

MEASURES 3

From unpublished text by Tina di Carlo. All text © Tina di Carlo 2010.

Photograph | *Thing*

The thirty-five images presented in the exhibition are culled from Germany's worn-torn and politically scarred past. Present is the half-filled blue-tiled bathtub in which the reputed conservative West German politician Uwe Barschel died fully clothed in 1987, a scene which still remains mysteriously rumoured with speculation. Exposed is Hitler's room of his military headquarters where he narrowly escaped an assassination attempt. Opened is the door to an office in the Stasi headquarters after the fall of the Berlin wall. Demand enters as model maker, documentary photographer, artist, sleuth, accomplice, witness, CSI, and at times, colluder and criminal who constructs, presents, re-presents, sometimes effaces or eradicates, evidence. We as viewers, gaze to witness and detect. Scenes are pregnant with a past yet all-too commonplace to be anywhere at anytime in particular. One culls and susses out clues in high-resolution pixelation, low-resolution memory, after the fact, in the accumulation of information on the web.

Demand's images are those culled and reconstructed from those in the media.¹ "Bathtub" for example, is something that any German over 40 or 50 will recognize immediately. And "Room" as Demand confesses:

is admittedly a very German picture, a picture that you can find in every history book. I was confronted with it throughout my school years and my entire adolescence. Growing up in West Germany, you saw it over and over again. At the time it was taken, it was proof that Hitler was still alive; in the history books, it was proof that not all Germans were bad and not all Germans voted for Hitler; for me, it is also proof that I went through the German educational system. So its meaning fluctuates and changes all the time. There is not just one meaning: there are layers of meaning. It is a public memory as much as it is a personal one. Nevertheless, it is a picture, not a story and the picture has to work on its own.

Demand intentionally side-steps explanation of his images. **MEASURES 3: REPRESENTABILITY**

And likewise, the point here is not to de-bunk the photographic imperatives of his work -- to focus on

¹ Other times as in the images remain clandestine. So for example, Demand's photograph entitled *Embassy* literally exposes the Niger embassy in Rome in which stationery and stamps taken from its offices figures in the forged dossier used as evidence that Saddam Hussein had tried to buy the uranium concentrate known as "yellowcake" from Niger and in which this self-same dossier helped precipitate the invasion of Iraq. In this way the evidentiary is not necessarily related to a truth clause, but is, as Weizman writes, "inclined towards complex, sometimes unstable, and often contradictory accounts, questioning the obviousness of what directly meets the eye, raising suspicion and demanding an investigative approach" -- this time through the spectator. Layers of constructed meaning and inference, hidden and overt constructed socially, personally, through the media, through layer of time, through the process and actual construction of the artwork itself. Demand's work serves as further evidence, perhaps even assuming in the instance of the *Embassy* the profaned role of the media within the artistic space.

the photograph as indexical object. Nor is it to develop an ethical line of argumentation as to the moral obligation involved in the capacity of a documentary photograph as an evidentiary truth claim which would supposedly appeal to the political and moral consciousness of the viewer to act,² the argument here being that "reason works when it exposes, reveals, and argues."³ To read these photographs a such would be to (mistakenly) see them as what Sontag calls in the 1980s merely selective, in need of captions and texts to be interpretative, and to render truths in a dissociated moment. As the vehicle for a truth claim the photographs are not equal to certainty or truth thus hold little interest. It is rather the way in which vision and gaze produce and are produced by the evidentiary, in which the truth claim itself is now unstable, inclined to complex, often contradictory, contested and often irreconcilable accounts. Evidence is what we see, what is exposed or obvious to the eye. "It exists," as Tom Keenan writes, "against the backdrop of a contagion and proliferation in the field of the visible and evidential and takes us on towards the techniques and regimes of vision." Such an antiquated tradition of the photographic object which someone like Sontag lays out in the 1980s and which Butler actively seeks to re-read and argue against, is radically and obviously overturned in *Demands* work.

Indeed Sontag's argument -- that the photographic image is merely selective rather than interpretive, the photographs render truths in a dissociated moment -- is to place the photograph on one side of what Lorraine Daston and Peter Galison have discussed in their recent *Things that Talk and Objectivity* as the 500-hundred year reflexive relationship between objectivity and subjectivity. Sontag's implication, compounded with her argument that the photograph merely "flashes up" in what Butler terms a Benjaminian sense to lack any sort of narrative coherence, is that the photograph lies flatly one the far end of the spectrum, connoting objectivity as the extreme condition of limiting subjecthood. Albeit Daston and Galison are writing from the field of science their argument here nevertheless applies: "To be objective is to aspire to knowledge that bears no trace of the knower -- knowledge unmarked by prejudice or skill, fantasy or judgment, wishing or striving. Objectivity is blind sight, seeing without inference, interpretation, or intelligence. Only in the mid-nineteenth century did scientists begin to yearn for this blind sight, the 'objective view' that embraces accidents and asymmetries" ⁴ Rather Galison goes onto argue for a joint epistemic project addressing the historically changing and mutually conditioning relation of 'inside' and 'outside' knowledge¹ in which subjectivity and objectivity are inextricably linked, and in which each is posited as limiting condition, inside and outside the other.

