Stony Brook University

OFFICIAL COPY

The official electronic file of this thesis or dissertation is maintained by the University Libraries on behalf of The Graduate School at Stony Brook University.

© All Rights Reserved by Author.

Contemporary Manhattan Cartographies: Ephemeral Public Projects in New York

A Dissertation Presented

by

Andrew Wasserman

to

The Graduate School

in Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements

for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

Art History and Criticism

Stony Brook University

December 2012

Copyright by
Andrew Wasserman
2012

Stony Brook University

The Graduate School

Andrew Wasserman

We, the dissertation committee for the above candidate for the

Doctor of Philosophy degree, hereby recommend

acceptance of this dissertation.

Michele Bogart – Dissertation Advisor
Professor, Department of Art

Joseph Monteyne - Chairperson of Defense
Associate Professor, Department of Art

Raiford Guins – Reader of Dissertation
Associate Professor, Department of Cultural Analysis and Theory

Erika Doss – Reader of Dissertation
Professor, Department of American Studies, University of Notre Dame

This dissertation is accepted by the Graduate School

Charles Taber
Interim Dean of the Graduate School

Abstract of the Dissertation

Contemporary Manhattan Cartographies: Ephemeral Public Projects in New York

by

Andrew Wasserman

Doctor of Philosophy

in

Art History and Criticism

Stony Brook University

2012

This dissertation considers the emergence of a cartographic public practice in both contemporary art and contemporary cities, attending to the ways in which ephemeral public projects create map-like objects that diverge from official urban projections. Rather than marking a single location, such projects structure networked connections between several sites, transforming undifferentiated urban spaces into legible urban places. Evaluation of this recent cartographic turn entails the triple consideration of placemaking, placemakers, and placemarkers as constructing spatialized identities for different neighborhoods and setting forth wayfinding strategies within these same neighborhoods. Focusing on Manhattan, the dissertation surveys how the borough has served as a source of raw materials from which artists and art institutions constructed new urban models, both against and alongside recent urban redevelopment policies. Three chapter-length case studies constitute this investigation: the public installation, guided tours, and staged Opening Ceremony of REPOhistory's *Lower Manhattan Sign Project* (1992-1993); the circulating printed image repertoire of the Studio Museum in Harlem's *Harlem Postcards* (2002-present); and the New Museum's *Counter Culture* (2004), *GET LOST: Artists Map Downtown New York* (2007), and new building (2004-2007). By embracing the dual roles of urban archivists preserving marginalized forms of urban visual culture and public artists creating new site-specific and site-responsive projects, each artist collective or organization adopts the mantel of mapmaker. While generating new guides to the city, these mapmakers assert their own presence on the urban landscape as well. In each case, what results is a "processual" map that is responsive to shifting material forms and social dynamics.

Table of Contents

Introduction ……………………………………………………………………………………1
Project Overview ………………………………………………………………………………4
A Cartographic Turn in Public Art ……………………………………………………….....9
Outline of Chapters ………………………...…………………………...………………….19

Chapter 1: The Past Comes Back and Combs Its Beard: REPOhistory's *Lower Manhattan Sign Project* …………………………………………………………………………………...29
Recovering the History of REPOhistory ……………………………………………...32
Public Education ……………………………………………………………………...36
The Prehistory of REPOhistory ………………………………………………………42
Organizing Theory ……………………………………………………………………50
Creating New Landmarks …………………………………………………………….58
Walking through the Signs ……………………………………………………………62
Walking with the Past ………………………………………………………………...66
A History of Mobilizing History ……………………………………………………...87
Portraits of Two Neighborhoods ……………………………………………………...93

Chapter 2: As You See and as You Already Know: The Studio Museum in Harlem's *Harlem Postcards*……………………………………………………………………………………..117
Something that Represents the Neighborhood ……………………………………….120
Building a Museum ………………………………………………………………….126
Building a "Museum" ……………………………………………………………….134
The Museum's Golden Era ………………………………………………………….141
Picture Harlem ……………………………………………………………………....145
Local Investments …………………………………………………………………...152
Welcome to Main Street, Harlem, USA …………………………………………….157
Selling 125th Street …………………………………………………………………..164
The Studio Museum's *Studio* ………………………………………………………..173
Beautiful Harlem …………………………………………………………………….177
Another Local Investment …………………………………………………………...188

Chapter 3: Small Projects about the Bowery: *Counter Culture, GET LOST: Artists Map Downtown New York*, and the Museum Building. …………………………………………..217
From Marcia's Bootstraps to Lisa's Loserville ………………………………………..220
Rethinking the Museum in the Sky…..……………………………………………..…..224
Finding its Place……………….……………………………………………………..235
Sites of *Counter Culture* …………………………………………………………….239
Finding Landmarks in *GET LOST: Artist's Map Downtown New York* ……………….247
Building a New Building …………………………………………………………….279
Building a New Brand ……………………………………………………………….288

Building a New Bowery ……………………………………………………………….292
Building a New Legacy...…………………………... …………………………………303

Conclusion ………………………………………………………………………………..326
Curating the *Museum of the Phantom City: OtherFutures* …………….…………………331

Bibliography ……………………………………………………………………………...339

Introduction

In the summer of 2012, a series of advertisements appeared across Manhattan promoting *NYC Map*, a new digital mapping application jointly sponsored by NYC & Company and CityMaps.[i] NYC & Company, self-defined on its website as "the ultimate resource for visitors and residents to find everything they need about what to do and see in New York City," is multi-division tourism, marketing, and informational agency for New York City. The agency offers to the public travel packages including information about hotel accommodations and local sites of interest, provides coordination services for the planning of conventions and trade shows, and serves as a public relations arm for the city's consumer and tourism industries.[1] Founded in 2010, CityMaps is an online commercial and transportation services mapping program. It generates interactive online maps on which retail and restaurant locations are indicated by their respective corporate logos. Clicking on a logo reveals the street address, contact information, and updated reports on daily promotions offered by the particular business. Integrating data derived from social networking websites—such as Twitter, Facebook, and Foursquare—CityMaps promotes itself as "the web's first Social Map" and "a hyper local, living, breathing, one-stop-shop plot-it-out on a visually intuitive map that knows everything there is to know about your city. Seriously. Everything."[2]

When *NYC Map* was made available for free download to smartphones and mobile devices from the iTunes online store starting in April 2012, it was one of a series of recently created mobile programs sponsored by the city, in collaboration with other independent

[i] Notes for this chapter can be found from page 24 to page 28.

organizations and companies, to encourage informed urban exploration.[3] However, *NYC Maps* is unique in the public promotional program developed to announce its release. Video monitors in taxicabs, usually dedicated to playing short clips of news updates from local news stations, displayed short thirty second animated clips touting the functionality and accessibility of the new program, while large posters were mounted on the exterior panels of bus shelters. As an introduction to this dissertation, I want to briefly consider the content of these posters. [Figure 1]

The poster is dominated by the image of a touch screen phone displaying the open and actively running *NYC Map* program. The *NYC Maps* name appears large (and in all capital letters) at the top of the poster. Directly underneath this in three stacked horizontal bands are the CityMaps logo, a message to "DOWNLOAD THE NEW FREE APP!" and the question "WHERE DO YOU WANT TO BE?" This question is ostensibly answered with the visible screen of the phone: the poster viewer is shown the search results for the toy store FAO Schwarz, set against the gridded street plan of midtown Manhattan filled with logos for banks, a furniture store, a jewelry store, and several restaurants. Location identification is cast as a targeted search through commercial graphic logos.

The CityMaps logo is also present in the poster. It is a pair of binoculars, through which a simplified set of eyes peer. The binoculars face out from the surface of the poster, with the wider set of lenses closest to the viewer. The meaning seems clear enough: these are the location-seeker's eyes, narrowing in on his or her destination with the aid of the amplifying lenses. Thus the logo emphasizes the related processes of finding and seeing. However, the logo does not shown is what is actually found and seen. It shows a process, in which urban visual discovery is mediated through a device designed to focus, clarify, and extend vision. The logo points to a

method of seeing: a guided approach to urban discovery yielding the representation of the city found on the screen of the phone and the surface of the poster.

In the context of the poster (and *NYC Map* in general), the binoculars mark the role played by the mapping program and the creators and sponsors of this program in structuring the user's interaction with the city. Coordinated interests of the program's designers, municipal sponsors, and participating businesses determine the appearance of the businesses within the map.[4] The city is represented as a place literally dominated by dollar signs: green circles with dollar symbols are used to identify recently offered retail deals. On the whole, Manhattan becomes known through its commercial contributions: a metropolis mostly filled with repeating chain restaurants, franchises, and branded grocery stores. Although smaller merchants, restaurants, and cultural and recreation sites are included in more detailed views of the interactive map, prominence is given to those addresses where a branded retailer is located. Neighborhood distinctions are apparent only through the thinning in the number of Starbucks and Chase Banks in some regions and an elevated density of them in others. Manhattan is thus mapped as a place of familiarity, availability, and affordability, simultaneously at odds and in line with what some would consider "the real" Manhattan.

Choices made regarding locations meriting inclusion, how to convey information, and the amount of flexibility afforded to the user to further modify such maps inform both how the user navigates through urban space and assigns meaning to this space. The representations yielded as the products of such choices guide one's experience of the city as a place, informing one's expectations, perception, and understanding of this place. A central theme of this dissertation is this process of cartographic placemaking through the manipulation of urban content: organizing

fluid space into a structured and legible place through public art objects. What follows is an investigation of the related processes of mapping public space and making a public place.

Project Overview

This dissertation considers the emergence of a new cartographically-informed public practice, attending to the ways in which contemporary ephemeral public art projects create maps that diverge from "official" spatial projections. Focusing on Manhattan, the dissertation surveys how the borough and different neighborhoods within the borough have served as a source of raw materials that artists and art institutions manipulate to construct new models of urban locations. Three chapter-long case studies structure this investigation: the public installation, self-guided tours, and staged Opening Ceremony that comprised REPOhistory's *Lower Manhattan Sign Project* (1992-1993); the circulating printed image repertoire of the Studio Museum in Harlem's *Harlem Postcards* (2002-present); and the New Museum's *Counter Culture* (2004), *GET LOST: Artists Map Downtown New York* (2007), and new building project (2004-2007). Revealed and recovered are how the artist collective or organization adopts the mantel of mapmaker. Each mapmaker generates a representation of the city that operates as a legible map-like guide to the city. By embracing the dual roles of urban archivists preserving marginalized or overlooked forms of urban visual culture and urban public artists creating new site-specific and site-responsive projects, these mapmaking collectives and institutions assert their own presence on the urban landscape. The result is a reading of the cartographic projects that draws out the mapmaker's own relationship to the city at the moment of the map's creation and that demonstrates what cartography historian Denis Cosgrove has identified as the "carto-city" or the urban map's position "between creating and recording the city."[5]

What I refer to as the cartographic turn in public art, as will be discussed below, involves the triple consideration of placemaking, placemakers, and placemarkers as constructing a spatialized identity for different urban neighborhoods and setting forth wayfinding strategies within these same neighborhoods. Rather than marking a single location, the cartographic public project structures a networked connection among locations, drawing these various sites together, unified by a guiding theme. When successfully deployed by the project creator, this theme can be discerned by an audience's engagement with the project at the sites to which the project refers. Thus crucial to such projects is the concept of legibility: the audience's ability to read the project as mapping formerly undefined or ill-defined spaces as clearly recognizable or understandable places. Through this process, the public cartographies communicate identities for urban neighborhoods at moments when the material forms and social dynamics of the contemporary city are being actively remade.

Histories of the postwar period in American cities are often concerned with tracking the causes of and measures taken to reverse cities in decline. Frequently recited in the literature—written by urban historians, sociologists, anthropologists, and reformers—is the desire at different moments to "save" or "revive" or "rethink" the metropolis, processes that occur as a result of governmental policies of intervention on national and municipal levels, grassroots and community engagements, and the collaborative partnerships between private and public sector investments.[6] Along with such studies, a secondary field of literature has developed, evaluating the effects of gentrification within American cities. Since the 1964 coining of the term by sociologist Ruth Glass to describe a change process already underway in London whereby traditionally working class districts were being displaced by a flood of newly-arrived middle class residents and investors,[7] gentrification as both a concept and a practice has been divisive.

Strategically rhetorically deployed as a positive action by political representatives and real estate investors as a political strategy to drive programs of urban change, gentrification has also become a pejorative buzzword for urban activists and residents decrying and the pricing out of long-time residents and top-down urban engineering that ignores street level citizen concerns. Recent studies of gentrification as a tool to save the American metropolis from the brink of crisis and to remake localized urban neighborhoods have often highlighted the deleterious effects of such practices: the further marginalization of minority and low income communities, the standardization of neighborhood appearance, and the perceived accompanying loss of "authentic" urban spaces.[8]

New York City, and the borough of Manhattan in particular, has served a frequent source of inquiry for such studies of contemporary gentrification-informed urban transformations. Establishing a chronology that begins with the Koch administration's quality of life initiatives and financial austerity programs and continues through the Dinkins, Giuliani, and Bloomberg administrations' promotion of public-private collaborations in developing and regulating urban spaces, recent New York City-centric studies have sought to challenge the narratives of progress and "revitalization" and instead argue for framing such programs as masked forms of class, racial, sexual, economic, and even environmental warfare.[9] Such studies question not only the value of gentrification on the city but also place of gentrification in the city. Place in this case should be understood not only as being synonymous for location but also for the real-world impact of gentrification in urban spaces: how this complex process of real estate and commercial investment from public and private sources not only introduces new local social dynamics and architectural forms, but also constructs a representation for this urban space. Vague terms "renewal" or "revival" are often part of the promotion of such development plans, terms that

both sides of the gentrification debate have adopted and inflected for their own purposes. As an alternative, the projects considered in this dissertation demonstrate attempts to more clearly define these recently transformed spaces as distinct places.

Each of the three case studies of this dissertation adopts a different position towards contemporary acts of urban gentrification. REPOhistory's projects confront gentrification, presented as responsible for urban banality and the eradication of vibrant local culture within both the Lower East Side and Lower Manhattan. The Studio Museum in Harlem's curatorial programs are supportive of the two and a half decade-long economic investment and cultural rebranding of Harlem, recording local diversity while also rhetorically positioning this diversity as a contemporary neighborhood beautification project. And finally, while not uniquely responsible for the transformation that has recently overtaken a once-no-man's-land between the East Village and SoHo, the New Museum nonetheless stands at the forefront of an ideologically complex imaging and building program within and along the Bowery.

To consider these organizations' responses to gentrification provides only a partial understanding of the projects. Just as the real estate developments of these different Manhattan neighborhoods occur under specific socio-historical conditions, so too do the projects emerge at specific moments within the history of their sponsoring agencies. Each of the three organizations was founded as an alternative arts organization with commitment to present contemporary art making strategies to receptive audiences neglected by the greater art world or art promotion machine.[10] During the times when the projects considered in this study were planned and publically revealed, each sponsoring group found itself also engaged in a critical period of transition. For the membership of REPOhistory, this transition entailed asserting a commitment to an intellectually rigorous and pedagogically minded form of public practice while breaking

away from earlier generational approaches to community activism. For the Studio Museum in Harlem, this transition entailed reaffirming a founding mission dedicated to serving the local community following over a decade of institutional practices defined by other interests. For the New Museum, this transition entailed moving to the institution's first fully-self-designed site of operation, announcing the museum's "arrival" not only on Bowery (the street) but also alongside comparable institutions in the New York art world and global contemporary art world.

In order to fully understand how the different projects considered in this dissertation serve not only as placemarkers employed in cartographic acts of placemaking but also as chartings of their placemakers' response to the contemporary city, the dissertation tracks parallel biographical histories of the projects and their respective creators. By drawing out the presence of the projects' sponsors-as-mapmakers, both located at and alerting attention to the "axis where the known and the unknown or the visible and invisible tend to meet," to borrow from Tom Conley's analysis of the early modern cartographic signature, is to begin the process of a reconstructing the motivations of cartographer himself or herself—or, in the case of an artists collective or institutional body, itself.[11]

Setting aside previously art historical uses and definitions for "ephemeral art,"[12] this dissertation considers ephemeral cartography as a public art-structured form of placemaking conterminal with a public art-structured form of mapping. Each organization's attempt to remap Manhattan is the product of employing an expanded class of public art objects that circulate or through which circulation is encouraged, make reference to specific locations from which the public art objects can be acquired or viewed, and pinpoint destinations that the objects advocate traveling to and from. The result is a processual act of redefining regional identity within an urban context that is responsive to shifting forms and social dynamics of that urban setting.

A Cartographic Turn in Public Art

Following from the spatial turn and social turn that have occupied much of the art historical, philosophical, and cultural studies literature of the past several decades,[13] this dissertation considers a mapping-inspired model of public art practice: a cartographic turn in public art. This model is informed as well by rising concerns about the notion of "place" and interactions within places: the concept of place as a single location, as a material site in which social relationships (structured and unstructured; appropriate and inappropriate) are played out; and as something to which one forms an affective relationship.[14] These considerations of place have brought about a related body of literature concerned with placemaking and urban placemaking in particular. Often more closely affiliated with design studies than critical theory, such analyses examine the ways in which an environmental context can be transformed into a subjectively-determined meaningful place through the installation of permanent site markers, public sculpture, street furniture, or an entire architectural complex into public spaces. Such material interventions can structure one's experience of public spaces by forcing specific forms of behavior and social associations to coalesce around physical objects in the world. Thus, this process of placemaking is one defined by both material and social practices.[15]

This interest in placemaking is also connected to the research on public art and, more broadly, public projects. Recently, there has been a surge in studies looking to public art as contributors of aesthetic, material, political, and social definitions to cities, states, and even nations different moments in their history.[16] Often the endpoint of a process involving review boards and committee approvals, realized works of sanctioned urban public art have been identified as both products and reflections of power hierarchies as well as conscious constructions of intentionally asserted local or national value systems. However, with the

expanded consideration of what constitutes public art—not just any work of art installed in a public space and not just larger civic sculptural works or murals at that—has emerged the call for a redefinition and reevaluation of these same aesthetic, material, political, and social dimensions of public arts practices.[17]

Over the last twenty years, the literature on public projects has examined how visual and material interventions into public space—ranging in scale from monumental civic sculpture to minor street art-inspired interventions; from expansive centralized municipal plazas filled with furniture to community gardens and temporary storefront occupations—have engendered debates over cultural authority. Such projects force the question of who gets to assert oneself in public space.[18] Related investigations proposing not only cities and their infrastructure as sites for art but also cities as a works of art have further complicated these questions.[19] This view has yielded the call for the study not just of collections of objects in urban settings but of cities as urbanistic objects themselves: to be curated through a variety of engagements enacted by, on one side, urban planners, designers, and artists, and, on the other, by urban audiences of residents and visitors moving through city spaces. Architecture historians Sarah Chaplin and Alexandra Stara have recently set forth several possible approaches to this type of urban curation, including the architectural exhibition, the public gallery, the urban art installation, the city tour, and even processes of urban redevelopment.[20]

Through these discussions, methods for building urban representations are offered. These representations serve as ways of understanding the city, providing and fostering an identity linked to either the city as a unified place or an assembled collection of smaller, discrete neighborhoods with their own individual identities. Such representations are the products of acts of urban placemaking, transforming undifferentiated built spaces of the city into legible places of

urban forms and activities. For this dissertation, I am interested not only in acts of placemaking but in the placemakers and placemarkers that carry out these acts: the persons and material agents responsible for the transforming of undifferentiated urban space into a discrete and legible place.

Historian Dolores Hayden has argued that the "power of place" of urban landscapes rests in such landscapes' capacity to serve as storehouses of collective memory, social history, and cultural identity. Harnessing different facets of memory, history, and identity through the creative interpretation (and appropriation) of otherwise vernacular, modest, or neglected physical elements of the city allows for new narratives to be brought forth, new social attachments to be formed, and new representations to be generated.[21] As urban sociologist Christopher Mele observed in his study of Manhattan's Lower East Side across the late nineteenth and twentieth century, the "invented borders" of some neighborhoods can be formalized through such place-building representations. Mele also distinguished between an intrinsically felt "sense of place" or "place identity" and a poststructuralist-inspired reading of the repetitive circulation of constructed images, rhetoric, and symbols that can yield an essentialized identity of a place.[22] Despite the limits to this murky binary, productive for this dissertation is how competing localized definitions of a place, driven by social, cultural, economic, and political agendas and values, can manifest divergent forms of placemaking. In particular, I am interested in how such forms of placemaking can be both predicated on and become productive sources for newly charted cartographically modeled representations that are expressive of such urban place identities.

My decision to consider such projects as cartographies is informed by a considerably older critical theorization of mapping processes. Claudius Ptolemy's second century *Geography*

set forth the division between two different cartographic approaches to representing a place. Surveying previous patterns of narrative and graphic description, he discussed the difference between a geography and a chorography. The former is designed to offer a mathematically - derived and -precise rendering of the total world: it looks at "the position rather than the quality" of the places it describes, observing a consistent scale and proportion in an effort to convey a general yet useful guide to distances and locations. The latter has a narrower focus, attending to discrete parts of the world: it makes note of curious and particular features of the world, attending to "the smallest details of places" and "what kind of places those are which it describes" in order to reveal a "true likeness" of such places.[23] As more recently understood by Cosgrove, the chorographic mode of description (or "chorographic vision") privileges recording (or seeing) the individuality and uniqueness of place, and has persisted as a representational strategy despite the term's slightly more esoteric nature. For Cosgrove and others, the modern chorography can be found in Renaissance landscape and literary description, Dutch Baroque landscape drawings and painting, and in a nineteenth century John Ruskin-inspired picturesque criticism and design.[24] While the geographer is a man of science trained in the mechanical arts, the chorographer is more than a technically precise surveyor. As advanced by Ptolemy, "Chorography needs an artist, and no one presents it right unless he is an artist."[25]

While the subcategories of cartographic strategies are much more numerous than suggested by the Ptolemaic binary between geography and chorography,[26] it is nonetheless this chorographic tradition that informs my discussion of the projects and approaches to representing place pursued in this dissertation. However, my interest is not in the isolated visual representation of urban space, but rather processes whereby these representations serve as active creators of urban places by a forging of network of connection between map-creator, map-reader,

map-object, and map-referrent. Drawing upon science sociologist Bruno Latour's concept of the "immutable mobile," the scientific object that moves through the world while preserving both its form and informational content (in this case, a networked relation of associations),[27] Cosgrove has discussed the "prosthetic and circulatory aspects of mapping."[28] The former identifies the map's capacity as an instrument of knowledge production: the way in which the map draws the map user's attention to geographic or social patterns previously undetected or unrecognized. The latter calls attention to the way in which maps are social and cultural objects and producers, intervening into the spaces of the world, structuring the world and making the world legible to the map viewer.[29]

Building upon these lines of thought, a recent argument has been made for considering a "processual" approach to cartographies. Without wholly undoing Latour's claim for the scientific fixity of the immutable mobile, Rob Kitchin and Martin Dodge have proposed that, rather than occupying a stable ontological position in the world, maps are

> ontogenetic in nature. That is, maps are never fully formed and their work is never complete. Maps are of-the-moment, beckoned into being through practices; they are always mapping. From this perspective maps are fleeting, contingent, relational, and context dependent, emerging through transductive processes to solve relational problems.[30]

Under this view, maps are studied as being in a process of becoming, rather than a finished state of already being. Visible and material elements with the potential to coalesce into a map do so through an active process informed by the context, experience, and skill of both the cartographer and map-reader. Beyond treating maps exclusively as already-complete representations, such a model argues for understanding the maps as social matter impacting and impacted upon through their processual nature. This conception will, in part, drive my analysis of the projects considered in this dissertation as "ephemeral" cartographies of assembled map-like objects.

Some cartographers and cartography historians have used the somewhat unwieldy title of "map-like objects" to describe visual projections that seem to chart space without obviously resembling topographical delineations.[31] While some have described these departures from the "typical map" form as only basic and limited space-orienting tools (rather than communicating content-rich detail), others are more generous in their analyses, permitting what Jeremy W. Crampton has referred to as a "sliding scale of 'mappiness'"[32] Other have observed the shared origins and ongoing relationship between some categories of map-based and map-free visualizations of content: between topographic maps, thematic maps, hybrid maps (or "para-thematic" maps), and statistical data visualizations such as charts, graphs, and diagrams.[33] With a more permissive approach to the criteria for what constitutes a map's "mappiness," combined with a recent attention paid to "art maps" and "artist maps,"[34] the set of those representational strategies that can be defined as mapping and map-generative has become expansive without compromising the intrinsic meaning of what a map is or what a map does. In recent years, discussions of such tools for recording and communicating spatial relationships with a "locational attribute"[35] have included: notations made on single surfaces of disparate media, fragments cognitively assembled into a total representation, public landscape design, digital smartphone media applications, and durational performative actions that describe and inscribe space.[36] Again, to cite Crampton, the "degree to which these map-like objects are rated as maps increases as people become more familiar with them."[37] In essence, a map becomes a map through ongoing encounter: not only with the formal solutions employed by the map-like object or the material elements coming together to create a map-like object, but also the strategy whereby content of this representation is communicated to the viewer as recognizable and understandable. Thus the construction of the functional map depends upon both the mapmaker

and his or her intention behind and approach employed to charting space, the map itself as both form and content, and the viewer who needs to be able to legibly decode these intentions, approaches, form, and content to be effective.

The question of what can correctly be considered a map-like object is central to the dissertation. I contend that the combination of visual and material elements that make reference to a space as both a knowable and navigable place and are intended to either circulate or structure acts of circulation through these spaces create this category of map-like objects as a type of chorography. It is important to clarify that the map-like objects that I consider in this dissertation are not the final mapped representation. Instead, they are the components that, when combined together by the project audience adopting the position of the map-reader, yield a processual chorography of the neighborhood.

Historians, and specifically art historians, working in disparate time periods and geographic locations, have shown how the circulation of various media can be linked to emergent forms of spatialized urban knowledge and urban visuality: how the mobilization of street posters and broadsides, guidebooks, thematic maps of public heath data, comics, architectural projections, real estate certificates, and magazine and newspaper articles can link, manipulate, and produce otherwise disparate spaces into legible urban narratives and legible urban places.[38] Such projects can serve to enhance an audience's visual pleasure, reinforce power hierarchies, or expose and pose challenges to otherwise hidden authoritarian codes. Phrases such as "paper city" or "city on paper" have been used to describe these often printed-ephemera-based presentations of both real and speculative cities in which both the material city of stone and steel and the social city of politics and economics are translated into new meaningful and mobile representational forms.[39]

I seek to make two modifications to this body of literature. The first is to position the works more strongly within specific neighborhoods. As with more traditionally considered forms of public art, the media considered in my dissertation not only make places but also mark places. However, this act of positioning does not necessarily entail a permanent fixing in place. Although the aluminum street signs of REPOhistory, bracketed to municipal posts during their installation in public, and the sculptural building of the New Museum are the most literal ways in which these map elements are sited, the other media considered in the dissertation shares similar material connections to specific locations. REPOhistory's guided tours, performance, and public education programs were conducted with precise landmarks in mind. *Harlem Postcards* always connect back to the Studio Museum in Harlem as a physical presence on 125th Street, even when not literally shown. Significant elements in *Counter Culture* and *GET LOST: Artists Map Downtown New York* make reference to the New Museum's address at 235 Bowery.

The second change is to expand the types of media that can be considered as contributing to urban knowledge, urban materiality, and urban visuality. While the above-referenced studies are often concerned with ephemera and forms of print culture, the projects and project components discussed in the dissertation are not durational in the same way. Rather than examining solely paper-based materials, the dissertation considers printed media alongside aluminum signs, quickly fashioned timber and chicken wire sculptures and costumes, multi-media installations, and aluminum and glass buildings. By focusing on a quality of "ephemerality" rather than "ephemera" I shift the consideration of the project from the materials created to the neighborhood identities fashioned by the combination of these materials with contemporary urban dynamics. The label of "ephemeral" denotes a quality of the cartographies; not the media responsible for creating the cartographies.

In labeling the case study projects discussed in this dissertation as "ephemeral public projects," I am also engaging with the growing field of research dedicated to ephemeral public art. Often in this field, the terms "ephemerality" and "ephemeral" are conflated with "temporality" and "temporary" in an unacknowledged and uncomplicated manner. The effect has been two-fold: first, ephemerality has been adopted as a synonymous descriptor (although one a greater rhetorical flourish) when "temporality" or even "temporary" is meant; and second, the assumed synonymous substitution of terms has led to a somewhat wide scope of projects included under this ill-defined category.[40] Despite falling into this same trap of ambiguous vocabulary, performance studies historian Nicholas Whybrow's recent work nonetheless offers a helpful way for beginning to think about qualities specific to an ephemeral public practice. Citing the appearance of flash and freeze mobs and *parkour* and *traceur* actions, Whybrow located a quality of ephemerality in both the active realization of such projects and the sites of these realizations. For the former, ephemerality is a qualifier for the project's duration: there is a clear initiation and termination point; the project exists in the world only for a moment in time before receding into the past. For the latter, Whybrow sets forth two related but not mutually coextensive criteria. Such durational projects may appear in spaces physically and materially ephemeral: for example, spaces in transition between decline and renewal, regardless of the direction of this transition. They may also appear in spaces that are socially ephemeral: spaces whose population fluctuations and migrations render them in a dynamic evolving state.[41] It is with these multiple elements of ephemerality—the project, the physical site, and the social site—that my research engages in its positing of an ephemeral urban cartography.

Generated at and responsive to moments of real world change brought about by the political, social, and economic upheavals of regional gentrification, such spatialized

representations of place are themselves contingent on an urban context in flux. The choice to treat the projects considered in this dissertation as "ephemeral" cartographies rather than simply cartographies is attributable to the material impermanence of both context and map that they chart. Regardless of whether the materials of the public projects that serve as the constitutive elements for such maps are properly characterized as ephemera or not, the map itself (or placemaking map-like chorography) is an ephemeral reminder of the mapmaker's desire to imprint urban space with his or her own vision for organizing the urban space. This conception of ephemerality thus also builds upon José Esteban Muñoz's formulation of an evidentiary quality of ephemera—in Munoz's case, one related a queer material identity—as embodying an expanded notion of materiality. Ephemera is "interested in following traces, glimmers, residues and specks of things." It is "those things that remain… a kind of evidence of what has transpired but certainly not the thing itself." As extant traces of previously enacted processes of production, this kind of ephemeral content is bound to social experiences, excavated and brought to the surface during explorations of and challenges to dominant systems of everyday life.[42]

This dissertation is concerned with projects the effects of which linger. As Denis Cosgrove has argued, "the mapping's record is not confined to the archival" in that "it includes the remembered, the imagined, the contemplated. The world figured through mapping might thus be material or immaterial, actual or desired, whole or part, in various ways experienced, remembered, or projected."[43] The ephemeral public art cartographies as processual chorographies created by the projects in this dissertation share similar features. These contemporary public cartographies are reliant on material urban structures and intangible urban dynamics, real histories and constructed legacies, observed pasts and projected futures. Through a complex process involving individual artists, greater project sponsors, specifically created

works of art, the contemporary city, and an audience comprised of both residents and visitors to different neighborhoods, new representations of places are crafted, offering new ways of not only understanding urban space but of seeing urban places.

Outline of Chapters

As part of this investigation into cartographic placemaking, placemakers, and placemarkers, each chapter of the dissertation considers a separate art project or set of art projects designed to provide a clear identity for a different Manhattan neighborhood. In considering late twentieth and early twenty-first century Manhattan as a city continuously engaged in processes of remaking and being remade, the artists and projects discussed in the three central chapters of the dissertation are read as responding to these greater urban processes of change. In particular, they serve as clear responses—oppositional, complicit, and encouraging—to the different enacted variations of millennial gentrification across Manhattan neighborhoods. Each case study in this dissertation considers the way in which each project sponsor-as-mapmaker-as-placemaker (REPOhistory, the Studio Museum in Harlem, and the New Museum) puts multiple map elements-as-placemarkers into public spaces (aluminum street signs, guided tour routes, and theatrical performances; individual photographic postcards dispersed through a variety of means; and site-specific installations, a pamphlet of maps, and a site-responsive public sculpture-as-museum building). Guided by the mapmaker, these elements combine together to chart the boundaries of, identify crucial landmarks within, and provide an overall constructed identity for this newly defined place. Assembling these map elements together requires the kind of the placemaking "processual" cartographic action discussed above, engaging an audience to attend to the presence of both placemarker and placemaker.

Chapter 1 considers the artist collective REPOhistory's *Lower Manhattan Sign Project* (1992-1993) as a geographically displaced reaction against 1980s and early 1990s urban development in the Lower East Side. Borrowing a critical position from an earlier generation of activist practice yet tempering this against concerns to expand audience access and project visibility, the members of REPOhistory used forgotten, devalued, and uncomfortable interpretative registers of history in order to examine a contemporary narrowing of community representation through a leveling of cultural difference. Rather than siting their project exclusively in the Lower East Side, REPOhistory's signs were in the more broadly defined space "Lower Manhattan" and specifically the Financial District, a decision determined by project content, project purpose, and project sponsorship. The chapter examines the ways in which the group remapped both history and historical landmarks through establishing a networked set of locations, guiding viewers to both see the city in new ways as a form of public pedagogy across several different modalities: temporary sited installations of aluminum signs, the promotion of guided and self-guided tour routes, and an elaborate staged public performance modeled after traditional forms of historical pageantry. Each project component sought to expose the ways in which the borough had marginalized different historical narratives in favor of an abstract and hierarchically controlled notion of local and national progress, made newly relevant against a backdrop of contemporaneous local and national observances of the quincentennial celebration of Christopher Columbus' transatlantic expedition. By examining the biographical development of the REPOhistory and their projects, starting with the involvement of future REPOhistorians in Political Art Documentation/Distribution during the 1980s through to the creation of curriculum-supplementing art programs for Manhattan public schools developed at the end of the sign project installation, I propose reading the multiple components of the *Lower Manhattan Sign*

Project as creating cartographically-structured portraits of several neighborhoods designed to reject an idea of urban redevelopment as a positive force in the contemporary city,

Rather than challenging regional developments in Manhattan, the Studio Museum in Harlem's *Harlem Postcards* (2002 – present) adopts a more nuanced position in regards to contemporary changes in Harlem, and in particular Central Harlem. Chapter 2 looks at how these photographic postcards construct a chorographic visual directory for the "new Harlem," defined as the product of a three-decade long project in public and private investments in the uptown neighborhood. After tracking the various institutional positions adopted towards its local community, and the related institutional definitions formulated to organize this community (as either geographically, racially, or culturally defined), the chapter focuses on the museum's post-2000 exhibition and outreach programming. This period at the Studio Museum in Harlem marks an institutional return to a local focus, abandoned in previous decades in favor of constructing a national center for African and African American arts traditions. Part of a greater "Picture Harlem" initiative, the *Harlem Postcards* demonstrate an exploration of the surrounding neighborhood, and 125th Street in particular, capturing a neighborhood in transition as a series of discrete photographic fragments of vernacular elements of everyday Harlem culture. Available in an interstitial space in the museum and reproduced within the pages of the museum's bulletin, *Studio: The Studio Museum of Harlem Magazine*, the postcards serve as a circulating exhibitor of sorts, reliant on both other museum programs and the greater Harlem environment to provide both project content and context. The postcards act as an evidentiary visual justification for an asserted identity of Harlem as culturally diverse, commercially productive, and, perhaps most importantly, "beautiful." This chapter looks at *Harlem Postcards* not as an anti-gentrification

preservationist act, but as an act complicit with the greater psychological reframing that accompanies the material and economic remaking of the uptown neighborhood.

For Chapter 3, the focus of the dissertation returns to southern Manhattan. The chapter considers three recent projects sponsored by the New Museum: the site- and place-specific exhibition *Counter Culture* (2004), the twenty-one artist-created maps distributed as the booklet *GET LOST: Artists Map Downtown New York* (2007), and the museum's new building at 235 Bowery (completed and opened to the public in 2007). These three project adopted as their organizing theme, respectively: introducing the museum's audience to the Bowery, establishing the museum's own sympathetic cultural connection with the Bowery, and declaring clear presence in the Bowery. Both individually and collectively, the projects worked to implicate a shared identity between the museum and its adopted neighborhood: a place-based identity mutually informed by constructed legacies and present-day operations. Rather than asserting an institutional program either hostile to or meant to run alongside regional gentrification (as tracked in the previous chapters), the New Museum has asserted a policy more appropriately understood as "authentrification": an image making strategy in which local cultural forms are repurposed as brand-constitutive materials that encourage contemporary regional commercial and real estate development. In this chapter, I consider the museum's recent efforts to write a place-based identity for itself with its new home *on* the Bowery by not only aligning itself with the cultural identity *of* the Bowery but also physically implicating itself into the spaces *along* the Bowery. Through organizing interactive and participatory public installations, circulating a set of creatively configured mapped projections, and constructing a monumental public sculpture as its new building, the New Museum's idea of the Bowery as a traversable remapped place is one in which the space of the museum is coextensive with the space of the Bowery.

After sketching out several possible avenues for future research, the concluding chapter turns to an example similar to that with which this chapter opened. Returning to the topic of digital mapping applications for handheld mobile devices, the chapter discusses Irene Cheng and Brett Snyder's *Museum of the Phantom City: OtherFutures* (2009). The program is a database of visionary planning proposals that set forth both utopian and dystopian models for Manhattan's architectural development. With content spanning from the late nineteenth century to the present, the program matches proposals to the geographic sites to which they correspond, and alerts mobile program users whenever he or she approaches a content rich location during his or her passage through the city. Described as both a collaborative public art project and a mobile architecture exhibition, the project brings together acts of placemaking, placemakers, and placemarkers together with the recent trend of "curatorial me" media engagements. Users guide their experiences of the city through active engagement with the program, ranking and filtering program content, and affecting other users' experiences of the same program. Although set in motion by the creators of the program and the user-submitted content to the program, place definition is now more fully placed (both literally and metaphorically) in the hand of the project user, who moves through the spaces of a city being invisibly built and rebuilt through a digital cartography of architectural design.

[1] Originally the New York Convention and Visitors Bureau, NYC & Company adopted its current title in 1999. "About Us," NYC & Company, accessed July 10, 2012, http://www.nycgo.com/about-us.
[2] "Our Story," CityMaps, accessed July 10, 2012, http://about.citymaps.com/our-story/ and the embedded promotional animated "Introducing CityMaps" found on the same webpage.
[3] As part of the NYC Digital, a program developed by the Mayor's Office of Media and Entertainment, a separate webpage on the official website of the City of New York is devoted to the "Official Apps from the City of New York." Each sponsored application is aligned with a different New York City municipal department. For example, a few of those included are: "ABC Eats," the New York City Health Department's restaurant locator service that provides users with inspection reports; "Water-On-The-Go," the New York City Environmental Protection Agency's drinking water fountain locator; "NYC Condom," the New York City Department of Health's locator program providing directions to sites at which free condoms are distributed; and "You the Man," the New York City Department of Transportation's car service and subway station locator for those too intoxicated to navigate their way home without assistance. In addition, the city has recently sponsored "NYC BigApps," a series of software development competitions sponsored by the New York City Economic Development Corporation and the New York City Department of Information Technology & Telecommunications designed to promote new creative and functional uses of city information and services. Recent winners of the competition have included: "Embark NYC" and "Next Stop," subway system guides developed by Embark, Inc. and Pliable Matter LLC, respectively; "Work +," a site locator for available public workspaces developed by Tender Creative; and "Museum Without Walls," a public art and architecture guide developed by cultureNOW. For more information see: "NYC Digital," The City of New York, accessed July 10, 2012, http://www.nyc.gov/html/digital/html/home/home.shtml and "NYC Big Apps," New York City Economic Development Corporation, accessed July 10, 2012, http://2011.nycbigapps.com/.
[4] One online technology reviewer explained that the program affords local business owners the opportunity to "claim their spot on the map in order to curate their presence on it…" Sarah Kessler, "NYC Launches a Better Map App for Tourists," *Mashable Business,* April 2, 2012, http://mashable.com/2012/04/02/nyc-launches-map-tourists/.
[5] Denis Cosgrove, *Geography and Vision: Seeing, Imagining and Representing the World* (London: I.B. Taurus, 2010), 171.
[6] As only a partial list suggesting the volume of the recent literature on the topic, see: Jon C. Teaford, *The Rough Road to Renaissance: Urban Revitalization in America, 1940-1985* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1990); Joel Schwartz, *The New York Approach: Robert Moses, Urban Liberals, and Redevelopment of the Inner City* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1993); Howard Gillette Jr., *Between Justice and Beauty: Race, Planning, and the Failure of Urban Policy in Washington, DC* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995); Robert Halpern, *Rebuilding the Inner City: A History of Neighborhood Initiatives to Address Poverty in the United States* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1995); Fritz W. Wagner, Timothy E. Joder, and Anthony J. Mumphrey, *Urban Revitalization: Policies and Programs* (Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 1995); William Dennis Keating, Normal Krunholz, and Philip Star, *Revitalizing Urban Neighborhoods* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1996); Thomas J. Sugrue, *The Origins of the Urban Crisis: Race and Inequality in Postwar Detroit* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996); June Manning Thomas, *Redevelopment and Race: Planning a Finer City in Postwar Detroit* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997); Arnold R. Hirsch, *Making the Second Ghetto: Race and Housing in Chicago, 1940-1960* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998); W. Dennis Keating and Norman Krumholz, *Rebuilding Urban Neighborhoods: Achievements, Opportunities, and Limits* (Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 1999); Elise M. Bright, *Reviving America's Forgotten Neighborhoods: An Investigation of Inner City Revitalization* (New York: Garland Publishing, 2000); Paul Grogan and Tony Proscio, *Comeback Cities: A Blueprint for Urban Neighborhood Revival* (Oxford: Westview Press, 2000); Alexander von Hoffman, *House by House, Block by Block: The Rebirth of America's Urban Neighborhood* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003);); Robert O. Self, *American Babylon: Race and the Struggle for Postwar Oakland* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005); Gregory J. Crowley, *The Politics of Place: Contentious Urban Development in Pittsburgh* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2005); Jon C. Teaford, *The Metropolitan Revolution: The Rise of Post-Urban America* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2006); Colin Gordon, *Mapping Decline: St. Louis and the Fate of the American City* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008); D. Bradford Hunt, *Blueprint for Disaster: The Unraveling of Chicago Public Housing* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2009); and Samuel Zipp, *Manhattan Projects: The Rise and Fall of Urban Renewal in Cold War New York* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010).
[7] Ruth Glass, ed. *London: Aspects of Change* (London: Center for Urban Studies, 1964).
[8] Neil Smith's analyses of gentrification have become the leading studies of the social inequality driving and produced by such policies. See Neil Smith, *New Urban Frontier: Gentrification and the Revanchist City* (London:

Routledge, 1996) and Neil Smith, *Uneven Development: Nature, Capital, and the Production of Space*, third edition (Athens, The University of Georgia Press, 2008).

[9] For example, see Kim Moody, *From Welfare State to Real Estate: Regime Change in New York City, 1974 to the Present* (New York: The New Press, 2007); Tom Angotti, *New York For Sale: Community Planning Confronts Global Real Estate* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2008); Alex S. Vitale, *City of Disorder: How the Quality of Life Campaign Transformed New York Politics* (New York: New York University Press, 2008); Benjamin Shepard and Greg Smithson, *The Beach Beneath the Streets: Contesting New York City's Public Spaces* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2011); and Sarah Schulman, *The Gentrification of the Mind: Witness to a Lost Imagination* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2012).

[10] In the edited volume *Alternative Art New York: 1965-1985*, artist and curator Julie Ault presents a semi-comprehensive, chronological survey of the major New York City-based art collectives, organizations, and gallery spaces in operation during those two decades. Listed among the more than sixty groups and institutions cited are the Studio Museum in Harlem and the New Museum. REPOhistory, founded in 1989, falls outside of Ault's twenty-year focus, but is mentioned as part of the late 1980s and 1990s continued commitment among artists to social issues and cultural identity (included as well in this later category are groups such as Gran Fury and Women's Action Coalition). However, Political Art Documentation and Distribution, the artist collective out of which REPOhistory would emerge, is mentioned within Ault's list. Julie Ault "For the Record" and "A Chronology of Selected Alternative Structures, Spaces, Artists' Groups, and Organizations in New York City, 1965-1985" in *Alternative Art New York: 1965-1985*, ed. Julie Ault (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2002).

[11] Tom Conley, *The Self-Made Map: Cartographic Writing in Early Modern France* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996), 21.

[12] To provide just two cases: The critic Harold Rosenberg defined the "ephemeral art object" by way of example. This "vanguard concept" is applied to both Marcel Duchamp's readymades—objects with a great deal of material solidity but whose permanence is thrown into question by their interchangeable nature and thus ease of replacement—and performance works such a Happenings or integrated multimedia theater works. Barbara Rose used the category of "ephemeral art" as a way of denigrating the works of a new generation of emerging artists. The label was used alongside mention of stylistic heterogeneity and "sensational novelties" as strategies of "bemusing the public." Rose's chief target of attack were the influx of flash-in-the-pan painters of "competent mediocrity and desperate far-outness." The ephemeral artists and others grouped with them were actually afforded slightly higher rank in Rose's criticism than these painters—they are deemed to be "generally more sophisticated" as a result of perceived art school training—but it is, at best, faint praise by comparison. Ephemeral art in this case has less to do with the material conditions of the art than with the longevity of the artistic novelty and career of the artist responsible for its creation. While for Rosenberg, ephemerality was tied to the material conditions of the work of art, for Rose, ephemerality was a social condition, one ultimately to be determined by the art world and contemporary tastes. Harold Rosenberg, *The De-definition of Art* (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1972), 54 and Barbara Rose, "The Return of the Image," *New York Magazine* 5, no. 3 (January 17, 1972): 50.

[13] The "spatial turn" is attributed to the rise of Marxist geography and humanistic geography during the 1970s and 1980s, which explored the ways in which spatial dynamics implicated social, political, and economic dynamics in the former and implicated a perceptual and effective relationship to the world. For example, see Yi-Fu Tuan, *Topophilia: A Study of Environmental Perception, Attitudes and Values (*Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1974); Manuel Castells, *The Urban Question: A Marxist Approach* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1977); Yi-Fu Tuan *Space and Place: The Perspective of Experience* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1977); Edward Relph, *Rational Landscapes and Humanistic Geography* (London: Rowman and Littlefield, 1981); Manuel Castells, *The City and the Grassroots: A Cross-Cultural Theory of Urban Social Movements* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983); Doreen Massey and John Allen, eds., *Geography Matters! A Reader* (Cambridge: The Open University, 1984); *David* Harvey, *The Urbanization of Capital: Studies in the History and Theory of Capitalist Urbanization* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1985); David Harvey, *The Urban Experience* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1989); Edward Soja, *Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory* (London: Verso, 1989); Henri Lefebvre, *The Production of Space,* trans. Donald Nicholson-Smith (Oxford: Blackwell, 1991 [1974]); Ira Katznelson, *Marxism and the City* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993); and Edward Soja, *Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angles and Other Real-and-Imagined Places* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1996). The "social turn" has been discussed as a shift in contemporary art practice towards participatory and collaborative art making and art performing strategies: in essence, a form of social practice as art practice. The works considered are often site-specific or site-responsive. The recent scholarship on this is can be attributed to a rising interest in performance studies and relational aesthetics on the one hand and a critical attention to an expanded

public art practice on the other. For example, see Eleanor Heartney, "The New Social Sculpture," and "The Dematerialization of Public Art," in *Critical Condition: American Culture and the Crossroads* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 181-190 and 206-218; Nicholas Bourriad, *Relational Aesthetics* (Dijon, Presses du Reel, 2002); Grant H. Kester, *Conversation Pieces: Community and Communication in Modern Art* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004); Claire Bishop, "The Social Turn: Collaboration and its Discontents," *Artforum International* 44, no. 6 (2006): 178-183; Jane Rendell, *Art and Architecture: A Place Between* (London: I.B. Taurus, 2006); Ina Blom, *On the Style Site: Art, Sociality, and Media Culture* (Berlin: Sternberg Press, 2007); Shannon Jackson, *Social Works: Performing Art, Supporting Publics* (New York: Routledge, 2011); Grant H. Kester, *The One and the Many: Contemporary Collaborative Art in a Global Context* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2011); Claire Bishop, *Artificial Hells: Participatory Art and the Politics of Spectatorship* (London: Verso Books, 2012); and Nato Thompson, ed., *Living as Form: Socially Engaged Art from 1991-2011* (New York: Creative Time, 2012).

[14] For example, see John A. Agnew, *Place and Politics: A Geographical Meditation of State and Society* (Boston: Allen and Unwin, 1987); Edward S. Casey, *Getting Back into Place: Toward a Renewed Understanding of the Place-World* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1993); Tim Cresswell, *In Place/Out of Place: Geography, Ideology, and Transgression* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1996); Lucy Lippard, *The Lure of the Local: Senses of Place in a Multicentered Society* (New York: New Press, 1997); and Edward S. Casey, *The Fate of Place: A Philosophical History* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998).

[15] For example, see Ronald Lee Fleming and Renata von Tscharner, *PlaceMakers: Creating Public Art that Tells You Where You Are:* (Boston: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1987); Michael Hough*, Out of Place: Restoring Identity to the Regional Landscape* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990); Lynda H. Schneekloth and Robert G. Shibley, *Placemaking: The Art and Practice of Building Communities* (New York: Wiley, 1995); Sarah Menin, ed., *Constructing Place: Mind and Matter* (London: Routledge, 2003); and Ronald Lee Fleming, *The Art of Placemaking: Interpreting Community Through Public Art and Urban Design* (London: Merrell, 2007).

[16] Both narrowly focused explanatory guidebooks and more scholarly critical evaluations have adopted this view. For example, see Meredith Arms Bzdak, *Public Sculpture in New Jersey: Monuments to Collective Identity* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1999); Tim J. Janicke, *City of Art: Kansas City's Public Art* (Kansas City: Kansas City Star Books, 2001); Dennis Alan Nawrocki, *Art in Detroit in Public Places* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2008); Elmer Sprague, *Brooklyn Public Monuments: Sculpture for Civic Memory and Urban Pride* (Indianapolis, Dog Ear Publishing, 2008); Anne Gerin and James S. McLean, eds., *Public Art in Canada: Critical Perspectives* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009); and Cindy Kelly and Edwin H. Remsberg, *Sculpture in Baltimore: A Historical Guide to Public Art in the Monumental City* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2011).

[17] See Suzanne Lacy, *Mapping the Terrain: New Genre Public Art* (Seattle: Bay Press, 1995) and more recently Cameron Cartiere and Shelly Willis, eds., *The Practice of Public Art* (New York: Routledge, 2008)

[18] Michele Helene Bogart, *Public Sculpture and the Civic Ideal in New York City* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989); Harriet F. Senie, *Contemporary Public Sculpture: Tradition, Transformation, and Controversy* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992); Harriet F. Senie and Sally Webster, *Critical Issues in Public Art: Content, Context and Controversy* (New York: Icon Editions, 1992); Jane Kramer, *Whose Art is It?* (Durham, Duke University Press, 1994); Erika Doss, *Spirit Poles and Flying Pigs: Public Art and Cultural Democracy in American Communities* (Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press: 1995); Stanford Levinson, *Written in Stone: Monuments in Changing Societies* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1998); Malcolm Miles, *Art Space and the City: Public Art and Urban Futures* (London: Routledge, 1999); Miwon Kwon, *One Place After Another: Site-Specific and Locational Identity* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2002); Sarah Schrank, *Art and the City: Civic Imagination and Cultural Authority in Los Angles* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009); and Erika Doss, *Memorial Mania: Public Feeling in America* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010).

[19] For example, see Tom Finkelpearl, "Introduction: The City as Site," in *Dialogues in Public Art*, Tom Finkelpearl (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2000), 2-51; Cher Krause Knight, *Public Art: Theory Practice and Populism* (Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2008), 124-130; and Tracy Fitzpatrick, *Art and the Subway: New York Underground* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2009). See also several articles in the 1994 issue of *Places* including: Raymond Turner, "Designing London Transport," *Places* 9, no. 2 (1994): 52-53; Wellington Ritter, "Bridges and Bridging: Infrastructure and the Arts," *Places* 9 no. 2 (1994): 60-67; Cynthia Abramson, "Art and the Transit Experience," *Places* 9, no. 2 (1994): 74-79; Myrna Margulies Brietbart and Pamela Worden, "Creating a Sense of Purpose: Public Art and Boston's Orange Line," *Places* 9, no. 2 (1994): 80-86; Jessica Cusik, "Hands On – A Public Role in Transit Art," *Places* 9, no. 2 (1994): 87; and Alice Adams, "St. Louis MetroLink: Changing the Rules of Transit Design," *Places* 9, no. 2 (1994): 88-90.

[20] Sarah Chaplin and Alexandra Stara, eds., *Curating Architecture and the City* (New York: Routledge, 2009).
[21] Dolores Hayden, *The Power of Place: Urban Landscapes as Public History* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1995).
[22] For Mele, representations merely "stand for" a place and structure an outsider's understanding of a neighborhood while a deeper understanding of place is an affectively generated experience for long-term residents. Christopher Mele, *Selling the Lower East Side: Culture, Real Estate, and Resistance in New York City* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2000).
[23] Claudius Ptolemy, *Geography of Claudius Ptolemy*, trans. Edward Luther Stevenson (New York: Cosimo Classics, 2011), 25-27.
[24] Dennis Cosgrove, *Geography and Vision: Seeing, Imagining, and Representing the World* (London: I.B. Taurus, 2008), 7., 24-28. See also Lucia Nuti's "*Mapping Places: Chorography and Vision in the Renaissance*" and Michael Charlesworth's "Mapping the Body and Desire: Christopher Packe's Chorography of Kent," in *Mappings*, ed. Dennis Cosgrove (London: Reaction Books, 1999), 90-108 and 109-124. It is also in this intersection of art and mapping (or, more accurately, mapping in art) that the volume *Art and Cartography: Six Historical Essays* ed. David Woodward (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987) belongs. Edward Casey has argued for the difference between cartography (as a map of a place) and chorography (as a painterly image of a place). Using seventeenth century Dutch landscape painting as the central example of his discussion, he stated that cartographic approaches provide for "the measure of *sited spaces*… their geometric or geographic forms" while chorographic approaches provide for "the *shapes of places*… the morphic structure of places." In such a formulation, cartography rests more closely with the Ptolemaic understanding of geography, while chorography becomes a mode of pictorial describing. While at elsewhere in the same study Casey acknowledges a "continuing complementarity between chorography and cartography", it is nonetheless clear that for him, these remain not embedded categories but rather separable ones. Edward S. Casey, *Representing Place: Landscape Paining and Maps* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2002), 154-170, 203.
[25] Ptolemy, *Geography of Ptolemy,* 26.
[26] For example, see Matthew H. Edney's historical discussion of different "cartographic modes" including chorography, charting, topography, geodesy, cosmography and mathematical cosmography, and thematic mapping in "Cartography without 'Progress': Reinterpreting the Natural and historical Development of Mapmaking," in *The Map Reader: Theories of Mapping Practice and Cartographic Representation*, eds. Martin Dodge, Rob Kitchin, and Christ Perkins (Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011), 73-82.
[27] This concept was first introduced by Latour as the "immutable and combinable mobile" in Bruno Latour, *Science in Action: How to Follow Scientists and Engineers Through Society* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1987), 219-232, especially 227-228.
[28] Denis Cosgrove, *Geography and Vision: Seeing, Imagining, and Representing the World* (London: I.B. Taurus, 2010), 168.
[29] Ibid.,155-168 and 169-182. See also Cosgrove's earlier discussion of these ideas in "Cultural Cartography: Maps and Mapping in Cultural Geography," *Annales de Geographie* 117 (2008): 159-178.
[30] Rob Kitchin and Martin Dodge, "Rethinking maps," *Progress in Human Geography* 31, no. 3 (June 2007): 343. This idea, which has been referred to as a "de-ontologized cartography," is part of a larger school of cartographic theory that looks to the social constructions of representational and post-representational mapping. A overview of this recent trajectory in cartographic theory can be found in Rob Kitchin, Chris Perkins, and Martin Dodge, "Thinking about maps," in *Rethinking Maps*, ed. Martin Dodge, Rob Kitchin, and Chris Perkins (New York: Routledge, 2009), 1-25.
[31] Daniel Dorling and David Fairbairn, *Mapping: Ways of Representing the World* (Harlow: Longman, 1997), 3-7, 170.
[32] Jeremy W. Crampton, *Mapping: A Critical Introduction to Cartography and GIS* (Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), 44.
[33] Michael Friendly and Gilles Palsky, "Visualizing Nature and Society," in *Maps: Finding Our Place in the World*, ed. James R. Ackerman and Robert. W. Karrow Jr. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press and The Field Museum, 2007), 207-253. See also Arthur H. Robinson, *Early Thematic Mapping in the History of Cartography* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982).
[34] For example, see the Winter 2006 special issue of *Cartographic Perspectives* including: Denis Cosgrove "Art and Mapping: An Introduction," *Cartographic Perspectives* 53 (2006): 4; Denis Wood, "Map art. *Cartographic Perspectives* 53 (2006): 5-14; Dalia Varanka, "Interpreting Map Art with a Perspective Learned from J.M. Blaut," *Cartographic Perspectives* 53 (2006): 14-23; John Krygier, "Jake Burton's Performance Maps: An Essay," *Cartographic Perspectives* 53 (2006): 41-50. See also Katherine Harmon, *You Are Here: Personal Geographies and*

Other Maps of the Imagination (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 2004); Denis Cosgrove, "Mapping, Modernity: Art and Cartography in the Twentieth Century," *Imago Mundi: The International Journal for the History of Cartography* 57, no. 1 (February 2005): 35- 54; Denis Wood, "Catalogue of map artists," *Cartographic Perspectives* 52 (2006): 61-67; William Cartwright, Georg Gartner, and Antje Lehn, eds. *Cartography and Art* (Berlin: Spring-Verlag, 2009); and Katherine A. Harmon and Gayle Clemans, *The Map as Art: Contemporary Artists Explore Cartography* (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 2009). For studies of art objects read as map-like geographical objects see, James Housefield, "Marcel Duchamp's art the geography of modern Paris," *The Geographical Review* 92, no. 4 (October 2002): 477-502 and more recently Joshua Shannon, *The Disappearance of Objects: New York and the Rise of the Postmodern City* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009).

[35] Mark Denil, "Cartographic design: rhetoric and persuasion," *Cartographic Perspectives* 45 (2003): 8-67, 8.

[36] See also Jeremy W. Crampton, "Cartography: performative, participatory, political," *Progress in Human Geography* 33, no. 6 (2009): 840-848; Nadia Amoroso, *The Exposed City: Mapping Urban Invisibles* (Oxon: Routledge, 2010) and Les Roberts, ed. *Mapping Cultures: Place, Practice, Performance* (Houndmills, Palgrave MacMillan, 2012).

[37] Crampton, *Mapping,* 44.

[38] For studies of the early modern period, see Rose Marie San Juan, *Rome: A City Out of Print* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2001) and Joseph Monteyne, *The Printed Image in Early Modern London: Urban Space, Visual Representation, and Social Exchange* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007). For more recently-focused work, see Peter Fritzche, *Reading Berlin 1900* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1996); David Henkin, *City Reading: Written Words and Public Spaces in Antebellum New York* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1998); and Rebecca Zurier, *Picturing the City: Urban Vision and the Ashcan School* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006).

[39] For "paper city," see Nick Yablon, *Untimely Ruins: An Archaeology of American Urban Modernity, 1818-1819* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2009), 63-106. For "city on paper" see Zurier, *Picturing the City*, 8-9.

[40] For example, Patricia Phillips has argued that "temporary" public art projects place a productive burden on the audience to more carefully attend to the issues of "the public" as a volatile, shifting, and contested space of public debate. In her essay "Temporality and Public Art," Creative Time's *Messages in the Public* series used the Times Square Spectacolor lightboard is described as a "temporary" project with in a medium that "demands ephemerality," a concept considered self-evident in her essay and thus accompanied by no additional clarification. In highlighting this unacknowledged substitution, my intent is not to take away from the value of Phillips essay, in which she contended that temporary public art, on account of its ability to create specific engagements with issues and sites, intensifies the audience's perception of a contested, changing "public." It is instead to draw attention to the ease with which these two non-identical terms are brought together and the need to unpack them more fully. See Patricia Phillips, "Temporality in Public Art," *Art Journal* 48, no. 4 (Winter 1989): 331-335. This reading of "temporary art" has more recently been discussed in Florian Haydn and Robert Temel, eds., *Temporary Urban Spaces: Concepts for the Use of City Spaces* (Basel: Birkhauser, 2006) and specifically in this volume Haydn and Temel, "Introduction," 19-20, Temel, "The Temporary in the City," 55-62, and Haydn, "A Material that Never Comes to Rest: Concepts and Potentials of Temporary Space," 67-73.

As an example of a second generation of this pattern, in her recent dissertation attending to "ephemeral" public installations in Canada, Gillian Kaye Yates Atkins resisted clarifying her terms. She sets ephemeral works in opposition to traditionally valued art characteristics of "stability and permanence." In addition, ephemeral art is defined as almost analogous to "critical public art," a move that also goes unaddressed by the author. Guided by Phillips' essay, Atkins discussed how "A critical public art should challenge assumed eternal values… [and] to do so effectively, it should be both specific and temporary." This sets up a bit of a tautological definition, with critical art operating best when ephemeral and ephemeral art being the best approach to critical engagement in public. Atkins covers a great deal of spatial, chronological, and material terrain in her dissertation. Her case studies are centered around works appearing in Montreal, Toronto and Vancouver, and starting with the city-wide sculptural program at Expo 67 in Montreal and concluding with the ongoing international *[murmur]* project initiated by Shawn Micallef, James Roussel and Gabe Sawheny in 2003. Gillian Kaye Yates Atkins, "Ephemeral Installations: Contemporary Canadian Art in the Public Arena" (PhD diss., University of Toronto, 2007), especially 29-33.

[41] Nicholas Whybrow, *Art and the City* (London: I.B. Taurus, 2011), 111-112.

[42] José Esteban Muñoz "Ephemera as Evidence: Introductory Notes to Queer Acts," *Women and Performance: A Journal of Feminist Theory* 8, no. 2 (1996): 10.

[43] Dennis Cosgrove, "Introduction: Mapping Meaning," in *Mappings* (London: Reaktion, 1999), 2.

Chapter 1. “The past comes back and it combs its beard”: REPOhistory’s *Lower Manhattan Sign Project*

In advance of the 1992 quincentennial celebration of Christopher Columbus’ transatlantic expedition, numerous national and international commemorations were organized.[i] These often adopted the format of public events organized around traversing great geographic expanses, crossing both international borders and domestic state lines, in a nod to the original expedition inspiring the celebration. In the United States, Congress established a thirty-member special committee, the Christopher Columbus Quincentenary Jubilee Commission, for the purposes of planning, coordinating, and encouraging public participation in events tied to the commemoration. Sponsored events scheduled to take place throughout the year included: *Grand Regatta Columbus ’92*, an international fleet of ships, including replicas of the Nina, Pinta, and Santa Maria, starting in Genoa, Italy and docking at Cadiz, Spain, San Juan, Puerto Rico, and several United States East Coast port cities such as Baltimore, New York City, and Boston; and *Operation Sail ’92*, a 4th of July celebration on the Hudson River, to coincide with the New York berth of *Grand Regatta Columbus ’92*, and themed “Salute to the Age of Discovery.” [1] Separately, the Smithsonian Institution organized study tours to the cities of San Salvador, The Bahamas and Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic. Additional national projects such as the eighteen-city cross country hot air ballooning tour “Christopher Columbus Rediscover America Ballooning Quest” were also held.

In New York City, local public celebrations were organized.[2] Some of these less geographically ambitious programs adopted a similarly celebratory tone. Two parades, the 28th

---

[i] Notes for this chapter can be found from page 102 to page 116.

annual Hispanic Day Parade (alternatively known as the Hispanic Columbus Day Parade) and the 48th annual Columbus Day Parade were held in Manhattan on October 11 and October 12 (the nationally recognized date for Columbus Day), respectively.[3] Less widely advertised, the Arts for Transit program of the Municipal Transit Authority sponsored the "Hello Columbus! Design-a-Plaque" competition. For this project, artists submitted designs on subway car cards for the chance to have their image appear both as printed cards in the subway cars and as silk screened aluminum panels within the 59th Street/Columbus Circle subway station.

However, increased local and national attention on New York City events due to the convergence of the July 4th holiday and the quincentennial offered the opportunity for more than just celebration. Projects encouraging reflection and for scrutiny were programmed by major institutions, setting the legacy of Columbus against contemporary assessments of local and national heritage and identity.[4] Brooklyn City Opera Theater presented Darius Milhaud's opera *Christophe Colomb* on October 10, while the Queens Museum of Art presented Andrew Liotta's opera *Christopher Columbus* earlier in the year. Each used the heightened dramatic stakes of the operatic medium to suggest the complicated legacy of the historical figure, pitting the identity of divinely motivated adventurous explorer against that of savage conqueror of indigenous cultures. New York University sponsored the symposium "Five Centuries: Many Peoples Many Past," evaluating the impact of Columbus' arrival in the New World on native populations and the model it set for immigration patterns across subsequent generations.

During the summer, the cross-borough public art festival *1992: The Americas* was also held across New York City.[5] Publically and privately funded organizations from each of the city's five boroughs sponsored a project as part of the festival. Each group independently developed its respective project and planned associated educational outreach programs within its

local community. Project organizers used the anniversary as an opportunity to challenge cultural assumptions around historical narratives beyond those related to Columbus. In addition to this shared thematic interest, these projects were designed to be "exclusively temporary," collaborative, and platforms for community dialogue. Representing Manhattan, the Lower Manhattan Cultural Council sponsored REPOhistory's *Lower Manhattan Sign Project*, independently developed prior to the agency's sponsorship.[6]

This chapter examines the multiple project components of REPOhistory's *Lower Manhattan Sign Project* as not only as satisfying the criteria of *1992: The Americas* festival, but also developing a strategy for trans-historic and cartographic public placemaking. Against the increased public attention towards an uneasy and complicated national past, REPOhistory examined an uneasy and complicated local past, played out in an economically, socially, and culturally stratified urban environment of Lower Manhattan. The project, which involved the public installation of new site markers, the dissemination of guided tour routes, and the staging of an elaborate mobile theatrical spectacle, was designed to bring forth awareness of erasures within urban culture. It was planned in large part as a response to recent urban development and the resultant population displacement within the Lower East Side.

This chapter is guided by an interest in recovering the full material and chorographic dimensions of REPOhistory's *Lower Manhattan Sign Project* and recovering REPOhistory's actions and planning procedures during the project's development. By using temporary installations to structure a performance-based place-specific pageant, of which few elements remain, the group signaled the ephemeral qualtiy of the city, of ascriptions of place-based identity, and of the concept of history itself. Through its relating of past to present events, the

sign project and its associated programming created fleeting visualizations of a complex urban place by integrating historical recuperation with public education.

Recovering the History of REPOhistory

REPOhistory's *Lower Manhattan Sign Project* marked the culmination of three years of planning. Intended as the group's inaugural project, the *Lower Manhattan Sign Project* consisted of thirty-nine aluminum signs designed by forty-six artists.[7] These signs were displayed at thirty-six different sites, affixed to existing light poles and signposts in the city (in some cases with multiple signs on the same post), with a format mirroring municipal landmark and historic district signage. [Figure 2] The signs tackled a range of topics, among them the forgotten sites of nineteenth century ethnic immigrant communities, the derivation of contemporary street names, local leisure practices, economic disputes, and the plight of the homeless in the region. The signs were not sequenced according to historical chronology, nor were grand narratives of local or national progress offered. Through the installation, the group made physically present again traces of historical legacies that were previously either cast to the margins or omitted completely from one's everyday experience of the neighborhood.

As the project title indicates, the signs were installed throughout Lower Manhattan, in which the preservation of original non-gridded street plan of the colonial city maintains a visible and traversable link to the past. However, it would be more accurate to refer to the sites of installation as mostly contained within the Financial District, an area occupying much of the southern pole of Manhattan with a northern boundary of City Hall Park at Chambers Street. The regional convergence of centuries-old urban structures combined with more recently built skyscrapers turns the entire region into what cultural historian Thomas J. Schlereth has termed a "time collage." For Schlereth, the "time collage" is what the "above-ground archeologist" finds

while walking through the space of the city. It comprises the visible "series of artifacts from different eras in a community's history lined up along a single streetscape or clustered above a civic space."[8] REPOhistory's introduction of new signs into these spaces served as material interventions into this already historically and culturally rich place. In selecting this location, the group considered the past and present financial and political importance of the place, the significant population traveling through the region everyday for work, and the ethnic diversity of local communities in the area.

The group was cognizant as well of the signs' ability to provoke without being intrusive on the extant neighborhood visual media. In overviews of the project prepared for grant proposals, mention is made of the already present municipal historic markers that fill the region and how REPOhistory's additional signs would function as a similar mode of history marking. Rather than articulating the type of "official" historical record advanced by local city government agencies (e.g. municipal organizations and tourism boards), REPOhistory's signs advocated for an alternative historical record. The result was a site-specific marking of counter-histories challenging the dominant narrative of events in the region through an intervention in the everyday spaces.

Throughout the *Lower Manhattan Sign Project's* year-long public installation, REPOhistory members employed several methods by which they led viewers through the project. As discussed later in this chapter, tours were organized throughout the project installation. These public programs were staged for different reasons: to generate publicity and interest for both the project and the collective; to "guide" specific readings of each individual sign by highlighting aspects of the historical record in the spoken tour narrative that were not otherwise be apparent in the printed sign content; and to drive home a more complete narrative

across the entire installation, one that could connect the events of history more directly to contemporary social and cultural issues facing the region. Chief among these guided tours was the elaborate Opening Ceremony staged to inaugurate the project.

The collective officially unveiled the outdoor installation to the public on June 27, 1992 with an hour-long opening ceremony in the form of a history parade. [Figure 3] Part guided tour, part civic theater, and part participatory spectacle, the event involved not only the members of REPOhistory,[9] but also volunteer musicians and performers recruited for the event. This public presentation included the display of large cutouts of significant figures, moving set pieces, costumed figures, handheld props, cardboard placards of slogans and dates, and explanatory speeches and songs thematically connected to each of the signs along the parade route.[10] Through REPOhistory's "stage managing of history," figures and events from the past were revitalized in the present.[11] Rather than confining themselves to the space of the sidewalks, the crowd often walked in the streets when moving from one sign to the next. Starting at Castle Clinton in Battery Park and traveling throughout Lower Manhattan, the Opening Ceremony of the *Lower Manhattan Sign Project* served to reanimate through reenactment.

Building towards an analysis focusing on the programmatic structure of the Opening Ceremony of the *Lower Manhattan Sign Project*, I propose a corrective to the oversight of this and other contemporaneous REPOhistorian-guided projects in the literature on REPOhistory. Presented at the end of the chapter, this analysis includes the route, the sign content installed at each of the eight sites encountered, the performative events and narration at each site, and the supporting props introduced during each section of the procession. Such an analysis of the kind of hybrid public art project exemplified by the *Lower Manhattan Sign Project* demands looking beyond the signs as static visual markers, offering a chance encounter with the project for an

urban audience. Instead, it recommends looking towards an alternative models of engagement to reveal the project's full potential as a work of critical activist practice and public pedagogy.

My decision to focus on the content related to the opening ceremony, and thus only eight of the thirty-six sites and signs, does not present a distortion of the group's larger installation. I argue instead that not only do the eight operate synecdochically for the greater *Lower Manhattan Sign Project* but also for REPOhistory's practices as a whole. In addition, I suggest that the often-ignored opening day procession is in fact an exemplar of REPOhistory's greater organizational project—civic education through acts of public engagement—and thus key to understanding the *Lower Manhattan Sign Project* as a work of socially conscious and engaged public art. I demonstrate how the multi-modal presentation of the Opening Ceremony marked both an embrace and an inversion of traditional civic performance of historical pageantry in order to highlight the erasure of local historical narratives.

By focusing my attention to the events of the procession I do not mean to imply that the signs themselves are somehow unimportant. On the contrary, the signs structured the route as organizing landmarks within the procession. The content of each sign cued a particular performed narrative. This chapter positions both the signs and the peripatetic performance they structured as exemplifying of a pair of related strategies of spatialized public placemaking: the first, the street sign-cum-landmark plaque, installed within public spaces and allowing for the chance encounter with the project by the audience; the second, the walking tour-cum-historical pageant, planned by an artist or set of artists to guide the audience through a set of predetermined sites and performative happenings. Considered along with sets of tour routes offered as part of the year-long project installation, this chapter presents a more comprehensive analysis of the full range of placemaking and mapping approaches employed by the *Lower Manhattan Sign Project*.

Rather than limit my focus to an explication of this project, my greater goal in this chapter is to provide a more complete understanding of the REPOhistory's foundational practices. By unsettling the focus from the signs as works of art creation in isolation of other contemporaneous group activities, this chapter investigates REPOhistory as a whole during the group's formative years. This entails linking REPOhistory to Political Art Documentation/Distribution, or PAD/D, an earlier generation activist artist collective of which many REPOhistorians were also members. By stepping back through time to consider the actions of the later group during this period while still under the umbrella of the earlier group, the motivations behind developing works of public art that applies contemporary critical theory to local social policy more clearly comes into focus. The chapter will also move slightly beyond the sign project, presenting two related *Portrait of a Neighborhood* programs REPOhistory members organized for two Manhattan schools. As the most pronounced example of the group's intertwined interests in acts of historical recuperation and education in public, these projects provide additional support for the arguments advanced in the first several chapter sections. While strategies for place-specific ephemeral art practices in opposition to regional gentrification activities were practiced by group members during the 1980s when working within PAD/D, these strategies would be refined following REPOhistory's emergence as an independent collective: turning away from an interest in isolated sites of public intervention and towards creating a networked map of resistance.[12]

Public Education

In a 1992 project proposal, REPOhistorians Greg Sholette and Jim Costanzo jointly offered a summary assessment of the artist collective to which they belonged. In answer to the

self-generated question of "Why [create] an artist collective focusing on historical representation?" Sholette and Constanzo wrote:

> … specific sites within the modern city reveal only fragments of their history. The REPOhistory Sign Project intervenes at street level re-constructing the memory of specific sites and as such serving as a counterpoint to the historical pastiche of post-modernism. On another level the struggle to construct alternative historical representation is of course not new, any more than it is the exclusive concern of university-trained artists. Many communities "repossess" their histories through street festivals, storytelling, murals, neighborhood craftspeople, and everyday cultural practices. Within this conflicted terrain REPOhistory is but one more player.[13]

This statement highlights three crucial points about how these two leading members of the group understood the greater mandate of REPOhistory. The first is an interest in the present: calling out the "historical pastiche" and the historically vacuous citations that proliferate and typify the moment of "post-modernism" as reflected in works of visual and literary arts and theory. The second is an awareness in the mnemonic potential of a site-based project: how the intervention in targeted everyday spaces can not only repossess but also reconstitute events of the past in the present, making fragmentary histories whole again. Such an action serves as a negation of the pastiche-culture perceived as dominant in the present moment. The third recognizes the limited novelty of this second point. Sholette and Costanzo find homologous forms to their practice outside of the academy, drawing upon "popular"—as opposed to "elite"—models of cultural enactment and celebration. By looking to parallels offered by both popular visual and performance forms, REPOhistory's organizers would stake out an ideological position alongside local voices of a community. However, as will be discussed later in the chapter, this does not necessarily further inscribe their practice within the boundaries of an oft-pejoratively viewed "community art" practice. Included alongside references to Walter Benjamin and Bertholt

Brecht, Sholette and Constanzo's statement instead advocates for a street-level examination of contemporary social relations that attempts to dually operate in *both* popular and academic traditions.[14]

Beyond marking history and social dynamics, REPOhistory's projects served to communicate these histories and dynamics. The *Lower Manhattan Sign Project* in particular has often been discussed as serving as an alternative form of education in public spaces. Aiming for more than consciousness raising, there is a strong didactic component to the project: not just elevating awareness of forgotten historical events, but an explanation of the continued relevance and importance of these events to the contemporary age.

Artist and curator Nicolas Lampert has argued for the *Lower Manhattan Sign Project* as a pedagogical and tactical critique of "the overall process of visual commemoration" itself.[15] Lampert's essay appears within the context of a volume considering the "informal" educational practices and acts of instruction conducted outside of the clearly defined space of the classroom. This concept of an expanded "public pedagogy," informed by cultural theory and media studies, resituates learning to public spaces as sites of public resistance or sites for the assertion of counter-hegemonic narratives. In essence, learning in public space is as an opportunity for the productive "un-learning" in public space. Put otherwise, as art critic and historian Lucy Lippard has noted, REPOhistory's series of publically installed signs "[a]t the very least… can elicit a 'Hey, I never learned *that* in school' response."[16] In the same volume as Lampert, education researcher Andrew Hickey argues that the streetscape as well functions "as both active host of public pedagogies (such as the roadside billboard, or traffic sign) and as a pedagogical force of its own contextualization." It is up to the individual moving through these urban spaces to parse

out relevant information, with all sources of information "drawing their own discursive formation and identity forming practices."[17]

A similar idea is found in Greg Sholette's recent discussions of REPOhistory. Sholette explains that the group's projects served "as a kind of pedagogy oriented to the person in the street… a kind of pedagogy of the everyday."[18] The activist position of the group is found in the reframing of otherwise unassuming locations as not simply historically important but as asserting untold racial, ethnic, gender, or class minority narratives that *should be* deemed as historically important. Through the dual processes of constructive and instructive defamiliarization of spaces—creating a city made newly strange in order to impart a greater lesson about the social and cultural history of the city—REPOhistory engaged with a present-day selective formation of the local neighborhood and city identity narratives.

The editors of the volume in which Sholette's above remarks appear, a volume dedicated to the use of art in social studies education, state that REPOhistory's projects convey meaning through the audience's engagement with the installed signs. The signs provided a "useful 'hook' to engage public audiences in controversial material." Once engaged, the process of relearning history began.[19] However, I argue that such analyses that focus exclusively on the signs, even when such analyses are offered by the members of REPOhistory themselves, are only partial in their considerations of both the project and the manner of public education enacted by the project. While not fully discounting these arguments, I seek to more fully examine the contributions of the individual project components of the *Lower Manhattan Sign Project* and ways in which REPOhistory communicated relevant historical and cotemporary omissions to its project audience. In the case of the *Lower Manhattan Sign Project*, project content was communicated by more than just the stationary visual interventions into everyday spaces. The

timing of the installation as well as the multiple dynamic approaches to presentation guided the meaning for the project's audience.

The historical moment offered by the quincentennial, with its dual pulls of laudatory celebration and antagonist revisionism, is crucial not only to understanding the planning process behind the *Lower Manhattan Sign Project* but also to addressing the full range of project components. As a parallel, in 1987 the *Voices of Dissent* project in Philadelphia was organized to coincide with the bicentennial celebration of the drafting, signing, and adoption of the United States Constitution. A combination of a month-long art festival and three-day program of conference presentations by scholars, artists, and cultural activists, *Voices of Dissent* drew participants from across the United States to consider the form, content, role, and relevance of cultural activism and art making in contemporary society. Event organizer and future REPOhistory member Mark O'Brien described *Voices of Dissent* as initially conceived of as a "counter-celebration" held "against a backdrop of 'official' celebrations which packaged artistic freedom in the United States as an abstract, passively inherited historical commodity…" As an alternative, *Voices of Dissent* "claimed freedom of expression as an active challenge, a right which has and continues to be re-established in each generation."[20]

Rather than focusing on the resolutions determined as a result of the conference, relevant for this present study is the timing of the event. In his summary of the festival's planning, Mat Schwarzman, another project director for *Voices of Dissent*, stated:

> Most of the progressive cultural organizing in this country is done around issues of particularly interest to the Left: Central America, peace, civil rights, the environment, etc. Rarely, though, do we organize around July Fourth, Columbus Day, or some other civic holiday. These times when agendas ranging from radical to reactionary must acknowledge some level of common identity are, for the most part, consigned to the broom closet of progressive

> organizing work: either we ignore them completely or we exploit them as another occasion to criticize the mainstream and the Right.[21]

Schwartzman argued that such moments offer instead “vastly underexploited openings for us to build stronger ties between the Left’s disparate ‘issue communities’ and to offer progression visions to a much broader audience…. [W]e must utilize all the tools at our command, and one of those is public celebration.”[22] Instead of reiterating a leftist cultural activist position to an already sympathetic audience of similarly politically inclined artists and potentially further alienating a conservative-leaning and thus politically-unsympathetic audience, Schwartzman and the rest of the festival organizers called for an approach that would address heterogeneous audiences in a less overtly antagonistic but no less pointedly critical manner. Using the context and content provided by a moment of shared public identity not only amplifies the delivered but also transforms this message. The interrogation of topics such as “citizenship,” “patriotism,” and “national history” at specific calendar moments in which these same topics are already pushed to the fore, offers a chance to rethink and rework the traditional ways in which such topics are deployed for partisan agendas. Schwartzman called for cultural activists advocating for minority positions to learn from how hegemonic power structures employ the rhetoric of a noble national past, present, and future. Rather than a sea of disparate or separable issues, each put forth by a different activist voice, Schwartzman’s proposed “mission statement” encouraged a bridging of these issues, asserting them as collectively contributing to a single progressive vision for the betterment of the nation. These interests are offered as mutually contributing to a new form of citizenship advocated for and by a new form of citizen.

In presenting issues of gender, race, sexuality, and power hierarchies (drawn along economic, political, and social lines), brought together under a the banner of both a single project

and a single artists collective, REPOhistory's *Lower Manhattan Sign Project* offered one possible response to this call for action. With each topic given equal weight through a standardization of presentation and the public presentation of the total project first as the work of REPOhistory collectively and only secondarily as the work of individual artists, the project drew together multiple interests often associated with leftist activist practice. By publicly presenting these interests against the backdrop of the Columbus quincentennial, REPOhistory's use of history extended beyond those events found at each site of installation or recorded on each aluminum street sign.

The Prehistory of REPOhistory

Although REPOhistory would not exist as a formal collective until 1989, the pre-history of REPOhistory starts in 1979 with the founding of Political Art Documentation/Distribution, or PAD/D. Formed to correct the lack of an organized archive for political and activist art (produced not just in New York but also nationally and internationally), this new venture was the brainchild of art historian and critic Lucy Lippard and artist Jerry Kearns.[23] The call for participation in the then still-unnamed group appeared on the back of the exhibition announcement for the group show entitled *Art from the British Left* which Lippard curated at Artist's Space in the summer of 1979.[24] The call was not for a formation of a new group per se, but rather for interested artists to send Lippard documentation of their own politically-engaged art endeavors. The materials that arrived—often print multiples of the original artist projects—would become an archive and the new collective would become a committee to organize this now "archival" material. The first meeting was on February 24, 1980 at the artist bookshop Printed Matter. In attendance at the first meeting was Clive Phillpot, the then library director for

the Museum of Modern Art. It was Phillpot who initially proposed the name "Political Art Documentation," or PAD.

Subsequent meetings occurred the second Sunday of each month. These were open to the general membership of the group, approximately fifty people. In addition, a smaller body, a fifteen to twenty member "work group," met the other three Sundays at the Seven Loaves storefront, located at 177 East Third Street.[25] Offering members the opportunity to meet with similarly minded artists to discuss pressing matters of the day, PAD presented as its primary objective the documentation of recent and current activist practice into a sorted archive, with a second concern of building a community of connected, socially engaged artists. This second purpose would manifest itself as both a physically-located and networked discussion forum for artists and "artworkers."[26] A third aim, which emerged over time, was to sponsor public events echoing the concerns of this membership: public talks, art exhibitions, and organized political and social protests. Combined, the goal would be the development of a new "distribution economy" and a "left-to-socialist artists' resource" designed to facilitate future art practice and to serve as a form of art practice itself.[27]

PAD would maintain a presence in Lower Manhattan for the next several years. As tracked in the pages of *1st Issue* (later retitled *Upfront*), the published newsletters of PAD, the group occupied offices first at 605 East 9th Street and later at 339 Lafayette Street.[28] Artist submissions were to be sent to these locations, in the form of either artist multiples (e.g. posters and artist books) or documentation of projects (e.g. slides, photographs, and publications containing reproductions of works).[29] The building served as both meeting site and archival storage space for PAD. Following the dissolution of the organization in 1988 and the founding of

REPOhistory in 1989, not only was there a migration of members from one group to the other but also there was a transfer of occupancy of the physical space of the former to the latter.[30]

Only a year after the founding of the PAD, in response to rising dissatisfaction with an exclusively archival practice, a second "D" was added to the group's name: Distribution.[31] In retrospect, it seems that this kind of dissatisfaction was to be expected. The group's membership was primarily comprised of artists and writers with ties to other artist collectives, including the previous and current generations of collectives, directed towards the creation of new physical works of art and consciousness-raising interventions in public spaces. Among the groups represented in this multi-generational body were members of the Art Workers Coalition, Artists Meeting for Cultural Change, and Group Material. According to former PAD/D member and future REPOhistorian Janet Koenig, the new group's mandate to document the artwork of others revealed itself to be unrewarding work for many involved in the early meetings.[32] Armed with a rethought mission, the group began producing and "distributing" new works rather than exclusively serving as a storehouse for existing works or works created by others.

The earliest project of PAD/D was *Death and Taxes* (April 1 to April 18, 1981), which called for artists to produce works in response to the Reagan administration's spending of federal tax money on military initiatives rather than domestic social programs. Described in *Upfront* as a "public art event," *Death and Taxes* was the unifying title for a series of twenty public installations across Manhattan and Brooklyn.[33] On the final day of the outdoor exhibition, a one-day gallery exhibition was held presenting multiples and slide documentation of the works. The gallery used for the exhibition was Karin di Gia's Gallery 345, located on the ground floor of the same Lafayette Street building housing the PAD/D offices. For the next several years, Gallery 345 would include PAD/D-sponsored exhibitions in their annual calendar of events. The choice

to create a multi-platform display of information suggests awareness of different approaches to reaching an audience and the varied types of audience responses to art presentations: the gallery show within the potentially rarified, and therefore possibly isolating, space of the art gallery that one must decide to enter; the public installation installed within the everyday spaces of local neighborhood to be casually encountered by a heterogeneous audience; and the reproduction of works within a newsletter sent to those with already sympathetic leanings to the mission of the group.[34]

However, the inclusion of the "Distribution" identifier for PAD/D does not fully account for the development of the group throughout its almost decade-long existence. It does not acknowledge an important division inside the group, one that is often either overlooked or underemphasized in the PAD/D chronologies. A fracture within the group emerged with the formation of a reading group in 1981. Initially organized by Michael Anderson, Jim Murray, and Greg Sholette, the group adopted the somewhat unwieldy title of the "PAD/D Not for Sale: Anti-Gentrification Committee" and would subsequently be alternatively titled the "PAD/D Not for Sale: Anti-Gentrification Reading Group" and "Not for Sale: Anti-Gentrification Reading Group." It was created in response to a growing sense among some PAD/D artists that a lack of critical theory was hindering their practice. The reading group came about almost as a critique of PAD/D itself: a challenge to a perceived non-intellectual (but not necessarily an overt anti-intellectual) stance the larger group. Sholette in particular would spearhead this movement against what he identified as lack of "serious" consideration of the historical and ideological ramifications of politically engaged art practice.[35]

Over the next several years, the reading group met to discuss Frankfurt School theory and more contemporary cultural critiques (e.g. Raymond Williams, Fredric Jameson, and Terry

Eagleton on cultural theory and postmodernism; Laura Mulvey, Helene Cixous and Julia Kristeva on feminism and the gaze), as well as contemporary art critical discussions supplied by the pages of *October* (e.g. Benjamin Buchloh, Yve-Alain Bois, and Rosalind Krauss). However these discussion groups and the reading lists borne out of them demonstrate more than just a closed-off academic curiosity in inheritors of the mantel of Western Marxist tradition. Instead these sessions endeavored to synthesize these texts, testing their applicability to the rising social issues and responsive art making strategies. This fusion of scholastic and social engagement can be found not only in the naming of the group but also in the projects this now almost autonomously functioning group would present.[36]

The adopted name of the reading group signaled the group's staunch opposition to the Koch administration's sanctioned urban renewal activities throughout the city, and in particular the Lower East Side. In light of the joining of private commercial interests with a hard-line municipal stance on urban homelessness, familiar anti-gentrification rhetoric during the 1980s in New York decried the loss of regional local identity, visually realized in the forced removal of long-time residents through combined processes of complicit landlord abandonment of buildings and dramatic increases in cost of living in new construction. For the PAD/D reading group, a new manufactured "idea" of the Lower East Side was replacing the "actual" Lower East Side. The result was a fear of a city without a sense of place attached to it, or an "ageographia," to use Michael Sorkin's contemporaneously developed term.[37] This newly imposed image of the city spurred on artists, particularly those self-enrolled in a crash course in class dynamics and structures of representation, to offer a counter-offensive.[38]

The reading group evolved to create projects themselves, moving from collective discussion to collective action. Although submitting reports to the PAD/D membership and

recipients of PAD/D funding, PAD/D Not for Sale would ultimately act as an autonomous agent within PAD/D.[39] Of the projects developed by this subgroup, the most significant was a two year, two-part exhibition. The first phase of the project was the 1983 installation at El Bohio—a community center and former school building on East 9th Street, just south of Tomkins Square Park—entitled *Not For Sale: A Project Against Displacement*. Artists and neighborhood craft hobbyists were invited to contribute works to the exhibition. Although the works lacked a unifying theme, the goal of the exhibition was to highlight the diverse and vital culture present in a gentrification-threatened region. This first exhibition of the reading group proved to be a learning experience: both in terms of the need for coherence in the subject of the works presented and the manner in which the works were presented. Reflecting on the El Bohio show, Koenig recalled that

> we thought that the public would come in, that the community would come in. But the community did not come in… to that space. The community just didn't feel that it was their space. We didn't want to have that happen again, so we decided to bring the gallery outdoors.[40]

This recognition of the connection between audience and accessibility, or put otherwise between audience and sense of ownership of space, would drive the manner of presentation for the second exhibition, *Art for the Evicted* (alternatively titled *Out of Place: Art for the Evicted*), the following year.

Rather than using a formal gallery space (or even an unofficial or appropriated gallery space), *Art for the Evicted* was a public installation. In 1984, the group appropriated four street corners occupied by abandoned buildings, specifically the facades of the abandoned buildings on each corner. The result was the temporary marking of display spaces with four new street-side "galleries:" The Leona Helmsley Gallery, The Guggenheim Downtown, Discount Salon, and

Another Gallery. [Figure 4] Artists were called on to create wheat paste posters for each site. The requirement was that the artists had to engage with the site from some critical perspective, with the theme of gentrification being encouraged. The goal was to engage a local audience by presenting the perceived pressing issues of this audience in the everyday spaces of this audience.[41]

Beyond tracking the relevance of the objective of the installation and the specific artist submissions received and installed for the installation to this present study, I contend that there is an important link between the missions of the reading committee and the next generation of REPOhistorians that can be found in the planning of this public exhibition. Unacknowledged in all accounts of the *Lower Manhattan Sign Project* is the circulation of a flyer several years prior that seems to be an uncanny illustration of the later project. [Figure 5] This flyer served as the formal call for contributions for the *Art for the Evicted* project and forms a direct visual link to the later group's activities.[42]

The call for contributors exclaimed "ARE YOU SICK OF" followed by a list of social and economic complaints pertaining to the new reality of the Downtown region in the mid-1980s. These include a critique of the Lower East Side art gallery scene, the dominant art styles promoted by this emerging art world ("neo-expressionism," "unfocused angst," and "graffiti on canvas"), the increased rents driving out both residents and local businesses out of the region, and a general condition of the Lower East Side becoming "Sohoized?"[43] This call for proposals included a set of formal criteria for submissions (the maximum dimensions of the work; that it be able to be easily affixed to a flat outdoor surface) and specified thematic content for proposals (the work should be "pro-neighborhood and deal with the issues of gentrification or be a critique of the Lower East Side art scene").

In the center of this circulated page was a contemporary vision of the urban center, highlighting the dual identities of a city being built and demolished. Included as well was an open white rectangle, facing out from the image, proclaiming "PICTURE YOUR ART HERE." This was not a poster affixed to a city wall, the type of art advocated by the sponsoring committee. Instead, an anachronistically ornate frame, affixed to a municipal post on which other signs are already attached, surrounded this rectangle. Formally consistent with the *Lower Manhattan Sign Project* and not with the *Art for the Evicted* public project, the flyer acts a key previously-unacknowledged marker in the development of the future first project of REPOhistory, a group at the time existing in partial membership only and not yet in name. It demonstrates that in 1984 members of the group were already considering the potential for the public integration of this kind of art into the already present urban visual environment.

This flyer, a perhaps otherwise minor archival inclusion in another context, here reinforces a vital foundational connection between the reading group and the new artist collective founded in 1989. However, it is not the only such connection to be found. The reading group continued to meet throughout the remainder of the decade, continuing to discuss Marxist theory and developing proposals for an array of public projects, many of which remained at the planning stages.[44] Despite their unrealized form, such proposals nonetheless demonstrate developing interests in alternative forms of art circulation, leftist activist politics, and the crisis of history in the contemporary.

For example, a two-page prospectus sent by Sholette to the group in 1987 proposing a series of collectively produced artist's boxes to be "distributed via [an] artists books system" yet "exhibited as 'wall art.'" In a quickly drawn diagram of stacks of paper, cassette tapes, and small-scale sculptures contained within such a box, Sholette extolled the features of such a

project as “flexible,” “democratic,” “easily distributed” and “cheap.”[45] Relevant to this chapter is the list of topics included at the end of the second page of the proposal. Sholette provided a list of seven possible themes for the project. While some inclusions in the list engage specifically with the contemporary art world—the first, fourth and fifth topics are “Beyond the ‘Terminal Generation’ Syndrome (In Search Of the Heroic Without the ‘Redemptive’),” “A Lampoon Of ‘the New Criterion,’” and “A Polemical Box About A Current Show,” respectively—others more directly mirror future concerns of REPOhistory, to be more fully discussed in the next chapter section. These include: the second topic, “How To Be A Successful Artist While Remaining Politically Connected,” elaborated as a “A Book Of Aphorisms + Useful Tips!”; the third topic, “Counter Histories/A Re-Contextualizing of the Postmodern Pastiche”; the sixth topic, “Theory for Beginnings—A ‘Tool Kit’ for Artists”; and the seventh topic, “Political Art,” elaborated as “Explaining the Rhetoric + Iconography of Left Culture.”

Synthesizing these individual interests in art, politics, critical theory, history, and didactic explanation in order to comment on contemporary society would be a key point for the new collective. Equally significant would be the recognition that such a synthesis would not necessitate abandoning a commitment to place-specific and place-defining practices. As the next chapter sections show, these investigations promoted overlooked narratives not just as content for art making but instead as spatialized challenges to hegemonic narratives of both history and neighborhood identity formation.

Organizing Theory

REPOhistory formally convened for the first time in May of 1989, although still without an official name. Organized by Greg Sholette and Lisa Maya Knauer, this first meeting saw an attendance of a diverse set of artists, art professionals, historians, and theorists. In advance of this

meeting, an outline was drafted by Sholette and sent to Knauer in April 1989. In it, Sholette addressed a desire to recreate something of collaborative practice of PAD/D, but with mindfulness to the disorganization and divisiveness present in the early group. Briefly sketching the focus of the new organization, he insisted that:

> I have come to the conclusion that only when individuals gather to work on something that holds a mutual interest for them will things get done. Examining the way history is and has been represented or the way certain histories have not been represented has become a paramount interest of mine. Since I have made the choice of doing visual static artwork, virtually an anachronism in today's culture, I figure the least I can do is try to put some things out in a "public" context. Working on a project like this with other like minded [sic] people is appealing for that reason and for the partly collective aspect of group work, something I miss since the PAD/D days…. What seems obvious to me is for a group to parallel PAD/S's [sic] course it should begin where PAD/D started to go awry, a fairly early event in my opinion.[46]

Although containing jabs at the organization faults he perceived within the previous group, the letter did not sever ties completely with the PAD/D-era principles. Citing the ongoing desire for collective practice, the importance of establishing a clear mission early on in the group's formation was one that would be mutually valued by the members of the group. In addition, by highlighting the development of new, relevant modes of art production for the contemporary world, Sholette voiced his complaints with the earlier group while also laying forth a set of new procedural guidelines. The conditions that led to factions within PAD/D were to be avoided in this new collective by starting from the shared ideological standpoint of the reading group.

In the outline proper, Sholette set forth a concise statement of purpose in the affirmative for this new group, rather than defining it in opposition to PAD/D as he did in the cover letter. Labeled simply "CONCEPT," Sholette wrote that this new collective would adopt as its goal to "retrieve and relocate absent historical narratives at specific locations in the New York City area

through counter-monuments, actions, and events." In the longest section of the proposal, he explained the immediate art historical precedent and conceptual model for the type of project he would like to see realized: a recent group project "in a small city in West Germany" that was "sponsored by the local museum." A series of site-specific works were placed in previously Nazi-occupied locations, and these locations were then "roused from their anonymity by the intervention of these artworks."[47]

As this project is often cited in Sholette's recounting of REPOhistory's origins,[48] it is worth pausing to more fully consider the nature of the Austrian project. *Points of Reference 38/88* was the 1988 iteration of the annual Styrian Autumn Festival, a government-funded, multidiscipline cultural festival in Graz, Austria. The festival was started in 1968, making the 1988 festival the twentieth anniversary of the festival. It was to be a double anniversary as the organizers also sought to "commemorate" the 1938 annexation of the Austria by Hitler's regime. The city served as a crucial regional holding in Hitler's European network of domination. In connection to this local history reference, the festival was given the official motto of "Guilt and Innocence of Art."[49] The curator Werner Fenz was selected to guide the public art component of the festival. Fenz organized an international cohort of sixteen artists from across Europe and the United States. A total of eighteen possible locations were preselected, with each site's history researched and documented for the participating artists. Artists were then provided with a list of sites throughout Graz from which to select, with one site allotted for each artist.[50]

The Spring 1989 issue of *October* devoted several essays to the critical evaluation of the project. In his published curatorial statement, Fenz discussed the idea of the art project as forcing a dialogue between artist and audience, mediated by the material components of the piece and their engagement with history. Public space became "an intellectual space of action" in which a

"direct confrontation with an urban public" was enacted. This rhetoric of a public art of confrontation—art that was controversial in its meaning but also intrusive in its placement within the space of city—was central to the project. History, ideology, space, and the temporary engagement with all of these were identified as key to the project.[51]

In their summary overview of the project, Douglas Crimp and Rosalyn Deutsche praised the project's insistence "upon specificity with regard to context." They additionally advocated for the Austrian arts festival to be considered, if not necessarily an ideal model to be blindly copied for future practice, then as a case study through which one could begin to interrogate contemporary practices of cultural engagement. The exhibition delivered a challenge to the "abstraction of geography, aesthetics and history endemic to much public art that reduces it to the process of myth-making, thereby neutralizing and spectacularizing it."[52] For Deutsche and Crimp, the effectiveness of the project in its forcing of a dynamic and productive public dialogue, was a direct result of this locational and historical specificity and responsiveness.

