

Snare

by

Caitlin O’Keeffe-Almond

B.F.A, Emily Carr University of Art & Design, 2017

Project Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Fine Arts

in the

School for the Contemporary Arts
Faculty of Communication, Art and Technology

© Caitlin O’Keeffe-Almond 2020

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

Summer 2020

Copyright in this work rests with the author. Please ensure that any reproduction or re-use is done in accordance with the relevant national copyright legislation.

Declaration of Committee

Name: Caitlin O’Keeffe Almond

Degree: Master of Fine Arts

Title: Snare

Committee: **Chair:** Peter Dickinson
Professor, Contemporary Arts

Allyson Clay
Supervisor
Professor Emeritus, Contemporary Arts

Elsbeth Pratt
Committee Member
Associate Professor, Contemporary Arts

Anne Ramsden
Examiner
Associate Professor
University of Quebec at Montreal

Abstract

Snare (2020), explores the entangled relationship between visibility, concealment, and the domestic sphere as a site of artistic production. Through the use of pattern, painting and sculpture, *Snare* takes on the form and function of the decorative screen as a spatial partition, engaging transitive painting practices, the installation features five large sculptures and nine small oil paintings. This research has been concerned with the historical devaluation of decorative arts, ornamentation, the home as a site of artistic production and the military implications of pattern. *Snare* asks the viewer to consider the boundaries between the public and the private, and to ask what happens when the domestic is transported within the walls of a public gallery space? *Snare* employs ornamentation, interiority and exteriority to both obscure and reveal vital materialities.

Keywords: Domestic Art; Screen; Camouflage; Interiority; Painting; Sculpture

Snare is dedicated in loving memory of Angela O'Keeffe

Acknowledgements

I respectfully acknowledge that the following research was conducted within the unceded, traditional and ancestral territories of the xwməθkwəy'əm, Skwxwú7mesh, and Səl̓ílwətał Nations.

Special thanks to

Allyson Clay and Elspeth Pratt for their unceasing patience.

Erin Hofmann for your infinite kindness and studio support.

Andrew Curtis, Claudette Lauzon, Steven Hill, Melanie O'Brian, and Peter Dickinson.

Table of Contents

Declaration of Committee.....	ii
Abstract.....	iii
Dedication.....	iv
Acknowledgements.....	v
Table of Contents.....	vi
List of Figures.....	vii
Defense Statement.....	1
Introduction.....	1
The Domestic Sphere.....	2
Misrecognition.....	7
Contextual Gestures.....	9
Unclosed.....	17
References.....	20
Appendix. Research Paper. Fall 2019.....	22
References.....	29

List of Figures

Figure 1. Green Velvet.....	6
Figure 2. Installation View.....	9
Figure 3. Installation View.....	13
Figure 4. Log Cabin.....	16
Figure 5. Installation View.....	17
Figure 6. Installation Detail.....	18

Defense Statement

Introduction

My graduating project, entitled *Snare*, explores the entangled relationship between visibility, concealment, and the domestic sphere as a site of artistic production. Through the use of pattern, painting and sculpture, *Snare* takes on the form and function of the decorative screen, featuring five large sculptures, made of wood, plaster and canvas. The sculptural works in the exhibition are accompanied by nine oil paintings on both canvas and paper, establishing a dialogue between sculpture and painting. The sculptural elements are arranged within the Bartlett gallery to physically direct the viewer by creating pathways in the space which obstruct and obscure, screening what the viewer may and may not see.

Irregular and warped open-grid sculptures obtrude from the gallery floor; coated in excessive layers of dripping plaster and paint, the screens precariously negotiate form and formlessness¹. The excessive and vigorously worked media refer to the work of Alberto Giacometti, Rebecca Warren and Franz West. The textured surface of the screens is painted in dense and highly saturated all-over textile patterns like tartan, chevron and gingham, mimicking the texture and effect of thickly applied oil paint. The excessive material application buries the true structure and form of the screens. It is in this act of burying and concealing form that new form and formlessness is constituted, which in turn, refers to the process of painting, in which underpaintings are concealed, buried underneath layers of paint, to reveal new content. The form of the screens is further obscured through the painting process.

My use of textile patterns refers to the domestic environment in which decorative handcrafted screens are usually encountered, and plays with the notion of the screen as a domestic object, maintaining a structural function of division and concealment within

¹ I use the term formlessness as a means to describe the materiality of plaster, plaster as a material is in flux, changing from powder, to liquid, to rock-like solid form. I employ it here, not as a means to cast or mold form, but as a material gesture, invoking the unstructured, inchoate, amorphous materiality of plaster.

the home. Handcrafted decorative screens date back to eighth century AD in China², and were later adopted in Japan. Particularly popular was the Japanese 'Fusuma' or sliding door screen, and the 'Byobu' or folding screen, which would eventually be adapted and cannibalized by western modernist artists, like Henri Matisse, Felix Vallotton, Pierre Bonnard, and Maurice Denis. My research has been concerned with the ways in which the decorative screen is able to structurally institute difference between the public and the private, and the social and the intimate through decoration. The works included in this exhibition were informed by military applications of pattern, transitive painting, and the history of domestic art. Looking at the home as a site of artistic production, I will be reflecting on my own production of my graduating work at home. *Snare* asks the viewer to consider the boundaries between the public and the private, and to ask what happens when the domestic is transported within the walls of a public gallery space? Simultaneously employing form and formlessness, *Snare* employs ornamentation, interiority and exteriority to both obscure and reveal vital materialities, and question spatial hierarchies of the domestic.

The Domestic Sphere

My research throughout my graduate degree has been concerned with domestic labour, the historical devaluation of decorative arts, ornamentation, the military implications of pattern, and curatorial activism. Previously in my practice, I was exploring domestic signifiers and historical paintings, focusing on developing a painting practice that investigated colour, form and pattern as content while exploring material ephemerality³ through both medium and support. After developing a series of still life paintings, and large drawings of domestic and intimate interiors, this developing motif in my work of depicting or relying on signifiers of domesticity (curtains, windows, fabric, furniture etc.), revealed to me an underlying interest in the relationship between objects and painting. This series of still-lives developed into a series of sculptures which sought to explore and develop the objecthood of my painted subjects. A series of three

² Historically, Chinese screens were intended as partitions, while the Japanese folding screens, were used in a more decorative fashion, as a type of furnishing which not only demarcated private and public space but served as a decorative element (due to pattern and hand painting).