No doubt the question of representation, or what Butler terms **representability** enters. In looking at the war photos from Abu Ghraib -- photos which whose exposure has been largely limited and controlled by governmental restrictions of seeing and embedded reportage -- Butler, whom I intentionally quote at length here writes:

² See for example Thomas Keenan's cogent "Mobilizing Shame," and

³ In fact a whole line of argumentation and interpretation of *Demands* work could be developed around this point. Albeit Butler is citing the Abu Ghraib photographs of war what she writes (which again is quoted intentionally at length to follow) *Demands* work now reveals, an line of argumentation transmuted and transmogrified to the realm of art: "I want to suggest that the

⁴ Lorraine Daston and Peter Galison. *Objectivity* (New York: Zone Books), 2007, p.17.

What is at stake is the regulation of those images that might galvanize political opposition to a war. I refer to "representability" here, rather than "representation," because this field is structured by state permission (or, rather, that state seeks to establish control over it, if always with only partial success). As a result, we cannot understand the field of representability simply by examining its explicitly contents, since it is constituted fundamentally by what is left out, maintained outside the frame within which representations appear. We can think of the frame, then as active, as both jettisoning and presenting, and as doing both as once, in silence, without any visible sign of its operation. What emerges under these conditions is a viewer who assumes him or herself to be in immediate (and incontestable) visual relation to reality.⁵

Butler is writing on embedded documentary or journalistic photography but the argument equally applies here.

Demand invokes what is generally used as a trope within the architectural discourse -- the model -- to overtly frame or perhaps better said intentionally re-frame the camera and lense as a structuring device. Each photograph goes through a process of translation: from two-dimensional journalistic image to three-dimensional 1:1 model and back to two-dimensional photograph (which is then presented within the three-dimensional space of the exhibition). Thus photograph becomes evidentiary, merely a medium through which to present the final work in which the camera (as framing device) is self-consciously turned back on itself to reveal itself. Much in the way that Butler terms it: "...[I]t is not just that the photographer and/or the viewer actively and deliberately interpret, but that the photograph itself becomes a structuring scene of interpretation--and one that may unsettle both maker and viewer in its turn."

Demands photographs locates that which vacillates between what is in and outside the frame, what, foreclosed, becomes encrypted within the frame itself.⁶ Establishing the referentiality of the photographs is not enough. The photos are not only shown, but named; the way they are shown, the way they are named, and the words used to describe what is shown, work together to produce and interpretative matrix for what is seen.⁷ What can be said of the photograph can equally be said of the exhibition: each posit themselves not indexical but as a apparatus, an architecture or political plastic through which things pass. Truth here is beside the point. The photograph is a literal construction, constructive of and constructed by, our visual and spatial field. That the viewer assumes him or herself to be in immediate (and incontestable) visual relation reality is exacerbated within the space of the exhibition, given a myriad of operative device: how the photograph is hung, the 1:1 scale of the model and image, the angle of entry, and the painstakingly infinitesimal detail of the model's reconstruction.

⁵ Butler, p. 73.

⁶ Butler, p.75.

⁷ Butler, p. 79.

What Butler's reading suggests and Demand's work proposes, is what Latour calls a peaceful passage between object and subject.⁸ In this sense Demands works become a vehicle, a figure of speech, that instead of *breaking* the subtle language of practice within the intimidating choice "is it real or is it fabricated ... provides a different move, a different register for practice."⁹ Paradoxically what Demands work recovers is the *passing shot* or the dialectic repair between object-subject or what Latour calls the *fait-faire*, literally, making do.¹⁰ As he writes:

There is no object, no subject, no contradiction, *no Aufhebung*, no mastery, no recapitulation, no spirit, no alienation. But there are events¹¹ Action is not what people do, but is instead the *fait-faire*, the making do, accomplished along with other in an event, the specific opportunities provided by the circumstances. These other are not ideas, or things, but nonhuman entities, or as I called them ... propositions...¹²

Within Latourian discourse the photographs maintains status of a quasi-object -- that object which is more threadlike, more fragile, more complex, more richly vascularised and fully able to generate that either the fetish, in this case the journalistic images -- what Latour terms an empty stone onto which meaning is projected -- or a fact -- an absolute certainty which can be used as a hammer to break away all the delusions of belief. Such a quasi-object is a ventriloquist phenomenon, a hybrid, or *a factish*. In his words: "It is sturdier, much more reflectively, richly invested with in a collective practice, reticulated like blood vessel. Reality, not belief, is entangled in its filaments."

