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We are pleased to present this new volume in the publication series of the Academy of Fine Arts Vienna. The series, published in cooperation with our highly committed partner Sternberg Press, is devoted to central themes of contemporary thought about art practices and art theories. The volumes in the series comprise collected contributions on subjects that form the focus of discourse in terms of art theory, cultural studies, art history, and research at the Academy of Fine Arts Vienna and represent the quintessence of international study and discussion taking place in their respective fields. Each volume is published in the form of an anthology edited by staff members of the Academy of Fine Arts Vienna. Authors of high international repute are invited to write contributions dealing with their respective areas of emphasis. Research activities such as international conferences, lecture series, institute-specific research focuses, and research projects serve as the points of departure for the individual volumes.

With this book we launch volume fifteen of the series. *Not Now! Now! Chronopolitics, Art & Research* collects proceedings from an international conference of the same title that took place at the Academy of Fine Arts Vienna in October 2013. This conference was held as part of the European Art Research Network (EARN), of which the Academy is a founding partner together with institutions like the Finnish Academy of Fine Arts in Helsinki, the Malmö Art Academy at Lund University, the Faculty of Fine, Applied and Performing Arts at Gothenburg University, and others. Alongside these institutions, including the EU project Step-Change for Higher Arts Research and Education (SHARE) under the lead of the European Institutes of the Arts (ELIA), the Academy of Fine Arts Vienna has been dedicated for many years to the establishment and fostering of artistic research: through establishing a doctoral program (PhD in Practice) within this field, thus strengthening the structural implementation of artistic research on an institutional level; and by proposing topics for this field that are discussed internationally, thereby setting the thematic agenda for a discourse that is often confined to methodological and institutional issues. This book is a result of the Academy’s engagement in the area of artistic research as well as a kind of anniversary present: it marks the five year existence of our PhD in Practice program.

We would like to thank this volume’s editor, Renate Lorenz, who—together with Anette Baldauf—codirects the PhD in Practice program at the Academy, for her efforts in collecting the proceedings. We are certain that the contributions on the many dimensions of time and chronology, undertaken from different positions of artistic and theoretic reflections, will prove to be timely.
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The title of the conference from which these essays spring, “Not Now! Now!,” shimmers with complexity. It suggests the past reappearing in the present, “not now” showing up, uncannily, “now.” It invokes the time of stop-and-go rhythm, as with the American children’s game Red Light!/Green Light! in which an announcer shouts “green light!” and children move in a frenzy, until hearing “red light!” and freezing in whatever position they are in. And it calls forth the veilings and unveilings of the striptease, as in “Now you see it, now you don’t.” History and memory. The sheer physicality of time in rhythm. The problems and the pleasures of visualizing time. These three themes course through these essays in provocative and beautiful ways.

First, on the past (and sometimes the future) reappearing in the present. Invoking the trope of memory-seeds, Jamika Ajalon gives us the figure of the “space cowboi” to conjure an image of movement through time: a “time cowboi,” we might say, who like a time-traveling, gender-outlaw Johnny Appleseed moves between events, eras, moments, not only scattering but picking up the pips of what has been and what might be, mixing memory (“not now”) and desire (“now” in the imperative). Ingrid Cogne’s surfing is another way of being a time-cowboi: waiting patiently for that “NOW” when you can catch a wave of time and let it take you elsewhere than now. Yva Jung makes this surfing literal in her meditations upon travel, where, creating “something uncontainable,” she lets a yellow suitcase filled with her friends’ artworks take her on a trip without an itinerary, marked by stairs, train compartments, stages, galleries, and bridges, using the unspecified time of her travels to reorganize spatial relations and even the historical relations of possession: her point is less to leave only a footprint (that sign of human domination over land from Robinson Crusoe to astronauts on the moon) than to take “only air.” Yasmine Eid-Sabbagh offers the figure of an archive of photographs from the Burj al-Shamali camp that would include “the ones people entrusted me, the hidden ones/the imagined ones, the ones from the past, the present, and also the ones from the past possible futures.” Ana Hoffner’s queer family album is another such archive that rearranges the ligaments between then and now, between so-called generations, and so between events that are not mere repetitions of one another and yet are not for that unrelated. And of course Sharon Hayes’s uncanny performances of archive fuse “not now” and “now” into something more powerful and visceral than memory: she writes that we “absorb much of the historical specificity of our first decade of life” before we have the capacity to process it. This figure of absorption, of physically soaking up history, also captures the way Hayes leaks or leeches, we might say, the past into the present in her performances. Her respeaking, resituating, reanimating are modes of reenacting the past such that it irrupts into the present rather than, as with reenactment, casting the past as safely other.
My metaphors of leeching and leaking are not incidental here, for the physicality of time appears in these essays as texture: as the aprons, wood, scratches, layering that manifest Nana Adusei-Poku’s racial time; as Mara Lee Gerdén’s red lipstick smears and stains; as Jung’s increasingly battered suitcase; as the scratched sidewalks in Eid-Sabbagh’s piece; as the soiled black piece of weed-controlling fabric with dried grass and used duvet covers that indicate Mathias Danbolt’s conception of dormancy. Texture, as Renu Bora has reminded us, “expresses how temporality […] is intrinsic to the meaning of materiality.” For texture includes a history of material transactions between object and users. I sometimes think that too much of an emphasis on texture returns us to the German Romantic worship of the relic whose decay makes history manifest, yet whose presence attests to something eternal. Bora offers the term “texture” to suggest something less fetishistic that also organizes many of the works in this volume; texture includes the violence of transforming materials and of being transformed oneself as one engages with them. Likewise, in many of the essays and artworks bound together here, texture is the mark of the ordinary violence that changes us: wear and tear, cooking, building, making up, gardening, and sleeping.

The most frequent textural/textual appearance in these essays is the veil, so everyday in many cultures, a hybrid of the tactile and the visual and a figure of seeing and not seeing, of folding in time rather than progressing so everyday in many cultures, a hybrid of the tactile and the visual and a figure of the time of language into discrete units of going and stopping and going again, and yet also leads us to the uncaptured, uncapturable time of dreaming and darkness. Ajalon’s cowboys invoke the frontier, but muddle its spatial and temporal boundaries. Gerdén asks us to kiss our specters, which would ordinarily seal a promise and guarantee a future, but here demands that repressed histories appear. And Andrea Ray finds in marriage—an institution that so attempts to manage time that death is predicted in the very vows securing it—a call from past utopian schemes to confront the contemporary “monogamous-normative state.” The fold that all of these essays risk is this: something that seems temporally reactive, conservative, or regressive rubs into something static or emblematic (in Gerdén’s terms a “stereotype”) or into something that, in Lorenz’s terms “feeds the temporality of progress”? But Lorenz also invokes the question I think is crucial to any radical chronopolitics that relies on making time appear so as to manipulate it or our understanding of it: How do we “perceptualize” time without turning into space, into something static or emblematic (in Gerdén’s terms a “stereotype”) or into something that, in Lorenz’s terms “feeds the temporality of progress”? As Milevska and Lorenz clarify, opacity (“now you don’t see it”) is as often as not an invitation to reveal something, or a promise that something will appear in the future. So, we might say, is the figure of time itself. When we make time appear, we risk arresting it into and as the eternal or the homogenous present.

Thus the project becomes, as the veil would have it, twofold: to find objects and situations that are at once charged with progressive time and also capable of blocking it. Danbolt’s dormancy, for instance, promises future activity and yet also leads us to the uncaptured, uncapturable time of dreaming and darkness. Hence the cowboys invoke the frontier, but muddle its spatial and temporal boundaries. Gerdén asks us to kiss our specters, which would ordinarily seal a promise and guarantee a future, but here demands that repressed histories appear. And Andrea Ray finds in marriage—an institution that so attempts to manage time that death is predicted in the very vows securing it—a call from past utopian schemes to confront the contemporary “monogamous-normative state.” The fold that all of these essays risk is this: something that seems temporally reactive, conservative, or regressive rubs up against its own potential to do otherwise.

This fold is beautifully captured in the exclamation point separating “Not Now!” from “Now!” At least one scholar has written that the mark was originally a folding over itself, formed from the Latin io, “joy,” with the “I” folded up and set over the “o.” Furthermore, “I” is a mark of strong feeling, of affect, of things felt rather than seen. It solicits action (“now!”) but also blocks forward movement (“not now!”). It is part of the system of punctuation that organizes the time of language into discrete units of going and stopping and going again, and yet its connection to strong emotion makes it excessive to that system. And it is, in a sense, content-free, a force rather than a figure. As a way of being in time, as the sign for a radical chronopolitics, we could do worse than the exclamation mark.

Literature


2 Ibid., 99.

Introduction

Renate Lorenz

The order of time is an unwearied worker on normalcy. Appearing under a range of names such as “chrononormativity,” “reproductive temporality” or “straight time,” it organizes our biographies and intimate relations. It is credited with the hierarchy of respectability. It makes good use of a whole range of seemingly innocent instruments such as schedules, to-do lists, calendars, deadlines, watches, and computers. “The naked flesh is bound into socially meaningful embodiment through temporal regulation,” as Elizabeth Freeman formulates. As chronobiopolitics the order of time not only regulates individual lives, but takes measures to police the asymmetrical rhythms of entire populations and thus organizes the seemingly “timeless” value and meaning of time. It opts for maximized productivity and a steady progression in reference to lifestyles, able-bodiedness, professional carriers, or even the handling of capital, disqualifying turbulences, or stagnation. It even still contributes to upholding colonial concepts by which some groups see themselves as ahead of others who supposedly still live in the past. A temporality that focuses on aims, events, progress, and linear time management is also at the core of many educational, artistic, leftist, and critical political projects. Only if time is seen as a mere effect of asymmetrical power relations and not as a foundational part of its very construction can this entanglement be rated as negligible.

Otherwise one might feel invited to introduce or reinforce artistic practices as chronopolitics, as a likewise productive means to challenge orderly and rigid temporal concepts and their effects on bodies and the social. One might either develop breaks and different rhythms or produce collapses in the connection between time and meaning. How exactly and by which formats and methods are these interventions taking place? Is there any promise, even in arts-based research, a field that has by its very means been especially burdened with the temporalities of academic research, with research plans, urgent questions, and a linear development of knowledge? Linda Tuhiwai Smith cuts right to the chase: “The term ‘research’ is inextricably linked to European imperialism and colonialism. The word itself, ‘research,’ is probably one of the dirtiest words in the indigenous world’s vocabulary.” The following will sketch

---

1 This text is based on many productive discussions and experimentations around the topics of chronopolitics and opacity in the PhD in Practice program of the Academy of Fine Arts Vienna, especially with the participants of the first three years: Nika Autor, Michael Baers, Mareike Bernien, Giulia Cilla, Ingrid Cogne, Eva Egeman, Yasmine Eid-Sabbagh, Till Gathmann, Anna Hoffner, Hanna Husberg, Annette Krauss, Xiaoyan Men, Elske Rosenfeld, Anna T. Regarding opacity I would especially like to mention Eva Egeman’s, Yasmine Eid-Sabbagh’s, and Anna T.’s work.


3 Ibid., 3.

deferral/opacity

An apricot-colored silk curtain moves slowly toward the camera until it almost completely fills the frame. But it doesn’t remain; instead some invisible mechanism or some hands in the off space shake the cloth a little and take it away. One might expect this curtain to reveal something, that some person or object might appear behind the curtain to have its entrance, now that the cloth has been lifted. Instead, behind the curtain waits another one—this time fawn-colored—moves toward the camera, shakes slightly, and disappears. A red curtain turns up with golden lace on its lower end. While one beautiful curtain after another moves closer, dances a little and disappears, we hear a slow folk song with guitar that sounds as if it were being played from an old and already quite used record at a too low speed.

What I am describing here is the beginning of Kenneth Anger’s 1949 short film Puce Moment. After watching a whole number of curtains appear and disappear and following the film for some two more minutes (which means that we have seen almost half of this short film) it turns out that we are actually seeing silk dresses, not curtains, moving as if they had a life on their own. The film reduces speed and then accelerates to faster than the norm while a black silk dress, not curtains, moving as if they had a life on their own. The film has in color, if quite artificially. After another moment the black dress again turns up with golden lace on its lower end. While one beautiful curtain after another moves closer, dances a little and disappears, we hear a slow folk song with guitar that sounds as if it were being played from an old and already quite used record at a too low speed.

Given the importance of a clear vision for what has been coined as the project of modernity and Enlightenment, it might be important to connect chronopolitics to the question of sight/visibility, particularly in the field of (visual) arts-based research. Acknowledging the critique of Gayatri Spivak, who has introduced the term “epistemic violence” to characterize the Enlightenment’s merciless pursuit of knowledge production, I would like to trace how far a different form of seeing and of knowing is produced by a strategic opacity. To think along the political possibilities of opacity as an artistic strategy, I refer to Édouard Glissant’s claim of the “right to opacity” and his request that “we must fight against transparency everywhere.” As Glissant describes it, opacity works as a category of epistemology—in order to avoid reduction, we have to conceive of the Other is opaque to us and even to accept that we are obscure to ourselves. But at the same time opacity is an ontological category, it implies the Other’s density, thickness, or fluidity, its “irreducible singularity” and “the welcome opaqueness, through which the Other escapes me.” In both senses opacity works as a defence against understanding, an act of aggression, as Celia Britton sees it, which produces objectification and subjection. Opacity thus is characterized by taking the starting point of its passive activity from the hierarchy that operates in the process of violent knowledge production. Seen like this, opacity is even more than an epistemic and ontological category, namely, a strategy of resistance: Glissant refers quite literally to slaves, who rendered themselves opaque by disappearing into a dense forest, and he gives advice about how to take care of one’s own identity: “I should not allow it to become cornered in any essence,” as Glissant argues: “Opacity, then, transforms the status of the colonised subject’s visibility from a source of vulnerability—the kind of vulnerability to which Fanon refers when he writes that ‘the black man has no ontological resistance in the eyes of the white man’—to the active production of a visible but unreadable image.”

