

“Finders Keepers”: Performing the Street, the Gallery and the Spaces In-between

Luke Dickens

The first Finders Keepers “street-gallery” was described on the hand-drawn flyer as presenting “found, stolen and borrowed city trash gloriously decorated for your pleasure by London’s filthiest marker wielding villains” (see figure 1). The idea behind the event was for a group of street artists to meet up, go drinking and seek out items of street detritus on which to produce their work. A week later, they would reconvene at a secret location, bringing with them their finished artworks, which would then be put on display. Members of the public were then invited to “come join the crowd for broken beats and dustbin booze,” forming a kind of opening party in the temporarily occupied space. The event culminated with the blowing of a whistle, at which point the crowds were free to grab an item of work they liked and take it home with them, ripping down the whole scene in a few short minutes and disappearing into the night. Initially these events were located in the distinctive post-industrial landscape around the Shoreditch Triangle in the London Borough of Hackney, UK—a warren of small streets, alleys, abandoned plots and seedy bars framed by Old Street to the north, Great Eastern Street to the west and Shoreditch High Street to the east—and became a notorious part of what was later described as the “glory days of British Street Art” (Hames) that had characterized the area at the turn of the millennium. Given the success of the London events, Finders Keepers went on to host a series of temporary street-galleries in Europe throughout 2003 and 2004, appearing in Barcelona, Munich and Milan (see C100 178-179; Reinecke 63-68).

Luke Dickens is a doctoral student in cultural geography at the Department of Geography, Royal Holloway, University of London, UK.

ISSN: 1557-2935 (online) <<http://liminalities.net/4-1/finderskeepers.htm>>

"Finders Keepers"



Fig. 1: Flyer for the first Finders Keepers, 2003 (photo by PMH)

This paper draws on the early Finders Keepers projects in order to develop what Tim Cresswell, in his analysis of New York's 1970s graffiti scene, describes as the crucial "where" of graffiti ("Crucial," *In Place*, and *Night*). Looking at reactions to the appearance of graffiti at the time, Cresswell suggests that a moral geography of the city was produced, whereby "at the same time as graffiti was painted as a wild anarchic threat to society by one dominant group (the "authorities"), it was taken off the streets and placed in galleries by another dominant group (official culture)" (*In Place* 50). Cresswell points to a distinct urban spatiality, constructed through the displacement of graffiti from the street, where it was deemed to be criminal and "out-of-place," into the gallery, where it was viewed as "art" and put into its "proper place." In advancing these ideas, this paper explores the ways these spaces are negotiated through the actions of contemporary graffiti practitioners themselves, and how, on their own terms, they might "[keep] alive a certain politics of space" (Nandrea 11), beyond the politics of more powerful groups (Pile). Drawing upon Henri Lefebvre's social production of space, Borden et al. remind us: "the city cannot be reduced to either *form* or *representation*" (4). This paper explores how the artists involved in the Finders Keepers project, (known collectively as Finders Keepers Crew or FKC) momentarily, and consciously, produce a space "in-

between” the street and gallery—a differential space through which the city is rendered a site of play and pleasure, surprise and critical possibility.

Recent work in urban and cultural geography has begun to ask broader questions about the way people write, explore and, ultimately, come to know the city through the practice of various forms of “urban inscription” (Amin and Thrift 24-5; Pinder “Arts” 383-411; Smith 86-9; Nandrea; Dickens “Placing”). In this paper urban inscription is understood not simply in terms of what it might represent—particularly given the persistent understanding of graffiti as spray painted “tags,” and the tired debates about its status as either art or crime—but as critical social practice (Latham and Conradson; Dewsbury et al; Rose and Thrift “Part 1” and “Part 2”). This research also provides an opportunity to build upon recent work broadly concerned with the place of art, and the fertile intersections between geographical thought, artistic practice and political expression (Cant and Morris; Nash, Prendergast and Swenson; Pinder “Arts”).

Empirically, discussion here is structured around *Drawn, Scribbled, Scrawled, Scratched* (2003), a documentary film based on the first two Finders Keepers events. Made by amateur London film-makers Philip Marshall and Toby Whitehouse, the film features a series of short interviews with the street artists who devised the Finders Keepers project—D*face, Mysterious Al, Dave the Chimp and PMH—presented alongside stills and video footage taken at the events.¹ My interviews undertaken with Marshall and members of the FKC, which derive from a broader ethnographic research project into the geographies of post-graffiti in London, are also used to support my argument throughout. The first section unpacks the ways FKC conceive of their own artistic practice and urban engagements, with reference to recent shifts in both popular and subcultural understandings of graffiti. As their comments make clear, such alternative conceptions of graffiti pose new insights into the ways we might expand a research agenda into such practices, and importantly here, how changes in approaches to inscribing the urban lead us to reconsider ideas of “the city” more broadly. With these important

¹ These names have not been changed, as they are already anonymous pseudonyms.

“Finders Keepers”

framing ideas established, the second section then moves on to explore the social networks and core ideas behind the Finders Keepers events. In particular, I discuss how the group’s friendship ties and experiences within both formal art world education and the design industry result in a strategic do-it-yourself approach to working outside the limitations of gallery spaces in London. The following sections then take a closer look at the sequential stages involved in actually putting on a Finders Keepers show. Section three examines the search for “treasure” on the streets around Shoreditch, highlighting the group’s playful encounters within such spaces, and the alternative politics that emerge out of their pursuit of trash that might become art. Section four then looks in detail at the curation of the exhibition space, which both deliberately apes many of the formal art world conventions and avoids the authoritarian gaze of the street, resulting in the creation of a hybrid street-gallery. Finally, the chaotic climax of the event is considered, where an essential tension between the aims of the group and the agency of various publics in attendance is used to show how such alternative spaces seem always and necessarily transient. The conclusion reflects on how such practices might be situated in-between the pervasive spatial binaries set out above, expanding the notion of “urban inscription” and the potential for reconsidering the city as it is experienced through such creative engagements.