Thus to read through Demand's work -- to hear it speak -- is to see not merely the crime scene itself billed as a composite of collective memory or a sort of guilt ridden revealing but rather to posit it as evidentiary and embodied, to see it as that very *moment of exposure* in which a set of circumstances and forces -- political, social, spatial, historic, economic even art and architectural historical as in this article -- cohere-to construct and re-construct an apparatus at work, which is itself constitutive and constituted. In this way it assumes that the power of the "thing", in Daston's words, lies not in what it reveals but rather in its Heideggerean conception, in its power to "gather" other elements to it. It is self-sufficient, which does not imply a sort of inertness but rather an essence that is neither captured by its appearance nor by scientific theories about it. To be sure Daston draws on Heidegger's famous essay "Das Ding,"ⁱⁱⁱ to sharply and early on differentiate between the Heideggerean "thing" and the Kantian "object" (*Gegenstand*). While the former is 'self sufficient,' and its essence ... captured neither by its appearance as given by perception nor scientific theory, the latter is that product of ideas and representations of the thing. Insofar as thingness of the thing is not inert but lies exactly in its power to "gather" other elements to it the thing it seems, elucidates one sense of Heideggerean technology, an enframing (*Gestellen*), which now has the potential to gather or issue forth, a coming to presence.

⁸ Latour, p. 267.

⁹ Latour, p. 267.

¹⁰ Latour, p. 281.

¹¹ Latour, p. 281

¹² Latour, p. 288.

Model | *Presence*

In *Things that Talk*, Lorraine Daston proposes that the 1898 models of the *Blaschka Glass Flowers* were more authentic than the original: that they did not simply represent nature but replaced it. And likewise, one could claim the same of Demand's models. For his 1:1 constructions shift the photograph and the space of the exhibition from representation to presentation, becoming more *real* than real.

Demand uses a three-dimensional paper construction -- what could be termed an architectural model and what he calls sculpture -- as a moment of translation between the two-dimensionality of the journalistic image and the artist photograph. As a full-scale construction it immediately eschews any indexical relationship of copy to original via its 1:1 scale and as the construction or re-construction of an event whose origin is indeterminate and co-constituted (as argued above). More Demand's terming of these works as sculptures rather than as models places them as a full-scale work-in-itself, which albeit art historically considered representational, do not share the same kind of indexicality of the architectural model -- i.e., a scaled replica, surrogate or stand-in for that which is elsewhere. His constructions do not seek to reveal, so much as it to constitute (or perhaps re-construct) and make present an event for the photographic lenses (again as discussed above). Such an intermediate and transitional position is highlighted in *Nationalgalerie*, where photograph-model model-architecture are equivocated, through a complex mirroring within the space of the exhibition itself. The (and for lack of a better term) 1:1 three-dimensional construction -- either as architectural model or sculpture or building -- becomes a point of intersection or what could be called, a mirroring device that reflects one as the other.

As mentioned earlier, Demand's places a sign on the facade of Mies' *Neue Nationalgalerie* called *Nationalgalerie*. This gesture effectively claims the exhibition as an artist's work in itself -- i.e., as a three-dimensional spatial construction -- and claims and appropriates the building as one work among others within the artist's work (i.e., the exhibition). What results is an architecture that is simultaneously inside and outside itself -- a building which contains the exhibition and a building that is now invoked as a work within the exhibition. Once more -- within Demand's work -- architecture now shares a role or status analogous to that of the paper model. Invoked as 1:1 three-dimensional constructions -- the model is presented via the artist's photograph, the building via the artist's exhibition. A tautological relationship ensues in which paper model equals building or model is equated with architecture via the fact that each is constructed at full -- i.e., 1:1 -- scale and used in the similar way by the artist. As such 1:1 not only refers to scale but the fact that the relationship between model and architecture has now become tautological -- equivalent. Finally these tautological mirrorings -- what could be called the extensive space of the exhibition -- reflect and mirror (though perhaps obliquely) the horizontal and vertical symmetry of Mies' *Neue Nationalgalerie*, i.e., that is the extensive space constitutive of and by the architecture itself.¹³

¹³ See Robin Evans famous argument in *The Projective Cast: Architecture and Its Three Geometries* (Cambridge: The MIT Press), 1995.

