

TERRA NULLIUS

Jim Brogden New Work



1. COTTAGE 2006 83 x 112cm



2. SALVAGE 2006 83 x 112cm



3. EXIT 2007 83 x 112cm



4. ASHES 2006 83 x 112cm



5. COPSE 2007 83 x 112cm



6. GARDEN 2006 83cm x 112cm



7. DEPOT 2006 83 x 112cm



8. PYLON 2006 83 x 112cm



9. BOUNDARY 2006 83 x 112cm



10. DEPARTED 2006 83 x 112cm



11. WOODLAND 2006 83 x 112cm



12. MOUND 2006 83 x 112cm



13. VEIL 2006 83 x 112cm



14. HEDGEROW 2006 83 x 112cm



15. CHECKOUT 2006 83 x 112cm



16. CAR PARK 2006 83 x 112cm



17. WASH ROOM 2007 83 x 112cm



18. PASSAGE 2006 83 x 112cm



19. REFINERY 2006 83 x 112cm



20. TARN 2006 83 x 112cm



21. HARVEST 2006 83 x 112cm



22. BUSINESS PARK 2006 83 x 112cm



23. PLASTIC 2007 83 x 112cm



24. HOME 2007 83 x 112cm

JAMES BROGDEN

Encountering the “Non-Place”

Introduction

What do we mean when we refer to a “non-place”? One might consider these places as “liminal spaces.” I propose that non-place is familiar territory, yet at the same time, an anonymous part of culture: locations that are recognised in relation to their iconography of the abandoned, places which most people usually avoid: “ruptured” spaces in the Nora¹ sense, “exiled” urban zones where one inhabits a liminal “no-man’s land,” often situated amongst redundant industrial sites, abandoned spaces, often isolated by modern infrastructure developments—forgotten sites on the verge of recovery, regeneration or cultural erasure. Such interstitial places (not surprisingly) are found near prohibited sites within the urban milieu, where access and ownership are often ambiguous, or in dispute. There is the sense when walking through these non-places, that they are fugitive locations—having been created, I suggest, through a vicarious process of “urban renewal.” And, as the leitmotiv of this paper, I would argue that these palimpsestic non-places act as potential metonyms for the displaced urban community, commemorating, in some new form, its passage, and, to a certain extent, an existing relationship with the perceived inequities of late-capitalism.²

One of the functions of the contemporary photographer is to document the underbelly, the blind spot, of late-capitalism. The investigative photographer is a

“privileged witness”³ to the dismantling and erasure of a particular urban collective memory. It would seem appropriate in this age of rapid digital mediation of global culture, to choose the medium of digital photography to reveal the complex iconography of the non-place, where we confront the photographer as a “hunter” of the indexical, attempting to track the meaning of a new territory, to document the socio-economic narrative for an audience already experiencing what I would describe as image fatigue.⁴ In the manner of an “antiphon”⁵ (to borrow Roland Barthes’s description of the photograph as “alternate chanting”), the photographs presented here record a specific example of an emerging non-place within a late-capitalist context: each digital photograph has the potential to elicit a dialogic encounter with the complex indexicality of the urban non-place.

One could argue that the photographs depict a particular encounter with the perverse celebration of chance juxtaposition, quixotic intervention and departure—“prayer flags” of various plastic bags ensnared in hawthorn, images of absence, that may present an elegiac substitute for human presence. The intention is to present the abject in epic simplicity, where we are invited to encounter a contemporary simulacrum in the form of the distorted plastic bag, the rampant winter buddleia, a relocated shopping trolley.

To anticipate certain doubts as to the value of encountering “non-place” in the first place, I would argue that in the West (especially in Britain) the “non-place” could be regarded as an emerging cultural and bio-diverse asset. For, beyond its more utilitarian potential as a dormant “brown-field site” for redevelopment, there is the possibility to engage the urban inhabitant in, perhaps, a more unconventional landscape experience, an experience that potentially subverts the expectations of the public garden and park. This absence of a municipal landscape-design aesthetic within the existing non-place could provide for a desire in people (especially some children) to have the opportunity to make

sense of a less prescriptive urban space—through a more empowering interrogation of non-place iconography.

