}, a retrospective of 20 years of British sculpture in an international context, at the then new Tate Gallery Liverpool in 1988 or exhibitions of artists at d'Ollay's, Long's London dealer). Of those 15, 14 were held outside London. As well as noting that the majority of these type of exhibitions were held outside the capital, it is also worth observing that the majority of the artists involved in them live and work
outside London. In particular, many exhibitions and artist's homes are in the South West of England (Bristol, Exeter and Cornwall), and in Yorkshire, Wales and Scotland, places associated with a strong regional identity and acknowledged as having a desire for some kind of autonomy or separation from London/South Eastern domination. Although they may have connections with the 'centre' - as a place to undertake their studies and for gallery representations for example - it is clearly important that these are not 'London' artists and that they do not live in the capital. The main figures, and particularly that index of British Land Art, Richard Long, are dispatched via the major galleries and collections from the capital to give legitimacy to the regional instances of Land Art. The presence of a Richard Long work in any show acts to confer importance on the other works in the show and identify them with the high ground of Land Art and leading British Sculpture. Gradually other artists' works and presence are able to do this, notably David Nash, Andy Goldsworthy and John Maine. Nash and Maine acquired their indexical status by being the first sculptors in residence at the Sculpture Parks and Trails set up in 1977. Nash at Grizedale, Maine at the Yorkshire Sculpture Park. The centre is still affirmed, the influence goes on expanding.

Clearly, Land Art is very useful. Big name products like Long are promoted abroad, it is also useful at home. It’s cheap, it doesn’t have to be maintained, it provides commissions without too much financial risk and it can easily be given environmental and community credentials. It organises people's use of the land and enables land to be open to the public (fulfilling government policy for greater access) and yet policing and controlling that use. Grizedale Forest is a key example of this where fears on the part of the foresters and forestry commission about the consequences of greater public access to the forest were alleviated by routing easily followed paths, producing maps and guides and a programme of organised events and activities. Car parks and access points, particularly the shop, gallery, café and children's play area tend to concentrate visitors into particular areas without the strategy appearing too coercive. Once in the Forest visitors are often too busy looking for sculpture to wander into the forestry or wildlife areas.

Such ‘domestic policy’ Land Art seems to have emerged around a time of political crisis and institutional questioning in the arts. During the early 1970s questioning of the existing arrangements for arts funding, education and organisation was voiced in the leading British art journal Studio International. As well as articles examining the situation in Britain, there were articles looking at the situation further afield, particularly the considered ‘enlightened’ funding of the arts in the Netherlands. In particular their ‘1%-arrangement’, subsequently imitated in other European

---

British outdoor sculpture projects in the late 1960s and early 1970s had been largely urban based, some continuing the style of placement pioneered in the new towns, others more temporary events. For example the exhibition of sculpture in Coventry Cathedral in 1968, that was accompanied by a conference entitled ‘People and Cities’, and the Stuyvesant Foundation City Sculpture Project of 1972, in which sculptures were sited in city locations around Britain. British art journalism of this period shows a keen interest in outdoor and public projects elsewhere in Europe, and again the Netherlands featured strongly. In particular the 1971 manifestation Sonsbeek 71 in Arnhem, Holland attracted British interest and can be seen as one of the models for sculpture project activities in Britain.

The exhibition Sonsbeek 71 was one in a series of sculpture exhibitions held in the park in Arnhem in Holland. The previous exhibitions had displayed works at various locations in the park and in pavilions, and were similar to the Battersea Park sculpture exhibitions held in Britain from 1948. However ‘This time Sonsbeek is different’ as the preface to the exhibition explains. ‘We could of course, have mounted another exhibition according to the now familiar pattern: sculptures in the beautiful surroundings of the park.’ But no. Professor P. Sanders goes on to state:

There is none of this in Sonsbeek 71. The organizers [...] have not taken the easy way out. [...] Sonsbeek 71 does not fit in with the usual forms of mounting an exhibition. Sonsbeek 71 is truly a Sonsbeek beyond the pale. It is a manifestation that oversteps the mark of the staple exhibition. It even extends far beyond the city of Arnhem, although the Sonsbeek park is still the heart of the manifestation.

Following this bold introduction, the writer goes on to discuss the document one is reading and in which these words are published:

The catalogue shows what Sonsbeek 71 is all about, so there is no need for me to go into details here.

The writer then goes on to stress aspects of Sonsbeek which it shares with other contemporary and subsequent exhibitions: the open-endedness of the event, the fact that ‘once it is opened, it cannot be considered complete’ and the importance of the active role and involvement of the visitor to the

177 A few European Countries have now also established something that is known in the Netherlands as the 1%-arrangement. Of all new buildings put up by the State, 1% of the cost of construction may go to the application of art. This is not a law, it is a possibility, mainly used in relation to University buildings, schools, hospitals and representative government buildings. R. W. D. Oexnaar, ibid., p. 204.
178 for an account of both Coventry and Stuyvesant initiatives see: Lewis Biggs, ‘Open Air Sculpture in Britain: Twentieth Century Developments’. in A Sense of Place, Sculpture in Landscape, eds. Peter Davies and Tony Knipe (Sunderland: Sunderland Arts Centre Ltd.; Cullfrith Gallery, Cullfrith Press (no. 73), 1984), pp. 32-33. For a contemporary assessment of the Stuyvesant Foundation City Art Project see Studio International, Vol. 184, No. 946 (July/August 1972).
180 ibid.
181 ibid.
exhibition. The preface ends by stating: ‘Sonsbeek beyond the pale asks you, as a visitor, to approach
this experiment without prejudice. [...] Sonsbeek 71 is an adventure both for you and for us.”

The exhibition involved artists and works dispersed throughout the neighbouring regions. Reviewing the
exhibition in Studio International, Carel Blotkamp claimed that in order to see everything, the visitor
would have to travel at least 1000 kilometres. Back in the park, three inflatable pavilions housed the
nerve centres of the exhibition - an information room, a debating room and a video studio. Events and
information were conveyed by television, telephone and telex connected to five other cities. In addition
the exhibition extended itself through the printed media with announcements and actual works being
printed in newspapers and weekly publications, all of which reached a far larger contemporary audience
than actually attended the exhibition manifestation itself. The exhibition was an innovative combination
of technology and natural setting, information, planned events and improvisation, that provides a
defining milieu for much of the early experimental and experiential Land Art projects by artists such as
Long, Brown, Dibbets, Andre and Oppenheim.

By the late 1970s in Britain, exhibitions such as ‘Art for Whom’ at the Serpentine Gallery
and ‘Art for Society’ at the Whitechapel Gallery set the tone. There was clearly a problem. 1976 had seen the
British media circus of the Carl Andre ‘Bricks Affair’, an event whose reverberations both on the subject
of arts funding and the incomprehensibility of ‘modern art’ continue to the present. In February 1978
Studio International dedicated an entire issue to present an edited transcript of a conference held at the
ICA London on 10-12 February 1978 entitled ‘The State of British Art: A Debate’. Some of the terms of
the debate are summed up in a perusal of the titles of the conference sessions: The crisis in
Professionalism, Who Needs Training?, The Multinational Style, Why Not Popular? and Images of
People. In the previous year an exhibition of outdoor sculpture had demonstrated both the strength
and variety of contemporary British sculpture and the limitations of the existing provision for sculpture
exhibition.

The ‘Silver Jubilee Exhibition of Contemporary British Sculpture’ exhibition at Battersea Park, London
included works by 49 British sculptors. The tone of the exhibition catalogue is shot through with a kind
of grudging attitude towards the very kind of government and arts bodies that funded the exhibition (in
this case the London Celebrations Committee for The Queen’s Silver Jubilee, the GLC and the Arts
Council of Great Britain), giving the impression that this is an exhibition that almost talks itself out of

483 Ibid.
485 Art for Whom (London: The Serpentine Gallery, 22 April - 14 May. The Arts Council of Great
Britain, artists selected by Richard Cork.
486 Art for Society (London: Whitechapel Art Gallery), selected by Caroline Tisdall
488 For more on art controversies in the 1970s see Caroline Tisdall, ‘Art Controversies of the Seventies’
existence. All three of the major catalogue essays contain attacks on the state of British Art or of some aspect of contemporary art. For example, William Packer concludes his contribution with the following:

The Battersea Park series of exhibitions, with its official patronage and semi-official status, could be seen as one such instrument provided by ‗them‘ to support ‗us‘, for the good of the community and, of course, of art. But we would do well to remember, in our crumbling welfare state that art is a difficult and even antisocial profession, and, in the minds of many, a troublesome slut of a mistress who is no better than she ought to be. Why they should do anything to help her the public cannot begin to imagine.

Of course any half-decent society will support art and those who serve her; but artists have no right to demand that it shall, nor to rely on practical support being forthcoming before they set to work. The artist must take his chance in the world or he is no artist at all, and leave it to society to educate itself to do the decent thing and make an honest man of him.  

In retrospect it is easy to discern the rhetoric of burgeoning Thatcherism, or rather of the popular beliefs that sustained her leadership for so long, for example, the withdrawing of state involvement in providing for ‗society‘ as some unified whole and the emphasis on self-reliance and personal responsibility.

Bryan Robertson’s complaint is against certain contemporary artistic practices, namely those labelled ‗Conceptual‘. He takes a snipe at Long’s work without naming him, but there is no mistaking at whom the comments are directed:

[...] conceptual art is partly puritan and intellectual idealism but can lapse into the presentation of a few signs of artistic sensibility, without a work of art. If the tonic agent in the best art of this century is freedom from nostalgia, e.g. Matisse, Brancusi. I’m at a loss when confronted by Wordsworthian sermons in sticks and stones placed at my feet by a man who likes walking. I think back uneasily to Victorian ladies who pressed flowers and leaves in books, as keepsakes.  

The catalogue reads as a text that undermines the show. Throughout the catalogue there seems more mention of artists not in the show than of those included. Both Tucker and Long occur in the texts as key figures, yet are absent from the exhibition. There is discussion of American and European counterparts and influences. Barry Martin mentions both Dutch and American attitudes towards sculpture in public spaces to contrast them with the problematic role sculpture plays in such settings in Britain. Similarly, discussing the state of art criticism, Martin compares British art critics unfavourably with their American counterparts:

Since much sculpture has been stripped of any literary or figurative connotations the artist has come more and more to rely on the critic to explain his sculpture to the public. Most contemporary British critics have failed the artist in this respect and arc neither willing to create nor capable of encouraging creative debate about the subject. It is not surprising that many British artists envy their American counterparts whose activities are monitored.

---


890 Tucker had just left Britain for North America after expressing his disillusionment with the British art establishment. see Peter Fuller. ‘Troubles with British Art Now‘ in Artforum (April 1977), p 43.
supported and willed to challenging proportions by informed, enthusiastic and sometimes visionary criticism, even if the enthusiasm may be for someone else's work. 491

The issue of space dominates the final section of Martin's essay, most crucially for my discussion here he poses the question 'what happens to contemporary sculpture once it has been made?' He points out that 'A number of large works in the present show have been lying idle for a number of years.' Clearly the Silver Jubilee exhibition raised issues not only about the ideological place of sculpture in society but also about its physical place. The two issues are clearly related, as contemporary scandals had demonstrated. Large sections of 'society' - at least those that could be marshalled into action by the press - thought there was no place for a great deal of contemporary art anywhere in the public realm, and certainly that no public money should be spent on it. After 1977 for an increasing number of large scale sculpture and sculpture commissions the solution to a lack of space has been to dump it in vast tracts of rural space known as Sculpture Parks, Walks or Trails. These have become semi-permanent storage sites for many large scale works of sculpture. Whilst the problems of vandalism and maintenance have not been entirely absent, they have, in the case of vandalism, not been so visible since these sites are usually remote, and in the case of maintenance often elided by calling in the useful Land Art rhetoric of temporality, 'natural' life span and reclamation by natural processes (i.e. being left to rot, eaten by animals, or fall apart and so on).

The Silver Jubilee exhibition catalogue is far from a confident celebration of British Sculpture. Rather it is a begrudging, cynical and pessimistic vision full of sentiments such as 'Put up and shut up' or 'Not bad considering' or Packer's 'No better than she [sic] ought to be'. Artists, Art Critics and Arts funding bodies all come in for criticism. The effect is only alleviated by attempts at positive summing up sections in each text. It is clear that by 1977 a Battersea Park 'Sculpture for All' exhibition can no longer be made unproblematically. Sculpture and the 'society' it is 'for' have changed, or maybe the perception of that role by those that organise exhibitions has changed. There seems, on the part of the three contributors to the catalogue, an awareness that public art exhibitions can no longer be the well-meaning confident gestures of an elite class who possess finely tuned aesthetic judgement and feel confident to decide what is good art and what art is good for the public. The catalogue thus expresses some of the uncertainties, and a degree of despondency, on the part of the British art establishment.

The period 1977-1978 represents the hiatus in a crisis in public art and its mission, purpose and function in Britain. The Silver Jubilee Exhibition of Sculpture marked a turning point. From that point policy and commissioning changed. It is a crisis out of which comes a new attitude and the inexorable rise of Domestic Policy Land Art. Both the Yorkshire Sculpture Park and the Grizedale Sculpture Trail began in 1977, and the Scottish Sculpture Trust was set up in 1978. In spring 1977, a few months before the Silver Jubilee exhibition opened, Studio International produced a special issue devoted to 'Art

491 Barry Martin, 'Developments in the Sixties and Seventies' in Silver Jubilee Exhibition of Contemporary British Sculpture.
Outdoors and in 1980 a booklet was produced to document the first few projects at the Yorkshire Sculpture Park and to set out its aims and plans for development. The booklet included an essay by Bryan Robertson whose earlier essay for the Silver Jubilee Exhibition of Sculpture is referred to in the booklet (and who had, of course, initiated the New Generation exhibitions back in 1965).

'The idea of a sculpture park' (the title of Robertson's essay) clearly drew on European examples such as Sonsbeek and the Kröller-Müller. It also provided solutions to peculiar British problems. These included changes in public access to land, for example by the Forestry Commission and National Trust. By the mid-1980s outdoor permanent and semi-permanent sculpture projects were a major growth area. Such projects demonstrate the annexing of British traditions of landscape art and orderly enjoyment of the landscape to give justification for new projects and argue they are part of an ongoing existing practice. The idea of 'Landscape' had supplanted more general notions of 'sculpture in the open air' (the title familiar from the first wave of Battersea exhibitions) and 'sculpture outdoors', the title of the 1977 issue of Studio International. Another special issue of Studio International, published in April/May 1983, reinforces the dominance of landscape. This time it is entitled 'Landscape in Art' and with an editorial on 'Art in places: a celebration of nature'. The magazine includes an article by Mark Prior on Grizedale Forest Installations.

The first two sculptors in residence at Grizedale and the Yorkshire Sculpture Park are useful indicators of the way enduring themes in British Art are continued into the new work, whilst at the same time

---

97 Studio International Vol. 193, Vol. 986 (March/April 1977). The Editorial was eager to point out a concern with urban as well as rural projects: 'Hence the decision to devote this issues of Studio International to 'Art Outdoors' rather than the more familiar 'Land Art' label, which has become so inextricably associated with rural projects alone.' (p. 82).

The articles in this issue act as a summary of the state of discourse on Land Art and associated areas at this crucial point. They were: an Editorial on Art Outdoors by Richard Cork, Lucy Lippard's 'Art Outdoors In and Out of the Public Domain' (the transcript of a slide lecture which gave its title to the issue and embraced both urban and rural aspects of sculpture placement); Simon Pugh's 'Blind Alleys and New Horizons: The Aesthetics of a Formal Garden' (which effects the linkage of the practice of landscape gardening to contemporary practice, a connection that is made more concretely in later essays and articles such as those by Stephanie Ross and Stephen Bann); Jasper Halfmann and Clod Zillich's 'Reality and Reduced Model'; Dave Cashman and Roger Fagin in conversation with Richard Cork: 'Outside the Art System: Collaborative work in Schools' (emphasising the community and educational aspect, one of the projects discussed in this article featured on the cover of the magazine); Nancy D Rosen: 'A Sense of Place: Five American Artists' (note the use of this 'classic' phrase) and Andrew Causey's 'Space and Time in British Land Art' (discussing and thus linking under the heading 'British Land Art' the artists: Hamish Fulton and Richard Long with precedents and parallels drawn from the work of Richard Wilson, Henry Moore, Paul Nash, Graham Sutherland, Anthony Caro, David Hockney and Carl Andre. The article opens with a comparison of a Fulton work with a passage from Wordsworth).

98 These changes as they affected the site of one of the earliest sculpture trail projects are detailed in Bill Grant, 'Introduction', The Grizedale Experience, pp. 7-10.

99 see for example, Patrick Wright, 'Trafficking in History', On living in an old Country, pp. 33-92.


101 Mark Prior, 'Site Specific Sculpture: Grizedale Forest Installations', ibid., pp. 10-13. The notions of 'installation' and 'site-specificity' dominate this issue as well as the overriding concern with landscape. The first section of the magazine is entitled 'Site Specific Art: Artists' approach to Landscape.'
embracing the limits of the acceptable public face of British outdoor/landscape art. Maine works with stone, notably Portland stone, which has a long and enduring significance as a British stone. This enables Maine to be clearly linked to Moore who famously used indigenous British stone for his carvings. Nash works in wood, again a material with a British inheritance going right back to the wood carvings of the gothic period. Both artists can be linked to the ‘thoroughly modern’ and seen as rooted in tradition. Duncan Macmillan’s review of Nash’s exhibition at the Fruitmarket gallery, Edinburgh in 1983 neatly collects these views, linking Nash to mainstream modernism as well as Land Art and the whole ensemble with institutional success:

Modernism made cosy goes back to nature, the breeze block safely screened with Oaksey Beames. It is the quick dodge into gentility that makes all issues harmless. Gentility is the English disease. No wonder Nash is a success! He will be a knight of the British Council in no time, the true accolade of the genteel artist. Flippancy apart however, there is an aesthetic at work here and it is one that is worth examining for the light that it can throw on the misconceptions on which such success is based.

Clearly from the tree planting exercises, from the Welsh existence and the general stress not just on the wood but on the trees, this is in origin a landscape aesthetic. This links Nash with land art as he himself has suggested, but it also goes back to something older and more conservative, because what is still working here is the old landscape idiom that Henry Moore got a lot of mileage out of, but did not originate.97

Maine and Nash are acceptable to those establishment figures, such as Bryan Robertson, who, as his text in the Silver Jubilee exhibition catalogue demonstrates, at the time of the inception of the first Sculpture Parks and Trails in Britain in 1977, viewed the work of Long for example with some cynicism.98 The more ‘conceptual’ and ‘technophilia’ aspects of British Land Art (those with an affinity to the types of work included in Sonsbeek 71 for example) have not fared so well in domestic promotion and use of Land Art. The Sculpture Parks and Trails have tended to commission more ‘object-based’ sculpture that can clearly be identified as ‘a sculpture’. These tendencies are represented, for example in the Kröller Muller sculpture park in Holland. There is no permanent British equivalent of a work as conceptual as the one by Stanley Brouwn at the Kröller Muller which consists of a number of plaques distributed around the garden section of the park indicating the beginnings of walks of varying numbers of steps

98 Maine (and Nash) also manage to bridge the ‘object art’ v ‘conceptual art’ or constructed v ‘new art’ divisions so often featured in accounts of British sculpture in the 1960s and 1970s (see my sculpture chapter for details). Both Maine and Nash were included in Tucker’s survey of sculpture The Condition of Sculpture in 1975 (London: Hayward Gallery, 29 May-13 July 1975), and yet could also be shown in a Land Art context with members of the opposing camp. Whilst Tucker’s comments and theories seem diametrically opposed to Long’s practice, he was keen to point out when I spoke to him in 1995 that he had been responsible for giving Long his first public showing in Britain, in the Young Contemporaries exhibition of 1968 (Peckham Galleries, London, 30 January - 27 February), when he was on the board of judges. Tucker claimed that the solution to the inclusion of this more conceptual work had been to make a separate section within the exhibition for ‘time based’ work. The relevant section in the exhibition catalogue/pamphlet is entitled ‘Darkened Room’ and consisted of: ‘1. Automatic projection programme by students of light/sound workshop. Advanced Studies Group. Hornsey College of Art. 2. Environmental Piece by students of Medway College of Art. 3. Jacob’s Ladder by students of Ravensbourne College of Art. 4. Film experiments by St. Martin’s College (sic.) of Art. 5. […] a continuous programme of student films. Programmes available at the Royal Institute Gallery.’
Figure 82. Stanley Brouwn. One component of *Project for the Rijksmuseum Kröller-Müller*, 1984-1985.
made by the artist on 20 December 1984 [figure 82]. There have however been more conceptual works in temporary outdoor exhibitions more recently, such as Georgina Starr’s ‘Acous-ti-Guide’ piece, ‘Last Seen At Killerton’, that was part of the Ha-Ha exhibition at Killerton Park in 1993.

British Land Art is a highly politicised area of British art practice. In its foreign policy guise it can be seen to follow the post war predilections of the British Council and Arts Council in promoting a British art that celebrates those aspects of Britain that are well known and loved abroad and that are relatively safe and (supposedly) politically neutral: the British Countryside, an identification with the land and a rural (or feudal) background. Importantly this is a vision that is enduring, timeless, natural and naturalised. Such an approach is also encouraged because it can be called in constantly to refer to and reflect glory on the earlier protagonists of this type of art, the landscape painters such as Constable, Turner, Gainsborough and Cotman, and also in the more recent past, and in the living memory of those on the boards of many of the organisations, the British artists of the immediately pre- and post- Second World War era: Moore, Hepworth, Nash, Sutherland, whose inspiration, subject matter and association was the landscape. This centre is constantly reinforced and affirmed as these artists are mentioned, referred to and acknowledged in the new work. Particularly in the case of sculpture this is often the result of having received (or hoping to receive in future) money from the Henry Moore Sculpture Trust.

The interest in ‘Landscape’ as a human construction and aesthetic category is one of the operative terms in discourse on British Land Art that acts to set it apart from its American counterparts. Whilst this is a more sophisticated and certainly more subtle distinction than the more crude distinctions of scale, materials and economics (which run along the lines: Americans use bulldozers. British use less intrusive tactics. Americans shift loads of material. British just move a few stones or take a photograph. Americans purchase great tracts of ‘real estate’. British use common, public land), it can nonetheless be seen as the re-enactment of long held prejudices and an enduring history of using discourse on landscape and landscape gardening as a masked text on national differences. The phrase with which I opened this chapter, ‘our landscape-island’ is enclosed in a quotation that compares American and British landscape:

Knight’s system appears to me the jacobinism of taste. [he] would have nature as well as man indulged in that uncurbed and wild luxuriance, which must soon render our landscape-island rank, woody, damp and unwholesome as the incultivate savannas of America.