Sholette attributed his awareness of this project to the artist Dennis Adams, who participated in it and also served as a contributing member to PAD/D. In addition, Sholette's former teacher at Cooper Union, Hans Haacke, a frequently-invoked influence and mentor for Sholette, also participating in the Austrian festival. My goal in emphasizing the importance of the analysis of the event in *October*, a journal familiar to Sholette and members of the former reading group, is not to undermine these personal connections as sources of alerting REPOhistory to the international project. Instead, it is to suggest two related points.

The first is to emphasize the awareness within academic art circles of the Graz installation. Appearing in the pages of *October* and subject to evaluation by the journal's cohort of writers marked the international project with a degree of academic "high art" heft. The second

is that, as a result of the stated influence of the Austrian project on REPOhistory's foundational activities, it seems appropriate to call for a reevaluation of REPOhistory's projects relative to those discussions happening within similar scholarly circles. This call resituates REPOhistory beyond the typological boundaries of the often-dismissed late 1980s and 1990s fad for "community art" practice, of which the group is frequently taken as an example. In considering the continued role of contemporary discussions of critical theory played for group organizers, the gap between REPOhistory's practices and those more conventionally discussed exemplars of an October generation of "serious" contemporary art practice begins to be bridged.[53]

The continual influence of the reading group-era critical theory is apparent throughout the remainder of Sholette's initial outline for the group. The outline consisted of three headings: "Research and Themes," "The Works," and "Follow Up." "Research and Themes" included both a reading list of methodologies of historical research (Karl Marx, Friedrich Nietzsche, Michel Foucault, and Hayden White are cited) and a list of potential events and topics in New York City history. Labor, racial, and political struggles were listed, as were potential systems of relating historical events to one another. For "The Works," several possibilities for the form that the project might take were suggested. Discussed were the alternatives offered by official city permission and guerilla public art projects, as was the idea of a didactic gallery installation. The final heading of "Follow Up" discussed possibilities for outreach programs connected to the project: courting press interviews in both local and art world publications, organizing educational programs for students and community groups, and establishing a framework to allow collaboration between artists and radical historians "to continue projects indefinitely."[54]

By the fall of the same year, Sholette drafted a second three-page mission statement. This was distributed at the September 26, 1989 meeting of the still unnamed new group.[55] This

proposal, rather than broadly addressing practical group actions or formal elements of the project, was concerned with the theoretical grounding of the new project, at the time referred to as "History Project NYC." Demonstrating a similar indebtedness to 1980s-era critical theory, the document set forth several guiding principles discussed in the group's meetings from earlier in the year. Reduced to keywords, these were: site-specificity, colonialism, representation, and personal agenda.[56] Newly relevant academic issues of the era—multiculturalism, post-colonial studies, and identity politics—were referenced within this proposal as well. The goal was to mobilize a group at the forefront of academic, artistic, and activist practices.

In the section advocating for the importance of site-specific practice, group member Jayne Pagnucco was credited with suggesting that the group should survey several different neighborhoods. Proposed was a preliminary gathering of local data, with lists of sites within these neighborhoods sorted through at a more advanced stage in the project. Sholette added to this the suggestion of consulting local historians as part of this research.[57] He wrote, "As we being to work on particular locations, its [sic] possible that questions about landscape, architecture and demographics will become more important to us necessitating meetings or readings with specialists in these areas."[58] The importance of this early advocacy for the consultation of "neighborhood historians/activists" and "specialists" would be revealed in a document Sholette drafted at the close of the project, suggesting ways to reform the process for future projects.[59]

Citing Edward Said's *In the Shadow of the West*, Sholette examined the link between representation and structures of control. Of particular interest was how these types of relationships are already present in everyday public media—public art, architecture, and advertising—and how representations serve to further inscribe these relations upon future

generations. Additionally acknowledged was the way in which power need not be overtly represented to still be present. Omission can ironically mark the trace of a dominant/oppressed relationship. This can occur as a result of omission from the everyday visual field (limited or absent representation of certain communities; limited or absent representation of certain cultural motifs or themes) or omission from the historical record (absence of ethnic or social community narratives; absence of “challenging” historical moments). This section also contained a series of oppositions: possible alternatives within the writing of history. These divisions set up history as alternatively: monumental/palimpsestic, documented fact/oral or written narrative, Hegelian linearity/Benjaminian catastrophes, simulacrum/parody, delivered myth/participatory myth, and determined/open. The last division was cast between the “traditional documentary” and the “documentary which questions the role of the maker.” This final division operated as a transition into the final concern of the outline.

Sholette wrote

> Lastly, how do we figure into this project? What is our relationship as artists-educators-intellectuals to the history, the communities, and the memories we wish to represent? What are our desires and how do they inform our agendas?[60]

If these questions sought to get at the overall ideological stance that the group would adopt, additional questions challenged the specific processes by which the group would operate:

> Should we aim to attract media attention with spectacular projects (thus risking participation in the media-spectacle) or should we target smaller, more specific viewers/communities… Or are both of these desirable aims? Can we actually “disengage” from the mediascape, the culture industry? Or must we confront our own paradoxical role in it?[61]

Rather than laying out a clear material basis for the project, this document instead served as a hybrid thought experiment, critical exegesis, and call to action. The concern for how a history

project, an art project, and a history project as an art project could be realized, and the challenge that one's own entrenched position within the greater culture presents to these categories, were posed as long term issues to be considered (even if not ultimately resolved). Over the next several months the topic of what form such a project should take became the central topic of discussion.

It was at these first meetings in 1989 that it was decided to develop a project for the Columbus quincentennial anniversary. Despite national and local plans to commemorate the event already underway, REPOhistory's decision to mark the occasion with a project occured independent of their later invitation to join the cross-borough public art celebration *1992: The Americas*.[62] In a draft of a mission statement from March 1990, Sholette positioned the group as "doing more than filling-in 'missing' pages from the book of history," citing instead the importance of a practice designed to "de-monumentalize, re-narrate, in word reposes [sic]…"[63] The goal was the transformation of a past record through the active seizure and manipulation of that record, rather than simply providing an addendum to it. An interest in colonization—applied to both physical territories and local and national memory—is prevalent in this brief two-page document. As illustration of this idea, Sholette discussed two forthcoming projects by the group. The long-term project was to be the sign project, designed to serve as an interventionist assault on a predominantly white male colonization of both place and history.[64] The short-term project would ultimately remain unrealized. It would, however, inform the sign project.

Proposed for this short-term project was "a sort of portable pavilion" to be installed around Wall Street in the Financial District. The choice of location is driven by a desire to showcase a trans-historical theme: how interests in international economic colonization unified past Dutch trade and present global finance. The pavilion was to serve as the framework for the

display of visual works and a setting for performances.[65] A notarized Statement of Purpose, signed on September 26, 1990 by Sholette, echoed this interest in combining public installations with performance for the purpose of public education. Writing as official spokesperson for the collective, Sholette discussed the group's interest in creating projects "which are exclusively educational and artistic, for the purpose of educating the general public about New York City's diverse geographic cultural and ethnical communities and their histories." Within the document, several broad categories of projects and activities are listed as ways to advance this goal. These included sponsoring historical research, encouraging minority participation in programming, and promoting awareness of different communities through the distribution of printed material. Significantly, examples of activities include plans to "design and install site-specific public art projects; produce plays and other original public performances; [and] conduct walking tours of… different New York City neighborhoods."[66] As will be shown in the following chapter sections, the group would find a way to resolve these disparate strategies in the multiple presentations of the *Lower Manhattan Sign Project.*

Creating New Landmarks

In the interest of reconstructing the full range of creative production surrounding the *Lower Manhattan Sign Project*, it seems best to start with those project elements that are still extant: the signs themselves. The signs remain as one of the few traces of an otherwise ephemeral multi-media art project. However, as currently archived within the Downtown Collection at New York University's Fales Library and Special Collections, they are separated from their initial signpost supports, providing a contextual and material transformation of the original project. Viewing the signs collectively in the present now entails not only a remaking of the hidden planning processes of REPOhistory that guided the sign construction but also the

cognitive reconstruction of Lower Manhattan as a series of installation sites. The archiving of the signs also marks a privatization of ownership and encounter of an initially public project, enacting yet another transformation—if not distortion—of the original intention of the project.[67]

Each of the preserved aluminum signs is of uniform dimensions: 18 inches wide by 24 inches high. In addition, each sign is covered with a white plastic coating, onto which the artist-generated images and text have been screen printed.[68] [Figure 6] Each artist was given a three color limit (in addition the white background) for his or her project. In preparing for the production of the signs, each artist was required to submit a "comp" to the Graphics Committee, a working group within REPOhistory.[69] The comp was a finished mark-up of the proposed sign, complete with accurate scaling, placement, and coloration for each visual element. Submission of the comp was the final stage in a four-stage submission process each contributing artist was asked to follow. Each artist submitted first a written outline highlighting the person or event to be presented, then a drawing of the approximate plan for the finished sign, then a draft of the text to be include on the sign, and finally a finished comp.

The usable space on each sign was slightly more limited than the full surface of the sign. Contributors were informed that on the reverse of each sign would be a uniform text box, 15 1/2 inches wide by 4 1/2 inches high. As described by REPOhistorian Tom Klem, this uniformity was employed as a signal to the project's audience "to recognize that the [single] sign they are looking at is part of the total project."[70] Within this panel, the REPOhistory logo appears in the lower right corner: "HISTORY" horizontal and underlined, with "REPO" angled across the top, rendered to appear as though rubber stamped (complete with ink blots at the corners of the rectangular outline around the word). Underneath this appears "REPOSESSING HISTORY." In the upper right corner of the text box is a black circle with a white numeral inside, corresponding

to the group's official number listing of each sign and site. However, the overall focus of these panels is not the logo, but rather a series of questions. Often two questions appear on each sign, designed to provoke the viewer into considering a more complicated history or social reality than is frequently set forth. Of the approximately two-dozen variations used, these questions include: Is this an historic site? Who makes use of this history? Whose history is remembered? How do you know the past? What meanings to you bring to this place?

Two holes were punched on the left side of every sign, through which bracketing hardware was affixed to mount the sign to a municipal sign and lamppost. Signs were affixed at right angles to the posts, in order to allow for both sides of the sign to be visible to the public. Once Frank Addeo, executive assistant to commissioner of the Department of Transportation, gave his assent in February 1992 for the temporary project, installation was tasked to members of REPOhistory. REPOhistory's involvement of the Department of Transportation in the project execution was a late-in-the-game decision, yet a nonetheless crucial one.

The choice to seek local municipal support for the project signaled a significant shift for members of the collective. In the April 1989 project outline, three possible approaches to public projects were described: those in which city permits are secured in advanced and therefore beholden to city regulations; those in which city permission is not sought at all and independently installed in a rogue action; and those which avoid public installation altogether and instead display works "at a separate location using maps and documentation of real sites."[71] Throughout the first several years of project planning, one finds continued reticence among REPOhistory's members to abandon the idea of an unsanctioned public intervention or an appropriation of public property as display surface analogous to the *Art for the Evicted* exhibition several years earlier. In June of 1990, REPOhistory members were still referring to the project as

a “guerilla art action.”[72] Echoing this vocabulary, REPOhistorian Jim Costanzo stated that during the development process an early project plan was “that we would have to put up the signs in the middle of the night guerilla style.”[73] In addition, Greg Sholette has more recently repeated this sentiment, describing prior art installation processes undertaken “in the dead of night, more or less like illegal graffiti writers.”[74]

The decision to pursue an alternative course—to collaborate with the Department of Transportation and local cultural groups in realizing the project, or, as Nicholas Lampert has considered it, to receive “permission to disrupt”[75]—identifies the decision to seek new approaches to activist practice: to work within a system often considered hostile to such practices. The benefits of such an approach were ensuring that a wider audience would see the work, a more sophisticated level of production in light of securing increased financial backing, and a longer, uninterrupted public installation. There were two assurances entailed by this final category: first that the signs would be allowed to be replaced if removed by vandalism; and second, that the signs would not be subject to municipal removal by the city during the agreed upon duration of installation.[76]

Nonetheless, as late as May 1991, reticence to fully abandon a guerilla approach still existed. Several weeks prior, REPOhistorian Tom Klem drafted a proposal to the Lower Manhattan Cultural Council seeking project sponsorship. At a May 20, 1991 meeting, in light of receiving the Lower Manhattan Cultural Council’s offer to support the project as their contribution to the quincentennial cross-borough public art festival, and after weighing the political and financial cache and potential restrictions such support entailed, three possible paths for REPOhistory to take were discussed among the collective’s membership: working exclusively alongside the Lower Manhattan Cultural Council, seeking funding and support

beyond that offered by the Lower Manhattan Cultural Council, and rejecting the offer altogether and putting up the signs independent of any city organization.[77] The group ultimately pursued the second option.

The Lower Manhattan Cultural Council was instrumental in securing the support of Community Board One, in the district of which the signs would be installed. Benefitting REPOhistory and its project proposal was Jenny Dixon's concurrent holding of the titles of Executive Director of the Lower Manhattan Cultural Council and Chairman of the Community Board One's Art Committee. Capitalizing upon this dual influence, and emphasizing the temporary and educational aspects of the proposed project, the project was able to gain community board approval. Following this approval, REPOhistory received both financial and advisory support from not only the Department of Transportation but also from additional municipal and cultural organizations within the region.[78] The institutional legitimization granted by this support also proved instrumental in securing necessary permits from other city agencies, such as the New York City Department of Parks and Recreation, required in order to mount a sign and stage the start of the Opening Ceremony within Battery Park.[79] The installation was intended to last only six months, ending on January 1, 1993. However, REPOhistory would be granted a six-month extension for the project by these same city agencies that initially gave their assent for installation.

Walking through the Signs

In an undated memo written at soon after the project's deinstallation, Sholette outlined to the group objectives for potential future projects in light of pitfalls encountered during the planning and installation of the *Lower Manhattan Sign Project.* Issues addressed in this post-project summary included: adhering to a stricter planning timeline, setting submission and

editing deadlines earlier in the planning process, consulting local historians earlier to get a more accurate reading on the "significant" community landmarks, independently verifying research and having artists submit research with their artwork, and more closely attending to technical issues relating to the size of font, color of the text, and amount of text on each sign. In addition, Sholette pointed to the necessity of greater site evaluation. He encouraged artist site visits, so that the extant architectural and general physical visual setting of a place could be incorporated into the design of the signs. Sholette also noted the importance of clustering the individual sites in future projects closer together. He warned future organizers to "discourage or reject signs that would take a potential viewer too far out of a walking-tour loop."[80] Despite his concern for the spatial distribution of the *Lower Manhattan Sign Project*, there were attempts to compensate for the somewhat unwieldy distance spanned across the installation sites of all of the signs: extending as they did across the full east to west expanse of the southern end of the island and south to north between Battery Park and Franklin Street.[81] Chief among these was the identification and promotion of possible routes running through the project, advertised to the public as REPOhistorian-led guided tours.

Arranged tours were part of a greater set of outreach initiatives mobilized by REPOhistory. These initiatives chiefly included the active courting of public school teachers and principals. Packets containing reproductions of some of the signs, a copy of *The New York Times*' review of the project,[82] and a map directory were sent to local schools. These informational packets also contained a list of guided walking tour routes and themes covered during each possible route. In an open letter dated October 1992 and addressed to simply "Teacher/educator," these tours are promoted as "intended to supplement [already in place] social studies, history and art curricula." Drafts of letters from REPOhistory to school programs

to elicit interest in the tours make mention of the appropriateness of the tours for students in 7th through 12th grade. For a requested $30 fee, one could select from three possible tour routes: Tour A, including signs 1-11 and starting at Battery Park; Tour B, including signs 12-21 and starting at Trinity Church; and Tour C, including signs 27-36 and starting at City Hall Park.[83] Rather than clustered thematically, the signs in each were organized according to proximity to one another and the feasibility of visiting a set of signs within the projected hour and a half duration of the guided tour. [84]

Beyond targeting high-school age children, walking tours were organized for the general public as well. At the one-year anniversary of the project, two different public tours were also organized for consecutive weekends: Saturday June 19, 1993 and Sunday June 27, 1993. These were advertised as "Repohistory Alternative History Walking Tours [through] Lower Manhattan," as presented on a circulated announcement flyer. Although the specific route of these is not recorded on this promotional sheet, an initial meeting place is noted: the fountain at the southern edge of City Hall Park. A description of the major themes and events to be covered suggests that yet a fourth route was developed for these tours: a combination of selected signs from each of the three above stated routes. In addition, a tour duration of two hours is advertised, longer than that offered for any of the school tours.[85]

My decision to emphasize these programmatic and ordered presentations of the *Lower Manhattan Sign Project* is not to deny the possibility of the chance encounter with either an individual sign or sets of signs in close proximity to one another. The project's installation within the heavily trafficked spaces of Lower Manhattan meant a high probability for the daily encounter with some component of the project for the uninformed viewer, an identifier used here to suggest a viewer dually unaware in advance of REPOhistory's public installation and unaware

of the historical record announced at each point of the installation. Nor do I deny the possibility of one conducting a self-guided tour of the signs. The self-guided tour was in fact encouraged as an option in the brief catalogue produced for the *Lower Manhattan Sign Project*, published during the period of installation. The reader of the catalogue was provided with a route "running from Battery Park at the southern tip of Manhattan, north to Leonard Street, just above City Hall. Visits to these sites can also be broken into three lunch-hour walks taking in the clusters of signs around Battery Park, Wall Street, and City Hall."[86]

In such scenarios, armed with a map showing each sign location and a key providing the subject of each sign, the directed viewer had the option to either follow the sequenced path from one landmark to the next or to depart from this itinerary and tread a new route. Both forms of interaction create expansive possibilities for encounter and interpretation, although admittedly those driven by the subtle yet still-present guiding hand REPOhistory. The group provided a framework of new landmarks to seek out; the self-guided wanderer can decide how to operate within this framework. As a result of these expansive possibilities, the potential for unintended reactions was high, making the need for a structured, directed narrative crucial to legibly delivering the sponsoring group's intended project message.[87]

In formulating these routes, there was an implicit act of selection. This sign selection is even more pronounced in the limitation placed on the number of signs covered in the Opening Ceremony procession. Focusing primarily on the farthest south of the three possible walking tour routes, the procession route was further limited to included only eight of the eleven sites of Tour A. The reason to only include these eight sites out of the eleven still remains unclear. The most obvious reasons can to be attributed to the time allocated for the procession, the distance between the sites, and an expectation that the audience would not remain for the total event if it were

longer (in terms of both geography and duration). As it was, the number of parade participants without obvious ties to REPOhistory (i.e. those who were not REPOhistorians or friends and family members of REPOhistorians) waned as the event continued.[88]

Walking with the Past

This chapter section provides a reconstruction of the Opening Ceremony, conducted among the eight out of eleven signs of tour route A. After an introduction and analysis of the guides tasked with leading the procession, each stop along the programmed route is considered in the sequence in which it was encountered. For each stop, the names of the sign and artist responsible for its creation are provided, as is the site of installation.[89] Attention is paid to the interactions of different media presented and performative approaches enacted at each of the eight locations. During the course of the programmed itinerary, the assembled audience was witness to theatrical recitations, interjections of song and dance, and the presentation of both the aluminum signs and secondary props. Through the combination of these components, REPOhistory produced not only a spectacle public performance, but also a public demonstration of their interpretation of both "history" and a "historical record." For the organizers, history was built up from a series of reoccurring themes manifest at different levels of social and cultural production. Through the excavation of forgotten events and the communication of these events through different modes of presentations, the group demonstrated the impossibility of a univocal univocal historical record, while at the same time putting forth "their" version of a historical and geographic charting of Lower Manhattan.

A flyer circulated prior to the Opening Ceremony declared in a banner heading "Calling the Spirits of the Past: A Walking Ceremony to Unveil the RepoHistory Street Sign Project." The event is described as a "walking, dancing, singing and shouting ceremony, containing puppets,

cut-outs of historical figures, songs and chants, and even a “New-Orleans-style street band.”[90] This four-member band was hired not only to enhance the festive parade atmosphere but also to occasionally provide commentary on and reinforcement of the tone suggested by each sign.[91] Of particular importance to the ceremony was a trio of “town criers:” REPOhistorian Neill Bogan, performer Mia Tutavilla, and musician Yekk Muzik. Their role was to announce each site and briefly narrate the event or events represented by each sign. Bogan was chief among the three criers, for reasons to be discussed below.[92]

Programs were distributed at the beginning of the parade. [Figure 7] The top of the page proclaimed the official title of the event as “Walking with the Past.” Underneath this was a list of each of the eight signs, accompanied by a general description of the image on each and a refrain to be recited at each site. From the perspective of the spectator, the full listing of information on the itinerary prepared him or her for the full range of locations and content to be introduced. From the perspective of the organizers, providing this information allowed for a greater likelihood of active and engaged participation, even if only at the level of repeating scripted phrases.

Planned in advance, at each sign, the procession stopped and a similar sequence of performances was enacted. While ringing a bell, a REPOhistory member reached into a dirt-filled satchel tied around his waist and marked out a circumference of space. Bogan introduced the significance of the site and sign in the form of a “history rap.” Tutavilla described in brief key historical data of each event, often mirroring the content presented on the sign. She essentially functioned as the most overtly didactic voicing of the sign’s historical content to the gathered audience. She also served as the corrective ensuring efficient communication of the sign’s content, content which was either be difficult to see from a distance of ground-level

viewing or was difficult to focus on when attention was drawn to the other speakers. After Tutavilla, Yekk Muzik performed a song he wrote for each historical moment.[93]

To conclude the performance at each site, the trio staged a repeated ritual: they raised their arms and dramatically exhaled while pushing outward from the center of the circle. [Figure 8] This deliberate action was repeated at least four times at each site. However, the specific formation in which they stood during this action would vary: sometimes they were paired into two sets of two; other times they formed a single line of actors. Although the specific meaning of this act was never announced to the rest of the parade participants, members of the crowd were often encouraged to join in and repeat this ritualized movement with the performers.

The Opening Ceremony commenced with a series of introductory remarks. With a crowd assembled in front of Castle Clinton at Battery Park, REPOhistorian Lisa Maya Knauer acknowledged those individuals and city agencies whose contributions and support led to the realization of the sign project.[94] Following her an official proclamation by Manhattan Borough President Ruth Messinger designated June 27, 1992 “REPOhistory Day” in the Borough of Manhattan. The start of the procession proper was officially signaled with a fanfare from the band.[95] They played “When the Saints go Marching In” as the group slowly began to walk from Castle Clinton to the first sign.

After arriving at this first stop, and with the space of performance demarcated around the sign in accord with the process explained above, Bogan introduced himself and announced the role he was to play within the pageant. He was the only one of the three town criers given a specific character identity. He presented himself as “The Deputy Mayor of Doggerel.” True to his assumed title, throughout the procession he recited, often in rhyming couplets, a series of “History Raps.” Each broadly addressed the topic of the sign while also providing a loose

narrative continuity for the procession. However, rather than referring to a specific historical event, the first rap functioned as an announcement of his assumed role and provided a framework for the narrative to follow for the duration of the parade.

While standing in front of the first sign, Bogan announced:

> You've laid in the sun and played in the shade—
> But now it's time to start the parade!
> So gather round.
>
> I'm am the Deputy Mayor For Doggerel
> here to announce
> that of common sense I have not one ounce,
> but the People have spoken, so here I come,
> with a broke-leg rhythm and rhymes so dumb
> they'll hurtcha!
> To take you back through the streets of the past,
> And, presently, unveil these signs of the future, at last.
>
> Now, you may notice I'm not even from here,
> but let me make one thing perfectly clear—
> The people have spoken: I been dully elected and delegated,
> to take y'all to where these REPOhistory signs is located!
>
> Now, it's opening day, so it's time to play—
> play host to a ghost when the coast is clear
> The past comes back and it combs its beard,
> and it brings its friends—there they are,
> like ten families living in the same yard;
> like ten cups cupped inside one another—
> the people of the past are crowded together.
> Call 'em up; you might get an answer. [96]

Bogan's function was that of the lead guide: negotiating multiple chronologies and contexts, leading the viewer "through the streets of the past" while "presently, unveil[ing] these signs of the future." With his alternately highly sophisticated internal rhyme ("play host to a ghost when the coast is clear") and jarring use of colloquial dialect ("to take y'all to where these REPOhistory signs is located"), this first performance introduced Bogan's character as semi-knowledgeable (despite having "not one ounce" of common sense) but also a folksy guide (one

who speaks with a “broke-leg rhythm”). It also formalized the role that Bogan is to play: he has arrived as a result of both the need and will of “the people.” It is they who have elected him to take on this role. He twice declared that it is this popular will to which he is responding, and clarifies that it is by assent of the people that he has been granted his title, however provisional it may be: he was significantly the “Deputy” Mayor.

In character, Bogan serves as the contemporary iteration of the traditional pageant actor. As described by historian Claudia Bushman in her analysis of contemporary religious pageantry, the pageant actor is a carefully constructed type that closely follows a clear set of performance guidelines. Pageant actors “do not emote—they pose, they gesture. They are not meant to be realistic but rather larger than life.” Through dynamic and hyper-theatrical presentation, as Bushman discusses, “Subtlety is banished.” In its is place the scripted figure who commands his or her audience through a combination of education and entertainment.[97]

With his introductory recitation, Bogan was clearly marked as an outsider, neither from this time nor geographic place. Beyond donning a flashy costume—Bogan wore a rainbow-striped jacket across which he tied salmon-colored sash—Bogan intentionally announced his removed position vis a vis the route and content presented as one not from the region. Rather than undercutting his authority, this distancing was meant to invest his and his band of fellow criers’ messages with greater veracity. They were not part of some official history machine nor were they not of the tourist heritage culture of early 1990s Manhattan. As the leader of a troupe of criers, Bogan’s mission was to expose overlooked historical content without being beholden to official hegemonic mandates.

From this preamble, the rest of the Opening Ceremony was as follows:

1. Sign: Jayne Pagnucco, *Potter’s Field/Ellis Island* [Figure 9a,b]

Location: Battery Place, the west side of the Whitehall Building

This first stop presented the topic of immigration and access to the "American dream." One side of the sign displays a photograph taken by Jacob Riis in 1889 of an open mass grave on Hart Island, the location of the city's potter's field. The site has been and continues to be used the by city as a gravesite for those unable to afford private burial. In Riis' photograph, gravediggers pause from their activity of lowering into the ground child-sized wooden caskets (larger ones already line the mass grave) just long enough to pose. One figure still holds a casket under his arm. Underneath the photograph is the question "What is an all-inclusive history?"

The back of the sign recounts the history of immigration through Ellis Island at the turn of the Twentieth Century by focusing on the experience of an immigrant named Rose. Traveling with a friend in 1904, Rose was deemed mentally defective when examined at Ellis Island. She was marked with an X, refused entry to the mainland, and placed in isolation, where she then died. Her friend, who was allowed to continue on, returned to reclaim the body, but officials refused her access to it. The back of the sign speculates about the fate of the body: medical dissection or experimentation, burial in Brooklyn or Queens, water burial in New York Harbor, or "an indigent's burial" on Hart Island. The sign allows for the flagging of several different themes relating to the immigrant experience, in both the past and present: among these class differences, government bureaucracy, and labor issues.

For his performance at the site, Yekk Muzik presented the years of operation of Ellis Island, and the seemingly fickle decisions for entry made there. He sang, "Millions of people came from their homes/ Most had their hopes, most had their dreams/ Some were let in, but others had to go…/ But who is the judge?" Bogan echoed the issue of unequal access to the country, adding the idea of Rose as representing a life discarded: "She's around here somewhere/

But nobody knows, and few have cared/ where her body lies." With Yekk Muzik's encouragement, the parade participants began chanting, "When will America be discovered?" The repeated phrase serves as a thematic bridge between the first two signs: Rose's thwarted "discovery" of America for the first and European colonization of the West for the next.

2. Sign: Todd Ayoung, *Indian Giver or When Will America be Discovered* [Figure 10a,b]
Location: Battery Place and Greenwich Street

The next stop examined the connection between economic exchange and territory ownership. It also presented a much greater chronological span than the first, connecting the seventeenth century sale of "Manhatta" island to contemporary land disputes between the Native American tribes in upstate New York. This historical span is presented on the back of the sign. The older dispute is introduced by claiming the improbability that the Canarsee intended to permanently surrender their vital hunting and fishing grounds to Dutch merchants. The contemporary issue is structured around pro- and anti-gambling positions within the factioned Mohawk nation. These debates are traced to federal laws: the 1790 Congressional prohibition against states brokering independent deals with Native Americans and the 1794 Congressional recognition of the sovereignty of the Mohawk. Also mentioned is a 1796 violation of the second law: the New York government seized nine and half million acres of Iroquois-owned land and granted them a disproportionately small area on which to build a reservation.

The front of the sign displays a ten-cent slot machine. Contrasting against the black and white image of the machine is a trio of red-printed words: "INDIAN," "GIVER," and "CONQUERED." Although difficult to discern from a distance, additional words are printed on the machine in black text: "RESERVATION," "ENTERPRISE." "OWNERSHIP," and "PLANTATION." The entire image is framed by the phrase "SPIRITS OF AMERICA" in red.

In the territorial history presented on the back of the sign, several words and phrases are red within a predominantly black-colored text field: “sale” (which appears twice), “sold,” “Columbus’ Indians,” “pro-gambling,” “anti-gambling,” “THAT’S THE BASIS OF OUR CLAIM,” and the now-combined “INDIAN GIVER.”

The sign plays with the derogatory identification of an “Indian giver,” pointing to the conditions under which land was “gifted” or “given.” The slot machine links such claims to property to a combination of luck and chance. For some who played the game (the Dutch settlers and later American Congressional leaders) they benefited greatly, when compared to their relatively minor economic investment. For others (the Canarsee), luck would not be on their side. During the procession, the image of the slot machine was repeated. Now on street-level, a member of the crowd carried a large-scale cardboard cutout of the object. The phrase “Indian Giver” was written across the top of the cardboard slot machine as well.[98]

For his rap at the site, Bogan announced “In fourteen hundred and ninety two!/ Something happened…/ But—I’m not sure exactly who to.” He elaborated upon his limited knowledge of both the event and the major figures related to it:

> I think maybe the Americans discovered European business
> practices about then.
> Something—
> or somebody—got discovered, boy.
> They looked out of the long-house and said,
> for all I know,
> something that sounded a lot like, “Whoa, no!
> How we gonna deal with this?
> Better go find out what they want.”

Two key points deserve attention. The first is that Bogan did not specifically discuss any of the events presented either in the sign or in Tutavilla’s echoing of these events.[99] Instead, he described the events of Columbus’ voyage, the most overt reference to the quincentennial

anniversary during the parade. This leads to the second point. Bogan reversed this act of "discovery" from its traditional narrative. Rather than European explorers "discovering" North America and indigenous cultures, it is now the American Indians who "discover" the Europeans and *their* cultural practices. The Deputy Mayor gave a voice to the Indians: one of confusion and exasperation. In keeping with his questionable grasp on the veracity of the historical accounts, this was presented as pure speculation and approximation. The Indians were reported as saying "something that sounded a lot like" what Bogan presents, "for all [he] know[s]."

Once Bogan finished, Yekk Muzik immediately started signing, "There were people in America before Columbus came." This is followed by a listing of who these people were: the Mohawks, the Seminoles, and the Cherokee, all "founders of great civilization." He then abruptly cut off his own singing, shouting "Wait. Wait. Wait. Wait. Wait a minute," and then recited a free verse poem about the implications of established cultures present in North America prior to the Europeans:

> Now if there were people in America before Columbus
> I mean before, ante, before
> That must mean they had families, right
> And that must have meant they had civilizations
> They must have had food, or else they would have died
> Now, they must have had a name for this place before they called
> it America
> Maybe they called it… home
> Maybe they called it home, yeah, home
> You know: where the heart is… home.

This possibility of the sale of home personalized an otherwise impersonal territory grab and economic transaction. The loss of home was linked with the loss of voice and the loss of voice with in the loss of the ability to tell one's history. This was made clear with the chant of "Who's going to tell me my own story," the connecting refrain between sites.

3. Sign: Mark O'Brien and Willie Birch, *The Great Negro Plot of 1741* (three signs) [Figures 11a,b, 12a,b, and 13a,b]
Location: Northeast entrance to Battery Park

The next stop on the route led to a trio of signs, each connected to the "Great Negro Plot of 1741," alternatively presented as "The New York Conspiracy of 1741" The three signs inform the viewer of the uprising in the winter of 1741. Following two weeks of fires set throughout the city, it was determined through circumstantial evidence and witness testimony that the cause of the arson was a plot by slaves and Catholics to burn down the colonial city. Swift arrests and court trials resulted in a wave of panic—and perhaps vice versa. Almost one fifth of the city's population of black slaves was implicated. The hanging of twenty-one men (seventeen black and four white men) and the burning at the stake of another thirteen (all black men) followed.

The focus of the narrative is on a culture of chaos. This includes the panic that ensued, both during the fires and in the year and a half aftermath that followed from them, and the already in place popular anxiety that led to this panic emerging in the first place. The signs demonstrate how rumor and social circumstance, exacerbated by economic crisis and a rising minority population, can lead to the demonization of minority groups. The connection between an endemic ethnic, racial, and cultural distrust is reinforced by the collaged images on the front of each sign. Transfers of eighteenth century prints of colonial leaders, bonfires, and figures being burned at the stake and hanged are juxtaposed against contemporary photographs of police in riot gear ordering about African American men. Whereas the former are set against colonial maps the latter are set against more recent maps of the city.

Parallel imagery is emphasized in the cardboard cutout associated with this sign. A set of four adult African or African American figures comprised a chain gang, dressed in blue and brown prison stripes and manacled at their wrists. The scale of the prop was such that it required

two members of the procession to carry it. Three of the cardboard figures looked down, while the fourth figure on the end stared outward. This terminal figure carries a child, and this frontal orientation combined with the cradled infant child evoked traditional Madonna and Child imagery (despite the fact that the gender of the parental figure was ambiguous at best). On the reverse of this banner cutout the four adult figures appeared in contemporary, everyday dress of diverse professions: one wore overalls, another a suite and tie; one held a wrench, another a briefcase. All four now look directly outwards, lacking the solemn expression worn by the men on the other side. Even the expression of the figure with the child was softened: no longer the stoic iconic image of the sacred parent and child, the suggestion of a smile humanized both figures as a father holding his son.

Within Bogan's recitation at the site, several key phrases are significant. The first is his statement "where, again, something happened,/but, this time, no one knows what." It signals a loss of memory and specificity of history. Bogan did not clarify what the "something" was that triggered the public panic. Again raised was the questions of who gets to present history and what is the value of even a fragmentary recovery of the historical record: what is achieved by having a vague sense of a partial history almost two hundred and fifty years later? The second key statement of his pronouncement suggested the answer. He drew a parallel to the contemporary with the sentence "But, like our recently rumored non-riots,/ it cause the whole town great disquiet." Although not specified, it is likely that the reference was to the 1991 Crown Heights riots in Brooklyn, rather than more recent but destructive 1992 Los Angeles riots.[100] Equally driven by racial tensions, these references asserted the continued relevance of the recounted colonial history.

The drawing together of past and present was emphasized in Yekk Muzik's contribution as well. Following an initial cry of "Extry! Extry! Read all about it!" he shouted the mock headline of "Seventeen Africans hanged, thirteen burned at the stake!" and pairs it with "What about Rodney King? Eleanor Bumpers?" The latter two names belong to a more recent historical record: each was linked to a contemporary example of police violence and race. The former clearly invoked the Los Angeles riots, while the latter recalled the eviction and killing of an emotionally disturbed woman on October 29, 1984 by the New York Police Department, escalating tensions within the Bronx as well as the rest of New York City in general.

4. Sign: Stephen Duncombe, *Leisler's Rebellion* [Figure 14a,b]
Location: West side of Whitehall Street at Beaver Street, in front of the United States Customs House

The next stop introduced Stephen Duncombe's sign, a study in visual austerity. Only two objects are show on the front: a bright red, nine-rung ladder angled towards the center of the sign and a noose suspended from the top margin of the sign. This clarity is repeated on the reverse of the sign, in which a straightforward history of "Leisler's Rebellion" is presented without the aid of increased type size, alternative coloration, or rhetorical flourish. The image of the ladder was represented as well as a large cardboard prop carried during the procession.

In 1689, Jacob Leisler led a local militia company in a siege of Fort James and established an interim government. He capitalized on a moment of ambiguity: a political upheaval in Europe brought on by the overthrow of James II by William of Orange meant that a new governor would need to be appointed in the colony. Leisler, a merchant with the support of the working class, built his provisional government from carpenters, bricklayers, limners, and other laborers. Two years later, Leisler would be ousted, accused of treason, and sentenced to hanging and decapitation. However, the population of working class laborers refused to produce

the needed ladder to use to bring Leisler to the hangman's elevated scaffolding. In the Opening Ceremony, the ladder was a symbol for rebellion through passive resistance.

Bogan delivered his rap, drawing out a long tradition of government disgust and necessity for middle-class rebellion. This chronology extended from Leisler to then-presidential candidate Ross Perot, although each figure was placed on a different side of the struggle. For his performance, Muzik proclaimed:

> I had a vision of New York City
> When it was a very different place
> When people were not judged by
> How much money they had
> By their gender
> Or the color of their face
> Million of people working together for the good of all
> And no matter if you were young or old or fat or thin
> It was a very different place to be in.

Muzik concluded with the repetition of two phrases, each emphasizing this future utopist ideal of class recognition and representation: "Bright moments were the sign of the times…It was a vision, and I saw it that way, the day of the working people had their day." The examples of Leisler's seizure of power and the refusal by others to easily cede to authority figures following his arrest were offered as possible models for future restructurings of power. Here the past suggested not only a present parallel but also served as a strategy for potential future action.

5. Sign: Tom Klem, *Homelessness*: *Forgotten Histories* [Figure 15a,b]
Location: South Side of Stone Street, off of Whitehall Street

Out of the entire *Lower Manhattan Sign Project*, the sign at the next stop most closely resembled municipal landmark signage. The background is a brushed gold color, the text of the sign is outlined and shadowed to suggest raised lettering, and the entire image field is outlined and framed to suggest an "official" demarcation of site. However, the narrative content of the

sign does not provide information about the former residence of a famous figure or alert the viewer to the site of notable military defeat. Instead the sign describes three anonymous homeless men struggling to stay alive one evening in March of 1991. When the procession arrived at this sign, the historical focus shifted dramatically to the recent past.

The subjects were the "invisible people" that populate an urban space, described in Tom Klem's sign text as "forgotten and discarded by family, friends and country." This idea of making visible that which is or was invisible was consistent with the greater aim of REPOhistory's project. The sign made these homeless men present again, as the only trace of their existence was the unmarked heating grate on which they once slept to stay warm. This sense of a displaced or completely lost trace of presence took on increased relevance at the time of the procession: during the June date procession it was unlikely that any building heating duct would be roaring, thus receding farther into the background for the urban audience.

The choice of format for the sign image was intended to elevate the lives of these men, their specific plight, and the plight of homeless in contemporary society in general.[101] The inclusion of roundel containing "R-H" in the place where one would expect a government insignia served to not only reinforce the use of a landmark sign format but also emphasized that this was a history being "officially" marked by REPOhistory. The group's goal to elevate audience awareness of and access to overlooked minor histories was further cued by repeating the printed narrative on the front of the sign in English and back of the sign in Spanish. This dual printing facilitated greater access to a historical record, at least on a linguistic level.

One of the more elaborate props carried during the procession was connected to this sign. Approaching classification as a movable set piece, a three-tiered, muslin covered structured was brought forth, resembling a vacated, boarded-up three-story building. The top story supported a

"No Trespassing" sign. Some windows on the structure were shown with planks of wood covering them, while others appeared occluded by bricks. Given the PAD/D-era reading group's preoccupation with the forced removal of local residents, the house shifted the site's meaning. Despite the sign's installation in the Financial District and its recording of an event linked to that specific site, the Opening Ceremony performance staged at this stop expanded the geographic and historical referent of the sign. Rather than exclusively focusing on acts of survival by the homeless, the conditions that cause homelessness within the contemporary moment were highlighted. The prop's "No Trespassing" sign implicated a third party, actively barring others from taking up residence, even in an otherwise abandoned building, an all-too-familiar site on the Lower East Side during the 1980s.

Muzik reinforced the need to reassign accountability and responsibility for contemporary homelessness from the individual himself or herself to a society in his performance at the site. He sang:

> There's a whole lots of people
> Who got nowhere to go
> Some folks say they should live in shelters
> There's another group that might say that's a shame
> We say if they got no place to live, everyone's to blame.

Emphasized was the collective responsibility to address this pressing urban issue and the belief in equal access to an expansively defined concept of "home." This was explained with the repetition of the refrain "Everybody needs a home: that's food, water, shelter" as the procession continued to the next sign marker.

6. Sign: Betti-Sue Hertz, *Whitehall Induction Center* [Figure 16a,b]
Location: Whitehall Street and Pearl Street, northwest corner

The next stop looked slightly farther into the past, this time to the Vietnam War. The back of Betti-Sue Hertz's purple and black sign documents a 1967 protest at the Whitehall Army Induction Center, located on the block on which the sign was installed. The sign describes the burning of eighty-eight draft cards and the arrest of two hundred and sixty-two people. The sign also presents a more general critique of the war. An anecdote is provided about a married father of three, mistakenly drafted, and ultimately killed in Vietnam while he slept. Although this is the largest text on the front of the sign, most of the sign is filled by smaller fragments of content: Arlo Guthrie song lyrics, interspersed images, the façade of the induction center, a figure holding a banner proclaiming "Hell No Ed Won't Go," and figure holding a child while running away from a Napalm bombing in Saigon.

As the Persian Gulf War ended the year before REPOhistory's opening ceremony, U.S. military engagement halfway around the world and the separation of families through the calling up of enlisted soldiers—although not by draft in the case of the more recent war—would have resonated with the parade participants and audience.[102] Rather than directed towards the induction center or even Vietnam, Yekk Muzik's performance highlighted the toll of all wars. Delivered as a personal request to the President of the United States as Commander in Chief of the military, he sang:

> When is Daddy coming home
> It just seems so long
> Since Daddy left in a green suit
> I want my Daddy home
> My birthday came and Christmas too
> And nothing that we heard
> Now Mommy cries herself to sleep
> And she doesn't say a word
> Now Mr. President I know that you
> Are chief of this great land
> But please, please bring my Daddy back
> He's the only Dad I have

He's the only Dad I have.

The prop associated with this sign also emphasized the domestic impact of foreign war. Mirroring the look of a protest sign, one side proclaimed "War is not healthy for children and other living things" with the iconic daisy of 1960s era protests marking the center. The reverse repeated the direct message of "HELL NO WE WON'T GO." However, the prop was more than just a double-sided protest sign. The prop was the *representation* of a 1960s protest sign. It was a citation through recreation of the protest sign form, signaled by the large cutout hand affixed to the wooden vertical post of the cardboard sign. On one side of the post was the back of the hand, while the other side shows a closed fist, suggesting the hand wrapped around the post itself. More than just a nostalgic 1960s reference, the symbol of the protest sign was brought forth to indicate the continued relevance of and need for its message.

7. Sign: Sabra Moore, *Origin of Pearl Street* [Figure 17a,b]
Location: South Side of Pearl Street, west of Whitehall Street

The next stop examined the exchange of goods over time and the establishment of several economic markets in the region. Sabra Moore's sign specifically was concerned with the origin of the name "Pearl Street." The front of the sign explains how the Dutch colonial embankment, the site of a thriving fur trade between the European and the Indian populations, was originally lined with mollusk shells. The back of the sign presents another use for these shells during this same period. Native Americans would carve whelk shells into beads, string these beads into belts, and exchange these belts in peace treaties with the Europeans. Although the beads were initially white, signifying life, they could be dyed purple, signifying death. On each side of the sign, images of shells interrupt the text. They are scattered as isolated objects, combined together to represent the embankment and a belt, and arranged to suggest a gesturing figure.

Two procession participants stood out in connection to this sign. The first, a Caucasian woman, was dressed in silver iridescent fabric and carried a circular silver paper fan. She was the personification of Pearl Street. She advanced to the front of the crowd during the recitation of the site's history. Standing next to her was the second participant of note, a South Asian Indian woman. She was casually dressed and not in costume. She held a long pole, at the top of which was a large-scale representation of a purple bead. Together, these women and their respective props served as a tangible recreation of the dual material history presented by the sign.

More than an explication of the historical significance of roadway's name, the performances at the site brought this economic history to the present time. Bogan recited:

> What was the new becomes the old
> In streets of pearl as in streets of gold
> Where once fell leaves there soon fell soot
> Where once fell the pad of the foxes foot
> There soon fell the crunch of the Dutchman's boot
> And now the Reebok dwells, and the Gucci roams
> In the streams of traffic and the valleys of stones.

Within this stanza, the full history of a Lower Manhattan unfolded: the natural world gave way to colonial trappers who gave way to storefronts of major international corporations. Bogan's performance was followed by Yekk Muzik's repetitions of "sacred symbol" and "walk soft." This second directive was further elaborated with the repeated refrain of "Walk soft. Walk soft. The people of the part are crowded together." It served as both a literal and metaphorical directive. As part of the mobile pageant, it cued the physical actions of the parade participants. As a reference to the history of the region, it cautioned against a careless trampling of fragile histories embedded, lest they be destroyed.

8. Sign: Curlee Holton, *Nelson Mandela's Visit to New York City* [Figure 18a,b]
Location: State Street and Pearl Street, southwest corner

The final sign returned to the procession again almost to the present, commemorating the visit of Nelson Mandela to New York in the summer of 1990. His visit was part of a ten day, eight-city tour of the United States, which itself was part of a greater six-week fourteen-nation world tour. Coming on the heels of his recent release from a twenty-seven year prison term in South Africa, Mandela's travels endeavored to gain international support for continuing sanctions against his apartheid divided home country in an effort to force a reversal of the policy of racial segregation. Upon arriving in New York City, Mandela was greeted with an extensive parade route. An unofficial gathering of the public started in Queens at Kennedy International Airport and traveled through Brooklyn before meeting with the official ticker-tape parade through the "Canyon of Heroes" in Lower Manhattan.

During REPOhistory's opening ceremony, the crowd was led in a chant of "Apartheid, NO!" and a short performance by teenage members of Theater in a New Key (THINK). The teenagers sang, expressing hope for Mandela's message to travel to the rest of the world. They carried several of the signs bearing dates corresponding to the historical events covered by the entire Opening Ceremony itinerary, now collectively brought together in this smaller concentrated performance. In addition, one member of the troupe carried a sign bearing one of the themes of the pageant: "Whose memories are worth recording?"

Holton's sign displays a monochromatic black drawing on the front, captioned with the single word "FREEDOM." The viewer is positioned behind a set of prison bars with a view of New York City beyond. This view of the city is a composite illustration of Mandela's visit. The bars become both real and symbolic barriers, suggesting not only the prison cell in which Mandela was imprisoned but also the metaphoric "Bars of ignorance" and "Bars of fear," as stated in the poem printed on the back of the sign. In the drawing, Mandela's face is the only

element in the composition able to transcend the two spaces: the confined space behind bars and the open space of the city.

Two hands tightly grip the bars at the bottom of the composition, juxtaposed against the open hand extending out into the center of the composition beyond the space of the cell. The emphasis on hands was also present in Tutavilla's recitation. She described a diverse crowd assembled to witness the 1990 parade. Those "people who usually pass each other with heads down and gazes fixed ahead" now laughed and shared in conversation. As Mandela passed by, "the crowd swells in expectation of a healing hand." This image of the healing hand was literally translated into the large-scale, two-sided cardboard cutout of an open hand. The coloration of this prop represented this idea of a race-crossing healing hand. It was painted to represent Caucasian hand on one side and an African hand on the other side. An emphasis on hands also appeared in the poem on the reverse of the sign, stating "Hold hands that are/stronger than our differences./Mandela's/Freedom/will be our freedom."

Yekk Muzik led the crowd in delivering the refrain at the site, encouraging the holding of hands, actively forming a diverse community brought together by the lesson of Mandela. Bogan then delivered his final history rap of the parade:

> Just recently there came to New York
> one hellova fella
> known by the name of
> Nelson Mandela.
> From right here he started his drive up Broadway;
> let's cheer him again, in our own small way,
> and think—
> about of the future of this city so vast—
> and here we will end our walk through the past!

With a final flourish, he declared "Yay Yay REPOhistory Day!" With the pageant now completed, the crowd was led back towards Castle Clinton. From there, both actors and audience dispersed.

By presenting a non-chronological, multi-media, multi-narrative presentation of a select history of the region, the Opening Ceremony put forth an account of history that was complex, non-linear, and open-ended. The procession revitalized these histories, serving as a didactic theatrical performance that brought to the surface the depth of a lost cultural heritage. The programmed counter-historical narrative provided by the moving pageant cued for the participating audience a new understanding of the vital culture not only once found at each location, and still presently discoverable. Furthermore, by REPOhistory's own designation of only eight of the greater corpus of signs comprising the *Lower Manhattan Sign Project*, the collective pointed towards an even greater number of histories still to be uncovered.

The Opening Ceremony and the *Lower Manhattan Sign Project* as a whole can be understood as a call to arms to protect those traces of a complex local urban culture that do not necessarily fit into "official" programs of urban renewal. The markers were designed to focus public attention on a history buried beneath the surface of the city, a history that continued to be reburied and forgotten in the present as local communities were still being driven out of the region. More than a recovering history, the project sought to recover the legacy of the communities involved in this history, as well as the communities themselves.

By spatializing this recovery effort, REPOhistory's project served to engage its audience in both a kinesthetic and cognitive remapping of Lower Manhattan. The group created a new "time collage" through the deployment of multiple project components, both those fixed in place and mobile. As the title of the Opening Ceremony indicated, the audience walked *with* the past

while walking *through* both the extant city and REPOhistory's reorganized city. While moving through these two urban forms simultaneously, the project's audience was to have its own understandings of the city, local history, and the ways in which history is recorded and remembered transformed as well.

A History of Mobilizing History

Sharing an interest in linking the past to the present and the present to a possible future, the public cartographies generated by REPOhistory's project encouraged audience interaction and education. Productive engagement with the project was predicated on the use of traditional media of historical designation and commemoration. Perhaps most obviously, REPOhistory modeled their signs upon the familiar visual vocabulary of municipal signage. However, there was another traditional media format used by the collective. Although the word "pageant" appears only infrequently in the planning and promotional materials for the Opening Ceremony,[103] the performative components of REPOhistory's project nonetheless borrow from this older model of programmatic public spectacle. Part didactic exercise and part mobile art form, the historical pageant has functioned as a form of civic-oriented theater in the United States since the nineteenth century. Both American pageantry and REPOhistory's Opening Ceremony encouraged an examination of local and national progress and civic responsibility, although with different summary messages being delivered. Introducing the parallel to historical pageantry—although, in the case of REPOhistory, enacted on a smaller scale than late nineteenth and early twentieth century pageantry exercises—allows for a treatment of those elements of the opening ceremony that fall outside of the "conventional" guided walking tour model of a spatially performed public pedagogy.

In his recent analysis of New York City walking tour guides, Jonathan R Wynn identified several defining characteristics that differentiate walking tours from other forms of guided sightseeing activities. These included the presentation of specialized content, an engagement between guides and audience, an infinitely changeable itinerary (driven by personal interests of the guide and his or her desire to attract larger audiences), a diversity of professional backgrounds of the guides, and the targeting of local rather than visiting audiences.[104] Despite serving as a potentially obvious parallel to REPOhistory's project, there are several key departures motivating my choice to treat REPOhistory's Opening Ceremony as borrowing from but not identical to this form of public wayfinding and theatricalized placemaking. First, the standard guided walking tour rarely involves the creation of additional visual markers to support the tour, relying instead on the verbal narrative to give context to the already in place architecture and visual media of the city. Second, the number of performers involved in REPOhistory's project—not only the trio of town criers but also the band, theater performers, and prop bearers—differentiate it from the predominantly single or co-guided walking tour. Finally, although there are tours that take as their theme leftist politics or selectively highlight local monuments, the underlying objective of activist critique of REPOhistory is often not the primary focus of the more populist and accessible tone and content of such tours.

Although I am not discounting the influence of this model of public information as an influence (and certainly this would be the dominant model for the tours REPOhistory conducted following the Opening Ceremony), the nature of REPOhistory's project requires looking to additional models of theatrical public engagement. The traditions of radical street theater and community-based performance provide other possible sources. Jan Cohen-Cruz has identified radical street performance as a format for questioning existing social and political power

hierarchies through interventionist practice in everyday realities. While the specific manner of intervention may vary, Cohen-Cruz acknowledged a unifying theme of such practices as emerging at occasions of rupture in social consciousness. The turn towards this type of practice coincides with a desire to disturb the status quo, a desire that finds its origins within the recognition of an endemic cultural problem.[105]

I propose that, in considering the Opening Ceremony as a historical pageant, this expands upon the possible performance options that such community-based activist performance offers. REPOhistorians transformed this civic event into the kind of collective local social and aesthetic action that Cohen-Cruz examined. REPOhistory's event demonstrates the set of four mutually reinforcing principles Cohen-Cruz identified within such performances: the project concept as emerging from a communal context and collective practice, reciprocity and dialogic exchange between artists and community participants, a hyphenated disciplinary identity, and a drawing upon an active culture of engagement with previously untapped audience potential.[106] However, what links REPOhistory's Opening Ceremony performance to historical pageantry specifically rather than most other forms of public theater is the historical specificity of the moment of presentation and the specific summary message imparted to the audience by the event.[107]

Organizers of the modern historical pageant emphasized the element of reform: the moralizing and aesthetic values to be gleaned from their higher-minded public spectacles of mass participation. Over the course of the programmed performance, history was placed in the service of advancing class-determined social and civic ideals. Within the nineteenth-century urban pageant form, these elite-interests were formally staged and ideologically elided with what historian Brooks McNamara has described as nostalgic, self-consciously enacted, highly conventionalized forms of patriotism. The invocation of a familiar content and symbolism

connected to a noble American heritage served to align the contemporary moment in which the public event was staged to a crafted and seemingly uncontroversial national legacy.[108]

In his study of Progressive Era pageantry, historian David Glassberg presented this new public theatrical form as designed to unify potentially divided communities; to bring together diverse, fragmented, and partial histories into a singular, whole, and comprehensive account of local and progress and cultural authority. Glassberg situated the emergence of the pageant tradition in the United States to a historical moment in which a previously fixed and homogenous local identity was compromised by an increasingly mobile and heterogeneous social structure. This new social identity was brought about through increases in recently arrived immigrant populations, shifting national ideologies and allegiances, and perceived insidious political machinations from abroad.[109]

Carefully controlled by specialized civic groups, pageantry performances inevitably omitted a number of narratives: those that did not speak to the interests of "genteel culture" or to financial backers who sought national reconciliation as a means to boost commercial enterprises. The goal of crafting a specific version of public memory necessitated casting aside perceived minor or outlying voices, lest "unregulated memory" supplant official narratives and expose less than flattering depictions of contemporary social struggles or elevate individuals outside of the set of pre-determined national leaders.[110] Frequently "forgotten" were the contributions of marginalized social groups, identified along ethnic, racial and gender lines.

Although the popularity of the pageant form would wane by the middle of the twentieth century, the desire by some to bolster a public image of a unified populace did not.[111] As historian Richard M. Fried has shown, amidst Cold War era anxieties displays of history were considered "cod-liver oil [remedies] for civic irregularity."[112] The difference was that where

once a homogenous local community was the central thematic focus, now an attention to national unity was promoted by such public demonstrations. Driven by a desire to mark a triumphant national history in an era of ideological national uncertainty, due to by perceived threats at home and abroad, historical commemorations saw a resurgence.[113] Costumed and scripted historical dramas and parades, tourist cruises retracing exploration paths, and the circulation of commemorative plaques, coins, and other forms of ephemera were put in service of steadying a national resolve.[114] Similar to the local goals of the preceding generation of historical pageantry, these events sought to assert a national narrative of a heroic past in the efforts to suggest an equally heroic present and future nation. However, unlike their older counterparts, these new forms flourished at a moment when public demonstrations pointing to a fracturing of society were also on the rise.

Leftist performance in the late 1950s, 1960s and 1970s emerged as a form of popular activism, spurred on by civil rights movements and reactions to social inequality. The marginal position of the participants was an additional transformation from the earlier forms of public performance. Grassroots community theater, direct action performance art, and staged street actions comprised a new form of social protest. Driven on by a greater art historical turn to making art out of the materials of everyday life, didactic performance in public spaces emerged, particularly within urban spaces.[115]

Rather than putting these traditions of civic pageantry and activist performance in opposition to one another, REPOhistory's *Lower Manhattan Sign Project* fused them together. Whereas earlier forms of pageantry sought to exert a homogenous identity as a defense against a threatening heterogonous social identity, REPOhistory's performance and original mission as a whole reversed this trajectory. For the art collective, the threat was not the rise of "the other" but

rather the rise of economic practices through real estate that sought to eliminate traces of "the other," deemed incompatible with the present view of the future city. Rather than seeking a univocal mode of history and community, the group sought the multivocal for each. The Opening Ceremony, and the greater *Lower Manhattan Sign Project*, fragmented historical narratives, introducing otherwise forgotten or minor voices, an act that substantiates the presence of these voices.

REPOhistory's inaugural project demonstrated the inheritance of the mantle of leftist activism, in large part passed down to the group through the direct involvement of several of its leading members in PAD/D and similar groups in the preceding decades. However this was not an inheritance without alteration. The extent of the evolution in project development and audience engagement between PAD/D-era projects is clear. Although preserved are interests in place-specific actions, the reclamation of public space, and public education through consciousness-raising actions, the new group demonstrated a more accessible and less overtly antagonistic project of critique. While still not wholly populist in form or content, the choice in manner of presentation combined with the approval and sponsorship by city agencies marked a significant change in response to threatened local conditions when compared to projects created by REPOhistory members while part of the earlier artist collective.

Returning to his analysis of the pageant, Glassberg described how civic officials

> piled historical artifact, narrative, and image upon image in antiquarian detail to bring the full weight of tradition to bear upon their neighbors discharging what they felt was their sacred duty both to teach their beliefs and values to the public and to explain the present residents' unique place in a succession of past and future residents who together constituted the historical community.[116]

By rethinking the form of the historical pageant as an anachronistic format for historical commemoration, REPOhistory was able to guide their project's audience in two meaningful ways. The first was through the didactic explication of the necessity of historical recovery: pointing out the continued relevance that previously overlooked histories bring to bear on the present moment. By performatively explaining these events and themes using a variety of media, the group enacted alternative forms of public pedagogy: understood as both pedagogy carried out in public and pedagogy tailored to a heterogeneous public

Portraits of Two Neighborhoods

Following the *Lower Manhattan Sign Project*, REPOhistory completed several additional public projects, in New York City and across the United States. These similarly adopted historical excavation as an organizing theme and many—although not all—used the form of municipal public signage as a primary medium. Since the group disbanded in 2000, a fairly standard list of these projects has been frequently recited. The list of projects created under the imprimatur of REPOhistory during the remainder of the decade includes: *Queer Spaces* (1994), developed alongside a comparably titled exhibition at the Storefront for Art and Architecture, in which eight pink triangular aluminum street signs presenting topics about LGBT history were installed mostly throughout downtown Manhattan; *Entering Buttermilk Bottom* (1996), the group's first of two projects created for Atlanta, Georgia, in which twenty aluminum signs, stenciled street markers, and a public pavilion were created to coincide with a homecoming reunion organized for the urban renewal-displaced African-American residents of Buttermilk Bottom; *Voices of Renewal* (1997), the second Atlanta project, in which six aluminum historical signs were installed within the city's Fourth Ward's Glen Iris neighborhood; *Out from Under the King George Hotel* (1998) a project created for Houston, Texas, in which a printed map was

circulated and pasted on the exterior of the abandoned hotel in order to advocate for the structure's conversion to a halfway house for the local homeless population; *Civil Disturbances: Battles for Justice in New York City* (1998-1999), sponsored by The New York Lawyers for the Public Interest, in which twenty aluminum signs presenting "landmark" cases of legal disenfranchisement were installed throughout Lower Manhattan; and *Circulation* (2000), a multimedia project in which postcards, magnets, and web-based media were used to structure a public dialogue about contemporary urban heath in relation to both the human and city body.

In this final chapter section, rather than addressing these projects, I offer an analysis of projects that have received far less attention in the REPOhistory literature: the multiple iterations of the *Portrait of a Neighborhood* school workshops. The limited focus placed on these programs is perhaps to be expected. It could be argued that *Portrait of a Neighborhood* more comfortably characterized as a supplemental educational outreach initiative rather than an independent art project per se. In addition, much of one of the cycles of the proposed program was ultimately never realized.

In drawing attention to these "minor" projects of REPOhistory, my goal is not to discount the value of looking to more frequently cited REPOhistory projects. A comparative treatment of the group's "major" projects could certainly be used to show both the continuity and the evolution of the group's practices and ideas over the course of the decade. For example, projects such as *Queer Spaces* and *Civil Disturbance* mirror the *Lower Manhattan Sign Project* in format, material used, geographic scope, and development process.[117] An analysis considering the *Lower Manhattan Sign Project* in relation to the Atlanta and Texas projects as well provides for a revealing study in the ways in which the group's methods were impacted by assuming the role of tourists in unfamiliar cities. *Circulation* offers the chance to examine not only the collective's

embrace of disparate media and technologies for public practice. In addition, each of these projects allowed for continued exploration of urban mapping and remapping.[118]

However, given this chapter's greater objective of historical recovery (not only of the full range of practices involved in the original sign project but also the full range of practices of REPOhistory during its formative years), less often cited projects prove instructive in their own right. Both versions of *Portrait of a Neighborhood* were developed in the immediate wake of the *Lower Manhattan Sign Project*. Each approached a different Manhattan neighborhood as generative sources of project content. The projects also shed light on REPOhistoy's interests in place-based historical explications through combining public art practice with public education: namely through a literal engagement with and enhancement of a public school social studies curricula. By bringing together public history, public pedagogy, and public commemoration, these projects help to further understand REPOhistory's continued response to urban redevelopment, as well as the public's positive response in the form of new commissions to the perceived success of the group's first sign project.[119]

In the fall of 1992, while the *Lower Manhattan Sign Project* signs were still in situ, members of REPOhistory began the preliminary conversations with the staff of the Hudson River Middle School about developing a potential artist in residence project or after school program for the school. Located at the time in the Clinton section of Manhattan—also known as Hell's Kitchen—the school was founded as an alternative public intermediate school. Initially coordinated by Joseph Ubiles, a social studies teacher at the school, and Felicita Santiago, the school's principal, and REPOhistorian Mark O'Brien, the project was intended as a supplementary enrichment program to the 7th and 8th grade social studies curriculum in nineteenth and twentieth century American history and a corrective to the school's lack of an in-

house art program. This provisional partnership between the school and the artist collective received small grants from New York Foundation for the Arts and the Manhattan Community Arts Fund to continue developing the project between January and May of 1993, intended to lead to the realization of a year-long project for the 1993-1994 academic year. Such discussions entailed both brainstorming the form the year-long project should take, debating the project's merits as satisfying a greater curriculum, and recruiting parent and community involvement in such a project.[120]

During this same five-month discussion period in early 1993, the grant was put towards funding a collaborative project between REPOhistory and the school's "Community History Research Club," a group of 8th graders at the school, also overseen by Ubiles, who at the time were receiving instruction in conducting and composing oral histories. While not technically part of the *Portrait of a Neighborhood* program, the name given to the projected project for the following year, the Community History Research Club project would share similar ideological and practical interests. As part of this untitled program, REPOhistory members and students created what the collective would come to describe as a "demonstration project."[121] The students worked with REPOhistory artists to create t-shirts over the course of several half-day workshops in mid-March of 1993. As recorded in the meeting minutes held prior to the start of the workshop, the choice to create t-shirts was made "for its simplicity and mobile visibility." The report continues, describing how "Students will use what they have learned from their oral histories project with Joe [Ubiles] as subject matter for the T-shirt designs. We will help them develop symbols that reflect the local culture and history, and direct them in printing or stenciling the imagery onto the shirts."[122]

Each student was provided with a white t-shirt, upon which was printed in dark blue a map of the school's surrounding neighborhood: the western side of Manhattan between 39th and 51 Streets and between 8th Avenue and the Hudson River. A topographic view of the island was shown, an uncorrupted view of the landscape with different natural formations represented: in-land rivers, tributaries, tufts of grass, etc. Overlaid on top of this was the gridded street plan, indicating the coexistence of two different identities for the region: the "lost" natural world and the present built environment.[123]

Within the frame of the printed map, students were encouraged to develop their own set of significant region landmarks and set of cartographic designators. The result would be a personalized, wearable map, intended to serve as a trans-historical guide to the neighborhood in which it was both made and would be worn. In the project, academic history in (the mandated public school curriculum) was combined with community outreach (the oral history training), which then combined with community mapping in the form of an individualized public art able to circulate not only within the school but throughout through the neighborhood. However, this "demonstration project" would be a minor undertaking compared to the proposed year-long school project under development.

Portrait of a Neighborhood was an even more elaborate public history program, similarly designed by REPOhistory for 7th and 8th grade students at the school. Rather than an afterschool crafts program, *Portrait of a Neighborhood* created and implemented a new social studies curriculum to be team-taught by four REPOhistorians and a teacher from the school. Starting in September of 1993 and culminating in June of the next year, for one afternoon a week, a new program dedicated to examining museum operations and the preservation of historical and contemporary material cultures. Over the course of several weekly sessions, students were led on

field trips to area museums (such as the Museum of Natural History, the Museum of the American Indian, and the Chinatown History Museum), gather data during these visits, and synthesize their findings through class discussion and writing assignments in the classroom. This fieldwork research was intended to be put in service of developing a museum for the school itself, described by REPOhistory in a grant prospectus as an in-house "living archive and museum of a neighborhood history." To further direct the students in organizing this, photographic walking tours of the neighborhood, an archival map study project, and presentations on methods of historical preservation of objects were planned. Students would also continue to conduct oral histories, to be archived in both written and videotaped formats, and create a collaged timeline and map of the neighborhood.[124]

Although the museum was never completed, REPOhistory's intentions for the format of the project demonstrate continuity between this educational program and their better-known public art practices. Among the anticipated supplementary student projects to be completed in advance of the museum were: the creation of a series of graphic public landmark emblems, either as spray painted stencils or in some other still-to-be-determined medium; the publication of a guide and walking tour for the neighborhood surrounding the school.[125] The parallels to the *Lower Manhattan Sign Project* are evident.

Budgetary restrictions and the anticipated closing of the Hudson River Middle School determined REPOhistory's ultimate resiting of the *Portrait of a Neighborhood* program elsewhere.[126] *Portrait of a Neighborhood: The Lower East Side* was the re-implemented version of the program at the Leadership Secondary School. The school was and is located in the Lower East Side of Manhattan, returning REPOhistory to the neighborhood of its formative years and where its official administrative office was still housed. REPOhistory received a two-year New

York State Council on the Arts arts-in-residence grant for the project. For the first year, this grant covered the costs associated with a pair of planning phases from July to September 1994 and from December 1994 to January 1995, with full implementation beginning in February of 1995. This new program started with a series of twelve half-day artist-organized and artist-led workshops examining local community history. These sessions were offered free of charge to students at the Leadership Secondary School. Six REPOhistorians were involved in the planning of the program, and four were placed in residency in the school.

The goals of this second *Portrait of a Neighborhood* program were comparable to those of the Hudson River Middle School iteration of the program, save for the abandonment of the museum-development program. The objective of the program was for students to generate parallel personal and local histories while acquiring practical training in camera operation, historical research, and interviewing. Using the students' neighborhood as a starting point for an investigation, an expansive temporal net was cast: historical documentation (in both textual and pictorial forms) was assembled and recollections and contemporary impressions of the neighborhood were recorded. For a set of final projects, students and REPOhistorians collaborated on the production of artists' books, videotaped oral histories, and written autobiographies. While the members of REPOhistory provided training in practical skills of film production and oral history collection, the program more broadly served as an interrogation of the way in which history is learned and transmitted: how multiple overlapping neighborhood identities was not a sign of a blighted region, but rather a thriving one.[127]

Rather than instructing an audience without a direct connection to the region (as in the case of the Financial District audience for the *Lower Manhattan Sign Project*) to attend to newly excavated histories from below, to borrow historian E.P. Thompson's phrase,[128] each of the

school programs encouraged the creation and viewing of neighborhood record by an audience already with a connection to that neighborhood. While I do not propose leveling the differences between the *Lower Manhattan Sign Project* and the "minor" projects planned during this formative period in the group's history, I do want to signal a common interest in bridging place-making and charting practices through programs of public pedagogy. In its promoted creation of an archive of community history on the Lower East Side, a project that can be interpreted as designed in opposition to strategies of erasure perceived as accompanying gentrification, REPOhistory returned to the geographical, social, and cultural concerns of the PAD/D reading group era. However, the distance between the two eras is nonetheless clear: a more tempered reaction to similar community development and cultural overwriting is found in the later projects. This is not to suggest a weakening of the resolve of the project creators in the intervening years or a more accepting position towards the loss of an "authentic" or complex Lower East Side identity. Instead, the change over time signals awareness of the broadened communicative potential and audience reach of using institutional support to construct placemaking and place-defining strategies with similar goals.

As the next chapter demonstrates, a decade after REPOhistory's interventions across southern Manhattan, the Studio Museum in Harlem also endeavored to remake its local environment. Responding to similar but not identical urban development programs underway in Harlem, and Central Harlem in particular, the Studio Museum leveraged its position as a regional cultural arbiter to guide related image-making programs. However, rather than aluminum street signs, larger-than-life orators, cardboard props, and guided tours, the Studio Museum in Harlem's process involved the creation, manipulation, and circulation of a city on paper through *Harlem Postcards*. As a greater departure from REPOhistory, rather than resisting change, the

Studio Museum in Harlem’s ephemeral cartographies would accommodate the already-underway material development and rhetorical reframing transforming contemporary Harlem.

[1] The Christopher Columbus Quincentenary Jubilee Commission was established by Congressional Act on August 7, 1984 and was disbanded on December 31, 1993 following the submission of an official commission report to Congress. In addition to *Grand Regatta Columbus '92* and *Operation Sail '92*, this body was also responsible for organizing *AmeriFlora '92*, a six-month horticultural exhibition held in Columbus Ohio.

[2] Citywide celebrations were also undertaken in other large metropolitan cities in the United States that year, including in Philadelphia ("Neighbors in the New World") and Miami ("Discovery of America Celebration").

[3] The Hispanic Day Parade started at 44th Street and continued north along Fifth Avenue to 77th Street. The Columbus ay Parade started at 42nd Street and Fifth Avenue and continued north and east to 86th Street and Third Avenue. An annual debate is inspired by these two parades, over who gets to claim cultural heritage over Columbus and his legacy. The Hispanic Day Parade organizers emphasize the Spanish funding of the voyage while the Columbus Day Parade organizers promote Columbus' Italian birth as demonstrating heritage rights. However, not all public gatherings coinciding with the parades are staged to participate in an uncritical and hagiographic reading of the legacy of Christopher Columbus. Each parade has provided a media backdrop against which special interest and cultural groups organize smaller protests.

[4] Just one year prior, the city played host to similar moment divided between celebratory commemoration and critical evaluation: the June 1991 "Operation Welcome Home" victory parade to mark the conclusion of war in the Persian Gulf. With this recent global conflict in mind, *The New York Times* attempted to provided an assessment of the collective national psyche during the celebratory moment offered by the New York Harbor-related events of the 1992 July 4th weekend:

> The nation this Independence Day was besieged with problems: a sagging economy, grinding unemployment and poverty, racial strife, conflicts over abortion and profound concerns over crime, educational failures, soaring health costs and dismal choices in a Presidential election year.
>
> But it was also a nation at peace, with the apocalyptic threat of nuclear war receding and promising new ties to old foes in the world, and there remained a strong underpinning of faith in a diverse, democratic people who had somehow weathered wars, depression and other crises and would do so again, if need be.
>
> The venerable tall ships seemed to capture that spirit. They evoked a sense of America's immigrant experience, of commerce and the dangers of life at sea, of skills and ideas in a new land. And in their rugged seaworthiness, they offered something quietly authentic in a world crowded with noisy artifice.

Robert D. McFadden, "A Quiet Majesty Sails the Hudson with Tall Ships," *The New York Times,* July 5 1992, 1, 24. For an evaluation of the complex ideological engineering of the "Operation Welcome Home" parade, see Mark Sussman, "Celebrating the New World Order: Festival and War in New York," *TDR* 39, no. 2 (Summer 1995): 147-175.

[5] *1992: The Americas* is the title that appears most frequently in planning notes for the festival. However, alternative titles also crop up in correspondence between the project organizers, including *Americas?*, *1992? The Americas?*, and *1992: Columbiana Re-Viewed*.

[6] The Snug Harbor Cultural Center on Staten Island hosted an installation of Southwestern artists, examining popular imagination related to cowboy culture, Native American culture, and the rugged idealism of westward expansion. In Queens, Socrates Sculpture Park and the Fulton Ferry State Park presented a group exhibition of new works made specifically for the festival. Sponsored by the Bronx Council on the Arts and its affiliated Longwood Art Project, *Troubled Sleep: Houses of the Spirit/Memories of the Ancestors* was another group exhibition, to be held in Woodlawn Cemetery and focusing on Columbus' expedition. The Fund for the Borough of Brooklyn and the Rotunda Gallery commissioned a series of artist-designed billboards, examining themes of exploration, migration, and immigration, to be installed in different sites throughout Brooklyn. Although planned, the Brooklyn component of the project was never realized.

As presented in grant proposals for the festival, the decision to work collaboratively on temporary installations was motivated by the reduced financial burden incurred in maintaining a temporary rather than a permanent display and the ability for small arts organizations to compensate for limited programming budgets through joining efforts with similar organizations. In support of the former, it was stated that temporary installations "are often forgiven by the public where, as permanent pieces, they would not necessarily be favorably received." This suggests a sideways acknowledgement of the potential for controversy that the organizers of the exhibition could be courting with the themes highlighted in the sponsored projects. In the then very recent wake of the almost decade long dispute over Richard Serra's *Tilted Arc* in Manhattan's Federal Plaza, it is also probable that the

organizers were aware that controversial public art need not be limited to judgments based on the content of the work alone. For the full project proposal and budget allocation, see the memo from Olivia Georgia to the 1992: The Americas participating organizations, 1991; The REPOhistory Archive; MSS 113, Box 4; Folder 32; Fales Library and Special Collections, New York University Libraries.

[7] Although the *Lower Manhattan Sign Project* had been planned as the first formally presented project of the group, REPOhistory participated in one solo exhibition and two group exhibitions that opened prior to June 27, 1992. The solo exhibition, *The Lower Manhattan Sign Project: A Work in Progress*, was held at the Brecht Forum at 79 Leonard Street from June 23 to July 31, 1991. As indicated by the title, this exhibition presented several printed mock-ups of sign images for the future public installation.

The first of the two group exhibitions, *The Power of the City/The City of Power*, was held at the Whitney Museum of American Art, Downtown at Federal Reserve Plaza, from May 19 through July 10, 1992. The annual project by the Helena Rubenstein Fellows in the Whitney Museum Independent Study Program, this group exhibition focused on site-specific responses to contemporary urban experience. As stated in planning and press materials, the exhibition sought to "explore issues of cognitive mapping rather than mimetic description of urban space" while examining "the city as a privileged space where political and socio-economic powers exert their most obvious control and influence." Among the artists included were Vito Acconci, Denis Adams, Sophie Calle, Hans Haacke, Jenny Holzer, Aldo Rossi, Andy Warhol, and David Wojnarowicz. Documents from the Situationist International, specifically those relating to the concept of the *derive*, were also included in the exhibition to provide a historical grounding to the later Conceptual works presented. REPOhistory members originally developed a project proposal for a sculptural and documentary installation adopting the form of a fake bank robbery of the adjacent Federal Reserve Bank of New York. However, the expense needed to realize the proposal far exceeded the stipend granted by exhibition organizers. Instead, a single introductory sign for the *Lower Manhattan Sign Project* was installed perpendicular to the gallery wall above a box containing of printed maps of the locations of the other publically installed signs. In the catalogue for the exhibition, the project is listed as *The Lower Manhattan Street Sign Project*. Preliminary drawings and narrative proposals for the bank robbery project can be found in the REPOhistory Archive at the Fales Library and Special Collections of New York University

The second group exhibition, *A New World Order; Part One,* was held at Artists Space, from June 11 to July 11, 1992. For this, REPOhistory created the artist's book *Choice Histories: Framing Abortion*. Also a collaborative project, the book the forty-four page book is comprised of two parts: single and double page graphic renderings of significant moments in the history of abortion (with the pages formally resembling the signs that would comprise the *Lower Manhattan Sign Project*); and a timeline, starting in 3000 BC and extending to the then present, presenting this same history in a more structured and didactically legible manner. In his introductory essay to the book, Sholette states that the group's forthcoming sign project is "less ambitious than CHOICE [Histories] in the form of its collaboration," although this statement is not further explained. For more information on *The Power of the City/The City of Power* exhibition and the multiple proposals, see The REPOhistory Archive; MSS 113, Box 9; Folder 12; Fales Library and Special Collections, New York University Libraries, and Christel Hollevoet, Karen Jones, and Timothy Nye, *The Power of the City/The City of Power* (New York: Whitney Museum of American Art, 1992). For *A New World Order*, see REPOhistory, *Choice Histories: Framing Abortion. An Artists Book by RepoHistory* (New York: Artists Space, 1992).

[8] Thomas J. Schlereth, *Cultural History and Material Culture: Everyday Life, Landscapes, Museums* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1992): 316-321.

[9] The membership of REPOhistory was in flux throughout the organization's history. Even within the three years of planning for the *Lower Manhattan Sign Project*, membership rolls expand and contract with each meeting, as recorded in meeting minutes and lists accompanying correspondence between the group and outside organizations. Beyond the forty-six artists directly participating in the *Lower Manhattan Sign Project*, the clearest record of an officially designated organizing and managing committee for the collective appears in an October 28, 1991 letter written by Greg Sholette to Olivia George of the Snug Harbor Cultural Center. In the letter, Sholette lists " a smaller group of key people [who] tend to be responsible for the management of the project… [and] the backbone of REPOhistory for the last two years." In alphabetical order, listed are: Todd Ayoung, Jim Costanzo, Carin Kuoni, Tom Klem, Ed Eisenberg, Lisa Maya Knauer, Alan Michelson, Mark O'Brien, Lise Prown, Leela Ramotar, Tess Timoney, Greg Sholette, Dan Wiley, and Darin Wacs. As he explained in a separate correspondence, Sholette self-identified as "the defacto coordinator of the group." Letter from Greg Shollete to Olivia Georgia, 28 October 1991; The REPOhistory Archive; MSS 113, Box 1; Folder 6; Fales Library and Special Collections, New York University Libraries and Letter from Greg Sholette to Selwyn Garraway, 16 August 1991; The REPOhistory Archive; MSS 113, Box 1; Folder 6; Fales Library and Special Collections, New York University Libraries.

[10] In presenting the event as an activist hybrid performance—combining tour, spectacle, pageant, and parade—I am pushing against previously argued distinctions between such theatrical acts in public spaces and echoing theater historian Bim Mason's observation that the "outer edges of theatre are likely to blur into other activities." Susan Stewart has argued for the chronological evolution from carnival pageant to parade to spectacle, with each phase realizing a different relationship between audience, performer, and greater social governing body. In the *Lower Manhattan Sign Project*'s appeal to audience participation and incorporation at each stop along the parade route, as well as the encouragement for the audience to become the parade as it travelled from stop to stop, it breaks through the both real and metaphoric barriers that separate audience from performer that structure contemporary parades. It maintains the sense of fantastic juxtaposition that Stewart ascribes to the vernacular town festival, while also demonstrating an attachment to the didacticism to the format of the guided tour and the historical pageant (two concepts which will be discussed more fully below in this chapter). One category of performance is never wholly separated from another, and thus the somewhat free use of the terms that follow in the chapter is not to deny differences exist between such categories, but rather to suggest that they need not operate as wholly separable or mutually exclusive forms. Bim Mason, *Street Theatre and Other Outdoor Performance* (London: Routledge, 1992), 6 and Susan Stewart, *On Longing: Narratives of the Miniature, the Gigantic, the Souvenir, the Collection* (Durham, Duke University Press, 1993): 80-86.

[11] Edward Gross, "The Social Construction of Historical Events Through Public Dramas," *Symbolic Interaction* 9, no. 2 (Fall 1986): 191. Gross argues that "a deliberate, rational, strategic process of social construction" often guides events of theatrical historical reenactment. They are dedicated to "inventing and proclaiming a new vision…. Events cannot then simply be allowed to occur; they must be proclaimed and their significance made clear to people who would otherwise not notice or would soon forget as they go about their everyday tasks." For more recent analyses of this idea see also Alexander Cook, "The Use and Abuse of Historical Reenactment: Thoughts on Recent Trends in Public History," *Criticism* 46, no. 3 (2004): 487-496 and Stephen Gapps, "Mobile Monuments: A View of Historical Re-Enactment and Authenticity from Inside the Costume Cupboard of History," *Rethinking History* 13, no. 3 (2009): 395-409.

[12] In this respect, my project in part is about reconstructing a partial history of Political Art Documentation/Distribution, or PAD/D, as well. PAD/D is often overshadowed by, perhaps ironically, more well documented artist collectives and collaborations such as Group Material, Collaborative Projects (or Colab) or its storefront exhibition space ABC No Rio, and Fashion Moda. In Greg Sholette's recent analysis of the legacy of PAD/D (in which he does not differentiate between those activities of the greater organization and those of the reading group within the organization, a difference that I draw out within this chapter), he presents the group's actions as contributing to the wave of "critical *detournement*" in New York City at the time. Alluded to as part of this movement are contemporaneous works such as Colab's three-day occupation of a storefront on Delancy Street on December 31, 1979 to mount the *The Real Estate Show* and Fashion Moda and Storefront for Art and Architecture's *Soup Kitchen* performance series from October 2 through October 15, 1983 which served as fundraising events for the Coalition for the Homeless.

Sholette does not provide a reason for the omission of or limited role played by PAD/D from the history of 1980s socially responsive activist art in New York City. However this overshadowing by other groups can in part be attributed to the fame of the individuals who comprised these groups (i.e. the mainstream or canonical art historical fame ascribed to specific artists either during their time as part of a collective or afterwards), an evaluation among historians that these other groups were somehow "more innovative" than others or "got there first," and the more mainstream media focus on particular projects due to their audaciousness at the time of creation and first presenation. Lucy Lippard has proposed that PAD/D's overlooked status is simply attributed to "its straightforwardly left politics," however provides no greater explanation for why this alone would lead to the group's omission from accounts of 1980s art. Gregory Sholette, *Dark Matter: Art and Politics in the Age of Enterprise Culture* (New York: Pluto Press, 2011), 67; and Lucy Lippard, "Biting the Hand: Artists and Museums in New York since 1969," in *Alternative New York 1965-1985*, ed. Julie Ault (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2002): 102.

[13] Greg and Jim for the Whit. Dnt. 92, 1992; The REPOhistory Archive; MSS 113, Box 13; Folder 18; Fales Library and Special Collections, New York University Libraries.

[14] Sholette and Costanzo's full two-paragraph statement is introduced by an epigraph from Walter Benjamin's *The Arcades Project*. Quoted is: "Streets are the dwelling place of the collective… For this collective the shiny enameled store signs are good and even better a wall decoration as a salon oil painting is for the bourgeoisie." Bertholt Brecht is mentioned in within the artists' analysis of post-modernist art projection. They write: "The fascination with the *look* of history permeates post-modernist imagery, but what is lacking is the density of particular historical

narratives. Brecht observed that a photograph of a Germany factory building tells us little about the social relations going on inside." Ibid.

[15] Nicolas Lampert, "Permission to Disrupt: REPOhistory and the Tactics of Visualizing Radical Social Movements in Public Space," in *Handbook of Public Pedagogy: Education and Learning Beyond Schooling,* eds. Jennifer A. Sandlin, Brian D. Schultz, and Jake Burdick (New York: Routledge, 2010), 524.

[16] Lucy R. Lippard, "Anti-Amnesia" in *Cultural Activisms: Poetic Voices, Political Voices,* eds. Gertrude M. James Gonzales and Anne JM Mamary (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1999), 190.

[17] Andrew Hickey, "When the Street Becomes a Pedagogue," in *Handbook of Public Pedagogy: Education and Learning Beyond Schooling,* eds. Jennifer A. Sandlin, Brian D. Schultz, and Jake Burdick (New York: Routledge, 2010), 169.

[18] Interview with Greg Sholette in Jessica Hamlin and Dipti Desai, "'Committing History in Public' Lessons from Artists Working in the Public Realm," in *History as Art, Art as History: Contemporary Art and Social Studies Education*, ed. Dipti Desai, Jessica Hamlin, and Rachel Mattson (New York: Routledge, 2010), 80.

[19]Ibid., 80.

[20] Mark O'Brien, "Introduction" in *Reimaging America: The Arts of Social Change*, eds. Mark O'Brien and Craig Little (Philadelphia: New Society Publishers, 1990), 11.

[21] Mat Schwartzman, "Building Bridges: *Voices of Dissent* and the Culture of Cultural Work," in *Reimaging America: The Arts of Social Change*, eds. Mark O'Brien and Craig Little (Philadelphia: New Society Publishers, 1990), 331.

[22] Ibid., 331-332.

[23] In both his dissertation and subsequent book-length publication on New York City activist collectives, Alan Moore discusses the advances that such a pedigree afforded this new group. Citing the founding members as positioning the group, directly or indirectly, as "the inheritor of a lineage of direct political activism," Moore argues that this "conferred advantages, like links to labor unions and alliance with the international socialist bloc." However, this established leftist cultural network of communication would not be considered a boon to all artists soon to be involved with the group. In his book, Moore suggests that this led to a concern of more politically naïve artists being overshadowed and directed by those more politically engaged, an echo sentiment echoed by more forcefully presented in his dissertation. In this earlier draft, he labels this concern as a wariness towards organization "stalinism," an ideologically loaded term omitted in the finished book publication. Alan W. Moore, *Art Gangs: Protest and Counterculture in New York City* (Brooklyn: Autonomedia, 2011): 110 and Alan W. Moore, "Collectivities: Protest, Counter-culture and Political Postmodernism in New York City artists' organizations, 1969-1985" (PhD diss., City University of New York, 2000), 103.

[24] At the time of the exhibition, Artist's Space was located at 105 Hudson Street in SoHo. This exhibition has alternatively been referred to as *Some British Art from the Left* in subsequent histories of PAD/D (for example, see Barbara Moore and Mimi Smith, "The Other Side of the Coin: On Being Documentalists in an Activist Organization," *The Museum of Modern Art Library: Library Bulletin* no. 86 (Winter 1993/94): 7-9). This alternative name seems to be based on the banner exhibition title printed on the gallery wall. However, the title *Art from the British Left* is the one that appears in gallery announcements in *New York Magazine* (July 9-16 1979), *The New Yorker* Vol. 55 Part 4 (1979), and *Kunstforum International*, Vol 34 (1979). In addition, it is *Art from the British Left* that appears in the "History So Far" entry in the first issue of PAD/D's *1st Issue* bulletin.

[25] Seven Loaves was a coalition of several community arts groups. Founded in 1972, the coalition initially consisted of the already active groups Basement Workshop, Charas, Children's Art Workshop, Cityarts, Los Hispanos Co-op, the Printshop, and the 4th Street i. The number of participating groups would increase throughout the 1970s, but the Seven Loaves name persisted as a reference to the New Testament miraculous multiplication of loaves and fishes to sustain a community. For more on the coalition and its development, see Council on Museums and Education in the Visual Arts, *The Art Museum as Educator: A Collection of Studies as Guides to Practice and Policy* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978), 211-220.

[26] The term "artworkers" appears in the brief history of the group sketched in *1st Issue*, printed in February 1981. For a recent account of Lucy Lippard's connection to not only the Art Workers Coalition but also the concept of the artworker in connection to contemporary American art practice, see Julia Bryan-Wilson, *Art Workers: Radical Practice in the Vietnam War Era* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2009).

[27] Lucy Lippard and Jerry Kearns, "Waking Up in NYC" *1st Issue*, (February 1981): 1-3 and *1st Issue*, Number 2 (May-June 1981).

[28] After the second publication of *1st Issue*, it became clear that serializing a publication under this title would become unwieldy in the future. Thus for the third issue the title of the newsletter was changed to *Upfront*. The

Lafayette Street office location is also known as the A.J Muste Building and as "The Peace Pentagon." The L-shaped office building contained not only the offices of PAD, but also other activist and alternative collectives throughout the 1980s including the War Resistors League, Paper Tiger Television, Deep Dish TV, the Libertarian Book Club, the Nicaragua Solidarity Network of Greater New York, Women's Pentagon Action, and the Worker Solidarity Alliance.

[29]As recorded in the third issue of *Upfront,* for a short period of time submissions were sent to a post office box in Grand Central Station. This marked a transitional moment between the 9th Street and the Lafayette Street offices. The procedure for submitting material however remained the same at each location.

[30] The PAD/D archive would ultimately find a home within the archival holdings of the library of the Museum of Modern Art in Long Island City, New York.

[31] Despite changing its name to include Distribution in 1981, the acronym "PAD" with only a single D persisted. The acronym change appears in the group's official newsletter for the first time in the fourth issue of *Upfront* from February/March 1982.

[32] Greg Sholette et al., "Political Art Documentation/Distribution (PAD/D)," in *Group Work*, ed. Temporary Services (New York: Printed Matter, Inc., 2007).

[33] Among the artists included in the exhibition were: Michael Anderson, Stan Baker, Rudolph Baranick, Patrick Brennan, D.A.R., Liliana Dones, Ed Eisenberg, Elizabeth Kulas, Roberta Handler, Donna Henes, Lyn Hughes, Ellen Levine, Lucy Lippard, Thomas Masayrk, Mickie McGee, Herb Perr, Anne Pitrone, Time Rollins, Mimi Smith, and Irving Wexler. Projects included manipulated IRS tax forms and dollar bills as posters and stickers, film projections, and public sculptural and architectural installations. See *1st Issue*, Number 2 (May-June 1981).

[34] In addition, Alan Moore has argued that a clear chronology and development of ideas can be set up between the interests of PAD/D in 1981 and those several years later. Singling out the PAD/D-sponsored and Tim Rollins curated exhibit *Demonstrate! Agitate! Participate! Communicate! Liberate!* Moore states that "The historicizing exhibition Rollins organized at Gallery 345 in 1981 had demonstrated PADD's self-consciousness about the form of streetworks; the Artist Call sessions responding practically to the need to share information on methods and tactics." He points towards the key interests of PAD/D during the first half of the decade: the documentation of a new history of activist practice and the communication of activist strategies represented within this history to a network of similarly engaged practitioners. Moore, *Art Gangs*, 124.

[35] This would lead to cries amongst the membership that an antagonistic faction group was emerging. Sholette did not help matters by distributing an essay amongst the membership entitled "Fear of Formalism or If I See One More Painting of Ronald Reagan as Hitler, I'm Taking up Landscape Painting" which directly attacked some of the practices used by some PAD/D members in previous projects. A draft of the full text of this circulated position paper appears in The REPOhistory Archive; MSS 113, Box 13; Folder 6; Fales Library and Special Collections, New York University Libraries.

[36] They were never completely autonomous during this time, as the reading group sought out funding from the greater PAD/D group to fund art projects and installations. For partial bibliographies compiled by the reading group, see The REPOhistory Archive; MSS 113, Box 13; Folders 1, 4, 6, and 7; Fales Library and Special Collections, New York University Libraries.

[37] Michael Sorkin, "Introduction" in *Variations on a Theme Park: The New American City and the End of Public Space*, ed. Michael Sorkin (New York: The Noonday Press, 1992). The volume is set up as a call to arms "for a return to a more authentic urbanity… [an] effort to reclaim the city" against the shifting, destabilizing forces of "generic urbanism." The result is "a city of simulations, television city, the city as a theme park," where imageability replaces actual encounter or historical depth. Contained within this volume are two essays pertaining specifically to the image-making process actively overtaking Lower Manhattan: Neil Smith's "New City, New Frontier: The Lower East Side as Wild, Wild West" and M. Christine Boyer's "Cities for Sale: Merchandising History at South Street Seaport." Both of these essays reflect a growing unease with the public-private partnerships in New York City during the 1980s and the creation of faux-historical sites and fabricated mythologies of nostalgia in different downtown districts.
It is worth recognizing that REPOhistory's *Lower Manhattan Sign Project* was installed the same year as the publication of *Variations on a Theme Park*, making the art project an almost illustrative example of a remedy against the kind of empty urbanism the authors challenge in the text.

[38] This concept is perhaps best identified with Kevin Lynch's now canonical 1960 hybrid sociological study and urban design proposal *The Image of the City* (Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1960). The role of artists and the art world more broadly in gentrification is best argued in two essays from the time. In their article "The Fine Art of Gentrification" *October* 31 (Winter, 1984): 91-111, Rosalyn Deutsche and Cara Gendel Ryan argue that this process

of gentrification can be traced not only to a city-government partnership with private speculators, but also to the mainstream art establishment. In his article "The Problem with Puerilism" *Art in America* 72, no. 6 (Summer, 1983): 162-163, Craig Owens also attacks the complicity that Deustche and Ryan identify. He too challenges the authenticity of the new bohemianism suggested by the complex network of galleries, art journals, museums, well-established alternative spaces, and marketing machines behind all of these, arguing that the consistent visual and verbal narratives churned out result in something closer to a simulacrum rather than an authentic subculture space.

[39] Greg Sholette et al., "Political Art Documentation/Distribution (PAD/D)," 80.

[40] Ibid., 82. El Bohio was previously occupied by Charas, a Puerto Rican activist collective.

[41] Over the course of the three months of installation, PAD/D Not for Sale would replace the posters when needed (e.g. if they were damaged due to decay or vandalism).

[42] This untitled flyer can be found in The REPOhistory Archive; MSS 113, Box 9; Folder 28; Fales Library and Special Collections, New York University Libraries.

[43] The latter is a reference to the complete transformation of the neighborhood the prior decade, spurred on by the combination of Robert Moses-era gentrification projects and the migration of the Upper East Side art galleries into the former commercial warehouse district in southern Manhattan.

[44] An October 1986 group history and outline coauthored by Greg Sholette and Janet Koening and circulated among the members of the reading group sheds light on some of these possible projects, or at least current discussions concerning the form such projects could take. In an appendix to the outline, under the dually labeled category of ""formal explorations" and "Formal ideas," the authors set forth several ways "of involving our varied talents in non-conventional ways and brining theory to bear on our work." What followed were seven general project categories. As they appeared on the final page of the outline, these included:

> 1. Tableaux vivants: in video, film or photos
> 2. diagrams or panoramas (perhaps incorporating 20th century forms/technology into these 19th century forms such as video, slides, text, tape loops, sound
> 3. Mime the documentary forms used in archeological and anthropological exhibits to alienate the audience from its present history
> 4. Create collages/bas reliefs/panels for outdoor settings (at permanent locations? Guerilla type placements such as banks, museums?
> 5. Other types of public structures (kiosks, round billboards, spinning text panels
> 6. An ongoing workshop doing smaller scale projects or models
> e.g. develop a public kiosk in small scale to be used for obtaining grant for real thing
> e.g. illustrate a book that has a bearing on our above concerns—each person taking one episode or chapter.
> 7. a publication or book—perhaps summarizing the above work?

For the full outline, see The REPOhistory Archive; MSS 113, Box 11; Folder 7; Fales Library and Special Collections, New York University Libraries.

[45] Greg to Group, October 1987 Project, 1987; The REPOhistory Archive; MSS 113, Box 11; Folder 3; Fales Library and Special Collections, New York University Libraries.

[46] Letter to Lisa Knauer, 11 April 1989; The REPOhistory Archive; MSS 113, Box 13; Folder 17; Fales Library and Special Collections, New York University Libraries.

[47] Proposal outline, 1989; The REPOhistory Archive; MSS 113, Box 13; Folder 17; Fales Library and Special Collections, New York University Libraries.

[48] In an undated letter (although based on its archival filing most likely from between 1990 and 1991) from Sholette to Olivia George, then director of the Newhouse Center for Contemporary Art at the Snug Harbor Cultural Center, he writes "While I did use this exhibition concept as the starting point for REPO, the many members of the collective have shaped the intellectual and artistic vision of REPOhistory into a unique entity since that initial proposal made in 1989." It seems here that Sholette's purpose is to distance the group from being considered simply a copycat entity, merely thoughtlessly mirroring the Austrian project. The REPOhistory Archive; MSS 113, Box 1; Folder 6; Fales Library and Special Collections, New York University Libraries.

[49] In his discussion of his contribution to *Points of Reference 33/38*, Hans Haacke touches upon the contemporary "agitated public debate" during this festival in light of dual troubling historical reminders: the anniversary itself and the remembering of Austria's enthusiastic welcoming of Hitler in 1938 and the recent election of Kurt Waldheim as president, who served as a Wehrmacht officer during World War II. Hans Haacke, "Und ihr habt doch gesiegt, 1988," *October* 48 (Spring 1989): 79-87.

