



Waterside Mooring

Cameron Rowland
34-31 82nd Street
11372

Dear Cameron Rowland,

Congratulations on your purchase of a up to 42' 6" / 13.00m mooring at Albert Dock L1 AB-001-013-4230 and for making the initial deposit payment.

Before we can allocate the mooring to you, we will check that you meet the requirements set out in the Terms and Conditions. If necessary, we may contact you to verify certain information. You can view the status of your application via your profile on the website.

Once the above has been completed we will process your mooring application within 15 working days and you will receive an invoice confirmation of your purchase and deposit payment.

You will be able to move your boat onto the site on the date your contract commences.

Thank you for choosing to moor with Waterside mooring and should you have any queries, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Kind regards,

Lisa Shaw

Mooring Sales Manager
07900 051972 or 0303 040 40 40

Canal & River Trust, a charitable company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales with company number 7807276 and registered charity number 1146792, registered office address First Floor North, Station House, 500 Elder Gate, Milton Keynes MK9 1BB



Waterside Mooring

Mooring Contract

Cameron Rowland
34-31 82nd Street
11372

Customer No. 8227126
Boat Index: N/A
Boat Name:

Site Name	Albert Dock L1
Functional Location	AB-001-013
Mooring Length	Up to 42' 6" / 13.00m
Listing Type	Buy it Now
Start Date	01 December 2019
Contract Fee	£2,710.50
Annual Fee	£2,710.50
Contract Length	1 Year
Fee Paid	£2,710.50
Payment Method	Debit Card

Once this contract expires, you will receive an invitation to renew for a further 12 months. Please note the renewal document will not be available to download in your website account.

Should you wish to not renew your mooring after the expiry date, please advise us in writing or cancel in your website account.

Please note: if you have chosen to pay by monthly Direct Debit, your deposit payment will be allocated to the first Direct Debit shown on the invoice you will receive once your application has been processed.

Subject to our Terms and Conditions agreed upon your purchase.

Canal & River Trust, a charitable company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales with company number 7807276 and registered charity number 1146792, registered office address First Floor North, Station House, 500 Elder Gate, Milton Keynes MK9 1BB

Cameron Rowland, *Mooring*, 2020, AB-001-013

William Rathbone and Sons was a timber merchant company founded in Liverpool in 1746. “[T]he foundation of the Rathbone fortune and business was built on the Africa slave trade.”¹ During the 18th century, they imported timber felled and milled by slaves in the West Indies and operated a number of trading ships that sailed to West Indian colonies as well as the Southern States of America.² Rathbone and Sons’ yard occupied a large portion of the Liverpool South Docks.³ Rathbone and Sons supplied timber for slave ship builders in Liverpool until at least 1783.⁴ These ships carried enslaved black people who were sold in the West Indies and in British North America. Ships built in Liverpool also carried the slaves who were sold on Negro Row at the Liverpool South Docks.⁵

Liverpool built the world’s first wet dock in 1716, allowing cargo ships to dock directly at the port. By 1796, Liverpool had built 28 acres of docks.

Liverpool’s proximity to Ireland also not only facilitated a profitable trade, but provided a relatively safer route that allowed Liverpool ships less chance to be captured by French privateers. Additionally, the copper and brass manufactures in Lancashire and Ireland allowed for local companies that manufactured African trade goods such as manillas to carry on a prosperous export trade, further giving Liverpool a competitive edge. The relationships forged with nearby merchants not only helped secure trade goods, but also valuable credit terms.⁶

In 1784, Rathbone and Sons imported the first consignment of raw cotton to England from the United States.⁷ From this point, they became stated abolitionists and free trade advocates.⁸ The abolition of the “West Indian monopoly” on the import of goods to the British Isles would allow for the expansion of U.S. cotton trading. Liverpool became the primary port of 19th-century cotton importation to England. Rathbone and Sons imported American cotton to Liverpool through the American Civil War.⁹ The company continues to operate as the investment and wealth management firm Rathbone Brothers Plc.

The mooring at the Albert Dock: AB-001-013 is on the former location of the Rathbone warehouse. This mooring has been rented for the purpose of not being used.