Thus opacity is a category within the visible that works against hierarchy, wounding, and domination. As Glissant explicates—particularly in the field of poetry and language—opacity can be very well pursued by means of aesthetics. Accordingly it would be possible to see, for instance, John Cage’s practice of silence as a resistance strategy against the transparent instruments and methods of domination. As Glissant puts it, “silence is the gesture of resistance,” and he describes the moment of silence as a moment of “colonial rescue.” Silence is not absence, it is a gesture, it is an act of resistance. Silence is a refusal, it is a resistance to domination, it is a refusal to be silenced, it is a refusal to be silenced by the Other.

5 Freeman, Time Binds, 9.
9 Glissant, Poetics of Relation, 193.
10 Ibid., 192.
11 Ibid., 190.
12 Ibid., 162.
14 Glissant, Poetics of Relation, 162.
15 Ibid., 193.
“silence” as a strategic opacity, as queer theorist Jonathan Katz seems to propose. Cage explores silence in his poetry, for instance in his “lecture on nothing” (“I am here / and there is nothing to say/nothing more than/nothing/can be said”) and as well in his scores. His best-known piece might be 4’33”, a piece “for any instrument or any combination of instruments,” where nothing is played for the time that is mentioned in the title. Of course there are things to be heard during this time, but they might not be produced on purpose. Cage’s use of silence has been read as connected to his social position as a gay man. Instead of seeing it as a symptom of oppression in a homophobic social surrounding, Katz argues that it was, on the contrary, a chosen (and quite visible) mode of resistance, an appearance that gave clear proof of its unsuitability. Opacity thus is not invisibility or concealment. Opacity is a category of active visualization, of a visualization however, that is rendered unintelligible, beyond understanding.

Does this mean that strategic opacity would be a valuable measure against being known and thus being placed at the low end of the hierarchies in the field of knowledge and power? If we follow Sara Ahmed in her text “Knowing Strangers,” the relation of knowledge and opacity becomes more complicated. In order to develop a critical and antiracist epistemology, she proposes engaging with the term of the “stranger” instead of the “Other.” She opposes the intuitive understanding that the “stranger” is someone who escapes knowledge, who is “precisely not the object of knowledge. Instead the stranger, for her, is produced as a category within knowledge, “the stranger is somebody we know as not knowing, rather than somebody we simply do not know.”

Coming back to the film Puce Moment, one could hold that the woman/diva is visualized as a stranger in Ahmed’s sense. In the moment her face becomes visible, it becomes re-veiled. Then, we see her performing some acts, which look like reenactments of film scenes; for instance, she poses on a divan rather than just sitting down. Then she leaves the house with a group of very photogenic greyhounds. We neither understand the history of the beautiful dresses, nor do we get to know whom we are watching—someone important enough to enjoy seeing her posing. Deferral here is the means that produces opacity out of vision. Our attention is upheld by the deferral of understanding. But still, we could very well see these actions as a production of strangerness, instead of as an escape from the project of Enlightenment. Strangerness is the position of someone who might be known in the future, if not now, and who is now the object of projections, identifications and exoticizations; Ahmed speaks of “stranger fetishism.” The stranger is exactly the epistemic figure who instigates and upholds the temporality of a steady progress in knowledge production. Seen from this perspective, a strategy of opacity could just as well feed the temporality of progress. Thus, it is important to question if and how opacity/deferral could become effective against the production of strangerness.

suspense/opacity

Oliver Husain’s film Purfled Promises shows a metal frame, which holds a greenish curtain instead of a projection screen. Frame and curtain slowly move toward the camera frame and toward us, the viewers, until the frame extends the camera frame. The curtain opens, and reveals another frame with the same curtain, which again starts to move toward the camera. We observe this process again and again. After a while the color of the curtain changes, the metal frame is replaced by a wooden one, and a deferral of understanding: But still, we could very well see these actions as a production of strangerness, instead of as an escape from the project of Enlightenment. Strangerness is the position of someone who might be known in the future, if not now, and who is now the object of projections, identifications and exoticizations; Ahmed speaks of “stranger fetishism.” The stranger is exactly the epistemic figure who instigates and upholds the temporality of a steady progress in knowledge production. Seen from this perspective, a strategy of opacity could just as well feed the temporality of progress. Thus, it is important to question if and how opacity/deferral could become effective against the production of strangerness.

Renate Lorenz

Fig. 2
Oliver Husain, Purfled Promises, 2009
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poses another frame. A series of old dresses is used instead of curtains and produces an even more obvious reference to Kenneth Anger’s film, only that there is no woman’s face revealed. We see through a keyhole and a camera lens. While this film is also and even more explicitly working against the means of epistemic violence, it uses suspense, the waiting for a moment only to produce more suspense on top of it. I see suspense as a specific type of deferral, one that is saturated with desire. Freeman describes this temporality as related to S/M sexuality, as one that “hyperbolically clarifies the temporal aspects of power and domination and yet also offers new modes of temporal apprehension and historical consciousness.” In S/M, power is at the center of the play: the power to explore and reveal is overtly present and ritualized in this film. The history of violent research is there, however, the film does not show or mediate any effects or findings. While the film plays with the expectations of revealing, uncovering, exposing, and unmasking, everything it actually shows lies beside or beyond those expectations. We see the different fabrics, gloves, feathers, pearls, and balloons, but we see neither bodies nor other objects that could stand in for a production of profound knowledge about queer lifestyles, practices, sex, and looks. While the film uses the visual rhetoric of revelation, it asks the viewers to watch everything outside “the parameters of confession and truth, the humanist desire for reflection, and the ideal of transparency” at the same time. While producing a break in the temporal order by means of suspense the film produces opacity. Conversely, opacity turns out to be not only a category within the field of a critique of vision, but also as a category within the field of chronopolitics.

Thus, the film does not deny that our relation to difference is already placed in the realms of knowledge, temporality, and visibility. Rather, it refuses to produce clarity in these realms and instead sketches a potentiality of another, namely, deferred and thus opaque, relation to difference. A ritualized usage of suspense produces the endlessly repeated moment in between the “now!” and the “not now!” The “Not Now! Now!” is employed, not to highlight the moment of the revelation of truth, and also not to introduce a strangerness that would allow for projections and the awaiting of a future knowledge. Rather, the “Not Now! Now!” allows for a potentiality of a ephemerally materialized sketch of a future, which is not yet here. The “Not Now! Now!” is the time out of joint, the time which is not fully accessible.

In the end of the film an empty metal frame moves toward the camera and the image turns black. After having no sound at all for most of the film, a smooth voice, accompanied by emotional film music, explains that the screen is moving closer toward the audience “imperceptibly slow” and overwhelming the viewer, “an experience horrifying but not entirely unpleasant,” as we learn. Thus, the film does not even respect the position of the viewer as one outside the frame, s/he instead stages how the audience might become slowly but steadily overwhelmed by the screen. I attended the first screening of the film at the “Live Film! Jack Smith!” conference, where the projection was part of a performance. The film was projected onto a mobile screen that was held by some people, standing in the dark. When the voice started to talk about the screen moving toward the audience, the screen indeed was carried slowly in the direction of the audience, until it was handed over to the audience and placed above our heads. In a way this performance was not only bringing the audience literally onto the screen, since it urged us to start focusing on the context of the projection, the theater, the projection machinery, and the fellow audience members. We also somehow got the means to cover ourselves, to use the screen not for visualizing but for guaranteeing some opacity, but at the same time we got the responsibility of dealing with the screen and finding out how to hold it up or to hand it over to others.
The experimental composer Pauline Oliveros brought her concepts of “sonic awareness” and “deep listening” into music, which ask musicians and audiences alike (although in some of her pieces there is no division between them) to listen. Instead of focusing on silence as Cage did, she gave “recommendations for how you can help to break the silence and change the paradigm of exclusiveness in music.”

She created pieces where she listened to her body sounds and tried to recreate them with her instrument, the accordion. In her score To Valerie Solanas and Marilyn Monroe in Recognition of Their Desperation, she included a part where the musicians listen to each other’s tones and modulations and try to imitate them with their own instruments. Besides opening up for the soundings of your surrounding, even in everyday life, this concept of deep listening seems to have more far-reaching political implications. Since it also asks us to listen to and make room for the Other’s sounds, Olivero’s work is engaged with the development of an ability to listen, which Spivak called for when she said that it is not a question of whether the subaltern can speak, but of whether there is someone who is able to hear. The ability to listen allows us to become aware of and maybe even leave the dominant parameters of thinking and practicing.

As Glissant mentions, a disrespect for opacity affects and displaces not only marginalized groups, but both sides of the hierarchy. With some malicious joy he gives an anecdote about the death of Victor Segalen, a French ethnographer who travelled through Polynesia and China. Segalen died in 1919 under mysterious circumstances in a forest in France. Glissant believes devoutly that “Segalen died of the opacity of the Other, of coming face to face with the impossibility of accomplishing the transmutation [of being Other] that he dreamed of. [...] Unable to know that a transfer into transparency ran counter to his project and that on the contrary, respect for mutual forms of opacity would have accomplished it, he was heroically consumed in the impossibility of being Other.”

It is said that an open copy of Hamlet was placed beside Segalen’s dead body—Hamlet’s uttering “the time is out of joint” opens up Derrida’s thoughts about the “not now” in Specters of Marx about a present time that has lost its context and the fixed relations of a before and after.

Coming back to the films Puce Moment and Purfled Promises we could picture Segalen, continuously trying to produce enlightenment by lifting one curtain after the other, without finding an object that could be appropriated or identified with. Learning from these difficulties, Britton asks for a “detour,” borrowing another of Glissant’s terms. Even if we can’t enter the “Other’s” world, we can still suspend our own world. This might need some time.
Literature


Thinking about the meaning of Blackness in the contemporary was the starting point for my ongoing research of the idea of post-black. The more I engaged with this question in connection to contemporary Black artists and the curatorial concept post-black, the stronger I was immersed in questions about time, history, and the contemporary. I was intrigued by the curatorial concept post-black as it heralded a shift in the politics of representation. This concept emerged from the exhibition trilogy “Freestyle,” “Frequency,” and “Flow” by curator Thelma Golden and artist Glenn Ligon at the Studio Museum in Harlem, New York in 2001, which explored tendencies in contemporary art by Black artists. For Golden post-black was “a clarifying term that had ideological and chronological dimensions and repercussions. It was characterized by artists who were adamant about not being labeled as ‘black’ artists, though their work was steeped, in fact deeply interested, in redefining complex notions of blackness.”

Unfortunately, as often with curators who feel obliged to create new terms, the latter excerpt was the only definition, which somehow allowed insights into what post-black could mean; the rest of the two-paged curatorial statement is rather vague, which makes the meaning of the term still subject for assumptions. Moreover, it is highly contested, as post-black is often misunderstood as a proclamation of post-race as well as the overcoming of racially based inequalities.

So however vague the definition may be, what I encountered right from the beginning, despite Golden’s emphasis on chronology and its inherent generationalism, was that the artworks confront the spectator with temporal overlays and synchronicities produced through various archival resources and in depth discourses about African-American histories. Instead of making totalistic

---

1 I have to note that the term wasn’t entirely new; the art historian Robert Farris Thompson already noted in 1991 that “a retelling of modernism to show how it predicts the triumphs of the current sequences would reveal that ‘the Other’ is your neighbor—that black and Modernist cultures were inseparable long ago. Why use the word, ‘post-modern’ when it may also mean ‘postblack’?” Robert Farris Thompson, “Afro Modernism,” Artforum, vol. 30, no. 1 (1991): 91. Thompson thus highlights the intertwinedness of the development of modernism in the West and the inspiration it borrowed from African and diasporic art. He stressed that the term “post-modern” perpetuated the politics of Western hegemonic narrative of art/culture in a time in which diversity, multiculturalism and a multiplicity of perspectives are more salient in politics and intellectual thought.


3 I won’t follow the discussion on post-black, because it would be subject to a whole different debate, but I have to highlight that I am not talking about post-race when I use the term.
Fig. 5
Leslie Hewitt, selection from the series *Riffs on Real Time*, 2013
claims about being Black or Blackness, the exhibitions introduced young artists that were in search of meaning in this vast and often violent history, because to think about the contemporary meaning of Blackness cannot be pursued without the history that produced that very same category. What I am interested in are the various layers of times and temporalities that reflect the synchronicity of the multiple categories, histories, and relations we occupy, which I consider key to the contemporary meaning of Blackness.

A work that caught my attention ever since I had this question on my mind was *Riffs on Real Time* (Fig. 5) by Leslie Hewitt, who was also part of the already-mentioned post-black art show.

As a trained sculptor, Hewitt moved her practice from producing three-dimensional physical sculptures to photography (and film); this background is still reflected in the composition and arrangements of her photographs, and has led to a description of her photographs as “sculpturally constructed,”6 (Fig. 6) a formal feature that links her work to that of conceptual photographers like Miriam Böhm, Anne Collier, or Jimmy Robert, all of whom explore the realm of photography through its materiality, include ephemeral objects through iconic texts from either literature (*Midday* series) or bodies (the black body *Riffs on Real Time*) or activates-situated knowledge. I argue that her approach not only activates a political dimension of sculptural photography, but that it also can be read as a critique on the sometimes clean, constructed, and socially one-dimensional aspects of German photographers like Thomas Demand or Böhm because her work operates through the visibility of racialized social relations, as I will explore in the following.