[50] The organizers originally planned to have only fourteen artists participate, resulting in only fourteen sites. The number was to correspond with the Christological Stations of the Cross, adding a theme of sequenced, ritualized encounter with the different sites. The number was increased to sixteen to accommodate additional proposals that were deemed worthy of inclusion, and thus meriting the surrender this original intention. Participating artists included: Dennis Adams, Peter Baren, Jacques Charlier, Walter Daems, Braco Dimitijevic, Fedo Ertl, Bill Fontana, Jochen Gerz, Hans Haacke, Eric Hattan, Werner Hofmeister, Gruppe Irwin, Kogler+Scheffknecht, Beate Passow, Norbert Radermacher, and Heribert Sturm.
[51] Werner Fenz and Maria-Regina Kecht, "Protocols of the Exhibition 'Points of Reference 38/88,'" *October* 48 (Spring 1989): 71-74.
[52] Douglas Crimp and Rosalyn Deutsche, "Hans Haacke's Contribution to "Points of Reference 38/88," *October* 48 (Spring 1989): 69-70.
[53] There is one exception to this critical trend. REPOhistory is mentioned in Hal Foster's essay "The Artist as Ethnographer," in Foster's *The Return of the Real: The Avant-Garde at the End of the Century* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1996), 197. The group is name-checked in passing in connection to sign projects created by Edgar Heap of Birds. Both projects are given scant attention in the study, offered as variations on the kind of "quasi-anthropological" role assumed by some artists in the 19980s and 1990s.
[54] Proposal outline, 1989; The REPOhistory Archive; MSS 113, Box 13; Folder 17; Fales Library and Special Collections, New York University Libraries.
[55] According to the undated Sholette-written document labeled "REPOhistory RECORD VERSION II" a provisional name of "History Group" was being used. Possible titles for the project were discussed, including History City, Our Story, Herstory, Local Nineties, and 2nd Story. REPOhistory Record Version II (1992); The REPOhistory Archive; MSS 113, Box 13; Folder 17; Fales Library and Special Collections, New York University Libraries.
[56] A similar set of keywords is found at the end of the April 1989 outline. Forming an appendix of "Related Subjects" these include: public art and public spaces, radical history, teaching art history and history, and the history of semiotics of representation.
[57] During the development of what would become the *Lower Manhattan Sign Project*, the following academic and popular local urban historians served as an informal advisory committee: Steven Brier, Deborah Gardner, Mike Wallace, Steven Wheeler, Sherrill D. Wilson, and Steve Zeitlin.
[58] History Project NYC, 1989; The REPOhistory Archive; MSS 113, Box 13; Folder 18; Fales Library and Special Collections, New York University Libraries.
[59] Greg's notes for the management and production of another sign project (undated); The REPOhistory Archive; MSS 113, Box 5; Folder 18; Fales Library and Special Collections, New York University Libraries. See footnote 80 in this chapter for additional suggestions Sholette made as part of this document.
[60] History Project NYC, 1989; The REPOhistory Archive; MSS 113, Box 13; Folder 18; Fales Library and Special Collections, New York University Libraries. Underlining emphasis is included in the original document.
[61] Ibid.
[62] REPOhistory's decision to mark the occasion with a project occurred independent of their later invitation to join the inter-borough public art celebration. In the cover letter to the April 1989 outline, mention is made of the upcoming quincentennial celebration: Sholette encourages Knauer to share the proposal with "the Columbus project folks." As a group whose members were steeped in a tradition of art making in which speed and currency of response to the contemporary were stock in trade, the creation of smaller projects to be developed in the interim period was also discussed. Shared among all of the proposals was a plan to reframe commonly accepted historically important sites. Ranging from fragments of ideas still needing to be developed to more fully realized proposals, possible projects discussed include: structuring a project around Native American paths that were later renamed by European colonists, creating inflatable counter-monuments to be installed by the United States Custom's House at Bowling Green, erecting of a mobile counter-theme park at the South Street Seaport and Coney Island and have costumed historical figures inform viewers of alternative histories, and installing either fake bronze plaques onto already marked historical sites or developing hollow plaques to be slipped over existing public historical markers. Most of these projects would be created without city approval. Although these projects in these specific forms would not come to fruition, their continued influence subsequent planning meetings and finally realized projects should be clear. REPOhistory Record Version II, 1992; The REPOhistory Archive; MSS 113, Box 13; Folder 17; Fales Library and Special Collections, New York University Libraries.
[63] REPO-HISTORY mission statement, 1990; REPOhistory Record Version II (1992); The REPOhistory Archive; MSS 113, Box 13; Folder 17; Fales Library and Special Collections, New York University Libraries.

[64] Sholette is quick to note that at the time he wrote this the group itself was predominantly white, although more balanced in gender, and the tenuous ability to intervene on the part of disenfranchised communities without simply inscribing variations on traditional oppressive hierarchies.
[65] Although no further description is given, original watercolors and pencil drawings contained elsewhere in the REPOhistory archive provide a hint of how this project and the proposals mentioned above (the counter-theme park, the new temporary monuments, etc) could appear were they to be realized. Shared among all of these preparatory works is the presence of multi-panel display structures, sharing properties with both didactic presentation boards and carnival fairway stalls. One drawing depicts a mobile stage on which additional material would be displayed, while another calls for the inclusion of a popcorn stand and carnival barker pedestal, underscoring a spectacle approach to presentation. However, all is not fun and games: a critical relationship to history is still present in these proposals. In another drawing, most likely intended for the Customs House project, banners proclaiming "EMPIRE" and "CUSTOM" frame an installation containing photographs, "artifacts," and what appears to be the large-scale head of a toppled monument. For this and similar drawings see REPOhistory Archive; MSS 113, Box 5; Folder 15; Fales Library and Special Collections, New York University Libraries.
[66] Statement of purpose of REPO-HISTORY, 1990; The REPOhistory Archive; MSS 113, Box 5; Folder 18; Fales Library and Special Collections, New York University Libraries.
[67] In the two gallery exhibitions that preceded the public installation of the signs in the summer of 1992 the actual aluminum signs of the project were not shown. At the Brecht Forum exhibition, paper mock-ups of several signs were displayed. For the Whitney Museum Downtown exhibition, an aluminum sign was on view, but this was an introductory sign to the project rather than one corresponding to any of the thirty-nine ultimately displayed outside. This introductory sign, although identically scaled and formatted to the rest, presented a project overview rather than specific historical narrative. Printed on one side was a map showing the location of each of the thirty-six sites, while the reverse presented a summary of REPOhistory's actions and ideas. As installed in the gallery, the sign was mounted perpendicular to the wall, positioned above a rectangular box within which paper maps identical to the one presented on the sign were placed. Similar maps were distributed throughout the outdoor project installation. New York University's Downtown Collection's holdings include this introductory sign. However, missing from the archival holdings is Keith Christensen's sign *Smith Act Trials*, listed as Sign 35 in REPOhistory's final ordering sequence for the signs. *Lower Manhattan Sign Project*, 1992; The REPOhistory Archive; MSS 113, Map case drawers 8 and 9; Folders 1-36; Fales Library and Special Collections, New York University Libraries.
[68] The final screen printing process was carried out by Benjamin Tang and the Adds Company.
[69] The Graphics Committee consisted of Lise Prown, Janet Koenig, Greg Sholette, Tom Klem, Jim Costanzo, and Peter Gourfain.
[70] Letter from Tom Klem to Annette Kuhn, 2 April 1991; The REPOhistory Archive; MSS 113, Box 1; Folder 7; Fales Library and Special Collections, New York University Libraries.
[71] Letter to Lisa Knauer, 11 April 1989; The REPOhistory Archive; MSS 113, Box 13; Folder 17; Fales Library and Special Collections, New York University Libraries.
[72] REPOhistory Record Version II, 1992; The REPOhistory Archive; MSS 113, Box 13; Folder 17; Fales Library and Special Collections, New York University Libraries.
[73] Letter from Jim Constanzo to Kathy Novak, November 1991; The REPOhistory Archive; MSS 113, Box 1; Folder 6; Fales Library and Special Collections, New York University Libraries.
[74] Greg Sholette interview as quoted in Lampert, "Permission to Disrupt," 530.
[75] Nicolas Lampert, "Permission to Disrupt: REPOhistory and the Tactics of Visualizing Radical Social Movements in Public Space," in *Handbook of Public Pedagogy: Education and Learning Beyond Schooling,* eds. Jennifer A Sandlin, Brian D. Schultz, and Jake Burdick (New York: Routledge, 2010), 524-530.
[76] Despite similar assurances, REPOhistory's later sign project *Civic Disturbances* (1998-1999) would find itself victim to both vandalism and early municipal removal during its installation.
[77] REPOhistory Record Version II, 1992; The REPOhistory Archive; MSS 113, Box 13; Folder 17; Fales Library and Special Collections, New York University Libraries. At a May 20, 1991 meeting, in light of the Lower Manhattan Cultural Council, or LMCC offer to support the project and the political and financial assistance such support entailed, three possible paths for REPOhistory to take were discussed: working alongside the LMCC, seeking funding and support beyond that offered by the LMCC, and simply rejecting this body altogether and putting up the signs independent of any city organization.
[78] Among those groups drafting letters of support for the project were The Municipal Art Society, The New York Historical Society, Group Material, the Alternative Museum, Henry Street Settlement, Exit Art, and El Museo del Bario. In addition to agency sponsorship, the group sought independent grant funding as well. During its first three

years, the group received financial grants from the Andy Warhol Foundation, Art Matters, Inc., Artists Space, the Resist Foundation, the New York Community Trust, The Puffin Foundation, and the Franklin Furnace Fund for Performance Art.

[79] These included an "Art Permit" for the installation of a sign at the periphery of the park and a "Special Events" permit for the Opening Ceremony, each one granted by the New York City Department of Parks and Recreation. In addition, the National Parks Service also granted permits. Tom Klem's remarks on this process are recorded in Nicholas Lampert's essay "Permission to Disrupt: REPOhistory and the Tactics of Visualizing Radical Social Movements in Public Space," 525-527.

[80] Greg's notes for the management and production of another sign project (undated); The REPOhistory Archive; MSS 113, Box 5; Folder 18; Fales Library and Special Collections, New York University Libraries. However, there *was* attention paid to the legibility of images and readability of texts in the planning stages of the project. An undated planning memo sent to the members of the group suggests a solution to these issues through controlling aspects of the formal presentation of each sign. In this document, the font for all text is specified to be Avant Garde with a size of no smaller than 36 point, although 40 or 45 point is recommended. Additional recommendations are given as to the average number of characters per word (5) and the number of words per side (245 on the front; 177 on the back). However, an exception is provided for "very large type [which] will be considered artwork" and formatting decisions for projects using this would fall outside of the above parameters. The goal seems to be balancing the desire for a unified collective project against not wanting to unnecessarily limit individual contributions. For more on the criteria for each sign submission, see Specifications for the REPOhistory LOWER MANHATTAN SIGN PROJECT, undated; The REPOhistory Archive; MSS 113, Box 5; Folder 16; Fales Library and Special Collections, New York University Libraries.

[81] In the printed maps generated and distributed as part of the project, the thirty-sixth sign was indicated only by a northward pointing arrow, directing the viewer outside of the frame of the map. Located at Church Street between Franklin and Leonard Streets, it was installed two blocks north of the area charted by the map. The sign at this site was Stephanie Basch's *Untitled Tailoresses Society.*

[82] Mervyn Rothstein "Signs of Olden Times Bring History to the Streets," *The New York Times,* June 25, 1992, B2.

[83]The REPOhistory Archive; MSS 113, Box 10; Folders 1; Fales Library and Special Collections, New York University Libraries.

[84] Signs 22-26 were relegated to the category of "extra" signs to be grouped into Tour C if there was additional time or interest on a specific tour date.

[85] The REPOhistory Archive; MSS 113, Box 10; Folder 5; Fales Library and Special Collections, New York University Libraries.

[86] The reader is provided with a route "running from Battery Park at the southern tip of Manhattan, north to Leonard Street, just above City Hall. Visits to these sites can also be broken into three lunch-hour walks taking in the clusters of signs around Battery Park, Wall Street, and City Hall." REPOhistory, *The Lower Manhattan Sign Project* (New York: REPOhistory, 1992), 9.

[87] These reactions were not always positive. To provide just twos example: In an August 12, 1992 letter from Mary Antonia Thomas to Jenny Dixon, then Executive Director of the Lower Manhattan Cultural Council, described are four different attempts in the course of a week to visit the project. Aided by the official *Lower Manhattan Sign Project* map showing both sites of installation and the corresponding sign content at each site, Thomas recounted her extremely disappointing experience of the project. She wrote:

> Unfortunately, I never saw one single person who had stopped to read a sign.. [sic] Some are too difficult to read with their faint print far above the head of the spectator.. [sic] According to the Map above the title and the address of the signs, some are NOT where indicated. I wonder what the expectations are for the use of the signs. Surely they present little-known details re. the sites and their historical and cultural value, but who is reading those that are available for reading? My experiences are not very encouraging!! In fact, I found little artistic merit, little craftsmanship, absolutely no inherent beauty of the materials or the messages and a demonstration of few archival skills.
>
> Here is what I found:
>
> Missing: could not find these, not where indicated---

#2,3,4,7,9,13,21 (Too bad because at this junction of Water/Pine with its plaza, water wall, and two pieces of stainless steel sculpture, few people would miss seeing the sign!!), 22, 23, 33, 34, 35

These I did not try to see:

#5, 14, 15, 16, 17, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31
#32, and #36 may be in place… I was too discouraged to search for them.

These were as indicated and as expected:

#1.. [sic] sensational information, very deep philosophical questions

#6.. [sic] near Whitehall on Stone, very dramatic description, placed very high and with very faint paint; rather hard to read its Spanish on one side with English on the other.

Given the six-month extension of the initial installation, her dissatisfying experience seems not to have been typical, or at least did not influence the reissuing of permits. A more measured response to the project is found in an October 13, 1992 letter from Beatrice and Nathan Falk to the REPOhistory membership in general. In the generally positive note, mention is made of the importance of the project in presenting histories not covered in schools. However, the Fales also wrote about difficulty encountered not in finding the signs but in decoding some of the signs' content: "We experienced some problems reading the signs because of the ways they were hung – i.e. height and angles and in some cases the colors used or the designs made the reading material hard to make out." Letter from Mary Antonia Thomas to Jenny Dixon, 12 August 1992; The REPOhistory Archive; MSS 113, Box 14; Folder 9; Fales Library and Special Collections, New York University Libraries and Letter from Beatrice and Nathan Falk to REPOhistory, 13 October 1992; The REPOhistory Archive; MSS 113, Box 1; Folder 4; Fales Library and Special Collections, New York University Libraries.

[88] As of several weeks prior to June 27th date of the Opening Ceremony, a tentative route was planned for the procession that included nine rather than eight signs. In an undated meeting report, mention is made of a site visit by Stephanie Basch, Carin Cuoni, and Michael Elder to develop a tentative parade route around Battery Park. Signs to be covered by the route include those by Todd Ayoung, Jayne Pagnucco, Darin Wacs, Tom Klem, Sabra Moore, Betty Sue Hertz, Gustavo Silva, Curlee Holton, and the collaborative sign of Mark O'Brien and Willie Birch. Wacs and Silva's signs would be omitted in the final parade route plan and Stephen Duncombe's sign would be added. In the meeting report an upcoming meeting scheduled for April 20 is mentioned, thus documenting the choice to include nine rather than eight signs to as recent as at least as recent as ten weeks prior to the opening ceremony. The REPOhistory Archive; MSS 113, Box 14; Folder 13; Fales Library and Special Collections, New York University Libraries

[89] The titles and locations listed reflect those appearing in the *Lower Manhattan Sign Project* catalogue, published during the yearlong installation. Although these titles differ from those appearing on an itinerary distributed to the audience at the start of the procession, I argue that itinerary presented a description of the works rather than the official titles. Supporting this is the inclusion of the date of the event presented, rather than the date of the sign's creation, as well as the omission of artist attributions for each sign. For a copy of the itinerary, see The REPOhistory Archive; MSS 113, Box 5; Folder 33; Fales Library and Special Collections, New York University Libraries

[90] Calling the Spirits of the Past: A Walking Ceremony to Unveil the RepoHistory Street Sign Project, 1992; The REPOhistory Archive; MSS 113, Box 5; Folder 8; Fales Library and Special Collections, New York University Libraries.

[91] At different moments during the procession, the band played "When the Saints Go Marching In," "Down by the Riverside," and "Saint James Infirmary."

[92] My decision to refer to Bogan, Tutavilla, and Muzik as town criers comes from another REPOhistory public procession in 1993. Rather than the Columbus quincentennial as its subject, this subsequent performance adopted the then present debates around the African Burial Ground as its structuring theme. The African Burial Ground was rediscovered in Lower Manhattan in 1991 during a site excavation for a planned federal office building. In some ways, this reinforces the greater sense of historical awareness in the city in the late 1980s and early 1990s, with the African Burial Ground exemplifying a popularly overlooked history now literally rising up out of the ground and demanding to be recognized. Between 1991 and 1993 a number of public fora were held to discuss the landmark

designation and preservation of the site, including a commemorative public festival sponsored by The Municipal Art Society in which REPOhistory was invited to stage a ceremonial parade.

For this parade, Yekk Muzik was again present and is described in the group's notes as a "town crier or storyteller who narrated our actions." The presence of a "trio of town criers" is also noted on a schematic diagram of the proposed procession route. This diagram has been misfiled in the REPOhistory Archive in the Fales Collection: it is currently filed with notes associated with the opening ceremony of the *Lower Manhattan Sign Project*. Although I have not yet been able to locate the term "town criers" in the archival notes for the *Lower Manhattan Sign Project*, I believe that the similarities between two processions and the roles played by these commenting figures in each justifies this decision. Similar to the *Lower Manhattan Sign Project*, REPOhistory members were assigned roles to play and were given props to enact a full theatrical performance. A group of four "pallbearers" were tasked with carrying a large wooden coffin containing a live tree, throughout the procession, while others carried a large canopy, smaller coffins painted black, water jugs, and flowers. The procession started at Liberty Street, traveled towards Trinity Church, St. Paul's Chapel, City Hall Park, up Chambers Street, and towards the official festival at Elk and Duane Streets where the Committee to Preserve the African Burial Ground was staging a twenty-four hour drum vigil. REPOhistory's parade was intended to arrive at the site at the end of the vigil. However, delays in programming as well as miscommunication resulted in an aborted finale to REPOhistory's performance, in which the tree was to be taken out of the large coffin and planted at the vigil site. For a recounting of the procession, see The REPOhistory Archive; MSS 113, Box 9; Folder 1; Fales Library and Special Collections, New York University Libraries. For the diagram, see Calling the Spirits of the Past: A Walking Ceremony to Unveil the RepoHistory Street Sign Project, 1992; The REPOhistory Archive; MSS 113, Box 5; Folder 38; Fales Library and Special Collections, New York University Libraries.

[93] This sequence—Bogan, Tutavilla, Muzik—was repeated at *almost* every location. Tutavilla spoke at all but the fifth sign (the reason for her absence at this site is not given). At each of the other seven, her narrative often echoed that of the sign itself.

[94] These included the Lower Manhattan Cultural Council and specifically Jenny Dixon and Greta Gunderson, Community Board I, the Department of Transportation including Frank Addeo, the New York City Parks Department, the Mayor's Office, the Department of Cultural Affairs, and sign printer Ben Tang.

[95] As part of her introductory remarks to the parade, Lisa Maya Knauer motioned towards the table set up with organized stacks of maps and tour itineraries and, in line with the theme of the day, announced, "We're repossessing this table and making it a stage."

[96] A note about the raps as they appear throughout this chapter: the punctuation and line breaks are in accord with the printed list of raps in the REPOhistory Archive. For cases in which there is a disparity between the text prepared in advance and recorded in the archive and that recited during the parade (e.g. the addition or omission of lines, the re-sequencing of phrases, etc), the transcript presented corresponds to that which was recited. This performed text and text of Yekk Muzik's songs and poems are transcribed from the film of the opening ceremony, found as well in the REPOhistory Archive. For the Bogan's raps, see The REPOhistory Archive; MSS 113, Box 5; Folder 38; Fales Library and Special Collections, New York University Libraries.

[97] Claudia Bushman, "The Pageant People: A Latter-day Saint Appropriation of an Art Form," in *Pageant and Processions: Images and Idiom as Spectacle,* ed. Herman du Toit (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2009), 218.

[98] Despite this visual repetition of the symbol of the slot machine, a clear understanding of the relationship between prop and sign or symbol and sign by the audience still could not be guaranteed for each sign. This was even true in cases when members of the crowd were tasked with carrying such props during the procession. For example, one of the members of the THINK theater troupe, who performed during the presentation of the final sign, was also given the role of a sign bearing the date 1620. This date sign corresponds to the *Indian Giver* sign. On the film of the opening ceremony held within the REPOhistory Archive at the Fales Collection, the boy is interviewed towards the end of the parade about the significance of the date on the placard he is holding. He responds enthusiastically, "The slot machines! The coming of the slot machines!"

[99] Tutavilla only discussed the 1620 sale of Manhattan, referencing neither the 1492 discovery nor the more recent land disputes.

[100] The Crown Heights Riots took place over the course of three days in the summer of 1991. The riots were triggered when a seven-year-old black boy was struck and killed by a car driven by a twenty-two year old Hassidic Jewish male on August 19, 1991 in the Crown Heights section of Brooklyn. The perception of racially motivated preferential medical care exacerbated already tense relations between the two communities. The Los Angeles Riots started on April 29, 1992, two months prior to the start of the opening ceremony. The catalyst for the six days of

rioting that followed was the announcement of the not guilty verdict in the trial of four Los Angeles Police officers accused of beating Rodney King. Despite videotape evidence documenting the assault, the police were acquitted. Although certainly on the minds of those attending the parade, the reference to "our" recent rioting suggests a closer geographic link. Also, the widespread destruction caused by the Los Angeles riots, against which the admittedly not insignificant destruction in Brooklyn nonetheless paled in comparison, does not fit with the "non-riot" label provided by Bogan. In addition, the Los Angles riots would be mentioned elsewhere in the performance at this sign.

[101] The subject of the city's policy towards urban homelessness under both the Koch and Dinkins administrations and the response of local artists to newly instituted governmental policies is perhaps most famously discussed in Rosalyn Deutsche's *Evictions: Art and Spatial Politics* and Martha Rosler's volume for her Dia Foundation-sponsored project and published symposium proceedings entitled *If You Lived Here: The City in Art, Theory and Social Activism*. Rosalyn Deutsche, *Evictions: Art and Spatial Politics* (Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1996) and Martha Rosler and Brian Wallis, *If You Lived Here: The City in Art, Theory and Social Activism* (Seattle: Bay Press, 1991).

[102] See footnote 4 in this chapter.

[103] One of the few explicit mentions of this traditional form of public theatrical spectacle is on a circulated call for participation in a series of four-hour workshops held on Mary 20 and June 13, 1992. Held at the Theater for a new City at 155 1st Avenue, these meetings were dedicated to the fabrication of the props and signs, and costumes for the parade. The banner title on the printed flyer states that this is a call for "Artists, Performers, Musicians to collaborate on a pageant/parade for the opening of REPOhistory's LOWER MANHATTAN SIGN PROJECT." The REPOhistory Archive; MSS 113, Box 5; Folder 38; Fales Library and Special Collections, New York University Libraries.

[104] Jonathan R. Wynn, *The Tour Guide: Walking and Talking New York* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011), 15-33.

[105] Cohen-Cruz served as a consultant during the early REPOhistory organizing meetings, and is cited in Sholette's mission statements as being an academic source for several driving theoretical principles. The interventionist forms more recently identified by Cohen-Cruz range from agit-prop partisan mobilization, public witnessing, theatrical integration and insertion, enacted social utopias, and the presentation of communal cultural values. Jan Cohen-Cruz, ed., *Radical Street Performance: An International Anthology"* (London: Routledge, 1998), 1-6, 13-14, 65-66, 119-120, 167-168, 219.

[106] Cohen-Cruz' arguments are informed by Paulo Freire and August Boal's ideas of educational dialogic exchange. For Friere this is a pure pedagogical exercise; for Boal, it is a theatrical pedagogical exercise. For the latter, performance can enact the transformation from passive spectatorship to dynamic action. I would argue that rather than Boal's "Theater of the Oppressed," REPOhistory's oppressed are those local residents actively driven out of the region by political and economic action. For her analyses, see Jan Cohen-Cruz, ed., *Radical Street Performance: An International Anthology* and Jan Cohen-Cruz, *Local Acts: Community-Based Performance in the United States* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2005).

[107] A nod to the pageantry tradition is made in Alan W. Moore's volume's study of contemporary New York City-based art collectives, although in reference to PAD/D and not REPOhistory. In his analysis of PAD/D's streetworks, Alan Moore argues that they continue a form of political speech aligned with earlier twentieth century agit-prop and street demonstrations. However, in citing this tradition, he collapses any distinction between a street demonstration and political pageantry. While an opportunity for social critique—as in the case of the 1913 Manhattan-held Patterson Strike Pageant or suffragist parades, which Moore cites—the characteristic principles of historical pageantry lack the kind of overt political and social antagonism that Moore would like to ascribe to the genre. However, in doing so, Moore in effect continues Allan Schwartzman's 1985 argument of aligning then-contemporary street practices with the politicized modernist avant-garde. Although Schwatzman rejects PAD/D's and similar group's style of activism as "political pronouncement" without aesthetic innovation, he ignores the more subtle distinctions that need to be made between types of political activism. For all of the productive work that Moore's volume contributes, in this particular case, he seems to succumb to the same problematic broad-stroked analysis that Schwartzman also presents. In REPOhistory's version of this traditional model, while a pointed critique underscores the event, overt antagonism is suppressed in favor of maintaining a mostly celebratory spirit. In this tonal shift one finds another subversive quality of REPOhistory's performance. Alan Moore, *Art Gangs,* 124-125 and Allan Schwartzman, *Street Art* (Garden City: Dial Press, 1985).

[108] Brooks McNamara, *Days of Jubilee: The Great Age of Public Celebrations in New York, 1788-1909* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1997).

[109] David Glassberg, *American Historical Pageantry: The Uses of Tradition in the Early Twentieth Century* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1990). Although it does not specifically attend to historical pageantry, for how ideas of selective cultural authority were enacted in turn of the century American culture see as well T. J. Jackson Lears, *No Place of Grace: Antimodernism and the Transformation of American Culture, 1880-1920* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994).
[110] John Bodnar, *Remaking America: Public Memory, Commemoration, and Patriotism in the Twentieth Century* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994).
[111] The popularity of the nineteenth century model of public history spectacle would be short lived beyond the third decade of the twentieth century. The spread of popular filmic media entertainments and the increased accessibility of automotive transportation meant greater access to different leisure activities than a generation prior. In addition, Great Depression-era economic and agricultural hardships limited rural audience enthusiasm to stage costly and time consuming celebratory festivals running counter to the psychological tenor of the age. For an example of the continuation of pageantry in rural communities during this era, see Charlotte M. Canning, *The Most American Thing in America: Circuit Chautaqua as Performance* (Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 2005).
[112] Richard M. Fried, *The Russians are Coming! The Russians are Coming! Pageantry and Patriotism in Cold War America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998): 99
[113] As part of this trend, New York state declared 1959 the "Year of History." More specific commemorative events included the three hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the founding of Jamestown colony, the three hundred and fiftieth anniversary of Henry Hudson's Half Moon voyage, Benjamin Franklin's two hundred and fiftieth birthday, Alexander Hamilton's two hundredth birthday, the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the Declaration of Independence, the sesquicentennial of Washington D.C.'s founding, the Lincoln Sesquicentennial in honor of the Abraham Lincoln's birthday, and the Civil War Centennial.
[114] Fried, *The Russians are Coming!,* 87-137. See also Michael Kammen, *Mystic Chords of Memory: The Transformation of Tradition in American Culture* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1991).
[115] Examples of artist collectives and theater companies engaged in this type of public performance include productions by Bread and Puppet Theater and Carpetbag Theater, the Diggers' Death and Money and Death of Hippie street parades, and institutional protests by the Art Workers Coalition and Guerrilla Art Action Group. For a history of such socially engaged performance-driven works, see Robert H. Leonard and Ann Kilkelly, *Performing Communities: Grassroots Ensemble Theaters Deeply Rooted in Eight U.S. Communities* (Oakland: New Village Press, 2006) and Bradford D. Martin, *The Theater is in the Street: Politics and Performance in Sixties America* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2004), 125-159.
[116] Glassberg, *American Historical Pageantry,* 19.
[117] As just a quick explication of this point: *Queer Spaces* was originally proposed under the title *Against the Bias*. The project was to examine both historical and contemporary cases of "bias-related violence" including racial, ethnic, and sexuality-based incidents. Notable places, individuals, and organizations that either fell victim to or fought against prejudice were to be marked. During the development of the project, the scope narrowed to focus exclusively on cases of homophobia and specific moments in the history of gay liberation and the number of signs were reduced. The initial proposals for *Against the Bias* called for the creation of fifty metal signs to be installed on city lampposts, in a manner identical to the *Lower Manhattan Sign Project*. These signs were also to be installed throughout Lower Manhattan, rather than the more geographically limited range ultimately adopted. In a grant proposal for the *Against the Bias* project, developed well after the de-installation of *Lower Manhattan Sign Project*, a projective summary of the formal elements of the signs were provided. These included the provision that "One side of each sign will be the same: a simple visual logo or recurring image with a quote, question or slogan in several languages. This would serve to link the signs which will be dispersed over a white geographic area." The reverse of the sign would feature a clear statement of a specific topic through combinations of text and archival imagery, restricted to only four colors in order to be "visually striking." This proposal also stipulated a review process to be undertaken in the selection of topics and approval of artist submissions. As with the *Lower Manhattan Sign Project,* an editing and design committee was established. Artists were able to submit their own topics, but a team of academic and neighborhood historians and community leaders was available for consultation and topic recommendation. The group also planned to develop a map of the sites of installation of each sign. See Public Service Award Proposal FY95, 1994; The REPOhistory Archive; MSS 113, Box 1; Folder 29; Fales Library and Special Collections, New York University Libraries.
[118] In an undated letter circulated amongst REPOhistory members sometime after the spring of 1995, Sholette drew attention to the way in which the group's projects had begun the process of remapping spaces already previously remapped by the group. For example, the location of the former Army Induction Center on Whitehall Street was

used as a location for the *Lower Manhattan Sign Project*. This same location was then later used for *Queer Spaces*, although differently historically inflected. As Sholette noted, "It is this layering of histories over one place… that is in my opinion REPOhistory's primary contribution even if it is more potential now than realized." He is describing both a general contemporary art world and society contribution. The REPOhistory Archive; MSS 113, Box 11; Folder 3; Fales Library and Special Collections, New York University Libraries.

[119] During this period between 1992 and 1994, records indicate that at least four additional projects were in the early stages of development for the group: the first, a project in collaboration with the Brooklyn Historical Society, which would examine the development of Downtown Brooklyn through the installation of historical signs; the second, a project in collaboration with the Brooklyn Children's Museum in Crown Heights (provisionally entitled *The Crown Heights History Proejct*), which would entail a residency by members of REPOhistory at the museum and the organization of workshops for students in the community; the third (provisionally entitled *Banderas del Barrio*), a collaborative project with Taller Boricua, the Association of Hispanic Arts, and the Museum del Barrio to create a three part exhibitor—eight banners for public display, an additional thirty banners for a gallery show, and a combination memorabilia and video-taped oral history archive—of East Harlem to coincide with both the opening of the Julia de Burgos Cultural Center and the quincentennial celebration opening of Christopher Columbus' discovery of Puerto Rico; and the fourth, an exhibition to be held at the Museum of the City of New York to be collaboratively planned between REPOhistory and the museum's staff. The final two projects were the most advanced in terms of the depth of their planning and time allocated to organization, and thus seemingly closest to realization. However, none of the four projects were ever realized.

[120] Planning meetings minutes during this time reflect the initial hesitancy by some parents at not only to the involvement of the REPOhistory in the school but to a project devoted to looking at the local neighborhood. One such parent's response is recorded simply as: "You don't want to be doing anything around *here*!" "RepoHistory/Hudson River School Planning Minutes 1-12-93 Meeting," 1993; The REPOhistory Archive; MSS 113, Box 9; Folder 8; Fales Library and Special Collections, New York University Libraries.

[121] Dan Wiley, RepoHistory Education/Outreach Committee Hudson River Middle School Project, February 1993; The REPOhistory Archive; MSS 113, Box 1; Folder 8; Fales Library and Special Collections, New York University Libraries.

[122] "RepoHistory/Hudson River School Planning Minutes 2-2-93 Meeting," 1993; The REPOhistory Archive; MSS 113, Box 9; Folder 8; Fales Library and Special Collections, New York University Libraries.

[123] The map was placed between two horizontal banners: "Hudson River Middle School" across the top and "Community Research Club" across the bottom. The name of the school appeared on the left sleeve (right if worn) of the shirt, along with a large "1993." The heads of the nines were designed to look like two sides of a globe: the first showing the Western hemisphere; the second showing the Eastern hemisphere. On the right sleeve (left if worn) of the shirt, the head of a figure from an 1840 print was placed. Although the coloration of this figure varied, the rest of the t-shirt colors were consistent. The REPOhistory Archive at the Fales Library and Special Collections at New York University currently has three of these t-shirts in its collection. However, these shirts are not personalized: instead, they simply display the standardized template used for the project. See The REPOhistory Archive; MSS 113, Box 19; Fales Library and Special Collections, New York University Libraries

[124] New York State Council for the Arts Application, 1993; The REPOhistory Archive; MSS 113, Box 1; Folder 26; Fales Library and Special Collections, New York University Libraries.

[125] Ibid.

[126] In addition, a 1993 letter from the New York Foundation for the Arts to Felicita Santiago indicates displeasure with the school by the granting committee. The topic was the grant to fund the initial program development between January and May of 1993. The letter indicated that the New York Foundation for the Arts' grant was contingent upon the school raising additional moneys for the program, which they failed to do. Witten by Alyson Holoubek, then-administrative assistant to the funding organization, the letter stated that failure to provide the additional funds, which were to pay REPOhistory for their involvement, "violates the terms of your grantee contract and jeopardizes your chances for current and future funding." While the organization ultimately provided the initial promised grant, it is unclear if they gave any future aid to the school. Letter from Alyson Holoubek to Felicita Santiago (November 17, 1993); The REPOhistory Archive; MSS 113, Box 9; Folder 8; Fales Library and Special Collections, New York University Libraries.

[127] Similar to the Hudson River Middle School program, in planning for the second year of the project, proposals included moving to develop a program with a "larger public-art/neighborhood outreach component (possibly sign project)." However, a project on the scale of the *Lower Manhattan Sign Project* or *Queer Spaces* was ultimately not

realized. Minutes from the REPOhistory General Meeting, January 30, 1996; The REPOhistory Archive; MSS 113, Box 11; Folder 3; Fales Library and Special Collections, New York University Libraries.

[128] E.P. Thompson, "History from Below," *Times Literary Supplement* (7 April 1966): 279-280 and anthologized as "History from Below" in *The Essential E.P. Thompson*, ed. Dorothy Thompson (New York: The New Press, 2001): 481-489.

Chapter 2. "As you see and as you already know…": The Studio Museum in Harlem's *Harlem Postcards*

In the summer of 2012, Zoe Crosher's *Katy, Kori, & Rashid and other backs (Crumpled), for the Studio Museum* (2012) (*Harlem Postcards* Summer 2012 series) was made available as part of the Studio Museum in Harlem's ongoing *Harlem Postcards* project.[i] [Figure 19] The California-born and –based artist's photographic postcard image offered not simply a way of understanding Harlem the place as comprised of a series of persons, places, or things but rather a comment on the way in which Harlem the idea is constructed through a mediated repertoire of visual content.[1] Instead of pristine souvenir postcards available for taking, the postcards captured in Crosher's photograph have been, as indicated by the title, crumpled. They are folded and creased. Some edges are torn. In their decidedly non-flattened state, they resist orderly sequencing. They are a pile: an agglomeration, rather than a collection. Crosher's *Harlem Postcard* is an accumulation of previously made and recently handled *Harlem Postcards*.

The Katy, Kori, and Rashid of the photograph's title are the artists Katy Schimert, Kori Newkirk, and Rashid Johnson. Each contributed a postcard to an earlier cycle of the *Harlem Postcards*: Schimert with *North Meadow, Central Park Harlem* (2006) (*Harlem Postcards* Fall/Winter 2006/2007 series), [Figure 21] Newkirk with *Notorious Finnest* (2002) (*Harlem Postcards* Fall 2002), [Figure 20] and Johnson with *the coolest nigga you never did see* (2005) (*Harlem Postcards* Fall/Winter 2005/2006 series). [Figure 22] It is the reverse of these artists' postcards that are the "backs" mentioned in the title of the work. The pictorial content of the postcards in Crosher's photograph are turned away from the viewer. Only the reverse of each

[i] Notes for this chapter can be found from page 192 to page 216.

card is shown: four blank lines to include the address of the postcard recipient, a space for a written message, and the indentifying information of artist and his or her unseen photograph on the side of the card turned away from the viewer. Thus Crosher's photograph twice frustrates access to an image: once in the destruction of the cardstock as a material support for the previous postcards and again in the denial of access to these modified surfaces through the showing of only the reverse side of these previous postcards.

Crosher's contribution to *Harlem Postcards* offers a chance to reflect on the greater visual archive of postcards created under the museum's sponsorship. Treating the full series of postcards as both visual and tactile representations of Harlem—meant to be seen, handled, distributed, and dispersed—yields another approach to an ephemeral cartographic public practice. Unlike REPOhistory's multiple media-supported tours, the Studio Museum in Harlem's placemaking project generates a representation of the uptown neighborhood without the aid of objects physically fixed in place. *Harlem Postcards* relocates access to the people, places, and things that define contemporary Harlem away from their real-world referents yet still maintains correspondence to these referents. The postcard format allows for a circulating map-like object, with the individual photographic postcards collectively serving as constitutive map elements, the museum and artists commissioned serving as mapmaker, and the museum visitor, postcard viewer, and Harlem traveler serving as the map-reader.

In addition, rather than serving as a critique of three decades of gentrification-led transformation in Harlem, *Harlem Postcards* more comfortably sits alongside recent economic, material, and ideological developments in Harlem. The postcard project and its museum sponsor occupy a middle position between opposing camps: those on the one side decrying gentrification and the loss of a unique local culture and those on the other celebrating the physical

transformation of Harlem in recent years and the psychological and rhetorical reframing of the neighborhood that has accompanied this. Amidst changes in the greater built environment and social and economic dynamics, changes dedicated to altering both how Harlem appeared and how Harlem was considered in the greater public consciousness, the Studio Museum's renewed dedication to Harlem-centric programming necessitates being viewed as part of building the "new Harlem."

The sum total of changes bringing about this new Harlem has often been described as resulting in a new renaissance for the uptown Manhattan neighborhood. With the frequent evocation of the Harlem Renaissance of the 1920s and 1940s—and, to a lesser extent, the culturally and politically powerful incubator of Harlem and 1960s—scholars ranging across disciplines have sought to identify an analogous period in contemporary Harlem. This new "Harlem renaissance" (as opposed to "Harlem Renaissance") started in the early 1980s and continues into the present.[2] However, unlike the previous renaissances of the 1920s and 1960s, the role of cultural production in defining this contemporary renaissance has been deemphasized. Discussions of the economic programs of revitalization are prioritized instead. In this recent neighborhood revival, the label of "renaissance" has become something of a consciously deployed tool to further the related programs of gentrification and neighborhood rebranding.[3]

More than a document of a moment of urban transition, *Harlem Postcards* fills this cultural absence. The series of artist-commissioned photographs promotes a vital cultural and economic identity for Harlem by asserting a selective—and, importantly, a rhetorically framed as "beautiful"—visual identity for contemporary Harlem. This chapter considers how, through the postcards, otherwise dismissible urban clutter—overcrowded vendor stalls, eccentric neighborhood denizens, cracks in a sidewalk—are sanitized, localized, and made acceptable,

thus encouraging exploration and continue investment in the neighborhood. Across the accumulated visual and material fragments of *Harlem Postcards*, the museum charts a version of the new Harlem. Collectively joined together, the photographic postcards comprise a new imaging of Harlem that moves beyond what current Studio Museum in Harlem Executive Director Thelma Golden has described as "the usual documentation of what Harlem was" and that instead begins "to ask what Harlem is and might be."[4]

Something that Represents the Neighborhood

Since 2002, the Studio Museum in Harlem (hereafter Studio Museum) has commissioned sets of artists to produce a single postcard each for the *Harlem Postcards*. Initially, three artists at a time were chosen. The number has since been increased to four for each seasonal iteration of the postcards. The artists selected to participate within any cycle are drawn from a pool of early-, mid-, and late-career artists; those already working from within Harlem, the greater Manhattan area, other locations across the country, and internationally; and those who engage a variety of media (and sometimes not necessarily even photography) in their professional practice. After the artists are selected they are provided an honorarium and are invited to venture into the neighborhood surrounding the museum with a camera, with only the directive of creating an image that speaks to the visual identity of Harlem.[5] The time spent by the artist can range anywhere from an afternoon to close to a week, the latter more frequent among those artists already connected to the museum: for example, through the Studio Museum's Artist-In-Residence program or in connection to an exhibition either in development or on view at the museum in which the artist is participating. When requested by the artist, the museum provides a staff member to accompany the artist in his or her exploration of the neighborhood.

Once an image is selected by the artist and sent to the museum for approval, the photograph is made into a postcard. The sets of these are then displayed in the lobby of the museum. A large framed print of each of the four postcard images is hung directly outside the entrance to the museum's main exhibition galleries. The artist and title of each image are identified. The image is also accompanied by a brief artist's statement, relating either to the image content, the artist's process used for taking the photograph, or both. Next to these four prints is a rack containing sets of the postcards themselves, with an accompanying sign encouraging the public to take one.[6]

The images range in both content and tone. Some convey serious social messages, such as: Alice Attie's *Wake Up Black Man* (2004, *Harlem Postcards* Winter 2004 series), a view through a chain link fence to a boarded-up building on which the title of the postcard appears [Figure 23]; Lan Tuazon's *Sky watch* (2008, *Harlem Postcards* Spring 2009 series), a composite photograph of a view of Morningside Park, an elevated police Sky Watch observation tower temporarily installed on 142nd Street, and a now triple-replicated statue of Adam Clayton Powell Jr. from 125th Street, the artist's comment on the total surveillance of Harlem and a call to challenge such actions [Figure 24]; and Hank Willis Thomas' *Change gonna come* (2010, *Harlem Postcards* Spring 2011 series), a collaged arrangement of seventeen photographs spelling out the title of the image [Figure 25]. Others suggest the depth of an often-uneasy and complex history within the neighborhood. Examples of this include: David Levinthal's *Tap Dancer* (2003, *Harlem Postcards* Summer 2003 series), an image of an antique blackface tap dancer figurine standing on a brick-painted platform in front of a signpost for the intersection of Lenox Avenue and 125th Street [Figure 26]; and Ginger Brooks Takahashi's *She was married to a white woman Gladys Bentley 1907-1960* (2010, *Harlem Postcards* Summer 2010 series), an

archival image of lesbian performer Gladys Bentley, documenting a historic queer presence in Harlem [Figure 27]. Other photographs embrace elements of humor. Chief among these is Adia Millett's *You used to be my lover* (2005, *Harlem Postcards* Fall/Winter 2005/2006 series), showing the faux melancholy and nostalgic longing of a pigeon pecking at a discarded fried chicken wing. [Figure 28]

Harlem Postcards offers a diversity of visual content culled from different sections of Harlem: domestic interiors to street scenes; panoramic views and highly cropped and focused details; prominent public figures to anonymous everyday residents. However, in surveying the over one hundred postcards that now comprise the set of *Harlem Postcards*, certain visual motifs and categories of subjects reoccur. These repetitions attests to the prevalence of such subjects in the uptown neighborhood's culture, lending credence to their relevance in constructing a visual identity for the neighborhood in postcard form; becoming representative of the "look" of contemporary Harlem. Familiar landmarks crop up. Sidewalk culture is prevalent. Locations are often presented as peopled spaces, with pedestrians walking through Harlem, lines of audience members outside of local attractions, and a range of anonymous figures suggesting the variety of seemingly innocuous everyday activities taking place in Harlem. This point of visual and thematic repetition is central to the argument of this chapter.

The postcards and the accompanying larger prints make for an unassuming art installation within the museum. They comprise one of two sets of works that one first encounters after paying admission to the museum. They are presented across from a series of saleable prints created by participants in the museum's Artist in Residence program. Thus one unfamiliar with the project could be forgiven for mistakenly assuming that the four postcard photographs are an extension of the museum's fundraising endeavors. Their proximity to an entrance to the Museum

Store, the Studio Museum's bookstore and gift shop, does little to clarify matters. In addition, as they are located outside of the exhibition galleries—the domain of "serious" art—a hierarchy is subtly enacted. As indicated by their physical position in the museum, the postcards occupy a middle space between exhibition and souvenir, fully comfortably fitting into neither category.

Rather than suggesting the Studio Museum was engaging in poor museological endeavors or problematic curatorial choices, I argue that this placement of the postcards signals how the postcards operate, certainly within the walls of the museum specifically but more broadly within the space of Harlem. The individual postcards that comprise *Harlem Postcards* are not museum souvenirs per se. Or at least they cannot be considered souvenirs comparable to those considered by Mary Beard in her study of museum postcards in British museum stores. Beard's study is concerned with the commercial aspect of museum culture and the popularity of a specific kind of postcard image: that which presents the museum object transformed into a take-home token available for purchase, allowing for the viewer to re-experience his or her initial encounter with the object in the museum's exhibition galleries through the postcard.[7]

The difference is that for *Harlem Postcards* the image on the postcard rarely corresponds to a work on view in the museum's galleries proper. Sited in the entry hallway of the museum, an interstitial space between entryway and gallery proper, the postcards are cast as similar to saleable items in the nearby store, but are free. The postcards are available to be taken, yet none of the same hesitancy that one finds with comparable interaction-based take-away works offered in gallery settings is found here.[8] Visitors to the Studio Museum, particularly those traveling in groups, can be observed casually taking postcards as they open the doors to the gallery, sliding them into their pockets or bags, and continuing on into the galleries to see the "art."

In one sense, this is precisely the point of the postcards: they point outside of the museum's galleries. They signal the viewer to the everyday visual and material culture found within the streets of Harlem. However, it cannot be overlooked that this signal is nonetheless made within the physical and ideological space of the museum. In her discussion of the museum space as liminal space, Carol Duncan argues for the experience of entering the museum as one structured by a number of institutional cues. In such a space, severed from the flow of everyday life, the viewer performs within the guidelines of a prescribed script that, if successfully deployed, generate an intended aesthetic experience of the art object.[9] In the case of *Harlem Postcards*, the context in which the art object is presented promotes an aesthetic experience of the content of the photographic image. The museum setting and the idea of a museum as the site of culturally significant works provides legitimacy and cultural value to what could be otherwise be mistaken for often seemingly mundane imagery.

There is little promotional media specifically or exclusively connected to each cycle of the *Harlem Postcards*. The postcards instead *become* this kind of promotional media for both the Studio Museum and for the greater Harlem region in general. The images generated as part of the project create a visual lexicon of and for the neighborhood at a critical moment in Harlem history, one in which regional real estate developments and a greater neighborhood quality branding programs converge with concerns about the loss of an "authentic" local visual culture.

In considering *Harlem Postcards,* I argue that a process of hovering between truth and fiction is enacted. Setting aside those postcards that demonstrate a clear manipulation of the visible content of the image and considering only those that make claims towards an accurate and authentic capture of the world, one finds a similar partiality to the project. *Harlem Postcards* asserts a truthful yet still ameliorative identity to the region, which is guided by underlying

processes of selection enacted by the museum. The image repertoire generated by the postcard photographs is not fully open-ended as image content is motivated and informed by its museum presentation: Harlem is framed in such as a way as to be consistent with the institutional goals of the museum.

The image content of the postcards promotes objects as new representative landmarks of Harlem as well as promoting ways of seeing these newly minted place-defining visual landmarks. Thelma Golden recently summarized both the process and objective of the *Harlem Postcards*: "We ask artists to take a picture, and we print it as a postcard… Our hope is that visitors from near and far leave with something that represents not only the museum but the neighborhood."[10] However, while providing artists a great deal of autonomy in the selection of their subjects, the museum is nonetheless essential to generating meaning for the project. By requiring an engagement with the museum as part of the acquisition of the postcard (either by entering the physical structure of museum's building on 125th Street or, more recently through the museum's website to access an e-card version of the postcard) the museum assigns an additional cultural heft to the Harlem captured in the photographs.

Functioning as a circulating art exhibition and regional beautification project (ideas which will be more fully explained over the course of this chapter), *Harlem Postcards* serves as another example of a curated ephemeral public project. In reading the history of the Studio Museum as a community-connected institution through both its programming and exhibition choices, and situating changes in each against contemporary developments in Harlem, *Harlem Postcards* acts as a visual and material reinforcement of the rhetoric of a "new Harlem" created both out of and within millennial Harlem. I consider *Harlem Postcards* as enacting what art historian Margaret Olin has recently referred to as a process of "tactile looking." The circulation

of photographs draws together communities: communities of people, communities of places, and communities of things.[11] Both image content and the way in which this content is presented structures a relationship among the photographers, sponsoring institution, viewing audience, and location.

Revealed is the complex institutionally-driven rhetorical and aesthetic reframing of an everyday local visual culture. These related processes do not specifically promote a gentrified neighborhood or a neighborhood in transition, but rather a more broadly defined destination willing to accept new visitors and show off its "beautiful things." *Harlem Postcards* does not adopt an explicit position towards gentrification processes, but it cannot be understood as fully separable from such greater processes. The circulation of the museum-sponsored imagery reframed the discussion of what Harlem as place was and would be. This promoted visual directory allows for the movement away from the entrenched and limiting identity of "old Harlem" as the "dark ghetto" towards the more recently applied and generous identity of "new Harlem" as the "beautiful place."[12]

Building a Museum

Contributing to a project about the making and remaking of Harlem and Harlem culture has been at the forefront of the publicly-stated mission of the museum since its founding. An emphasis on serving the community—despite internal struggles to determine just how to define this community—structured much of the early programming of the museum. The question not just of how to define the museum's relationship to the Harlem community, but what constituted a Harlem community would lead to a series of quick and often partial institutional shifts during the first decade of the museum's history. More significantly altering the institutional mission was the emphasis placed on building an encyclopedic record of African and African American art

through collecting and creating a national academic center for researching this collection. The turn towards building a national cultural center rather than a neighborhood cultural center defined much of the museum's programming between the eraly1980s and the late 1990s. The next two chapter sections survey these initial decades, tracking internal debates regarding institutional self-definition, community composition, and community relation, in order to provide historical context for the millennial operations of the Studio Museum. The first section considers the museum under the directorships of Charles Innes (founding Executive Director), Theodore Gunn (Executive Director from 1968 to1969), Edward Spriggs (Executive Director from 1969 to 1975), and Courtney Callendar (Executive Director from 1975 to 1977). The second section considers the museum under the directorships of Mary Schmidt Campbell (1977-1988) and Kinshasha Holman Conwill (interim director from 1988-1989, full appointment from 1989-1999) By presenting this chronology, I show how projects such as *Harlem Postcards* and the greater institutional initiative from which it sprung (discussed in subsequent chapter sections) are part of a greater recommitment by the museum in recent years to the original mandate of the museum and to the museum's local neighborhood.

The precise events surrounding the origin of the museum are still debated in the literature, with the idea to create a community museum attributed to different organizations and committees.[13] In addition, how one is meant to interpret the impulse to found this museum—either a unique socially- and politically-motivated alternative site of cultural practice or as part of a greater institutional art world model of establishing satellite centers—is also a fraught topic.[14] What is agreed upon in the literature is the emergence of the museum as local response to national causes: to address a perceived limit on available high art cultural resources within the

Harlem community spurred on by the rising Black Arts and Black Power Movements across the country.

The Studio Museum in Harlem opened is first site of operations to the public on September 26, 1968 at 2033 Fifth Avenue, between 125th and 126th Streets. By this time, it had been operating as an incorporated not-for-profit institution for the better part of a year. During this year, museum officers began searching for physical presence within the uptown neighborhood, joining similar regional culture providers such as The Children's Art Carnival, the Dance Theater of Harlem, and the JazzMobile. Described in one local newspaper as located "beyond the glamour,"[15] the museum would ultimately come to occupy a former factory sweatshop loft space, located above a liquor store and luncheonette. A single sign above the doorway announced the presence of the museum to those walking by. Access to the museum proper was granted after ascending one flight up from street level and through a single glass door. On the other side of the door was the museum's main exhibition gallery, which extended the length of almost half a city block.[16] The total space of the site was 8,300 square feet. In addition to the main exhibition space, the site comprised an office for museum staff and a four-room complex, which housed the film workshop program, to be discussed below. Site limitations prevented presenting spatially expansive exhibitions, the concurrent presentation of several exhibitions at once, or the amassing, storage, and presentation of a permanent collection.[17]

Although not the first exhibition organized under the banner of the newly formed Studio Museum in Harlem, the first exhibitions presented in the loft space were Tom Lloyd's solo exhibition *Electronic Refractions II* (September 26 to October 24, 1968) and *X to the 4th Power* (June 1 to July 14, 1969), a group exhibition featuring works by Melvin Edwards, Sam Gilliam, Stephan M. Kelsey and William T. Williams.[18] Such exhibitions emphasized the non-exclusively

race-based identity encouraged by early planners for the museum: that the museum should present "art forms of today" and thus trends in contemporary art. As advocated by the Committee for the Harlem Museum,[19] this entailed presenting "new art media, such as films, light-plays, multiple media projections, etc." Rather than making recommendations about specific works or artists, the Committee sought to address and resolve the concern that "New York needs a New Museum," one "with a more experimental, less institutionalized approach. The proper place for this museum is Harlem, where a sense of newness, strength and change is inescapable."[20] While the artists whose work was shown were black, and the rhetoric of Harlem as a site of "newness, strength, and change" can be couched in Civil Rights-era rhetoric, the emphasis on an experimental freedom in terms of media and contemporary formal solutions in art initially took priority in the museum's public identity.

These early exhibitions also reflected the first component of a triad of the museum's founding programming initiatives: to offer a series of exhibitions to be curated by a roster of guest curators, to sponsor an Artist-in Residence program, and to organize a filmmaking workshop for children and young adults.[21] While the Artist-in-Residence program would come to define and justify the "Studio" portion of the institution title (an emphasis that continues to be asserted in the present as the program continues as well in the present),[22] the final programming inclusion—the film program—has been little mentioned in the literature on the museum. I contend that an understanding of the film program allows one to more fully understand the museum's early identity as community resource in ways that move beyond looking at gallery-based exhibitions. The decision to include a practice-based educational outreach program as a core principle indicates a literalized interest in not just serving as a cultural resource to the community, but as providing a cultural service for the community

In July 1968, the Studio Museum launched The Studio Museum Film Workshop.[23] Through the program, free instruction and equipment was provided at no cost to New York City teenagers: the program was offered not exclusively to residents of Harlem, but instead to young adults across the city. Approximately ten participants were accommodated at any given time, with the specific duration of the program individually tailored to the participant's skill level and progress.[24] The success of the public program was such that in November of the following year, the museum announced the creation of a film festival tied to the workshop. Coordinated by Daniel Dawson, the festival was given the title "Bout US." Advertised as Harlem's first major film festival of black films, the program was held on four Friday nights from November 21 to December 12, 1969. Screenings were held at IS 201 127th Street and Madison Avenue. Each screening presented a feature work by a young filmmaker (although not necessarily a member of the workshop) along with several supplementary films and a talk-back session with a guest filmmaker following the screening.[25]

Two months after the museum's opening of a gallery space, an opportunity for artists from the community to display their works in the museum's gallery was made available. In November 1968, the museum hosted *Art for the New World*, advertised as a "community exhibit." An open call was circulated in advance inviting artists to participate.[26] The organization of community exhibits would also result in more selectively-curated exhibitions such as *Harlem Artists 69* (July 22 to September 7, 1969) in which one hundred and six works by fifty-three artists were shown. The exhibition was originally intended to show works exclusively by Harlem-based artists. However, according to Theodore Gunn, who served as the coordinator of the exhibition, since "Harlem has for many years been the center of Black America, the spiritual and cultural home for tens of thousands of black people across the county… it seemed only

natural, as word of the show spread and black artists brought in works from all parts of the city," to include contributions from artists who did not specifically reside in the uptown neighborhood.[27]

Taking up the idea of Harlem as a "spiritual and cultural" center allowed for setting aside an understanding of Harlem as a geographically delimited place and replacing this understanding instead with a "Harlem" as a cultural concept without fixed geographic boundaries; emphasizing Harlem identity as linked to a celebrated yet abstract site of creation rather than a set of mapped coordinates firmly bound to contemporary concerns of everyday life. Alongside the concern for fostering the potential of "younger black artists" as a community of artists, the exhibition was targeted an audience of a national "black community" as well.[28]

The closer identification its exhibition offerings with race-defined cultural production can also be understood as an attempt to ameliorate tensions caused by the creation of a museum with a fifty-percent white board claiming to speak for and to Harlem. In a 1971 article in the *Los Angeles Times*, then-Studio Museum Executive Director Edward Spriggs stated, "Many of the people were hostile at the outset, but enough were in favor for survival… The people have to feel they're a part of the museum and it's part of them. They have to become interested in what it's doing and feel they're involved in the process."[29] Projects that not only brought the community into the space of the museum but also brought artists into the space of the community became a significant component of the Studio Museum's activities during these early years, in large part to formalize involvement with and of the community in museum operations. The issue of defining a community to speak with and for resulted in the museum adopting a dual focus: targeting an underrepresented black community, non-geographically defined, and targeting an underrepresented black community, geographically defined.

Along with providing an under-considered history of artistic production by black Americans and Africans, the museum emerged as a site for the showcase of a "black aesthetic." Under Spriggs exhibitions tracked and fostered developments in a pan-African art, highlighting both contemporary and "elder creators" establishing a historical precedence for "creations [that] focus on the Black Experience."[30] This was apparent in a number of early museum-sponsored public programs. Such programs served to actively to draw connections between the museum as a physical site and generative cultural hub embedded within Harlem. Beyond *Art for the New World*'s invitation to display works within the museum, these programs fostered a connection between local audience and museum, sited both in and around the museum's galleries.

In 1971, the museum announced the creation of *Studios in The Street,* the museum's first truly "public art" project in the traditional sense of the term. The program involved placing six artists and the local community in dialogue with one another.[31] The project was intended to emphasize both the "Studio" and "in Harlem" components of the museum's title. The artists first met in the museum's gallery on July 26, 1971 where they developed a public workshop conducted within the museum. This gallery-based project was then opened to the public on July 30. From August 9 to August 14, the artists collaborated on a mural at 126th Street and Seventh Avenue. Following this, the group of six fragmented, working on several independent projects at different locations throughout Harlem. This final component of the project lasted until the second week in September. Although all of the artists involved were painters, with the exception of the collaborative mural, not all of the artists principally created paintings during the run of *Studios in the Streets.* The objective of the project was not exclusively to create a community mural, but instead to allow for an interested public to observe the art-making process across several different styles, approaches, and media. For example, while Joseph Delaney, Babatunde

Folayemi, and Sudan (Ted) Pontiflet continued to produce mural works during the final phase of the project, Curtis Bryan sculpted masks out of wire and sand, Dindga McCannon produced a series of prints, and Vincent Wilson crafted jewelry works.[32]

Studios in the Street was intended to serve as the test phase of a year-round program. The museum projected the possibility for applying this type of public art meets community beautification project to not only exterior walls of buildings, but also murals on church, library, and recreational center interiors. However, despite the ultimate short-lived nature of the program beyond the summer of 1971, developing a Harlem-based audience would guide much of the outreach programming during the first decades of the studio Museum's history. Beyond purchase-based exhibitions and workshops,[33] lectures, and conferences designed to cultivate both informed art viewers and informed art collectors,[34] the Studio Museum's public programming positioned the institution as a social and cultural community center. Such early programs include the creation, sponsorship, and hosting of an annual Kwanzaa celebration and the sponsorship of an annual book fair. Contrary to previously written analyses of the museum, this annual celebration continued well beyond the Spriggs-era, programmed as consistent community event well into the late 1980s.[35]

The tailoring of programming to its local community was also enacted through exhibitions that took community concerns as the subject of the exhibition. Exhibitions such as *Living Space* in the summer of 1977 examined four centuries of urban sociology across New York City. The exhibition presented architectural renderings, blueprints, models, and photographic documentation of different sites, complemented by the display of several more traditional "fine arts" works highlighting aspects of urban everyday life.[36] Alongside other exhibitions such as the earlier photographic survey of Harlem architecture *Visions of Harlem* in

the fall of 1974, these presentations served as more than a documentation of a material identity of the community. They instead approached the visual construction of the urban center as an inhabited space, pulled in several directions by economic, social, political, and cultural internal concerns and external constraints.

Thus rather than exclusively attending to Harlem as an abstractly defined spiritual center, the Harlem community addressed in the exhibitions and public programs of this era was that of a real place filed with real people with real concerns. Upon the announcement that he would be assuming the directorship position of the museum, Spriggs declared

> Creating a museum in a black community from the clear blue is a new phenomenon. People have to understand that your program not just to bring downtown art uptown or to undermine the activity that is going on up here. The Museum should be a supportive institution to the art activity already in its community. It has to exist in for the community.[37]

The inclusions of “downtown” and “uptown” indicate that Spriggs is, in this case, speaking to a geographically-defined place. The museum was cast as working in concert with and in support of its surrounding neighborhood. However, the importance of this locational identity of contemporary Harlem to defining the museum’s mission would further be put into question following the next administrative shift in the museum’s history, coinciding with questions about the museum’s physical place within Harlem.

Building a “Museum”

The museum’s attention paid towards contemporary Harlem as place throughout the early 1970s would be short lived. Between the mid-1970s and the late 1990s, the Studio Museum’s programming, both exhibition and outreach, was defined by an almost single-minded concern to create a national center for the collection and display of African and African American art. While

sponsorship of new art continued through the museum's Artist-in-Residence program, a look backwards from the present and outwards from Harlem became more typical of the museum. Reverence for historical Harlem replaced investigations of contemporary neighborhood dynamics, with a celebratory tone for the former in stark contrast to the more dire view inspired by the latter.[38] This shift in institutional focus can be attributed to two related events. The first is the relocation of the physical site of the museum. Although ultimately a minor geographical shift, the debates surrounding potential locations and the interest in acquiring a greater space for museum operations reveal a focus beyond 125th Street. The second is the appointment of the next two directors who would steward the institution through the next two decades: Mary Schmidt Campbell and Kinshasha Holman Conwill. This section tracks this period of the museum history, providing the immediately preceding historical and institutional context against which the museum staff responsible for developing *Harlem Postcards* would respond.

The necessity of a permanent site to accommodate greater administrative, exhibition, and storage space emerged as a concern soon after the beginning of the museum's operations. Serious discussions among the Board of Trustees about a site relocation started in 1972. Spriggs described any potential new locations of the museum as needing to clearly reflect institutional mission. "We are community oriented," he declared. "Our first concern is Harlem, but we are very much aware of the general need of increasing the exposure of Afro-American culture to a much larger audience." However, Spriggs quickly followed with the recognition of real-world limitations involved in finding an appropriate site locally. He described how there are "very few places in Harlem [where] we could do something like this." He was nonetheless insistent that the new building should continue to be along the "125th Street corridor."[39] However, not all members serving on the museum's executive committee shared this view. Spriggs' desire to keep

the museum in Harlem was countered with other board members' interests in moving the museum to a location that would better physically, ideologically, and (perhaps most importantly) financially allow for continued museum operations.[40]

The topic of an appropriate site for the museum would continue to divide museum officers for the next several years. On August 1, 1977, Courtney Callendar resigned from his position as Executive Director, in part due to frustrations at the Board of Trustees' insistence on seeking a building site removed from 125th Street.[41] Beyond causing a great deal of internal tumult, the topic of the museum site played out in the local press, reverberating within the greater community.[42] Alternative sites pursued by museum's board, at the time chaired by Richard Clarke, included the Heckscher Children's Center at 104th Street and Fifth Avenue and an abandoned school building at 145th Street between Amsterdam Avenue and Broadway.[43] Callender raised the point that, on a practical level, such locations would be financially detrimental to the museum: the museum previously received grant funding tied to geographically-specific community outreach projects. In addition, a move south and east to 104th Street would move the museum to a predominately Hispanic neighborhood of Spanish Harlem and put it in direct competition with El Museo del Barrio. A move to 145th Street was equally dismissed by Callendar with the declaration that "nobody's gonna go there."[44] Beyond these practical locational concerns, Callender and others believed that the serious consideration of such sites by museum officers a greater shift in the museum's core mission.[45]

These internal—and external—debates proved moot by the fall of 1979. At this time, the New York Bank for Savings publically announced its donation of a new building located in the center of Harlem to the museum.[46] This was the Kenwood Building, a five-story office building on 144 West 125th Street, between Lenox Avenue and 7th Avenue,

recently renamed Adam Clayton Powell Jr. Boulevard in 1974. The building is located across the street from the Harlem State Office Building, also later renamed the Adam Clayton Powell Jr. State Office Building in 1983. In moving to this new location, the square footage of museum operations increased from approximately 8,300 square feet to close to 60,000 square feet. Arthur Barnes, president of the New York Urban Coalition and chairman of the Studio Museum's Fund Development Committee, negotiated the transaction between the bank and the museum.[47]

The formal ceremony in which the deed to the property was transferred to the museum occurred on October 12, 1979. In attendance were representatives of the bank and the museum, as well local politicians, business representatives, and community leaders. In one of his final acts as outgoing Chairman of the Board of Trustees, Richard Clarke signed the deed for the museum, as did Mary Schmidt Campbell, Callendar's successor as Executive Director of the Studio Museum. The gift of the building was heralded as demonstrating how corporate actions could beneficially support community programming. This celebration would be portentous, given the role that private corporate investment would play in defining—or, as some would argue, negating—Harlem cultural identity in the following decades.

Newly designed by architect J. Max Bond, the building opened to the public with great fanfare on June 20, 1982.[48] According to one report in the local press, the new building offered a "spiritual and moral aesthetic for people to enjoy" while meeting the necessary technical requirements "for preserving the 'health' of fine object[s] for posterity."[49] Campbell was equally effusive in her analysis of the influence that the new building would have, declaring the opening not only a "renaissance" moment for the institution, but also "a milestone in the revitalization of Harlem."[50] In addition to providing a brief chronology of other significant milestones in the museum's history (e.g. the development and implementation of programming initiatives and

significant exhibitions),[51] Campbell contextualized the event within a greater history of Harlem cultural innovation. This started with the "glitter" of Harlem of the 1920s and 1930s, extended through the Civil Rights movement and Harlem community programs of the 1960s, and ended with the burgeoning contemporary physical transformation of Central Harlem along 125th Street. As later discussed by Campbell, the Bond-designed building "established a beachhead of physical clarity and beauty amid the ruined buildings of 125th Street."[52]

Campbell's appointment was immediately characterized as announcing a new era within the museum. It was greeted as a sign of a quelling of internal tensions at the museum, and a replacing of brash and blustery ego clashes with a "soft, slender, gentle form" of management, a characterization perhaps equally guided by real policy differences and gendered stereotyping. Campbell arrived in the position with the goals of building the museum's endowment, maintaining its commitment to supporting contemporary practices through the Artist-in-Residence program, and further developing a relationship with the community by supporting education initiatives in local schools.[53] However, such community practices were publically framed in a manner markedly different from that of the previous decade. Campbell included such programs under an umbrella mission of defining the Studio Museum first and foremost as "a fine arts museum," as opposed to a cultural history or heritage museum. She elaborated upon this, stating, "I want it to be the leading center for the study of Black art. It will be the place where serious scholars feel they must come to find out about Black artists."[54] A clear shift in purpose can be found in this institutional projection. The mandate to create a national center for the study of black art began to take priority over founding aspirations to attend to local cultural needs.

Upon the opening of the new building, Campbell stated that the Studio Museum had now "gone beyond its origins as a work space or 'studio' type of museum."[55] While not eliminating

the studio programs of the museum (chiefly the Artist-in-Residence Program), the key word in the organization's title has shifted from an emphasis on "Studio" to an emphasis on "Museum." Crucial to Campbell's idea of a museum was the development of an encyclopedic museum collection. For the first time in the museum's history, the idea of attending to collecting was a realistic possibility. In 1979 the museum began developing a formal permanent collections policy with the first exhibition of the collection on view less than four years later.[56] Despite previous analyses of this period in the museum's history, it is unlikely that Campbell's academic art history-driven interests art alone would have yielded such immediate and large-scale change without the institution's move to a site of increased storage, exhibition, and administrative space and receipt of a National Endowment for the Arts Advancement Grant of $144,400.[57]

During this time, an institutional identity predication on the linked interests of history and ownership was asserted. The museum created for itself the role of custodian of the history of African and African American art: to serve as a visual and archival source for an in-development art historical canon.[58] Beyond presentations of the permanent collection, the museum continued the Spriggs-era interest in "elder creators" with the "Black Masters" series, started a new "Artists in Mid-Career" exhibitions series, and developed sweeping "landmark" exhibitions intended to be impressive in both chronology covered and bulk of works shown.[59] While Harlem's legacy as site and source of artistic creativity was observed, the museum's dedication to featuring the contemporary neighborhood in its galleries waned in favor of this historical focus. This focus was sustained following Campbell's departure from the museum.

In the summer of 1987, Campbell was appointed as New York's Commissioner of Cultural Affairs by then-mayor Edward I. Koch. Kinshasha Holman Conwill replaced Campbell as acting director while the museum searched to fill the vacancy with a more permanent hire, a

search that ultimately led to the granting of the title to Conwill outright in January 1988. The formal announcement was made on January 17, 1988, as the museum celebrated its twentieth anniversary. There were multiple causes for celebration that day also saw the museum's receipt of a certificate of accreditation from the American Association of Museums.

Conwill continued Campbell's focus on creating a national art center through the end of into the 1990s. The decade saw the celebration of the twentieth and thirtieth anniversaries of the museum, each marked with an exhibition series focused on marking the chronological span of and encyclopedic value of the museum through art,[60] as well as the initiation and completion of a set of construction projects to further expand the museum's facilities.[61] Harlem continued to serve as an exhibition reference point: large-scale exhibitions dedicated to the giants of a pre-1940s era Harlem and a 1960s era Harlem celebrated the local as a place grounded in a nostalgic ideal to contemplate rather than a contemporary environment to confront.[62]

At the same time, in line with a greater art world elevation of national multiculturalism alongside global practice and its own institutional interest in developing an encyclopedic collection, the Studio Museum continued to explore the formation of a global black aesthetic. In discussing the planning of the then-upcoming global art exhibition in 1988, Conwill succinctly voiced the museum mission for this new era: "We [the Studio Museum] will be the premiere institution collection of Black American art plus black art with international or global implications."[63] In addition, she professed an interest in developing in-house research collections, to be made available to visiting scholars. Adding to visual archive of works of art, this entailed building an archive of artists' papers (which at the time already included the full papers of Benny Andrews and documents of Sam Gilliam and Betye Saar), the museum's own records and correspondence with artists, slide and photographic documentation of artworks, and

videotape recordings of lectures delivered as part of the museum's "Vital Expressions in American Art" program.[64]

In the span of a decade, this idea of a national research center dominated the museum's mission. In 1997, then-Studio Museum curator Valerie Mercer summarized the museum's mission as "to basically collect, research, document and exhibit art of people of African heritage throughout the world." With the collection offering a contemporary "global perspective," publicly emphasizing its holdings of works Africa, the Caribbean, South America, and "African America."[65] At the end of the 1990s, the "Harlem" of the museum's title settled into a position of almost tertiary importance, with "Museum" as a primary and "Studio" as a close behind secondary interest. Starting January 1, 2000, this ranking radically shifted again, ushered in by the directorship of Lowry Stokes Sims and the curatorial oversight of Thelma Golden.

The Museum's Golden Era

With the 1990s officially designated "The Decade of Collecting" for the Studio Museum by the museum's executive and curatorial leadership, thus promoting a backwards-looking view of art historical production with canon formation guiding institutional identity formation,[66] the 2000s can be considered embracing a more presentist approach for the museum. In large part this change was brought about through a series of staff changes, publically announced hires, and the implementation of new programs that followed from these. In the fall of 1999, Kinshasha Holman Conwill was appointed to the position of Director Emeritus. In her place, Lowery Stokes Sims was brought on as the new Executive Director, a title of which she formally assumed responsibility on January 1, 2000. In advance of this, Sims and the museum board also discussed the introduction of additional prominent staff members to join the museum's ranks. Chief among these was Thelma Golden, who Sims described as "part of my dream team" for the museum.[67]

Golden was given the title of Chief Curator and Deputy Director of Exhibitions at the museum. The two women would hold these positions until July 1, 2005. At that time, Sims assumed the title of President of the Studio Museum. Golden was then appointed as Executive Director while retaining the title of Chief Curator. Despite the press coverage initially focusing the dual hires,[68] this coverage would soon focus on Golden as the more public face of the institution. However, the summary impact of such hires, regardless of to whom primary credit could be given, was a shift in the public profile and institutional mission.

In an interview with the *Los Angeles Times* in 2001, Golden discussed the mandate given to her by Sims, revealing both women's view of the past, present, and future missions of the Studio Museum:

> When I came to the Studio Museum, [director] Lowery Sims gave me a big charge but a blank slate. She had a vision of the museum being at early middle age. The issues of growing up and getting professionalized were behind us, so we could stretch out and begin to create a foundation for the next 30 years. That includes an endowment, expansion, any number of things, but also redefining the role the museum could play.
>
> When this museum was founded, it took on the role of institutions four times its size. It saw itself as the primary publisher of work on African American artists and the organizer of major retrospectives, which weren't being done in the mainstream museums. I wanted to pull back from that a bit because we are in a moment when the Jacob Lawrence show is traveling the country and will open at the Whitney in a couple of weeks; the Romare Bearden show is being done by the National Gallery and will travel the country. That's the scale of what those shows should be, but what could we do? It seemed to me that we could present new work by new artists.[69]

This recognition of the museum's legacy, particularly vis a vis a record of black art and cultivation of new work, guided what can properly be considered the Golden years of the Studio Museum.[70]

This new era was forcefully announced with the opening of the Golden and Christine Y. Kim curated exhibition *Freestyle* (April 28 to June 24, 2001), the first of a trilogy of thematically linked survey exhibitions the museum would offer over the course of the decade. *Freestyle* was followed by *Frequency* (November 9, 2005 to March 12, 2006) and *Flow* (April 2 to June 29, 2008).[71] Each tracked the development of the Glenn Ligon and Golden-termed “post-black” influence in contemporary African and African-American art. These three exhibitions have received the greatest attention from academics interested in exploring a cultural aesthetics of contemporary art practice, redefining “blackness” in an age of both a global art and idea exchange. However, this trilogy of exhibitions only tells part of the story of the museum’s recent history.

There is another important curatorial and programming initiative that defines the recent history of the museum, one that is central to this chapter. Beyond an examination of global contemporary art practice and the next phase of black art production four decades after the Black Art Movement, the museum in recent years has once again turned its attention to the local. Rather than re-inscribing binaries—both rhetorical and real—structured by the local and the global or the community arts center and the professional museum that played out during the first thirty years of the museum’s history, the post-2000 era of the museum has publically embraced a “both… and…” approach to the institution and its neighborhood.

In his 2000 article discussing the museum’s hiring of Sims and Golden, Holland Cotter commented upon the parallels between the museum and the greater neighborhood: the transformation of 125th Street is equated to the “major changes” taking place at the Studio Museum.[72] The uptown migration of both women coincides with a greater “discovery” by the mainstream art world of Harlem’s reemergence as a thriving art space.[73] In Cotter’s article, Sims

discussed her plans for the Studio Museum. In addition to preserving well-known and foundational interests such as the Artist-in-Residence program, overseeing facility renovations already underway, and continuing to build the permanent collection, Sims was quoted at length advocating linking the museum to its "community." Elaborating on the definition of to which community the museum belongs, Sims assigned connections to "the Harlem community, the art community, the media community, the international community." Citing the museum's founding mission of a local community museum focused on presenting art ignored by the mainstream art world, Sims stated that the time had arrived to "re-examine" that mission.[74]

Sims' views on Harlem were presented at length in the same article. She stated that:

> This is an amazing, complicated community. It's engaged in a commercial revitalization, but it still struggles to define itself within the city around issues of class and race. There are great spaces, streets that feel like Europe and quirky, abandoned industrial sites… [Harlem is] a work of art in the public realm.[75]

Sims' idea of a city as a work of art is supported by the dramatic transformations underway within the uptown neighborhood by the end of the decade. One year after the publication of this initial article, Cotter revisited the changes at the Studio Museum. In examining the results yielded in a relatively short period of time, he too drew a comparison between the noticeable shifts between the museum and its surrounding environs. He announced, "The 'new' Harlem has a 'new' Studio Museum, or at least a museum that has given itself a revivifying shake."[76]

Reading the direction of the museum under the guiding hand of Sims and Golden requires also reading the contemporary state of Harlem. This "new" Harlem to which the "new" Studio Museum responded was the product of a thirty-year economic and ideological reframing of the neighborhood; efforts undertaken on the neighborhood, city, and national levels to rebrand and revitalize Harlem as both a commercial and cultural center. By way of response, the museum

developed programmed to sit comfortably alongside such urban transformations. Through projects that take as their focus the everyday world immediately outside the museum's walls, the museum's staff tacitly embraced "the new" as a positive yet incomplete process of change.

Picture Harlem

Almost immediately following the arrival of Sims and Golden at the Studio Museum, the multi-platform, provisionally entitled "Picture Harlem" initiative was started in the winter of 2000. Each program of this initiative supported the development of a photographic record of Harlem. "Picture Harlem" can best be understood as consisting of three categories of activities, with each category supported by a related schedule of public exhibitions: the first, a renewed investment in research into and presentation of a historical photographic archive of Harlem, including the James VanDerZee archive, of which the museum had custodianship since the 1977;[77] the second, an educational outreach program targeting both community seniors and students that including practical training in photography practices; and the third, the ongoing commission of works by visiting artists, of which *Harlem Postcards* is but one part. These three programs often overlap, the results of each informing the others in the both planning and yielding of final projects. Beyond a shared emphasis on photography as a medium, these programs also held in common the visualization of the "new Harlem."

With implementation of the "Picture Harlem" program, VanDerZee's works have continued to hold a position of prominence in the museum, appearing as inclusions in both group exhibitions and permanent collection exhibitions, participating in a greater exhibition schedule emphasizing Harlem photography. Group exhibitions have been typical of this interest, most clearly exemplified by the 2005 photography exhibition *hrlm: pictures*.[78] Organized by museum curators Rashida Bumbray, Ali Evans, and Christine Y. Kim, *hlrm: pictures* (July 20 to October

23, 2005) showcased the history of a constructed vision of Harlem. As set forth by the curators, the survey of images "will become part of our definition of Harlem, and help us to see Harlem as it is today, remember Harlem as it was yesterday, and relate to Harlem as it will be tomorrow."[79] However, the exhibition was not exclusively interested in generating a visual record of the neighborhood. As the curators' statement reveals, the exhibition also was intended to "further the Studio Museum's critical role as a living, breathing archive and visual record of this visible vibrant community."[80] The exhibition positioned the Studio Museum as source of an archival and contemporary visual record of Harlem.[81]

A second category of "Picture Harlem" entailed the development of new community education and outreach programming. This included the creation of an elementary-through-high school level curriculum focused on Harlem's visual history, and the development of a combined photography and oral history project for community senior citizens. Also launched was a youth photography and filmmaking program. Collectively, these individual projects would fall under the banner title of "Expanding the Walls: Making Connections Between Photography, History and Communit*y*." As it exists today, over a decade since its introduction, "Expanding the Walls" is comprised of three related programs: a family program, a senior program, and a youth program.[82] The youth program is presently the most publicly well-known of the three, itself leading to an ongoing series of exhibitions of the students' photographs held at the museum.[83]

Recent titles of these exhibitions signaled using photographs to do more than document one's surroundings. For example, exhibition titles included: *Adjusting the Lens, Reclaiming Beautiful*, *Beyond Sight*, *Shift in Focus*, *We Come with the Beautiful Things*, and *Hi Res*.[84] The institutional import placed on the optical and more significantly the qualitatively "beautiful" designator for both the photographs and the elements of the neighborhood captured by them will

be discussed more fully in the penultimate chapter section below. For now it is worth noting the repetition of the idea of moving beyond a surface visuality across several of these titles, moving "beyond sight" alone. The titles encouraged an adjustment of viewpoint: a closer, more attuned, and concentrated way of looking that isolated certain otherwise hidden aspects of the urban environment in order to "reclaim" elements of this environment as "beautiful things." This reclamation of a local visual culture through new photography guided the final of the three programs of "Picture Harlem" as well.

It is in the third and final program, the commissioning of new photographic works by visiting artists, that *Harlem Postcards* finds its origin. In a short, undated (although most likely written in early 2001) cover letter for a grant application from Golden to Eileen Cohen at Art for Art's Sake, Golden described *Harlem Postcards* as "one of the first major initiatives which exemplifies our new mission." Elaborating, Golden discussed how the project "will allow us to both reach our immediate community and help them see the richness and rapid change of the community around them as well as allow outsiders a new view of this historic community."[85] This project overview was telling. It spoke to the multiple audiences targeted by the visual neighborhood chronicle to be generated by the project: residents of Harlem who have direct knowledge of the community and "outsiders" who may be encountering Harlem for the first time. From the beginning, the postcard project was designed, in part, as an opportunity to alert both groups to a "new Harlem." While not negating or neglecting the Harlem of the past (as a historical imaging of Harlem would still feature into other components of the "Picture Harlem" program, as already discussed), it is the contemporary remaking of the historic community that would be put on display.

According to this same project proposal, *Harlem Postcards* was intended to launch in the spring of 2002, signaling the start of the first phase of a three-phase development process. In this first phase, four artists would come to the museum during the course of the year: two during the spring and another two during the fall.[86] Although initially planning for four artist commissions per year, the proposal also suggests involving a greater number of artists annually should the budget allow. During this time, the artist would venture into Harlem to create a series of photographs. The second phase would also involve the culling of these photographs and the selection of a single image to be realized as a postcard. Multiples of the selected postcard would be printed and then made available for free to museum visitors. In addition, printed versions of the postcard would be provided to participants in other museum-sponsored community programs as well. At the end of the year, each of the four artist-produced postcards would be made available through the museum as a single completed set. The third and final phase of the project would come to fruition only after several cycles of the first two phases had been completed. After approximately five years, a book was to be published as a formal record of the individual postcard commissions. The resultant images were to be interspersed with historical images of Harlem, creating a printed equivalent to *hrlm: pictures* and the "Expanding the Walls" exhibitions: serving not only a visual record of changing artistic styles and practices, but also documenting decades of change within the community itself.[87]

In examining *Harlem Postcards* a decade after this initial proposal, it is striking to note those elements that have been realized, although perhaps in slightly modified forms. The first cycle of *Harlem Postcards* was made available to the public in the fall of 2002, the result of the first round of artist invitations from earlier in the year. For this first cycle, three photographs were selected for inclusion: Tony Feher's *Sweetheart* (2002, *Harlem Postcards* Fall 2002 series),

an image of a discarded red heart-shaped lollipop on gum-pocked gray sidewalk pavers [Figure 29]; Anissa Mack's *After the Fact (Rachel and Renee Collins at RiteAid on 125th Street)* (2002, *Harlem Postcards* Fall 2002 series), presenting two girls sitting shoulder-to-shoulder on a bench in a drugstore photo-studio [Figure 30]; and Kori Newkirk's *Notorious Finnest* (2002, *Harlem Postcards* Fall 2002 series), in which a window display of shelves of different colors of solvents are shown from the standpoint of looking out from the store onto the street beyond. Over the next year, an additional eight cards were created: three in the winter, two in spring, and another three in the summer. The participating photographers were, in order by series: Nikki S. Lee, Christian Marclay, and Eduardo Sarabia; Warren Neidich and Ester Partegas; and Stephanie Diamond, Howard Goldkrand, and David Leventhal. The three-cards-per-season pattern was repeated for the Fall 2003, Winter 2004, and Spring 2004 series. Four cards were produced for the Summer 2004 series, followed by another three per series for the Fall 2004, Winter 2005, and Spring 2005. Beginning with the Summer 2005 series, four cards per season were consistently issued. This also coincided with a change to the museum's division of the exhibition calendar year. Rather than four iterations for each year, there were three—a summer, a fall/winter, and a spring series—yielding twelve *Harlem Postcards* every year.

The list of participating photographers is also revealing. In the 2001 program proposal, several artists were listed as being "under consideration" by the museum. These included Doug Aitken, Janine Antoni, Nan Goldin, Roni Horn, Sharon Lockhart, Tracey Moffat, and Jack Pierson. The names represented a collection of well-known contemporary photographers. However, few of them are associated with street photography let alone street photography in Harlem. Instead, the list offered a cross section of internationally-known, internationally-born, exclusively white, mid-career contemporary artists with established reputations for working a

variety of media. It thus formed a curious, though not wholly inexplicable, list for a project the focus of which was on the local Harlem community. On one level, the list indicated an intention by the museum to treat *Harlem Postcards* as a "serious" artistic endeavor, meriting recruitment and inclusion of prominent art world figures. On another, it suggested a desire to brand the project as such to others, encouraging outside financial support for a project with such heft. On yet another, it indicated a broadening of the definition of who gets to speak for a local community—or more accurately, who gets to show for a local community.

The opening up of the category of who gets to create a photograph of and for Harlem is significant. Although most of the artists mentioned in this initial list would not ultimately produce a postcard for the museum, the diversity of artists initially considered—diverse in terms of race, heritage, previous subject matter, medium of choice, etc.—reveals an interest in a expansively conceived visualization of the neighborhood. Rather than narrowly, or even stereotypically, defining itself or the neighborhood in which it is located as a black museum for black artists in black Harlem, the museum under Golden and her curators instead planned to invite a multi-racial and multi-ethnic set of artists to engage with a similarly diverse community. This was an intentional decision, reflected in a series of official changes to the museum's mission in 2000 and 2001.[88] This was also made further explicit in the early *Harlem Postcards* proposal. The proposal stated that the postcard project "will engage a broad group of artists, including those outside of our traditional collecting parameters" in concert with the museum's recent "effort to broaden the base of our programming to include artists who are not of African descent while staying focused on our original mission."[89]

I read this reference to "our original mission" in a literal manner, marking the return to the late 1960s and 1970s mission of the institution. As *Harlem Postcards* moved from planning

stage to implementation, there were several points of contact with institutional mandates set in motion during the Spriggs and Callendar eras of the museum. In particular, the initial three broad categories of programming came together within the postcard project: the cultivation of new works by providing financial support to artists, the planning of an ongoing series of exhibitions highlighting both new art making strategies and subject matter important to the museum staff, and the creation of projects that serve the local community through providing both community outreach and art making technical support. Commissioning artists to create postcards for the museum and the exhibition of the resultant postcards aligned with the first two of these categories. Since the "Expanding the Walls" program can be considered a more recent iteration of the original Studio Museum Film Workshop (combining technical training, community outreach, and cultural dialogue), and since the "Expanding the Walls" program has been directly connected to *Harlem Postcards* in recent years, *Harlem Postcards* too fulfills the third and final category of founding-era programming for the museum.

Starting in 2004, one student participant's photograph from each annual "Expanding the Walls" exhibition was invited for inclusion within *Harlem Postcards*.[90] Rather than considering these as separable or somehow privileged inclusions, the "Expanding the Walls" submissions blend seamlessly with the greater visually directory formed by the rest of the postcards. The only indication of its origin as part of "Expanding the Walls" is a single line of text on the reverse of the postcard incorporated within the identifying information standard to every other *Harlem Postcards*.

Strong parallels in the image content found in the student images and in the "professional" photographs of *Harlem Postcards* can be identified. For example, "Expanding the Walls" participant Genesis Valencia's *Hands with a Heart* (2011, *Harlem Postcards* Summer

2011 series), which focuses on a street musician's hands resting atop a drum, visually echoes Brooke Williams' *Hands* (2007) (*Harlem Postcards* Summer 2007 series), which presents fifteen Polaroids of local residents' hands, and Deana Lawson's *Untitled* (2010) (*Harlem Postcards* Fall/Winter 2010/2011), a close view of the darkened fingertips of a woman in a West African clothing boutique in Harlem.[91] Much of the remainder of this chapter looks at several ways in which such clear repetitions of subjects and categories of subjects can be identified across the postcards and how the project in general can be understood as a response to the "new Harlem." The next chapter section however examines how this new Harlem was forged in order to understand the environmental context from which "Picture Harlem" in general and *Harlem Postcards* in particular emerged.

Local Investments

The shifting social and economic dynamics of contemporary Harlem, as well as the literal visual transformation brought about by these new dynamics, has influenced the recent Harlem-centric programming of "Picture Harlem." However, beyond a reading this programming as mere passive reflections of the contemporary moment, I would instead argue that the museum has adopted a more active role the redefinition of a contemporary Harlem with such programming through promoting a revisualization of Harlem. The museum participated in constructing its own vision of and for contemporary Harlem. The rapid development radiating across Harlem dictated a need not to preserve a disappearing urban form, but rather to clarify and define the new Harlem as a real place (rather than a space of invisible systems of economic investment). This chapter section proposes situating the museum and its programs within the more frequently discussed real estate and commercial machine dedicated to making millennial Harlem.

The creation of new private and public real estate contractual agreements was well documented in the press throughout the 1980s and 1990s, creating a journalism-based promotion of the promise of the "new Harlem" to support the material changes underway in the uptown neighborhood.[92] Fulfilling the 1986 prediction of sociologists Richard Schaffer and Neil Smith for how gentrification would fully take hold in Harlem, a prediction based upon an official New York City urban redevelopment strategy of the early 1980s,[93] an initial wave of non-resident black investors was supplanted by a more racially balanced pool of investors.[94] Rather than continuing regional development with an eye towards refurbishing existing residential sites, much of this second wave of investment has occurred on a commercial level with an eye towards new construction and the rehabbing of commercial properties throughout Harlem. Attended to were major public sites and historical landmark attractions that had in recent years either fallen into disrepair or were viewed as possible contributions to fostering centralized commercial and entertainment hubs. This included the development of individual sites (e.g. the Apollo Theater, the New Lafayette Theater, the Lenox Lounge, and The Renaissance Ballroom) as well as a general investment in extended districts (e.g. 125th Street in Central Harlem).

By the middle of the 1990s, an economic boom in Harlem mirrored economic prosperity on the national level. Beyond simply a phenomenon of zeitgeist, this was a carefully negotiated and purposefully anticipated shift in financial profile. Clinton-era domestic economic policies led to the establishment of the 125th Street Businesses Improvement District in 1993 and the Upper Manhattan Empowerment Zone in 1996, and the designation of Harlem as an Economic Redevelopment Zone also in 1996. Although supporting local small businesses was planned as a key feature of this policy, the granting of tax breaks to larger organizations willing to invest in

Harlem—both literally and figuratively—would have the greatest impact throughout the region, and in Central Harlem in particular.[95]

With public funding encouraging private sector investment, the introduction of new national corporations to Harlem significantly altered the economic and visual profile of the region. The dominant profile left by the presence of such larger businesses has led to the continued outcry among some community members and local politicians at a perceived limited targeting—and even outright abnegation—of the local community and cultural forms that once made Harlem a distinctive place. Although furthering the economic revitalization of the region, the arrival of franchises and satellite storefronts of multinational corporations have been characterized as turning a distinctive local commercial culture into a generic shopping mall, which Michael Sorkin has referred to as a "decidedly suburban phenomenon."[96] This has often been coupled with broader focused protests against municipal policies perceived as favoring newly arrived or soon-to-arrive commercial interests over longer term local residents' interests.[97]

It has been rare for either side of this argument over the value of the recent urban transformation to fully cede the self-perceived rightness of its respectively entrenched position. However, in his analysis of Harlem economics, David J. Maurrasse has asserted a more centrist ground. Cognizant of the unique place Harlem occupies within both the local, city, national, and international consciousness, Maurrasse argued that the continued economic survival of the uptown neighborhood nonetheless requires a rejection of intransigent nostalgia for the way things once were and openness to both material and ideological change.[98] One strategy employed by both business "outsiders" attempting to integrate into the community and cultural "insiders" desiring to remain relevant and financially sustainable has been a shared emphasis on and appropriation of the idea of "local" culture.

Recent analyses have examined how smaller retailers in Harlem have used a local culture and community as part of branding strategy: suggesting an embedded, authentic relationship between merchant and community. The claim of authenticity, and thus the ability to speak to and for a given neighborhood, is often bound to a specific material and visual form. The mobilization of appearances believed to conform to local legacy validates assignments of the label of "authentic" by playing off what urban sociologist Sharon Zukin has referred to as an "aesthetics of heritage."[99] Both Zukin and Miriam Greenberg have considered how dual cultivations of lifestyle-focused journalism and commercial branding programs can not only generate images of a trendy neighborhood but also provide public assurances of safety for a previously considered unsafe or marginal neighborhood. Such branding—or more accurately rebranding—strategies are designed to increase economic revenue for local business owners by enticing both local residents tourists to stay and invest in the region.[100] For customers, the idea would be that by shopping at, purchasing from, or partaking in the services of such establishments, they were supporting local business and having an authentic local experience. For business owners, the goal has been to turn regional cultural capital into actual capital.

Often missing from such discussions of real estate and commerce is an extended consideration of roles played by local arts and cultural organizations in the building this "new Harlem" by positioning local culture as compatible with the contemporary development. When cultural organizations are discussed, it is often in similar terms of economic investment.[101] Absent is the way in which these cultural institutions can be implicated in a process of placemaking in and for Harlem through a visual and rhetorical investment as well. Similar to the lifestyle branding of recent commercial ventures in Harlem—those designed by businesses, as Zukin argued, "to claim a role as insiders in the community—to become, in short, an *authentic*

part of Harlem"[102]—the Studio Museum's recent Harlem-centric programming advances an image-based identity of Harlem announced from an insider's position of authority. A reciprocal relationship between Harlem and the museum is set forth as a justification for this position: the museum's multi-decade history of occupying a physical position within Harlem legitimates its institutional authority to speak about and present a view of Harlem.

As a result of its legitimized place, the museum has been able to adopt the roles of neighborhood tour guide and chorographic reference. Similar to the members of REPOhistory, the museum's curatorial staff directs its audience's attention to everyday urban places, providing a structured way of seeing millennial Harlem as a new Harlem for both long-time residents and recent visitors. Projects developed under "Picture Harlem," and *Harlem Postcards* in particular, *show* (rather than REPOhistory's didactic *telling*) the new Harlem. The image directory that is advanced emphasizes the beauty of the local urban visual culture while diminishing contemporary local social and economic antagonisms. The remainder of this chapter considers the regional representation developed as a result of these selective interests.

The next chapter sections examine the identification of 125th Street as Main Street in Harlem and the promotion of this identity in *Harlem Postcards*. In the chapter section that follows, I look at the ways in which historically competitive social and economic dynamics along 125th Street also have been recorded in the postcards. Not simply reified as discrete, object-based representations, these dynamics have been negotiated and artificially resolved through the collective set of postcards. Through the museum's distanced yet still traceable intervention, idea of a thriving, diverse Harlem sidewalk economy is set forth, without acknowledging the ever-present tensions underlying this economy. The chapter then moves to look at how the museum has set forth a qualitative evaluation for not only the image content of

the *Harlem Postcards* but for Harlem itself. After considering another context in which the postcard images have been and are currently circulated—in the pages of the museum's bulletin—I discuss how the label of "the beautiful" has been applied to disparate everyday local forms. The result is the revelation of the museum's photographic project as that of a public cartography of urban beautification: a visual directory of the people, places, and things in contemporary Harlem that serves as a guide to the neighborhood while advancing a rhetorical position about the neighborhood.

Welcome to Main Street, Harlem, USA

Overt visual reference to the Studio Museum's location along 125th Street is absent from almost all of the postcards. Neither the interior nor exterior of the museum building have appeared in any image to date.[103] Unlike the centrality of the New Museum's Bowery address, which has served as a fixed visual and ideological constant across many of their projects in recent years (as discussed in the next chapter), the Studio Museum adopts a more invisible position in its program of regional visualization. However, this absence should not suggest that the institution's relationship to 125th Street is somehow insignificant to the "Picture Harlem" program. In this section, however, I consider the appearance of 125th Street as a charted space-turned-place in *Harlem Postcards*. This process includes the consideration of images of the roadway itself, the businesses located along the street, and the dynamic pedestrian and vehicular movement that occurs there. The events, people, architecture, and goods that line and the roadway define the site as both Harlem's "Main Street" and main street. With the idea of 125th Street already culturally associated as the center of Harlem, the record of the roadway offered by the postcards affirms this association by grounding it in a body of visual documentation.

The elevated position that 125th Street holds in the postcards is not surprising given the elevated position that 125th Street holds in the cultural imagination of Harlem itself. To reference 125th Street in Harlem is to call upon several frequently invoked associations and phrases. For example, 125th Street is “Main Street” in “Harlem, USA.” This appellation of “Harlem, USA” has popular and historical resonance dating back farther the Upper Manhattan Empowerment Zone’s mid-1990s sponsorship of the Harlem USA shopping and entertainment center along 125th Street.[104] In 1964, Seven Seas Publications printed the first edition of the John Henrik Clarke-edited anthology *Harlem: U.S.A.: The Story of a City Within a City,*[105] a title repeating James Weldon Johnson’s analysis of the uptown neighborhood in his 1925 essay “The Making of Harlem.”[106] Each text formalized a linked spatial and conceptual understanding of Harlem, positioning the neighborhood as representing both a distinct territory and a distinct cultural community.