1. Jehanne Wake, *Kleinwort Benson: The History of Two Families in Banking* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), 15.
2. Wake, 16.
3. Adam Bowett, “The Jamaica Trade: Gillow and the Use of Mahogany in the Eighteenth Century,” *Regional Furniture* 12 (1998): 22.
4. Wake, 16.
5. Eric Williams, *Capitalism and Slavery*, 2nd ed. (1944; repr. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1994), 52.
6. Katie McDade, “Liverpool Slave Merchant Entrepreneurial Networks, 1725–1807,” *Business History* 53, no. 7 (2011): 1094.
7. Eleanor F. Rathbone, *William Rathbone: A Memoir* (London: Macmillan and Co. Limited, 1905), 11.
8. Wake, 15, 31.
9. Sheila Marriner, “Rathbones’ Trading Activities in the Middle of the Nineteenth Century,” *Transactions of the Historic Society of Lancashire & Cheshire* 108 (1956): 118.

REVIEWS

FOCUS

xxx	Marina Vishmidt <i>on</i> Cameron Rowland	
	NEW YORK	CHICHESTER, UK
xxx	Jeffrey Kastner <i>on</i> Gladys Nilsson	xxx Emily LaBarge <i>on</i> Prunella Clough
	Colby Chamberlain <i>on</i> Teresa Margolles	GATESHEAD, UK
xxx	Jeff Gibson <i>on</i> T. J. Wilcox	xxx Melissa Gronlund <i>on</i> “Animalesque/Art Across Species and Beings”
xxx	Jan Avgikos <i>on</i> William Cordova	PARIS
xxx	Zack Hatfield <i>on</i> Troy Brauntuch	Lillian Davies <i>on</i> Marie Losier
	Donald Kuspit <i>on</i> Erró	xxx Hannah Stamler <i>on</i> Jules Adler
xxx	Charity Coleman <i>on</i> Josep Grau-Garriga	DIJON, FRANCE
xxx	Linda Simpson <i>on</i> Jayne County	xxx Mara Hoberman <i>on</i> Farah Atassi
	Barry Schwabsky <i>on</i> Issy Wood	BOLOGNA, ITALY
xxx	Sasha Frere-Jones <i>on</i> Tiril Hasselknippe	Veronica Santi <i>on</i> Urs Lüthi
	Domenick Ammirati <i>on</i> Corin Hewitt	NAPLES
xxx	Alex Jovanovich <i>on</i> Clarity Haynes	xxx Eugenio Viola <i>on</i> Renato Leotta
xxx	Wendy Vogel <i>on</i> Annabel Daou	GENEVA
	PROVIDENCE, RHODE ISLAND	xxx Daniel Horn <i>on</i> “Writing by Drawing”
xxx	Abraham Adams <i>on</i> Katarina Burin	VIENNA
	CHICAGO	Caroline Lillian Schopp <i>on</i> “4 x 1 = 30”
	David J. Getsy <i>on</i> José Santiago Pérez	BERLIN
	SAN FRANCISCO	xxx Dominikus Müller <i>on</i> Susanne Paesler
xxx	Maria Porges <i>on</i> Donna Ruff	MUNICH
	LOS ANGELES	Daniela Stöppel <i>on</i>
xxx	Catherine Taft <i>on</i> Johanna Went	Raphael Weilguni and Viola Relle
	Suzanne Hudson <i>on</i> Helène Aylon	WARSAW
xxx	Ashton Cooper <i>on</i>	xxx Agata Pyzik <i>on</i> Karol Radziszewski
	Pauline Boudry and Renate Lorenz	TEL AVIV
xxx	Jan Tumlrir <i>on</i> Paul McCarthy	xxx Nuit Banai <i>on</i> “Transferumbau: Liebling”
	Yxta Maya Murray <i>on</i>	NEW DELHI
	Lynette Yiadom-Boakye	xxx Meera Menezes <i>on</i> Shambhavi
	VANCOUVER	BEIJING
xxx	Amy Fung <i>on</i> Douglas Watt	Qing Zhang <i>on</i>
	MEXICO CITY	“A Geography of Resistance”
xxx	Fabiola Iza <i>on</i> Beatriz Zamora	HONG KONG
	BOGOTÁ	xxx Stephanie Bailey <i>on</i> Ho Sin Tung
	Fanny Singer <i>on</i> Delcy Morelos	AUCKLAND
	SÃO PAULO	xxx Anthony Byrt <i>on</i> Zac Langdon-Pole
xxx	Camila Belchior <i>on</i> Alex Cervený	
	LONDON	
xxx	Harry Thorne <i>on</i> Ruth Asawa	
	Gilda Williams <i>on</i> Jade Montserrat	



Cameron Rowland, *Pacotille*, 2020, brass manillas manufactured in Birmingham, 18th century; glass beads manufactured in Venice, 18th century, 40½ × 26¾ × 1½". Rental.

