

Whitechapel
London
The MIT Press
Cambridge, Massachusetts

T H E
E V E
R Y D
A Y

Edited by Stephen Johnstone

Documents of Contemporary Art

Stephen Johnstone

Introduction//Recent Art and the Everyday

Mostly, I believe an artist doesn't create something, but is there to sort through, to show, to point out what already exists, to put it into form and sometimes reformulate it. That's the spirit in which I gathered all the press clippings and photos of women, their postures, their gestures – their hands stirring sauce or putting on a bandage. It's a language in itself, which is why we don't pay any attention to it. I didn't invent anything, I indicated ...

– Annette Messager, *Word for Word*, 2006

The banal, the quotidian, the obvious, the common, the ordinary, the infra-ordinary, the background noise, the habitual? [...] How are we to speak of these common things, how to track them down, how to flush them out, wrest them from the dross in which they are mired, how to give them meaning, a tongue, to let them, finally, speak of what it is, who we are.

– Georges Perec, *Species of Spaces*, 1974

Contemporary art is saturated with references to the everyday. Since the mid-1990s numerous international biennales, site-specific projects, historical overviews of modernism and themed group exhibitions have attested to the widespread appeal of the quotidian to curators and artists alike.¹ Coupled with this is the persistent presence of the term and its affiliates in reviews, articles and essays, in which everyday life attains the status of a global art-world touchstone.

Drawing on the vast reservoir of normally unnoticed, trivial and repetitive actions comprising the common ground of daily life, as well as finding impetus in the realms of the popular and the demotic, the rise of the everyday in contemporary art is usually understood in terms of a desire to bring these uneventful and overlooked aspects of lived experience into visibility.

For some, this turn to the ordinary leads to a recognition of the dignity of ordinary behaviour, or the act of stating simply, 'here is value'.² For others, it may result in an unveiling of the 'accidentally miraculous', or the desire to make art with the unassuming ease of the amateur photographer.³ For others still, an art that focuses on the everyday might construct 'a vaguely ethnographic aesthetic',⁴ or be nothing more than the record of simply venturing out and happening across something interesting.⁵ Elsewhere, the everyday sparks a distrust of the heroic and the spectacular; its oppositional and dissident connotations are foregrounded as it is deployed in a confrontation with 'the bureaucracy of controlled

consumption'.⁶ From another position, interest in the everyday signals a loss of guilt before popular culture and its pleasures,⁷ while elsewhere again, the investigation of everydayness asks us to consider the deceptively simple question: What happens when nothing happens?⁸

From another perspective, however, a commitment to the quotidian has a profoundly political tenor: accessed through the use in art of ordinary found materials, the everyday might be the common ground of experience that allows museum visitors to 'understand the effects of history on the private lives of those who were usually overlooked'.⁹ Commitment to the everyday can also indicate the desire to give a voice to those silenced by dominant discourses and ideologies – a commitment coupled with the responsibility to engage with the everyday's transformative potential; for in this dialogue to notice the taken-for-granted conversation of others is the first step in irrevocably changing everyday life.¹⁰

Connecting these various and sometimes contradictory approaches to the everyday are a number of common assumptions. First is the sense that the everyday, as in Georges Perec's epigraph above, exists below the threshold of the noticed and is everywhere and nowhere at the same time. Secondly, there is a desire to confront things in the world at large rather than in the art world (i.e., the critique of other art or of art institutions). Linked to this is the assumption that the everyday is both authentic and democratic; it is the place where ordinary people creatively use and transform the world they encounter from one day to another. Thirdly, when artists and curators allude to the everyday it is almost always to suggest that what is at stake in such a gesture is the extent to which an artist is able to get close to things, to be immersed in the world, as opposed to observing and judging from afar. And finally, running through many of these examples is the sometimes unstated but always implicit notion that a turn to the everyday will bring art and life closer together.

But why the everyday now? Possibly, as John Roberts suggests, it has something to do with the lure of the ordinary¹¹ and, in this regard, the final point above is germane here; in the reconciliation of art and life lies perhaps the potential to undermine what has appeared to many as a misconceived view of art's destiny: to be no more than an autonomous and rarefied sphere of production and consumption.