5 The term generation in this context is of course contestable as it reinscribes Black politics into a progress narrative, which I try to avoid. I would rather like to emphasize what the African-American painter and author Romare Bearden articulated when he said “I believe in the aesthetics that informs the artwork of black people [...] since aesthetic formulations derive from cultural responses not from inherent racial endowments” Romare Bearden, “Letters to Allen Shields Article: Is There a Black Aesthetics?,” Leonardo, no. 2 (Spring 1974): 188–89.


Riffs on Real Time and the Present
That Is Fleeting though Captured

Racialized social relations are most lucid in Riffs on Real Time, a series of photographs in 76.2 x 61 centimeters that depict various layers of rectangular shaped objects and that can also be described as three-layer collages that “are sculptural as well as image-bearing.” Hewitt is interested in relicts, ephemera, leftovers, somehow the hidden stories in the attic whose narrators have failed to survive their rediscovery. She questions the dramaturgy of histories, genres, and the eagerness of the spectator to make sense by using the historical debris. The way in which these leftovers reappear as layers has led to the notion that “Hewitt reshuffles historical and everyday ephemera in a new suspended time and context to consider the role of images and objects in our personal and collective consciousness.” An observation that leads me to discuss how time, spatial relations, and materiality are connected in her work.

I am starting my reading of Riffs on Real Time (Fig. 8) with the layer that is furthest away from the viewer. The basis, ground, and biggest layer, which reappears in all of the pieces from the series, is build by a monochromatic dark red or dark blue carpet of timber apron in different shades. The apron is the most recurring background motif and shows signs of everyday use, as it is left with marks, scratches in the enamel, paint stains, grain, and dirt. The wood shows its natural signs of growth and visualizes the duration it took to shape the grain into dark and light lines that mark the individual biography of this material. The stains and scratches on the other hand allow assumptions about the human interaction or use of the material or its location (the artist’s studio, a workshop).

The second layer varies between magazine images, receipt-sheets, paper with sketched figures, notebooks, other unidentifiable books, and maps. All of these objects are documents of time, material witnesses of historical moments, and part of a public discourse that either heralded the shift of politics or simply testified a past status quo. They appear more personal although don’t allow to be deciphered. In an example that I would like to further explore, the second layer consists of an unfolded magazine page showing young, predominantly male protesters (only one supposed woman, who wears a pleated skirt and who appears on the right front side of the image) on a street and wearing school uniforms and bonnets, a fashion from 1970s South Africa. Only the word “Release” and letters “AA” are readable from the board on the upper-right part of the photograph and the banner on the mid-left side of the page. The street appears rural as urban indicators like houses or stores are missing—a tree in the upper middle of the page and the blurry scenery in the background allow this assumption. The camera may not have been able to capture the background and the scene reminds me of the fogginess of the Hammamat, the dry and dusty wind from the Sahara, which obnubilates the Ghanaian sky and landscape from December until February; it is a tense time, in which the dryness and the dust dominate the landscape. Since the protesters are of high school age, their bodies tell us that the picture shows the Soweto Uprising, which stands synonymous for the protest of South African students’ against being taught in Afrikaans—a Dutch-colonial descending language—and which was defeated by the Apartheid regime with violence on June 16, 1976. The students’ disobedience to the existing political regime resulted in the spreading of the protest with an estimated number of deaths that range from 176 to 700. On the lower side of the page is the name of the magazine printed, its year and page number indicated. This photograph is part of an Ebony magazine issue from October 1976, a small detail, which draws a connection between the African Diaspora and the African continent, since Ebony represents the first Black “lifestyle” magazine in the United States and was banned in South Africa as the photo editorial with the title “The Handwriting on the Wall” to which this image
originally belongs states. Despite the spatial distance and different political conditions, this little detail creates a metaphorical bridge to the third layer of the collage, which appears to be located in the United States.

The third layer in the series Riffs on Real Time consists of snapshots, amateur analogue photography (the trace of time is here materialized through the yel-

lowed gouache and the way temporality is inscribed in the styles and designs depicted). These snapshots are equally part of a public discourse, if they are

considered as diasporic documents of Black life and subjecthood. Despite

their emotional enclosure can these snapshots be read as intimate capsules of retainable memory with their own sociohistoric and intersubjective narratives? As art historian Huey Copeland argues: “Hewitt highlights vernacular photographic practices that conjure alternative visions of black life. Not content to target the brief intervals in which African American politics perennially unfolds in mainstream narratives, she proffers the expansive envelope of everyday temporality.” They additionally offer spatial dimensions when the snapshots show landscapes, workspaces, or a still life devoid of human protagonists.

The snapshots that Hewitt has chosen are also material witnesses to the developments of technology, since the paper is not produced anymore and therefore digitally preserves photographic history.

The third layer from the given example depicts a scene in a garden that again layers different times, which is implied by the early 1970s green-and-white webbed lawn lounge chair that dominates the frame as the closest object to the camera. Although the people depicted don’t allow a clear determination of the point in time in which this picture was taken, its age is indicated by the faded colors, red tinge, and pale edges. The format, a 1970s quick-print indicated by the square with round edges, can be found in almost every household’s photo-collection, which represent artifacts of family histories; images that are taken with cameras and printed on paper that is often not even produced anymore.
The snapshot shows four bodies in a scene of a barbecue gathering, two men sit opposite to each other, one on a garden chair and the other one on a small garden bench. The Black man on the right leans slightly forward and the left one with a white-and-black pleated short-sleeved shirt has a relaxed posture and white napkin on his lap. Their bearing gives the impression that they are in conversation. One lawn chair on the left middle of the photograph is empty and adds to the notion that more people are part of the scene than the ones captured in the photograph. The color of the green-and-white braided plastic chair with wooden armrests is contrasted by the deep red color of the shirt of the Black man sitting on the bench, as well as by the man standing next to the bench. The skin color of the standing man and the man wearing the black-and-white shirt doesn’t allow the assumption that they are white, but they appear fairer than the rest of the depicted. I include this observation in order to highlight the racial mixing in the photograph in contrast to the racial segregation that we encountered looking at the South African protesters.

The composition of colors, planar intersections, faceless bodies, and tamed expanse is reluctant to give meaning or aesthetic pleasure. It is its ephemeral nature and supposable unimportance that creates a tension between the magazine picture of the protesting students and the snapshot. The idyllic appearance family memory captured in the snapshot is contrasted or in other words literally embedded within the historical discourse of freedom struggle in South Africa. But neither are free from affective capacities—quite the opposite. The historian Tina Campt wrote in her conclusion of Image Matters about the affective temporality of family photographs when she realizes that she is unable to read her own family photograph’s potential of “multiple touch, sonic rhythms, synchronies, ensemblic improvisations or experience the humming of music.” Her photographs are saturated with affect and are thus caught in a “before and after” of that specific moment from her own biography.14 Whilst looking at the family snapshot in Hewitt’s work such kind of affective saturation does not appear; one sees someone else’s family or friends at a barbecue, which creates an affective play of visual and sonic impressions like laughter, movement, and the scent of deliciously spiced barbecue smoke. The image creates an idea of being together and enjoying each other’s company and this moment is transcoded into a closed up suspension, as we—the viewers—create an idea of being together and enjoying each other’s company embeded in a heteronorrnative value system in which we are socialized, but it can also mean the opposite: a notion that supports an argument in concern of family photographs if they produce shame, pain, or frictions depending on one’s own memories and family constellations. Campt underlines this argument by saying, “My wounded kinship with my own family photos provides both a primary motivation and a significant reinforcement for my conviction that such images are powerful objects of affective condensation that register both the intensity of positive affects and the equally intense wounds of negative affects.”15

The Soweto Uprising on the other hand stresses the notion of being hurt, wounded in the contemporary from the historical events that will follow this demonstration of the will for political freedom through trying to get heard.16 Speaking about the history of slavery in an interview about his movie 12 Years a Slave, Steve McQueen clarifies the emotional depth that the history of imperialism still causes by saying, “Angry? [He looks puzzled.] No. You feel hurt that someone did such things, but angry? No.” To McQueen, the notion sounds as bizarre as finding slavery funny: “Painful, sure. Hurt, absolutely. I don’t know if that can be seen as anger. Not to say that I’m not angry with injustice, of course—and slavery is a huge injustice. But thinking about it that way? No.”17 The notion that historical events of injustice and inequality create painful experiences is an important observation, whilst looking at the archival material in Hewitt’s work, which brings the wounds of the past into the present and thus creates a polyphonic emotional landscape.

Hewitt challenges these three layers that I have just described with the fourth layer of the photograph, by which I mean the photograph itself, and the act of looking.

Space is symbolically compressed and the bird’s-eye view—which was so revolutionary in the Neue Sachlichkeit—that is supposed to give an “overview on the world” is transcoded into a closed up suspension, as we—the viewers—have to look closer, investigate the layers in concern of their histories and relations. Photographers like Alexander Rodchenko, Germaine Krull, and Aenne Biermann, who were instrumental in creating the “Neue Sehen” in the beginning of the twentieth century, used a bird’s-eye view in urban photography in order to make things and connections visible that the flaneur in the street wouldn’t recognize, and therefore gave voice to counter-ideological views in art and politics.18

14 Ibid., 203.
15 Ibid.
16 For the connection of speech, political freedom, and politics, see Hannah Arendt, Between Past and Future: Eight Exercises in Political Thought (New York: Penguin, 1977).
By using this historical background of the genre, Hewitt inspires the viewer to search for a narrative or connections between the objects or layers of images depicted. They appear to have their own inherent connection, a logic which is enclosed, inaccessible on rational grounds. The objects are connected, not through sharing the same space and time in terms of point of origin, but through the act of photographing them together. They are linked and the power of association opens up the notion of time, where the moment lingers in the present tense, exploring the space in-between, the unpictured moments, exposing the hidden interlocutor, the eye of the photographer.

*Riffs on Real Time* creates rhythmic structures, although the photographs are arranged in a stoic, neutral, and repetitive way. The scale (76.2 x 61 cm) emphasizes this notion as the images gain an additional sculptural quality; in front of the white wall appears a group of photographs like windows into a surreal world, in which the ground describes the horizon. But the photograph doesn’t offer a vanishing point; the spectator is rather drawn into an archive that appears to exist in a parallel world, or is this parallel world the utopia we already live?

Riffs on Real Time creates layers of time that collapse in the moment of picture taking and gazing at them. This argument can be underlined by Hewitt’s approach to photography, which she describes as: “What if we understood a photographic image as an abstraction of facts, extracted from life in its fullness and dimension? I understand photography as a compressed version of the world, funneled through a monocular point of view.”

Photography as a medium can grasp and extract meaning and allows the viewer a very specific perspective, as Susan Sontag described when she said that “to photograph means to appropriate the thing photographed. It means putting oneself into a certain relation to the world that feels like knowledge—and, therefore, like power.” In connection to my argument that the various archival layers also create an emotional landscape, Sontag’s quote highlights that the spectator also encounters emotional knowledge, which correlates to McQueen’s notion of being hurt.

possible presents

Copeland highlighted, borrowing from Hal Foster, the “archival impulse” in Hewitt’s work, which expresses itself through the clustering of historical documents, amateur photography, and objects like books, magazines, and snapshots. Foster describes in his article “Archival Impulse” the practice of artists-as-archivists with the example of Tacita Dean, Thomas Hirschhorn, and Sam Durant. He shows the ways in which these artists reframe, gather, oppose, or “connect what cannot be connected” from archival material and thus “recoup failed visions in art, literature, philosophy, and everyday life into possible scenarios of alternative kinds of social relations, to transform the non-place of the archive into the no place of utopia.”

The artist does not elaborate further who directs the “monocular point of view,” but her statement shows that it is a technical as well as subjective gaze; read with Sontag, it is one which appropriates and empowers unseen, unfelt emotional knowledges, narratives, and relations of history.

this impulse encloses the practice to trace gaps in the narrative of history and their identification as “construction sites.” The “construction site” of history collapses when these different notions and ideas of time, history, and the contemporary fuse in the deceleration of looking which is at the forefront of Hewitt’s artistic work. According to Copeland, “In their deliberative composition, Hewitt’s photographs record the pleasures and difficulties involved not only in mining the archive but also in expanding its purview by forging connections between the shards of black memory and dominant cultural narratives.”

Rewind Selecta

Historian Michael Hanchard emphasizes in his article “Afro-Modernity” the temporal dimensions of racial inequality. He uses the example of distribution of data—in the form of schoolbooks between whites and Blacks, or access to institutions, public services, or to food during the time of racial segregation in North America—which created an institutionalized temporal disjuncture. His attempt is, above all, to highlight that Black liberation politics has always had at its heart the overcoming of these temporal gaps, which he calls “racial time.” Hence, he looks at the temporal politics of racialization and claims that “racial time is defined as the inequalities of temporality that result from power relations between racially dominant and subordinate groups.” Thus the strategy to create disjuncture was applied in every context of racial oppression, be it in the diasporas or on the African continent. He consequently depicts the ways how Africans and people of African decent have been modern subjects by arguing that “only under conditions of modernity could people defined as African utilize the very mechanisms of their subordination for their liberation.”

He argues conclusively that there are many vantage points from which one can view and experience this thing known as modernity: as nightmare or utopia; as horrible past or future present. These contrasting views caution us against modernity’s reification and implore us to view modernity as a process of lived experience, with winners and losers, as well as стремления for redemption, recovery, retribution, and revolution, each experience tumbling into another and becoming—dare I say—history.

