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And the Open Bridge:  
Labour, Enchantment, There Forever

Linda Marie Walker and Stephen Loo

The bland does not utter the things of the world—does not paint the world—except at their point of assimilation back into the Undifferentiated, where they shed their distinctive traits, integrate their differences, and give reign to their propensity for fusion. An imponderable quality...blandness is, of necessity, fugitive... (Jullien, 2004: 91).

Introduction

This essay draws upon a project we were both closely involved with—as curator and project manager—titled There Forever. It was an ephemeral public art project, commissioned for a local community festival, namely the inaugural Port Adelaide Festival in April 2007. The project, made possible by a grant from Arts SA (the South Australian government’s arts funding body) involved the curating of eight artists from the city of Adelaide, several of whom knew the local situation in Port Adelaide from living there, but all of whom were aware of the significant and enigmatic suburban history of the port within the context of the city.

Writing a paper by drawing upon a project, in this case an ephemeral art project, raises critical issues of ‘use’, and, for us, this idea of ‘use’ carries with it a feeling best described as ‘reticence’. This reticence is about writing itself: what it is, what it does, how it can be ‘voiced’; and how it is productive of a politics between what can be sensed and how that appears as work. In this essay, two different voices literally come together (there was no pretence at conventional composition), to operate together: left aligned, Linda Marie Walker, right aligned, Stephen Loo.

A question of use

The Project was, and is, at the mercy of what ‘use’ is what ‘use’ is ‘impermanence’ (what ‘use’ is death); what ‘use’ is investment—money, time, space, thought—in the fleeting, the temporary, the virtual (in other words, life). And integral to The Project was: how to ‘use’ the given conditions; to think with continually, and to make a set of independent ephemeral artworks, with limited means, limited space, and limited days, so as to form an event without resolution; or, in other words, to form a substance, an awkward or elegant shape, a community of voices, or/and a gathering of moods. Last night Teri Hoskin, an artist in The Project, read from her writing-work for The Project. The piece she read came from the evening of Day 8:
Waterways around the world are changing — artists and academics sink their teeth into these rich sites of transformation, often funded by developers, local government and councils — cynically one could say we are moved in to make smooth the transformation — yet something else happens which will take a little longer than this time to unfold. The story goes something like this: as sites of transformation post-industrial areas present a rich ground of competing forces of global capitalism, urban renewal changing work/leisure practices, the impact of new technologies, memory, memorial, etcetera (all those labels that roll so easily off an academic tongue).  

The Project’s institutional raison d’être is overtly political: to find other ways to commission public art than memorializing (literally) through monuments in space; to tap into the affectual register and thus reify the singularity of the architectural remains of an historic port, as justification for the conservation of place; to engage with a community (and they are not one) whose identity is inscribed in ‘Historic Port Adelaide’ as a name, and so forth. If one has to write The Project as an historical event, how can this writing remain within Jacques Rancière’s notion of politics as a process of democratic emancipation from the structures of policy (laws, codes, governance) that deny equality, when writing itself cannot escape from appearing as the material effectuation of/as policy? More importantly, how can I, as project manager — one already charged with the task of mobilizing policies belonging to sanctioned codes of practice, which in turn relate to ‘proper’ activities by stakeholders (the governmental art body who funded the project, or the State road and transport authority whose mandate is to police the ‘correct’ use of public infrastructure) — write The Project as political? The political force of the project is not an identifiable community (The Project does not ‘represent’, as such, those who have been dispossessed or forced to relocate by rampant urban rejuvenation of the Port), but rather it is the population that has been variously named, and therefore has the possibility of being misnamed (the generic other that each time falls outside a particular distribution of the sensible, whose identity is being invented, or is not yet invented). These are highly specific categories of the public which, paradoxically, exist because of a certain partitioning in the way things can be seen and spoken, internal to institutionalization or governmentality; a public, who by being named, is continuously negotiating its equal status within a given space of community. It is through the subjectivization of the variously and continuously changing public, as a never ending site of verification of equality, that the political emerges (Rancière, 2004b:33).

To remain so-touched

Listening — as the almost-accidental curator of The There Forever Project — reminded me of the duty (the love for what is created) one has toward something as delicate and tenuous (and tenacious) as this project was — and still is. Overall, The Project, as a work-of-art named ‘ephemeral’, had a permanency similar to, but at odds with, the named ‘permanent’ art-work (it is ‘there’, permanent, and then vanishes). The ephemeral work offers its absence, its afterwards, as ‘real’: it appeared; it disappeared. One could fight for its sites
3. James Geurts’ work titled Bridge Drawing Water went through several iterations due to weather; the work eventually became an almost-imagined work: a public bridge was opened by negotiation, a number of ordinary events occurred as a consequence, a very small ‘sound-situation’ on the water passed beneath the open-bridge, and then the bridge closed (just as it has been doing for decades).

