

Rhetoric and Materiality in the Museum Park at the North Carolina Museum of Art

This paper contributes to the scholarly discussion on rhetoric's materiality by demonstrating how the sculptures and installations of the Museum Park at the North Carolina Museum of Art create "spaces of attention" wherein visitors are invited to see and experience the landscape around them in new and profoundly rhetorical ways. Our analysis reveals two overarching enactments that characterize these spaces of attention: the inside/outside and the regenerative/transformational. It concludes by examining the tensions contained within these enactments as well as the implications of their possible transference to other contexts.

Key Words: material rhetoric, spaces of attention, multi-modal experience, environmental sculpture, landscape

In one of the few contemporary essays to examine landscape architecture or "garden design" from a rhetorical perspective, Lawrence Rosenfield investigated the extent to which Central Park – the first urban park expressly constructed for general public use – served much the same function as that of civic oratory or eloquence, providing the means "to celebrate institutions and ideological principles thought to be the genius of those cultures."¹ More recently, Gregory Clark employed Kenneth Burke to demonstrate how touring America has been made an experience of rhetorically engaging not only the vast landscape "that is made a general material symbol of the nation, but also the particular symbolic places within that landscape that prompt within visitors various feelings and attitudes that leave them understanding themselves and their place in the national community differently than before."² And Michael Halloran and Clark, drawing upon the work of J.B. Jackson, maintained that places like national parks provide an infrastructure and background for collective existence by connecting the aesthetic function of scenery with the rhetorical function of influencing individual identity in collective ways.³ While they employ the language of symbolism in their rhetorical analyses, these scholars are describing what other rhetorical critics, writing about public art installations, commemorative sites, and public

parks conceive of as “material rhetorics” and, therefore, as among “the richest sites for inquiry into the production of cultural and personal knowledge.”⁴

For rhetorical critics, moving from symbolicity to materiality involves a shift from examining representations (what does a text mean/what are the persuader’s goals) to examining enactments (what does a text or artifact do/what are the consequences beyond that of the persuader’s goals) and, as Carole Blair suggests, to considering questions including, among others: what is the significance of a particular artifact or text’s material existence? What does it do with or against other artifacts? And how does it act upon persons?⁵ For example, in their analysis of public art in urban spaces, Margaret LaWare and Victoria Gallagher suggest that material rhetorics contribute to discourses of public identity by inviting visitors to see and experience the landscape (or physical context) around them in new, and very much embodied, ways. More specifically, this rhetoric creates “spaces of attention”: as visitors encounter these works they are led to notice the material context in a way that previously may not have been significant.⁶ As Jonathan Crary might explain, spaces of attention engage “more than the single-sense modality of sight”; they also involve “hearing and touch and...irreducibly *mixed* modalities which, inevitably, get little or no analysis within ‘visual studies.’”⁷

In this paper, we attempt to make the concept of “spaces of attention” even more explicit for rhetorical critics interested in the material rhetoric of public parks and other sites, and to delineate some of its important rhetorical features, by examining a particular landscape, the “Museum Park” at the North Carolina Museum of Art (NCMA) in Raleigh, North Carolina. We thereby contribute to the scholarly discussion of material rhetoric and its enactments,

exemplifying how artifacts, such as the sculptures and installations in the Museum Park may invoke a kind of collective consciousness and sense of civic and cultural understanding.

As the NCMA's webpage and the comments of the artists indicate, the Museum Park and its artworks were developed as a response to environmental issues of direct concern to the citizens of Raleigh. While the city is known for its green spaces, many residents and their political leaders are wrestling with ways of managing the area's rapid growth and dwindling natural resources.⁸ The Museum Park's sculptures and installations enable visitors to experience the natural space into which they enter, and the environmental concerns associated with (spaces like) it, in innovative ways, through what Sarah Cant and Nina Morris call "embodied-sensuous experience ... and performative, 'non-representational' and reflexive approaches."⁹ As Mary Miss, one of the Museum Park's artists puts it: in a region challenged by environmental problems, overwhelming people with conservation rules and caveats is only one solution. "Using artists is the best thing we have at hand today" to change the way people see the world and to make them "intimately" aware of environmental issues.¹⁰ Curators for the NCMA describe it this way: the function of the Museum Park is to feature "innovative art projects that connect art and nature and expand the visitor's perception of both" while providing "a laboratory for experimentation with environmental art and ecological restoration, a place for a quiet walk of discovery and a bridge to connect the broadest possible audience with artistic and environmental issues of the future."¹¹

What Miss describes as making people "intimately" aware of environmental issues through art, and what the curators refer to as "experimentation," "restoration," "discovery," and "connect[ing] the broadest possible audience with artistic and environmental issues of the future," are accomplished primarily, we argue, through two material enactments of the

human-nature interface: inside/outside and regenerative/transformative. By *inside/outside* we refer to the experience of moving 1) between constructed spaces, such as a museum space or an urban landscape, to less constructed, more organic spaces such as the outdoor park or the rural landscape; and 2) between what we refer to as natural history and human history. By *regenerative/transformative* we mean moving 1) from natural states to human constructed states and back again to nature, and 2) from one state of understanding to another. The capacity to create spaces of attention that call forth particular experiences reveals the potential rhetorical impact and reach of the Museum Park's material forms.¹² Ultimately, we wish to argue that the Museum Park provides what Della Pollock calls an "exceptional space" ripe with "performative" possibilities for attending to environmental and design issues in new ways; it presents a blueprint for how citizens of Raleigh in particular, and of other urban/rural places in general, might re-imagine themselves and their relationship to the local landscapes.¹³ At the same time, however, our study reveals crucial tensions associated, first, with any material enactment which serves to mediate the human/nature interface and the collective identity of a community; second, with efforts to transfer the Museum Park's rhetorical gestures and enactments to other contexts where they may be employed to justify human encroachment into wilderness areas; and third, with the material and symbolically open character of the Museum Park's "spaces of attention" versus more discursive, direct representations of environmental issues.

In what follows, we briefly describe the Museum Park. We then provide a critical analysis of the Museum Park, demonstrating how the *inside/outside* and *regenerative/transformative* enactments engage visitors rhetorically, thereby creating spaces of attention in which they can consider and experience the human/nature interface in new ways.¹⁴ We conclude by examining

the extent to which the material rhetoric of museum parks (and other outdoor mediated spaces) may lead to the development of environmental consciousness and community identity as well as the tensions associated with this process.