If Harlem is to be a “city within a city,” pace Weldon, Clarke, and more recently Golden,[107] it is a city built around a city center. This center is 125th Street, the four-lane, east-west running street, and specifically the section of 125th Street that cuts through Central Harlem, with the approximate boundaries of Fifth Avenue to the east and St. Nicholas Avenue to the west.[108] Beyond serving as a chief regional transportation artery—in addition to its east-west crossing of Manhattan, the street is also dotted with stations for subway lines and a Metro North commuter rail stop—125th Street also serves as central commercial and cultural corridor within the Harlem. Thus it has followed that if Harlem is, for some, to be considered as the center of Black America, 125th Street has assigned the related title of “Main Street of Black America.”[109]

To regard 125th Street as the Main Street of Harlem requires unfixing the idea of Main Street as something fundamentally associated with small town America and re-siting the idea

within the context of the urban America.[110] As a result of modifying this contextual appearance of Main Street, it is worth considering how the representation of Harlem's 125th Street-as-Main Street within *Harlem Postcards* also modifies previous traditions of representing comparable Main Street sites; how an aesthetic of Main Street undergoes a similar transformation upon its geographic remapping to an the urban setting. Such a consideration is motivated by the fact that as, with *Harlem Postcards*, the traditional medium of seeing Main Street was the photographic postcard.

As Alison Isenberg wrote in her analysis of downtown districts, "Although downtown real estate is economically valuable and symbolically potent, it is also composed of the mundane—artistic lampposts, garbage cans, storefronts, parking lots, lunch counters, plywood, broken glass, and red brick."[111] Choices governing the preservation or omission of these mundane urban objects can be read as evidence of local values reflected in city planning. For this purpose of this study, Isenberg's analysis of the commercial picture postcard, particularly her attention to the processes of inclusion and omission of these mundane items as advancing an image-based ideal of "the New Main Street" and "Main Street as a place," is valuable. The fiction of the early twentieth century photographic postcard—retouched, hand-colored, selectively cropped, carefully aligned—advanced an ideology of both visual and moral clarity. "Sidewalk obstacles" such as independently installed street furniture, commercial signs, vendor showcases, and even people were eliminated from the images in order to present an unobstructed visual corridor. This corridor encoded the value of a commercially successful Main Street: the collective, unified, and pristine physical structure reflecting a similarly organized social order.[112]

Harlem Postcards adopts the opposite approach. Instead of a limited number of conventional views of a total Main Street area, *Harlem Postcards* offers a disparate collection of

fragmentary views in which discrete elements and details are offered. Rare is the long, linear perspective-structured vista typical of the early twentieth century picture postcard. When such views do appear in *Harlem Postcards*, they are not the selectively edited (either through real world removal or through photographic manipulations) view of the main streets of Isenberg's study. Instead, prominently featured is the "messy" streetscape, an object world filled with the vernacular emblems of disparate commercial and social interests. As will be discussed throughout the rest of this chapter, it is these messy elements that that would otherwise stand in the way of a Main Street revitalization program that the *Harlem Postcards* instead elevate as distinctly place-defining features of Harlem.

Several of the postcards focus on 125th as a built urban space, attending to the architecture, municipal signage, and street furniture on either side of the road. Adler Guerrier's *A Circuiteer about Harlem* (2003, *Harlem Postcards* Winter 2004 series) shows an oblique view of the southern side of 125th Street between 7th and 8th Avenues (alternatively titled Adam Clayton Powell Jr. and Frederick Douglass Boulevards, respectively). [Figure 31] Chain clothing retailers such as Strawberry, Lane Bryant, Payless Shoe Source, and Champs Sports are dwarfed by the view of the Hotel Theresa, the imposing lateral depth and height of which looms over the surrounding structures. The Hotel Theresa appears as well in Louis Cameron's *The Hotel Theresa (after James VanDerZee)* (2005, *Harlem Postcards* series Fall/Winter 2005/2006). [Figure 32] The title of the image signals its indebtedness to an older image, VanDerZee's *The Hotel Theresa* from 1933. Rather than Guerrier's long view along 125th Street, both VanDerZee and Cameron isolate the eastern façade of the hotel, just off of 125th Street on 7th Avenue. The earlier photograph's presentation of the hotel and its restaurant has been discussed as cuing a sense of then-recent regional racial triumph: VanDerZee's commentary on the granting of access

to the previously segregated luxury hotel and ground-level Theresa Bar & Grill and Theresa Tap Room to the local black population[113] As part of a larger project of re-photographing places appearing in VanDerZee images, Cameron's photograph preserves the contemporary replacements of the restaurant: a White Castle and Church's Chicken. The image comments on contemporary dining culture in Harlem while engaging in a visual dialogue with a historical dining culture in Harlem.

As part of the same postcard cycle as Guerrier's postcard, Kira Lynn Harris' *Lenox & 125th* (2003, *Harlem Postcards* Winter 2004) shifts the scene one and a half blocks to the east. [Figure 33] Instead of a clear document of businesses along the roadway, Harris' image shows the speed of the intersection described by her title. Moving traffic is blurred; headlights on cars appear as extended lines of neon luminosity. However, it becomes clear that it is not just traffic that is moving, but the photographer herself. Otherwise static elements such as buildings, light posts, and hanging traffic signals, are also made indistinct by the artist's own active passage though the intersection. Pedestrian movement and visibility along the street provides the central theme for Jeremy Kost's *Boulevard of…* (2009, *Harlem Postcards* Summer 2009 series). [Figure 34] Preserving the relative image dimensions of Kost's usual Polaroid practice—the photograph reproduced on the postcard occupies a reduced square of space with the rest of the image framed by a white border—the work shows the drag queen Erica Tour Aviance walking west on 125th Street.[114] The figure turns around mid-walk to acknowledge the photographer, rehearsing the familiar idea of the nineteenth century European spectacle of the city as a place to see and be seen. The parallel to Paris and fashionable culture is made explicit in Kost's artist statement for the project in which he describes 125th Street as the "Champs-Elysees of Harlem."[115] Updating the trope of the flaneur, or perhaps the flaneuse, Kost moves with the object of his study,

observing both her and other spectators in the city, presenting the roadway as an urban stage set for performances of self and identity.

Rather than depicting the street itself, Yara El-Sherbini's *Given Directions* (2009, *Harlem Postcards* Spring 2010 series) uses municipal street signs as a stand-in for the roadway. [Figure 35] El-Sherbini shows the intersection of 125th Street and 6th Avenue, complete with the designated alternative names for each. The municipal sign for 125th Street is positioned above another sign announcing the retitled name of the street as Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard. Mounted to the same post and posited perpendicular to these first two signs is a second set of signs. Rather than declaring 6th Avenue, these two additional signs show successive generations of retitling: the first, the renaming of the roadway as Lenox Avenue, after the nineteenth century collector and philanthropist James Lenox; and the second, the more recent renaming of the same roadway as Malcolm X Boulevard. Thus in El-Sherbini's photograph, the street itself is literally marked as an intersection of different local histories.

A subset of postcards featuring 125th Street can be formed out of those that use the street as a visual point of entry into the neighborhood. Building upon and reinforcing the idea of 125th Street as Main Street, 125th Street is used as the place from which messages to the visiting public are transmitted. Rather than an obvious entryway positioned at the perimeter of a territory, in this case the entry in this case is relocated to the center of the territory.

With the photographer's lens directed towards existing marquee messages, the postcard image itself serves as an announcement of greeting to the viewer. For example, Larry Mantello's *Welcome To* (2007, *Harlem Postcards* Spring 2008 series) presents an illuminated sign declaring "WELCOME TO 125 TH ST" set against a darkened night sky. [Figure 36] The phrase stretches across the full horizontal length of the postcard, with each letter of the sign comprised of sets of

light bulbs. A variation of this message is offered in Berni Searle and Candice Breitz's contributions to *Harlem Postcards*. Searle's *DSC000123.JPG* (2007, *Harlem Postcards* Spring 2007 series) shows a crowd lined up for the public funerary viewing of singer James Brown's body. [Figure 37] Crowds fill the sidewalks and are set behind metal police barricades to prevent them from spilling into the street. However, rather than showing the Apollo Theater, in which the memorial service was held, Searle's photograph isolates the section of the crowd in front of the Victoria 5 Theater (formerly the Loew's Victoria Theater and Movie Center 5) at 233 West 125th Street. The former movie theater site is half a block east of the Apollo Theater, located at 253 West 125th Street. Rather than solely focusing on the crowd, Searle's photograph is centered on the marquee of the theater. Above a sentence recognizing the passing of Brown, the marquee proclaims "WELCOME TO HALREM USA." The juxtaposition of sentiment aside—one of condolence, the other of celebratory greeting—the marquee welcome message is the more permanent of the two, appearing in Breitz's *Welcome O Harlem* (2005, *Harlem Postcards* Spring 2006 series) one year prior. [Figure 38] Breitz focuses on the marquee exclusively: instead of the west-facing message board shown in Searle's postcard, it is the southern and thus central marquee space that Breitz features. Across the three stacked horizontal rows of plastic letters, the message "WELCOME TO HARLEM USA" was installed. However, the "T" of the second word has fallen, transforming the message into the title of Breitz' postcard. The effect is a refocusing of the audience receiving the message. Rather than welcoming a visiting audience, as is the message conveyed in Searle's image, now it is Harlem itself that is being addressed with "WELCOME O HARLEM USA."

Rather than documenting lax signage maintenance, Breitz's photograph announces the arrival *of* a neighborhood instead of simply an arrival *to* a neighborhood. This arrival can be

expansively, but not inappropriately, understood as a reference to the contemporary “arrival” of Harlem into the age of urban gentrification, and the related “arrival” as a destination deemed acceptable to a moneyed middle class public.

To revisit the objectives of the Studio Museum’s “Picture Harlem” program in the context of this discussion, the question posed by and to the museum staff was what defines a visual experience of contemporary Harlem culture. A presentation of 125th Street as speaking to and for Harlem begins to address this question. However, 125th Street as a material environmental site is more than a transportation thoroughfare across the region, assemblage of architectural forms, and system of structural support from which messages are sent. Once 125th Street-as-Main Street is treated as both an entry to and center of the neighborhood, the social and cultural practices sited along the street informs a greater Harlem identity as well. Thus, a more fully dimensional record of 125th Street entails addressing such practices, namely, the commercial and consumer activities that equally define this central corridor. The visualization of these practices, and the museum’s subtle position adopted in relation to these practices, is more fully examined in the next section.

Selling 125th Street

Commercial culture features prominently in the *Harlem Postcards* photographs taken along 125th Street. In the Studio Museum’s representation of the business practices along 125th Street through *Harlem Postcards*, practices in which the museum has at least a partial vested interest due to its location, the often-tense historical relationship between “official” storefront retailers in Harlem and licensed and unlicensed street vendors along the roadway gives the appearance of resolution. The *Harlem Postcards* showcase both storefront and sidewalk culture, not discriminating between official licensed retailers and those operating independent of both

permanent structures and city-granted permits, in order to suggest a commercially vibrant Harlem as a visually diverse, object-filled place. Beyond providing a visual exploration of Harlem, these postcard images adopt a middle ground in the debate between storefront and sidewalk retailers, while also tacitly encouraging an economic investment in Harlem through an emphasis on saleable goods and thriving commercial practice.

125th Street has historically served as the centerpiece of the Harlem economy, supported by not only brick and mortar stores but also temporary table and sidewalk displays.[116] The resultant corridor of street vendor and peddler displays along 125th Street in Central Harlem has been discussed as a geographically transplanted African street market.[117] Other less generous accounts have referred to the marketplace as a "massive outdoor illicit bazaar."[118] Even before the influx of West African immigrants to Harlem and its sidewalks in the late 1980s, for decades 125th Street played host to sequential arrangements of stall, table, and blanket displays filled with goods sold by a predominantly black population.[119]

In the present, through the sale of foodstuffs, small electronics, books, newly released films, ethnically-specific, brand label, and generic clothing, small figural collectibles, domestic utilitarian objects, and incense and scented candles, the sidewalk culture along 125th Street defines an almost total sensory experience of the place. The visual, auditory, and olfactory impression generated through the pedestrians' encounter with the vendors lining the perimeter of the sidewalk closest to the street and the racks of merchandise spilling forth onto sidewalks from the storefronts lining the other side of the same sidewalk create a distinct regional impression. A 1991 editorial in the *New York Amsterdam News* argued that the street vendor culture within Harlem served as an expression not simply of a general Black culture but of a quintessentially Harlem-specific culture.[120]

This historical lineage combined with these kinds of identity claims have only exacerbated the ongoing regulatory problem that the place of vendors within Harlem, and along 125th Street in particular, has posed for city officials. Not only serving as visual and economic competition to the storefronts in front of which the have stationed themselves, sidewalk vendors have provided competition to the urban reimagining and reimaging plans throughout the previous several decades. However, *Harlem Postcards* groups together both sidewalk vendors and storefront merchants as mutually contributing to s roadway and neighborhood identity requires, in part, a recognition of the depth of hostilities between the two parties over the past half century. It also entails a resolution to treat these often-polarized groups as nevertheless mutually contributing to a distinct regional visual culture. Each group—licensed sidewalk vendors, occasional unlicensed peddlers, and storefront business owners—creates a population of public characters that Jane Jacobs credited with comprising and managing the street-level diversity and a local specificity of everyday life.[121] More recently, in his study of sidewalk vendors, Mitchell Duneier has argued for understanding these vendors and their merchandise as comprising the visible traces of a set of mostly invisible social dynamics governing of a greater sidewalk culture.[122] By focusing on the merchandise, *Harlem Postcards* and the Studio Museum do not just intervene into these social dynamics.[123] The postcard images put forth a selective image of Harlem commerce and thus a selective image of Harlem: remade by masking competing interests and underlying tensions and setting forth an indiscriminate abundance of stuff.

Since the 1960s, complaints leveled against the vendors by local residents and businessmen included the vendors' playing of loud music, encouraging overcrowding and loitering on city sidewalks, and the leaving of refuse and debris littered about the sidewalks and streets. These were distilled into a more concise complaint of a general disruption of "official"

business practices. Street vendors created an extra source of competition, particularly when selling identical wares at often less expensive prices than the permanent storefronts in front of or near which they set up. This has led to petitions filed with community boards to create “vendor free zones” and specifically designated marketplaces for vendors.[124] On the other side of the debate, licensed and unlicensed vendors have complained of decades of mistreatment by police and city officials. Levying of steep fines, arrests, temporary and permanent confiscation of merchandise, and destruction of merchandise brought on by increased police crackdowns in the 1980s continued for these vendors through the early 1990s. Although not denying the need for the regulation of vendor practices and the need for greater dialogue between vendors and local fixed-site businesses, vendors and representatives were unwilling to cede full regulatory autonomy to city agencies.[125]

Greater municipal in quality-of-life policies in the 1980s and 1990s, combined with the parallel-running gentrification policies discussed earlier in this chapter, contributed to the creation of community board-sponsored regulation programs including the allotment of temporary venues within Harlem for the sale of goods by licensed vendors and a multi-year construction project for a permanent, indoor marketplace created on 125th Street.[126] However, mismanagement of the site combined with its inadequate scale for meeting the number of vendors to be accommodated resulted in both the 125th Street sidewalk economy and the related tensions associated with it persisting.[127]

These tensions would come to head under the Giuliani mayoral administration. On October 17, 1994 police cleared 125th Street of illegal vendors. Giuliani’s targeting of vendors was not restricted to 125th Street but was rather a citywide initiative.[128] The October raid on 125th Street resulted in the estimated removal of close to one thousand street vendors, the arrest of

twenty-two people, and the confiscation of property of many of those displaced.[129] An editorial in *The New York Times* published several days after the October raid provided an analysis of the situation: while the sidewalks of 125th Street were, at least for the moment, clear to pedestrians, the absence of a once familiar community presence was palpable. The attraction of 125th Street as a culturally distinct place within New York City was perceived as being put in jeopardy. The loss of sidewalk vending entailed the loss of a critical component of street life for the uptown region. Concern was raised that the eradication of the familiar vendor culture that, for the author of the editorial, had become crucially constructive of an experience of 125th Street in Central Harlem could potentially put future pedestrian traffic and tourist visitation to the neighborhood in question.[130] In the decade following the raid, vendors slowly returned to the region despite unannounced police removal still remaining a persistent threat. Even more recent sweeps and removal actions along 125th Street attest to an ongoing legal and visual marginalization of independently operating street vendors, both licensed and unlicensed.[131]

Among a number of the Studio Museum's *Harlem Postcards* one finds vendor culture not just present but also compatible with the idea of a contemporary Harlem. Often shown without reference to specific addresses, the images featured on the postcards suggests a general merchant culture that is most readily associated with but not necessarily geographically confined to that found on 125th Street. Through its sponsorship of the project and promoted circulation of the images, the museum's curatorial staff serves as an otherwise invisible (and perhaps even unintentional) mediator between different competing economic interests in the region. This is noteworthy, not only for the vision of the Harlem as a commercially vital place that is advanced but also because of the museum's own history of having an uneasy relationship to the commercial sidewalk culture located immediately outside of its walls.[132]

Since the first exhibition cycle of *Harlem Postcards,* photographs presenting sidewalk merchandise have been featured. These include vendor displays of cellophane wrapped books, carved fruit from food carts, tables of bottles of perfumes and scented oils, canisters of different brands and scents of incense, and compilation album track lists printed on brightly colored paper.[133] Alternatively, views of and through the windows and entryways of storefronts businesses are also frequent postcard images. Featured have been shelves of brightly colored products, the neon sign of a nail salon, window advertisements for an Internet café, a window display of cake shops, racks of brightly colored belts, and pet store signage.[134] [Figures 39, 40, and 41]]

Some postcards have shown the spilling over of the contents from the stores into the space of the sidewalk, such as Barkley L. Hendricks' *Harlem's High Heel Heaven/4 pairs for $20* (2008, *Harlem Postcards* Fall/Winter 2008/2009 series). [Figure 42] In Hendricks' image, rows of women's shoes are displayed in front of two large windows for a store selling women's clothing, perfume and jewelry. In the window display, shoes are sparingly presented and thus barely visible among the other goods, with greater focus pulled to the bare-footed leg of the display's mannequin, pointing outward from the store. This posed gesture draws the connection between the two spaces of commerce, without necessarily implicating the store in a nefarious take-over of public space. Instead, offered is a diverse yet orderly arrangement of goods, available for both looking and purchasing, and unifying the space of the sidewalk and the space of the store.

In addition, Zoe Strauss' *Furniture Store on 125th Street* (2007, *Harlem Postcards* Fall/Winter 2007/2008 series) places the viewer fully within the space of the retail store, crouched down so as to be at eye level with the top of a pink and white dresser. [Figure 43]

Between the viewer and the dresser is a mattress, the lower level of a two-tiered bunk bed set. The rest of the store is filled with diverse styles of lamps, other single pieces of furniture, framed works of art, and posters taped to the store's walls. Despite facing into the store and away from the street, 125th Street is nonetheless present in the image. In the lower right quadrant of a mirror resting on the dresser is a burst of daylight. The intensity of the light reflected through the window makes the world outside the store difficult to decipher. 125th Street is present yet uneasily decoded.

The partial access to the street offered by Strauss' image becomes—perhaps indirectly—emblematic of one broad purpose of *Harlem Postcards*, a purpose that extends beyond mollifying tensions between storefront and sidewalk merchants. A focus is placed on the otherwise mundane domestic goods for sale along the regional commercial corridor, thus suggesting an identity for the corridor through an object-based portrait. The objects are both the goods for sale and the postcards themselves. The neighborhood is not fully defined by a single postcard. Each artist's contribution offers a fragment of the region, with a more total view constructed by the viewer cognitively piecing together the visual fragments.

The question remains: what is the result of this accumulated vision offered by these kinds of images? In part, the creation of a visual directory can be linked to Anselm L. Strauss' classic discussion of mass media promotional content directed at urban travelers. Strauss' focus—that of Anselm, not Zoe—was on the promotional images published in glossy travel publications. These photographs accompany "fairly factual" articles designed to excite the mind of the potentially unfamiliar urban visitor to a given places unique offerings: those "local, different, or interesting" elements that construct a reputation for some unknown urban locale.[135] As Strauss explained, "The city which is to be the traveler's destination is not merely described; the traveler must be

promised, reassured, and directed." Conveyed are promises of "you will see" sight X or Y, and reassurances that unseemly—both visual and moral—elements will be hidden from view. These are then combined with clear directives, which, as explained by Strauss, include supporting verbal imperatives such as "'go,' 'do,' 'see,' [and] 'buy.'"[136] In the case of the above-described *Harlem Postcards*, the encouragement is to go, do, see, and buy along the streets of Harlem, now pictorially communicated without the textual additions.

Recently, Fatimah Tuggar's *Voguish Vista* (2012, *Harlem Postcards* Spring 2012 series) tackled the subjects of both the competition between small businesses and national corporations within Harlem and the competition between vendors and storefront businesses. [Figure 44] Brought together in a photographic montage of a window display, Tugger's inserted clothing from the West African clothing retailer Daisy's Fashion Designs into an American Apparel display. While American Apparel is located on 250 West 125th Street between 7th Avenue (or Adam Clayton Powell Jr. Boulevard) and 8th Avenue, Daisy's Fashion Designs occupies the space of two stalls at the Malcolm Shabazz Harlem Market at 52 West 116th Street between 5th Avenue and Lenox Avenue (or Malcolm X Boulevard).[137] Through its eliding of content, Tugger's photograph not only relocates the licensed vendor back to a position along 125th Street, but also provides the vendor with a more prominent and less precarious position through installation of the clothing within the storefront. While Tugger's work can be read as individually provoking a discussion about destabilizing power hierarchies,[138] a less antagonistic approach has been more typical of the full range of *Harlem Postcards* featuring commercial culture.

Featuring images of both storefront businesses and vendor offerings together, *Harlem Postcards* enacts a partial leveling of the tensions that exist between the two, creating a selective

and ameliorative vision of Harlem. Each postcard's image is given equal weight and distinctions between storefront, stall, and table, and between licensed and unlicensed, are blurred as a result. For the most part, individual shop owners and vendors are omitted from view (the most notable exception being Zefrey Throwell's *Free Nuts: Reinvesting in Harlem* (2009, *Harlem Postcards* Fall/Winter 2009-2010 series), showing a licensed roasted nut vendor and her cart on 125th Street). Instead the focus is on showcasing the street level object culture itself. This object culture is made representative of a visual and economic culture within which all is made equally available to be seen and bought. Sidewalk culture is offered as contributing the experience of Harlem as an exotic yet safe destination, with the defining characteristics of 125th Street commercial culture informing an impression of the rest of the region.

To understand the full extent of how such promises and reassurances are delivered by *Harlem Postcards*, it is important to consider that the postcard images are not fully free from additional supporting and reinforcing promotional content. The museum's encouragement to the viewer of the postcards to see Harlem differently is reliant on additional guiding material, analogous but not identical to the textual directions described by Strauss. As discussed at the beginning of the chapter, the postcards are on view in the museum's lobby, providing the museum visitor with a sense that these are "art" images rather than mere amateur snapshots, thus elevating both the image and the content contained within it. As also already discussed, the reverse of each postcard contains a short list of identifying information about the image—artist, title, date, the *Harlem Postcard* series from which it was originally issued—and the museum. Thus when circulated beyond the walls of the museum building, the postcard images are still given added weight of being a Studio Museum-sponsored art project rather than exclusively touristic media.[139]

However, there is yet another site of contextualized encounter to consider: the museum-published periodical *Studio: The Studio Museum of Harlem Magazine*. The reproduction of the postcards in the pages of the museum's semi-annual bulletin, itself a circulating promotional tool for the institution, provides another forum for encounter with the project. In recent years, the bulletin has come to resemble the kinds of glossy publications on which Anselm Strauss based his argument. The next sections of this chapter consider the publication's content and the place the *Harlem Postcards* have played and continue to within this content. Examining the articles and similar Harlem-centric photographic explorations published in *Studio* alongside the *Harlem Postcards* reveals a greater program of neighborhood reframing that informs not only the *Harlem Postcards* but the greater policies of the Studio Museum since the implementation of the "Picture Harlem" program in 2000.

The Studio Museum's *Studio*

The impact of the "Picture Harlem" program mission was felt in the simultaneously reconceived museum bulletin, *Studio: The Studio Museum of Harlem Magazine*. During its early years of operation, the museum published a quarterly newsletter. The newsletter had as its primary goal to inform about the upcoming exhibitions and programs housed at the museum. By the 1990s this effort took the form of a program calendar. In 2001, the newsletter was rethought as *SMHArts*, a single-color, vertically-scaled pamphlet. By the summer 2003 issue, *SMHArts* had been converted into a horizontally-scaled publication, increasing in the number of pages included in each issue while still a printed as single-color publication. In 2005, *Studio* was introduced as a more fully developed museum bulletin, resembling a full-color magazine. As Ali Evans, the editor in Chief of Studio observed, the renewed format of the periodical was conceived "a place for us to rethink our engagement with our visitors and the world at large."[140] Evans stated that it

acts as a "printed record of the work of today's artists and a space for creative expression" while it also "reflects the essence of the institution" after which it is named.[141] *Studio* is sent to museum members, fellow cultural institutions, as well as freely provided with the purchase of admission to the museum. Although initially operating on reduced schedule of new issues published three times a year (Spring, Summer, and Fall/Winter), recently the publication of *Studio* has been further consolidated to new issues appearing only twice a year (Summer/Fall and Winter/Spring).

The pages of the magazine often have served as a second exhibition site for the museum. In addition to summary overviews of current and upcoming exhibitions held at the museum, issues of *Studio* have offered excerpts of catalogue essays, photographs of gallery installation, and quarter-, half-, and full-page color reproductions of works related to or directly duplicating those featured in current exhibitions held in the museum's galleries. In considering the connection to *Harlem Postcards,* this duplication of exhibition sites becomes even more pronounced. From the first issue of *Studio* in 2005, series of *Harlem Postcards* have appeared in the pages of the bulletin. Unlike other exhibitions profiled in *Studio*, each series of *Harlem Postcards* is reproduced in full in the pages of the bulletin (as opposed to either an excerpted text entry or the presentation of a select number of representative images for each exhibition). Participating artists are identified along with color reproductions of each image. Thus formatted, the reproduction of the postcards in the bulletin approximates the gallery encounter with each *Harlem Postcards* exhibition. For example, although the artists' statements accompany the large-scale reproductions of the postcard images when displayed in the museum, these statements do not appear on the postcards themselves but they are printed alongside the reproduction of the images in the bulletin.

The effect is that of putting into circulation again an already circulating art project, but as a total exhibition. In moving from postcard support to periodical support, the use of an ephemera-based printed medium is maintained. There are, perhaps obviously, key differences between the two systems of circulation. The first difference concerns the content being circulated. The postcards exist as single entities in most situations. Consideration of souvenir collectors—or dissertation writers—aside, *Harlem Postcards* as postcards present individual images, able to be severed from the other photographs with which they were originally exhibited. This same separation does not occur when the *Harlem Postcards* are reproduced in the museum bulletin. A complete cycle of the *Harlem Postcards* is offered at once in such a context. In addition, when encountered within *Studio*, not only are individual postcards connected to the other three postcards of the cycle but they are also related to the rest of the text and image content of the bulletin.

Although articles detailing current and upcoming exhibitions are staples of *Studio* content, much of the bulletin's published content often trends towards being supportive of, rather than merely duplicative of, the museum's gallery offerings.[142]*Studio* has served as a space within which works from the museum's permanent collection and archival holdings can be reproduced and thus placed on view for the public through an alternative manner of circulation and audience engagement.[143] The bulletin has also been used for the publication of original visual and literary works, either inspired by or referential to the museum's holdings and exhibition offerings.[144] The result has been the use of the magazine as an extension of the museum's education and outreach programs: engaging an audience outside of the museum building through works not necessarily contemporaneously found in the museum building. This is particularly true of *Studio* content explicitly dedicated to showcasing Harlem.

Recent issues of *Studio* have featured series of photographic essays that seek to document the everyday physical realities of Harlem, supporting the institutional interest in presenting Harlem through "picturing" Harlem. Although the museum's institutional influence can be detected within these articles—as they appear in the context of the museum's promotional bulletin—the museum as a physical place is often not explicitly referenced in these photographic essays, similar to its omission from the *Harlem Postcards*' visual directory.[145] Thematically clustered, such essays adopt as their focus either highlighting a single visual or material form or a drawing a connection between the present and a historical time period. Examples of the former include: Felicia Megginson's "Franco the Great's Harlem Gates," Aric Mayer's "Harlem Exteriors," Lenard Smith's "Harlem Interiors," and Accra Shepp's "Islands of New York."[146] For the latter, examples include: a series of articles by John Reddick—"Madame Walker Didn't Live Here, Harlem Architecture After the Renaissance," "Future Designs on Harlem," and "A Voyeur's View from Langston's Block,"—as well as Cynthia Jones and Petrushka Bazin's "A Literary Walk Through Harlem, " a narrative and visual tour of local "literary landmarks."[147] Inclusions such as Richard H. Rose's "Sugar Hill" series of eight Polaroids and "My Harlem" visually isolate specific neighborhoods within Harlem,[148] while photographer Kira Kynne Harris and novelist Brian Keith Jackson's "wePod.Harlem.Shuffle" traces a daylong journey throughout Harlem, punctuated by series of encounters with local residents, sites and experiences.[149]

Presenting content responsive to an experience of the Harlem nieghborhood has been a consistent interest of the publication. In addition to including both advertisements and feature articles highlighting Harlem businesses (often alongside advertisements and feature articles highlighting books and merchandise available in the Studio Museum Store),[150] the bulletin has also served as a space for both the documentation of a Harlem visual identity. In presenting these

articles and creative works, *Studio* offers its readership perhaps unfamiliar with the neighborhood surrounding the museum a chance to discover the greater both cultural and environmental context, informed by both major and minor urban visual inclusions. For those already familiar with the neighborhood, the publication offers a chance to discover locations and activities that have previously existed beyond their radar.

When *Harlem Postcard* photographs have been reproduced in *Studio*, they appear amidst this entire corpus of supporting material, mutually constitutive of this visual identity for contemporary Harlem. In the next chapter section, I offer a focused discussion of three Harlem-centric photographic essays that appeared in *Studio*. Commissioned by the museum staff exclusively for publication in successive issues the bulletin between 2006 and 2007, a series of three "hrlm" articles assigned the clear label of "the beautiful" to the everyday visual content of the neighborhood. By drawing together the parallels between these articles and *Harlem Postcards*, I locate the Studio Museum's most explicit presentation of Harlem aligned with the principles of the "new Harlem." Reading the *Harlem Postcards* alongside the "hrlm" essays—themselves serving as photographic collections in the publically circulating exhibition space of *Studio*—and the explanatory introduction to each of the three essays, makes more clear the way in which the museum has participated and continues to participate in a qualitative charting of space. Rather than presenting objective documents of the contemporary moment, the museum's promoted image directory of the millennial Harlem is revealed as part of a rhetorically inflected, photographic program of urban beautification.

Beautiful Harlem

As discussed in the previous section, rather than secondary offerings by the museum because of their display outside of the confines of the gallery, the three photographic essays

appearing in *Studio*—"hrlm: beautiful people" in the Summer 2006 issue, "hrlm: beautiful places" in the Fall/Winter 2006/2007 issue, and "hrlm: beautiful things" in the Spring 2007 issue—functioned as exhibitions in support of a greater institutional program. Rather than encountered in the walls of the museum, these three additional "hrlm" exhibitions were presented as printed, circulating exhibition content in their own right. The name of each photographic essay came from a series of programs created by the museum under the *hrlm* banner, the most public manifestation being the exhibition *hrlm: pictures* (July 20 to October 23, 2005), discussed earlier in this chapter. In general, *hrlm* was conceived as a greater program of museum-sponsored activities: a "series of Harlem-specific, site responsive exhibitions and projects that investigate and observe the breadth of the community through the work of contemporary artists."[151]

I propose that the meaning encouraged by these three photo-essays was even more ideologically determined and focus than that of *hrlm: pictures*. This was accomplished not only with the already-discussed context provided by the rest of the articles in *Studi*o but also by the inclusion of the adjective "beautiful" to not only frame but also qualify the photographs. In the chapter section that follows, I am not attempting to assign an evaluative judgment to the photographs (i.e. my interest is not in proving or disproving if these are in fact beautiful people, places, or things), but rather to indicate how these three articles enact a rhetorical visual reframing both comparable to and in support of that demonstrated by *Harlem Postcards*.

Similar to the process involved in each commission for *Harlem Postcards*, for each of the three photo-essays, an artist was invited to create a series of photographs recording different aspects of Harlem. Rather than being displayed in the museum or made into a takeaway photographic postcard, the three photographic essays appeared in *Studio,* formally mirroring the presentation of *Harlem Postcards* when reproduced in the bulletin. Each photo-essay spanned

between five and six pages within the bulletin and was introduced with a slight variation of a stock paragraph composed by editor in chief Ali Evans. Within each paragraph, the name of the contributing artist was mentioned along with a broad framework guiding both the photographer's investigation of the neighborhood and the resultant images. For "hrlm: beautiful people," this read:

> Nothing says more about the character of a community as it evolves in this world than the faces of its people—at a specific time, a specific place. We invited artist Jayson Keeling to turn his lens to contemporary Harlem to capture the essence of this ever-changing neighborhood. As you see, and as you already know if you live here, the people in Harlem are beautiful.[152]

For "hrlm: beautiful places," this read:

> Public places and private spaces converge to create what Harlem Is today. Images of our landscape and images in our neighborhood show us what Harlem has been, what it is now, and what we can expect to come. We invited artist Aric Mayer to turn his lens to contemporary Harlem to capture the essence of this ever-changing neighborhood. As you see, and as you already know if you live here, the places in Harlem are beautiful.[153]

For "hrlm: beautiful things," this read:

> Like the beautiful people and places that create the vibrant energy known as Harlem, things—objects that remind us of everyday life—also tell us a story, reminiscent of the past and hopeful for the future. We invited artist Eric Henderson to turn his lens on contemporary Harlem to show us some of the things that makeup the character of this neighborhood today. As you see, and as you already know if you live here, the things in Harlem are beautiful.[154]

The concluding phrase of each paragraph is meant to serve as a definitive evaluation of the different aspects of Harlem. As written by Evans, the people, places, and things in Harlem *are* beautiful: a declarative statement offered as an unchallengeable fact. The summary conclusion to be drawn across the three paragraphs, and thus the three articles, seems clear: if the people, places, and things of Harlem (thus covering the full spectrum of visible matter in Harlem) are

beautiful, then Harlem itself is beautiful. In a contemporary reworking of the 1960s and 1970s Black Power and Black Arts movements borne slogan "Black is Beautiful," the articles imply a declaration of "Harlem is Beautiful."[155]

Promotion of "Harlem is beautiful" has become an implicit part of the museum's programming, effectively aligning the "new Harlem" with the beautiful Harlem. As part of the "Picture Harlem" era, exhibition and program titles have asserted the label of "beautiful" to a visual culture of everyday items in contemporary Harlem.[156] Beyond the three "hrlm" articles, other *Studio* content has explicitly drawn attention to "beautiful" aspects of Harlem.[157] Just as programmed exhibitions and published bulletin content inform other exhibitions and content, the emphasis on showcasing "beautiful" Harlem extends to other contemporaneously-developed museum endeavors, even when the specific word is not explicitly ascribed to these projects. Such is the case with *Harlem Postcards*, in which the word "beautiful" does not appear in the standard introductory paragraphs accompanying each new cycle of the project.

The evidence supporting the museum's endorsement of "Harlem is Beautiful" is foremost visual evidence. To return to a point addressed earlier in this chapter, rather than banishing the messiness of everyday urban material culture in favor of conventions of urban beautification that are more keeping in line with those of previous generations, contemporary urban beautification in Harlem becomes not a process of deletion but of attention. The lens of the photographer captures these elements of otherwise ignored or decried elements of urban heterogeneity. Presented within the multiple layered contexts of an serial art project, an essay offered as evidence of "beautiful" elements, and sponsorship by the leading art museum in the region, these heterogeneous elements are both elevated and validated as worthy place-defining elements: worthy as defining not the identity of Harlem as a deleterious urban ghetto but rather the identity

of Harlem a vital city within a city, filled with a diversity of beautiful people, places and things. This is part of the new Harlem that exists alongside the new Harlem of luxury housing; that the museum offers not as opposed to but as uniquely complementary of greater large-scale programs of contemporary urban gentrification.

In the series of Evans-composed paragraphs accompanying the "hrlm" articles, noteworthy is the clause preceding the final statement. The two parts of this—"As you see, and as you already know if you live here"—simultaneously address two ontological processes. Confirmation of the truth of Evans' assertion of the "beautiful" Harlem is grounded in seeing the photographs and in seeing Harlem. The experience of both record of the neighborhood and the neighborhood itself would yield the same conclusion. The quality of the "beautiful" can be ascribed to and gleaned from both the environment itself and representations of this environment. In addition, the inclusion of "if you lived here" signals an additional pairing: the two audiences to whom the paragraphs are addressed. A residential audience would first hand experience of the neighborhood itself, while visitors to the Harlem require the recorded Harlem, a document once removed, to know the "essence" or character" of Harlem.

For "hrlm: beautiful people" Jayson Keeling presented thirteen portraits. [Figure 45] Most of them are of single figures, save for two photographs which show two people. These photographs alternate between interior and exterior settings. They show the subjects within domestic setting, workspaces, and leisure spaces outside the home. Ages vary from an infant, shown suspended in a swing in a public playground, to an older man standing on the sidewalk outside of the 136th Street community center. The figures are of different races and genders, and all but one look directly at the camera. Each photograph is captioned, providing the names of the subjects and their locations. Beyond this, no textual explanation is provided for why the

photographer has selected these seventeen people. The result is a tiled presentation of the various physical expressions of the local: presenting not only facial features and clothing choices of these figures, but also implicating settings as somehow belonging to these figures. Although some of the figures look more serious than others, none seem uncomfortable in their surroundings, with many adopting a relaxed pose as they stand, sit, and lean before the camera.

The following issue of *Studio* contained "hrlm: beautiful places" in which seventeen photographs by Aric Mayer were reproduced. Similar to Keeling's photographs, Mayer's were captioned with an interest in communicating a specificity of location. As opposed to Keeling's photographs, Mayer's show a Harlem evacuated of people. Although the traces of a population are apparent in the capture of residential buildings, commercial storefronts, church steeples, works of public art, and elements of urban detritus, the actual population interacting with these forms is absent. The human presence is made visible in only two photographs, and is nonetheless still displaced in each: *Monument, West 125th Street*, which shows Branly Cadet's *Higher Ground* (2005), a monumental bronze, stainless steel, and black granite memorial statue of Adam Clayton Powell Jr. installed in front of the Adam Clayton Powell Jr. State Office Building; and *Southern Fried Chicken, Convent Avenue*, in which only the shadow of a male figure is cast on the wall of the restaurant. Shadows consistently appear in the photographs, casting a somewhat unsettling visual presence over the images. This is also underscored by the repetition of geometric patterns throughout the works as well as the low vantage points from which the photographs are taken. Buildings seem to tower forebodingly over the viewer, municipal signage project overhead at dramatically acute angles, and fire escape grillwork and exposed brickwork that appear to go on without end.

However, rather than exclusively a visual demonstration of an urban uncanny, the photographs are offered as examples of the “beautiful places” of Harlem. Under this banner, the two photographs of construction sites are brought semantically together with the photographs of a flock of birds in flight and a patch of grass covered with leaves. The beautiful is assigned as a title unifying these disparate urban views. It also validates those views that would perhaps otherwise be dismissed as signs of urban blight. Mosaic tilework and gum-speckled pavement contribute to the aesthetic of a beautiful Harlem.

The final photo-essay in the series, “hrlm: beautiful things” presented ten of Eric Henderson’s photographs. [Figure 46] As a category, “things” is perhaps the most expansive of the three noun-identifiers. What qualifies as a “thing” entails a focus on objects, but similar to Keeling’s photographs, these are objects in an environmental context: they are objects in places. Although some of Henderson’s photographs can be described as static still life compositions, the overall theme is an literally dynamic object-based Harlem; a Harlem on the move. Henderson’s photographs thus serve as almost a summary overview of the previous two bulletin-based exhibitions, while also adopting a more expansive and almost more fanciful approach to the subject. A fruit stand, an electric crossing sign, the graffitied back of a bus: these are the wondrous objects to be discovered in Harlem. Transportation comes across as a dominant theme in the series: the aforementioned images of the exterior of the bus and crosswalk are joined by photographs of the Triborough Bridge, municipal traffic and street signs, and the legs, feet, and luggage of those riding the M60 bus.

This resistance to multiple kinds of urban stasis is summarized with the final of Henderson’s ten photographs. *sometimes beauty demands itself beneath the full moon* is a photograph of a handmade sign affixed to a chain link fence. Against a background of a full

moon sky and illuminated by an out of frame electric light, the sign reads “This community needs beauty not luxury housing.” With this overt reference to anti-gentrification sentiment, the photograph nonetheless points towards an alternative strategy of the new Harlem program. Setting beauty and luxury housing as diametrically opposed elements, the sign in the photograph—and the photograph itself—calls for a strategy predicated on beauty as having redemptive potential for the neighborhood. However, in the context of the photo-essay, as well as in the context of the series of three photo-essays, the class of things that comprise this category of “the beautiful” becomes something quite expansively delimited. The person on the street, the food vendor stand, Harlem infrastructure, and even a handmade sign all find places within these categories of the beautiful visual material that comprises the contemporary beautiful Harlem.

Using this tripartite category division of beautiful people, beautiful places, and beautiful things, and adding to this the expanded definition of what qualifies as “beautiful,” sheds light on the photographs of the *Harlem Postcards*. There are clear parallels between the content presented in the three photo-essays and that presented in the postcards. For example, among the “beautiful things” highlighted by Keeling is a basketball hoop in the photograph *off the glass at St. Nicholas Park* (2007). The image evokes similar basketball court photographs discussed earlier in this chapter: both Robert W. Johnson’s *Dream Rumble* and again “Expanding the Walls” participant Kareen Dillon’s *Waiting*. Keeling’s *no standing... except for Duke* (2007), an oblique view of a municipal signpost with a “No Standing” sign perpendicular to the West 106th Streets marker of “Duke Ellington Way” recalls the roadway signs of Yara El-Sherbini’s *Given Directions* and its highlighting of the trans-historical commemorative intersection of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard and Lenox Avenue/Malcolm X Boulevard. Similarities can be found

between Mayer's "beautiful places" of *Fire Escapes and Windows, Edgecombe Avenue* (2006) and "Expanding the Walls" participant Cheng-Jui Chiang's *Junction* (2007, *Harlem Postcards* Summer 2007 series), each presenting an upward view of a fire-escape clad building. Similar repetitions exist between Mayer's *Monument, West 125th Street* and Lan Tuazon's *Sky watch*, each featuring the public monument to Adam Clayton Powell, Jr.; and between Mayer's *Flock of Birds, West 119th Street* (2006) and Petra Lindholm's *Rare Bird* (2005) (*Harlem Postcards* Spring 2005 series) and Arnold J. Kemp's *[Them] Trees… [Them] Changes* (2009) (*Harlem Postcards* Spring 2009 series), with the former's bird-filled sky echoing the branch-perching birds shown in the latter two.

Beyond those cases of where a repetition of content can be identified, the noun-centric structure and qualitative evaluation provided by the series of "hrlm" articles can be applied to almost the full set of postcard images. A similar interest in the unassuming and quotidian matter of everyday life, now elevated as the stuff of regional aesthetic pride, informs the visual directory yielded by the museum's ongoing project. Starting with Anissa Mack's *After the Fact (Rachel and Renee Collins at RiteAid on 125th Street)*, from the inaugural series of the postcards, the representation of Harlem as a populated urban center has been a dominant theme. These include those postcards that offered both named and unnamed subjects.[158] For the category of Harlem places, *Harlem Postcard* artists turn their lenses to both commonly referenced landmarks as well as more unassuming Harlem locations. Beyond looking to 125th Street as a representative place-defining location within Harlem, a number of more narrowly focused locations have been featured. As with the images of the people of Harlem, the identity and locations of such places are offered with various degrees of clarity: often the caption of the image provides more functional indentifying information than the image content itself.[159]

There are *Harlem Postcards* in which the three subject categories bleed into one another, revealing what can best be defined as "thingly people" or "peopled places." Belonging to the former category are those images in which the identity of the featured person or people are negated through the photographer's intervention, rendering the figure or figures more closely belonging to an object world through close cropping or deliberate posing.[160] In the case of the latter category of "peopled places," the photographers' works identify specific Harlem locations (either in the image itself or through the caption) but identifies these as either lived in, worked in, or visited places. Local churches, sites of entertainment, and residences typify this category of photograph.[161] There are postcards that could best be defined as presenting "thingly places," in which a location is visually defined by either a single object or series of objects. In part, this is similar to the postcards already discussed in an earlier chapter section that call attention to the vendor and storefront culture that exist along 125th Street and throughout much of the Central Harlem area. However, there are *Harlem Postcards* that feature non-commercial settings as well, but still rely on an object culture to define a specific Harlem location such as the Apollo Theater and Trinity Cemetery.[162]

These kinds of typological divisions—people, places, things, and combinations thereof—are certainly artificial grouping strategies overlaid upon the set of postcards. Unlike the three *Studio* articles which declare their unifying subject as a title, *Harlem Postcards* offer no such clear organizing principles or analytic tools in either the planning overviews or the standardized introductory paragraphs the accompany each new iteration of the project. In addition, the qualifier of "beautiful" that additionally draws together the three articles as part of a continuous series is also omitted from discussion of the postcards. However, in drawing attention to the mirrored content between the two bodies of work—the *Studio* articles and the *Harlem*

Postcards—I seek to position the articles as serving as a similar but more overt demonstration of the museum's creation of a visual directory for and guided reading of contemporary Harlem than found in *Harlem Postcards*. If the series of articles with their repetitive emphasis on the "beautiful" and on clearly calling out to an audience comprised of both community residents and outsiders models something closer to the didacticism of REPOhistory (e.g. telling one's audience what to glean from the experience of the project), *Harlem Postcards* models something different. With an explicit explanation of purpose minimally indicated in the introductory text accompanying each cycle of the postcards, and individual artist's statements separable from the postcards once they are sent into circulation, the Studio Museum's project foregrounds a process of urban placemaking through showing (rather than telling).

It is not just a neutral recording of urban everyday life that is offered by *Harlem Postcards*. Across the range of contributions to the project, Harlem is not just diverse, but beautifully diverse; not just commercially productive, but non-antagonistically commercially productive. A quality of visual messiness is made into a positive attribute. As a collaboration between museum, artist, photographic subject, and the postcard viewer to see the image advanced, the project challenges socially constructed and accepted definitions of both the beautiful image and the beautiful place.[163]

It seems clear that *Harlem Postcards* marks another departure from the type of push back to regional gentrification enacted by the *Lower Manhattan Sign Project*. While the earlier project adopted a stance in opposition to the eradication of local variation across several neighborhoods of within Lower Manhattan, an opposition made known through the resiting of historical narratives amidst everyday places, *Harlem Postcards* features still extant variation while adopting more tempered response to change in Harlem. However, despite bell hooks' reading of

the identification of beauty in everyday objects as "an act of resistance in a culture of domination," the Studio Museum's project is one less of opposition to than of partial complicity with a gentrification processes already underway.[164] Rather than overtly proclaiming the validity of the "new Renaissance" in "new Harlem," the museum's programming after 2000 nonetheless adds support to a developing rhetoric of regional rebirth and a stabilized and sanitized community ready for future investment by new residents and commercial enterprises.

If viewed in isolation, the postcards present evidentiary fragments of the diversity within neighborhood. However, when viewed both collectively as part of an ongoing series of contributions and within the greater context of the "Picture Harlem" program, *Harlem Postcards'* advancement of the museum's position as regional mapmaker comes into focus. More than an agent of patronage, the Studio Museum qualitatively inflects the assembled archive of local imagery. The set of people, places, and things are curated as a circulating ephemeral public project. The postcards reveal themselves less as souvenirs and more as map-like objects or, more precisely, individual constitutive components a map-like object. Thus *Harlem Postcards* encourage a critical visual decoding of not only the literal content presented on each postcard but also the cartographer (the museum more than the individual artists) responsible for transforming a space of urban flux into a place of beautiful people, places, and things.

Another Local Investment

In concluding this study of the *Harlem Postcards*, I return to one of the postcards mentioned above. Discussed in the context of the chapter section of vendor culture along 125th Street, Zefrey Throwell's *Free Nuts: Reinvesting in Harlem* (2009) (*Harlem Postcards* Fall/Winter 2009-2010 series) is the one *Harlem Postcard* to clearly show a sidewalk vendor rather than just objects to be purchased. [Figure 47] One of the owners of a roasted nut cart,

located just west of entrance to the museum along 125th Street, is featured. This is Piyara, shown in profile, smiling yet absorbed in her work, seemingly oblivious to Throwell's camera. The cart occupies most of the image, with a label of "FREE NUTS" printed in red on the cart's metal frame. In line with the greater chapter discussion, this image could be characterized as one of the beautiful people, beautiful places, beautiful things or any combination therein of Harlem.

In explaining the process leading to the production of his *Harlem Postcard*, Throwell, a Brooklyn-based artist, wrote, "I am essentially a tourist to Harlem, I come, I buy a few things, and leave. I love it here, but I don't live here."[165] Rather than taking the stipend provided by the museum and spending it in Brooklyn or using it to further a separate project, Throwell used the commission to invest in the local Harlem economy. He combined the stipend with a separate private monetary donation and gave the total sum to the owners of the cart. However, this was not an act of charity. Instead, it was the first step of a larger exchange in which Throwell advanced a specific manner of use for the postcard.

Rather than indicating a questionable long term business plan or overt generosity by the cart's owners, the "FREE NUTS" printed on the side of the cart and prominently featured in the photograph signaled the second step of Throwell's project. Between November 12 and November 30, 2009, the first two weeks of the cycle of distribution for the Fall/Winter postcard series, postcards with Throwell's image could be exchanged for a bag of nuts from the cart. This "free" bag of nuts—in fact paid for by the artist in advance—could only be acquired by engaging in a series of actions implicating the photographer, museum, the museum visitor, and the museum's immediate surrounding environment. A series of interactions and behavioral expectations was levied upon the audience. One had to first enter into the museum, interact with museum staff (at the very least a front desk attendant to pay the required admission fee), view the

current on-view *Harlem Postcards* exhibition, read Throwell's directions included in his artist's statement printed next to the large print of the photograph mounted on the museum wall, leave the museum with the art project, and then interact with the vendor. In the end, for the cost of museum admission, the holder of Throwell's postcard temporarily received a pseudo-souvenir and a snack. The postcard and its provisional owner also temporarily bridged the space between the museum and the world outside its walls.

Looking at only the approximately two-week period in which these object-structured interactions occurred,[166] several possible related avenues of analysis emerge. As discussed earlier in the chapter, the postcard assisted in the museum-structured negotiation between sidewalk vendors and storefront owners (although, as a licensed cart operators, Piyara and her husband Miah would not be the conventional targets of ire from local businesses). Rather than relying on an exclusively image-based negotiation, Throwell's postcard enacted both a barter exchange (between the museum/museum visitor and the vendor in the form of the card to nut exchange) and a financial exchange (between the Throwell and the vendor in the form of the artist's stipend and additional moneys to nut exchange). For the latter, the museum ended up not only financially supporting the creation of a new work as part of their ongoing project but also indirectly financially supporting hyper-local Harlem businesses, and street vendor businesses at that.

In addition, the museum also became responsible for its visitors moving outside of the museum and engaging in a micro-exploration of Harlem. While the journey was limited—the distance from he doors of he museum to the cart is less than half a block—and the exploration was motivated by the promise of some sort of compensation upon reaching the targeted destination, there was nonetheless an act of a promoted and directed community discovery. In addition to the charted representation of Harlem assembled from the full corpus of *Harlem*

Postcards, Throwell's postcard directly encouraged its audience to move through Harlem, seeing and seeking the neighborhood in a potentially novel way. The impetus to move through space was certainly on a smaller scale than REPOhistory's itineraries but no less structured. With the Studio Museum designated as a hub from which directions were received and from which neighborhood exploration started, the project also provides a parallel to the New Museum's recent cartographic public projects discussed in the following chapter.

The next chapter returns to the southern end of Manhattan to look at placemaking strategies employed by the now Bowery-based New Museum in recent years. Whereas *Harlem Postcards* reflects an institutional sympathy towards commercial development in Harlem, the three projects of the New Museum demonstrate a more active institutional role played in regional development. Rather than REPOhistory's staunchly counter-gentrification platform or the Studio Museum's image- and rhetoric-based contributions to local gentrification, the New Museum drives a program of gentrification. In this program, the museum as both a placemaking sponsor and physical placemarking structure is located at the center the process of urban redevelopment. The generated mapped representation of a neighborhood is part of this process.

[1] In her artist's statement accompanying the display of her photograph in the museum, on the museum's website, and in the museum's bulletin *Studio: The Studio Museum of Harlem Magazine,* Crosher discussed her attention to the image archive generated by a decade of similar commissions by the museum to produce a photographic postcard. Highlighting the durational process undertaken in the documentation of a place, Crosher explained, "I decided to concentrate on the physicality of the existing postcard archive… Rephotographing the backs of the previous postcards brings physical attention to the past efforts to capture a photographic sense of Harlem…" More than an interest in an ephemera-based archival practice, Crosher's statement also reflects her engagement with the project's greater cartographic practice. Acknowledging her own geographically removed position from Harlem, Crosher's experience of the neighborhood is one informed by "documents of imaginings of Harlem that have come before me." As a result, for Crosher, Harlem exists as conjured "place I know only as an imaginary version of itself." "Harlem Postcards Summer 2012: Yasmine Braithwaite, Zoe Crosher, Moyra Davey, Lauren Halsey: Jun 14, 2012 – Oct 21, 2012," Studio Museum in Harlem, accessed August 1, 2012, http://www.studiomuseum.org/exhibition/harlem-postcards-summer-2012-yasmine-braithwaite-zoe-crosher-moyra-davey-lauren-halsey.

[2] Henry Louis Gates has identified this period as bringing about the fourth "African American Renaissance," a renaissance that is culturally connected to but not exclusively geographically fixed to Harlem. For Gates, the first such renaissance was the era of Paul Laurence Dunbar and Booker T. Washington at the turn of the twentieth century; the second was the more frequently referenced Harlem Renaissance of the 1920s; the third was aligned with the Black Arts movement and cultural nationalism of the mid-1960s through the early 1970s; and the fourth appeared in the late 1980s through the 1990s—he locates this contemporary renaissance as grounded in reconciling a black cultural legacy embedded within the place of Harlem as both myth and social reality. See Henry Louis Gates, "Harlem on Our Minds," *Critical Inquiry* 24, no. 1 (Autumn 1997): 1-12. The ongoing negotiation of the legacy of the mythic Harlem of the 1920s in the contemporary day is also a central subject in Monique M. Taylor's *Harlem between Heaven and Hell* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2002). As a related point, Lance Freeman described this recent neighborhood reprise occurring between 1980s and the mid-2000s as "most aptly described as a poor neighborhood experiencing the *process* of gentrification," rather than a fully-arrived "gentrified" neighborhood, and thus a renaissance in the making rather than a clearly delimited historical period or already completed event. Lance Freeman, *There Goes the 'Hood: Views of Gentrification from the Ground Up* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2006), 17-34.

[3] See Tatsha Robertson, "Harlem on the Rise," *The Crisis* (May/June 2005): 22-27 and Sharon Zukin, "Harlem Between Ghetto and Renaissance," in *The New Blackwell Companion to the City*, edited by Gary Bridge and Sophie Watson (Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011), 561-570.

[4] Thelma Golden, "of Harlem: an introduction," in *harlemworld: Metropolis as Metaphor*, ed. Thelma Golden (New York: Studio Museum in Harlem, 2003), 9.

[5] The honorarium was originally $1000, but that fee has since been reduced to $500 for each commissioned postcard.

[6] The sign's message—"Please Take One Postcard"—is ambiguous: one could infer that the museum is encouraging each visitor to take either a single postcard from a choice of the four postcards offered or, alternatively, one of each of the four postcards.

[7] Mary Beard, "Souvenirs of Culture: Deciphering (in) the Museum," *Art History* 15, no. 4 (December 1992): 505-532. For a more recent approach to Beard's consumer ethnographic research in museum souvenirs, see Emilie Cameron, "Exhibit and point of sale: negotiating commerce and culture at the Vancouver Art Gallery," *Social and Cultural Geography* 8, no. 4 (August 2007): 551-573.

[8] For example, seeing museum visitors approach a Felix Gonzalez Torres candy pour and then check with the gallery guard to see if they are in fact "allowed" to take one is a familiar sight to most frequent museum-goers.

[9] Carol Duncan, *Civilizing Rituals: Inside Public Art Museums* (London: Routledge, 1995), 7-20.

[10] Pia Catton, "Headed Uptown for a Harlem Renaissance," *Wall Street Journal,* March 7, 2011, A22.

[11] Margaret Olin, *Touching Photographs* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2012).

[12] The association of Harlem with the phrase the "dark ghetto" is most often linked to Kenneth Clark's 1965 sociological study. Clark's study is not an attack on Harlem in order to re-inscribe these stereotypes, but rather a study unpacking the economic, social, and psychological conditions that led to the demonization of urban and rural black communities in post-war American society and the ideological and real world ramifications of this kind of marginalization. Kenneth B. Clark, *Dark Ghetto: Dilemmas of Social Power* (New York, Harper and Row, 1965).

[13] For example, in 1966, the Museum of Modern Art's Junior Council initiated a proposal to establish a community museum in Harlem. This was part of a several similar projects to install satellite institutions throughout New York

City boroughs to address a perceived cultural neglect within underserved minority communities. In 1967, the Committee to Form the Harlem Museum was created independently, with its membership comprised of local youth community organizers within Harlem, wee-known black artists with ties to the neighborhood, and art establishment professionals from downtown museums. In addition, the Harlem Cultural Council was already offering its own periodic program of group exhibitions of local artists throughout the1960s in rented storefront spaces in Central Harlem (and specifically on 125th Street). Although without a permanent space, these exhibitions were proximally located to sites proposed by the other institutions, with one exhibition housed at 114 West 125th Street, the current site of the Studio Museum in Harlem. For more on the Museum of Modern Art's Junior Council and the Committee to Form the Harlem Museum, see Lisa Anne Meyerowitz, "Exhibiting Equality: Black-Run Museums and Galleries in 1970s New York" (Ph.D. diss., University of Chicago, 2001), 148-153 and 157-159; Andrea Alison Burns, "'Show Me My Soul!': The Evolution of the Black Museum Movement in Postwar America" (Ph.D. diss., University of Minnesota, 2008), 88-94; and Betty Blayton-Taylor et al., "'When That Time Came Rolling Down: Panel I' March 25, 1984" *Artist and Influence* VI (1983): 143-178. For Harlem Cultural Council exhibitions see, "Cultural Council Has Art Exhibit In Store," *New York Amsterdam News,* June 25, 1966, 24; Romare Bearden, "Art of American Negro on Exhibit in Harlem," *New York Amsterdam News,* June 30, 1966): 30; and Romare Bearden, "Art of the American Negro on Exhibit in Harlem," *New York Amsterdam News*, July 16, 1966): 46.

In addition, the Metropolitan Museum of Art's controversial *Harlem on My Mind: Cultural Capital of Black America, 1900-1968* exhibition has been linked to the emergent need to represent both local Harlem culture and national black culture at the end of the decade. Taking chronology into account, the exhibition itself could not have impacted planning discussions to create the Studio Museum, as the museum was already in open to the public for several months before the Metropolitan Museum of Art's exhibition opened. Curiously, this fact is often omitted from discussions of the divisive exhibition. However, it is likely the turbulent and almost immediate response to the exhibition would have informed, at least partially, exhibition and programming choices for the uptown institution (least of all in the Studio Museum's frequent presentation of James VanDerZee's photographs). See Steven C. Dubin, *Displays of Power: Controversy in the American Museum from the Enola Gay to Sensation* (New York: New York University, 1999), 18-63 and Bridget R. Cooks, *Exhibiting Blackness: African Americans and the American Art Museum* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2011), 53-85.

[14] Beyond Ault's inclusion of the Studio Museum in her narrative chronology of alternative spaces (as discussed in the Introduction of this dissertation) others are less willing to assign this characterization. Emblematic of this equivocation is Dennis Raverty's discussion of alternative art spaces established during the rise of the Black Art Movement. He initially refers to the Studio Museum as the "flagship organization in the alternative art space movement." However, Raverty quickly retreats from this characterization, determining that the conditions of its founding make it more appropriately "institutional than alternative." Dennis Raverty, "Alternative Exhibition Spaces for Black Artists in New York City During the 1970s: Towards a Partial History," *The International Review of African American Art* 22, no. 2 (2008): 43.

[15] "A Museum is Born in Harlem," *New York Amsterdam News*, September 21, 1968.

[16] This single long gallery space would ultimately be divided into two spaces: the East Gallery and the West Gallery.

[17] Alternatively, Eleanor Holmes Norton, the museum's then-vice-president, attributed the lack of a permanent collection not to space limitations but to a desire to rethink the concept of an art museum. In a *New York Times* article discussing the opening the museum, Norton states "When you have the vested interest of a collection you lose the desire to innovate… We're trying to do something other museums aren't. We want to show new work that the older establishments aren't on to. And of course that includes artists of all ethnic groups." This would be echoed in Campbell Wylly and Irene Gordon's summary presentation of the museum's mission in the Museum of Modern Art's 1969 *Members Newsletter*. They also discuss the lack of a permanent collection as intentional, signaling an institutional directive to showcase new work over developing an archive of works of the past. With a commitment to the contemporary and endowed with "the kind of flexibility that will permit an immediate response to events in the art world as they occur," the Studio Museum would highlight new cultural creations (emphasizing the "studio" part of the title). For the Norton quotation, see Grace Glueck, "A Very Own Thing in Harlem," *The New York Times,* September 15, 1968. D34. For Wylly and Gordon's essay, see Campbell Wylly and Irene Gordon, "New York's Newest Museum*," Members Newsletter* No.3 (January-February 1969): 2-3.

[18] Prior to occupying a museum building, the Studio Museum sponsored an exhibition of fifteen artists' works at the American Greetings Gallery in the Pan Am Building (now the MetLife Building) at 200 Park Avenue. *New Voices: 15 New York Artists* ran from March 11 to May 3, 1968. In attendance were artists, art collectors, museum officials from other New York institutions, and local politicians The artists presented represented a young generation of black artists living in New York: Benny Andrews, Emilio Cruz, Avel deKnight, Melvin Edwards, Reginald Gammon, Al

Hollingsworth, Emma Amos Levine, Tom Lloyd, William Majors, Earl Miller, Mahler Ryder, Raymond Saunders, Betty Blayton Taylor, Jack White, and Jacky Whitten. Several of these artists were involved with the Committee to Form the Harlem Museum and would continue to play a significant role in the planning and operations of the museum during its first several months and years. See "15 Artists Premier First Gallery Show," *New York Amsterdam News*, March 16, 1968, 7. For the first article announcing the shows in the museum space itself, see Grace Glueck, "Harlem Initiates First Art Museum," *The New York Times,* September 25, 1968, 40.

[19] In light of the emphasis placed on the museum's title as The Studio Museum in Harlem, I would argue that the attention to the name of the Committee to Form the Harlem Museum is also instructive. The article "the" becomes important, suggesting that the future museum will not merely be "a" space for exhibitions in Harlem, but will rather be "the" exhibition space within the neighborhood. Within the planning notes of this committee, it becomes clear that the museum is to serve as a local attraction: addressing neighborhood residents, those from other parts of the city, and those living outside of the city to Harlem.

[20] Committee for the Harlem Museum, "The Studio Museum in Harlem," (n.d.), 152, cited in Burns, "'Show Me My Soul!': The Evolution of the Black Museum Movement in Postwar America," 90. For a possible explanation for the selection of Tom Lloyd as the artist for the first exhibition, see Betty Blayton-Taylor, "Betty Blayton-Taylor," Interview with Halima Taha, *Artist and Influence* XVII (1998): 51-52. For more on Lloyd's exhibition, see also Julian Euell, "Julian Euell," Interview with Camille Billops, *Artist and Influence* XIX (2000): 73 and Kellie Jones, "To the Max: Energy and Experimentation," in *Energy/Experiementation: Black Artists and Abstraction, 1964-1980* (New York: The Studio Museum in Harlem, 2006): 17-18 and 23-26.

[21] This three-part program was publicly announced at the opening of *New Voices: 15 New York Artists*. See footnote 18 in this chapter. In 1976, the museum formally established its "Curatorial Council." This was initially a twelve-member committee of artists, curators, critics, and scholars. The Council's task was to recommend and review exhibitions and museum programs. Throughout its history this group included Benny Andrews, Elizabeth Catlett, Roy DeCarava, David Driskell, Adolphus Ealy, Jacob Lawrence, Norman Lewis, Richard Long, Merton Simpson, Hughie Less Smith, Charles White, and Hale Wooddruff.

[22] In setting up the museum as a hub capable of both reflecting a local culture and drawing artists to participate within this local culture, the museum created its Artist-In-Residence program in its first year of operation. Initially plagued by economic constraints, the first artists supported by the program were James Bernard and Leroy Clarke in 1973 (despite other reports indicating Leroy Clark and Valerie Maynard as the first artists to hold residency position). Once operation, the program offered studio space and financial assistance were provided by the museum. In addition, community outreach and education was engendered initially through allowing visitors into the artist's studio to watch the artist's at work. This interaction was further encouraged through the establishment of a program bringing artists into public schools to teach art. These programs thus fostered a reciprocal exchange of introductions: it not only brought artists to Harlem but also Harlem residents to the artists.

[23] The program was directed by Randy Abbott, a filmmakers and photographer. During the first year, Rodger Lawson served as a consultant. Starting in the mid-1970s, this program was supplanted by a jointly organized program between the Studio Museum and Peoples Communication Network Inc., a community communication organization. A series of thirteen-week video-production courses were offered at the museum guided by instructors from Peoples Communication Network Inc. Rather than a program designed for older teenagers, this program was open to any interested person or organization. In addition, the museum would begin hosting a series of art classes for adults and children. These courses provided instruction in drawing, painting, photography, and printmaking for a small fee. See "Video Workshop at Museum," *New York Amsterdam News,* July 16, 1975, D4 and Mel Tapley, "About the Arts," *New York Amsterdam News,* February 5, 1977, D10.

[24] Within its first year of operation, forty-five teenagers participated. By the early 1970s, the program was later formalized to a six-month course in film production.

[25] The films shown during the festival were *Black Girl* on November 21, *Still a Brother* on November 28, *Come Back Africa* on December 5, and *The Cool World* and *Rhodesian Count Down* on December 12. Dawson also organized a second festival in the early 1970s. Although the museum hosted and sponsored film screenings throughout the 1970s, formal film festivals of this nature were rare. In April 1980, it was announced that Dawson had returned to the Studio Museum and the museum plan its third film festival. The New York State Council on the Arts cosponsored this. It took place over the course of six successive Thursdays from April 3 to May 22, 1980. The festival was held in the second floor art gallery of the Harlem State Office Building. Similar to the first festival, the program offered independently produced black films and lecture presentations and discussions that followed the film screening. This third festival spurred on the development of the festival as an annual museum event. With the exception of a summer film series held in the late 1980s, I have been unable to track the occurrence of the museum

sponsoring a similar formal annual film festival after 1983. However, the museum would continue to sponsor and host several events in which films were screened. These were usually tied to exhibitions, holidays, or greater community events in which the museum participated (e.g. Harlem Week and Black History Month celebrations, for which the Studio Museum sponsored a series of film screenings for children). See Grace Glueck, "Less Downtown Uptown," *The New York Times,* July 20, 1969, D19, D20; "Studio Museum Announces Harlem Black Film Festival," *New York Amsterdam News,* November 15, 1969, 19; "Harlem Film Festival," *New York Amsterdam News,* November 29, 1969, 20; "Studio Museum Sponsors First Black Film Festival in Harlem," *Philadelphia Tribune,* November 29, 1969, 18; "Harlem Studio Museum Has Black Art Festival," *New York Amsterdam News,* December 6, 1969, 18; "Studio Museum's 6-week film festival," *New York Amsterdam News*, April 5, 1980, 28; Nelson George, "Studio Museum Film Festival," *New York Amsterdam News*, April, 26,1980, 27; Les Matthews, "Mr. 1-2-5 St." *New York Amsterdam News,* May 30, 1981, 5; "Studio Museum film festival zooms in on Africa's diversity," *New York Amsterdam News,* June 5, 1982, 31; "Studio Museum festival to promote filmmakers," *New York Amsterdam News,* February 12, 1983, 25; Mel Tapley, "Art comes in many forms: Dolls, paintings and..." *New York Amsterdam News* , March 10, 1984, 21; "Dr. King Film series," *New York Amsterdam News,* January 16, 1988, 21; Mel and Muse, "Around town," *New York Amsterdam News*, August 27,1988, 26, 29; "Harlem Week Festivities kick-off set for Aug. 4," *New York Amsterdam News,* July 29, 1989, 5; "African Film Festival and forum at SM," *New York Amsterdam News,* March 3, 1990, 25; and "Black History Month Community Calendar," *New York Amsterdam News,* February 6, 1993, 8.

[26] "Readies Exhibit of Art," *New York Amsterdam News,* November 9, 1968, 20. Beyond this advertisement, I have thus far unable to confirm if this exhibition ever came to fruition.

[27] Edward D. Spriggs, "Forward" in *Harlem Artists 69* (New York: The Studio Museum in Harlem, 1969), 3. This idea of Harlem as the "center of Black America" was in large part the result of Harlem's reputation as a center for black politics and culture that the uptown neighborhood held since the Harlem Renaissance of the 1920s, a reputation that it would continue to securely hold as a result of regions use as an incubator in the late 1950s and 1960s for black nationalist politics and aesthetics. See James Edward Smethurst, *The Black Arts Movement: Literary Nationalist in the 1960s and 1970s* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2005), 108-114.

[28] Edward D. Spriggs, "Forward," 3 and Theodore Gunn, "Introduction," in *Harlem Artists 69* (New York: The Studio Museum in Harlem, 1969), 5. In her analysis of *Harlem Artists 69*, Burns broadly reads the exhibition as a counter to the Metropolitan Museum of Art's *Harlem on My Mind* exhibition. However, the inclusion of artists not residing in Harlem is overlooked by Burns in her analysis, as are Spriggs' and Gunn's remarks on the exhibition specifically. Instead Burns' interest rests in examining the reception in the New York art press, specifically on Peter Schjeldahl's review in *The New York Times*. Burns"'Show Me My Soul!'" 198-201. More specifically linked to Harlem as a specific place was the exhibition *Resurrection* (November 15, 1970 to January 31, 1971) which presented the works of the Harlem-based collective Weusi-Niyumba Ya Sanaa. The Weusi Artists group formed in Harlem in 1962. They established the Nyumba Yu Sanaa Gallery in Harlem in 1967 and in 1969 the group became a full cooperative, a change accompanied by the renaming of the group Weusi-Nyumba Ya Sanaa. They occupied a significant public presence in the community, sponsoring an annual Harlem Outdoor Art Festival throughout the decade. This presence though would exist often separate from the Studio Museum's showcase of the collective's works.

[29] Carolyn A. Bowers, "Museum a Project of Its People," *Los Angeles Times*, June 20 1971, T57-T58.

[30] Ed[ward] Spriggs, "Executive Director's Report," *Studio Museum in Harlem Newsletter* 1, no. 2 (April 1974): n.p. A non-exhaustive list of such organized and hosted exhibitions include: *Invisible Americans: Black Artists of the '30* (November 10 through November 26, 1968, later extended to January 5, 1969), *Afro-Hatian Images and Sounds Today* (February 14 to March 30 1969, later extended to April 6, 1969), *The Black Panthers: A Photographic Essay by Ruth-Marion Baruch and Pirkle Jones* (1969); *Ben Jones and Joe Overstreet* (November 5 to November 23, 1969), *Africobra* (June 21, 1970 to August 30, 1970), *Impact Africa* (January 25, 1970 to April 19, 1970, later extended to June 30, 1970), *Black Artist in Graphic Communication* (September 6 to September 27, 1970),[30] *All Praises Due I* and *All Praises Due II*; *The Prevalence of Ritual* (July 16 to September 30, 1972), and the establishment of the "Black Masters" series in September 1971 which offered exhibitions about Elizabeth Catlett, Palmer Hayden, Hughie Lee Smith and Richmond Barthe.

[31] Prior to Studio in the Streets, there were other Harlem-based mural programs underway by artist collectives. From 1968 to 1970, the Stackhouse Group created murals. Comprised of William T. Williams, Melvin Edwards, Billy Rose and Guy Garcia, the group completed a series of abstract murals in collaboration with local youth. The goal was a physical transformation of the environment. This in turn would motivate a subsequent social transformation.

See Michael Oren, "The Smokehouse Painters, 1968-1970," *Black American Literature Forum* 24, no. 3 (1990): 509-531.

[32] Other locations included walls at the corners of 126th Street and Fifth Avenue, 128th Street and Fifth Avenue, and 128th Street and Madison Avenue. The title of this program varies in the newspaper records from 1971. It is first introduced as "Studios in the Streets," although the title of the article in which it first appears refers to it as "Studio in the Streets." In addition, within the article, Edward Spriggs refers to the program as "Street Studios." Further complicating matters, a subsequent article calls the program "Studio-in-the-Streets." "Studio in the Streets" *New York Amsterdam News,* August 14, 1971, B3 and "In the galleries," *New York Amsterdam News,* September 18, 1971, B13. See also Didnda McCannon, "Didnda McCannon," Interviews with Camille Billops and Myrah Brown Green, *Artist and Influence* XXII (2003): 113.

[33] In March of 1971, the museum announced the creation of a new series of photography exhibitions: *One Apiece*. It was designed as a purchase exhibition: photographers each contributed one work apiece to the exhibition, with the understanding that the works would be sold and proceeds would go towards future photography exhibitions held at the museum. The photographers Roy DeCarava, Doug Harris, Charles Blackwell, and Louis Draper, all members of the museum's Photography Committee, organized the first, and possibly only, iteration of this program. They also contributed works, as did Bert Andrews, Anthony Barbosa, James Belfon, St. Clair Bourne, James Bourne, Ronie Brathwaite, Adger Cowans, Dan Dawson, Bilal Abdul Malik Farid, Al Fennar, Rey Francis, Fundi (Billy Abernathy), Bob Greene, Rufus Hinton, Leroy Lucas, George Martin, Jimmy Mannas, Herbert Robinson, Ed Sherman, and James VanDerZee.Works were sold for between twenty-five and thirty dollars.

A similar procedure would be carried out for the exhibition *Elizabeth Catlett: Prints and Sculptures* (September 1971 to January 9, 1972). For this exhibition, each of the prints and a number of sculptures on view were available for purchase. The works, as described in one review, were "reasonably priced—if not underpriced." Unmounted prints were sold for between forty and eighty dollars, with some large scale and more rare works approaching two-hundred dollars. The affordability of the works was intentional: it allowed for a cultivation of a class of moderate-income collectors, allowing for artists to increase the awareness of their work among a broader audience. As the same review noted, this also provided the opportunity for "average Black people [to] have a chance to take original pieces into their homes." The success of the exhibition—in both attendance numbers and sales of works—qualified the exhibition as "a landmark in the Museum's effort to penetrate Black awareness and taste." An earlier solo exhibition by Brooklyn-born black artists Vincent Smith held at the museum from September 21 to October 19, 1969 is also described as having works for sale. A brief article in *The New York Times* about the exhibition explains that prints of the artist's work were available for purchase at the museum. However at this point in my research, I am not yet able to gauge the extent of the sale of works or if the motivations can be considered comparable to that of the *One Apiece* the Elizabeth Catlett exhibitions. "Photogs Organize Exhibit," *New York Amsterdam News*, March 13, 1971, 6 and "Catlett show tops at Studio Museum," *New York Amsterdam News*, December 25, 1971, B8.

[34] One such ongoing program was "The Fine Art of Collecting." It was established under Courtney Callendar's directorship and initially jointly organized by Callendar, Clarke, Benny Andrews, and Harold Freeman. The first iteration of the program was in November 1976, with a second iteration in the form of a two day seminar program on May 7 and May 21, 1977. This then became a semi-regular Saturday seminar series, and ultimately an annual series by the end of the decade. The program brought interested collectors to the museum for a series of seminars and presentations. The goal was to foster patronage of black arts as well as foster a new class of black patrons for the arts, particularly by a local black community. See "Collect Art in Two Easy Lessons," *New York Amsterdam News,* May 7, 1977, D7; Barbara Lewis, "Art Insures… Survival," *New York Amsterdam News,* July, 23, 1977, D18; and "Learn how to collect art," *New York Amsterdam News,* April 4, 1981, 36. In an article written more than a decade after the first "The Fine Art of Collecting" program, Mel Tapley addressed the previous need for the program: "Things were so bad a couple of years ago that the Studio Museum had to tell Black folks that collecting art is worthwhile." Mel Tapley, "Are the affluent remembering the struggling artists?" *New York Amsterdam News,* November 12, 1988, 25. See also Meyerowitz, "Exhibiting Equality," 178-180.

[35] Under the directorship of Edward Spriggs, the seasonal holiday Kwanzaa program grew to an annual week-long celebration of activities for children hosted by the museum. The museum board decided such annual public holiday events could be used to "build goodwill and increase memberships." Activities included speaker presentations and storytelling sessions, jewelry making and craft workshops, films screenings, and parties. Although this extended event would ultimately be scaled back, the museum still celebrated Kwanzaa as a community event. For example, in 1984 the museum cosponsored a family Kwanzaa celebration with the New York Urban Coalition. Hosted in the museum on December 16, the afternoon program included a film, storytelling, and musical performances. In the

following years, the program was supplemented with a performance by the African dance ensembles Sabar Ak Ru Afriq and Kairaba as well. In 1987, additional holiday family programs were added. An Ornaments Workshop and a Paper Toys Workshop were held on December 12 and December 19 respectively and were sponsored by the museum's education department. "Children participate in traditional African Xmas," *New York Amsterdam News* December 30, 1972, D1; Jorge Aponte, "Audience at Studio Museum learns meaning of Kwanza," *New York Amsterdam News,* January 6, 1973, C5; Mel Tapley, "About the Arts," *New York Amsterdam News,* November 30, 1974, D16; Mel Tapley, "About the Arts," *New York Amsterdam News*, December 20, 1975; "A heap of Holiday happenings for children: Studio Museum," *New York Amsterdam News,* December 18, 1976, D20; "Kwanzaa at Studio Museum," *New York Amsterdam News* (15 December 1984): 26; "Studio Museum Activities," *New York Amsterdam News,* December 14, 1985, 29; " Kwanzaa at the Studio Museum," *New York Amsterdam News,* December 19, 1987, 36; "Celebrate Kwanzaa and the Holidays with the Studio Museum in Harlem," *New York Amsterdam News*, December 16, 1989, 34; and "Studio Museum gift-making," *New York Amsterdam News*, December 12, 1987, 30.

Under Callendar, the Studio Museum also sponsored the annual Lewis H. Michaux Book Fair. The fair is named after Michaux who operated the National Memorial African Book Store for four decades. The first annual fair ran from May 21 to May 22, 1976, and admission was free to the public. The fair offered displays of current academic and popular books alongside an exhibition of archival material, rare books, photographs and letters from Michaux's collection. A presentation program of authors reading from their works was also developed. In subsequent years the event expanded to three days. Activities also grew to included the awarding of prizes named after Michaux to prominent authors such as Ishmael Reed, Toni Morrison and Amiri Baraka, symposia coordinated with the Harlem Writers Guild, and film screenings at satellite locations. Mel Tapley, "About the Arts," *New York Amsterdam News,* May 15, 1976, D6; Les Matthews, "Mr. 1-2-5 Street," *New York New Amsterdam News,* May 22, 1976, A3; Mel Tapley, "About the Arts," *New York Amsterdam News,* July 10, 1976, D8; "Michaux Fair set to bloom," *New York Amsterdam News*, May 6, 1978, D1; "Studio Museum Lewis Michaux Book Fair," *New York Amsterdam News*, May 24, 1980, 44; and "Lewis H. Michaux Book Fair at Studio Museum," *New York New Amsterdam News,* June 20, 1981, 34.

As demonstrated by these newspaper accounts, this ongoing programming of these events challenges assertions made by Meyerowitz—and later recited by Campbell—in their dissertation studies of the Studio Museum. In explaining the ideological, museological, and curatorial differences between Mary Schmidt Campbell and her predecessors, Meyerowitz pointed to Campbell's discontinuation of the Kwanza and Book Fair activities "because she thought they were unrelated to art museum programs." This conclusion occurs within a greater discussion of Campbell's desire to professionalize the museum while turning away from an institutional identity tied to a politically restrictive form of black nationalism. However, it appears that such celebrations were held not only through but also beyond Campbell's tenure at the museum. Meyerowitz's conclusion was unsupported in her text: a footnote crediting an interview she conducted with Campbell as her source of information was ambiguously placed in the context of Meyerowitz's discussion of several points about Campbell's leadership at the museum. In her later study, Burns parroted Meyerowitz's claims of the cancellation of the celebration and the reasoning behind the cancellation even in spite of trying to suggest a more nuanced reading of the association between the museum and its engagement. See Meyerowitz, "Exhibiting Equality," 186 and Burns, "'Show Me my Soul!'" 258.

[36] Lowery Stokes Sims, at the time a curator at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, curated the exhibition (although Callendar has been attributed with initially conceiving of the exhibition). In connection with the exhibition, evening lecture and discussion sessions were organized on a series of successive Wednesdays. Topics included issues contemporary governing public housing, tenant rights and contributions to housing services, and the rise of Harlem artist spaces. "Studio Museum Traces Black N.Y. Housing," *New York Amsterdam News*, April 30, 1977, D21 and "About Where We Live," *New York Amsterdam News,* May 21, 1977, D10.

[37] "Studio Museum Gets New Director," *New York Amsterdam News,* July 26, 1969.

[38] The museum's perception of its surrounding neighborhood was revealed in grant proposal applications during this period. In a 1993 proposal sent to the Greenwall Foundation, the museum provided a brief overview of its history. In the section describing its institutional profile and reputation, the proposal states, "With its base in Harlem—a community with one of the richest cultural histories in the country—the Museum has steadily built a reputation for the breadth, depth and excellence of its programs. That reputation has been all the more remarkable given the limited resources of a community in which promise and despair are in constant struggle." The language is telling: Harlem is a place with a praiseworthy rich cultural history but presently faced with limited resources—and despair-worthy limitations at that—in the contemporary. "Proposal to The Greenwall Foundation from the Studio Museum

in Harlem"; undated [1993]; Greenwall Foundation Archive; MSS 336; Box 32; Folder 9; Fales Library and Special Collections, New York University Libraries.
[39] James P. Murray, "Fifth Ave. Culture At the Studio Museum… Is Richly, Uniquely Harlem Style," *New York Amsterdam News*, August 3, 1974, D12-D13.
[40] A 1974 *New York Amsterdam News* report on the proposed relocation cites the museum's desire to acquire a recently abandoned YWCA building on West 125th Street and suggests that acquisition was of the property was, at the time, immanent. Ibid.
[41] Founding trustee Betty Blayton Taylor also resigned from the board at this time. This was also accompanied by the firing of Daisy Voight as the museum's Director of Public Relations.
[42] Artist Nil Ahene Mettle-Nunoo publicly requested to withdraw his etching *Arrow of God* from the museum's permanent collection "as a result of self-evaluation in relation to the present intentions of the Museum's Trustees." Mel Tapley, "About the Arts," *New York Amsterdam News,* August 6, 1977, D13.
[43] Clarke's support for the 104th Street site was motivated by his conviction that such a location would put the museum closer to other Museum Mile locations. This would open up the museum to a greater mainstream art-going public. This was interpreted as many as a "white" art audience, a claim that Clarke did not specifically deny. He argued that his interest was in accessibility across racial lines, suggesting that even in its current location the museum was struggling to attract even a local black population. Clark clarified what kind of black population he wished to attract though with his declaration that in its current location the museum "can't even get the three B's—the beautiful Black bourgeoisie." "Studio Museum Relocation Stirs Controversy," *New York Amsterdam News,* June 25, 1977, D2.
[44] Clarke challenged this point as well, applying Callender's own arguments to the current museum site, declaring "No one wants to come up there. The place is dying." "Studio Museum Relocation Stirs Controversy," D2.
[45] Benny Andrews, representing both the museum's Artist Committee and his position as head of the Black Emergency Cultural Coalition, stated "Any Black museum belongs in the heart of the Black community serving its residents. That's the function of an institution like the Studio…We don't say it shouldn't move to another site, but the move should be in the Black community. We oppose any suggestion that it move out of the Black community and the 104 Street site is on the fringe." Ibid.
The Black Emergency Cultural Council was more supportive of a move to 145th Street than Callendar. The organization sent a list of six demands to the Board of Trustees. These first was "The Studio Museum in Harlem remain located in central Harlem." Given the alternative between 104th Street and 145th Street, the latter was supported as geographically more appropriate. Offered as well was moving the museum near to the proposed site for the new Schomberg Black Research Center at 135th Street. The other demands pushed for a review of museum policies, both executive and financial. Charges of improper use of power by Clarke and mismanagement of the museum finances were leveled against the institution. "What's Happening to Studio Museum? A Wise Move for the Studio Museum – Or a Devious Ploy," *New York Amsterdam News,* July 9, 1977, D1.
[46] Although institutional division brought about by the location debate had ended, the museum was not without internal tumult over the next several years. In the first six months of 1981, a number of museum staff members resigned and were fired, three members of the Board of Trustees members and another three members from the board's finance committee resigned, and a termination lawsuit was filed against the museum. Speaking as Chairman of the Board of Trustees, William Pickett III attempted to diminish the negative publicity of such concentrated staff dismissals, stating "I personally do not desire to lose effective trustees for any reason, but persons resign for a variety of reasons—professional, personal, sheer physical exhaustion—and over matters of policy. This is to be expected—indeed, if we all agreed on everything, I'd be bored to death—it's stimulating and energizing to disagree without being disagreeable." Pickens himself would resign from the position of Chairman of the Board of Trustees just two months after making this statement (although he would remain a board member). Mel Tapley, "Harlem's Studio Museum makes steady progress," *New York Amsterdam News*, June 27, 1981, 27. See also Leroy Jefferson, "Turmoil at Studio Museum," *New York Amsterdam News*, May 2, 1981, 3.
[47]Following the announcement of their plans to adopt the new building, the museum contracted The Harlem Urban Development Corporation to redesign the façade of the building. However, the gift of the building did not fully solve the museum's operational problems. Estimates placed the cost of renovating the building between $800,000 and $1,400,000. Ultimately absorbed within a greater $1.6 million capital campaign. Although the museum was initially responsible for independently raising the money to cover these expenses, significant funding was sought from the Urban Development Action Grant program and the Ford Foundation. "The Studio Museum: N.Y. Bank for Savings give Studio Museum," *New York Amsterdam News*, October 27, 1979, 28-29; "Harlem's cultural mecca," *New York Amsterdam News*, October 27, 1979, 37; Cathy Chance, "Two Black artists remembered," *New York*

Amsterdam News, November 3, 1979, 20; "N.Y. Bank for Savings gives Studio Museum," *New York Amsterdam News,* November 3, 1979, A10; and Simon Anekwe, "Funds for the 125th Street mall up to Carter," *New York Amsterdam News*, November 17, 1979, 2.

[48]Aside from preparing gallery and office spaces within the building, several sites within the new building were created for the purpose of raising revenue for the museum: for example, a souvenir gift shop and print shop, a concession stand, and a commercial gallery. The new gift shop had a separate opening on December 3, 1982. Lest this be deemed a minor institutional event, the museum organized a special members-only preview of the gift shop two days earlier.

[49] Cathy Connors, "Studio Museum—an aesthetic wonder," *New York Amsterdam News,* June 26, 1982, 61.

[50] Mary Schmidt Campbell, "The Studio Museum in Harlem: A Perspective," *New York Amsterdam News*, August 7, 1982, 36.

[51] There appear to be several inaccuracies within the timeline she provides. For example, the film and photography workshop is included as starting between 1971 and 1973, despite, as already shown, it was operational even prior to the museum's occupation of its first gallery space. Also, she sets the start date of the "Fine Art of Collecting" series in 1978, despite its first meeting occurring in 1976.

[52] Mary Schmidt Campbell, "The Role of the Arts in a Time of Crisis," in *Artistic Citizenship: A Public Voice for the Arts*, eds. Mary Schmidt Campbell and Randy Martin (London: Routledge, 2006), 29.

[53] The museum's Co-operative School Program (alternatively referred to as the Cooperative School Program) began in 1974 under Callendar and would continue under Campbell. It was designed, in part, to counteract the effects of a recent decision by the Board of Education to remove music and art education from all New York City elementary schools. Initially, the program entailed the museum working with District 5 schools, but would eventually include Districts 6, 9 and 10. As part of the program, the museum contracts artists to spend between fifteen and eighteen weeks in district classrooms. For approximately six hours each week, the artists provide instruction in drawing and painting fundamentals to the students. The program culminated in an annual exhibition of some of the students' works. These exhibitions were held in different community locations, although not always within the museum itself. In 1984, the program was expanded. As a result of a $12,000 award by the David M. Winfield Foundation and a $12,600 award by Bankers Trust Company, the museum initiated the a new program: the David M. Winfield/Bankers Trust Company Search for Excellence at the Studio Museum in Harlem. Under this, the original program was restructured. It was now expanded to include four humanities workshop sessions, led by writers, to supplement the artist-led instruction. During this period, the program also sponsored exhibitions of student art, including a 1979 in-house gallery show and a 1983 show held at Con Edison Harlem's Customer Service Branch Office at 32 West 125th Street.

[54] Mel Tapley, "About the Arts: Studio Museum: committed to present, honors past" *New York Amsterdam News* December 3, 1977, 41. Five years later, Campbell would define what she meant by this in the introduction to the msueum's first permanent collection exhibition. She wrote,

> On the basis of the current collection, the Museum could become a major center for the study of the 100-year history of Black photography. Another area of anticipated growth is 18th and 19th century painting. Contemporary art, especially The Harlem Renaissance of the 1920s, the WPA of the 1930s and '40s, and post-World War II contemporary art, the period which has witnessed the most activity among Black artists is an area of current strength and will be an area in which [the] Studio Museum expects to have no equal. Black American folk art from slavery to the present, Caribbean (especially Haitian) and African, traditional through contemporary are areas of anticipated growth.

Mary Schmidt Campbell, "Introduction: The History of Collecting at The Studio Museum in Harlem," in *The Permanent Collection of The Studio Museum in Harlem Volume I 1983* (New York: The Studio Museum in Harlem, 1982), 5-6

[55] Mary Schmidt Campbell, "The Studio Museum in Harlem: A Perspective*," New York Amsterdam News,* August 7, 1982, 36.

[56] This was *Gifts and Promised Gifts: Selections from the Studio Museum in Harlem's Permanent Collection along with Proposed Acquisitions: Selections from The Countee Cullen Collection on loan from Mrs. Ida Cullen* (June 19 to September 11, 1983), framed as an opportunity to publically consider the future of the museum as a collecting institution. In addition to attending to the acquisition of individual works, the museum asserted its belief in the value of purchasing full, already assembled collections. The Countee Cullen Collection served as a model of such a collection, with works from it interpolated into the holdings of the museum for the exhibition. However, even before

moving into the new building, the museum was involved in developing a permanent collection of works for Harlem. This collection was just not to be an in-house collection for the museum. In 1976, Senator H. Carl McCall the Harlem State Office Building Committee on Arts and Culture announced the allocation of $180,000 for the development of a Harlem Art Collection, later known as the Harlem State Office Building Collection. The collection would be dedicated to works "reflecting the Black and Hispanic experience." $130,000 of the $180,000 was allocated by the New York State Office of General Services. The remaining $50,000 was to be raised through contributions by private donors. The initial $130,000 had been available for three years, allocated for a similar but ultimately unrealized project, and had been all but forgotten about before McCall's discovery of the sizeable allocation. A panel of artists, art-professionals, and community cultural leaders would determine acquisitions. Purchases would be officially designated as being made by Office of General Services of the State of New York. By November 1977, the committee acquired over one hundred works from sixty-five local artists. This collection in large part mirrored the exhibition interests of the Studio Museum: artists included Hale Woodruff, Norman Lewis, Jacob Lawrence, Palmer Hayden, Elizabeth Catlett, Richard Mayhew, Joseph Delaney, and James VanDerZee. The Studio Museum was selected to act as the primary caretaker for the collection, with responsibilities including cataloguing, framing, and inspecting the condition of each of the works. The museum and its staff were also tasked with arranging exhibitions of the collection. Exhibitions would be mounted at both the museum and other regional community museums and galleries, as well as ultimately in a permanent space within the Harlem State Office Building. The first formal curator of the collection was Terrie S. Rouse, who was appointed to the position in 1979. She would be joined by Patricia Moman Bell to also serve as a curator for the collection. In July 1980, the first exhibition of the collection in the Second Floor Gallery of the Harlem State Office Building was installed. Following this, the museum staff continued to serve as "curatorial consultants" for the collection. Mel Tapley, "$180,000 Grant to Buy Black, Puerto Rican, Art," *New York Amsterdam News*, October 2, 1976, A1 and "Another View on Community Art," *New York Amsterdam News*, December 4, 1976, D12; "Harlem Art Collection Saved!" *New York Amsterdam News,* August 12, 1978, D1, D7; "Appoint curator of HSOB," *New York Amsterdam News*, September 8, 1979, 40; and "Studio Museum opens show of Black Masters at HSOB," *New York Amsterdam News* July 5, 1980, 45.

[57] Developing from an interview conducted with Mary Schmidt Campbell, Lisa Ann Meyerowitz presents the decision to collect as guided by Campbell's training as an art historian, a continuation of the founding political position to establish a record of black cultural production, and a capitalization of the then-recently affordable availability of a number of high quality works by significant black artists. Mention of the direct impact of a facility to accommodate such a collection is absent from Meyerowitz's analysis of this moment in the museum's history. See Meyerowitz, "Exhibiting Equality," 185.

[58] When the new building opened in 1982, three exhibitions were on view: *Images of Dignity: A Retrospective of he Works of Charles White* (June 20 to August 31, 1982), *Ritual and Myth: A Survey of African American Art* (June 20 to November 1, 1982), and *Harlem Heyday: The Photograph of James VanDerZee* (June 20 to September 1, 1982). The exhibitions collectively chart a backwards looking view: White's social realism tackling the early and mid-twentieth century everyday black experience as its subject, a celebration of the legacy of interest in a mid-1960s Civil Rights Era-inspired interest in global black culture, and a heralding of Harlem during the Harlem Renaissance of the 1920s and 1930s. In presenting these three exhibitions and thus three historical moments together, the museum is positioning itself not only as the inheritor of a legacy of black cultural achievement but also as the keeper of the record of these moments.

[59] For the "Black Masters" series, retrospective exhibitions were dedicated to the works of Beauford Delaney, Hale Woodruff, and Edward Clark. For the "Artists in Mid-Career" series, Sam Gilliam and Jack Whitten were provided with more narrowly targeted shows. For exhibitions of offerings from the permanent collection, examples include 1986's *Contemporary Sculpture: Selections from the Permanent Collection* and the planning of 1988's *Treasures from The Permanent Collection: 1970-1987, Part I,* which would open under Campbell's successor, Kinshasha Holman Conwill. For the final category, the exhibitions *Tradition and Conflict: Images of a Turbulent Decade, 1963-1973* and *Harlem Renaissance: Art of Black America* were mounted by the museum in 1985 and 1987, respectively, with the latter becoming the longest running exhibition in the museum's history.

[60] For the twenty-fifth anniversary, this included a William T. Williams retrospective of twelve paintings and twelve works on paper created between 1973 and 1990. The presentation of the works of artist who was involved in the museum's founding exhibition year and works covering almost the full span of the history of the museum—creating an approximate although not identical chronology of the museum itself—served as an appropriate yet subtle marking of the passage of time. The museum also exhibited and toured *Studio Museum in Harlem: 25 Years of African American Art*, presenting forty-five works from the museum's permanent collection, including paintings, sculptures,

drawings, collages, and prints. Similar to the Williams retrospective, the works offered in the exhibition approximate the full inclusive chronology of the museum, then from 1968 to 1993. As signaled in the first half of this later exhibition's title, the exhibition attends not only art production during this timeframe, but also the museum's identity as a storehouse for this production. An extended program of exhibition spanning two years marked the thirtieth anniversary. During this time, the museum offered a combination of self-generated and hosted exhibitions covering similarly expansive ground. These included: *Normal Lewis: Black Paintings, 1946-1977*, *The Fine Art of Collecting African-American Art*; *To Conserve a Legacy: African Art from Historically Black Colleges*; and *African American Arts and American Modernism*.

[61] At an official ribbon cutting on December 14, 1993, the Studio Museum in Harlem Sculpture Garden opened, touted as the first of its kind in the uptown neighborhood. The Museum acquired the adjacent vacant lot on the east side of the museum building in 1984. Initiating a fundraising "challenge" with the City of New York, the museum raised $500,000 in private, corporate, and foundational donations. This was then matched equally by the city. A long-term lease containing an option to buy the property outright in the future was signed by the museum in 1989. The lot was developed according the designs provided by Fred Bland of Beyer, Blinder and Belle. The moneys generated were ultimately used for construction programs beyond the sculpture garden. The museum distributed the funds to support exhibition programs and the construction of an underground auditorium. For its thirtieth anniversary, the museum initiated a new multi-year construction project. Finished in 2003, the project entailed creation of several new galleries dedicated to presenting the permanent collection, an auditorium, a café, and a renovated façade. See Cathy Connors, "Studio Museum cuts ribbon opening its sculpture area," *New York Amsterdam News,* December 18, 1993, 8, and Emily M. Bernstein, "Neighborhood Report: Harlem: Sculpture Garden Rises on Rubble of a Vacant Lot," *The New York Times,* December 26, 1993, A5.