As well as the obvious reference to politics in France, it is worth considering the recent state of independence that America had secured from British rule at the time this comment was made. The references to the land’s lack of cultivation encodes an indictment of the character of the natives as much as the condition of the landscape. Such prejudice that connects the land and land use with the people

90 Stephen Daniels, Iconography of Woodland, p. 66.
that inhabit it haunts the attacks and comparisons of British Land Art with its American counterparts, for example those by Richard Long about his own practice in his letter to Art Monthly in 1983:

I was [in the 1960s] for an art made on common land by simple means, on a human scale. It was the antithesis of so-called American ‘Land Art’, where an artist needs money to be an artist, to buy real estate to claim possession of the land, and to wield machinery. True capitalist art. To walk the Himalayas (Walking with the River’s Roar) is to touch the earth lightly, but is in fact more robust and dynamic, and has more personal physical commitment, than an artist who plans a large earthwork which is then made by bulldozers.  

and this comment by Peter Davies and Tony Knipe about the Grizedale Forest project:

The roots [of Grizedale sculpture] were closer to the North American experience through the Works Programme Administration (WPA) and the ‘earth works’ of artists such as Michael Heizer, Robert Smithson and Richard Long. It is the lack of interest in real estate, the use of natural materials, the marriage of site to sculpture, the working methods, that have tipped the balance to Richard Long’s English sensibility.

The most familiar of these historical national distinctions is probably that between the formal, geometric gardens of the French and the ‘English’ style, and these distinctions are easily and frequently politicised. In 1990 a text on European garden architecture drew on these stereotypes to write:

Dangers, the English garden architect would say of his lawn, are unthinkable, indeed out of the question. It is impossible to get lost on a lawn, impossible to feel ill at ease, since it allows no differences, there can be no injustice.

Supposedly British notions of open government, democracy and generalism feature prominently in 18th century comparisons of French and English gardens and it is easy to see how these well-rehearsed juxtapositions can be transposed into the comparisons of the straightforward openness of British art in the 1960s and 1970s as compared with its American and European counterparts. A clear example appears in Anne Seymour’s introductory essay to The New Art catalogue (1972) where she identifies a specifically British ‘eschewal of aesthetic mumbo-jumbo’. The British work, like its gardening precedents, is controlled, common sensical and ordered rather than sensuous or excessive.

Peter Fuller identifies this attitude as one of the defining features of British institutional taste in thrall to modernism, a condition he claims has maligned the identification and promotion of the indigenous British tradition he identifies (aloof from international modernism, prepared to use its strategies when it suits its own ends, and of course rooted in the landscape tradition and the attentive study of Nature). Fuller quotes Whistler to voice the attitude he opposes: ‘Art should be independent of all clap-trap, should stand alone, and appeal to the artistic sense of eye or ear.’

408 Peter Davies and Tony Knipe, ‘Introduction’ to A Sense of Place, p. 11.
409 Torsten Olaf Enge and Carl Friedrich Schroer, Garden Architecture, p. 223.
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Such an attitude characterises the dominant discourse on British Land Art. That this ‘eschewal’ amounts to a refusal to discuss the complex rhetorical strategies of claims to transparency and produces its own ‘clap-trap’ is ignored. Straightforwardness, ‘realism’ and the strategy of silence (defended for example in Seymour’s New Art introduction) are not withdrawals from aesthetic discourse, but merely strategies by which to shift the debate onto a transcendent level of personal conviction at which disputation can effectively be avoided (if only temporarily). Hal Foster invokes Adorno to debunk expressionism. It is an observation that retains its currency in the context of Land Art:

Such a “transcendent attack on culture,” Adorno wrote, “regularly speaks the language of false escape, that of ‘nature boy.’” And so with expressionism: it speaks a language, but a language so obvious we may forget its conventionality and must enquire again how it encodes the natural and simulates the immediate.

Where the practicalities of land management, the economic imperatives of a tourist and service (leisure) based economy and the appeasement of local desires meets the inculcated rhetoric of a British tradition of landscape, finely manufactured and highly refined to the point of appearing ‘natural’, the result is highly effective and supremely useful. It can effectively be manoeuvred by all colours of political persuasion, and consequently is hard to label, and even more difficult to debunk and deconstruct.

Peter Fuller’s alternative account of British Art in the 20th Century claimed that British art was at its best when it eschews international modernism.508 He delineated an indigenous British tradition that took as its iconic images landscape images that are not so much reassuring as they are ‘spiritual dilemmas’ or ‘sombre realities’, the responses to a loss of faith in God.509 The high points (or crisis points) of Fuller’s ‘Higher Landscape’, as he defines this indigenous tradition, are images such as Constable’s Dover Beach, Holman Hunt’s The Scapegoat (1854) or William Dyce’s Pegwell Bay, Kent - A Recollection of 5th October 1858. For Fuller, these ‘godless landscapes’ offered the challenge that modernism failed to confront, but rather evaded or denied, often in thrall to a machine or industrial aesthetic rather than a ‘natural’ one. His stinging attack on Institutional taste was calculated to maximise its effect by being written at the time of, and in direct response to the Royal Academy’s blockbuster exhibition British Art in the Twentieth Century. Fuller writes:

The growth of arts patronage in the post-war era, and the injection of public funding into the modern art museums, the Arts Council, and the art education system led to the expansion of bureaucracies of modern art which lacked the vision, taste and judgement of men like Kenneth Clark or John Maynard Keynes, who had brought them into being. These bureaucracies today, are committed to International Modernism, or as it now likes to call itself, Post-Modernism; the closing sections to the British Art show at Burlington House, with their celebration of nonentities, like Richard Long, Gilbert and George, Bruce McLean, and Barry Flanagan - are a

509 for a more detailed discussion of Fuller’s ideas on this ‘loss of faith in god’ see: Peter Fuller, Images of God: The Consolations of Lost Illusions. (London: 1985).
monument to the shoddy taste, which I like to call BICCA, or Biennale International Club Class Art. \textsuperscript{510}

It is strange that Fuller included Long in his list of indicted nonentities, since in many ways his work could be seen to perpetuate the very tradition Fuller is championing. There are plenty of godless landscapes in Long’s oeuvre. It seems only Long’s stated commitment to (international) modernism that stands in the way of his being considered part of Fuller’s ‘true’ British tradition.

In a sense Goldsworthy’s \textit{Ice and Snow drawings} is the most un-British Land Art, however. in Fuller’s terms it is a very British landscape vision in the tradition of \textit{The Scapegoat}, \textit{Dover Beach}, and particularly Dyce’s \textit{Pegwell Bay}, veering away from the decorative and aesthetic, embracing a concern with geology rather than geography, with the stuff of the earth, its constituents rather than its appearance. Tiberghien brings out this distinction between the designations ‘Earth’ and ‘Land’ in the introduction to his 1993 book \textit{Land Art}. [discussed in \textit{Land Art Beginning} above] Goldsworthy himself notes the lack of understanding with which this particular aspect of his work has been met, a note at the end of the \textit{Ice and Snow drawings} book states: ‘The artist would like to thank Graeme Murray for his commitment to this body of work which has been little known or understood.’\textsuperscript{511} Elegance, order, reserve, quietness are qualities admired in the British work - a certain poetics - not the unpredictable (and quite unpleasant) look of some of these drawings (incontinent, unpredictable, messy).\textsuperscript{512} Goldsworthy’s work and its reception highlighted some of the chief differences between British and other Land Art, but, conversely, it also brings out some of its key features. One of the key features of British Land Art it emphasises is the stress on the knowledge and intimacy of artist and his bit of the country, the place where he lives.

This strong identification features in the rhetoric of Common Ground, the introduction to their ‘New Milestones’ project reads: ‘The New Milestones Project is about what places mean to the people who live in them, about how to express that meaning in an imaginative and accessible way through sculpture.’\textsuperscript{513} There is in Common Ground’s rhetoric of Local Distinctiveness, and particularly in their catchphrase ‘Know your place’, an implicit class and moral coding of the landscape. The identification of artist and place through their artistic practice is found in accounts of other sculptors associated with the landscape, especially when they are being constructed as ancestors for the current work. For example, Barbara Hepworth and St Ives or some of the artists in the \textit{Unpainted Landscape} book. The first photograph in

\textsuperscript{510} ibid., p. 65.
\textsuperscript{511} Endnote to \textit{Andy Goldsworthy Ice and Snow drawings}, designed by Andy Goldsworthy and Graeme Murray, published on the occasion of the exhibition ‘ICE and SNOW drawings and THROWS’ at the FruitMarket Gallery, Edinburgh: 1992. p. 64
\textsuperscript{512} Being merely decorative and derivative are the very things Long criticised in Goldsworthy’s work when he described Goldsworthy as ‘Second Generation Decorative’ when talking to the MA Sculpture Studies students in Bristol in June 1991.
the book shows Hermann de Vries in his 200km² atelier - his forest. Despite comparisons that have 

stated that American art is capitalist and about real estate whereas British artists use common, public 

land. (Long's letter to *Art Monthly* and in the book *A Sense of Place*, quoted above), the majority of the 

British Artists are in fact land owners, and the function of their bit of land is crucial to their practice. 

(As I have already noted, the disappearance of the rhetoric of using common public land and the 

universal free ownership of the ideas and work is matched by an emphasis on works made, developed or 

begun on one's own land, originated in one's own place.) For Goldsworthy and Nash it provides the 

necessary continuity to produce works that take time to develop, mature and grow. This is particularly 

the case with Nash, for example his *Ash Dome* piece, begun in 1977 and still growing. [Figure 83] It can 

be a place to return to and recharge, which is how Seymour talks about Long's place in Bristol in 

*Walking in Circles.* The notion of home is particularly strong in the early works of Long's which used 

images of Bristol, generally in the form of appropriated picture postcards, and much later in *Walking in 

Circles* where a word work begins on his land and one of the images in the book is a work cemented to 

the patio in his back garden and called 'Home Circle'. Long has always lived in Bristol except for his 

student years in London. His journeys are temporary sojourns, always with the assumption of a place to 

return to. This identification with a particular place comes out to an extent with Nash and Goldsworthy. 

Goldsworthy has 'adopted' a landscape, and his learning about it has become his work. His attitude is 

summed up in a comment published in 1990: 'My work has always been about the area around where I 

live, whether it be Brough, Langholm, Leeds or London.'

Ian Hamilton Finlay's identification with his land is exclusive, not least because his agoraphobia makes 

it impossible for him to leave. He has lived at Stonypath Little Sparta since 1967 and makes use of 

modern technologies of communication in order to be an international artist. What aeroplanes are to 

Long, typewriter, telephone and fax are to Finlay. He has produced a massive amount of correspondence 

which will be almost impossible fully to catalogue or contain. He has dispersed himself extremely widely 

through this medium. Long and Finlay are a bit like the two types of Storyteller in Benjamin's *The 

Storyteller* - the one who goes away in order to return with fantastic tales, and the one who stays at 

home gleaning wisdom from intimate knowledge of his immediate surroundings. This paradox also 

inhabits Calvino's *Invisible Cities* where Kubla Khan remains at home and Marco Polo supposedly 

travels, but never leaves his imaginative home of Venice, the home of his oneric self, the city that figures 

in Calvino's text like Bachelard's oneric house in his *Poetics of Space*. Landscapes can be construed

514 *The Unpainted Landscape*, p. 8.
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Ash Dome
planted 1977, Cae'ny-Coed, N. Wales

2.2 ash trees planted in a 30m diameter ring; through budding and pinning the trees will form a 'dome' space, 50 years to grow, a space for the twenty first century.

Mulching Ash Dome, Cae'n-y-Coed, N. Wales 1979
First Bend, Ash Dome, Cae'n-y-Coed, N. Wales 1983

Figure 83. David Nash. Ash Dome, 1977 -
as this imaginative construction of the self too. A phenomenology of the landscape could be written to accommodate each Land Artist, and perhaps also some of their devoted followers. The leading Land Artists in Britain assume almost the status of cult leaders in the eyes of their most ardent admirers. Fans undertake pilgrimages to the places in which these artists work and public speeches, by Andy Goldsworthy for example, seem to inspire highly emotive responses.\(^\text{520}\)

The close identification of an artist with a particular place found in these contemporary examples could be compared to the place the 18th Century poet Alexander Pope created for himself as ‘a place to stand’. Famously his replication of a grotto in which to write was completed with real stalactites shot down from the caves at Wookey Hole. Pope’s house and garden was the subject of a GLC exhibition in 1980.\(^\text{521}\) The connections between Land Art and the Landscape Gardens of the 18th Century has featured strongly in the discourse on Land Art and is discussed in greater detail in the following chapter of this thesis. However, in the context of Land Art and Landscape, phrases such as ‘a place to stand’ or ‘a sense of place’ recurrent in texts on British Land Art link them to more recent writings on the British Landscape as well as to the aesthetic discourse of the 18th century. The social construction of landscape, the politics of landscape and the ideology and theory of landscape have been the subject of a large number of books by authors such as John Barrell, Stephen Daniels, Andrew Hemingway and Simon Schama.\(^\text{522}\) Such texts have focused on the meaning of landscape and the uses of landscape both practically and ideologically, considering the Landscape’s past and representations of that past.

The insights of such writings provide useful parallels for exploring issues raised by the contemporary work. In particular, one section of Stephen Daniel’s essay ‘The political iconography of woodland in later Georgian England’\(^\text{523}\) is, I think, particularly revealing when read against some of the works discussed in this chapter. Daniels discusses ‘Trees and the politics of the picturesque, 1794-1816’ focusing on the views of the three leading theorists: Uvedale Price, Richard Payne Knight and Humphry Repton.\(^\text{524}\)

In works by Fulton such as *A Hollow Lane* from 1971, there are signs of civilisation and human use literally embedded in the landscape’s surface. The hollow lanes and ridgeway paths (figure 84) are deep indentations caused by centuries of use and are some of the oldest roadways in Britain. They are also the very sort of landscapes Uvedale Price would have appreciated, as Daniels writes:

---

\(^{520}\) as I found out when I attended the talk Goldsworthy gave at the ‘Chaos and Creativity’ conference at the Royal Botanic Gardens in 1992.


\(^{523}\) Stephen Daniels, ‘iconography of woodland’.

\(^{524}\) ibid., p. 57.
Figure 84. Hamish Fulton.
Valuing a landscape with distinctions but not divisions. Price was particularly sensitive to routeways and borders. Embowered 'hollow lanes and bye roads' provided a paradigm for the improver because they were not designed but the product of piecemeal indiscriminate changes, some human, some natural.\textsuperscript{25}

The subtle blending and textural complexity of such landscapes is also the vision of the English style of gardening that marks the culmination of Enge and Shroër’s History of Garden Architecture in Europe. ‘All men are equal on a lawn, be they beggars or kings.’\textsuperscript{26} This historic vision could be seen as one of the sources of the levelling and liberationary rhetoric of British Land Art and of its claims to universality and general appeal. Such ideology however masks massive social divisions, in the language of contemporary Land Art as in the landscape gardens of the late eighteenth century, or in 18th and 19th century landscape paintings.\textsuperscript{27} It is revealing to compare the very different readings of Capability Brown’s landscaping in Enge and Shroër’s text and in Daniels’. In the former, Brown’s gardening style is the culmination, the final attainment of freedom, whereas for Daniels, Brown’s vision was dehumanised, representing total power and mastery. People and the signs of their habitation were diminished to specks on the horizon. Presenting the view of the radical critics of Brown, Daniels writes:

For Price ‘persons not conversant in pictures and drawings’ were much more attentive to distant objects than to near ones’. This echoes Burke who emphasised the moral indifference of ‘geometricians’ in politics whose ‘long views’ were drawn towards the vanishing point of linear perspective: ‘their humanity is at their horizon - and like the horizon it always flies before them.’\textsuperscript{28}

In discussing the work of Humphry Repton, Daniels uses a pair of illustrations from Repton’s last published work Fragments on the theory and practice of landscape gardening (1816). [figure 85] They are parodies of his own technique used in his earlier works where an ‘improved’ landscape is contrasted with the unimproved version (a sort of before and after type contrast).

A greater interest in landscape and gardens and the increased awareness of environmental issues over the past thirty years may have changed government policy and policies of land use and accessibility, however, any venture into the British countryside is as likely to come across signs and symbols of prohibition as ones of openness and welcome. One is allowed to enjoy the British Countryside but only the bits designated and only in the way dictated and policed by the bodies, private, public and semi-public that own and administer them. Fay Godwin’s vision of the British landscape is full of such signs. Comparing an image from her book Our Forbidden Land [figure 86] and an image by Richard Long [figure 87] with the improved and unimproved estates shown in Repton’s ‘Improvements’ of 1816, one realises that it is not that one temporally succeeds the other, but that both visions are present and prevalent in the British Countryside. it not only depends where one looks, but how one looks. It is not different British landscapes that one looks at, but looking with different visions, different approaches to

\textsuperscript{25} ibid., p. 61.
\textsuperscript{26} Torsten Olaf Enge and Carl Friedrich Schroër. Garden Architecture, p. 223.
\textsuperscript{27} see John Barrell. The Dark Side of the Landscape.
\textsuperscript{28} Stephen Daniels. ‘iconography of woodland’. pp. 59-60.
the land. Where Long sees beckoning horizons, Godwin sees barbed wire fences and private signs. This is not a change of scene but a change of perception. Godwin’s stile - that symbol of access that features in Repton’s positive view of the landscape, inviting the weary labourer to take a short cut through the estate - is accompanied by discouraging signs and warnings. And in Godwin’s caption we are alerted to the fact that this footpath has only been ‘reopened under duress’ (my emphasis). Whilst Long’s vision may appear unimpeded, it may be that some more invisible prohibition lurks between his position and the horizon, some genuine or effective ‘ha-ha’ invisible from the garden side. (Perhaps this aptly summarises the relative positions of Long and Godwin, Long on the garden side looking out to the park, Godwin on the park side looking towards the garden and house, where the garden represents property, power, ownership, privilege, and the park outside, otherness, the rest, the remainder, the owned and dispossessed. Following the cautions outlined in my introduction, I distrust such crude binaristic analyses, however effective, and I will continue, elaborate and refine my discussion of the ha-ha and positional points of view in my concluding chapter.)

Daniels also speculates on the identity of the aged figure with a stick shown in Repton’s ‘improved’ image, using an extract from the accompanying text to emphasise the point:

[... ] the bench was gone. the ladder-stile was changed to a caution about man-traps and spring-guns, and a notice that the footpath was stopped by order of the commissioners. As I read the board, the old man said ‘It is very true. and I am forced to walk a mile further round every night after a hard day’s work.

Repton’s letters of this period reveal that he often projected the personal hardships of his old age, in particular his failing career and health, into the decline in English society he narrated in his published writings.

A projection of oneself into one’s created and altered landscapes seems an increasingly prevalent strategy in Long’s work (see my discussion in Land Art Repetition and Land Art Body above). However, whilst Repton seems to emphasise his passing years, Long’s seems an ever-youthful and unchanging image. Whilst for Repton his physical decline mirrored the national demise he perceived around him, Long’s perpetual youth seems in accord with the myth, identified by Wiener for example, of the British landscape as unchanging. It remains to be seen what Long will actually do to perform his walking works and how he will depict himself in it as he gets older, and what effect that will have on the vision of landscape presented in his works. There is already the whiff of nostalgia about every new major Richard Long publication as it reproduces some of the early works alongside the latest additions. This strategy within Long’s oeuvre is discussed in my introduction. In this context it is intriguing to speculate on how such nostalgia and repetition might function in relation to the wider context of the landscapes represented and produced in the work.

---
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Fig. 8 Humphry Repton, 'Improvements', from *Fragments on the theory and practice of landscape gardening* (1816).

Figure 85. Illustrations from Stephen Daniels, ‘The political iconography of woodland’.
Footpath reopened under duress at Lydèl

Figure 86. Fay Godwin. From Our Forbidden Land, 1990.
Figure 87. Richard Long. From *Walking in Circles*, 1991.
Ian Hamilton Finlay is one artist whose work is explicitly discussed in terms of theories of the picturesque and sublime. Stephanie Ross (and others) draw parallels between the landscape gardens of the 18th century and contemporary Land Art. in her case on the grounds of function. They observe that there is a danger of historicism in trying to locate the new work in an older tradition, as Rosalind Krauss pointed out in connection with ‘Land Art’ type works in her essay ‘Sculpture in the Expanded Field’. However I do think that there are links, but not the ones often stressed. There are similarities in the functioning of the two areas of discourse, in regards to its politics, and in the ideological motivation of landscape visions, depictions and events. Finlay’s Landscape vision is the most overtly political of the practices discussed here.

Ian Hamilton Finlay, the Capability Brown of Conceptual Art, has concocted a pithy aphorism about gardens: “Certain gardens are described as retreats when they are really attacks”. To this end, his own garden in Stonypath, Scotland, is furnished not with innocuous gnomes, but with miniature Chieftain tanks carved in wood and stone.

Notwithstanding the fact that this description of Finlay’s Little Sparta suggests that the author hasn’t actually been there, Finlay is not a Capability Brown, but more in keeping with the more radical ideas and practices of Uvedale Price and Richard Payne Knight. Finlay described himself as ‘a modest wee jacobin’, a description that could have been levelled at Knight according to Daniels’ account:

‘When Knight recommends vandalizing Brownian parks to allow forest to regenerate his point is as much to revolutionize landscape as to restore it.’

Knight’s poem The Landscape (1794). Towards the end of The Landscape, at the climax of the poem, Knight expresses an unambiguously radical politics of natural rights as he likens the ‘undressing’ of a Brown-style lake to revolutionary liberation. [extract from the poem] Knight closed the poem with a five page footnote on the French Revolution, lamenting the direction it had taken during the Terror but not disassociating himself from its impulse.