4. Here Rancière is outlining the contradictions inherent in Deleuze’s poetics: on one hand Deleuze hopes for an “innocent” multiplicity in texts, on the other he installs the figure of the eccentric as the hero of this multiplicity. For Rancière, the political stake in literature is in the multiplicity in writing’s incarnation that arrives from the non-preferential but non-celestial movement of the text in the specific (named) public and text.

so-touched to remain so-touched (a lighthouse, a bridge, a building, a wharf, a basement, an archive): they would be ‘afterwards’ works. (They do remain, in some shape or other, although vaguely ‘touched’ forever). A site is imagined (the rowboat did not have to be seen; it became sound); the touched-site is elemental, it continues to be ‘the work’. The ephemeral art-work’s passing does not make it any less visible (or desirable); its variable duration is not unlike ‘an exhibition’ in a gallery – it’s scheduled, and then it’s gone – a minute, twenty five years, or forever (it passes).

Perhaps it is only through a Rancièrean disagreement that I can arrive at the political in writing about the politics of The Project: that is, to enact an interruption to the distribution of the sensible. We do not set out a disagreement of known political positions, nor are we enacting an oppositional practice, but rather a ‘dissensus’ over the given of a particular situation made visible by a particular distribution of the sensible. Touching lightly, the writing(s) enact disjunctions and conjunctions between what is meant to speak and to understand, between the visible and the invisible, the audible and the inaudible.

Writing about The Project affords an encounter which causes the objects and utterances to be deterritorialized from their original contextual space of discourse and temporal designations, so that thinking, as reterritorialization, can begin (again). Thinking is always a rethinking (Rancière, 2000: 120).

**Fading**

It was critical that The Project did not cohere into a single state or objective: its times of ‘openings’ and performances varied; its physical locations were multiple; information was delivered by invitation, website and word-of-mouth. These were not deliberate complications; complexity emerged as forces of containment faded (immediate structure, overarching mood, clear meaning).

In such rethinking is the question of relations and their implicit repetitions and tensions, as manifest in the following conditions: firstly, the elusive material presence of The Project (there were many who claimed that they were unsure if they had missed it altogether); secondly, its presence as writing, whether representational or otherwise (Rancière would say that writing is always on the way to an incarnation that lies ahead of both writer and reader: “the population of the novel [writing] is also the promise of a people to come” (Rancière, 2004a: 157)); and thirdly, the present, the here and now, given by this essay as an eventual site.

To unravel The Project would make of it what it did not have the propensity to be; it would impose upon it an ‘atmosphere’ ruled from elsewhere: the world of art; the world of local-interest; the world of politics (re-development, tourism, business, for instance).

Isabelle Stengers, writing about the “passing fright that scares self-assurance”, says that even though fright makes “an interstice in the soil of good reasons” it does not mean “fright is sufficient” to know how to proceed in order to provoke thought and slow down (so as to become aware of “the problems and situations mobilizing us”). Because, “[i]nterstices close rapidly” (Stengers, 2005: 994-996).
The Project kept its diffuse beginning, but with exuberance: talk, disquiet, meetings, excursions, eating, etc. It gathered over time to see what could appear, and to see how not to, if possible, exhaust oneself, and in so doing exhaust the project, the place, the subject; although exhaustion did occur, as did inexhaustiveness - to see what else could be done, with what was understood and by making, performing, and exhibiting the works.

The category of art, as work, whose visibility is primarily given by the image of material instantiation – there-being (of) something on the ground – is frequently appropriated to uncover, represent, enunciate, the politics of public space. A corollary question is whether a work of art can inherently be political? It seems the question of the aesthetics of a work of art can be found to hover between the enactment of the politics, and being political in its enactment, resulting in a certain irresolvable undecidability in the politics of aesthetics. It is this metapolitics which Rancière says gives art work its possibilities (2006: 45).

