



A BALMY ELSEWHERE: MANIFESTO FOR RESTORATIVE MATERIALISMS

E.C. Comstock (Brian Snapp)
Department of Art & Art History

ABSTRACT

A Balmy Elsewhere is a body of work which came about through integrating scholarship from new materialism into my ceramic and intermedia art practice. I used a theoretical framework granting agency to non-human objects as a scaffold informing the physical creation of the work and the discussion of it which comprises this paper. I introduce the context of the “material turn” occurring across disciplines alongside the emergence of new materialism from poststructuralist and post humanist thought. This realm of theory critiques traditional Western subject-object relationships and opens the door to non-hierarchical relationships with matter. I argue how contemporary ceramic objects, on their own and in combination with performance art and new media benefit from a new materialist analysis. The recognition of the vast implications uncovered while fully embracing the pull and agency of material demands the creation of strategies to understand this new, dynamic, porous relationship with these objects. I frame the activation of material during performance art as a research method, and humility and perversity as effective postures to approach the implications of the topic. Throughout this process, I discover nuances, flaws, and contradictions of new materialism, especially in its conceptual overlap with indigenous ways of knowing. I steer towards a recapitulation of the branch of study as “restorative materialism,” serving as a tool to heal the fissure between ourselves and tactility, immediacy, and empathy, which was created by the informational milieu and slip from meaningful symbolic exchange of our moment.

INTRODUCTION: ASSUME VOLITION

I began following the threads that led to this body of work when I was introduced to Jane Bennett’s book *Vibrant Matter*, as it put in dialogue with a ceramic oil jar operating as a leading actor in the Taviani brothers’ Italian drama film *Kaos* (1984). This was the first time I saw the phrase new materialism, and I look back on it as an incredibly appropriate introduction to the field of study in that it maintained an arm’s distance from the pot itself as a tactile object, more interested in the abstract capacities of the jar than the immediacy of the pull of the thing. *Immediacy* has been the operative tool in my exploration, problematization, and integration of new materialist thought into my practice. I strive towards bringing into tactile fruition the hypotheticals introduced by new materialism and its many semi-related branches of study which all “pivot on... matter as an underexplored question,” and break down subject-object distinctive hierarchy (Sencindiver). I work towards a lens seeing all handmade ceramic objects as actors and develop a copacetic clay-as-collaborator process to generate intimacy. Yet it is not just the clay or the objects I cultivate intimacy with, it is also the tools and raw materials of my craft, the kiln, and the refuse created by the ceramic process that I turn my attention to, armed with a rudimentary understanding of a new materialism. I long for the distinction between myself and

fabrication, the process and products of it, to fade. In describing the dissolve of the distinction, my language remains saturated with dichotomies and phrases that imply a doer and a subject of the doing--a weaver and a woven, a penetrator and a penetrated. What happens when my, or my viewer's, interactions with matter expand beyond the capacity of words? This body of theory combines strands of critical thought to reexamine frameworks of agency and relationships inherited from traditional Western notions of subject-object hierarchy, reaching outside Kantian matters of reason (Abadia 168-169). As I attempt to make a cosmology of work increasingly blurring the boundaries between maker, viewer, and object, my relationship to this body of discipline-straddling theory has continuously changed as I evaluate the validity and relevance to work in clay. There is no conclusion of the relationship between new materialism and contemporary ceramics in this thesis, but rather an example of mining an area of study for instrumentally effective tools for justifying creative research—a consideration of new materialist thought as a means rather than an end.

New materialism emerges from a wider “material turn” that occurred across disciplines around the millennium following the retreat from material during postmodernism (Alaimo and Hekman 3; Sencindiver) The precise purpose of new materialism hazily varies between scholars and disciplines, but the approach of political theorists Diana Coole and Samantha Frost represents what I've gleaned as central recurring themes throughout published research across disciplines. The first theme is an ontological post humanist reorientation that upholds matter as possessing agency, and lively in itself. Also crucial is the exploration of “material details of everyday life,” as embedded and carrying great sway in dense power networks, whether these networks be biopolitical, bioethical, geopolitical, or socioeconomic structures. Here, materialization is a “relatively open process,” self-constituting, productive, resilient, pluralistic, complex (Coole and Frost 7). The many iterations of the theory also share “basic conviction that matter – whether in the forest or the lab – has agency, can move, act, assume volition, and even enjoy degrees of intelligence often assumed to be the unique domain of human subjectivity.” Some scholars are keying into the radical possibilities this could have, within the dimensions that subvert anthropocentric traditions that have upheld subject-object divisions since the Enlightenment, which preserved a rift between culture and nature (Horton and Berlo 17).

A true understanding of new materialism requires a knowledge of materialist philosophies of the nineteenth century, notably established by Marx, Freud, and Nietzsche, which the theory reacts to, as well as a familiarity with the ontologies of Spinoza as an alternative to Cartesianism, and the work of Manuel DeLanda as deriving from Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari (Coole and Frost 8-9). Adequately exploring the breadth of this materialist or vitalist lineage is beyond the scope of this paper, but the extensions of their work appear throughout, particularly the DeLandan conception that, “Materials are not just dead ‘stuff’ that we shape; material participates in shaping us...” (Wohl). Examining material causality is key to any materialist theory of agency, as is feeling the gravity of corporeality, which means “returning to the most fundamental questions about the nature of matter and the place of embodied humans within a material world” (Coole and Frost 2-3). The purpose, framed optimistically, is to invite an increasingly relational culture which invites human to interact *with* others instead of *upon* them (Horton and Berlo 18).

The position of aesthetics in new materialism as a recent branch of study is understood as least disruptive to art history, although its exact role is largely an ongoing negotiation. Within this ambiguous negotiation, the challenges of finding a way for theories of things, which were not meant to describe art objects, is exacerbated by my lack of trained familiarity with philosophy, political ecology, and critical theory from which new materialisms largely originate. I focus on the de-privileging of human experience as opening up possibilities of a thing's own experience of

themselves, us, and each other, allowing a horizon of encounter between the ordinary and extraordinary, and “a relational dance of agency” (Wisknoski 208). This maneuver is what I argue to carry great insight into methods of creating and viewing contemporary art and reconfiguring these methods to be nonhierarchical. Though the role of aesthetics remains ambiguous and somewhat forgotten in the “material turn,” I think it’s an application ripe for the examining, as the artist has already reached a heightened attunement to materiality, and the art object often presents this materiality to be relished in. I pull from Amelia Jones’ use of Karen Barad’s theory that makes “agential cuts” into the interrelations between self and art object, which serves as cross sections of dynamic, phenomenological interactions rather than definitional examinations. The present social landscape especially casts these potentials into high relief for study, alteration, and integration.