Fire and war certainly play an important part in Finlay’s garden, and they were crucial aspects of the iconography of woodland Daniels analyses. The material of ships, those symbols of British warfaring and trading prowess, so crucial to an island nation, were the trees of the woods and forests of Britain. Trees often thus acquired patriotic associations, and particularly during the Napoleonic era columns were erected amongst the trees to attest to this value. A survival to the present day, one of these columns ‘British Liberty’ at Gibside, near Burnopfield, County Durham, was featured in the Independent in September 1993, having been saved from decay at a cost to the National Trust of £72 000. Antony Gormley may or may not have been aware of this reference in his work Post for the Ha-Ha exhibition at Killerton Park in 1994, one of the works which merited his successful nomination for the Turner prize for contribution to British art during that year. [figure 88].

---
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Figure 88. Antony Gormley. *Post*, 1993.
One of the earliest inscriptions in Finlay’s garden at Little Sparta reads ‘Hic lacet Parvulum Quoddam Ex Aqua Longiore Excerptum’ or ‘Here lies an extract from a larger stretch of water’. The bringing into being of a total vision of land and sea through small extracts is a key strategy of Finlay’s garden. It is also the key to garden design according to Enge and Shröer who invoke Leibniz’s theory of monads in the conclusion to their history of Garden Architecture in Europe:

Each monad is also a reflection of universal wholeness. Thus the idea of a wood no longer requires the actual large-scale planting of a trees (sic). The monadic tree achieves the same effect, if one only knows how to place it and perceive it in the correct way. This is precisely the task of garden design, and is true not just for a tree but also for a meadow, a house, a stream, a cow. Each individual thing, with its carefully-staged solitude pointing to universal relationships of nature becomes a window onto a world theatre [its] containing an infinite number of stages next to, above and below each other. In each of these stages even the smallest object can tell its individual cosmic story.

I began by putting forward the image of Britain as a total work of Land Art. Conversely, Land Art in its many and disparate guises is a work of fragments that make claim to a(n absent) totality, extracts that presuppose a non-existent total or complete text. Land Art makes claims to universality where its vision is strictly partisan. Evinces isolationism where it presents itself as an international art. In the next and final chapter the paradigm of the garden and its relation to British Land Art is considered in more detail with reference to Finlay’s garden at Little Sparta. Finlay’s is a garden that renders these contradictions manifest. It is a microcosm of the landscape-island, or to invert Anna Seward’s words with which I began, An island-landscape.

---


Land Art Ha Ha Ha

Ha ha (ha ha) OE
A interj. The ordinary representation of laughter
B sb. A loud or open laugh 1806. Hence Ha ha v. to utter ha ha in laughter, to laugh aloud

Ha-ha (haha) sb. Also haw-haw. 1712. [Fr. haha (XVII), usu. taken to be so named from the expression of surprise at meeting the obstacle: redupl. of HA,] A boundary to a garden, pleasure-ground, or park, of such a kind as not to interrupt the view from within, and not to be seen till closely approached; a sunk fence. Also attrib.
Shorter Oxford Dictionary 1983

This section follows on immediately from the chapter on Landscape, but it also carries on directly from the introduction, picking up the introduction’s promise:

I have begun with the words ‘Land Art,’ and introducing them has been the task of this introduction. By the conclusion I will again consider these two words, their coming together, and the effect and products of bringing them together with other words, with other discourses made of words and with other contingencies, in the main chapters of this dissertation. The process might be seen as that of rending the words and discourses apart, seeing what is hidden in the folds between them and then putting them back together, assessing the problems and liabilities of such a realignment.

It is perhaps as if the intervening chapters could be concealed in a ha-ha and the beginning and conclusion of this dissertation read as a continuous vista, perceived as unbroken when viewed from the garden side, which has now been entered.

The Ha-ha is used in this chapter as a theoretical device, but it also serves to reinforce the connections often drawn between the practices of Land Art and those of Landscape Gardening.

One of the main problems of producing this dissertation has been with the very act of writing and with the mass of uncertainties and problems that surround that activity. From the outset this writing has problems of form and of content. The form of a PhD thesis with its assumptions of making a unique contribution to knowledge assumes several certainties that are deeply unsettled, if not demolished, by recent theory and philosophy. A thesis contains within itself for example the notion of progress, the idea that knowledge moves on towards something or somewhere. This confident belief in progress has been unsettled if not entirely swept away. The question of what a thesis is for, that in some confident (and perhaps mythical) Golden Age in the near distant past could be adequately answered as ‘for the sake of knowledge’, is no longer adequate. The pursuit of knowledge for its own sake does not any longer hold water, particularly with the bodies that fund such research projects as this. Writing a dissertation becomes a pragmatic necessity, a statement of position or a demonstration of sheer determination in completing the Herculean task and joining the Gods on Mount Olympus. More realistically, and
seriously. the writing of a dissertation feels like the wheeling out for inspection of a shaky and ramshackle edifice riddled with uncertainties and questions to be prodded, poked and tested for stability.

The production of any such writing is always inadequate, always a compromise. The problem is how to proceed, of how to write anything, mindful of the great weight of theory that militates against it. A PhD thesis is a kind of book, a totality, and time and again one finds oneself up against Derrida’s conflict of text and book. ‘The idea of the book, which always refers to a natural totality, is profoundly alien to the sense of writing.’

This dissertation unashamedly employs several (borrowed) strategies of avoiding the inevitable impasse that this presents. It often breaks down into trains of thought that cannot be finalised or completed (unconnected sentences), it does not have a totalling ‘thesis’ that binds it together, arrogantly stating what Land Art is. Indeed the persistence of that title is itself a potential hazard, for whilst this body of writing attempts to deconstruct, redirect and reconfigure Land Art, it always runs the risk, again identified by Derrida, that:

To put the old names to work, or even just to leave them in circulation, will always, of course, involve some risk: the risk of settling down or of regressing in to the system that has been, or is in the process of being, deconstructed. To deny this risk would be to confirm it: it would be to see the signifier - in this case the name -as a merely circumstantial, conventional occurrence of the concept or as a concession without any specific effect.

It is to be hoped that other strategies at work prevent so unquestioning an acceptance of the word ‘Land Art’ in this study. Rather than avoid using the name, or attempt to invent a new one, the word is repeated. For repetition has other effects than the embedding in the memory that the frequent repetition of one’s times-tables is supposed (erroneously in my case) to effect. Conversely repetition can lose any effect through its repetition, its impact exhausted, as with the overuse of an expletive. Repetition can also be a chant to ward off a feared evil, a chanting that confronts by naming and challenging the named to come forward out of concealment. The repetitive chanting of Mantras is used to render things present, emphasising the immediate and ‘arresting time’, a function that Virginia Whiles likened to the use of repetition in abstract (modernist) art.

And finally, (or additionally, since there are surely other effects), repetition has an uncanny ability to make the familiar strange. The familiar word repeated over and over again. and then enunciated slowly and deliberately. takes on a strange and otherworldly (or otherworldly) being. Repetition as well as settling and fixing meaning can radically unsettle it. One can

---

540 ‘Repetition of Mantras annuls the ‘reality’ of the secular world. Repetition of imagery employed in the reductive aesthetic of contemporary culture, including art, literature, music and film, has a similar purpose: that of emphasizing the immediate and arresting time. ‘It is repetition alone that has the power to isolate the present tense’ (Kierdegaard).’ Virginia Whiles, ‘Tantric imagery: affinities with twentieth-century abstract art’, Studio International Vol. 181 (March 1971), pp. 100-107., p. 103. Whiles’ article also includes an illustration (on p. 102) of a work by Richard Long executed in Battery Park, New York City in 1969. (This work was arranged under the auspices of the New York dealer/gallerist John Gibson). The work was entitled Old Sod.
use it to reinforce, but one can also exhaust it and show up its weaknesses. It can be a way of breaking into the discourse.

Attempting to answer a question does not do away with the question. As Maurice Blanchot writes:

A sound response puts down roots in the question. Common sense believes that it does away with the question. Indeed, in the so-called happy era, only the answers seem alive. But this affirmative contentment soon dies off. The authentic answer is always the question’s vitality. It can close in around the question, but it does so in order to preserve the question by keeping it open. 541

If one were to add Deleuze and Guattari’s idea of proliferating rhizome onto Blanchot’s imperative for answering a question, one might conclude that the most effective answers concerning Land Art will be those that rather than ‘rooting’ themselves in the question, would make canals, in-roads, networks, packs and spreading systems into the question, thereby letting the question stand, bringing it into the clearing, rending it open. Ultimately the question What is Land Art? can not be answered. Instead, as Derrida does, following Heidegger’s lead with the word ‘Being’, the term is crossed out, ‘letting both the deletion and word stand’. 542 The problematic word or term is marked to show that it has been problematised and that it can no longer be left to stand as an unproblematic or even analysable thing. Under such conditions Land Art will still be a question, still open, still problematic.

Deleuze and Guattari offer a number of strategies for going on, a number of tricks or escape routes for evading the inevitable impasse in which one finds oneself when one begins to question the activity of writing. For example, one’s anxieties about the impossibility of saying what one means, that are exacerbated to the point of complete impotence by reading Derrida’s ideas about the impossibility of meaning, are soothed by Deleuze and Guattari’s idea of the amexact. One accepts that self-present and precise meaning is impossible, acknowledges that writing is an imprecise tool, and that its use is full of pitfalls resulting from all the multifarious uses it has been put to in the past, as Nietzsche puts it: ‘only that which has no history is definable’. 543 But nevertheless one can go on. This is truly liberating. One asks different questions of the book/thesis/writing. As Massumi writes of Deleuze and Guattari’s A Thousand Plateaus:

The question is not: is it true? But: does it work? What new thoughts does it make it possible to think? What new emotions does it make it possible to feel? What new sensations and perceptions does it open in the body? 544

544 Brian Massumi, translator’s Foreword to A Thousand Plateaus, p. xv.
That, it seems to me, is a satisfying and challenging ambition for any piece of writing.

Questions such as What is Land Art? What does Land Art do? and Where is Land Art? will still remain open when this writing is through. Making incursions into the text and beginning to write are united in Heidegger’s term der Riss, the rift that is both an opening, a tear, an incursion into the text, but also a plan, a blueprint, an inscription, a beginning to write.545 This is a practical way of thinking one of the most important aims of this piece of writing.

Heidegger’s rift or tear might be likened to Smithson’s description of the ‘alphabetic chasms’ at the end of Edgar Allan Poe’s Narrative of A. Gordon Pym,546 discussed in Craig Owen’s review of The Writings of Robert Smithson, published in 1979.547 Inside the chasms one cannot read the words, they can only be seen from a distance, from the air. The words that are spelled out by the chasms are cut or incised into the earth.

Smithson’s term, Earthwords, reminds one that the materials of Land Art or Earth Art are not so much the ‘earth and sod,’ maps, photographs, paper, ink, sticks or stones, but the words that Land Art discourse is made up of. Words are very much the object of this study, however tied up they may be with things one might, or might not call ‘Land Art’ or ‘Earth Art’ or ‘Earthworks’.

Poe’s earthwords also highlight the question of perspective, of how things appear depending upon where one stands. The ha-ha, the boundary ditch so central to the aesthetics of the 18th Century English landscape garden that gives the title to my conclusion, is invisible from the garden side, from the ‘insiders’ side. It is only visible close to, whereas the chasms in Poe’s story are only visible from far off.

This section considers the idea of the Ha-Ha as a concealed space, rift, fold or rupture in discourse. It is invisible from the garden side, insurmountable from the park side, only visible when standing close to. But Ha-ha has also the meaning of a bursting forth, an uncontained and uncontainable excess, an outburst, an expression of surprise at encountering the obstacle.548 When the writing is through, when the ha-ha has been inscribed in text, this will still remain.

545 ‘In German der Riss is a crack, tear, laceration, cleft, or rift; but it is also a plan or design in drawing. The verb reissen from which it derives is cognate with the English word writing. Der Riss is incised or inscribed as a rune or letter. Heidegger here employs a series of words (Abriss, Aufriiss, Umriiss, and especially Grundriiss) to suggest that the rift of world and earth releases a sketch, outline, profile, blueprint, or ground plan. The rift is writ.’

Editorial note by David Farrell Krell to Martin Heidegger. ‘The Origin of the Work of Art’, p. 188.


547 Craig Owens. ‘Earthwords’, October no. 10 (Fall 1979), pp. 121-130. p. 121.

548 The ha-ha does have the potential of providing a real ha-ha - a cause for laughter - on the part of the landowner at the real, or imaginary, spectacle of somebody unsuspectingly falling into the ditch. From the ha-has I have seen I would think the possibility of accidentally falling into a ha-ha, unless it was very dark, is unlikely. Nevertheless, the potential hilarity or at least absurdity of somebody meeting such a fate is surely part of the ha-ha’s humour.
The term Land Art involves the bringing together of two words to make a new word or term. The conjunction could be seen initially as unexpected, and by now as conventional or even naturalised. The hyphen used to connect two words does not appear in most occurrences of the word Land Art, although it is present in some early texts.\(^4^9\) Ha-ha is a term of two repeated identical units. It is the bringing together of two units of speech that are something less than complete words. In the *Oxford English Dictionary* it is the form of ha-ha signifying the landscape gardening feature that contains the hyphen, whereas ha ha signifying the expression of laughter is the unhyphenated form. Adorno’s fascinating essay on punctuation\(^5^0\) suggests that there is potential meaning in even the tiniest details of writing as the hyphen, dash or other punctuation mark. According to Adorno, punctuation marks are the residue in written text of its bodily origins in speech. They are the marks that represent pauses, the raising and lowering of tone or the stresses and intonation of various elements of language. The dash, as it is used in the word ha-ha both brings the words together and effectively keeps them apart as discreet elements, ‘it separates things that feign a connection’.\(^5^1\) Adorno points out that one function of the dash is to connect things that would not be expected. Its appearance thus indicates the element of surprise.\(^5^2\) and is perhaps the corollary in writing of the ha-ha in the landscape. The device of the ha-ha and of the term Land Art perform connective functions in practice and theory. One of the tasks of this conclusion is to reveal some of the more hidden connective strategies that link elements of Land Art and British sculpture discourse, strategies that resemble that played by the ha-ha.

The ha-ha is a physical feature in the landscape: a technological innovation in the technique of landscape gardening. It enabled the appearance of continuity across a landowner’s estate and yet ensured actual and effective division.\(^5^3\) Descriptions of the effects of the ha-ha on gardening design recognise its revolutionary impact. In the 18th Century, the era of the ha-ha’s ‘invention’ and popularisation in Britain by gardening practitioners such as William Kent. Horace Walpole wrote: ‘With the ha-ha invented. Kent leaped the fence and saw that all nature was a garden.’\(^5^4\) In the twentieth century, in the same year as some of the earliest ‘earthworks’ - 1966 - the English garden designer and landscape architect Geoffrey Jellicoe wrote: ‘The ha-ha is no more than a sunken ditch with a wall on the garden or park side, unclimbable by cattle. Its effect upon landscape design can only be described as overwhelming. Overnight the remnants of the old enclosed paradise garden vanished, and in its place the whole environment became a paradise.’\(^5^5\) The transformative rhetoric of these descriptions could

---

\(^{4^9}\) The term Land-Art (with a hyphen) is given as the heading under which Schum’s name appears in the *Neue Brockhaus encyclopedia*. Georg Jappe, ‘Gerry Schum’ (1973).


\(^{5^1}\) ibid., p. 93.

\(^{5^2}\) Although Adorno points out that the ‘surprises’ announced by the dash are seldom ‘any longer surprising’. ibid.

\(^{5^3}\) The ha-ha was of course only ‘invisible’ from the garden or insiders side. From the outsiders’ side it was a powerfully emphatic, and highly visible, expression of the commoners’ exclusion from the estate.


\(^{5^5}\) ibid., p. 63.
easily apply to the early ambitions of Land Art and Earthworks. Echoes can be discerned in Smithson’s appropriation of unregarded environments as art\(^55^6\) or in Long’s regarding the whole world as material for his art.\(^55^7\) The notion of ‘leaping the fence’ could be transferred into the idea of escaping from the confines of the gallery and museum. Again Smithson voiced these concerns in his 1972 text ‘Cultural confinement’.\(^55^8\) Gerry Schum both states them and acts upon them in his Land Art exhibition and other activities of the Fernsehgalerie, and even Richard Long’s seemingly throwaway comment in the Earth symposium at Cornell reveals this desire to get ‘outside’ the institution: ‘My work will be outside in front of the Museum.’\(^55^9\) Of course, in retrospect, the museums, galleries and other institutions merely found ways of extending their practices to re-enclose all these ‘escaped’ activities. They did so however by means that approximate to the tactics of the ha-ha - by concealing the boundary at which one kind of property (the garden, the gallery) became another (the park, the artist’s sphere of activity). Walpole’s statement is revealing because it demonstrates that the most radical shift is one of perspective, one of seeing. The whole of nature is seen as a garden, for the land artists the whole of ‘nature’ is potentially available for art, revealing the artifice inherent in naming some domain ‘nature’ and in constructing it in opposition to the domain of ‘culture’, the supposedly ‘natural’ home of ‘Art’.

Gardens and gardening have a somewhat ambivalent position in the history of art. The National Trust handbook for 1995 proudly claims for Stowe Landscape Gardens that ‘its sheer scale must make it Britain’s largest work of art.’\(^56^0\) In an article published in 1987, Elspeth Thompson and Ken Fieldhouse claim that ‘the English ‘landscape garden’ was probably the most successful and influential innovation in the arts that this country has ever produced.’\(^56^1\) Writing in 1993, Stephanie Ross claims that ‘gardening is no longer considered a fine art. Major artists do not make statements in this medium, and our sense of gardening’s kinship to painting and poetry has been lost.’\(^56^2\) and also that gardening

\(^{54}\) For example in his ‘Towards the Development of an Air Terminal Site’, Artforum 5 (Summer 1967), pp. 36-40, in which Smithson writes: ‘Pavements, holes, trenches, mounds, heaps, paths, ditches, roads, terraces, etc., all have an aesthetic potential.’ (p. 38); and in ‘The Monuments of Passaic’. Artforum 6 (December 1967), pp. 48-51.

\(^{55}\) For example in conversation with Martina Giesen (Long’s comments are in bold):

I think you need the whole world, the whole globe.

As my place, as my arena? Well, I do. That’s how it is.

Richard Long in Conversation, Part Two, p. 5.


declined as a fine art after the 18th century and had no role to play in the 'ferment of modernism'.\textsuperscript{563} After delineating what she describes as 'the surprising symbolic powers of eighteenth-century English gardens',\textsuperscript{564} she goes on to 'imagine a different future for the eighteenth-century English garden, one in which gardening did not decline but instead participated fully in the heady, tumultuous events as modernism altered the artworld'.\textsuperscript{565} She could have saved herself a great deal of imaginative energy in creating her speculative history of modernist gardens if she hadn’t laboured under the erroneous belief that there were none. But before disputing her argument with a list of actual modernist gardening practices and practitioners and the role gardening has played in relation to the arts of painting, sculpture, architecture, film and literature, it is worth considering Ross’s claim, not least because she is certainly not alone in believing such a history. Stephen Bann writes: ‘Despite the occasional exception, like Monet’s garden at Giverny, the provinces of gardening and painting became progressively estranged from one another, and the apparent atrophy of the landscape genre under the impact of Modernism only hastened this process.’\textsuperscript{566} The standard collections of documents of modernism and modern art do not contain many references to gardening nor do they (apparently) contain texts by gardeners.\textsuperscript{567} Even when Ross does find some ‘modernist’ gardens to discuss, and in particular a garden by Martha Schwartz, she also manages to find reasons why its existence does not ‘threaten her claims about the decline of gardening.’\textsuperscript{568} In the case of Schwartz’s The Stella Garden, Ross states her reasons as ‘For one, the work sits not in a public space or gallery setting, but in the artist’s mother’s back yard.’ (I don’t recall Stowe, Stourhead or Rousham sitting in a public space or gallery setting, in fact they are precisely in their family’s (albeit rather large) ‘back yards’.\textsuperscript{569}) Secondly, Schwartz’s garden ‘has not, to the best of my knowledge, had any significant influence on other gardens or on other works of art.’ According to Ross therefore, to qualify as a participant in the modernist progress of art, the garden in question needs to

\textsuperscript{563} ibid., p. 159.
\textsuperscript{564} ibid.
\textsuperscript{565} ibid., p. 167.
\textsuperscript{567} For example: Modern Art and Modernism, Art in Modern Culture, Art in Theory.
\textsuperscript{568} Stephanie Ross, ‘Gardens, earthworks, and environmental art’. p. 168. Schwartz’s garden was inspired by Frank Stella’s 1970s relief paintings.
\textsuperscript{569} It is important to point out that notions of ‘private’ and ‘public’ have changed in the period from the 18th to 20th centuries. Although such large estates as Stowe and Stourhead were privately owned they were ‘public’ in a limited sense in that a limited public were invited to come and view the gardens. It is not true to say that these gardens were intended simply for the private contemplation of their owners. For a discussion of the changing notions of public and private see Richard Sennett, The Fall of Public Man (London: Faber and Faber. 1986).
appear in a public space (and surely the New York Times in which Ross came across Schwartz's garden is as public a space as any gallery space) and needs to have an influence on other similar or related practices. Ross might have done well to read the periodical Landscape Architecture, in which she would have found plenty of examples of 'modernist' gardens influencing other gardening practitioners, and examples of cross-over influences from other disciplines.\(^{565}\)

Despite their invisibility from a certain point of view, gardens it seems, are never far away from modernist art. Michael Fried's 'Art and Objecthood', a key modernist text central to much recent art debate,\(^{566}\) finds itself repeated twice in the context of gardening. These instances are not without humour.

The first is a piece of marginalia, easily overlooked, and probably destined to be irretrievably forgotten were it not that it appears in one of the most famous, and most often reproduced, articles by Robert Smithson. 'A Sedimentation of the Mind: Earth Proposals' was published in Artforum in September 1968\(^{567}\) (the same periodical in which Fried's 'Art and Objecthood' had appeared just over a year previously). Smithson's parody of one of the most famous phrases in Fried's article introduces a footnote (the only footnote in the article) about gardens. One of Fried's 'three propositions or theses'\(^{568}\) in 'Art and Objecthood' is 'Art degenerates as it approaches the condition of theater', Smithson asks: 'Could one say that art degenerates as it approaches gardening?'\(^{569}\) Smithson's footnote is a meditation on gardens, and in particular on the Garden of Eden.\(^{570}\) Smithson introduces a religious note into his writing, the constant but impossible task of attaining 'the certainty of the absolute garden', a sentiment that is worth comparing with Fried's defence in 'Art and Objecthood' of an art that transcends

---

\(^{565}\) John Beardsley includes six references to Landscape Architecture in the bibliography to his Earthworks and Beyond, including one to the special issue on 'Landscape Sculpture: The New Leap' Landscape Architecture 61 (July 1971) pp. 296-343, which including a fascinating early glossary of terms, see appendix 2: Grady Clay, 'The New Leap: Landscape Sculpture', pp. [1].