Defining the “non-place”

It is perhaps useful at this juncture, to highlight briefly the case for children⁶ and their relationship with the “non-place.” When I have shown photographs of non-places to a range of adult audiences in the UK, their first impulse is to declare that the places depicted remind them of where they played as children. The photographs seem to elicit an immediate childhood reverie—of unique adventures in the zones which we are referring to here as “non-places.” Those members of the audience who spoke vividly of such places would have been children (aged 5-16) in the period 1960-1980. This discussion is by no means an analytical study of the value of non-place as a public amenity; nevertheless, anecdotal evidence of this kind does perhaps strengthen the case for a change in attitude to non-places, as such areas clearly affect people. They value the perceived “chaos” of these random parcels of land, which, in the broader context of my argument, I would refer to as the “shrapnel” of “late-capitalism,”⁷ where the incongruity of industrial remnants is absorbed into the fabric of natural re-colonisation and re-wilding. One could argue that childhood incursions into such places make a valuable contribution to child development, providing an introduction to “risk-taking” creative play, in most cases liberated from parental supervision. More importantly, I would suggest, these places provide the opportunity to interact imaginatively with a range of discarded materials—to create idiosyncratic games released from the imposition of municipal signposting⁸ found outside the non-place. One might consider this shift in the public debate regarding children and their spatial engagement, in the context of so much of our landscape experience—in which our reading of landscape is often decoded for us, not only through navigational

devices, but through “aesthetic prompts” whose function, I would suggest, is to confirm and legitimise the value system of the dominant ideology.

In relationship to Britain, some might argue that many of our landscape encounters are perceived through the pervasive lens of the heritage industry as well as through literary associations, as exemplified by designations such as “Brontë Country” in West Yorkshire, or “Hardy Country” in Dorset. This process of both explicit and implicit privileging of one place over another is most evident in the designation of the National Park, a landscape “construction” (in the cultural sense), completed with the obligatory visitor centre and further articulated through the interactive tourist information screen. It is here that we witness the visitor as “pilgrim” to the venerated site, suggesting a degree of complicity in an agreed valorisation of nature and landscape.

Furthermore, let us consider what I would term “the plaque effect,” where value is bestowed upon landscape through a form of spatial “branding”—a “designer label” for place, perhaps? In this context, we may wish to hypothesise (for “demonstration purposes only”) how the authority of the plaque might transform the reification of the “non-place:” say, for example, on an anonymous arboreal embankment along the M1 motorway? Would we then perceive that place differently? I suggest that we would.

Heidegger described the “liminal” experience as a space between two worlds, a potent middle ground that holds, joins and separates two worlds at the same time. Interestingly, the cultural anthropologist Victor Turner advanced the theory that from time to time people inhabit states of marginality, inbetweenness or liminality.⁹ For Turner the value of liminal experiences lay in their ability to expose “new realms of possibility,” and more importantly (in the context of our discussion here), could provide opportunities to subvert or challenge “cultural givens or conventions.”

The *status* of the “non-place,” I would argue, is in marked contrast to the more embedded cultural notions associated with the *park*, *countryside*, and, more

problematically, the *wilderness*. In general, most of the population disregard non-places. They are usually engaged with as neutral zones which have to be passed through on the way to the “real” destination—unless you are destitute, of course, when such places may offer some form of temporary shelter. To provide a more ludic definition of the non-place, one would not expect to find recreational activities taking place there. And, to allude to the golf-course scene in the Michael Douglas film *Falling Down*¹⁰ there are no families having picnics here either. On the contrary, one is more often confronted by the anthropological evidence of a more feral and disenchanted human agency, where one recognises that the contemporary *imbroglio* of non-place is not without its social problems associated with drug use, increased fly tipping, car theft disposal, itinerant habitation, and other site-specific problems.