The dream to remain

That is, ‘the work’ did not complete itself; it just came to a specified date, a pre-set hour. The permanence of the ephemeral is ‘contained’, in this instance, in its slowness to sustain a continuation (of making), and to fade from the ‘governance of art to manifest non-process, non-transitoriness. The dream to remain, to stay (alive), is not an avoidance of product or market, but is an
acknowledgment that what arrives at the set-hour is, wonderfully, on ‘the way’ to something/where else. Therefore, it is implicit to honour what appears by giving it as good a chance as possible to stay-alive (venue, empathy, curiosity, context). For the artist who has taken to heart, or is in the midst of, issues of community, conflict, sadness, anger, loss, and their political effects, determinations, and arguments, ‘dissensus’ rather than resistance (as a stance, or reaction, in the form of an artefact) is a possible mode of thinking:

... a way of reconstrcuting the relationship between places and identities, spectacles and gazes, proximities and distances. ... The problem, first of all, is to create some breathing room, to loosen the bonds that enclose spectacles within a form of visibility, bodies within an estimation of their capacity, and possibility within the machine that makes the ‘state of things’ seem evident, unquestionable (Rancière, 2007: 261). 5

Within the modernist paradigm of public space, the politics of art work is collapsed into the ‘public’ as an inherently political category: public art effectuates the public politics. Under this regime of effectuation, the concepts of ‘public’ and ‘politics’ per se remain coherent, their integrity unquestioned, and they are, in this way, able to afford aesthetics a visibility, as they make available the ground for structuration (for speaking, showing, writing, and making – of essays, research, sculpture, design and architecture, etc.). However, the ground as a place for (other) types of structures, or movements of labour, is never felt or experienced.

**Degrees of freedom**

The artists in *There Forever* Project combine mediums – sound, text, drawing, video, objects, light, painting, weaving, photographs, performances. They are not ‘multi-media’ artists, nor are they artists who primarily work as ‘public’ artists. 7
The world has laws of circulation, and degrees of freedom, and it appreciates
the placement of one's feet on the ground: "... of knowing what one is doing in
a particular place, in a particular system of exchange. One must find ways to
create other places, or other uses for places" (Rancière, 2007: 263). The rest of
my writing for this essay consists of eight fragments written during the making
cf The Project, to help 'feel' my feet on the ground.

(1) The Labour Of Others

An expanding practice, where one thing leads to another - a proliferating
practice that affects the relationship between things - everything for/to itself,
gaps and separations, exact places for thought ... looping to the outside world,
the way the body does (connecting to the air); the performance done ...

Perhaps the question becomes: how can we make the ground, as the movement
(literally, as kinesis) of labour, political? Or, how do we work with accepted
structures and institutions to create new movement structures, ones which are
of non-representative politics? What The Project is (in search of), is a politics
of movement not already inscribed with a partisanship, or militancy, or
citizenship, but one without a recognized political subjectivity. In The Project,
the politico-aesthetics of movement arrives not from planned demonstrations
and orchestrated performances, but from the general capabilities of the human
being (for example, the ability to communicate, improvise, hold dissonant
beliefs, etc.), as it labours in moving from one definition or name, given
in governmentality, to another.

... or not done, the risk is elsewhere, in how we dress, labour, the appearance
of labour as art, as the past before us, that things are not over, ever, the making
of arrangements, the stories we tell each other, are artefacts, there is no secret,

Julie Hendirson, Continuous Wave,
Forms of a Dialogue.

8. "Freedom is not about breaking
or escaping constraints, it's about
lifting them over into degrees of
freedom. You can't really escape
the constraints" (Zournazi, 2002:
222).

9. "The idea of emancipation
implies that there are never places
that impose their law, that there
are always several spaces in a
space, several ways of occupy-
ing it. And each time the trick is
knowing what sort of capacities
one is setting in motion, what
sort of world one is constructing"
(Rancière, 2007: 262).

10. As Deleuze says of intellectual
work relating to institutions (he
was talking about mental asylums
to Foucault), "representation no
longer exists, there is only actions
-theoretical and practical actions
which serve as relays and form
nothing missing, and we float out, away, we can do this, bringing enchantment
to the ground of matter, of using the body uselessly (weakly), our own labour
(working) with the labour of others.

Why is constructing new political forms from movement, or giving political form
to diverse experiences of movement, an important concern for public art as an
aesthetic practice? To answer this we must return to the partitioning of the ways
we can say and speak, which regulate the governance of social, economic and
psychical configurations. We need to find political forms that possess new
consistencies, because the uncertainty of our affectual relations, owing to the
circulation of the sensible, makes us succumb too easily to the security afforded
by forms of institution and the State. More specifically, we need to understand
that these political forms are immanent to the search, as processes which
interrupt the current distribution of the sensible, not by establishing other
partitionings that need to be policed, but by throwing in to the distributive mix
other names, categories and structures, to make visible the ('wrong') names
(Rancière, 1999: 21-42) that have been imposed on the public. Names, as the
'wrong', summon the démos – the 'common' identified as outside of the names
imposed, plebeians supplementary to the named democracy – who, in the events
that make up 'public' life, will challenge their exclusion by the 'wrong'.