Rhetorical Enactments in the Museum Park

In Raleigh, the director and staff of the NCMA have devoted considerable resources to the construction of an outdoor Museum Park in which environmental sculptures and other artworks are combined with natural elements to create an innovative public space ripe with meaning. At 164 acres, and situated between some of Raleigh's most thriving urban and serene rural settings, the Museum Park is thought to be the largest outdoor museum park in the United States.¹⁵ In addition to supplying local residents with recreational and leisure opportunities, the Museum Park also represents an emerging trend in art-related structures that seek to mediate the human/nature interface through "mixed modalities," creating modes of attention which, as Crary explains, "are neither exclusively nor essentially visual but rather constituted as other temporalities and cognitive states."¹⁶ As Cant and Morris put it, "the human-environment relationships associated with art outdoors and explorations of art-forms ...are not solely determined by visual experiences, but open out new spaces and encounters with art and art-making."¹⁷ It is important to note that, as in the material rhetoric of many other parks and public art sites, the material rhetoric of the Museum Park does not so much articulate policy proposals in an argumentative space. Rather, it opens up an experimental, performative space, in which visitors are pushed to look beyond the normal conventions and boundaries of museums, as well as of urban and rural landscape design, to experience what Crary calls "counter-forms of attention."¹⁸ Following the work of Homi Bhabha, Pollock might explain this experience as "the next best thing to an originary

moment: it is ... a ‘performative’ moment, redolent with possibility, productivity and agency.”¹⁹ In short, the Museum Park points to how natural and urban/suburban spaces in Raleigh and elsewhere might co-exist or be alternatively imagined and how new versions of community might be experienced in urban/rural settings.

The Museum Park surrounds the NCMA on three sides. The Museum complex itself is located in an urban area of west Raleigh, bounded by a private college, a subdivision of homes, a collection of health-related and state government buildings, North Carolina State University agricultural fields and forests, and William B. Umstead State Park, a 5577-acre park reserved for outdoor recreation. Hiking/biking trails connect Umstead Park, the urban areas, and the Raleigh Greenway trail system with the NCMA and its Museum Park, which was built on what were formerly farmland and the site of the Polk Youth Correctional facility, since relocated. The Museum Park consists of woodlands, open areas, and streams traversed by connecting trails and various works of art, and can be accessed from any number of entrances, both those emanating from the Museum and those outside of it.

Once inside the grounds, visitors can view several artworks, all connected by and set next to the extensive trail system. Starting at the main Museum entrance, the Museum Park trail wanders along a hill above an outdoor theatre and past what was, at one time, the correctional facility. Off to the left, acting as a sort of nexus between the Museum-building, the theatre and the Museum Park, is Barbara Kruger’s permanent cornerstone installation, “PICTURE THIS” (1994-1997) -- 80-foot long letters dotted onto the landscape that, according to the Museum’s website, “relates the theatre to the Museum building physically and thematically.”²⁰ Just beyond the Correctional facility site, visitors encounter Vollis Simpson’s “Wind Machine” (2002), a sprawling mechanical contraption made of found

objects sitting atop a 35-foot pole, parts of which twirl in the breeze while visitors watch and horses graze in a nearby pasture. The site for this and other artworks along the trail near the pasture are important, since the pasture is one of the last of a series of “lovely horse pastures” that once lined highways around the Museum.²¹ From the site of “Wind Machine” the trail runs along a ridge lined by benches, footbridges and gateways constructed out of salvaged materials from the old prison, and past Thomas Sayre’s “Gyre” (1999) -- three sunken ellipses of concrete colored with iron oxide, reinforced with steel, and dappled with dirt residue, what Sayre calls “earth castings.”

Until recently, the trail also ran next to Patrick Dougherty’s “Trail Heads,” (2005), a primitive-looking, cocoon-shaped sculpture woven from maple and sweet gum saplings (“Trail Heads,” as we will discuss in greater detail later in the essay, has since been composted). Down the ridge from and to the left of “Trailheads” is landscape artist Mary Miss’s ongoing reconstruction of a retention pond, to be turned into a stormwater management demonstration project and representing unique experimental collaborations between artists, architects, landscape architects and environmental scientists. To the right of the ridge the trail splits: one section runs off into the distance to a new pedestrian bridge over a cross-town expressway and the other down the ridge and into a clump of deep woods. Visitors encounter three additional sculptures on this portion of the trail, which moves from manicured lawns to overgrown grassy fields to deep forests. These include Martha Jackson-Jarvis’s “Crossroads/Trickster 1” (2006), a tall, thin tower consisting of carnelian and Italian glass tile embedded around and within shattered bricks from the Correctional facility; Steven Siegel’s “To See Jennie Smile” (2006), a giant steeple-like stack of newspapers, folded and nailed around a split gum tree and two-by-fours, slowly biodegrading into the forest floor on

which the sculpture has been anchored; and Chris Drury's "Cloud Chamber for the Trees and Sky" (2003), a stone and thatch chamber, the interior of which reveals images of overhead trees and clouds projected onto the walls and floor through a *camera obscura* in its roof.

In the summer of 2007, the NCMA also commissioned/acquired two additional outdoor sculptures from South African artist Ledelle Moe: "Collapse," "a monumental piece that resembles either a giant humanlike boulder or a rocklike person sinking into a grassy slope," and "Untitled," a smaller companion sculpture that looks like a "figure curled up tightly and resting under the trees."²² As we demonstrate below, the symbolic and material resources of each of these artworks serve to evoke two primary enactments for the Park's visitors.

Inside/Outside

The close connection between 1) an urban museum and 2) a large outdoor park with its own rolling prairies, pond, streams and forested areas dedicated to preserving the natural landscape, creates a unique opportunity for visitors to experience the relationship between art and urban/rural ecology and to have an intensified experience of existing both inside and outside at the same time. As Linda Dougherty (the Museum's contemporary art curator) describes the experience: despite being surrounded by urban/suburban density, the Museum Park "kind of becomes wilder and wilder as you move away from the [Museum] building."²³ In fact, the experience is one of moving from the stark, modernist geometric forms of the Museum buildings, and artworks like "PICTURE THIS" and "Gyre," to the increasingly more organic shapes and materials of "Crossroads," "To See Jennie Smile," and finally "Cloud Chamber." This transition from a highly structured material state (inside) to a "wilder" experience of nature (outside) is not particularly evident at any specific place along the trail except perhaps at the very beginning near the parking lot, although even here the

wildflower gardens, tree-lines and other natural elements encircle and interpenetrate the overall Museum area. Yet the effect is one of what Michael Osborn calls “intensification” often associated with visual rhetoric: the gradual shift in the formal elements of the artworks from geometric to more and more organic intensifies the visitor’s emotional experience of the natural elements around him or her.²⁴ Giles Deleuze and Felix Guattari push this insight further, describing such experiences as “flow,” or, the de-segmentation and dismantling of organized structures so that aspects of the world artificially separated for scientific or other purposes are reconnected; these parts of reality “flow” together, with no discerning breaks or transition points.²⁵ Peter Reed clarifies: “Rather than seeing a discrete separation between surface landscape and architectural support, some designers have begun to explore forms and ideas that meld the organic and the built.... This exploration of connectivity and flow leads to complex forms that blur the distinctions between landscape, infrastructure, and architecture.”²⁶ Thus, the material rhetoric of the Museum Park evokes this sense, so that visitors can actually experience (in the heart of an urban area) themselves and nature co-existing harmoniously, in a state of “flow” or the “inside/outside.”