Many threads in new materialism, coming from scholars which are typically unfamiliar with the studio, are uniquely suited to and underused in fabricating a contemporary, post-Anthropocentric lens for visual art. I agree with Michel Foucault’s prescient assertion, “We are at a moment, I believe, when our experience of the world is less that of a long life developing through time than that of a network,” which endlessly connects events and signifiers in a way that intersects and interrupts its own surface (1). Works of art, in the wake of this post-structuralism, assert themselves as meta-objects, “reflecting on the problematics of materiality and materials” to an even greater extent than the rest of the broad swath of bodies, whether organic, inorganic, fetishized, or forgotten, which new materialists turn their attention to (Apter et. al. 1, 13). Artists are uniquely positioned to understand the disorientation of being alive and human, and I attest as an artist to subscribe to the “boundary between science fiction and social reality” being “an optical illusion” just as in Donna Haraway’s “A Cyborg Manifesto,” which further sharpens the qualification of art objects to be examined as the essence of the post-Internet, posthuman, post-postmodern time they arise out of (6). It is the artists with the most fluid, experimental, and disintegrating conceptions of the self which outfit their work for a productive analysis through a new materialism. Study through such a lens follows a trajectory set by post-structuralist thinkers that rejected “the Cartesian conception of self” and landed in antihumanist critical theory (Abadia 171). This is a rejection ripe with liberating potential, as creators already understand that participating in computer-mediated communication has irreversibly changed the practice of making physical objects (Young and Whitty 209-210) Both craft and design practices over the last century has transformed in tandem with the proliferation of digital media, “Surfaces have acquired depth, becoming dense, complex substances equipped with their own identities and behaviors...The outer envelope has detached from the interior volume,” (Lupton, et. al 31). The new primacy of skin has changed the way we handle even non-haptic surfaces. Perhaps we pick up pots in a way that is more expectant than before, perhaps this expectancy can be utilized to increase attunement to objects rather than looking at it as straying further from understanding material.

Our interior life as well, has distinctly shifted. The person entering cyberspace is no longer a knowing subject possessing an interconnected mind and body as Decartes would have us believe (Young and Whitty 209-210). While this invites possibilities of fragmentation of self for individuals living at this time, it also opens potential for artists to uncover resonances and forces impossible to locate through hierarchical frameworks, finding “affinities across...differences,” especially by following vital materialist pathways (Bennett 99). By collapsing interior and exterior, acknowledging the living forces generated by human and non-human intimacy, vital materialism reveals similarities between “categorical divides and lights up structural parallels between material forms in ‘nature’ and those in ‘culture,’” (Lupton 2, Bennett 104).

CLAY AS COMPANION

Ceramics, out of all material, lends itself to new materialist expansions of the subject-object relationship and deserves unprecedented application of the available theory. Here is a conceptual connection that existed long before new materialism became a recognized branch of study. I propose this relevance in reaction to the lack of writing in this area explicitly highlighting ceramic objects. I point to postwar ceramics, when throwing on the wheel began to mean something besides a means to an object only. As Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick said, “Attending to psychology and materiality at the level of affect and texture is also to enter a conceptual realm that is not shaped by lack nor by commonsensical duality of subject versus object or of means versus ends.” The result of a shift into this realm on the part of makers individually and collectively meant that making in clay served as a vehicle for cultivating camaraderie and social engagement into craft and art processes, “overturning the traditional ideologies of craft as either an object-based commodity or a fetishization of labor,” (Sorkin 4).

Reaching outside the commodification and fetishization dichotomy is possible for the artist by rejecting subject-object duality and opening the space to hand-fabricate objects that are intended for immersive, authentic sensuousness rather than productivity. In 1934 John Dewey was writing that, “art, in its form, unites... doing and undergoing, outgoing and incoming energy, that makes an experience an experience,” (48). In the midst of establishing foundational theory for experiential learning, Dewey tapped into an integral part of the creative process that unites interior and exterior, bringing the viewer inside an experienced object inside the artist. By describing art as permeating, and aesthetics as “a lack of distinction between self and world...Dewey anticipates New Materialism in positing the integration of a provisional subject within a landscape of reciprocal energies” (Wisnoski 208-209). Looking back further to Dr. Soetsu Yanagi’s seminal compilation of essays, *Unknown Craftsman*, much of what he arrives at writing on *mingei* pottery and the responsibilities of the artist-craftsmen sound uncannily similar to foundational thoughts in new materialism. The text is rooted in objects having the potential to “serve as man’s companions in his daily life,” but transcending this, “...the sense of beauty is born when the opposition between subject and object has been dissolved, when the subject called “I” and the object called “it” have both vanished into the realm of Non-dual Entirety,” (108, 152).

It is not just in the history of ceramics in which new materialist philosophies are woven, but in the particles themselves. In *Vibrant Matter*, political ecologist Jane Bennett explores the vitality of metal in a way which begins to reveal the understated gravity of the theory in understanding ceramic art. As Bennett explains the travel of cracks in the polycrystalline edifice of metals as “not deterministic but expressive of an emergent causality, whereby grains respond on the spot and in real time to the idiosyncratic movement,” (59) I think also of the movement of fissures between clay platelets functioning the same way during moisture and heat change which causes cracking, crazing, crawling, dunting (Hamilton and Hall 1). These changes occur in real time beyond seemingly directly proportional relationships the artist attempts to create while formulating a clay body, glaze, or firing schedule. This is the moment at which a ceramicist may begin to attune themselves to vibrancy in the non-deterministic processes which occur entirely without them. Bennett positions those concerned with what the metal can *do* rather than what it *is* as more emergent of its materiality themselves, more in collaboration with it (59). In the same way, ceramicists entangle themselves inseparably with the matter, inundated in it further than artists who do not work with material undergoing such processes. Firing ceramic work is a uniquely traumatic process to inflict onto a material, the 2300°F atmosphere forcing the materials to chemically and physically transform from one state to another (Hamilton and Hall 3). As the clay melts, fuses, and vitrifies in the kiln, so too is the maker open to state change. The ceramic

pieces they have formed now form them as the kiln requires catering to every variation in heat flow, air current, and availability of oxygen determined by the specificity of the material demands from the pieces in the kiln at the time.

Insulators, Balmy Evening: Imbrication, and 3, all discussed later, involve atmospherically fired components. Atmospheric firing typifies the “reciprocal relational landscape of human and non-human energies” that characterize possibly the best face of new materialist ontologies--the applications to craft (Wisnoski 212). This kind of firing takes place over roughly 24 hours, during which time I’m watching and listening carefully to all sensory feedback the kiln provides to dial in the rate of heating, amount of fuel, and level of reduction that the work inside, the kiln furniture, and the kiln will like. I feel the most truly “called to” by a thing when I’m firing. Our agencies truly intermingle as the adjustments I make produce markedly different smells, flame height, flame color, and sounds.



I also borrow from Catherine Malabou’s use of plasticity, which derives from Hegel, in “Ontology of The Accident: An Essay on Destructive Plasticity,” describing a characteristic of both giving and taking form. There is no way to manipulate the rise and fall of extreme temperatures without constant potential of disaster in the kiln, which is where I see the “thingly turn,” of new materialism as so helpful in its attention to qualities of material and objects that are outside our language or conscious perception (Crockett 4). This is a tool in understanding the implications beyond the artist and power of annihilation held within the destructive plasticity that the firing process exemplifies. Artists can also give new attention in this way to the self-transcending communion they have with the kiln as a machine while firing. Even from a liberated perspective, visual vocabularies have mostly lost the suggestion of “curves and movements of the human body” they once had. “In contemporary design, eroticism is present yet kept at a distance...The fulfillment of desire and the satisfaction of touch are blunted by protective layers of material.” (Lupton, et. al 35) Is ceramic just another of these blunting materials? Or could it be utilized as an intermediate tool for reminding ourselves of the importance of human touch--plush, fleshy, unmediated. Is it really an enlightened post-humanist turn toward the vibrance of objects, or is it a new utilization of these objects to point back toward temporal, uncloaked, sensual parts of being human? The impetus for the creation of new

materialism is fraught with such contradictions; this is only one of many moments that led me to use the theory instrumentally rather than holistically.