The 'wrong' brings us to the limit of politics, not to get to the other side (the
‘other’ is after all identified by the 'wrong' names which are set in place by
particular distributions of the sensible), but to inhabit the constant to-ing and
fro-ing between outside and inside as a kind of non-teleological labour. Such
movement is work that needs to be done – an obligation imposed by the metastable system of individuation (Simondon, 1992) as we negotiate belonging to a space. Our citizenship of public space is reliant upon the contingent experience of kinesis (from work associated with drifting migration and emigration, to experiencing artwork, to the use of certain infrastructures and not others, etc.).

(2) The bridge watching us

The world comes into view; the things of the world come into view to be acted and touched upon, to be worked ‘with’, in concert, so as to bring about through constellation, conjunction, intersection, something else again, slight, to the side, upward, or more centred, an image, a slowing of time, a bringing of silence, to listen, to make-out a figure, a boat, who/what that might or might not be, to feel it as oneself, as the self that brought that to its moment, movingly, the aspects, the stopping, the pausing, the resuming, our breath, our willingness, our sadness, our aloneness, and the extreme force of each aspect (a flash, like lightning) – the weight and mechanism of the opening bridge, the pleasure of the bridge-controller, the lights lining the bridge, the sirens and bells, the cars waiting, the rain, the deep currents, the lighthouse weirdly behind us, and the sound of the rower in the boat, passing, and (perhaps) seeing the tiny star-flash of the man on the bridge watching us watching.

(3) Without brief(s)

There was no brief, no document intended to guide the artists in the project. There were already many shaping conditions though: location, time, festival, money, mediums. And the job was to bring work into existence, from the location itself, work that arose in response to the environment of The Port.

The public gathered in the square, well before time, anticipating a large flash. After all, this was the name of the work: FLASH. PORT ADELAIDE, AUSTRALIA, 22 APRIL 2007 8:02 PM. There was going to be light, and sound. The space of this almost instantaneous work, and thus the public space in...
which the work occurs, is registered by a one-to-one correspondence between light and sound. At 8.10pm, 8 minutes later than expected, the sensuous experience of the work—its movement contained to a couple of seconds by this correspondence—was over. The audience remained motionless for quite a while.

‘Did I miss something? Is there more; should there be more [experience]?
Can I move; should I move? I am unsure, as this is an art work; but this is public space; and so on.’

At 8.18pm, it happened again, unplanned. Many were caught unawares. The sound triggered sensuous registration: the flash was not fully perceived, but experienced nevertheless in a non-sensuous way; it was presumed to have occurred with the sound. Here is the work’s actual durationality: the space-time disjunction that is felt in the anticipation, then dissipation, of the work: the shifting of bodies in the crowd, the walking away and turning back again; the disturbance of the idea of a beginning and a completion of the work; all of which call into action the public’s general capacity for improvisation, non-linguistic communication, adaptation and alteration of the environment.

This sort of (in)attention of public art and public space is politically non-affirmative, figural rather than figurative, and it is felt rather than known. A new political composition unfolds, owing to an interruption from within the institutional structure.

(4) The open labour

As a practice, it (a thought), tried to stay open (unlike the bridge that had to close again), to offer, as an invitation the chance to change, alter, stop, re-make, or break the work— at the moment of viewing or encountering. To offer the
invitation, carefully, to an-other to be/come with the work, as the work, as an
aspect of, a component ... (interrupted) ... of framing room for another to enter
so as to assist, and therefore assist 'and change' 'the work', the labour (of the
aesthetic) of the work.

(5) Community of communities

The Project was not a community-art 'project'. However, it was hoped from
the start that there would be contact with communities from the area. At the
same time though, there was no imperative to engage, literally, at the
'community' level. Community was a question.

There are strong and deeply loved historical roots, ones that temper the
entire sense of the place: working class, maritime, football, abandonment and
so on. Respect was required, but more - deference, honour - so as, at least, no
grand imposition 'artworks', from the 'outside', would come to bear,
show-up, and undermine, or overmine perhaps, the 'ground' of The Port.
This, also, was not a 'rule'.

The political is the negotiation, not to negate the governing institution, but
to embrace it in the search for the conceptual networks which cause reality to
appear, and in creating fictions using the signs that belong to a local reality
which show up their contingency.