In a parallel enactment of the inside/outside, museum goers become more actively self-conscious of human and natural history -- namely the tensions between nature’s ongoing processes and human efforts to manipulate and control these processes for human use. “Gyre,” for example, situates visitors temporally, by reminding them that the course of natural history is different from the span of human history.²⁷ “Gyre,” a humanly constructed object, seems enduring enough, with its three rings, weighty and sunken into the earth; however, the discoloration of the surface betrays the vulnerability of the structure to the environment, that is, to natural forces beyond the artist’s (and visitor’s) control. In other

terms, the work demonstrates how things can exist outside of nature: the massive scale and weight of “Gyre” would seem to be immune to natural forces. But in fact, as visitors can clearly experience by touching its metallic surface, “Gyre” is wholly manufactured (the accompanying text panel gives details regarding the earth casting process used by the artist to manufacture the sculpture) and completely exposed, thereby impacted by the whims of the natural world. As Sayre himself has written, “For two decades my work as a sculptor has played with ideas about human control versus serendipity (or what some would call chance), the relationship between human-made objects and the natural landscape, as well as the differences between person-built versus nature-built forms.”²⁸ Fittingly, “Collapse,” installed just up the trail from “Gyre,” contains a similar message about the relationship between the constructive impulse of humans and the simultaneously constructive and deconstructive power of nature. As Moe explains, “It feels very archaeological. It’s in that interesting place of construction and destruction that I hope comes through in my sculptures...”²⁹

“Gyre,” with its monumental forms that frame views of the Museum Park, was seen as explicitly performative by some of the students we took there because, they argued, the form and placement of the pieces encourage visitors to “move in and around them.” Also, during our many visits, we have seen children and adults lying underneath, entwining their around, and chasing one another under and between the arches (see figure 1). Rather than simply standing in front of a fixed sculpture, as museum goers generally do at more conventional exhibits, visitors become intertwined with the artwork – in a way, interacting with it. Ultimately, this experience, according to our students, helped them to “see the Park from different perspectives.”



Figure 1

“To See Jennie Smile” also exemplifies permanence and impermanence, as they are experienced inside and outside of nature and human history, but in a slightly different manner. Like other artworks in the Museum Park, this sculpture is ephemeral, gradually shrinking and collapsing into the earth. However, Siegel’s mountain of paper also reveals for visitors the possibility that even as the natural materials we take from nature (in this case, the wood pulp for newsprint) remain impermanent, they serve our purposes for periods of time (see figure 2). Siegel’s choice of compacted newsprint for an environmental sculpture is rhetorically significant, also, because the relationship between humans and nature is shown metaphorically, as (physically) “layered,” where the layers of natural history extend well beyond the bounds of human history. Siegel’s work has been likened to a fossil formation that far exceeds the heritage of humans, mere seconds in comparison to the vastness of natural time and space: “Siegel’s stacked paper sculptures are like contemporary fossils, striated, compressed, and densely layered. His works emulate geologic time and the topographical layers of the landscape.”³⁰ “To See Jennie Smile,” in other words, provides a view of being both *inside* of human history and *outside* of it, the latter of which, natural

history, is almost beyond human imagining and a rather sobering reminder that nature will far outlast the things of our making.



Figure 2

On the other hand, the sculpture also suggests that objects taken out of nature for human consumption must ultimately return to it: they must exist, in different forms, both inside of nature and outside of it. Walking around Siegel's work one becomes acutely sensitive to this 'environmental' imperative. As Reed has written about similar sculptures, by not hiding trash from public view, making it "visible to the public, the hope is that people will become more educated about and sensitive to the impact they inflict on the urban infrastructure and environment with the tons of trash they generate."³¹ This seems to be the impression one visitor we interviewed had when, after strolling around and touching "To See Jennie Smile," she said she was reminded of how much garbage humans create and of the

need to find ways of “recycling” this detritus so that future generations could “enjoy the trees.” The sculpture seemed to engage her many senses at once, leading her to a “performative” moment “redolent with possibility,” in which “recycling” and “enjoying” the trees became something of a personal epiphany. Of course, in “To See Jenny Smile,” the value of recycling old cans, newspapers, and bricks is displayed as a possibility everyone who saw the work could do once they left the Museum. The installation, in other words, reminded visitors of how the environment might be enabled. In this sense, just as Rosenfield has suggested that Central Park served the pedagogic function of embodying and promoting civic virtue, “To See Jenny Smile,” as a space of attention, disclosed an important way of being responsible *inside* of human history and, therefore, of performing *environmentally*.

The idea of “inscribed” history is shown differently in “Crossroads/Trickster,” which “echoes the history of” the Museum Park and its surrounding area, according to NCMA curator Linda Dougherty.³² In “To See Jennie Smile,” history is displayed on newsprint; however, the actual typed text is barely visible beneath the rapidly peeling and sepia-colored paper of Siegel’s mound, like current events receding into the past, another poignant sign of human fragility. But, creating a moment ripe with interpretive possibility, Jackson-Jarvis leaves it to individual viewers to peer into the mosaic of richly colored bricks and glass and to imagine what the history of the area might have been like. As Pollack explains, “Insofar as texts signify ‘the operations of the objects they have been,’ they evoke their place within a history of tools, uses, and action: they evoke their historicity.”³³ Indeed, besides having been sources for the bricks, the prison (and the U.S. Army, Civil War, and farming-related facilities that pre-dated it) is still in some sense ephemerally present, in that “Crossroad/Trickster’s” shape “echoes” the only relatively intact fixture remaining from the

original site, a tower that can be seen in the distance. The earth colors of red, brown and orange also connect the old correctional facility to the natural world, since the red earth of central North Carolina was most likely the source of clay for making the bricks. Additionally, along the path leading to “Crossroads/Trickster,” a love seat constructed out of steel bars taken from the windows of the correctional facility, invite visitors to sit closely together. As one of our students suggested, there is an irony in the fact that bars “that had been used to socially distance” young men are now used “to encourage social closeness” in an urban-rural setting. Other visitors we interviewed expressed a kind of deep wistfulness about this site, as there frequently is in many natural landscapes where urban structures once stood, their presence and the many stories of individuals who lived or worked there only a faint memory.