I have introduced this argument, because the second layer—the Soweto Uprising—of the photograph depicts and derives from a time in which this contestation of racial time is inscribed.

In connection to the artistic practices that I have researched with a focus on what it means to be Black in the contemporary, I argue for the synchronicity of racial time and a multiplicity of temporal disjunctures that demand for a reading of art that pays attention to the synchronicity of different temporalities. Because the historical and contemporary disjunctures that a subject occupies play different temporalities simultaneously on a corporeal schema.

28 The politics and strategies that emerged and countered these tools of control addressed the temporal and spatial dimension, which he shows with examples from Cuba, Brazil, North America, and West Africa.
29 Hanchard, “Afro-Modernity,” 246. Similar arguments can be found in Paul Gilroy’s analysis of Enlightenment philosophy, which highlights the intrinsic dependency of the process of racialization and the idea of modernity and also in Homi K. Bhabha’s discussion of modernity’s notion of aporetic coexistence.
30 Ibid., 268.
This notion of synchronicity leads me to first the title of the piece, *Real Time*, and secondly to its relation to Henri Bergson’s concept of time, which includes real time. The latter describes the very moment in which we experience time. Bergson argues there are two distinctions of times: duration and real time. Simplified, this means that duration, in contrast to real time, is the way in which we measure time or experience time: how we memorize, how we are able to process, articulate, and record time. Additionally, Gilles Deleuze refers to duration time, drawing on Bergson’s theories, as a coexistence of the past within the present, rather than time as succession.31

Real time, in contrast, is the actual moment of perception without “before or after,” this ungraspable and fleeting phenomenon. Or in Bergson’s words expressed:

> Everyone will surely agree that time is not conceived without a before and after—time is succession. Now we have just shown that where there is not some memory, some consciousness, real or virtual, established or imagined, actually present or ideally introduced, there cannot be a before and an after, there is one or the other, not both; and both are needed to constitute time. Hence, in what follows, whenever we shall wish to know whether we are dealing with a real or imaginary time, we shall merely ask ourselves whether the object before us can or cannot be perceived, whether we can or cannot become conscious of it.32

What lays at hand following this quote in connection to the reading of Hewitt’s photograph is that real time creates a gap or a disparity as it accumulates the (non-)possibilities of a “before” and an “after,” which is particularly important since Bergson conceptualized duration in contrast as “the continuous progress of the past which grows into the future and which swells as it advances.”33 34

Particularly, Bergson’s proposal to ask whether one can or cannot become conscious of an object—whether it is imagined or real35—in connection to *Riffs on Real Time* is of importance to me, because each photograph poses this question anew and creates layers of temporalities that I call “hetero-temporality” in order to stress the sociohistorical dimensions in Hewitt’s work.

**Hetero-Temporality**

The term “hetero-temporality” should not be misunderstood with Jack Halberstam’s use of hetero-temporality in contrast to queer time, because “hetero” in Halberstam’s approach is a signifier for sexual orientation and heteronormative orders of space and time, embedded in a discourse of situated knowledge and sociological observations. Queer time for Halberstam is the dark nightclub, the perverse turn away from the narrative coherence of adolescence-early adulthood-marriage-reproduction-child rearing-retirement-death, the embrace of late childhood in place of early adulthood or immaturity in place of responsibility. It is a theory of queerness as a way of being in the world and a critique of the careful social scripts that usher even the most queer among us through major markers of individual development and into normativity.36

The way in which Halberstam uses “hetero” raises attention to heteronormative restrictions and determinations of time and sometimes, also, to the disjuncture in individual’s biographies. There is hence a disjuncture of becoming in spaces that can or cannot be occupied.37 I think this approach is extremely valuable in order to talk about disjunctures in narratives, and it can be added to the racial time that Hanchard described. Connection to racial time leads Halberstam’s concept to a triple-bind, which describes people of color not only affected by queer but also by racial time, an aspect that I see neither reflected in Halberstam’s nor in Hanchard’s writing as both focuses either exclude the category race, as in Halberstam’s case, or normativity, as in Hanchard’s analysis. My conceptualization of hetero-temporality is not embedded in a discourse of queer/hetero binaries and rather derives from hetero in contrast...
to singular or mono of linear time. It includes racial as well as queer time and reconnects to the gaps in time as described in *Real Time*.

My first impulse to look at Hewitt’s work as hetero-temporal derives from Michel Foucault’s use of heterotopia and the mere etymological derivation of “different.”38 “Different” is seen not as a biologist ascription of sex, but rather as a way of incorporating differences and conclusively multiplicities into the idea of time itself. Copeland’s use of “archival fever” and henceforth its utopic potential and the observation that both aspects appear simultaneously, leads to heterotopia as a space and time concept, which is connected to utopia and nevertheless remains in the present. Foucault’s proposition that he calls heterotopia is described as “probably in every culture, in every civilization, real places—places that do exist and that are formed in the very founding of society—which are something like counter-sites.” He calls them “a kind of effectively enacted utopia in which the real sites, all the other real sites that can be found within the culture, are simultaneously represented, contested, and inverted.”39

Foucault’s notion of heterotopia describes a utopic yet existing “practiced” and nevertheless illusive space—or as I would frame it, a gap—which delineates the border of a society. I argue that Hewitt creates a space of illusory yet existing character that we may not even consciously, and sometimes not willingly, enter and which emphasizes the spatiotemporal dimension. She creates such kind of space through the sculptural layers in her photographs, but instead of demarcating a real space, it is our perception that is challenged by realizing that we perceive the world as well as history through real time.

What I see in these layers of photographs and their relational connectivities is the presence of histories, the multiplicities of being, embodied in the spectator in connection to the art piece. Being in the context of this art piece means to break out of the singularity of our perception, constructions, and identities, and to realize its intrinsic multiplicity—this not within a temporal analogy or linearity, but rather through every minute we breathe.

So hetero-temporality is reconnected to space, but also to the temporalities that photography is able to express and the spectators are capable to perceive. It should thus be understood as intersectional because it includes more than one category and perceives these categories as instable and floating. In *Riffs on Real Time*, Hewitt creates layers of objects concealed within a photograph, that, in their seriality, echo and communicate with each other, constantly reminding and emphasizing historical overlaps and connectedness in a multidirectional polylogue and hetero-temporality.

The histories and presents that Hewitt comprises are histories and multipresences that are often not present in cultural narratives. In other words, she establishes a matter of course of the presence of these marginalized histories with a formal dramaturgy that offers a reading going beyond the racial epidermal schema and rather calls attention to the connectedness of the multiplicities of positions and gazes we inhabit simultaneously; to me this is only the point at which to begin thinking about an idea of Blackness that does not fall into the pitfalls of an idea of totality.

---

38 This notion of difference is also connected to an acceptance of difference or a non-understanding of difference and non-totality deriving from Édouard Glissant’s notion of opacity. It is less concerned with reproductive heteronormativity, but it can implicitly function as a critique of the very same, as Glissant stressed: “If we examine the process of ‘understanding’ people and ideas from the perspective of Western thought, we discover that its basis is this requirement for transparency. In order to understand and thus accept you, I have to reduce. Accepting differences does, of course, upset the hierarchy of this scale. I understand your difference, or in other words, without creating a hierarchy, I relate it to my norm. I admit you to existence, within my system. I create you afresh.—But perhaps we need to bring an end to the very notion of a scale. Displace all reduction.” Édouard Glissant, *Poetics of Relation*, trans. Betsy Wing (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1997), 190.


I learned from a friend's family anecdote why and how that which is between your legs is important. My friend is often confronted with transphobia coming from his family. In one of those numerous family disputes he asked his dad: “Daddy, how do you know that I am not really a man like you, a real grown-up man?” He got the following reply: “Put your hand between your legs and you will know!” My friend, who was a queer and antifascist activist during and after the wars in ex-Yugoslavia, said the following: “But what if I lost my hand in the war? How will I know?”

My friend's story suggests that there is not only a connection between masculinity, body norms, and family relations, but also that these entities depend on the differentiation between war and peacetime. The way a masculine body is created and made socially intelligible transforms according to these temporalities. In times of war, gendered and sexualized differences within kinship relations seem to rely on the exclusion and eradication of memories that show the fragility and limitations of body norms. My friend's father does not or does not want to remember the fragmentation and loss caused by the ex-Yugoslavian wars in the 1990s. All remembrance of the fragmentation of a body’s “wholeness” through national warfare is taken out of the normative framework of his memory and brought back by my friend's reply. According to a linear historization of lifetime and state history, memories such as these, memories of body fragmentation, become queer memories and have to be pushed aside. But what if it is exactly these queer memories that suggest a different way of relating, a different kinship that doesn't rely on daddy’s identification of proper masculinity and its belonging to the nation-state project? Is it possible to link individual and historical time in a different way, through a queer kinship? How does one think about memory, history, and queerness?

The transformation of the European space after the Cold War as mentioned in my friend's story is not only about the wars in ex-Yugoslavia but also about previous times of war: Second World War, the transnational context of National Socialism, fascism, the Holocaust. Comparisons of atrocities to other atrocities, which happened in the wars in ex-Yugoslavia to those of the Holocaust, evoked by pictures made in the Bosnian camp Omarska by ITN journalists in 1992, have shown the incapacity to produce a differentiated remembrance not only between nationalities of former Yugoslavia but also regarding previous historical events. Omarska, a mining complex transformed into a camp in the Bosnian War, was featured in a report by journalists Penny Marshall and Ian Williams who used a visual vocabulary that reminded one of atrocity images of Nazi concentration camps. A video still from the report was later put under the headline “Belsen 92” by the British newspaper Daily Mirror suggesting a return of traumatic memories of the Holocaust. What was called “Vergangenheitsbewältigung” between 1945 and 1989, an official dealing with the past regulated by nation-state structures, was strongly put into question in postwar
transformations of the Cold War by images such as these. Mostly a politics of memory, which suggested these histories to be in conflict and competition, regulated remembrance of both historical events. Claiming clear identification of history and memory seems increasingly difficult when the wars in ex-Yugoslavia are compared to the Holocaust. One of the most urgent political and social issues of the present is figuring out how to represent both events in a way that clarifies their similarities and differences. It calls for a thinking about history and lifetime from a queer perspective in which queer memories would not be excluded from a normative framework of remembrance but made productive for a linking of historical time and individual time. Creating a queer family album that can transform to a queer archive of historical references might be a way to open different practices of remembrance and a different way to historicize—queer potentiality to consider.

I have chosen six images to show me and my three daddies. Among them is a baby picture. In the lower left corner a dark stain indicates that somebody was holding a camera in order to take these pictures. The gesture makes the photographer present and suggests proximity between the baby and a probably beloved person. Is it “me” as a baby asking the reader and viewer of the family album to identify his three daddies in six pictures? Or does the “me” belong to the boy-girl in General Idea’s Nazi milk? In front of a bright orange background holding a glass of white fluid close to his white mustache, this figure shows the main masculine symbol of Nazism as just a childish trace. For the artist group General Idea, who worked with the heteronormative triangle of mom/dad/baby and shifted its social meaning in their artwork, the outcome of having three daddies could definitely be a baby or a baby Nazi. But the Nazi could also be a daddy for someone else in this collection, and then there would be already four daddies for one baby. One cannot be sure what happened first and what kind of kinship is reliable in this queer album of family relations. The photographer’s gesture, which transforms to an arm holding a glass of milk transforms to a sleeve with glittery swastikas on Helmut Berger’s glamorous uniform. The 1970s actor became famous not only for his Nazi roles but also for his drag performances as Marlene Dietrich; therefore there are two pictures showing her.

There might be more security about artist Boban Stojanović’s queer performance, although in this context the gesture of a dancing queen might be closer to the Nazi salute. Stojanović’s performance at a queer cabaret in Belgrade in 2008 related past and present day fascisms to each other in postwar Serbia. His performance centered on the triangle of the holy family, the nation-state, and fascism. The daddy circle is closed with Fikret Alić shaking hands directly with the viewer of atrocity images. Alić became known as the emaciated man photographed standing behind barbwire as a prisoner of the Omarska camp. He escaped the camp by employing a wartime drag survival strategy: dressed in women’s clothes, he was to be taken to another camp for forced sexual labor, but managed to escape and survived. This image of him was taken recently evoking memories of the camp in the Bosnian War as well the Holocaust, and it still produces the same inability to clearly identify memories of these historical events. What is it that brings together those images and actors in a familial relation? What is behind the desire of a fictional “I” to make them daddies across time, space, and history?

Elisabeth Freeman suggests that there is a connection between moments of historical rupture and sexual dissidence, and that “the pleasures of queerness can be found in the interstices of national-political life.” According to Freeman’s thought one might think of a connection between queerness and a way of relating in times of transformation and war that is not bound to familial relations and national historization, but offers possibilities for a different kinship. All figures in the queer family album are supposed to be in close relation to one another; the pictures show that they are connected through queer memories of body language and gestures that create similarities across space and time. Remembrance is implemented for a desire to create connections in contrast to a normative framework of remembering exclusively some events and forgetting others.

Many theorists have explored this relation of memory and desire. Kaja Silverman speaks of unconscious memory, which plays a crucial role for desire and relationality. The subject situates the other in “libidinally saturated and specifically visual memories” in order to establish a relation. All figures in the queer family album seem to have memories of Nazism, but they use symbols, objects, and gestures to create queer pleasures of drag, dancing, posing, dressing up, and acting among each other. These memories are involuntary or unconscious for Silverman, while for Marianne Hirsch, a theorist in Holocaust studies, they are part of a “postmemory,” which allows the second and third generation of Holocaust survivors to articulate a remembrance that was not directly experienced but transferred through family relations. In both cases, memory is employed in order to create a field of relations, not by rejecting memories of traumatic events and traumatic experience, but by making them central to a potentiality to remember and relate.