[62] Exhibitions included: the retrospective exhibition *Memory and Metaphor: The Art of Romare Bearden* (April 4 to August 11, 1991), *Jacob Lawrence: The Frederick Douglass and Harriet Tubman Series of Narrative Paintings*, *The Art of Archibald J. Motley Jr.* (April 12 – June 7, 1992), and *William H. Johnson* (July 15 – September 20, 1992). Discussing the neighborhood, Conwill stated that "Some of the most important cultural institutions in the world are in Harlem, —important artists are from here, come through or have been here, have been touched by Harlem in their training, background or experience." "Museum is 20 and Growing," *Newsday* (19 October 1987): 31. The *Newsday* article also does provide a troublingly selective editorial description of then-contemporary Harlem: "Harlem certainly touches the museum. The entry canopy extends over a sidewalk where street vendors offer socks and sweet potato pie. Shoppers brush through clothing and liquor stores nearby, while a fence next to the museum encloses some weedy puddles." Although the puddles are explained as part of a construction project in an adjacent lot—a future site of an outdoor sculpture garden for the museum—the impression presented is noticeably less inviting than the celebratory "beautiful" Harlem set forth fifteen years later and discussed at the end of this chapter.

[63] Although unnamed, this is most likely the then-forthcoming *Contemporary African Artists: Changing Tradition* which opened in early 1990. Mel Tapley, "Legislators support Studio Museum," *New York Amsterdam News,* May 7, 1988, 30.

[64] The "Vital Expressions in American Art" series was started in 1986 under Campbell's directorship.

[65] Arlene Edmonds, "African American Curators: Keepers of the Culture" *Philadelphia Tribune*, January 31, 1997, A12-A13, A18.

[66] This is the label assigned to the Studio Museum by then-Director Kinshasha Holman Conwill in her forward to the 1994 catalogue *The Studio Museum in Harlem: 25 Years of African American Art.* Conwill explains the label as intending to "signify a period of accelerated growth for the permanent collection" which had recently included the acquisition of several significant African American and Diaspora artists' works in honor of the museum's twenty-fifth anniversary." This moniker of the "Decade of Collecting" was repeated in curator Valerie Mercer's essay for the same catalogue. See Kinshasha Holman Conwill, "Forward," in *The Studio Museum in Harlem: 25 Years of African American Art.* (New York: The Studio Museum in Harlem, 1994), 5 and Valerie Mercer, "Twenty-Five Years of African-American Art from The Studio Museum in Harlem's Collection in *The Studio Museum in Harlem: 25 Years of African-American Art* (New York: The Studio Museum in Harlem, 1994), 6.

[67] Carol Vogel, "Inside Art" *The New York Times*, October 29, 1999, E36. This new team included Sandra D. Jackson-Dumoni and Christine Y. Kim. Jackson-Dumoni was appointed as the Director of Education and Public Programs in 2000. She left in 2006 to serve as the Deputy Director of Education at the Seattle Art Museum. Kim was appointed assistant curator at the Studio Museum in 2000, subsequently advancing to an associate curator position. She left in 2009 to serve as the associate curator of contemporary art at the Los Angeles County Museum of Art.

[68] In his article about the dual hire in *The New York Times*, Holland Cotter argued that the cause for great attention needing to be paid to appointments is attributed, in part, to both women's recruitment "from the very center of the art world," defined as The Metropolitan Museum of Art and the Whitney Museum of American Art for Sims and Golden respectively. Cotter states that the women bring with them "the glamour of high powered institutions elsewhere." Sims served as a curator at the Metropolitan Museum of Art leading up to her new appointment at the Studio Museum in Harlem, and would continue to serve as a consultant to the Metropolitan Museum. Golden "resigned" from the Whitney Museum of American Art in 1998 in response to a "curatorial restructuring." Holland Cotter, "Shaking Up a Harlem Museum," *The New York Times*, February 28, 2000, F1. See also Nancy Ann Jeffrey and Jen Bensinger, "Art & Money," *Wall Street Journal*, October 29, 1999, W16 and "Lowery Stokes Sims appointed director of the Studio Museum in Harlem," *New York Amsterdam News,* November 18, 1999, 5.
[69] Suzanne Muchnic, "Making the Case for the 'Post-Black' School of Art," *Los Angeles Times,* September 29, 2001, F1.
[70] This kind of personality-driven institutional appellation was assigned almost immediately upon the announcement of Golden's hiring. In 2001 a *Village Voice* profile about Golden titled "The Golden Age," Greg Tate characterized Sims and Golden as "performing not just a makeover but a resurrection" on the Studio Museum. Moving beyond the still in-progress renovations to the lobby of the museum, Tate addressed the ramifications of the hires, and Golden's appointment in particular. The new program for the museum was cast as steered by Golden, a "highbrow mackdiva of the first magnitude." In Lynda Richardson's *New York Times* profile on the curator from the same month, she described Golden as dynamic and adventurous in her actions as she is resolute in her thinking and drive. With equal column space given to her presence as a fashion plate as to her curatorial record, Richardson presented Golden as a force with which to be reckoned and impossible to ignore. See Greg Tate, "The Golden Age," *The Village Voice,* May 22, 2001, 49, 52 and Lynda Richardson, "The Art of Plunging In, Without Fear," *The New York Times,* May 1, 2001, B2. In Sarah Bayliss' analysis of the museum in December 2002 for *The New York Times*, despite emphasizing the impact that Sims has had on the museum, Golden's arrival looms large. Sarah Bayliss, "Where Art Can Be Made as Well as Hung," *The New York Times* December 8, 2002, A44.
[71] The development of both curatorial ideas and institutional support in the years between *Freestyle* and *Flow* is apparent in the catalogues produced for each of the three exhibitions. An increase in the number of artists and works included in each exhibition, as well as an increase in the number of catalogue essays, related increase in total length of catalogue, and elevated material quality of the publication, signals a related institutional growth during the decade. See *Freestyle* (New York: The Studio Museum in Harlem, 2001), *Frequency* (New York: The Studio Museum in Harlem, 2005), and *Flow* (New York: The Studio Museum in Harlem, 2008). Beyond these three "post-black" survey exhibitions, the museum organized similarly minded exhibitions in recent years. These include: solo exhibitions of contemporary artists such as Stephen Burks, Stan Douglas, Meschac Gaba, Barkley L. Hendricks, Kalup Linzy, Kerry James Marshall, Kori Newkirk, Chris Offili, Yinka Shonibare, Lorna Simpson, Kara Walker, and Kehinde Wiley; thematic group exhibitions such as *Black Romantic*, *Black Belt*, *African Queen, Africa Comics,* and *30 Seconds off an Inch*; and continued presentations of offerings from the museum's permanent collection as part of the *Collection in Context* and *Collected* series.
[72] Holland Cotter, "Shaking Up a Harlem Museum," F1.
[73] One of the first announcements of this was the Whitney Museum of American Art's awarding of the first Bucksbaum Award to Paul Pfieefer, a white artist represented by the Project gallery. Project was started by Christian Haye in 1998 as an uptown alternative to the Chelsea-based gallery world, taking advantage of less expensive real estate in Harlem. The gallery is located on West 126th Street. In 2001, the nonprofit gallery Triple Candle opened on West 126th Street. For an alternative and less laudatory analysis of the impact of this "discovery" of a contemporary Harlem art community, see Deborah Solomon, "The Downtowning of Uptown," *The New York Times Magazine*, August 19 2001, 44-47.
[74] Holland Cotter, "Shaking Up a Harlem Museum," F1.
[75] Ibid., F1.
[76] Holland Cotter, "Material and Matter," *The New York Times*, March 9, 2001, E36.
[77] The James VanDerZee photography archive is a collection of approximately 125,000 items, including photographic plates, prints, and negatives. The works of James VanDerZee have held a prominent place in the museum's exhibitions, dating back to the earliest years of the institution when the museum hosted the first major retrospective exhibition of the photographer's work from October 10 to November 14, 1971. The exhibition directly developed out the Metropolitan Museum of Art's *Harlem on My Mind* exhibition, often credited with the "rediscovery" of VanDerZee. The Studio Museum's retrospective exhibition spanned seventy years of the artist's career, showcasing approximately sixty-five works. A similarly expansive VanDerZee exhibition was hosted by the

museum six years later. Jointly sponsored by the Studio Museum and the James VanDer Zee Institute, *The Black Family Album* (September 12 to October 17, 1977) featured approximately one hundred panels of the family photographs. The Studio Museum gained custodianship of the archive from the James VanDerZee Institute in the summer of 1977. Prior to this, the archive was housed at the Metropolitan Museum of Art. Coinciding with the 1977 relocation of the archive, Reginald McGhee was appointed the curator of photography at the Studio Museum. In the late 1970s, VanDerZee himself also served on the museum's Board of Governors. However, in 1981, VanDerZee filed a lawsuit against the museum to regain personal custody of his work. The case was settled in 1984, with the VanDerZee estate reclaiming fifty-percent control over the archival holdings, with the other fifty percent divided between the Studio Museum and the James VanDerZee Institute. See Mel Tapley, "About the Arts," *New York Amsterdam News*, October 1, 1977, D13 and "Studio Museum tries to resolve VanDerZee matter," *New York Amsterdam News,* November 21, 1981, 65; C. Gerald Fraser, "Photographer Sues to Regain Works," *The New York Times*, December 29, 1981, C9; and Philip Shenon, "Van Der Zee Suit Settled," *The New York Times,* March 31, 1984, C21.

[78] In addition, although solo exhibitions part of a provisionally titled "Views from Harlem" series—provisionally intended to feature works by photographs such as Helen Levitt, Gordon Parks, and Weegee—did not come to fruition, the museum mounted *Aaron Siskind: Harlem Document* (October 15, 2003 to January 4, 2004) to coincide with the centennial celebration of the photographer's birth.

[79] "hrlm: pictures" *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Summer 2005): 3. In addition to VanDerZee's photographs, the works of Dawoud Bey, Gordon Parks, and Aaron Siskind were offered as supporting an "incredible nostalgia for Harlem's glorious past." These works were on view alongside more contemporary contributions, including photographs by Terry Body, Robert Johnson, Melinda Lewis, and Camilo Jose Vergara.

[80] "hrlm: pictures" *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Summer 2005): 3.

[81] As a literal example of the role of promoting the creation of new images of Harlem, the museum offered the family program "hrlm: Spell it With Pictures" to complement the *hrlm: pictures* exhibition. In this one-day event, held on October 1, 2005, parents and their children were invited to a tour the exhibition. Following the tour, and using the works on view as their inspiration, the museum's education staff guided the children in producing their own photographs.

[82] The family program was an addition to the initial "Picture Harlem" proposal. This program entails hands-on art making activities sponsored by the museum, as well as interactive guided tours of exhibitions on view in the museum and of sites around Harlem. The senior program, part of the original project proposal, pairs senior citizens from local senior centers with local high school students trained by the museum in conducting oral histories. These histories are inspired by and united to the images of a historical Harlem featured in the VanDerZee archive. The histories are then archived for inclusion alongside the VanDerZee photographs within the museum. For the youth program, local high school students participate. Rather than serving as the conduits through which another person's history is recorded, the students generate a document of the present state of Harlem as they see it through instruction in both the history of photography and technical training.

[83] Each cycle of the approximately eight-month-long student program is structured around both an interest in the history of Harlem street photography and a practical training in photography. Starting with the study of the VanDerZee archive and discussions of how different versions of a community can be communicated through choices in technique, subject matter, and composition, students are then trained in using a 35-mm camera. With camera in hand, the students then take their own photographs. Throughout the course of study, students also participate in local symposia both on and off site from the museum building, meet with local cultural figures including artists, author, and curators, and tour different neighborhoods of Harlem. This project culminates in an annual group exhibition of the students' photographs shown alongside selections from the VanDerZee archive, forcing a visual comparison between the past and present visual recordings of Harlem. Until recently, the students' work was developed exclusively as black and white photographs, creating an even more clear formal parallel to VanDerZee's photographs. Color and digital photography, video, and web-based documentation strategies have been slowly incorporated into the program over recent years.

[84] *Adjusting the* Lens was on view from July 16 to September 28, 2003, Reclaiming *the Beautiful* from July 20 to October 23, 2005, *Beyond Sight* from July19 to October 22, 2006, *Shift in Focus* from July 18 to October 28, 2007, *We Come with the Beautiful Things* from July 16 to October 25, 2009, and *Hi Res* from July 15 to October 24, 2010.

[85] Thelma Golden, Cover letter for Art for Art's Sake grant proposal, 7 February 2001. Copy provided by Lauren Haynes (Assistant Curator at the Studio Museum in Harlem) September 25, 2009.

[86] Recognizing that the schedule of artists is not always accommodating to an institution's seasonal exhibition programming, the proposal concedes that although the "presentation of the projects will coincide with our exhibition

calendar, we will produce the projects opportunistically and take advantage of the possibility of a project when an artist might be in NYC." Thelma Golden, "Harlem Postcards," February 7, 2001. Copy provided by Lauren Haynes (Assistant Curator at the Studio Museum in Harlem) September 25, 2009.

[87] Thelma Golden, "Harlem Postcards," February 7, 2001. Copy provided by Lauren Haynes (Assistant Curator at the Studio Museum in Harlem) September 25, 2009. Although a volume exclusively devoted to the postcards has not yet been produced, the museum published *Harlem: A Century in Images* in 2010. With an introduction written by Thelma Golden and essays by art historians Deborah Willis and Cheryl Finley and author Elizabeth Alexander, the book tracks a photographic record of Harlem from the 1910s to the present across over seventy photographs. It is in the final section of book, "Harlem Plays the Best Ball in the World," which contains photographs from 1969 to the present, that eighteen works from the *Harlem Postcards* series appear. These include *Harlem Postcards* contributions by Alice Attie, Candice Breitz, Tony Feher, Coco Fusco, Chitra Ganesh, Ellen Harvey, Barkley L. Hendricks, Chato Hill, Pearl C. Hsiung, Rashid Johnson, Lauren Kelley, Terence Koh, Ray A. Llanos, Glenn Ligon, Adia Millett, Dominic McGill, Acra Shepp, and Do-Ho Suh. In addition, photographs are included from local student artists who contributed postcards to the series as part of the museum's "Expanding the Walls" program and from professional artists who were commissioned to produce works for the museum's bulletin *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine*. These latter two programs are more fully discussed in the main text of this chapter. See *Harlem: A Century in Images* (New York: Skira Rizzoli International Publications Inc. and The Studio Museum in Harlem, 2010).

[88] A 2001 grant application describes this series of changes to the museum's mission. It states that, "In 2000, the mission of the Studio Museum in Harlem was revised to assert the following priorities: 'to exhibit collect, research and interpret the works of artists of African descent locally, nationally, and internationally. In 2001, the trustees expanded the mission to incorporate this addition: 'as well as the work that reflects the experiences of peoples of African descent.'" Within this rubric, the set of photographers initially proposed would fall into this final category, with photographs of Harlem fulfilling the category of work that reflects the experiences of peoples of African descent. Proposal to The Greenwall Foundation from the Studio Museum in Harlem; undated [1993]; Greenwall Foundation Archive; MSS 336; Box 32; Folder 4; Fales Library and Special Collections, New York University Libraries.

[89] Thelma Golden, "Harlem Postcards," February 7, 2001. Copy provided by Lauren Haynes (Assistant Curator at the Studio Museum in Harlem) September 25, 2009.

[90] The first postcard was Nicoletta Bumbac's *Harlem Salvation* (2004, *Harlem Postcards* Summer 2004 series), and was followed by Galina Mukomolova's *Cyclic Aspirations* (2005, *Harlem Postcards* Sumer 2005 series), Kareen Dillon's *Waiting* (2006, *Harlem Postcards* Summer 2006 series), Cheng-Jui Chiang's *Junction* (2007, *Harlem Postcards* Summer 2007 series), Alani Bass' *Pride* (2008, *Harlem Postcards* Summer 2008 series), Marley Gonzalez's *Scent of Harlem* (2009, *Harlem Postcards* Summer 2009 series), Tiara Hernandez's *Intriguingly Impetuous* (2010, *Harlem Postcards* Summer 2010 series), Genesis Valencia's *Hands with a Heart* (2011, *Harlem Postcards* Summer 2011 series), and most recently Yasmine Braithwaite's *Size of the Third World* (2012, *Harlem Postcards* Summer 2012 series)

[91] Other content parallels between the Expanding the Walls set of *Harlem Postcards* and the full set of postcards include: "Expanding the Walls" participant Kareen Dillon's *Waiting* (2006, *Harlem Postcards* Summer 2006 series), a photograph of an airborne basketball arcing towards a basketball hoop on a community court, which recalls Robert W. Johnson's *Dream Rumble* (2005, *Harlem Postcards* Summer 2005 series), an image of a building-mounted basketball hoop with a plywood backboard; and "Expanding the Walls" participant Marley Gonzalez's *Scent of Harlem* (2009, *Harlem Postcards* Summer 2009 series), a black and white photograph of the hexagonal caps of incense canisters sold by street vendors along 125th Street, which cues Rina Banerjee's *The scent that we will breath in the heavens* (2006, *Harlem Postcards* Spring 2006 series), a color photograph of a display of bottles of scented oils, which itself cues Kori Newkirk's *Notorious Finnest* image from the first cycle of postcards.

[92] As just a small sample of this attention paid to Harlem's real estate development between 1980 and 2000: Sheila Rule, "Signs of Harlem Rebirth Seen in Construction Spurt," *The New York Times,* March, 1, 1980, L25; Lee A. Daniels, "Outlook for the Revitalization of Harlem," *The New York Times,* February 12, 1982, A23; "$14.5 million arts project for Harlem," *New York New Amsterdam News,* January 21, 1984, 1; Robin Pogrebin, "Neighborhood Report: Harlem, Helping the Renaissance Ballroom Live up to its Name," *The New York Times*, June 18, 1995, 6; Carlyle C. Douglas, "For Some, City Auction of Houses is Chance to Come Home to Harlem," *The New York Times,* June 20, 1985, B1, B9; Carlyle C. Douglas, "149 Win in Auction of Harlem Houses," *The New York Times,* August 17, 1985, 46; Carlye C. Douglas, "The Brownstone Project in Harlem Raises Hopes and Fears," *The New York Times,* September 15, 1985, E22; Samuel G. Freedman, "Harlem and the Speculators: Big Profits but Little

Renewal," *The New York Times*, December, 19, 1986, A1; Lisa W. Foderaro, "Harlem's Hedge Against Gentrification," *The New York Times*, August 16, 1987, R1; Shawn G. Kennedy, "A Housing Renaissance Sweeps Central Harlem," *The New York Times,* August 27, 1989, R1 R9; "UDC approves $90 million to study Central Harlem developments," *New York New Amsterdam News,* August 24, 1991, 19; Shawn G. Kennedy, "New Momentum Builds on 125th Street But Business Still Struggles on Harlem's Main Thoroughfare," *The New York Times,* November 8, 1992, R1, R6; J. Zamgba Brown, "Renaissance Ballroom will be restored to old splendor," *New York Amsterdam News*, January 2, 1993, 3; Ian Fisher, "Street of Dreams: After decades of decline, 125th Street now pulses with life as a crossroads of black culture, commerce, and pride," *The New York Times*, April 11, 1993, V1, V9; "Abyssinian Corp. gets $500,000 to rehab Renaissance Ballroom," *New York Amsterdam News,* October 23, 1993, 20; Dan Barry and Jonathan P. Hicks, "Re-imagining 125th St.: With Harlem At a Crossroad, Visions for Economic Future Diverge," *The New York Times,* December 24, 1995, 1, 19, 21; David Dunlap, "Retailers Have Harlem on Their Mind," *The New York Times*, November 10, 1996, 1; Nina Siegal, "Can Harlem's Heritage Be Saved?" *The New York Times,* February 7, 1999, C1, C10; Alan S. Oser, "At Leonx and 116th, Co-ops and Stores are Rising," *The New York Times,* August 8, 1999, 7; and Nina Siegal, "Harlem on the Brink," *The New York Times,* September 26, 1999, C1.

[93] In the mid-1980s, foreclosed upon brownstones were auctioned by the city to private developers to generate a residential interest in "resettling" Harlem, a term which nodded to the recruitment of a rising population of middle class black investors in the traditionally minority neighborhood. The success of the initial auction of twelve properties in 1982 would lead to this program continuing throughout the decade and beyond. This set of black middle class investors is the same population that Henry Louis Gates targets as directly contributing to bringing about the contemporaneous fourth "African American Renaissance." For more on Gates' argument, see footnote 2 in this chapter. See also footnote 94 below for more on 1980s municipal gentrification in Harlem.

[94] In their 1986 analysis of the rise of gentrification in Harlem, sociologists Richard Schaffer and Neil Smith discussed how Harlem "represents a challenging obstacle for gentrification in New York City… a supreme test for the gentrification process..." With the stigma of "the dark ghetto" looming large over the region, investment in Harlem by a white middle class (often positioned at the forefront of urban gentrification practices) lagged behind similar New York City renewal projects. However, as Schaffer and Smith argued Harlem's location just north of Central Park and close proximity to a newly developing midtown Manhattan made future gentrification practices inevitable. Spurred on by the collaborative funding both by neighborhood, city, and national improvement grants, and by the relatively inexpensive property sale and rental rates offered by the neighborhood, property rehabilitation programs were untaken within Central Harlem in the first half of the 1980s. Schaffer and Smith observed that the purchasing of lots in Harlem most obviously departed from similar processes of gentrification in other Manhattan neighborhoods in that the recent private investors were most often black. See Richard Schaffer and Neil Smith, "The Gentrification of Harlem?" *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 76, no. 3 (1986): 347-365.

[95] See David J. Maurrasse and Jonathan Gill's analyses of the Upper Manhattan Empowerment Zone in David J. Maurrasse, *Listening to Harlem: Gentrification, Community and Business* (Routledge: London, 2006), 29-40 and Jonathan Gill, *Harlem: The Four Hundred Year History form Dutch Village to Capital of Black America* (New York: New Grove Press, 2011), 439-442.

[96] Michael Sorkin, "The Great Mall of New York," in *The Suburbanization of New York: Is the World's Greatest City Becoming Just Another Town,* eds. Jerilou Hammett and Kingsley Hammett (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 2007), 113-128, specifically 118-120. Frequently cited signs of a commercially gentrified Harlem include the early 1990s openings of Ben and Jerry's and The Body Shop, and the building of the Harlem USA shopping center and Magic Johnson's multiplex movie theater in the next decade, which occupied most of the block between 124th and 125th Streets and between Frederick Douglass Boulevard and St. Nicholas Avenue. These new presences encouraged the proliferation of lifestyle brand and apparel chain retailers, the first wave of which included The Gap, Old Navy, Modell's Sporting Goods, and the Disney Store, while American Apparel and H&M have been arrivals on 125th Street in more recent years. As the almost universally acknowledged announcement of the neighborhood's recent commercial transformation, Starbucks opened in 1999 on the corner of Lenox Avenue and 125th Street, with a second Starbucks following soon after just over a block away at the corner of Adam Clayton Powell Jr. Avenue and 125th Street.

[97] A recent flair up of these kinds of debates occurred with the 2008 rezoning of 125th Street to encourage greater future mixed-use development along the already busy thoroughfare. The entire rezoning program affected twenty-four city blocks, between 124th and 126th Streets from Broadway to 2nd Avenue. City officials cited: the construction of 125th Street's first new class A office building in several decades, the setting of new standard building height limits, provisions for affordable housing, building story placement of retail spaces, and the inclusion of art and

entertainment sites within new developments. However great public attention particularly that inspired by vocal opponents to the rezoning, was placed on how such changes would ultimately bring about another wave of exclusionary gentrification practices in Harlem. In particular the issue of building heights was viewed as a major transformation to the region. The previously mostly five-story high buildings that lined the roadway would now compete with potential new construction of residential and commercial towers reaching as high as nineteen stories. This kind of projective development was perceived by some to further push out longtime residents and business owners who would be out-priced by the increasing real-estate value along 125th Street, repeating patterns that had emerged as a result of the proliferation of new high-rise luxury housing developments in recent years throughout Harlem and other previously economically marginalized and socially stigmatized New York city districts.
For an analysis of the greater rezoning policies in recent years in New York City, of which the 125th Street rezoning was part, see Jarrett Murphy, "The UnPlanned City," *City Limits* 34, no. 6 (January 2011): 12-56.
[98] Maurrrasse, *Listening to Harlem,* passim.
[99] In the case of Harlem, this has been evident in the arrival of a number of small businesses and restaurants with Afrocentric and Harlem-specific names, a large percentage of which are run by entrepreneurs lacking a specific connection to Harlem: for example, Nubian Heritage, a cosmetics company and spa on 125th Street, and Harlem Vintage, a wine shop carrying products from minority-owned wineries. For more about these businesses, see Sharon Zukin, *Naked City: The Death and Life of Authentic Urban Places* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 63-94, in particular 84-87. For the limitations of such consciously scripted and materially-structured promotions authenticity, particularly when authenticity is predicated as much on race as it is on location, see Kwame Anthony Appiah and Amy Gutman, eds., *Color Conscious: The Political Morality of Race* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996); J. Martin Favor, *Authentic Blackness: The Folk in the Harlem Renaissance* (Durham, Duke University Press, 1999), and John L. Jackson, *Real Black: Adventures in Racial Sincerity* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005).
[100] Miriam Greenberg, *Branding New York: How a City in Crisis was Sold to the World* (London: Routledge, 2008) and Sharon Zukin, *Naked City: The Death and Life of Authentic Urban Places* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010).
[101] In addition to cultivating a thriving corporate commercial presence within Harlem, the Upper Manhattan Empowerment Zone allocated funding to the sponsorship of a cultural presence in Harlem. As part of a $25,000,000 Cultural Investment Fund, moneys were allocated to support the Harlem Strategic Cultural Collaborative. This collaborative agency was and is comprised of the Apollo Theater (and the related Apollo Performing Arts Center), the Boy's Choir of Harlem, the Dance Theater of Harlem, the Schomburg Center for Research in Black Culture, and The Studio Museum in Harlem, along with other local cultural organizations. Regarding the Studio Museum specifically, ongoing funding from the Upper Manhattan Empowerment Zone Development Corporation has supported several museum exhibitions, the redesign of the Studio Museum's website, and the realization of publications. Maurrasse, *Listening to Harlem,* 97.
[102] Sharon Zukin, *Naked City*, 86.
[103] There are two partial exceptions to this. The first is Sam Durant's *144 W. 125th St., Los Angeles, CA* (2006, *Harlem Postcards* Summer 2006 series). The artist uses the address of the Studio Museum and relocates this site across the country, photographing a Los Angeles roadway while standing in front of the comparable address. While the address of the museum may provide the impetus for the image, the resultant image bears little in common with the museum's actual location, thus avoiding to contribute to the same image archive of Harlem as most of the other *Harlem Postcards* do. Instead of the busy main thoroughfare of Central Harlem, the image presents a street mostly devoid of activity, lined with wood and barbed wire fences, and draped with power lines overhead. The second exception is Hank Willis Thomas' *Change gonna come* (2010, *Harlem Postcards* Spring 2011 series). Rather than the building appearing, shown in one of the seventeen tiled photographic fragments that comprise Willis' image is David Hammons' *African American Flag* (1990), which currently hangs outside the museum from a flagpole affixed to the museum's northern façade.
[104] See footnote 96 in this chapter.
[105] Clarke's text was not however the origin of the phrase "Harlem, USA." Clarke's title instead reflected an already used and potentially audience-specific familiar reference. As just one example, the 1946 Spencer Williams-directed film "Dirty Gertie from Harlem U.S.A." predates the publication of the anthology by almost twenty years.
[106] John Henrik Clarke, *Harlem, U.S.A.: The Story of a City Within a City* (Berlin: Seven Seas Publications, 1964). James Weldon Johnson's essay "The Making of Harlem" appeared in the March 1925 issue of the Alain Locke-published journal *Survey Graphic* (Locke served as a special guest editor for this issue of the journal; the journal was otherwise edited by Paul Kellogg). In the second paragraph of his historical survey of the origins and

development of a black Harlem, written as a defense for rights of the black population in the United States, Johnson described the conditions for what made the then-contemporary Harlem a "city within a city." Johnson wrote

> In the make-up of New York, Harlem is not merely a Negro colony or community, it is a city within a city, the greatest Negro city in the world. It is not a slum or a fringe, it is located in the heart of Manhattan and occupies on one the most beautiful and healthful sections of the city. It is not a "quarter" of dilapidated tenements, but is made up of new-law apartments and handsome dwellings, with well-pave and well-lighted streets. It has its own churches, social and civic centers, shops, theatres and other places of amusement. And it contains more Negroes to the square mile than any other spot on earth. A stranger who rides up magnificent Seventh Avenue on a bus or in an automobile must be struck with surprise at the transformation which takes place after he crosses One Hundred and Twenty-fifth Street. Beginning there, the population suddenly darkens and he rides through twenty-five solid blocks where the passes-by, the shoppers, those sitting in restaurants, coming out of theatres, standing in doorways, and looking out of windows are practically all Negroes; and then he emerges where the population as suddenly becomes white again. There is nothing like it in any other city in the country, for there is no preparation for it; no change in the character of houses and streets; no change, indeed, in the appearance of the people, except their color.

James Weldon Johnson, "The Making of Harlem," *Survey Graphic* "Harlem Mecca of the New Negro" VI, no. 6 (March 1925): 635-639.

[107] In her introductory essay to the 2004 architecture and photography exhibition *harlemworld: Metropolis as Metaphor* (from January 28 to April 4, 2004), developed as part of the "Picture Harlem" initiative, Thelma Golden similarly addressed the way in which contemporary Harlem continued to exist as both physical urban environment and cultural symbol; as both "the spiritual and physical space for the soul of black culture." [107] Echoing without referencing James Weldon Johnson's 1925 essay "The Making of Harlem," Golden observed, "Harlem is a city within a city that has endured various histories, struggles, triumphs and projections, because like most good myths, it exists to be made up by its inhabitants. A new generation arrives and there is a new Harlem to be built."

The *harlemworld* exhibition was conceived as existing as both an installation in the museum's galleries as well as a museum publication (rather than the publication serving as a secondary archiving document of the gallery presentation). The exhibition's gallery displays of photographic works made visible the past and present histories of Harlem, while the architects' contributions to the exhibitions offered possibilities for the future form of Harlem. These diagrammatic approaches to urban forms offered potential strategies to both making and seeing the contemporary neighborhood already in a state of flux. *harlemworld* presented the work of eighteen architects and teams of architects. Each was provided with the broad directive to consider both present and future interventions that architects can make in urban spaces and to create a gallery project as well as multi-page catalogue contribution related to their project. In addition, a series of four photography exhibitions were prepared to accompany these architectural projects. The photographers included were James VanDerZee, Alice Attie, Adler Guerrier, and Kira Lynn Harris. The title "harlemworld" was created from fixing together the phrase "Harlem world" from a 1997 lyric by the rapper Mase. Thelma Golden, "of Harlem: an introduction," 11.

[108] The full roadway of 125th Street continues beyond Central Harlem to both the east and west. It extends though West Harlem to the Hudson River and terminates in East Harlem at the Triborough Bridge.

[109] Just as the title of the "Center of Black America" has been applied to cities other than Harlem, the title of "Main Street of Black America" has also been liberally applied to other roadways throughout the nation. For example, see: Margaret McKee and Fred Chisenhall, *Beale Bblack and Blue: Life and Music on Black America's Main Street* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University, 1981) and Jim White, "Bringing Blues into TV room," *Chicago Tribune*, December 11, 1986, D14; George Papajohn, "Into Elvis land Beyond the kitsch, Memphis has a lot to see," *Chicago Tribune,* April 14, 1991, 15; Sally Eckhoff, "A magical realism," *Times Union*, May 1, 2005, J4; and Aimee Edmondson, "Hotel diggers go back in time: 1930s ceramics at Westin on Beale," *The Commercial Appeal*, December 23, 2005, B1. In addition, Jonathan Tilove has argued for a reframing of the over six hundred different roads named after Martin Luther King Jr. as enacting a kind of loosely networked Main Street of Black America. See Jonathan Tilove and Michael Falco, *Along Martin Luther King: Travels on Black America's Main Street* (New York: Random House, 2003).

[110] Chester H. Liebs provides an analysis of earlier generations of urban Main Streets and "Main Street by extension" roadways that emerged as sites of commerce and new technologies of transportation starting in the late nineteenth century and continuing to develop well into the twentieth century. Chester H. Liebs, *Main Street to Miracle Mile: American Roadside Architecture* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995) 7-15.

[111] Alison Isenberg, *Downtown America: A History of the Place and the People who Made It* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004), 12.

[112]Ibid., 42-70. For other analyses on the standardized "look" of Main Streets, see Richard V. Francaviglia, *Main Street Revisited: Time, Space, and Image Building in Small-Town America* (Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 1996) and Gabrielle M. Esperdy, *Modernizing Main Street: Architecture and Consumer Culture in the New Deal* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008).

[113]See Peter B. Hales, *Silver Cities: Photographing American Urbanization, 1839-1939* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2005), 452-453.

[114] Kost's photograph is one of a series of a Polaroid works he created in combination with a seven minute and twenty-one second film also entitled *Boulevard of…* (2009). The film tracks the full duration of Erica Tour Aviance's journey across Central Harlem, starting with her descent from the elevated platform of the MetroNorth station at Park Avenue and 125th Street and Park Avenue, continuing across the length of 125th Street towards the west side of the city, and ending with her entrance down into the subway station at 125th Street and St. Nicholas Avenue.

[115] "Harlem Postcards Derrick Adams, Marley Gonzalez, Jeremy Kost, and Ray Llanos: July 16, 2009 – October 25, 2009," Studio Museum in Harlem, accessed August 1, 2012, http://www.studiomuseum.org/exhibition/harlem-postcards-derrick-adams-marley-gonz-lez-jeremy-kost-and-ray-llanos.

[116] Starting in the 1940s, newspaper reports document a rise in not only the honest sale of goods but also racketeering along 125th Street, and the competition each created for local storefront businesses. By the end of the 1960s, 125th Street between 7th and 8th Avenues in particular served as home to a number of independent street merchants, having migrated from other parts of the United States and other nations. George Norford, "Sketch Book: Diary - Saturday Night," *New York Amsterdam News,* October 4 1941, 17; "Harlem's 125th St. is Now 'Beggar's Roost' Saturdays," *New York Amsterdam News,* September 1, 1945, 6A; "Cops Start 125th St. 'Move On' Drive: Black Market Racketeering is Under Fire," *New York Amsterdam News,* October 12, 1946, 1; "Colonel Philipp Condemns Pullers-In Merchants: Chamber Head Asks Orthodox Selling Rules," *New York Amsterdam News,* February 21, 1948, 7; Olivia Pearl Stokes, "Africa and Harlem," *New York Amsterdam* News*,* October 5, 1963, 10, 54; "Peddlers Irk Stores in Harlem," *The New York Times*, September 24, 1990, B3; Karen Carrillo, "CB10 said to seek to have Harlem street vendors thrown out of 125th St." *New York Amsterdam News,* December 14,1991, 5, 34; and Michael Adams, "Harlem's African Marketplace," *The New York Times,* August 11, 1994, C3.

[117] One account from 1990 observed, "Sidewalk vendors from Senegal, Ghana and our other faraway homes in Africa, the Caribbean, Georgia or the Carolinas have made 125th Street an exciting, colorful bazaar with a vast number of tempting commercial products." Mel Tapley, "Couldn't match Studio Museum Shop's rich variety, if you had Aladdin's Lamp," *New York Amsterdam News*, December 22, 1990, 25.

[118] Julian Jingles, "125th St. vendors: A dilemma with great potential," *New York Amsterdam News,* July 3, 1993, 3, 38.

[119] See Paul Stoller, *Sensuous Scholarship* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1997), 89-134 and Stoller, *Money Has No Smell: The Africanization of New York City* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002).

[120] "The Harlem street markets," *New York Amsterdam News,* August 10, 1991, 26.

[121] Jane Jacobs, *The Death and Life of Great American Cities* (New York: Vintage, 1961).

[122] Mitchell Duneier, *Sidewalk* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1999).

[123] For an account of these dynamics along 125th Street in establishing a "black public sphere," see Regina Austin, "'An Honest Living': Street Vendors, Municipal Regulation, and the Black Public Sphere," *The Yale Law Journal* 103, no. 8 (June 1994): 2119-2131.

[124] Disagreements between street vendors and storefront owners were not new development at the end of the century. Such disagreements in the 1960s had led to the temporary formation of the Peddlers 125th Street Association in 1968. However, by the end of 1980s, due to increased immigration combined with a local and nation economic downturn, the number of vendors lining the 125th Street corridor alone significantly increased. This was accompanied by an equal escalation in tensions between vendors and business owners. Willis Chester, "125 St. Peddlers Cry Bias," *New York Amsterdam News*, August 31, 1968, 34; Les Matthews, "Peddlers Will Not Move," *New York Amsterdam News,* September 21, 1970, 1, 41; Bryant Rollins, "Executive Editor's Report: Where I'm comin' from: Police vs. the 125th St. merchants," *New York Amsterdam News,* March 25, 1972, 1, 4; "A Time for

Decision (An Editorial)," *New York Amsterdam News,* March 31, 1973; Grace Waters, "Vendors and storeowners in can dispute," *New York Amsterdam News,* August 17, 1985, 35; Albert Nickerson, "Complaints increase over Harlem street vendors," *New York Amsterdam News*, December 28, 1991, 4; Karen Carrillo, "Battle between street vendors, store owners on 125 is old feud," *New York Amsterdam News,* December, 28, 1991, 7; and Julian Jingles, "125th St. Vendors; Is there an organized group behind counterfeiters?" *New York Amsterdam News,* July 10, 1993, 3, 48.

[125] In response, in the early 1990s, vendors staged protests, held weekly rallies, and circulated newsletters encouraging the formation of vendor-rights organizations. On October 22, 1992, a sweep of illegal vendors prompted a day-long protest of the vendors along 125th Street between Madison and St. Nicholas Avenues. The protest was focused on shutting down commercial operations within stores along the thoroughfare. A related racial element was at play in these protests as well. A majority of the street vendors were either black West African immigrants or African Americans who lived in the surrounding neighborhood, as opposed to the predominately white or Asian owners of storefront businesses who tended to not live in the area. The phrase "Buy Black" was repeated throughout the protest and would later appear on stickers and other circulating protest ephemera. The call to "Buy Black" and bypass those storefronts not owned by black merchants would also be pervasive during the 1994 raid on 125th Street discussed below. Following the October 22, 1992 protest, public outrage was momentarily quelled: an agreement was brokered between the 125th Street Vendors Association and the local Community Board Number 10 allowing for temporary self-policing actions among the vendors to take place in exchange for ending the protest. In addition to the 125th Street Vendors Association, other groups were organized in the wake of the 1992 action including the Washington heights Vendors Association in Manhattan and the Afrikan International Merchants Association of Flatbush Avenue in Brooklyn. The quickly mobilized, almost riot-like actions that erupted on 134th Street in July 10, 1993, prompted by a similar seizure of an unlicensed vendor's goods would demonstrate the growing influence of the vendor organizations.

The city also established a new task force in response: the Vendor Operating Committee, an inter-agency initiative with representatives from the mayor's office and the city's sanitation, health, and transportation departments. The strong-armed stance of the city towards illegal vendors, and those vendor organizers highlighting race as a perceived motivating factor, would be summed up in an editorial published by Wallace R. Ford II, Commissioner of the New York City Department of Business Services and co-chair of the Vendor Operating Committee with Police Commissioner Raymond Kelly. This editorial was circulated through several local black newspapers. Ford wrote:

> No one should think that the vibrancy and color that street vendors bring to 125th Street is a permanent phenomenon…At a time when community unity is at a premium, who are these people who would try in vain to turn the Harlem community against the first African-American mayor in the history of New York City just to serve their own selfish, short-term goals? Do they live in Harlem? Do they employ Harlem residents? Do they pay taxes that help Harlem residents? Do they invest in the Harlem community? Do they even have plans, real plans for long-term development in Harlem? Or are they just cheap dimestore tough guys, hiding behind anonymous and foul rhetoric?

Simon Anekwe, "Training for street vendors in Harlem," *New York Amsterdam News,* June 7, 1980, 6; Peter Noel, "HUDC denies vendors exclusion allegations," *New York Amsterdam News*, September 17, 1983, 3; J. Zamgba Browne, "Peddlers decry cop crackdown" *New York Amsterdam News,* April 6, 1985, 3, 32.; Mark Holder, "Are peddlers pests to public?" *New York Amsterdam News,* December 26, 1987, 2, 35; J. Zamgba Browne, "Harlem vendors protest law evicting them from 125th St.," *New York Amsterdam News,* August 25, 1990, 21; Lynn Cowan, "12th Street vendors call laws on street sales unfair," *New York Amsterdam News,* December 8, 1990, 5; Karen Carrillo, "The new, young Black Street vendors of Harlem," *New York Amsterdam News*, July 25, 1992, 5; Karen Carrillo, "Black Street vendors close 125th St. stores for a day," *New York Amsterdam News,* October 31, 1992, 3, 45; and Karen Carrillo, "125th Street vendors start publishing own newsletter," *New York Amsterdam News,* June 12, 1993, 25; Karen Carrillo, "Black street vendors planning massive protest against police," *New York Amsterdam News,* June, 26, 1993, 9; Julian Jingles, "125th St. vendors: A dilemma with great potential results" *New York Amsterdam News,* July 3, 1993, 3, 38; Debbie Officer, "Near riot breaks over seizure of vendor's goods," *New York Amsterdam News,* July 10, 1993, 3, 49; Wallace L. Ford, "City responds to street vendors: An open letter to the Harlem community," *New York Amsterdam News,* July 31, 1993, 12, 50; Floyd Johnson, "125th St. vendors respond to Commissioner Ford," *New York Amsterdam News,* August 14, 1993, 4, 38; Jonathan P. Hicks, "Police Move Street Vendors in Harlem," *The New York Times,* October 18, 1994, B1, B3; Jonathan P. Hicks, "Muslims Urge

Store Boycott in Harlem," *The New York Times,* October 19, 1994, B1, B3; Alan Finder, "Bratton Joins Watch Over Harlem Boycott," *The New York Times,* October 22, 1994, 26; and Jonathan P. Hicks, "Harlem Divides Over Merits of Vendors or Their Ouster," *The New York Times,* October 23, 1994, 1, 42.

[126] In response to a 1970 a plan put forth by the 125th Street Peddlers Association to create an indoor marketplace on or near 125th Street, a series of temporary open-air sites was set aside in the latter part of the decade. These included, according to the chronology of availability, a lots at Seventh Avenue between 125th and 126th Streets, the plaza in front of the State Office Building, and a lot at 125th Street between Seventh and Eight Avenue. This final location, an abandoned lot opposite the Apollo Theater, would be the site of further plans to create a more permanent site out of which legal vendors could operate. Starting in 1979, proposals were approved to transform the site into an enclosed public marketplace, variously referred to as West 125th Street Mart, 125th Street Mart and Mart 125. Ultimately named Mart 125, the site opened in 1986 (after a six year delay) offering leasable space to merchants. Once opened, the new approximately 18,000 square foot space accommodated seventy-five stalls and six pushcart vendors. This was decreased from the original plan to house one hundred and twelve stalls and ten pushcarts. Funding was provided by the Harlem Urban Development Corporation, which leased the site from the city and oversaw the operations on the property. It was initially a state-controlled site, with ownership transferring to the city in 1996.However, the expense of individual leases combined with an abundance of both licensed and unlicensed peddlers unable to be accommodated at the location resulted in little of the way of providing a permanent solution, with illegal vending continuing to occupy sidewalk space of Harlem well into the 1990s. See "Peddlers Seeking Market," *New York Amsterdam News,* September 19, 1970, 1, 36; Causewell Vaughan, "Harlem vendors find a home," *New York Amsterdam News,* August 27, 1978, 21; Mark Wilson and Utrice C. Leid, "Hard sell for peddlers," *New York Amsterdam News,* October 13, 1979, 44; J. Zamgba Browne, "Pols open new Harlem Mart 125 for vendors," *New York Amsterdam News,* August 30, 1986, 20 and Carolyn A. Butts, "125th Street vendors pledge to fight law to protect turf," *New York Amsterdam News*, October 27, 1990, 4.

[127] A combination of needed yet unaddressed structural repairs and a pattern of merchant evictions left the complex completely vacant in 2002. Initial plans for the site redevelopment primarily focused on attracting national and regional retailers or restaurants—in concert with the program of corporate investments in Harlem already discussed—rather than the independent local vendors for which the site had been initially intended. Still without a permanent tenant in 2008, the city proposed offering the space to local nonprofit cultural organizations. The current plan for the site is to be a mixed-use space, divided between rentable commercial space, a New York City Visitors' Center branch, and the future homes of the National Jazz Museum in Harlem and the ImageNation Sol Cinema. These latter two organizations offer evidence of the shifted desire in the redevelopment programs of Harlem to more actively foster local cultural creations. However, the place of local vendor culture is noticeably absent from such programs. Karen Carrillo, "Business as usual," *The Village Voice*, April 15, 1997, 27; Yusef Salaam, "Rudy's Rabid Revenge: Giuliani's vultures circle Mart 125," *New York Amsterdam News,* February 4, 1999, 1; Herb Boyd, "Giuliani pushes for close of Mart 125," *New York Amsterdam News,* April 13, 2000, 3; Herb Boyd, "End of Mart 125? Black businesses cling to life," *New York Amsterdam News*, December 27, 2000, 1; Herb Boyd, "Black Business Dying: Giuliani prepares burial," *New York Amsterdam News*, January 11, 2001, 1; Herb Boyd, "Mart 125 still in jeopardy," *New York Amsterdam News,* June 28, 2001, 1; Herb Boyd, "The end of Mart 125," *New York Amsterdam News,* July 5, 2001, 3; Amy Waldman, "Vendors Angry at Evictions from City Mall in Harlem," *The New York Times,* August 16, 2001, B1; Denny Lee, "A Vacant Mart, Symbol of Failure, Is a Candidate for Redevelopment," *The New York Times,* February 9, 2003, CY6; "New Plans in Harlem for Failed Marketplace," *The New York Times,* November 30, 2003, N37; Timothy Williams "In plan for Vacant Harlem Market, City Envisions a Cultural Base," *The New York Times,* September 2, 2008, B2; and Julie Satow, "A Series of Second Acts Prepares to Open on a Harlem Street," *The New York Times,* August 31, 2011, B9.

[128] Jonathan P. Hicks, "Giuliani Broadens Crackdown to Banish All Illegal Vendors," *The New York Times*, May 9, 1994, B1, B4 and Todd S. Purdum, "What Makes Us Angry: With the Mayor Leading the Way, 'Quality of Life' Is This Year's Civic Credo. But What Qualities? Whose Lives?" *The New York Times,* August 7,1994, CY1, CY9.

[129] This police action was not unanticipated. A new vendor relocation program had already been discussed and recently implemented: rather than permitting street peddling of any kind on 125th Street, vacant lots on Lenox Avenue between 116th and 117th Streets previously reserved were advertised as relocation options for both licensed vendors and unlicensed vendors willing to pay rent for a provisional license only to be used within the designated market lot. Alternatively considered sites included open-air markets in lots located at 126th Street and 145th Street. Following the raid, the sites along Lenox Avenue were transformed into the Malcom Shabazz Harlem Market. With construction costs publically declared as approaching 1.6 million dollars, the project was intended to provide an affordable and permanent retail space for local independent vendors. Construction started in 1998, and the site

officially opened in the spring of 1999. Containing one hundred and fifteen vendor booths, the open-air marketplace was created through a partnership between public and private organizations: the New York City Housing preservation Development, the New York City Housing Development Corporation, the Upper Manhattan Empowerment Zone Development Corporation, the Chase Community Development Corporation, the Blue-Stone Organization, Full Spectrum Building and Development, Suna/Levine and Company, and the Malcolm Shebazz Development Corporation. The entrance to the site, located at 52 West 116th Street, is announced with a pair of brightly painted towering faux minarets, emphasizing a "exotic" bazaar-like atmosphere of the marketplace found within the site. For reports on the planning and construction of the project, see Nina Siegal, "Slow Blues in Harlem for Street Vendors," *The New York Times*, February 28, 1999, CY4; Yusef Salaam, "Marketplace open for business in Harlem," *New York Amsterdam News*, June 3, 1999, 5; and Ali Rahman, "Malcolm Shabazz Vendor's Market in Harlem," *The New York Beacon*, June 23, 1999, 10.

[130] "Walking! On 125th Street," *The New York Times,* October 21, 1994, A30.

[131] A recent law enforcement sweep of 125th Street on January 12, 2012 resulted not only the arrest of three vendors selling scented oils without a license but also the voluntary departure of other vendors along the roadway. The action was coordinated by both the New York City Department of Consumer Affairs and the New York City Police Department. Some accounts claim that the sweep was conducted in an effort to clear the streets in advance of a visit of President Barak Obama to the Apollo Theater, planned for the following week. See Jeff Mays, "Harlem Vendors on 125th Street Cleared in Sweep Ahead of Obama Visit," January 18, 2012, DNAinfo.com, http://www.dnainfo.com/new-york/20120118/harlem/harlem-vendors-on-125th-street-cleared-sweep-ahead-of-obama-visit and Gina Lee, "License crackdown rattles 125th Street vendors," January 23, 2012, *Columbia Spectator,* http://www.columbiaspectator.com/2012/01/23/license-crackdown-rattles-125th-street-vendors.

[132] In 1990, *New York New Amsterdam News* reporter Mel Tapley connected the museum to this street vendor culture occurring just beyond the museum's doors. This connection was made through an analysis of the museum's store. In addition to available exhibition catalogues, souvenir cards, trivia games, and tote bags, crafts and goods from around the world dominate the shop. The store is described as filled with authentic and replica African and Meso-American masks, musical instruments, and figurines. Then-store manager Michelle Lee is quoted as linking the merchandise to the museum's globally-oriented mission at the time: "We are into the documentation of the art of Black American and the African Diaspora and those products that reflect the African American, Caribbean and Latin American creativity." Then inviting the reader to "Step outside," Tapley explained how one finds street merchants creating an environment analogous to everyday African culture celebrated by the museum's exhibitions. However, the museum as a whole did not have quite the sympathetic relationship to the street vendors along 125th Street that Tapely's article suggested. Just one year after Tapley's article was published, the Studio Museum "requested" that the vendors directly in front of the museum relocate to another spot. While not an outright rejection of the vendors' rights to continue to make a living, there is an element of "not in my backyard" to the museum's encouraging of the vendor relocation. In addition, in recent years, the focus of the museum shop has moved away from a space dominated by merchandise of important sculptural objects and more towards a space filled with exhibition catalogues, Harlem guides and cookbooks, and decorative accessories. The divide between the environment inside the museum and that outside the museum has increased significantly. See Mel Tapley, "Couldn't match Studio Museum Shop's rich variety, if you had Aladdin's Lamp," *New York Amsterdam News*, December 22, 1990, 25 and Albert Nickerson, "Complaints increase over Harlem street vendors," *New York Amsterdam News,* December 28, 1991, 4.

[133] In order, these are: Warren Neidich's *Scrapple from the Apple* (2003, *Harlem Postcards* Spring 2003 series); Marepe's *Mango Flower* (2004, *Harlem Postcards* Fall 2004 series); Rina Ranerjee's *The scent that we will breathe in the heavens* (2006, *Harlem Postcards* Spring 2006 series); "Expanding the Walls" participant Marley Gonzalez's *Scent of Harlem* (2009, *Harlem Postcards* Summer 2009 series); and Lauren Halsey's *Summa Everything* (2012) (*Harlem Postcards* Summer 2012 series).

[134] In order, these are: Kori Newkirk's *Notorious Finnest* (2002, *Harlem Postcards* Fall 2002 series); Christian Marclay's *Harlem 1999* (2003, *Harlem Postcards* Winter 2003 series); Cory Arcangel's *Computers, Internet* (2007, *Harlem Postcards* Fall/Winter 2007-2008); Nina Katchadourian's *Hot Cake (Capri Bakery, 186 East 116th Street*) (2004, *Harlem Postcards* Spring 2004 series); Jean Shin's *Found Installation (Colored Belts)* (2004, *Harlem Postcards* Winter 2005 series), offering racks of brightly colored hanging belts in front of the Harlem Depot Center; and Pearl C. Hsiung's *Pet Mash* (2008, *Harlem Postcards* Spring 2008 series). Occasionally, choices in image content seem to be made to emphasize the jarring juxtapositions found in such displays. For example, Katchadourian's *Hot Cake* features a standing fan placed atop a wedding cake, while Hsuing's *Pet Mash* shows a brightly colored window decal of a parrot placed beneath a red neon light proclaiming "FISH."

[135] Anselm L. Strauss, *Images of the American City* (New Brunswick, Transaction, 1976), 70, 74.
[136] Ibid., 71.
[137] For more on the Malcom Shabazz Harlem Market, see footnote 129 in this chapter.
[138] There is a third component to the montage. The artist includes a reflection of the recent Occupy Wall Street movement's protests in the window. The meaning of the image thus changes from that of showing the multiple meanings of global apparel (the migration of a cultural and geographically specific form from West Africa to Harlem combined with the opening of a global retailer's chain within Harlem) to a pointing to issues more generally related to power, capital, and consumerism.
[139] This same contextualization is also given with the museum's recent practice of making the postcards available as a e-cards through the museum's website. They are listed as a separate exhibition, and the artist's statement for each image, when one is available, is provided.
[140] Ali Evans, "Letter from the Editor: Studio Design(ed)," *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Summer 2007): 23.
[141] Ali Evans, "Sign of the Times," *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Summer 2009): 22.
[142] The closest blurring of the difference between newly created bulletin content and gallery content is the article "Sketches of Harlem: Wardell Milan II" which appeared in the Summer 2008 issue of *Studio*. The artist was part of the museum's 2006-2007 Artist in Residence program. During this time, the museum's staff approached him "to capture Harlem's distinctive facades and storefronts in… works on paper" that would be reproduced in the pages of *Studio.* The drawings were based on photographs the artist took of Harlem, and then translated into sketch-like recreations of recognizable—but not necessarily tourist—locations in Harlem. The following year, the museum organized the exhibition *Wardell Milan: Drawings of Harlem* from November 12, 2009 to March 13, 2010. In the exhibition announcement, mentioned is made of the exhibit's origin as part of *Studio* content. See "Sketches of Harlem: Wardell Milan II," *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Summer 2008): 54-57. The artist's work had been featured previously in the bulletin: a two-page reproduction of the artist's digital photo-collage *My mother's flowers grow tall. They grow as tall as she wants* (2006) appeared in *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Summer 2007): 24-25.
[143] Works from the museum's permanent collection and related archives that have been reproduced in the bulletin include: Romare Bearden's *Untitled (Tropical Scene)* (2004) in *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Spring 2005): 32; James VanDerZee's *Tap Dance Team* (1931) in *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Summer 2005): 53; Nontskelelo "Lolo" Veleko's *Sibu VII* (from *Beauty is in the Eye of the Beholder* series) (2003-2006) in *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Spring 2007): 53; James VanDerZee's *Portrait of a Man Holding a Cane* (1932) in *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Summer 2007): 77; James VanDerZee's *Band Leader leading a Band* (1932) in *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Summer 2008): 73; James VanDerZee's *Knights of the Commandery* (c. 1920) and James VanDerZee's *Barefoot Prophet* (1929) in *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Summer 2009): 60; and Roy DeCarava,'s *Couples Dancing* (1956) in *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Spring 2010): 73. In addition, full page reproductions of works highlighted as recent acquisitions by the museum have also been presented, including: Mequitta Ahuja's *World* (2010) in *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Winter/Spring 2011): 4 and Hurvin Anderson's *Mrs. S. Keita – Turquoise* (2010) in *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Winter/Spring 2012): 2. In the Summer/Fall 2011 issue, then-Curatorial Fellow Tasha Parker's essay "Collected. A Brief history of Our Permanent Collection" was published. Although providing an abbreviated overview of key moments in museum's collection policy since its founding, the essay more fully focuses on activities following 2001, and in particular since 2009. Accompanying the essay are three photographs of general installation views of three recent exhibitions (*Collected. Reflections on the Permanent Collection* (2010), *Collected. Black & White* (2010), and *Collected. Vignettes* (2011), although the specific works in each photograph are not indicated) and a separate photograph of permanent collection inclusion Melvin Edwards' *Working Thought* (from the *Lynch Fragment* series) (1985). Tasha Parker, "Collected. A Brief History of Our Permanent Collection," *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Summer/Fall 2011): 7-9.
[144] From its early years of publication, artists' works exclusively commissioned for the magazine have appeared in *Studio*. Contributing artists have included Robert Pruitt, Annette Lawrence, Mark Bradford in collaboration with Willard Brown, Deborah Grant, Sanford Biggers, Troy "Gericault" Roberts, Kehinde Wiley and Mickalene Thomas, Katonya, Nina Chanel Abney, and Xaviera Simmons. These works appeared, respectively, in *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Spring 2005): 17-19; *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Summer 2005): 27-29; *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Fall/Winter 2005/2006): 38-39; *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Fall/Winter 2006/2007): 38-39; *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine*

(Spring 2007): 18-19; *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Summer 2007): 52-55; *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Spring 2008): 41-43; *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Summer 2008): 32-33; *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Summer 2009): 46-47; and *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Spring 2010): 28-31.

Selections from the permanent collection—including Joshua Johnson's *Portrait of Sarah Maria Coward* (c. 1804), the earliest work in the museum's collection, Adia Millet's *I Love You (rifles)* (c. 2005), Carrie Mae Weems' *Untitled (Black Love)* (1999-2001), Barkley L. Hendricks' *Lawdy Mama* (1969), Alder Guerrier's *Flaneur: nyc/mia* (2001), and Romare Bearden's *Come Sunday* (1975)—have been used as sources of inspiration for the bulletin series initially entitled "Studio Fiction." In these collaborations, authors were invited by the staff of the *Studio* to compose texts in conversation with the works of art. For example, see Brian Keith Jackson, "He the Man, 1804 or Amour de soi Amour-Propre," *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Fall/Winter 2007): 26-31; Brian Keith Jackson, "No There in There," *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Spring 2008): 50-53; Brian Keith Jackson, "Untitled," *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Summer 2008): 52-53; Hilton Als, "SL." *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Fall/Winter 2008/2009): 34-37; Jesmyn Ward, "Where the Line Bleeds," *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Summer/Fall 2010): 72-73; and Amina Gautier, "Come Sunday," *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Winter/Spring 2011): 68-70.

In addition, illustrators were commissioned to produce interactive pages for *Studio*'s younger readership from the earliest issue of the revised bulletin's publication. Often black and white illustrations running across two consecutive opened pages, these contributions were initially part of a section titled "add color!," then "Coloring page," and finally "Art Junior." Artists invited to submit to this section have included Christopher Meyers, Javka Steptoe, Kadir Nelson, Benny Andrews, Nicole Tadgell, R. Gregory Christie, Bryan Collier, Frank Morrison, E. B. Lewis, Elaine Pedlar, Paul Rogers, Layron DeJarnette, Abdi Farhah and Elan Ferguson. Each artist's contribution is contextualized with a one page biographical profile, usually immediately preceding the image. Meyers' work has appeared twice in this section: in the first issue of *Studio* in the summer of 2005 and again in the Summer 2009 issue as well. The full list of where the illustrations appears is: *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Spring 2005): 43; *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Summer 2005): 38-39; *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Fall/Winter 2005/2006): 51; *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Spring 2006): 38-39; *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Summer 2006): 38-39; *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Spring 2007): 30-31; *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Fall/Winter 2007): 58-59; *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Spring 2008): 50-51; *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Summer 2008): 42-43; *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Fall/Winter 2008-2009): 50-51; *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Summer 2009): 62-63; *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Spring 2010): 49-51; *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Summer/Fall 2010): 75-81; *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Winter/Spring 2011): 78-79; *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Winter/Spring 2011): 76-77; and *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Summer/Fall 2011): 67-77.

[145] The rare exception is in Jones and Bazin's literary walking tour, which includes the sentence "Perhaps we should end our trek at the Studio Museum in Harlem, 144 W. 125th St., a meeting place for artists and authors alike."

[146] Felicia Megginson, "Franco the Great's Harlem Gates," *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Summer 2005): 16-21; Aric Mayer, "Harlem Exteriors," *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Spring 2008): 58-61; Lenard Smith, "Harlem Interiors," *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Spring 2008): 62-65; and "Islands of New York: A photography commission by Accra Shepp," *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Summer 2009): 38-43.

[147] John Reddick, "Madame Walker Didn't Live Here, Harlem Architecture After the Renaissance," *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Fall/Winter 2005/2006): 58-59; John T. Reddick, "Future Designs on Harlem," *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Fall/Winter 2007): 42-43; John Reddick, "A Voyeur's View from Langston's Block," *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Summer 2008): 58-61; and Cynthia Jones and Petrushka Bazin, "A Literary Walk Through Harlem," *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Summer 2006): 56-57.

[148] Richard H. Rose, "Sugar Hill," *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Fall/Winter 2008/2009): 60-63. For the "My Harlem" series, the members of the museum's staff provided accounts of experiences walking through the neighborhoods surrounding the museum. These first-person narrative accounts are accompanied by either the author's own photographs or photographs taken by other museum staff members of sites and objects mentioned. For example, see Ginger Cofield, and Julie Quon, "Perspective: My Harlem," *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Spring 2010): 38-39; Gabrielle Lopez and Alex Uballez, "Perspective: My Harlem: Between D.F. and

Dakar: Flavors of 116th Street," *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Summer/Fall 2010): 47-49; and William Armstrong, "My Harlem: Cash for Gold," *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Summer/Fall 2011): 58-59.

[149] Kira Lynne Harris and Brian Keith Jackson, "wePod.Harlem.Shuffle," *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Fall/Winter 2005/2006): 42-46. Harris provided Jackson with a series of ten photographs, in response to which Jackson developed a series of ten paragraph-long responses in the form of a first-person narrative of walking tour journal entries.The images range from showcasing recognizable landmarks—such as a Theresa Hotel and Marcus Garvey Park (alternatively known as Mount Morris Park)—to fragmented captures of local content, suggesting a less pointedly specific real-world referent—such as a glowing illuminated cross affixed to a church exterior and the blur of traffic headlights along a busy thoroughfare. A similar collaboration was repeated twice the following year with "The Sweet Conductors of His Mystery," a collaboration between photographer Leslie Hewitt and writer Anthony Joseph, and "Salt & Light," a collaboration between photographer Aida Millett and writer Diana McClure. However, despite a similar process of collaboration, the products revealed a quite different from that of "wePod.Harlem.Shuffle." Rather than photographs of the local neighborhood, these latter two projects were structured by photographs of still life arrangements and object-filled interior spaces, respectively. In addition, the accompanying text for the latter two articles was poetry rather than a first-person narrative account. See Leslie Hewitt and Anthony Joseph, "The Sweet Conductors of His Mystery," *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Summer 2006): 26-31; and Aida Millett and Diana McClure, "Salt & Light," *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Fall/Winter 2006/2007): 32-36.

[150] For example, coverage of local businesses and artisans include: "More-in-store: Jumel Terrace Books," *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Spring 2006): 19; "More-in-store: Sistahs of Harlem," *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Summer 2006): 55; "Covered: More-in-Store, *Harlem Toile de Juoy* by Sheila Briedges for Studio Printworks," *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Fall/Winter 2006/2007): 30-31; and "More-in-store," *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Spring 2008): 16.

[151] "hrlm: beautiful people," *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Summer 2006): 51.

[152] Ibid., 51.

[153] "hrlm: beautiful places," *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Fall/Winter 2006/207): 41.

[154] "hrlm: beautiful things," *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Spring 2007): 33.

[155]The phrase "Black is Beautiful" emerged as a counter to race-based social hierarchies both from outside and within the black community. Ascribed to both personal appearance and to arts production, "beautiful" in this context was connected to a non-geographically-delimited population asserting a shared black cultural nationalism. See Jeffrey O.G. Ogbar, *Black Power: Radical Politcs and African American Identity* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2004) and Amy Abugo Ongiri, *Spectacular Blackness: The Cultural Politics of the Black Power Movement and the Search for a Black Aesthetic* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2010).

[156] Two "Expanding the Walls" exhibitions have used the descriptor: *Reclaiming Beautiful* in 2005 and *We Come with the Beautiful Things* in 2009. For the former, the exhibition was publicly framed as containing images that "offer new observations on beauty by re-envisioning cultural conventions through personal imagery, re-imagining family tradition and documenting Harlem's transformation." The interest in negotiating the space between tradition and change is made manifest in examinations of the otherwise mundane and ordinary: "In portraits of friends, beauty becomes a question of identity. In photographs of everyday activity, the overlooked is highlighted. By depicting home, the usual is illuminated… *Reclaiming Beautiful* is a dialogue about how perception affects meaning."[156] The examples of the "beautiful things" referred to in the latter exhibition's title included abstract arrangements of natural forms and portraits of the student photographers' friends and family members. In addition, the images also confronted the concept of "the beautiful" as a socially constructed label, and one that is not necessarily a universally accepted or comfortably assigned label. For example, included in the exhibition were works such as Rakeisha Mulligan's *Take the Body, Take the Mind* (2009), showing a bottle of bleach resting on the ledge of a bathtub, in which sits a dark skinned female almost fully cropped out of the image by the edge of the photograph. See "what's up: student exhibition: Reclaiming Beautiful July 20 – October 23, 2005" *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem* (Summer 2005): 8 and "What's Up: *We Come with the Beautiful Things Expanding the Walls* Student Exhibition July 16 – October 25, 2009" *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem* (Summer 2005): 10-13.

[157] The series of twelve of Troy "Gericault" Roberts' drawn portraits that appeared in the Summer 2007 issue were accompanied by the similar sentence "Like we've told you before, as you'll see (and as you know if you live here), the people in Harlem are beautiful." Roberts' work was commissioned for inclusion in the magazine, and his process in creating the series was explained: "Summer draws people from around the world to the vivacious streets of Harlem, and they all eventually make their way to 125th Street. Troy "Gericault" Roberts… set his easel right

outside our doors on this iconic thoroughfare to capture some of the many faces that make up this extraordinary metropolis." Roberts' work appeared in the issue immediately following issue containing the final of the three "beautiful" photo-essays. The use of the same phrase to describe Roberts' work, and the more emphatic way in which it is employed, indicates an intention on the part of the editorial staff for *Studio*'s audience to be reading across issues of the bulletin. The reader is made aware of a previous encounter he or she should have had with not just this phrase but also this sentiment. The retention of this cross-issue interest in the visual culture of a beautiful Harlem is intended not only to draw together Roberts' work to the *hrlm* project, but also to draw the different iterations of the *hrlm* projects together themselves. "Artist Commission: Harlem World: Drawing the People," *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Summer 2007): 52-55.

In addition, the Spring 2006 issue of *Studio* introduced a section entitled simply "A beautiful thing!" No additional contextualizing or explanatory text offered beyond the title. Beneath this exclamation appeared an uncredited photograph of the Apollo Theater. This section reappeared in the next issue, although rather than a Harlem location, the "beautiful thing" was William Scott's *William and Tracy* (2002). A short description explained that TG (most probably Thelma Golden) discovered the work while it was on display at White Columns gallery at 320 West 13th Street in SoHo, but, again, no further discussion of the work is given. Given their appearance immediately following the publication of the first two "A beautiful thing!" entries, and the photograph of Harlem as the first "beautiful thing," the three "hrlm" articles can be viewed as an outgrowth of this initial series. However, after the final "hrlm" collection of photographs, the "a beautiful thing!" would not appear again until the Summer/Fall 2011 issue of *Studio.* In this recent issue, the "beautiful thing" was Faith Ringold's collaboration with New York City students to produce the *9/11 Peace Quilt* (2006), then on display at the Metropolitan Museum of Art. "a beautiful thing!" *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem* (Spring 2006): 25; "a beautiful thing!" *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem* (Summer 2006): 18; and "a beautiful thing!" *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem* (Summer/Fall 2011): 36-37.

[158] For *Harlem Postcards* in which the person is named, examples include: Stephanie Diamond's *Will (I didn't realize his sister was eating candy, from Inside/Outside High School)* (2003) (*Harlem Postcards* Summer 2003 series), a view of domestic interior in which stand the two named children; Jayson Keeling's *Isaiah Sass, The Riverton, 138th Street* (2006) (*Harlem Postcards* Summer 2006 series), in which the named subject appears both as seated in his apartment amidst his possessions and as a framed portrait hanging on the wall of the room; Petra Richterova, *Dr. George Nelson Preston* (2010) (*Harlem Postcards* Fall/Winter 2010/2011 series), showing the art historian and curator surrounded by African sculptures; and Leilah Weinraub's *Michael Ramos* (2012) (*Harlem Postcards* Spring 2012 series), in which the long-haired figure wears multiple layers of purple, almost chromatically matching the set of drapery behind him. For *Harlem Postcards* in which the person is unnamed, examples include: Beat Streuli's *09-09-03 on 125th Street* (2003) (*Harlem Postcards* Fall 2003 series), a set of eight individual portraits tiled across the face of the postcard of pedestrians the artist encountered along 125th Street; Slater Bradley's *Doppelganger in Harlem* (2004) (*Harlem Postcards* Summer 2004 series), an audience of black children, in the center of which sits a single white male, sitting and watching an event take place outside the frame of the image; Xaviera Simmons' *Slamminest adj. (1980s-1990s) Rakim Rakim Rakim (Harlem)* (2004) (*Harlem Postcards* Fall 2004 series), a female figure fishing with a rudimentary fishing pole; Ray A. Llanos' *Uptown Babylon by Bus* (2006) (*Harlem Postcards* Summer 2009 series), a view into a bus through the windows, showing a girl with braids seated in front of a male passenger with a tricolored flag and knit cap; Phillip Pisciotta's *What is Won by "Continuing to Play," East Harlem, NYC* (2006) (*Harlem Postcards* Summer 2011 series), a shirtless man standing in front of portraits of Nelson Mandela, Martin Luther King, Jr., and Malcolm X; and Mariamma Kambon's *Ebony hands on each ivory key* (2011) (*Harlem Postcards* Fall/Winter 2011/2012 series), featuring a woman seated on a piano bench and playing an outdoor piano.

[159] Photographs of these Harlem places, shown without the presence of the local population inhabiting these places, include: James Casebere's *Foyer* (2006) (*Harlem Postcards* Fall/Winter 2006/2007 series), the empty foyer of the Metropolitan Baptist Church in Harlem; Katy Schimert's *North Meadow, Central Park Harlem* (2006) (*Harlem Postcards* Fall/Winter 2006/2007 series), a view of a grass- and tree-filled parkland with the sun rising behind the foliage; Kambui Olujimi's *Going Postal* (2007) (*Harlem Postcards* Fall/Winter 2007/2008 series), featuring an alcove of post office boxes in a Harlem post office; Joshua Phillippe's *hrlm 1* (2008) (*Harlem Postcards* Fall/Winter 2008/2009 series), a rooftop view of the Harlem; Derrick Adams' *Joe Louis Boxing Gym (Police Athletic League, 119th Street & Manhattan Avenue* (2009) (*Harlem Postcards* Summer 2009 series), showing the interior of the gym featuring the boxing ring and the filled trophy case mounted to the wall behind it; and Accra Shep's *On Sugar Hill* (2009) (*Harlem Postcards* Fall/Winter 2009/2010 series), presenting the exterior wall display of a basement-level photography studio.

[160] Representative works include: Miguel Calderon's *Purple Haze/Purple Rain* (2008) (*Harlem Postcards* Summer 2008 series), showing four figures, all of whom are wearing sweatpants and sweatshirts (three in purple; the fourth in black) and all of whom are cropped at the neck by the upper margin of the postcard; Lyle Ashton Harris' *Untitled (The Chalet, The Scott House, Accra Ghana)* (2005-2006) (*Harlem Postcards* Spring 2006 series), in which candid photographs and portrait photographs are tacked to a wood-paneled wall alongside other drawings and paper-based ephemera; and Xavier Cha's *Sense in Front* (2007) (*Harlem Postcards* Spring 2007 series), in which the back of a girl's head is shown, drawing attention to the braided patterns of the girl's hair rather than the identity of the girl.
[161] Works belonging to this category include: Nikki S. Lee's *Sunday Morning, Abyssinian Baptist Church* (2003) (*Harlem Postcards* Winter 2003 series), showing a line of white parishioners standing outside of the famous house of worship; Touhami Ennadre's *Lenox Lounge* (2004) (*Harlem Postcards* Spring 2007 series), an almost fully darkened interior with the faces of two embracing figures lighted in the center of the image; and Jeanne Moutoussamy-Ashe's *Holcombe Rucker Playground* (2000) (*Harlem Postcards* Spring 2011 series), a black and white photograph of two boys playing basketball. Also considered appropriate to this category could be William Pope.L's *268 West 136th St. My Grandmother lived here for sixty years until the past came to visit her up through the floorboards and linoleum…* (2004) (*Harlem Postcards* Spring 2004 series), a view of the exterior of the building mentioned in the title, with the presence of the artist's grandmother verbally rather than pictorially signaled.
[162] Dario Robleto's *A Dream Repeats Itself over and over again: Stump of the Tree of Hope, The Morning after Amateur Night at the Apollo Theater, September 4* (2003) (*Harlem Postcards* Fall 2003 series) shows the golden pedestal-mounted Tree of Hope, inextricably linked to the Apollo Theater in which it is presently housed as well as the Lafayette Theater in front of which the tree initially stood prior to 1934. Moyra Davey's *Critter* (2012) (*Harlem Postcards* Summer 2012 series) focuses on a small sculpted stone animal on top of a child's headstone in Trinity Cemetery as well as the artist's own independent practice of sending photographs as letters (the reproduction of the original photograph in postcard form evidences Davey's folding of the image into quarters and affixing postage).
[163] Although the focus of her study is exclusively on portraiture, Deborah Willis' analysis of acts of "participatory self-representation" between photographers and subjects as guiding readings of beauty in African American photography is nonetheless helpful in understanding the relationship between contemporary Harlem, the commissioned photographers, and the Studio Museum in creating the *Harlem Postcards* photographs. See Deborah Willis, *Posing Beauty: African American Images from the 1890s to the Present* (New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 2009).
[164] Without assigning a narrow definition as to what creates the beautiful thing, hooks draws attention to the everyday object as a source of aesthetic pleasure and emotional uplift, regardless of whether that object is made of commonplace material or is a luxury good: "the earth, the sky, the eggs in the henhouse, a finishing worm uncovered in dark, moist dirt, the sight of a tomato growing on a vine… the objects seen in advertisements, on the screen, and in catalogues… a house, a car, furniture, clothing, shoes, etc." bell hooks, "Beauty Laid Bare: Aesthetics in the Ordinary," in *Art on My Mind: Visual Polemics* (New York: The New Press, 1995), 119-124.
[165] Zefrey Throwell, "Free Nuts: Reinvesting in Harlem," accessed July 30, 2012, http://www.zefrey.com/project_freenuts.html.
[166] For the remainder of the exhibition cycle, which lasted until March 14, 2010, Throwell's postcard could not be exchanged for nuts. It instead assumed a position equal to that of the other three contributions to the *Harlem Postcards* Fall/Winter 2009-2010 series: Chitra Ganesh's *Yellow Girl* (2009), Sheree Hovespian's *Props* (2009), and Accra Shepp's *On Sugar Hill* (2009).

Chapter 3. Small Projects About the Bowery: *Counter Culture, GET LOST: Artists Map Downtown New York*, and the Museum Building

Since December 1, 2007, the date of the official opening of its new building at 235 Bowery, [Figure 48] the New Museum and its building have served as a backdrop and supporting frame for two large-scale works of public sculpture.[i] The network of aluminum mesh covering the exterior of the museum's SANAA-designed building provided the structure against which the first two visually striking offerings of the institution's new "Façade Sculpture Projects" series were presented. The inaugural work, Ugo Rondinone's *Hell, Yes!* (2001), was installed on an outdoor ledge of the building from December 1, 2007 to November 12, 2010. [Figure 49] The arced, rainbow-striped irreverent exclamation of the work's title hovered on the surface of the building, conveying both joyful enthusiasm for and confirmation of an unrecorded previously spoken statement.[1] The second work, Isa Genzken's *Rose II* (1993, recreated 2007), was installed November 13, 2011 and had July 31, 2012 as the date for de-installation (the date has since been pushed back to July 31, 2013). [Figure 50] The twenty-eight foot tall stainless steel, aluminum, and lacquer sculpture continues to rise up from the terraced level between the first two stacked units of the building, as though growing out of the mesh cladding, as though it is a window-box planting run amuck.[2]

On its website, the New Museum provided an interpretation for each of the two works. Rondinone's sculpture "encapsulates the philosophy of openness, fearlessness, and optimism" accompanying the museum's "reemergence in the contemporary art community."[3] The series of letters form a speech bubble of sorts for the museum, silently yet boldly communicating to the

[i] Notes for this chapter can be found from page 309 to page 325.

public. Alternatively, rather than promoted as a statement about or from the museum, Genzken's sculpture was offered as the artist's personal tribute to New York City as "city of incredible stability and solidity."[4] However, rather than exclusively a visual analogy for the determination of the city, Genzken's flower in its current presentation can be understood as an illustration of the museum's own institutional fortitude. The flower projects forth vertically, calling to mind urban flora pushing their way undeterred through cracks in pavement.

Even in spite of their sequential rather than contemporaneous presentation, I propose that Rondinone's and Genzken's sculptures mutually inform one another. They assert themselves as visual declarations of the New Museum's presence in and claim to the neighborhood. They can also be read as appropriate representations for the museum's historical place within the New York art world. Whereas Rondinone's sculpture envoices the museum—both structure and institution collectively shouting a celebratory yet still confrontational "Hell, Yes" at the neighborhood and art world—Genzken's sculpture records the results of a durational act of will. If Rondinone's sculpture is a shout attesting to new presence, Genzken's sculpture declares determined ascendency and continuous thriving in spite of seemingly inhospitable environmental factors. Each writes its respective message large and publically: the former, employing an overt and direct address; the latter, a more understated treatment of the theme.

Two collective public projects recently sponsored by the museum mirror these messages. The first, *Counter Culture* (2004), was a clear and forceful announcement of introduction to a new neighborhood. The second, *GET LOST: Artists Map Downtown New York* (2007), more subtly encoded a sympathetic relationship to this neighborhood, drawn out over time, anticipating future growth in spite of potential external resistance. As with Rondinone and Genzken's sculptures, these projects could not exist without the stabilizing and supporting

structure provided by the new building of the New Museum. Rather than a physical form, the building served as a thematic and geographic unifier for each project. Even in its most nascent form as a designated construction site in 2004, the building afforded an ideological and physical context, as it was itself embedded into a greater ideological and physical context of the Bowery. Once completed, the building as a newly iconic sculptural form, continued to exert a meaningful presence in and on the Bowery neighborhood, contributing to the already underway development of a former urban no-man's-land.

This chapter focuses on these three New Museum public projects: *Counter Culture* as a navigable series of six site-specific installations and programmed interactions with community members, with locations indicated by stenciled graphic markers and reinforced by the distribution of printed guides; *GET LOST* as a circulating booklet of twenty-one artist-created maps testing the limits of cartographic legibility and utility while also promoting user-generated urban explorations; and the New Museum's new building itself as a site-responsive monumental public sculpture, serving not only as a functional work of architecture but also as a newly fashioned regional landmark. Shared across each of these projects is a desire to restructure and redefine the area of both "Bowery"—the roadway, a geographically delimited place—and "the Bowery"—the neighborhood, a space with more fluid boundaries. The effect of these projects has been the museum's redrawing of the space around 235 Bowery, each project contributing to a single, cumulative, and protracted charting of urban space. Presenting these three projects together, contextually situated with respect to both the New Museum's history and the cultural history of the downtown Manhattan neighborhood, reveals as well a complex program of identity construction enacted by the museum-as-mapmaker. Alongside this chorographic representation

has been the dual fashioning of a new institutional identity for the New Museum and a new regional identity for the Bowery.

From Marcia's Bootstraps to Lisa's Loserville

Approaching the thirtieth anniversary of its 1977 founding, the New Museum moved from being a scrappy upstart, defined by what former New Museum President Henry Luce III called "Operation Bootstrap," to a major exhibition center within not only the New York but also the global art world.[5] However, at the time of the presentation of *Counter Culture* in the summer of 2004 and the distribution of *GET LOST* in the summer of 2007, the museum was without a functional permanent base of operations. Its current building at 235 Bowery was still under construction and would not be open to the public until December 1, 2007. In anticipation of its immanent relocation, the New Museum emphasized a downtown Manhattan culture scene through not only curatorial initiatives such as *Counter Culture* and *GET LOST* but also through extra-curatorial programs. A series of promotional initiatives highlighting the shape of the new building, museum exhibitions following the opening, and community endeavors that the museum has organized in subsequent years continue to foster a connection between institution and neighborhood. Central to this chapter is an understanding of the relationship between the histories of the New Museum—its sponsored exhibitions, building, and publicity programs—and the neighborhood in which the museum now finds itself.

While the museum's new building does not graphically appear in either the individual *Counter Culture* components or the set of *GET LOST* maps, the building site looms large over each. The marking of the building location in each project—as an immanent and active construction site, respectively—served not just to generally ground each project in a neighborhood but instead to specifically target a single meaningful location as a vital source of

artistic production. With the then-future museum site, given repeated emphasis across the disparate artist contributions in both *Counter Culture* and *GET LOST*, these projects endeavored to enact mutually reinforcing relationships between the artistic heritage of the region, the museum now located there, and the spatial scope of influence of each.

As will be discussed, the museum's new building reflects while also challenging well-rehearsed modernist conventions of architecture, and specifically architecture designed for the showcase of works of art. It visually conveys the transformation of the "white cube" as both a real and ideological site of display. In her analysis of architecture and media, architectural historian Beatriz Colomina has considered modern architecture's embedding within a greater network of communication systems. In particular, Colomina called for a re-siting of the experience of architecture. As she described, architectural production was "no longer exclusively located at the construction site, but more and more displaced into the immaterial sites of architectural publications, exhibitions, journals." These "supposedly much more ephemeral media" than the brick and mortar—or steel and glass—materials of buildings served to permanently fix them in history and in the minds of those considering the place and influence of such buildings. Colomina advanced the idea that by managing the forms of media in which representations of the buildings circulated, modern architects took personal legacy construction into their own hands.[6]

In a modification of the processes undertaken by the early and mid-twentieth century architects of Colomina's study, the New Museum has used both the look and location of its building to craft a future legacy while rewriting a personal history. Through recent exhibition, outreach, and promotional programming, by each category of which both *Counter Culture* and *GET LOST* can be claimed, the New Museum aligned itself with a tradition of "downtown"

alternative art production, specifically a selective a legacy of "the Bowery." This alignment has entailed the incorporation of the site of the museum within the context of other regional landmark locations and the presentation of community-, site-, and object-based collaged portraits representative of a "downtown scene" with redrawn boundaries. The New Museum, as an institution only recently concerned with aligning itself with a specific architectural form, is similarly involved in process of legacy construction through an ephemeral cartographic means.

The New Museum's arrival in the Bowery has been described as changing the geography of the New York art world and affirming the rising presence of the Lower East Side as a viable commercial art scene. However, rather than singularly announcing the arrival of gentrification to the Bowery, the construction and completion of the New Museum's new building can be more appropriately read as continuing a process of transformation already a over a decade in the making. Reports of the changing real-estate prices and physical alterations to the local environment began appearing in the early 1990s, and increasing in frequency through the 2000s. I would argue instead that such New Museum projects could be viewed as participating in a greater culture of nostalgia—and in some cases false nostalgia—that seems to have accompanied this declared loss of an authentic local identity brought about by gentrification. Through project such as *Counter Culture* and *GET LOST*, the museum promotes a crafted, backwards-looking view while at the same time becoming complicit in the forward march of recent commercial speculation within the region.

The museum's goal seems to be to present an institutional identity predicated on what journalist Alexandria Symonds has referred to as a process of "*authentrification*." This neologism, a combination of authenticity and gentrification, entails a certain quest for legitimacy and acceptance by new high-end businesses and specialty retailers within a neighborhood into

which they have recently arrived, even if this legitimization is enacted only on a superficial level. In such a process, traditional visual markers of gentrification are modified in an attempt to pay a lip-service level homage to previous local cultural forms. Seized upon are those elements of the region's past—including significant figures, sites, and events—that are then repurposed as part of a greater design and branding scheme. Possible manifestations of this can include the preservation of already extant signage or façade designs, or the fashioning new facades that consciously mirror those of older storefronts.[7]

As will be demonstrated, beyond mining local community narratives, *Counter Culture* endeavored to build anticipation for the museum's future move to 235 Bowery. At the same time, the exhibition was designed to counteract the stigma associated with the Bowery as a marginal neighborhood; as "Loserville," the tongue-in-cheek appellation given to the neighborhood by a 2005 headline in *The Village Voice*.[8] However, whereas *Counter Culture* sought a clean break from past associations, a break activated by the museum's intervention, *GET LOST* positioned the institution as a seamless extension of its new neighborhood's cultural heritage. As mobile art exhibitions existing alongside a monumental sculptural project, *Counter Culture* and *GET LOST* can be read as enacting a institutional self-definition: generating and affirming a public identity for the New Museum in which place matters.

Through these projects, the concept of "the Bowery" is made analogous with an aesthetic of a "downtown" alternative arts scene extending throughout southern Manhattan and specifically encompassing the Lower East Side, SoHo, and Lower Manhattan. The New Museum has positioned itself as integral part of this culture: the museum's presence and its sponsorship are situated within real places and alongside real landmarks. The ways in which these cultural elisions have been made will be discussed throughout the chapter.

Rethinking the Museum in the Sky

Current New Museum Director Lisa Philips has argued that, in its early years, "With such a generic name, and with so many new museums being built, the museum had a difficult time establishing itself as an institution with a clear identity and location. It lacked the identity that a body can give, and it lacked good spaces to show art in."[9] However, although the museum would not define itself through its location during its first twenty years of operation, the museum did have a clear identity in these earliest years. Founding Director Marcia Tucker *was* the New Museum for over two decades. For much of the institution's early history, this was the museum that Marcia built. This chapter section considers the New Museum's public identity under Tucker's directorship, providing the historical context for the shift in institutional self-definition that occurred under Philips' directorship.

During the first two decades of its history, the New Museum can be understood as unofficially following two related guiding principles. The first, that the museum was the "Museum of the Sky" or, alternatively, the "Museum in the Sky," was developed almost immediately. Appearing in a 1977 interview conducted with Tucker and *The New York Times* and formalized in a painting by the artist Jonathan Santlofer from the same year, this phrase suggests both an institutional ideal and an ideal institution.[10] [Figure 51] The museum would be untethered to established art museum principles. It would also be physically untethered, struggling to find a permanent site of operations as it moved from temporary space to temporary space, while exploring the relationship between the physical gallery and the everyday world. These explorations—one geographical; the other conceptual—would continue even beyond the earliest years of the museum's existence. The second principle, that of "Rethinking Museuming," a phrase that appeared in a 1985 draft of an intra-institutional memo, signaled a questioning the

very nature of what it means to be a museum dedicated to the contemporary moment.[11] This kind of self-investigation, the ongoing inquiry into what defined the identity of the museum, was linked to a desire to remain relevant amidst the changing currents of both a local New York art world and an international contemporary art world.

Through such investigations, the New Museum itself became a theoretical object, defined by institutional attitudes towards exhibiting works of art rather than defined by the works of art arranged upon or within the museum's walls.[12] The New Museum was also a peripatetic object: migrating through various neighborhoods within the southern part of Manhattan, removed from the more well established neighborhoods of "official" art culture of the period: namely the "Museum Mile" of the Upper East Side and extending south to the midtown locations of the Museum of Modern Art and private commercial galleries. Settling in SoHo for much of the first two decades of operation, the New Museum developed an institutional identity that viewed its locational attachment as something warranting limited emphasis yet something notheless needing to be compensated for.[13] Instead, for much of the first approximately twenty years of operation, the museum was more clearly a personality-driven institution, a term not intended to diminish the programs developed but instead meant to emphasize the prominent position of the figure guiding these programs towards realization.

Tucker's impulse to create a new institutional showcase for recent artists' work was borne out of the perceived failure on the part of existing New York museums to respond to the rapidly shifting landscape of contemporary art. According to the now somewhat-mythologized origin narrative, the New Museum—or "The New Museum" as it was initially titled—was founded by Tucker following her very public firing as a curator at the Whitney Museum of American Art (hereafter Whitney Museum) in the late fall of 1976.[14] The Whitney Museum was

moving away from displaying "new" American art in exhibitions generated by the museum's staff to strengthening its commitment to its permanent collection, advanced primarily through the acquisition of already established, older artists. When her position changed from Curator of Painting and Sculpture to that of Curator of Contemporary, a category made all but obsolete under the shifted institutional mandate, and recognizing the limited future for her at the museum, Tucker planned for her next career venture.[15]

During her final weeks employed at the Whitney Museum in the late fall of 1976, Tucker established a small institutional trust and filed financial paperwork to receive tax-exempt status for the new institution she was planning. This would allow it to accept future tax-deductable contributions from the moment it started operations. She also worked to secure both office and exhibition spaces for the new art organization. Tucker's goal was to create "a workable, serious contemporary arts center that would bridge the gap between alternative spaces… and the top-heavy bureaucratic structures that take fewer and fewer chances."[16] For Tucker, existing museums were unable to appropriately respond to and reflect the rapidly appearing new works of living artists; unable to present, let alone make sense of, the shifting debates among contemporary post-war American art practices.[17] The bureaucracy of large museums—responsible for both the often slow process by which exhibitions were proposed and then planned and issues in securing funding for potentially conceptually controversial and thus low-attended exhibitions—convinced Tucker that simply moving laterally in her career to another curator position would improve neither the situation for her nor for contemporary American artists.

The entrenched exhibition practices of institutions such as the Whitney Museum and the Museum of Modern Art throughout the 1970s were among those against which Tucker was actively reacting in her curatorial choices. She saw each as having sacrificed significant early

principles in the decades since their respective founding.[18] Tucker's interest in creating an institution modeled after the promise of previous "new" New York museums of contemporary art appeared in the 1976 New Museum Trust Agreement she drafted. Tucker's New Museum was set forth "as a forum for the kind of visual and verbal exchange between artists and public that existed in the 1920's and 1930s when the Museum of Modern Art and the Whitney Studio Club were first formed."[19] Left unsaid but certainly implied in this statement was Tucker's desire for her new museum to serve as a corrective: to fulfill what she perceived as the once promising mission of these older museums to effectively negotiate the divide between acting as a kunstmuseum and a kunsthalle for works of contemporary art.[20]

Nonetheless, establishing a new *museum* was of primary importance to Tucker's venture.[21] In her posthumously published memoirs, Tucker recalled that if she "was going to challenge a paradigm, it needed to be a paradigm I knew best." She would "redefine the concept of the museum altogether, to turn it upside down and do all the risky things I had wanted to do but couldn't at the Whitney—and wouldn't be able to do at any other museum in the country either."[22] The challenge was to change the institutional framework surrounding the display of artistic practices: the museum as organizing concept, the museum as site of cultural display, and the museum as arbiter of "the good" and the officially sanctioned in art. In addition, Tucker elevated comprehensive documentation and scholarly evaluation as the chief "museological function" inherent in operating a museum space.[23]

In adamantly asserting the "museum" aspect of the endeavor over an alternative art space or temporary exhibition space, Tucker not only affirmed her position as an art historian guiding a traditional institution but also leveled a challenge to the very idea of this kind of institution from within the institution.[24] This idea of an informed challenge would serve Tucker's mission well. It

allowed Tucker to bring not only her first hand knowledge of museum operations, internal politics, and self-determined responsibility to provide high quality scholarship with her to a new institution, but also her experience and connections which would yield a network of supporters familiar with her record of ambitious curatorial practice.[25]

Tucker's "The New Museum" began its first month of operation in January 1977. With a startup budget of $17,000 from two benefactors, the Museum established its headquarters in a rented office in room 803 at 105 Hudson Street. The building already housed other artworld tenants: Artists Space, Printed Matter and the Julian Pretto Gallery, leading to the popular naming of the site as the Fine Arts Building. In spite of these other multi-functional spaces—serving as offices and exhibition galleries—the museum's space in the building operated only as an administrative office. The first several exhibitions sponsored under the banner of The New Museum were not held in the Fine Arts Building, but rather at satellite exhibition spaces and organized from the Hudson Street office space. Mounting group exhibitions held as close as Leonard Street to as far away as Woodstock, New York and Tokyo, Japan, the New Museum-as-sponsor sought to announce a visual and conceptual identity of contemporary art practice alongside a curatorial identity for the new institution.[26]

The administrative side of the museum was initially set up to be nonhierarchical. Staff would hold positions for the duration of one year, at which time everyone would trade positions. The justification was to allow for each member of the New Museum staff to have the opportunity to have first-hand experience in the full spectrum of tasks and responsibilities needed in running a contemporary museum. In addition, underscoring this non-hierarchical structuring, all decisions were to be made by consensus. However, both of these ideals were quickly abandoned as impractical.[27] More traditional were the topics of institutional concern outlined by Tucker and

her staff and circulated among the Board of Trustees and Advisory Board in 1977. These included: Exhibition Programs, Collections, Information Service, Education Program, Staff Organization, Location, Potential Audience, and Funding. While acknowledging a chief short-term objective to both find and act as an exhibition space, Tucker's proposal took a longer view of the museum's growth. This entailed the development of a museum collection, later realized as the Semi-Permanent collection. The rules governing the collection would be periodically renegotiated throughout Tucker's directorship, until the dissolution of this manner of collecting in 2000.[28]

In July 1977, the building at 105 Hudson was sold and all of the tenants were forced to relocate. The New School for Social Research quickly provided the New Museum with a temporary facility in the Albert and Vera List Center at 65 Fifth Avenue and 14th Street, formerly home to the New School Graduate Art Center. This accommodation was made, in no small part, through Vera List's status as an early trustee and ardent supporter of the museum. The museum was provided with 2,500 square feet of space on the ground floor of the building. In addition, a small stipend was provided as an operating budget. The museum converted the space into a pair of smaller offices adjoining a larger gallery space, serving as the first in-house gallery space New Museum exhibitions would occupy. Exhibitions featuring works challenging expected definitions of artistic and curatorial practice, subject matter, and even good taste began to establish a public identity for the institution as an extension of that already provided by Tucker's art world clout and reputation. Over the next five years, exhibitions hosted in the New School galleries included iterations of the *New Work/New York, Outside New York*, and *Currents* series, solo exhibitions of artists including Alfred Jensen, Barry Le Va, Ree Morton, John Baldessari, and group

exhibitions organized around formal, methodological, and thematically-driven issues in recent art production.[29]

During this same time, one can detect not only an institutional interest in developing a canon of contemporary practice, unrestricted by medium, content, or the artist's geographic location, but also an interest in thinking about the institution as a series of spaces for exhibiting such practice. Combining this museological concern with a practical desire to maximize public attention for the museum led to the creation of the "The Window," a new exhibition series in which artists' works were installed within the List Center's first floor showcase windows on 14th Street. The series sponsored close to twenty installations over the next two years. These short-duration exhibitions ran alongside the scheduled gallery exhibition, with the window content varying between complementing and independent of the works in the museum's galleries.[30] This series marks an early perforation of the boundary between sites of display for the museum: exhibitions that explored the binaries between the isolated gallery exhibition and the accessible exhibition held in public space and between the conventional museum display of works and an alternative model more often associated with the storefront gallery space. The New Museum's negotiation of these boundaries governing places for art and developing strategies to undo such real and ideological divisions served as an ongoing concern throughout the museum's history.

During the early 1980s, the topic of spaces within and around the New School gallery became more fraught. Mutual agreement about protocols regarding the sharing of public spaces, particularly building entrances and public halls in front of the gallery space, was demonstrated to be problematic for both the museum and the university. This tenuous relationship would lead to a series of memos "clarifying" the rights of ownership and use of the space throughout the museum's tenure in the building.[31] The search for a new location for the museum had been a

topic of discussion almost from the beginning of the occupation of the New School site, with an awareness of the temporary nature of this occupation well understood by both parties. At the end of five years of tenancy at the Fifth Avenue space, a new location was needed.[32]

In December 31, 1982 the New School formally asked the New Museum to vacate the space, the same day that the museum received the deed to what would become their institutional home for the next two decades: the Astor Building at 583 Broadway, between Houston and Prince Streets.[33] The museum received a multi-million dollar gift in the form of the lower two and a half floors of the building located in the heart of SoHo, then the center of the New York art world.[34] The total space available for museum use increased from 2,500 square feet available at the New School to 22,000 square feet in the Broadway building. The expanded space allowed for an expanded museum lobby, exhibition galleries on both the first and second level of the building, a museum shop, office space including a conference room, exhibition preparation space and storage, a curatorial archive, a library with additional archival holdings, an a 200 seat auditorium. Between 1996 and 1997, after almost fifteen years of occupation by the New Museum, the building underwent a significant two-phase program of renovation. Achieved was the further expansion of gallery space to an additional floor of the building, the redesign of a newly-increased lobby space, the renovation of administrative offices, the improvement of building facilities (including updating the heat, gas, and air conditioning systems) to bring the building up to code, the creation of the New Museum Bookstore and subterranean auditorium, and the development of a basement educational outreach center including classroom space to be used by the High School Arts Program.