If the everyday is the realm of the unnoticed and the overlooked, however, it might be asked just how we can attend to it? How do we drag the everyday into view? And if we manage to do so, is there a form or style appropriate to representing what has been identified as the 'inherent indeterminacy' of the everyday? Which in turn begs the question: why should we wish to investigate the everyday in the first place? Is it simply to see what remains hidden in our lives, to identify what we take for granted? Or do works about the everyday in

some way show us how to look more critically and in so doing 'train attention on our own experience, so that discourse on the everyday is ultimately pragmatic or performative in character?'¹² And finally, what of the injunction that to bring the everyday into view is to change it?

The diverse texts collected here address these questions, while not answering them in any simple way. This anthology documents the various different ways that artists have engaged with the everyday since 1945. The focus is on contemporary practice since the 1980s and the antecedents that most often inform this work, from the Situationist International and Fluxus to conceptualism and feminist art of the 1970s. In recent years publications on the everyday have surveyed aspects of the Soviet avant-garde, Dada and Surrealism, documentary photography in Weimar Germany and the Mass Observation movement in Britain; identified the aesthetic character of everyday life; and introduced figures such as Henri Lefebvre, Michel de Certeau and Georg Simmel to a new audience. Even more recently we have seen a polemic that attempts to reinvigorate the revolutionary potential of the everyday and in so doing counter the perceived 'contraction' and 'philosophical foreshortening' of the idea into a theory of creative consumption.¹³

However, very little exists on the everyday in recent art. In gathering this material together it is possible to begin mapping the singularity and specific character of art's recent encounter with everydayness. A number of the texts gathered here make it explicit that the everyday is one of the few critical concepts in which the agency of art is acknowledged – it is in the speculative, unsystematic and ambiguous work of writers and artists, dramatists and poets that we see the pre-history of an analysis of the everyday. Thus, while a key theorist of the everyday such as Henri Lefebvre may at times be extremely critical of the specialized knowledge art produces and the professional identity of artists, he readily acknowledges that the imprecise and ambiguous realms of art, literature and drama have played a fundamental role in bringing everyday life into view. While it may be the case that for Lefebvre art still remains an alienated activity and a sphere of limited freedom, artworks can offer illuminating and revealing routes into the everyday. For example, in volume II of the *Critique of Everyday Life* he suggests that art is fundamentally linked to play and, like play, is 'transfunctional' (that is, it has many uses and at the same time it is not useful at all). In fact, Lefebvre claims, the work of art acts as a kind of 'play-generating yeast' in the everyday; an action that suggests both the splitting down into simpler substances and the process of fermentation, agitation and disruption.¹⁴ Developing this theme in the well known opening section of *Everyday Life in the Modern World* some seven years later in 1968 Lefebvre emphasizes the crucial role of James Joyce's novel *Ulysses* in establishing the revelatory character of art's

experimental engagement with the everyday. For Lefebvre, Joyce's 'profoundly boring' book is the first time a piece of creative fiction had dared to exploit language 'to the farthest limits of its resources, including its purely musical potentialities' in order to convey the dailyness of daily life. In so doing, Joyce 'rescues, one after the other, each facet of the quotidian from anonymity'.¹⁵

For Lefebvre the aim of any investigation of the everyday is 'to grasp a certain quality', to 'get inside' it. But what is there to get inside? For the everyday, as Lefebvre goes on to tell us, is what is 'left over' when specialized knowledge has been exhausted. In the essay that opens this collection Maurice Blanchot goes so far as to suggest that the everyday exhibits an 'absence of qualities', that it cannot be approached cognitively, and 'displays an energizing capacity to subvert intellectual and institutional authority'. It is 'inexhaustible, unimpeachable, always open ended and always eluding forms or structures'. Moreover, the everyday is the site of a fundamental ambiguity: it is both where we become alienated and where we can realize our creativity. Here Blanchot closely follows Lefebvre, who argues that the everyday is the place 'where repetition and creativity confront each other': it is both 'humble and sordid' and 'simultaneously the time and place where the human either fulfils itself or fails'.¹⁶