\(^{566}\) Michael Fried, 'Art and Objecthood', Artforum Vol. 5 (Summer 1967), pp. 12-23. Fried's article has become a set piece on the opposing minimalist/materialist and abstractionist/idealist 'camps' in the modernist tradition, a dichotomy that Fried's article, according to the editorial introduction to Art in Theory, 'did much to dramatize' (Art in Theory, p. 822). Harrison (one of the editors of Art in Theory) had previously written on this interpretation and the influential nature of Fried's article in his essay in the exhibition catalogue 1965 to 1972 - when attitudes became form: 'To anyone who'd read Artforum's special issue on sculpture, published in summer 1967, it was clear that a lively critical contest was being conducted between opposed factions' (p11). Fried's article achieved more exposure through its frequent reproduction and citation, particularly its reprinting in Minimal Art: A Critical Anthology, ed. Gregory Battcock (New York: Dutton, 1968), pp. 116-147., with a brief introductory note that has done much to standardise its interpretation. Its importance was again reasserted in art historical debate when Fried himself referred to it in the debate between himself and T. J. Clark, dramatized in the book, Pollock and After: The Critical Debate, ed. Francis Frascina (London: Harper & Row, 1985).


\(^{568}\) used to defend his claim that 'theater and theatricality are at war today, not simply with modernist painting (or modernist painting and sculpture), but with art as such - and to the extent that the different arts can be described as modernist, with modernist sensibility as such.', 'Art and Objecthood', p. 21.

\(^{569}\) Robert Smithson, 'A Sedimentation of the Mind'. p. 46.

\(^{570}\) ibid., p. 50.
temporality, that aspires to the condition of eternal presentness, embodied in the lost and unattainable paradise of the eternal.

Smithson's repetition of Fried forges a crucial link between theatre and gardens, and thus between Minimalist practices and those of gardening and Land Art. This is the notion of temporality. A garden necessarily exists in real time and the experiencing of it is in terms of a temporal progression, a movement through the disparate elements that involves the body and senses, and not merely the visual sense. The ideas of movement, actual time and direct experience in works of art constitute a strand discernible in modernist practices through, for example, Constructivism, Bauhaus theatre, Brecht, Gabo, Rickey, kinetic art, through to computer generated and video practices. For Fried's interpretation of modernism, this is a bastard line, not 'true' modernism, and for those keen to discern a binary opposition within modernism it constitutes the opposing tradition to Fried's abstract, static modernism. Thus Fried's first foray into the discourse of gardening, through Smithson's parodic repetition, leads to a discussion of temporality and idealism that demonstrates a point at which the practices of gardening have never been far away from the centre of modernist argument.

There seems no reason why gardening should not have played a part in the 'ferment of modernism', and indeed it did. To cite just a few examples at this juncture: Monet's garden at Giverny; the garden design of Gertrude Jekyll. Barbara Hepworth's garden at St. Ives, which is not merely a showroom for her works, but as any visitor immediately comprehends, a total and absorbing environment; Geoffrey Jellicoe's gardening/landscape architecture projects and in particular his Kennedy Memorial at Runnymede (1965) (discussed in more detail below); Isamu Noguchi's work (sculpture and garden

576 Iwona Blazwick discusses the etymological connections of landscape and theatre, with reference to the writings of John Barrell, in her essay 'Ha-Ha' in the catalogue to the exhibition *Ha-Ha: Contemporary British Art in an 18th Century Park*, Killerton Park, Devon, 19 June to 31 October 1993 and Spacex Gallery, Exeter, 19 June to 21 July 1993, curated by Iwona Blazwick and Peter Pay (catalogue unpaginated).

577 The temporal, movement and experience oriented strand in modernism is traced for example in Jack Burnham's *Beyond Modern Sculpture*, it also constitutes much of the informing strand in Michael Archer's introduction to *Installation Art*, eds. Nicholas de Oliveira, Nicola Oxley and Michael Petry (London: Thames and Hudson, 1994) Many of these practices were claimed for 'postmodernism' when that term was in the height of its vogue in the mid-1980s. Rather than a strand within modernism these practices were seen as an internal critique leading to the postmodernist overthrow of modernism (that this was a modernist line of argument seems to have been overlooked by many commentators who forwarded it). Fried himself decided that 'post-modernism' was theatricality (his 'old' enemy of authentic art) with a 'new name' (Pollock and After, p. 78, footnote 17). Foucault's systematic history of discourses comes in useful here, pointing out that the 'literal' and 'theatrical' can only be seen as 'postmodern' once the latter term has been inaugurated in that connection, and thus Fried rewrites his earlier text in the present, shifting that segment of discourse in such a way that it is changed, substantially, by his later assertion. Jonathan Benthall identifies an 'alternative kinetic tradition' which uses the transformative processes inherent in nature, rather than motors and machinery. In this tradition he locates the artists Medalla, Metzger and Mark Boyle. Only Medalla of these was included in any of the Land Art/Earthworks/Earth Art exhibitions (in *Earth Art at Cornell*). Jonathan Benthall, 'Haacke, Sonfist and Nature', *Studio International* 181 (March 1971), pp. 95-96, p. 95.

578 In particular her work in collaboration with Edwin Lutens. Jekyll's garden design was compared to Impressionist painting. 'One Foot in the Past' BBC TV, BBC 2, Thursday 24 August, 1995.
projects) which draws heavily on the Japanese concept of the garden. In connection with this latter example there is a clear connection of influence between Noguchi and other art to fulfil Ross’s criteria for inclusion in her modernist history. Richard Long claimed Noguchi as one of his earliest influences, Anne Seymour writes: ‘Having seen a work by Noguchi, in the 54-64 exhibition at the Tate Gallery, which he felt was entirely about being on the floor. Long began creating sculptures on the ground, which not only articulated an indoor space but looked forward to his first outdoor work a few months later.’

Humour is also an important strategy in Smithson’s text. His parody of Fried is amusing in a satirical way, and humour is very much a part of Smithson’s rhetoric. He produces a highly amusing typology of humour in relation to crystallography which he calls, to entice one further into a play on words and terminology, the “ha-ha-crystal” concept:

[R. Buckminster] Fuller was told by certain scientists that the fourth dimension was “ha-ha,” in other words, that it is laughter. Perhaps it is. It is well to remember, that the seemingly topsy-turvy world revealed by Lewis Carroll, did spring from a well ordered mathematical mind. [...] The highly ordered non-sense of Carroll, suggests that there might be a similar way to treat laughter. Laughter is in a sense a kind of entropic “verbalization.” How could artists translate this verbal entropy, that is “ha-ha,” into “solid-models”? [...] The order and disorder of the fourth dimension could be set between laughter and crystal-structure, as a device for unlimited speculation.

Let us now define the different types of Generalized Laughter, according to the six main crystal systems: the ordinary laugh is cubic or square (Isometric), the chuckle is a triangle or pyramid (Tetragonal), the giggle is a hexagon or rhomboid (Hexagonal), the titter is prismatic (Orthorhombic), the snicker is oblique (Monoclinic), the guffaw is asymmetric (Triclinic).

The second repetition of Fried’s ‘Art and Objecthood’ in the context of gardening is a more exact one. And the way in which I came across it is also worth retelling. I’d like here to re-use the words of a paper I presented on this subject when I was invited to speak at the Spring School for students of Landscape Architecture in March 1995 (my foray into the realms of gardening). I used the opportunity to discuss my finding Michael Fried transposed into the realm of the garden.

The following section appears in edited form from my paper ‘Travels in time and space between land art and landscape architecture’.

579 Anne Seymour, ‘Walking in Circles’, p. 16. Seymour’s assertion that it was Noguchi’s work that first prompted Long to articulate the ground plane in his work, prior to his arrival at St Martin’s School of Art is highly significant since it disallows the standard interpretation that this use of the ground was initiated by Anthony Caro. Seymour breaks the connection that had linked Long to Caro, forged, for example by Andrew Causey in his essay ‘Space and Time in British Land Art’, Studio International 193 (March/April 1977), pp. 122-130. Causey writes: ‘So far as the sculptural context [for land art] is concerned, the crucial figure is Anthony Caro, whose work was well-known to the English land artists in the mid-1960s. He has said that one of his main concerns then was with “extension”, and Strip (1965), which is as ground-hugging as any work of land art, bears witness to this.’ (pp. 122-123).


581 ‘Travels in time and space between land art and landscape architecture’, paper presented at the Spring School, Department of Landscape Architecture, Leeds Metropolitan University, 30 March 1995.
One day I was in the Brotherton Library at the University of Leeds looking things up in the *Art Index* bibliography in the Art section of the library. I forget now exactly what I was looking for, but I chanced upon an article by Michael Fried. It was published in the same year as *Art and Objecthood* - 1967 - a few month's later than the *Artforum* essay. But two things were particularly striking about this entry. One was the title of the article: `Roadscape as a Visceral Experience'. The idea of the visceral body or the concept of experiencing a work are both highly temporal ideas, things that take place in `real' time, that have a life span or a duration. Such notions were anathema to the kind of approach that could claim that the ideal condition of painting and sculpture is `of existing in, indeed of secreting or constituting, a continuous and perpetual present'. That is of existing outside of time - of transcending time.

The second striking thing about the Fried entry was the location of the article `Roadscape as a Visceral Experience'. The article was published in *Landscape Architecture*, a periodical that is not held in the Brotherton Library. I had already found a number of references to articles in this periodical, and this discovery, with the intrigue it provoked, was just the impetus I needed to seek out the said journal.

The search took me a very short distance, to the architecture library at Leeds Metropolitan University. Only a few minutes walk away from the Brotherton library where my voyage of discovery began, but I found myself in unfamiliar territory. No longer in the art or sculpture section, but with books on architecture, town planning and landscape design. I found the periodical, the right volume. I sat down, found the right page `Roadscape as a Visceral Experience'. And I began to read. I felt a strange sense of deja-vu as I scanned the words on the page, and then my eyes came to rest at the end of the short article on a line that read: from "Art and Objecthood" in *Artforum*, Summer '67. (a- ha! - the expression of surprise similar to the one from which the name of the ha-ha is derived) It was an extract from the same article. A very short article. And not only that, if I'd been a little more observant in my fervour to find the piece, I might have noticed that the article appeared in a whole section of extracts from other journals and newspapers that had been collected together and published, presumably with the idea that they would be of some interest or relevance to readers of *Landscape Architecture*.

I could have felt bitterly disappointed at this revelation, and at the realisation that I hadn't in fact stumbled across a little known piece of writing by Fried that other art history scholars had somehow overlooked. However I was still intrigued.

The extract is short. Looking back to the original *Artforum* article I discovered that in the original it occupied less than half of a page in a twelve-page article. But what was interesting was exactly what had been chosen to be reprinted in *Landscape Architecture*. A good third of the section quoted was given over to the famous account by the minimalist sculptor Tony Smith which Fried quoted in order to illustrate the very qualities in minimalist sculpture he deplored. What was intriguing was that *Landscape Architecture* seemed to undermine Fried's account - to present an appraisal rather than a

---

82 Michael Fried. 'Art and Objecthood', p. 22.
criticism of Smith’s work - by quoting, repeating exactly. Fried’s own article. Not only that, but the title Landscape Architecture gave to the article reinforced this opposing interpretation by allying Fried’s name with concepts his theory positively set itself against. Smith’s account - itself quoted by Fried from its original source in an interview with Samuel Wagstaff Jr., published in Artforum in December 1966 (Talking with Tony Smith) has made a journey from the issue of Artforum in which it appeared in the context of an interview, to be repeated first in Artforum’s special issue on American Sculpture in the summer of 1967, and now in Landscape Architecture.

The effect of my discovery of the Fried article in Landscape Architecture was to redirect my investigations away from an internal dispute between different types of sculpture, or different theories of sculpture, towards an interaction between landscape architecture and sculpture, and in particular, Land Art and landscape architecture. It became clear looking through subsequent issues of Landscape Architecture over the next decade, that a lot of interaction and debate continued and was elaborated in that periodical.

Almost exactly a decade after the (double) publication of Fried’s ‘Art and Objecthood’, Catherine Howett wrote an article entitled ‘New Directions in Environmental Art’. It was published in the January 1977 issue of Landscape Architecture. In it she points out the lessons she feels the profession of landscape architecture can learn from Environmental, Earth or Land Art (whichever title is used) and the potential for ‘an ongoing dialogue in which landscape architects ought to be participating - not through fear of seeing their own concerns co-opted, but because there is much to learn and much to contribute.’

The artist she invokes in order to reinforce her point is the sculptor Robert Smithson. Howett cites the last of Smithson’s articles, published in Artforum a few months before his accidental death in 1973, an article about Frederick Law Olmsted, the designer of Central Park and, according to Smithson, ‘America’s first earthwork artist.’ Smithson locates contemporary earthwork sculpture firmly in the tradition of landscape gardening and architecture and in the theories of 18th century landscape gardening practitioners such as Uvedale Price and William Gilpin. Through Howett’s account, as through other accounts such as those by John Beardsley or Stephanie Ross, Earthworks or Land Art can be seen to share a history with landscape architecture.

584 An early connection between Earthworks and the 18th Century theory of the picturesque was made by Sidney Tillim reviewing the Dwan Gallery Earthworks show in 1968. He included an illustration by Thomas Rowlandson from The Tour of Dr. Syntax in Search of the Picturesque (1815) (p. 44) and states: ‘What I think is involved in earth art in particular and actual media art in general is a 20th-century version of the picturesque.’ and ‘[... ] it is further confirmation of my analogy that minimalism has resulted in a body of theoretical writing comparable to that produced by the proselytizers and theorist of the original picturesque.’ (p. 43): Sidney Tillim ‘Earthworks and the New Picturesque’, Artforum 7 (December 1968), pp. 42-45.
585 John Beardsley. Earthworks and Beyond.
I spent some considerable time in the Landscape architecture and gardening sections of libraries during my research. Another ‘discovery’ was Jellicoe’s John F. Kennedy Memorial at Runnymede. This is one example that could refute Ross’s claims that there are no modernist gardens, were it not that Jellicoe’s memorial is not strictly speaking described as a garden. It is a kind of garden of remembrance. The memorial is in the form of a walk leading to an inscribed tablet. In his Studies in Landscape Design, Jellicoe described the work in terms of an allegorical representation of Bunyan’s Pilgrim’s Progress.

The walk, like Bunyan’s allegory, begins at a wicket gate. Jellicoe’s walk then proceeds through a wood [figure 89] and emerges in the open at a high vantage point overlooking the site where the Magna Carta was signed. [figure 90] The memorial is situated on an acre of land that was ‘given’ to America and is thus American territory. When I visited the site I was intrigued to find that a real ha-ha divided the lower edge of the American territory from the surrounding land, allowing, as the ha-ha does, an uninterrupted view from the memorial to the site of the signing of the Magna Carta. [figure 91 shows the view across the ha-ha] This unbroken vista is highly symbolic in this context, both of the relationship it tries to forge between Britain and the USA, the lost colony, and between the past and the present, represented textually by the repetition of the Magna Carta in the American Constitution, a connection that had already made Runnymede a place of pilgrimage for American citizens.

The apprehension of authentic art, according to Fried’s ‘Art and Objecthood’, is something instantaneous. Sculptures like those of Anthony Caro, which Fried admired - not withstanding the fact that they exist in real space, can be walked around, and thus have an almost infinite number of points of view - are, according to Fried’s theory experienced in an instant. ‘as though,’ Fried states ‘if only one were infinitely more acute. a single infinitely brief instant would be long enough to see everything, to experience the work in all its depth and fullness, to be forever convinced by it’. Jellicoe’s Kennedy memorial cannot be experienced in its totality from any point of view, however acute one’s intellect. It perhaps only approaches such a totallising view when seen in Jellicoe’s plan of the site in his essay describing the work. Even then the colours, the effects of the season or the time of day and the changing materials of the progress cannot be fully experienced through a secondary medium. Jellicoe’s work is experienced in time, as one moves through it temporally and physically. The element of time, or of temporality, is something that was and is crucial to landscape design, from gardens like Stourhead to contemporary urban plazas. In repeating Fried’s ‘Art and Objecthood’, Landscape Architecture had picked up on the part of Fried’s article that he was trying to diminish, that he had detected as all that was wrong with the art he opposed. Ironically he brought it to public attention and inadvertently valorised it. Taken out of context his comments read like approval. In picking up on these developments in contemporary sculpture that Fried viewed with such cynicism, had landscape architecture noticed something in contemporary sculpture that it identified with?

586 Stephanie Ross, ‘Gardens, earthworks, and environmental art’.
587 On the day I visited Runnymede, the Kennedy Memorial and the memorial to the Magna Carta, the majority of the people I encountered (there weren’t many, it was mid-winter) were American.
Figure 89. G. A. Jellicoe. John F. Kennedy Memorial. Runnymede. 1965
Figure 90. G. A. Jellicoe. John F. Kennedy Memorial. Runnymede. 1965
Figure 91. View from the Kennedy Memorial, Runnymede.
The Kennedy Memorial not only serves as a demonstration of relations between Britain and the USA, one of the on-going themes in art criticism and history of the period under discussion in this dissertation, but also of the relationship between the practices designated Landscape Architecture or gardening and those designated ‘Land Art’. Jellicoe’s Kennedy Memorial walk is a piece of landscape architecture making no claim to be anything else and yet there seems something in it that, for me at least, resonated with many of the works claimed to be ‘Land Art’. Not least with one particular example, a work made in the USA by a British artist.

The artist is Roelof Louw, and his account is of a work he made for an exhibition in New Jersey in 1975 appeared in *Tracks*, a journal of artists’ writings, in Spring 1977:

The form of the project is allegorical: its model might be John Bunyan’s Pilgrim’s Progress. It is a slow-motion climb to a distant goal, in which time appears to be attenuated by the position of the steel walls. The six physical stages of the journey are split up into corresponding visual metaphors. At each location the position of the steel walls deflects attention to distinct features of the landscape that refer to the psychic states identified with this symbolic journey. But it is a form of allegory with a difference: a cinematic experience of broken frames has been transposed to the physical world.

Reference to cinematic experience is clearly a reference to Smithson who is ostensibly the subject of Louw’s piece of writing. Louw’s essay explicitly demonstrates what is implicitly seen elsewhere in British art and particularly in Land Art type works, and that is the immense influence of and interest in Robert Smithson in Britain. What is more, looking back at Louw’s writing from the perspective of the present, and with the knowledge of the terms and modes of argument forwarded by the so-called ‘postmodernist’ writers in *October* magazine, notably Rosalind Krauss, Craig Owens and Yve-Alain Bois, it is fascinating to observe many of their fixations present here in Louw’s writing. The mention of allegory links Louw with Owens, whilst Louw’s phenomenological mode of description resonates with Bois’s descriptions of Richard Serra’s work *Clara-Clara*. Similarly Louw’s description of Alice Aycock’s work bears similarities to the account of Mary Miss’s work *Perimeters/Pavilions/Decoys* (1978) with which Krauss begins her famous article ‘Sculpture in the Expanded Field’.

---

*589 This marks the end of the section taken from my paper ‘Travels in time and space between land art and landscape architecture’.*


*591 Yve-Alain Bois. ‘A Picturesque Stroll around *Clara-Clara*’. *October* 29 (summer 1984), pp. 32-62. Bois writes of the experience of viewing Richard Serra’s *Clara-Clara*: ‘In walking inside *Clara-Clara*, going toward the bottleneck that these two arcs form at their middle, the spectator constantly has the strange impression that one wall goes “faster” than the other, that the right and left sides of his body are not synchronized. Having passed through the bottleneck, which reveals to him the reason for his strange feeling - although the slant of the walls is actually rather slight - he then sees the lateral differences reversed: the symmetry of this effect is foreseeable, but not the surprise that accompanies it.’ Both Bois and Louw offer a phenomenological account of experiencing sculpture which includes descriptions of the ways in which the sculpture affects the body and what effect this has on one’s perception.*

*592 Rosalind Krauss. ‘Sculpture in the Expanded Field’. p. 31.*
of writing is full of mentions of ‘gaps’, ‘interstices’, ‘ruptures’. With knowledge of the importance of rupture and discontinuity to the *October* writers’ theories of postmodernism, one is left speculating on the possible connections between Louw’s writing and those of the *October* writers.

Is it possible to interpret Louw’s words as signs of what I have been calling the ha-ha, attempts to make (invisible) connections and to intervene to create discontinuities and ruptures in existing fields, both physically (through his sculpture project and those of others he describes) and theoretically? Louw’s is an account in which gardening and gardeners are called upon (he mentions Capability Brown and Gilpin for example) to make the connection between the (pre-existing) landscape and the contemporary works placed in it, and in which physical strategies of disruption allow for contemporary intervention.

Roelof Louw attended St Martin’s school of Art from 1961 to 1965. He features in the list of artists from ‘The sculpture course at St. Martin’s’ in *Studio International’s* special issue on ‘Some aspects of contemporary British sculpture’ in January 1969, and also is a participant in the symposium on ‘Anthony Caro’s work’. He is also included in Charles Harrison’s article ‘Some recent sculpture in Britain’ and in a feature on Stockwell Depot, where Louw was working at the time, all in that same issue of *Studio International*. Despite his prominence in this highly influential magazine issue, Louw seems strangely absent from many later accounts of sculpture of this period. By the mid-1970s he was, as his writing quoted above suggests, working very much in a Land Art direction and back in 1969 Harrison had identified his sculpture as relating to the work of the ‘younger’ St. Martin’s artists (Flanagan, McLean, Long). Why does he not feature in the discourse of Land Art? The first reason is quite straightforward - he was not included in any of the ‘founding’ exhibitions of Land

---

593 Louw’s text concludes with the following section: ‘These projects work within the *interstices* of the metaphorical process, exploring the nature of the act of transference, placing this operation in physical space, permuting the formation of analogies in time, and *rupturing* the act of attachment. Subject means and object are *separated* in a process where these *gaps have to be consciously bridged*. Both the inner origins as well as the external social circumstances that foster emotional identities are openly displayed as sites and non-sites are *intercut*. As I see it, these projects both *demystify* and *reform* the metaphorical process.’ Roelof Louw, ‘Sites/Non-Sites’, p. 15. (my emphases)

594 ‘In contrast to the primitive and scaleless sites used for ’60s earthworks, the surroundings at Far Hills are already an architectonic readymade. Entirely cultivated and gardened, this artificial [sic] order draws one into a heady union with the earth and vegetation. Through fences, lawns, gravel paths, ditches, hedgerows and clearings, bodily movements intertwave with nature in the equivalent of an intimate erotic embrace. To enter these thoroughly humanized surroundings is to conform to a well-established way of life. Given this condition, to directly alter the site (leave human markings or make excavations) or to use it as an architectural setting (a kind of backdrop for an earthwork) would have been ineffectual. Instead, what emerged at Far Hills was an original encounter with the landscape that drove it back, kept it at a distance through formal strategies of alienation. In the most interesting works (in my view), the process of negotiating the physical qualities of the site (and its transfer into metaphor) was directed by the use of physical strategies of rupture, intercession, and discontinuity with the existing features that develop from Smithson’s site/non-site dichotomy.’ ibid., p. 12.