The vessel appears in various iterations throughout the work that follows. While it might be fragmented, closed, or obscured in my pieces, I consider it the grounding, binding form of the medium, vital to how every ceramic object operates and enacts. The vessel always already talked and looked back in a way that I draw from contemporary theory to explicate and extend to other material. The exterior form reveals what the interior space looks and feels like. I bring a vessel to my lips, a body turned inside out, unknowingly sharing in secrets in the process. It can contain them for me. It has one entrance and one exit, the same thing, showing all and seeing all. It holds not just what appears to be its contents, but also the air surrounding that, and the room surround that, and beyond. Each layer fully in full contact with itself, each layer resting on the one below and finally within the volume of the vessel, on its surface. It's common to find artistic or literary metaphor referencing that the vessel *is* ourselves, and I suggest that the vessel is *around* us perpetually. We are of the vessel, rather than it being of us.

BLURRING: NON-KNOWING & INTERMEDIA

My curiosity about the object/thing dichotomy originates partially out of the constant awareness artists have of the gap between a thing and its representation. Theodor Adorno describes this gap as “nonidentity,” and it is what breeds the ever-present discomfort that artists and viewers feel to some degree standing in front of a work . We see ourselves as “knowers,” so we constantly feel an imperative to reconcile this “inadequacy of representation,” as Jane Bennett describes it (13-14). The embrace of nonidentity in my work invites the viewer to rebuff their own desire for complete knowing and dominance over non-living objects, especially by allowing objects to tread a line of identifiability. There's a possibility that the collapse occurring by stepping into the gap clears a path to finding comfort in complete knowledge being permanently elusive. Adorno and Bennett suggest such is the case whenever we accentuate the dissonance of experiencing non-identity to create meaning in it. I hope to push this paradoxical comfort within discomfort to a maximum, beyond even the feeling of acceptance, and channel the “*pleasure* in the confusion of boundaries” which excites Haraway (7). I would like to see my work as vestiges of an imaginary world of new agentic capacities. It is a world where in every direction are Deleuzian assemblages in perpetual, non-hierarchical shift.

This is an array which new materialists claim to prioritize, as anthropologist Arjun Appadurai describes, but which few scholars have fully cultivated an ability to see beyond a hypothetical departure from outdated frameworks of subject-object dualism (221). The absence of linear narrative in almost all my work accesses a cache where the fabricated, found, identifiable, and unrecognizable exist on the same plain and blur into one another. Releasing from things as identifiable or knowable allows a person, viewer, artist to attune to what a thing or material might be enacting, as an actant, just as DeLanda would have us look at a building, rather than remaining concerned with what it might mean or signify (Wohl). My route towards this end involves focusing on things that sensuously present themselves as both nebulous and obstinate in the midst of ambiguity, contrasting with the functionality and organizational ability of objects that are concretely nameable (Mitchell 156).

The gap between a thing and its representation unsettles us only as a result of our self-imposed status as “knowers.” In my piece *Insulators*, I borrow the form of antique cast glass telephone pole insulators. By choosing obsolete objects, and fabricating them out of ceramic rather than glass, I create a displacement of identifiability. These forms carry an association with the collectibility, and possible kitsch, that insulators have acquired, while remaining reminiscent of an industrial purpose. The reclaimed steel and stained alder shelves they sit on also teeter

between an authentic reference to the original context of the objects and the domestically curated windowsill that so many have wound up on. I point to the commodification and fetishization of material adding a haziness to the identifiability of “how” a material is in addition to “what.” The highly bodily pieces that I’ve shown this work next to cast on an additional layer of complication--the roundness at the top of the forms echoes the fatty, mammary, and penetrative qualities in some other pieces. The shift between recognizable and not is meant to usher in a release of the compulsion to know and dominate matter. Hopefully, the viewer can be open both to reflection on conceptualizations posed in the forms as well as vibrant affective qualities, swimming in the textile woven between speculated signification and surface or form data. These objects were chosen in part to be transformed into ceramic to nudge at the material similarities between glass and ceramic, and the richness in attuning to material that has been melted or vitrified.





3 is a piece consisting of three large pinched pouring vessels containing crumbles of plaster, wax-soaked fabric, and raw clay submerged in honey. This piece served as a tactile bridge between several other pieces in my body of work, concentrating and decontextualizing raw materials to cast their identity into a fluid territory, operating much like *Insulator* in the possibilities for experiencing a continuous shift the entire time the piece is experienced. The nonidentity is more extreme in this piece, the depth in the color of the clay and texture of the pinch marks serving as a frame that asks to be held and touched while the contents speak to varying levels of uncertainty or disgust. This was a crucial manifestation of the emphasis on enactment over signification that presents itself within new materialism, an exercise in releasing from the grasp to impose narrative or symbolism onto material, and rather relish in its abundance and inherent properties. The vessels were constructed to facilitate this relishing, and suggest possible motion or activation of the contained material.





If materiality defines an art practice, it can also act as a connective thread between separate art forms, creating a productive exchange where ways of knowing or representing blur together incidentally or in an explicitly charged interaction (Apter et. al. 15). On this foundation, I metamorphose presupposed subject-object relationships with my pieces while creating intermedia work, particularly in hybrid iterations of ceramics and video art. Haraway casts the cyborg as “resolutely committed to partiality, irony, intimacy, and perversity” because it is not bound by the dichotomy between public and private (9). My intermedia videos, functioning as cyborgs in this sense, engage an enigma outside the dichotomy by superimposing the spheres of the general and the personal in tension. I created *Tenderize* to present a tactile experience on an impenetrable screen, which is encased in an uncanny figurative structure that presents the components in the honesty of their materiality. The viewer receives the actual and the nonactual simultaneously through the vehicle of a sculpture contrasting low craft and high craft methods—tenderly carved alder tools hang on unmonumental PWD and 2x4’s. The video offers moments I have experienced apart from others, inscriptions of the intimacy experienced when I am in congress with my objects, utilizing these fictitious tools to coat myself in oil, and percussively tenderize or prod my own flesh. The curated and the incidental blur together in this sacredly private space which voyeuristically invites the viewer as a confidant or unsuspecting witness.





I select video and the baggage of new media specifically in stark opposition to the intrinsic reference to antiquity and lineage that ceramics and other craft traditions carry. Arising from this is the opportunity for absurdity in my videos, which not so innocently capitalizes on the perversity Haraway positions at the hand of the cyborg. The moment at which Haraway writes represents a transition created by industrial capitalism where society moves from the realm of essential, organic properties to the polymorphous realm of “informatics of domination” where all bodies can be interfaced with (28-29). I argue our present moment is an intensification of this transition. The realm of informatics is less hierarchical than the organics of domination, yet it means we find ourselves immersed in all-encompassing sinister networks where we are reduced to the “terms of [our] disassembly and reassembly” for the use of the capitalist market (31). By positioning my ceramic objects, epitomizing the antiquated ontology of the organics, against the informatics of the video, I resist this reductionary inevitability however temporarily. Just as the thing, “in its unruliness, its mystery, its stubbornness—still captivates” (Wasserman) amidst the immersive global networks dominating our century, the ceramic objects have a unique pull and vibrancy in my chosen video format creating a cyborg of new media and old, just as the dissolution of a boundary between my product and my viewer implicates them as participating in a similarly perverted or cannibalized entity.