Lefebvre not only suggests how difficult it is to answer the question 'what is the everyday?' but also indicates that any attempt to do so using a 'one-way critique' or a single body of existing knowledge may well immobilize the qualities that define the very thing we are concerned to locate. There is no either/or position in the study of the everyday, for to adopt such a stance would miss the complex, contradictory overlapping of alienation and creativity at its heart. Thus the everyday is said to demand an interdisciplinary openness, a willingness to blur creatively the traditional research methods and protocols of disciplines such as philosophy, anthropology and sociology. Perhaps these contradictions and qualifications that characterize the everyday make it seductive territory for those artists who intuitively value the qualities of ambiguity and indeterminacy as ends in their own right (Annette Messenger, Susan Hiller, Fischli and Weiss, for example). Most of the art presented or discussed here may aspire to directness and immersion but it does not approach the everyday in any straightforward documentary way. Much of it uses ruses and subterfuge to find ways of representing or engaging with the quotidian (Annette Messenger as a trickster and 'word thief'; Stanley Broun as someone lost in need of directions; Sophie Calle as a chambermaid rifling through the belongings of hotel guests). Or it adopts a childlike attitude (Yoko Ono's instruction to jump in every puddle; Francis Alÿs playing nursery rhymes with a drumstick on street railings). It trades in a kind of willed naïveté (Gillian Wearing) or nostalgic passivity (Allen Ruppersberg's loving recreation of a café, 'sumptuously filled with romantic detail'). It adopts strategies

associated with schooling and socialization such as copying out lists of instructions – how to cook properly or make a shelf for your kitchen (Annette Messenger). It questions the need to make choices when noticing the ordinary (we are going on a journey so we must take our camera and film everything we see – Fischli and Weiss). It takes advantage of chance (the overheard fragments of conversation collected by Ian Breakwell; Gabriel Orozco's films of interesting chance configurations found in the urban landscape; Richard Wentworth's street photos of objects evidencing makeshift solutions to everyday problems). It stages barely noticeable events (Roman Ondák's *SK Parking* – Slovakian Skoda cars parked behind the Secession building in Vienna for two months; or Hans-Peter Feldmann's 'actions' in which he paints the exterior of his family car in different ways, as if he belonged in turn to a rock group, a circus, a striptease club). It deploys poetic devices such as slow motion and the over-extended take (Andy Warhol, Chantal Akerman), or literally shooting from the hip when something captivating comes into sight (Jonas Mekas – who frequently films without looking through the viewfinder). All of which alerts us to another important point about the relation between art and theories of the everyday: most artists don't read Henri Lefebvre or Michel de Certeau in order to discover the ordinary. When the artists above perform these actions they are not doing so in order to illustrate the central theses of *The Practice of Everyday Life* or *Everyday Life in the Modern World*. What becomes evident in the interplay between the theoretical writings of such theorists and the examples of individual artworks presented here is a dialogue in which all of those interested in the everyday search to find a language or form that can adequately convey its complexity, ambiguity and elusiveness.

In a key contribution to the first section 'Art and the Everyday', Jonathan Watkins, who curated the 1988 Sydney Biennale titled 'Every Day', develops a historical and generational argument to account for the contemporary rise of the everyday. He claims that the desire to look at the ordinary is to reassert 'a non ironic kind of realism' and to 'express what it's like to be in the real world'; a desire to communicate what it really feels like 'to be here, now'. This everyday realism is also linked to 'efficacy and unpreciousness' in the way art looks, and a new concern with 'the power of relatively simple gestures' as art connects with lived experience. Such works are 'unforced artistic statements, incidentally profound observations on our lives as lived everyday'. This art has no particular form – in the sense that no one form or style predominates over any other – but the artists selected for the Biennale (and the number here is large, around 100 or so) are united by a shared concern: 'an aspiration to directness, as opposed to gratuitous mediation or obscurantism'. And so, with no individual style privileged over another, works as various as the process-based paintings of Bernard Frize (frequently produced using commonplace tools such as a roller or ad-hoc painting

devices such as four brushes tied together to produce rhythmic paintings that 'embody the passage of time'); the multi-monitor video work *Visible World* by Fischli and Weiss (nearly 100 hours of video footage that transcribes their many unremarkable journeys in which everything they see appears to demand their attention); Vladimir Arkhipov's *Museum of the Handmade Object* (a collection of makeshift, hand crafted devices, tools and household items made by ordinary Russian people out of discarded and broken materials); and Navin Rawanchaikul's *Navin Gallery, Bangkok* (in which taxi drivers sell comic books in their cabs narrating events from their lives) can all 'communicate the nature of the everyday'. The direct simplicity of these artworks is then positioned as a 'rejoinder to played-out operatic tendencies and an overloaded academic (or pseudo-academic) discourse in the visual arts'.¹⁷