Culture and non-place

It is appropriate at this stage to contextualise the cultural potential of non-place, for, in an age when the main agenda is focused on global environmental issues such as climate change, the potential of indeterminate non-places to make a positive contribution to the broader debate has perhaps been overshadowed by their ordinary locations and their relatively small scale. Nevertheless, if these fragmented non-places (in which I include motorway embankments and roundabouts, etc.) were hypothetically collated into one specific area, then its size would probably rival a UK national park, and furthermore, this non-place “park” might even display, paradoxically, a greater biodiversity. My contention is that these disparate non-places are emerging as the “new landscape,” a “new landscape” that requires sensitive stewardship to retain its essentially idiosyncratic qualities.

A similar sentiment resonates throughout John Vidal’s *Guardian* newspaper article¹¹ published in May 2003, in which he challenges the assumption that late-capitalist non-places are worthless wastelands:

Being hailed as England's rainforest... the former Occidental site on Canvey Island is an oasis in a landscape of oil refineries, new housing, massive roundabouts and drive-through McDonalds. Laid out with concrete roads and street lighting, it has been untouched for 30 years.... [I]t has already been found to be home to at least 1,300 species, including 30 on the UK "red list"....

What seems to connect these disparate non-places is a shared public "amnesia," a perceived absence of cultural definition, compounded or even exoticised by ambiguous public access. Iain Sinclair alludes to this process of exoticisation through restrictive access during his recent account of a "modern pilgrimage" around the M25 motorway encircling London: "Land, which is forbidden, is also preserved: ...that which is unviewed becomes the ultimate view."¹² There are parallels to be drawn between the problematic accesses to certain non-places, and the difficult access to land owned by the Ministry of Defence in the UK, where again, paradoxically, there is evidence of a flourishing wild life habitat. We are also reminded of the former industrialised zones of East Germany, the no-man's land associated with the Berlin Wall, and, of course, the revealed "green corridor" tracing the former route of the *Iron Curtain*, where, unsurprisingly, nature has benefited from a restricted programme of industrialisation. In view of the previous claims made for a more positive acknowledgement of non-place, do we then concede that culture is predisposed to privilege certain landscapes for veneration and commemoration?

It may be difficult to refute that established natural icons such as forests, mountains, and rivers, have embedded various cultures, providing cultural stability through associated rituals, symbolism, a profound sense of place, and belonging—landscape symbolism which, I suggest, is often resurrected to bolster the notion of national identity, for various reasons. One could argue that this innate need to belong to a particular landscape still exists amongst our displaced, and constantly evolving, urban communities, as they endeavour to adapt to "flexible working conditions" and the more

general massification of late-capitalism, and (to an increasing extent) what Marc Augé would define as “supermodernity.”¹³

Late-capitalism and the anthropology of non-place

The term “late-capitalism” in relation to non-place is applied throughout this paper to denote the rapid socio-economic changes associated with globalisation, the increased fluidity of technology, transport, and communications; and furthermore, according to Marc Augé in *Non-places: Introduction to an Anthropology of Supermodernity*, these effects are embroiled in the recent notions of “accelerated history” and history “without meaning,” where the pace of time and information precludes any meaningful reflection upon the recent past: “For it is our need to understand the whole of the present that makes it difficult for us to give meaning to the recent past.”¹⁴ This feeling of dissociation from the recent past through the complex negotiation with the present, compounded by an uncertain future, may, I suggest, find physical form in the non-place. Most non-places provide the interested visitor with “forensic” evidence of a dispossessed human agency, in which we are invited to deconstruct the encoded casualties of late-capitalism—the marginal place frequented by the marginal. This is non-place as repository for the detritus, so often ascribed as symptomatic, of Western consumerism. Although capitalism created urban non-places in the nineteenth century through dynamic industrial expansion (and housing provision for its workforce, etc.), during the 1960s (specifically in the UK) a unique rupture of the urban landscape took place, through the adoption of the new aesthetic of high-rise urbanism, supported by a robust road development strategy. Although this urban “renewal” included provision for palliative green open spaces, since the early 1980s these same urban zones have continued to change through the construction of the ubiquitous business park, its associated ribbon development, and the more recent appearance of the gated community. These new structures, which are seen to

promote a return to “city living,” are often ironically contiguous to the remnants of an industrial past that relied upon workers living within walking distance or the sound of the factory siren. Many such workers (some retired) now find themselves displaced to the new estates located throughout the metropolitan zone.