Most of the traditional pottery that comes to mind when considering the road to contemporary ceramics relies upon meaningful symbolic exchange. Borrowing from Baudrillard’s work, symbolic exchange now ceases to function as an organization factor in society and art, as we live in a hyperreality of “the ambiguous and the imaginary” (Thiry-Cherques). It becomes much more difficult to link labor-value to objects. Artists do not perform the valuation of their pieces according to work ethic they once did, as they must confront an informational milieu in which the labor of the living and the inanimate commingle. This confrontation necessitates entering unfamiliar spaces that naggingly question the aesthetic object, its existential status, and the paradigm for valuation and assessment (Apter et. al. 5). It is these new spaces also in which artists wade through ceaseless duplication and alteration of information and images which provide room for non-human elements in our ethics (Soge). This expansion of ethics allows for my use of an intermedia practice as a cyborg iteration of traditional ceramics in response to the posthuman society which denies its own status. My lived experience is irreparably fragmented by a post-truth created by the deluge of data in perpetual recombination and distribution throughout the webspace which has defined my generation (Lupton 3). The concurrent popularity of “Thing Theory” and the emergence of object-oriented ontology and new materialism is “symptomatic of millennial and postmillennial anxieties regarding our increasing reliance on virtual objects,” which risks the obsolescence of human labor and “promises to render ‘our most familiar object, our planet [...] uncanny’” (Dini). Haraway observes, “High-tech culture challenges these dualisms in intriguing ways. It is not clear who makes and who is made in the relation between human and machine. It is not clear what is mind and what is body in machines that resolve coding practices” (60). My momentum toward intermedia work only increases upon this collective confusion around the roles of maker and made. Following the newfound widespread isolation upon the COVID-19 outbreak, it is hard to imagine the confounding relation between human and machine has not grow deeper and more abstruse. People have used their devices as subject-object blurring biotic extensions of their ability to communicate since personal computers and smartphones became widespread, but amidst the unprecedented reliance on such biotics, can it irreversibly plunge us further into a territory where the living and inanimate become increasingly indistinguishable and the planet becomes more uncanny?

WHAT OF THE BODY

As Haraway characterizes the 21st century broadly, “we find ourselves to be cyborgs, hybrids, mosaics, chimeras. Biological organisms have become biotic systems, communications devices...” Using new lenses found in post humanist writing, ceramicists can push their understanding of the relationship further to see “There is no fundamental, ontological separation in our formal knowledge of machine and organism, of technical and organic,” (60) and expand into a broadened horizon where they are on the same plain and being in the same way, indistinguishable, as their clay, their kiln, their viewer. Perhaps it is not so horrifying to be a cyborg in this sense, but liberating. I’ve taken ceramic making methods as technologies and equated them with the organic in my live performance *Dissolution*, using my own body as a communication device with raw ceramic matter. This performance began when I poured a spreading puddle of wet clay slip, and a pile of small crushed dry clay pieces. I set aside my handmade pouring vessels and lined up my unfired pots, taking care with their malleability. I joined them on the ground. We rolled through the slip, slick, cool, coating, then through the dry pile, the fine pieces adhering to our skin. I negotiated my body with theirs to roll back the other way, the layers of wet and dry accumulating and coagulating on both of us. I looked at my pots and myself, and touched. I picked them up, observing them watchfully while I put clothes on over my skin saturated with matter. I continued to my next class and later to work, savoring this residual of the shared space for an entire day. Body became material and material became body.







Dissolution was an attempt at undoing the ontological separation between technological matter and an organic flesh being. A clay-body encounter unfolded, elongated and scaled to maximize the surface area and relish in the contact between skin and silica. At the site of contact emerged permeability, porosity, and dissolution within the fine membranes typically separating artist, substance, and viewer. I caressed my pots, churned and writhed with them, savoring and delighting in the vitality and activity of matter. In doing so, I gave an experience to my pots rather than asking one of them, inverting the traditional subject-object hierarchy to call forth intuitive, saturating ways of knowing attuned to materiality, centering immediacy. The attempt continues on and on, each encounter approaching a sustained union, a healing of the fissure between conception and fruition, an immersiveness and tenderness of the offering. The residue of the encounter was as sanctified in the act as the pots which underwent the intimacy and negotiations of our bodies. On my skin, I preserved the combination of wet and dry clay reaching equilibrium as I departed the beginning of the performance. It shared my spaces, my movements, and my sweat; by allowing the clay to absorb my own moisture as it dried, I granted the clay agency and a bit of my own autonomy. This performance served as a small act in a trajectory towards a bewildering post-structural landscape of actants and assemblages.

Balmy Evening: Imbrication is another live performance that heavily incorporates bodily points of reference to manifest points of overlap between artist and material. This piece focuses on non symbolic actions and mixtures that actuate *imbrication*, a term information systems academics have recently started to use to describe the site of overlap that contains human and material agencies as interwoven. People and matter differ phenomenologically, yet it is possible for them to interlock in a way that generates and alters. *Imbricate* comes from the verb used to describe the interlocking within the overlapping pattern of tiles in Roman and Greek architecture that allow them to function interdependently, creating a waterproof roof. The contours of human and material agencies, when positioned together correctly, create an integrated structure

(Leonardi 150-151). The analogy of tiling to visualize a route across the subject-object dichotomy is delightful in its tactility, especially in the ceramic materiality of the tiles and in the utility of imbrication to describe the “human/non-human dance of agency” as ongoing and concrete. I incorporated this concept into my *Balmy Evening: Imbrication* piece in the sense of the interdependence of the component parts. Narrow pots sat on a round supportive vessel, dyed cloth connecting them umbilically, and next to them was a brick structure containing cups full of honey and coconut oil. On these cups were inlaid images of fabric tied around bed frames, or knots of cloth on their own. Imbrication is a kind of knotting together, and the alternating tight or restrictive, and loose, flowing qualities of the cloth in the two- and three-dimensional iterations speak to both the boundedness and ease I can find within interdependent relationships with material, as well as unifying the pieces visually. Small spokes of dry white clay protruded from between the bricks. During the performative activation of *Imbrication*, I used nail clippers to gradually trim these protrusions, offering tenderness and maintenance to the bodily portion of the piece. I collected the trimming in one of the narrow pots, and poured in the honey and oil from all the cups. After mixing these elements with my hands, I brought scoops of the slurry into the mouth to further mix with my tongue and teeth. This gesture manifested an impulse I’ve had since I began this course of study to ingest art-making matter. I smeared the mixture onto the vessels with my fingers and face. I see this performance as a kind of intercourse, stepping into the overlap with materials courageously to fully imbricate in a way I hadn’t with other work.