Coming to terms with “graffiti”

Marshall’s and Whitehouse’s film begins with a series of interview extracts in which members of the FKC discuss the nature of contemporary graffiti, and the appropriate terminology to describe their work. For example, Dave the Chimp explains that, for him, graffiti was not so much a hip-hop, spray-can based subculture from 1970s New York City, but was something that could be understood more broadly as “anything out on the street.” Within this expanded understanding of graffiti, which the group all seemed to share, a number of sub-terms were raised explicitly in the interviews. D*face picks up on this by referring to the term “street art,” which he seems to view with a certain ambiguity, as both a term which he felt was



Fig. 2: “Fuck You All,” by Dave the Chimp. Acrylic on found roof slates. (photo by Dave the Chimp)

devised by marketing executives, while also conceding that it did indeed make sense as “just a new term for graffiti.” In a later interview, Mysterious Al confirmed this stance by explaining that his street-based work was always something he understood as graffiti plain and simple, pointing out that “when we started doing it, we didn't know what street art was, there was no such thing,” while acknowledging that he had indeed come to be viewed by many as a street artist, not a graffiti artist (Mysterious Al, 09/02/06). Likewise, in the documentary and in personal discussion, PMH attempted to separate out the terms, describing street art as much more “artistic, bohemian, European, and nicer” than graffiti, which he saw as simply “writing your name” (PMH, 01/06/06). Nonetheless, he was careful to suggest that, while the two terms related to slightly different practices, they did share a similar cultural lineage, explaining that “[street art] is like an inbred cousin, like the banjo player from *Deliverance*.² [Street art and graffiti] are connected, but they don't want to hold hands in public” (PMH, 01/06/06). Such suggestions are often received critically by those both inside and outside the graffiti

² *Deliverance* is a film directed by John Boorman (1972)

“Finders Keepers”

subculture (see Dreph and Sami; Jones), and graffiti writers commonly view street art with disdain and lacking authenticity.³ Nonetheless, this does not detract from the point that such distinctions, debates and ambiguities over its meaning make clear a sense that “graffiti” is increasingly being understood beyond the rather narrow terms of a now familiar spraycan model of “writing.”

Related to this shift in terminology is the idea that graffiti has crossed-over into the more formal, essentially capitalist systems of the art and design world. Indeed, Marshall’s and Whitehouse’s film shows the self defined graffiti artist, Adam Neate, discussing the translation of aerosol graffiti from trains to canvas as a shift from “graffiti” to “post graffiti”: the death of graffiti proper according to “the media.” This is a particularly problematic suggestion for many graffiti writers, more so in this case because the first screening of Marshall’s and Whitehouse’s documentary took place at a Finders Keepers event in the Dragon Bar, a favorite writers’ haunt in Shoreditch, in November 2003. When the clip of Adam’s discussion came on screen, Marshall recalled how Adam felt that he had been misrepresented as claiming that graffiti was dead, which he was especially upset about because the event was packed with his peers. As Marshall explained: “we showed it once and he wanted it to be pulled and never shown again, [...] he just thought he had been edited down saying that graffiti is dead” (Philip Marshall, 29/03/07). While Adam was eventually pacified, his reaction to this short section of the film is a clear indication of both the importance and difficulty of using the “right” terms to discuss this sort of work.

The first explicit references to post-graffiti emerged at a time when graffiti was being claimed to have been largely killed-off by the NYC authorities’ zero tolerance policy, which prompted some of the better known writers to concentrate on putting their work in Manhattan galleries. For example, in Paul Tschinkel’s film, *Graffiti/Post Graffiti* (1984), some of the big names from the graffiti

³ “Writer” is short for “graffiti writer.” This is a more common and accepted term than “graffiti artist,” since many writers seek to distinguish what they do from “art” in any formal sense. For an excellent account of the way graffiti writing has come to be seen as art, and labelled as such, see J Austin, *Taking the Train: How Graffiti Art Became an Urban Crisis in New York City* (New York: Columbia, 2002).

scene at the time—Fab 5 Freddie, Lady Pink and Jean-Michel Basquiat—discuss their mixed feelings about attempts to realign their work within the art world and away from the spaces of the street and subway. For Cresswell, this shift profoundly altered the mainstream perceptions of such work, where “crime becomes creativity, madness becomes insight, dirt becomes something to hang over the fireplace” (“Crucial” 337). Likewise, Mysterious Al is equally critical of the idea of post graffiti, claiming that it is used simply to “make it sound more intelligent than it really is” (Mysterious Al, 09/02/06). Yet, the negative connotations of this shift were not entirely misplaced, since the relationships between writers and galleries, often supported by art establishment publications, had a tendency to become exploitative of the former.⁴ As Futura 2000, a notorious writer from New York City, put it:

the art world just ate us up [...] they started trying to make quick money on different artists and certainly didn't care about individuals [...] after a few years, no one was interested anymore in doing shows because they commercialized it. (qtd in Cooper 147)

This experience has lead many writers, even today, to insist that graffiti and the art world have incompatible and irreconcilable ideological strategies, and that they should exist as separate spheres. “Post graffiti,” for many, still serves as a reminder of the damage that fickle art world attention and money can bring to a vulnerable underground scene, and as such, is almost universally dismissed within such circles. However, despite these rather well-worn responses, a growing body of literature has begun to critically explore the broader spectrum of practices and styles that do indeed seem to differ from graffiti thus far conceived: alongside “street art” and “post graffiti,” terms such as “guerrilla art” (Makagon), “brandalism” (Banksy), “urban art activism” (C100) and “interventionist art” (Miles 205-208) have all been mooted in an effort to address this significant evolution.

⁴ In a slightly different but related sense, “post-graffiti” can also be taken more literally, in order to draw attention to the adaptive careers of graffiti writers once they reach adult life, whether they have crossed over into more formal art and design world or not. See Dickens “Pictures.”

“Finders Keepers”

While a full account of these intricate (and at times convoluted) debates is beyond the scope of this article, the basic details are worth sketching out here (see Brennan; Burnham; Ganz; Institute of Contemporary Arts *Branding* and *New Global*; Manco *Stencil* and *Street*; Reinecke). First, a general expansion in the repertoire of production materials beyond the spray-can seems to have occurred, where the use of posters, stencils, stickers, tiles, oil paints, emulsion, pastels and sculpture now appear almost as common. Second, the production of a more graphic aesthetic concerned with logos, symbols, characters and signs, rather than letter forms, can be also identified, a shift often attributed to the exponential growth in urban media and advertising. Related to this is a discernable attempt to enter into more direct engagement with mass, popular and outside audiences than in more classic styles of graffiti, where outsiders often see but rarely are able to read the inscription. Similarly, there are shifts in the sorts of people undertaking contemporary work: while they remain almost always male, practitioners today are generally older, more media and art-world savvy, upwardly mobile and entrepreneurial in their approach than the early graffiti writers, who were predominantly non-white, working-class youth with strong ties to marginal neighborhoods. Perhaps most important is the massive impact that the Internet and other new communications technologies have had, in serving as an additional and often symbiotic field of action, and in fueling an awareness of the globally spread but locally diverse range of graffiti cultures and their connected histories.