What these complex relationships argue: is that architecture as an assemblage or spatial apparatus or *thing* which is co-constituted and productive -- is best *presented* within the space of the exhibition by its *other* -- in this case the art work and the exhibition now created by an artist. What they further propose: is that the exhibition is architectural -- or as I will argue, the exhibition *as* architecture. What it renders is the nineteenth-century tropes of the display of architecture, plan, model, section and elevation -- in which architecture attempts to represent via representational surrogates or stand-ins -- obsolete. Such an argument is indicative of a broader, discursive shift from representation to presentation. in which the model a *thing* -- a real and fabricated assemblage, produced and productive - - not only becomes more authentic than the original as a work art, but one in which use-value is now conflated with aesthetic-value. The profaned object replaces the sacred and the exhibition --as one *thing* (work) among others -- becomes both art and architecture.

[MEASURE 3: PRESENTATION] The architectural model historically functioned within a broader genus of nineteenth century representational models. These assumed a variety of forms (conceptual, graphical, material or mechanical, formulaic) on a variety of sites within institutional settings (scientific laboratories, lecture theatres, museums and administrative bureaus, legal entities, patent bureaus).¹⁴ Yet in each case, they functioned to represent, memorize, analogize and make portable. Within architecture the model is historically used as both a tool of production and of display. It is defined according to its scale, as a stand-in or surrogate for that which is elsewhere. It is *used* to design, evaluate, show more or less detail, sell, display or exhibit. In short, the model functions as an indexical working device.

While the model has a long history (a discussion which goes well beyond the scope of this essay) here I am referring to specifically to the way that the model functions as a trope in curating architecture at, for example, the Museum of Modern Art. Here the scaled-model is collected and displayed in lieu of the actual building. Never considered original its function is that of a representational, or indexical object.¹⁵ As such it commands a value within the art market -- which values authenticity, originality and uniqueness -- far less than that of that of a work of art understood to embody these values. (However these values may have been defined and redefined, for all intents and purposes modern art has always privileged them).

Recently Daston and Peter Galison (writing from the history science) as well as Alain Potage (writing from the field of law) have contested this understanding of the model as essentially representational. have argued for a shift from representation to presentation, a long argument but one that equally applies to Demand and is symptomatic of a broader discursive turn. "Representation," as Daston and

¹⁴ Alain Potage, p. xx.

¹⁵ This differs, for example, to the architectural drawings, which at times and in the cases of visionary architecture, has been considered the work of architecture itself. This was the point behind, for example, Jeff Kipnis' *Perfect Acts of Architecture*. Rem Koolhaas' *Exodus* and those within the Howard Gilman Visionary Archive, for example, also maintain a similar status.

Galison write in *Objectivity* -- a 500-page tome that traces the history of the term through the modern scientific atlas -- "is always an exercise in portraiture though not necessarily mimesis. The prefix *re* is essential: images that strive for representation present again what already is. Representative images may purify, perfect, and smooth to get at being, at 'what is,' but they may not create out of the whole cloth, crossing forever from nature into art."¹⁶ Daston and Galison no doubt frame their argument from what they call a kind of scientific or structural objectivity, in which the image or model is an attempt to strip away all individual peculiarities, the marks of creed and nationality, of sensory apparatuses and species. Yet as they write, "...[T]hose of artistic subjectivity were no less concrete and specific -- and our chief point here -- in reverse mirror image relationship to the other." That the *Blaschka Glass Flower* somehow *supercedes* the representation of nature, replacing it, thus enters into a longer argument in which the models shift from a representing of what is, to become a constructive and productive of *what is*.

So what happens when the making is the seeing? Or what happens when the image or model is not only involved in observing or replicating, but actually *producing*?