Thus, by entering into this space of attention, visitors also enter *inside* of another history even as they are standing *outside* of it. The enactment of this relationship in the material form of the brick and glass obelisk-structure is rhetorically important because, by looking at or touching it, viewers are reminded of the value of memory to any given public space. As Linda Dougherty suggests, the form and composition works metaphorically, resonating “with the history and memories of the site,” thus putting the past inside of the present and visa versa or combining “past and present. The artist has described the old bricks ... as ‘time capsules,’ a way of creating a new work that speaks to the historical significance of this place.”³⁴ The sculpture thereby enacts the fact that the current existence of this place, like the presence of all other urban environments, is tied to the past and in most cases to nature. As Cant and Morris might argue, this sculpture focuses “attention to the different ways that art may stimulate and embody understandings of landscape, place and identity, across a range of transitory encounters that contribute to the telling of ephemeral and

sometimes invisible stories connected to a site/artwork.”³⁵

Located at the confluence of field and forest, “Cloud Chamber” is fashioned out of the materials of nature. It enacts a transitory experience of time and space and of nature and culture – the inside/outside moment of the Museum Park’s presence – only here the transition is “from public to private, man-made to natural, open to enclosed.”³⁶ The hut is “manmade,” relying upon simple human engineering, yet its construction materials come mostly from objects found in forests like the one in which the hut has been built. (The logs were fashioned on site; the rocks for the rock-facing were brought from the base of a North Carolina mountain and cut and fit into place by local master masons; the earthen-roof was constructed out of pond-liner placed on top of stacked logs and covered with soil and vegetation). The Museum Park, furthermore, attracts hundreds of visitors daily, but only a few people, possibly no more than five or six, fit comfortably together in the hut at any particular time.

Sitting “enclosed” in the space alone or accompanied by one or two others makes for the Museum Park’s most intensely “private” (inside) space of attention: visitors are inside of nature, shut away from the hikers and bicyclists and the distant sounds of city life in the “open” areas outside. Simultaneously, if one thinks of the hut as manmade, nature is nonetheless allowed *inside*, as shadows from the trees and clouds overhead, from the *outside*, filter through the *camera obscura* to be reflected onto the hut’s interior walls. In either case, the hut does not so much segment the experience of being inside and outside of nature and culture as it actually “melds” them, creating a sense of “connectivity and flow.” In this way, the sculpture reminds visitors that nature’s solitude is possible even within the confines of urban space, but a space that has been meticulously landscaped to create this experience.

Finally, “PICTURE THIS,” in its evocation of pictorial imagination, is a powerful

inducement to performance, what according to artists and the Museum's curators is supposed to transpire inside and then again outside of that space. In fact, in order to read the letters, viewers have to be *inside* of the Museum and take an elevator to the top floor, which overlooks the Museum Park grounds and "PICTURE THIS." Once a visitor is down on the ground, *outside*, the letters become largely unreadable. From this vantage point, they are more something that a visitor must experience as part of the landscape. Viewers are now in a performative space and less a purely observational one. Moving through the section of the trail containing Kruger's block letters, they are positioned within a space of (counter) attention, to do what the giant epigram provokes: to think unconventionally about the process of *building*, perhaps challenging urban designers and/or developers to "picture" new and innovative ways of using urban and suburban space.

The Regenerative/Transformative

This emphasis on picturing new and innovative ways of seeing/using connects to the next set of enactments, the *regenerative/transformative*. As indicated earlier, by *regenerative/transformative* we mean moving 1) from natural states to human constructed states and back again to nature, and 2) from one state of understanding to another. Another way to conceptualize this enactment is via the trope of *before and after*: nature as it existed before and after human intervention, humans as they exist before and after they encounter the Museum Park. Indeed, the Museum Park's material rhetoric creates spaces of attention wherein visitors experience how nature can be transformed into items of human use, and then transformed yet again through regenerative processes of recycling or natural deterioration, so they may return to something of their original state. Thus this rhetoric reveals nature to be regenerative through its capacity (sometimes with the assistance of humans) to restore itself.

But, by calling attention to the regenerative and transformative as important values and ways of relating to the natural world, the artworks also evoke environmental consciousness, both on the individual and communal levels. They remind visitors that, by refusing to regenerate and transform nature, some of what remains will one day be forever lost. The individual artworks enact these values, ways of relating, and modes of consciousness in unique material ways so that, taken together, they intensify visitors' emotional experience of regeneration/transformation by enabling them to experience nature on its own terms, as a sensual, organic form.

The most obvious example of what we are describing is "To See Jennie Smile," which portrays the regenerative/transformational cycles of life; it is "a literal depiction of 'before and after' – the newspaper's original source and its current state – directly juxtaposing the manmade and the natural. Siegel brings the newspaper back to its point of origin, the forest.... the work [mimics] the cycles of the natural world."³⁷ In addition, Siegel's sculpture suggests that, in order for humans to literally inscribe their "histories" onto paper, they must at the same time find ways of recycling – that is, regenerating -- the original paper source, so that nature itself, the trees and forests, can have a future history as well.

Too, "Gyre" depicts in materially evocative terms the cycles of life and death. Stemming from the Greek word *gyros*, "Gyre" refers to circular or spiral movement or form. Here the three ellipses, parts of which are buried in the ground, suggest on the one hand the realization that all life ends, just as it begins, in some primordial, inorganic state. On the other hand, the stout shapes, sinking into earth but rising out of it, enact the 'organic' possibilities of transcendence and regeneration. In fact, at least one of Sayre's other projects – similar "earth cast" sculptures at Raleigh's "The Healing Place," a nonprofit recovery and

rehabilitation program for homeless alcoholic and drug addicted men -- makes these possibilities of before and after, regeneration and transformation, even more explicit. One work is a 17-18-foot tall window-like structure and the other, standing at roughly the same height, looks like a massive door. According to Jim Jenkins, both works suggest “the barriers Healing Place participants will face and [a] door removed through which they will eventually pass [after treatment]. Ultimately, Sayre [says], he hopes ‘real meaning will be discovered by the men who come here.’”³⁸ In other words, just as the sculptures reveal new possibilities for progress from one place or state to another, so too might alcoholics and drug addicts transcend their addictions and spiritually, psychologically, and physically regenerate (that is to say, heal) themselves.