These new approaches to urban inscription do indeed seem to have informed the Finders Keepers events. Reflecting on the zero-tolerant conditions which still characterize London today (despite the massive changes the metropolis has gone through in the last twenty years), D*face explained to me that “you just have to act and think differently [...] there is always another way” (D*face, 02/06/05). As such, the implications that such approaches pose for understanding the relationships between urban inscription and the city are significant. Proponents of these shifts in aesthetic practice argue that “the classic practice of graffiti and tags has been replaced by *new ways to act within the city*” (Stak 12, my emphasis). For example, Scott

Burnham's call for new language offers clear openings for further research into these apparently new forms of writing the city:

[O]ur relationship with the city has changed so significantly that we are [...] in need of a new language, or rather, a recognition of the emerging language of street art, the visual translator between the physicality of the city and the humanity contained within. (Burnham 9)

Therefore, just as the practices of graffiti writers and their documenters have featured in important research into the geographies of the de-industrializing city—including ideas of territoriality (Ley & Cybriwsky), gang discourse (Adams & Winter; Bandaranaike), masculine identity politics (Macdonald), urban frontiers (Nandrea) and the geographies of transgression (Cresswell "Crucial," *In Place*, and *Night*), particularly in New York City (Austin; Cooper and Chalfant)—these more recent commentaries offer new insights into the ways we might conceive of the contemporary neoliberal city, its sophisticated mediascapes, technologies, networks and increased reliance on creativity and innovation.

Becoming Finders Keepers



Fig. 3: The first Finders Keepers on Paul Street, Shoreditch, transformed an old shop and side alley into a street-gallery for the afternoon. (photo: Dave the Chimp)

Following their discussion of appropriate terminology, Marshall and Whitehouse encourage the FKC to elaborate on how they got together as a group. FKC explain how they had all known each other

"Finders Keepers"

for some time before forming the group—PMH and D*face were school friends—and met Mysterious Al and Dave the Chimp in London through their shared interest in street art. In later interviews they explained how it was at the launch party of Mike Dorrian's cult book, *Stick 'Em Up*, in which they had each been featured, when they first met one another and discovered their shared interests. Here they first encountered and established links with many of the artists they would later invite to produce work at Finders Keepers events. Significantly, these ties were not based on neighborhood or gang territory, as they were in many of the earlier Latino and African-American graffiti crews in New York City and Philadelphia, but were established through their contact with art and design circles (all four were successful freelancers working within the design industry in London). Indeed, much of the broader street art scene at the time was comprised of a loose network of predominantly white, middle class and cosmopolitan young men, based in capital cities in western Europe and North America, and able to collaborate through a combination of cheap flights and the Internet.

In terms of the ideas behind the Finders Keepers events, much of what the group discuss in the documentary betrays a kind of accidental logic, albeit one that was self-conscious of the particular history of art in which it was situated, where the project is discussed as taking shape through serendipity and a series of revelatory moments. A precursor to the events, as D*face explains in the film, was what he described as an "illegal street gallery" that Dave the Chimp had put on in 2001. Actually this was less illegal than he suggests, and was more of an attempt by Chimp to get rid of his excess work at a time when he was faced with having to leave his rented studio space in Hackney, east London. As Chimp explained to me:

there was this alley way—one side was a brick wall and the other side was a wooden wall—near my studio. And I decided, well what I'll do I'll just take all these remaining paintings, there was like 15, 18 paintings or something and a couple of papier-mâché sculptures that I'd made that were sitting around. I'll just take those and I'll just hang em down the alley way, and put some posters up saying 'free art gallery' or whatever it was, and just see if anybody takes

Luke Dickens

them. So I did that, and literally within 24 hours, everything was gone. (Dave the Chimp, 15/02/06)

By coincidence, D*face had been in the area, and had taken a piece of Chimp's work before they had even met each other. As he recalled, the surprise encounter with free art on the street was something that had stuck with him. At about the same time, Adam Neate had also begun to make a name for himself by producing hand-painted self-portraits on scrap wood and cardboard, which he would simply leave on the street once finished. He too had featured in several of the more influential design books at the time, such as Tristan Manco's bestselling *Street Logos*, and was known to the FKC in both a personal and professional capacity.

These ideas were in the back of their minds when, in June 2003, PMH and D*face met in a Shoreditch bar, got drunk and spent an evening bemoaning the state of the London street art scene. As PMH points out in the documentary, their complaint was specifically regarding the nature of a "horrible" gallery system at the time, which relied on knowing the right people, and significant amounts of time and money to break in to. Likewise, Mysterious Al pointed out that they had also become disillusioned by an upsurge in street artists "doing really wack shows in bars, you know, a bar with two white walls, that called itself a gallery space" (Mysterious Al, 09/02/06). In this sense then, FKC were not so much against the idea of showing their work to audiences outside the scene, or were against gallery shows outright, as many of the more hardcore graffiti writers often seemed to be, but just felt that appropriate spaces in which to exhibit their work were sincerely lacking. Al explained to me:

I am fed up of normal exhibitions, you know, customized trainer and skateboard blah, blah, blah. And in a way, this exhibition space offers me the opportunity to work differently and that is why most people went to the streets in the first place, because it is a different method of getting their work out there. (Mysterious Al, 09/02/06)

PMH expressed similar sentiments, stressing that gallery shows could work but that they needed to be far more sensitive to the nature of street based forms of inscription. Importantly, he makes the

“Finders Keepers”

point with reference to the experience of graffiti writers in New York twenty years previously:

You’ve only got to watch *Wildstyle*⁵ where he gets fucked over by the gallery. [...] I mean learn from history. Learn from what happened. [...] as long as you say, it is not the be all and end all and it is not the only thing I am going to do [...] it’s a game and you play it, rather than just going in blinded. (PMH, 01/06/06)

Thus, what is expressed here is not only their awareness of the nature of the gallery system and its impact on past subcultural art forms, but a sense that they possessed the sorts of social and cultural capital that enabled them to critically engage with such a system. This point seems relevant to FKC’s distinction as white professionals in this field, whereby education is highly implicated in the difference between graffiti writers and street artists, and how and why they have distinct but similar practices. Indeed, while they might refer to themselves as street artists, they would almost certainly think and act differently if they had actually been “schooled” on the street.