598 ‘Sculptors at Stockwell Depot’. ibid., pp. 34-37
Art/Earthworks/Earth Art. However, this has not prevented other British artists from being included in later accounts of the phenomenon, such as Beardsley's. David Reason's or Rupert Martin's. Hamish Fulton, Andy Goldsworthy, David Nash, Richard Harris and Ian Hamilton Finlay for example, all feature in later accounts although they did not participate in any of the founding exhibitions. In the case of Goldsworthy, Nash and Harris, these artists could be seen to constitute a 'second generation' of land artists or sculptors in the landscape, and indeed this is often how they are portrayed. Fulton has remained in the picture partly on account of his close association with Richard Long, and Finlay has featured in an increasingly prominent role as a linking figure between different, conflicting traditions in British Sculpture. Thus in one way or another, these, and other artists have remained in the discourse of British Sculpture, even if not explicitly in the discourse of Land Art or Landscape Sculpture.

Falling between categories has often led to artists being overlooked. In the case of British Sculpture, falling between generations can equally lead to obscurity. Charles Harrison's account in 1969 is an outstanding example of the construction of a generational model. Here one can see clear signs of Louw's potential sidelining, along with another, now infrequently mentioned, St. Martin's sculptor, Roland Brener. Harrison writes: 'Roelof Louw is another member of the group working at Stockwell who belongs in age to the New Generation but who left St. Martin's at the same time as Brener and whose work relates more to that of the younger group and 'The wide divergence of apparent intent between the two generations of younger sculptors (with the exception of Louw, roughly divided between those over and those under 30) is partly a matter of different economic situations and different environments.' The shape of British Land Art, and of British sculpture history more generally, owes a great deal to the a priori imposition of these simplistic 'generational' models onto an evidently complex situation. These models have to some extent been modified or reassessed but remain more or less

599 John Beardsley, Earthworks and Beyond (first and expanded editions).
600 For example David Reason's essay 'A Hard Singing of Country' in The Unpainted Landscape.
601 Rupert Martin, for example in his The Sculpted Forest, or in his essay 'The Journey as Pilgrimage' in The Journey. A Search for the Role of Contemporary Art in Religious and Spiritual Life.
602 Another reason for the exclusion of Louw and Brener from accounts of British sculpture is that they moved to North America in the early 1970s. In November 1972 Louw was reported as 'going to the United States to teach in the winter': 'Contributors to this issue', Studio International 184 (November 1972) and in January 1974 as 'presently working in New York': 'Contributors to this issue', Studio International 187 (January 1974). Brener moved to Canada in 1974.
603 Charles Harrison. 'Some recent sculpture in Britain'. p. 29.
604 Ibid. p. 32.
605 Ivor Abrahams is a good example of an artist who has been excluded from accounts of British Sculpture and Land Art for reasons including that of not falling into a particular 'generation'. Abrahams did attend St Martin's School of Art between 1952 and 1953, whereas the earliest attendance at St Martin's recorded in the influential Studio International article 'The sculpture course at St. Martin's' is 1955 (for Tim Scott). Abrahams' work does not fit with the stylistic categories of British Sculpture, and although his work from 1966 focussed on the imagery of the modern garden and landscape features, his materials were artificial and thus he could be excluded from the category Land Art on material grounds. These 'reasons' for exclusion say a lot about the construction of the discourse of Land Art and British Sculpture. In the Foreword/Introduction to a catalogue of Abrahams' work published in 1973, Mortimer S. Bibble writes: 'In contrast with much contemporary sculpture Ivor Abrahams' art seems aberrant, eccentric and a little devious. His sculpture resists the usual categories; its [sic] difficult to pin the work down' (p. 6) and 'To a strict art historical determinist. Abrahams' work is deviant and somewhat
Reviewing the discourse on Richard Long and Ian Hamilton Finlay for my BA dissertation in 1990, I commented on how, during the 1980s, Finlay had begun to be considered in the context of Land Art. At the time I saw this as a symptom or effect of 'postmodernism' - a shift in discourse that enabled Finlay and Long for example to be mentioned in the same breath. Finlay was pigeon-holed under the heading 'Post-Modernism' as well as under 'Landscape as self-exploration' in Art and Design's profile of 20thC British Art. In a number of texts in the 1980s Finlay began to figure as a connector between different traditions in British sculpture, and in particular, between different generations of British Sculptors. In the catalogue to The Sculpture Show in 1983, Stuart Morgan demonstrates the logic of this analysis of British Sculpture:

[...:] ideas of younger and older generations are deeply ingrained in any history of British sculpture, partly because of art teaching. Philip King was Henry Moore's assistant, and so on. A simple approach to the generations would regard them in ten-year cycles Henry Moore, Geometry of Fear, New Generation, the second generation of St. Martin's students . . . They
disreputable.' (p. 7). The moral and ethical overtones of the words Bibble uses are both disturbing and revealing. Ivor Abrahams: Environments, Sculptures, Drawings, Complete Graphics. (Cologne: Kölnischer Kunstverein and Rotterdam: Lijnbaan Centrum, Rotterdamske kunststichting, 1973), exhibition catalogue text in German and English.

---

606 See for example Charles Harrison, 'Sculpture's Recent Past'. This much later account (1987) reconfirms (with slight adjustments) the history presented in Harrison's earlier accounts. With particular reference to Louw, Harrison writes: 'Though Louw is the exact contemporary of Bolus, King, and Witkin, he did not attend St. Martin's as a student until the years 1961-65. He was not included in the "New Generation" exhibition of 1965, nor was his work evidently compatible. As one of those working at Stockwell Depot in the later 1960s, he shared in a critical reaction against the hermeticism of recent British sculpture and in that concern for the interaction of sculpture and context which developed in part as a consequence.' p. 22.

607 John Griffiths, 'Modern Movements in British Art'.

608 It is worth noting that Finlay's first major (London) retrospective followed on immediately from the Silver Jubilee exhibition of Sculpture. (Finlay was shown in the Serpentine Gallery from 17 September to 16 October 1977) and that his important work, Lyre, an Oerlikon gun with a philosophical inscription on its base, was exhibited in Battersea Park as part of the Silver Jubilee exhibition of sculpture. The gun, installed amidst the greenery of the park, at once a piece of sculpture and a threatening piece of war machinery appears on the cover to the exhibition catalogue that accompanied Finlay's Serpentine Gallery exhibition, it seems a fitting symbol of the ferment evident in the Silver Jubilee Exhibition of Sculpture catalogue (discussed above in Land Art Landscape, pp. 228-232) and of the ambiguity of the prevailing 'punk' scene in London, with its messages of anarchy, the wearing of swastikas (Finlay too has been criticised for using this symbol in his work) and the Sex Pistols famous 'God Save the Queen' album cover that caused great offence to 'the establishment' in Jubilee year. This is not to claim Finlay as a 'punk' artist (an amusing but totally inaccurate analogy) but simply to see these images as timely and thus comprehensible at that point. The use of potentially inflammatory insignia and symbols by 'outsiders' whether they be artists or punks is revealing of a tension within the establishments of government or the art world that are observable elsewhere in documents from the period. Finlay becomes part of the momentous events of 1977 and subsequently becomes useful, as is seen by the inclusion of his work in several of the 'sculpture parks', to the new broadened, regionalist, retrospective agenda of Landscape Sculpture / Land Art post-1977, however critical he is personally of such manifestations. See Finlay on Sculpture Parks in More Detached Sentences on Gardening in the Manner of Shenstone in Yves Abrioux, Ian Hamilton Finlay: A Visual Primer, p. 40.
shift (roughly speaking) in decades. And they do so by reversals of both material and form which constitute savage denials of their predecessors. [...] Metaphors of killing the father, looking gift horses in the mouth or biting the hand that feeds you seem to express perfectly the gesture that separates Caro from Moore, or for that matter Long from Caro.595

Morgan was talking to Kate Blacker who had chosen Finlay and Long amongst her selection of artists for the show. Blacker herself links Long and Finlay together with Stephen Willats, as artists she thought of as belonging to an ‘older generation’ than the other artists she includes. The ensuing discussion between Morgan and Blacker draws out several connections between Long and Finlay. For example, the way in which they ‘employ a range of media simultaneously and play constantly on the relationships between them’; their ‘interest in poetry’; their ‘need to integrate their work fully into their lives’; and their concern ‘with ways of life which exist predominantly outside art confines’.610 Whatever justification Blacker gives for linking these artists together, it is a curatorial bracketing performed by herself with no need for justifications other than those she chooses to forward. In this sense it is similar to the kind of institutional groupings that inaugurated Land Art, discussed in Land Art Beginning.

In Richard Francis’s introduction to the catalogue to the 1988 exhibition, Starlit Waters, at the Tate Gallery Liverpool. Finlay assumes a much more crucial and central role. Not only is it a piece of Finlay’s work that gives the title to the exhibition,611 but he is also claimed as one of a number of artists who played an ‘essential catalytic role’ between the two ‘fields’ or ‘generations’ of artists that the exhibition focuses on. These. Francis identifies as:

the artists associated with the ‘Vocational Sculpture Course’ run by Frank Martin at St. Martin’s School of Art in London in the late 1960s. (Bruce McLean, Barry Flanagan, Richard Long, Hamish Fulton, John Hilliard) and on sculptors showing at the Lisson Gallery from the early 1980s (Tony Cragg, Richard Deacon, Shirazeh Houshiary, Anish Kapoor, Richard Wentworth, Bill Woodrow).

The other ‘catalytic’ artists named are: John Latham, Art and Language, William Tucker and Michael Craig-Martin. According to Francis, two exhibitions codify these groupings. The New Art (1972) the first and Objects and Sculpture (1981) the second. It is a historical exhibition based on other exhibitions, an exhibition about institutional groupings and their validity. It reinforces the grouping designating a useful role for the few artists included in the Tate’s permanent collection, who don’t fit in, or whose relation to the other more fixed and stable groupings is problematic. Ha-ha tactics again. These artists perform the invisible break between the two groups, making their differences imperceptible from a particular point of view: the present. Starlit Waters is an important exhibition in another sense, and one discussed in the chapter Land Art Landscape. Starlit Waters was the first exhibition at the Tate

595 Stuart Morgan and Kate Blacker. ‘Loose talk.’ p. 92.
610 Ibid., p. 93.
611 Ian Hamilton Finlay’s Starlit Waters (with Peter Grant, 1967) was acquired by the Tate Gallery in 1976. the same year in which it acquired a number of works by Richard Long (see list in note 247 above) and the same year as the so-called Carl Andre ‘Bricks Affair’; in the light of which the Tate were also criticised for purchasing this work by Finlay. see David Brown. ‘Stonypath: an Inland Garden’. Studio International 193 (January/February 1977). pp. 34-35. p. 34.
Gallery Liverpool, the northern outpost of the Tate Gallery. In this sense, British sculpture is again used to reinforce a regionalist agenda. ‘Important’ art is dispatched from the capital to inaugurate and approve the importance of this regional art space. The importance of the presence of Long’s work in performing such affirmative gestures is borne out by the fact that more works by Long were shown than by any other artist. 612

Morgan is critical of the generational model even as he finds himself reconstructing it in his conversation. Towards the end of the conversation Blacker asks him whether he ‘really feel[s] concerned about this’ generational struggle interpretation, to which Morgan replies: ‘I don’t really. I’m playing devil’s advocate for a historical determinism I no longer respect’. 613 By 1988 and the Tate’s Starlit Waters this historical model was, with the minor adjustments described above, still in place. The generations remain, according to Francis, because they are historical facts, and Starlit Waters is an ‘historical rather than exploratory’ retrospective exhibition. The generational model remains moreover because it is useful and because it affirms and satisfies the most deeply ingrained modes of reasoning, the dialectic, derived from Hegel and demonstrated with supreme clarity, not to mention humour, by Finlay in his Hegel Stile in his garden at Stonypath Little Sparta.

One comes across the Hegel Stile walking out from the garden towards the Moorland and Lochan Eck, the small loch Finlay constructed by damming a small stream. A fence divides the garden from the wilder moorland and water beyond. Inscriptions on the garden side of the fence read: ‘Thesis - fence’, ‘Antithesis - gate’. Planks placed through the fence provide a footing to step over. The barrier negotiated, an inscription on the other side of the fence reads: ‘Synthesis - stile’.

A stile appears in one of the two contrasting views by Humphry Repton discussed by Stephen Daniels 614 and illustrated at figure 85 above. The stile enables the working man to cross the estate, it is a surmountable boundary, marking territory but not excluding passage across it. By contrast, the wall that is constructed in place of the open fence is a total barrier. One cannot get over it, and neither can one see past it. The owned inside has effectively been sealed off from the outside. The ha-ha is a subtle development on these modes of division, for it enables effective exclusion without impairing the visual prospect. Appearance and reality are separated. The ha-ha is no less formidable a barrier for its invisibility. The ha-ha represents an increased ownership rather than a more restricted one. It does not divide, as the fence does, as the wall does, owned from unowned land, but rather one sort of property from another. The land on both sides of the ha-ha is owned, but they belong to different aspects of the

612 There are 6 entries for Long in the catalogue of the exhibition. However, Long’s work did not physically occupy the greatest amount of space, since 4 of the 6 works shown were framed works consisting of photographs and texts. The three artists with 5 works each, all substantial works in three dimensions, were by the three leading figures of the so-called ‘1980s’ or ‘Lisson Gallery’ sculptors: Tony Cragg, Richard Deacon and Bill Woodrow. This demonstrates the status they had acquired by this point.

613 Kate Blacker and Stuart Morgan, ‘Loose talk’, p. 97.

land owning economy. The garden side belongs to the domestic and familial economy. The park side belongs to an economy of agriculture, forestry, or game-rearing. The ha-ha marks difference within the economy of the same, whereas the fence and wall, whether or not provided with opportunities for dialectical overcomings, marks two opposing systems (inside and outside, private and public, culture and nature, tame and wild and so on). Furthermore, in the ha-ha situation, all of the landscape is subordinated to a powerful visual organisation, creating the appearance of continuity from a particular point of view, that is to say, from the present.

The stile demonstrates and operates within the sharply delineated landscape of the Hegelian tradition. The ha-ha could be seen to relate to the expansive landscape of a prevailing 'anti-Hegelianism'. The lie of the land in this landscape is outlined in Deleuze's work with Guattari and also in texts by Deleuze alone, notably Difference and Repetition and The Fold: Leibniz and the Baroque. In Difference and Repetition Deleuze introduces the signs of 'a generalized anti-Hegelianism' in which 'difference and repetition have taken the place of the identical and the negative, of identity and contradiction.' In The Fold, Deleuze proposes a possible way of proceeding using a tradition that exists and persists but has been overlooked because of the overarching dominance of the prevailing philosophical tradition (in which Hegel features predominantly). Leibniz's theory of Monads is given a new lease of life by Deleuze as a system that allows for the consideration of unique entities and broad complexities, a system that is not predicated on oppositional or binaristic models, not thesis - antithesis - synthesis (becoming a new thesis and so on), but one of a complex of non-hierarchical elements that can perpetually be rearranged and reordered. The ha-ha could be seen to correspond to Deleuze's idea of the 'fold' which he takes from Leibniz: 'Deleuze shows that when Leibniz invented the concept of the 'fold' in philosophy - a concept inspired by the Baroque period in the history of art - he opened the way to a new practice of philosophy as the constitution of disjunctive figures (e.g., the monad). More precisely, the fold is the relationship of difference with itself.' The ha-ha could relate to a broad range of recent philosophical and theoretical models that are concerned with horizontal as opposed to vertical (hierarchical) modes of thought, and with disruptions in this plane of thought and practice. Humour too has its place on/in these

---

615 Robert Smithson makes a connection between fences and modernism in his essay 'A Sedimentation of the Mind: Earth Preposals'. Smithson writes: "Allan Kaprow's thinking is a good example - "Most humans it seems, still put up fences around their acts and thoughts - " (Artforum, June 1968.) Fried thinks he knows who has the "finest" fences around their art." (pp. 46)


617 Gilles Deleuze, Difference and Repetition.


619 Gilles Deleuze, Preface to Difference and Repetition, p. xix.

620 As Brian Massumi describes Deleuze and Guattari's thinking: 'Nomad thought replaces the old equation of representation, x = x not y (I = I = not you) with an open equation: ... + v + z + a + ... + arm + brick + window + ...)'. Translator's foreword to Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari, A Thousand Plateaus, p. xiii.

621 John Lechte, Fifty key contemporary thinkers: from structuralism to postmodernity (London: Routledge, 1994). pp. 103-104.
surfaces of thought, as Jean-Jacques Lecercle's analysis of the spatial metaphor that governs Deleuze's thought demonstrates.\footnote{Satire is concerned with the depth of the primary order, it deals with insults and obscenities, and regresses to oral aggressive sex, to excrement and food: it is the art of regression, and Swift, the famous satirist, is also the author of the infamous poems to Stella. But irony is the art of heights: its game of equivocation and metaphor is controlled by an all-mastering subject; it is a form of domination where the subject is placed in the elevated position of a God. Humour, however, frees the subject to creep along the ground, on the surface: not going down the the satirical incoherence of depth, where objects are dismembered, but clinging to the discrete absurdity of surfaces, where sense rules over the serious game of paradoxes, and negation no longer denies but only confuses'. Jean-Jacques Lecercle, Philosophy through the Looking-Glass: Language, nonsense, desire (London: Hutchinson, 1985), p. 112.}

A horizontal or non-hierarchical logic ‘orders’ (or doesn’t order) the discrete elements of language that make up Ian Hamilton Finlay’s several collections of detached or unconnected sentences. These take their cues from a number of sources, including gardening. After the gardening theory of Shenstone, Finlay produces his Unconnected Sentences on Gardening and More Detached Sentences on Gardening in the Manner of Shenstone.\footnote{Extracts from these are published in Yves Abrioux, Ian Hamilton Finlay: A Visual Primer, p. 40 and ‘A Walk Through Little Sparta, and a Few Detached Sentences on Gardening by Ian Hamilton Finlay’ (with photographs by John Stathatos), Untitled: a review of contemporary art, no. 2 (London: Autumn 1993), pp. 10-11.} Finlay has used a similar format to produce sentences on subjects ranging from pebbles (Detached Sentences on the Pebble) to Metaphysics (Detached Sentences on Metaphysics).\footnote{Discussed in Yves Abrioux, ‘Neopresocratic’ in Ian Hamilton Finlay: A Visual Primer, pp. 218-221, p. 219.} A collection of sentences published in 1985 were published as Table Talk of Ian Hamilton Finlay,\footnote{Ian Hamilton Finlay, Table Talk of Ian Hamilton Finlay (Mission BC, Canada: Barbarian Press, 1985).} a title which serves to link this form of discourse to laughter as well as gardening. In his essay on ‘Laughter and Freedom’, Mikhail Bakhtin writes:

The antique tradition of free, often improper, but at the same time philosophical table talk had been revived at the time of the Renaissance; it converged with the local tradition of festive meals which had common roots in folklore. This tradition of table talk was continued during the following centuries. We find similar traditions of bacchic prandial songs which combine universalism (problems of life and death) with the material bodily element (wine, food, carnal love), with awareness of the temporal element (youth, old age, ephemeral nature of life, the changes of fortune); they express a peculiar utopian strain, the brotherhood of fellow-drinkers and of all men, the triumph of affluence, and the victory of reason.\footnote{Mikhail Bakhtin, ‘Laughter and Freedom’ (1940) reprinted in Contemporary Critical Theory ed. Dan C. Latimer, pp. 301-307, p. 303.} The liberation from the normal rules of etiquette represented by this form of table talk frees the speaker to speak truths. As Bakhtin puts it: ‘the world was permitted to emerge from the official routine but exclusively under the camouflage of laughter. Barriers were raised, provided there was nothing but laughter.’\footnote{ibid.} It is under this camouflage of laughter in the form of table talk that Finlay can reveal ‘truths’ about writing and about the political dimension of Land Art. To cite one sentence of Finlay’s Table Talk:
Land Art (so-called) is a city art. It is an amusement of Aztecs who shed no blood, cannibals who practise vegetarianism. Natural Men who aspire to no Revolution, wandervogel who would not have prospered in the Hitler Youth.628

Laughter and humour are key elements in Finlay’s work. Laughter represents the disruptive element within Land Art and within art history and theory more generally. Humour and laughter is certainly discernible as a strand within modernism but it is a problematic one. In Nietzsche’s philosophy laughter is connected with the Dionysian, the unreasoned, unruly and yet essential side of the Apollonian, the ideal of civilisation. In more recent philosophy and theory, laughter connects with the idea of excess. Laughter is an excessive response which cannot be contained physically. It is thus capable of breaking down the inside/outside binarism so central to modernist (Hegelian) thought. Finlay’s Hegel Stile is an example of (and a critique of) a strategy that turns two realms into a dialectic: inside-outside, garden-landscape. Smithson’s notions of ‘site/non-site’ and ‘dialectical landscape’ reveal him as still resolutely modernist (still Hegelian) however loud the claims for his practice as postmodern.629

When Finlay is admitted into the established discourse on Land Art, he not only enables more explicit reference to gardening but his inclusion places the disruptive and dangerous power of laughter into that discourse. Finlay’s presence makes subversion of the category possible in a way that, before his inclusion and before the admission of a humorous element, was not possible. But Finlay is not the only thing ‘missed out’ along the way in the history of Land Art. The omissions are frequently more interesting than the inclusions.