Such a shift from image-as-representation to image-as-process, as Daston and Galison go on to argue, can be seen in the nascent field of nanotechnology. Here, "no longer are images traced either by the mind's eye or by the pencil of nature, but rather the images function as least as much as a tweezer, a hammer or an anvil of nature: a tool to make and change things."¹⁷ Image as model enters in another navigational dimension, either in the form of virtual archives that allow one to "zoom, excise, rotate, or fly through" or as haptic (or tactile) images which can modify physical objects. A coming-into-existence occurs, in which artistic presentation that entices and displays (now divorced from pure scientific objectivity) and where the image *acts* as manipulator. Seeing (or image-made) and making are fused. Suspended midway between art and science, a *vita contemplativa* -- the figure of observation from a distance -- is exchanged for a *vita activa* of science, i.e., "intervening in the world as a way of establishing what we actually understand and therefore what is really out there." In other words, what counts as real, to cite philosopher Ian Hacking's parsing of Baconian philosophy, "is that which can be used in the world, through experimental intervention, to affect something else."¹⁸ Seeing or pure

¹⁶ Daston and Galison, p. xx. Indeed scientific models, as representational "probed the depths of nature's types plumbed, nature's appearances registered, nature's patterns intuited. But nature was always in the picture, literally so." Yet in each an every case they served a common goal: "what we have called a faithful representation of nature." That is, "each aimed to be faithful to nature, in its fashion. Yet none of them pretended to be, much less transform nature."

¹⁷ Daston and Galison, page 383.

¹⁸ Daston and Galison, page. 392. "If you can spray positrons to do something," Hacking remarked, "how can positrons not count as real? Scientists establish the reality of entities not by displaying them but by using them, for example, to achieve their goals in particle physics." For Hacking the long history of scientific depiction would always fail. Only *use* could provide a robust realism. He goes on to contend: "Maybe there are two quite distinct mythical origins of the idea of 'reality.'" One is the reality of --representation, the other, the idea of what affects us and what we can affect. Scientific realism is commonly discussed under the heading of representation. Let us now discuss it under the head of intervention... "

receptivity is not enough. *Action* produces knowledge. Action shows what does and does not exist, in realms too small or too large to grasp with our unaided senses.¹⁹

Daston and Galison's argument, which wrenches the scientific model or image from its long representational track is not unique. Within the field of patent law, Alain Potage likewise pries presentation free from its prefix through an interpretation of patent models, which had to be submitted to prove and evidence invention in a court of law. Potage argues that patents models²⁰ were not just items of evidence, but rather means for exhibiting, fabricating and reproducing legal doctrine. Figuratively speaking these models were sensible objects through which patent law was machine made -- that is articulated and developed as legal doctrine through a working and now portable machine²¹ that embodied the principle of the invention itself. Thus the patent model no longer signified a relation of original to copy but was rather, as Mario Biagioli observes, a presentation of the inventive principle of the thing itself, "where the distinction between model and machine was not one of copy to original, but just one of scale." He continues: "We cannot say whether the 'original' was the machine or the model, or whether the model was scaled-down or the machine scaled-up". Audiences had learned to see *through* the form to the intangible principle that it embodied. The patent model, in other words, was a legal relation made material.

Potage goes onto argue that the patent model can be taken as a reason to dispose of the very notion of representation as 'image or copy', hence echoing Daston and Galison's argument. He notes with interest the methodologies developed by scientific studies in action: that is, "how should we trace out the assemblage of gestures, inscriptions and materialities through which scientific knowledge is fabricated, cultured and transferred?"²² By Potage's definition, models participate as the very assemblage of elements: as a *thing* that gathers forth, otherwise said as a "vector, relay or irritant"²³ or as "a specific inflection of more generalized procedures of cognitive fabrication." He asserts:

[T]he question to ask of a model 'cannot be "what does it represent?" but rather must be about how it is involved in acts of representation and what meanings these produce'.²⁴ Models have to be scaled up ... in the sense that their material form has to be expanded and diffused back into the

¹⁹ A paraphrase of Daston.

²⁰ Potage clarifies that these models should be more properly called "patent litigation modes: models as they were deployed in infringement actions, rather than models as means of patent administration." Compare p. 12.

²¹ Potage uses the model of the sewing machine, for example, whose model embodied and had to show, the actual working mechanism of pedal. Thus the patent model was not a representation of the pedal, it was a pedal which functioned and evidenced the invention as such. In short the patent model itself was a working machine. It was operative.

²² The literature here is well known; highlights include: Latour & Woolgar, *Laboratory Life*, Hans-Jorg Rheinberger *Karin Knorr-Cetina*, Peter Galison

²³ See generally Latour

²⁴ Herbert Mehtens, 'Mathematical models', in Soraya de Chadarevian & Nick Hopwood, *Models. The Third Dimension of Science* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2004), 276-306, at p 284. In the case of mathematical models, for example, the agency of the model refers to the 'intricate web of meanings [woven] by imagined, immaterial things like blackboards, chalk marks, and plaster objects, as well as by material processes like talking, writing, drawing, and gesturing'. (Page 23, and Loc cit.)

capillary network of knowledge, know-how and communicative forms that was essential to their operation. With models as with anything else, materiality is sociality;²⁵ the specific materiality of a model is the effect of a particular disposition of semantic forms, communicative competences, and material instruments.²⁶

"To learn to observe and depict... is to acquire at once an ethos and a way of seeing ... and ways of seeing become ways of knowing," write Daston and Galison. Hence, the model in Demand becomes—like his photographs—the thing through which we see, produced and productive, more *real* than real -- an embodied object that presences what might philosophically be termed according to Daston, Galison, Potage, Butler and Azoullay's thought, a sort of a collective empiricism.