PERFORMANCE AS RESEARCH METHOD

Utilizing my own body, in conjunction with material, and sometimes the human bodies of others, pries open and reveals the workings of the subject-object relationship as most of us conceive of it. Within traditional Western frameworks, humans occupy the dominating position in the hierarchy, as possessors of complete knowledge. We build, manipulate, and exact upon materials and objects, and when I begin a performance with objects, I exist in this place by default. I, the artist, have prepared and arranged vessels or sculptures in the designated art space, and I will enter and move them to evoke a thought or feeling. The intention and attention allotted to the components of the work, however, grants an elevation and special position to the things. The way I look at and handle any material involved in a performance, as a collaborator, surrounds it with an affect and subtle sense of autonomy. I try to enter with as much vulnerability as possible to these interactions, to show clearly the vibrant, at times visceral, effect that the fired or unfired clay has on my body, psyche, gestures, and emotions. I am uncovering a response from myself in the hopes that we, the objects and I, will uncover something in the viewers. In this way, I find out the limitations and possibilities in artist, viewer, and object becoming one over the course of an experience. While the performance can be considered a piece unto itself, and I often speak about it that way, my creative research upholds my performative gestures as a research method for investigating the properties and affective potential of ceramic and other materials.

Doing performance that utilizes and generates physical, ultimately static, objects, artifacts, and residue, as I've done in *Cede*, *Dissolute*, and *Balmy Evening: Imbrication*, can be seen as a type of hybrid practice. This hybridity complicates the stasis of the involved objects, as well as the "visceral experience of the performative moment of enactment" (Jones 20). If performance is a means of *doing* rather than *describing*, the interrelation between action and materiality that it creates enacts and enlivens the embodiment of the viewer as well as the artist. Cassils' 2013 performance *Becoming an Image*, in which the artist's body punching a 2,000 pound lump of clay is illuminated for the audience only by intermittent camera flashes, characterizes the reciprocal defining possible for the artist, material, and viewer. This is a mode of generating multidirectional intersections that can't be analyzed with the formalism of structural analysis, or solely through the ephemerality that performance theory emphasizes. New materialism offers interpretations of the interrelatedness occurring within a phenomenon, rather than peering at the action or objects in a way that produces a fixed definition (Jones 18, 25).

VISCOSITY: HUMILITY & PERVERSITY

In *Hyperobjects: Philosophy and Ecology After the End of the World*, Timothy Morton explores those objects that are "massively distributed in time and space relative to humans" (1). Hyperobjects are rich in the ways they stand in opposition to traditional ideas we generally accept as givens for objects, and in this way they pose a utility in my exploration of a relational approach to things that transcends our everyday conceptualization with them in the West. While not a new materialist himself, Morton highlights something I'm driving at about objects by discussing this particular category. The inability to scale or limit hyperobjects through physical space or even phases of time presents undeniable examples of nonhuman matter *enacting* on us, in this case, in a way that we could not dominate or prescribe no matter how hard we try. The sum of the material components of global warming is the most tremendous example of a hyperobject that Morton looks at, and it serves as an example to look at one of the prime inherent qualities of hyperobjects, and the one I'm most interested in, which is viscosity. Global warming is sticky in the sense that it is "on" you no matter where you go (Morton 7-8). Exploring this

insight into the potential pull of objects as sticky or viscous, I began with a material study with a literally viscous substance, honey.

I created three round sack forms in high fire porcelain with sand and submerged them in raw pure Utah honey. While suspended from the ceiling in a small aesthetically controlled environment, I studied the fluid motion of the substance as it entered in through the softly shaped holes while submerged, and then strained and stretched when the honey was pulled away and the honey extracted itself from the orifices of the forms. I considered this a live performance, allowing the honey to drip onto my naked body and coat it almost completely. The final product became the still images of the material interactions, which best represent the stretch, adhesion, and transparency of the material over the holes of the hard yet smooth forms. This treads through a space between grotesque and gorgeous.





The quality of sickened infatuation I experienced watching and feeling the honey descend from my sculpture was akin to the affective quality of entering Morton's *Hyperobject* treatment of the 1945 test of Gadget, the Manhattan project's first atom bomb, that took place in Trinity, New Mexico. Gadget as an object is incredibly sticky on many levels. Hiroshima and Nagasaki were bombed a month later as a result of the test. The immense heat of the detonation created a new substance, trinitite, which is a mildly radioactive glass formed from the melted sand in the area. The Tularosa Basin Downwinders reported serious negative health effects in their community from the bomb test for decades to come. In many ways, the test can be considered the beginning of the atomic age, which has dramatically, irreparably shaped our contemporary era beyond recognition.

I see the cardboard packing material I chose to cast in aluminum for *Trinity, 0.016, etc.* as typifying the contemporary moment where entire categories of discarded shipping materials are their own hyperobject, far outscaling me in the physical space and time range they encompass. This is a distant vestige of Gadget ushering in the post-postmodern hellscape created by global technological advancement, and I see our current practices of transporting goods as deeply interrelated to the beginning of the atomic age. I chose a glass table to present that object, and honey as a "gasket" between the aluminum and the porcelain cloud shape, each for their translucency, reminiscent of trinitite, and their passage of light, attempting to nudge towards radiation being a form of light. The stickiness of the honey, of course, vitally operates as the agent of stickiness on the whole sculpture. Morton writes, "Light itself is the most viscous thing of all, since nothing can surpass its speed. Radiation is Sartre's jar of honey par excellence, a luminous honey that reveals our bone structure as it seeps around us. Again, it's not a matter of making some suicidal leap into the honey, but of discovering that we are already inside it" (32). I borrow the porcelain form from an image of the Trinity test of Gadget, captured at 0.016 seconds into the test. For a period of time, this image was banned as it was considered more provocative than the mushroom cloud (Morton 7).





To me, the “discovering that we are already inside it” which Morton refers to extends beyond poisonous substances into the rest of the overlap and intimacy with material that I’m studying. The sheer scale of the pull that material has on us is what makes it so hard to see and connect to, and pointing at it is almost a redundancy. I’ve developed a posture of humility to approach this all-consuming stickiness as a matter of necessity within my claims. To grant objects agency is to imply that we would even know what we’re looking at when that agency is embodied, and to assume that we can eventually comprehend how this agency manifests. To delineate a material as a collaborator is to humble ourselves firstly in the face of the material, and believe we can find alternate methods to facilitate dissolving the default subject-object hierarchy. A stance of reduced ego, non-judgmental attention, and creativity within comradeship is what I consider the stickiest kind of humility that the agency of objects will adhere to. I think it enables the enormous leap I take in positioning myself as being “called to” by things, by art, and implying that everyday life could be filled with such immersiveness. Perhaps even more than immersiveness, this is a proclamation of intimacy. It requires a sticking, constant, persistent ceding of the self to enter the intimate space with a thing.

In *Cede*, I participate in a simple and humble activation of my own ceramic forms. I incorporated a modern dancer for this portion of the piece, and we slowly rolled four high fired ceramic forms into place, dialoguing with the architecture in the installation vicinity. This action was done in the best hopes of the visual motion and sound produced by the ceramic against the concrete, as well as the path made through space, would allow both the viewers and the performers at least a small moment of immersiveness and absorption into the qualities of the materials at hand all of their own. I tried to place faith in our ability to be merely facilitators of this sense information, and collaborators with forms rather than prescribers or directors. What occurs within this interaction of movement artists was mirrored in the negotiation of our bodies with high-fire sculpture that we installed over the course of the performance. Here, a snapshot of internal change undergone through the tactility that emerges from the static-dynamic edge

encounter. Human and ceramic curves activate and caress one another. Hips roll against hips. Once the forms were in place, I installed the perforated pillow like form that rests on all four. Inside and around the form was raw beeswax that my fellow performer and I melted with torches. The dripping of the wax onto the forms below was an analog for the leaking and seeping that occurs as I delve further into intimate, authentic, and humble relationships with material. Attuning to this leaking requires patience and grace that I consider to be contained within humility.