Watkins' polemical assertion that the everyday may be seen as an antidote to a barren, academicized and theoretically overloaded art was not unique in the latter part of the 1990s and several of the essays reproduced here express variants of this belief, most notably those by John Roberts and Nikos Papastergiadis.¹⁸ But it would be a mistake simply to position art as the experimental research arm of everyday life studies. Art may offer models for revealing what is hidden in the everyday but the question of what actually happens to quotidian phenomena when they are recoded into art is still a thorny issue for many critics. Oppositions and contradictions are not smoothed out in this collection and texts range from the affirmative to those condemning the appropriation and containment of the everyday by art. For some, such as Papastergiadis, the particularity of the engagement that art may have with the everyday must be grounded in an awareness of the materiality of art and the type of counter-intuitive knowledge that art might produce. For others, such as Ben Highmore, the relationship of art to the everyday is entirely problematic: while he may develop an argument to support the claim that art, particularly the early twentieth-century avant-garde, has played a fundamental role in identifying the everyday, he also asserts that 'high culture's propensity towards subjective expressionism in relation to the everyday' must be dislodged if the aesthetic is to become an appropriate tool for registering everyday life's contradictions and inexhaustible ambiguity.¹⁹

The complexity of art's position in relation to the everyday is thus central to the essays in the first section. In addition to key texts by Lefebvre and Blanchot, and those by the authors mentioned above, are a discussion between the curators David Ross and Nicholas Serota on the role of recent art about the everyday in bringing to light new narrative accounts of modernism; Martha Rosler's polemic for an art of *Verfremdungseffekt* or distanciation in order to subvert the myths of the everyday; Jeff Wall's analysis of the role of fellow artist Dan Graham's 1960s magazine works in fusing a 'journalistic attitude ... with a

situationist-conceptualist strategy of interventionism, or *détournement*' in order to intrude into the everyday sites of the media'; and Allen Ruppersberg's *Fifty Helpful Hints on the Art of the Everyday*, which in stark contrast to Rosler's text is a bright and sunny set of aphorisms that encapsulate Ruppersberg's affectionate embrace of the ordinary, summed up by the artist Allan McCollum as 'a love letter to the ephemeral and to memory, a valorization of the things that are destined to disappear'.²⁰

These essays and statements help to frame what follows in the subsequent sections on looking and noticing, and on ethnographic and documentary approaches, but it's important to note that they don't in any way contain what comes next. Texts such as Sally Banes' historical overview of the recuperation of the ordinary in the New York art world of the early 1960s; Helen Moleworth's essay on Mary Kelly, Mierle Laderman Ukeles, Judy Chicago and her collaborators, and Martha Rosler; and Lucy Lippard's account of the participation of women in conceptualism; all demonstrate that the everyday was the focus of a wide range of investigations long before the current use of the concept.

The second section, 'The Poetics of Noticing', features a number of shorter texts – works by Yoko Ono, Daniel Spoerri, Ian Breakwell; statements by Marcel Duchamp, the Lettrists, Alison and Peter Smithson; interviews with Stephen Shore, Francis Alÿs and Roman Ondák – all of which highlight strategies to represent that which is apparently untellable or below the threshold of the understood and the seen. This theme of noticing, or attending to, is the fundamental concern of Perec's experimental writings from the early 1970s and the extract included here centres on his attempts to find a model of notation appropriate to the task of simply looking at the everyday and describing an ordinary street scene. The importance of Perec's work to the emergence of the everyday as a site of interest for artists, writers and theorists alike is emphasized in the extracts from an interview with Paul Virilio, who worked with Perec on the journal *Cause Commune* in the late 1960s. He identifies the notion of the 'infra-ordinary' as central to Perec's concern with everydayness (*infra* here meaning below, beneath or after): 'What do we do when we do nothing, what do we do hear when we hear nothing, what happens when nothing happens?' This concern is also explored in the text by Ivone Margulies on the influential early films of Chantal Akerman, who employs extended takes, no camera movement and a lack of any kind of dramatic action as she trains her camera on the repetitions of ordinary life – a woman doing domestic chores, a pension hotel, a New York street scene. Margulies places Akerman's work in the context of neo-realism and the films of Andy Warhol to discuss the representation and experience of boredom as a central concern in any attempt to mine the everyday.