Considering what is missed out of the discourse of Land Art demands more than just the retrieval or assertion of a few individuals, or even a critique of the way the existing models are constructed. As with the British sculptor Ivor Abrahams,630 the exclusions reveal things about the way in which the existing models of Land Art discourse are constructed. The artists in the following paragraphs are potential
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628 Ian Hamilton Finlay, Table Talk, pp. 7-8.
629 For example by Craig Owens ‘Earthwords’, ‘The Allegorical Impulse: Toward a Theory of Postmodernism’, October 12 (Spring 1980), pp. 67-86, and Part 2, October 13 (Summer 1986), pp. 59-80. Or as Michael Archer writes: ‘[...] by the time modernism is discussed in any length in his writings, it is already at the service of Smithson’s prototypically postmodern cultural vision.’ ‘Extra terrestrial: Michael Archer on Robert Smithson’, Frieze, no. 11 (Summer 1993), pp. 36-40, p. 38. The strand that links modernist (and some described as postmodernist thinkers) - most importantly Greenberg and his students Fried, Krauss and Jane Harrison Cone - (and this could be extended to include Smithson, Owens and innumerable others) - to Hegel, was pointed out by Barbara Reise in 1968, in the first line of part 2 of her essay ‘Greenberg and the group: a retrospective view’, Studio International 174 (June 1968), pp. 314-316: ‘The philosophical form of Greenberg’s historiography is quasi-dialectic progress in linear evolution; it is influenced by Marx, later dominated by Wolflin, and thus tied to pre-Darwinian thought and to Hegel.’ (Reise’s essay is reprinted in Art in Modern Culture, pp. 252-263, where unfortunately the leading impact of this bald statement is rather diluted by appearing half way through the text (on p. 256) and with no indication of how the parts were originally divided. This is just one example of the way in which segments of discourse can be changed, their priorities altered simply by their reprinting. The reprinting of a section from Fried’s ‘Art and Objecthood’ in Landscape Architecture (discussed on p. 260 above) is another good example of this.)
630 see note 600 above.
inclusions in the discourse of Land Art whose reasons for exclusion are revelationary of the category Land Art and whose inclusion could alter significantly the discourse on Land Art.

William Turnbull, whose works such as Project for sculpture (a stone megalith with a circle drawn around it in the earth, illustrated in Living Arts) could easily be construed in relation to earthworks or in relation to prehistoric remains. Turnbull is of an ‘older generation’, he was not at St. Martins, and moreover he is connected with the ICA Independent Group (which included: Reyner Banham, Richard Hamilton, Eduardo Paolozzi and Alison and Peter Smithson). In standard accounts of British art history this group is connected with British pop art and a fascination with the technologic. One of the most famous demonstrations of this tendency was the exhibition This is Tomorrow held at the Whitechapel Art Gallery, London in 1956. Jonathan Benthall, whose ‘Technology and Art’ columns in Studio International are quoted extensively in this study, was (from 1972) Controller of the ICA. This identification and the (false) oppositional model that contrasts Pop art / Independent Group / ICA against New Generation / New Art / Stockwell Depot / St Martins has prevented any of the former group being considered in connection with Land Art. The (re)assertion of the importance of the technologic in Land Art that I argue for in the dissertation would make possible the inclusion of such artists as Turnbull (or Carl Nesjar) in discussions of Land Art.

Mark Boyle (and the Family Boyle) are often left out of the picture simply because Boyle is a self-taught artist who did not attend art school in many accounts the institutional origin of many groupings. In 1971 Boyle was mentioned by Jonathan Benthall in relation to Hans Haacke, one of the artists shown in the Cornell Earth Art exhibition. Mark Boyle’s work was included in the exhibition The Sixties: Art Scene in London (1993). This exhibition highlighted painting as well as sculpture and indeed, Mark Boyle was the only artist included in the exhibition’s section on Land Art or Landscape Art. Boyle’s exclusion from the category Land Art has also, like Abrahams, been on media grounds. Boyle reconstructs areas of the earth’s surface using a variety of mediums, the resulting panels are then
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632 London: The Whitechapel Art Gallery. This is tomorrow. 9 August - 9 September 1956.

633 Previous to this date Benthall had been lecture programme organizer at the ICA and had organized lecture programmes on ‘Ecology in theory and practice’ (1970); ‘The Limits of Human Nature’ (1971) and ‘The Body as a Medium of Expression’ (1972-3).

634 See Carl Nesjar. ‘Letter from the airport’ Living Arts, no. 1, pp. 53-63. Nesjar’s article begins with the passage: ‘I find myself in an aeroplane one clear beautiful morning, crossing the Alps from Nice to Geneva. It isn’t a fast plane and we aren’t flying high, so that there are mountain peaks above us. Below, on either side, masses of rock and ice jut out, rising, falling, thrusting, receding; as though we were moving slowly across an enormous natural sculpture, the parts of which seem themselves to be in motion.’ The idea of seeing landscape as sculpture shares similarities with later Land Art.

635 As Catherine Grenier puts it: ‘Mark Boyle did not go through art school. His work has evolved, as he himself has, on the periphery of the art world’. ‘The Claimed Sculpture’ in Britannica: Trente Ans de Sculpture, pp. 7-21, p. 18.


displayed, like paintings, on the wall. It seems overly simplistic, but is nonetheless arguably the case, that Boyle’s work is not considered Land Art simply because it is displayed exclusively on the wall rather than on the floor, or it involves ‘indoor’ performances. In interview in 1986 Mark Boyle suggested that his insistence on making objective art or objects had led to his condemnation. This could explain why his work was not included in discussions of ‘conceptual’ or ‘dematerialised’ art of the 1960s and 1970s, despite the highly conceptual basis of his projects.

Other shifts in the discourse of Land Art would be effected by shifting the hierarchy of inclusions, for example affording a more prominent position to the Dutch artists, in particular Stanley Brouwn, who often merits little more than a footnote, and who was arguably making Land Art works long before many of the other American, British or German exponents who figure so prominently in Land Art discourse.

Discourses encode their own exclusions as well as inclusions. Each new element of discourse that is incorporated into the ‘authorised’ version, for example by its inclusion in an exhibition catalogue or magazine article, introduces new elements into the account, it also acts to foreclose on certain avenues of investigation. Thus Beckett, Wordsworth or Zen are legitimate considerations in relation to Long. They are suitably high-brow and serious. Other themes are forbidden or excluded. Again reasserting or introducing other elements could significantly shift the discourse. One good example would be a discussion of the Occult. David Nash’s active interest in the theories of occultist Rudolf Steiner provides a linkage between Land Art and a whole range of fascinating connections, which include linkages with Joseph Beuys.

Beuys is again an artist who could figure more prominently in Land Art discourse (he does merit a few mentions) and is certainly a strong (if unacknowledged) influence on many of the artists involved in ‘Land Art’. Most of these potential inclusions figure somewhere on the surface of existing discourse, they have not for the most part been dredged up from obscure or unpublished sources. An elaborate policing operates unseen and undetected at the surface level of the discourse as well as at any deeper

---

638 Interestingly the Boyle Family is mentioned in relation to sculpture in the landscape in Elspeth Thompson and Ken Fieldhouse’s article ‘What Price for Landscape Art’ in Landscape Design. ‘Pushing out from the boundaries of sculpture, the Boyle family challenges our perceptions of landscape with painstaking reconstructions of randomly-chosen sections of the earth’s surface.’ (p. 30)

639 Mark Boyle, ‘The Family Boyle: Mark Boyle interviewed by Henry Lydiat’, Art Monthly, no. 101 (November 1986), pp. 6-9. Boyle comments: ‘[T]here was a time when everyone condemned us because we were still making objective art. At that time you weren’t supposed to produce an object. They sold us their photographs and their statements for the same prices people were selling their objects - they somehow managed to differentiate between a photograph and an object. It seemed to me both the subject and the statement were actually objects. I could never quite work that out. So I never believed in non-objective art.’ (p. 8)

640 Hilary Gresty mentions a work by Stanley Brouwn from 1962. A Walk through a grass field exactly at the same time on the same line a - b every day for a year. ‘From the New Generation to The New Art’, p. 170 (Chapter on Richard Long).

level. Occasionally something slips through (as humour does via Finlay). This is one reason why Fulton's text, included in the catalogue accompanying Long's 1991 exhibition Walking in Circles was so intriguing. It intimated what might always have been suspected, that beneath that neatly sans-serifed, modernist, serious exterior, the concerns of Long's work (and I would suggest of Land Art more broadly) might actually be more earthy, less transcendental. The forbidden themes and exclusions of Land Art discourse might indeed be best characterised according to a familiar formulation: Sex, Drugs and Rock 'n' Roll.

The issue of sex in relation to sexuality and gender is raised in the chapter Land Art Body. It needs to be addressed more explicitly. As far as gender is concerned, there are no British women Land Artists and the American ones are rather an afterthought. This over-definitive statement needs some justification. To return to my first, very narrow analysis of Land Art in terms of its founding instances in exhibitions in the late 1960s, there simply were no women artists included. Subsequently, there is a clear difference between the role and status of women artists in American Land or Earth Art and in the British work I have been concerned with in this dissertation. By the early 1970s there were women involved in American Land Art, they are discussed in Lucy Lippard's book Overlay and featured in articles in Artforum magazine for example. The fascinating thing about these women is their close personal involvement with the male exponents of Land Art. The leading female figures of American Earth Art were the partners of male Earth Artists, most famously Nancy Holt who was married to Robert Smithson, completed his Amarillo Ramp work after he died during its construction, edited his collected writings and has continued to produce work in her own right. American Earth Art / Land Art promotes a thoroughly conventional heterosexual lifestyle. This can also be detected in certain of the European exponents associated with Land Art such as the couple Bernard and Hilla Becher. True to convention, the male partners lead, their work and exposure comes first, the women follow. In the case of Holt she steps into her husbands shoes - taking over the family business as it were - following his untimely death. There are a few interesting reversals, notably in the case of Lucy Lippard and her partner Charles Simonds. He is one of the few male artists discussed in her book Overlay, and she is aware of the potential accusations of nepotism in promoting his work in the article she wrote for Studio International in 1977.
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643 Lucy Lippard, 'Art Outdoors. In and Out of the Public Domain'. Lippard writes: 'Simonds' work is a rare guidepost towards an aesthetically important art successfully integrated with social concerns' (p. 86) and follows this up with a footnote (p. 90, note 6): 'I say this at the risk of being accused of nepotism, as I have lived with Simonds for four years, although I was impressed and influenced by the work before I met the artist.'
Lippard’s writing also indicates one area of Land Art in which women are not excluded - from writing about Land Art and thus from constructing its discourse in words - a role which is of no small significance, particularly to the approach taken in this study. One of the earliest accounts of Land Art was written by Beatrice Parent, and Anne Seymour has played a crucial role in promoting both British sculptors more generally as well as her continued involvement with Richard Long. In charting the increasingly visible role of women artists in American Land Art / Earth Art, one could do well to examine texts by John Beardsley which have become definitive in this area. In his Earthworks and Beyond (in both first and expanded editions) the only women artists discussed are Nancy Holt and Maya Lin. The latter is discussed in relation to her Vietnam Veteran’s Memorial (1982) which serves for Beardsley as a work to connect works in the land with the direction his argument takes towards urban and permanent sited works. In 1993, writing in the catalogue to the American Art in the 20th Century exhibition held at the Royal Academy, London, Beardsley included another woman Land Artist, in the form of Ana Mendieta. Again Mendieta qualifies for inclusion on account of her partnership with one of the male artists included in the Land Art / Earthworks / Earth Art grouping - she was married to Carl Andre who was included in the inaugural Earthworks exhibition. Mendieta’s inclusion represents a clear shift in Beardsley’s account (and more widely) towards a re-alignment of Land Art with Body Art or Body Works and an increased importance of the body in Land Art discourse. More cynically and spectacularly, the interest in and presence of Mendieta in discourse owes more to her sensational death than to her life and work. In John F. Moffitt’s writing Mendieta’s death is itself transformed into an earthwork:

Her last earthwork production was inadvertent; in the course of a violent argument with her husband, Carl Andre, she was pitched out of a high window, thus coming to make her last, violent communion with the asphalted terra firma situated some stories below.

In one way or another then, women artists become entangled with Earth Art and with Earth Artists and come to figure increasingly in American Land Art discourse.

The British case is quite different. Gender and sexuality are almost entirely unconsidered in the discourse of British Land Art. Stephanie Ross in her (albeit problematic) typology of Land Art / Earthworks / Earth Art has a category entitled ‘masculine gestures in the landscape’. The artists included are exclusively American. Whatever her justifications for designating the category masculine
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642 Beardsley writes in the introduction to his Earthworks and Beyond, p. 8: ‘From a discussion of the American avant-garde, which confirmed the widespread reengagement with landscape in the late 1960s, the commentary moves out to the contemporary English response, back to traditions and twentieth-century antecedents, and forward to sited sculpture and the application of landscape art to the improvement of public spaces - two things that have caught fire in the last few years.’
643 From the early days in the late 1960s this connection was made by Willoughby Sharp who created, curated or defined both the terms Earth Art and Body Works. The re-emphasis on the body in more recent Land Art discourse is discussed above in Land Art Body, pp. 121-211.
644 She was included in Lucy Lippard’s Overlay.
(and they are unconvincing to say the least\textsuperscript{649}) she does identify a particularly masculinist tendency within Earth Art towards a powerful assertion of patriarchal or phallic power through sheer physical dominance of the earth. Translated into terms of male-female culture-nature binaristic logic (discussed for example in Lippard’s \textit{Overlay}) this does lead to an assertion of male prowess. British Land Art lacks this overtly masculinist language of power. Long’s use of ‘universal’ symbolism and the absence of any critique aimed at a serious analysis of Long’s work in terms of sexuality or gender could, and indeed often does, lead to Long’s work being discussed in terms that are either sexually neutral or, more interestingly, sexually ambiguous. The following comments made by Long in conversation with Martina Giezen in 1986 are highly intriguing as regards the questions of gender and sexuality and the sexual neutrality or ambiguity of Long’s work. (Giezen’s words are italicised):

.... I use rocks and hills and mountains and I use lines, which are male things and I use circles and water, a sort of female .... I think it is much more powerful to use a line and a circle than to make my own individual, idiosyncratic shape. It means a mark can be a human sign and anonymous as well. Mia, Martin Visser’s wife who died, once said to me that for her my work was very sexual .... It is not obviously sexual, but I thought that was an interesting, positive thing to say.
The sexual energy is an important thing in life. isn’t it? It has to do with wellbeing, feeling good ....
Feeling charged with energy or feeling at peace with the world .... sometimes all these things can flow together.
You put a photograph of you climbing up a mountain next to the image of an ancient hill figure. It is not the giant of Cerne Abbas.
It is the one without the penis. It is just a very classical, beautiful image. The other one was too strong. This one is more neutral. I don’t know .... with my rucksack, I just felt it was similar.\textsuperscript{650}

Long’s personal life has never featured in his scant bibliography despite the numerous claims that his art equals his life (strangely his life does not equate to his work). His marital status is never featured, his wife or children never acknowledged - in direct contrast to later additions to the British Land Art fraternity whose family background features prominently.\textsuperscript{651}

When I began the line of enquiry that led to the paper forming part of the above chapter \textit{Land Art Body},\textsuperscript{652} I looked through works and publications on and by Richard Long for evidence of human relationships that were acknowledged or referred to in the work. I found references to ‘My Father’ both in a text work\textsuperscript{653} and in the dedication of one of Long’s artist’s books.\textsuperscript{654} I also found the suggestive

\textsuperscript{649} ‘I called this first group of artworks masculine because of their scale.’ Stephanie Ross, ‘Gardens, earthworks, and environmental art’, p. 171.
\textsuperscript{651} For example. David Nash. whose relationship with his wife features prominently in his bibliography and work, his marriage and the birth of his children forming important points in his artistic biography. She too is an artist and made works for Grizedale Forest. So too Andy Goldsworthy whose wife again features in his biography and is acknowledged in his books. She has been actively involved in his work. notably taking the photographs of his various ‘throws’.
\textsuperscript{652} ‘Making time for space’ (paper given 10 February and 12 March 1993), pp. 124-145 above.
references to ‘Friend’ that appear in a number of works. Speculating on the possible gender of Long’s ‘Friend’. Additional to this is the highly suggestive imagery of the two rucksack images and the reciprocal acknowledgements of friendship and the taking of photographs that Long appends to the end of Walking in Circles and that animate Fulton’s account of his and Long’s companionship in ‘Old Muddy’. The sociability of British Land Art as typified in the work of Long and Fulton is one of a brotherly fraternity (in which one could read homosexual references). This potential line of interpretation within the work is never discussed. It is one of the major exclusions of Land Art discourse.

A discussion in these terms serves to separate the early works of the American and British Land Artists in terms of sexuality and gender through a contrast of the heterosexual and male-dominant imagery and rhetoric of the American work to the ambiguous and marginalised sexuality in the work and discourse of the British artists. This line of enquiry also serves to discern a shift within the British work as it moves from its ‘foreign policy’ to ‘domestic policy’ outlooks in the late 1970s where artists’ wives, families and domestic arrangements become more explicit in the accounts and ideology of Land Art. In the sculpture parks and trails Land Art becomes, both in terms of its producers and consumers, a family affair.

There are women artists included in the many sculpture parks and trails around Britain and there are a number of women artists who have produced work that might, on stylistic grounds, be termed ‘Land Art’. An investigation in the Women Artists Slide Library as well as a perusal of their magazine turned up a range of women artists working in some way, critically or otherwise with the landscape or in modes that might approximate to the practices of Land Art. It is particularly interesting to observe how many
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64 The dedication of this book is ‘FOR MY FATHER’.
655 The word ‘FRIEND’ appears in A Three Day Bicycle Ride 1982, illustrated in Richard Long in Conversation, Part One; the words ‘TWO FRIENDS’ begin the text accompanying Thirty Seven Campfires, Mexico 1987, illustrated in Richard Long, Old World New World, pp. 24-29.
66 There is I think considerable potential for comparing Long’s walking companion and friend (both actual and represented in texts and photographs in his work) with Wainwright’s imaginary fantasy (female) friend mentioned so often in Wainwright’s A Pennine Journey, see notes 351, 352 and 353 above.
68 See the discussion of ‘foreign’ and ‘domestic policy’ Land Art above in Land Art Landscape, pp. 223-232.
69 When I visited the Women Artists Slide Library in 1992 the artists were arranged not only alphabetically by name, but also with respect to the area or genre of art with which they identified themselves. The category ‘Landscape’ contained one of the largest groups of artists. I enquired about women artists who could be thought of as making ‘Land Art’ type works. The following names were forwarded, although the more memorable aspect of my visit was a discussion with Rita Keegan questioning why women might not have chosen to engage with this area of art practice. The artists were: Lorna Green, Rosie Leventon, Roxane Permar and Julie Westerman. Stylistic linkages are the strongest connection with Land Art here, since these artists only began working as professional artists, or only began working with the landscape in the 1980s. Katy Deepwell has written more critically on women and landscape in the journal of the Women Artists Slide Library (now called Women’s Art Magazine), Landscape and feminist art practices, Women Artists Slide Library Journal, no. 27 (February/March 1989), pp. 25-26; and ‘Beyond the Eye’, Women’s Art Magazine, no. 52 (May/June 1993), pp. 10-12. This issue also included other articles on landscape: Sally Townsend, ‘Through the Eye’ (an interview with Fay Godwin). pp. 8-9; Shirley Armstrong, ‘Time on their hands’ (on the early Irish sketching
women artists who have been involved in the sculpture parks, trails and so on, have produced work depicting animals.\textsuperscript{664} [figures 92 and 93] The line of interpretation that could lead from this observation is perhaps obvious but worth pointing out. In many of these locations, particularly Grizedale, the animal inhabitants of the forest have been driven out in order to make the forest a safe and economically productive environment. This is most noticeable in the case of Grizedale, whose name derives from the wild pigs that used to inhabit the forest. By depicting these excluded and ‘natural’ inhabitants, the women artists have allied themselves with the animals they depict and with their marginalised position in relation to the world of cultural and economic production.

If one proceeds to analyse Land Art discourse in phenomenological terms, as I did to a great extent in my earlier discussions of women, gender and Land Art (above), one arrives at a situation in which one can analyse the exclusions in terms of the actual exclusions of female bodies (and of visceral bodies of either gender) from Land Art. A phenomenology of space thus offers a certain potential for women’s inclusion through their active participation physically in experiencing the spaces of Land Art and the landscape. Aware of the ideological exclusions that operate to limit and restrict experience of the works directly, one can nonetheless envisage a situation in which the male domination of Land Art can be redressed to a certain extent through the simple devices of a female perspective and the inclusion of a few visceral bodies. Not so in a politics of space, in which one is forced to acknowledge that the exclusions that prevent women’s active and physical involvement in Land Art and the Landscape, as well as inhibiting the discussion of gender and sexuality in relation to Landscape and Land Art, derive from custom, cultural hearsay and folklore, encouraged as political expediencies to actively enforce particular spatial exclusion zones. The city, the countryside, the forest, the city-centre park, are inhabited with dangers and prohibitions that are monsters of the imagination as much as of the physical world. Acknowledging these dangers not only limits our actual freedom to inhabit the world through our bodies but also inhibits any real action to deter and end such violence that does occur.

\textsuperscript{664} For example, Sally Matthews, \textit{Wild Boar Clearing}, 1987 [figure 92] and \textit{A Cry in the Wilderness}, 1990 (illustrated in \textit{The Grizedale Experience}, p. 95); Sophie Ryder, \textit{Stag}, 1986 (also Grizedale) [figure 93] and \textit{River Crossing}, 1988 (illustrated in Rupert Martin, \textit{The Sculpted Forest}, p. 56).
Figure 92. Sally Matthews. *Wild Boar Clearing*, 1987.
Figure 93. Sophie Ryder. Stag, 1986.
A typical example is the panic that followed the murder of two young boys on a fishing trip and a young girl snatched from a tent in a friend’s back garden in the summer of 1995. The message was to police your children, keep them indoors, don’t let them out of your sight. The burden of responsibility was shifted from the individuals that perpetuated these anti-social crimes onto those who fail to heed the warnings that the world is a dangerous place. There are as many monsters in the forest now as there always were. These dangers are at their most potent when abstracted from the individuals that perpetuate crimes into a generalised evil that can, and does, inhabit real spaces. Women it seems are more subject to these exclusions than men. As I completed this dissertation I heard the news that the woman mountaineer I had mentioned earlier in my writing, Alison Hargreaves, was missing presumed dead on an expedition to K2. Predictably, accounts of her fate were met with discussion of her familial duties, the young children she left motherless, the husband she left a widower. I don’t remember these issues being raised in relation to male explorers.