I would argue that the topography of late-capitalism (in comparison to the nineteenth century) reflects the struggle over space: who controls it, for what reasons, and to what ends? If we consider nineteenth-century capitalism to represent the desire for faster production, then the late-capitalist (twenty-first century) equivalent seems more concerned with the economic advantages of “out-sourcing,” utilising “smart technology,” and, in certain circumstances, is content to sit on assets—especially land. My point is that speculative investment in land (and certain properties of course) could be a determining factor in the production and fragmentation of non-places throughout Western cities. As a result of this complex zoning of the modern city into various active and dormant sectors, we witness the inexorable inscription made by big business (and the state) on our sense of the city as “place” (with meaning), rather than the more impersonal and abstract term of “space.”

What then are the effects of the rapid transformation of the remembered urban milieu into non-place? Perhaps a consequence of this late-capitalist urban configuration is that the notional link between a “sense of place” and a sense of collective belonging becomes increasingly untenable (or at least under threat), where a general feeling of alienation persists. Therefore, have we underestimated the power of place to unite communities—to withstand the fracture of collective memory, as Nora lamented so presciently in *Les Lieux de Mémoire*? The feeling of physical and emotional detachment from place is alluded to by Barry Sandwell:

the ‘crisis’ is not purely intellectual or ‘spiritual.’ In essence it reaches into the personal, social, and political fabric of modern societies [and] the ‘loss of truth’ ... now inscribed in the central institutions and technological media of modern life.¹⁵

Can the modern self find some form of consolation from this crisis of identity¹⁶ by finding new urban encounters—new routes in those non-places previously overlooked?

Could this potential re-engagement with non-place (however individual and infrequent such encounters may be) form some tenuous sense of collective belonging with place, as a gesture of “resistance” to the ineluctable homogenisation and mediatisation of the local, regional, and national landscape?

Recovering collective memory through non-places

In the context of inexorable urban change, how can we recover what has already been lost from the urban landscape in the recent past? And what exactly is it that we wish to recover? One might suggest that the non-place functions as a compressed “archive” for a form of collapsed collective memory—the non-place as a potential palimpsestic counter-monument, to “commemorate” the displacement of the urban community’s sense of place, each one unique, depending on the neighbourhood and city.

In the wake of post-1960s late-capitalism, the non-place may provide an opportunity to step off the accelerated future alluded to by Augé, to enable a more reflective engagement with the recent past. Although the clues to this past may not be easily exhumed from the detritus of the ever-present, the memory “trace”¹⁷ (to borrow Freud’s term) once found, could trigger some form of memorial association or, in relation to the legitimacy of non-place itself, stimulate further discussion. For, as the debate expands (amongst a range of interested parties) in relation to the potential value of non-place, the more likely the erosion of the “non” in “non-place” may occur, to be reinscribed as “place” (with meaning) perhaps.

Although I understand that my claim for the non-place to be perceived as an emerging memorial place, or counter-monument, could be viewed as hyperbolic or simply absurd (in the context of the largely ignored status of such places), I would like to suggest

here that the memories of these non-places (especially those associated with our formative years, referred to earlier), have the potential to contribute to the “DNA” of the self, and, in a broader sense, to the accretive collective memory of community. It is, in fact, common practice for people to make sense of their social identity by reference to their environment: for example, “to place someone,” to “know one’s place.” (Interestingly, one person’s “place,” with meaning, could be another person’s “non-place,” without meaning), a selection process as unpredictable and complex as the formation of memory itself). According to Peter Jackson, the “language of social existence is unmistakably geographic,” as he calls for a decoding of landscape imagery, a reading of the environment through “maps of meaning,”¹⁸ which reveal, reproduce and sometimes resist social order. To continue this navigational metaphor, we may consider non-places as random folds within a much used map, a narrative “glue” which, however fragile that adhesion may be, could be seen to make an important contribution to the accretion of collective memory. Antze and Lambek examine the significance of this narrative process within the architecture of memory: “In forging links of continuity between past and present, between who we are and who we think we are, memory operates most frequently by means of the threads of narrative.”¹⁹ And, as Paul Ricoeur also reminds us in *Memory, History, Forgetting*, “It is through the narrative function that memory is incorporated into the formation of identity: [with] memory as the temporal component of identity, in conjunction with the evaluation of the present and the projection of the future.”²⁰ The regeneration, or the overly enthusiastic preservation, of these palimpsestic non-places could sever such dormant social and economic narratives from future exploration, thereby precluding an alternative direction in negotiating the modern self.