European goods traded for enslaved people were manufactured specifically for this purpose. Manillas were used as a one-directional currency, which Europeans would offer as payment but would never accept. The Portuguese determined the value of slave life at 12–15 manillas in the early 1500s.¹ Birmingham was the primary producer of brass manillas in Britain, prior to the city's central role in the Industrial Revolution. The British also used cheap beads acquired throughout Europe to buy slaves. Eric Williams describes the "triple stimulus to British industry" provided through the export of British goods manufactured for the purchasing of slaves, the process-

ing of raw materials grown by slaves, and the formation of new colonial markets for British-made goods.² The production of European goods for the slave trade supported domestic manufacturing markets. British trade in West Africa was understood to be nearly 100% profit.

What renders the Negroe-Trade still more estimable and important is, that near Nine-tenths of those Negroes are paid for in Africa with British Produce and Manufactures only. . . . We send no Specie or Bullion to pay for the Products of Africa, but, 'tis certain, we bring from thence very large Quantities of Gold; . . . From which Facts, the Trade to Africa may very truly be said to be, as it were, all Profit to the Nation.³

Goods produced for the trade of slaves, which carried nearly no value

in Europe, were called *pacotille*. *Pacotille* translates from French to English as "rubbish."⁴

1. A. H. M. Kirk-Greene, "The Major Currencies in Nigerian History," *Journal of the Historical Society of Nigeria* 2, no. 1 (December 1960): 146.
2. Eric Williams, *Capitalism and Slavery*, 2nd ed. (1944; repr. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1994), 52.
3. Malachy Postlethwayt, *The National and Private Advantages of the African Trade Considered*, 2nd ed. (London: John and Paul Knapton, 1746; London: William Otridge, Bookseller, 1772), 3. Citations refer to the Otridge edition.
4. Marie-Hélène Corrêard, "pacotille," in *Pocket Oxford-Hachette French Dictionary: French-English* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 594.

Cameron Rowland

ICA, LONDON

Marina Vishmidt

'IF WE HAD BEEN in the hold and were never held, we were never, neither, actually excluded by "the black letter of the law," which all along wrote something like the depression of our inclusion as the color line; black subjectivity is the horrible harmony of power and intimacy.' Simone White, 2018

For the greater part of a decade, Cameron Rowland has been engaged in making something like a museum of racial capitalism minus costumed re-enactors and plus a remarkable and ever more attuned grasp of how to mediate webs of real abstraction in art institutional space. A museum is perhaps inapt, as 'continuing violations' are the fabric of its historiography; the format of a Visitor's Centre is closer to the matter, its artefacts purposefully excerpted from daily use to demonstrate something, or offer a manual. What is salient about this work, however, is not the exceptional acuity of how it depicts or the total-ity of what is disclosed in the research apparatus. It's the actual boring into the legal infrastructures of property that has marked Rowland's project over the span of its iterations. If property survives its abolition, as in the case of chattel slavery, and even thrives – as in the globalised

free-trade boom experienced by Britain in the wake of the 1833 Abolition Act cited in the show's title, or the fact that this and other abolitions were handsomely compensated throughout the imperial 19th century – then, like all capitalist relationships, it is racked by antagonism, and the contradictions of its life can always be dramatically, diagrammatically, pushed, which is what Rowland does. In that sense, perhaps, abolition can be extracted from property, but only according to the tenets of the kind of graduated and tortuous legal realism that terms such as 'disgorgement' (the court-ordered return of ill-gotten gains) and 'encumbrance' (a type of lien) evoke. Legal mechanisms that add friction to how a piece of the fictitious commodity of land is able to circulate (Depreciation, 2018), that buy up shares in companies holding slave insurance policies intact from the era of the 'peculiar institution', pending reparations (Disgorgement, 2016), and finally, here at the ICA, that puncture the value-retaining capacities of slave-industry-made goods now serving as Crown assets, still marketable but less so (Encumbrance, 2020). As these assets include the mahogany doors and banister of the ICA's Regency-period building, here the legal instrument of encumbrance becomes most akin to a species of termite. Commodity fetishism riddled by termite tracks. The inescapable ownership relation between the ICA and the Crown Estate gets aerated by a parasitical one, which it has itself invited, sanctioned and signed. The deployment of the exhibiting institution as contractual partner in speculative ventures is one of the two main ways that property performs as a medium in Rowland's work. The other one is the reflexive location of property in the ownership relations of the artworks themselves, which are objects that are generally acquired rather than fabricated by Rowland or by any other purposefully artistic means, and if they are made available, it is under conditions of outright purchase, rental, or rental at cost. There can at the same time be the conditions under which these objects enter the exhibition space, as with *Pacotille* (2020) and *Society* (2020) in this show or at MOCA LA, Group