It seems to me that an adequate and transformative account of Land Art with regards to gender, sexuality and women’s involvement will not be produced by finding a few women to include in the discourse, but by acknowledging their exclusion. To include women artists on stylistic grounds (the grounds upon which many texts operate) not only defeats the approach taken in this study, but it also prevents the more interesting questions that can be asked once it is acknowledged that women did not participate. What needs to be analysed is not merely the exclusions placed upon women but their own self-imposed exclusion, their reluctance or refusal to engage with this area of art practice.

Just as implicit references to sex and sexuality can be read into the works and words of British Land Art, so too can references to drugs be discerned. As with the provocation to speculate on the ‘meaning’ of the two rucksacks image in Long’s work, the title of the work ‘A Line in Bolivia’ has amused students to which I have shown this work who detect a reference (deliberate or not) to cocaine. The implications of drug taking are at their most explicit in Fulton’s ‘Old Muddy’ text in 1991. The word STONED appears after a discussion of Long’s work Dragon 1990 (a small zigzag line of white china clay splashed across the clean floor). On the following page Fulton quotes ‘Leave no turd unstoned’ Don Whillans, 1983, as quoted in Thin Air, by Greg Child, 1988. Speculation in the early 1990s as to a reform in the laws regarding illegal drugs and an increasing awareness of the widespread use of ‘recreational’ drugs as a part of ‘normal’ social life perhaps prompted a less guarded approach to the subject. It will be interesting if drug reform does take place to see how many artists claim drugs as a part of their work and
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661 See the article quoted from in the chapter Land Art Body: David Nicholson-Lord, ‘Coming soon to a location near you ... the secure forest’, note 308 above.
662 Hamish Fulton, ‘Old Muddy’, p. 244.
663 ibid., p. 245.
664 The famous full-page advertisement in the Times in the summer of 1967 calling for the legalisation of marijuana (paid for by Paul McCartney) was re-run in 1992. Further evidence of a reappraisal of drug legislation in the 1990s appeared in a number of newspaper articles, for example ‘Heidi high’ in the Independent Magazine, 16 September 1995, pp. 24-27.
lifestyle once its illegal status is lifted. Fulton's text certainly presents ready evidence to read this in after the event. The role played by drugs in other areas of the arts, particularly in literature, has been a more or less accepted subject of discussion in relation to works ranging from Coleridge and Shelley to Oscar Wilde to William Burroughs. As far as the visual arts are concerned such issues are taboo or at least unofficial. If drugs were admitted to the range of available 'influences' on artists, one could construct a very interesting alternative distinction between the famous two generations of St. Martin's artists in terms of their preferred drugs.

Artists of the era of The New Generation were involved in discussions about the artistic applications of LSD. A workshop on this subject, led by Michael Hollingshead and entitled 'Experimental Art and Theatre' was held under the auspices of St Martin's famous Sculpture Forum on 7 January 1966. Individuals from St. Martin's expressed an interest in the ideas of Project Sigma, a London based organisation who listed amongst its interested individuals a number of 1960s luminaries such as Anthony Burgess, William Burroughs, Allen Ginsberg, R. D. Laing and Timothy Leary. What has to be remembered is that LSD was not at this time an illegal substance, and the interest in its creative possibilities a serious and studied investigation. The hushing up of the broad and creative influence of LSD and other so-called 'psychedelic' drugs in the 1960s was a later development. It is only recently that a more open climate of discussion has again explored the profound influences of this experimentation. The preferred drugs of the so-called second generation or New Art generation seem far more organic in origin: from Gilbert and George's famous intoxication, their 'Drinking Sculpture' to Long and Fulton's 'stoned' wanderings in the Himalayas. The temptation to extend this comparison/analogy is irresistible: the brightly coloured psychedelic sculpture of the New Generation artists in artificial, man-made materials such as plastics and polyester to the natural materials of the second generation, earth, grass, sand.

The use of drugs in music is no less notorious, a fact that was brought home to me recently watching the film footage of the famous Isle of Wight festival in 1970. Again the drugs issue as it relates to music has become more seriously discussed in recent years, including Paul McCartney finally going on record as admitting the drug taking influence on the Sergeant Pepper LP (Just in case anyone missed it). Hilary Gresit made a footnote to the influence of pop music on the St Martin's artists she discussed, stating 'The link between pop/rock music and art at this time needs greater research'. There are a number of references to drug-related art (or art's relation to drugs) in art publications in the late 1960s and early 1970s. For example, Jean Clay mentions the use of LSD in New York in his 'A cultural heatwave in New York', Studio International 175 (February 1968); and in Six Years, Lucy R. Lippard includes reference to a work by Lee Lozano entitled 'Grass piece' which records the artist's experimentation and its effects from April 1969 to January 1971. Six Years, pp. 101-102. I am indebted to Judith Winter for drawing my attention to these events.

The use of artificial materials is among the reasons for Ivor Abrahams exclusion from the discourse of Land Art. Dibbets' reaction against the use of artificial materials for sculpture and the bond that was established between Richard Long and Jan Dibbets on this basis is stated in Jan Dibbets, 'Pieces of a talk' information from Galerie Swart, Amsterdam, reprinted in Gerry Schum Land Art (unpaginated).
strong a word for the amount of investigation required to unearth the debt to popular music evident in the work of Richard Long and Hamish Fulton. Long often quotes from popular music in his text works. The earliest are often from Country and Western music. Long stated in 1985: ‘I never lecture in college about my work. I do not really believe in that kind of educational approach. All I do sometimes is play music to slides of my work. One slide is shown for the duration of one piece of music. If I show twenty slides I play twenty pieces of music.’ In such an approach no speaking is required, and thus Long’s policy of silence can be maintained. In more recent work Long has quoted lyrics from Bob Dylan and there are numerous references to popular music in Fulton’s ‘Old Muddy’ text, including the one in the list of ‘beginnings’ with which he begins the text, Chuck Berry’s Roll over Beethoven.

A discussion of Sex, Drugs and Rock ‘n’ Roll in relation to Land Art is not only revealing, it also allows just a tiny space for that other most crucial exclusion from the discourse of Land Art - Humour. For a practice with so much potential for hilarity (even if only at the naivety of what the Land Artists find entertaining), the discourse on Land Art has removed all potential hints at laughter, so that even a titter cannot find a space. Finlay reminds us that ‘Certain gardens are described as retreats when they are really attacks.’ The garden is a place of humour and pleasure but it is also the site of unspeakable terrors and memories of evil. Smithson’s footnote that follows his comment ‘Could one say that art degenerates as it approaches gardening?’ captures something of this:

The sinister in a primitive sense seems to have its origin in what could be called “quality gardens” (Paradise). Dreadful things seem to have happened in those half-forgotten Edens. Why does the Garden of Delights suggest something perverse? Torture gardens. Deer Park. The Grottos of Tiberius. Gardens of Virtue are somehow always “lost”. A degraded paradise is perhaps better than a degraded hell. America abounds in banal heavens, like Death Valley National Monument or The Devil’s Playground. The public “sculpture garden” for the most part is an outdoor “room” that in time becomes a limbo of modern isms. Too much thinking about “gardens” leads to perplexity and agitation. Gardens like the levels of criticism bring one to the brink of chaos. This footnote is turning into a dizzying maze, full of tenuous paths and

---

669 For example, Long used a verse from a Johnny Cash song (‘I keep a close watch on this heart of mine / I keep my eyes wide open all the time / I keep the ends out for the tie that binds / Because you’re mine / I walk the line.’) in the work Reflections in the Little Pigeon River, Great Smokey Mountains, Tennessee 1970. Photography, Public Freehold. Illustrated in R. H. Fuchs, Richard Long, p. 20. A exhibition catalogue/artists book used a line from a Willie Nelson song: ‘Angel flying too close to the ground’ and the words to a (folk) song, ‘John Barleycorn’, were used for a publication for the Stedelijk Museum, Amsterdam in 1973 (to accompany an exhibition held from 7 December 1973 to 27 January 1973). Long commented ‘the use of this song: ‘John Barleycorn is a song about a circle. It’s about nature and circles. I heard it in my local pub. [...] I used a bit of a Johnny Cash song once in an Art and Project bulletin. I feel somewhat that it has to do with emotion. Often I think music is a good way to go with feelings and emotions about work, somehow it is much more direct.’ Richard Long in Conversation, Part Two, p. 20.


The abysmal problem of gardens somehow involves a fall from somewhere or something. The certainty of the absolute garden will never be regained. 673

Some of the ambiguity that inhabits gardens and gardening history was suggested in a piece by Cornelia Parker in the exhibition Ha-Lla at Killerton Park in 1993. Parker actually made use of Killerton's ha-ha to make a witty but serious intervention into the landscape. She planted a flower bed in the shape of a pair of scissors on the park side of the ha-ha. [figure 94] Peter R. Pay, writing in the catalogue to the exhibition describes Parker's work as follows:

A vegetable plot shaped in the configuration of scissors is planted in the ha-ha. The image is composed from edible plants, attractive market produce, but the composition also refers to the parterre gardens to be found in elaborately decorated formal gardens of the French taste. This little garden is also reminiscent of municipal flower-bed motifs. The scissors appear to cut along an imaginary line to stimulate some hard thinking about physical, social and economic boundaries; cultural barriers. It is no paradox that this non-decorative, edible art, being on the 'wrong side' of the ha-ha, is most vulnerable. 674

Pay's description shows how useful a figure the ha-ha is to introduce discussions of connections and divisions. Pay uses it in connecting French and English gardens, municipal and 'high' art or decorative and utilitarian uses of materials (in this case food produce). He also uses it to suggest (although he avoids specific examples) physical, social, economic and cultural barriers. Presumably the discussion of gender would fall under one (or any) of these headings. When I visited the exhibition, the use of the scissors also put me in mind of the childhood game 'scissors, paper, stone' in which the two players make hand gestures in the forms of these three elements, and then 'win' or 'lose' according to a set of phrases relating the elements: 'scissors cut paper, paper wraps stone, stone blunts scissors'. These relations led me on to thoughts about British Sculpture and Land Art discourse.

'Paper wraps stone' might suggest the way in which texts on paper back up and consolidate, encircle and wrap around, British Land Art and sculpture practices, and it is not without relevance that stone is so important to British sculpture. It provides just the kind of media link that can connect Long to Moore and through this tradition back to the British Gothic and Romanesque stone carvers of the middle ages (the kind of British tradition (with the exception of Long) that Peter Fuller, for example, forwarded). It has been noted how stone still plays a crucial role in British sculpture, there are still 'leading' British sculptors who carve and work with stone and others, such as Tony Cragg and Anish Kapoor, who have moved to this highly traditional medium having begun with more unusual sculptural materials (shards and scraps of plastic and other urban debris in the case of Cragg, powdered pigment in the case of Kapoor).

But scissors cut paper, and this might indicate something about the strategies of Parker's ha-ha work, or of mine in this dissertation. Scissors are one component used to cut and paste, to cut into the discourse

and re-paste it back together. Parker's locating her work close to the ha-ha and on the 'wrong', wild, park side allows for interpretations along the lines of domesticity goes wild, or of a return to 'Nature'. Humour clearly plays a role in this work. Parker's Ha-Ha is quite funny, not particularly profound, worth a chuckle (or some other sort of simple laughter from Smithson's ha-ha crystal typology). However in order to reconfigure the discourse on Land Art one needs more than that. One needs the bodily bursting forth, guffaws, explosive bursts of uncontrollable, blissful, painful, laughter. This is, it seems, in a discourse evidently able constantly to recombine and reform in a seamless continuity, the only antidote, the only possible and pragmatic retort. Laughter is the interruption that breaks the silence, that irreverently disturbs and detracts from the seriousness - and terror - of the established discourse of Land Art.
Figure 94. Cornelia Parker. Ha-Ha, 1993.
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## Appendices

### Appendix 1

Table of artists included in three ‘founding’ exhibitions, *Earthworks, Land Art and Earth Art*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Earthworks</th>
<th>Earth Art</th>
<th>Land Art</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5-30 October 1968</td>
<td>11 February - 16 March 1969</td>
<td>Broadcast on German television (1 Programme), 15 April 1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York: Dwan</td>
<td>Ithaca, New York: Andrew Dickson (White Museum, Cornell University)</td>
<td>Femsehgalerie Gerry Schum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMITHSON</td>
<td>SMITHSON</td>
<td>SMITHSON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPPENHEIM</td>
<td>OPPENHEIM</td>
<td>OPPENHEIM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEIZER</td>
<td></td>
<td>HEIZER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORRIS</td>
<td>MORRIS</td>
<td>DE MARIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE MARIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LONG</td>
<td>LONG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DIBBETS</td>
<td>DIBBETS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDRE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLDENBURG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEWITT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KALIENBACH</td>
<td>HAACKE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEDALLA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JENNEY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UECER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FLANAGAN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BOEZEM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources:**


Appendix 2

Land Art Definitions - Documents of Land Art.

Foreword to Earth Art. Andrew Dickson White Museum of Art. Cornell University. 1969
by Thomas W. Leavitt, Director.

This catalog is a documentary record of the "Earth Art" exhibition at Cornell University in February of 1969. Because most of the works were not finished until just before the show opened, the catalog could not be produced until after the exhibition took place.

The idea of bringing together the works of a number of artists who use earth as a medium originated with Willoughby Sharp. He knew the artists personally, persuaded them to come to Ithaca to execute new pieces, and acted as coordinator for the exhibition. Most of the artists are Americans, however. Jan Dibbets from Holland, Gunther Uecker from Germany, and Richard Long from England also came to Cornell to participate. David Medalla from the Philippines took part by sending instructions for the execution of his piece. Robert Morris, who could not make it to Ithaca because of a blizzard in New York City shortly before the opening of the exhibition, sent instructions by telephone.

While at Cornell, the artists chose their sites and materials and created their works with the help of students from the University. At one point eight of the artists participated in an informal symposium held in an auditorium filled to capacity with Cornell students and faculty. In this discussion, as well as subsequently in the pieces that they produced, the artists demonstrated that although their material might be similar their aims were very different from one another. It became clear that an earth art movement could not be spoken of as such, but that the artists, in their concern for elemental material and its use to sharpen sensory and intellectual perception, had begun to create an art form that contained profound implications for the future of art and of art museums.

Earth art is one facet of a general tendency among younger artists to renounce the construction of art objects in favor of the creation of art experiences related to a broad physical and sociological environment. If this tendency prevails, it could ultimately transform the entire structure of the art world. Museums wishing to support the efforts of contemporary artists may have to think increasingly in terms of backing projects rather than acquiring art objects or holding conventional exhibitions. A basic revamping of most museum budgets would be required to effect this change, but several forward-looking institutions have already begun to think in these terms. Some museums are beginning to sponsor temporary and permanent environmental projects far removed from the confines of the museum building. It appears that, in the future, any museum wishing to contribute seriously to the advancement of contemporary art will have to devote part of its resources to extramural projects like those in this exhibition. It is even conceivable that a new kind of museum, a true "museum without walls," could come into being. In such an institution the physical plant could be quite modest, housing perhaps only administrative offices and the documentary records of the projects it has sponsored. Its main activity would take place in the outside world, wherever an artist's sensibility led him to alter an existing environmental conditions. For most museums, however, the new tendency will add an exciting new dimension to existing programs.

In spite of the statements of several artists who are involved in environmental art, I see no reason to suppose that the making of art objects has reached a dead end. Probably there will always be artists whose aesthetic feeling for form and scale will lead them to produce works for contemplation and enjoyment within a museum context. There is nothing mutually exclusive about the two approaches to art. An artist must decide in favor of one or the other, but there is no reason that a viewer cannot appreciate both art objects and the environmental projects.

The White Museum was hardly prepared to participate in the "Earth Art" exhibition: our financial resources were meager and we were completely inexperienced in this kind of endeavor. The resourcefulness and forbearance of the artists, however, as well as the enthusiastic cooperation of students, staffs of several departments at Cornell, and local business firms brought all the projects to fruition. We are especially grateful to Richard M. Lewis, director of the Cornell Plantations; George T. Swanson, superintendent of the Grounds Division at Cornell; Clateus H. Rhoades, supervisor of
Industrial Safety; and the staff of Cornell's Center for Aerial Photographic Studies. For their material and assistance in Robert Smithson's project, we wish to thank the Cayuga Rock Salt Company and its vice president, William B. Wilkinson, and the Falconer Plate Glass Company, Falconer, New York. We are also indebted to the many Cornell students who helped with the construction of the projects and the photographic documentation of them. In addition to the hundreds of photographs taken of the various pieces, thousands of feet of motion picture film were taken under the direction of Willoughby Sharp. Mr. Sharp and Professor William C. Lipke have generously contributed the introductory essays for this catalog.

Many of the artists did not limit their art activities in Ithaca to the one project needed for the exhibition. Their creative energies which were stimulated by the geological conditions and the climate of Ithaca led them to produce additional pieces which provided a dividend to visitors to the exhibition. Hans Haacke, for example, stretched a rope across Fall Creek just below the waterfall so that icicles were formed along it and appeared to be suspended in midair. Dennis Oppenheim used various materials to reproduce the shape of the Museum galleries in outdoor spaces in Ithaca. Jan Dibbets selected fourteen trees standing in a row in a forest and painted them white from the ground up to a height of five feet. Robert Smithson chose a nearby rock quarry for an additional site and used a stone-walled closet in the Museum's basement for the non-site. Photographs of these projects are included in the back of the catalog. The making of these additional pieces exemplifies the continuous creative response to environment which is characteristic of the new sensibility embodied in earth art.

Source: Earth Art Ithaca, New York, Andrew Dickson White Museum of Art, Cornell University, February 11 - March 16 1969

Notes Toward an Understanding of Earth Art (Extract)

By Willoughby Sharp.

Since the fall of 1966, a new kind of sculpture has become increasingly recognized. The exhibition of these works and the critical interest they have stimulated indicates that this seemingly accidental, unordered, and unpretentious art is the outcome of a sculptural sensibility which is quite independent of the last dominant mode, Minimal Sculpture. Variousy characterized as antiform, anti-illusion, elemental, elemental sculpture, impossible art, microemotive art, the new naturalism, and poor art, the new work was examined in at least four other important exhibitions in 1969: "9 at Leo Castelli," New York City; "When Attitudes Become Form," Kunsthalle Bern; "Square Tats in Round Holes." Stedelijk Museum, Amsterdam; and "Anti-Illusion: Procedures/Materials," Whitney Museum of American Art, New York City.

One of the most striking aspects of this work is the wide range and unusual character of the materials employed, materials seldom previously associated with the making of sculpture. These have certain features in common: they tend to be easily manipulated, commonplace, flexible, and often heavily textured. How far contemporary sculptors have ventured in their search for new materials for sculptural expression is clearly shown by the following list, by no means exhaustive: air, alcohol, asbestos, ashes, bamboo, benzene, candles, chalk, charcoal, down, dust, earth, excelsior, felt, fire, flares, flock, foam, graphite, grease, hay, ice, lead, mercury, mineral oil, moss, rocks, rope, rubber, sand, sawdust, seeds, slate, snow, steel wool, string, tar, twigs, twine, water, and wax.

The treatment of material by different sculptors is hardly less diverse than the range of things used and is to a large extent dictated by the properties peculiar to each. They are bent, broken, curled, crumpled, heaped, or hung, piled, propped, rolled, scattered, sprayed, spread, and sprinkled. Such procedures appear casual, offhand; they blatantly defy the definition of sculpture as something modelled or carved. Nothing is made in the traditional sense. materials are allowed to subside into, or assume, their final shape naturally without being coerced into a preconceived form. The tools employed are very basic or else considered redundant. With a tremendous vocabulary of means at its disposal, the new sculpture manifests itself in an infinite variety of configurations. a common denominator of these works is their focus on physical properties - density, opacity, rigidity - rather than on geometric properties.

A natural consequence of the features singled out above is the intimate relation which the work bears to its site. Many pieces are improvised in situ. Distribution of the constituent matter is intuitive and informal and little attempt is made to arrange the material. The massiveness of the works is often
dictated by economic factors rather than by esthetic considerations. A sense of anonymity and impermanence emanates from them. Of especial importance in the context of site is the work's relation to the floor or the ground. The new sculpture does not stand remote and aloof on a pedestal. It is laid down on the ground or cut beneath its surface. The floor or ground often forms an integral part of the piece, as may the wall plane. Spectators can sometimes pass through the work as well as past it or around it.

Apart from the new attitude to making and the close work-to-place relationship, other aspects of the new sculptural sensibility are an emphasis on time and process, and antiobject orientation, and a desire to subvert style. The new works seem to proclaim the artists' rejection of painting and previous sculptural concerns; the production of artifacts, the commercial art world and its consumer ethos; the urban environment; and the long-standing esthetic preoccupations with color, composition, illusion, and the internal relation of parts. Many works express a strong desire to draw attention by artistic means to real phenomena. Materials usually thought of as mundane and inartistic have now been designated as esthetically interesting. With the new sculpture, the pure presentation of materials in carefully selected environments; and the long-standing esthetic preoccupations with color, composition, illusion, and the internal relation of parts. Many works express a strong desire to draw attention by artistic means to real phenomena. Materials usually thought of as mundane and inartistic have now been designated as esthetically interesting. With the new sculpture, the pure presentation of materials in carefully selected situations has become a significant esthetic statement. The nonutilitarian use of certain ordinarily useful materials is not without a sense of paradox: many of the works display a certain stubbornness and recalcitrance, as though they refuse to be absorbed into the existing culture. One major consequence of this is that the traditional line between art and life has become blurred. We are encouraged to draw the distinction between the two afresh.