New materialists compel us to “consider anew the location and nature of capacities for agency” within expansive, multifaceted interlocking systems, and in doing so, convince us to consider causation as far more complex than modernity would have us think (Coole and Frost 10). Since beginning the path of understanding this complexity, the horizon of possibilities upon considering how alternative agencies hold sway in our vast networks of being becomes entirely overwhelming. I’ve resolved to allow the granular pieces, both visual and written, that emerge from my wandering in this complexity to be sufficient gestures of subject-object connection, without encompassing the entirety of the implications discussed in this thesis. I extend this resolution to apply to my process as well, humbly accepting however they may fit into this convoluted framework, as plastic, specific, living things and actions. Convolution is a key concept here, I don’t find instrumentalizing new materialism to be a wholesome undertaking even if it requires humility. Appropriately, the subject matter I put into fruition through the agentic dance with material often emerges with a convoluted edge. I find deeply contemplating the interior experience of a thing or material, and how a personal interiority can overlap with it, requires a certain level of perversity to even approach. While the embrace of a thing within a non-hierarchical object ontology is markedly, explicitly different from fetishizing a thing, this embrace can become unruly and degenerate. Attempting to put pieces of the material agency ontology into full practice, as a new, experimental, and unguided process easily results in a relationship to things that is considered abnormal or fringe.

My material explorations have become a place for my own abnormalities to surface, especially as I’ve dug deeper into desires to penetrate and be penetrated by matter. Embracing agency and vitality is a pursuit of fixation, which I’m naturally suited for. In this way, I play with the idea that new materialisms are meant to be explored and put into effect by those with a degree of perversity. To sit and wonder about the interior life of the material and objects that one handles, which surround one daily, possibly *requires* a level of perversity. Some recent work, especially *Alter*, serves as an embrace of this seepage of my perversity, personal fixations, and identity formulation that center materiality and dovetail with this fixation-based process of privileging material agency.

Alter foregrounds my unnamed twink alter ego that incompetently attempts to attain the trappings of a personhood that expresses gay male identity, appealing to other men in his toughness at the same time as he indulges in flamboyance. The entire time, the material choices of this pursuit are as misguided and absurd as they are revealing about the dialogical potentials between the “equipment” of gayness and artmaking, placing sex toys and tools in parallel within the video piece that is projected on the back of the sculpture. *Alter* consists of his fictitious nightstand drawer fabricated in ceramic, filled entirely with slipcast lighters and miniature buttplugs. As an incompetent contriver of identity, my alter ego has incorrectly calculated that the more material vestiges of gay malehood present in his vicinity, the more successful this contrivance is. Transforming these objects into matte, fleshly ceramic is an analog for the alter’s own illusive identity formation and the dreamlike non-reality that he’s chosen to live in by embracing the materiality of a social role without understanding its broader context or implementation.





The longer I've swam in the depths of material agencies, and pushed further and further into the immediacy and immersiveness that attracted me to the ideas in the first place, the more the objects that naturally seem to possess the most agency have crept into my forms. The dildo is the most recognizable of these, especially in *Cede*, *Dool*, and *Penned*. This is a trend I've chosen not to resist. As I press into opportunities to engage non hierarchically with things, I grow increasingly interested in which objects seem to already have an intimacy with human interiority granted to them. The vibrator or dildo is ripe with insights into how we can allow a broad range of things to have a true, tangible pull on us, and allowance to shape us, in contrast to the prescriptive relationship we generally have with things as their users, owners, shapers. I consider the eroticism of new materialist explorations to be deeply understudied and I maintain this as a primary place of focus for future interrogation.





I hope that the viewer of ceramic work finds themselves in the same role we assign to unfired clay. They are formed and altered by experiencing ceramic work, even if momentarily. The walls of the triad between object, viewer, maker fall in on themselves. But what if this collapse began long before the gallery, before the firing? Over the course of throwing, the momentum of the spinning clay on the wheel as the artist centers does more to the exertion and position of the potter than they will transmit to the clay. It is here that pottery especially adopts the implications of a disintegration of a boundary between human and nonhuman in a remarkably consistent interaction with a constant material on a perpetual basis not found in other ceramic methods. Centering is a daily meditation upon this subject-object shattering dialogue (Richards 9). This is where I arrive at the necessity to move both directions at once by maintaining such a ritualistic incorporation of the handmade vessel into work which is so decidedly interdisciplinary. Like many creative peers, I am concerned that art institutions “have latched on to a renewed investment in the object because it provides perfect justification for the impulse to collect, reify, and institutionalize every scrap, every residue, every trace” (Apter et. al. 17). It is the pot, which remains easily traded, distributed, and collected outside the systems of commodification which reliably resist this institutionalization or reification if the maker so chooses. I agree with Brown that it is the makers of the Constructivist movement that came the closest to healing the fissure between things and people, and in doing so ushered things into an honored place of collaborator and co-conspirator (10). It is in making pottery that I feel I most directly channel the spirit of the rupture-straddling Constructivist makers. Incorporating these pots into the rest of my more interdisciplinary work is part of a radical bricolage which appears suited for the art institution or the gallery initially but have embedded in them prototypes for postrevolutionary object-comrades which I could easily shift my practice to put into production as objects integrated with human practice, as equals (10).

It is crucial that my work not only represents nonhuman entities as agents, but allows the human viewer to temporarily step into the role of passive receiver or vessel in the way we normally associate with objects. I see the risk at the core of this intention, as Bennett also identifies, is unintentionally moving in a direction of objectification in the way we typically use the word to condemn exploiting humans. Or possibly, as Appadurai asks, if agency is granted across all bodies, would the foundations of criminal justice “disappear into a bewildering landscape of actants, assemblages, and machines?” (234). As I’m using the implication of receiver only in service of minimizing the subject-object distinction, Bennett answers that this can only elevate the agency of all bodies and bring their “resistance and protean agency...into sharper relief” upon so dramatically broadening the definition of the self (13). Appadurai picks up here, suggesting that this newfound distinction would in fact travel outside that framework of agency entirely. Here, all bodies become *mediants*, but those that we used to call human actors have a unique responsibility as regulators, being the entities capable of incurring the greatest cost onto the planet as we have identified in the Anthropocene (234-235). For my work, this means propelling the viewer into an active awareness that they are far more enmeshed than they thought in a network far denser than it appears.

Stretching the implications of new materialism to include the internal transformation of people brings with it an array of risks and limitations. The further I promote this as my personal corollary of the theory through my pieces, not only do I reiterate the distinction between myself as a creator and the scholars whose work I borrow from, I recenter the human and their behaviors and experiences (as separate from the experiences within matter). By turning so much attention towards the value of *people* living well, I create boundaries in what was supposed to be an endless amorphous playland of boundarylessness. At the same time as I feel I’m violating the

solidity of a posthumanist framework with my own humanist values, I also find relief in the fear of delving too far into theory that is “navel gazing” or irresponsible in its self-indulgent, abstracted purview. Here, there is tangible potential for liberation from the “Cartesian-Newtonian understanding of matter” that “yields a conceptual and practical domination of nature,” which is the very thing that new materialism rejects (Coole and Frost 8).