Jess Wallace spoke with locals about the pollution of the river. She was
dissuaded from diving. She shot her video in a public pool in another suburb:
the people involved came to The Port to see the work. Other viewers recounted
their stories of the Port River as a playground and as a place of death. Julie
Henderson spent ten weeks with the radio club members. She attended their
weekly meetings. She also met Rick, who works in the boat shed behind the
Radio Shack, and recorded his stories. The radio club members agreed to open
their Shack to the public several times, and helped Julie with her sound
installation there. They provided special lights in the Shack as well as objects
for display.
In this way The Project work gives. I am reminded here of Jane Bennett’s notion of enchantment: “Enchantment is a feeling of being connected in an affirmative way to existence; it is to be under the momentary impression that the natural and the cultural worlds offer gifts, and in so doing, remind us that it is good to be alive” (Bennett, 2001: 156). Enchantment is valuable for ethical life because it can supplement, though not replace, a code-based approach to ethics, providing it with a motivational basis and a spirit of generosity that moral rules cannot generate on their own.

‘Deano’ worked closely with Julie, supplying spotlights and a generator for her performance on the wharf, and then he spontaneously joined in her performance on the night so as to ‘help’ her cart the water bottles from the shack to the wharf. Rick built Julie a frame for the door to his shed so she could install a TV and video-player to show her film of him talking about his work and the development of The Port. Julie placed an advertisement in the local newspaper calling for old TVs. She received an Aster Plymouth and two lamps, one a small desk lamp.

The Astor and the desk lamp became key components of her installation at Headquarters (HQ).22

Johnnie Dady’s cardboard pianos gently protested against (the) tension that exists between The Old Port and The New Port: aspirations, renaissance, new-life coming from an old-life. You will need a baby grand, surely. And if you’re poor, a cardboard one will ‘do’. The seven pianos became a community, and they were silent. What does a community have to turn itself into so that you will hear its worth; what does one have to become (beautifully poorly grand) to have a say?

(6) The worry of being worried

The surface of the space within which this project makes itself and shows itself is not a public or a ‘common’ space. Unless a specific space is ‘designated’ a public one ‘for art’ – agreed upon officially, and then officially offered for the reception of a public work of art that must, to a large extent, meet predetermined interests (monument, commemoration, general good, environmental message) – the surface of the earth, the bits one can find to work with, are subject to highly regulated (impossible) conditions.

What The Project gives are the signs, which give visibility to the sensible, a visibility that is not necessarily there: an image. These signs do not go towards the remembering of historical events. To Jean-Luc Nancy, the image is a re-presentation of the thing to which it owes its ontology, but which competes with the thing in its showing. The image interrupts the self-presencing of the thing, by bringing the latter to presence; the image is essentially monstrative (Nancy, 2005: 21), a force which deforms the things it shows. An image, in the presentation of itself, forcefully differentiates itself, and the thing it demonstrates, from the chaotic pool of entities or beings.

Everything is, from the outset, approached from the position of ‘trouble’. And when one speaks of it, worries what to do, responses are, surprisingly, that this ‘trouble’ is expected-trouble. The surface, or ‘field’, upon which one works – to
produce from and for – appears amidst appearances and is a plane upon planes; it is, actually, dynamic, transitory and replete. The ‘public’ is a weave of immense complexities: each complexity is an instrument that rules and regulates; each addresses important issues of danger, damage, injury, liability, not issues to ignore, and issues that one must care for; issues for discussion and generosity, not contention and contestation. There is only police/d space.

(7) Trying to speak

Julie Henderson (and Michael Yuen) spoke to a group of students. Julie talked about the men and women of the radio crab (at the Radio Shack), and how her work is slow, and may not have an outcome, even though a performance is advertised for 8pm, 26th April on Fisherman’s Wharf. The talk was part of the performance: the artwork is scattered, made of un(ideterminate things and events of different substances that dissolve and spread. Jean Luc-Nancy writes: “Sense is in the exscription of the book, sense is that sense does not stop coming from elsewhere and going elsewhere…” (1997: 191).

There are many signs given by The Project – images of community, place, history, ecology, architecture, life/lives, death – whose work staves off revelation by signs. These are signs for forgetting, not through emptiness or the void, but by a forestalling of closure that restores the lie to remembering. As Jorge Luis Borges says: in forgetting is the hope that there is nothing to reveal (there are no pre-empted relations), nothing but the revelation that itself does not come about (Nancy, 2005: 26).