Sources and Inspiration of Earthworks

Early indications of a painterly interest in earth materials may be seen in Duchamp's *Dust* (1920), the pebbles in Pollock's *Number 29* (1950), and Robert Rauschenberg's *Nature Paintings* (1952-53). A more environmental attitude is present in Herbert Bayer's outdoor playground, *Earth Mound* (1955) in Aspen, Colorado; in Walter De Maria's proposal for an "art yard" (1960) using earthmovers in an empty city lot; and in Heinz Mack's *Sahara Project* (1961), an "art reservation" which aimed to activate sculpturally a large-scale land mass. A number of kinetic sculptors became interested in earthmoving works in the mid-sixties. In 1964 David Medalla made both his first *Sand Machine* and the first of his series of *Mud Machines*. In 1966 Gunther Uecker did two works with sand. *Small and Large Desert* and *Sand Mill*. After that, the interest in outdoor earthworks accelerated with Robert Morris's *Model and Cross-Section for a Project in Earth and Sand* (1966) and *Earth Project* (1967); Robert Smithson's *Tar Pool and Gravel Pit* (1966); Hans Haacke's *Grass Cube* (1966) and *Grass Mound* (1967); Mike Heizer's *Depressions* (1967); Barry Flanagan's *One Space Sand Sculpture* (1967); Richard Long's *Dirt* (1967); Claes Oldenburg's *Pit* (1967); Dennis Oppenheim's *Cut in an Oakland Mountain* (1967); Walter De Maria's *Pure Dirt* (1968), and Jan Dibbets's *Grass Roll* (1967). While local factors have played some role in shaping the works of these artists, crosscurrents in the art world and the almost immediate information flow have brought about the existence of a truly international sensibility with national variants. Given the number of significant works with earth, critics have hailed an earth art movement. But most of the artists mentioned have sculptural concerns which transcend the use of any single material or group of materials. There is no earth art, there are just a number of earthworks, an important body of work categorized under a catchy heading.

Source:


Earth Systems

by William C. Lipke

The Exhibition "Earth Art" at Cornell brought together a number of works which illustrate various recent aesthetic positions that can collectively be described as minimal, kinetic, and environmental. Within the broad spectrum of these statements there are similarities which explain their inclusion under one rubric. The artists, in their concern with natural materials and processes, use earth both as a means to expression (as a material) and as a means of expression (as a medium). Further, their similar philosophic viewpoints are evidence of a "transition from an object-oriented to a systems-oriented
culture. Here change emanates not from things, but from the way things are done.” 1 Emphasis is placed not on the creation of enduring art objects, but on conceptual or ideological speculation.

The work in this exhibition can be grouped conveniently by manner of presentation: (1) works which were placed within the existing landscape. (2) works whose components were placed both within and without the boundaries of the museum, and (3) works whose material limits were revealed both within the confines of the gallery space. Confronting works with these unconventional presentational schemes, the viewer experiences difficulties because of the various perceptual and conceptual adjustments necessary to focus on each piece. as on student observed after visiting the exhibition: “We expect to see art objects - paintings hung on the walls and sculpture occurring in discrete places. Our biases tend to limit our interaction with what is really there. This process is only a part of the conventionalization of perception and experience that occurs as a result of growing up in a patterned society.”

The visual statements at the earth show not only fall outside the traditional categories of painting and sculpture but also deny altogether the notions of the art object as traditionally displayed. As Jack Burnham notes: “In systems perspective there are not contrived confines such as the theatre proscenium or picture frame. Conceptual focus rather than material limits define the system.” 2

Because it contributes to the playing down of aesthetic information, art is now seen as a reunification of the conceptual/perceptual dichotomy; earth art, especially as practiced by an artist like Robert Smithson, somehow attempts to bring into clearer focus the relationship between the artifact and the experience for which it stands. Smithson commented: “The piece is there in the museum, abstract, and it’s there to look at, but you are thrown off it. You are sort of spun out to the fringes of the site.” 3 Thus, it would be misleading, for example, to see these works essentially as extensions of problems or solutions raised within traditional media, particularly sculpture. 4 Although the concept of “systems” has been offered as one approach to these works, other constructs are also plausible, such as Michael Fried’s “theatrical objects or situations”; Dennis Oppenheim’s “transplants”. Neil Jenney’s “environments”; and Gunther Uecker’s “zones”. Only the concept of “art” seems applicable to every work in the exhibition. For although it is true that these works tend to escape any systematic categorization it is incontestable that they are intended to be seen as “art”.

The earthworks are not defined as art through our usual criteria - iconographic. formal. material. or conventional presentation of the art object - but instead by usage and intent. much in the same way that ordinary language philosophy determines the meaning of a word by usage rather than by a priori definition. Earthworks thus illustrate Robert Morris’s thesis that: “Anything that is used as art must be defined as art. The new work continues the convention but refuses the heritage of still another art-based order of making things. The intentions are different, the results are different. so is the experience.” 5

The nature of the experience to which Morris is referring places aesthetic considerations in a secondary position, a view substantiated by the earth artists themselves. Haacke states: “I’m not interested in the form. I’m more interested in the growth of plants - growth as a phenomenon which is something that is outside the realm of forms or composition and has to do with the interaction of forces and interaction of energies and information.” And Oppenheim comments “At this point I’m concerned with an art that rides above the frequency of pictorial positional treatment.” It is in this sense too that one must understand Jenney’s remark, “I don’t care what the work looks like.”

Given these departures from traditional art, how do we critically assess the work? For. surely, the older models of criticism are irrelevant, and there is little in recent criticism that seems applicable.

---

2 ibid., p. 32.
3 In the symposium of earth art held at Cornell University on February 6, 1969, excerpts of which appear in section 4 of this catalog. Related points of view were expressed by Dennis Oppenheim.
4 All quotations from the earth artists, unless otherwise noted, are from the symposium.
5 However, it should be noted that most, if not all. of the earth artists were previously concerned with sculptural or object making, three-dimensional rather than strictly two-dimensional concerns. In part, the present works seem to confirm the development of the medium of sculpture as stated by Carl Andre: “The course of development/Sculpture as form/Sculpture as structure/Sculpture as place.” quoted in David Bourdon. “The Razed Sites of Carl Andre,” essay in Minimal Art, ed. Gregory Battcock (New York: E.P. Dutton and Co., 1968), p. 103.
“Modernist” criticism is particularly inappropriate to earthworks, and an elaboration of this position is needed at this point to reveal more clearly just how far earthworks have gone beyond modernist thinking.

One tendency in criticism has been to see each new kind of visual statement as a criticism of earlier art. This tendency to suggest a constant feedback implies a set of problems established by the limits of a given medium, such as painting and sculpture, and when these problems are successfully resolved or exhausted new problems must be invented within the limitations of the medium. This point of view, and that of modernism in general, has been put forth by Clement Greenberg: “Given that the initial look of non-art was no longer available to painting, since even an unpainted canvas now stated itself as a picture, the borderline between art and non-art had to be sought in the three-dimensional, where sculpture was, and where everything material that was not art also was. Painting had lost the lead because it was so ineluctably art, and it now devolved on sculpture or something like it to head art’s advance.”

Earth art does not fit Greenberg’s analysis of the situation because the intention is different: there is no attempt to provide critical feedback to conventional art forms because earth artists intend a reorientation of the very function and process of art.

A position related to Greenberg’s is held by Michael Fried who claims “that the literalist espousal of objecthood amounts to nothing other than a plea for a new genre of theatre; and theatre is now the negation of art.” Fried argues that literal objects — as contrasted with art objects — have a stage presence evidenced by the nature of the experience of the spectator, noting that the duration of the experience between the work of art and the spectator is also paradigmatically theatrical.

Fried’s thesis depends upon fundamental but inconsistent propositions regarding the nature of art. He would admit that the concept of art differs iconographically and even physically from culture to culture and that the locus and function of art changes in relation to any given society. Neither are constants. Yet Fried maintains, as does Greenberg, that the concepts of quality and value are constants and that categories within the visual arts, such as painting and sculpture, are absolute to the degree that all artistic problems must be resolved within the limits of those media boundaries. This proposition is stated quite clearly by Fried when he argues that “the concepts of quality and value — and to the extent that these are central to art, the concept of art itself — are meaningful, or wholly meaningful, only within the individual arts. What lies between the arts is theatre.” Hence, according to Fried, earthworks are theatrical because they fall between the arts. But, in fact, it would be truer to say that they fall outside the realm of art as defined by Fried and Greenberg.

A slightly different statement of modernism has been offered by Sidney Tillim in his comments directed to the earthworks show held at the Dwan Gallery in New York City in December 1968. Like Greenberg, Tillim implies that this “non-art” exercise is a bid for “avant-gardism,” specifically, an attempt to “renew modernism.” Referring to earthworks as a kind of “precious primitivism,” Tillim draws a parallel between earth artists and the eighteenth-century artists who cultivated the concept of the picturesque. He implies that the earth artists, like these earlier artists, have substituted the sentimental for nobility of feeling and developed the cult of nature as an antidote to the excessive sophistication of cultivated society. The contrary seems to be the case, especially in the work of Robert Smithson. The picturesque as an eighteenth- and nineteenth-century mode of vision was, as Christopher Hussey noted, “the first step in the movement towards abstract aesthetic values.” The ensuing aestheticism of the last quarter of the nineteenth century and its camouflaged appearance in the contemporary preference for formal analysis are precisely what Smithson and others intend to avoid. As Smithson remarked: “You just can’t say it [art] is all just shapes, colors, and lines. There’s a physical reference. The choice of subject matter is not simply a representational thing to be avoided. It has important physical


7 “Art and Objecthood,” Artforum 5, no. 10 (Summer 1967, special issue): 15.

8 Ibid., p. 21.


implications."¹¹ Smithson and the other artists in this exhibition assume an attitude of literalness to nature which is anything but picturesque. They are insisting now on the other half of experience, on the physicality to which their works refer and of which they are made.

Few if any of the artists at Cornell were concerned with the way or manner in which their statements were made. In earth art the shift toward a concern for awareness of literal presence and the emphasis on the conceptual aspect of art is in accordance with Jack Burnham's thesis that the purpose of such statements is to show the "relations between people and between people and the components of their environment."¹² In this regard, Oppenheim has talked about art's being eventually reintegrated into the social system rather than remaining something distinct and remote from other activities. Once the transition to a socially integrated art is complete, we may see the full implementation of the art impulse in an advanced technological society. Earth artists just may fulfill an ideal stated earlier by John Cage to "set forth a view of the arts which does not separate them from the rest of life, but rather confuses the difference between Art and Life, just as it diminishes the distinctions between space and time."¹³

Source:


LAND ART by Beatrice Parent

In the United States, about 1967, a few artists left their classical surroundings of the studio, portrait gallery, collector's apartment, in order to work directly in the nature. anywhere (at the sea, mountain, desert, country side, and sometimes the city). However this tendency is not only found in the States. In Europe, especially in England, Holland and France, other artists are working in this way. This demonstration and work done in natural surroundings is known as Land Art or Earth's Works. There is no special style or school. these artists often working in very different ways. Most of these works are usually invisible for the public eye as they are either worn away by time. or situated in such far-off places that it is impossible to see them: the artists display them by means of documents: photos. plans. and more rarely films (these being sometimes combined).

Some important exhibitions have been devoted to Land Art: «Earth Works», Dwan Gallery, New York, 1968. - «Earth Art», White Museum, Ithaca. New York, 1969. - «Op Lasse [sic] Schroeven» Stedelijk Museum, Amsterdam 1969 (exhibition where the principal tendencies in Land Art at present were shown). - «Quand les attitudes deviennent formes», Kunsthalle, Bern, 1969 (idem). Then again, in April 1969, Gerry Schum, the Fernsehgalerie or T.V. Gallery director (not a traditional gallery. only a sort of agency content to produce and present films for the television) put eight films on the television showing eight Land Art works by Boezem, Dibbets, Heizer, Flanagan, Long, De Maria, Oppenheim and Smithson. Land Art is still little known in France, until now there has only been one single exhibition dedicated to Oppenheim at Yvon Lambert Gallery, in 1969. It seems rather dangerous to attempt a thorough analysis of Land Art having so few indications. Therefore I shall confine myself to giving a review of each artist. information with no claim to being complete, but which will give an account of his work. And to conclude. I shall endeavour to point out the main problems set by this form of activity.

The artists: Carl ANDRE, Marinus BOEZEM, Bernard BORGEAUD, Jean (sic) DIBBETS. Barry FLANAGAN, Hans HAACKE, Mike HEIZER, Richard LONG, Walter DE MARIA, Dennis OPPENHEIM, Robert SMITHSON

One can now ask the question as to what Land Art signifies: if this tendency terminates in the total liberation of art; if it should be considered as revolutionary. Questions to which it is difficult to reply:

¹¹ Robert Smithson in conversation with the author, 1969. Smithson elaborated: "Reversing the perspective to get another viewpoint. We've seen it so long now from the decorative design point of view and not from the point of view of the physicality of the terrain. That perception is needed now more that the abstract, because we're now into such a kind of soupy, effete thing. Art has been so one sided and groundless."


one risks a conclusion much too quick and premature. However, from what we have already seen, we can put forward certain assumptions. With Land Art appear new ideas.

1 The artists break away from their traditional locality (museums, galleries) which cage them in, which cut them off completely from the world outside, and which, according to Dibbets, form a barrier to creativity, for, unconsciously they work with this aspect in mind.

2 Almost all the works executed outside are transitory; the notion of durability of the work is absent; this work does not now overpass life by being timeless and unperishing, but on the contrary, is bound to life by the very fact that it can be destroyed by time.

3 The work has no real existence in relation to the spectator but is independent in the sense that it is temporal and has its own life. The spectator becomes a simple witness: his presence is no longer necessary as it was for classical art. However the usual conception of a work of art remains, and the problem of communication with the general public is far from being solved. One can say that certain artists, such as C. Andre, Dibbets, Boezem, Flanagan, Haacke, Long, for some of his <sculptures>, and Smithson, consider nature not for itself but as a material, a means and place of experiment, all the more marvellous for being open, to every action, a widening of the frame permitting a greater liberty. Generally speaking, a second tendency in Land Art is represented as it were by Oppenheim and Heizer who approach nature, that is the situation and space, from a much more sensitive angle. as their works tend to reveal beauty and immensity in face of man. Their approach remains traditional after all, for they go from work to work incorporating undeniable plastic and esthetic forces, seeking rather to work with «forms» (Oppenheim) than to demonstrate the intrinsic existence of nature. Considering nature as a base for artistic experiment or as a ground ideal for making a «sculpture», these artists are still attached to the traditional conception of the work of art although its very foundations are undermined by Land Art. The only ones who try at present to bring together art and life, and so doing, to merge the one into the other, are Long above all with his film produced for the T.V. Gallery. Borgeaud with his work whose purpose is to establish nature in its cosmic reality, and lastly De Maria whose work is more of a comportment and a way of life than an art production.

Unfortunately, whatever the object of these artists may be, whatever intention they may have, there is always a barrier, situated on the communications level, between them and the public. As I mentioned above, the only means is the photograph; but this is, for the moment, the domain of galleries or specialized reviews. In the galleries, it is tied to all the restrictions that are involved: special presentation (under glass for example) analogue to a work of art, collectors itinerary, a very limited privileged public. One of Land Art's essential questions lies on the level of ambiguity between the work itself and its photographic presentation, especially as an artist like Dibbets has no hesitation in declaring that the photo is the work of art. It is undeniable that in this regard Land Art faces a problem difficult to solve, relinquish this method of information or remain in the customary form. What is more, the photo itself creates an obstacle to appreciation for, through it, the work is presented to the spectator at a mental level, so that an effort has to be made in order to imagine the work shown. Besides this, the photo cannot represent that important dimension of which I spoke before: that is the real existence of Land Art. The work shown in a photo is a set proposition where all life is absent. The only solution offered at the moment is the television, as explains Gerry Schum who produced the Land Art film for the T.V. Gallery. Television holds an enormous force of impact by the fact that it reaches thousands of spectators all at once and that it makes art enter directly into their lives, without them having to visit a specialized cultural locality. Television, by its very form, is the direct opposite of a gallery; the aspect of buy and sale is wiped out, its only object being (and this is very important): «the communication of art instead of the possession of the work of art» Gerry Schum.

Grady Clay: 'The New Leap - Landscape Sculpture'

Like William Kent, who "leapt the fence and saw that all nature was a garden," many contemporary "dirt-art" sculptors are breaking with the art gallery limits, escaping from Manhattan Island, and viewing the total American landscape as their medium.

Digging the outdoors as their new art form, they look at landscape in new ways. For some of them, as Roy Bongartz has observed, this is "probably a futile revolt against the socialite show-biz art scene" of New York City.

But in Breaking with gallery-art, the dirt artists are also helping to break the spell which has kept so many landscape architects and other environmental designers stuck in an old-fashioned attitude toward Sculpture with a capital "S."

This has set off a revolution which the current issue of LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE begins to explore. Hundreds of artists are pulling out of the commercial galleries and turning to the open landscape as the object of their art. And in doing so, they are moving closer to the field of landscape architecture and many of its traditions, concepts and practitioners.

To report on the potentials of this alliance, LAQ devotes much of this issue to the new artists and their works. To help sort things out, we also publish on these pages our own glossary.

"Dirt art," as LAQ observed in October 1969, is a "trend in landscape sculpture so promising and yet so susceptible to being hammed-up, tricked out, and pop-art-eyed that its own inner significance is easily obscured."

We can say that again. The dirt-art phenomenon has now been highly publicized into becoming a major assault upon the tradition of sculpture as object-art hustled in and out of galleries.

The phenomenon has been overlooked if not scorned by many environmental designers including landscape architects who concentrate on regional studies, large-scale landscape plans, and environmental resource analysis. Many of them think of sculpture as architectural embellishment, or as objets d'art brought in to a landscape job by the client, or added to a dull landscape "for effect," and possibly competing for a piece of the fee.

Few attitudes could do more that these to widen the gap between landscape architects and that portion of their own history as practitioners of a historic fine art. As we see it, landscape sculpture is a term that embraces one design process including land forms and other media as well: it admits no artificial distinctions between designers who work in this-medium-but-not-that-one; it invokes collaboration.

As a point of reference, let's begin with the typical Outdoor Sculpture Exhibition of the 1960's - at Battersea Park, London, 1963, illustrated elsewhere in this issue. This was clearly a traditional show of object-art: it was filled with easily transportable, free-standing items of gallery sculpture that happened to be sited (artfully to be sure) in an available outdoor setting open to the public. They were stuck to the site by gravity.

Next we can traipse our way through typical large public exhibitions of sculpture in recent years (Expo-Montreal 1968, the Vienna Museum 1968, Hemisfair, San Antonio 1969, Maryland Institute, College of Art 1971 to pick four) without finding a single hint that sculpture could relate to, or be a part of a total landscape composition or design. Objects were hauled in, set down and abandoned to the pull of gravity and the musings of critics. Few shows or individual works in recent years have captured the full potential of all the plastic media (earth, masonry, concrete, metals or industrial plastics) which are available to be designed as an organic system of materials to express a unified esthetic concept. What the public has been getting is free-standing bronze pieces on plazas of concrete: or plastic angularities facing each other across polished gallery floors or clipped lawns.

In attempting to break away from all that, the new dirt artists are taking all outdoors as their studio - Michael Heizer cutting open trenches in the Black Rock Desert of Nevada; Jan Dibbets plowing up string-marked paths through woods of Ithaca, N.Y.; Robert Smithson building a "spiral jetty" 1500' long, 160' wide into Great Salt Lake: and Dennis Oppenheim creating such ephemeral geographic paradoxes as a giant X cut in a Dutch wheatfield, concentric circles cut into Canadian lake ice, etc. They
are turning out not so much gallery objects as huge impositions on the landscape in their search for some dynamic interchange with the totality of sites.

Public fury is more easily aroused in outdoor than in, as many site-artists are discovering when their work is thrust into the public's gaze. Richard Koshalek and Mike Steele recount in this issue the political tumult let loose on public art shown at Minneapolis-St. Paul last October: one work was dismantled others removed. Editorialized the Minneapolis Tribune "Not the least factor perhaps was an uneasiness (due largely to the recent bombings) about large, bizarre structures that suggested disruption of a familiar environment."

The Walker Art Center's recent experience in Minneapolis this spring is instructive. Preparing for its May 15 show timed for the opening of a new wing (with three outdoor roof sculpture plazas), the Center invited 20 artists to participate. The majority wanted to work outside. "It's tough on museum people," said a staff member. "Artists aren't interested in working inside anymore."

What is most striking about much of the new work is its continental and territorial quality. Many artists have begun to look at and use large areas of the North American continent in an Olmsteadian-Whitmanesque way. Their scale resembles that of landscape architect Philip Lewis whose recent works (i.e. regional landscape plans) cover six states in the Upper Mississippi-Great Lakes Region. As Max Kozloff has observed in the Nation, the dirt-artists' breaking-loose onto the open plains and deserts "is unprecedented in American art because artistic dimension had never, until now, taken for its arena a whole continent."

But some of these adventuresome artists have also become landscape defacers - ripping off cliffs, digging up untouched deserts, scarring rare landscapes with the ego-strips, getting away with it easily in remote locations. They talk ecology but practice destruction; preach conservation but act like Anaconda Cooper or Peabody Coal, only on a smaller scale. Theirs is often the most superficial engagement with landscape in all its complexities.

Yet they do show an experimental way of looking at landscape, sometimes intensely personal and idiosyncratic but often wholly new and exciting. Given the right conditions of collaboration, they could offer insight and innovation to the new and often dead-serious teams of environmental designers being assembled across the land.

What the best experiments show is a willingness to combine several sculptured media in a landscape that has its own requisites (climate, soil, slope, traffic, ownerships, etc.) This is far more complex than gallery art; and can produce multi-media landscape sculpture that can be exciting and liveable as well.

In short, landscape sculpture can generate a set of conditions, and not merely a set of emotions. That is its great promise and power.

GLOSSARY

EARTHWORKS (or "Dirt Art"): art forms designed and made principally upon, from, or within the earth's surface.

PUBLIC SCULPTURE: located so as to be used by the public, or seen in, or from a public place with minimum restrictions on the movement of the public.

ENVIRONMENTAL ART: a catch-all term for new works or art generally not confined to traditional galleries or structures. (Some artists insist that creating a "sculptural environment" within a gallery is "environmental art" but we are sticking to the out-of-doors in this definition).

SITE ART: an art work anchored to one or more particular sites, deriving its essential form from conditions influencing that location.

CONCEPTUAL ART: a work of sculpture designed to conform to the artist's pre-conception and unrelated to site conditions or to the site's larger environment.

LANDSCAPE SCULPTURE: LAQ's working term for designed landscape forms which embody more than one sculptural medium beyond earth itself; an organic system of materials used to express a unified, esthetic concept, and responsive to conditions set by its physical environment.