Musing on the potential for getting around the exiting gallery system, PMH explained how D*face and himself had begun to break down the essential elements for displaying work: as he says in the film “All you need is a wall.” Recalling the conversation in an interview with me, he expounded:

One of us said, why don’t we just nail our pieces to a wall. Then I think at that moment light bulbs went on, and we thought that was not too bad, you know. So what do we do with all the artwork then? We could take it home or why don’t we give them away? [...] Then we kind of set ourselves rules like, we’re only going to do it on found objects and that way there’s no... we didn’t really care about looking after the art or anything. [...] We said, right, let’s make it disposable then, so that way, no-one is upset. Then it was like, hey, that is quite a good idea, because then it gets quite cool. [...] It’s free stuff. Whatever you find in the street is street art. (PMH, 01/06/06)

With the idea of the Finders Keepers project beginning to form, the pair decided that while complaints and critiques of the formal art

⁵ *Wildstyle* is a film directed by Charlie Ahearn (1983)

world were frequently expressed by street artists, all too often nothing was actually done about the situation, and they resolved to take immediate steps to put the first Finders Keepers into practice. As Dave the Chimp made clear to me, “in any generation and in any scene, or whatever, there are like 10% of people that do something and 90% of people who talk about doing something” (Dave the Chimp, 17/05/06). Similarly, Daniel Makagon has suggested that “the ‘do it yourself’ (DIY) ethic that is so important to punk rock is also pertinent to guerrilla art since the artists are often producing their own art and making the art visible without any financial support or assistance from others” (207). As PMH sought to stress, “we didn’t do it because it was a guerrilla show, so we could get the sort of kudos for, yeah, we do illegal street art. It was literally, ‘that was the only option.’” (PMH, 01/06/06). However, it is important to note that the group also clearly had specific resources to do-it-themselves. They had good contacts within the art and design industries, had travelled Europe and the world as “street artists,” and could use their freelance positions to sustain “personal projects.” The following morning, after their initial booze-fuelled conversation, D*face and PMH met up with Al and Chimp, roughed up a plan for the first event, which was to be held the following weekend, and emailed out a flyer to a group of like-minded street artists who might consider participating (see fig. 1).

From Trash to Treasure

The first stage of any Finders Keepers event was for the artists involved to scour the spaces of the street for objects on which they could produce their work. As D*Face explains in the film, the idea was “to take what is, essentially, rubbish, and then let people turn it into treasure.” In the video footage, we see old fridge doors, broken office chairs and all sorts of wooden, metal and plastic panels transformed into art in this way. While on one level this was a practical means of ensuring the work was free and disposable, it also represented a political position from which artists might make use of waste, and foster an alternative economy for art (e.g., Assman). Such practices are not isolated. A diverse range of contemporary artists

“Finders Keepers”



Fig. 4: “Booty Not Bombs” series by Dave the Chimp. Acrylic on found wood panels. (photo by Dave the Chimp)

have sought to use waste materials in the production of art (e.g., Hauser), a practice which has a well-established use in British “agitprop” art (Rose). Within the British street art scene, a notorious example of this approach was the great play the self-proclaimed “art terrorist,” Banksy, made out of the transformation of a piece of shattered concrete into his *Peckham Rock*, which he then surreptitiously added to the walls of the British Museum in 2005 (Dickens “Placing”). The idea that “whatever you find in the street is street art,” then, was a potent one, in that it allowed the streets to exist beyond simple backdrop or surface, as they might in more traditional forms of spraycan graffiti, and instead become reconfigured as a central component in the work of art itself.

In addition to the fact that discarded objects found on the street became raw materials for the production of art, the act of finding such objects was also central to the politics of these events. For those involved in the search for suitable detritus, the street extended beyond the function of utility, of work and mundane travel. Streets became spaces to explore, wander through and to encounter in surprising and intimate ways. Through this reflexive and embodied register, the artists were able to know the street anew, to “discover its

overhang, its lack of borders and boundaries, and fluidity [...] to attend to its margins, to what happens in the corners, what is seemingly off the street, and where it connects, leads, anticipates” (Crouch 163). PMH described this practice with reference to the specific conditions that Shoreditch, east London, provided:

Because all the streets back then weren’t buffed and it was still pretty much a playground [...] the reason why everybody does stuff, did stuff there was because it was free and easy.⁶ That’s why everyone went there when they were visiting London to put up, because Hackney couldn’t afford to get the place cleaned, and there were all these alleyways and bars and stuff and it was ideal there. (PMH, 01/06/06)

The southern tip of Hackney, particularly Hoxton within the Shoreditch district, served as a “playground” for those seeking to make use of the city in alternative ways. It was very specific parts of the city which afforded the opportunity to put on such an event: a streetscape characterized by alleyways, railway infrastructure and widespread dereliction, of particular forms of amenity such as underground bars and pubs, and by a local government apparatus too stretched to cope with the minor indiscretions associated with the practice of street art. As filmmaker Philip Marshall reflected, “at that time Hoxton really felt very similar to New York SoHo in the early eighties [...] that was the buzz that kept you going and wanting to do your bit of artistic anarchy” (Philip Marshall, 29/03/07). This artistic anarchy, running around the streets looking for “treasure,” and taking the chance to put up stencils, stickers and tags on the way, was something very much afforded by this particular part of the city, where more authoritarian boroughs, such as Westminster, have responded to similar projects rather differently (Dickens “Art”).

The pursuit of treasure, in this sense, also makes use of the rhythmic geographies that produce this part of the city. Tim Cresswell, citing an essay by Karrie Jacobs, describes these sorts of alternative spatio-temporal engagements as “night discourse,” which “approximates the older ideal of a public realm—an arena in which

⁶ “Buffed” is a term used by graffiti writers to mean “cleaned” or “removed.” See Cooper and Chalfant.

"Finders Keepers"

members of the public meet to accommodate competing values and expectations and hence in which all goals are open to discussion and modification" (Cresswell *Night* 268-9; see also Jacobs). Similarly, Iain Borden in his work on the performative relationships between skateboarding and the city, develops Lefebvre's rhythmanalysis as a way of knowing the city "not through explanation or codified interpretation, but through lived experience" (195). As is made clear in their discussions, FKC were acutely aware of these experiential forms of knowledge in undertaking this stage of their project. Dave the Chimp claims, "as with most of the East End, like the City and Old Street and stuff, at the weekend or at night, it's dead when everybody goes away from work. So we were alright." (Dave the Chimp, 15/02/06)

The specific nature of this discourse was not so much one of aggression or confrontation—like the "bombing runs" undertaken by graffiti writers at the hardcore end of the urban inscription spectrum—as it was an assertion of an alternative aesthetic practice (see Bandaranaike). Much of this exploration has distinct synergies with the Situationist practice of *dérive*, an irreverent "drift" or "extravagant passage" through the city in an attempt to discover and remake it (see Sadler; Knabb). As David Pinder notes, the Situationists sought to counter the contemplative and non-interventionist power of the spectacle "by intervening in the city and experiencing its spaces directly as actors rather than spectators" (*Visions* 149). Thus, a central element in Guy Debord's "Theory of the *Dérive*" was "playful-constructive behavior" as a means of reclaiming the city, where non-competitive, inclusive games enhanced the freedom afforded by such an environment (Knabb 50-4). Pinder further asserts that, "a characteristic feature of the *dérive* was the way it allowed an undercutting of such categories of work/leisure with its sense of *dépaysé*, of being out of place according to the dictates of a city governed by principles of utility and efficient circulation" (*Visions* 151). Thus, while Cresswell has suggested that forms of urban inscription on the street were a threat to the dominant order, their being deemed "out of place" was something consciously and deliberately celebrated as an alternative ethics of being in the city by those who actually undertook it.