The artist labours, is a labourer-artist who can labour differently; the artist can be “… along the surface of this coming of sense. … praxis is not lacking in him whether as reform or revolt, migration or habitation, pain or joy, invention or routine, or as decision endlessly replayed” (Nancy, 1997: 191). That is, there is ‘free’ labour, where one is truly (or thereabouts) in-the-place or in-servitude (serving place), as one might think one’s subject/audience/other is.

But it is not so simple, even though, in all evidence, it is also not the reverse. For the moment, it remains – and it seems to me urgent – to say the following: let us not decipher the world in terms of our philosophical melancholy – no more than in terms of a maniacal optimism that is another form of the same thing. But let us learn to think toward the world (Nancy, 1997: 191).

Here, the relations are imminent, always coming, hovering.

(8) A man on an open bridge

A man walks halfway across a bridge
From a long way away someone sees a man walk halfway across a bridge

There were biomorphic pinnacles in a dark basement.
And two sun deck chairs.
He stops to watch someone a long way away, across the water he thinks someone is watching him there.

he thinks they see him

*New Metaphors* is an interplay between the enchantment by the image which holds apart the actual landscape, and the interconnectedness of art and the ecosystem in a best fit selection. In the first condition, the material appearance of Angela Valamanesh’s work may be read, rationally, as symbolic images of an ecosystem.

As a man standing on a bridge he thinks of a boat in the water beneath him

He stops to look across from him, to slow down, to see the other one he thinks he sees
He hears around him what he has never heard before it sounds like he is what he hears that this is what he is, inside himself.

In the second, the morphological transformations in the art work mirror an ecology of practices involving environmental, social and mental systems, which, owing to the constant presence of ambiguity in reading, create conundrums in attempts at a Platonic theory of beauty associated with truth.

Perhaps it is Yhonnie Scace, in her Fanny Graham, that demonstrates most clearly the work of art as political, through its transformations between human affectual or biological relations, and non-human materiality, not only in imaginative terms, but also in terms of real relations, as actively constituting the places in which we live.

He hears himself as a man on a bridge
Across the water someone hears what there is to hear that they have never heard before It is the sound of a man on a bridge They think of a boat in the water beneath him

The red yarn, worked with, at times, difficult human labour into a material surface that itself bears the marks of human movement (being trod, danced, tripped on), and the movement of the work itself (it was dragged to various locations, folded and unfolded, hung). As the ground, surface or terrain for movement that is the confrontation between what can be sensed (by way of names, institutions, culture, habits) and the attempts by the public to verify their worth, ‘use’, and, therefore, equality in such partitionings of the sensible, the work of art emerges as a political agent with which we, as the named public, are entwined, and it is complicit in the emergence of our public places (its aesthetics is immanent to ‘being-there’), and the ways we comport to these places.
It sounds to them like something they've heard before too, somewhere else.
They take a photograph of him, they take a photograph of the sound of a
man on a bridge, a man they think they see on a bridge.
He takes a photograph of someone he thinks he sees a long way away, inside the
sound of himself, then he walks back across the bridge.

(Everything else happens in the world)²
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Introduction:
Consensus versus Disagreement

A.-Chr. Engels-Schwarzpaul

Post-millennium consensus politics are, to French philosopher Jacques Rancière, everything but a model of "social peace". On the contrary, they suppress the struggle constitutive of the political (la politique), destroying the space of the political (le politique), and producing various forms of identitarianism, and gloom, as their flip side. Consensus politics re-established racism and xenophobia (Rancière, 2000: 119). Consensus reduces people to populations, and rights to facts, and incessantly works to fill in the gaps between things (2006: 6), denying what makes them different. This filling-in and ironing-out is also the concern of the police, which is, for Rancière, not identical with the uniformed arm of the State executive but a partition of the sensible characterized by the absence of a void or a supplement: society consists of groups dedicated to specific modes of action, in places where these occupations are exercised, in modes of being corresponding to these occupations and these places. In this fittingness of functions, places, and ways of being, there is no place for a void (2001: Thesis 7).