³ I use this term "material ephemerality" in reference to using materials and techniques that are impermanent and accelerate decay and fragility. For example; painting with oils directly onto unprimed delicate surfaces, using non-lightfast pigments etc.

sculptures, *Dusty Rose* (2019), *La-Z-Boy* (2019), and *A Room of One's Own* (2019), endeavored to ask painterly questions through sculpture and installation. In applying painted pattern directly onto handcrafted forms, the series explored the literal assertion of the objecthood of painting and inadvertently entered into a conversation with craft, prompting my research into the ideological construction of femininity and its conflation with domesticity and interiority.

Much of my research has focused on unravelling the processes by which domestic art has been and continues to be diminished and devalued simply by virtue of its subject matter or the sphere in which it was produced. It was out of this research that I conceived of my graduating project *Snare*. My interest in pattern, concealment, craft and domesticity, all seemed to culminate within this one seemingly benign household object, the room divider, or decorative screen as I refer to it. An inconspicuous domestic object such as the screen, can operate as both a 2D painting surface, and a 3D object with a structural spatial purpose. My practice is motivated by an interest in developing an installation in which works could speak to and of one another, where painting and sculpture could not only co-exist but materially and spatially converge, establishing a network of transitive exchange, in which works could converse with one another across disciplinary formations. In asking, what happens when painting leaves the frame, what are the boundaries of painting, and can it leave the wall behind and physically take form within a space, I looked to pattern and craft as both a connective and transitional means of inquiry.

In Rozsika Parker and Griselda Pollock's pivotal text *Old Mistresses: Women, Art and Ideology* from 1981⁴, Parker and Pollock trace the processes by which women's art was socially and ideologically segregated and canonically devalorized due to sexual difference. The ideological marginalization of women's art was cemented during the 18th and 19th century, contributed to by continual educational segregation and conservative Victorian familial ideals which confined women to domestic spheres. It is this relegation

⁴ Rozsika Parker and Griselda Pollock's pivotal text, deconstructs the notion of the artist as 'male', and examines the canonical devaluation of women artists, sexual divisionism, and the construction of the feminine within art. Parker posits that "By simply celebrating a separate heritage we risk losing sight of one of the most important aspects of the history of women and art, the intersection in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries of the development of an ideology of femininity, that is, a social definition of women and their role, with the emergence of a clearly defined separation of art and craft." (Parker 58).

of women to the domestic realm, that effectually de-professionalized⁵ their artistic output, and precluded the possibility of working in other artistic mediums such as sculpture or painting (due to the demands of scale, often these activities could not be done in the home). In this paradigm, production by men is privileged over production by women, based on the location or sphere in which work is produced. Women's work made in the home is thus rationalized as being domestic art and thereby less culturally valuable. It is this division of spheres of production which ultimately contributed to the hierarchical division between fine arts (what occurs in the public sphere) and crafts (that which occurs in the home), subsequently aligning crafts with femininity and pejorative notions of the decorative.

It is these pejorative notions which linger and proliferate within contemporary art criticism and curatorial practices, this stigmatization of craft and women's art is reflected not only by its continual omission from the western canon but indicated by subject oriented exhibitions which aim to revise and fill canonical gaps. This persistence of the Western canon's devaluation of domestic art and decorative arts is evinced by the recent resurgence of interest in craft and the decorative arts within museum exhibitions⁶. This surge of decorative arts focused exhibitions in 2019, indicates a trend in curatorial activism⁷. Curatorial Activism is a curatorial trend oriented around resistance, with the aim of employing counter-hegemonic strategies to revise the exclusions of the Western

⁵ In confining women to the home, their source material and influences were severely delimited. Women were not only encouraged to depict imagery which reflected conservative familial ideals, but in delimiting their art forms and forcing function to the forefront, ornamentation became an important means of increasing aesthetic value. Thereby, conflating ornamentation with domestic art. Ornamentation itself carries connotations of excess. To ornament something is to add supplementary detail, implying that there is an implicit deficiency. The notion of excess attributed to ornamental detail has contributed to its conflation with the domestic sphere, femininity and decadence, and its subsequent designation as a minor or non-art form.

⁶ *"With Pleasure: Pattern and Decoration in American Art 1972–1985"* Opened in October 2019 - May 2020 at the Museum of Contemporary Art, Los Angeles (LA MoCA), *Making Knowing: Craft in Art, 1950–2019* opened at the Whitney museum in New York on November 22nd, 2019, *MAD Collects: The Future of Craft Part 1* was on view from Sep 6–Mar 31, 2019 at the Museum of Arts and Design (MAD) in New York, *REVIVAL: Contemporary Pattern and Decoration* at the Bronx's Longwood Art Gallery @Hostos Centre for the Arts and Culture, was on view April 4 - June 6, 2018.

⁷ Lucy Lippard and Maura Reilly advocate for the relational approach to curation in Reilly's text *Curatorial Activism: Towards an Ethics of Curating* (2018) positing that the relational approach is perhaps the most ethical approach to curating contemporary art in that it disrupts the Eurocentric centre/periphery binary inherent to the additive approach, and eludes the ghettoizing effects of the singular voice of area studies through its focus on developing transnational and cross cultural polylogues.

canon. One such approach is area studies, this popular curatorial strategy of resistance, aims to produce new canons. Area studies produces new canons through a focussed curatorial examination of a singular subject or marginalized group, like race, sexuality, women artists or domestic art etc., which operates outside of the dominant centre (patriarchal white male centre). While area study exhibitions are integrative, and often well researched examinations of a subject, in separating from the canon they risk becoming culturally or biologically essentialist and ghettoizing. While exhibitions like these are nonetheless interesting and informative, they fail to grapple with the terms of exclusion that deemed them necessary. In *Differencing the Canon: Feminist Desire and the Writing of Art's Histories* (1999), Griselda Pollock illustrates that

“Such cultural practices that are typically downgraded because they are (mis)identified with the domestic, the decorative, the utilitarian, the dexterous – that is with what patriarchal logic negatively characterizes as quintessentially ‘feminine’ – appear as merely instances of difference, and paradoxically confirm (rather than afflict) the canonical – normative – status of other practices by men. This is a prime instance of being trapped in a binary where reverse valuation of what has hitherto been devalued does not ultimately breach the value system at all.” (Pollock 25).

In curating women focussed or decorative art focussed exhibitions, the marginalized work is envisioned as being revalorized, however this “revalorization” occurs within this specific field, remaining separate and secondary, this concept of reverse valuation does not breach the exclusionary value system, but remains trapped within the binary by virtue of separation. In this way, area study exhibitions like the recent decorative arts focussed exhibitions at LaMoCa and the Whitney, actually reinforce gendered relations within the home, gendering the home as a site of artistic production and re-establishing the conflation of femininity with domesticity. Although Pollock’s text is now more than twenty years old, these issues of separate histories and separate spheres of production remain relevant and persist within contemporary art today, issues which have become a motivating force behind my graduating project.