Luke Dickens

Another important aspect of this stage of the Finder Keepers project was the opportunity for hedonistic forms of social networking that it facilitated; a sense of belonging and coming together in an otherwise alienating and exclusive environment, a socio-spatial transgression of a jovial and friendly variety (see Sibley). Thus, while Marshall joked that this stage was “just a piss up really” (Philip Marshall, 29/03/07), it is worth bearing in mind Pinder’s note that “drunkenness also characterized many drifts, which were frequently based around movements between bars” (*Visions* 151).

Curating the Street



Fig. 5: Artists curating the street-gallery as part of the second Finders Keepers. (photo by Dave the Chimp)

Just one week after trawling for rubbish through the streets of Shoreditch, the artists returned to the “secret” location to put their freshly produced work on display. In the film, D*face describes how this was his favorite part of the event, a point where only the artists themselves know the location of the exhibition—emailed out to them the night before by FKC—and where they come together for a chance to see each others’ pieces for the first time. He relays the palpable sense of excitement and surprise as they arrived in small

“Finders Keepers”

groups and took the opportunity to show their peers what they had produced.

The site chosen in this instance was an abandoned plot of land hidden behind the Shoreditch High Street, the buildings that had once stood there having been roughly cleared, and like many similar sites in the area, was being used during the week as a semi-legitimate private car park due to its proximity to the financial heart of the city. What remained was a curious void, half-heartedly chained off where it joined the narrow street, and surrounded on three sides by tall Victorian warehouse facades. Having already put on a Finders Keepers event, the Crew were well aware of the sort of space they needed—“somewhere off the beaten track where the police wouldn’t hassle us [...] somewhere, which was sort of self contained” (PMH, 01/06/06)—and this site fitted the bill. Tim Edensor, in his fascinating study of industrial ruins, makes a compelling case for understanding these seemingly abandoned parts of the urban fabric as providing an alternative to the “authoritative spatiality” of the contemporary city (“Waste” and *Industrial*). For him, these sites become “spaces where forms of alternative public life may occur, activities characterized by an active and improvisational creativity, a casting off of self-consciousness conditioned by the prying gaze of CCTV cameras and fellow citizens, and by the pursuit of illicit and frowned-upon practices” (*Industrial* 21). These sentiments certainly resonated with the various practices that took place on this particular site. Alongside the unofficial car parking, and the Finders Keepers event, other illicit uses were apparent, as PMH spelled out:

It was like a car park and it was also like a whore’s knocking shop. There were mattresses, condoms, blood on the wall and stuff like that and syringes. And I know that sounds like a really Boho dream, but it was true. It is not an easy thing to be so hip and so trendy. (PMH, 01/06/06)

Significantly, PMH’s comments not only give an insight into the sorts of hidden practices that took place there, but by suggesting that this environment was some sort of bohemian paradise, he implies that participants reveled in these characteristics. FKC, like most of the other artists who took part in the events, did not come from the

area, they were not locals, and so their decision to undertake their work in this area, at least in part, alludes to a sort of “grime chic,” whereby the aesthetics of decay, dereliction and depravity were seen as something to be appreciated in an ironic sense of “cool.” Cresswell, drawing on Bourdieu, explains that “the streets are the lowest spaces in the same hierarchy of which galleries form the pinnacle. The location of art on the street, then, is a contradiction in terms” (*Night* 272). However, for the Finder Keepers events and this sort of street art more generally, it seems that this contradiction was something that could be usefully employed: “low art” and “low culture” were central to the “trendy,” “edgy” appeal of their undertakings. In his observations of a group of children using a piece of wasteland near a housing estate in North-west London, David Crouch has suggested that abandoned sites of this kind were instrumental in enhancing their sense of identity, empowerment and belonging (167-8). This would also be true of the ways the FKC used these derelict spaces in the cracks of the urban fabric, but the sense of identity, empowerment and belonging fostered here was one characterized by a certain kind of privilege.

Despite this, the way the artworks were put on display in the space did represent an attempt at critical practice, with considerations of how this was to be done being left entirely to the artists themselves. This open curation allowed for an organic, almost random placement of curious objects and collective imagery that, in D*face’s terms, “takes on its own appearance [...] it becomes alive.” As such, the ways the artist made use of the micro-geographies of the site resonate with Foucault’s notion of the heterotopia, or counter-sites that exist as “a kind of effectively enacted utopia in which the real sites, all the other real sites that can be found within a culture, are simultaneously represented, contested, and inverted” (24). In particular, the hybrid street gallery that the street artists produced in this space, consciously or otherwise, was an affective parody of the art world convention of the “private view”, and the curatorial practices and puritanical aesthetic of the white cube gallery space (O’Doherty). The same active and improvised spirit that defined the artists’ use of the wider streetscape in the pursuit of objects and

"Finders Keepers"

material for the production of their work was extended into their curatorial practices within the space of display.

Edensor develops this point by elaborating on the ways ruins serve as productive "art spaces" with explicit reference to Cresswell's work on graffiti and the urban geographies of transgression. He suggests that, unlike the more regulated spaces of the city, in which such activities are inevitably deemed "out of place," ruins enable graffiti artists to develop their alternative aesthetics and skills precisely because their presence is more ambivalent in these spaces of dereliction (*Industrial* 34). Borden, too, makes the point that while this in part reflects graffiti writers' desire to avoid social conflict, "it is also an attempt to write anew—not to change meaning but to insert a meaning where previously there was none" (182). This too is a point that applies to the Finders Keepers event. As Philip Marshall explains, "the police stopped at one time, but they just sort of let it carry on thinking that it was organized" (Philip Marshall, 29/03/07). These ambiguities, I would argue, are profoundly connected to the ways these artists had developed and evolved their practices beyond a narrowly defined model of graffiti. D*face elaborates on this point:

If someone sees a can of paint or spray paint in your hand then you are a bandit [but] you can definitely get away with a paint brush. I have done it in practice. I know that it works [...] The best camouflage is actually not being camouflaged and looking like you are meant to be there and pitching up in broad daylight, wearing a neon vest and looking like you are a worker and start painting a wall. You look like you have permission and who is going to question you? (D*face, 13/10/05)

Thus, despite his insistence in the film that "the place is illegal, we don't have permission, we wouldn't want permission," such sentiments made little sense applied to practices that took significant steps to appear legal. The point, then, is not so much what dominant groups seek to assert, but that subcultural groupings have significant agency in contesting, reframing and working outside of such assertions.