In the space of the political, the police and the political confront each other as regimes of visibility, which strive to police the current distribution of the sensible or, respectively, to disrupt and re-partition it. Their confrontation and conflict is a disagreement (mésentente) about what it means to speak, and over the distribution of the sensible that delimits what can be said, and determines the relationship between seeing, hearing, doing, feeling, making and thinking: "Political litigiousness/struggle is that which brings politics into being by separating it from the police that is, in turn, always attempting its disappearance ... Politics is first and foremost an intervention upon the visible and the sayable" (Rancière, 2001: Thesis 7). Politics is about altering the visibilities of places and "abilities of the body in those places, ... the partition of private and public spaces, ... the very configuration of the visible and the relation of the visible to what can be said about it" (2003: S5). Art and architecture can have a part in politics (certainly, they are not apolitical), but correspondences between aesthetic and political virtues are difficult to ascertain. There are no criteria for establishing an appropriate correlation between the politics of aesthetics and the aesthetics of politics" (2004a: 61). Aesthetics has its own politics of changing perceptions and asserting invisible rights: for instance, the right not only to labour and suffer, but also to observe or take part in a spectacle. And, "to read what was never written" (Hofmannsthall in Benjamin, 2002: 416).

same day, New Zealand’s TV3 news broadcast The "Terror" Plot about the arrest of 17 activists. The report opened with 2005 footage of Māori activist Tame Iti challenging members of the Waitangi Tribunal before the beginning of the hearings at Taurare Maraē (Ruautoki, Tuhoe; TV3, 2007).¹ Iri Akarana-Rewi said of this event, that it took Māori culture, which had become “catalogued and contained on performance stages”, into the valleys, roads and streets as “a functioning part of everyday life” (Indigimedia, 2005). According to Iti, the performance, of which the challenge was a part, sought to make the Tribunal “feel the heat and smoke, and Tuahae outrage and disgust at the way we have been treated for 200 years” (Indigimedia, 2005).³ “Remembered most for his outrageous protests” (TV3, 2007), Iti honed his theatrical sensibilities in The Tempest, a collaboration with the Māori dance troupe, in early 2007 – at a time when Professor Paul Moon found interest in the Treaty of Waitangi at a dangerous low. Now on remand in Mt Eden Prison, Iti explores further the “delicate interstices of constitutional law” (Jackson, 1999).

Writing, itself, is partitioned by a blurring and contested interstice. Through disagreement, politics and writing can open up new ways of perceiving. The printed word has a mobility that frees the “orphans letter” to wander aimlessly around, to talk to anyone, to undermine the sensible co-ordinates of a current aesthetic regime (Rancière, 2004b: 14). As an artistic practice, writing intervenes in the “general distribution of ways of doing and making, as well as in the relationships they maintain to modes of being and forms of visibility” (2004a: 13). Printed text stages a theatrical “partition of identities, activities and spaces”, exhibiting fantasies capable of disturbing the status quo to “a community of readers ... formed only by the random circulation of the written word” (14). However, as in politics, where those who previously had no-part will inevitably take part in Rancière’s police (once they succeed in making themselves heard and becoming a part of society), writing can institutionalise, legitimise and control perception. However tentative, written words make permanent a new distribution of the sensible. This tension is a galvanizing and productive one. Interstices, as an academic journal (and particularly in its refereed section), is implicated in this force field. We invite readers to disagree, and thereby be part of this tension (and perhaps contribute to the next issue).

Michael Ostwald’s “Rancière and the Metapolitical Framing of Architecture”, which opens this issue, is about the impact that blurring and changing lines between police and politics have made on the perception and critique of two representatives of the Russian paper architecture movement: Alexander Brodsky and Illya Utkin. Their work became internationally known in the wake of glasnost, and was immediately perceived as a form of rebellion against the authoritarian Soviet state. Ostwald questions the ways in which it was constituted as an aesthetic affront to the communist state, and investigates the nature of Brodsky and Utkin’s defiance. In the force field between architectural aesthetics and politics, were their position one of juridical opposition (dissent), or a political dispute (dissensus)? Only the latter would make their practice one of Rancièrian disagreement proper. When can disagreement even take place? In “Travel in Tropical Islands – Enemies Co-existing in Peace”, Tina Engels-Schwarzpaul explores the potential for creative conflict at the Tropical Islands Resort at Brand, Germany. Set in the ruined surrounds of a former Soviet military base in the Brandenburg province, it now stages a ‘One-world-village’, with a Samaon Fale
in the centre of a Tropical Village that conjures up dreams of Pacific life styles. Do visitors and operators recognize historical and current conflicts in the politics of display between locals and foreigners, former colonial power and colony?