Unexpectedly, my research of the secondary status of domestic art, and spheres of production, suddenly became much more personal and pertinent to my work. In the midst of making my graduating project, a global pandemic was declared. In the short span of a few weeks, I no longer had access to my studio space and my studies and graduating project, came to a sudden halt, along with the rest of the world. Forced to relocate my artistic production to inside my home, I was able to experience the

limitations of working from home firsthand. In shifting my artistic production from the public sphere of the studio, into the domestic private sphere of my home. I now had to adapt to the constraints of my new space, my paintings shrank in size, I was able to work only in a small scale (16 x 20 inches), and I was compelled to work in short fast bursts. However, out of this displacement, my paintings developed into a focused vision, in relocating my artistic practice to my home, my painting practice seemed to be reinvigorated. In working from an in home studio space, domestic life and materials were able to directly inform my practice. Rather than merely influencing my work, domestic materials around my home were able to operate as direct source materials. In negotiating the home as a site of artistic production, my new paintings were able to explore the notions of domestic labour which I have been researching and writing about in a much more personal way. The paintings featured in *Snare* were all created from home, and reflect a certain degree of intimacy and immediacy.



Figure 1. Green Velvet, 2020.

Misrecognition

During my early research of pattern in the studio, I came across the concept of dazzle camouflage. My studio work at the time examined spatial flatness within pattern and explored camouflage in its tradition sense, of concealing form and blending in within an environment. Painting images of chairs and other domestic objects that appeared to be melting into curtains and wallpaper, I became curious about the relationship, (if there was any) between domestic environments and camouflage. In thinking about these ideas of visibility, concealment and safety affiliated with notions of home, I began researching dazzle camouflage. Research which would eventually lead me to my inquiry of misrecognition and interiority, and frame my understanding of the domestic realm and its conflation with femininity. Dazzle camouflage employed disruptive coloration and the collaging of geometric patterns as a means of obscuring the form of both naval and merchant ships, the sheer visibility of the bold contrasting patterns was elemental to the success of dazzle as a defensive strategy. The disruptive coloration of dazzle aimed to misinform the optical perception of U-boat captains of enemy submarines;

“Transforming a thing of the profoundest military signification – a warship – into something optically meaningless. Abstraction of the mid-twentieth century could – and did – misinform courtesy of its transformation from an optical thing of aesthetic self-signification into an ideologically loaded weapon.” (McElroy 23).

Both English Vorticism and common textile patterns like stripes, zig zags and chevron patterns are visible influences in the development and form of dazzle. Pattern, which is simultaneously both mundane and intimate, is made so familiar by its ubiquitous presence as an aesthetic decorative element in clothing, magazines, art and domestic textiles – the very trappings of domestic habitation. Pattern, thereby signifies that it belongs to an interior domestic sphere, constructing interiority through its familiarity. Interiority in this sense, is defined as that which is either recognized as, physically or imagined to be contained or sheltered, suggesting domesticity, interiority presents the possibility of occupation.

These notions of exteriority, interiority and visibility of pattern, were amplified in World War II through the camouflaging of gun emplacements as domestic architecture. Gun emplacements in particular, were often disguised as domestic spaces of habitation

through the use of painted canvas coverings, and exterior faux finishes. During the Second World War in New Zealand, the government disguised their gun emplacements along the coastline as holiday homes⁸. This military application of ornamentation and domestic architecture articulates a latently insidious implication for the notion of 'home', in which the socially conditioned notion of home as a place of safety, comfort and asylum is apprehended and tactically invoked to obscure violence and political gains. Camouflage is positioned by architectural theorist Dr. Christine McCarthy⁹ in her text "Camouflage: Military Upholstery and Interior Disguise" (2002), as a tactic which does not rely on misrepresentation but instead relies on misrecognition. Camouflage, she writes, is

"Not an attempt to construct the implements of violence and war as harmless and safe. It is an attempt to construct them as if they were not there and as if they were not hidden. The gun (the literal interior of the crudely rendered house) is hidden because it is misrecognized as architecture." (McCarthy 324).

Camouflaging as a defensive strategy has a long history of employing painting and illusionism to turn two-dimensional spaces and objects into three-dimensional architectural forms. Decorative and architectural elements were deployed to signify domesticity, rather than a military presence, much like dazzle camouflage, this defensive strategy relied on misidentification.

"The domestic space this camouflage scheme attracts, repels the utter exteriority of the two-dimensional surface image, inferring interiority and the possibilities of space and habitation. Rather than assuming the domestic nature of the interior, the two-dimensional dummy buildings disguise the fact that space and the three dimensional are flat and two dimensional." (McCarthy 328).

This militarized construction of interiority through patterned and painted canvas covers, functions in a sense as upholstery, mimicking the interior tradition of covering domestic furnishings with patterned textiles (like bedspreads, tablecloths, wall hangings etc).

⁸ Gun emplacements disguised as holiday homes were located in Castor Bay, St Kilda and Bluff in New Zealand. Disguised by the addition of beach umbrellas, painted windows and "By the addition of timber and canvas lean-tos and pitched roofs. Weatherboards and windows were painted on the sides of the houses, and gun barrels poked coyly out of the front doors. (McCarthy 321).

⁹ Christine McCarthy holds a PhD in Architecture and is a senior lecturer of interior architecture at the University of Victoria, Wellington, New Zealand. Her scholarly research examines architectural representation, interior architecture theory (defining interiority), and interior archaeology.



Figure 2. Installation View.

Contextual Gestures

The division between fine arts and craft, public and private spheres of production, and military uses of upholstery and pattern inform the ways in which contemporary artists are addressing these same notions of interiority, exteriority and visibility. Many contemporary women artists working with traditional craft media are reclaiming the same signifiers of domesticity which were previously exploited by early twentieth century painters. Signifiers such as decorative screens, woven carpets, curtains, ceramics and

embroidery are becoming quite prevalent in the practices of women artists such as the late Miriam Schapiro¹⁰ and Betty Woodman, and contemporary artists Anne Low and Michelle Grabner¹¹. In contextualizing this project against a gendered history of craft, and the military implications of the application of pattern, I looked to the work of these women artists to visually inform my work.

Anne Low is a Canadian artist whose practice focusses specifically on traditional craft techniques and domestic objects, concerned with the production of domesticity, Low's work refers to the ideological construction and fusing of femininity with the decorative arts. One of Low's recent works titled *Grubby* made in 2018, is a fireplace screen - intended to be placed in front of an empty hearth to conceal any unsightly remnants. Employing traditional craft techniques and materials, *Grubby* is made with handwoven silk, and embroidered with thread and sequins, depicting a comical illustration of a smiling sun.