The representation of non-place

The term indexicality here describes the ability of the photograph to fix in focus a remarkable “index” of disparate visual elements in great detail, enabling the viewer to scan the surface at leisure—to form connections through a deconstruction of the semiotic surface. Discussing photography in *The Production of Space*, Lefebvre (perhaps echoing some of our earlier non-place and late-capitalist discussion) declares that the role of photography is to locate “implicit and unstated oppositions,”²¹ where we experience “a political economy of space,”²² in which the processes of centralisation and monopolisation that underwrite capitalist competition produce direct and indirect spatial effects which transform lives at “micro and macro levels.”²³ Through the visual exploration of these non-places as a pedestrian, one has to acknowledge physically the inextricable link between the motorcar and the late-capitalist urban landscape, in which non-places could be seen to be the progeny of this symbiosis. The revelatory potential of this peripatetic activity is discussed by Michel de Certeau in his essay *Walking in the City*: “Pedestrian movement can be seen to open up individual experience to new and different ways of perceiving and designing the world.”²⁴

There is evidence, amongst certain sections of the contemporary arts, of a renewed interest in places which do not conform to the more conventional template of landscape beauty. What seems to connect these more recent representations is perhaps a common interest in the revelatory potential of place and memory in relation to the search for identity. This search for landscapes that reveal what one might term “socio-political truth,” is epitomised in the UK by prescient chroniclers of the emerging non-place hinterland such as the novelist J. G. Ballard and the psycho-geographer Iain Sinclair. In North America several prominent photographers have engaged with the non-place landscape. One of the most memorable of these projects was created during 2000 by the photographer Joel Sternfield, whose seasonal recording of the redundant fourteen-mile-long suspended New York commercial railway, the High Line, questions notions of

beauty and (more importantly for our debate) functions in relation to the legacy of industrial obsolescence. In the supporting gallery catalogue, *Joel Sternfield Walking the High Line*, Adam Gopnik describes the natural restoration which has taken place within the seven-acre Manhattan site: “For the moment, the High Line has gone not to wrack and ruin but to seed: weeds and grasses and even small trees sprout from the track bed. There are irises and lamb’s ears and thistle-tufted onion grass....”²⁵ As a postscript to Sternfield’s project, efforts have been made by the *Friends of the High Line* to preserve this sinuous “park” from development.

The recovered landscape of non-place

The argument for some form of preservation of the non-place has been gaining ground recently amongst a selection of contemporary landscape architects who, through their ideas and projects, are acknowledging the issues surrounding the reclamation, preservation, and regeneration of these sites. The inherent paradox that non-places present is how to protect the natural re-wilding process, without such intervention interfering with the integrity of the serendipitous place. It would seem that within this new aesthetic of landscape architecture the re-colonisation of non-place is both physical and eidetic. I use the term eidetic here to describe the notion that landscape itself is capable of transmitting ideas beyond its purely phenomenological state. In *Recovering Landscape: Essays in Contemporary Landscape Architecture*, the American landscape architect James Corner argues that we engage with landscape through the eidetic filter of ideas: “Landscape reshapes the world not only because of its physical and experimental characteristics but also because of its eidetic content, its capacity to contain and express ideas and so engage the mind.”²⁶ The creative challenge for both architects and planners, according to James Corner, is to “resist the homogenisation of the environment whilst also heightening local attributes and a collective sense of place.”²⁷