From 1983 to 2004, during which time it occupied the SoHo building, the New Museum positioned itself as a major center for contemporary art, not only within the New York art world

but also extending its influence to position itself a national, and ultimately international center. With this came the need to reaffirm an institutional mission. In 1983, the name of the museum was officially changed to "The New Museum of Contemporary Art," clarifying the institution's purview.[35] Two years later, Tucker and her staff attempted to further clarify what it meant to be a museum dedicated to the contemporary. This was particularly important as the institution approached its ten-year anniversary. The museum was now established at a long-term physical site, following able-to-be replicated procedural patterns, and demonstrating a record of past work upon which its identity could be determined and evaluated. Launching a defense against claims of complacency accompanying such maturation, Tucker delivered a speech on November 5, 1985 in which she declared, "This [The New Museum of Contemporary Art] is a Museum that doesn't suffer from that dreaded disease known as Museumitis, or Museitis, in lay terms called internal stultification."[36] The proactive remedy to this potential illness would be a rigorous interrogating museum practice in which the concern to be "relevant" was key.[37]

This imperative to remain relevant and how this relevance was to be programmatically realized took on different meanings for Tucker and her staff: to engage with "relevant" issues, to remain "relevant" to contemporary art making strategies (either formally or conceptually), and to generate and disseminate critical evaluations in "relevant" media formats.[38] Mindfulness towards a "relevant" museum as being a museum of ideas, events, and situations yielded a series of programs throughout the 1980s and the 1990s that examined the multiple uses and meanings of the museum as a space. Greater attention was paid to both physical spaces of exhibition and emerging media platforms, used not only to create new types of art practice but also to expand the possibilities for exchange and interaction between this new art and the museum's audience. Programs included: "On View," an umbrella program under which "The New World Gallery," a

revised version of "The Window," and the "WorkSpace" series were brought together; "One Night Only," in which, true to its name, the museum was transformed into a setting for "nightclub-like performance art" for a single evening on March 20, 1987;[39] and the hybrid exhibition and feedback exchange project the "Rhetorical Image Resource Room: A Viewer Participation Project of The New Museum of Contemporary Art," from December 9, 1990 to February 3, 1991.[40] As an extension of this, during the 1990s discussions of the possibilities offered by the Internet were repeated throughout several planning memos circulated within the institution.[41] This was accompanied by the creation of the *Living Library* program. Formulated to be "more than an archive of texts and ephemera from the recent past," this was instead "a space devoted to supporting the creation and dissemination of critical and creative 'publication,' and a space for interaction among museum visitors, community-based organizations, schools and remote constituents (via the Internet)." On-site and off-site programs met in this physical and digital space through the presentation of on-line exhibitions and the creation of web-based public programs and discussions.[42]

However, such experiments in audience and presentation did not mean fully surrendering a schedule of exhibitions and the presentation of the "objects" of contemporary art. While the events such as "One Night Only" may have raised the profile of the museum as willing to embracing novel art staging strategies, a more traditional schedule of exhibitions continued to provide a necessary foundation upon which this reputation could rest. While within the SoHo building, the New Museum presented solo exhibitions of previously underrepresented yet now canonical artists in major New York institutions. These included exhibitions of works by Joan Jonas, Leon Golub, Hans Haacke, Bruce Nauman, Ana Mendieta, Felix Gonzalez-Torres, Christian Boltanski, Nancy Spero, Mary Kelly, Bob Flanagan, Andreas Serrano, Carolee

Schneemann, Mona Hatoum, Doris Salcedo, David Wojnarowicz, Cildo Merieles, and William Kentridge.[43] Alongside these, the museum produced thematically structured group exhibitions. These highlighted artists' responses to social and political hot button issues, particularly topics of race, gender sexuality and cultural identity.[44]

Beyond being categorized as either artist- or thematically-driven, these exhibitions can also be understood as curatorially- and personality- driven as well. Just as the New Musuem's identity in the first several years following its founding was that of the museum that Marcia built, the influence that Tucker wielded well into the 1990s cannot be overlooked or understated. Tucker directly organized new exhibitions and oversaw the hiring of teams of curators who programmed exhibitions sympathetic to Tucker's model: Tucker's preferences for artists and themes continued to hold great sway.[45]

However, the end of the 1990s would also mark the end of an era for the museum. On May 26, 1998, Henry Luce III announced his decision to retire as President and trustee of The New Museum, positions he held since the museum's founding in 1977.[46] The following year, Tucker too resigned the position she held since the museum's beginning. Tucker originally intended to step down from her position of Executive Director in June of 2000, following the completion of the exhibition *The Time of Our Lives*, from July 15 to October 17, 1999. Although a search for a replacement was already underway, Tucker asked for the date of decision be moved up several months. Diagnosed with non-Hodgkins lymphoma, Tucker requested, as stated in a letter circulated among New Museum board members, a long-term "leave of absence from directing in order to focus on the exhibition, my health, and my family."[47] Tucker assumed the title of Founding Director while Lisa Philips started in the position of Director of the New

Museum on April 20, 1999.[48] In a curious mirroring of history, prior to taking on the new title, Philips was Curator of Contemporary Art at the Whitney Museum.

Finding its Place

The retirements of Luce and Tucker marks a clear historical break in the chronology of the museum, with the hiring of Philips a literal introduction of a new guard. With this appointment came not just a staffing change, but also the opportunity to rethink the principles and programs defining the New Museum. In an article announcing Phillips' New Museum appointment, *Artforum International* contributor Lee Smith wrote, "For much of the '90s, the New Museum of Contemporary Art wasn't high on the list of must-see New York venues. Its feisty glory days a thing of the past, the institution, with its uninviting space and an exhibition program that was spotty at the best seemed ready for a major overhaul… and given the New Museum's current state, there's no place to go but up."[49] The museum's post-1999 investigation of where this place could be found directly informs the three public projects considered in this chapter. Through the introduction of new programs, new curatorial staff, and, ultimately, a new location entirely the museum would begin to chart a new era for itself. This chapter section considers the groundwork laid for this new period in the early years of Philips' directorship: in which a policy of "rethinking museuming" would again be applied.[50] Rather than just practice, place would as well become crucial to this self-evaluation.

In an article appearing in *The New York Times* several months prior to the 2007 opening of the New Museum's new building at 235 Bowery, Carol Vogel emphasized the "newness" of the New Museum. In addition to citing an increased curatorial staff[51] and new trustee membership,[52] Vogel also referenced "the museum's re-energized mission—to showcase the newest art…"[53] Under Philips, several long-term organizational programs and alliances with

other art institutions were fostered, emphasizing the institutional networked connectivity that has defined much of contemporary art practice in recent years. Such programs included: affiliating with the online digital art network Rhizome.org; participating in a museum consortium with the Museum of Contemporary Art, Chicago and the UCLA Hammer Museum; and partnering with Insa Art Space in Seoul, Korea, the Townhouse Gallery of Contemporary Art in Cairo, Egypt, the Van Abbesmuseum in Eindhoven in the Netherlands, and the Museo Tamayo Arte Contemporaneo in Mexico City, Mexico international to create the "Museum as Hub" program. This final program, developed in 2007 and described by New Museum as "a new model for curatorial practice and institutional collaboration," was conceived as an opportunity to think both locally (with each institution in this first year of collaboration developing programs around the concept of "neighborhood") and globally (as such an international network of idea exchange would naturally entail). An example of the New Museum's contribution to this program will be discussed in the penultimate section of this chapter.

However, rather than considering this time as defined by a re-energizing of mission, it is perhaps more appropriate to evaluate this period as a re-crafting of institutional identity. Inherited programs either historically troublesome or recently revealed to be incompatible with the developing place-based definition of the museum were cast off, while alternative programs were intended to supply a newly "relevant" institutional definition.[54] A radical reconceptualization of and recent emphasis on the museum's geographic place in Manhattan contributed to this institutional redefinition. Alongside its recent global connections, the museum also asserted a pronounced local focus.

In the middle of the 2000s, the New Museum was an institution without a home. In the fall of 2004, the SoHo Building at 583 Broadway ceased serving as the museum's administrative

center and main exhibition space. On September 18, 2004 the museum began operations at the on the ground floor of the Chelsea Art Museum at 556 West 22nd Street. The New Museum rented 7,000 square feet of space from the then two-year old Chelsea Art Museum.[55] This temporary relocation allowed the New Museum to continue public programming following the sale of the SoHo building and while awaiting completion of construction on its new building on Bowery. In a brief article from April of 2004 in *The New York Times* discussing the immanent cohabitation of these new "Museum Roommates," Lisa Philips enthusiastically praised the Chelsea Art Museum as "the perfect space" for the New Museum. She commended the new space as being both "fully outfitted" with necessary practical materials needed to run a contemporary exhibition space and proximally near to the New Museum's "core community."[56]

This label of "core community" proves telling in light of the promotional program soon to be employed by the New Museum in connection to its Bowery location, discussed in greater depth at the end of the chapter. Worth highlighting for now though is how the notion of the New Museum's community became a fluid concept, employed to reflect selectively emphasized shifting interests. In 2004, the New Museum's community was not simply the recently developed Chelsea gallery system. It was also located across the island, father to the south and east, a connection made even more clear upon the opening of the new building in late 2007.

During the museum's temporary cross-town re-siting in the Chelsea Museum, the online art news and criticism magazine Artnet remarked that although the New Museum "is still waiting for its new headquarters to open… that doesn't mean it's idle!"[57] Over the two and a half years of this transitional period, eleven New Museum exhibitions were presented in the Chelsea space.[58] These can be understood not only as maintaining the museum's public profile, but also as laying the groundwork for institution's imminent move to the Bowery. Upon formally arriving

in the Chelsea space, the New Museum offered a trio of exhibitions: a projection of Alex Villar's 2001 performance *Upward Mobility*; an exhibition of recent projects by Heath Bunting entitled *Heath Bunting: Rules of Crime*, from September 18 to November 13, 2004; and the appropriately titled exhibition *Adaptive Behavior*, also from September 18 to November 13, 2004.[59] This third exhibition was a group exhibition presenting the works of eleven international artists, unified by an interest in the use of performance to suggest one's capacity to adapt personal actions to different public situations. The theme and title of the exhibition seem meaningfully relevant in light of the institution's own required adaptive behaviors in response to the museum's unmoored and transient state.

In addition, the exhibition *East Village USA*, also held in the Chelsea space from December 9, 2004 to March 19, 2005, can also be read not merely an isolated curatorial endeavor but rather as establishing a context for the New Museum's then- and future-locational situation. This exhibition dedicated to the "East Village scene" of the 1980s was expansive in its art historical scope while delimited in its geographic focus. Presented were works by artists representing solo and collaborative practice, studio and street art, and both the independent storefront and the mainstream commercial gallery system.[60] Although the time required in organizing an exhibition from conception to completion should not be discounted, the timing of the exhibition is nonetheless revealing. While possible to understand the exhibition as part as a continuation of recently organized New Museum shows held in the SoHo building (Dan Cameron previously curated retrospective exhibitions of Martin Wong and David Wojnarowicz in 1999 and 2000 respectively), the timing of the exhibition can also be interpreted as part of a greater program of formalizing the museum's place in the Bowery.

In the concluding paragraph of her introduction to the *East Village USA* exhibition catalogue, Philips made this point clear. She wrote, "Over the years, it has always been young people, students, and new foreign arrivals who have driven the energy, ingenuity and idealism of the East Village. We look forward to being part of this vital history as we build our new Museum on the Bowery, a gateway to the East Village and the Lower East Side."[61] Her capitalization of "Museum" guided the reader to believe Philips was discussing not only the new building at a specific address on the roadway but an entire set of programs indicative of the New Museum's reputation and legacy to soon to be relocated within the greater downtown area.

The next two chapter sections of this dissertation examine two museum-sponsored projects that drove this connection between the New Museum and the Bowery prior to the opening of the new building. Both projects shared an interest in mining the Bowery as a socially and culturally rich place. The first, *Counter Culture*, served to introduce the museum's audience to the blocks surrounding 235 Bowery through a series of site- and place-specific installations. In addition to generating a legible map-based guide to the project and neighborhood, *Counter Culture* also structured a series of interactions between audience, residents, artists, and local landmarks in order to present the neighborhood as a place for exploration and interaction. Following this chapter section, the dissertation considers *GET LOST: Artists Map Downtown New York* as a project designed to integrate the museum into the neighborhood. With the regional introduction process initiated three years prior, *GET LOST* communicated the museum's place within a set of both historical and present-day Bowery locations. However, *Counter Culture* was planned as a transitional project during the museum's relocation from SoHo to Chelsea, rather than from Chelsea to the Bowery in the case of *GET LOST*.

Sites of *Counter Culture*

Between July 10 and August 14, 2004, the New Museum presented *Counter Culture*, a group exhibition as a public installation of several site-specific projects. Organized by Melanie Cohn, curatorial coordinator for the New Museum, the exhibition featured six works, many of which were comprised of multiple components: Raul Vincent Enriquez's *Audio, Map, and Icon* (2004), Flux Factory's *Secret Spaces*, Jean Shin's *Wishing Well* (2004), Julianne Swartz's *Can You Hear Me* (2004), Marion Wilson's *This Store Too* (2004) and Ricardo Miranda Zuniga's *From Darkness to Daylight* (2004). The individual projects took as their subjects the Bowery as a materially constructed place, a commercially productive environment, and an inhabited neighborhood home to a diverse population. The title of *Counter Culture* was intended to suggest forms of exchange—the transmission of goods, culture, and conversation over the space of the public counter—while also bringing to mind the concept of a sociological "counterculture" contained within and represented by the Bowery.

Filling the transition between exhibition programming in the SoHo building and the Chelsea Museum's space, *Counter Culture* served two purposes. It enabled the museum to present a project at a moment when a physical gallery space was not yet available. It also allowed the museum to provide its audience with a public introduction to the Bowery, cultivating public familiarity of and building anticipation for the museum's future residency in the neighborhood. Rather than drawing an art audience to its new Chelsea location, *Counter Culture* served as an initial step in the museum's longer process of placemaking in the Bowery.

The museum organized a series of outreach programs linked to the exhibition. Free tours, offered every Sunday afternoon during the run of the exhibition, guided the public through the different project locations. Cohn along with one of the participating artists led each tour.[62] Jonathan Wynn has discussed the public's encounter with the *Counter Culture* projects in the

context of these curator-guided tours. He described how "curated by the museum, the expressed goal of the tour formed the content, which then shaped the interactions participants had as part of the experience… [of] connecting tourists with marginalized people."[63] I propose an alternative reading of this type of structured experience with the neighborhood. First, the label of "tourist" assigned to the project audience needs to be understood broadly as one for whom the Bowery was unfamiliar terrain, a category inclusive of native Manhattanites and not simply out-of-towners. Second, the goal of the project was not exclusively to put the audience in contact with the "marginalized people" of the Bowery as an end in itself: any social consciousness raised seems a secondary consequence of interactivity promoted by a few individual projects rather than the exhibition as a whole. Instead, the projects that comprised *Counter Culture* engaged an audience to begin the process of transforming a perceived industrial "no-man's-land" into a familiar and unthreatening setting for an art going public.

The "*Audio*" element of Raul Vincent Enriquez's triadic *Audio, Map, and Icon* (the other two components of the triad will be discussed below) was a self-guided walking tour designed to connect the listener with local business owners and artists by splicing together audio files of pre-recorded interviews. An audio file playable on an MP3 device was made available for download through the New Museum's website, while a CD of the same tour was available for purchase for two dollars at local businesses throughout the Bowery.[64] Access to Flux Factory's *Secret Spaces* was granted a password revealed by Eunriquez's audio recording. *Secret Spaces* was also structured around the model of the guided tour. The first stop of *Secret Spaces* was an installation at the Bowery Martial Arts at 246 Bowery. [Figure 52] Entry was granted after providing the password "Gert Frobe," a reference to the actor Karl Gerhart Frobe, famous for playing the James Bond villain Goldfinger in the film of the same name. Once inside the

installation, similar to an agent in a Bond movie, the project audience's would find performable "missions" left for them by members of Flux Factory. Many of these missions involved further navigating through walking tour routes across the local neighborhood.[65]

For *Wishing Well,* Jean Shinn relocated a commercial stainless steel sink to in front of the restaurant Public, located at 210 Elizabeth Street, while a second more elaborate fountain was placed inside of the restaurant. [Figure 53] The project inverted the relationship between the "front of house" and the "back of house" locations and practices of the restaurant. As a mass-produced version of its nostalgic referent, the commercial sink served as a contemporary wishing well, inviting both passersby and patrons of the restaurant to drop coins into the basin while making a wish. The sink, usually used by kitchen staff for washing dishes, became the first form encountered by potential diners approaching the restaurant, while fewer people saw the more ornate basin. Shin's project also made reference to often-unseen immigrant populations who work in trendy kitchens: their wishes for the fulfillment of the American Dream as predicated upon this functional commercial sink. In bringing forth this sink, the artist also brought forth these workers.

Marion Wilson's *This Store Too* was more directly linked to the Bowery. [Figure 54] *This Store Too* offered the public an opportunity to collaborate on a project with Wilson. A participant would offer a material good or simply an idea to Wilson who would then use this object or concept as either the source material or inspiration for creating a new sculpture. This newly crafted work was then sold on a pushcart staffed by the artist traveling throughout the neighborhood. Profits from sales went to the Bowery Mission, the homeless organization serving the neighborhood. Thus an act of creative exchange made manifest as a possible goods exchange resulted in further economic, service, and welfare exchange at the local level.

Both Ricardo Miranda Zuniga's *From Darkness to Daylight* and Julianne Swartz's *Can You Hear Me* sculptural constructions made present the local population for the exhibition audience. Zuniga's project was installed at SILO, the gallery at 1 Freeman Alley, a rare Manhattan alleyway located between Bowery and Chrystie Street and off of Rivington Street. Building upon the prominence of a neighborhood industrial vocabulary, the project was comprised of three large galvanized steel ventilation ducts interwoven together. [Figure 55] Each duct terminated in a set of wooden planks, in the center of which was embedded a computer monitor. On each monitor, an animated character appeared. These characters' physical features were modeled after current residents of the Bowery, who also provided the voices for these talking heads. Each screen presented a different narrated record of local history, stretching across a one hundred and fifty year period. This collapse in the temporal distance between past and present modes of address and material forms was made literal through the intermingling of the channels of ductwork terminating in video monitors. [66] *Can You Hear Me* was an even more elaborate installation. Swartz constructed a bright yellow communication system that piped in both sounds and images from the Sunshine Hotel, a one-time residential hotel more readily associated as a flophouse, to Bari Restaurant Supply Store. [Figure 56] The two businesses are located next to one another, sharing the address of 241 Bowery. Swartz' construction was made from an industrial duct pipe, a series of mirrors, and a square callbox. It also included a platform on street level on which one could stand in order to both listen and watch the events taking place inside the hotel. A trio of plastic placards affixed to the front of the sign—one at eye level and another two suspended overhead—graphically illustrated the exchange connecting those walking on the Bowery to those staying on the Bowery. Otherwise private lives could be observed in

public, with the objective less on illicit spying than on revealing hidden truths about Bowery residents.

In planning the public exhibition, the curator and participating artists discussed how to identify each site as part of a larger network of installed projects. As part of his project contribution, Enriquez developed a logo for the project. This was then spray painted in front of each installation location. Temporary paint was used, so as not to permanently alter the environment. Enriquez's logo—or Enriquez's "*Icon*"—was an antenna actively broadcasting content, with repeated arcs laterally radiating out from a circuitry diagram perpendicularly intersecting the central axis. [Figure 57] Rather than a simple crossing, Enriquez's use of an electrical symbol reinforced the idea of energized communication activated at and by the site. Beyond representing an antenna, the central axis also served to unite two additional symbolic representations. The upper pole of the axis terminated in an arrow, one of four inwardly directed arrows gathered around a central point. The lower pole terminated in a partial, doubly inscribed rectangle (the lower edge of the outer rectangle is omitted) also surrounding a single point. This formed both a base for the antenna and a separate coded symbol. Taken together the grouping of arrows and the rectangle not only suggested the individual project components brought together as part of *Counter Culture* but also signaled the place in which these projects are located. Drawing upon ideographic symbology, four arrows around a central point indicated a collective meeting place, while the boxed in circle referred to the dangerous quality about a place.[67] Linked together, these served as a coded identity for the Bowery: a collective gathering place in which potential danger lurks for the itinerant traveler. The veracity of this ominous quality was tested, with the intent to disprove, through structured interaction with the *Counter Culture* projects.

The third of Enriquez's three components to his project—the "*Map*"—was not only the cognitive map generated through the exhibition's audience's following of the artist's audio tour. It was also found visibly represented on the cover of a pamphlet distributed in connection to the exhibition. Both project overview and promotional resource, the pamphlet encouraged an additional self-guided tour of the different installations, with short descriptions of each artist's contribution and each project's respective location.[68] On the cover of the pamphlet, below the *Counter Culture* title and the dates of installation, was a color photograph of a right hand, lying flat, with the open palm directed towards the camera. [Figure 58] Upon the flesh, a schematic diagram of the relevant neighborhood streets has been drawn in black marker. Bowery, Stanton, Prince, Elizabeth, and Rivington Streets, and Freeman Alley were charted and labeled. Bowery provided the central axis, for both the map and the palm: the line of the roadway axially extended from the center of the third digit down to the wrist. A directional arrow pointing north was included to provide general orientation, as was an asterisked notation that the map is "NOT TO SCALE!" Digitally imposed over the photograph were the specific destinations within the map where the different *Counter Culture* projects can be found. Red location dots were linked to limited identifying information: artist, title, date, and address.

The use of the body, even in its partially dismembered form, to chart the region seems important to understanding not only Enriquez's contribution but the set of installations as a whole. This form of palm reading, with the associated predictive folk value of such practices, also serves as an appropriate image for the collective project of embodied participation. Engagement with *Counter Culture* entailed practical navigation through the Bowery, which revealed the neighborhood as a peopled place. Directed to meaningful locations, the project audience interacted—either directly face-to-face or mediated through different technologies—

with the local population. The result recalibrated the emphasis on what the Bowery represents in an effort to unsettle the “dangerous” association. Encouraging opportunities for collective gathering, not only among those already within the neighborhood but also drawing together residents and new visitors, the project and its sponsor put forth a rereading of the neighborhood through a re-charting of the neighborhood. Moving from site to site, individually marked as local destinations with the complex icon, the project audience established themselves within the local “counter culture” and ”counterculture” by participating in the different networks of exchange at each location.

In addition to the series of painted logos, a sandwich board placard was placed in front the barbed wire-topped chain link fence that ran around the western side of 235 Bowery. [Figure 59] Still in use as a parking lot for the duration of *Counter Culture*, the site gave little indication on its own of the museum building that would soon rise there. The installed unassuming site marker offered in a few short paragraphs a statement about the future fate of the lot and a short description of *Counter Culture*. In addition, project pamphlets on which Enriquez’s map appeared were placed within a box affixed to the sign, underneath the heading “TAKE ONE.”[69] The presence of the placard was significant to the exhibition: it identified the parking lot as an information hub for the project while also presenting the lot as a landmarked location itself. However, rather than asserting historical significance to the site, projective significance was presented. This temporary marker, an otherwise minor material inclusion, staked claim to the site, drawing the future museum building into the context of the neighborhood prior to any traces of actual construction.

In an interview conducted at the start of the exhibition, Cohn stated that *Counter Culture* was intended to bring an art-going public to the area since otherwise “people really have no

reason to go down there to look at a parking lot."[70] Rather than a specific project or neighborhood location, Cohn singled out the parking lot-cum-future construction site as the target location of the project. Beyond providing a general introduction for the public to a potentially foreign community of residents and activities, the museum was also more crucially providing a general introduction to what would become its new home.

Whereas the artist contributions to *Counter Culture* provided a general understanding of the territory of the Bowery, none of the projects, save for the box of pamphlets affixed to the signboard cued the New Museum's new museum. Both the pamphlet and the placard, which could mistakenly be dismissed as supporting rather than primary exhibition content signaled the illusory presence of the museum in real space. Attending to this subtle yet crucial marking of the 235 Bowery building location is instructive in thinking about how the same location was mapped three years later in *GET LOST*.

As discussed in the next section, *GET LOST* marked a more immanent announcement of presence while continuing to foster this process of placemaking. However, there are two key differences between the projects that deserve attention. First, rather than only encouraging exploration of the Bowery across a few blocks, the geographic area covered by *GET LOST* was expanded to include the entire southern pole of the island. Second, whereas *Counter Culture* announced the impending arrival of the museum, *GET LOST* adopted as its unstated goal the seamless integration of the New Museum into a long, continuous history within the region. Rather than the New Museum marked as "new" or the unfamiliar needing to be made "familiar," *GET LOST* endeavored to suggest a sympathetic alignment between institution and neighborhood, effectively redrafting the legacy of each.

Finding Landmarks in *GET LOST: Artist's Map Downtown New York*

A booklet of twenty-one maps created by artists and artist collectives, *GET LOST: Artists Map Downtown New York* set forth alternative ways of considering not just the Bowery, but much of the southern end of Manhattan as a site of cultural and social activity. As the narrative introduction accompanying the project stated, the project offered “fictional landscapes, utopian visions, private memories, and obsessive instructions to explore Manhattan, its past, present, and future… An exercise in emotional geography, *GET LOST* sketches the coordinates for an endless drift across the streets and myths of downtown New York.”[71] One can read the mapping project as an attempt to recover an archive of personal histories of the city: of subjective interactions between individuals and the greater urban environment. The original circulation of the maps—as well as the project title of *GET LOST* itself—implied the engagement of a third-party participant, who would use the maps to explore Lower Manhattan himself or herself, to produce his or her own conceptual renderings of significant landmarks, and to see familiar streets in newly expansive ways. The maps’ initial dispersal to the public and their use as both art novelty and, in some cases, practical guides to city moved *GET LOST* from an otherwise conceptual work into the domain of a public project, one in which relative position of the map reader is collapsed with that of the cartographer-artist.

During its original cycle of distribution, starting June 6, 2007 and running throughout the summer of that year,[72] *GET LOST* was made available for gratis at different sites throughout New York City. These included performance spaces, local museums, and galleries representing the artists involved in the project, as well as select clothing retailers and restaurants. These locations extended beyond the downtown area and even beyond Manhattan, with several locations in Brooklyn, Queens and the Bronx.[73] Copies were also available at the New Museum Store, which was still operational at the Chelsea Art Museum, and distributed by mail to

subscribers to the *New Museum Paper*, the museum's newsletter. The project was also accessible on line through the New Museum's website, as a digital project archive that until recently still existed.[74] Following the opening of the new building, the project was also available for purchase at the New Museum Store. However, now a marketable collectable, it had to be purchased outright rather than being freely available for taking.

The press release for the project touched upon the criteria guiding artist selection for inclusion. It described in brief how the project "features the work of artists who are known to have a storied past in or great love of New York, as well as artists who frequently explore the concept of mapping in their work."[75] Although an elaboration of which artists falls into which category is not provided, this acknowledgment of different criteria for selection—some with personal attachments to the city; others whose work is consistently engaged with an expansively defined cartographic practice—only partially explains the different approaches found across the twenty-one maps. For the project, individual contributions run the gamut from completely obtuse to overly didactic. Most of the maps submitted are stylistically consistent with their respective artist's greater body of work.

In an interview coinciding with the summer 2007 distribution, the project curator Massimiliano Gioni stated his motivations for organizing *GET LOST*. He described how "When you work as a curator, you find yourself relocating to a new city every couple of years… Every time I move, I try to get to know the city through the eyes of the artists."[76] Gioni's statement of "I try to get to know the city through the eyes of the artists" could be completed with "who live there" or "who know it best" or 'who have something to say about it." *GET LOST* was thus framed as a series of personalized representations of the city trying to communicate aspects of the city to the viewer.

In its overview of the project, the *Time Out New York* blog commented how the series of maps "will get you to think about your city in ways those wallet-sized lower-Manhattan maps never will."[77] This is in reference to popular maps produced by companies such as Streetwise: maps of specific regions of the New York City that contain major roadways, subway and bus lines, and notable landmarks. In such reference maps, the clear, graphic communication of information is presented to maximize both user friendliness and comprehension. Intended as resources for both tourists and residents alike, these maps take up ease of efficient navigation as their primary focus. In short, they are informative as to be utilitarian. The maps of *GET LOST* make no similar claim, or at least not overtly.

Upon first encounter, the project initially appears as a formal experiment in mapping, with some of the contributions more audacious than others. Scribbles on paper and torn collages, lists of locations for explicit sexual trysts, directives to seek out manhole covers and Asian dumplings: all are categorized as maps and challenge the meaning of such a category label. However, as the *Time Out New York* blog also stated, some other project inclusions are "truly cartographical."[78] This raises the question of what being "cartographical" really means. It also suggests an inclination of project readers to read the set of contributions as a series of separable, individual articulations, rather than a continuous or unified single project. In the following analysis, I take up these issues.

As a way of approaching the twenty-one maps that make up the project, I offer the following descriptive category divisions.

1) Maps that retain an established street plan, but put forth alternative sites of interest;
2) Maps that supply their own fictive street plan, but preserve cartographic conventions;
3) Maps that supply their own fictive street plan, and use fictive cartographic conventions;

4) Maps that reject street plans, and instead use written directions; and
5) Maps that reject street plans, and instead use arrangements of objects.

Such divisions did not appear in the project: the booklet format presented an undifferentiated, seemingly random ordering of the maps. In fragmenting the project—first grouping the maps into these five categories and then further dividing the categories in order to treat the projects individually—I offer an analysis that starts by examining the formal strategies employed by each artist. In re-sequencing the maps and positioning them into these artificial categories, I do not feel as though I am significantly transforming the meaning of the project either. In the original stapled form, *GET LOST* offered a similar approach for comparison across the project, flipping back and forth between individual contributions.

However, my goal is more than a simple explication of formal content or cartographic strategy. In suggesting these typological divisions I hope to expose not only the different approaches employed in creating mapped representations of the same region but also the ways in which the project as a whole communicates an argument about the region and the New Museum's place in it. Although made available to the public prior to the opening of the then still unfinished new building, like *Counter Culture* the project drew the viewer's attention to the future museum site. Just as different approaches govern the overall map aesthetics, the approaches to presenting the museum in the maps were equally as varied. In many project contributions the museum overtly appeared: for example, as a designated landmark on the regional graphic plotting or its address included within a narrative set of directions. However, in others, its inclusion was more subtle. Several maps presented a cultural collage of the region, highlighting a 1960s and 1970s-era alternative art production, suggesting a cultural affiliation with a "scene."

The centrality of the museum's imminent Bowery location to the maps—both as providing both visible content inclusions in specific projects and as providing meaning to the total project—was not acknowledged within the press release for the project. Nor have critics remarked on this before. The closest one finds to a public acknowledgement of the New Museum's new site comes in the form of a brief summary statement on *GET LOST* participating artist Cory Arcangel's personal website. Included in a list of "Things I Made," a list of completed art projects, documentation of installations, and archive of articles written, Arcangel described *GET LOST* as a "Small project the New Museum invited me to do about their new location on the Bowery."[79]

A continued awareness of these parallel readings of the project—as a collection of separable artist contributions and as a unified single project; a broadly site-referencing examination of strategies to mapping and promotional tool for the museum—is key to my analysis. Content within individual maps carried across the maps, brought together to create an identity of not only the neighborhood but also the sponsoring institution. As a circulating exhibition and promotional project, produced at the moment when both identity and physical location were becoming more closely aligned for the museum, *GET LOST* served to reinforce this connection through linking the cultural institution's history to the region's cultural history.

1. Maps that retain an established street plan, but put forth alternative sites of interest

Many of the *GET LOST* maps can be placed into the category of those that take the existing municipal map as a starting point from which to work. Legible within each is a clear connection to an "official" city projection. This map is used as a template upon which points of interest are rearticulated. Map content undergoes a transformation through additions and deletions guided by personal choices. For some, moved to the fore are alternative locations with

subcultural resonance, individual personal attachment for the map creator, or both. Alternatively, other artists chose instead to offer a view of the region based on absence, isolating unique spaces or defining the city through spaces lacking in productive or beneficial content.

Aleksandra Mir, *Manhattan* (2006) [Figure 60]

Formally consistent with her collaboratively created large-scale Sharpie-drawn works, Mir's contribution is telling for what it leaves out as much as what it contains. Her drawing presents the outline of the island of Manhattan, with several major roads and bridges connecting to Brooklyn shown. Shading of the water around the island reveals various piers along the Hudson River in negative space. A stylized rendering of the Statue of Liberty looms large to the left, with perspective dramatically compressed and expanded at various points across the figure, so that Liberty Island terminates at the same point as the southern end of Manhattan and the torch extends almost to the northern end of Manhattan. Within Manhattan itself, Mir preserves the gridded street plan around Central Park, as well as the transportation arteries running through the park. However, beyond the northern and southern boundaries of the park, there is a greater selectivity in reproducing the city streets. Major north-south running avenues are shown, but the east-west cross streets almost entirely vanish. Those neighborhoods farthest away from the park are almost completely evacuated of their roadways. Only Broadway is retained. It is also the only street that is named in the drawing.

The drawing preserves references to acts of both exploration and cartographic creation. In midtown, Broadway is shown diverging into two different arteries. One of them has since been crossed out, marked with the label of "WRONG WAY." This indicates the map generation as an active process, with the traces of false starts and reconsidered routes remaining. It also suggests that there is more to be charted. The terminal ends of the island are still frontiers still to be

explored. In the case of Lower Manhattan, this becomes even more telling given its historical position as an original site of foreign settlement and the source of later northward expansion. However, in Mir's map, this is part of the borough that is least revealed by the mapmaker and thus the territory with the most potential for future exploration and discovery.

William Pope L., *Old New Jersey* (2007) [Figure 61]

The artist William Pope.L's map is a remnant from an existing map, torn just above 14th Street. The upper ragged edge of the original map is preserved. This destructive act of tearing has isolated downtown Manhattan, with its diversity of neighborhoods shown through the varied coloration of different districts. However, beyond this act of cartographic appropriation, William Pope.L transforms the map further through the elimination of previous labels and markings. The names of districts and the criteria by which they are distinguished from one another have been omitted with white correction fluid and blue and yellow paint. The artist blots out street and bridge names, landmarks (the Statue of Liberty is not spared), and entire roadways altogether. This subversion of an official marking of space is replaced with the artist's own demarcation of sites of significance: he has included the location of six safe houses.

The effect renders the map and region as one offering both safe haven and a culture of danger. The presence of so many sites of sanctuary suggests the very necessity of these sites. In addition, by limiting the information communicating where these safe houses can be found, the artist also frustrates access to them. Without additional landmarks or street names to serve as reference, navigation to them becomes difficult. But perhaps this is the artist's point: he is suggesting the ability to go undetected; to confound attempts at a clear identification of places. This is emphasized by the fact that although the names of landmarks are omitted, the symbols designating official regional landmarks—a star inscribed within a red circle—remain. The traces

of places of significance are presented, but their identity remains occluded. The effect becomes one of hiding in plain sight.

Inaba and Associates, *Noise Sanctuaries* (2007) [Figure 62]

The architectural firm of Inaba and Associates also took on this issue of seeking sites of safety. Rather than the safe houses marked by William Pope.L, Inaba and Associates demarcated "noise sanctuaries" throughout the region. Providing both an explanatory paragraph and a computer-generated map of Lower Manhattan, the firm's submission declares that: "noise is the number one complaint of NY residents." As a result, the map shows parts of the city with "moderate" noise level, determined by distance away from subways, high volume road congestion, and commercial districts.

Although slightly graphically unclear, the map presents a series of radiating points referring to spaces of intense volume. These opaque circles overlap throughout the island, occluding visual access to the street plan under which these zones are overlaid. These circles cluster mostly around both anticipated neighborhoods, such as SoHo and the Financial District, as well as unexpected ones, such as the West Village. Spaces deemed noise sanctuaries are outlined in blue, chromatically consistent with the blue color of the phrase "noise sanctuaries" in the accompanying description. It is these sections of the city that are not occluded: sonic freedom is indicated through a visual freedom and access to the aerial city plan. It is again through the absence of content that information is presented.

Marcel Dzama, *Downtown New York* (2007) [Figure 63]

The Canadian illustrator Marcel Dzama provided a watercolor and pencil drawing on spiral-bound notebook paper for his contribution. The map contains surreal imagery: an

anthropomorphic tree trunk, a pinwheeled quartet of women with rifles, and simultaneously comic and menacing ferocious animals (or perhaps humans wearing animal costumes). However, within the context of the tradition of map iconography, these inclusions generate less uneasiness than his standalone watercolors. For example, a pair of trees becomes a graphic signifier for green space. The four rifle-bearing women become an elaborate compass, with each figure aiming at a different cardinal direction. The wild animals are arranged around a fictive heraldic coat of arms for New York City. Rather than the official seal of four sails of a windmill framing barrels of flour and beavers, Dzama's emblem is a more traditional compass within an elaborate shield, framed on either side by a bear and a lion, with English Gothic-inspired fillagree above and below.

In addition to the heraldic arms, a noble presence is also initially indicated by the list of honorific titles in French in the top left corner of the page. However, a more careful reading reveals this to be a list of chess pieces rather than the titles of real-world nobility. Chess prominently factors into the work, with Dzama renaming Thompson Street "Chess Street." This Greenwich Village street is host to the Village Chess Shop and Chess Forum—both indicated on the map, with the latter marked with a gray knight piece—as well as New York City Chess Inc.—curiously omitted from the map. Dzama does include a rook next to the label "THE CHESS PLAYERS CORNER of the PARK," just north of these other landmarks. The park is Washington Square Park, represented by a section of a tree trunk supporting a single limb. The tree, dually identified as "the hanging Elm" and "THE HANGING TREE OF WASHINGTON SQ," supports a brown suited male figure hanging by a noose from the limb.[80]

Much of the rest of the image presents uncharacteristically uniformly perpendicular cross streets extending from 4th Street to the southern tip of the island (the farthest south location is the

National Museum of the American Indian between Bowling Green and Battery Park). Dzama annotated these cross streets in pencil with several personally selected landmarks: the one-time residences of Billy the Kid, Samuel Gompers, Henry James' grandmother, Edgar Allan Poe, Frank Zappa, and Lou Reed. Great prominence is given to "the lady who sits all day out side [sic] city hall [sic] her name is Mellies." Her presence not only indicated by this description, she appears similarly dressed to the compass women, although seated in a chair with her hands on her knees. More conventional landmarks that are noted include the locations of City Hall Park, a statue of Nathan Hale, the World Trace Center, Cooper Union, Tompkins Square Park, and the New Museum's new building site. This final site is at the center of the human pinwheel: a line links the red landmark dot to the center of the figural grouping.

More obviously personal is Dzama's renaming of the center of Greenwich Village as "Little Winnipeg," a reference to his own Canadian hometown (although the reasons for the retiling of the neighborhood also remain unclear). At the lower left corner of the work "826" is prominently written (the numbers first outlined in pencil and then filled in with black watercolor). This is a reference to 826NYC, the non-profit New York City-based satellite creative writing program modeled after San Francisco's 826 Valencia Program. Dzama serves on the advisory board for the program. Although headquartered in Brooklyn, Dzama includes it in the Manhattan map twice: once, in the left corner of the work, as already noted; and a second time along the right margin of the work, with an arrow pointing outside of the image to the right, towards Brooklyn.

Jonas Mekas, *My Downtown* (2007) [Figure 64]

Filmmaker Jonas Mekas' map is of 1960s-era downtown. Similar to Pope.L, his map is a manipulation of an official map. He has substituted the space between 14th Street and Chambers

Street with is own remapped set of roads and landmarks. Major thoroughfares are marked, including Sixth Avenue, Broadway, Second Avenue, Avenue B, Canal Street, Houston Street, and 8th Street. He annotated this abbreviated roadmap by highlighting the locations of different residences and studios of artists, writers, and musicians, and performance and exhibition spaces. Mekas' map establishes a cultural identity for the region through the one-time residents of the region. The reader is alerted to the once presence of The Velvet Underground, Philip Glass, Donald Judd, Robert Frank, CBGB, Mars Bar, Jack Smith, and Gallery East. Elsewhere the names of Patti Smith, Nam Jun Paik, William Burroughs, Red Grooms, James Rosenquist, Richard Serra, Claes Oldenburg, Larry Rivers, Maya Deren, La Mont Young, Yoko Ono, and John Cage have been written. Wooster Street has been retitled as Maciunas Street after George Maciunas, the Fluxus pioneer who once who lived there. It is also worth noting that this is a culture in which Mekas identifies himself a participant: his own name is included in the map as well. The title *My Downtown* confirms this personal ownership of the region. Demapping streets and singling out figures and locations he deems personally significant, Mekas remakes urban space according to his own associations, both social and emotional.

Terence Koh, *After Dark* (2007) [Figure 65]

Artist Terence Koh created a hand-drawn map of the East Village, between Mott and Pitt Streets to the west and east, and Houston and Canal Streets to the north and south. Each draughted street is meticulously rendered and labeled. Within these cross streets, Koh has marked sixteen different locations, numerically corresponding an accompanying legend printed below the map. Alternating between physical descriptions of places and directives about possible actions, it becomes clear that Koh's sites are unified by a common theme: he is listing locations for illicit public sexual liaisons. Places include "on the steps of the old bank building" at the

corner of Chrystie and Grand Streets, "just by the subway entrance" at the corner of Essex and Delancey Streets, and "a squat surrounded by chicken wire and warning sign" at the corner of Clinton and Stanton Streets.[81] Warnings are given for some of the locations: number seven warns the reader to "walk quickly into the car park, watch out for the attendant!" while number ten advises to "keep in the shadows under the manhattan bridge. don't let the river lights catch you."

For the final site, number sixteen, located just north of the intersection of Spring Street and Bowery, the reader is instructed to "sneak anywhere into this construction site. consecrate [sic] it with yourself." Rather than delving into the kind of activities that Koh would have his reader engage in order to enact this consecration, I instead draw attention to this site as specifically meaningful in the context of *Get Lost*. Although presented with the same generality as other unnamed parking lots and community gardens mentioned in Koh's lists, the construction site referenced is the New Museum construction site.

Christopher Knowles, *Lower Manhattan* (2007) [Figure 66]

Rather than a collaged appropriation of or intervention within an official cartographic projection, the artist Christopher Knowles' map is a fully hand-drawn reconstruction of a municipal map. Street locations are preserved, park spaces are delineated, familiar tourist landmarks are titled, and even traffic patterns are indicated (directional loops of the traffic circle by the Manhattan Bridge and patterns across Canal Street are shown). The piers along the southern end of Manhattan along the East River and the Hudson River are meticulously numbered. Ferry routes to Staten Island and to Statue of Liberty are presented through the linear repetition of black dots in the water. General neighborhood markers are also noted, including Chinatown, the East Village, and Greenwich Village.

The map can be read as Knowles personalizing the city map through a process of painstaking transcription. Although little changes in content between an official projection of the neighborhood and Knowles' version, redrawing the city as an act of literal remaking positions Knowles in the position of both mapmaker and city planner. Mapping is presented as a creative art project, as is creating the physical city. It is also worth nothing that this is not a slavishly uninflected recreation of another map. There is a single landmark given a place of honor within the drawing. The New Museum's location appears twice: the first is as a cross-hatched square at the corner of Houston and Broadway, with the entire space of the block used to write "New Muse. of C. Art Soho"; the second is indicated only by an unlabelled blue dot, the only graphic mark of this kind in the map. It sits in the middle of the block along Bowery between Houston and Spring Street, the location of the museum's new building. It is the only clear landmark addition to the map.

2. Maps that supply their own fictive street plan, but preserve cartographic conventions

The two works in this group apply familiar cartographic conventions to personal conceptions of the city's spatial form. It is not only the street plans that depart from their real world structure, but also the shape and topography of the island of Manhattan that is rethought in these maps. In the case of one of the maps, while a gods-eye-view approach is preserved and formal choices are consistent with topographic projections, the landmass is broken apart. In the other, a celestial map is presented, and in doing so does not attempt to delineate the island form at all. However, to follow the map requires looking down in order to track this overhead schema.

Lordy Rodriguez, *Downtown* (2007) [Figure 67]

Artist Lordy Rodriguez's map presents an overly fortified downtown, now severed from the rest of the island, with an expansive waterway channel running between the two halves. Similar to Mir's map, Broadway is not only preserved but also given increased import: it forms the only connecting bridge between these now physically separate regions. The map graphically formalizes the differences between the gridded uniformity of midtown Manhattan and the irregularity of the piecemeal expansion-informed street plans of downtown Manhattan. Despite the exaggerated separation, many of the other formal elements are consistent with one's expectations of how to read graphically encoded cartographic information, particularly differences in terrain. In the absence of a clear legend, the viewer can decode the structure of the map: blue spaces are bodies of water, green spaces are areas of dense vegetation, and gray spaces are the built-up urban center. Central Park is colored in different gradations of greens, with attention paid to different densities and elevations. However, rather than constrained by the grid, it is an organic vertiginous mass: an extended biomorphic form in the center of the island. A similar approach is used to indicate the presence of both Roosevelt Island and Brooklyn, areas that seem to not yet have succumbed to the urban development of much of Manhattan. The shapes of these park spaces and peripheral regions are in contrast to the somewhat more angularly structured city blocks.

The southern landmass in Rodriguez's map is shown as a crowded, fortified zone. Within this already divided landmass, the area approximating the Financial District is further isolated. A band cuts across the full expanse of the island, giving the impression of a canal with locks or fortified garrison wall.[82] Within this barrier-defended space, two city blocks standout, colored in bright red. Based on the relative location of these spots, that they are paired, and that defense is emphasized, Rodriquez seems to be charting the former location of the World Trade

Center. In this context, Rodriquez's map moves away from just being "Manhattan in the tradition of cult films such as Blade Runner or Escape from New York," the interpretation offered by the museum.[83] Instead it more specifically serves as a representation highlighting a post-9/11 focus on security.

Lawrence Weiner, *Untitled* (2007) [Figure 68]

Conceptual artist Lawrence Weiner contributed a proposal for a previously created public project. In 2000, the Public Art Fund in collaboration with Con Edison and Roman Stone Construction sponsored the installation of Weiner's *In Direct Line with Another & the Next*, a series of nineteen cast-iron manhole covers to be installed throughout downtown Manhattan. Many were clustered around major park spaces or public squares (e.g. Tompkins Square Park, Union Square, Washington Square Park, Cooper Union Square, and Bleeker Street Playground), while others were installed at heavily trafficked pedestrian throughways (e.g. along West 4th Street and Bank Street). The manhole covers themselves did not simply mark the entry access to utility services. Onto the surface each manhole cover the message "IN DIRECT LINE WITH ANOTHER & THE NEXT" was cast. Renewed attention to Weiner's series of manhole covers was given in 2007, due not only to their inclusion as part of *GET LOST,* but also to the planning for and opening of the retrospective exhibition *Lawrence Wiener: As Far as the Eye Can See*, held at the Whitney Museum of American Art from November 15, 2007 to February 10, 2008.

Within the *GET LOST* series of maps, Weiner's project serves as a literal guide to the locations of these covers, still in place following their 2000 embedment into the street surface. The printed page provides the artist's statement explaining the genesis and necessity of the project. Weiner wrote how, as a result of the bright lights of the city, locational specificity cannot be gleaned by looking to the stars, undermining the traditional nautical navigation systems of

orientation and guidance. In urban space and in Weiner's proposal, rather than looking up, one's attention is directed towards the terrestrial world and objects within this world in order to find one's way. For Weiner, "material reality itself allows each manhole cover to offer a certitude" of place. Furthermore, the idea of a link between one cover and the next becomes analogous to the relationship that people form not only with other people but also with objects. Weiner foregrounds these relationships of reliance—people on people; people on objects; perhaps even artists on institutional sponsors and urban tourists on artist guides—as sources of effective wayfinding.

3. Maps that supply their own fictive street plan, and use fictive cartographic convention

I argue that the works in this third category ultimately fail as functional maps, relying (if such a thing exists) too heavily on artistic innovation at the expense of legibly conveying the location they purport to describe. Ronald Rees, surveying trends in the history of cartography, has noticed that maps have routinely "served esthetic as well as utilitarian ends… [They are] symbolic abstractions [yet]… to be effective [they] must still evoke appearances."[84] The contributions that fall into this category are too vague or obtuse to serve as guides to the region on their own.

Chris Johanson *Best Thoughts* (2007) [Figure 69]

Artist Chris Johanson's image combines several panels of competing "best thoughts." Collectively, the panels suggest conditions that can make city living chaotic and inhospitable to residents. A woman wistfully stares out from her minimally-furnished high rise apartment and declares "I really love the Big Apple," while her companion drinks a martini. However, another speech bubble emerges from underneath the floor as a large overfed rat challenges this urban

paradise by wondering out loud “Why would they pay 1 million dollars. So much to live with a Rat!” The lower right panel shows a public park as an alternative microcosm of city life. Displaying the stock tropes of hippie culture—a peace sign t-shirt, a guitar, long hair—one figure encourages others to “Quit your job and sell everything.” The corporate world and the urban nightlife come together in the lower left panel of the page. Lists of takeout ethnic dining options are crammed into a corner, as is the message “Where did the piss smell go?” A figure in profile, labeled a “heshe” and a “shehe,” asks “And how are we doing this evening?” She leans against a literal corporate ladder in the shape of a dollar sign, upon which figures struggle to reach to top.

However, little about the scene speaks specifically to downtown Manhattan. Several ideas associated with urban living are represented: wonderment at the skyline, outrage at steep rent prices, a vibrant youth culture, a chaotic jumble of advertised options, and feverish corporate competition. Neighborhood parallels can be found for some, as associations with the commercial bombardment and alternative culture are evoked. While the latter could be understood as standing in for the Lower East Side, the former is more Times Square than SoHo. The mention of exorbitant rent rates speaks more generally to the condition of living in New York City, as well as most contemporary urban metropolises, rather than a culture found uniquely south of 14th Street. The presence of these competing ideas and identities cue a diverse city space, but aside from the reference to the Big Apple, little suggests the kind of location-specific engagement reflected in other map submissions. The result is a failure to create a guide that is demonstrably of the downtown region.

Julie Mehretu’s *Drift (Below 14th Street)* (2007) [Figure 70]

Artist Julie Mehretu’s works are often discussed as presenting mapped spaces: imaginative cartographies of pseudo-fictional places, combining real world references, geometric

abstractions, and dizzying networks of whiplash lines. However, for her contribution to *GET LOST*, she presented a departure for her meticulously rendered large-scale works. Instead, depicted is "Manhattan with the trembling traces of an emotional seismograph."[85] The obtuseness of this explanation is reflected in an ultimately frustrating image. A series of broken lines scattered across the surface of the page, Mehretu's "map" is a series of recorded gestures. Unlike William Anastasi's series of process-oriented *Subway Drawings*, where the physical conditions of creation guide the form and meaning of the work and the content of which closely formally mirrors Mehretu's map, Mehretu's drawing resists a similar kind of causal interpretation. The museum's analysis that the image is of Manhattan "seen from the removed distance of Berlin, where the artist recently moved" provides no greater insight to the work.[86] Combining "seen" with the idea of "an emotional seismograph" suggests an analytic reading of a scientific data resulting from a highly personal recollection. But how is one then meant to read the image? Is this an expression of the ungridded streets? Does it encompass a full experience of an emotional "drift" of all places south of 14th Street, or a specific neighborhood? It is a psychological portrait of the neighborhood? Or of the artist's understanding of the neighborhood? Is it both? Or several of these ideas? The limited legible specificity of engagement with the particular site results in the work becoming both about an infinite number of possible interpretations and yet also no interpretation. Put simply, it cannot be a map when viewed in isolation form the other *GET LOST* maps, or at least it cannot be according to Rees' definition.

4. Maps that reject street plans, and instead use written directions

The maps in this category provide instructions for the viewer. These are the most obviously didactic of the projects in *GET LOST*. Consistent among many of the contributions is the use of

the personal itinerary as a wayfinding strategy. This approach structures a dialogue between artist, viewer, and city without showing specific cross streets or building façades. Instead, the viewer is asked to follow either the provided narrative or the series of explicit directions set forth in the work.

Jennifer Bornstein, *From How to Ride the Bus, Four Corners Books, London* (2007) [Figure 71]

Artist Jennifer Bornstein's graphically austere page leads the reader on a bus trip throughout the city. The single typed page presents directions for "How to Ride the Bus": specifically, how to travel from West 14th Street to the Lower East Side. Several possible routs are proposed, each offering what seems to be the least efficient route possible. To follow Bornstein's advice would place the traveler at various points along these circuitous routes in Brooklyn, Harlem, Battery Park City, the Upper West Side, and the Upper East Side. Among the sites passed along this wandering itinerary are Marcel Duchamp's studio at 210 West 14th Street, the 1990s television character Felicity's supposed dorm near NYU in Greenwich Village, and Ungano's nightclub at on West 70th Street. Bornstein provided the reader not only with a travelogue but also with a series of seemingly helpful suggestions (seeming helpful, until one critically examines just to where she is sending the traveler). Beneath this, a related list of "God buses" and "Bad buses" is offered as well. Several of those buses are mentioned in the narrative directions, with annotations about their quality provided. For example, the M15 "comes every five minutes" while the M14 "takes forever."

The emphasis on all forms of urban transportation is central to Bornstein's method of mapping. The reader is informed that as one gets closer to the Lower East Side, particularly 1st Street, "No subways go anywhere near these neighborhoods, and they're really a drag to walk to." Taking the bus then becomes an act of necessity. New York City's often-discussed identity

as a walking city is replaced by New York City as a city of mass transit, and a selectively efficient system of mass transit at that.

The course charted in Bornstein's map is similar to that undertaken by the New Museum in its institutional migration across Manhattan. Bornstein's project starts with the sentence "If you're on the west side near 14th Street and want to go to the Lower East Side." The reference to the New Museum can be understood in two ways. The first takes into account the museum's operations at the Chelsea Museum of Art at 556 West 22nd Street, certainly falling within the reasonable definition of "on the west side near 14th Street." The shift of eight blocks from the 14th Street bus stop location to 22nd Street is not an insurmountable walk for anyone seeking a cross-town bus stop. The second is more closely aligned with the move from the museum's 1977 home at 65 Fifth Avenue, located at the intersection of Fifth Avenue and West 14th Street. The winding route of the bus journey, touching upon a number of diverse cultural references, becomes an appropriate metaphor for the museum's own far from direct process of geographic movement and organizational maturation.

Cory Arcangel, *New York-Las Vegas* (2007) [Figure 72]

The topic of efficient travel is also taken up in digital artist Cory Arcangel's project submission. Using the online direction-generating program of Google Maps, Arcangel presented a route from 235 Bowery to the closest Las Vegas casino. The latter has been input into the program as simply "Las Vegas, NV." The familiar graphics of the program are reproduced: the narrative set of step-by-step directions which include when to turn right or left and the distance spanned by each directive along the longer route; the national map, used for directions covering longer geographic expanses, showing the two locations pinpointed; and a set of local maps,

showcasing the starting point on the Bowery and the end point just off the Las Vegas Expressway.

However, Arcangel's project is also one that suggests false helpfulness. Google Maps is often used to generate driving directions. Arcangel's project begs the question: why would one need to know how to drive from the New Museum's construction site to Las Vegas? Although Google Maps offers its user the most direct route, in this case it is hardly the most efficient route or even the most efficient manner of travel. Arcangel has challenged the intended rapidity proposed by the program. By insisting on automotive travel rather than air (or even rail) travel, Arcangel's project yields a journey that will take one day and fourteen hours to complete. Within the context of the greater *GET LOST* framework, this subversion of the helpfulness becomes even more pronounced. The average viewer of the project in its original printed form would be on foot in Manhattan, making this proposed journey to Las Vegas even more of an outlandish undertaking.

Francis Alys, *Pacing* (2001) [Figure 73]

In *Pacing*, rather than citing specific streets, the artist Francis Alys proposed sequences of directional movements: "North to South and South to West/West to East and East to South/South to North and North to West/West to South and South to East/East to West and West to East." These programmatic steps are described as coming from the artist's own journeys through Manhattan. Similar to the Situationist *derive*, these daily walks are presented as being unguided by objective or destination; structured only by "just the walking/ and the counting." Although not explicitly meant as directions to be copied, the methodical laying out of the process suggests at the very least an advocating of a model for exploration. This daily exercise of walking the city is described as "pacing the grid of Manhattan."

The invocation of the Manhattan grid in the written directions is reinforced by the inclusion of a graphic charting of these journeys on four sheets of graph paper. A photograph of two different open notebooks, Alys' pencil-marked representation of these walks uses the rigid right angles of the graph paper to indicate turns at the corners of the traversed grid. However, problematic is the association of a right angle plan with the downtown network of streets. The less predictable angles of street intersections throughout the southern part of the island make this kind of precision almost impossible. It is unclear if this is meant to be Alys' intention—highlighting the impossibility of such a journey—or if the goal is to merely advocate for a kind of aware walking: the graph paper used as a representation but not as a useful diagram, alerting the project viewers to his or her own steps by making it impossible to follow Alys' steps.

Dorothy Iannone, *My Downtown New York of the 60's* (2007) [Figure 74]

Like Jonas Mekas, artist Dorothy Iannone created a map of a recalled Manhattan. As the banner title for the drawing indicates, this is Iannone's New York of the 1960s. Arranged around a composite self-portrait, Dorothy Iannone's nostalgic walking tour combines personal narrative with cultural history. The work is divided into two vertical columns of text, a drawing of the artist dividing the two. She is nude except for a g-string, armband, garland of flowers around her neck, and feathered cape and crown. These final two accessories, jagged bursts of reds and yellows, stand in stark contrast to the rest of the work's chromatic restraint. They also suggest a triumphant presence of the female figure, accentuated by the single raised arm brandishing a paintbrush. In place of a drawn head, a newspaper image of Iannone is included. As explained in the text, the 1961 photograph appeared in the *New York Herald Tribune*, taken at the courthouse at Foley Square. The event marked Iannone's successful lawsuit to have her seized copy of Henry Miller's *Tropic of Cancer* returned to her, "a great setback to censorship in general."

Rather than an iconic frontal stare, she looks off to the side, at odds with the assertive figure cut by her substitute drawn body.

The left vertical column presents a series of eleven locations (a twelfth is included in the middle of the page beneath the central figure's legs). Each is inscribed within a double rectangle frame. These locations include: the Tenth St. Galleries at 10th Street and Third Avenue, the Cedar Tavern on University Place, Grand Street and Canal Street as the site of Happenings and Fluxus events respectively, and MacDougal Street as affiliated with both Bob Dylan and the Beatles. The works of Normal Mailer are identified as "pervading the air" and Iannone's own former residence on 12th Street in between Fifth and Sixth Avenue is also given. The right vertical column provides an extended narrative. It tracks the period from when Iannone first arrived in New York City in the fall of 1958 and identifies select events from her life over the next decade. In addition to recounting her legal victory, it recollects public events such as Ionnone's opening of the Stryke Gallery with her husband as well as memories of memorable movie scenes (e.g. Gena Rowlands hailing a taxicab in the film "Gloria"). Sprinkled throughout are references to "the great ones [who] walked among us," a list that includes E.E. Cummings, Susan Sontag, Allen Ginsberg, and Paul Goodman.

The theme of the entire page is colored by Iannone's concluding statement in her first paragraph on the right column. She wrote: "I particularly remember one moment while sitting in an outdoor café in Sheridan Square when I was filled with a sense of the vast promise of the world around me, and perhaps downtown would feel the same for me today if I were twenty-five again." Offered to the reader is a chance to reflect upon his or her own youth, while armed with an almost bullet-point list of significant sites from the artist's youth. One can travel to many of these same locations, determining not only the physical distance between them but also the

temporal and psychological distance between Iannone's experienced sense of possibility in the past and the map reader's own sense of possibility in the present day.

Beth Campbell, *Tracking a few common personal myths and some notable public restrooms (My early encounters with Lower Manhattan)* (2007) [Figure 75]

Artist Beth Campbell's watercolor combines Ionnone's personal experiences with Bornstien's practical advice. Campbell created a flow chart of information. Identified are ideal places to shop, the location where she met and married her future husband, and recollections of her first visit to New York City. For Campbell, downtown Manhattan is broadly defined as the region south of 14th Street, indicated by the inclusion of Union Square Park in her work. There is a consideration of relative geographic positioning: Union Square as the farthest north site is indicated at the top of the page, Bloomingdales in SoHo is in the center of the page, and the World Trade Center is at the bottom of the page. However, the goal of the maps is not to provide directions for navigable routes, but rather practical information at each site, some of greater benefit to the reader than other. Following the sinuous lines connecting site-marking blotted orbs of orange color, the viewer learns that Bloomingdales has the best bathroom in SoHo, Century 21's bathroom is located in the basement, and that the Pink Pony has a bathroom mirror that allow you to "catch a glimpse of yourself the way others see you." For some urban wanderers, the location of public restroom facilities can outrank historic districts as significant landmarks to know.

Rikrit Tiravanija, *Untitled (Eating Map)* (2007) [Figure 76]

A bathroom location is a key inclusion in relational artist Rikrit Tiravanija's map. His map organizes a dining pilgrimage starting from 7th Street and Avenue B. Presented is a listing of different Lower East Side eateries and the meals to order at each stop along the route. These

pairings include: Jubb's on East 12th between Avenues A and B for electro lemonade, Essex Market for cheese samples, GoGo Dim Sum on the corner of East Broadway and Bowery for "some very special dumplings," Joes Shanghai on Pell street for soup dumplings, and Café Rome in Little Italy for espresso and cannoli. The final direction is "Go to the New Museum and use the restroom."

Opposite these narrative directions is a hand drawn map surrounded by photographs of each site. These are photographs of both the exterior of the different restaurants and the meals to be purchased. However, map locations are not labeled: stops are indicated by red rectangles at different points along the thick-black line that charts the journey. A thin red rectangular circuit guides the viewer around Essex Market, the start of the route. A similarly thin red line leading from Broom Street to the location of the New Museum's new building signals the final direction. However, timing matters. When initially distributed one could not use the bathroom in the building: construction of the building was not yet complete. In addition, now that the building has been completed, one still cannot simply walk into the museum to use the bathroom, or at least not without first paying the $12 general admission fee. While perhaps a lighthearted referential jab at the museum, the inclusion of the direction underscores the role of the museum: it is cast as providing a respite from the journey; a home point within the region.

16 Beaver Group, *Untitled* (2007) [Figure 77]

The political discussion group and art collective 16 Beaver Group's map provides directions of a different kind than the other projects included in this category. Although contained within a single page of the *GET LOST* booklet, the contribution presents multiple notebook pages of strategies encouraging transnational connectivity. Following from the title of "WE PREFER NOT TO GET LOST," the project examines the ways in which downtown

Manhattan can be thought of as a nexus of multiple national and foreign economic, political, and cultural influences. A schematic representation of the Twin Towers of the World Trade Center is diagrammatically connected to a smoke-filled urban scene. Rather than a static meditation on this single event, the work offers a way of considering the event as implicating dynamic relationships between other sites, cities, and hidden networks. Beyond just the joining together New York and Bagdad, the cities London, Palestine, Tokyo, Kabul, Baghdad Caracas, Khartoum, Tehran, Havana, Seoul, Mexico City, Mumbai, Karachi, Bogata, Hong Kong, Zurich and Baltimore are brought equally close together through new media technologies. This is made explicit with the a banner of "BEIRUT [sic] A MAP OF NEW YORK IS A MAP OF LODON IS A MAP OF TOKYO IS A MAP IS A MAP OF DUBAI IS A MAP OF SINGAPORE IS A MAP OF PARIS IS A MAP OF GUANTANAMO."

The project advocates for an understanding of the way local knowledge meets global action, with the connection between the two understood as the awakened engagement of the world citizen. Offered up is a kind of "counter-cartography" in which "relations of people and friendship-of time—of intesities [sic]—of activities" replaces maps of physical locations. Sixteen options are presented for strategies to combat the isolating act of getting lost. Repeated throughout the plan is the phrase "How the map of one place can" concluding options including "indicate/hint the map of another" and "connect and open us up to the tyranny of simultaneous global time." The map integrates the New Museum into a system of institutions listed on a continuum between policies of militarization and neoliberalism: prison, university, humanitarian relief and non-profit organizations, culture, news media and entertainment, and banking systems. The Museum is sited between media and culture on this continuum. Rather than a physical site,

the map charts the location of the museum as a source of social, cultural, and political policy influence.

5. Maps that reject street plans, and instead use arrangements of objects

This final category of projects contains those maps that cast aside traditionally cartographic strategies predicated on street plans or verbal itineraries to present instead assemblages of pictorial and textual elements culled from the real world. In nods to the Benjaminian collector and rag-picker, the three works in this category present fragments imbued with the residue of their historical age. Despite this—or perhaps because of this—these maps still retain legible and regionally-specific content. The cartographic contributions that result are personalized views of downtown Manhattan created using an object culture. In particular, this object culture is an historical ephemera-based material culture.

These projects also function as acts of preservation, both personal and institutional. The individual artists selected elements of ephemera to be doubly preserved: once in the artist's original contribution to the New Museum's project, and again through the New Museum's duplication and archiving of the project as part of *GET LOST*. As personal acts of preservation, there is also an element of nostalgia to the individual works. Objects from the past are repurposed and put in service of providing a relevant or meaningful object portrait for the present moment.

Dave Muller's *New York Sonic Strata* (2007) [Figure 78]

Artist, musician and DJ Dave Muller contributed an object-based sonic identity of downtown Manhattan. His photograph-as-map is formally similar to his previously created series of drawings and paintings of vertically and horizontally stacked records. The spines of records and 8-track cartridges of musicians' and sound artists' works are shown, suggesting the

complexity of the aural history of the region. The audio material spans five decades, including original releases and more recent reissues and compilation albums. The printed covers metonymically stand in for both historical creations and their historical creators. An extended history of downtown is revealed through the archive of the albums. Through such a project, Muller is attempting translation of media: visual preservation as enacting both material and audio preservation. Those artists and musicians represented include Yoko Ono, John Cage, Lou Reed, Sonic Youth, Madonna, The Ramones, La Monte Young, and the cast of Sesame Street.[87] Many of the covers are worn, suggesting not only the age of the albums but the repeated return to the original albums and their continued use. Both seeing Muller's work and listening to the album content in it are suggested as mutually constitutive of a remaking of the region as a specific cultural place in during an extended cultural moment.

Thurston Moore, *Street Mouth #23 – Joey* (2006) [Figure 79]

Musician and artist Thurston Moore's band Sonic Youth is referenced in Muller's work. In his own contribution, Moore's downtown Manhattan is similarly cast as a collection of musical identities. However, rather than showcasing album sleeves, Moore collaged a series of photographs and newspaper clippings. Moore had previously shown the full series of collages at his first one-man exhibition earlier in 2007. Each work consisted of published press clippings, photographs from professional and personal photo shoots, and personal correspondences. All of the material came from Moore's own collection of ephemera. *Street Mouth #23* was originally part of this earlier exhibition.[88]

Street Mouth #23 is structured around a central black and white photographic print of punk rock icon Joey Ramone. With his shaggy hair, Ramones t-shirt, leather jacket, and sunglasses, Ramone stands in as the iconic image of a Lower East Side alternative music scene

of the 1970s and 1980s. Among the related figures surrounding him are Lou Reed, Patti Smith, and the duo Suicide. A newspaper advertisement for the East Side Book Store is included, although rather than its usual 34 St. Marks Place the address is printed as 17 St. Marks Place. Included in this pricelist are books such as R.D. Laing's *Politics of Experience*, Timothy Leary's *The Psychedelic Experience*, and Allen Watts' *Myth and Ritual in Christianity*.

However, Moore's "rock and roll family album" fails to label any of the figures.[89] Some information is provided in the verbal inclusion of locations and names, but, for the uninitiated, the project encourages the viewer to engage in additional acts of historical discovery. Avoiding didacticism, the work nonetheless encourages the viewer to seek awareness of the cultural ethos of the place being charted. The collaged surface of each work suggests discovery, with the viewer's scanning of the page's equated with the both artist's original search for the objects presented and subsequent investigations into the period and the region.

Isa Geznken, *I Love New York, Crazy City* (1995-1996) [Figure 80]

For the final map of the project, artist Isa Genzken presented a similar collage of appropriated visual material. Rather than unified by a specific material or subcultural scene, Genzken's pair of collaged pages is a chaotic assemblage culled from a diversity of sources and real world referents. The project contribution comes from the three-volume series of books Genzken created between 1995 and 1996, later photographed and turned into a single monumental tome in 2006. Although this final document of the project is not paginated, Genzken's submission to *GET LOST* falls within the first third of the book. The two facing pages are fully reproduced, along with the visible edges of both the front and back covers of the book.

Held together by red electrical tape and metallic masking tape, the pages present a cacophonous view of a cacophonous city; a compositional palimpsest of an actual urban

palimpsest. Combined are two paper fragments of the Manhattan skyline and harbor, a page of sheet music showing a bass line passage, and an announcement for an all-night drag show. The two collaged elements of the local cityscape differ significantly however. One is an artist's rendering of a series of tall buildings, with only the general shape of their profile shown. The full advertisement from which this image comes is cut off: both the skyline and the ad copy underneath are both abruptly halted by the overlaying of the second skyline image over the right half of this advertisement. While this may too come from mass media publication advertising the city, any specific indication of commercial reference is cropped from the photograph. Instead, the viewer shown a photograph of the former World Trade Centers, with the Statue of Liberty set in front of them, the torch of which is positioned directly between the two towers. The rhetorical power of the original image in itself is not subtle. However, within the context of not only Genzken's pages and *GET LOST* as a whole, the image takes on greater resonance.

Taken at dusk and suffused with muted purple and blue tones, the photograph counters the austere black and white image to its left and the jarring bright red color of the tape. Instead, it becomes a quiet meditative break set into an otherwise chaotic visual arrangement; a brief hiatus in an otherwise "crazy" city. Although Genzken's original book was assembled prior to the destruction of the World Trade Centers, the selection and presentation of these pages in particular as part of *GET LOST* in the summer of 2007 causes both the single image and the submission as a whole to take on a different meaning for the viewer. Preserving a downtown landmark that no longer exists, the photograph results in the entire page now becoming suffused with a tone of nostalgia and loss. The pages make visible an emotional experience of a place, both at the moment of the artist's creation and the moment of the viewer's reception. This is a

place that no longer exists, or at least not as it once did. The page thus serves as a visual guide to a place both real and imagined in the present.

In Muller, Moore, and Genzken's contributions, the New Museum does not appear: no mention of the address is made, it is not graphically represented, and its title is not mentioned. These contributions instead present evidence a vital yet historical regional artistic culture. However, within the context of the greater *GET LOST* project, the museum is implicated within this culture as well. In bringing together artists that speak to alternative strategies of art making (and place-describing), the museum suggested its own link to these acts of creation in both attitude and approach: a freedom to explore and challenge. More specifically, as applied to the final category of maps, this attitude and approach was grounded in a specific alternative art scene: one in which the messy, found-object-based and collaged aesthetics, suggestive of the gritty nature of both a Bowery and Lower East Side subculture. This idea will be more fully parsed in the sections below.

While perhaps on their own some of the project contributions fail to geography or distinct regional character of the downtown Manhattan, collectively they generate a chorographic projection of the region through these disparate contributions. In moving from consideration of the individual maps as representing different strategies to a consideration of the maps as comprising of a single project, commonalities emerge. While each contribution communicates a different subjectively determined aspect of urban space, they each endeavor to transform this space into an understandable place. In addition, across the project as a whole, the museum as landmark site is well represented. It is clearly designated as a specific location in several contributions in the first and fourth categories of approaches. More than this, it is culturally cued

in the fifth approach. Although not explicit in each map, the new location (broadly geographically defined) of the New Museum serves as a unifying feature across the submissions.

As a result, the project enacted an ephemera-based ephemeral chorography for the neighborhood while also establishing a cultural legacy for the museum. The documentation and dissemination of this legacy facilitated the process of a place-based formation of institutional identity. *GET LOST* positioned the museum within a greater history of cultural production beyond the museum's history of direct sponsorship, suggesting a sympathetic alignment with this production. Beyond the physical circulation and manipulation of maps by an audience, the continued preservation of the maps on the museum's website and availability through the museum's bookstore served to continually reinforce this statement of regional belonging and cultural affinity beyond the opening of the museum's new building.

Building a New Building

The New Museum's decision to purchase the lot at 235 Bowery, located at the intersection of Bowery and Prince Street, was made in 2002 following a year-long real estate search. The official groundbreaking at the site occurred in November of 2005, and over the next two years construction progress on the new building could be tracked remotely using a live web feed on the museum's website. Construction was completed in October of 2007, the building was dedicated on November 30, 2007, and it opened to the public the next day, December 1, 2007. Within these two years, the parking lot previously occupying the site was transformed from a visual cavity between commercial buildings on either side of it into the setting for a monumental sculptural installation. The completed building initially announced itself as an exception presence in the neighborhood. As a series of six monumental box-like building units enclosing an eight-story structure, with an additional ninth story underground, it towered over the

surrounding structures. Nonetheless, the design of the new building shares several points of contact with a greater cultural history: both the history of exhibition spaces of contemporary art and the history of the Bowery. This chapter section draws out these two histories in connection to the building, arguing that the visual impact of the new building has played a key role in defining this place-defined era in the museum's history.

The local critical evaluations on the building were positive if not, in some cases, effusive. Bolstering their praise, such reviews made note of the building's connection to both an institutional and neighborhood context. Writing for the *New York Review of Books*, Martin Filler referred to the building as the "miracle on the Bowery." Filler identifies the building as "the highpoint of New York's postmillennial construction boom," a category within which he includes Renzo Piano's The New York Times Building (2004) and Norman Foster's Hearst Tower (2006).[90] In his review for *The New York Times*, Nicolai Ourousoff praised the building for its success "as a hypnotic urban object, a subtle critique of the art world and as a refreshingly unpretentious place to view art." He also considered it as a meditation on the liminal identity of the neighborhood: on the threshold "somewhere between the legacy of a fading bohemian downtown and the ravenous appetites of a society awash in new money…. Between the innocence of New York's artistic past and an encroaching money-driven cynicism." The clash between the "dirty brick façades" of restaurant-supply stores already present on the block and the physical gleaming towers of gentrification arriving in the area is made visible in the building.[91] Rather than finding a middle place somewhere between these two visual vocabularies, Justin Davidson's *New York Magazine* review situated the building as perfectly aligned with the "legacy of inspired idiosyncrasy" within the region: the building's "apparent randomness" and

"ungainly" structure serving as "a fine way to be contextual in a corner of the city known for its endangered population of eccentrics."[92]

Despite recent claims to the contrary, the creation of a permanent site of operations was a concern from the beginning of the museum's history.[93] In the 1977 proposal for the New Museum, Marcia Tucker addressed the importance of a permanent location for the museum. While still occupying the temporary space in the Fine Arts Building, Tucker proposed an ideal space of approximately 30,000 square feet, allowing for office space, storage, and of course exhibition space. While conceding that location of the building would depend upon property and financial support availability, she provided a plan for such a future space: "We are looking, ideally, for a landmark building, the interior of which could be altered to provide a neutral environment that would function in the service of the work to be shown; its exterior character would link us, as a cultural institution, with the history of New York City."[94] In the construction of its new Bowery building in the 2000s, Tucker's late 1970s proposal would be realized.

The new building at 235 Bowery served as a contemporary, self-consciously fashioned landmark within the downtown area.[95] It is twice the size of the Astor Building, with a total floor area of 58,700 square feet, almost doubling Tucker's late 1970s projection. Of this, over 13,100 is dedicated to available gallery space.[96] There can be little doubt on the impact of the building's physical presence. Despite Philips' claim that the museum did not simply want "trophy architecture," it did want a building that could serve as "an important artistic statement… making a contribution to the architecture of the city."[97] Within the context of recent construction projects undertaken by other contemporary art museums, the appearance of the museum building itself has become almost as significant to addressing and defining institutional concerns as the everyday functionality of the building. In discussing this recent architecture and design trend,

Carol Becker observed the tendency whereby “the building itself, and not the art, is the main attraction, and the art objects are at the service of the building—the largest sculpture of all.”[98] Building from Becker’s statement, this chapter examines 235 Bowery as a truly large sculpture: a monumental public sculpture, anchoring the museum to the neighborhood while drawing attention to the museum in the neighborhood.

An international competition of architects was held to select a building proposal for the “new” New Museum. Among the criteria considered by the museum’s planning committee was the desire to showcase young architects, specifically those that had yet had a chance to work on a major project in New York City. During the process the initial group of forty-five architectural firm applicants was culled to a group of five finalists. From these, the Japanese firm of SANAA, led by architects Kazuyo Sejima and Ryue Nishizawa, was selected in 2003.[99] As later described by Lisa Philips in a New Museum publication chronicling the selection process, SANAA’s proposal was selected “for best bringing the site, the New Museum’s mission, and the program into alignment through their design.”[100] This final criterion, the program, is explained as the task set to potential architects to create a building “that was striking and surprising, that would elicit curiosity and would reflect the activity on the inside through its form… a building made of vernacular materials, materials part of everyday life in keeping with the Bowery neighborhood, both scrappy and stylish.”[101] Elsewhere in this essay, a similar list of descriptors is found. However, rather than in reference to the Bowery, Philips applied to these to the museum itself. The New Museum’s “charm” is defined by “its flexibility, scrappiness, and refusal to look anything like a museum.”[102] Adding to this list of adjectives, Sejima explained how, in preparing their proposal, he and Nishizawa were struck by the commonalities between the Bowery and institution:

> Both have a history of being very accepting, open, embracing of every idiosyncrasy in an unpredicted manner. When we learned about the history of the New Museum we were flabbergasted by its attitude, which is very political, fearless and tough. The New Museum is a combination of elegant and urban. We were determined to make a building that felt like that.[103]

In their desire to marry together all of these demands and abstract attributes, the architects conceived of the building itself as a work of site- and sponsor-specific public work of art.

SANAA's design for the building is one at once both consistent with and an expansion on modern New York City architecture. The design references the development of setback designs in accord with historical New York building codes, most famously the 1916 and 1961 Zoning Resolutions, as well as more recent city-mandated building limitations. However, more than an empty historical citation, the stepped approach to the building resolves a functional constraint. Through the staggered arrangement of building units, natural light streams into the galleries through a series of skylights.[104] This irregular structural formation, while not noticeable within the galleries themselves, leads to a striking exterior impression.

The design of shifted boxes was also employed as a somewhat forced visual metaphor for the mission of the museum itself. Philips promoted the building as a "dynamic, shifting and open form, which perfectly mirrored the Museum's mission and the nature of contemporary art" with a building design that "suggests a museum that is open, fearless and alive: a thing of beauty and also an unpredictable and unstable place of curiosity discovery, and exploration."[105] The building is anchored around a vertical core projecting through the entire building. The structure then gives way to a movement around this fixed core. Boxes appear to push outward from it, expanding and contracting under the weight of other boxes, giving the impression of something positioned at the moment between fixed stability and dynamic chaos. As reflecting an organization dedicated to

showcasing contemporary art, a shifting and pivoting structure alludes to the impulse to tackle this field: maintaining institutional stability while accounting for a field forever in flux.

In its promotional material on the building the museum has referred to the structure as a series of “blocks.” Rather than drawing attention to rotation around a stable core, this image suggests an act of creative play. It evokes the image of a child—admittedly a very large child—assembling and rearranging stackable elements to create a whimsical tower. The irregular balance of forms indicates a precarious balancing act by both the giant architecture-forming toddler and the museum institution, guiding the structure into a stable form that is nonetheless open to the rules of chance and possibility. This quality of the unexpectedly transformative becomes particularly apparent which one considers the appearance of the building in situ, attending to the visual impact of both the structure and surface.

In considering a qualitative experience of the building, rather than the quantitative data presented in blueprints and schematic elevations, the building indeed reveals itself to be suggestive of an assembled vertical column of cubes.[106] This is particularly apparent when only the top-most floors of the building can be seen, as when approaching the building from the south. For example, walking north on Bowery from Broome Street, the building slowly comes into view. [Figure 81] Sections of the structure are visible through the staggered heights of the buildings that line the rest of the streetscape. The topmost New Museum building unit, which houses the building’s mechanical operating facilities, first appears as a distinctive cube hovering above the surrounding architecture. The second highest stacked unit, masking two interior floors designated as the museum’s rentable event space and additional mechanical storage, optically merges with the stacked unit beneath it. Particularly when the exterior is illuminated, the building’s outer appearance masks most geometric irregularities, creating the impression of a

structure both stable and in transition, the assembled cube-like forms expanding and shifting in place.[107]

In large part, this optical transformation is due to the uniform cladding of the building's exterior surface.[108] The building is covered with second skin: a silver coated aluminum mesh suspended an inch and a half in front of gray painted corrugated aluminum panels. The outer mesh screen is mounted to these inner panels by a series of stainless steel clips. The effect is of a simultaneously solid and undulating structure, hovering above the ground floor glass-covered lobby of the building. The mesh cladding has a perceptual influence on the viewer. Philips has discussed the mesh as generating the effect of a building that "optically dematerializes."[109] This is echoed by the architects who have similarly described the façade as "like drapery" that "dematerializes the building and makes it softer."[110] In the context of a museum of contemporary art and a sculptural form, it does not seems inappropriate to link Philips' statement to Lucy Lippard's famous analysis of the "dematerialization of the art object" in contemporary sculpture.[111] However, rather than subject to the same conceptual processes of 1960s era artists negating the very "object" quality of the art object, the required sculptural solidity of SANAA's building (required to prevent the building from tumbling down onto museum staff and visitors) is undermined by the structure itself. It is the material of the building and the material covering the building that enacts the process of dematerialization. The choice of aluminum rather than steel was made to exploit formal elements of these materials, specifically its color and the ways in which it can visually undermine fixed stability. The architects praised the "bright, white transparency" of aluminum.[112] They repeated this elsewhere, describing aluminum as being "bright and white and translucent. It gives the building a totally different feeling of lightness, subtlety, and permeability."[113]

The emphasis given to the color white in the architects' descriptions, as well as the museum's promotion of this visual identity in its sponsored-publication, indicates a clear programmatic interest. However, this control of keywords makes the museum's omission of the word "cube" all the more noticeable, given the often-used description of the "white cube" to describe the modern and contemporary gallery space.[114] The argument of the white cube as prototypical gallery space was most famously developed in a trio of articles Brian O'Doherty published in the pages of *Artforum* in 1976, subsequently anthologized as *Inside the White Cube: The Ideology of the Gallery Space*.[115] O'Doherty surveyed then-contemporary art, locating that the radicalism of the art of the age "in its attitudes to the inherited 'art' structure, of which the gallery space is the prime icon."[116] Structure here is understood to signal both visible and invisible constraints: the white cube as physical gallery format and the hierarchical conventions of the art world and art market machinations that flow through this space. O'Doherty argued that the new art of the late 1960s and 1970s addresses "the white cube" as the structure that once fallaciously served as a neutral container for art. The modernist gallery is "[u]nshadowed, white, clean, artificial… Their ungrubby surfaces are untouched by time and its vicissitudes."[117] The believed sterility of this space served as the barrier shielding the sanctified domain of art from the messiness of everyday life, hence an absence of windows to deny visual reference to other locations. This barrier was made permeable as a result of new art's demand on context rather than form to signal meaning. In encounters with this new art, compatible with the kind discussed by Lippard, the viewer in the white cube now attended not only to the art within the space but also to the space itself.

Less often considered is the way in which these "ungrubby surfaces" have themselves become "grubby" following a physical shift in the form of the gallery itself. Applied to the New

Museum's building, rather than focusing on the art housed within the building—despite their being obvious ways to seek literalized "grubby" parallels in recent New Museum exhibitions[118]—I contend that the building itself acts as a trace of the kinds of shifts in contemporary practice. The way in which the New Museum's building tacitly acknowledges these traditions—the dematerialization of the object and the evolving white cube—while also undermining it mirrors Hal Foster's recent evaluation of contemporary architecture. Foster considered how contemporary museum architecture enacts processes of materialization and dematerialization through both building form and perceptual experience.[119] Lacking the extensive proliferation of walls of glass common to the structures of Foster's analysis, the New Museum building encases its series of stacked building unites as modified white cubes within a "drapery" of aluminum. The effect is a transformative engagement with the visual history of contemporary exhibition spaces.[120] The interior space of the gallery, with its polished gray concrete floors and exposed white drywall is consistent with aesthetically and contextually neutral mid-century developed gallery spaces while the exterior appearance marks a departure. The contemporary museum building-as-sculptural object, made specifically as applied to the exterior form of the New Museum building, reflects a reworking of this visual vocabulary for the contemporary moment. The building—in form, material, and location—drives home a connection to regional aesthetics and art world traditions.[121]

Thus while the New Museum was creating a new institutional home for the twenty-first century, it was also engaged in developing an aesthetic that challenged the conventional idea of the contemporary museum and gallery space. Consistent with a historical mission to experiment with defining operations of the museum, the SANAA building can be read as experimenting with museum form itself. However, beyond reflecting a global contemporary art world context in the

building's form, the museum building also engaged with an aesthetic traditional of the neighborhood. The choice of the aluminum mesh was another way in which the architects sought to connect the building and location. It is a reference to a still perceptible visual vocabulary of industrialization that once defined the neighborhood. Nishizawa has stated that choice of a mesh screen was made to reference "the roughness of the Bowery" and "to acknowledge the 'texture' of the surroundings and maybe… the nature of the New Museum."[122] The ways in which both the building and institution housed within it integrate and have been integrated into a local context will be further examined in the following chapter sections.

Building a New Brand

From the time the original SANAA building design was decided upon through to the present day, the shape of the building itself has become something of a logo for the museum. It has served a visual moniker, in the same way that Frank Lloyd Wright's design for the Guggenheim Museum farther uptown has served as a recognizable symbol attesting to the presence and sensibility of that institution. The shape of the SANAA building has featured prominently in a greater branding program designed to generate awareness, anticipation, and enthusiasm for the new building and the institution housed within it. Such uses mark yet another way in which the formerly austere and removed space of the white cube has been made to integrate and interact with the material of the everyday world, and specifically an everyday world suggestive of a gritty—or grubby—subculture aesthetic.

The design and brand consulting firm Wolff Olins, under Creative Director Jordan Crane, was hired to create a new "identity system" for the museum.[123] Developed alongside a tagline of "New Art New Ideas," the firm advised simplifying the name of the institution (turning away from the original 1977 "The New Museum" and the 1983-adopted "New Museum of

Contemporary Art" titles and asserting instead the article-omitting "New Museum" name) and creating a flexible graphic identity to be employed across different advertising initiatives. Initially, the dominant media format of the program presented sets of stacked tiers of text. Set against black backgrounds, capital lettering in a Neographik font in both white and neon colors proclaimed variations of: "NEW/NEW ART/NEW IDEAS/MUSEUM," "NEW/235 BOWERY/NEW YORK NY/ 10002 USA/ MUSEUM," "NEW/OPENING/DECEMBER 1/MUSEUM" and "NEW/OPENING/DECEMBER 1/235 BOWERY/MUSEUM." Each line of text was brought into alignment along a left margin, with the right side of the text tower creating a staggered effect, cuing the staggered stacked units of the museum building. Beyond advertising the opening of the new building in 2007, these formations appeared and continue to appear not only on museum stationary and press releases. They are also as part of an ongoing outdoor campaign of lamppost-hung banner advertisements.

Prior to the building's December 1, 2007 opening, the New Museum organized a series of public interventions to generate awareness and interest in the launch of the new building.[124] The advertising agency Droga5 was contracted to develop the campaign with Wolff Olins.[125] Dually influenced by the street art and commercial design backgrounds of the artists involved and the New Museum's own interest in developing a cultural affinity to alternative subcultural (or "countercultural") forms, an aesthetic vocabulary predicated on street media and the manipulation of urban space through the use graffiti, stencils, stickers, and street sculpture was employed.

One of the most striking works produced as part of the campaign was a durational piece involving the collaboration with and appropriation of already extant advertising media. Over three days, a Calvin Klein clothing billboard at the northwest corner of Houston and Lafayette

Streets was slowly defaced. On the first day, November 26, 2007, magenta paint appeared to have been poured from the top of the billboard image, covering the surface of most of the black and white clothing ad. [Figure 82] At first glance it certainly appeared to be an interventionist statement directed at the company: large-scale, anti-corporate vandalism carried out in public. As would become apparent in subsequent days, the vandalism was simply a trompe l'oeil effect conveyed through the reprinting and remounting of the billboard image over the course of successive days. Rather than defacing the original image by pouring of paint over the surface of the image, the billboard surface was recovered each day with a new printed image. During the printing process, the original image was digitally altered to include the paint drips. Each new billboard image was affixed in the early morning hours using a crane, a process carried out in plain sight for all passing by to observe.

Over the course of the next two days, the drip patterns were lengthened. Ultimately most of the ad copy was covered, save for two sections. [Figures 83 and 84] The Calvin Klein Jeans brand name was preserved: few of the drip lines crossed the logo, with new drips lines started beneath the name to give some sense of total visual continuity. The other open space preserved on this second day was in the center of the billboard, again revealing the drip pattern to be far from random. Right angles within the streaks of magenta indicated a carefully controlled drip pattern, one that would reveal by the third day the full outline of an irregularly structured, multi-sided geometric shape. Then outlined in white, this shape's clear referenced to the outline of the New Museum's new building at 235 Bowery, approximately five blocks away, was evident. The address, along with the New Museum name itself, was also "co-branded" on the billboard.[126] The modified Calvin Klein billboard remained in place until December 3, two days after the official opening of the museum.[127]

The billboard was but one component of a larger campaign Wolff Olins and Droga5 collaboratively executed. As a variation of the billboard effect, a number of sticker projects also appropriated existing advertising spaces. Large and small-scale stickers in the shape of the new building began appearing on subway walls, making it seem as though the wall had been blown out and providing an illusionistic view into an expansive space beyond the vertical surface. Billboards, transportation kiosks, and advertising banners on the sides of busses were also covered with stickers. While some stickers simply blotted out already-present advertising image content, others adopted a similar strategy of playing with negative space found on the Calvin Klein billboard. The outline of the building was presented in the negative space of large adhesive sheets placed on top of existing street-level advertising for companies like Radar and Blender. Many of these larger format stickers included not only the name of the museum but also the address and the December 1 opening date.[128]

By citing a visual vocabulary with presumed regional subcultural significance (e.g. post-graffiti media such as stickers and wheatpaste posters), inserting key New Museum content into this vocabulary (e.g. the building shape, the museum address, the museum slogan), and installing the results throughout the city in a manner meant to evoke an illegal appropriation of urban space, the new brand identity of the museum superficially suggested a gritty, anti-authoritarian stance. The projects played with street art and anti-advertising strategies, usually associated with efforts to combat the intrusion of corporate content into public spaces. However, in a post-Naomi Klein and Kalle Lasn era of brand scrutiny, these kinds of urban advertising tactics have become commonplace.[129] There was a slickness to the overall New Museum campaign that reads as an obvious corporate promotion rather than a subversive gesture. Rather than transforming

corporate messages through interventionist acts designed to reclaim public space, these projects add to an extant commercial image culture.[130]

The question then remains: Why adopt this vocabulary in the first place? Why would a thirty-year old organization, contemporaneously responsible for the construction of a monumental public sculptural building, presume to suggest an alignment with graffiti and street art culture? This kind of token alignment with an alternative visual culture should be read in accord with a greater ideological assertion of the museum's "alternative" and "vanguard" place in light of otherwise present milestones of maturation. Place needs to be understood here as signaling both a cultural and geographical position. Rather than looking to street art as representing a historically and culturally specific class of artists or cultural figures, the promotional style cultivates a general cache of "cool" for the museum, now far removed from its early days as an experiment museum practice. However, it is also important to acknowledge that this is also a geographically specific coolness being cultivated. Similar to the way in which the *East Village, USA* exhibition projected the move to the neighborhood, the brand strategy and visual style employed makes reference a comparable youth-oriented culture. Understanding the Bowery dually as both a narrowly-defined present-day real place and expansively-defined historical space of cultural creation is crucial to these brand identity-formation projects. This slippage between "the Bowery" and "downtown" continued to guide projects following the museum's opening.

Building a New Bowery

Just prior to the building's opening, Paul Goldberger, then-architecture critic for *The New Yorker*, wrote: "after two decades in SoHo the New Museum had seen both the upside and downside of gentrification…. [A]s the museum grew larger it drifted from its radical beginnings,

just as the Museum of Modern Art had done two generations before. The decision to move to the Bowery was perhaps a clever way of assuring its supporters that its agenda remains radical."[131] There are several points needing to be unpacked in this final sentence: How would the Bowery suggest a radical agenda for the museum? Would the neighborhood alone be enough to engender an agenda of cultural radicalism by association? Once engendered, how could this radical agenda be communicated to a savvy art world audience? And once the initial move to the Bowery was complete, how could the museum continue to foster this connection between institution and location? This section offers some answers to these questions by examining projects completed by the museum either contemporary with or just after the opening of the new building.

In his analysis of the two century-long history of museums dedicated to "contemporary" art, J. Pedro Lorente identified a locational pattern among these museums: that they were built in "decaying cities or neighborhoods." For Lorente, such institutions do not just participate in but instead actively trigger and guide processes of urban renewal within their respective neighborhoods. In recent years this process has become popularly referred to as the Bilbao effect, referring the Solomon R. Guggenheim Foundation's mid-1990s creation of a museum for contemporary art in then-industrially depressed Basque country. As analyzed by Lorente, the new contemporary art museum cultivates a community around itself. Complementary galleries, retail stores, and restaurants crop up, forging a new neighborhood dynamic intended to be beneficial to the institution's continued economic success, enacting a cultural institution-driven process of gentrification. Although how Lorente's discusses the New Museum's specific participation in such a process is problematic, his greater argument is nonetheless productive for considering the New Museum's actions following its relocation to the Bowery.[132]

The New Museum's migration to the Bowery has been described as changing the geography of the New York art world and affirming the rising presence of the Lower East Side as a viable commercial art scene.[133] Adding to this idea of the transformative impact of the museum are statements issued by the museum's executive staff in advance of the institution's arrival on Bowery. Saul Dennison, Henry Luce III's successor as President of the Board of Trustees of the New Museum, was quoted in the summer of 2003 as announcing the museum's intention "to take a leadership role in the revitalization of this great and storied district…"[134] There are two underlying implications to such a statement. First, that this is a neighborhood somehow in need of revitalization: that it is stagnating and needs to be improved in order to raise itself to the standards of the contemporary urban ideal. Second, that this revitalization process has, up until now, been held back: something has prevented this process from occurring either spontaneously or through an internally organized leadership. Dennison's remarks position the New Museum at the forefront of this radical program of an externally-determined ideology of progress; as the catalyst that also drives the path to an a priori determined level of potential.

However, rather than announcing the arrival of gentrification to the Bowery, the construction and completion of the New Museum's building is more appropriately read as a contributing to a process of transformation already a decade in the making. Reports of the changing real-estate prices and physical alterations to the local environment began appearing in the early 1990s. Although these appear with greater frequency following 2000, it would nonetheless seem appropriate to characterize the New Museum's involvement in the gentrification process as hopping aboard an already moving train rather than driving the engine out of the station as Dennison's comments would suggest.[135] In addition, as discussed at the beginning of this chapter, the New Museum can be viewed as participating in a culture of

nostalgia to assuage concerns over the displacement of a local culture caused by their arrival. Ironically, the Museum has become both promoter of this backwards-looking view while at the same time complicit in the forward march of commercial speculation within the region.

In response to why the Bowery was selected as the neighborhood for the new building, Lisa Philips responded that multiple downtown locations had been considered. However, rather than selecting an available space in Greenwich Village or SoHo, the idea of the Bowery offered something unique. She recalled:

> The Bowery had been an eye-sore for so long and it was a place that was kind of invisible—no one wanted to look at it. The more we thought about it the more interesting that seemed… We also realized that psychologically it seemed a long way away but physically it was really close to our prior home on Broadway. If you think about it, it's basically Third Avenue. When you say Third Avenue it sounds really close to everything, whereas the Bowery sounded very far away to be people. It was all psychological.[136]

Philips echoed this sentiment almost verbatim in an interview conducted upon the opening of the new building. Using much of the same loaded vocabulary, she stated, "We just noticed that the Bowery was kind of sitting there languishing… It's been such an eyesore for so long, and a kind of psychological barrier for people. But it's really an amazing street with an amazing history."[137] The repetition of oppositions set forth in these phrases is telling. With Philips as spokesperson, the museum's new neighborhood as a negatively inflective, aesthetically deficient, and psychologically distant place is simultaneously also a place of possibility, interest, and historical depth.

The new location at 235 Bowery is only approximately six blocks away from the former building at 583 Broadway in SoHo. During its tenure at the SoHo building, the museum witnessed the ascent of the surrounding neighborhood in the commercial art world (as well as

more recently the world of higher end retail). However, this kind of mainstream place of privilege that SoHo enjoyed by the late 1990s had yet to extend over the geographic boundary line of Bowery. The museum's move to the new location on Bowery and in the Bowery would involve not only transgressing the "psychological boundary" referenced by Philips, accomplished through the series of projects already discussed in this chapter, but also blurring the existence of a boundary completely by construction a legacy underscoring the museum's close affinity (geographically and culturally) to the Bowery.

In his study of the history of the Bowery, Rob Hollander draws a distinction between the two sides of Bowery, the roadway, a real-world division predicated on municipal districting.[138] The west side of Bowery falls under the protection of Community District 2, largely responsible for the historic designation and preservation of large swaths of the West Village, Greenwich Village, Little Italy and SoHo. The east side of Bowery belongs to Community District 3, responsible for the Lower East Side and less beholden to preservation demands. As a result, while the west side of the street presently enjoys greater zoning and historic building protections, on the east side of the street almost invites open season for development. New high-rise apartments and large-scale commercial structures have begun to crop up in recent years, particularly in the area between Cooper Square and just south of Houston. Often touted as the clear sign of regional development and gentrification, a 71,000 square foot, two-story Whole Foods Market now sits at the southeastern corner of Bowery and Houston Street (Whole Foods is to the Bowery what Starbucks is to Harlem, as addressed in the previous chapter). Located on the east side of Bowery, the museum too belongs to Community District 3.[139]

Despite its unassuming appearance at the end of the twentieth century, the plot of land at 235 Bowery has a rich history of serving local culture. From 1876 to 1909, the London Theatre

was located at 235 Bowery. The theater housed a number of celebrated variety and vaudeville performers of the day. In 1909, under new ownership, the name of the theater was changed to the Lipzen Theatre. It then served as part of the greater Yiddish theater circuit, until 1913 when the theater became the Variety Theatre and played home to the then newly popular spectacle attraction of motion pictures. After three more name changes—Maorio's Royal Theatre in 1916, the Caruso Theater in 1924, and the Chinese Theatre in 1926—the building lot was sold. Replaced by manufacturing storefronts and warehouses, the greater social identity of the Bowery shifted start in the 1920s. This industrial character persisted, with restaurant and lighting wholesale supply businesses becoming the dominant commercial exchange of the road, particularly along the southern half of the Bowery. With the theater long torn down, the parking lot that replaced it was a more fitting regional landmark for a neighborhood defined by utility.[140]

As already discussed in connection to the use of materials employed in its new building, the New Museum selectively references this industrial history. Perhaps less obviously pronounced is the museum's cultivation of another narrative of the Bowery as local reference: as a home for of a mid- and late-twentieth century alternative artist communities combined with a romanticized notion of the enduring legacy of "the Bowery Bum" and the Bowery as "Skid Row."[141] Taken together, they create an imagined identity of the Bowery as New York's answer to a bohemian Montmartre.[142] This downtown neighborhood has been ideologically reconstructed as a locus for significant post-war era American artistic innovation. The museum has attempted to carve out its own neighborhood designation, constructing and preserving a cultural memory of those that have lived and worked *in* "The Bowery" rather than necessarily *on* "Bowery."