Meanwhile, “Wind Machine” quite literally enacts transformation by converting wind to kinetic energy; thus it points to current and possible future harvesting of natural forces into ‘green’ power. Also, as the Museum Park’s most overtly discursive argument for green approaches to the environment, Miss’ retention pond “turn[s] science into art,”³⁹ and, with the projected ecological restoration (educational) projects for visitors and students from local schools, art into science. As Jarvis has written, “Working with N.C. State University, the museum will turn [the retention pond] into a stormwater management demonstration project – perfect for biology field trips – and a significant piece of environmental art.”⁴⁰ Most importantly, the space will bristle with material and symbolic regenerative/transformational possibilities: designed terraces planted with trees and other shrubbery “will naturally filter stormwater as it drains to the pond,”⁴¹ while efforts to transform the now mud-colored pool to blue will reveal the physical cleansing or regeneration of fouled water.

The willowy cocoon or womb-like structure of “Trailheads” (see Figure 3) also enacts

regenerative/transformative possibilities. In this space of attention, performance is vital to linking oneself to the environment in a most direct way, for the sculpture enables children and adults alike to enter the sculptures, weaving in and between the small “rooms” and “passageways.” It thus creates an imaginary play space, and, in this sense, recalls a tree house – but a house rooted at the base of the trees and earth, which it requires for its existence, allowing the human players and the tree to become one. More pointedly still, “Trailheads” provokes visitors’ imaginations, stimulating curious, transformative modes of experience and thinking. Based on our interviews with museum goers and our own impressions, the material enactments here, as elsewhere in the Museum Park, appear to lead to a kind of identification with nature, and then, to a transformation of consciousness. As Deleuze and Guattari might put it, the Museum Park’s spaces of attention enable visitors to escape from the human strata by strange “becomings:” “This should be read without a pause: the animal-stalks-at-five- o’clock. The becoming evening, becoming-night of an animal, blood nuptials. Five o’clock is this animal! This animal is this place! ‘The thin dog is running in the road, this dog is the road,’ cries Virginia Woolf. That is how we need to feel.”⁴² Deleuze and Guattari suggest that animals “become” the “place,” that the “dog” becomes the “road,” and thus they urge us “to feel” like the dog in order to explore alternative experiences. Likewise, once they begin performing within the Museum Park – climbing and crawling in and around “Trailhead” or “Cloud Chamber,” for instance -- visitors enter nature to “feel” it, becoming like rodents and forest creatures that make their homes in the roots of trees or in the burrows of the earth. As Blair might observe, visitors are “conscripted” to identify with nature, so that they may act on nature’s behalf as “agents of change,” without necessarily relying exclusively on prescribed institutional solutions.⁴³ On

another level, though, “Trailheads” literally enacts regeneration and transformation, as the twigs and saplings of the sculpture have been converted into mulch for a walkway to an educational shelter to be built on the site where this work once rested. But like “Cloud Chamber,” “Trailheads” also reminds one of ancient huts constructed out of natural materials discovered in the surrounding environment, what we would suggest is another example of nature being transformed into objects of human use and, with the mulching, back to nature.



Figure 3

The tower sculpture of “Crossroads/Trickster” reveals how an unattractive correctional building may be transformed into something “beautiful.” In this sense, the space of attention created here is very much like what Reed describes when he notices how “defunct steel mills, sanitary landfills, [and] polluted riverfronts” have been reclaimed and transformed by landscape architects who turned them into “our new parks.”⁴⁴ In the Museum Park Jackson-Jarvis has taken the prison as a place for ‘bad’ people, a site of human suffering and dislocation, and suffused it with new meaning by returning the site to nature. Thus she recombines nature and the human-made in an innovative manner, transforming “not only our preconception of what makes a park but also what makes a landscape beautiful.”⁴⁵

While the idea of *personal* transformation is gestured toward by all of the Museum Park's sculptures, there is, perhaps, no better enactment than in "Cloud Chamber." Enclosed by the structure's sometimes damp, always cool walls, a visitor feels almost buried beneath the primordial earth. However, stepping outside from the dark, womb-like enclosure, one experiences what many visitors we talked with called "a spring-like resurrection or re-birth" back into the tree-filtered sunlight, in which the museum goer experiences a new vision or image of nature. Here, as in the Museum Park's other sculptures, enactment occurs by engaging multiple modalities, since visitors are invited to think about, to feel, touch, and smell the environment, as a way of "connecting" to or "becoming" part of it.

Lastly, "PICTURE THIS" encourages a change from one state of mind to another, challenging conventional thinking and serving as an invitation to participate in the transformative experience of the Museum Park. As an overtly *discursive* space of attention (and in this way, somewhat similar to Miss's retention pond), it is in one sense disruptive of the natural landscape. Yet its placement at the beginning of the trail system rhetorically enacts the creative possibilities of what a museum (and other recreational or residential) outdoor space can become when much of its original natural character is retained, as opposed to the sculpture gardens at other museums, with their "flat manicured lawns and easily accessible paths."⁴⁶ In other words, by turning largely un-disturbed nature into art and *visa versa*, "PICTURE THIS" poses alternatives for transforming rural space in a suburban/urban-dense zone ripe for commercial development. Such "transformative" alternatives would seem to be increasingly important in cities like Raleigh, where conservationists find themselves in "a race against developers who are swooping into previously rural areas..."⁴⁷

Implications and Conclusions

As our analysis has demonstrated, both of the Museum Park's main enactments, *inside/outside* and *regenerative/transformational*, contribute to forming spaces of attention that highlight what Peter Kraftl calls "everyday practices," actions individuals can perform to enable themselves and the natural environment around them. Writing about the Steiner school of Pembrokeshire, in West Wales, Kraftl says that art and nature intersect as "performance" in the "everyday practices" of life. At the Steiner school, performance infuses the type of education that occurs there, the physical process of constructing the school, and the daily uses of the buildings.⁴⁸ Similarly, in the Museum Park the learning is in the doing -- in wandering around and 'interacting' with the artworks, in partaking in the nature walks, experiments, and other educational activities offered by the Museum's curators and centered around such environmental installations as Miss's water retention pond. Even before Miss's project, the area around the retention pond was a site of education when elementary students from a downtown Raleigh magnet school were asked to make drawings of what they imagined to be environmentally-friendly landscapes that included a pond and residential quarters. For these and future students, the pond was and continues to be a place of performing what it means to be connected to natural space in an environmentally thoughtful and responsible manner. In addition, guided walks along the trails include lectures on the environmental artworks, discussions about pond design, and eco-tours investigating "species adaptations in birds, trees, ferns or wildflowers of forest, field or stream habitats."⁴⁹ As Maxwell Anderson, the director and CEO of the Indianapolis Museum of Art (which has a museum park designed with the same intent as the one at the NCMA) has observed, this sort of museum experience encourages new ways of acting within and thinking about the environment: "It's interesting to consider what a museum is trying to achieve with a park.