It was while first wading into the void between ceramics and posthumanist materialist thought, that I first read *The Unknown Craftsman* as a means of reconnecting with seminal moments from the lineage of ceramics, looking backward to the heart of traditional, even conservative, formal and aesthetic exploration in clay. Yet there I found Yanagi hitting on exactly the things I found exciting in the legible moments of much of the theory I was delving into, when the presupposed differences in the “I” of the self and the “it” of the object fall away. This was the first time I tasted the reality that new materialism is not new at all, and in fact has outright stolen directly from many non-European cultural and spiritual frameworks and practices while repackaging them as groundbreaking academic thought and often employed the ideas for purposes antithetical to the source material.

To investigate what a healthy, reframing relationship with new materialism might look like, I interviewed Marcelo Garzo Montalvo, a danzante (Aztec ceremonial dancer), experimental musician, and assistant professor of Ethnic Studies at California State University San Marcos. As a scholar-activist whose work has been categorically relegated to new materialism at times, Montalvo explained that new materialism doesn’t come from a lineage that he wants to “stay rooted in or reproduce.” They described to me that the emergence of the new materialist framing of traditional nondual ways of knowing, many indigenous and ancient, is part of an inherent appeal for newness which is at the heart of modernity. “If you’re thinking from modernity, the fetishizing of newness is built into your tools,” and it is this creation of modernity in the West that “sought to exterminate these ways of knowing,” of people indigenous to what became the U.S., which upheld nonhuman matter as vibrant and vital. Now, as the West slowly sees the limitations and harm of the frameworks it built for the sake of development and progress as it defines them, scholars attempt to describe the revelatory, radical possibilities of material agencies as if they’ve just come across them, they fail to adequately address, “What got us to this most recent relationship to matter, and settler-colonialism, slavery, and genocide being foundational to this.”

Marcelo posited that new materialism should be more “rooted in a more reparations conversation than it is,” and a means to a “restorative process to the harm that has been done in the name of science.” Our conversation is when I began thinking of creating a different lens for my work entirely, pulling from a yet-to-be-developed realm of Restorative Materialisms, which pay acknowledgement and reparations to the harmful lineage that new materialism comes from, as well as connecting with the heart of the immediacy, empathy, and connection that subject-object non-duality can produce, rather than praising the many publishable niche branches of materialist study that exist for the sake of themselves.

Following our conversation I generated *parkway*, about the Jordan River Parkway trail and its materiality. I wanted to steer away from the hypotheticality that comprises so much of this body of work and the academization this reeks of. Figuring out my relationship with the land I occupy and its materiality will be messy. The process of creating this structure with its excess of semi-unstable layers and superfluous variety of materials was appropriate in embodying this messiness, and the learning that can only occur by doing. I reached for the plaster as a skin for the natural materials I collected from the parkway trail, it functions as an analog for the constant narrative building and meaning-making I was imposing in real time during the period I spent commuting on the river trail during my gap year. The tannins in the

wooden branches seeped a bit through the plaster, discoloring it. This was a fantastic discovery aligning with my object of focus in the piece, my own attempt to distance from my (colonizer) narrative prescribing tendencies, the kind of prescription process that coats material and life in a monochromatic skin. I took the advice of Marcelo, that a necessary part of my incorporation of new materialism, and perspective on materiality of natural environments in my work, is to ask, how am I benefitting from this stolen land? How am I stepping into the space made by genocide? As I entered these questions, I grounded myself into other topics we explored in our conversation, about matter and energy not being separate. Matter is something I can activate with my body. The more connected to my body I am, the more connected I am to the land and the process of finding the right relationship to it. A lot of my process was entering my body by walking along the trail, during which time I reflected on the surrounding settler development (hyperobject) that has choked and irreversibly altered the river. Yet, the veins of the river remain. There are still ways to talk to the water. Marcelo explained to me that plants have a different temporality than we do, and there is a way to speak to this. I began collecting dead thistles along the river, which I also coated in plaster and appear around the sculpture. I may not know how to reach toward the alternate temporality of plants, but it felt important to incorporate natural materials and open the door to the pull plant material might have on me, especially considering the absence of plants in the rest of my body. This piece represents what I consider the crucial jumping of point for future study, de-colonizing new materialism and entering a more direct and reparative path to tactile embrace and response.





CONCLUSION: FLESH HAS FLESH

A huge pull towards new materialism, even as I try to disentangle myself with its problematic emergence and existence, is the reverse-justification it provides for what I refer to as clay-people pedagogy. This tenant of my personal practice is the result of the constant struggle I have to interact with people. I try to learn how by working with clay, allowing the complexities, finesse, and unpredictability to inform how I handle other humans. As struggles emerge working with clay, I look to my entanglements with people for insight. My performance work both represents and exemplifies this dialogue. The theory I'm citing to justify this isn't necessary for continuing or presenting this practice, but my hope is that by fleshing out the theoretical end, possibilities will open to a broader understanding of how myself and others carry what they learn in relating to and interacting with objects into our interactions with other humans. It bolsters my argument that reconceptualizing the non-human object conditions our brains in new ways to foster empathy, and my work is an experiment in this new kind of empathy learning. Opening the door to these new pathways to and through objects has produced overwhelming and overflowing results, and performance art is a different kind of container that I must use to catch and sustain the fluxy power of negotiation between entities.

In the midst of wading into this scholarship, I sometimes feel I have floundered in an indecipherable sea of intersections and contradictions between actor-network theory, speculative realism, vibrant materialism, object-oriented ontology, object-oriented feminism, study of literary matter, art theory, post-Anthropocentrism, and postmodernist constructionism. This propels me further into the fragmented, hyperpluralistic stew of post-humanist, post-structuralist life to which most of these studies respond. I must retreat back into the lucidity of the clay itself, representing a direct telegraph of myself into material. Critical theorist Bill Brown asks in his key text "Thing Theory," Why complicate things with theory? "Why not let things alone? Let them rest somewhere else--in the balmy elsewhere beyond theory," as a relief, an alternative to the fetishized "ambiguities and anxieties" (1). When I emerge with my objects and experience, I pick these theoretical threads up with a rich, intimate relationship connection to the material to ground my research in. Rather than my work being a means of promoting or even condoning new materialism, it is a mental strategy to perpetuate the creation of art and experiences. This lack of fundamental adoption of new materialism has produced a rift in my practice, a tear down the middle of it. The times when I'm able to translate the implications on subject-object connection into an authentic offering of and invitation to empathy, I believe the work comes across with an attitude of gratitude and faith in the sanctity of objects that have been vested with vibrancy. While I fear bastardization and elitism present in the act of taking the honest, sacred act of working with clay and debasing it with fairly inaccessible, largely abstract, self-contradictory theory, I continue to constantly find caches of justification for donning a contemporary, metacritical lens in order to keep producing objects.