This is most evident in one of the museum's recent initiatives: the archival *Bowery Artist Tribute*. This multi-platform initiative has thus far yielded three publications, *Bowery Artist Tribute Vol.1*, *Bowery Artist Tribute Vol. 2*, and *Bowery Artist Tribute Vol. 3*. Each contains oral histories with artists and authors who worked in and around the Bowery. The diversity of artists mentioned within these two texts tracks a canonical chronology of art historical movements and cultural styles over the previous half century. Abstract Expressionism, Pop, Minimalism, Conceptualism, Sound art, intermedia installation and Performance art, Punk, New Wave, and Graffiti art are developmentally linked to the New Museum's definition of the Bowery.[143]

Prior to museum's recent gallery exhibition *Come Closer: Art Around the Bowery, 1969-1989* (September 19, 2012 to January 6, 2013), the most public offering of the *Bowery Artist Tribute* had been online interactive informational archive which is still active today. The user of the database is initially shown a map of downtown Manhattan, extending from approximately 8th Street to the north and East Broadway and Worth Street to the south. Within this frame, the map is color-coded: the area marked as "The Bowery" is colored in a lighter shade of gray than the rest of the surrounding area. Within this space, individual locations are marked by fuchsia dots. Clicking on these brightly-colored markers reveals a specific address and the artist or artists associated with it. Clicking again produces a short artist biography and a series of images representative work.[144]

The scope of geographic inclusion in the online archive is considerably vast. The area color-coded as the Bowery proper extends from Broadway to the west, East 11th Street to the north (with the transition between Bowery and Fourth Avenue marked two blocks south of this), First Avenue to the east (save for a section farther south of Houston that pushes as far east as Clinton Street), and Canal Street to the South.[145] As a result, newly designated as

"Bowery artists" are: filmmaker Jack Smith, whose residence is located in the heart of SoHo on Grand Street and Green Street, and the farthest west of those sites included on the map; and younger artists Inka Essenhigh and Steve Mumford at Suffolk Street and Rivington Street, the eastern-most site included in the database.[146]

Informed by a similar desire to acknowledge an ongoing legacy of regional artistic production has been the New Museum's commissioning and presentation of works that take mapping of the Bowery as their primary content. Organized by Eungie Joo, the Keith Haring Director and Curator of Education and Public Programs for the New Museum, and part of the museum's contribution to the cross-institution "Museum as Hub" initiative, a series of works were installed in the fifth floor Education Center of the new building and archived on the museum's website. The first work to be presented in this new space was Martha Rosler's now canonical *The Bowery in Two Inadequate Descriptive Systems* (1975), which presents a complex portrait of the "Bowery bum" as the Bowery. On view from December 1, 2007 to February 27, 2008, and thus coinciding with the opening of the new building, Rosler's series of forty-five tiled pairings of photographs and text plates records neighborhood blight through images of urban detritus and lists of synonyms for drunkenness. Human figures are almost entirely evacuated from the Rosler's photographs, their presence known only through a remainder object culture of empty liquor bottles and broken glass. The artist's pairings suggest both the identity of the once-present figures in the spaces and the spaces themselves as now tainted with similarly negative connotations.

Following the display of Rosler's work, a rotation of internationally coordinated programs was held in the Museum as Hub space, as per the original program proposal. For the New Museum's own contribution to this series, the exhibition *Museum as Hub: Six Degrees*

(September 25, 2008 to January 11, 2009).[147] The title refers the angle of displacement of the Bowery roadway relative to the Manhattan grid. Rosler was again represented, this time with a work that can be understood as a contemporary updating of her earlier project. Rosler's *Bowery High Lights* (2008) is a two-channel video installation in which photographs and text are again paired. However, rather than a static mounting of the pairings on backing boards, *Bowery High Lights* adopts the format of a digital slide show. Over the course of the video, images of new regional development give way to captured traces of the older Bowery built form, and vice versa. Also presented within the gallery as part of this exhibition were: Dave McKenzie's *Postcards From* (2008), a video installation in which the artist is shown sequentially presenting to the camera a set of photographs he took of Lower East Side locations while struggling to provide to the specific name for each location; My Barbarian's *Post-Living Ante-Action Theater (PoLAAT): Post-Paradise, Sorry Again* (2008), a two-channel video installation showing documentary footage of the collective's two week residency at the New Museum in June of 2008, during which time they offered workshops for local artists; and Ginger Brooks Takahashi's *an army of lovers cannot fail* (2004-present), a recent iteration of an ongoing project in which the artist organizes a series of "Powerstitches" or public quilting forums, promoting community dialogue while participants add additional stitch work to an all white quilt.

However, the projects presented as part of *Museum as Hub: Six Degrees* were not exclusively contained within the museum's walls. A number of works used the exhibition as an opportunity to transcend the space of the gallery. In doing so, these artists did not negate the presence of the museum, but instead promoted an exploration and possible integration of the space of the museum as continuous with the greater urban environment in which it was now placed. For example, in *Line Up* (2008), Lisa Sigal proposed painting a single line extending not

just from but also through the museum site to the horizon. Mirroring the color and width of demarcated municipal bicycle lanes, Sigal's ribbon of green paint extended over roadways and across the exterior of building surfaces, not only bringing into contact the artist and local community owners, but also visually tethering the museum to this community.[148]

Dave McKenzie produced an additional two projects that not only moved beyond the space of the gallery, but also positioned the museum's influence beyond the Bowery roadway. For *I'll Be There* (2008-2009), the artist arranged a series of six meetings to take place at different locations throughout the Lower East Side. A calendar was made available through the museum to encourage public attendance at these informal, unstructured encounters. The content to be discussed, the duration of the meetings, or the specific activities to be undertaken were not established prior to the meeting, leaving possible the opportunity for a mostly open-ended encounter between artist and audience (the only pre-planned structured element of the interaction is the artist's promise to "be there"). McKenzie also created *On Location* (2008) for the exhibition. For this project, the artist drafted letters to the public, printed on brightly colored paper, and then taped onto the sides of buildings, construction sites, and dumpsters throughout the Lower East Side. These letters modified the format of the film location announcement familiar to anyone who has ever had his or her street taken over by a movie project. McKenzie's flyers provide basic information for the fictional film project: the title of the film is provisionally set as *On Location*, the filming is not intended to cause a disruption of everyday life (McKenzie provides the assurance that no cars will be moved during his filming, a rarity for on-location filming in Manhattan), and the goal of the film is to try to "learn to see a place." If McKenzie's gallery-installed *Postcards From* mediates an experience of a broadly geographically-defined Bowery from within the walls of the New Museum, *On Location* positions this artist-informed

(and New Museum-sponsored) experience of place within the streets of this similarly expansively drawn territory.

However, an outright time-capsule preservation or documentation of a Bowery idea has not been the museum's interest. The museum has taken steps to physically expand its presence along the Bowery. One year after opening the new building, the museum purchased a 47,000 square foot, five-story building at 231 Bowery, which previously served as a restaurant supply store, located adjacent to the SANAA building. 231 Bowery was initially designated to serve as a site for storage, although, as described by Philips, the space's longer-term use would be left open to housing future exhibition programming, for unspecified "revenue generating activities," and "an investment in our future growth." Philips acknowledged the museum's responsibility in "being part of a neighborhood in transition… to work with the community to bring about positive change. One of the biggest challenges is to preserve the creative community that has flourished here for several decades and attracted us in the first place."[149] Despite this statement, the occupants of the new space would come not from the Bowery but from a global art world.

In the fall of 2011, the New Museum's official plans for 231 Bowery were announced. A new exhibition series, entitled "Studio 231," would be held within the space.[150] Overseen by Massimiliano Gioni with specific exhibitions organized by New Museum curator Gary Carrion-Murayari, the series was promoted as presenting installations and performances of emerging international artists, providing these artists with a forum within which they can "realize ambitious new works conceived especially for a street level space" and "to foster a new relationship with he public by allowing artists to create work outside the confines of the main museum building and in closer proximity to the energy of the street and to the creative space of the artist's studio."[151] The once commercial supply space was partially renovated, transformed

into the conventional industrial loft-indebted gallery space, in fact mirroring the interior appearance of the gallery spaces in the adjacent museum building. Works by the British artist Spartacus Chetwynd, the Italian artist Enrico David, and the Swedish artists Nathalie Djurberg and Hans Berg have filled the space during its first year of exhibitions.[152]

It remains to be seen just how either this "closer proximity to the energy of the street" described in the above press release is in fact enacted. Is it simply a matter of physical closeness to street level, with its first floor galleries as opposed to the second floor galleries or the gallery space at the rear of the first floor lobby in the 235 building? Or is this energy of the street somehow indicated by the individual projects shown in the space? Left unstated by this announcement is that the exhibitions housed in 231 Bowery, regardless of their taking place "outside the confines of the main museum building," will nonetheless occur in a space framed by the museum: the museum's ownership of the building, the proximity between the two sites, the overlapping curatorial programming and promotion of events and exhibitions, and the shared physical appearance of the two locations.

While not suggesting some nefarious motive for the museum in purchasing the space, demonizing the institution for driving gentrification practices or engaging in some sort of land-grab, this ongoing program of both real estate and ideological expansion needs to be acknowledged as part of a greater program of place-based identity construction. Played out in both digital and analog media, in virtual and real spaces, the museum's cultivation of a legacy of neighborhood connection continues through to the present day. Beyond writing its own history along side that of the Bowery's history, the museum redraws the space of the Bowery in remaking a place for the Bowery in accord with this constructed history.

Building a New Legacy

Whereas projects such a *Counter Culture* and *GET LOST* suggested belonging in a way that anticipated future physical presence along Bowery, the projects discussed below used the now-completed museum building as a landmark location around which public events were organized. These events occurred in connection with the ambitiously titled *Festival of Ideas for the New City*, held from May 4 to May 8, 2011. Three and a half years following the opening of the new building, *Festival of Ideas for the New City* was part street fair, part seminar series, and part relational art project. The festival brought together several New York City cultural organizations in order to "harness the power of the community to imagine the future city and explore the ideas that will shape it."[153] During the long weekend program, symposia, curated art exhibitions, information sessions and public events were held. Topics such as sustainable urban architecture, community gardening and cultivating green space, community formation and responsibility, and opportunities for informal creative play were presented. At the time, the project was described as the inaugural occurrence of this festival, anticipating the annual occurrence of this urban consciousness-raising public forum-cum-festival.[154] As co-sponsor of the event, the chief anchor site of the festival was the New Museum.[155]

The museum's involvement in local community activities of this kind was not novel. Throughout the 1980s and 1990s, while located at 583 Broadway in SoHo, the museum was a frequent participant in the then-annual Broadway Street Fair. The museum often sponsored a booth in which information packets of exhibition schedules and free passes to exhibitions were distributed and catalogues were made available for purchase at a reduced price. As minutes from museum staff meetings record, participating in these kinds of localized public festivals served as "a good publicity event" for the museum.[156] With the *Festival of Ideas for the New City*, the museum's involvement would move from that of participant to that of critical organizing body.

However, shared between these two events would be the potential of capitalizing on the event as an opportunity to generate attention for the museum, as an integral and contributing community body.

The New Museum played a key role in structuring the centerpiece of the *Festival of Ideas for the New City*, the street fair StreetFest. Over seventy-five fair booths extended along Bowery between Houston and Spring Streets, spilling over onto Stanton and Rivington Streets as well. Represented in each booth were different local nonprofit groups, small businesses, and community service organizations. The iconic image of the StreetFest was Family and PlayLab's *The Worms*, a series of eight ten-foot high and twenty-foot wide, brightly colored, modular tubular forms. [Figure 85] An updated version of the traditional vendor tent, these accordion waterproof nylon coverings were supported by rolled galvanized steel ribs. The eight enclosures were produced for the fair in both cyan and raspberry colored nylon.[157] Fair vendors where shielded within these tubular forms, with vented openings along the sidewalk allowing those walking by entrance into the covered spaces. Within this arrangement, the museum building served as the information center for the fair, from which information about other downtown satellite sites and activities was disseminated. In addition, the museum building was also intended to serve as a physical and visual center. Original schematics for the placement of *The Worms* have the tubular forms leading into and out of the entrances of the New Museum building. [Figure 86] However, in their actual installation, these coverings ran parallel to the museum along the sidewalk rather than providing a formal pathway directly into the museum building.

If the enclosures of *The Worms* formed a temporary three-dimensional intervention into the neighborhood, a jarring visual expanse that, in part, reified the museum's sponsorship of the

fair along Bowery, *After Hours: Murals on the Bowery* served as two-dimensional imprinting of the museum's co-sponsorship upon already extant surfaces along the same roadway. This project was organized in collaboration with the Art Production Fund. Eighteen roll-down metal security grates belonging to private businesses along Bowery between Houston and Grand Streets were painted, with each gate designed by a different artist or collective.[158] While the distance spanned by the network of murals was greater than that of *The Worms*, the greatest number of murals—thirteen out of the eighteen—were located along the same span of Bowery as StreetFest and *The Worms*.

Completion of the murals was timed to coincide with the start of *Festival of Ideas for the New City*, although the temporary public installation was ultimately visible between May 7 and July 7, 2011. Acknowledging the ever-increasing ways in which audiences utilize technology in engaging with works of art, a prerecorded audio guided tour for *After Hours* was also offered by the museum for download to compatible smartphone devices. In addition, during the two month installation, printed maps were available in the museum lobby with a downloadable version of this map accessible through the museum's website. Within the map, the New Museum is the only regional landmark to be designated aside from the series of murals. [Figure 87]

Additionally presented as part of the weekend festival was *Flash: Light*, an evening electronic light public art installation held on Saturday May 7. Curated by Anna Muessig and Jeff Grantz of Materials & Methods, *Flash: Light* was promoted as part of both the greater *Festival of Ideas for the New City* and the second annual Nuit Blanche festival held across New York City.[159] As part of *Flash: Light* several sites within SoHo and the Lower East Side hosted film screenings and performances, and were transformed into supporting structures for site-specific installations.[160] Several of these locations were on Mulberry Street between Houston and

Prince Streets, a short walk away from the New Museum. The New Museum's building was used as a screen for the evening: the west façade provided a surface onto which the premier of the film *Let Us Make Cake* (2011) was projected. [Figure 88] The collaborative film is comprised of short clips of several artists manipulating scale models of the SANAA-designed building.[161] The evening screening not only marked the first public viewing of the film but also the first time the surface of the New Museum building was used for such a purpose. During this inaugural presentation, viewers of this both site- and content-specific project were cordoned off by police barricades on the sidewalks directly across from the museum on Bowery. However, the crowd spilled onto Prince Street, with the best view of the films achieved by standing in the middle of the street itself, an act requiring the disregard for both oncoming traffic and police admonishment.[162]

Although sharing some similarities with Creative Time and the Museum of Modern Art's jointly sponsored projection of Doug Aitken's *Sleepwalkers* (2007) on the walls of the Museum of Modern Art's building four years prior in January and February of 2007,[163] *Let Us Make Cake* used the New Museum's building as more than just a structural scaffolding for the projection. The museum building—the actual building, its shape, and the concept of an experimental museum structure—was an integral part of the film, the film's presentation, and the audience's experience that evening. During this nighttime spectacle on May 7, admiration of the New Museum building was neither for it as a storehouse for art nor exclusively as a sculptural object. Instead attention was directed at the building as representing multiple forms of support: providing a physical framework, allowing for temporary display of a recently created project; and providing the foundational content for this new project, with the artist-driven reconstructions and, in some cases, destruction of the building presented as the filmed material. During the

screening, the building also served as an illuminated beacon upon Bowery, a massive glowing form announcing and anchoring the nocturnal art festival in the neighborhood.

Once the building is understood as serving as this kind of support, the process of sympathetic neighborhood identification and integration moves closer to completion. A process initiated with the programming of public projects such as *Counter Culture* and *GET LOST*, which used the building site as a way of projecting a connection to the neighborhood, evolved in order to make use of the now realized form of the building as a physical presence within the neighborhood. At the end of this process, the building itself has become part of the found material of the Bowery. Beyond creating a new building as a material synthesis of the stylishness and grittiness of a constructed Bowery identity, the New Museum's place within the new Bowery helps to perpetuate this identity. A decade following the retirement of Tucker and half a decade following the opening of the new building, the New Museum's self-selected location continued to contribute an identity to the institution itself.

Returning to the two façade sculptures by Rondinone and Genzken with which this chapter started, the New Museum's almost decade-long programming of public projects intended to reciprocally designate a place for itself on Bowery and designate the Bowery as a place appropriate for the museum has played out through dual processes of neighborhood interjection and integration. Continuing Tucker's desire to create a "relevant" institution, the post-2000 identity for the museum has been one that seeks institutional definition through place-based and -marked engagements. Selectively mining the history of the Bowery while contributing to the future placemaking of the Bowery, the museum embraced and continues to embrace regional gentrification—or authentrification—as an opportunity to chart a new legacy for both itself and its new neighborhood.

[1] While the implied preceding statement remains unknown, following the installation of the Rondinone work, two responses were given. However, neither were provided by the museum. The first was an anonymous stencil, sprayed in black paint on the base of a municipal signpost directly across from the museum's entrance on the opposite side of Bowery. In a similar arced formation, but monochromatic, the phrase "Hell, No!" appeared several months after the hanging of the Rondinone. The second response appeared a few months after this. In May 2008, the art collective Bruce High Quality Foundation hung a string of similar rainbow-striped letters on the brick façade of the building opposite from the New Museum across Bowery. The arc of the sequence of letters was the inverse of Rondinone's, and the phrase replaced with "Heaven Forbid!"

[2] Genzken's *Rose* fulfills, perhaps unintentionally, a previously abandoned design plan by SANAA for the building. In discussing the application of the aluminum mesh to the side of the building, the architects describe a plan for ivy to grow through the mesh cladding. Lisa Phillips et al., "Work in Progress: Site Visits," in *Shift: SANAA and the New Museum*, ed. Joseph Grima and Karen Wong, (New York: New Museum, 2008), 56.

[3] "Ugo Rondinone, Hell, Yes!" New Museum, accessed April 3, 2012, http://www.newmuseum.org/exhibitions/18.

[4] "Isa Genzken, Rose II," New Museum, accessed April 3, 2012, http://www.newmuseum.org/exhibitions/433.

[5] The phrase "Operation Bootstrap" appears in Luce's letter as President of the New Museum in the museum's first biannual report. Praising the ambition of Tucker and the generous financial support offered by some to the museum, yet still observing that the museum "still has no Mellons, Rockefellers, Vanderbilts, or Guggenheims behind it," Luce wrote, "If ever there was an Operation Bootstrap, The New Museum is it. A product of some combination of an intellectual leap and act of faith, it had the benefit of neither a long planning period nor funding. It simply appeared. Once in view, there was no making it go away. The idea was contagious." Henry Luce III, "From the President," *The New Museum Report 1977 and 1978* (1978): 2.

[6] Beatriz Colomina, *Privacy and Publicity: Modern Architecture as Mass Media* (Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1994), 13-15.

[7] Alexandria Symonds, "In Which we Mark Graves Like Birthplaces: Ceci N'est Past CBGB," This Recording, accessed October 10, 2011, http://thisrecording.com/today/2011/10/3/in-which-we-mark-graves-like-birthplaces.html. Symonds' examples relating specifically to the Bowery include: Daniel Boulud's self-consciously titled DBGB restaurant at 299 Bowery between Houston and 1st Street, with an interior design meant to evoke the Bowery's past a restaurant wholesale supply district; a John Varvatos clothing store at 315 Bowery at the intersection of Bowery and Bleeker Street, the former site of the music club CBGB, in which traces of the club's graffiti have been preserved; Patricia Field's store at 302 Bowery between Houston and 1st Street, with its awning announcing "Pat's Restaurant Equip;" and the inclusion of an art gallery showcasing photographs of the neighborhood in the late 1970s and 1980s within the boutique Blue & Cream, occupying a street-level corner storefront on Bowery at 1 East 1st Street.

The relevance of Symonds' essay continues to assert itself. Recently, the gallery at Blue A Cream hosted a photography exhibition entitled "A Tribute to Mars Bar." Presenting the works of photographer Debby Hymowitz, the exhibition opened April 11, 2012. Mars Bar was an East Village punk music club at 25 East 1st Street that was closed in July 2011. The building was sold as part of a plan to create a twelve-story luxury condominium high-rise. As per the official press release of the Blue&Cream exhibition, Hymowitz "has captured the essence of this gritty and martyred establishment through her brilliant photos that will help carry on the Mars Bar essence, just as it should be remembered. After all, this is Blue & Cream's neighborhood. It's time to pay our respects with a really great party. Just as any Bowery native would want it." Both the exhibition and press release make clear this idea of cultural appropriation through claiming to speak as the voice of the neighborhood and as inheritor of the mantle of local production and preservation.

[8] Joy Press, "The Last Days of Loserville," *The Village Voice,* March 8 2005, 34.

[9] Lisa Phillips, "Past, Present, Future" in *Shift: SANAA and the New Museum*, eds. Joseph Grima and Karen Wong (New York: New Museum, 2008), 5.

[10] Grace Glueck, "Art People," *The New York Times,* June 3, 1977, C14. Jonathan Santlofer's *The Museum in the Sky Becomes a Reality* (1977) can currently be found in the Marcia Tucker Papers, 1957-2004; 2004.M.13; Box 147; Research Library, The Getty Research Institute. Tucker uses the phrase when discussing the founding of the museum in her memoir *A Short Life of Trouble: Forty Years in the New York Art World* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2008), 121. The New Museum's website currently features an essay entitled " 'The Museum in the Sky': A History of the new Museum in Sites and Spaces," written by Megan Heuer, a research assistant at the museum. While mostly correct in its chronological explication of the different locations the museum has operated, there are a several incorrect statements, including mischaracterizations of museum mandate attributed to Tucker. Among these is the claim of "Tucker's ambition to establish a museum without either a permanent home or a

permanent collection as an initial foundation required not only a radical reconception to the definition of a museum, but also a flexible physical structure." While the argument is correct in asserting Tucker's reticence to developing a permanent collection (which would result in the formation of the New Museum's Semi-Permanent Collection formally implemented in 1979), it is incorrect in claiming that Tucker did not want a permanent site for the museum. I will return to this point in the latter part of this chapter in connection with the construction of the museum's new building at 235 Bowery. See "Proposal for The New Museum," 1977; Marcia Tucker Papers, 1957-2004; 2004.M.13; Box 4; Folder 2; Research Library, The Getty Research Institute. For Heuer's essay, see "The Museum in Sky:" History of the New Museum in Sites and Spaces," New Museum Digital Archive, accessed August 20, 2012, http://archive.newmuseum.org/index.php/Features/Show/displaySet?set_id=22.

[11] This memo served as an invitation to the New Museum's staff to broadly consider what defined museum operations in general. Tucker posed to her staff the question of: "What if, rather than just rethinking exhibitions, we rethought the museum?" In a later draft of this same memo, although "Rethinking 'Museuming'" was changed to "Rethinking Exhibitions," this interest in analyzing the museum as institution persisted. This later draft included questions such as: "Why does the New Museum do exhibitions?... What is a possible alternative to this?… What if a museum (and it is a museum, with trained personnel, a facility, a reputation, a structure, and some degree of funding) instead focused on IDEAS, EVENTS, AND SITUATIONS for a given period of time?" For the original "Rethinking 'Museuming' memo, see Marcia Tucker, "Rethinking 'Museuming'" 30 October 1985; Marcia Tucker Papers, 1957-2004; 2004.M.13; Box 7; Folder 4; Research Library, The Getty Research Institute. For the redrafted version of this memo, see Marcia Tucker, "Rethinking Exhibitions" 1985; Marcia Tucker Papers, 1957-2004; 2004.M.13; Box 7; Folder 7; Research Library, The Getty Research Institute.

[12] The museum as "theoretical object" was considered by John Rajchman in his article "The Postmodern Museum." Rajchman presents philosopher Jean-Francois Lyotard's curated exhibition *Les Immateriaux* at Beaubourg Museum from March 28 to July 25, 1985 as representing new possibilities in curatorial practice and "museological nominalism." A copy of Rajchaman's article is currently included as part of Tucker's papers within the same folder as Tucker's proposal for "A Year of Experimental Programming," developed at the same time as the "Rethinking 'Museuming'" memo. However, it is not my contention to argue that Tucker was looking to Lyotard's exhibition as a model as something to be copied literally. Instead, I suggest that Tucker's own advocacy for expansively thinking about museum practice is in keeping with ideas generally being put forth in art circles at the time, with Lyotard's exhibition and coverage thereof as part of the dialogue. See John Rajchman, "The Postmodern Museum," *Art in America* 73, no. 10 (October 1985): 110-171. Tucker's copy of the article is found in the Marcia Tucker Papers, 1957-2004; 2004.M.13; Box 7; Folder 11; Research Library, The Getty Research Institute.

[13] In a 1979 report prepared by Dieter M. Kearse, then Director of Planning and Development for the New Museum, addressed the museum's "less than ideal current location." Although unique in its mandate to serve contemporary art practices, its location (then at 65 Fifth Avenue and 14th Street) rendered the museum "geographically removed from similar cultural institutions" and thus diminished the amount of street traffic the museum could attract. Elsewhere in the report, Kearse made clear which neighborhoods he considered more advantageous for the museum should it ultimately move. The "best" location for a new site was proposed as somewhere between 50th and 90th Streets, between Sixth and Park Avenues in order to "attract an audience which might not go out of its way to seek out the museum elsewhere." Although he raises the possibility of taking over a retail space on Fifth Avenue at street level, he does caution that this might be a prohibitively expensive undertaking. Thus it seems clear that Kearse advocated for the traditional Upper East Side Museum Mile, home to the Metropolitan Museum of Art, the Guggenheim Museum, and the Whitney Museum of American Art, without explicitly mentioning these institutions by name. Dieter M. Kearse, "Long Range Planning Proposal," 1979; Marcia Tucker Papers, 1957-2004; 2004.M.13; Box 4; Folder 16; Research Library, The Getty Research Institute.

[14] From the time she was hired by the Whitney Museum as Curator of Painting and Sculpture in 1969, Tucker ruffled a number of feathers of both museum staff and long-time members with her insistence on proposing exhibitions departing from those programmed by the Whitney Museum and its sister institutions: for example, *Anti-Illusion: Procedures/Materials*, from May 19 to July 6, 1969, a conceptual art group exhibition including works by Carl Andre, Michael Asher, Lynda Benglis, Eva Hesse, Barry Le Va, Robert Morris, Bruce Nauman, Robert Ryman, Richard Serra, Joel Shapiro, Michael Snow, Keith Sonnier, Richard Tuttle, and others; *Bruce Nauman: Works from 1965 to 1972*, from March 29 to May 13, 1973, an early career retrospective of the artist's works that was first exhibited at the Los Angles County Museum of Art before traveling to the Whitney; and *Richard Tuttle*, from September 12 to November 16, 1975, which displayed the artist's wall-mounted wire "sculptures" and arranged string "drawings" set on the gallery floor. These shows, while retrospectively landmark in their introduction of

minimalist, conceptual, process, performance, and video art into the New York museum world, were less than well regarded by the New York critical press, particularly by then- columnist for *The New York Times* Hilton Kramer.

[15] This new mandate was in large part initiated by a change in museum officers: in particular, stemming from the retirement of John I. H. Bauer as museum director and the appointment of Tom Armstrong as his successor in January of 1974. With this transfer of power, Tucker's title was changed from Curator of Painting and Sculpture under which she was hired to that of Curator of Contemporary. In the early fall of 1976, Tucker was asked by Armstrong to resign. After refusing, she was then fired, effective at the end of the year. An October 15, 1976 article in *The New York Times* printed Tom Armstrong's densely worded public statement obliquely referencing the firing: "Any changes in the staff of the museum are judgments by the director toward the attainment of objectives based upon priorities established at the particular time in the history of the museum." Grace Glueck, "Art People," *The New York Times,* October, 15, 1976, C18. Tuckers recounted her own version of the events leading to her dismissal from the Whitney at length her memoir. Tucker, *A Short Life of Trouble,* 108-119.

[16] Letter from Marcia Tucker to Brian [O'Doherty], 27 December 1976; Marcia Tucker Papers, 1957-2004; 2004.M.13; Box 39; Folder 19; Research Library, The Getty Research Institute.

[17] Although the New Museum would adopt a more global perspective in the 1990s, Tucker's connection to the Whitney Museum made her acutely aware of the dearth of either scholarship about or exhibition opportunities for specifically contemporary American artists.

[18] Tucker was not alone in this view. The art critic Barbara Rose wrote a series of articles detailing the what she perceived to be a crisis moment for the Museum of Modern Art. The recent resignation of John Hightower as Director, rumors of prolonged staff infighting, and a reported annual deficit of over one million dollars led Rose to declare that the time had come for "the Museum to take a long hard look at itself." See Barbara Rose, "Why MoMA Needs Help," *New York Magazine,* 5, no. 4 (January 24, 1972): 62 and Barbara Rose, "New space for new art," *Vogue*, 167 (November 1977): 205.

[19] New Museum Trust Agreement, 29 November 1976; Marcia Tucker Papers, 1957-2004; 2004.M.13; Box 4; Folder 1; Research Library, The Getty Research Institute. This same language was repeated in grant proposals filed by Tucker after the opening of the New Museum. See the Marcia Tucker Papers, 1957-2004; 2004.M.13; Box 4; Folder 2; Research Library, The Getty Research Institute. In a letter Tucker circulated to the trustees of the Whitney Museum upon her firing, Tucker pointed to the historical irony of her dismissal. Tucker cited the legacy of Gertrude Vanderbilt Whitney, the founder of the museum, whose commitment to "encourage, support and preserve the best art made by living American artists" in 1930 as consistent with her own curatorial actions four decades later. She presented this commitment as a chief reason for her firing and thus an affront to the legacy of Gertrude Vanderbilt Whitney. Draft of letter sent by Tucker to the Trustees of the Whitney Museum of American Art, undated [1976]; Marcia Tucker Papers, 1957-2004; 2004.M.13; Box 3; Folder 20; Research Library, The Getty Research Institute. Sections of this letter were reprinted in Tucker's memoirs, *A Short Life of Trouble*, 118.

[20] The connection between the collecting habits of the Museum of Modern Art and the New Museum is quickly sketched by Bruce Altshuler in his introductory essay "Collecting the New: A Historical Introduction," in *Collecting the New: Museums and Contemporary Art*, ed. Bruce Alshuler (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005), 1-13. For more on the Museum of Modern Art as both kunsthalle and kunstmuseum during the founding era of the museum, see Irving Sandler, "Introduction" in *Defining Modern Art: Selected Writings of Alfred Barr, Jr.,* eds. Irving Sandler and Amy Newman (New York: Abrams, 1986), 9, 28-30. Similar connections between the Whitney Museum and the New Museum are infrequently made. When they are made, the focus is on the Whitney Museum of the 1970s and not of the 1920s and 1930s, despite a shared concern between Tucker's museum and the older museum's founding era dedication to the promotion and purchase of works by new American artists.

[21] Simply creating "alternative art space" would not be the solution either. Tucker saw this model as presenting its own limitations in the kind of context created around the works presented. For Tucker, artists guide alternative art spaces, while art historians guide art museums. In a letter written to Brian O'Doherty in December 1976, days before the opening of what would become the New Museum, Tucker writes that "I want to make a workable, serious contemporary arts center that would bridge the gap between alternative spaces like The Clocktower and Artists Space and the top-heavy bureaucratic structures that take fewer and fewer chances." Letter from Marcia Tucker to Brian [O'Doherty], 27 December 1976; Marcia Tucker Papers, 1957-2004; 2004.M.13; Box 39; Folder 9; Research Library, The Getty Research Institute.

[22] Tucker, *A Short Life of Trouble,* 121.

[23] The types of documentation Tucker had in mind would pertain both to the greater contemporary art world and to exhibitions sponsored by the New Museum. For the latter, these included exhibition catalogues, announcements and reviews, written scholarly critical evaluations of exhibitions, cassette tape recordings of interviews with artists,

curators, critics, scholars, and other contemporary art-related professionals, and a slide library containing of installation views from recent important solo and group exhibitions in the United States and Europe. The effect would be the promotion of the proposed museum as dually operating as a comprehensive research center. For the former, documentation alone was not sufficient for Tucker. Instead, generating new scholarship was for Tucker "essential." Not simply exhibition lists of works shown but extended bibliographies, biographies of artists, and lengthy critical essays situating the works within a greater formal and ideological art historical contexts accompanied even the earliest exhibitions. See Proposal for The New Museum, 1977; Marcia Tucker Papers, 1957-2004; 2004.M.13; Box 4; Folder 2; Research Library, The Getty Research Institute and Letter from Marcia Tucker to Brian [O'Doherty], 27 December 1976; Marcia Tucker Papers, 1957-2004; 2004.M.13; Box 39; Folder 9; Research Library, The Getty Research Institute.

[24] In a 1980 interview with *Artworkers News*, Tucker clarified her definitions of these different institutional exhibition sites. Tucker discussed the museum as speaking to a broader public than a more niche-driven, and often overtly activist, alternative space. Rather than suggesting that museums cannot adopt activist positions, Tucker believed that a museum had a greater public platform, with which came a responsibility to provide serious critical analyses of and comprehensive records for those works presented within the museum's galleries. Despite the misleading title, see David Troy, "The New Museum as *Kunsthalle*: Treading a Thin Line Between Alternative Space and Traditional Museum," *Artworkers News* (December 1980), 20-21.

[25] These supporters would be the early recipients of Tucker's prospectus. Several of them were asked to serve on an Advisory Board for the new museum. The early membership of the Advisory Board, and their affiliation at the time of its organizing, consisted of: Richard Boardman (United States Information Agency), Linda Cathcart (Albright-Knox art Gallery), Gideon Chagy (Business Committee for the Arts), William Dunn (Legal Aid Society), Anne Foche (and/or), Al Held (Yale University), Phil Linhaires (artist and independent curator), Linda Nochlin (Vassar College), Robert Rosenblum (Institute of Fine Arts, New York University), Janet Solinger (Smithsonian Institute), and Kenneth V. Stevens (Parsons School of Design). Others invited to join the board, but seem to have declined, were art critic Robert Pincus-Whitten, Brenda Richardson, and Henry Hopkins, Director of the San Francisco Museum of Modern Art. Within the first several months of 1977, a formal Board of Trustees was formed. Members included Jack Boulton of the American Federation of the Arts, Allen Goldring of Goldring International, Vera List, the artist and art critic Brian O'Doherty, and Tucker. By the end of the year, the artist Patrick Ireland would replace O'Doherty on the board, although O'Doherty would continue to serve as an advisor to the museum. O'Doherty also had received an invitation to join the Advisory Board in late 1976, but appears to have declined this formal position as well. Upon the receiving Tucker's initial prospectus and invitation to join the Advisory Board, Robert Rosenblum enthusiastically replied, recognizing potential in Tucker's plan to "become the second half of the 20th century what MOMA was for the first. See New Museum Proposal, 1977; Marcia Tucker Papers, 1957-2004; 2004.M.13; Box 4; Folder 2; Research Library, The Getty Research Institute; New Museum Proposal, 1977; Marcia Tucker Papers, 1957-2004; 2004.M.13; Box 4; Folder 5; Research Library, The Getty Research Institute; Marcia Tucker, Correspondence, undated; Marcia Tucker Papers, 1957-2004; 2004.M.13; Box 33; Folder 2; Research Library, The Getty Research Institute; Robert Rosenblum, Letter to Marcia Tucker, 15 December 1976; Marcia Tucker Papers, 1957-2004; 2004.M.13; Box 33; Folder 2; Research Library, The Getty Research Institute; and Marcia Tucker, Correspondence, undated Marcia Tucker Papers, Marcia Tucker Papers, 1957-2004; 2004.M.13; Box 39; Folder 19; Research Library, The Getty Research Institute.

[26] These first exhibitions were: *Memory,* the inaugural exhibition, held at C-Space at 71 Leonard Street in New York City from May 10 to May 21, 1977, which offered a cross-media presentation of works by eight artists either directly or indirectly addressing the ideas of remembered experience; *New Work/New York*, hosted by the Gallery of July and August in Woodstock, New York from June 25 to July 13, 1977; *Four Artists, Drawings*, from August 20 to September 29, 1977, which debuted at the Institute of Contemporary Art in Tokyo, Japan; and *The 1970s: New American Painting*, organized under the mantel of and at the invitation of the International Communication Agency of the Department of State, which traveled throughout eastern and western Europe from June 1979 to April 1981. The artists included in *Memory* were Sarah Canright, Brenda Godman, Steve Gwon, Kent Hines, Ronald Morosan, Earl Ripling, Martin Silverman, and Katherine Sokolnikoff. *New Work/New York* included Don Dudley, Edward C. Flood, Jonathan Santlofer, D. Jack Solomon, Marianne Stikas, and Caludia Schwalb. *Four Artists* included Sharon Haskell, Bill Jensen, Dennis Kardon, and Donald Sultan. More ambitious than these previous three exhibitions, owing to the government-backing of a greater international program of American cultural production, *The 1970s: New American Painting* included forty-two artists: Nicholas Africano, William Allan, Terry Allen, Jennifer Bartlett, Jack Beal, Joan Brown, Judy Chicago, Chuck Close, Richard Estes, Audrey Flack, Charles Garabedian, Ron Gorchov, Robert Gordy, Nancy Graves, George T. Green, Nancy Grossman, Richard Haas, Al Held, Neil Jenney,

Bill Jensen, Alex Katz, Jane Kaufman, Sylvia Plimack Mangold, Brice Marden, Bill Martin, Ree Morton, Elizabth Murray, Jim Nutt, Howardena Pindell, Dorothea Rockburne, Susan Rothernberg, Ed Rucha, Joan Snyder, Earl Staley, Pat Steir, Gary Stephan, John Torreano, Jack Whitten, William T. Tiley, Robert Zakanitch, and Joe Zucker. The exhibition was curated by Tucker, Allan Schwartzman, and Kathleen Thomas, and would include a number of artists the works of whom would continue to be present in New Museum exhibitions over the next several years.

[27] In 1977, with Tucker as the Director, the initial staff was given the following departmental designations: Al Bryson in charge of Development, Susan Logan and Allan Schwartzman representing Curatorial, Maureen Reilly and Charlie Soule in Administrative, and Michiko Miyamoto overseeing International programming. A team of six interns joined them. By the following year, Cheryl L. Cipriani joined the museum staff. Throughout the first several years of museum operation, a great percentage of the day-to-day operations of the museum were completed by volunteers, many of whom were artists. This included light construction, organizing mailing lists and sending out invitations to exhibition openings and events, and setting up a membership department.

[28] Proposal for The New Museum, 1977; Marcia Tucker Papers, 1957-2004; 2004.M.13; Box 4; Folder 2; Research Library, The Getty Research Institute. This new program of collecting was formally implemented in 1979. Only works created within ten years of the date of potential acquisition would be candidates for acquisition. Works ultimately acquired by the museum would then be held for a minimum of ten years and a maximum of twenty years. During this time, these works would be made available for exhibition at the museum—and crucially "exhibited unedited," without the influence of any quickly arrived at retrospective evaluation—loan to other institutions, documentation in critical essays, and study purposes by academics, critics, museum professionals, and other artists. Following the initial ten-year period, the work would then be deaccessioned: made available for sale to other museums and galleries, both independently owned and overseen by colleges and universities. This collection would exist as an evolving document of the contemporary: forever up-to-date, forever in flux, and forever being re-evaluated based on changing notions of what defines "contemporary" art. See footnote 54 in this chapter.

[29] The first show to be held in the New School space was *Early Work by Five Contemporary Artists*, from November 11 to December 30, 1977. The next year, Tucker curated the intentionally provocatively titled *Bad Painting,* from January 14 to February 28, 1978. The additional exhibitions of *New Work/New York* were: *New York/New York*, from May 13 to July 8, 1978; *New Work/New York*, from December 8, 1979 to February 8, 1980; and *New Work/New York*, from January 30 to March 25, 1982. *Outside New York*, as the exhibition title indicates, offered an opportunity to present contemporary work produced by those geographically outside of the dominant New York City art world. The exhibitions mounted as part of this series were: *Outside New York*, from September 23 to November 11, 1978; and *Outside New York: The State of Ohio*, from April 26 to June 26, 1980. This series continued after the museum's 1983 relocation to SoHo with *Outside New York: Seattle*, from March 26 to June 1, 1983. The *New Work/New York* and *Outside New York* series were later brought together in a single exhibition, appropriately titled *New York: New York/Outside New York*, from June 2 to July 15, 1984. *Currents* was a set of simultaneously presented paired solo exhibitions of artists cast in dialogue with one another. These included *Currents: Mary Stoppert* and *Currents: Al Souza*, from June 12 to July 29, 1982; and *Currents: The Reverend Howard Finster* and *Currents*: *Candace Hill-Montgomery*, from August 7 to September 22, 1982. The *Current* series also continued following the museum's move to SoHo with *Currents: Martin Puryear* and *Currents: David Ireland* from July 28 to September 9, 1984; and *Currents: John Hull* and *Currents: Mia Westerlund Roosen*, from February 23 to April 14, 1985. Among the solo exhibitions presented during this time were: *Alfred Jensen: Paintings and Diagrams from 1957-77*, from March 22 to April 21, 1978; *Barry Le Va: Four Consecutive Installations and Drawings 1967-1978*, from December 16, 1978 to February 10, 1979; *Ree Morton: Retrospective 1971-1977*, from February 16 to April 17, 1980; and *John Baldessari: Work 1966-1980*, from March 14 to April 28, 1981, which was jointly organized with the University Art Galleries at Wright State University. The list of additional group exhibitions presented during this time include: *The Invented Landscape,* from February 17 to April 14, 1979; *Sustained Visions* from April 23 to June 23, 1979; *In a Pictorial Framework,* from June 30 to September 15, 1979; *Dimensions* Variable, from September 29 to November 29, 1979; *Deconstruction/Reconstruction: The Transformation of Photographic Information into Metaphor*, from July 12 to September 18, 1980; *Investigations: Probe – Structure – Analysis*, from September 27 to December 4, 1980; *Alternatives in Retrospect: An Overview 1969-1975*, from May 9 to July 16, 1981; *Stay Tuned,* from July 25 to September 10, 1981; *Persona*, from September 19 to November 12, 1981; *Not Just for Laughs: The Art of Subversion*, from November 21, 1981 to January 21, 1982; *Extended Sensibilities: Homosexual Presence in Contemporary Art*, from October 16 to December 31, 1982. In addition, the exhibition *Hallwalls: 5 Years* was jointly organized by New Museum curators Allan Schwartzman, Kathleen Thomas, and Gerard Roger Denison, and was installed in the galleries of the Parsons School of Design before traveling to other institutions across the country.

[30] The inaugural exhibition was *Window: Mary Lemley*, from December 7, 1979 to January 3, 1980. The list of additional artists and collectives who created installations as part of this series included: John Ahearn, Laurie Hawkinson, Jeff Koons, David Hammons, Richard Prince, Orly Haddad and Hank Lewis/Contemporary Urbicultural Documentation, Collaborative Projects/Fashion Moda and Taller Boricua, James Holl, Gina Wendkos, Bill Bierne, Claudia Fitch, Colette, David Troy, Joseph Hilton, the Public Works Committee of Political Art Documentation/Distribution, Brad Melamed, Anne Turyn, Richard Armijo, and Kenneth Shorr.

[31] In the minutes from March 10, 1981 meeting of the Board of Trustees, the pettiness of these conflicts is hinted at. Raised as part of "other business" at the meeting is the decision by the New School to no longer allow the New Museum to have access to New School copy machines and the demand for the museum to purchase their own. Meeting of the Board of Trustees, 10 March 1981; Marcia Tucker Papers, 1957-2004; 2004.M.13; Box 5; Folder 9; Research Library, The Getty Research Institute.

[32] Within the lists of possible locations considered over several years, relocating to the site of a former Con Edison Powerhouse at 115-121 East 12 Street (122 East 13th Street) between Third and Fourth Avenues, a series of four brownstones between West 54th and West 55th Streets, the Grand Street Police Station, the Vertical Club at 59th Street and 2nd Avenue, and spaces within recently built complexes by Hunter College and New York University were discussed.

[33] Despite occupying the building since 1983, the building would not be officially renamed "The New Museum Building" until 1994. The choice occupying the Astor Building, and in moving to SoHo in general, was not a unanimous one. In the minutes from a September 9, 1980 meeting of the Board of Trustees, Vera List is recorded as being "negative" about the new neighborhood. Meeting of the Board of Trustees, 9 September 1980; Marcia Tucker Papers, 1957-2004; 2004.M.13; Box 5; Folder 4; Research Library, The Getty Research Institute.

[34] The space was effectively "donated" by the limited partnership 583-587 Broadway Association, which owned the building and would continue to own and operate the spaces of the building not occupied by the museum, the developer HQZ Fine Arts, and the museum.

[35] The addition of "of Contemporary Art" to the museum's title needs to be read as a public declaration-cum-clarification of mission and joint institutional marking of territory. In her survey article of the Marcia Tucker papers at the Getty Research Institute, Mara Gladstone remarks that the reason for the change of the museum's name "sometime in the 1980s" is "unclear." This is inaccurate. The decision to change the name of the museum was brought on by news that the collector Edward Broida intended to open his own "museum" in SoHo, with works drawn from his own collection. According to a New Museum trustees memorandum and related correspondence, Broida intended to refer to his "new museum" as a display for "contemporary art." On advice of legal counsel, The New Museum's name change was thus meant to block the collector's use of a name that could lead to visitor confusion or overt denial of the New Museum's unique geographic territorial and larger art world status.See Memorandum from Henry Luce III to the Trustees of the New Museum, 21 March, 1983; Marcia Tucker Papers, 1957-2004; 2004.M.13; Box 35; Folder 18; Research Library, The Getty Research Institute and Letter from Marcia Tucker to Henry Luce III, 18 March 1983; Marcia Tucker Papers, 1957-2004; 2004.M.13; Box 35; Folder 18; Research Library, The Getty Research Institute. For Gladstone's article, see Mara Gladstone, "Marcia Tucker and the Birth of the New Museum," *Getty Research Journal* no. 4 (2012): 187-194.

[36] Tucker elaborated that hers was an institution that looked critically at its own practices, and also did not rest on its previous successes. It was also a museum that was not concerned with either necessarily popular or populist programming. In this speech, she stated, "This is a Museum that does not believe in the Let the Public Eat Pablum Theory," instead relying on education and outreach to promote discussion and bridge the divide between public and sometimes frustratingly oblique contemporary art. In the transcript for the talk, next to the sentence "We don't alter our shows to garner public support" Tucker handwrote the phrases "no Leroy Neiman, no Muppets." Marcia Tucker, "Corporate Lunch," 5 November 1985; Marcia Tucker Papers, 1957-2004; 2004.M.13; Box 7; Folder 9; Research Library, The Getty Research Institute.

[37] In 1985, Tucker proposed having "A Year of Experimental Programming" to fill the 1987-1988 anniversary year. Challenged were that the museum needed to be a single fixed physical site, develop a programming calendar around a set of discrete exhibitions, and stage exhibitions in which an in-house permanent collection was presented. Promoted were thinking about both the physical and ideological space of the museum as able "to provide a flexible, unpredictable and collaborative forum… [for] creating a polemical situation… that will engage people outside of the art community alone." Repeated throughout the broadly drafted proposal is the word "relevant." "Entr' Acte: A Year of Experimental Thinking," 1985; Marcia Tucker Papers, 1957-2004; 2004.M.13; Box 7; Folder 4; Research Library, The Getty Research Institute.

[38] Proposed was the production of magazines, videos, and newspapers, with each format to be considered as both catalogue and a work of art.

[39] "One Night Only" included performances by Dancenoise (Anne Iobst and Lucy Sexton), Ethyl Eichelberger, Danny Mudlack, Pat Oleszko, Danita Vance, and Flotilla Williams. According to a report from the museum's public affairs department, the evening was "a tremendous success—with more than 225 in attendance and many turned away." See "Department Report for Board Meeting," 30 March 1987; Marcia Tucker Papers, 1957-2004; 2004.M.13; Box 8; Folder 2; Research Library, The Getty Research Institute.

[40] This program ran alongside the museum's gallery exhibition *Rhetorical Image*, from December 9, 1990 to February 3, 1991. The Resource Room was placed in a separate gallery in which museum visitors were asked to fill out postcards answering questions posed by the exhibition's curators. These included: "How do you understand a Work of Art" and "How do you think the museum perceives you?" The participatory installation engaged the viewer in order to examine the way in which meaning is a socially constructed, relying on a dialogic exchange between artist, museum, and viewer. See Milena Kalinova and Diedre Summerbell, eds., *Rhetorical Image* (New York: The New Museum of Contemporary Art, 1990).

[41] "The New Museum of Contemporary Art" Long Range Planning Summary Draft, 1 January 1996; Marcia Tucker Papers, 1957-2004; 2004.M.13; Box 11; Folder 4; Research Library, The Getty Research Institute and "The New Museum of Contemporary Art" Facilities renovation and objectives summary, 1 February 1996; Marcia Tucker Papers, 1957-2004; 2004.M.13; Box 11; Folder 4; Research Library, The Getty Research Institute.

[42] Letter from Brian Goldfarb to the Facilities Planning Team, 25 October 1995; Marcia Tucker Papers, 1957-2004; 2004.M.13; Box 11; Folder 4; Research Library, The Getty Research Institute and Letter from Charlayne Haynes to Henry Luce III, Sal Dennison, Carlos Gomez, James McClinnen, Paul Schnell, and Laural Skoler, 7 May 1997; Marcia Tucker Papers, 1957-2004; 2004.M.13; Box 11; Folder 4; Research Library, The Getty Research Institute.

[43] These include, respectively: *Joan Jonas,* from April 1 to May 20, 1984; *Golub*, from September 22 to November 25, 1984; *Hans Haacke: Unfinished Business*, from December 12, 1986 to February 15, 1987; *Bruce Nauman Drawings: 1965-1986*, from September 11 to November 8, 1987; *Ana Mendieta: A Retrospective*, from November 20, 1987 to January 24, 1988; *Felix Gonzalez-Torres*, from September 16 to October 16, 1988; *Christian Boltanski: Lessons of Darkness*, from December 9, 1988 to February 12, 1989; *Nancy Spero: Works since 1950*, from May 19 to July 9, 1989; *Mary Kelly: Interim*, from February 16 to April 8, 1990; *Visiting Hours: An Installation by Bob Flanagan in Collaboration with Sheree Rose*, from September 23 to December 31, 1994; *Andres Serrano: Works 1983-1993*, from January 27 to April 9, 1995; *Carolee Schneemann: Up to and Including her Limits*, from November 24, 1996 to January 26, 1997; *Mona Hatoum*, from December 4, 1997 to February 22, 1998; *Doris Salcedo: Unland*, from March 19 to May 31, 1998; *Fever: The Art of David Wojnarowicz*, from January 21 to June 20, 1999; *Cildo M*eireles*,* from November 18, 1999 to March 5, 2000; and *William Kentridge*, from June 2 to September 16, 2001. In large part, the greater attention paid to international artists and global themes in these later years can be attributed to the museum's hiring of curators Dan Cameron and Gerardo Mosquera in 1995.

[44] Examples of such exhibitions include: *The End of the World: Contemporary Visions of the Apocalypse*, from December 10, 1983 to January 22, 1984; *Difference: On Representation and Sexuality*, from December 8, 1984 to February 10, 1985; *Art and Ideology*, from February 4 to March 18, 1984; *Choices: Making an Art of Everyday Life*, from February 1 to March 30, 1986; *The Other Man: Alternative Representations of Masculinity*, from May 8 to June 8, 1987; *Until that Last Breath: Women with AIDS*, from February 24 to March 24, 1989; *The Decade Show: Frameworks of Identity in the 1980s*, from May 12 to August 19, 1990, which was a collaborative exhibition held concurrently at The New Museum, The Museum of Contemporary Hispanic Art, and The Studio Museum in Harlem; *Rhetorical Image* , from December 9, 1990 to February 3, 1991; *Embodying Faith*, from May 11 to June 11, 1991; *Bad Girls (Part I)*, from January 14 to February 27, 1994, *Bad Girls (Part II),* from March 5 to April 10, 1994; and *Picturing the Modern Amazon*, from March 30 to June 25, 2000

[45] As just one example of Tucker's continued influence: In a 1996 letter responding to Henry Luce III's inquiry about presenting Judy Chicago's *Dinner Party* in a future New Museum exhibition, Tucker provides a series clear reasons for why she would advise against such a plan. These include the oft-cited objections over the work's incorporation of un-credited artists' labor and its simplified feminist commentary, its recent display in the Brooklyn Museum, and its potential redundancy with similarly aligned exhibitions of works about sexual politics hosted at the museum both in recent and future exhibition seasons. However as an addendum to the letter, Tucker includes the following: "PS I forgot the most important reason: I HATE Judy Chicago. I will never, ever live down the fact that I taught her and Miriam Shapiro consciousness-raising techniques early in the 1970s. They devastated many a budding young artist by telling her that her work wasn't 'feminist' enough." As a second addendum, Tucker wrote, "PSS Burn this letter, lest it get into the wrong hands." Letter from Marcia Tucker to Henry Luce III, 22 May 1966

[1996]; Marcia Tucker Papers, 1957-2004; 2004.M.13; Box 41; Folder 7; Research Library, The Getty Research Institute.

[46] Luce's retirement would be effective following the close of a New Museum Board Meeting on June 9, 1998. Letter from Henry Luce III to Saul Dennison, 26 May 1998; Marcia Tucker Papers, 1957-2004; 2004.M.13; Box 41; Folder 7; Research Library, The Getty Research Institute.

[47] Letter from Marcia Tucker to unnamed recipients, 11 November 1998; Marcia Tucker Papers, 1957-2004; 2004.M.13; Box 42; Folder 1; Research Library, The Getty Research Institute. An earlier draft of this letter can be found in Box 42, Folder 2 of the same archive. In each, Tucker asserts her productivity over recent months, citing her oversight of the museum's then-recent Capital Campaign, guidance of the renovation and reopening of the SoHo building, and continued calendar of lectures, studio visits, and exhibition planning for the museum and abroad. She also asserts that despite her diagnosis, she is "happy, productive, and with the exception of occasional fatigue, not at all debilitated," an inclusion that can be read as both a personal and professional reassurance.

[48] Her appointment to the position was publically announced on December 17, 1998.

[49] Lee Smith "Like New," *Artforum International* 37, no. 9 (May 1999): 56.

[50] The notion of a comparably personality-defined moment—a "Phillips era" to follow the "Tucker era" was dismissed by some art world publications as an outmoded form of institutional management. For example, in a 2007 *Artforum* article, mention is made of the museum's late 1990s movement away from being a "personality-driven" institution that once "reflected Marcia Tucker's iconoclastic personality." Phillips' early tenure was described as more precisely enacting an almost perfunctory managerial role, as embracing a "penchant for resourceful affiliations and partnerships" guided by "executive, rather than artistic" direction. Anne Doran, "Out with the Old," *Artforum International* 46, *no 1* (September 2007): 167.

[51] Much has been made of the New Museum's hiring of a trio of new staff members as infusing new curatorial direction into the museum: offering the needed artistic direction that Phillips' executive direction alone not provide. Providing the tacit "in with the new" companion phrase to Anne Doran's 2007 *Artforum International* article's title of "Out with the Old," added to the staff were Richard Flood in the position of chief curator, Laura Hoptman as senior curator, and Massimiliano Gioni as curator. Representing a prolific and ambitious international curatorial track record among them, these three new hires would impart a cross-generational approach to contemporary curatorial strategies, approaches with historical reverence to but fostered separate from Tucker's institutional policies. Immediately prior to his appointment as chief curator for the New Museum, Flood served as the chief curator of the Walker Art Center in Minneapolis. His New Museum appointment was announced in June 2005. Hotman was the curator of contemporary art at the Carnegie Museum of Art in Pittsburgh. Her appointment as New Museum curator was publically announced in October 2005. Gioni developed a track record as an internationally mobile curator, serving as the artistic director of the Nico Trussardi Foundation in Milan and co-directing the Wrong Gallery in Chelsea with Maurizio Catellan and Ali Subotnick. His appointment as New Museum curator was announced in October 2006. In 2010, Hoptman left the New Museum to serve as curator in the Department of Painting and Sculpture at the Museum of Modern Art, where she previously worked as an assistant curator from 1995 to 2001. Doran, "Out with the Old," 167.

Critic and curator Matthew Hicks grouped the appointments of Flood, Hoptman, and Gioni as part of a larger personnel shift occurring within the New York City not-for-profit art world between 2005 and 2006. In addition to the Flood, Hoptman, and Gioni, this shift involved notable art world figures such as Debra Singer, Gianni Jetzer, Benjamin Weil, Rochelle Steiner, and A.A. Bronson. Beyond a "mere human-resources shakeup" Hicks characterizes this multi-player realignment as constituting "a profound shift in both ambition and attitude, one that suggests an equally profound opportunity even a mandate, to reimagine and reanimate an entire culture." For Hicks' argument, see Matthew Hicks, "New York," *Artforum International* 45, no. 4 (December 2006): 249-251.

[52] Under Phillips, the number of trustees was increased from eighteen to thirty-five.

[53] Carol Vogel, "The Great Buildup: On the Bowery, a New Home for New Art," *The New York Times,* March 28 2007, H1.

[54] To provide just one example: the Semi-Permanent Collection, implemented in 1979, seems to have been discontinued starting in late 2000. In September 2000, the Altoids Curiously Strong Collection, comprising over one hundred fifty works of contemporary art by mostly emerging artists, was officially donated to the museum. This was the museum's largest receipt of a corporate donation to date. Its importance to the museum and its public identity is even more pronounced given the series of exhibitions tied to this gift in subsequent years. On January 12, 2001, the three-week exhibition *Fresh: The Altoids Strong Collection* opened. In the years that immediately followed, an exhibition of the Altoids collection was programmed annually: *New Additions to the Altoids Curiously Strong Collection* (January 25 to February 17, 2002); *Five Years of the Altoids Curiously Strong Collection 1998-2002*,

(October 22 to November 30, 2003); *Sixth Annual Altoids Curiously Strong Collection* (October 29 to November 20, 2004); and *Seventh Annual Altoids Curiously Strong Collection* (September 29 to October 29, 2005). This series of exhibitions was followed by the 2008 announcement of the establishment of the Altoids Award, an intended-to-be biennial award granting $25,000 to four emerging artists. Although the link between the gifting of the corporate collection and the move away from the idea of a semi-permanent collection predicated on deaccssioning works that seems to have followed has never been publicly declared, the scale and timing of the gift is such that its impact cannot be discounted as having an impact on the replacement of the Semi-Permanent Collection with a more traditional program of collecting in recent years.

[55] The Chelsea Art Museum was opened in November of 2002. Started by the German painter Jean Miotte and his wife Dorothea Kesser, the museum was started at the former site of a Christmas ornament factory. During the first two years of operation, the Chelsea Art Museum transformed the first two floors of the building into gallery spaces to host traveling exhibitions. The third floor of the building was used as offices for the Miotte Foundation. During the New Museum's occupancy, the Chelsea Art Museum continued a program of exhibitions within the building's second floor gallery space.

[56] Carol Vogel, "Inside Art," *The New York Times*, April 30, 2004, E29.

[57] "Artnet News June 13, 2006," Artnet, accessed May 18, 2012, http://www.artnet.com/magazineus/news/artnetnews/artnetnews6-13-07.asp.

[58] These included: *Sixth Annual Altoids Curiously Strong Collection* (October 29, to November 20, 2004); *East Village USA* (December 9, 2004 to March 19, 2005); *Transmission II: Airborne* (April 9 to June 4, 2005); *Contagious Media* from April 28 to June 4, 2005; *Rhizome ArtBase 101* from June 23 to September 10, 2005; *Aeronout Mik: Refraction* (June 23 to September 10, 2005); *Patty Chang: Shangri-La* (July 8 to September 10, 2005); *Seventh Annual Altoids Curiously Strong Collection* (September 29 to October 29, 2005); *Brian Jurgen* (September 29 to December 31, 2005); *Fresh Projects: Shimmer* (November 10 to December 31, 2005); and *Andrea Zittel: Critical Space* (January 26 to May 27, 2006). Following the exhibition of Zittel's work, the New Museum did not present a gallery-based exhibition until *Unmonumental: The Object in the 21st Century*, on view at the opening of the new building on December 1, 2007.

[59] There was one New Museum exhibition held within the Chelsea space prior to September 2004. *Fiona Tan: Correction* was a photography and video installation than opened on April 9, 2004 and ran until June 4, 2004. However, between the close of the exhibition and the fall of that year, no other New Museum exhibitions were held in Chelsea.

[60] The exhibition checklist of one hundred seventy-five works can be found in The New Museum of Contemporary Art, *East Village USA* (The New Museum of Contemporary Art, New York: 2004), 152-157.

[61] Lisa Phillips, "Forward" in The New Museum of Contemporary Art, *East Village USA*, 9.

[62] In addition to this schedule, a "Family Day" was programmed for Saturday July 31, 2004. A similarly structured progression through the project was offered, although specifically targeted to younger children and their parents. As described in the exhibition pamphlet, this tour was to be both "a fun scavenger hunt" and "an investigative tour."

[63] Wynn also provides a recounting of his interaction with Swartz's project in his analysis of *Counter Culture* in *The Tour Guide: Walking and Talking New York* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011), 68-70

[64] An additional text-based pdf of the route was also available for download through the museum's website. However, this printed version of the Enriquez's project, in its undercutting of the "audio" element, seems to work as a secondary document of the artist's project, rather than the project itself.

[65] Each mission was given title, assigned a level of difficulty and category description, and came with an appropriate alias for the participant to adopt. For example, Mission "D2" was an expert-level polygraph mission that came with the alias M. Kano. After reading a context-providing narrative, in which a "Special Agent" named Lenkin is tricked into divulging information, the project participant is instructed to: "Report to a local bar, café or tavern. Locate your target and buy that person a drink. When you have secured their confidence, ask your new friend to tell you a secret. Be sure to use your alias and file a report." The bottom of the page contains an additional set of general instructions and warnings: "The Organization disavows all knowledge of your activities. During your mission, you may be followed. Other operatives may interact with you. Watch your back. Watch your front. File your report in the Completed Missions Folder at HQ." No such folder existed. For more on this project, see "Counter Culture – New Museum: Secret Places, July 10 to August 15th at The New Museum," Flux Factory, accessed June 19, 2012, http://www.fluxfactory.org/projects/counter-culture-new-museum/.

[66] Along with the public installation, Zuniga created an accompanying online project component similarly presenting Bowery history through the presence of local residents.

[67] In his study of the international variations of meaning applied to these symbols, Carl G. Liungman defines this specific ideogram as meaning "dangerous neighborhood." It is related to a broader category of symbols used by French and American itinerant populations as signs for danger. However, the specific arrow formation Enriquez uses is not found in Liungman's study. Instead, Liungman identified a configuration of four arrows pointing towards the center, with the angle of the arrows at a 45-degree angle, rather than Enriquez's perpendicular arrangement. The variation that Liungman allowed for in this ideogram pertains to the central dot: it can either be present or absent, without meaningfully changing the meaning. See Carl G. Liungman, *Symbols: Encyclopedia of Western Signs and Ideograms* (Stockholm, HME Publishing, 2004), 111, 118, and 305.

[68] Such self-guided tours of the *Counter Culture* projects were possible during public exhibition as performers and project components were made available to the public between 12:00 noon and 6:00 p.m. from Tuesdays through Sundays during the run of the exhibition.

[69] A full copy of the brochure is available at http://www.raulvincentenriquez.com/new_museum/CCbrochure.pdf.

[70] Randy Kennedy, "The New Museum's New Non-Museum," *The New York Times*, July 25 2004, AR 27. Kennedy's article refers to *Counter Culture* as "guerilla art in only the nicest, new-millennium sense."[70] While a rhetorically interesting statement, the project was in fact an city-sanctioned site-specific work created by the museum. Nothing about the projects suggests "guerilla art," as appropriate permissions and permits were acquired prior to installation.

[71] "Get Lost: Artists Map Downtown New York" New Museum, accessed March 1, 2008, http://www.newmuseum.org/assets/general/getlost/index.html8.

[72] As the projects were available at a number of locations, the "end" of the distribution cycle of the physical project is difficult to determine. Adding to this indeterminacy is its continual availability after the opening of the museum, as discussed.

[73] One could obtain a copy of the booklet in four of the five boroughs of New York City. The specific places of distribution included: in Manhattan, at Artist's Space at 38 Greene Street, Babeland at 43 Mercer Street, The Bowery Hotel at 340 Bowery, Bowery Poetry Club at 308 Bowery, Congee Village at 100 Allen Street, Freemans Restaurant at Freeman Alley and Rivington Street, Joe's Pub at 425 Lafayette Street, The Kitchen at 512 West 19th Street, Lost City Arts at 18 Cooper Square, Opening Ceremony at 35 Howard Street, Patricia Field at 302 Bowery, Screaming Mimi's at 382 Lafayette Street, and Two Boots at 155 East 3rd Street; in Brooklyn, at The Rotunda Gallery at 33 Clinton Street and the Bedford Cheese Shop at 229 Bedford Avenue; in Queens, at the Sculpture Center at 44-19 Purves Street in Long Island City; and in the Bronx, at the Bronx Museum 1040 Grand Concourse at 165th Street.

[74] In August 2012, the New Museum redesigned its website, including its online archive of past projects. Once archived under the category of "Special Projects," *GET LOST* has now vanished from the website entirely with this recent update.

[75] "Get Lost Artists Map Downtown New York, New Museum Presents a Unique Exhibition on Paper and Free Distribution Magazine," New Museum, accessed March 1, 2008, http://www.newmuseum.org/assets/general/pressreleases/2007.5.29Get_Lost.pdf.

[76] Rachel Wolff, "Slideshow: The Homeless 'Get Lost' Show," *New York Magazine,* June 5, 2007, http://nymag.com/daily/entertainment/2007/06/slideshow_the_homeless_get_los_1.html.

[77] Genevieve Ernst, "Let's Get Lost," *Time Out New York*, June 21, 2007, http://newyork.timeout.com/things-to-do/own-this-city-blog/95617/lets-get-lost.

[78] Ibid.

[79] Cory Arcangel, "Things I Made," Cory Arcangel's Internet Portfolio Website, accessed January 5, 2012, http://www.coryarcangel.com/things-i-made.

[80] A real English elm tree, the "hanging tree" is located at the northwest corner of Washington Square Park. The New York City Department of Parks and Recreation has identified the tree as one of oldest tree in New York City, and although the number of executions to have taken place at the site is a topic of some debate, it is now nonetheless a popular site for New York City ghost tours and historical walking tours through the neighborhood.

[81] Some locations are somewhat more ambiguous, such as number fourteen which simply alerts the viewer to "a basketball hoop, its net half missing."

[82] Despite the inclination to read this as a wall, and thus as a designator for Wall Street, the placement of this band is too far north to support this reading. In comparing Rodriguez's map to the Manhattan street plan, the artist's inclusion more closely approximates the placement of Chambers Street, Worth Street, or Canal Street. Although the several angles within Rodriguez's wall do not align perfectly any of these three options, the general plan of these three streets, and the ways in which they cut across the island and intersect with other north-south running roadways convincingly suggests any of these three streets as possible references. However, when the map was archived on the

New Museum's website the band was described as a canal, reinforcing the reading as a literalized representation of Canal Street.
[83] "Get Lost: Artists Map Downtown New York" New Museum, accessed March 1, 2008, http://www.newmuseum.org/assets/general/getlost/artists/lordy_rodriguez.html.
[84] Ronald Rees, "Historical Links Between Cartography and Art," *Geographical Review* 70, no. 1 (1980): 78.
[85] "Get Lost: Artists Map Downtown New York" New Museum, accessed March 1, 2008, http://www.newmuseum.org/assets/general/getlost/artists/julie_mehretu.html.
[86] Ibid.
[87] The full list of artists and albums includes: Yoko Ono, *Fly* (which appears three times); Alan Ginsberg, *Holy Soul Jelly Roll: Poems & Songs*; Bill Dixon, *Thoughts*; James White and the Blacks, *Off White*, Milton Babbitt *Philomel* and Fred Lerdahl, *Wake*; Rhys Chatham *Die Donnergotter*; Rat at Rat R, Amer$ide/*Rock & Roll is Dead, Long Live Rat at Rat R*; Lou Reed, *Street Hassle*, John Cage, *Atlas Eclipticalis, Winter Music, Cartridge Music* and Dieter Schnebel *Glossolalie*, Moondog, *Moondog 2*; *Dread Meets B-Boys Downtown: The Hip-Hop Sound of New York 81-82*; Sonic Youth, *Dirty*, Madonna, *The First Album*; The Michael Zager Band, *Let's All Chant*; *The Columbia-Princeton Electronic Music Center*; Arthur Russell, *World of Echo*; La Monte Young, *The Well-Tuned Piano*; *The Sesame Street Book and Record*; The Ramones*, It's Alive*; *Sound Effects Vol. 1, Documentary Recordings by Tony Schwartz*; Michael Tilson Thomas and Ralph Greirson, *Three Dances & Four Organs*; *Anti NY*; Lou Reed, *Metal Machine Music (The Amine β Ring)*; and Vertico, *New Wave*.
[88] The exhibition *Street Mouth* ran from April 7 to May 12, 2007 at KS Art on the Lower East Side. The gallery's press release describes the work as presenting "Screaming fields of disjointed imagery… yielding tales from the pulp crypt of a not-to-be-forgotten New York underground." Moore was less poetic about his process, describing it as "some kind of punk Photoshop method where I can actually drop myself and other referentials into the pieces… to create an ongoing open-heart bio-historagophy. [sic]." "Exhibitions: Thurston Moore, Street Mouth, April 7 – May 12, 2007," KS Art, accessed May 9, 2012, http://www.ksartonline.com/tmex2.html.
[89] "Get Lost: Artists Map Downtown New York" New Museum, accessed March 1, 2008, http://www.newmuseum.org/assets/general/getlost/artists/thurston_moore.html.
[90] Filler also drew comparisons to New York City's previous modernist masterpiece, Mies van der Rohe's Seagram Building, with both buildings described as demonstrating "the power of understatement." Martin Filler, "Miracle on the Bowery" *The New York Review of Books,* January 17, 2008, http://www.nybooks.com/articles/archives/2008/jan/17/miracle-on-the-bowery.
[91] Nicolai Ourousoff, "New Look for the New Museum: A Home for Art Rooted in the Rough and Tumble," *The New York Times,* November 30, 2007, E35.
[92] Justin Davidson, "The Gray Ghost of the Bowery: An unsentimental valentine from the New Museum," *New York Magazine* November 25, 2007, http://nymag.com/arts/architecture/reviews/41267/.
[93] See footnotes 10, 28, and 54 in this chapter.
[94] Proposal for The New Museum, 1977; Marcia Tucker Papers, 1957-2004; 2004.M.13; Box 4; Folder 2; Research Library, The Getty Research Institute.
[95] In his review of the new building and its inaugural show, *Unmonumnetal: The Object in the 21st Century* for *The Village Voice*, Chistian Viveros-Faune described the building as an "instant landmark." Christian Viveros-Faune, "The New Museum of Contemporary Art debuts its new home; Strong building, weak show," *The Village Voice*, November 27 2007, http://www.villagevoice.com/2007-11-27/art/the-new-museum-of-contemporary-art-debuts-its-new-home/.
[96] The breakdown of gallery space throughout the building is as follows: 1,100 square feet in the Lobby Gallery, 5,000 square feet in the Second Floor Gallery, 4,000 square feet in the Third Floor Gallery, and 3,000 square feet in the Fourth Floor Gallery. An addition 615 square feet of space is designated as "Installation Space" in the lobby outside of the underground theater. A quantitative analysis of the building can be found in *Shift: SANAA and the New Museum*, ed. Joseph Grima and Karen Wong, (New York: New Museum, 2008), 68. In the Fall 2004/Winter 2005 issue of *New Museum News*, Phillips wrote that the construction of the new building in the Bowery signaled a "historic project [that] will change a neighborhood, bring great architecture to New York, contribute to the revitalization of downtown, but most importantly, will be the most important center for contemporary art in New York—a world capital of art." I read Phillips' reference to the revitalization of downtown here less of a reference to the Bowery specifically than to a more broadly directed rhetorical claim that was often voiced by commercial developers in the years following September 11, 2001. Lisa Phillips, "Letter from the Director," *New Museum News* (Fall 04/Winter 05): 1.
[97] Phillips, "Past, Present, Future," 7.

[98] Becker's statement rehearses the proliferation of celebrity architect-generated designs for major public sites, sometimes referred to with the unflattering moniker of "starchitecture." Examples of this sort include: Frank Gehry's Guggenheim Bilbao, Spain, Santiago Calatrava's addition for the Milwaukee Art Museum, Renzo Piano's additions to the Art Institute of Chicago, the Isabella Stuart Gardner Museum in Boston and the Morgan Library and Museum in New York City, Tadao Ando's designs for the Modern Art Museum of Fort Worth and for Pulitzer Foundation for the Arts in Saint Louis, and Jean Nouvel's proposals for the National Museum of Qatar and the an additional tower for the Museum of Modern Art in New York City. Carol Becker, *Thinking in Place: Art, Action and Cultural Production* (Boulder: Paradigm Publishers, 2009), 47.
[99] The other four finalist firms were Reiser + Umemoto, Abalos & Herreros, Gigon/Guyer Architects, and Adjaye/Associates. Prior to the New Museum commission, SANAA had completed just one other American commission: the Glass Pavilion at the Toledo Museum of Art in 2006.
[100] Lisa Phillips, "Past, Present, Future," 9.
[101] Ibid., 7.
[102] Ibid,. 5.
[103] Quoted in Jayne Merkel, "SANAA's New Museum of Contemporary Art, New York," *Architectural Design* 78, no. 3 (May/June 2008): 100.
[104] Skylight shapes vary throughout the levels: some are l-shaped while others are straight rectangles. Gallery illumination is also provided by sets of overhead fluorescent lights on each level.
[105] For more on SANAA's considerations of melding zoning constraints with an encoded symbolism for the New Museum's mission, contemporary art, and the Bowery, see Joseph Grima, "Interview with Kazuyo Sejima and Ryue Nishizawa" in *Shift: SANAA and the New Museum*, ed. Joseph Grima and Karen Wong, (New York: New Museum, 2008), 23-39, Phillips et al, "Work in Progress: Site Visits," 41-60. For Phillips, see Phillips, "Past, Present, Future," 9,11
[106] Technically, the stacked units of the building are not cubes. Variations in volume between the floors and the unequal relationship between length, width, and height within each floor, undermine the assignment of this specific geometric term. In addition, a desire to incorporate the building's placement on the Bowery into the structural form also precludes the stacked units' categorization as literal cubes. The west wall of the building follows the angle of Bowery. The roadway is angled slightly off of the 1811-implemented gridded street plan for the city, preserving the path of the irregular early seventeenth century Dutch roadway and property lines cutting through the region. Thus rather than running parallel to the eastern side of building (the back of the building), the museum's west façade is instead oblique.
[107] In addition to skylights positioned between the staggered building units, within each gallery and public space of the building a series of electric lights are installed. In the evening, this artificial light glows through not only the windowed panels of the lobby floor, public observation deck, and event space terrace, but also through the skylights. This effectively segments the building into horizontal tiers that do not necessarily correspond to the structural tiers of the stacked units. This effect is noticeable, although less so, when one approaches the building from the west along Prince Street.
[108] Instead of praising the mesh as an optical device, Justin Davidson recast it as a "coat of mail" designed "to shield the Bowery from the relentlessly gentrifying influence of art" in his review of the building. Justin Davidson, "The Gray Ghost of the Bowery: An unsentimental valentine from the New Museum," *New York Magazine,* November 25, 2007, http://nymag.com/arts/architecture/reviews/41267/.
[109] Phillips, "Past, Present, Future," 9.
[110] Phillips et al, "Work in Progress: Site Visits," 50.
[111] Lucy Lippard, *Six Years: The Dematerialization of the Art Object from 1966 to 1972* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997).
[112] Phillips et al, "Work in Progress: Site Visits," 50
[113] Grima, "Interview with Kazuyo Sejima and Ryue Nishizawa," 28.
[114] Absent from both the museum-generated promotional material for the building and many of these published reviews is mention of the word "cube" to describe the components of the building. When one does find reference to the form of cubes in the critical press, this frequently appears in connection to reviews of the first exhibition held in the new space rather than of the space itself. For example, in her review in *The New York Times* for the new building's inaugural exhibition, Roberta Smith describes SANAA's structure as "a stack of neutral, elegantly off-register, no-frills white cubes not only inside, but outside too." A variation on this description is found in the *Time Out New York* review of the same exhibition. After presenting a general overview of the interior of the building, Anne Wehr makes a similar reference when posing the question: "But after three peripatetic decades of making do

with spaces in existing buildings, who can fault the New Museum for wanting something along the lines of a utilitarian Chelsea white box?" Roberta Smith, "In Galleries, a Nervy Opening Volley," *The New York Times*, November 30 2007, E35 and Anne Wehr, "Unmonumental: The Object in the 21st Century," *Time Out New York*, 6 December 2007, http://newyork.timeout.com/arts-culture/art/18670/unmonumental-the-object-in-the-21st-century. An exception is critic Nikas Maak's review in *Flash Art*, which sequentially analyzes both the building and the inaugural exhibition. However Maak's sloppily worded summary of the building—"a seven-story exposed concrete cube"—does little to accurately convey how the structure of the cube is translated into the building design. Niklas Maak, "The New New Museum: The King of The Bowery," *Flash Art* 41 (January/February 2008): 124-125.

[115] Brian O'Doherty, "Inside the White Cube: Notes on the Gallery Space," *Artforum* 14 (March 1976); Brian O'Doherty, "Inside the White Cube: The Eye and the Spectator," *Artforum* 14 (April 1976); Brian O'Doherty, "Inside the White Cube: Context as Content," *Artforum* 15 (November 1976); and Brian O'Doherty, *Inside the White Cube: The Ideology of the Gallery Space* (Santa Monica: The Lapis Press, 1976 and 1986).

[116] Brian O'Doherty, *Inside the White Cube: The Ideology of the Gallery Space* (Santa Monica: The Lapis Press, 1976 and 1986), 77.

[117] Ibid., 15.

[118] The exhibition to inaugurate the new building was the four-part *Unmonumental* series of exhibition. This was comprised of three gallery exhibitions—*Unmonumental: The Object in the 21st Century* (December 1, 2007 to March 30, 2008), *Collage: The Unmonumental Picture* (January 16, 2008 to March 30, 2008), and *The Sound of Things: Unmonumental Audio* (February 13, 2008 to March 30, 2008)—and a final web-based exhibition—*Montage: Unmonumental Online* (February 15, 2008 to March 30, 2008). The first exhibit, *Unmonumental: The Object in the 21st Century* was a survey of contemporary sculpture, comprised of primarily found and fragmentary materials. The art was culled from the literal detritus of everyday life, collapsing the distinction between the realm of the gallery and the realm of the outside world. The second exhibit in the series introduced collaged works into the galleries, moving this detritus from the center of the galleries onto the walls of the galleries themselves. Thus the programming literally sullied the "ungrubby surfaces" of the ideal white cube.

[119] Hal Foster has labeled this the Minimalist-Pop dialectic in contemporary architecture. See Hal Foster, *The Art-Architecture Complex* (London: Verso, 2011), 104-129. For a related argument, see also Nicholas Serota, *Experience or Interpretation: The Dilemma of Museums of Modern Art* (London: Thames and Hudson, 2000).

[120] Phillips et al, "Work in Progress: Site Visits," 50.

[121] In his review for the *Los Angeles Times*, Christopher Hawthorne relates the structure and appearance of the building to other features of the local art world. Hawthorne highlights a quality of optical "fuzziness" created by the building façade (which he describes as covering a series of "boxes"). He then unpacks two justifications for the appropriateness of this visual feature. The first is as a way of engaging with regional gentrification, with fuzziness as "a fundamentally ambivalent quality—a quay to avoid choosing sides." The second places fuzziness as "a shrug of the shoulders, a sigh of 'Whatever,' a reflection of New York's jaded, seen-it-all art and youth culture. In that sense Sejima and Nishizawa have produced one of the first art-world buildings that seeks to understand the generation of museum-goers now in their 20s and 30s." Christopher Hawthorne, "Architecture Review; A fuzzy look and a clarity of purpose," *Los Angeles Times,* December 3, 2007: E1.

[122] Grima, "Interview with Kazuyo Sejima and Ryue Nishizawa," 28.

[123] Crane's team was comprised of Designer Lily Williams, Production Director Beth Kovalsky, Production Artist Kris Pelletier, Content Strategists Brian Boylan and Susie Ivelich, and Project Managers Melissa Bamber and Erin Nolan. For more on the campaign, see: "New Museum, Identity Guidelines Manual," AIGA Design Archives, accessed June 3, 2012, http://designarchives.aiga.org/#/entries/olins/_/detail/relevance/asc/11/7/19702/new-museum-identity-guidelines-manual/1 and "New Musuem," Wolff Olins, accessed June 3, 2012, http://www.wolffolins.com/work/new-museum for more information.

[124] I am purposefully using "launch" here to describe the occasion of the new building's opening event. Although more frequently associated with the release of a music album or clothing line, the word here accurately conveys the idea of building anticipation in advance of the release of a branded product to the public. Given the contracting with a commercial advertising agency and the conveyance of a carefully constructed brand message, the sentiment seems both analogous and appropriate.

[125] Led by Executive Creative Directors David Droga and Ted Royer, the assembled team to develop the account included Ji Lee as Creative Director and Artistic Director of Design, Scott Witt as Creative Director of Media, and Jesse Juriga and Amanda Cleland as Artistic Directors of Design. For more on the campaign, see: "New Museum," Droga5, accessed June 3, 2012, http://www.droga5.com/#/work/newmuseum/newmuseum/newmuseum.

[126] This is the phrase used by a spokesperson for the New Museum when asked for a comment on the unusual advertising strategy by the New York City popular news website Gothamist. Jen Carlson, "The New Museum and Calvin Klein Make a Splash," *Gothamist*, November 28 2007, http://gothamist.com/2007/11/28/splashing_is_th.php.
[127] The company's cooperation, at least in its granting of consent, in this promotional program can be assumed by Calvin Klein's sponsorship of the New Museum's opening night party. In addition, Target Corporation underwrote a program providing free admission to the museum for the first thirty hours following the opening (the museum intended to remain open continuously during this time).
[128] In addition, welded sculptures similarly mirroring the outlined shape of the building were chained to public bicycle stands throughout the city. However, these lacked similar identifying information (e.g. the museum address or the date of the building opening).
[129] See Naomi Klein, *No Logo* (New York: Picador, 2000) and Kalle Lasn, *Culture Jam: How to Reverse America's Suicidal Consumer Binge, and Why We Must* (New York, Quill, 2000). Despite the New Museum's description of its promotional program as an "unconventional initiative" the strategies employed were not unique. This approach is similar to the stencil graffiti-inspired logo developed in 2005 by Siegel and Gale for the Parsons The New School for Design. This comparison is suggested by designer Joe Marianek in his essay Joe Marianek, "New Brand for New Museum," Brand New, January 4, 2008,
http://www.underconsideration.com/brandnew/archives/new_brand_for_new_museum.php. For the New Museum quotation, see Carlson, "The New Museum and Calvin Klein Make a Splash."
[130] Far removed from this subculture citation, and adding support to the pure commercialism of the endeavor, part of the project involved the covering of the storefront windows of Bloomingdales. The building shape featured prominently in these full window coverings, allowing for the building to glow as a result of the backlit store windows. In addition, advertising space was purchased in the Arts page of *The New York Times* website. A similar stencil cut-out would appear, first within the designated box for digital ads at the margin of the webpage, and then would travel across the entire page, covering article text underneath.
[131] Paul Goldberger, "The Sky Line: Bowery Dreams: A new home for the New Museum of Contemporary Art," *The New Yorker,* 19 November 2007,
http://www.newyorker.com/arts/critics/skyline/2007/11/19/071119crsk_skyline_goldberger.
[132] The New Museum is given scant attention in Lorente's study. It is restricted a two paragraph summary statement overview spanning Marcia Tucker's 1977 idea to the recent SANAA building. Within this He groups Tucker with several other "alternative" spaces established in New York in the 1970s, among these AIR, PS.1, Artists Space, Fashion Moda, and ABC No Rio, with little attention to the important differences implicit in the missions of each. Instead, attention is paid to their position relative to the Museum of Modern Art and similar "*establishment* museums." Building on Reese Greenberg, Bruce Ferguson and Sandy Nairne's work, "position" is chiefly used to signal the physical location of each of these spaces, described as being "located in the artists' quarters of Manhattan's historical centre, often SoHo," a false locational identity given his examples.

Lorente also confusingly describes the New Museum's new building as "the icing on the museum cake in the process of gentrification of the Lower East Side." While he seems to try to underscore the museum's role in the physical and economic regional transformation, the iced gentrifying museum cake he describes serves only as a frustrating image. It also undermines the argument he is presenting: rather than guiding gentrification practices, the museum as described by him occurs at the tail end of an already underway cycle of gentrification. With a more narrow geographic focus (i.e. rather than the whole of the Lower East Side, simply limiting himself to the area around the Bowery) would yield a more convincing discussion of the New Museum in the twenty-first century. J. Pedro Lorente, *The Museums of Contemporary Art: Notion and Development* (Surry: Ashgate, 2011), 12, 243-244, and 287-288.
[133] In *Artforum International's* annual year in review issue, Deborah Singer discussed the impact that the New Museum's new building would have on a second wave of attention to a new wave of the Lower East Side as a hotbed for contemporary art following the 1980s "discovery" of the East Village art scene. Singer posits that, with the opening of the museum, the geographically adjacent "Lower East Side is sure to be fully consecrated as a necessary, no-longer-underground part of the [gallery] circuit." Debra Singer, "On the Ground: New York," *Artforum International* 46, no. 4(December 2007): 284. For more on the 1980s Lower East Side scene, see Liza Kirwin, "It's All True: Imagining New York's East Village Art Scene of the 1980s," Ph.D. diss, University of Maryland at College Park, 1999 and Marvin J. Taylor, *The Downtown Book: The New York Art Scene,1974-1984* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006).
[134] As quoted in Betsy Phillips and Nathan Hogan, "Notes from the Field" *Afterimage* 31, no. 1 (July/August 2003): 2,16.

[135] Richard Kepperdahl, "In Memoriam: The Bowery," *The New York Times*, January 16 1994, CY 17; Marvine Howe, "New Blow to the Old Bowery," *The New York Times,* March 1, 1994, CY 6; Nick Ravo, "After a Retreat, Gentrification is Marching to the Fringes," *The New York Times,* October 29, 1995, Section 9, 1; David Isay and Stacy Abramson, "The Sunshine Hotel: Bedbugs, Fellowship, and Chef Boy-ar-dee: Voices from One of the Last Flophouses on the Bowery," *The New York Times*, September 13, 1998, CY1, CY12; Sandee Brawarsky, "Oh, It's Not What It Used to Be," *The New York Times*, June 16, 2000, E29; Edwin McDowell, "Apartment Building to Rise on Infamous Bowery," *The New York Times,* December 15, 2000, B12; Sara Kugler, "On the Bowery, a Flophouse's Last Stand" *The Washington Post,* July 15, 2001, A12; Dennis Hevesi, "On the New Bowery, Down and Out Mix with Up and Coming," *The New York Times,* April 14, 2002, L1; Jesse McKinley, "Along the Bowery, Skid Row is on the Skids," *The New York Times*, October 13, 2002, I1; Mary Reinholz, "A boom in the Bowery, A makeover is underway blending luxe and low-income," *Newsday*, September 16, 2005, C09; Janny Scott, "Making a Flophouse a Home and a Decent One at That," *The New York Times,* April 30, 2006, 33; Damon Tabor, "Urban Tactics: Between Skid Row and Starbucks," *The New York Times,* June 10, 2007, CY 4; and J. Alex Tarquinio, "Some Big Bets that the Funky Bowery Can Be Luxe," *The New York Times,* November 28 2007, C6.
[136] Lisa Phillips quoted in Phillips et al, "Work in Progress: Site Visits," 49.
[137] Eve MacSweeney, "The New Thing," *Vogue* 197, no. 12 (December 2007): 296-304.
[138] The 1957 closing of the Third Avenue elevated train line, and the related removal of the infrastructure, marked the elimination of a physical barrier dividing the east side of Bowery from the west side.
[139] Hollander draws out the continued presence of the "Bowery bum" over the course of two centuries. Although the physical environment changes, the bum persists. The difference is that the early form of the historical bum is one associated with the nineteenth century flophouse and tavern, while the present bum is the real estate developer who demolishes without concern for the irretrievable loss of a visible history of a neighborhood. Edwin Burrows and Mike Wallace present a similar division in their discussion of the historical Bowery. However, rather than discussing the cultural differences between different sides of the street, Burrows and Wallace examine the differences between Broadway and Bowery. Within the space dividing these two major thoroughfares, a space of only a few blocks, there is a significant socio-economic difference. Broadway to the west is host to a "propose-parade of the fashionable" while the Bowery to the east is the "thoroughfare of sportsmen, dandies, gangsters, and fire ladders." By the end of the twentieth century, it would seem the space between these two worlds is so compressed that it is now contained within Bowery itself. Rob Hollander, "Forward" in Eric Ferrara, *The Bowery: A History of Grit, Graft, and Grandeur* (Charleston: The History Press, 2011), 10-18 and Edwin G. Burrows and Mike Wallace, *Gotham: A History of New York City to 1898* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), 762.
[140] For a brief explication of this history, see Eric Farrara, *The Bowery, A History of Grit, Graft, and Grandeur* (Charleston: The History Press, 2011).
[141] Starting in the mid-19th century, the Bowery gained the identity of a neighborhood appealing to and thus attracting the lower levels of society. As characterized by New York historian Luc Sante, the Bowery quickly developed a reputation as being:

> the proverbial den of all vices… stamped early on with the brand of an idyllic spot gone to seed… an image of decline. Until fairly recently the Bowery always possessed the greatest number of groggeries, flophouses, clip joints, brothels, fire sales, rigged auctions, pawnbrokers, dime museums, shooting galleries, dime-a-dance establishments, fortune-telling agencies, lottery agencies, thieves' markets, and tattoo parlors, as well as theaters of the second, third, fifth, and tenth rank. It is also a fact that the Bowery is the only major thoroughfare in New York never to have had a single church built upon it.

Following the economic slump of the Great Depression, an urban destitute sought shelter in the number of religious-order affiliated missions that did take over abandoned flophouses and storefronts on the Bowery. However, this did little to change the perception of the region as catering to the dregs of society. Luc Sante, *Low Life: Lures and Snares of Old New York* (New York: Farrar Straus Giroux, 1991), 11-12.
[142] In a 2005 *The Village Voice* article, the Bowery is discussed as "more than a physical place" and instead "an imaginary zone onto which the world projected its most lurid fantasies and anxieties." In this imaginary zone, the Bowery Bum, a symbol of the moral failure of individual in contemporary society, stands alongside the artist, himself a symbol of social outcast unable to thrive in the everyday culture. In Nicolai Ourousoff's review for *The New York Times* of the building, he described how museum's choice to move to the Bowery can be understood as a desire to engage with this quality of the neighborhood: "its uninhibited characters, seedy settings, voyeuristic

attractions and, above all, rejection of bourgeois tastes." Press, "The Last Days of Loserville," 34 and Nicolai Ourousoff, "New Look for the New Museum," E46.

[143] In her introductory statement to *The Bowery Artist Tribute Vol. 2*, Lisa Phillips wrote:

> While the Bowery's reputation for alcoholism, homelessness, and poverty held strong throughout the 1970s, the artist population in the neighborhood quietly continued to grow. As the Pop artists and Abstract Expressionists departed, a new generation took their places. Building a much different relationship with the Bowery's space and sunlight, conceptual artists, performance artists and filmmakers began filling its lots… and in the mid-1970s the Bowery hosted the birth of American punk rock and new wave at CBGB. The Ramones, Blondie, Television and the Talking Heads, all Lower East Side residents, took advantage of the neighborhood's permissiveness and creative energy to launch a revolution. With the rise of graffiti in the 1980s, the Bowery's walls were bent to another use as Jen-Michel Basquiat, Fab Five Freddy, and Keith Haring all roamed the neighborhood.

Lisa Phillips in *The Bowery Artist Tribute Vol. 2,* ed. Ethan Swan (New York: New Museum of Contemporary Art, 2010), 2.

[144] A comparison can be drawn between the New Museum's *Bowery Artist Tribute* interactive map and Place Matter's *Marking Time on the Bowery: Selected Places in the Bowery's Unique Journey*, also created in 2007. Place Matters is a joint projects sponsored by New York City's Municipal Art Society and City Lore, a non-profit cultural programming organization. Place Matters' projects involve the compilation, archiving, and presentation of a database of still present, destroyed, and forgotten landmark locations across the five boroughs. For the organization's online Bowery project, a similar interactive map of the Bowery is offered. Rather than exclusively artists' studios and residences, Place Matters' project adopts broader criteria for inclusion. Highlighted historical landmarks include theater, clubs, restaurants, schools, civic buildings, banks, infrastructure programs, hotels, and charity organizations. The location of each is indicated not only in list form (the name of the site provided next to its corresponding address) but also graphically. Similar to *Bowery Artist Tribute*, a map of the region is shown. Despite its broader frame of types of landmarks, Place Matters adopts a much more strict geographic criteria. Place Matters' map of "The Bowery" almost exclusively presents sites located on Bowery. The exceptions are the Manhattan Bridge and two locations just beyond the northern terminus of the roadway: Cooper Union at Cooper Square, and The Five Spot jazz club with both its initial location at 5 Cooper Square on Bowery between East 4th and 5th Streets and its subsequent location at 2 St. Marks Place at the corner of Third Avenue and 8th Street indicated. Each landmark location is identified first as a red circle along the roadway. Similar to the New Museum's online archive, clicking on the location reveals a narrative summary of the site and a set of digital historical images of either the location or relevant ephemera associated with it. For Place Matters' *Marking Time on the Bowery: Selected Places in the Bowery's Unique Journey*, see http://www.placematters.net/files/flash/bowery/bowery.swf.

[145] In regards to the inclusion of the literal roadway of Bowery in this charting of "the Bowery," the museum omits sections of the roadway that run south into Chinatown, terminating at Chatham Square. The map also conflates the distinction between Bowery and Cooper Square to the north.

[146] The online project is described as an in-progress archive, with new information able to be added. As a result of its unfinished, but still freely accessible, state, there are a number of inconsistencies and errors that appear. For example, the artist Tom Wesselman is shown as occupying residences at both 157 Bleecker Street and 175 Bleecker Street, each firmly placing him in the center of what most would recognize as Greenwich Village rather than the Bowery.

[147] A Hub Fellows seminar program—a semi-regular schedule of evening seminars later christened "Nigh School" and organized by artist Anton Vidokle—and museum exhibition schedule were developed, both housed on a rotating schedule within the New Museum's gallery space. A partial archive of Museum as Hub programs can be found at http://www.museumashub.org/.

[148] Following the Museum as Hub program, Sigal's project evolved to include a proposal to continue this line internationally. Sigal proposed similar projects at each of the four other cities involved in Museum as Hub, the first step in extending the line not simply in these additional cities but ultimately around the entire world. The documentation of these additional proposals was included in the gallery exhibition of *Museum as Hub: Six Degrees*.

[149] Phillips, "Past, Present, Future," 11.

[150] Prior to this announcement, the museum had used the space to host a previous exhibition. *Cronocaos,* from May 7 to June 5, 2011, was the second iteration of an exhibition previously organized by the architecture firm OMA and

architect Rem Koolhass for the 2010 Venice Biennale. The exhibition presented documentation charting three decades of the intersection of preservation practices with architecture and urbanism. The exhibition coincided with the New Museum co-sponsored *Festival of Ideas for the New City*, which is more fully discussed in the final section of this chapter.

[151] "Press release for *Spartacus Chetwynd: Home Made Tasers*," New Museum, accessed March 23, 2012, http://www.newmuseum.org/assets/general/pressreleases/spartacuspressrelease_v3.pdf.

[152] These exhibitions were: *Spartacus Chetwynd: Home Made Tasers* (October 26, 2011 to January 1, 2012), featuring biomorphic sculptural installations doubling as set pieces, through which a troupe of actors and dancers guided the audience; *Enrico David: Head Gas* (January 18 to April 22, 2012), presenting a series of the artist's recently completed large scale painted canvases, smaller works on paper, and folding screens; and *The Parade: Nathalie Djurberg with Music by Hans Berg* (May 2 to August 26, 2012), a multimedia installation of five stop-motion claymation films interspersed with dozens of bird-like assemblages and Berg's accompanying film score-cum-soundscape.

[153] "Festival of Ideas for the New City," *Festival of Ideas,* accessed May 25, 2012, http://www.festivalofideasnyc.com/.

[154] Recently, this calendar has been amended. Rather than a biannual event, the second run of the festival is currently provisionally planned for May of 2013.

[155] Other organizations sponsoring the festival included The Architectural League, the Bowery Poetry Club, C-Lab, the Columbia University Center for Architecture, Cooper Union, The Drawing Center, New York University's Robert F. Wagner Graduate School of Public Service, and the Storefront for Art and Architecture.

[156] Minutes of Marketing Division Meeting, 18 August 1993; Marcia Tucker Papers, 1957-2004; 2004.M.13; Box 9; Folder 14; Research Library, The Getty Research Institute.

[157] Family and PlayLab's design was selected as the winning entry in an international design competition to provide temporary structures for StreetFest. The competition was sponsored by Storefront for Art and Architecture, the New Museum, and the Department of Transportation with the winning design chosen by a jury of architects, engineers, and city and art administrators. At the end of the festival, these units were used as structures at other summer city events overseen by the Department of Transportation.

[158] Participating artists included Judith Bernstein, Matthew Brannon, Ingrid Calame, Christ Dorland, Elmgreen and Dragset, Ellen Gallagher, Amy Granat, Mary Heilmann, Jacqueline Humphries, Deborah Kass and pulp, ink., Glenn Ligon, Adam McEwen, Barry McGee, Richard Prince, Sterling Ruby, Gary Simmons, Rikrit Tiravanija, and Lawrence Weiner.