Michelle Grabner is an established American artist, whose previous work in painting explored the deployment of domesticity through pattern. Michelle Grabner's matter of fact approach to pattern and methodology of working have helped to ground my exploration of pattern and the grid as an underlying structural device. In her work, pattern is employed as a means of focusing on the act and form of repetition itself. Grabner's recent work has taken on the sculptural form of bronzed blankets, displayed on varying heights of plinths, they operate visually and structurally within the space as individual decorative screens. Grabner's bronzed screens subvert the expectation of interiority and softness inherent to the form of the woven blanket through its juxtaposition against the harsh materiality of the bronze surface texture. Occupying a shifting territory, this textural effect of the hard bronzed surface of the crochet blanket (what should be

¹⁰ Miriam Schapiro's concept of the "Femmage" is a gesture of feminist appropriation, privileging a feminist vocabulary. Femmage collages together images, forms and patterns with the use of traditional craft techniques, like embroidery and patchwork. Her work was directly influenced by the arts and crafts movement, she became one of the foremost artists associated with both the pattern and decoration movement, and feminist art movement.

¹¹ Michelle Grabner is the chair of the School of the Art Institute of Chicago's painting and drawing department, While, Grabner is primarily a painter, her paper works and specifically paper weavings amount to a significant portion of her practice, they demonstrate her disinterest in the content of the pattern. Demonstrating that her interest lies in the act of repetition and of copying pattern, and that her use of the pattern relates more to its readiness within her domestic environment.

soft), subverts the expectation of softness associated with the material form of crochet, simultaneously, it conjures notions of interiority and exteriority to the surface of the work.

Informed by Grabner's recent sculptural works, my studio practice has therefore sought to formulate and advance a vocabulary of materially driven surface gestures, which would, according to Gaston Bachelard¹², develop "two kinds of space, intimate and exterior space" which would in turn "keep encouraging each other, as it were, in their growth, to designate space that has been experienced as affective space." (Bachelard 218). This materially driven interaction between intimate and exterior space within Michelle Grabner's work occurs differently in the work of Betty Woodman. Betty Woodman, whose sprawling career as a well-recognized ceramicist and sculptor, and whose practice developed out of the pattern and decoration movement of the mid 1970's and early 1980's, collapses material distinctions between disciplines in her work. Woodman's practice merges the two dimensionality of painting, and three dimensionality of ceramics. Influenced by Etruscan ceramics, Henri Matisse, Pierre Bonnard and Paul Gauguin, Woodman's work coalesces the boundaries of form; objects and paintings are unified through uninterrupted pattern and composition. In Woodman's installations her works are not separate pieces, they are proto-transitive installations in which she sets up relationships between high art and craft. In this way, her installations operate as a network of objects speaking of and to one another, intersecting materially and affectively within spaces. Woodman's 3D forms, composed almost as painterly assemblages, simultaneously, together and apart, institute a dialogue with her 2D works, generating affective space through their installation.

Snare (2019-2020) is an installation which started as a sculptural exploration of painting and its relationship to the frame, endeavoring to engage painting outside of the picture plane by asking, what happens when painting leaves the wall and occupies space? My work draws on what David Joselit suggests in his essay *Painting Beside Itself*¹³, in which he introduces the idea of transitivity in painting. "Transitive painting, [...]"

¹² In *The Poetics of Space*, Gaston Bachelard frames the home phenomenologically as a space of poetic intimacy. Bachelard posits that objects within the home, or architectural elements, like the attic or basement are imbued with memory and experience, able to both reveal and conceal meaning.

¹³ In David Joselit's 2009 essay entitled "Painting Beside Itself" for *October* magazine, Joselit posits that painting is able to avoid the trap of reification by acknowledging the network of circulation and

invents forms and structures whose purpose is to demonstrate that once an object enters a network, it can never be fully stilled, but only subjected to different material states.” (Joselit 132). Developing out of the historical entrapment of traditional 2D painting practices, transitive painting calls for more transgressive possibilities for the medium. Transitive painting, according to Joselit is the acknowledgement and demonstration of painting’s role as an object within an open network of exchange, visualizing painting as a system of transitive passages of interactive actions occurring both independently and spatially. In considering these notions of transitivity and open networks of interactive behaviors and actions of objects, I turned my attention to the issue of translation between mediums.

My first step in my research was to begin by developing a series of sketches of organic and warped grid-like forms which would form the basis of my prototype screen, a prototype which would be not only a surface for painting, but a 3D household object with a specific history and structural function. Positioned throughout the Bartlett gallery, both on the floor and on plinths¹⁴, are five 5x5 foot plaster structures, each weighing over 300 pounds. Each is differently vividly painted with red stripes, orange and green chevron, blue and green tartan, blue lace, and rich yellow and ochre gingham patterns. Pattern and paint struggle to negotiate with the irregular form and gritty surface texture of the imposing structures. These large wooden structures, which have been wrapped in layers of canvas and burlap until the framework beneath is distorted by the layers of fabric, are then covered in several layers of plaster, thickly and roughly applied by hand. The pliant fabric is instantaneously transformed into a hard rocklike unyielding surface, dimpled and dotted with drips, fingerprints, and trace elements now fossilized within the plaster.

commodification in which the medium is complicit, Joselit visualizes a network of transitive passages between works and their social/spatial contexts.

¹⁴ In the installation of *Snare*, three screens were displayed atop of plinths, and two screens were displayed directly on the gallery floor. I used plinths in this iteration of the work as a means to extend the work, employing the plinths as an extension which exaggerated the works’ height and allowed for a more imposing presence. Influenced by the installations of both Betty Woodman and Michelle Grabner, I had envisioned using plinths of varying heights, in addition to having some works directly on the floor. In Grabner’s work she uses plinths of varying size and heights, supporting both paintings and sculptures, used to this effect, they seemingly affirm paintings as sculptures thereby establishing a dialogue between painted and sculptural works. In the next iteration of *Snare*, I would replace my use of plinths with vinyl patterned floor tiles. The vinyl floor tiles would function as a type of flattened plinth from which the sculptures could emerge. Creating an illusion of the patterned sculpture emerging out of the patterned tile. Displayed on floor tiles, the screens would operate more closely to that of domestic object within a domestic interior rather than referring to the historical affiliations of sculpture and the plinth.

Once dry, the structures were able to be erected upright from the floor, transitioning in this shift of orientation into screens. Painted one by one in bold contrasting colours and patterns, the screens borrow patterns from common household textiles.