Instead of excluding some memories as queer and unfitting, it turns out that there is a queerness of memory itself, which doesn’t allow clear identifications of historical events, nor individual heteronormative lives. The images I have chosen for a queer family album show one possible way of working with these memories. Drag performance, queer activism, and strategies of survival activate a specific memory that is not exclusively an instrument for linear, national, and familial historicity, but is open for temporalities, practices, and knowledge formations, which include the very embodiment of neglect, erasure, and effacement. The family album offers the possibility to work with the queerly remembered and their link to desire, instead of conflict and competition. Taking into account that a normative framework of remembering and forgetting is insufficient to describe relations of history and lifetime could also mean including politics of memory in Judith Butler’s thinking about precariousness: to be concerned with the very conditions which endanger memory and make it precarious for subjects to remember; and to use memory as enabling a perception of precariousness and vulnerability of other traumatic events, others’ experiences.


Literature


When asked to explain my interest in strategies of historical return or, more specifically, my focus on protest and protest movements from the ’60s and ’70s, I often refer to the fact that I was born in 1970. I go on to elaborate my general understanding that we absorb much of the historical specificity of our first decade of life though we are unable to intellectually process the events of the world as our own conscious experiences. Parallel to this response, I also describe what I have come to understand as my generational specificity: moving to NYC in the middle of the AIDS crisis. As a twenty-one-year-old who had just recently come out and was not yet an artist, I landed, in 1991, in a community that was besieged by the crisis. Generationally and situationally, it was not my close friends who were dying but those people eight, nine, twelve years older than me—artists, dancers, writers, filmmakers, performers, activists—people I had just met, people I was aspiring to be. A decade later, in conversation with a group of artists six, nine, eleven years younger than me, I became aware that my relationship to the AIDS crisis was equally distinct from theirs, which involved no lived relationship to those urgent and intense years in New York City in the ’90s.
Although these understandings both have deep relevance to my practice as an artist, I recently found myself thinking again about the formative impact of my encounter with feminism, an encounter that, historically speaking, occurred in a moment of time in between the two that I typically elaborate as impactful to the temporal strategies of my work. And I found myself thinking again about the way in which this encounter with feminism shapes both the content and the form of my work as well as the way in which I regard the work’s temporal relations.

My encounter with feminism happened mundanely in a sense. I went to a lecture in 1989, the spring semester of my first year in college, by an activist named Ann Simonton. A former fashion model, Simonton stopped modeling in 1980 and began protesting against the practices of the fashion and beauty industries. Her talk, which she continues to give in various forms, was called “Sex, Power and the Media.” To me, at age eighteen, the lecture was a revelation. Thinking back on that memory now, what was so alarming and exhilarating about Simonton’s lecture was its simplicity. She was simply showing images of women from fashion and media. They were pictures that I saw multiple times every day though, of course, it was as if I was seeing them for the first time. The experience was a total cliché—a clichéd political awakening but one no less effective for being predictable. I remember sitting shocked in the lecture hall after the talk. Within weeks, I joined the college Women’s Association and started calling myself a feminist. As this memory returned to me a year or so ago, I realized that my experience of becoming a feminist happened within an intensely complicated temporality that I barely understood at the time.

I encountered Simonton on the lecture circuit in 1989. The moment of her political awakening/activism was the early ‘80s. The college that I was attending in the spring of 1989, once an all-male college, accepted its first coed class in 1972, the same year that the Equal Rights Amendment passed both the US House of Representatives and the Senate. The decision by the college to start accepting women was part of a national trend of accelerating change in which single-sex institutions transitioned to coeducation. This trend was motivated by social and political pressures, some of which were brought on by the activism of the early ‘70s feminist movement, as well as by economic imperatives with regard to continued enrollment growth. In the late ‘70s several women activists at the college I attended organized a political group called the Women’s Association. By 1982 this group had secured a designated space, called the Women’s Resource Center, for feminist activities. When I joined the group shortly after attending Simonton’s lecture, I had no idea that the organization was only ten years old, nor that they had only had a designated space for six years. It is curious to recognize, in retrospect, the ways in which I assumed that the conditions of my immediate environment were stable, that they existed almost without history.

The US Constitutional Amendment known as the ERA or Equal Rights Amendment was originally written by suffragist Alice Paul in 1923 and was introduced to every session of Congress from 1923 until its passage in 1972. Its central provision states: “Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.” From 1972 on, feminists fought for its requisite ratification. In 1982, the last of its deadlines for ratification passed without the full thirty-eight states necessary and the Amendment was determined to have failed ratification. The same Amendment has been reintroduced into every session of Congress since 1982.
In 2007, while researching the short-lived gay liberation movement in New York City, I came across an image shot by a photographer named Diana Davies. The image is of a woman named Donna Gottschalk standing on the street at the 1970 Christopher Street Liberation Day parade wearing a placard around her neck that reads: “I Am Your Worst Fear, I Am Your Best Fantasy.”

I used the image in the publicity material advertising two large-scale public performances I organized at the Democratic National Convention and the Republican National Convention in 2008. An artist named Michaela Griffo, who was working with the Walker Art Center in Minneapolis, saw the image and relayed to me through one of the Walker curatorial staff that she made the sign with Gottschalk the night before the CSLD parade in 1970.

We have a familiar way to understand these relationships to history. Gottschalk and Griffo lived gay liberation and I did not. They were there and I was not. But actually, my encounter with feminism leads me to consider a more complicated set of relations to history and to commonness.

In the first chapter of her book *The Human Condition*, Hannah Arendt writes:

> The term “public” signifies two closely interrelated but not altogether identical phenomena:

> It means, first, that everything that appears in public can be seen and heard by everybody and has the widest possible publicity. For us, appearance—something that is being seen and heard by others as well as by ourselves—constitutes reality. Compared with the reality which comes from being seen and heard, even the greatest forces of intimate life—the passions of the heart, the thoughts of the mind, the delights of the senses—lead an uncertain, shadowy kind of existence unless and until they are transformed, deprivatized and deindividualized, as it were, into a shape to fit them for public appearance. [...] Each time we talk about things that can be experienced only in privacy or intimacy, we bring them out into a sphere where they will assume a kind of reality which, their intensity notwithstanding, they never could have had before. The presence of others who see what we see and hear what we hear assures us of the reality of the world and ourselves.1

I’m interested both in the possibility and the limitation of Arendt’s notion of public appearance.

---

If what appeared to me through my mundane and clichéd political awakening through feminism was both a set of conditions vis-à-vis gender, money, and power and a community of people who called themselves feminists who were addressing the inequity and constraint of those conditions, then my experience is common to any number of people who also had the coincidence of awakening to the conditions of gender inequity and to the possibility of a political identification at the same time. In this sense, my encounter with feminism also offered me the possibility of being in-common with any number of feminists from the '70s or '80s. In fact, in the lecture room of my story, I was in-common with this feminist from an earlier moment of feminism, I was in-common with the event which formulated her own political consciousness, her event became or initiated my event and, in so doing, feminism offered the possibility, in this sense, that we were part of a shared public.

This description is, in some ways, very close to a simplified one of my identifying with activists or activism from an earlier moment, and so conjuring myself in some kind of communion with them; but here I am trying to assert the distinction of being in-common to being in communion. I am trying to speak toward the possibility of a different relationship than that of identification; I am trying to speak toward something more foundational to our lived experience of politics that I also think is always at the base of my work.

Reexamining my relationship to feminism has allowed me also to see again but with a deeper understanding, that my work is grounded in an experience of a given present moment and, therefore, a given public (in Arendt’s sense of appearance) as composed of and through many temporalities that exist simultaneously. What I am doing in my work is not returning to anything, but rather attempting to speak from an understanding of public and from an understanding of my own public relations as composed of and through multiple temporalities that are held together in a singular moment.

To further elaborate this argument, I will address three strategies or methodologies that I’ve used in my work in relation to three specific artworks.

The first methodology is one that I call “respeaking.” In 2003, I made two works utilizing a performative strategy of respeaking, one of which was a performance and video work called Symbionese Liberation Army (SLA) Screeds #13, 16, 20 & 29.

In this piece, I was interested in layering two moments of time on top of one another: the initial historical moment when Patty Hearst and the SLA, a group of about eight people with names and profiles known to the public at that moment, and the moment that I was a woman living in the same time zone, watching the same television shows, reading the same newspapers, and calling myself a feminist (in Arendt’s sense of appearance) as composed of and through many temporalities that exist simultaneously. What I am doing in my work is not returning to anything, but rather attempting to speak from an understanding of public and from an understanding of my own public relations as composed of and through multiple temporalities that are held together in a singular moment.

To further elaborate this argument, I will address three strategies or methodologies that I’ve used in my work in relation to three specific artworks.

The first methodology is one that I call “respeaking.” In 2003, I made two works utilizing a performative strategy of respeaking, one of which was a performance and video work called Symbionese Liberation Army (SLA) Screeds #13, 16, 20 & 29.
point in time, made four separate audio tapes in some underground safe house in Northern California in 1974; and the performed moment, in 2003, when I respeak Patty Hearst’s text in front of four separate audiences of people. I told each of the audiences that I had partially memorized the text, and I asked them to correct me when I was wrong. The audience of each of the four performances, the audience that vocalizes, that you can hear on the tape but can’t see, is to some extent cast in the position of the SLA, not theatrically but structurally, as I am cast in the position of Hearst, again not theatrically but structurally.

I’m interested in several questions raised by this collapse. What is the nature of a speech act and how does it locate one in position or identity? The words I speak in the video don’t have the same kind of ownership as a novel, a play, or a political speech even. The words are collectively authored. Collectively authored in the sense that in 1974, the primary question raised by the case, both in terms of popular sentiment and criminal guilt, was precisely who is literally “speaking?” (in essence, who should be held responsible for those words?) Was it the SLA through the figure of Hearst, or Hearst on the behalf of the SLA, or Hearst independently speaking for herself for the first time in her young nineteen years of age? But I mean collectively authored also in the literal sense that in each performance, I speak what had already been spoken at a particular moment in 1974 and, in so doing, transmit the text once again to a set of listeners/viewers who, being addressed in the present moment, literally receive the spoken words.

In the most practical sense, respeaking describes a form of performance in which I filter a spoken text through a process of interpretation (a sort of oral transmission) that is necessarily informed by the temporal gap that exists between two moments of enunciation: the original and the respeoken. This work is not reenactment. Respeaking is not about a seamless or authentic transmission; on the contrary, it is resistant to such tidiness. The transmission and reception of the text is halted, fragmented, and distorted, making it impossible to access the past moment as any kind of projected wholeness. This respeaking asserts that I am not Hearst, the speaking audience is not the SLA and the time is not 1974. In so doing, it inserts the political urgencies, demands, violence, and impotencies of the text into a present moment and forces consideration of it as a text not of the past, but as a text in and of the present moment.

---

**Speaker:** Dad, Mom, I’m making this tape so that you know that I’m still okay.

**Audience:** to let you know...

**Speaker:** ...to let you know. Dad, Mom, I’m making this tape to let you know that I’m still okay and to explain a few things I hope. First about the good faith gesture, there...there’s been some misunderstanding.

**Audience:** ...there was some...

**Speaker:** ...and that they have every intention that you should be able to meet their demands. But the SLA is not...

**Audience:** ...they were not trying...

**Speaker:** ...they were not trying to present an unreasonable request. It was never intended that you feed the whole state so what ever you come up with is basically okay. Just do it as fast as...

**Audience:** ...and just...

**Speaker:** ...and just do it as fast as you can and everything will be fine. Umm...but the SLA is really mad about certain attempts to make the feeding of food be the receiving of goods that were gotten by extortion

**Audience:** ...and they

**Speaker:** ...and they. what else?

**Audience:** don’t want...

**Speaker:** And they don’t want people to be harassed by the police or by anybody else. So...

**Audience:** And...

**Speaker:** And I hope you can do something about that. And if you can’t, well, I mean, they’ll do something about it. Also...

**Audience:** So.

**Speaker:** So I hope you can do something about that?

**Audience:** So you shouldn’t...

**Speaker:** So you shouldn’t worry about that too much. Also I would like to emphasize that I am alive and that I am well and that, in spite what certain tape experts seem to think, I mean I’m fine. Really?

**Audience:** It’s really...

**Speaker:** It’s

**Audience:** ...it’s really depressing...

**Speaker:** in spite what certain tape experts seem to think, I mean I’m fine. It’s really depressing to hear people talk about me like I’m dead. I can’t explain what it’s like.

**Audience:** What it does...

**Speaker:** What it does. What it does is that it begins to convince people that maybe I’m dead and if everybody is convinced that I’m dead, then it gives the FBI an excuse...

**Audience:** Well, it gives...

**Speaker:** If everybody is convinced that I’m dead, well it gives the FBI an excuse to come in here and get me out.
The second temporal strategy that I use in my work is anachronism. In the Near Future is a performance-based work in which I stage anachronistic and speculative protest actions in an ongoing investigation into the figure of the protester, the speech act of the protest sign, and the contemporary political construction of public space and public speech. In the Near Future exists in two parts: the first part is a series of performative actions and the second is an installation in which the photographic documents of these actions are projected from multiple slide projectors.

The performative actions of In the Near Future are not constructed as a reenactment of a past protest but as anachronism. As anachronisms, they are out of their temporal place, misplaced in time, errors in chronology. For the audience to the actions, the encounter produces an experience of the uncanny. The scene is familiar, but can’t quite be placed. I look like a protestor, but the event is not a protest. In this embodied action, the action functions as a stutter, evoking the memory of a past protest and the possibility of a future one, but moving neither forward nor backward.