Vincent Kaufmann's text on Guy Debord views the influential situationist idea

WHAT HAPPENS WHEN NOTHING HAPPENS ?

of the *dérive*, the activity of the 'drifter' in the city, as a principle of 'pure mobility' that presages an art with no works. Three texts by critics, on Hans-Peter Feldmann, Fischli and Weiss and Richard Wentworth, and a statement by the artist Gabriel Orozco, focus on art that explores the idea of looking and noticing.

Concluding this section and, at the same time, constructing a bridge to the discussion of ethnography in the next, is Michael Sheringham's text 'Configuring the Everyday', focused on 'projects of attention'. Sheringham takes us directly to the question 'Should we pay attention to the everyday, and if so how should we do it?'. Recognizing that '*quotidienneté* dissolves (into statistics, properties, data) when the everyday is made an object of scrutiny' he proposes that what connects the most redolent and suggestive attempts to acknowledge the everyday is their project-like status. Drawing on examples from French everyday ethnography, such as Cortázar and Dunlop's *Les Autonautes de la cosmoroute, ou Un Voyage intemporel*, a journey from Paris to Marseilles in a camper van during which they never left the immediate confines of the autoroute; Jean Rolin's attempt to walk the line of the Paris meridian; and examples from contemporary art, such as Sophie Calle's *L'Hôtel*, Sheringham details the 'characteristic myopia' of these projects and the attendant 'preoccupation with the domain of practice' as self-imposed rules, tasks and constraints force the authors into an 'interrogative rather than assertive' mode of looking.

The final section, 'Documentary Style and Ethnography', focuses on the idea of 'getting inside' the everyday and the methods that artists have adopted to register the quotidian from a position of being *plongé dans* (plunged into) dailyness and triviality. Of key interest here is the way that various artists appropriate and transform the conventions of documentary filmmaking and photography and the protocols of ethnography as they search for a way to find a form of practice that stays immersed in the everyday. This possibility is explored in the essays by John Roberts, Abigail Solomon-Godeau and Tom McDonough in relation to transgressive forms of popular pleasure in the British art of the 1990s; the intimate 'insider' photographs of Nan Goldin; and the experimental documentary filmmaking of Edgar Morin, Jean Rouch and Guy Debord in the early 1960s. Also included in this section are Joseph Kosuth's call for artists to cultivate cultural fluency as a way of ensuring an anthropological art of engagement and praxis, Susan Hiller's informal lecture about her work *Monument* (1980–81) that reflects on a collaborative form of noticing in order to produce new meanings, and Stephen Willats' statement describing his work *The Lurky Place* (1978), in which he investigates how 'counter consciousness' might be produced by the users of everyday objects and places.

Among the other significant works by artists in this section, Annette Messenger's short text pieces from the 1970s are included here as examples of an

art of the everyday that endlessly plays with the conventions of documentary and ethnography to forge a poetics of the social forces, influences and desires that have shaped femininity in post-1945 France. Moving between the twin poles of ethnographer and fantasist, her work shines an ambiguous half-light on the hidden language that underpins the most quotidian of activities, those of washing the dishes, opening the post, finding an appropriate type of signature, sewing, cleaning and cooking. In the resulting notebooks and personal albums, pages from magazines and household instruction manuals are copied, redrawn and collaged together, and then in turn combined with poetic personal maxims, proverbs and omens, repetitive observations about men she sees on the street or photographed in magazines, lists of phrases culled from romance novels and comic books, and photographs of household gestures. All of this is then presented in hundreds of school-type writing books or cheap albums that are almost impossible to classify, in that they both intimately resemble and at the same time distance themselves from the kind of instructional notebooks promoted in women's magazines and schools. Contextualizing her work, Rebecca DeRoo describes how 'by preserving women's work through ethnographic methods that presented it as a form of subculture, Messenger not only engaged in a task of preservation and celebration, but also displayed an awareness of limitation'.