Figure 3. Installation View

Gathered together in the space, their all-over patterns tessellate, visually disrupting both their individual and communal forms. At a distance, the screens mimic the effects of dazzle camouflage - patterns and colours merge together, distorting form through their all-over painted patterns, influencing and disrupting what the viewer does and doesn't see. *Snare* relies on the viewer's physical position to produce meaning, the paintings and the screens interact differently, from different positions. Rather than passively moving through the space looking at distinct and individual works of art, the viewer is instead asked by the installation itself to inhabit the space. Accompanying the screens within the gallery space, are nine relatively small (20 x 16 inches) oil paintings on canvas and paper, hung at varying levels throughout the space so that they can be viewed and obscured through the frame of the screens. Studies of pattern, the paintings depict abstracted fragments of pattern, like chevron and paisley and elements of foliage. Hung at differing levels through the space, the paintings seek to eschew a fixed relationship to the wall. Instead they work to institute an active relationship with the space and the sculptural works within it, reflecting and negating the form of the screens by virtue of

their colour, pattern or placement within the space. In obscuring viewpoints, the screens in this way refute visibility, refuting the immediacy of consumption, they instead demand participation from the viewer. Participation becomes a performative gesture, in which the viewer is forced to interact with the work, *vis-à-vis* the work's *own* conditions and terms of viewing. Forcing the act of close looking, the installation demands participation in exchange for visibility, prompting a series of transitive actions and behaviors between the viewer, the space and the objects. Thereby enacting David Joselit's notion of transitive painting through this network of unstable relationships and unfixed meanings, establishing a relationship between the interiority of painting and the exteriority of the frame and the boundaries of moderation.

Defining interiority¹⁵ itself is challenging. It is that which is opposed to the *exterior*, but unlike *interior*, interiority is not grounded. Interiority is an abstract quality that is fluid and shifts precariously across meanings. Interiority is exclusion as much as it is inclusion, and implies that there are boundaries, that there is containment. The possibility of interiority implies with certitude the presence of exteriority. Interiority occurs when boundaries are instituted to contain space, and shelter the space from the exterior world, creating a space of control, familiarity and safety through exclusion. These boundaries moderate exteriority. In containing and sheltering space from the external world, visibility becomes limited, interiority becomes sheltered, contained and concealed. It is not simply a physical relationship between the outside and the inside, exteriority and interiority are not discrete or mutually exclusive detached concepts simply divided by boundaries. Rather, they are an interwoven set of relations, occurring in parallel to one another, becoming a porous place of transformative and shifting signification.

In considering my studio research within these definitions of interiority and exteriority, exteriority becomes akin to what Sigmund Freud describes as the *Unheimlich* in his 1919 essay *The Uncanny*. *Unheimlich*- which literally translates into English as "unhomely" (but semantically it is commonly translated as uncanny), and *heimlich*

¹⁵ In "Toward a Definition of Interiority."(2005), Christine McCarthy attempts to define the immaterial characteristics of interiority, positing that interiority is not predicated upon architectural containment nor is it an absolute condition, but a set of unstable interrelated relations.

translating as “homely”. The unhomely according to Freud, refers to that which is unfamiliar, frightening, eerie or unknown –

“What gives the *unheimlich* its terrifying power over the psyche is the fact that it is actually a condition of the *Heimlich*, to the extent that *Heimlich*, a word that denotes familiarity and safe enclosure, also bears within it connotations of withdrawal, concealment, secrecy, even danger. Thus *Heimlich*, Freud concludes, “is a word the meaning of which develops in the direction of ambivalence, until it firmly coincides with its opposite, *unheimlich*.”¹⁶ (Lauzon 22).

In this way, the homely and unhomely do not exist in opposition to each other but exist simultaneously. What is unsettling is that the presence of one implies the existence of “the other”. This notion of the *unheimlich* quietly lurking within the interiority of domestic objects is a current issue in my work. By virtue of their containment within the home, domestic objects unsettle seemingly stable notions of safety and intimacy, constantly threatening to reveal the boundaries of interiority. This relationship between the homely/interiority and the unhomely/exteriority is at the heart of my studio research, operational in negotiating the relationship between painting and sculpture. The boundaries between sculpture and painting become a point of intimate contact and transition, the surfaces across which interiority/homely and exteriority/unhomely exchange values, becoming a liminal threshold of exchange.

¹⁶ In *Breaking and Entering: The Contemporary House Cut, Spliced, and Haunted* (2015) edited by Dr. Bridget Elliot, Claudette Lauzon poses that the *unheimlich* is the “Underbelly of the uncanny: where the uncanny is associated with exposing the demons that haunt from within, therefore facilitating reflection on the limits of home’s status as both site and source of domestic bliss and safety, the unhomely invokes the constant threat of external intrusion.” (Lauzon 23), employing the term to account for geopolitical displacement.



Figure 4. Log Cabin, 2020.



Figure 5. Installation View.

Unclosed

Driven by an impulse to fragment and conceal form through the application of pattern, *Snare* employs the visual tactics of dazzle camouflage, applying pattern to both 2D surfaces and 3D forms. Fragmented pattern becomes a means to engage painting outside of the picture plane, invoking the interiority of painting through the form and function of the decorative screen as a spatial partition. Intrigued by the tenets of transitive painting, I devised an installation in which sculptural surface could become painterly surface, visualizing a network of interactions between works and their material and spatial contexts. The works in this exhibition set out to examine the instability of interiority embedded within pattern. Pattern becomes a relentless repetition of interiority, shielding the duplicity of the unhomely through the safety of familiarity.



Figure 6. Installation Detail

In *Snare*, pattern becomes a form of translation, acting as the interlocutor between mediums, it stretches across surfaces, giving that which is flat form, and flattening that which is form. Caught between the sculptural and painting, painted surface within the installation aims to hold pattern, colour and form in suspension, enacting what Joselit proposes is: “What defines transitive painting [...] is its capacity to hold in suspension the passages internal to a canvas, and those external to it.”(Joselit 129). In this sense, boundaries within the works of this installation are held in suspension, suspended in an open network of exchange, unable to close, unable to resolve. The works in this installation do not ask for resolution but instead desire openness and space. Suspended between interiority and exteriority, meaning is left unresolved without closure, implicating the works within an unceasing network of exchange, suspended in transit.

The future development of *Snare* will seek to further the transitive relationship between the interiority and exteriority of painting, endeavoring to create active networks between objects in which; “Imagination, memory, and perception exchange functions. The image is created through co-operation between real and the unreal, with the help of

the functions of the real and the unreal” (Bachelard 79). Infusing ideologies of camouflage, and transitive painting into the structural and conceptual form of the decorative screen as a spatial partition, *Snare* envisions boundaries as a point of transit, transforming the surface of the screen into a threshold of exchange.