For us, it's really creating a safe place for artists to make work that is experimental and challenging and about the natural environment.”⁵⁰

Even as the Museum Park creates innovative opportunities for individuals to attend to the human/nature interface, it also seeks to move these personal epiphanies toward a *communal* identity based upon an appreciation of, and a respect for, the natural environment. This is similar to what Rosenfield, and Halloran and Clark, refer to when they argue that parks create opportunities “of beholding a common reality” and “of joining with our community in giving thought to what we witness,” so that we may contemplate or celebrate the values we share.⁵¹ As suggested earlier, even in the Museum Park's more solitary spaces of attention visitors are “conscripted” to gather, to think and talk about the landscape around them. They may or may not be conscripted to be “environmentalists,” in the technical and political senses of the term. But, rhetorically, this may not really be the point. In fact, museum goers do perform membership in a community made up of walkers, bicyclists, joggers, art enthusiasts, and so on who, by virtue of their very use of the grounds, would seem to value open space and who are, in any case, *interpellated* by the Museum Park to become more “intimately” aware of environmental issues. Thus our analysis illustrates how museum parks and other material rhetorics have the potential to serve as sites of rhetorical performance or “performativity” and thus to animate a shared critical consciousness (i.e., new ways of seeing or attending to) the human/nature interface that then bear significance for how we engage environmental issues and not least, perhaps, questions of urban development.

Indeed, as NCMA officials stated, the artworks are meant to “stimulate discussions about the relationships among art, public space, landscape design and the natural environment.” Patrick Dougherty has also spoken about how he is “dedicated to a kind of

conversation with the world about sculpture. What turns me on is to make something big and public that's a statement, and then to stand behind it and have conversations with people – almost to use it as an excuse for the dialogue.”⁵² And, by linking her “Crossroads/Trickster” with passageways, Jackson-Jarvis’s sculpture evokes connectedness over solitary meditation. Indeed, the value of a strong community identity is no place better materially enacted than in “To See Jenny Smile,” in which the layers with “the fold” facing out – all the pages held tightly together – will far outlast the layers in which the individual edges face out, clearly rotting from the elements. Like other spaces of attention in the Museum Park, both “Crossroads/Trickster” and “To See Jenny Smile” contextualize their respective grounds, linking those who wander there with the adjacent women’s college and the rest of the Raleigh Greenway. Accordingly, the sites are evocative of “community” in that they act as gathering places and as public passageways where visitors can actually convene, converse, and move to and from the surrounding urban areas.

As a space of attention writ large, the Museum Park provides the resources for encouraging individuals to consider and re-consider their relationship with nature, and, also, with each other. As one of our students declared, “Perhaps we need bigger gestures outside in nature to help us realize who we are, what we are doing, and the consequences of our actions.”⁵³ Still, as we mentioned at the beginning, there are several tensions contained within the Museum Park’s enactments, which are important to consider as we think more generally about material rhetoric, and the concept of “spaces of attention.”

First, no matter how *inside* nature the experiences in any particular museum park may be, it is important to keep in mind that they are not the same as direct experiences or, what Rosenfield might refer to as “reality’s disclosure.”⁵⁴ By creating specific spaces of attention,

material rhetoric of all types change natural space and our experience of it from direct appreciation for what *is* to a more prescriptive mode that recommends what we ought to do and be. In this sense, in the Museum Park “Cloud Chamber” is both the most direct in its enactment and the most prescriptive in the way its form and structure shape visitors’ experiences of nature in specific ways. Visitors must relinquish control by giving up, at least temporarily, their sight. The result is that they come to see nature as it is revealed through the *camera obscura*, as a reflection of trees and clouds on the floor of the chamber. When they re-emerge outside the womb-like enclosure, they have performed a particular experience of and relationship to nature, one that involves giving up some control to gain a new perspective. But the experience has been entirely mediated through a material rhetoric. The tension at issue here revolves around the extent to which any museum (or other type of) park’s ability to promote communal epiphanies gained through common rhetorical experiences of the human/nature interface hinders individual epiphanies gained through an ecstatic experience of nature as it appears to an onlooker in some remote part of an untamed natural space.

Of course, as Cronon observes, all experience of wilderness is mediated: “‘nature’ is not nearly as natural as it seems. Instead, it is a profoundly human construction.... the way we describe and understand that world is so entangled with our own values and assumptions that the two can never be fully separated.”⁵⁵ Crary, too, acknowledges that no newly structured space of attention can direct us to a primordial, original or “authentic” view, what he might call an “ontologically privileged” image of space.⁵⁶ Despite their use of natural materials, the NCMA’s artists and conservators, with their focus on displays of natural forces and cycles, recognized this. Still, we wonder if some visitors to the Museum Park or similar

outdoor venues might leave with the view that one need not venture into or be overly concerned about the loss of remote wilderness areas, since one can hike or run in the parks and, by encountering a specific space of attention, have virtually the same ‘authentic’ experience of nature. Or that a museum’s materially constructed enactments -- what Cronon calls “*nature as artifice, nature as self-conscious cultural construction*”⁵⁷ -- is all there is of nature or of the human/nature interface (his emphasis).