The anachronism or conditionality of each sign’s slogan disrupts the familiarity produced by the ubiquitous scene and image of a person holding a protest sign, and it confuses the usually direct claim of a protester. Instead of making a demand, the action(s) function outside the register of a typical protest action and raise questions. The initial questions are perhaps just quizzical: Why is this white woman holding an “I am a Man” sign? Why is that young woman asking “Who Approved the War in Vietnam?” These initial confusions and curiosities lead to more complicated questions addressed to the present moment with its rich and confused sense of time: How does the speech act of the protest make meaning? What is the relation between the words of the slogan, the body that carries that slogan, and the time and place in which it is held? What constitutes an act of public resistance at a given current political moment?

Additionally informing the work was the complex relationship between an event and, what I called, the not-event of its document. Photographs or recordings of political events, political traumas in particular, circulate through a vast range of time and space. Many political events/traumas circulate via images that we can conjure without reproduction, the ones that position us as witnesses to events that we do not coincide with physically or temporally, ones that circulate across time and space, not in relation to a coherent timeline, but rather in chaotic relation to our singular and collective identifications. By this I mean that these “arresting images” don’t accumulate like an
ever-expanding archive, but rather that we (individually and collectively) cathect to specific images; we choose and are chosen by certain documents of certain events. Through these relationships, we accumulate a field of events to which we are witnesses, not passive observers of a thing that has past, but watchers with collective and individual spectatorial responsibility in the present moment.

I use various literal quotations quite thoroughly in In the Near Future, and while the primary operation of the work is that of anachronism, its citational impulse intrigued me so much that I utilized it more directly in I March in the Parade of Liberty But as Long as I Love You I Am Not Free. The work is a performance and a sound installation. It is the second in a series of works addressing the relationship between personal and political desire, and between
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Sharon Hayes, I March in the Parade of Liberty But as Long as I Love You I Am Not Free, 2007–08
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Sharon Hayes, I March in the Parade of Liberty But as Long as I Love You I Am Not Free, 2007–08, excerpt of script (facing page)
love and politics. In the first of this series, *Everything Else Has Failed! Don’t You Think It’s Time For Love?*, I emerged from the corporate headquarters of UBS in midtown Manhattan, at the corner of 51st Street and Avenue of the Americas, at lunchtime everyday for a work week, to speak to an anonymous lover. Beginning “My dear lover” or “My sweet lover,” the texts I spoke were addressed to an unnamed “you” to whom I, as the speaker, was separated from for an unexplained reason. Woven in between comments on and about personal longing and desire were comments about politics, war, and the trauma and dislocation of living in a moment of war. By inserting “private correspondence” into a scene of public speech, *Everything Else Has Failed! Don’t You Think It’s Time For Love?* provoked questions about the territory of the “political” and the “unspeakable” as it relates to love, enforced normativity, and the mythic notion of “free speech.”

In this work, I specifically butched up a bit so that the text, and the desire it spoke, would not slide into heteronormativity. I found myself thinking a lot about that choice and about the political specificity of queer desire and love. In an attempt to understand this specificity, I went back to examine a historical political movement that I thought I knew, but realized that I didn’t—the very short-lived political movement of Gay Liberation. This research became integral to the second work in the series, *I March In The Parade of Liberty But as Long as I Love You I Am Not Free.*

For eight days between December 1, 2007 and January 12, 2008, I walked from the New Museum at Bowery and Prince Streets in lower Manhattan to a different site of public address, stopping at street corners every few blocks and speaking a single, repeated love address to an anonymous and unnamed lover. Drawing from sources such as *De Profundis*, Oscar Wilde’s letter to Lord Alfred Douglas, and slogans from early gay liberation parades in New York City, the “love address” uses so-called private speech to get to the emotional imbrication of promise and disappointment in collective political action. In a literal sense, the text that I speak is highly citational, constructed out of equal parts original and found text; but I am also interested in the possibility that citation can help elucidate the way in which the work agitates the limits of and the constitutive conditions of public speech. By this I mean to posit a relationship between two forms of citation in the work: one being the textual citation of multiple texts, including gay liberation slogans and Oscar Wilde’s desperate, tenacious, and unsatisfied love; and the other being the physical citation of a public speech act. I also mean to point toward the possibility of citation to willfully recontextualize a text or action: to willfully confuse public with private address, to willfully confuse the landscape of war and protest with desire and disappointment, and to willfully confuse mainstream gay rights with the voice of gay liberation.

These three methodologies—citation, anachronism, and respeaking—allow me precise forms, performance forms, through which to materialize various sets of social, political, economic, and emotional relations that cross time and space. I am not interested in the transhistoric as an operation without foundation, as a means through which any bodies that did not coexist in the same time and place can be gathered together to fictionally appear. Rather, I mine these transhistoric relations to uncover, in the present moment, a given historic genealogy that was willfully obscured or erased; or to unspool a historic trajectory so that another present or future moment might have been, or might be, possible.

**Literature**


A couple of years ago there was an outburst of protests in Canada, triggered by the design of the new one hundred-dollar bill. On the banknote you see a woman leaning over a microscope, a depiction that is supposed to celebrate Canada's medical innovations. The protesting originated from the fact that the woman by the microscope had facial features that looked slightly Asian. Critical voices were raised from all sides, but one of the objections was that the banknote was racist, as it "represents a stereotype of Asians excelling in technology and/or the sciences."

I remember reading this, and I was like “Wuh, can’t imagine the agony, just walking the streets of Vancouver or Montreal, then suddenly someone calls out ‘Look a scientist!’ and I go, ‘Oh my God, he called me a scientist, I guess nothing left for me to do but go straight home and commit suicide.’”

So now, I turn to Canada with a sincere request: Can we please swap stereotypes? You can get ours and we’ll get yours. So all Asian-looking women in Sweden, Denmark, and Norway can cruise around, feeling the impact of being a scientist for a day, and
you, my Canadian counterparts, will in you turn experience what the relationship between a one hundred-dollar bill and Asian women really signifies, in Scandinavia. No need to be a scientist, to figure that out, dude.

A stereotype often exaggerates or represents something in a false or overly simplified manner. But if we turn to Homi Bhabha, he stresses that stereotypes above all constitute anxious, colonial knowledge. What makes a stereotype racist is thus not only its content. It has to do with time, something that is represented as unchangeable and fixed. Stereotypes are arrested language, arrested time. To counter them, we have to put them in motion again. How?

To start with, red lipstick. Makeup can be coded as politically charged whenever it doesn’t reproduce certain gender stereotypes. And, above all in relation to transgressive sexual identification, makeup will be seen as something subversive.

But I don’t want to talk about subversiveness (only) I want to talk about kissing. And it’s not about gender performativity (only). It’s about time. Time to talk about history.

For which subjects does history become a bodily matter? Matter that any second can transform into erotic matter? Answer: for the subjects who throughout their lives have been identified as, precisely, bodies, and as the body, as we know, is excluded from production of knowledge, these subjects are unrecognized, trivialized, marginalized, repressed, forgotten, closed, or quite simply, erased.

How do we do then, to remember them? Well. We have to get in touch, literally, we have to reach out and get in touch with the body that has been erased from our production of knowledge: the female body, the body of color, the disabled body, etc. (I hate that “etc.,” you get it from all scholars just playing safe, you know, making sure nobody’s been left out.)

Back to the kisses. Red lipstick. Makeup. Feels good to do this. More. Red. Why do some people feel this urge to put on too much lipstick? Why is it that the sheer applying turns you on? Makes you excited? What is it about applying lipstick, in a mirror, that connects you to a deep, deep desire? You can’t describe it, only that it feels like you are doing something forbidden, shameful. You shouldn’t be doing it. You should be ashamed of yourself, for doing this. Why?

The stereotypes have definitively something to do with the act of doing make up as connected to shame and desire. Many stereotypes or insults: the slut, the whore, the pervert, etc., are connected to sexuality, in some way. Those are the most shameful, because they aim at your intimate life. And the shame and hurt intensifies, because one can neither affirm nor deny...
them—however you do, you lose, ‘cause neither a “yes,” or a “no,” can undo its performative working; it’s already too late. In other words: denying and refusing can’t take away, it might on the contrary strengthen its effects. Because when confronted with the speech acts that we call provocations, or insults, an answer in terms of truthfulness or falseness is not valid, because the performative is a question of force and effect, and the answer must answer precisely in that mode. Force, and effect.

How?

Counter-performing.

More lipstick.

Puncture the stereotype with a greater force, not as parody, not subversive performativity, more like, temporal drag, or, so I am not risking reproducing yet another stereotype here (i.e., the drag artist), I might say “mimicry,” temporal mimicry: red lipstick can uncover not only stereotypes but, most important, the history of stereotypes. All the red lips that were silenced and shut in the past. The red stages a connection with the shameful, the guilt, the grief, everything that contemporary society wants to clear and hide away by putting on the market a more acceptable stereotype—the scientist. When lipstick becomes part of temporal mimicry, its main task is not to embellish. Rather on the contrary. The main task is providing a resistance against progress. I mean progress in the chrononormative sense: one where all sluts neatly will transform into scientists, eventually.

But progress that is not taking into account history, is no progress at all. Temporal mimicry constitutes a resistance, it requires that we impose an unwanted and repressed history upon the present. Elizabeth Freeman calls it “a usefully distorting pull backward.”

Temporal mimicry might in this case function as an anachronistic haunting: not a hateful one, but a necessary one, one of desire. Because there’s so much stolen desire, so many unkissed red lips. Going back and kissing your specters can be a good strategy, especially if the stereotypes that are haunting you are sluts. You know, they’ll give in to you, eventually.
Far Now
The Fugitive Archetype of Resistance and Her Ever-Changing Now (aka “We Go Back to the Future to Tell Our Stories”)

Jamika Ajalon

All my life I felt as if there was something I was forgetting, but I couldn’t prove it. Everything that should be there was there, my date of birth, my parents’ names, grandparents’ names, my address, my own name, but I had this infatigable feeling that I was missing someone or someplace, someplace that felt like home. Someplace where who I was made sense. Even as I was still figuring that out, I knew the person I was asked time and time to be, or the person I was told I was, was not that person. But I had no evidence. I figured it must have been lost in transit. I was a space cowboi blue.

Space cowboi blue

Home
Wherever I lay my hat
is where I belong
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Fig. 21–28: Jamika Ajalon, We Go Back to the Future to Tell Our Stories, 2013.
I’m always
Gone
Like a rolling stone
beat in the bone
beat in the bone

She’s a space cowboy blue
Azonal
Where she be, in between spaces
She moves between places
Leaving traces
Investigating interzonal cases
Representing
Unheard unseen
In between
Breaking out stasis
Radio static oasis
the place my microphone graces
Let her tighten up her laces
Rocket boots charged
She trip thru dimensions

Frequency sensation
disciple of creation
be patient
she moves in all directions
with out detection
Breaking the cage
with all this rage fueling
her rocket boots flying
high high
swallow up the sky
singing bye bye

She’s a space blues cowboy
Home
wherever my hat is
I belong
I am always
gone
Like a rolling stone
beat in the bone
beat in the bone
like a rolling stone
beat in the bone

she defy

Escher staircases
while she lie
in waiting
to see what the winds of change
will make she
carry no flags
just notebooks and rag takes
rewiring the matrix
she exists in azonal spaces
autonomous zones
transmitting code
thru radio static oasis
the place my microphone graces
let me tighten up my laces
rocket boots charged
she trips thru dimensions

Frequency sensation
disciple of creation
be patient
she moves in all direction
with out detection
Breaking the cage
with all this rage fueling
my rocket boots flying
high high
swallow up the sky
singing bye bye

Space cowboi blue, she is a direct descendent of the totem FAR, or Fugitive
Archetype of Resistance. For some time I have explored the possibilities and
narratives of WOC (women of color) as FAR. Not that she uniquely holds this
post, but rather that she holds this post uniquely—her intersectionality makes
her the subject most likely to become FAR. What I want to suggest is how her
very existence disrupts chrono-political narratives, and how her knowledge of
this reality fuels an agency. She creates extraordinary tomes in Othered time
zones.
A fugitive archetype skews the eyeline of majoriborg surveillance—it’s hidden in plain view, resisting assimilation. To acquiesce is to be destroyed. WOC cross and blur borders, simultaneously visible and nonexistent in Othered places. We are multiple linguists; in order to cross borders we must be like a secret agent. Our true voice is criminal. Our language, experiences, and articulations destabilize the dominant pejorative. A fugitive archetype is one that escapes or slips through the cracks of the fixed “law” or “ethic.” It doesn’t claim the permanence of “the origin,” but challenges the notion of the symbolic “pure” by mixing, blending, leaving, returning, and mixing and blending again.

We must keep moving to avoid detection. Once scanned via majoriborg surveillance we become co-opted inside consumption junction’s snow machine. We become spectacles within the minds and histories of those who design the majoriborg calendar. Fodder for memes and digital postcards.

(Repeat)

We must keep moving to avoid detection. Once scanned via majoriborg surveillance, we become co-opted inside consumption junction’s snow machine. We become spectacles within the minds and histories of those who design the majoriborg calendar. Fodder for memes and digital postcards.

What’s real, as we know, depends on who’s framing the story.