“One Piece Each! Fuck the Galleries!”



Fig. 6: Grabbing the free art at the end of the first Finders Keepers. (photo by Dave the Chimp)

As the evening set in, the crowds began to arrive for the “opening” party, the chaotic climax to the Finders Keepers event. Shrouded by nightfall, the serious business of drinking and socializing in the reclaimed space got underway. At about 11pm it was time for the big free art give away. With a distinct sense that they were losing control of proceedings, FKC climbed onto the roof of a nearby building, shone a torch down into the crowd and thanked everyone for coming along. Then the hotly anticipated moment came: D*face shouted “aaaand ... take the work you bastards!”, while the rest of FKC began to chant “One piece each! One piece each!” What was a chilled-out scene transformed instantly into a vicious mosh pit, as people scrambled up the walls or snatched at each other in an attempt to get a piece of the work. The torch searched out in the darkness for successful individuals, who waved their treasure around in celebration when it found them. For a few brief minutes, FKC had achieved what they had set out to do: a full-blown moment of artistic

"Finders Keepers"

anarchy—participatory, democratic and wildly beyond both the abstraction of the gallery and the surveillance of the street.

However, almost by definition, this achievement was a temporary one (Bey). Leaving events to unfurl of their own accord had also meant that certain things happened that the group had attempted to avoid. One main complaint that D*face had in particular was the instrumental approach taken by some of the audience to being offered free art. As he explained to me:

I heard conversations between people saying whose work should I get... yeah, stamp on that guy's because I have heard about him. And it was like you are not looking at it from the aesthetical point, which is what it was all about. You get free art. Don't be fucking choosy about it. Take a piece that you like the look of, just because you like the look of it. (D*face, 13/10/05)

Thus, while the event was supposed to sidestep the formal art market and the established capitalist relations between artist, dealer and consumer of art—what Chimp rather romantically described in the film as being “for the love not the money”—some people nonetheless seemed to be more interested in the names, reputations and potential financial value of the free art on offer. Whereas art on the street could be freely available to view, it usually exists in a form that is difficult to directly commodify. However, put onto objects in this way, the work had inadvertently gained currency as art proper that really could be, and often was, hung above someone's mantelpiece, sold on eBay and circulated amongst collectors of “primitive art.” Shouting “fuck the galleries!” at the end of the night was an idealistic but somewhat unrealistic hope on D*face's part, confirming the fragile, partial and ambiguous aims of the FKC's project. Indeed, resisting these forces and producing art entirely outside of such relations proved too difficult even for him, given his desire to pursue a career doing something he loved doing, and for all his frustration and opposition, he would go on to own and run his own “urban art” gallery space shortly after hosting the event.

Furthermore, while the FKC were happy with the turnout and the interest they had managed to generate in the event—which they felt, overall, was extremely good for supporting “the scene”—they

were also conscious that they themselves could well be implicated in reproducing the “boho dream” that they had often derided. FKC had posted the exact location for the party on Wooster Collective, an international networking website devoted to street art, hosted from downtown New York City.⁷ This mechanism meant that the sorts of people who attended the events were predominantly either friends or acquaintances of the various artists, or had a working knowledge of the street art scene. This was less an event for the public per se—though passersby did join in and were welcomed—as an event for an informed, socially and culturally resourced counterpublic (Warner). As Dave the Chimp lamented, “There just wasn’t the people there... normal people. I wanted normal people to be there” (Dave the Chimp, 17/05/06). Similarly, PMH described the crowd as containing a good deal of “fashionistas” (PMH, 01/06/06). Indeed, you can see in the film footage there is a fairly distinct type of person in attendance: predominantly white, young, and seemingly employed in various forms of fashion, art and design media in the way that they affect a very particular look. The event was indeed situated within a tradition of public art making that has sought to ask “who is the audience for art?” and “who owns culture?” (Lacy; Miles), but in this case, the answers to these questions pointed to a more limited, though no less telling, form of public engagement than was hoped for.

The attendance of various media bodies compounded the possibility that FKC really had brought into being the sort of exclusive art world event they had tried to avoid:

We had loads of people from like, you know, different magazines coming down on Finders Keepers nights, even though they were specifically not invited. And you can spot them a fucking mile off, you know, asking like, “Oh, do you know who Dave the Chimp is?”; “Do you know who Adam Neate is?” I would be like, “yeah, it is that guy over there in the orange T-shirt,” picking out a completely random person. (Mysterious Al, 09/02/06)

While they may well have avoided the authoritarian gaze of CCTV and the police out on the main streets, FKC were nonetheless

⁷ <http://www.woostercollective.com/>

“Finders Keepers”

exposed to a different but no less powerful and pervasive form of surveillance by those intent on seeking out “cool” people and places to fill the pages of magazines aimed at “urban” and “youth” markets. The Finders Keepers show even appeared on the WCRS website. WCRS is a marketing agency and branding consultant that is supposedly known for its “edgy” and “irreverent” advertising, and describes itself as “a brand’s best friend.”⁸ As Al later told me, however, “when Chimp found out about that, he actually emailed them—it is a real honor to appear on WCRS by the way—but he actually emailed them and asked them to take it off, saying that we wanted nothing to do with them” (Mysterious Al, 09/02/06). FKC, then, employed all sort of tactics to frustrate this kind of interest in the event. Nonetheless, it is important to note that mediated representations of the occasion were still very important to the group; the fact that FKC supported Marshall and Whitehouse in the production of their documentary, as well as providing photographs for a careful selection of “scene” magazines and books, is testimony to their recognition of the value of some form of record, and their desire to be in control of its message as far as possible. Marshall expressed this central tension clearly: “It’s a social event but the fundamentals of it is to give work away to the public and get people involved, but that’s when it becomes uncontrollable and doesn’t feel the same” (Philip Marshall, 29/03/07). Unable to entirely resist such pressures, FKC took solace in their transient successes and left their project behind as very much a moment in time.