Furthermore, in places like North Carolina, where the eradication of forests and farmland is relentless, the use of materially mediated spaces of attention to prompt citizens’ appreciation of nature – and to preserve cultural memory of lost natural space -- would seem directly related to the pace of environmental destruction. This, in turn, would necessitate constant advancements in (museum) park material rhetorics to safeguard, design, replace, or manage that which is lost, even though the resultant spaces of attention in no way guarantee an authentic replication of the unique spatial and temporal relationships already found in natural settings undisturbed by human development. As Kenneth Burke admonishes, an over-reliance on material – in this case, artistic/technological – solutions to environmental destruction leads to a kind of “helhaven” in which more material rhetoric must be generated and relied upon, over and over again, to replace in the form of a space of attention what is perhaps irrevocably damaged.⁵⁸

The second tension revolves around the possible transference of a museum park’s material rhetoric to other contexts, in which it could be used to justify further development of natural lands. In fact, a recent advertisement in the Raleigh-based newspaper *The News & Observer* indicated just this possibility with a three quarter page notice celebrating new housing developments marketed around the concept of different types of parks and the

experiences with nature that are made possible by living in, for instance, a “butterfly park” or a “tree house park” and so on. Persons enjoying the various natural “park” developments may easily lose sight of the incursions into nature necessary for creating those “park-like” spaces in the first place. As Cronon suggests, “Once we come to know what nature *ought* to look like – once our vision of its ideal form becomes a moral or cultural imperative – we can remake it so completely that we become altogether indifferent or even hostile toward its prior condition.”⁵⁹

In the Museum Park, spaces of attention created by works like “Crossroads/Trickster” preserve and in some ways critically interrogate the space’s “prior condition,” by situating viewers inside/outside of the memory. “Crossroads/Trickster” reminds visitors that the landscape on which it is sited has taken on several different forms. However, in many residential developments, the history of a particular landscape is obliterated from memory and replaced by an ersatz experience of being inside/outside of a re-invented nature. As Kevin DeLuca and Anne Teresa Demo demonstrate, 19th century depictions of the pristine western landscape, devoid of human beings, obscured the fact that these spaces were literally, and in many cases violently, emptied of their native-American inhabitants.⁶⁰ In new residential developments, people living in these ‘emptied’ spaces can easily lose sight of the fact that the plot of land on which their dwelling has been built was once forest “devoid” of humans or home to Native Americans or rural farmers. There are no mediating material rhetorics to critically enact for residents the costs associated with razing rural spaces and constructing the housing developments in which they now live or to reveal alternative uses of that commercially developed landscape. (Residents living in Raleigh subdivisions, for instance, are rarely directed to consider their neighborhood spaces, as they once existed, as

forests and as farmlands.) Individual communities will have to determine the extent to which new housing and other developments, actually promote the common good as this relates specifically to managing the delicate balance between conservation and preservation. If the rising suburban sprawl in developing areas is any indication, however, material enactments like inside/outside and regenerative/transformational can be easily utilized in the service of instructing and encouraging people toward consumer/individual gratification to the detriment of communal conservation and environmental protection.

The final tension revolves around the material and symbolically open character of a museum park's artworks versus a more discursive, directed approach toward interpretation and experience. Our analysis demonstrates the extent to which the material rhetoric of the Museum Park does not so much serve to advocate a particular argument but, rather, creates spaces of attention in which visitors experience a value orientation and new ways of seeing which can, just as importantly, be enacted beyond the Museum Park's boundaries. As Robert Hariman and John Lucaites explain, such visual and material practices should not be understood either as threats to practical reasoning or as mere ornaments. Our analysis illustrates the authors' point about how these practices "can provide crucial social, emotional, and mnemonic materials for political identity and action."⁶¹ Nevertheless, given the importance of humans' relationship with nature, a more overt, discursive set of representations might be articulated by some artists/scientists/conservators who seek to make environmentalist arguments as they relate to say, the transformation/regeneration of specific natural space and who wish to utilize a park's potential to create spaces of attention to reinforce these messages. Another possibility for framing the experience more discursively would be to take the enactments examined here and incorporate them into text panels at the

beginning, the end, or simply at each site to “open up” the symbolic and material elements to all viewers. Still another possibility might be to increase the level of communal engagement by asking visitors to leave records of their experiences for others to read and reflect upon, as they do at many national memorials. The incorporation of such practices would serve to instruct and move people more discursively.

While traditional rhetorical forms open up discursive spaces for the depiction of environmental issues, our analysis demonstrates the capacity of material rhetorics, such as sculpture and public parklands, to enact these issues in highly rhetorical, albeit somewhat less discursive, ways. By enacting a particular kind of co-existence between people and nature that is both complex and hopeful, museum parks can create spaces of attention wherein visitors become more actively self-conscious of the possibilities and pitfalls of this relationship.

Notes

- [1] Lawrence W. Rosenfield, “Central Park and the Celebration of Civic Virtue,” in *American Rhetoric. Context and Criticism*, ed. Thomas Benson (Carbondale: Southern Illinois Press, 1989), 64.
- [2] Gregory Clark, *Rhetorical Landscapes in American: Variations on a Theme from Kenneth Burke* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2004), 147-148.
- [3] Michael Halloran and Greg Clark, “National Park Landscapes and the Rhetorical Display of Civic Religion,” in *Rhetorics of Display*, ed. Lawrence J. Prelli (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2006), 141.
- [4] Susan Crane, *Museums and Memory* (Palo Alto, Stanford, University Press, 2000), 4.
- [5] See Carole Blair, “Contemporary U.S. Memorial Sites as Exemplars of Rhetoric’s

Materiality,” in *Rhetorical Bodies*, eds. Jack Selzer & Sharon Crowley (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press). See also Carole Blair, Marsha S. Jeppeson, and Enrico Pucci Jr., “Public Memorializing in Postmodernity: The Vietnam Veterans Memorial as Prototype,” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 77 (1991): 289-308, and Carole Blair, “Civil Rights/Civil Sites: “... Until Justice Rolls Down Like Waters,” *The Carroll Arnold Distinguished Lecture 2006* (Boston & New York: Pearson 2008).

[6] Margaret R. LaWare and Victoria J. Gallagher, "The Power of Agency: Urban Communication and the Rhetoric of Public Art," in *The Urban Communication Reader*, ed. Gene Burd, Susan J. Drucker, and Gary Gumpert (Cresskill, New Jersey: Hampton Press, Inc. 2007).

[7] Jonathan Crary, *Suspension of Perception: Attention, Spectacle, and Modern Culture* (Cambridge: Mass: MIT Press, 1999), 3.

[8] The environmental challenges facing the city of Raleigh are nicely summarized by Silber, who in an editorial urged Raleigh’s city managers to turn more land into city parks and green spaces. She notes that the city and the county in which it is located “are losing 26 acres a day [to development], as the county absorbs some 90 new residents every day, each one needing a home and stores and schools and parks and roads and water.” See Janet Silber, “Dix’s Past and Future: Preserving Raleigh’s Great Space,” *The News & Observer* (September 5, 2007), 11A.