That Demands inscribes models within his work has undoubtedly garnered attention from the architectural community. And yet, it can be argued that he undoes the very trope inscribed within its traditions, tearing the model from what is by-now its all too anachronistic roots. Demand's models are akin to Daston's the images in nanotechnology, situated *mid-way*. They are what Latour might call a *quasi-object* in which use-value collides with aesthetic-value, a productive tool where seeing equals making where "relations are made material" and "the assemblage of gestures, inscriptions, and materialities, are fabricated, cultured, transferred" and traced. Materiality becomes sociality. The model no longer *representational* presents (or is presentational). Presented in the photograph, the photograph now presences.

It was Heidegger who first attempted a metaphysics of presence, or as he termed it, a reflection of Being of being. For him *presencing* suggested a certain *givenness* not of a thing or an entity of any kind, but as the *condition of things* and entities and was central to his thinking on Being and Time. Yet what is pertinent here is not Heidegger's ontological argument. The emphasis within this essay is on an empirical argument, considered and read *through* Demand's work as *open*. That is, the art work is no longer posited a closed, dead ontological object for subjective consideration or onto which to imbue subjective meaning -- i.e., an "object" stand over against a "subject." The work or better *thing* is considered open and embodied, whose parameters and meaning are continually shifting. The implicit claim here is that *presencing*, far from that which is real as true is instead evidentiary, subject to dispute and co-constitutive. Here in lies the tie to exhibitionism as an evidentiary term in forensics. For as evidence or thing, rather than object, the work is subject to dispute, co-constituted not only by subject and object, but rather as part of a broader discursive and collective construction.

Such a sense of presence that comes closer to the evidentiary, is now subject to doubt, contest, literally *objection*. Here Husserl's ruminations on Heidegger's presence, in which Husserl finds *givenness* "in the mode itself...in evidence"²⁷ becomes more apt. As Birnbaum writes:

²⁵ For one version of this see Bruno Latour & Vincent Antonin Lépinay, *L'économie, science des intérêts passionés* (Paris: La Découverte, 2008), at p 47.

²⁶ p. 17)

That something is given as evident means first of all that the "thing itself" is there, and not some replica or representation the thing. But it does not imply that the thing is given in all its aspects. Therefore unforeseen aspects, which redefine the previous experience, cannot be excluded. In fact evidence in the broadest sense has nothing to do with undubitability, but merely designates a mode of givenness....thus the evidence of a thing seems to be synonymous with its presence for consciousness, i.e., its mode of givenness is that of presentation and not of representation.

Husserl's phenomenological position (as presented by Birnbaum) here is tricky because it argues not for a co-constitution of subject-object (as argued via Butler above), but for a constituting subject and an object in its givenness or better said "self-givenness." Yet Birnbaum aims to go beyond this reading to an expanded understanding of the subject-object relation. In *The Hospitality of Presence* he argues that integral to Husserl's thinking is the concept of *alterity*: "that subjectivity is constituted by that which is other than itself." In Birnbaum words "a hospitality of the living present ... makes possible a complex interweaving of the Same and the Other."

Such a conception is not far from Daston and Galison, who via the scientific atlas, argue that subjectivity and objectivity have been part of a 500-year reflexively bound relationship.²⁸ What Daston and Galison posit through looking at the extreme of what is considered scientific objectivity is that objectivity always intersects with subjectivity, "the multiplicity of one is simply the photographic negative of the multiplicity of the other. And in contrast to many other historical views of the self, subjectivity is intrinsically multiple ... objectivity and subjectivity are expressions of a particular historical predicament, not merely a rephrasing of some eternal complementarity between a mind and the world." In short what Daston and Galison argue for, using the scientific atlas, is a truly collective empiricism (and a joint epistemic project)-- which re-inforces, albeit via a different method, the reading of Demand via Butler as outlined above.