From myth to legend perhaps WOC exist within a kind of ontological alchemy. WOC as a fugitive archetype is azonal; borders do not exist for the FAR. Reflecting the FAR, our nomadic subjectivities are largely azonal, though at times “rest” in TAZ. The azonal is inter-dimensional, as it exists outside of all zones, including time. Understanding this we can begin to assert that the FAR not only changes over time, but transverses and transcends time and space, like an inter-dimensional nomad. Our intersectionality ensures, as previously discussed, subjectivities which are constantly moving (nomadic). WOC, as artists, academics, etc., have established and will reestablish that we speak in many tongues, that our subjectivities are in constant negotiation, a constant state of “becoming.” As a result, the zones we inhabit are not static. As we move (not unlike migrating vegetation), we leave memory seeds behind. These seeds fall in unsuspecting places, later creating spontaneous “settlements” of resistance. Flux creates the condition of (mental) time travel, better known as re-remembering or re-memory (Toni Morrison, 1987). Under dominant power structures, the memories of the Other are subsumed under the overarching memory that informs how we interpret force-fed realities—memory both reinforces our realities but also informs our possible futures resisting the constrictors of the majoriborg timeline.
This ability to speak in different tongues was/is a learned survival skill. The language perception and therefore histories of the majoriborg narratives, while they claim to include us, include only a hologram of us, an image projected onto our beings and replicated through mass media tropes. It's a kind of psychic violence that insists on telling us we are something that we are not, that our memories are wrong, that our lived timelines are obsolete at best, impossible and nonexistent at worst. In order to survive it we must be able to shift between different paroles and timelines, time zones. We go back to the future to retell our stories. With out this skill we could not exist.

In General Tubman’s time she used her intersectional skills as well as her ability to speak in many tongues, in short, her wits, to not only survive, but to also free others. Her niece once said of her:

“Aunt Harriet was one of those unusual Souls. Her religion, her dreams or visions were so bound together nobody, and I certainly should not attempt it, could separate them. Aunt Harriet was a member of an oppressed race. She had the ruggedness and common sense of one whose very existence depended upon wits (my emphasis). In her, one found stubborn tenacity of purpose. Her real strength was in the inspiration of the mystic, as well as sagacity.”

She was a wise woman. She knew that she was being recorded and chose her words carefully so that one could read between the lines if need be. She hid in plain view and skewed the eyeline of the surveillance camera. Who knows, maybe she even reinvented her stories to ensure their place in history.

I like to imagine Tubman as a time traveller, that during her moments of narcolepsy, when she had visions, that she was lucid about seeing the future. Perhaps when she told the story of her adventures she used the metaphor of God speaking to her because she knew what she was really experiencing would not be believed.
WOC have unbelievable realities. Intersectionality disrupts homogenous perception and disturbs majoriborg order. Her existence is an anomaly: unusual, freakish, fantastic. From Sara Baartman (aka Hottentot Venus) to Castor Semenya, it is easy to see how WOC have symbolized the grotesque, or the bizarre. We understand that our positioning is necessary to stabilize the monoreality of the majoriborg. (Much like the Oracle’s position in The Matrix.)

The discerning eye can sense complicity between the construction/deconstruction of difference and standardization. The distortion of difference is complicit to a standardization in which past, present, and future are imagined and represented under majoriborg rule. When we speak of futurism, the dominant definition is one of speed and technological advancement of the machine, a misogynistic, fascist machine again and again “conquering” otherness and difference. In the film The Matrix, the Oracle acts as a necessary anomaly in the system, while simultaneously threatening the very system that created her. The bizarre is a necessary anomaly. It occurs in spite of our precautions disturbing the idea of “reality” we have consumed. “Consumed” is a very operative word in this epoch where consummation has become a shackle; we are slaves to fabricated economies. But the bizarre is more powerful than any of these chains as it appears, seemingly, out of nowhere, disturbing our sense of what is real and what is to be. It demands that we question our presumptions of “normality.” Where the presumptive becomes “law,” the bizarre and the “grotesque” are outlaws. WOC, as outlaws, can utilize the FAR as totem. Under this totem we distort the “original” pathos of the futurist; we are eccentric futurists. The definition of eccentric is two-fold: 1) a departure from the established norm or pattern (synonym-strange); 2) not located in the center, the axis located elsewhere. In physics the eccentric is described as a disk or wheel having its axis of revolution displaced from its center so that it is capable of imparting reciprocating motion. Reciprocating motion: the ability to move forward and backward alternately; to recur in vicissitude; to act interchangeably; to alternate.

As eccentric futurists we are imagineers predicting and producing fantastic futures. To attach fantastic (so extreme as to challenge belief) to futurist
speaks to the power of our imaginings; we empower our positions within the matrix as symbols of the bizarre or grotesque, by (re)creating the fantastic in our own image.

This is what Octavia Butler did in her science fiction, perhaps most notably in her last book, *Fledgling*.

In *Fledgling*, Shori, a black fifty-year-old vampire in the body of what appears to be an eleven-year-old girl, wakes up in a cave badly injured and with amnesia. During the course of the story we learn, simultaneously with the protagonist, that she is the result of vampire-human experimentation. Vampire genes are mixed with an African-American woman’s in an attempt to make it possible for vampires to withstand daylight. We also learn that there are many old-school vampires who are dead against this miscegenation and work to destroy Shori’s entire family. Ironically, it is her ability to withstand the sun that saves her life. What resonated with me, however, was her process of remembering and re-remembering. Though most of the facts about who Shori is and where she comes from are told to her, there are certain things she just knows intuitively:

All my life I felt as if there was something I was forgetting, there was a huge gap in my memory but I couldn’t prove it. Everything that should be there was there, my date of birth, my parents’ names, grandparents’ names, my ad-

dress, my own name, but I had this infatigable feeling that I was missing someone or someplace, someplace that felt like home. Someplace where who I was made sense. Even as I was still figuring that out, I knew the person I was asked time and time to be, or the person I was told I was, was not that person. But I had no evidence. I figured it must have been lost in transit.

I forgot my roots my/suspected it/validated it thru research and the regeneration of rememory cells archiving/past and future selves simultaneously. But re-memory is not simply something awakened in the cerebral, it is also seeded in genes and left in traces by our surroundings. Even if collective memory, for example, was erased and historical events like the picnic massacres of newly freed slaves were forgotten, the trees would still “remember” the rotting bodies that hung from them winter through summer. The bullet-pocked concrete in Bosnia still carries the scars of endless war, an echo that “progress” can erase. Hiroshima reverberates under the skin of Japanese expansion. Bending the majoriborg timeline, we WOC as FAR twist the dominant narratives by using the past collected in each present to map our futures. Re-memory seeds are planted in us genetically, but are also deposited throughout history and now take root. We go back to the future to tell our stories.
DURING MY TRIP TO THE HIGH ARCTIC, a bear-watch warned us on the island,

“Leave nothing but the footprint.”

As I was transferring from the lagged time to the lapsed space, the airport became my favorite place. There, everything is built for the transition. At the Duty Free Zone, everyone is an immigrant.

------------------------> A to B
A perfect place to Be
IT ALL STARTED FIVE YEARS AGO. I was in New York and was about to get kicked out of my studio after graduation. My 8 x 10 ft studio, on the ninth floor on Sixth Avenue had two big windows with extra sunlight. I used to stare outside although jammed office buildings blocked my view too soon.

I didn’t want to cease my stare because I had to vacate my studio. If I can’t have a ninety-degree wall and a flat floor to mess around, I will make something uncontainable. The square footage of a room isn’t enough, anyway.

Shortly before the forced leave of absence, I ordered a yellow hardcase suitcase online. It came with a ten-year warranty and an address slip attached to the side of the suitcase. Which address? By that time, I had lived in six different addresses in Seoul and four in New York. Packing was never an issue. Getting to the new place was.

Leaving the slick address slip blank, I asked my friends in New York to give me their artworks. My grandiose plan was to take those art pieces in yellow suitcase and carry it around the world. Nineteen artists pitched in.

Prior to my departure, I didn’t have a ticket or confirmed itinerary but I did have an unexpired passport.


A preparatory image for a trip to Düsseldorf, 2010.
If I can’t leave anything behind but footprints,
I will take nothing but the air.
Chronopolitics and geopolitics of veils, folds, and interwoven fabrics touch on a very long list of topics like the relationship between visual culture and patriarchy; religion, feminism, and queer politics; and even surveillance, terrorism, racial profiling, and national security. They all intersect even though they function in different temporal registers and have their urgencies. I will look at different models of contemporary artistic research and performative practices dealing with the issue of veils. I want to argue that the artists researching the veil not only inevitably ponder these issues but they also establish new chronopolitical paths and trajectories.

The Archive of Veils/Folds/Events

Where in time or politics can one start a text about the veil, about the folded fabric that while covering one’s identity creates endless inflictions, divides the space into manifold proliferated events of outsides and insides? Should this text start with unfolding its subject from the outside—from the macro-politics of the cultural, the religious, or the political realm of the issue of the veil—or should it start from the inside, from the micro-political space underneath the folds that veil female subjectivity?

I will be looking at different media art projects and artists dealing with the visual and socio-political aspects of wearing veils. I want to argue that they connect singularity and the social production of face (in terms of Deleuze/Guattari conceptualisation of the phrase). Regardless of Deleuze and Guattari’s claim that faciality is part of certain assemblages of power (such as the artworks analyzed further in this text) and regardless of the invisibility of women’s face and body under the veil, my thesis is that the production of face is at the same time connected to singularities which might instigate new subjectivities and entail agency.

1 Some of the events that inspired this text: 1908—protests against wearing the veil in the Ottoman Empire after the Young Turks Revolution. Skopje (Macedonia); 1925—official ban of the veil in Turkey; 1952—ban of the veil in ex-Yugoslavia—communist government issued a law that resulted in Muslim women wearing trench coats and scarfs; November 2, 2004—the murder of Theodoor “Theo” van Gogh (1957–2004), a Dutch film director, film producer, columnist, author, and actor who worked with the Somali-born writer Ayaan Hirsi Ali to produce the film Submission, which criticized the treatment of women and aroused controversy among Muslims. He was assassinated by Mohammed Bouyeri, a Dutch-Moroccan Muslim; 2010—ban of the veil in France; August 25, 2013—Pakistani Imam cuts wife into pieces for refusing to wear veil. A confession written by the cleric stated that his act was “the best way to punish his wife for rebelling against Allah’s orders.”; October 8, 2013—Turkey lifts ninety-year-old ban on Muslim veil at university and work.
3 Ibid., 167–92.
Chronopolitics of the veil function only in sociopolitical and cultural space-time; notably I will argue that the veil could be also understood as a catalyst for an event of production of subjectivity that comes as an offshoot of the event, rather than as a result of dialectically overcoming certain obstacles or contradictions.4

Western philosophy often misconstrues the spatiality of the veil as separate from time in the following ways: a) as a space of the hidden truth that is not in possession of the woman interpreted as the truth.5 b) as the hidden space of the confined female identity.

There are other attempts to understand it as a protected and productive space for a new subjectivity to result despite this confinement. This view developed by the majority of non-Western feminists who defend the existence of the veil with the argument that it can be a protection as well as limitation.

In fact, this text attempts to circumvent the danger of any division in outside/inside metaphors. Rather than focused solely on the spatial and the visual appearance of the veil, I am concerned with the veil structured as event.6 The event marks simultaneously the fold of the space and the time of the veiling similarly as in the “eventual having to do with an event,” as Alain Badiou formulated it.7 Event here means something that compels someone to a new way of being.

For Deleuze, however, the concept of event is interrelated with the concept of fold. According to him “it can be stated that what is folded is only virtual and currently exists only in an envelope, in something that envelops it” and that “the inclusion or inherence is the final cause of the fold.”8

Thus, perceiving the veil/fold as an event challenges normative ideas of the temporal. Similar to Nietzsche’s paradoxical relation between cause and event, the veil is no longer simply the cause or machine of faciality, nor is it its effect. Rather, the relation between veil/fold and event is retroactive, yet still reciprocal: the event causes folds (veils) in the past, while these veils simultaneously point to the potentiality for new events of folding/unfolding in the future.

Historic Conceptualizations of the Veil

Several different conceptualizations regarding spatialization of the veil I should mention here before starting to explore the importance of the eventual and chronopolitical for understanding the veil.

The conceptualization of woman as veiled truth is a romanticized Western metaphor that in philosophical tradition repudiates the possibility to attribute gnoseological or epistemological capability to women. It still entails a kind of modernist belief in only one truth and in one available epistemology that is not accessible to women. According to such assumptions, a woman herself can be only a visualized and spatialized metaphor for the multilayered, veiled truth.

The Greek word for truth, alētheia, entails a presupposed relation with apocalypsis (disclosure, uncovering, unveiling, or revelation). This is the ultimate source for the understanding of truth as something that should be revealed, uncovered, and disclosed. The truth is thus imagined as a core hidden within the manifold and many layered structure to be reached at the end of the process of removing the layers. On the relation between the truth, its disclosure, and the apocalyptic nature of this event, Derrida says:

Unveiling or truth, apophantics of the immanence of the end, or whatever comes down, finally, to the end of the world. Not only truth as revealed truth of a secret on the end or of the secret of the end. Truth itself is the end, the destination, and that truth unveils itself is the advent of the end. Truth is the end and the instance of the last judgement. The structure of truth here would be apocalyptic. And that is why there would be not any truth of the apocalypse that is not the truth of truth.9

The feminist critique of logocentric philosophical thought and of the long tradition of metaphorization of woman usually focuses on the hidden phallogocentrism inscribed in such metaphors. A very rigorous critique of understanding femininity as unjustifiably opposite to rationality and logic (the position

5 Derrida’s account of the relation between philosophy and vision as a questioned medium for acquiring the truth refers back to Kant, Schleiermacher, and others who have introduced the “hermeneutics of the veil,” e.g., Jacques Derrida, “How to Avoid Speaking: Denials,” in Derrida and Negative Theology, trans. Ken Frieden, ed. Harold Coward and Toby Foshay (Albany: NY State University of New York Press, 1992), 41–42.
6 Such notion of an event differs from the common sense understanding of the phenomenon of event where the event entails infinitesimal duration. Many philosophers, like Leibniz, Whitehead, Wittgenstein, Derrida, Deleuze, and Badiou, challenged the usual understanding of an event as whatever is temporally before something else. Bertrand Russell and A. N. Whitehead’s definition from 1936 was based on the assumption that “all the events in space-time have finite duration, […] but still any finite part of an event is an event.”
derived from the denied achievability of truth by women within the context of psychoanalysis and philosophy) is mostly developed by American and French feminism.  