Messenger's work is emphasized here as it draws together many of the themes presented across this collection. Her projects suggest the active transformation of what she 'points' at, while simultaneously retaining a profound intimacy with it. At the same time, it becomes entirely unclear what her position is in regard to the political potential of this work. Is she simply pointing and saying here is value? Is she advocating a form of historical recovery and a celebration of traditional house-making skills that have been all but obliterated by the educational manuals and popular journals she draws on? Is she simply drawing attention to the overlap of fiction and reality in the everyday? Or is she suggesting that a creative impulse remains buried deep in the activities she documents?

Perhaps this is where Lefebvre's notion of art as play-generating yeast is useful. Artworks that attend to the everyday are not arguments; they do not offer resolutions or indeed even rational observations. As Messenger herself suggested in 1976, an art of the everyday might be nothing more than a modest and highly ambiguous form of paying attention and tinkering:

'Annette Messenger the Practical Woman, and Annette Messenger the Collector "pay attention". They do not want to lose anything: they recuperate whatever winds up in their home, file it and appropriate it. It must be able to be used again (while Annette Messenger the Artist dares to be much more extravagant ...)

In the end my work is nothing but a very large patchwork, just like our culture is cobbled together, a bric-à-brac of different elements, of heterogeneous

recollections juxtaposed like a patchwork quilt that constitutes our identity: that's why I am so interested in the notion of tinkering. Annette Messenger the Artist "tinkers with media" by mixing together photography and drawing in the same image, by altering their functions. So the drawing seems more objective than the photo; it may even become photography's evidence.²¹

- 1 'Everyday', 11th Biennale of Sydney (1998); 'The Quiet in the Land: Everyday Life, Contemporary Art and The Shakers' (Project with Shaker communities of Maine and an international selection of contemporary artists, 1995–98; exhibited at Institute of Contemporary Art, Portland Maine, 1997; Institute of Contemporary Art, Boston, 1998); 'Quotidiana: The Continuity of the Everyday in Twentieth-Century Art', Castello di Rivoli, Museo d'Arte Contemporanea, Turin (2000); 'American Standard: (Para)normality and the Everyday', Barbara Gladstone Gallery, New York (2001); 'Micropolitics: Art and Everyday Life 2001–1968', Espai d'Art Contemporani de Castello, Valencia (2003); 'The Everyday Altered', (curated by Gabriel Orozco) 50th Venice Biennale (2003). Other exhibitions include: 'The Epic and the Everyday', Hayward Gallery, London (1994); 'Radical Scavengers: The Conceptual Vernacular in Recent American Art', Museum of Contemporary Art, Chicago (1994); 'The Art of the Everyday: France in the Nineties', Grey Art Gallery and Study Center, New York (1997); 'Snapshots: The Photography of Everyday Life 1888 – Present', San Francisco Museum of Modern Art (1998); 'Experiments in the Everyday: Allan Kaprow and Robert Watts: Events, Objects, Documents', Wallach Art Gallery, Columbia University, New York (1999); 'Definition of Everyday', 2nd Prague Biennial (2003); 'Days Like These', Tate Britain (2003); 'Everyday: Contemporary Art from Japan China, Korea and Thailand' Kunstforeningen, Copenhagen (2003); 'The Interventionists: User's Manual for the Creative Disruption of Everyday Life', Massachusetts Museum of Contemporary Art, North Adams, Massachusetts (2004); 'Art, Design and Everything Else', 6th Shanghai Biennale (2005); 'An Image Bank for Everyday Revolutionary Life', Roy and Edna Disney CalArts Theater, Los Angeles (2006); 'Spinnwebzeit: Die ebay-Vernetzung' ('Spinning the Web: The e-bay Connection'), Museum für Moderne Kunst, Frankfurt am Main (2006); 'Homework', Gagosian Gallery, Berlin, 4th Berlin Biennale for Contemporary Art (2006); 'Everyday Laughter' section, 'All About Laughter: Humour in Contemporary Art', The Mori Art Museum, Tokyo (2007); 'Everyday People, Twentieth-Century Photographs from the Menil Collection', Menil Collection, Houston, Texas (2007).
- 2 David Ross and Nicholas Serota, 'Quotidiana', in this collection.
- 3 Geoff Dyer on Richard Wentworth, in this collection.
- 4 Kristin Ross, 'French Quotidian', in *The Art of the Everyday* (1997, see bibliography) 28.
- 5 Boris Groys, in *Peter Fischli and David Weiss, Swiss Pavilion, XLVI Venice Biennale* (1995).
- 6 Steven Harris and Deborah Berke, *The Architecture of the Everyday* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton Architectural Press, 1997) 3.
- 7 John Roberts, 'Mad For It', in this collection.
- 8 Ivone Margulies, 'Nothing Happens', in this collection.
- 9 Rebecca J. DeRo, *The Museum Establishment and Contemporary Art: The Politics of Artistic*