References

- Alfoldy, Sandra., Editor. *Neocraft: Modernity And The Crafts*. Halifax: The Press of the Nova Scotia College of Art and Design, 2007.
- “Anne Low: Chair for a Woman.” *Contemporary Art Gallery*
<https://www.contemporaryartgallery.ca/exhibitions/anne-low-chair-for-a-woman/>
Accessed 20 July 2020.
- Bachelard, Gaston. *The Poetics of Space*. New York: Penguin Books, 2014.
- Broude, Norma., Editor. *Feminism and Art History: Questioning the Litany*. New York: Harper & Row, 1982.
- Broude, Norma, and Mary D. Garrard. "Miriam Schapiro (1923–2015)." *American Art* 29, no. 3 (2015): 132-35. Accessed June 3, 2020. doi:10.1086/684924.
- Elliott, Bridget., Editor. *Breaking and Entering: The Contemporary House Cut, Spliced, and Haunted*. Canada: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 2015.
- Elliott, Bridget and Janice Helland, Editors. *Women Artists and the Decorative Arts 1880-1935: The Gender of Ornament*. England: Ashgate, 2002.
- Forbes, Peter. *Dazzled and Deceived: Mimicry and Camouflage*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009.
- “Interiors Imagined: Folding Screens, Garments, and Clothing Stands.” *The Metropolitan Museum of Art*.
https://www.metmuseum.org/toah/hd/fold/hd_fold.htm Accessed 14 July 2020.
- Joselit, David. “Painting beside Itself.” *October*, vol. 130, 2009, pp. 125–134. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/40368572. Accessed 26 July 2020.
- Krauss, Rosalind. “Grids.” *October*, vol 9, 1979. 51-64. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/778321. Accessed 16 June 2020.
- Lippard, Lucy, and Maura Reilly. *Curatorial Activism: Towards an Ethics of Curating*. London: Thames and Hudson, 2018.
- McCarthy, Christine. “Camouflage: Military Upholstery and Interior Disguise.” *Space and Culture*, vol. 5, no. 4, Nov. 2002, pp. 320–332, doi:10.1177/1206331202005004001.
- McCarthy, Christine. “Toward a Definition of Interiority.” *Space and Culture*, vol. 8, no. 2, May 2005, pp. 112–125, doi:10.1177/1206331205275020.

- McElroy, Gil. *Razzle Dazzle: The Uses of Abstraction*. Ontario: Robert McLaughlin Gallery, 2008.
- "Michelle Grabner". *James Cohan Gallery*.
<https://www.jamescohan.com/artists/michelle-grabner?view=slider#26> Accessed 13 December 2019.
- Parker, Rozsika. *The Subversive Stitch: Embroidery and the Making of the Feminine*. London: I.B.Tauris, 2010.
- Parker, Rozsika and Griselda Pollock. *Old Mistresses: Women, Art and Ideology*. London: Pandora Press, 1981.
- Schor, Naomi. *Reading in Detail: Aesthetics and the Feminine*. New York: Routledge, 2007.
- Taylor, James. *Dazzle: Disguise and Disruption In War And Art*. England: London Press, 2016.
- Van Horn, Jennifer. "The Art of Concealment." In *The Power of Objects in Eighteenth-Century British America*, 273-341. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2017. Accessed June 6, 2020.
www.jstor.org/stable/10.5149/9781469629575_vanhorn.11.
- Vidler, Anthony. *The Architectural Uncanny: Essays In The Modern Unhomely*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1992.

Appendix.

Research Paper. Fall 2019.

Ornaments and decorative detail have historically been considered synonymous with aesthetics, perceived as operating simplistically as objects of beauty to be consumed for self-gratification and intellectually undemanding by nature. Ornamentation itself carries connotations of excess, to ornament something, is to add supplementary detail, implying that there is an implicit deficiency. This notion of excess attributed to ornamental detail has contributed to its conflation with the domestic sphere, femininity and decadence, and its subsequent designation as a minor or non-art form, has thus created a seemingly indissoluble division between 'fine arts' and 'craft'. Ornamentation, specifically pattern is a defining feature of the decorative and applied arts, which are often challenging to define and categorize due to the wide range of mediums and craft techniques. Pattern thus functions as a uniting element among applied arts – it is present despite the medium – it is a constant feature of craft and applied arts. Through exploring the secondary status accorded to craft objects and the exterior and interior uses of pattern in both military uses of upholstery and in the domestic sphere, this essay will focus on how pattern functions in craft objects as a means to both conceal and reveal through the deployment of domesticity. This essay will also look at how contemporary artists like Victoria Manganiello, Michelle Grabner and Anne Low are reclaiming traditional craft media, and visually exploring these issues of interiority, exteriority and visibility in contemporary craft art.

Before examining these issues of interiority, exteriority and visibility of pattern, it is important to contextualize the relationship between craft, femininity, and domesticity. In Rozsika Parker and Griselda Pollock's seminal text *Old Mistresses: Women, Art and Ideology* from 1981, Parker and Pollock trace the processes by which women's art was socially and ideologically segregated and canonically devalored due to sexual difference. The burgeoning ideological marginalization of women's art was cemented during the 18th and 19th century, particularly during the Victorian era. The continual educational segregation and conservative Victorian familial ideals confined women to domestic spheres. It is this relegation of women to the domestic realm, that effectually de-professionalized their artistic output, and precluded the possibility of

working in other artistic mediums such as sculpture or painting (due to the demands of scale, often these activities could not be done in the home). Instead, women were encouraged, to take up needlework - which was both aesthetically pleasing and functional, and prevented women from being 'idle'. In relocating and limiting women's artistic production to the domestic sphere, women's work became symbolically identified with nature. According to the anthropologist Claude Levi-Strauss's research;

"Analyses of myths and belief systems of many cultures have shown how differences in the status of objects, practices, customs and indeed groups of people depend on the place they are given on a symbolic scale from nature to culture. This scale provides one of the most important structures of differentiation by which human society represents, defines and evaluates its activities." (Parker 69).

A structure of difference is thus instituted between the public and private spheres, the public sphere is tied to professional pursuits and masculinity, thereby associated with culture. Women however, are designated closer to nature due to sexual difference and their socially relegated position within the domestic sphere. It is this structure of difference between the public and private spheres, that institutes and reaffirms the structure of sexual division in art. In this paradigm, the production of men is privileged over the production of women, based on the location or sphere in which work is produced. It is this sphere of production which often dictates the audience for whom the work is made, women's work made in the home, is thus rationalized as being domestic art and thereby less culturally valuable. Assigning domestic or craft art a secondary status compared to fine arts;

"The historical processes by which women came to specialize in certain kinds of art [...] have been obscured by the tendency to identify women with nature. Paintings of flowers and the women who painted them became mere reflections of each other. Fused into the prevailing notion of femininity, the painting becomes solely an extension of womanliness and the artist becomes a woman only fulfilling her nature. This effectively removes the paintings and the artists from the field of fine arts." (Parker 58).