of 8 Used Bikes – Item: 1284-018213 (2018), which was bought as a lot at a police auction as one of several group of objects in the exhibition obtained through processes of civil asset forfeiture, a habitual moneyspinner for cash-strapped police departments in the US, along with equally normalised if exponentially more grotesque practices like billable probation (Probation Order Under 18 U.S.C. § 3607, 2020) or 'pay-to-stay' incarceration. This reflexivity about the conditions of the artist's participation in culture as a market agent, an instigator and delegator of various types of canny, brand-building action, and the resistance to separating this embedding from the histories and actualities staged by the work is recursive. In its many-sided thoroughness, Rowland's approach puts you in mind of a crystal drill, if there is such an appliance. It creates sightlines by means of cutting through (language, provenances, histories) but the cutting apparatus is already a prism. The legal term 'discovery' seems apposite

This is a practice where legal realism bears great imaginative agency.

here, as if establishing a contractual relation creates some other vantage on its fixity.

This is a practice where legal realism bears great imaginative agency. A typical example is the ambiguous status of the enslaved person, which was real and nightmarish rather than metaphorical, but still provides one of the best optics for Rowland's parallaxes. As they write in the text for the show, 'The property relation of the enslaved included and exceeded that of chattel and real estate.' As Ian Baucom also notes, in his discussion of enslaved people as both commodities and money capital, the 'double consciousness' of blackness inside white supremacy identified by W.E.B Du Bois had a parallel in the double consciousness of capital in the ways that enslaved subjects



Cameron Rowland, *Encumbrance*, 2020, mortgage; mahogany double doors: 12 Carlton House Terrace, ground floor, front entrance.

The property relation of the enslaved included and exceeded that of chattel and real estate. Plantation mortgages exemplify the ways in which the value of people who were enslaved, the land they were forced to labor on, and the houses they were forced to maintain were mutually constitutive. Richard Pares writes that “[mortgages] became commoner and commoner until, by 1800, almost every large plantation debt was a mortgage debt.” Slaves simultaneously functioned as collateral for the debts of their masters, while laboring intergenerationally under the debt of the master. The taxation of plantation products imported to Britain, as well as the taxation of interest paid to plantation lenders, provided revenue for Parliament and income for the monarch.

Mahogany became a valuable British import in the 18th century. It was used for a wide variety of architectural applications and furniture, characterizing Georgian and Regency styles. The timbers were felled and milled by slaves in Jamaica, Barbados, and Honduras among other British colonies. It is one of the few commodities of the triangular trade that continues to generate value for those who currently own it.

After taking the throne in 1820, George IV dismantled his residence, Carlton House, and the house of his parents, Buckingham House, combining elements from each to create Buckingham Palace. He built Carlton House Terrace between 1827 and 1832 on the former site of Carlton House as a series of elite rental properties to generate revenue for the Crown. All addresses at Carlton House Terrace are still owned by the Crown Estate, manager of land owned by the Crown since 1760.

12 Carlton House Terrace is leased to the Institute of Contemporary Arts. The building includes four mahogany doors and one mahogany handrail. These five mahogany elements were mortgaged by the Institute of Contemporary Arts to Encumbrance Inc. on January 16th, 2020 for £1000 each. These loans will not be repaid by the ICA. As security for these outstanding debts, Encumbrance Inc. will retain a security interest in these mahogany elements. This interest will constitute an encumbrance on the future transaction of 12 Carlton House Terrace. An encumbrance is a right or interest in real property that does not prohibit its exchange but diminishes its value. The encumbrance will remain on 12 Carlton House Terrace as long as the mahogany elements are part of the building. As reparation, this encumbrance seeks to limit the property’s continued accumulation of value for the Crown Estate. The Crown Estate provides 75% of its revenue to the Treasury and 25% directly to the monarch.

could be made to yield profit. The imaginative agency Rowland finds here is informed by the critical race and legal theory of scholars such as Cheryl Harris, Saidiya Hartman, Brenna Bhandar, Robert Westley, and K-Sue Park, a number of whom Rowland has been in dialogue with for some time. The earlier, groundbreaking work of Eric Williams’ *Capitalism and Slavery* has been instrumental as well for tracing the economic trajectory of slavery’s rise and fall, always heavily asymptotic to the ‘arc of the moral universe’ presented by received accounts of abolitionism. The dialogue with curator Richard Birkett, ongoing since 2016’s 91020000 at Artists Space, should be mentioned, with their shared interest in material critique as a way of operating in the space of art.