- Display in France after 1968* (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 2006) 2.
- 10 Jose Miguel G. Cortes, Introduction, in Juan Vincente Aliaga, et al., *Micropolitics: Art and Everyday Life 2001–1968* (Valencia: Espai d'Art Contemporani de Castello, 2003).
- 11 See John Roberts, *Philosophizing the Everyday: Revolutionary Praxis and the Fate of Cultural Theory* (London: Pluto Press, 2006) 1.
- 12 Michael Sheringham, *Everyday Life: Theories and Practices from Surrealism to the Present* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006).
- 13 See Roberts, *Philosophizing the Everyday*, op. cit., 1. On the centrality of the everyday to Russian avant-garde, Surrealist and German photographic culture see John Roberts, *The Art of Interruption. Realism, Photography and the Everyday* (1998). On Surrealism see Michael Sheringham, op. cit., Michael Gardner, *Critiques of Everyday Life* (2000); and Roberts, op. cit. On Mass-Observation see Ben Highmore, *Everyday Life and Cultural Theory* (2002); On Lefebvre see Stuart Elden, *Understanding Henri Lefebvre* (2004); Rob Shields, *Lefebvre, Love and Struggle* (1999). On design see Andrew Blauvelt, *Strangely Familiar: Design and Everyday Life* (2003). On cultural studies see Elizabeth B. Silva and Tony Bennett, *Contemporary Culture and Everyday Life* (2004). And on aesthetics see Andrew Light and John M. Smith, *The Aesthetics of Everyday Life* (2005).
- 14 *Critique of Everyday Life* (1961) vol. 2 (London: Verso, 2002) 3.
- 15 Lefebvre, *Everyday Life in the Modern World* (New York: Harper & Row, 1971) 2–3.
- 16 Lefebvre, 'Clearing The Ground' in *Critique of Everyday Life* (1961), vol 2 (London: Verso, 2002) 47; reprinted in this collection.
- 17 Watkins, in this collection.
- 18 Harris and Berke use an almost identical language in the introduction to *The Architecture of the Everyday* (op. cit.): 'the hegemony of structuralism and its derivatives' they assert, coincided with the 'virtual abandonment of architecture's social and political ambitions and the estrangement of direct experience from architectural discourse'. Clearly, the rise of the everyday in contemporary art is part of a much larger picture and connects not just with architectural discourse, but also with wider changes and transformations in the social sciences and humanities over the past thirty years. In his recent book about the centrality of the idea of everyday life in postwar French culture, Michael Sheringham goes so far as to suggest that in the 'new cross-disciplinary academic world, the everyday becomes the litmus test of viability' (Sheringham, op. cit., 295). This arises because, firstly 'the end of the structuralist embargo on subjectivity and reference' emphasizes lived experience, and secondly a turn to 'new ways of looking at the concrete human subject at grips with experience' brings with it 'a desire to escape from disciplinary pigeonholes' (Ibid., 300).
- 19 See also Highmore, Introduction, *The Everyday Life Reader* (2002) and 'Rough Poetry: *Patio and Pavilion Revisited*', *Oxford Art Journal*, vol. 29, no. 2 (Spring 2006) 269–73.
- 20 Allan McCollum, 'Allen Ruppertsberg: What One Loves about Life are the Things that Fade', in *Allen Ruppertsberg* (Limousin: Fonds regional d'art contemporain de Limousin, 2001) 20.
- 21 Annette Messenger, 'Patchwork' (1976) in *Word for Word* (2006, see bibliography).