But it also proposes something else: Modeled for the photograph, Demands work models implicitly and tacitly proposing that architecture is best *presenced* in the space of the exhibition by that which is *other* than what it is.²⁹ In Demand we witness a turn from representation to presentation, from an inert object to a *complex thing*, that is productive and produces, constructs and is constructed, which is *evidentiary* and *exposes*. The model act as a mirroring device, the space or *thing* or device through which architecture sees itself and is now reflected as the other -- *as* photograph and *as* the space of the exhibition itself. equivalent to the model itself. The model shifts Demand's work from the representational realm of art to what I would better call the propositional space of architecture

²⁸ It should be noted that Birnbaum's expands his own conception of alterity away from the 'epistemic other' found in Husserl, in order to incorporate the concrete 'moral other' of practices -- political, cultural, linguistic artistic, and religious. It should also be noted that Husserl makes a sharp distinction between presentation and re-presentation, a distinction that resides in language and unmediated experience. Memory, phantasy and empathy are thus all types of representation for the subject.

²⁹ Birnbaum,

congruent with some of the most contemporary spatial practices today. It is this space where intervention and occur, what Latour might call a space of action, the event or the *fait-faire*.

[MEASURE 2: DISPOSITIF]

Architecture | *Dispositif*

Since 2002 Eyal Weizman has invoked what he calls the extreme condition of war invoking war in what he calls an extreme condition in a multi-valent gradient, architecture is proposed no longer as an object contained in space, nor a spatial objects that contains other object, but instead a spatial apparatus along the lines of Foucault and Deleuze, constitutive of, and constituted by, a series of flows and forces. Conflict here is proposed no longer as that which is contained in space, but instead constitutive of space, what he calls a sort of political plastic. To see the object thus no longer to see it as one side of a coin but as an apparatus -- co-constitutive and co-constituted -- at once inside and outside itself, equally reflective and productive of social exchange. In short architecture in Weizman's thinking is proposed as a practice in which its form assumes that of the Foucauldian and Deleuzian apparatus or *dispositif*.

It is well known that the term *dispositif*, generally translated into English as apparatus, was never fully articulated by Foucault in his published works. The closest definition we have is one that he offered in a 1977 in an interview *The Confession of the Flesh* that, for accuracy, I will quote at length: "What I am trying to single out with this term is firstly, a thoroughly heterogeneous ensemble (set) consisting of discourse, institutions, architectural forms, regulatory decision, laws, administrative measures, scientific statements, philosophical, moral and philanthropic positions -- in short the said as much as the unsaid. Such are the elements of the apparatus [*dispositif*]. The apparatus is the system of relations (network) that can be established between these elements." As such, Foucault's objective was not the identification of the constituent elements of the apparatus per se, but rather in identifying or divulging "the nature of the connection that can exist between these heterogeneous elements." Hence, that which he termed the "disciplinary society" and "sexuality" can be said to emerge as symptomatic or evidentiary of the larger interplay of the systems at work, as produced through the apparatus of discipline, or through the apparatus of sexuality. For Foucault, as Agamben notes, the nature of the "apparatus is essentially strategic ... and appears at the intersection of power relations and the relations of knowledge." Said another way, the apparatus is "a tangle, a multi-linear ensemble," in which lines follows directions, trace balances which are always off-balance, draw together, distance themselves, proceed, break, bifurcate, re-direct, fork, drift. What reveals itself or is made visible in such processes is done so not within the lines of the apparatus that outline or surround such systems -- for the apparatus occupies the place of universal such as State, Sovereignty, Law and Power. Instead, what is at issue here is how one positions the self on these lines themselves, that is, within and of the apparatus itself. In as much as an apparatus eschews, repudiates and takes the place of such universals, we belong to the social apparatuses and act within them.

For Foucault the apparatus becomes a reflexive device -- invoked simultaneously as methodological and diagnostic tool by which to reveal a self-same heterogeneous discourse at work in the production

of concrete social phenomena (systems of subjectivity in a social apparatus). While Agamben follows broadly this analysis, he argues such questioning must be equally applied to the apparatus itself. "What is the strategy of practices or of thought, what is the historical context, from which the modern term originates?" he asks. In other words, what is the apparatus of the apparatus? In each case, and nevertheless, it is (as Deleuze articulates elsewhere), a question of making visible, of drawing or attention to "curves of visibility and curves of enunciation." Such visibility "is made of lines of light which form variable shapes inseparable from the apparatus in question. Each apparatus has its way of structuring light, the way in which it falls, blurs and disperses, distributing the visible and the invisible, giving birth to objects which are depending on it for their existence, and causing them to disappear. This is the case not only for painting but also for architecture: like the 'prison apparatus' [analyzed by Foucault *Discipline and Punish*] as an optical machine, used for seeing without being seen."