[9] Sarah G. Cant and Nina J. Morris, “Geographies of Art and the Environment,” *Social & Cultural Geography*, 7 (2006): 859.

[10] Quoted in Craig Jarvis, “Museum’s Pond to be Remade into a Work of Art,” *The News &*

Observer (December 9, 2007), 8G.

[11] “The Museum Park,” North Carolina Museum of Art Website,

<http://ncartmuseum.org/museumpark.shtml> (accessed February 5, 2006).

[12] Our goal here, as Crary explains, is “to multiply the links to” the Museum Park’s spaces of attention, ‘to remain attentive to the plural’ of these” spaces, “where ‘everything signifies ceaselessly and several times’.” See Crary, *Suspensions of Perception*, 9.

[13] Della Pollock, *Exceptional Spaces: Essay in Performance and History* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1998), 20-27.

[14] To supplement our analysis, we also interviewed Park visitors who had gathered around the various artworks. We asked them simply to describe their impressions of the works as they walked around or under them. In addition, on one occasion we took members of the Spring 2007 COM 498/598 Visual Rhetoric course at North Carolina State University, to see the Park. Many of their insightful comments are reflected in our analysis and we thank them for their enthusiasm.

[15] Ellen Sung, “A Site to See,” *The News & Observer*, (March 4, 2007):1G & 3G.

[16] Crary, *Suspensions of Perception*, 3.

[17] Cant & Morris, “Geographies of Art and the Environment,” 858.

[18] Crary, *Suspensions of Perception*, 3.

[19] Pollock, *Exceptional Spaces*, 24.

[20] “The Museum Park.” The pictures that appear in the text were taken by our assistant, Robert Bell.

[21] Silber, “Dix’s Past and Future,” 11A.

- [22] Craig Jarvis, "Art in the Park: Museum has New Sculpture for Walkers to See this Spring," *The News & Observer* (April 14, 2006):1E & 7E.
- [23] Quoted in Jarvis, "Art in the Park," 1E.
- [24] Michael Osborne, "Rhetorical Depiction," in *Form, Genre, and the Study of Political Discourse*, ed. Herbert W. Simons and A.A. Aghazarian (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1984), 86-88.
- [25] Giles Deleuze and Felix Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia* (University of Minnesota Press: Minneapolis, Minnesota, 1987).
- [26] Peter Reed, *Groundswell: Constructing the Contemporary Landscape* (New York D.A.P./Distributed Art Publishers, Inc, 2005), 23.
- [27] The artists of these works appear very much influenced by the ephemeral natural sculptures of the Earth Art movement of the 1970s and 1980s, such as Robert Smithson's "Spiral Jetty."
- [28] Thomas Sayre, "On Processing Change," <http://www.thomassayre.com/article.php?id=3> (accessed on March 9, 2007).
- [29] Quoted in Craig Jarvis, "Shaping Up: New Sculptures Along the Art Museum's Trail Signal Global Outlook," *The News & Observer* (August 19, 2007): 1G & 3G.
- [30] "Creative Consumption: Steven Siegel Installs New Sculpture in Museum Park," *Preview: The Magazine of the North Carolina Museum of Art*, May/June 2006, 8-9.
- [31] Reed, *Groundswell*, 28.
- [32] Quoted in Jarvis, "Art in the Park," 1E.

- [33] Pollock, *Exceptional Spaces*, 21.
- [34] Linda J. Dougherty, "Crossroads: Martha Jackson-Jarvis," *Museum Brochure*. North Carolina Museum of Art. (Raleigh, North Carolina).
- [35] Cant & Morris, "Geographies of Art and the Environment," 859.
- [36] Dougherty, "Crossroads."
- [37] "Creative Consumption," 8.
- [38] Jim Jenkins, "Healing Place: Seeing and Believing," *The News & Observer* (2003)
<http://newsobserver.com/563/v-print/sotry/313705.html> (accessed March 9, 2007).
- [39] Jarvis, "Art in the Park," 7E.
- [40] Jarvis, "Art in the Park," 7E.
- [41] Sung, "A Site to See," 36. See also Jarvis, "Museum's Pond to be Remade into a Work of Art."
- [42] Delueze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, 263.
- [43] Blair, "Civil Rights/Civil Sites," 9.
- [44] Reed, *Groundswell*, 25.
- [45] Reed, *Groundswell*, 25.
- [46] Sung, "A Site to See," 3G.
- [47] Peggy Lim, "Time, Money are Shot for Farmland Preservation," *The News & Observer* (July 24, 2007): 1A & 8A.
- [48] Peter Kraftl, "Ecological Architecture as Performed Art: Nant-y-Cwm Steiner School, Pembrokeshire," *Social & Cultural Geography* 7 (2006): 927-948.
- [49] "The Museum Park." See also Jarvis, "Museum's Pond to be Remade Into a Work of Art."

- [50] Quoted in Sung, "A Site to See," 3G.
- [51] See Lawrence W. Rosenfield, "The Practical Celebration of Epideictic," in *Rhetoric in Transition: Studies in the Nature and Uses of Rhetoric*, ed. Eugene E. White (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1980), 133. See also Halloran and Clark, "National Park Landscapes and the Rhetorical Display of Civic Religion," 141.
- [52] Quoted in Pat Summers, "Itinerant Artist: Patrick Dougherty," *Sculpture*, July/August 2005, 55.
- [53] Similarly, citing the landscape artist Robert Smithson, Reed describes the rhetorical potential of spaces of attention like the Museum Park as a "kind of pervasive and fantastic" human-made landscape that may hold "the clues to our future." Reed, *Groundswell*, 25.
- [54] Rosenfield, "Central Park and the Celebration of Civic Virtue," 253.
- [55] William J. Cronon, "Introduction: In Search of Nature," in *Uncommon Ground: Toward Reinventing Nature*, ed. William J. Cronon (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1995), 25.
- [5] Crary, *Suspensions of Perception*, 7
- [57] Cronon, "Introduction," 39.
- [58] Robert L. Heath, *Realism and Relativism: A Perspective on Kenneth Burke* (Macon, Georgia: University of Mercer Press, 1986), 231
- [59] Cronon, "Introduction," 40.
- [60] Kevin M. Deluka & Anne Teresa Demo, A. T., "Imagining Nature: Watkins, Yosemite, and the Birth of Environmentalism," *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 17 (2000): 241-260.
- [61] Robert Hariman and John Lucaites, *No Caption Needed* (Chicago: University of Chicago

Press, 2006), 14.