Non-place as palimpsestic counter-monument

I would argue that this collective “sense of place” is often articulated in space by the monument. The monument’s “voice,” its commemorative function, attempts, through siting and materiality, to assuage the fragmentary nature of memory and the contestatory nature of remembrance. But of course (and beyond the scope of this paper), we must acknowledge that the equally contested issue is: whose memories do we remember and commemorate in the first place—and where? In responding to this memorial question, Michael Landzelius challenges our tendency to memorialise the past, by encouraging a more spatialised disinheritance that would not petrify the past but maintain its complexity, therefore “forestalling a closure of meaning.”²⁸ A prescient reminder for our own period (and perhaps a view which could be seen to support the reclaiming of non-place as an appropriate palimpsestic counter-monument to the legacy of late-capitalism) is made by Sert, Léger, and Giedon in their 1943 essay, *Nine points on Monumentality*: “[Monuments are] only possible in periods in which a unifying consciousness and unifying culture exists. Periods which exist for the moment have been unable to create lasting monuments.”²⁹

It may be possible to view the non-place in this way, as a potential counter-monument to the disunities inscribed across the late-capitalist landscape—a “bottom-up” index of collective memory, perhaps embodying a redemptive function for those who have witnessed its gradual transformation from “place” to “non-place.” In relation to the function of the counter-monument, we might consider the German response to memory and place: one of the most intriguing responses to Germany’s memorial issues has been to incorporate the transient counter-monument, to challenge the conventional premise of the monument. For if we encourage monuments to do our remembering for us, then some would argue that there is also the temptation to forget. One is reminded of a particular

German counter-monument constructed in 1986, *Monument for Peace and Against Fascism*, a twelve-metre-high column made from aluminium and lead, created by Jochen Gerz and Esther Shalev. This haunting structure was designed to submerge into the soil over time, as “memory tourists” inscribed their memorial messages across the one-and-a-half-metre sections. The inbuilt “self-destruction” of such transient counter-monuments perhaps alludes to the contingency of all memory and meaning, but paradoxically (in this context) may ignite a more sustained act of remembrance, as James Young speculates: “By resisting its own reason for being, the counter-monument may paradoxically reinvigorate the very idea of the monument itself.”³⁰

So could a form of intervention work within the non-place, to provide us with an ever-changing counter-monument to urban collective memory, without affecting its essentially inchoate appearance? I would argue that those organisations which already purchase and act as the guardians of “areas of outstanding beauty”—most notably English Nature and the National Trust (in the UK)—might wish to reconsider their criteria when acquiring future sites. The acquisition of a non-place within their landscape portfolio would surely elicit a broader debate as to the existing notions relating to heritage and to that most difficult of words, beauty. Indeed, how ironic it would be if such valorisation led to an increase in access to the non-place, thereby placing those innate qualities previously discussed, at risk.

Conclusion

Through an encounter with non-place, we are presented perhaps with an opportunity to consider the urban dislocation ascribed to late-capitalism, its subsequent impact upon our “sense of place” and collective memory. There is also the possibility that society may come to view the non-place as a potential palimpsestic counter-monument to memorialise, through the rampant re-colonisation of flora and fauna, those previously disempowered

urban inhabitants who “made way” during the post-1960s urban reconfiguration. For the aetiologically reticent, the non-place may be simply cherished as an emerging “new landscape”—without apparent design, yet a place that is becoming increasingly valuable in relation to its paradoxical biodiversity, enabling perhaps, a unique aperture through which we might view an alternative to the increasing homogenisation of the urban landscape.

Notes

¹ Pierre Nora, *Les Lieux de Mémoire*, vol. 2: *La Nation* [Realms of Memory] (Paris: Gallimard, 1986).

² Although similar “non-places” exist in some form within the emerging cities outside the West, most notably the Indian *maidan*, such parallels are beyond the scope of this paper.

³ It is worth noting here the problematic position of the photographer (or any commentator within a critical debate perhaps) as “privileged witness,” and the related issues of power, exclusivity, and access to the resources of communication and audience, etc.

⁴ I use the term “image fatigue” to describe the problem of lack of interest in an audience already subjected to thousands of sophisticated visual messages every day.

⁵ Jean-Michel Rabate, in Rabate, ed., *Writing The Image After Roland Barthes*, (University of Pennsylvania Press, 1997), 35.