For Foucault, the possibilities of effects of space emerge out of specific constellations of the said and unsaid, as a particular constellation of forces: in short as a spatial and ideational constellation (an apparatus of power-knowledge) which is simultaneously a normalizing authority. Said another way any spatial conditions arise from a *dispositif* or apparatus of which they are inherently a part.ⁱⁱⁱ Insofar as space is produced and productive, Foucault's work can be seen as an alternative history of architecture, outside of a chronicle of what has naively reduced by other critics to a discussion of form and style.^{iv} "...[U]nder the gaze of the genealogist this history no longer obeys the rhythm of formal or tectonic-structural mutations ... instead it is inscribed in a much more complex field, where the discourse of knowledge, the applications of power, and the processes of subjectification [which] form three, linked yet irreducible vectors--all of which shows that architecture must be understood as an essentially *composite* object, an *assemblage* that results from convergent technologies."^v Weizman's expose of Israel's Architecture of Occupation, proposed first in its early stages through his 2002 *A Civilian Occupation and Territories*. Indeed what Weizman argues through the geo-political and territorial examination of Israel is that the organization of geographical space is elastic, that it must be studied through a diffused apparatus of power, from governmental and executive to a multiplicity of non-state actors. Far from being an independently and individually authored work, architecture as a territorial and spatial construct is collectively authored. As he writes:

Because elastic geographies respond to a multiple and diffused rather than a single source of power, their architecture cannot be understood as the material embodiment of a unified political will or as the product of a single ideology. Rather the organization of the Occupied Territories should be seen as a kind of "political plastic", or as a map of the interaction between all the forces that shaped it.

The architecture of the frontier could not be said to be simply "political" but rather "politics in matter."

Indeed for Weizman *Israeli Architecture* is read in the way "social, economic, national and strategic forces solidify in the organization and form of homes, infrastructure and settlements; alternatively

architecture is employed as a way of understanding political issues as constructed realities. Territories are considered architectural constructions and the architects are now multiple. Space does not become a background for political action, "an abstract grid on which events take place" -- but rather than medium that each of their actions seeks to challenge, transform or appropriate.

Most recently Weizman, along with several peers at Goldsmiths, namely Lawrence Abdul Hamdan Ayesha Hameed, Paulo Tavares, Lorenzo .. has been exploring what he terms forensics architecture. As he writes in a recent studio brief: "...[F]orensics assumes that events, as complex and multivalent as they might be, are registered within the material properties of objects-bodies-spaces. On the basis of artifacts, bodies, traces, medical samples, foot-finger printings, DNA samples or spatial products -- and to the extent that they have been accepted as evidence -- conclusions are made and decisions, taken. ... " Things become the embodiment of events, in which experts -- those in space, science, law and medicine -- are assigned the task of harvesting evidence, which is considered more objective than the testimony of the witness, or living subject. In this way Weizman argues: "Forensics implies a complex process of translation in which objects/things become the agents of controversy in dispute. Its "material rhetoric" presents the substratum around which a public forum is formed, but also creates a forum itself, for what count as the genuine evidence of an event is, in fact, the product of conflicts and negotiations over the very possibility of determining whether an object is what it purports to be, and what can thus be claimed in its name."

(clarify) Demands exhibition proposes a heterotopic space of the exhibition as an apparatus, the object as thing and the thing as quasi- or hybrid object. His work argues for an adjacency or a 1:1 tautology between exhibition : architecture : model : images : text. It posits a spatial apparatus in which exhibition as architecture now lies inside and outside itself. <from here?> Combining evidence (mostly material) and a forum (mostly social) Demands work results in what Weizman terms a political hybrid. And yet the hybridity goes beyond this, in fact, I would argue that in every sense what Demands present is a hybrid -- a bastard, a monster so to speak -- and it is here-in that the work proposes a sort of precedent for a new way of seeing, a proposal which, in Keenan's words, not only "takes us on toward (new) techniques and regimes of vision," and collaterally new spatial regimes of architecture and architectural exhibitionism.

ⁱ Galison, p. 292.

ⁱⁱ Martin Heidegger, "The Thing," in *Poetry, Language, Thought*, trans. Albert Hofstadter (New York: Harper & Row Publishers), 1971, pp. 163-186.

ⁱⁱⁱ <include above or **leave in footnote?**: Useful for an understanding of Foucault's spatialisations of the 18C, yet beyond the scope of this discussion, are the three spatialisations of 18C medicine as outlined by Osborne and Rose. add

^{iv} See p. 52, in John Ploger, "Foucault's Dispositif and the City."

^v Foucault and the Genealogy of Modern Architecture, p. 384.