Works Cited

- Abadía, Mónica Cano. "New Materialisms: Re-Thinking Humanity Within an Interdisciplinary Framework." *InterCultural Philosophy*, vol. Nr. 1, May 2018, pp. 168-183 Seiten. *DOI.org (Datacite)*, <https://doi.org/10.11588/ICP.2018.1.48071>.
- Alaimo, Stacy, and Susan J. Hekman, editors. *Material Feminisms*. Indiana University Press, 2008.
- Appadurai, Arjun. "Mediants, Materiality, Normativity." *Public Culture*, vol. 27, no. 2 76, May 2015, pp. 221–37. *DOI.org (Crossref)*, <https://doi.org/10.1215/08992363-2841832>.
- Apter, Emily, et al. "A Questionnaire on Materialisms." *October*, vol. 155, Jan. 2016, pp. 3–110. *DOI.org (Crossref)*, https://doi.org/10.1162/OCTO_a_00243.
- Bennett, Jane. *Vibrant Matter: A Political Ecology of Things*. Duke University Press, 2010. *DOI.org (Crossref)*, <https://doi.org/10.1215/9780822391623>.
- Brown, Bill. *Other Things*. The University of Chicago Press, 2015.
- . "Thing Theory." *Critical Inquiry*, vol. 28, no. 1, 2001, pp. 1–22.
- Coole, Diana, and Samantha Frost, editors. *New Materialisms: Ontology, Agency, and Politics*. Duke University Press, 2010. *DOI.org (Crossref)*, <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv11cw2wk>.
- Crockett, Clayton. *Derrida after the End of Writing: Political Theology and New Materialism*. Fordham University Press, 2017. *DOI.org (Crossref)*, <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt1xhr741>.
- Dewey, John. *Art as Experience*. Perigee trade paperback ed, Berkeley Publ. Group, 2005.
- Foucault, Michel. "Of Other Spaces." *Architecture /Mouvement/ Continuité*, Oct. 1984, <http://web.mit.edu/allanmc/www/foucault1.pdf>.
- Hamilton, Andrea, and Christopher Hall. "Erratum: The Mechanics of Moisture-Expansion Cracking in Fired-Clay Ceramics." *Journal of Physics D: Applied Physics*, vol. 46, no. 9, Mar. 2013, p. 099601. *DOI.org (Crossref)*, <https://doi.org/10.1088/0022-3727/46/9/099601>.
- Haraway, Donna Jeanne. *Manifestly Haraway*. University of Minnesota Press, 2016.
- Horton, Jessica L., and Janet Catherine Berlo. "Beyond the Mirror: Indigenous Ecologies and 'New Materialisms' in Contemporary Art." *Third Text*, vol. 27, no. 1, Jan. 2013, pp. 17–28. *DOI.org (Crossref)*, <https://doi.org/10.1080/09528822.2013.753190>.
- Jones, Amelia. *Body Art/Performing the Subject*. University of Minnesota Press, 1998.
- . "Material Traces: Performativity, Artistic 'Work,' and New Concepts of Agency." *TDR: The Drama Review*, vol. 59, no. 4, 2015, pp. 18–35.
- Lange-Berndt, Petra, editor. *Materiality*. Whitechapel Gallery ; The MIT Press, 2015.
- Leonardi. "When Flexible Routines Meet Flexible Technologies: Affordance, Constraint, and the Imbrication of Human and Material Agencies." *MIS Quarterly*, vol. 35, no. 1, 2011, p. 147. *DOI.org (Crossref)*, <https://doi.org/10.2307/23043493>.
- Lupton, Deborah. *Vital Materialism and the Thing-Power of Lively Digital Data*. 2018. *DOI.org (Datacite)*, <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.13191.09129>.
- Lupton, Ellen, and Jennifer Tobias. *Skin : Surface, Substance + Design*.
- Malabou, Catherine. *Ontology of the Accident: An Essay on Destructive Plasticity*. Polity, 2012.
- mireles, cildo. *Insertions into Ideological Circuits, 1970-75*. http://asounder.org/resources/mireles_insertion.pdf. Accessed 19 Apr. 2022.
- Mitchell, W. J. T. *What Do Pictures Want? The Lives and Loves of Images*. 6. repr, University of Chicago Press, 2010.
- Montalvo, Marcelo Garzo. *In Conversation: E.C. Comstock and Marcelo Garzo Montalvo*. 12 Mar. 2022.
- Morton, Timothy. *Hyperobjects: Philosophy and Ecology after the End of the World*. University of Minnesota Press, 2013.
- Richards, Mary Caroline. *Centering in Pottery, Poetry, and the Person*. 2nd ed, Wesleyan University Press, 1989.

- Sharon Wohl. *New Materialism & Assemblage*. 2020. YouTube, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sYlx_DVVsf4.
- Soge, Mikael Migu. *Ethics Explainer: What Is Post-Humanism?*
- Sorkin, Jenni. *Live Form: Women, Ceramics, and Community*. The University of Chicago Press, 2016.
- Thiry-Cherques, Hermano Roberto. "Baudrillard: Work and Hyperreality." *RAE Eletronica*, vol. 9, no. 2, 2010, <https://link.gale.com/apps/doc/A245115004/AONE?u=marriottlibrary&sid=AONE&xid=b4f52d0a>.
- Wasserman, Sarah. "Thing Theory 2017: A Forum." *ARCADE*, 2017, arcade.stanford.edu/content/thing-theory-2017-forum.
- Wisnoski, Barbara. "An Aesthetics of Everything Else: Craft and Flat Ontologies." *The Journal of Modern Craft*, vol. 12, no. 3, Sept. 2019, pp. 205–17. *DOI.org (Crossref)*, <https://doi.org/10.1080/17496772.2019.1678867>.
- Yanagi, Muneyoshi, and Bernard Leach. *The Unknown Craftsman: A Japanese Insight into Beauty*. 1. US ed, Kodansha, 2013.
- Yi Sencindiver, Susan. *New Materialism*. Oxford University Press, 26 July 2017, pp. 9780190221911–0016. *DOI.org (Crossref)*, <https://doi.org/10.1093/obo/9780190221911-0016>.
- Young, Garry, and Monica T. Whitty. "In Search of the Cartesian Self: An Examination of Disembodiment within 21st-Century Communication." *Theory & Psychology*, vol. 20, no. 2, Apr. 2010, pp. 209–29. *DOI.org (Crossref)*, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0959354309345633>.

IMAGE LIST

In order of mention:

1. *Insulators*; soda-fired ceramic, alder, reclaimed steel; 51"x 48"x 9"; 2022
2. *Balmy Evening: Imbrication*; reduction cooled ceramic, porcelain, fabric, coconut oil, honey, performance; 22" x 15" x 17"; 2022
3. *3*; reduction cooled ceramic, waxed fabric, wet clay, honey, plaster refuse; 12" x 33" x 21"; 2022
4. *Tenderize*; alder, PWD, 2x4's, spray foam insulation, oil paint, video; 48" x 18" x 10"; 2021
5. *Dissolution*; performance, ceramic, clay slip, wet pots, dry slip, hand-dyed fabric; 2022
6. *Cede*; performance, ceramic, beeswax; 2021
7. *Alter*; ceramic, video; 5" x 10" x 8"; 2021
8. *Dool*; ceramic, wax; 41" x 20" x 18"; 2022
9. *Viscc*; digital photos; 2022
10. *Trinity*, 0.016, etc.; cast aluminum, porcelain, honey, glass table; 2022
11. *parkway*; ceramic, thistles, branches, plaster; 66" x 16" x 16"; 2022