The discursive complexity of this exhibition, as in all of Rowland’s projects, feels both generous and like a vortex, finely imbricated as it is with the affective undertow which somehow links the high-Conceptual wall installation of the legal contract and the artefacts of disciplinary terror mounted a short distance away. Cattle brands used to burn a mark of ownership on the ‘people’ of a Barbadian evangelical mission in the 18th century hang on one wall, opposite an electronic monitor used today. The pieces create an echo of racialized terror administered via the flesh, which resonates painfully around the elegant room. Both objects recall an earlier work, the 2015 *Hand-Punch* photographic series, which pictured a biometric timeclock in various workplaces. This Postonian gadget (named here as such in tribute to the author of *Time, Labor and Social Domination*) acts as a memento of Rowland’s ongoing focus on how abstraction is measured, managed, and embodied. What makes this abstraction real, of course, as real as the ‘car that runs you over’ (Lukacs) is, precisely, property relations and the violent means of their enforcement in capitalist social life, and which have never existed in other than a racialized form, as Cedric Robinson posits throughout his work.

What would it mean to find desire in such an infrastructure, to brush against its dismal asperities?. It can be

said that Rowland approaches the materiality of social infrastructures such as prisons and the judiciary as a type of ‘hold’, in Wilderson, Moten or White’s terms, and also the title of one of Rowland’s works from 2017, an ensemble of shipboard fastenings (‘twistlocks’) and marine insurance certificates. A ‘hold’ which is not so much a melancholy fastness or a nourishing enclave of compromised sociality but a fraught container of antagonisms both expressed in, and suppressed by, the letter and the instrument of the law, which can be a print out or a police lamp, to go by the inventory of this show. A history which is always present if constitutively elusive, driven by a logic which, as Bhandar notes, ‘irrevocably fuses property and race together’ as modes of abstraction. Modes of abstraction, like equality before the law, the democracy of money, the natural intimacies of property. The artefacts in Rowland’s projects can have a compelling tremor to them, as banal objects with distinct backstories in the slave trade. Other times they testify to this history with an obdurate wit, like the canal boat mooring rented for the purpose of not being used (Mooring, 2020) but for the reason of being adjacent to the previous site of a warehouse belonging to the Rathbone company, a large player in the Liverpool node of the triangular trade, being a timber supplier, cotton importer and financial services provider, in that historical order. The dysphoria of the object in relation to the historico-legal complex, their asymmetry, is unfathomably huge. The allegorical and the baroque come to the fore, which the proliferation of contract panels alongside memento of confinement in the grand upstairs rooms reinforces. The oscillation between the functional, the critical and the aesthetic familiar from conceptualism’s penchant for contracts (Asher, Siegelau) and other administrative tools (Piper), as well as the institutional-critical strategies that involved re-orderings of space, inventory and fixtures (Asher, Wilson, Knight), are a few of the co-ordinates that could be cited here. The distinct character of Rowland’s approach, certainly with regard to Asher or Knight, is that there is no modification to the fabric of exhibition spaces,

which may be due to the fact that the spaces are not the addressee. Invoked instead are the property relations in which they are enmeshed, and the modifications to those relations they are in a position to support. The institution becomes another of the sourced objects on display, whose aporetic histories are relentlessly filtered and arrayed.

The objects appear as repositories of systemic dependencies. As Eric Golo Stone puts it in a piece from 2018, Rowland presents items ‘without alteration’, which is to say, in a non-proprietary way. Nothing is changed about them except the means of circulation. They thus come into the space as evidence or as transitional objects, both themselves and crystals of abstract systems, a feature they share with all commodities. They are object, image and (extensive) caption at the same time, recalling Benjamin’s terms of universal captioning as the potential politics of an all-consuming image space. Archaeology comes into play here, as well as the ‘evidence-based’ practices of Forensic Architecture, though perhaps only on one point: the way that documentation produces rather than stabilises reality. Each of Rowland’s projects has centred on an institutional site’s capacity to perform in its given role as well as constitute a party to a new contract, a capacity lent to it by capital and state. So far, 3 & 4 Will. IV c. 73 is perhaps the most angled towards the state, made available and even necessary as a question in a building leased from the monarchy, an institution which was sustained for centuries by the slave trade, and the moral and economic capital of its abolition across and beyond its imperial possessions. Real estate and nationhood come packaged together here in a way they couldn’t quite do in New York, LA, Cologne or Brussels. And what is it but real estate and nationalism that diminish the possibilities of earthly life, especially in London? The abstractions can’t help but take a more congealed form in the building of the ICA, while de-valorisation slowly fills the rooms you’ve just left ‘like a spirit, a gas.’□

MARINA VISHMIDT