Carl Douglas’ “Barricades and Boulevards: Material transformations of Paris, 1795-1871” is about a clearly conflictual and tumultuous series of configurations. Spatial operations of barricading effected a redistribution of the sensible as they transformed Paris in different ways. The city’s materials, spaces and activities are not a neutral surface. Rather, they make the city what it is, prescribe who inhabits which parts, and how. Barricades and boulevards are provisional metaphors for politics and police, for those who have no-part and those who want to control what they have. In Haussmann’s Paris, middle-class individuals and the mob were allocated different spaces. In Australian refugee camps, says Hélène Frichot in “Striving for a Coming Community and the Question of a Life”, architectural practices disregard inmates’ personal characteristics to create artificial, categorical groupings. Architecture can augment, as well as diminish, life in geopolitical conflicts, and Frichot argues for an ethico-aesthetic striving toward a coming community, a future people and a life, to suggest modes of acting collectively, beyond the isolated point of view of individuals who believe that what they do can make no difference. Frichot draws on concepts by Giorgio Agamben, Gilles Deleuze, Félix Guattari, Jean-Luc Nancy and Maurice Blanchot to outline alternatives to a spatial organization where refugees, strangers and others are segregated in the midst of a global body politic that is increasingly fragmented.

Leonhard Emmerling engages with a politics of recognition that is not identity politics, is even explicitly opposed to it. In “PLZKLME”, he stages disagreements between him and himself. Starting with a quote by bell hooks, he reflects on the relationship between the global art business and identity-art. To Emmerling, the art business perpetuates the assimilation, instrumentalisation, incapacitation and paternalism that Western colonisation has inflicted on the rest of the world. In identity-art, it does so by providing a stage for the restitution of identity, as compensation for that which is, in reality, denied: redress of injustices, equal rights and the realisation of an undamaged life. A reticence that Emmerling finds lacking in identity-art, with its eagerness to expose and demonstrate, made Linda Walker and Stephen Loo consider the role of writing in, “And the open bridge: labour, enchantment, There Forever”, their reflections on a 2007 Ephemeral Public Art Project in Adelaide. Explorations of Rancière’s writings are interwoven with poetical vignettes describing the events, spaces and objects of this project. No community is taken for granted, the role of the political only tentatively circumscribed, as writing itself is tested to see how much it “conceals itself in the flesh”, and how much it “openly reveals itself as the disembodied condition of any glorious flesh” (Rancière, 2004a: 60). In any event, writing applies a different language to the languages of the unwritten, and may even stand in the way of reading what was never written.

In the non-refereed section of Interstices 08, contributors take issue with architects and academics, juries and judging and books and buildings. The first two papers are from, and about, East Asia. Hong-Chi Shiau’s “The Glamorous, but Doomed, Bamboo Forest” narrates Tsai-Ho Cheng’s competition winning memorial project to the victims of the 1999 earthquake in Taiwan. Shiau reveals misalignment between intellectual and local desires and interpretations, and shows how a lack of consultation with locals led to the project’s failure. Tom Daniell, in “The Letter of the Law”, explains how Tokyo’s volumetric building regulations shape an unusual skyline of steeply angled roofs. Daniell shows how, in the pursuit of interesting urban form, it is possible to manipulate the regulations to good effect.
Bill McKay, in “A Short Venting of the Spleen on the Subject of the Architect and Science”, reflects upon what scientists have learnt about spherical planets and gravitational forces over the last 500 years, and wonders why these discoveries have not filtered through into architectural thinking, drawing and practice. In “The Myth of the Nation”, Andrew Leach targets New Zealand’s architectural profession, and suggests that local architects embrace an overly simplistic understanding of this country’s architectural history. Celebrating “exquisite apartness” and myths about New Zealand-ness, they ignore recent scholarship and alternative possibilities. Similarly, Paul Walker finds a lack of awareness in Architecture Inspired by New Zealand (2006), a book on houses in New Zealand landscapes, pointing to naivety in its conceptualization, and reliance upon clichés in its realization. In contrast, Peggy Deamer’s re-creation and analysis of “Dick Toy’s Last Lecture”, presented during the 2007 Auckland Architecture Week, demonstrates the desired levels of both complexity and nuance. Following, Julia Gatley, in “New Measures for Other Moderns”, navigates a path between historiography and pedagogy, reflecting upon the past, present, future and historiographical implications of the Measured Drawing course at the University of Auckland.

Kerstin Thompson Architects and Architecture Workshop’s competition entry for the Waitangi Precinct on Wellington’s waterfront (2009) is a scheme that warrants a more substantial place in the published record than it has been given to date, the local contributors having earned their place in the international field of entrants. Finally, Tim Adams’ translation of Daniel Payot’s “Le Jugement de l’Architecture” (“The Judgement of Architecture”), is concerned with criticism in the broadest sense, and architectural criticism in particular. One of Payot’s key points is that all criticism is ultimately positive.
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