Conclusions

This case study has attempted to open out some of the oppositions associated with the spaces of the street and the gallery, as set out in Cresswell’s analysis of the crucial “where” of graffiti in 1970s New York City (*In Place* 50). The unfolding of the Finders Keepers event is used to demonstrate how, beyond the dominant representations associated with one spatial category or the other, FKC effectively produced for themselves a series of differential spaces poised in-

⁸ <http://www.wcrs.com/>

between these idealized spheres of activity. In their hunt for “treasure” in the run-down back streets of Shoreditch, the artists reclaimed these parts of the city as spaces of play, of resistance and of fantasy, and began their noble pursuit of an alternative economy for their art through the reuse of street detritus. When they came to exhibit these works, their use of otherwise abandoned plots in the cracks of the urban fabric shows how they consciously moved between the abstractions of the white cube gallery space and the authoritarian gaze of the street. Significantly, they did not abandon outright the formalities of the art world, or reject the idea of producing “art” (as many traditional graffiti writers do), and instead sought to subvert the established channels of production, promotion, display and distribution of their art works. Neither did they directly confront the surveillance and control of the street (those used widely by more mainstream publics), but instead chose to operate at its margins, just out of sight and out of time enough to achieve the sorts of autonomy they desired. Yet, as these endeavors became exposed to outside audiences, which the FKC clearly wanted to do, many of the political and ideological motives expressed in the project were tempered by an artistic anarchy that enabled both a radical alteriety and the reassertion of capitalist relations in the consumption of the work. As such, it is clear that whatever purchase these undertakings may have had in contesting the “authoritative spatiality” of the city (Edensor *Industrial*), they did so only temporarily, partially and ambiguously.

Related to this reassessment of the place of graffiti is an attempt to expand its conception beyond a rather narrow spray-can, hip-hop model, rooted in the recent history of the North American metropolis. While graffiti writing of this kind clearly has played a significant role in advancing our comprehension of cities, and remains the dominant form across the world today, I have argued that a continued focus on such a specific style makes it difficult to appreciate the quite different range of ways people write, draw, mark and sculpt contemporary urban spaces. In view of this, the notion of “urban inscription” is used here in order to disassociate the term “graffiti” from a tiresome debate about its status as art or crime, and more importantly, to draw together this broad assortment of new

“Finders Keepers”

terms which collectively express elements of this rich and sophisticated, but often overlooked, nexus of creative engagement. While it is certainly true that only a small portion of this range is addressed here, in so doing I hope to encourage a research agenda more sensitive and open to the diversity, complexity and ingenuity of the aesthetic practices and spatial engagements that might constitute urban inscription today.

As this paper has suggested, these shifts in practices and styles are profoundly related to the ways cities themselves have changed, particularly those post-industrial world cities now awash with glossy visions of neoliberalism at its most seductive. At a basic level, the use of materials beyond the spray can has altered the look of such inscriptions, which in turn has complicated the appearance of such works as essentially illegal and “out of place” amongst the mass of more legitimate signs. Efforts to reach new audiences reflect, simultaneously, a deep knowledge of the visual forms of communication in the city, alongside a desire to critique, subvert and ultimately bypass such sanctioned aesthetics. Importantly, this communication with those outside “the scene” works both ways, and there is a good deal of evidence to suggest that various publics seem to view some of these alternative inscriptions as a beneficial and desirable part of living in the “creative city.” Also significant is the way such practices speak to emergent relationships between virtual and urban spaces. In part this is about how new communications technologies facilitate certain kinds of social grouping beyond the gaze of traditional forms of surveillance, and the rapid organization, hosting and disbanding of alternative happenings. In another sense, this relationship is addressed through the role played by mediated representations, such as the documentary film at the center of this investigation, and indeed this paper itself, which seem to be of central importance to the ways these transient aesthetic practices come to be known and valued. The sorts of people undertaking such works also appears to be changing, particularly in terms of race and class, though less so in terms of gender. The critical but sympathetic relations with the spheres of art and design suggest that access to education, specifically about the aesthetics, histories and markets of graffiti have become a key mediator in this shift. While FKC and their

contemporaries argue that their working practices are a reaction against domination and control in the production of their art, and the wider authoritarianism of the city, they actually appear to be rejecting the old guard in favor of producing new kinds of elitism, influence and control.

Taking these ideas into account, this paper has sought to illustrate something of the alternative ways that we might come to experience the city and perhaps even create it anew. Despite the questionable politics and certain degree of privilege that the Finders Keepers project encapsulated, David Pinder and others make a compelling case for insisting that “exploring ‘the meaning of living in a city’ at this time *is* crucial politically” (“Arts” 399, original emphasis). At the heart of this search for a differential space is a call for urban dwellers to become actors rather than spectators, to affect change rather than simply witness it. With this in mind, it is vital to understand urban inscription as an *act* as much as an *aesthetic*, whereby the city becomes known through the bodily, rhythmic writing and re-writing of it. This, ultimately, is a creative pursuit that transcends mere opposition and contestation in order to produce new forms of urban life, new spaces and times.

Works Cited

- Adams, Karen L., and Anne Winter. "Gang Graffiti as a Discourse Genre." *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 1.3 (1997): 337-60.
- Amin, Ash, and Nigel Thrift. *Cities: Reimagining the Urban*. Oxford & Cambridge: Polity, 2002.
- Assman, Aleida. "Beyond the Archive." *Waste-Site Stories: The Recycling of Memory*. Eds. Brian Neville and Johanne Villeneuve. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2002.
- Austin, Joe. *Taking the Train: How Graffiti Art Became an Urban Crisis in New York City*. New York: Columbia, 2002.
- Bandaranaike, Sue. "Graffiti: A Culture of Aggression or Assertion?" *The Character, Impact and Prevention of Crime in Regional Australia Conference*. Ed. Banksy. *Cut It Out*. England: independent publication, 2004.
- Bey, Hakim. *The Temporary Autonomous Zone: Ontological Anarchy, Poetic Terrorism*. New York: Autonomedia, 1991.