[159] The first Nuit Blanche festival in New York City was the previous year, with public light installations set up along the waterfront of Greenpoint. Brooklyn.

[160] Participating artists included: Rita Ackermann, Hisham Bharoocha, Marco Mbrabilla, Antoine Catala, Mithcell Joachim, Chris Jordan, Jason Kgam, Andreas Laszlo Konrath, Light Harvest, Jules Marquis, Ohad Meromi, Cary Ng, Miho Ogai, Aida Ruilova, Ursula Scherrer, Claire Scoville, Kant Smith, Softlab, Adraina Varella, and Guido van der Werve.

[161] The artists who contributed to the film included, in the order in which their segments appear: Daniel Arsham, Acconci Studio, Frederico Frum, Street Art, Read More, Chris Jordan, Ursula Scherrer and Claire Scoville, Z Collective, Alyssa Wednt, Junko Miura, Mary Temple, SOFTlab, Ryan Uzilevsky, Brian O'Connell, Mia Pearlman, Adriana Varella, Dustin Uellin, Chakiaia Booker, Olek, Terreform ONE, Jason Krugam and John Parker, Monika Wyndham, John Kessler, Light Harvest Studios, and Marilyn Minter.

[162] Although Mulberry Street between Houston and Prince Street had been closed to oncoming traffic, no similar measures were taken to close Prince Street.

[163] The eight film projections comprising Doug Aitken's *Sleepwalkers* were simultaneously cast on several buildings, including multiple facades of the Museum of Modern Art's building, then-recently redesigned by Yoshio Taniguchi and completed in 2004, and on the façade of the Museum of American Folk Art located just across the street. The multi-channel projection was on view from January 16 to February 12, 2007. The project was visible from 5:00 to 10:00 in the evening each day of the public installation. The film is divided into five sections, with each section serving as an impressionistic study of a different character. Although this would be Aitken's first major public art project in the United States, the artist would complete similar façade projections: for example, *Migration* (2008) which first premiered on the façade of the Carnegie Museum of Art in Pittsburgh as part of the 55th Carnegie International from May 3, 2008 to January 11, 2009; and *SONG 1* (2012) which was presented across the entire façade of the Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden in Washington D.C. from March 22 to May 13, 2012.

Conclusion

The preceding chapters and case studies demonstrated the different ways in which material interventions into contemporary Manhattan public spaces not only have served to define these spaces as places but also have facilitated the creation of new processual chorographies of these newly defined places.[i] Urban mapmaking has been treated as a collaborative act, implicating: the artists, collectives and institutions as mapmakers; the projects initially set forth as the constitutive elements of the map-like objects ultimately generated; and the audience engaged by each project as the map reader. The multiple contexts against which such maps were revealed and decoded were crucial to understanding not only how the resultant process of placemaking occurred, but also what kind of place-based identity was set forth in each new cartography. Providing context for the creation and reception of these new maps were the backgrounds and motivations of the artists and sponsoring agencies involved as well as the contemporary city itself as both a physically and socially constructed environment subject to competing political, economic, and cultural dynamics.

Across the three chapters, sculptural, interactive, and participatory installations, peripatetic theatrical performances, circulating printed ephemera, and monumental architecture provided material support upon which ephemeral cartographies were constructed. What this dissertation has endeavored to do is set up an interpretive model for proposing an expanded class of public art practices in which diverse media are used to counter, clarify, or encourage urban transformations. With the contemporary metropolis already thrown into a state of transition and

[i] Notes for this chapter can be found from page 337 to page 338.

remaking, in large part the product of recent gentrification policies and actions, neighborhood definition (as both drawing geographic boundaries and asserting a clear identity) became a concern. The contemporary cartographies charted in the dissertation served and continue to serve as legible guides to the neighborhoods to which they refer, providing definition for both the neighborhood and, reflexively, the mapmaker in the process. The projects discussed in the dissertation embraced an outward marking of space, impressing the presence of their creators upon extant yet able to be manipulated urban sites. It should not be surprising therefore that such the related act sof placemarking, placemaking, and placemapping occurred at significant moments of transition for not only the city but also for the project organizers: moments of maturation accompanying asserted organizational independence, internal mission reevaluation, and decisive announcements of continued relevance within the greater art world.

These case studies should not be taken as isolated instances of this kind of practice. Neither do the media forms addressed nor do REPOhistory, the Studio Museum in Harlem, and the New Museum have exclusive claim to these kinds of approaches to public placemaking. While maintaining a geographic limitation of boundaries of the island of Manhattan (itself an artificially imposed mapping limitation), future studies of this subject could include a number of additional projects. For example, consider the following three examples:

1. Continuing to expand upon the types of media that can be considered as constituting map-like objects, City Walls Inc.'s clustered murals provide a more historical example of similar kinds of urban public projects that reconfigured post-war Manhattan cartographies. An under-considered artist collective and art sponsorship agency, City Walls Inc., was established in 1967 and officially incorporated in 1969. The placement and appearance of each of the groups' murals were determined through negotiation between the City Walls artist responsible for the design, the

contractor employed to paint the mural, and the owner of the property on which the mural would be painted. Examining the first five years of the group's history, a period that most closely enacted the founding intentions of the group and saw the completion of over thirty murals, reveals a public practice that served as a clear announcement of contemporary art movement styles (first Supergraphics and later Minimalism) and a declaration of the power of artists' interventions to redefine urban spaces. City Walls, Inc. artist Jason Crum summarized this effect of the murals on the urban landscape as more than a simple aesthetic improvement: the murals acted as a "new kind of instantaneous urban renewal."[1] Former Public Art Fund President and City Walls President Doris C. Freedman described the murals as part of a new class of public art: "defining and enclosing public spaces, sharpening awareness of human form, helping to focus and neutralize a congested neighborhood."[2] In addition, rather than isolated interventions, the murals were geographically clustered. These clustered locations point not only to neighborhoods familiar to the City Walls Inc. artists but also to urban neighborhoods on the cusp of urban renewal across Manhattan. One of the consequences of the murals was that once the physical remaking of these targeted neighborhoods was underway, many of these murals were destroyed in the process of urban demolition and new construction, with one placemaking form replaced by another.[3] By charting the locations of several of these murals (e.g. along an axis cutting through the recently branded neighborhoods of NoHo, SoHO, and TriBeCa), a map of the city is revealed in which the landmarked locations correspond to neighborhoods just beginning to be revalued in the contemporary Manhattan real estate economy.

2. Contemporary with City Walls Inc. were the promoted and self-guided studio tours offered by the *Ten Downtown* program. Starting in 1968, the collective exhibition *Ten Downtown* served two functions. It allowed for artists to construct what art historian Jon Bird has

described as "an independent exhibiting scheme," a networked system of artists' studios as exhibition spaces as an alternative to hierarchical gallery and museum spaces.[4] The public was allowed free access to the artists' studios on each of the selected dates, with the promotional flyer generated for the occasion touting the chance to the see "the ARTIST and his WORK in his STUDIO."[5] The initial *Ten Downtown* was staged over three successive weekends, advertised in the local press and accompanied by the publication of a printed brochure. This calendar pattern and promotional process was repeated for each of the subsequent annual iterations of the program over the next two decades.[6] While the roster of participating artists varied from year to year, with one year's set of participating artists tasked with the responsibility for generating the set of participating artists for the subsequent year, the locations consistently tracked the same general geographic area through and around SoHo.[7] The program can be understood as providing more than the opportunity to for prospective buyers (both art world professionals and fair-weather collectors) to see new work and the studio in which the work was created.[8] *Ten Downtown* can be considered as contributing to the building of an identity for SoHo as a site of new artists and new art practices. By directing the mobile audience through not only the different galleries but the greater urban environment connecting these galleries, the program fostered a remapping and rethinking of the neighborhood.

3. As a more contemporary example of how public projects as public cartographies can structure placemaking, Storefront for Art and Architecture's *Performance Z-A* transformed an otherwise urban remainder space into a vital regional center for community and communal engagement. Marking the twenty-fifth anniversary of Storefront for Art and Architecture's first public project *Performance A-Z* in 1982, *Performance Z-A* was a twenty-six day outdoor festival held from September 21 to October 16, 2007. The centerpiece of the festival was architect

Minsuk Cho's *Ring Dome*, an architectural construction erected in Lt. Joseph Petrosino Park (formerly Kenmare Square), a traffic island adjacent to Storefront for Art and Architectures building at Kenmare and Centre Streets. Located at the intersection of—if not full gap between—Little Italy, Chinatown, the Bowery, and SoHo, the park was at the time an unassuming, mostly concrete-covered urban remainder space.[9] However, during the month-long celebration, new multi-media artist's works, film screenings, topical presentations and discussions, and concerts were held within and around both Storefront for Art and Architecture's gallery and *Ring Dome*, enlivening the place as a destination. Each public presentation was afforded a single day during the festival (the exception to this being Cho's dome, which remained in place for the duration of the festival) and each was afforded the title of "performance." While *Performance Z-A* provided the opportunity to mark Storefront for Art and Architecture's own history and address issues of contemporary local and global architecture, urbanism, and sustainability,[10] it also encouraged audience travel to, gathering in, and departure from the park. A result of the festival's designation of the park as a centralized regional landmark, information and resource hub, and site of whimsy and play was the repurposing and restructuring of overlooked space into a dynamic community place in advance of a real world development of the place.

As with the projects discussed in the previous chapters of the dissertation, these three additional projects are predicated on the introduction of new material components into the cityscape, components that, for the most part, either no longer exist today or exist in a significantly modified context. By tracking both the former sites of installation as well as the geographic references that appear in secondary promotional materials associated with each project (themselves additional material introductions), the ephemeral quality of these projects is

revealed and the spaces and places in which they were installed and to which they referred become newly revived. Beyond being "temporary," the multiple materials and the loss of these materials signal the ephemeral quality of both urban cartgoraphies and urban places themselves. New construction, new populations, new political mandates, new economic dynamics: each contribute to formulating place-based identity as much as the networked project components structure public mappings.

The question remains: can such ephemeral cartographies be found as public projects without comparable material interventions into urban space? What if rather than traditional materials of public practice, new media technologies are used to reorganize urban forms? How can the antispatial cities of electronic content organize the spatial cities of material content?[11] By way of a conclusion to this dissertation, I offer a short analysis of a final a project similar to that which this dissertation opened in order to address this question of materiality while also highlighting the importance of the project audience to the creation public processual cartographies.

Curating the *Museum of the Phantom City: OtherFutures*

In late September of 2009, a new iPhone and iPod application was made available as a free downloadable urban mapping program. This program combined elements of archival research, utopian design, and didactic tourism guidebooks. This program, *Museum of the Phantom City: OtherFutures*, was created by Irene Cheng and Brett Snyder, cofounders of the design studio CHENG+SNYDER.[12] Described by its creators as both a "collaborative public art project" and an "exhibition,"[13] the digital project transforms normative systems of public placemarking, placemaking, and wayfinding by destabilizing the chronological record of the city.

Cheng and Snyder's *Museum of the Phantom City* looks backwards to look forwards, spatially charting a history of unrealized planning in Manhattan.

After downloading and running program, the first screen to appear reveals the project title as a bright fuchsia logo set against a black screen. This screen quickly gives way to an interactive Google Map of Manhattan. Overlaid upon the darkened map are a series of approximately fifty pink and white dots, each designating a content rich location in the program. However, rather than these dots indicating presently existing landmarks, clicking on these locations unlocks stored database material for a historical yet futurist architectural proposal. Provided for each are: a brief narrative summary of the proposal, a quotation from the planner explaining either the physical properties of or theoretical necessity for the proposal, and at least one original architectural rendering for the proposal.

Projects range in date from 1870 to 2009. Despite variations in their specific conceptions for a new urban form, the plans are all ambitious in scope and scale. Mega-structures often appear, with archived proposals including: Antoni Gaudi's *Hotel Attraction* (1908), Raymond Hood's *Apartment Bridges* (1929), Norman Bel Geddes' *Rotary Airport* (1930), Buckminster Fuller's *Mini-Earth* (1956) and *Dome over Midtown Manhattan* (1960), Ron Herron's *Walking City* (1964), Paul Rudolph's *Lower Manhattan Expressway* (1967), Superstudio's *Continuous Monument* (1969), Rem Koolhaas' *City of the Captive Globe* (1972) and *New Welfare Island* (1976), and several competition designs for the new World Trade Center towers.

With proposals ranging from whimsical to ominous, the digital application allows user participation in rating each proposal. Using a system of sliding bars, users can assign personal determinations for where along the utopian or dystopian, sublime or subversive, or beautiful or "beast"-ly spectra the individual projects rest. User participation is also encouraged in the

building of the database: the program includes a feature allowing users to submit additional projects (both their own and historical projects developed by others) to be considered for database inclusion. While the capacity for feedback and additional contributions in part explains how the program has be understood as "encouraging users to act as both tourists and curators" as one online account of the project explained,[14] there is more to the task of urban exploration and curation carried out by the program user than accounted for by these two participatory features.

While standing in the urban environment of the present, one is provided with possible remakings of the city in order to reflect upon what is, what was, what could be, and what could have been. In a contemporary city of development and change, the project exclusively visualizes developments that never were. For the viewer of *Museum of the Phantom City*, the spaces of the city are visibly but non-materially built and rebuilt through a digital cartography of architectural designs. Without the program creators assigning a qualitative evaluation to the proposals—as this is left for the individual project user to determine—the program results in an increased awareness of the city as a site not only for potential rethinking and renegotiation but for personal rethinking and renegotiation. The fungible nature of built environment is revealed, exposing potential directions the architectural plan of city could have taken in its history.

More than the other projects discussed in this dissertation, the program user as map reader is given crucial importance in both activation of the public project and the realization of a new Manhattan cartography. Beyond the participatory elements to *Museum of the Phantom City* described above, the program also includes a feature that detects the user's location. While physically moving through the city, if the program is activated, users receive notifications about their approaching proximity to the location of an archival plan. As one moves through the city and different urban form are unlocked, the look and experience of the city is transformed. As

explained by Chris Speed in his recent analysis of digital mapping projects useing satellite navigation technologies and smartphone access, such projects promote “the sense of identification that users experience as they see themselves as a ‘blue ball’ on a screen who can ‘walk’ across a historical map as though it was laid beneath their feet in the ‘present’ space, and the realizations that occur as they correlate *representations of historical space* (maps) with a city’s *spaces of historical representation* (architectures of the past).”[15] This occurs without materially placing anything into those spaces other than the program viewer, already in possession of his or her smartphone device. The program in fact emphasizes how the mobile user is responsible for activating representational content to turn spaces into places. Just as an individual’s experience of the city is informed by the program’s content, the program’s content revealed to the user is informed by the use’s experience of the city: the locations the user travels to independent of any program directives activate the program.

Rather than following a structured route provided by the project organizers, the user of *Museum of the Phantom City* is the primary agent responsible for structuring his or her urban route, with the program acting as a supplement to this already underway urban explorations. This is the true “collaborative” aspect of both *Museum of the Phantom City* as a public project and signals to the program’s greater form as a processual map. The user-centered activation of content illustrates a variation of what public policy expert Bill Ivey and sociologist Steven Tepper have referred to as the “curatorial me.” According to Ivey and Tepper, through the manipulation of a personal digital media device, individuals “curate their own personal experiences—exploring new types of culture and choosing when and how they experience art and entertainment… The ‘curatorial me’ is another emerging form of active engagement with art and culture.”[16] To “curate” in this context denotes an act of empowered agency and selection: to

determine for one's self which elements from an array to attend to and to collect as representative of one's interests.

Thinking about the *Museum of the Phantom City* in terms of a processual cartography driven by "curatorial me"-related strategies of engagement (engagement with both the program and engagement with the city as one moves through it), identifies how the project yields a navigable representation of urban space that is simultaneously of the past, present, and future, but is also a representational determined by the individual project user always in the present. The contemporary urban context combines not only with the historical material set forth by the program creators but also the everyday itineraries of the program user. All three contribute to the creation of a new responsive chorography that is revealed through embodied movement across the Manhattan.

The related processes of urban placemaking and urban curation have been central to this dissertation. Taking Ivey and Tepper's idea and adapting it to projects such as the *Museum of the Phantom City*, or even the *Lower Manhattan Sign Project, Harlem Postcards*, or *GET LOST*, demonstrates the crucial role of the urban audience as map-reader of each project. Despite having a framework set up by each project's sponsoring institution (e.g. narrowing the possible ways of engagement through managing specific spatial configurations, cycles of postcard release, functionality and legibility of individual maps projects, it still remains up to the viewer to forge an individual experience of each project for himself or herself. Although constructing a neighborhood representation seen through the lens (or lenses, as CityMaps' binoculars logo literalizes) of the project's sponsoring institution and involved artists, each of the projects discussed in this dissertation have required viewers to configure—or curate—an experience of the city through their individual uses of and selective engagements with these projects. The

question of "WHERE DO YOU WANT TO BE" is crucial, wth the emphasis placed as strongly upon "YOU" as upon "WHERE."

To make sense of contemporary urban space, to understand this space as sets of urban places defined by more than their simple geography or economic profile, entails moving beyond seeing the present city as it is. Such a conceptual project instead requires asking what the city was, can be, or could have been, the answers to which are not always obviously found in the everyday urban visual and material culture. Thus, ephemeral public projects which record the ephemeral city as ephemeral cartographies endeavor to make known the often otherwise invisible urban forms that continue to linger amidst the recently built structures of the continuously developing metropolis.

[1] Crum is quoted in Doris C. Freedman, "City Walls, New York: A New Kind of Public Art," 1975; Public Art Fund Archive; MSS 270, Box 2, Folder 20; Fales Library and Special Collections, New York University Libraries.

[2] Freedman would label this type of a public art as constituting the new "colloquial street scene." Freedman was also responsible for the absorption of City Walls, Inc. into the Public Art Fund in 1977. Doris C. Freedman, "CITY WALLS: A NEW KIND OF ART," n.d.; Public Art Fund Archive; MSS 270, Box 2, Folder 20; Fales Library and Special Collections, New York University Libraries.

[3] For an analysis of such processes in the first half of the twentieth century in Manhattan, see Max Page, *The Creative Destruction of Manhattan, 1900-1940* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1999).

[4] Jon Bird, *Leon Golub: Echoes of the Real* (London: Reaktion, 2000), 47.

[5] The exclusively male modifier was due to the set of artists participating in the inaugural exhibition. The artists who opened their studios for the first *Ten Downtown* were Bernard Aptekar, Richard Baringer, Hans van de Bovenkamp, Bill Creston, Charles Ginnever, Leon Golub, Roger Jorgensen, Steve Montgomery, Julius Tobias, and Robert Wiegand. Mary Abbott and May Stevens were the first female artists to participate. They were included in the third annual exhibition in 1970.

[6] By the end of the 1980s, the format of the annual exhibition was modified. Rather than a series of studios, the exhibition was held in a set of storefront galleries and alternative art spaces. Although the title remained the same (reflecting the number of artists shown), this change in exhibition sites marked a dramatic departure from the original intent and effect of the work during, at least, the first decade of exhibitions.

[7] In his catalogue essay summarizing the then-ten year anniversary of the exhibition held at 112 Workshop Inc. between November 5 and November 9, 1977, Lawrence Alloway provided a general procedural overview for the organization and continued longevity of *10 Downtown*. In addition, he attributed the "topography of 10 Downtown" to issues of "artist contact" and studio proximity and that "the public for such an occasion depends on fairly tight clustering." Lawrence Alloway, "100 Studios," in *10 Downtown 10 Years* (New York, 1978), 3-7.

[8] In his historical analysis of SoHo, Richard Kostelanetz wrote how "More than one collector, or potential collector, remembers 10 Downtown not only for the art but also for glimpses of not one but several artists' studios, incidentally educating them about the possibilities of interior design." Richard Kostolanetz, *SoHo: The Rise and Fall of an Artist's Colony* (New York: Routledge, 2003), 99.

[9] The event was staged just prior to the year and a half long renovation of the park (completed in October of 2009), which resulted in almost doubling of the park's size from .03 acres to .05 acres and the addition of new pavers, curbs, fencing, security lights, and furniture including benches and a drinking fountain, and plantings. Prior to the renovation, *The New York Times* local "City Room" blog described how, "For years, the term 'park' was a generous way to describe the barren concrete triangle that rested between Lafayette and Spring Streets and Cleveland Place." This was echoed in the 2010 *AIA Guide to New York City*, seemingly unrevised in light of the park renovation, which also described the by-then fully renovated park as "an expanse of concrete…" See Andrew Key, "A Park is Renewed, the Better to Honor the Hero in Its Name," City Room, *The New York Times,* October 13, 2009, http://cityroom.blogs.nytimes.com/2009/10/13/an-officer-who-died-in-the-line-of-duty-in-italy/ and Norval White, Elliot Willensky, and Fran Ledon, *AIA Guide to New York City*, fifth edition (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 97.

[10] A film screening of footage from the original 1982 performance festival was held on October 4 and a new sound work by Barbara Held, who participated in the 1982 festival, was performed on October 16, the final night of the 2007 festival. Several of the programmed events drew attention to the issue of local urban engagement and discovery, including: "The Obscene Bird of Night," a block party staged by Engaging the City on September 25; a presentation by Florian Boehm of his then-recently completed photography project *Wait for Walk,* displaying portraits of New Yorkers as they wait to cross the street, on September 26; and Lorenzo Romlto and Stalked Lab's *NY Peace Walk: In the Footsteps of Paul Auster* (2007), a didactic walking tour from the gallery to the United Nation's Building followed by a lecture and discussion session on October 8.

[11] See William J. Mitchell, *City of Bits: Space, Place and the Infobahn* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1996).

[12] In addition to Cheng and Synder, who receive primary credit in developing *Museum of the Phantom City: OtherFutures*, collaborators on the project also included Ray Cha, Michelle Chang, Noah Keating, and Olivia Wright.

[13] For "collaborative public art project," see "Meet a NYFA Artist – Brett Snyder," New York Foundation for the Arts, accessed January 14, 2012, http://www.nyfa.org/level3.asp?id=702&fid=5&sid=156 . For "exhibition," see Irene Cheng and Brett Snyder, "Make it Visible: Museum of the Phantom City," *Urban Omnibus*, October 21, 2009, http://urbanomnibus.net/2009/10/museum-of-the-phantom-city-2/.

[14] This description of the project comes from the Van Alen Institute's website for the project. Cheng and Snyder were recipients of the 2008/2009 Van Alen Institute New York Prize Fellowship in Information and Communications. "Irene Cheng and Brett Snyder: Museum of the Phantom City," Van Alen Institute Projects in Public Architecture, accessed January 14, 2012, http://www.vanalen.org/fellowship/fellows/03_2009_ChengSnyder.
[15] Chris Speed, "Walking through Time: Use of Locative Media to Explore Historical Maps" in *Mapping Cultures: Place, Practice, Performance,* ed. Les Roberts (Houndmills, Palgrave MacMillan, 2012), 161.
[16] Bill Ivey and Steven J. Tepper, "Cultural Renaissance or Cultural Divide" *Chronicle of Higher Education*, May, 19 2006, B6-B8.

Bibliography

Books, Chapters, and Academic Articles

Abramson, Cynthia. "Art and the Transit Experience." *Places* 9, no. 2 (1994): 74-79.

Adams, Alice. "St. Louis MetroLink: Changing the Rules of Transit Design." *Places* 9, no. 2 (1994): 88-90.

Agnew, John A. *Place and Politics: A Geographical Meditation of State and Society.* Boston: Allen and Unwin, 1987.

Alloway, Lawrence. "100 Studios." In *10 Downtown 10 Years,* 3-7. New York, 1978.

Altshuler, Bruce. "Collecting the New: A Historical Introduction." In *Collecting the New: Museums and Contemporary Art*, edited by Bruce Alshuler, 1-13. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005.

Amoroso, Nadia. *The Exposed City: Mapping Urban Invisibles*. Oxon: Routledge, 2010.

Angotti, Tom. *New York For Sale: Community Planning Confronts Global Real Estate*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2008.

Appiah, Kwame Anthony and Amy Gutman, eds. *Color Conscious: The Political Morality of Race*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996.

Atkins, Gillian Kaye Yates. "Ephemeral Installations: Contemporary Canadian Art in the Public Arena." PhD diss., University of Toronto, 2007.

Julie Ault, "For the Record." In *Alternative Art New York: 1965-1985*, edited by Julie Ault, 1-16. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2002.

---. "A Chronology of Selected Alternative Structures, Spaces, Artists' Groups, and Organizations in New York City, 1965-1985." In *Alternative Art New York: 1965-1985*, edited by Julie Ault, 17-76. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2002.

Austin, Regina. "'An Honest Living': Street Vendors, Municipal Regulation, and the Black Public Sphere." *The Yale Law Journal* 103, no. 8 (June 1994): 2119-2131.

Beard, Mary. "Souvenirs of Culture: Deciphering (in) the Museum." *Art History* 15, no. 4 (December 1992): 505-532.

Becker, Carol. *Thinking in Place: Art, Action and Cultural Production.* Boulder: Paradigm Publishers, 2009.

Bird, Jon. *Leon Golub: Echoes of the Real*. London: Reaktion, 2000.

Bishop, Claire. "The Social Turn: Collaboration and its Discontents." *Artforum International* 44, no. 6 (2006): 178-183.

---. *Artificial Hells: Participatory Art and the Politics of Spectatorship.* London: Verso Books, 2012.

Blayton-Taylor, Betty. "Betty Blayton-Taylor," Interview with Halima Taha. *Artist and Influence* XVII (1998): 43-54.

Blayton-Taylor, Betty Tyrone Mitchell, Mahler Ryder, Theodore Gunn, Tom Lloyd, William T. Williams, and Ademola Olugebefola. "'When That Time Came Rolling Down: Panel I' March 25, 1984." *Artist and Influence* VI (1983): 143-178.

Blom, Ina. *On the Style Site: Art, Sociality, and Media Culture.* Berlin: Sternberg Press, 2007.

Bodnar, John. *Remaking America: Public Memory, Commemoration, and Patriotism in the Twentieth Century.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994.

Bogart, Michele Helene. *Public Sculpture and the Civic Ideal in New York City*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989.

Bourriad, Nicholas. *Relational Aesthetics.* Dijon, Presses du Reel, 2002.

Boyer, M. Christine. "Cities for Sale: Merchandising History at South Street Seaport." In *Variations on a Theme Park: The New American City and the End of Public Space*, edited by Michael Sorkin, 181-204. New York: The Noonday Press, 1992.

Brietbart, Myrna Margulies and Pamela Worden. "Creating a Sense of Purpose: Public Art and Boston's Orange Line." *Places* 9, no. 2 (1994): 80-86.

Bright, Elise M. *Reviving America's Forgotten Neighborhoods: An Investigation of Inner City Revitalization*. New York: Garland Publishing, 2000.

Bryan-Wilson, Julia. *Art Workers: Radical Practice in the Vietnam War Era.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 2009.

Burns, Andrea Alison. "'Show Me My Soul!': The Evolution of the Black Museum Movement in Postwar America." Ph.D. diss., University of Minnesota, 2008.

Burrows, Edwin G. and Mike Wallace, *Gotham: A History of New York City to 1898.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Bushman, Claudia. "The Pageant People: A Latter-day Saint Appropriation of an Art Form." In *Pageant and Processions: Images and Idiom as Spectacle,* edited by Herman du Toit, 217-224. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2009.

Bzdak, Meredith Arms. *Public Sculpture in New Jersey: Monuments to Collective Identity.* New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1999.

Cameron, Emilie. "Exhibit and point of sale: negotiating commerce and culture at the Vancouver Art Gallery." *Social and Cultural Geography* 8, no. 4 (August 2007): 551-573.

Campbell, Mary Schmidt. "Introduction: The History of Collecting at The Studio Museum in Harlem." In *The Permanent Collection of The Studio Museum in Harlem Volume I 1983*, 5-6. New York: The Studio Museum in Harlem, 1982.

---. "The Role of the Arts in a Time of Crisis." In *Artistic Citizenship: A Public Voice for the Arts*, edited by Mary Schmidt Campbell and Randy Martin, 23-32. London: Routledge, 2006.

Canning, Charlotte M. *The Most American Thing in America: Circuit Chautaqua as Performance*. Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 2005.

Cartiere, Cameron and Shelly Willis, eds. *The Practice of Public Art.* New York: Routledge, 2008.

Cartwright, William, Georg Gartner, and Antje Lehn, eds. *Cartography and Art.* Berlin: Spring-Verlag, 2009.

Casey, Edward S. *Getting Back into Place: Toward a Renewed Understanding of the Place-World*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1993.

---. *The Fate of Place: A Philosophical History*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998.

---. *Representing Place: Landscape Paining and Maps* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2002)

Castells, Manuel. *The Urban Question: A Marxist Approach.* Cambridge: MIT Press, 1977.

---. *The City and the Grassroots: A Cross-Cultural Theory of Urban Social Movements*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983.

Chaplin, Sarah and Alexandra Stara, eds., *Curating Architecture and the City.* New York: Routledge, 2009.

Charlesworth, Michael. "Mapping the Body and Desire: Christopher Packe's Chorography of

Kent." In *Mappings*, edited by Dennis Cosgrove, 109-124. London: Reaction Books, 1999.

Clark, Kenneth B. *Dark Ghetto: Dilemmas of Social Power*. New York, Harper and Row, 1965.

Clarke, John Henrik. *Harlem, U.S.A.: The Story of a City Within a City*. Berlin: Seven Seas Publications, 1964.

Cohen-Cruz, Jan. *Local Acts: Community-Based Performance in the United States*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2005.

Cohen-Cruz, Jan, ed. *Radical Street Performance: An International Anthology*. London: Routledge, 1998.

Colomina, Beatriz. *Privacy and Publicity: Modern Architecture as Mass Media*. Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1994.

Conley, Tom. *The Self-Made Map: Cartographic Writing in Early Modern France.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996.

Conwill, Kinshasha Holman. "Forward," In *The Studio Museum in Harlem: 25 Years of African American Art,* 5. New York: The Studio Museum in Harlem, 1994.

Cook, Alexander. "The Use and Abuse of Historical Reenactment: Thoughts on Recent Trends in Public History." *Criticism* 46, no. 3 (2004): 487-496.

Cooks, Bridget R. *Exhibiting Blackness: African Americans and the American Art Museum*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2011.

Cosgrove, Dennis. "Introduction: Mapping Meaning." In *Mappings*, edited by Dennis Cosgrove, 1-23. London: Reaktion, 1999.

---. "Mapping, Modernity: Art and Cartography in the Twentieth Century." *Imago Mundi: The International Journal for the History of Cartography* 57, no. 1 (February 2005): 35- 54.

---. "Art and Mapping: An Introduction." *Cartographic Perspectives* 53 (2006): 4.

---. "Cultural Cartography: Maps and Mapping in Cultural Geography." *Annales de Geographie* 117 (2008): 159-178.

---. *Geography and Vision: Seeing, Imagining and Representing the World.* London: I.B. Taurus, 2010.

Council on Museums and Education in the Visual Arts. *The Art Museum as Educator: A Collection of Studies as Guides to Practice and Policy*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978.

Crampton, Jeremy W. “Cartography: performative, participatory, political.” *Progress in Human Geography* 33, no. 6 (2009): 840-848.

---. *Mapping: A Critical Introduction to Cartography and GIS.* Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.

Cresswell, Tim. *In Place/Out of Place: Geography, Ideology, and Transgression* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1996.

Crimp, Douglas and Rosalyn Deutsche. “Hans Haacke’s Contribution to “Points of Reference 38/88.” *October* 48 (Spring 1989): 69-70.

Crowley, Gregory J. *The Politics of Place: Contentious Urban Development in Pittsburgh*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2005.

Cusik, Jessica. “Hands On – A Public Role in Transit Art,” *Places* 9, no. 2 (1994): 87.

Denil, Mark. “Cartographic design: rhetoric and persuasion.” *Cartographic Perspectives* 45 (2003): 8-67.

Deutsche, Rosalyn. *Evictions: Art and Spatial Politics.* Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1996.

Deutsche, Rosalyn and Cara Gendel Ryan. “The Fine Art of Gentrification.” *October* 31 (Winter, 1984): 91-111.

Doran, Anne. “Out with the Old.” *Artforum International* 46, *no 1* (September 2007): 167.

Dorling, Daniel and David Fairbairn. *Mapping: Ways of Representing the World.* Harlow: Longman, 1997.

Doss, Erika. *Spirit Poles and Flying Pigs: Public Art and Cultural Democracy in American Communities.* Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press: 1995.

---. *Memorial Mania: Public Feeling in America.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010.

Dubin, Steven C. *Displays of Power: Controversy in the American Museum from the Enola Gay to Sensation.* New York: New York University, 1999.

Duncan, Carol. *Civilizing Rituals: Inside Public Art Museums*. London: Routledge, 1995.

Duneier, Mitchell. *Sidewalk*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1999.

Edney, Matthew H. “Cartography without ‘Progress’: Reinterpreting the Natural and historical

Development of Mapmaking." In *The Map Reader: Theories of Mapping Practice and Cartographic Representation*, edited by Martin Dodge, Rob Kitchin, and Christ Perkins, 73-82. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011.

Esperdy, Gabrielle M. *Modernizing Main Street: Architecture and Consumer Culture in the New Deal*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008.

Euell, Julian. "Julian Euell," Interview with Camille Billops, *Artist and Influence* XIX (2000): 59-89.

Farrara, Eric. *The Bowery, A History of Grit, Graft, and Grandeur.* Charleston: The History Press, 2011.

Favor, J. Martin. *Authentic Blackness: The Folk in the Harlem Renaissance*. Durham, Duke University Press, 1999.

Fenz, Werner and Maria-Regina Kecht. "Protocols of the Exhibition 'Points of Reference 38/88.'" *October* 48 (Spring 1989): 71-74.

Finkelpearl, Tom. "Introduction: The City as Site." In *Dialogues in Public Art*, edited by Tom Finkelpearl, 2-51. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2000.

Fitzpatrick, Tracy. *Art and the Subway: New York Underground*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2009.

Fleming, Ronald Lee. *The Art of Placemaking: Interpreting Community Through Public Art and Urban Design.* London: Merrell, 2007.

Fleming, Ronald Lee and Renata von Tscharner. *PlaceMakers: Creating Public Art that Tells You Where You Are:* (Boston: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1987.

Flow. New York: The Studio Museum in Harlem, 2008.

Foster, Hal. *The Return of the Real: The Avant-Garde at the End of the Century*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1996.

---. *The Art-Architecture Complex*. London: Verso, 2011.

Francaviglia, Richard V. *Main Street Revisited: Time, Space, and Image Building in Small-Town America*. Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 1996.

Freeman, Lance. *There Goes the 'Hood: Views of Gentrification from the Ground Up*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2006.

Freestyle. New York: The Studio Museum in Harlem, 2001.

Frequency. New York: The Studio Museum in Harlem, 2005.

Fried, Richard M. *The Russians are Coming! The Russians are Coming! Pageantry and Patriotism in Cold War America*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Friendly, Michael and Gilles Palsky. "Visualizing Nature and Society." In *Maps: Finding Our Place in the World*, edited by James R. Ackerman and Robert. W. Karrow Jr., 207-253. Chicago: University of Chicago Press and The Field Museum, 2007.

Fritzche, Peter. *Reading Berlin 1900*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1996.

Gapps, Stephen. "Mobile Monuments: A View of Historical Re-Enactment and Authenticity from Inside the Costume Cupboard of History." *Rethinking History* 13, no. 3 (2009): 395-409.

Gates, Henry Louis. "Harlem on Our Minds." *Critical Inquiry* 24, no. 1 (Autumn 1997): 1-12.

Gerin, Anne and James S. McLean, eds. *Public Art in Canada: Critical Perspectives.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009.

Gill, Jonathan. *Harlem: The Four Hundred Year History form Dutch Village to Capital of Black America.* New York: New Grove Press, 2011.

Gillette, Howard, Jr. *Between Justice and Beauty: Race, Planning, and the Failure of Urban Policy in Washington, DC*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995.

Gladstone, Mara. "Marcia Tucker and the Birth of the New Museum." *Getty Research Journal* no. 4 (2012): 187-194.

Glass, Ruth. ed. *London: Aspects of Change*. London: Center for Urban Studies, 1964.

Glassberg, David. *American Historical Pageantry: The Uses of Tradition in the Early Twentieth Century*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1990.

Golden, Thelma. "of Harlem: an introduction." In *harlemworld: Metropolis as Metaphor*, ed. Thelma Golden, 9-11. New York: Studio Museum in Harlem, 2003.

Gordon, Colin. *Mapping Decline: St. Louis and the Fate of the American City*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008.

Greenberg, Miriam. *Branding New York: How a City in Crisis was Sold to the World*. London: Routledge, 2008.

Grima, Joseph. "Interview with Kazuyo Sejima and Ryue Nishizawa." In *Shift: SANAA and the New Museum*, edited by Joseph Grima and Karen Wong, 23-39. New York: New Museum, 2008.

Grima, Joseph and Karen Wong, eds. *Shift: SANAA and the New Museum*. New York: New Museum, 2008.

Grogan, Paul and Tony Proscio. *Comeback Cities: A Blueprint for Urban Neighborhood Revival*. Oxford: Westview Press, 2000.

Gross, Edward. "The Social Construction of Historical Events Through Public Dramas." *Symbolic Interaction* 9, no. 2 (Fall 1986): 179-200.

Gunn, Theodore. "Introduction." In *Harlem Artists 69*. 5. New York: The Studio Museum in Harlem, 1969.

Haacke, Hans. "Und ihr habt doch gesiegt, 1988." *October* 48 (Spring 1989): 79-87.

Hales, Peter B. *Silver Cities: Photographing American Urbanization, 1839-1939*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2005.

Halpern, Robert. *Rebuilding the Inner City: A History of Neighborhood Initiatives to Address Poverty in the United States*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1995.

Hamlin, Jessica and Dipti Desai. "'Committing History in Public' Lessons from Artists Working in the Public Realm." In *History as Art, Art as History: Contemporary Art and Social Studies Education*, edited by Dipti Desai, Jessica Hamlin, and Rachel Mattson, 67-80. New York: Routledge, 2010.

Harmon, Katherine. *You Are Here: Personal Geographies and Other Maps of the Imagination*. New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 2004.

Harmon, Katherine A. and Gayle Clemans, *The Map as Art: Contemporary Artists Explore Cartography.* New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 2009.

Harvey, David. *The Urbanization of Capital: Studies in the History and Theory of Capitalist Urbanization*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1985.

---. *The Urban Experience.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1989.

Hayden, Dolores. *The Power of Place: Urban Landscapes as Public History.* Cambridge: MIT Press, 1995.

Haydn, Florian. "A Material that Never Comes to Rest: Concepts and Potentials of Temporary Space." In *Temporary Urban Spaces: Concepts for the Use of City Spaces,* edited by Florian Haydn and Robert Temel, 67-73. Basel: Birkhauser, 2006.

Heartney, Eleanor. "The Dematerialization of Public Art." In *Critical Condition: American Culture and the Crossroads*. 206-218. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

---. “The New Social Sculpture.” In *Critical Condition: American Culture and the Crossroads.* 181-190. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Henkin, David. *City Reading: Written Words and Public Spaces in Antebellum New York.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1998.

Hickey, Andrew. “When the Street Becomes a Pedagogue.” In *Handbook of Public Pedagogy: Education and Learning Beyond Schooling,* edited by Jennifer A Sandlin, Brian D. Schultz, and Jake Burdick, 161-170. New York: Routledge, 2010.

Hicks, Matthew. “New York.” *Artforum International* 45, no. 4 (December 2006): 249-251.

Hirsch, Arnold R. *Making the Second Ghetto: Race and Housing in Chicago, 1940-1960*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998.

Hollander, Rob, “Forward.” In *The Bowery: A History of Grit, Graft, and Grandeur,* Eric Ferrara, 10-18. Charleston: The History Press, 2011.

Hollevoet, Christel, Karen Jones, and Timothy Nye. *The Power of the City/The City of Power*. New York: Whitney Museum of American Art, 1992.

hooks, bell. “Beauty Laid Bare: Aesthetics in the Ordinary.” In *Art on My Mind: Visual Polemics,* 119-124. New York: The New Press, 1995.

Hough, Michael. *Out of Place: Restoring Identity to the Regional Landscape.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990.

Housefield, James. “Marcel Duchamp’s art the geography of modern Paris.” *The Geographical Review* 92, no. 4 (October 2002): 477-502.

Hunt, D. Bradford. *Blueprint for Disaster: The Unraveling of Chicago Public Housing.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2009.

Isenberg, Alison. *Downtown America: A History of the Place and the People who Made It.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004.

Jackson, John L. *Real Black: Adventures in Racial Sincerity*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005.

Jackson, Shannon. *Social Works: Performing Art, Supporting Publics.* New York: Routledge, 2011.

Jacobs, Jane. *The Death and Life of Great American Cities.* New York: Vintage, 1961.

Janicke, Tim J. *City of Art: Kansas City’s Public Art.* Kansas City: Kansas City Star Books,

2001.

Johnson, James Weldon. “The Making of Harlem.” *Survey Graphic* “Harlem Mecca of the New Negro” VI, no. 6 (March 1925): 635-639.

Jones, Kellie. “To the Max: Energy and Experimentation.” In *Energy/Experiementation: Black Artists and Abstraction, 1964-1980*, 14-34. New York: The Studio Museum in Harlem, 2006.

Kalinova, Milena and Diedre Summerbell. eds. *Rhetorical Image*. New York: The New Museum of Contemporary Art, 1990.

Kammen, Michael. *Mystic Chords of Memory: The Transformation of Tradition in American Culture* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1991).

Katznelson, Ira. *Marxism and the City.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Keating, W. Dennis and Norman Krumholz, *Rebuilding Urban Neighborhoods: Achievements, Opportunities, and Limits.* Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 1999.

Keating, William Dennis, Normal Krunholz, and Philip Star. *Revitalizing Urban Neighborhoods*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1996.

Kelly, Cindy and Edwin H. Remsberg, *Sculpture in Baltimore: A Historical Guide to Public Art in the Monumental City.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2011.

Kester, Grant H. *Conversation Pieces: Community and Communication in Modern Art*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004.

---. *The One and the Many: Contemporary Collaborative Art in a Global Context.* Durham: Duke University Press, 2011.

Kirwin, Liza. “It’s All True: Imagining New York’s East Village Art Scene of the 1980s.” Ph.D. diss, University of Maryland at College Park, 1999.

Kitchin, Rob and Martin Dodge. “Rethinking maps.” *Progress in Human Geography* 31, no. 3 (June 2007): 331-344.

Kitchin, Rob, Chris Perkins, and Martin Dodge. “Thinking about maps.” In *Rethinking Maps*, edited by Martin Dodge, Rob Kitchin, and Chris Perkins, 1-25. New York: Routledge, 2009.

Klein, Naomi. *No Logo*. New York: Picador, 2000.

Knight, Cher Krause. *Public Art: Theory Practice and Populism*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2008.

Kostolanetz, Richard. *SoHo: The Rise and Fall of an Artist's Colony.* New York: Routledge, 2003.

Kramer, Jane. *Whose Art is It?* Durham, Duke University Press, 1994.

Krygier, John. "Jake Burton's Performance Maps: An Essay." *Cartographic Perspectives* 53 (2006): 41-50.

Kwon, Miwon. *One Place After Another: Site-Specific and Locational Identity.* Cambridge: MIT Press, 2002.

Lacy, Suzanne, ed. *Mapping the Terrain: New Genre Public Art*. Seattle: Bay Press, 1995.

Lampert, Nicolas. "Permission to Disrupt: REPOhistory and the Tactics of Visualizing Radical Social Movements in Public Space." In *Handbook of Public Pedagogy: Education and Learning Beyond Schooling,* edited by Jennifer A. Sandlin, Brian D. Schultz, and Jake Burdick, 524-530. New York: Routledge, 2010.

Lasn, Kalle. *Culture Jam: How to Reverse America's Suicidal Consumer Binge, and Why We Must*. New York, Quill, 2000.

Latour, Bruno. *Science in Action: How to Follow Scientists and Engineers Through Society.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1987.

Lears, T. J. Jackson. *No Place of Grace: Antimodernism and the Transformation of American Culture, 1880-1920*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994.

Lefebvre, Henri. *The Production of Space.* Translated by Donald Nicholson-Smith. Oxford: Blackwell, 1991.

Leonard, Robert H. and Ann Kilkelly, *Performing Communities: Grassroots Ensemble Theaters Deeply Rooted in Eight U.S. Communities*. Oakland: New Village Press, 2006.

Levinson, Stanford. *Written in Stone: Monuments in Changing Societies.* Durham: Duke University Press, 1998.

Liebs, Chester H. *Main Street to Miracle Mile: American Roadside Architecture.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995.

Lippard, Lucy. *The Lure of the Local: Senses of Place in a Multicentered Society.* New York: New Press, 1997.

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

---. “Anti-Amnesia.” In *Cultural Activisms: Poetic Voices, Political Voices,* edited by Gertrude M. James Gonzales and Anne JM Mamary, 185-192. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1999.

---. “Biting the Hand: Artists and Museums in New York since 1969.” In *Alternative New York 1965-1985*, edited by Julie Ault, 79-120. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2002.

Lippard, Lucy and Jerry Kearns. “Waking Up in NYC.” *1st Issue*, (February 1981): 1-3.

Liungman, Carl G. *Symbols: Encyclopedia of Western Signs and Ideograms.* Stockholm, HME Publishing, 2004.

Lorente, J. Pedro. *The Museums of Contemporary Art: Notion and Development*. Surry: Ashgate, 2011.

Luce, Henry, III, “From the President.” *The New Museum Report 1977 and 1978* (1978): 2.

Lynch, Kevin. *The Image of the City*. Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1960.

Maak, Niklas. “The New New Museum: The King of The Bowery.” *Flash Art* 41 (January/February 2008): 124-125.

MacSweeney, Eve. “The New Thing.” *Vogue* 197, no. 12 (December 2007): 296-304.

Martin, Bradford D. *The Theater is in the Street: Politics and Performance in Sixties America*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2004.

Massey, Doreen and John Allen, eds. *Geography Matters! A Reader.* Cambridge: The Open University, 1984.

Mason, Bim. *Street Theatre and Other Outdoor Performance*. London: Routledge, 1992.

Maurrasse, David J. *Listening to Harlem: Gentrification, Community and Business*. Routledge: London, 2006.

McCannon, Didnda. “Didnda McCannon.” Interviews with Camille Billops and Myrah Brown Green. *Artist and Influence* XXII (2003): 99-117.

McKee, Margaret and Fred Chisenhall, *Beale Black and Blue: Life and Music on Black America’s Main Street.* Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University, 1981.

McNamara, Brooks. *Days of Jubilee: The Great Age of Public Celebrations in New York, 1788-1909*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1997.

Mele, Christopher. *Selling the Lower East Side: Culture, Real Estate, and Resistance in New*

York City. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2000.

Menin, Sarah, ed. *Constructing Place: Mind and Matter*. London: Routledge, 2003.

Mercer, Valerie. "Twenty-Five Years of African-American Art from The Studio Museum in Harlem's Collection." In *The Studio Museum in Harlem: 25 Years of African-American Art, 6.* New York: The Studio Museum in Harlem, 1994.

Merkel, Jayne. "SANAA's New Museum of Contemporary Art, New York." *Architectural Design* 78, no. 3 (May/June 2008): 98-101.

Meyerowitz, Lisa Anne. "Exhibiting Equality: Black-Run Museums and Galleries in 1970s New York." Ph.D. diss., University of Chicago, 2001.

Miles, Malcolm. *Art Space and the City: Public Art and Urban Futures.* London: Routledge, 1999.

Mitchell, William J. *City of Bits: Space, Place and the Infobahn.* Cambridge: MIT Press, 1996.

Monteyne, Joseph. *The Printed Image in Early Modern London: Urban Space, Visual Representation, and Social Exchange.* Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007.

Moody, Kim. *From Welfare State to Real Estate: Regime Change in New York City, 1974 to the Present.* New York: The New Press, 2007.

Moore, Alan W. "Collectivities: Protest, Counter-culture and Political Postmodernism in New York City artists' organizations, 1969-1985." PhD diss., City University of New York, 2000.

---. *Art Gangs: Protest and Counterculture in New York City*. Brooklyn: Autonomedia, 2011.

Moore, Barbara and Mimi Smith. "The Other Side of the Coin: On Being Documentalists in an Activist Organization." *The Museum of Modern Art Library: Library Bulletin* no. 86 (Winter 1993/94): 7-9.

Muñoz, José Esteban. "Ephemera as Evidence: Introductory Notes to Queer Acts." *Women and Performance: A Journal of Feminist Theory* 8, no. 2 (1996): 5-16.

Murphy, Jarrett. "The UnPlanned City." *City Limits* 34, no. 6 (January 2011): 12-56.

Nawrocki, Dennis Alan. *Art in Detroit in Public Places.* Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2008.

The New Museum of Contemporary Art. *East Village USA*. The New Museum of Contemporary Art, New York: 2004.

Nuti, Lucia. "*Mapping Places: Chorography and Vision in the Renaissance.*" In *Mappings*, edited by Dennis Cosgrove, 90-108. London: Reaction Books, 1999.

O'Brien, Mark. "Introduction." In *Reimaging America: The Arts of Social Change*, edited by Mark O'Brien and Craig Little, 9-12. Philadelphia: New Society Publishers, 1990.

O'Doherty, Brian. *Inside the White Cube: The Ideology of the Gallery Space.* Santa Monica: The Lapis Press, 1976 and 1986.

Ogbar, Jeffrey O.G. *Black Power: Radical Politcs and African American Identity.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2004.

Olin, Margaret. *Touching Photographs.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2012.

Ongiri, Amy Abugo. *Spectacular Blackness: The Cultural Politics of the Black Power Movement and the Search for a Black Aesthetic.* Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2010.

Oren, Michael. "The Smokehouse Painters, 1968-1970." *Black American Literature Forum* 24, no. 3 (1990): 509-531.

Owens, Craig. "The Problem with Puerilism." *Art in America* 72, no. 6 (Summer, 1983): 162-163.

Page, Max. *The Creative Destruction of Manhattan, 1900-1940*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1999.

Phillips, Betsy and Nathan Hogan. "Notes from the Field." *Afterimage* 31, no. 1 (July/August 2003): 2,16.

Phillips, Lisa. "Forward." In *East Village USA*, 9. The New Museum of Contemporary Art, New York: 2004.

---. "Letter from the Director." *New Museum News* (Fall 04/Winter 05): 1.

---. "Past, Present, Future." In *Shift: SANAA and the New Museum*, edited by Joseph Grima and Karen Wong, 5-11. New York: New Museum, 2008.

---. Untitled introductory statement in *The Bowery Artist Tribute Vol. 2,* edited by Ethan Swan, 2. New York: New Museum of Contemporary Art, 2010.

Phillips, Lisa Kazuyo Sejima, Ryue Nishizawa, Florian Idenburg, Toshihiro Oki, and Joseph Grima. "Work in Progress: Site Visits." In *Shift: SANAA and the New Museum*, edited by Joseph Grima and Karen Wong, 41-59. New York: New Museum, 2008.

Phillips, Patricia. "Temporality in Public Art." *Art Journal* 48, no. 4 (Winter 1989): 331-335.

Ptolemy, Claudius. *Geography of Claudius Ptolemy*. Translated by Edward Luther Stevenson. New York: Cosimo Classics, 2011.

Rajchman, John. “The Postmodern Museum.” *Art in America* 73, no. 10 (October 1985): 110-171.

Raverty, Dennis. “Alternative Exhibition Spaces for Black Artists in New York City During the 1970s: Towards a Partial History.” *The International Review of African American Art* 22, no. 2 (2008): 43-48.

Rees, Ronald, “Historical Links Between Cartography and Art.” *Geographical Review* 70, no. 1 (1980): 61-78.

Relph, Edward. *Rational Landscapes and Humanistic Geography.* London: Rowman and Littlefield, 1981.

Rendell, Jane. *Art and Architecture: A Place Between*. London: I.B. Taurus, 2006.

REPOhistory. *Choice Histories: Framing Abortion. An Artists Book by RepoHistory*. New York: Artists Space, 1992.

---. *The Lower Manhattan Sign Project*. New York: REPOhistory, 1992.

Ritter, Wellington. “Bridges and Bridging: Infrastructure and the Arts.” *Places* 9 no. 2 (1994): 60-67.

Robinson, Arthur H. *Early Thematic Mapping in the History of Cartography*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982.

Roberts, Les, ed. *Mapping Cultures: Place, Practice, Performance.* Houndmills, Palgrave MacMillan, 2012.

Robertson, Tatsha. “Harlem on the Rise.” *The Crisis* (May/June 2005): 22-27.

Rosenberg, Harold. *The De-definition of Art*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1972.

Rosler, Martha and Brian Wallis. *If You Lived Here: The City in Art, Theory and Social Activism*. Seattle: Bay Press, 1991.

San Juan, Rose Marie. *Rome: A City Out of Print*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2001.

Sandler, Irving. “Introduction.” In *Defining Modern Art: Selected Writings of Alfred Barr, Jr.,* edited by Irving Sandler and Amy Newman, 7-47. New York: Abrams, 1986.

Sante, Luc. *Low Life: Lures and Snares of Old New York.* New York: Farrar Straus Giroux,

1991.

Schaffer, Richard and Neil Smith. "The Gentrification of Harlem?" *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 76, no. 3 (1986): 347-365.

Schlereth, Thomas J. *Cultural History and Material Culture: Everyday Life, Landscapes, Museums*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1992.

Schneekloth, Lynda H. and Robert G. Shibley. *Placemaking: The Art and Practice of Building Communities*. New York: Wiley, 1995.

Schrank, Sarah. *Art and the City: Civic Imagination and Cultural Authority in Los Angles.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009.

Schulman, Sarah. *The Gentrification of the Mind: Witness to a Lost Imagination.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 2012.

Schwartz, Joel. *The New York Approach: Robert Moses, Urban Liberals, and Redevelopment of the Inner City.* Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1993.

Schwartzman, Allan. *Street Art*. Garden City: Dial Press, 1985.

Schwartzman, Mat. "Building Bridges: *Voices of Dissent* and the Culture of Cultural Work." In *Reimaging America: The Arts of Social Change*, edited by Mark O'Brien and Craig Little, 331-339. Philadelphia: New Society Publishers, 1990.

Self, Robert O. *American Babylon: Race and the Struggle for Postwar Oakland*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005.

Senie, Harriet F. *Contemporary Public Sculpture: Tradition, Transformation, and Controversy.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Senie, Harriet F. and Sally Webster, *Critical Issues in Public Art: Content, Context and Controversy.* New York: Icon Editions, 1992.

Serota, Nicholas. *Experience or Interpretation: The Dilemma of Museums of Modern Art*. London: Thames and Hudson, 2000.

Shannon, Joshua. *The Disappearance of Objects: New York and the Rise of the Postmodern City* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009).

Shepard, Benjamin and Greg Smithson. *The Beach Beneath the Streets: Contesting New York City's Public Spaces*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2011.

Sholette, Greg, Janet Koenig, Barbara Moore, and Jerry Kearns, "Political Art Documentation/Distribution (PAD/D)." In *Group Work*, edited by Temporary Services,

76-91. New York: Printed Matter, Inc., 2007.

Sholette, Gregory. *Dark Matter: Art and Politics in the Age of Enterprise Culture.* New York: Pluto Press, 2011.

Singer, Debra. "On the Ground: New York." *Artforum International* 46, no. 4 (December 2007): 284-289.

Smethurst, James Edward. *The Black Arts Movement: Literary Nationalist in the 1960s and 1970s.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2005.

Smith, Lee. "Like New." *Artforum International* 37, no. 9 (May 1999): 56.

Smith, Neil. "New City, New Frontier: The Lower East Side as Wild, Wild West". In *Variations on a Theme Park: The New American City and the End of Public Space*, edited by Michael Sorkin, 61-93. New York: The Noonday Press, 1992.

---. *New Urban Frontier: Gentrification and the Revanchist City*. London: Routledge, 1996.

---. *Uneven Development: Nature, Capital, and the Production of Space*, third edition. Athens, The University of Georgia Press, 2008.

Soja, Edward. *Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory.* London: Verso, 1989.

---. *Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angles and Other Real-and-Imagined Places.* Oxford: Blackwell, 1996.

Sorkin, Michael. "Introduction." In *Variations on a Theme Park: The New American City and the End of Public Space*, edited by Michael Sorkin, xi-xv. New York: The Noonday Press, 1992.

---. "The Great Mall of New York." In *The Suburbanization of New York: Is the World's Greatest City Becoming Just Another Town,* edited by Jerilou Hammett and Kingsley Hammett, 113-128. New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 2007.

Speed, Chris. "Walking through Time: Use of Locative Media to Explore Historical Maps." In *Mapping Cultures: Place, Practice, Performance,* edited by Les Roberts, 160-180. Houndmills, Palgrave MacMillan, 2012.

Sprague, Elmer. *Brooklyn Public Monuments: Sculpture for Civic Memory and Urban Pride.* Indianapolis, Dog Ear Publishing, 2008.

Spriggs, Edward D. "Forward." in *Harlem Artists 69*, 3. New York: The Studio Museum in Harlem, 1969.

Stewart, Susan. *On Longing: Narratives of the Miniature, the Gigantic, the Souvenir, the Collection*. Durham, Duke University Press, 1993.

Stoller, Paul. *Sensuous Scholarship*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1997.

---. *Money Has No Smell: The Africanization of New York City*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002.

Strauss, Anselm L. *Images of the American City*. New Brunswick, Transaction, 1976.

Sugrue, Thomas J. *The Origins of the Urban Crisis: Race and Inequality in Postwar Detroit*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996.

Sussman, Mark. “Celebrating the New World Order: Festival and War in New York.” *TDR* 39, no. 2 (Summer 1995): 147-175.

Taylor, Marvin J. *The Downtown Book: The New York Art Scene,1974-1984*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006.

Taylor, Monique M. *Harlem between Heaven and Hell*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2002.

Teaford, Jon C. *The Rough Road to Renaissance: Urban Revitalization in America, 1940-1985*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1990.

---. *The Metropolitan Revolution: The Rise of Post-Urban America.* New York: Columbia University Press, 2006.

Temel, Robert. “The Temporary in the City.” In *Temporary Urban Spaces: Concepts for the Use of City Spaces,* edited by Florian Haydn and Robert Temel, 55-62. Basel: Birkhauser, 2006.

Thomas, June Manning. *Redevelopment and Race: Planning a Finer City in Postwar Detroit*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997.

Thompson, E.P. “History from Below.” In *The Essential E.P. Thompson*, edited by Dorothy Thompson, 481-489. New York: The New Press, 2001.

Thompson, Nato, ed., *Living as Form: Socially Engaged Art from 1991-2011*. New York: Creative Time, 2012.

Tilove, Jonathan and Michael Falco. *Along Martin Luther King: Travels on Black America’s Main Street*. New York: Random House, 2003.

Troy, David. “The New Museum as *Kunsthalle*: Treading a Thin Line Between Alternative Space and Traditional Museum.” *Artworkers News* (December 1980): 20-21.

Tuan, Yi-Fu. *Topophilia: A Study of Environmental Perception, Attitudes and Values.* Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1974.

---. *Space and Place: The Perspective of Experience.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1977.

Tucker, Marcia. *A Short Life of Trouble: Forty Years in the New York Art World*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2008.

Turner, Raymond. "Designing London Transport." *Places* 9, no. 2 (1994): 52-53.

Varanka, Dalia. "Interpreting Map Art with a Perspective Learned from J.M. Blaut." *Cartographic Perspectives* 53 (2006): 14-23.

Vitale, Alex S. *City of Disorder: How the Quality of Life Campaign Transformed New York Politics.* New York: New York University Press, 2008.

von Hoffman, Alexander. *House by House, Block by Block: The Rebirth of America's Urban Neighborhood.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

White, Norval, Elliot Willensky, and Fran Ledon. *AIA Guide to New York City*. Fifth edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Whybrow, Nicholas. *Art and the City*. London: I.B. Taurus, 2011.

Willis, Deborah. *Posing Beauty: African American Images from the 1890s to the Present*. New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 2009.

Wood, Denis. "Catalogue of map artists," *Cartographic Perspectives* 52 (2006): 61-67.

---. "Map art. *Cartographic Perspectives* 53 (2006): 5-14.

Woodward, David, ed. *Art and Cartography: Six Historical Essays*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987.

Wynn, Jonathan R. *The Tour Guide: Walking and Talking New York*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011.

Yablon, Nick. *Untimely Ruins: An Archaeology of American Urban Modernity, 1818-1819*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2009.

Zipp, Samuel. *Manhattan Projects: The Rise and Fall of Urban Renewal in Cold War New York.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Zukin, Sharon. *Naked City: The Death and Life of Authentic Urban Places*. Oxford: Oxford

University Press, 2010.

---. “Harlem Between Ghetto and Renaissance.” In *The New Blackwell Companion to the City*, edited by Gary Bridge and Sophie Watson, 561-570. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011.

Zurier, Rebecca. *Picturing the City: Urban Vision and the Ashcan School*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006.

Flow. New York: The Studio Museum in Harlem, 2008.

Freestyle. New York: The Studio Museum in Harlem, 2001.

Frequency. New York: The Studio Museum in Harlem, 2005.

Harlem: A Century in Images. New York: Skira Rizzoli International Publications Inc. and The Studio Museum in Harlem, 2010.

Newspapers and Periodicals

Adams, Michael. “Harlem’s African Marketplace.” *The New York Times,* August 11, 1994, C3.

Anekwe, Simon. “Funds for the 125th Street mall up to Carter.” *New York Amsterdam News*, November 17, 1979, 2.

---. “Training for street vendors in Harlem.” *New York Amsterdam News,* June 7, 1980, 6.

Aponte, Jorge. “Audience at Studio Museum learns meaning of Kwanza.” *New York Amsterdam News,* January 6, 1973, C5.

Barry, Dan and Jonathan P. Hicks. “Re-imagining 125th St.: With Harlem At a Crossroad, Visions for Economic Future Diverge,” *The New York Times,* December 24, 1995, 1, 19, 21.

Bayliss, Sarah. “Where Art Can Be Made as Well as Hung.” *The New York Times*, December 8, 2002, A44.

Bearden, Romare. “Art of American Negro on Exhibit in Harlem.” *New York Amsterdam News,* June 30, 1966, 30.

---. “Art of the American Negro on Exhibit in Harlem.” *New York Amsterdam News*, July 16, 1966, 46.

Bernstein, Emily M. “Neighborhood Report: Harlem: Sculpture Garden Rises on Rubble of a Vacant Lot.” *The New York Times,* December 26, 1993, A5.

Bowers, Carolyn A. “Museum a Project of Its People.” *Los Angeles Times*, June 20, 1971, T57-T58.

Boyd, Herb. “Giuliani pushes for close of Mart 125.” *New York Amsterdam News,* April 13, 2000, 3.

---. “End of Mart 125? Black businesses cling to life.” *New York Amsterdam News*, December 27, 2000, 1.

---. “Black Business Dying: Giuliani prepares burial.” *New York Amsterdam News*, January 11, 2001, 1.

---. “Mart 125 still in jeopardy,” *New York Amsterdam News,* June 28, 2001, 1.

---. “The end of Mart 125.” *New York Amsterdam News,* July 5, 2001, 3.

Brawarsky, Sandee. “Oh, It’s Not What It Used to Be.” *The New York Times*, June 16, 2000 E29.

Browne, J. Zamgba. “Peddlers decry cop crackdown.” *New York Amsterdam News,* April 6, 1985, 3, 32.

---. “Pols open new Harlem Mart 125 for vendors.” *New York Amsterdam News,* August 30, 1986, 20.

---. “Harlem vendors protest law evicting them from 125th St.” *New York Amsterdam News,* August 25, 1990, 21.

---. “Renaissance Ballroom will be restored to old splendor.” *New York Amsterdam News*, January 2, 1993, 3.

Butts, Carolyn A. “125th Street vendors pledge to fight law to protect turf.” *New York Amsterdam News*, October 27, 1990, 4.

Campbell, Mary Schmidt. “The Studio Museum in Harlem: A Perspective.” *New York Amsterdam News*, August 7, 1982, 36.

Carrillo, Karen. “CB10 said to seek to have Harlem street vendors thrown out of 125th St.” *New York Amsterdam News,* December 14,1991, 5, 34.

---. “Battle between street vendors, store owners on 125 is old feud.” *New York Amsterdam News,* December, 28, 1991, 7.

---. “The new, young Black Street vendors of Harlem.” *New York Amsterdam News*, July 25, 1992, 5.

---. “Black Street vendors close 125th St. stores for a day.” *New York Amsterdam News,* October

31, 1992, 3, 45.

---. “125th Street vendors start publishing own newsletter.” *New York Amsterdam News,* June 12, 1993, 25.

---. “Black street vendors planning massive protest against police.” *New York Amsterdam News,* June, 26, 1993, 9.

---. “Business as usual,” *The Village Voice*, April 15, 1997, 27.

Catton, Pia. “Headed Uptown for a Harlem Renaissance.” *Wall Street Journal,* March 7, 2011, A22.

Chance, Cathy. “Two Black artists remembered.” *New York Amsterdam News,* November 3, 1979, 20.

Chester, Willis. “125 St. Peddlers Cry Bias,” *New York Amsterdam News*, August 31, 1968, 34.

Connors, Cathy. “Studio Museum—an aesthetic wonder.” *New York Amsterdam News,* June 26, 1982, 61.

---. “Studio Museum cuts ribbon opening its sculpture area.” *New York Amsterdam News*, December 18, 1993, 8,

Cotter, Holland. “Shaking Up a Harlem Museum.” *The New York Times*, February 28, 2000, F1.

---. “Material and Matter.” *The New York Times*, March 9, 2001, E36.

Cowan, Lynn. “12th Street vendors call laws on street sales unfair.” *New York Amsterdam News,* December 8, 1990, 5.

Daniels, Lee A. “Outlook for the Revitalization of Harlem.” *The New York Times,* February 12, 1982, A23.

Douglas, Carlyle C. “For Some, City Auction of Houses is Chance to Come Home to Harlem.” *The New York Times,* June 20, 1985, B1, B9.

---. “149 Win in Auction of Harlem Houses.” *The New York Times,* August 17, 1985, 46.

---. “The Brownstone Project in Harlem Raises Hopes and Fears.” *The New York Times,* September 15, 1985, E22.

Dunlap, David. “Retailers Have Harlem on Their Mind,” *The New York Times*, November 10, 1996, 1.

Eckhoff, Sally. “A magical realism.” *Times Union*, May 1, 2005, J4.

Edmonds, Arlene. “African American Curators: Keepers of the Culture.” *Philadelphia Tribune*, January 31, 1997, A12-A13, A18.

Edmondson, Aimee. “Hotel diggers go back in time: 1930s ceramics at Westin on Beale.” *The Commercial Appeal*, December 23, 2005, B1.

Finder, Alan. “Bratton Joins Watch Over Harlem Boycott.” *The New York Times,* October 22, 1994, 26.

Fisher, Ian. “Street of Dreams: After decades of decline, 125th Street now pulses with life as a crossroads of black culture, commerce, and pride.” *The New York Times*, April 11, 1993, V1, V9.

Foderaro, Lisa W. “Harlem’s Hedge Against Gentrification.” *The New York Times*, August 16, 1987, R1.

Ford, Wallace L. “City responds to street vendors: An open letter to the Harlem community.” *New York Amsterdam News,* July 31, 1993, 12, 50.

Fraser, C. Gerald. “Photographer Sues to Regain Works.” *The New York Times*, December 29, 1981, C9.

Freedman, Samuel G. “Harlem and the Speculators: Big Profits but Little Renewal.” *The New York Times*, December, 19, 1986, A1.

George, Nelson. “Studio Museum Film Festival.” *New York Amsterdam News*, April, 26,1980, 27.

Glueck, Grace. “A Very Own Thing in Harlem,” *The New York Times*, September 15, 1968, D34.

---. “Harlem Initiates First Art Museum.” *The New York Times,* September 25, 1968, 40.

---. “Less Downtown Uptown.” *The New York Times,* July 20, 1969, D19, D20.

---. “Art People.” *The New York Times,* October 15, 1976, C18.

---. “Art People.” *The New York Times,* June 3, 1977, C14.

Hawthorne, Christopher. “Architecture Review; A fuzzy look and a clarity of purpose.” *Los Angeles Times,* December 3, 2007: E1.

Hevesi, Dennis. “On the New Bowery, Down and Out Mix with Up and Coming.” *The New York Times.* April 14, 2002. L1.

Hicks, Jonathan P. "Giuliani Broadens Crackdown to Banish All Illegal Vendors." *The New York Times*, May 9, 1994, B1, B4

---. "Police Move Street Vendors in Harlem." *The New York Times,* October 18, 1994, B1, B3.

---. "Muslims Urge Store Boycott in Harlem." *The New York Times,* October 19, 1994, B1, B3.

---. "Harlem Divides Over Merits of Vendors or Their Ouster." *The New York Times,* October 23, 1994, 1, 42.

Holder, Mark. "Are peddlers pests to public?" *New York Amsterdam News,* December 26, 1987, 2, 35.

Howe, Marvine. "New Blow to the Old Bowery." *The New York Times*, March 1, 1994. CY 6.

Isay, David and Stacy Abramson. "The Sunshine Hotel: Bedbugs, Fellowship, and Chef Boy-ar-dee: Voices from One of the Last Flophouses on the Bowery." *The New York Times*, 13 September 13, 1998, CY1, CY12.

Jefferson, Leroy. "Turmoil at Studio Museum." *New York Amsterdam News*, May 2, 1981, 3.

Jeffrey, Nancy Ann and Jen Bensinger. "Art & Money." *Wall Street Journal*, October 29, 1999, W16.

Jingles, Julian. "125th St. vendors: A dilemma with great potential." *New York Amsterdam News,* July 3, 1993, 3, 38.

---. "125th St. Vendors; Is there an organized group behind counterfeiters?" *New York Amsterdam News,* July 10, 1993, 3, 48.

Johnson, Floyd. "125th St. vendors respond to Commissioner Ford." *New York Amsterdam News,* August 14, 1993, 4, 38.

Kennedy, Randy. "The New Museum's New Non-Museum," *The New York Times*, July 25, 2004, AR 27.

Kennedy, Shawn G. "A Housing Renaissance Sweeps Central Harlem." *The New York Times,* August 27, 1989, R1 R9.

---. "New Momentum Builds on 125th Street But Business Still Struggles on Harlem's Main Thoroughfare." *The New York Times,* November 8, 1992, R1, R6.

Kepperdahl, Richard. "In Memoriam: The Bowery," *The New York Times*, January 16, 1994, CY 17.

Kugler, Sara. "On the Bowery, a Flophouse's Last Stand." *The Washington Post,* July 15, 2001,

A12.

Lee, Denny. “A Vacant Mart, Symbol of Failure, Is a Candidate for Redevelopment.” *The New York Times,* February 9, 2003, CY6.

Lewis, Barbara. “Art Insures… Survival.” *New York Amsterdam News,* July 23, 1977, D18.

Matthews, Les. “Peddlers Will Not Move.” *New York Amsterdam News,* September 21, 1970, 1, 41.

---. “Mr. 1-2-5 Street.” *New York New Amsterdam News,* May 22, 1976, A3.

---. “Mr. 1-2-5 St.” *New York Amsterdam News,* May 30, 1981, 5.

McDowell, Edwin. “Apartment Building to Rise on Infamous Bowery.” *The New York Times,* December 15, 2000, B12.

McFadden, Robert D. “A Quiet Majesty Sails the Hudson with Tall Ships.” *The New York Times,* July 5, 1992,1, 24.

McKinley, Jesse. “Along the Bowery, Skid Row is on the Skids.” *The New York Times*, October 13, 2002. I1.

Mel and Muse. “Around town.” *New York Amsterdam News*, August 27,1988, 26, 29.

Muchnic, Suzanne. “Making the Case for the ‘Post-Black’ School of Art.” *Los Angeles Times,* 29 September 2001, F1.

Murray, James P. “Fifth Ave. Culture At the Studio Museum… Is Richly, Uniquely Harlem Style.” *New York Amsterdam News*, August 3, 1974, D12-D13.

Nickerson, Albert. “Complaints increase over Harlem street vendors.” *New York Amsterdam News*, December 28, 1991, 4.

Noel, Peter, “HUDC denies vendors exclusion allegations,” *New York Amsterdam News*, September 17, 1983, 3.

Norford, George. “Sketch Book: Diary - Saturday Night.” *New York Amsterdam News,* October 4, 1941, 17.

Officer, Debbie. “Near riot breaks over seizure of vendor’s goods.” *New York Amsterdam News,* July 10, 1993, 3, 49.

Oser, Alan S. “At Leonx and 116th, Co-ops and Stores are Rising,” *The New York Times,* August 8, 1999, 7.

Ourousoff, Nicolai. "New Look for the New Museum: A Home for Art Rooted in the Rough and Tumble." *The New York Times,* November 30 2007, E35, E46.

Papajohn, George. "Into Elvis land Beyond the kitsch, Memphis has a lot to see." *Chicago Tribune,* April 14, 1991, 15.

Pogrebin, Robin. "Neighborhood Report: Harlem, Helping the Renaissance Ballroom Live up to its Name." *The New York Times*, June 18, 1995, 6.

Press, Joy. "The Last Days of Loserville." *The Village Voice,* March 8, 2005, 34.

Purdum, Todd S. "What Makes Us Angry: With the Mayor Leading the Way, 'Quality of Life' Is This Year's Civic Credo. But What Qualities? Whose Lives?" *The New York Times,* August 7,1994, CY1, CY9.

Rahman, Ali. "Malcolm Shabazz Vendor's Market in Harlem." *The New York Beacon*, June 23, 1999, 10.

Ravo, Nick. "After a Retreat, Gentrification is Marching to the Fringes." *The New York Times,* October 29, 1995, Section 9, 1.

Reinholz, Mary. "A boom in the Bowery, A makeover is underway blending luxe and low-income." *Newsday*, September 16, 2005: C09.

Richardson, Lynda. "The Art of Plunging In, Without Fear." *The New York Times,* May 1 2001, B2.

Rollins, Bryant. "Executive Editor's Report: Where I'm comin' from: Police vs. the 125th St. merchants." *New York Amsterdam News,* March 25, 1972, 1, 4.

Rose, Barbara. "The Return of the Image." *New York Magazine* 5, no. 3 (January 17, 1972): 50.

---. "Why MoMA Needs Help." *New York Magazine,* 5, no. 4 (January 24, 1972): 62.

---. "New space for new art." *Vogue*, 167 (November 1977): 205.

Rothstein, Mervyn. "Signs of Olden Times Bring History to the Streets." *The New York Times* (25 June 1992): B2.

Rule, Sheila. "Signs of Harlem Rebirth Seen in Construction Spurt." *The New York Times,* March, 1, 1980, L25.

Salaam, Yusef. "Rudy's Rabid Revenge: Giuliani's vultures circle Mart 125." *New York Amsterdam News,* February 4, 1999, 1.

---. "Marketplace open for business in Harlem," *New York Amsterdam News*, June 3, 1999, 5.

Satow, Julie. “A Series of Second Acts Prepares to Open on a Harlem Street.” *The New York Times,* August 31, 2011, B9.

Scott, Janny. “Making a Flophouse a Home and a Decent One at That.” *The New York Times.* 30 April 30, 2006, 33.

Shenon, Philip. “Van Der Zee Suit Settled.” *The New York Times,* March 31, 1984, C21.

Siegal, Nina. “Can Harlem’s Heritage Be Saved?” *The New York Times,* February 7, 1999, C1, C10.

Siegal, Nina. “Slow Blues in Harlem for Street Vendors.” *The New York Times*, February 28, 1999, CY4

---. “Harlem on the Brink.” *The New York Times,* September 26, 1999, C1.

Smith, Roberta. “In Galleries, a Nervy Opening Volley.” *The New York Times*, November 30 2007, E35.

Solomon, Deborah. “The Downtowning of Uptown.” *The New York Times Magazine*, August 19, 2001, 44-47.

Spriggs, Ed[ward].“Executive Director’s Report.” *Studio Museum in Harlem Newsletter* 1, no. 2 (April 1974): n.p.

Stokes, Olivia Pearl. “Africa and Harlem.” *New York Amsterdam* News*,* October 5, 1963, 10, 54.

Tabor, Damon. “Urban Tactics: Between Skid Row and Starbucks.” *The New York Times,* June 10, 2007, CY 4.

Tapley, Mel. “About the Arts.” *New York Amsterdam News,* November 39, 1974, D16.

---. “About the Arts.” *New York Amsterdam News*, December 20, 1975.

---. “About the Arts.” *New York Amsterdam News,* May 15, 1976, D6.

---. “About the Arts.” *New York Amsterdam News,* July 10, 1976, D8.

---. “$180,000 Grant to Buy Black, Puerto Rican, Art.” *New York Amsterdam News*, October 2, 1976, A1.

---. “About the Arts.” *New York Amsterdam News,* February 5, 1977, D10.

---. “About the Arts.” *New York Amsterdam News,* August 6, 1977, D13.

---. “About the Arts.” *New York Amsterdam News*, October 1, 1977, D13.

---. “About the Arts.” *New York Amsterdam News*, December 3, 1977, 41.

---. “Harlem’s Studio Museum makes steady progress.” *New York Amsterdam News*, June 27, 1981, 27.

---. “Art comes in many forms: Dolls, paintings and...” *New York Amsterdam News*, March 10, 1984, 21.

---. “Legislators support Studio Museum.” *New York Amsterdam News,* May 7, 1988, 30.

---. “Are the affluent remembering the struggling artists?” *New York Amsterdam News,* November 12, 1988, 25.

---. “Couldn’t match Studio Museum Shop’s rich variety, if you had Aladdin’s Lamp.” *New York Amsterdam News,* December 22, 1990, 25.

Tarquinio, J. Alex. “Some Big Bets that the Funky Bowery Can Be Luxe.” *The New York Times,* November 28, 2007, C6.

Tate, Greg. “The Golden Age.” *The Village Voice,* May 22, 2001, 49, 52.

Ivey, Bill and Steven J. Tepper. “Cultural Renaissance or Cultural Divide.” *Chronicle of Higher Education,* May 19, 2006, B6-B8.

Vaughan, Causewell. “Harlem vendors find a home.” *New York Amsterdam News,* August 27, 1978, 21.

Vogel, Carol. “Inside Art.” *The New York Times*, October 29, 1999, E36.

---. “Inside Art.” *The New York Times*, April 30, 2004, E29.

---. “The Great Buildup: On the Bowery, a New Home for New Art.” *The New York Times,* March 28, 2007, H1.

Waldman, Amy. “Vendors Angry at Evictions from City Mall in Harlem,” *The New York Times,* August 16, 2001, B1.

Waters, Grace. “Vendors and storeowners in can dispute.” *New York Amsterdam News,* August 17, 1985, 35.

White, Jim. “Bringing Blues into TV room.” *Chicago Tribune*, December 11, 1986, D14.

Williams, Timothy. “In plan for Vacant Harlem Market, City Envisions a Cultural Base.” *The New York Times,* September 2, 2008, B2.

Wilson, Mark and Utrice C. Leid, “Hard sell for peddlers.” *New York Amsterdam News,* October 13, 1979, 44.

Wylly, Campbell and Irene Gordon. “New York’s Newest Museum.” *Members Newsletter* No. 3 (January-February 1969): 2-3.

“$14.5 million arts project for Harlem.” *New York New Amsterdam News,* January 21, 1984, 1.

“15 Artists Premier First Gallery Show,” *New York Amsterdam News*, March, 16, 1968, 7.

“A heap of Holiday happenings for children: Studio Museum.” *New York Amsterdam News,* December 18, 1976, D20.

“A Museum is Born in Harlem.” *New York Amsterdam News*, September, 21, 1968.

“A Time for Decision (An Editorial).” *New York Amsterdam News,* March 31, 1973.

“About Where We Live.” *New York Amsterdam News,* May 21, 1977, D10.

“Abyssinian Corp. gets $500,000 to rehab Renaissance Ballroom.” *New York Amsterdam News,* October 23, 1993, 20.

“Another View on Community Art.” *New York Amsterdam News*, December 4, 1976, D12.

“Appoint curator of HSOB.” *New York Amsterdam News*, September 8, 1979, 40;

“African Film Festival and forum at SM.” *New York Amsterdam News,* March 3, 1990, 25.

“Black History Month Community Calendar.” *New York Amsterdam News,* February 6, 1993, 8.

“Catlett show tops at Studio Museum.” *New York Amsterdam News*, December 25, 1971, B8.

“Celebrate Kwanzaa and the Holidays with the Studio Museum in Harlem.” *New York Amsterdam News*, December 16, 1989, 34.

“Children participate in traditional African Xmas.” *New York Amsterdam News*, December 30, 1972, D1.

“Collect Art in Two Easy Lessons.” *New York Amsterdam News,* May 7, 1977, D7.

“Colonel Philipp Condemns Pullers-In Merchants: Chamber Head Asks Orthodox Selling Rules.” *New York Amsterdam News,* February 21, 1948, 7.

“Cops Start 125th St. ‘Move On’ Drive: Black Market Racketeering is Under Fire.” *New York Amsterdam News,* October 12, 1946, 1.

"Cultural Council Has Art Exhibit In Store." *New York Amsterdam News,* June 25,1966, 24.

"Dr. King Film series." *New York Amsterdam News,* January 16, 1988, 21.

"Harlem Art Collection Saved!" *New York Amsterdam News,* August 12, 1978, D1, D7.

"Harlem Film Festival." *New York Amsterdam News,* November 29, 1969, 20.

"Harlem Studio Museum Has Black Art Festival." *New York Amsterdam News,* December 6, 1969, 18.

"Harlem Week Festivities kick-off set for Aug. 4." *New York Amsterdam News,* July 29, 1989, 5.

"Harlem's 125th St. is Now 'Beggar's Roost' Saturdays." *New York Amsterdam News,* September 1, 1945, 6A.

"Harlem's cultural mecca." *New York Amsterdam News*, October 27, 1979, 37.

"In the galleries." *New York Amsterdam News,* September 18, 1971, B13.

"Kwanzaa at the Studio Museum." *New York Amsterdam News,* December 19, 1987, 36.

"Kwanzaa at Studio Museum." *New York Amsterdam News,* December 15, 1984, 26.

"Learn how to collect art." *New York Amsterdam News,* April 4, 1981, 36.

"Lewis H. Michaux Book Fair at Studio Museum." *New York New Amsterdam News,* June 20, 1 981, 34.

"Lowery Stokes Sims appointed director of the Studio Museum in Harlem." *New York Amsterdam News,* November 18, 1999, 5.

"Michaux Fair set to bloom." *New York Amsterdam News*, May 6, 1978, D1.

"Museum is 20 and Growing." *Newsday*, October 19, 1987, 31.

"N.Y. Bank for Savings gives Studio Museum." *New York Amsterdam News,* November 3, 1979, A10.

"New Plans in Harlem for Failed Marketplace." *The New York Times,* November 30, 2003, N37.

"Peddlers Irk Stores in Harlem." *The New York Times*, September 24, 1990, B3.

"Peddlers Seeking Market," *New York Amsterdam News,* September 19, 1970, 1, 36

“Photogs Organize Exhibit.” *New York Amsterdam News*, March 13, 1971, 6.

“Readies Exhibit of Art.” *New York Amsterdam News,* November 9, 1968, 20.

“Studio in the Streets.” *New York Amsterdam News,* August 14, 1971, B3.

“Studio Museum Activities.” *New York Amsterdam News,* December 14, 1985, 29.

“Studio Museum Announces Harlem Black Film Festival.” *New York Amsterdam News,* November 15, 1969, 19.

“Studio Museum festival to promote filmmakers.” *New York Amsterdam News,* February 12, 1983, 25.

“Studio Museum film festival zooms in on Africa’s diversity.” *New York Amsterdam News,* June 5, 1982, 31.

“Studio Museum Gets New Director.” *New York Amsterdam News,* July 26, 1969.

“Studio Museum gift-making.” *New York Amsterdam News*, December 12, 1987, 30.

“Studio Museum Lewis Michaux Book Fair.” *New York Amsterdam News*, May 24, 1980, 44.

“Studio Museum opens show of Black Masters at HSOB.” *New York Amsterdam News*, July 5, 1980, 45.

“Studio Museum Relocation Stirs Controversy.” *New York Amsterdam News,* June 25, 1977, D2.

“Studio Museum Sponsors First Black Film Festival in Harlem.” *Philadelphia Tribune,* November 29, 1969, 18.

“Studio Museum Traces Black N.Y. Housing.” *New York Amsterdam News*, April 30, 1977, D21.

“Studio Museum tries to resolve VanDerZee matter.” *New York Amsterdam News,* November 21, 1981, 65.

“Studio Museum’s 6-week film festival.” *New York Amsterdam News*, April 5, 1980, 28.

“The Harlem street markets,” *New York Amsterdam News,* August 10, 1991, 26.

“The Studio Museum: N.Y. Bank for Savings give Studio Museum.” *New York Amsterdam News*, October 27, 1979, 28-29.

“UDC approves $90 million to study Central Harlem developments.” *New York New Amsterdam News,* August 24, 1991, 19.

"Video Workshop at Museum," *New York Amsterdam News,* July 16, 1975, D4.

"Walking! On 125th Street," *The New York Times,* October 21, 1994, A30.

"What's Happening to Studio Museum? A Wise Move for the Studio Museum – Or a Devious Ploy." *New York Amsterdam News,* July 9, 1977, D1.

Articles in *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine*

Als, Hilton. "SL." *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Fall/Winter 2008/2009): 34-37.

Armstrong, William. "My Harlem: Cash for Gold." *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Summer/Fall 2011): 58-59.

Cofield, Ginger and Julie Quon. "Perspective: My Harlem." *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Spring 2010): 38-39.

Evans, Ali. "Letter from the Editor: Studio Design(ed)." *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Summer 2007): 23.

---. "Sign of the Times." *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Summer 2009): 22.

Gautier, Amina. "Come Sunday." *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Winter/Spring 2011): 68-70.

Harris, Kira Lynne and Brian Keith Jackson. "wePod.Harlem.Shuffle." *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Fall/Winter 2005/2006): 42-46.

Hewitt, Leslie and Anthony Joseph. "The Sweet Conductors of His Mystery." *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Summer 2006): 26-31.

Jackson, Brian Keith. "He the Man, 1804 or Amour de soi Amour-Propre." *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Fall/Winter 2007): 26-31.

---. "No There in There." *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Spring 2008): 50-53.

---. "Untitled." *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Summer 2008): 52-53.

Jones, Cynthia and Petrushka Bazin. "A Literary Walk Through Harlem." *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Summer 2006): 56-57.

Lopez, Gabrielle and Alex Uballez. "Perspective: My Harlem: Between D.F. and Dakar: Flavors

of 116th Street," *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Summer/Fall 2010): 47-49.

Mayer, Aric. "Harlem Exteriors." *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Spring 2008): 58-61.

Megginson, Felicia. "Franco the Great's Harlem Gates." *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Summer 2005): 16-21.

Millett, Aida and Diana McClure. "Salt & Light." *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Fall/Winter 2006/2007): 32-36.

Parker, Tasha. "Collected. A Brief History of Our Permanent Collection." *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Summer/Fall 2011): 7-9.

Reddick, John. "Madame Walker Didn't Live Here, Harlem Architecture After the Renaissance." *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Fall/Winter 2005/2006): 58-59.

---. "A Voyeur's View from Langston's Block." *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Summer 2008): 58-61.

Reddick, John T. "Future Designs on Harlem." *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Fall/Winter 2007): 42-43.

Rose, Richard H. "Sugar Hill," *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Fall/Winter 2008/2009): 60-63.

Smith, Lenard, "Harlem Interiors." *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Spring 2008): 62-65.

Ward, Jesmyn. "Where the Line Bleeds." *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Summer/Fall 2010): 72-73.

"a beautiful thing!" *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem* (Spring 2006): 25.

"a beautiful thing!" *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem* (Summer 2006): 18.

"a beautiful thing!" *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem* (Summer/Fall 2011): 36-37

"Artist Commission: Harlem World: Drawing the People." *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Summer 2007): 52-55.

"Covered: More-in-Store, *Harlem Toile de Juoy* by Sheila Briedges for Studio Printworks." *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Fall/Winter 2006/2007): 30-31.

"hrlm: beautiful people." *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Summer 2006): 50-

54.

"hrlm: beautiful places." *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Fall/Winter 2006/207): 40-45.

"hrlm: beautiful things." *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Spring 2007): 32-37.

"hrlm: pictures." *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Summer 2005): 2-3.

"Hurvin Anderson, *Mrs. S. Keita – Turquoise* (2010)." *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Winter/Spring 2012): 2.

"Islands of New York: A photography commission by Accra Shepp." *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Summer 2009): 38-43.

"James VanDerZee, *Tap Dance Team* (1931)." *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Summer 2005): 53.

"James VanDerZee, *Portrait of a Man Holding a Cane* (1932)." *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Summer 2007): 77

"James VanDerZee, *Band Leader leading a Band* (1932)." *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Summer 2008): 73.

"James VanDerZee, *Knights of the Commandery* (c. 1920) and *Barefoot Prophet* (1929)." *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Summer 2009): 60.

"Mequitta Ahuja, *World* (2010)."*Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Winter/Spring 2011): 4.

"More-in-store." *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Spring 2008): 16.

"More-in-store: Jumel Terrace Books." *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Spring 2006): 19.

"More-in-store: Sistahs of Harlem." *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Summer 2006): 55.

"Nontskelelo 'Lolo' Veleko, *Sibu VII* (from *Beauty is in the Eye of the Beholder* series) (2003-2006)." *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Spring 2007): 53.

"Romare Bearden, *Untitled (Tropical Scene)* (2004)." *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Spring 2005): 32.

"Roy DeCarava, *Couples Dancing* (1956)." *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Spring 2010): 73.

“Sketches of Harlem: Wardell Milan II.” *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem Magazine* (Summer 2008): 54-57.

“what’s up: student exhibition: Reclaiming Beautiful July 20 – October 23, 2005.” *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem* (Summer 2005): 8.

“What’s Up: *We Come with the Beautiful Things Expanding the Walls* Student Exhibition July 16 – October 25, 2009.” *Studio: The Studio Museum in Harlem* (Summer 2005): 10-13.

Websites

Arcangel, Cory. “Things I Made.” Cory Arcangel’s Internet Portfolio Website. Accessed January 5, 2012. http://www.coryarcangel.com/things-i-made.

Carlson, Jen. “The New Museum and Calvin Klein Make a Splash.” *Gothamist*, November 28 2007. http://gothamist.com/2007/11/28/splashing_is_th.php.

Cheng, Irene and Brett Snyder. “Make it Visible: Museum of the Phantom City.” *Urban Omnibus*, October 21, 2009. http://urbanomnibus.net/2009/10/museum-of-the-phantom-city-2/.

Davidson, Justin. “The Gray Ghost of the Bowery: An unsentimental valentine from the New Museum.” *New York Magazine,* November 25, 2007. http://nymag.com/arts/architecture/reviews/41267/.

---. “The Gray Ghost of the Bowery: An unsentimental valentine from the New Museum.” *New York Magazine,* November 25, 2007. http://nymag.com/arts/architecture/reviews/41267/.

Filler, Martin. “Miracle on the Bowery.” *The New York Review of Books,* January 17, 2008. http://www.nybooks.com/articles/archives/2008/jan/17/miracle-on-the-bowery.

Goldberger, Paul. “The Sky Line: Bowery Dreams: A new home for the New Museum of Contemporary Art.” *The New Yorker,* November 19, 2007, http://www.newyorker.com/arts/critics/skyline/2007/11/19/071119crsk_skyline _goldberger.

Kessler, Sarah. “NYC Launches a Better Map App for Tourists,” *Mashable Business.* April 2, 2012, http://mashable.com/2012/04/02/nyc-launches-map-tourists/.

Key, Andrew. “A Park is Renewed, the Better to Honor the Hero in Its Name.” City Room, *The New York Times,* October 13, 2009. http://cityroom.blogs.nytimes.com/2009/10/13/an-officer-who-died-in-the-line-of-duty-in-italy/.

Heuer, Megan. “The Museum in Sky:” History of the New Museum in Sites and Spaces.” New

Museum Digital Archive. Accessed August 20, 2012. http://archive.newmuseum.org/index.php/Features/Show/displaySet?set_id=22.

Lee, Gina. "License crackdown rattles 125th Street vendors." January 23, 2012. *Columbia Spectator,* http://www.columbiaspectator.com/2012/01/23/license-crackdown-rattles-125th-street-vendors.

Marianek, Joe. "New Brand for New Museum." Brand New. January 4 2008. http://www.underconsideration.com/brandnew/archives/new_brand_for_new_museum.php.

Mays, Jeff. "Harlem Vendors on 125th Street Cleared in Sweep Ahead of Obama Visit." January 18, 2012. DNAinfo.com. http://www.dnainfo.com/new-york/20120118/harlem/harlem-vendors-on-125th-street-cleared-sweep-ahead-of-obama-visit.

Symonds, Alexandria. "In Which we Mark Graves Like Birthplaces: Ceci N'est Past CBGB." This Recording. Accessed October 10, 2011. http://thisrecording.com/today/2011/10/3/in-which-we-mark-graves-like-birthplaces.html.

Throwell, Zefrey. "Free Nuts: Reinvesting in Harlem." Zefrey Throwell. Accessed July 30, 2012. http://www.zefrey.com/project_freenuts.html.

Viveros-Faune, Christian. "The New Museum of Contemporary Art debuts its new home; Strong building, weak show." *The Village Voice*. November 27 2007. http://www.villagevoice.com/2007-11-27/art/the-new-museum-of-contemporary-art-debuts-its-new-home/.

Wehr, Anne. "Unmonumental: The Object in the 21st Century." *Time Out New York*, December 6, 2007. http://newyork.timeout.com/arts-culture/art/18670/unmonumental-the-object-in-the-21st-century.

Wolff, Rachel. "Slideshow: The Homeless 'Get Lost' Show." *New York Magazine.* June 5, 2007, http://nymag.com/daily/entertainment/2007/06/slideshow_the_homeless_get_los_1.html. Genevieve Ernst, "Let's Get Lost," *Time Out New York*, June 21, 2007, http://newyork.timeout.com/things-to-do/own-this-city-blog/95617/lets-get-lost.

"About Us." NYC & Company. Accessed July 10, 2012. http://www.nycgo.com/about-us.

"Artnet News June 13, 2006." Artnet. Accessed May 18, 2012. http://www.artnet.com/magazineus/news/artnetnews/artnetnews6-13-07.asp.

"Counter Culture – New Museum: Secret Places, July 10 to August 15th at The New Museum." Flux Factory. Accessed June 19, 2012. http://www.fluxfactory.org/projects/counter-culture-new-museum/.

"Exhibitions: Thurston Moore, Street Mouth, April 7 – May 12, 2007." KS Art. Accessed May 9, 2012. http://www.ksartonline.com/tmex2.html.

"Festival of Ideas for the New City." *Festival of Ideas.* Accessed May 25, 2012. http://www.festivalofideasnyc.com/.

"Get Lost: Artists Map Downtown New York." New Museum. Accessed March 1, 2008. http://www.newmuseum.org/assets/general/getlost/index.html8.

"Get Lost Artists Map Downtown New York, New Museum Presents a Unique Exhibition on Paper and Free Distribution Magazine." New Museum. Accessed March 1, 2008. http://www.newmuseum.org/assets/general/pressreleases/2007.5.29Get_Lost.pdf.

"Harlem Postcards Derrick Adams, Marley Gonzalez, Jeremy Kost, and Ray Llanos: July 16, 2009 – October 25, 2009," Studio Museum in Harlem, accessed August 1, 2012, http://www.studiomuseum.org/exhibition/harlem-postcards-derrick-adams-marley-gonz-lez-jeremy-kost-and-ray-llanos.

"Harlem Postcards Summer 2012: Yasmine Braithwaite, Zoe Crosher, Moyra Davey, Lauren Halsey: Jun 14, 2012 – Oct 21, 2012." Studio Museum in Harlem. Accessed August 1, 2012. http://www.studiomuseum.org/exhibition/harlem-postcards-summer-2012-yasmine-braithwaite-zoe-crosher-moyra-davey-lauren-halsey.

"Irene Cheng and Brett Snyder: Museum of the Phantom City." Van Alen Institute Projects in Public Architecture. Accessed January 14, 2012. http://www.vanalen.org/fellowship/fellows/03_2009_ChengSnyder.

"Isa Genzken, Rose II," New Museum. Accessed April 3, 2012. http://www.newmuseum.org/exhibitions/433.

"Meet a NYFA Artist – Brett Snyder." New York Foundation for the Arts. Accessed January 14, 2012. http://www.nyfa.org/level3.asp?id=702&fid=5&sid=156.

"New Museum." Droga5. Accessed June 3, 2012. http://www.droga5.com/#/work/newmuseum/newmuseum/newmuseum.

"New Musuem." Wolff Olins. Accessed June 3, 2012, http://www.wolffolins.com/work/new-museum.

"New Museum, Identity Guidelines Manual," AIGA Design Archives. Accessed June 3, 2012. http://designarchives.aiga.org/#/entries/olins/_/detail/relevance/asc/11/7/19702/new-museum-identity-guidelines-manual/1.

"NYC Big Apps." New York City Economic Development Corporation. Accessed July 10, 2012. http://2011.nycbigapps.com/.

"NYC Digital." The City of New York. Accessed July 10, 2012. http://www.nyc.gov/html/digital/html/home/home.shtml.

"Our Story." CityMaps. Accessed July 10, 2012. http://about.citymaps.com/our-story/.

"Press release for *Spartacus Chetwynd: Home Made Tasers*." New Museum. Accessed March 23, 2012.
http://www.newmuseum.org/assets/general/pressreleases/spartacuspressrelease_v3.pdf.

"Ugo Rondinone, Hell, Yes!" New Museum. Accessed April 3, 2012. http://www.newmuseum.org/exhibitions/18.

Archival Collections

Greenwall Foundation Archive. MSS 336. Fales Library and Special Collections, New York University Libraries.

Public Art Fund Archive. MSS 270. Fales Library and Special Collections, New York University Libraries.

The REPOhistory Archive. MSS 113. Fales Library and Special Collections, New York University Libraries.

Marcia Tucker Papers, 1957-2004. 2004.M.13. Research Library, The Getty Research Institute.