The domestic sphere not only limited the range of mediums available to women, but also the subject matter accessible to them (and constrained them by what was socially deemed as appropriate for their work), delimiting women to working with; sewing, embroidery, miniatures, weaving and occasionally painting. It is this division of spheres of production which ultimately contributed to the hierarchical division between

fine arts (what occurs in the public sphere) and crafts (that which occurs in the home), subsequently aligning crafts with femininity and pejorative notions of the decorative. Despite the wide array of different methods, practices and mediums of craft, pattern persists as a vital and unifying decorative presence. Pattern functions in craft media as both an aesthetic and compositional tool, but also as a means of metaphorical collage. Pattern is a decorative element which relies on the borrowing and quoting of source material, while it is not a literal form of collage, it is a metaphorical form of collage due to the act of quotation; “The influences of decoration are submerged and transformed by virtue of their placement within another context, through translation within another context.” (Broude 320). The frequent use of pattern in craft media, such as; wallpaper, upholstery, tablecloths, curtains, ceramics, transformed patterned craft media into signifiers of domesticity, to be cannibalized in the fine arts (particularly in painting), as mere signifiers of interiority, softness and femininity. Frequent use of patterned craft objects, like decorative screens, woven carpets, curtains, ceramics and embroidery can be seen in much of the work of early 20th century painters, it is particularly evident in the work of Henri Matisse and his fellow contemporaries. Matisse often depicted patterned and decorative objects in his work, he displayed an

“Enduring taste for curvilinear rhythms, all-over patterns and decorative arrangements of flattened shapes to the character of fabrics, tapestries and embroidered wall hangings that were designed by artists associated with the international arts and crafts movement.” (Broude 319).

This deployment or exploitation of domesticity by the sphere of “culture” is particularly poignant in how the British military employed pattern in the development of dazzle camouflage and methods of militarized upholstery as defensive strategies in World War I and World War II. Dazzle Camouflage was developed in 1914 to be used by the British Navy. Initially conceptualized by Abbott H. Thayer and John Graham Kerr and then later taken up and developed by Norman Wilkinson. Norman Wilkinson was an established marine painter and illustrator, who developed the camouflage strategy while stationed as an assistant paymaster in the Royal Naval Reserve. Dazzle camouflage employed disruptive coloration and geometric patterns as a means of obscuring the form of both naval and merchant ships. Wilkinson proposed to “Paint the ship with large patches of strong colour in a carefully thought out pattern and colour scheme, which will distort the form of the vessel” (Taylor 27), his intention was not to conceal but to obscure

“Earlier theories for the disguising of seagoing ships have [...] had invisibility for their aim, whereas in this case, it should be pointed out, the idea is not to render the ship in any degree invisible, as this is virtually impossible, but to largely distort the external shape by means of violent contrasts.” (Taylor 27).

The interiority and sheer visibility of the bold contrasting patterns was elemental to the success of dazzle as a defensive strategy. The bold geometric patterns, and disruptive coloration of dazzle aimed to misinform the optical perception of U-boat captains of enemy submarines;

“Transforming a thing of the profoundest military signification – a warship – into something optically meaningless. Abstraction of the mid-twentieth century could – and did – misinform courtesy of its transformation from an optical thing of aesthetic self-signification into an ideologically loaded weapon.” (McElroy 23).

Dazzle camouflage thus demonstrated the political and military applications of pattern, implicating and exploiting the domestic interiority of pattern. These notions of the exteriority, interiority and visibility of pattern, were amplified in World War II through the camouflaging of gun emplacements as domestic architecture. Camouflaging as a defensive strategy has a long history of employing painting and illusionism to turn two-dimensional spaces and objects into three-dimensional architectural forms. Gun emplacements, in particular, were often disguised as domestic spaces of habitation through the use of painted canvas coverings, and exterior faux finishes. During the Second World War in New Zealand, the government disguised their gun emplacements along the coast line as holiday homes. Decorative and architectural elements, were deployed to signify domesticity, rather than a military presence, much like dazzle camouflage, this defensive strategy relied on misidentification.

This militarized inversion of the traditionally exterior/interior architectural relationship, incorporates the same techniques and patterned imagery employed within the applied arts. The military thereby exploits the designation of ‘feminine as nature’ through employing the decorative and ornamental to depict and project aspects of the ‘natural’ onto the unnatural, i.e: military armaments such as tanks, guns, etc. being painted in earth tones of green, beige, and brown intended to represent or camouflage against vegetative growth. These militarized exterior uses of pattern are also then reintegrated into the home through patterned upholstery;

“The intensified layer of upholstered fabric foliage covers beds, chairs, sofa, floors, walls, and tables. Foliated canvas coverings collapse domestic into military furniture, and vice versa, and the exterior surface of the house or garden into the internally located surfaces of covered furniture, as the surfaces of the house and garden, inside and outside, furniture and gun, become each other, but a shift of mobility and scale comes with the exchange of horticultural for architectural patterning. (McCarthy 329).

This military use of camouflage inverts the traditional relegation of ornamentation to the sphere of domesticity, in that, the military represents a male-dominated sphere of ‘culture’ in opposition to the ‘nature’ sphere of female domesticity. Yet the military use of camouflage - the ‘ornamental’- tends to use this ornamentation to disguise its ‘cultural’ war-based realm with imitations of ‘nature’, by creating tableaux of nature-hued, disparate fields of earth-tones that render the dominant, male culture’s existence and objectives ‘invisible’. Thereby appropriating, the self-effacing aspect of ornamentation to disguise and obscure military intentions, the feminized sphere of nature is exploited to achieve ‘cultural’ objectives. Interestingly, this is a stark departure from the more commonly expressed aspects of the military: public displays of brute force, power, and dominance. Ironically, therefore, the military application of pattern appropriates the realm of incarceration that the feminine has been relegated to and uses this function of invisibility or misidentification in a contradictory fashion to achieve its accustomed objectives of dominance and conquest. Through exploiting the domestic images of home, as a place of interiority, which shelters its contents from the exterior world, these

“Assumptions of domesticity, as necessarily safe, blind the possibility of the violence of the gun, as it is these domestic images and assumptions of space beyond visibility and the exterior that cannot be seen, that are believed, and these demand that the gun is mistaken for a house. Camouflage occurs when the possibility of that which is camouflaged is unable to be imagined, when its visual image has been replaced with another unseen image, as the image of the gun is replaced with that of the house and its interior.” (McCarthy 325).

This militarized construction of interiority through patterned and painted canvas covers functions in a sense as upholstery, mimicking the interior tradition of covering domestic furnishings with patterned textiles (bedspreads, tablecloths, wall hangings etc). Domestic coverings and upholstery effectively camouflages the interior from itself, through the use of pattern which depicts illusionistic representations of exterior images; “Camouflaging the interior with images from the exterior as the interior consumes what is outside of it,

reconstructing the exterior in beds of poppies, chairs of larkspur and tables of daffodils.” (McCarthy 329).