"Finders Keepers"

- Borden, Iain. "Another Pavement, Another Beach: Skateboarding and the Performative Critique of Architecture." *The Unknown City: Contesting Architecture and Social Space*. Eds. Iain Borden, et al. Cambridge, MA: MIT press, 2002. 178-99.
- Borden, Iain, et al., eds. *The Unknown City: Contesting Architecture and Social Space* Massachusetts: MIT, 2002.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste* New York: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1984.
- Brennan, Mark. "Under the Influence." *Ill Communication Ii*. Ed. S Armstrong. Manchester: Cornerhouse, 2004. 6-7.
- Burnham, Scott. "Street Art in the Public Realm." *Ill Communication Ii*. Ed. S Armstrong. Manchester: Cornerhouse, 2004.
- C100. *The Art of Rebellion 2: World of Urban Art Activism*. Aschaffenburg: Publikat Verlags, 2006.
- Cant, Sarah G., and Nina J. Morris. "Geographies of Art and the Environment." Special Issue, *Social and Cultural Geography* 7.6 (2006): 857-61.
- Cooper, Martha. *The Hip-Hop Files: Photographs 1979-1984*. Cologne: From Here to Fame, 2004.
- Cooper, Martha, and Henry Chalfant. *Subway Art*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1984.
- Cresswell, Tim. "The Crucial 'Where' of Graffiti: A Geographical Analysis of Reactions to Graffiti in New York." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 10 (1992): 329-44.
- . *In Place/out of Place: Geography, Ideology, and Transgression*. Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press, 1996.
- . ed. *Night Discourse: Producing/Consuming Meaning on the Street*. London: Routledge, 1998.
- Crouch, David, ed. *The Street in the Making of Popular Geographical Knowledge*. London: Routledge, 1998.
- Dewsbury, J-D, et al. "Enacting Geographies." *Geoforum* 33.4 (2002): special issue.
- Dickens, Luke. "Art, Anti-Social Behaviour and the Local State: London's 'Outside Institute' and the Control of Post-Graffiti." Association of American Geographers Annual Conference.
- . "Pictures on Walls: Post-Graffiti, Cultural Industry and the City." Royal Geographical Society - Institute of British Geographers' Annual Conference.
- . "Placing Post-Graffiti: The Journey of the Peckham Rock." *Cultural Geographies* (In Press).

Luke Dickens

- Dorrian, Mike, Liz Farrelly, and David Recchia. *Stick 'Em Up*. London: Booth-Clibborn, 2002.
- Dreph, and Sami. "Underground Resistance." *Graphotism* 2005: 124-27.
- Edensor, Tim. *Industrial Ruins: Space, Aesthetics and Materiality*. Oxford: Berg, 2005.
- . "Waste Matter: The Debris of Industrial Ruins and the Disordering of the Material World." *Journal of Material Culture* 10.3 (2005): 311-32.
- Foucault, Michel. "Of Other Spaces." *Diacritics* 16.1 (1986): 22-27.
- Ganz, Nicholas. *Graffiti World: Street Art from Five Continents*. London: Thames and Hudson, 2004.
- Hames, Peter. "They're Dancing on the Street." *State of Art* Jan/Feb 2006 2006.
- Hauser, Susanne. "Waste into Heritage." *Waste-Site Stories: The Recycling of Memory*. Eds. Brian Neville and Johanne Villeneuve. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2002.
- Institute of Contemporary Arts. *Branding the Street: New Directions in Graffiti Art*. 15.04.04 2004.
- . *New Global Graffiti*. 28.10.04 2004.
- Jacobs, Karrie. "Night Discourse." *Angry Graphics*. Eds. Steven Heller and Karrie Jacobs. Layton, UT: Gibbs-Smith, 1992. 8-15.
- Jones, Johnathan. "Dim, Cloned Conservatives: Modern Graffiti Is Not Subversive - It Is a Formulaic, Bankrupt Cliché." *The Guardian* 07/08/04 2004.
- Knabb, Ken, ed. *Situationist International: Anthology*. California: Bureau of Public Secrets, 1981.
- Lacy, Suzanne, ed. *Mapping the Terrain: New Genre Public Art*. Seattle, WA: Bay Press, 1995.
- Latham, Alan, and David Conradson. "Making Place: Performance, Practice, Space." *Environment and Planning A* 35.11 (2003): theme issue.
- Lefebvre, Henri. *The Production of Space*. Trans. D Nicholson-Smith. Oxford: Blackwell, 1991.
- Ley, David, and Roman Cybriwsky. "Urban Graffiti as Territorial Markers." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 64.4 (1974): 491-505.
- Macdonald, Nancy. *The Graffiti Subculture: Youth, Masculinity and Identity in London and New York*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2001.
- Makagon, Daniel. "'Got Meat?': Guerillas and the Art of Aggravation." *Text and Performance Quarterly* 20.2 (2000): 203-14.
- Manco, Tristan. *Stencil Graffiti*. London: Thames and Hudson, 2002.
- . *Street Logos*. London: Thames and Hudson, 2004.

“Finders Keepers”

- Miles, Malcome. *Art, Space and the City: Public Art and Urban Futures*. London: Routledge, 1997.
- Nandrea, Lorri. "'Graffiti Taught Me Everything I Know About Space': Urban Fronts and Borders." *Antipode* 31.1 (1999): 110-16.
- Nash, Catherine, Kathy Prendergast, and Ingrid Swenson. *Landings: Eight Collaborative Projects between Artists and Geographers*. London: Royal Holloway, University of London, 2002.
- O'Doherty, Brian. *Inside the White Cube: The Ideology of the Gallery Space*. Santa Monica and San Francisco: The Lapis Press, 1986.
- Pile, Steve. "Opposition, Political Identities and Spaces of Resistance." *Geographies of Resistance*. Eds. Steve Pile and Michael Keith. London: Routledge, 1997. 1-32.
- Pinder, David. "The Arts of Urban Exploration." *Cultural Geographies* 12.4 (2005): special issue.
- . *Visions of the City: Utopianism, Power and Politics in Twentieth-Century Urbanism*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2005.
- Reinecke, Julia. *Street-Art: Eine Subkultur Zwischen Kunst Und Kommerz*. Frankfurt: Transcript, 2007.
- Rose, Cynthia. "Agitprop Art: From the Spraycan to the Cd-Rom." *Trade Secrets: Young British Talents Talk Business*. Ed. C Rose. London: Thames and Hudson, 1999.
- Rose, Gillian, and Nigel Thrift. "Spaces of Performance, Part 1." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 18.4 (2000): special issue.
- . "Spaces of Performance, Part 2." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 18.5 (2000): special issue.
- Sadler, Simon. *The Situationist City*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1998.
- Sibley, David. *Geographies of Exclusion: Society and Difference in the West*. London: Routledge, 1995.
- Smith, Susan. "Graffiti." *City a-Z*. Eds. S Pile and N Thrift. London: Routledge, 2001. 86-89.
- Stak, Olivier. "Time of the Signs." *Ill Communication Ii*. Ed. S Armstrong. Manchester: Cornerhouse, 2004. 12.
- Warner, Michael. *Publics and Counterpublics*. New York: Zone Books, 2002.