⁶ A more extensive exploration of the relation between children and non-place could form an interesting further study, but is beyond the scope of this discussion.

⁷ Kevin Fitzpatrick and Mark LaGory, *Unhealthy Places: The Ecology of Risk in the Urban Landscape* (London: Routledge, 2000), 66.

⁸ In the UK in particular, one is reminded of the recent media debate (especially in *The Daily Telegraph*) regarding the issue of children and the proposed benefits of more “risk-taking” outdoor play, free from over-protective parental supervision.

⁹ Victor Turner, “Betwixt and Between: The Liminal Period in *Rites de Passage*” in *The Forest of Symbols: Aspects of Ndembu Ritual* (London: Cornell University Press, 1967), 95.

¹⁰ The film *Falling Down* (1993), directed by Joel Schumacher and starring Michael Douglas, traces the modern allegory of a disenchanting American white male traversing contested zones in the American city.

¹¹ John Vidal, “It doesn’t look much, but this bleak corner of Essex is being hailed as England’s rainforest” (London: *Guardian Newspapers*, 3 May 2003).

¹² Iain Sinclair, *London Orbital: A Walk around the M25* (London: Penguin Books, 2003), 241.

¹³ Marc Augé, *Non-places: Introduction to an Anthropology of Supermodernity* (London and New York: Verso, 1995).

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 30.

¹⁵ Barry Sandywell, *Reflexivity and the Crisis of Western Reason* (London: Routledge, 1996), 2.

¹⁶ I use the term “identity” specifically from a contemporary Western perspective (whilst acknowledging that this contested term in its relationship to the *sovereign self* is open to much debate, especially within the discipline of post-colonialism). My use of “identity” and to a lesser extent “self” is couched within the definition suggested by Richard Meyer in James Young, ed., *Critical Terms for Art History* (2nd edition, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003): “...the term was often used to designate a problem—an “identity crisis” or a “search for identity”—stemming from the individual’s alienation in the face of an increasingly anonymous society.”

¹⁷ Sigmund Freud, “A Note upon the ‘Mystic Writing Pad’” (1925), *General Psychological Theory* (New York: First Touch Stone Edition, 1997), 207.

¹⁸ Peter Jackson, *Maps of Meaning: An Introduction to Cultural Geography* (London: Routledge, 1995).

-
- ¹⁹ Paul Antze and Michael Lambek, eds., *Tense Past: Cultural Essays in Trauma and Memory* (London: Routledge, 1996), 17.
- ²⁰ Paul Ricoeur, “The Exercise of Memory” in *Memory, History, Forgetting*, trans. Kathleen Blamey and David Pellauer (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004), 81.
- ²¹ Henri Lefebvre, *The Production of Space*, trans. Donald Nicholson-Smith (Oxford: Blackwell, 1991), 65.
- ²² *Ibid.*, 104.
- ²³ *Ibid.*, 75.
- ²⁴ Michel de Certeau, “Walking in the City” in *The Practice of Everyday Life* (University of California Press, 2002), 40.
- ²⁵ Adam Gopnik, *Joel Sternfeld Walking the High Line*, Pace/MacGill Gallery (Göttingen: Steidl, 2001), 47.
- ²⁶ James Corner, “Recovering Landscape as a Critical Cultural Practice” in *Recovering Landscape: Essays in Contemporary Landscape Architecture*, ed. Corner (Princeton Architectural Press, 1999), 1.
- ²⁷ *Ibid.*, 6.
- ²⁸ Michael Landzelius, “Commemorative Dis(re)membering: Erasing Heritage, Spatializing Disinheritance” (*Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 21, 2003), 195-221.
- ²⁹ José Luis Sert, Fernand Léger, Sigfried Giedon, *Nine Points on Monumentality* (orig. ed., 1943, TXT Polis Research Centre, www.ub.es/escult/docus2/sert1.doc, Public Art Project, University of Barcelona, 2006), 2.
- ³⁰ James Young, “Memory / Monument” in Young, ed., *Critical Terms for Art History*, 245.