The division between fine arts and craft, public and private spheres of production, and military uses of upholstery and pattern inform the ways in which contemporary artists are addressing these same notions of interiority, exteriority and visibility. Many contemporary women artists working with traditional craft media, are reclaiming the same signifiers of domesticity which were previously exploited by early twentieth century painters. Signifiers such as decorative screens, woven carpets, curtains, ceramics and embroidery.

The decorative screen in particular is a peculiar domestic object, as it is decorative and yet maintains a structural function of division and concealment-theoretically functioning similarly to a curtain, however, decorative screens have a more significant physical presence. The decorative screen offers a dynamic interior/exterior relationship which both reveals and conceals, designating domestic space as either public or private based on its spatial orientation. Decorative screens have become a highly suggestive presence in the recent work of contemporary artists Victoria Manganiello, Michelle Grabner and Anne Low. Victoria Manganiello, is an emerging American artist, and educator (currently teaching textiles at Parson’s New School of Design and New York University). Manganiello’s employs traditional techniques of weaving and dying to create enigmatic patterns which are aesthetically suggestive of traditionally, earth toned camouflage colour schemes. Manganiello’s recent work, removes weaving from the wall, relinquishing any resemblance of wall hangings and tapestries in favour of colourful free standing wooden frames, transforming her transparent weavings into screens. Michelle Grabner, is the chair of the School of the Art Institute of Chicago’s painting and drawing department, is an established American artist, whose previous work in painting, explored the deployment of domesticity through pattern. Grabner’s recent work, has taken on the sculptural form of free standing bronze screens, which visually appear as suspended woven blankets. Grabner’s screens refer to pattern and textiles as an underlying structuring device - relying on negative space and surface texture. Grabner’s screens subvert the expectation inherent to the form of interiority and softness through the harsh materiality of surface texture, creating a tension similar to the tension instituted in military upholstery; “This making of the natural complicit with artificial means locates camouflage within a tension that provides the very

definition of interior and exterior.” (McCarthy 320). Anne Low, is a Canadian artist whose practice focusses specifically on traditional craft techniques and domestic objects, concerned with the production of domesticity, and spheres of production and structures of difference. Low’s recent work titled *Grubby* made in 2018, is a fireplace screen intended to be placed in front of an empty hearth to conceal any unsightly remnants. *Grubby* is made with handwoven silk, and embroidered with thread and sequins, depicting a humorous image of a smiling sun.

Handcrafted decorative screens, which date back to eighth century AD in China, were later adopted in Japan, and eventually evolved into the forms which we recognize today. Particularly popular was the Fusuma or sliding door screen, and the Byobu or folding screen, which would eventually be adapted and cannibalized by western modernist artists. Historically, Chinese screens were intended as partitions, while the Japanese folding screens, were used in a more decorative fashion, as a type of furnishing which not only demarcated private and public space but served as a decorative element (due to pattern and hand painting).

This resurgence of interest or reappearance of decorative screens within the realm of contemporary art, is perhaps due to the decorative screen’s structural relationship to both craft objects and domestic interiors. Decorative screens have an inherently structural function of division and concealment. Structurally instituting difference between the public and private, social and intimate through decoration. Simultaneously decorative and functional, deploying both interiority and exteriority, the decorative screen offers itself up to the contemporary artist as a domestic object ripe with signification and history, ready to obscure and conceal through its own visibility -“It is precisely in this marginal space that disruption ferments, always ready to dislodge the symbolic order and its dominant discourses” (Elliott et al, 5). These notions of interiority, exteriority, and visibility of pattern, all culminate within the decorative screen, similarly to how the military use of camouflage inverts the traditional relegation of ornamentation to the sphere of domesticity – the screen is able to occupy marginal and shifting territories of signification, through its relationship to pattern and craft media.

References

- Alfoldy, Sandra., Editor. *Neocraft: Modernity And The Crafts*. Halifax: The Press of the Nova Scotia College of Art and Design, 2007.
- Bachelard, Gaston. *The Poetics of Space*. New York: Penguin Books, 2014.
- Broude, Norma., Editor. *Feminism and Art History: Questioning the Litany*. New York: Harper & Row, 1982.
- “Anne Low: Chair for a Woman.” *Contemporary Art Gallery*
<https://www.contemporaryartgallery.ca/exhibitions/anne-low-chair-for-a-woman/>.
Accessed 13 December 2019.
- Elliott, Bridget., Editor. *Breaking and Entering: The Contemporary House Cut, Spliced, and Haunted*. Canada: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 2015.
- Elliott, Bridget and Janice Helland, Editors. *Women Artists and the Decorative Arts 1880-1935: The Gender of Ornament*. England: Ashgate, 2002.
- Forbes, Peter. *Dazzled and Deceived: Mimicry and Camouflage*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009.
- Freeman, A. Lindsay, et al. “Screen Memory” *International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society*, Vol. 26, Issue 1, 2013, pp 1–7.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10767-013-9135-x>
- “Interiors Imagined: Folding Screens, Garments, and Clothing Stands.” *The Metropolitan Museum of Art*.
https://www.metmuseum.org/toah/hd/fold/hd_fold.htm Accessed 13 December 2019.
- Manganiello, Victoria. *Victoriamanganiello.com*. “Selected works: Painting”
<https://www.victoriamanganiello.com/painting>. Accessed 13 December 2019.
- McCarthy, Christine. “Camouflage: Military Upholstery and Interior Disguise.” *Space and Culture*, vol. 5, no. 4, Nov. 2002, pp. 320–332,
doi:10.1177/1206331202005004001.
- McElroy, Gil. *Razzle Dazzle: The Uses of Abstraction*. Ontario: Robert McLaughlin Gallery, 2008.
- “Michelle Grabner”. *James Cohan Gallery*.
<https://www.jamescohan.com/artists/michelle-grabner?view=slider#26>.
Accessed 13 December 2019.
- Parker, Rozsika. *The Subversive Stitch: Embroidery and the Making of the Feminine*. London: I.B.Tauris, 2010.

- Parker, Rozsika and Griselda Pollock. *Old Mistresses: Women, Art and Ideology*. London: Pandora Press, 1981.
- Schor, Naomi. *Reading in Detail: Aesthetics and the Feminine*. New York: Routledge, 2007.
- Taylor, James. *Dazzle: Disguise and Disruption In War And Art*. England: London Press, 2016.
- Vidler, Anthony. *The Architectural Uncanny: Essays In The Modern Unhomely*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1992.