However, there is a fundamental risk in such a critique. It limits itself to circulating within the realm of belief in one truth. It certainly invests in something that it negates because it is again confined to a kind of mission that is prescribed to woman: to be included in the competition for acquiring the right to truth even though she is denied the access to it.  

Veil(s)/Event(s)

Event A: Performing the Veil, Event of Production of Face

The photograph of a young unveiled Albanian woman, taken sometime in the early twentieth century in Bitola by Milton Manaki in his studio on the Širok Sokak, the main street in Bitola, marks an event itself: the staging of the photograph as a photographic performance.

A young beautiful Muslim woman stands in front of the camera. She leans on a bamboo armchair that is strangely standing on two legs only; awry and unstable, it makes us feel as both the chair and the woman can easily succumb any moment. The photograph itself underlines this instability: it has a diagonal crack starting from the left upper corner going all the way down to the right corner. The small transparent tape so unwillingly visible in the bottom witnesses the physical violence, the division of the image put together in order to reconstruct the original setting. The paper positive obviously was made only later, from the original broken glass negative. Having her veil undone, the woman in the photograph smiles very discreetly. Her smile reveals that she is not shy. Still, she knows that although showing her face at least she should not look at the camera lens directly. It is not only the taking off of the veil that creates the impression of tasting the forbidden; it is that flirting pose, the open invitation to looking frozen, documented by the photographer that disturbs and at the same time conforms and confirms the patriarchal order. Taking off the veil was obviously a voluntary act. The excitement and a kind of unexpected confidence of the woman prevails over any fear from the consequences that she
might have had after the moment of taking the photograph, due to the broken rules of social behavior.

“The face is a politics,” write Deleuze and Guattari in their book A Thousand Plateaus.12 When discussing the “faciality machine” they write about the “social production of face,” and about “the relation of the face to the assemblages of power that require that social production.”13

The invisible face behind the veil, revealed by the simple act of raising the piece of black fabric, becomes the faciality machine that, in the case of the photographed woman, can ignite exactly this process of social production. The subject needs a face, needs to be signified. According to Deleuze and Guattari, faces are not individual signifiers because they define “zones of frequency and probability, delimit a field that neutralizes in advance any expressions or connections unnameable to the appropriate significations. The face itself is redundancy.”14 By the same token, the uncovered face of the Albanian girl announces the frequency and probability of many revealed faces in the future. When the photographer documented the “performance” of taking off the veil, he documented the possibility of the event “production of a face.” Furthermore Deleuze and Guattari state:

The face constructs the wall that the signifier needs in order to bounce off; it constitutes the wall of the signifier, the frame or screen. The face digs the hole that subjectification needs in order to break through; it constitutes the black hole of subjectivity as consciousness or passion, the camera, the third eye.15

While documenting the social production of the face, the photographer points to the face that was not one being hidden behind the visual obstacle of the veil. At the same time, the photographer documents this very event of singularity of the female face of the young Albanian from Bitola. The photograph shows her as one who has lived through turbulent times and who tried to resist the limitations of that very moment in history by allowing herself to be photographed isolated from others in her revealed uniqueness. Thus, the social production of face is not only part of an assemblage of power, but also entails an agency for the unravelling of a new subjectivity.

More importantly, the brothers/photographers Janaki and Milton Manaki were informed and were deeply involved in the movement of Young Turks that emerged in this provincial part of the Ottoman Empire. This allows the assumption that Milton Manaki (who took the photograph of the unveiling), must have been aware that one of the aims of the program of Young Turks was the abolition of the wearing of the veil because it was also he who took the first photographs of the protests of the Young Turks in 1908. The first leaders of the movement, Niyazi Bey and Riza Pasha, were the most active during the constitutional events in Bitola and their photographs were mostly made by the Manaki brothers, either in their studio or at the sites of the protests (still preserved in the archive in Bitola).16

The leader, usually called the “father” of the Modern Turkish society Kemal Atatürk, also photographed by the Manaki brothers (who were pronounced official court photographers of the Empire), was educated in the Military Academy in Bitola. Perhaps during his student times he was influenced by the Young Turks for his later speech in Kastamonu. His take on the veil is as militant as possible:

In some places I have seen women who put a piece of cloth or a towel or something like that over their heads or huddle themselves on the ground when a man passes by. What are the meaning and sense of this behavior? Gentlemen, can the mothers and daughters of a civilized nation adopt this strange manner, this barbarous posture? It is a spectacle that makes the nation an object of ridicule. It must be remedied at once.17

Milton Manaki registered this photograph with the caption “unveiled Albanian woman” in the archive when he donated his preserved negatives six months before his death.18 Besides all these uncertainties surrounding the actual event of taking the photograph, the caption is so precise: it inevitably directs toward the possible association of the photograph with the reality outside of the studio. The image makes a spectacle out of the historic event of unveiling. As Allan Sekula puts it: “The widespread use of photographs as historical illustrations suggests that significant events are those which can be pictured, and thus history takes on the character of spectacle.”19

---

12 Deleuze and Guattari, A Thousand Plateaus, 181.
13 Ibid., 181.
14 Ibid., 168.
15 Ibid.
17 Bernhard Lewis, The Emergence of Modern Turkey (London: Oxford University Press, 1961), 165. Kemal Atatürk’s speech, 1925, quoted in Leila Ahmed, “The Discourse of the Veil,” in Veil: Veiling, Representation and Contemporary Art, ed. David A. Bailey and Gilane Tawadros (London: inIVA, 2003), 55. ref. 13. Ahmed’s argument for this and similar statements by Muslim male leaders are closely related to the “global dominance of the authority of its discourses, and also against the background of the ambiguous position of man and women of the upper classes, members of Muslim societies whose economic interests and cultural aspirations bond them to the colonizing West and who saw their own society partly through Western eyes” (Ahmed, 51).
18 Unfortunately the author, the younger brother Milton, never dated this photograph.
The ritual of rebelling against the wearing of the veil in a photographic studio and making a spectacle out of this event was not a unique situation. For Sarah Graham-Brown, “another way to break the taboo of the veil was to go back to the studio where the photographer, using models, had the power to decide what should be exposed and what covered.” However, it should not be forgotten that the meeting between the photographer, a Christian member of the dominated local population and the unveiled woman who is representative of the ruling Muslim population is also a meeting between a man and a woman. That brings in mind the arguments of Linda Nochlin about Orientalist painting. According to Nochlin, the Orientalist paintings (in particularly those by Gérôme) by depicting highly charged erotic scenes of lascivious encounters of men with naked women brought forward “two ideological assumptions about power” and the hierarchical order of representation. One was about the power of men over women; the other about the power and superiority of white men over “inferior” dark races that cannot control their drives.

In fact the man who took the photograph is a representative neither of the colonizers, nor of the Slavic majority, but he belongs to the subjugated population; Milton Manaki was of the Vlach minority origin. Therefore, one could interpret the representational codes established in this photograph as an attempt to confront the Ottoman Empire's representational regime. The historic significance of this photograph is questionable and thus is the “truth,” the authenticity of the shown unveiling of the veil as a historic event. On the one hand, the photograph itself become sites where the significance of the removal of the veil, as agency of the new subjectivity, was recorded. On the other hand, the photographer who documents the unveiling of the young “liberated” woman in a way also denies that the act of unveiling can be revelation of any truth of woman. Woman may be the truth but she also does not believe in it—at least, she knows that she herself has no access to it. However, she allows the photographer to behave as if there is a truth, and that it can be unveiled, revealed as simply as that—with photographing her unveiled. She becomes a conspirator in this unveiling business. The only truth here is the question: What can be true about taking off the veil if all you can see underneath is another cultural deception, the seduction as inherited Western strategy of sexual domination?

The multiplied events that move and create the folds of the veil through time and space as a chain of turbulences can be understood as an agency that enables us to overcome the traps of the previous conceptualizations of the veil. That is, as either a visual/perceptual obstacle on the path to truth (and as a means of preservation of the patriarchal order), or as a defensive mechanism that would serve to justify its own politics. The question of the spatial and timely construction of female subjectivity in the Balkans is marked by the question of the veil, but the veil conceived neither as a historic object of Oriental origin, nor as a universal obstacle to the woman/truth.

Although it is true that the veil in the Balkans was “imported” along the colonial dominance of the Ottoman Empire (much earlier than in the rest of Europe), the object as such remained long after the Empire dissolved. Actually, it never disappeared completely. In fact, due to certain events it becomes more visible and actualized.

When it comes to a different interpretation of the veiled woman and her truth, some non-Western feminists emphasize the fact that women hidden behind the veils are actually more protected from the lust, the masculine gaze, and the scopic regime. The space underneath the veil, according to such arguments, is a private space that women in Muslim countries are allowed in contrast to the overexposed Western women. According to this interpretation the Muslim women that live in the West need such a space even more than when living in their own cultural environments (where they feel more comfortable because of the widely spread custom of wearing the veil). For example, in Leila Ahmed’s view:

> It was incorrect in its broad assumptions that Muslim women needed to abandon the veil the native ways and adopt those of the West to improve their status; obviously, Arab and Muslim women need to reject (just as Western women have been trying to do) the androcentrism and misogyny of whatever culture and tradition they find themselves in, but that is not at all the same as saying they have to adopt Western culture or reject Arab culture and Islam comprehensively. The feminist agenda as defined by Europeans was also incorrect in its particularities, including its focus on the veiling. Because of this history of struggle around it, the veil is now pregnant with meanings. As an item of clothing, however, the veil itself and whether it is worn are about as relevant to substantive matters of women’s right as the social prescription of one or another item of clothing is to Western women’s struggles over substantive issues.

While trying to euphemize the Western feminist position toward the veil, Ahmed is still entrapped in interpreting the veil as confinement and result of misogyny. She criticizes not only the feminists from the West, but also Eastern women for the uncritical acceptance of the arguments against the veil and its abandonment that, according to her, were originally based on “a vague and inaccurate understanding of Muslim society.”

It was in her opinion that “the Victorian colonial paternalistic establishment appropriated the language of feminism in the service of its assault on the religions and cultures of Other men, and in particular on Islam, in order to give an aura of moral justification to that assault at the very same time as it combated feminism within its own society — can be substantiated by reference to the conduct and rhetoric of the colonizers.”

**Event B: Against the Veil**

In 1908 (the same year as the “space-time” concept was introduced in physics), a constructive cooperation between the local Christian female population and the Muslim women took place in Skopje, Macedonia (Macedonia during that period was a part of the Ottoman Empire’s province Eastern Rumelia). This resulted with the first protests against the wearing of the veil.

There were approximately twenty protestors and some of them were put in prison on that occasion. Today we know only the names of two friends, the older Macedonian Rosa Plaveva and the much younger Turk Nakie Bajram, who participated in the protests and were captured together.

This particular event was a direct result of the Young Turks’ Revolution and of the influence that the European socialist movements had among the Balkan female intellectuals. Both women used to be schoolteachers whose activities were fully informed by the programs of the women socialist movements and organizations of that period. Plaveva is even believed to have been in a direct communication with Rosa Luxembourg several years after the protests, and was said to be informed about the first international conference of women socialist in Stuttgart.

The 1908 event demonstrates the very specificity of the Balkan situation. The constitution of different female subjectivities under such conditions stems from the greater turbulence in the region, and is not the effect of some isolated or particular event. However, the women leading the protests sparked these negotiations within the manifold and conflicted patriarchy in the Balkans. The questions of class, and national and gender awareness, entangled as they were, created the background and general framework for these early struggles that could be fought by these rare agents of female subjectivities. These unique women had their shaped arguments and opinions that could be recognized as new and at the same time dangerous. In Deleuzean sense, they made a rupture within the majority and also stand up from the minority.

While the encounter of different religions and cultures between the local Christian population and the Ottoman invaders was continuously taking place among their male representatives, the contacts among women of different origins were not very likely. It took several centuries until a kind of partial identification with the invaders would happen to Balkan men. They underwent a process that seems as a kind of “Orientalization”: a process of redefinition of masculinity in the Balkans with Oriental influence that developed during the five centuries of Ottoman rule.

The Balkan women, besides going through the same five-century period of the rule, underwent an entirely different process of subjectification. The confinement of the mothers, wives, daughters, sisters of the Ottoman rulers to their homes was not unique and culturally specific. The movements of Christian women in public were also restricted. Nevertheless, the fact that both Christian and Muslim women were not very active in public does not mean that they could never meet and interact with each other. Public places such as bazaars, *hamams* (Turkish baths), and schools were the social environments accessible to women of all origins for work or leisure, spaces where they could interact and communicate issues of common interest. Perhaps even the protests against the veil were conspired in one of the numerous hamams in Skopje of that period.

The law prohibiting the wearing of the veil (hijab and burka) on January 12, 1951, proves that the veil survived much longer. According to the historian Vera Veskovik-Vangeli, the act was treated as a violent intrusion among the Muslim population, as a direct result of the communist dogma, and therefore it was never thoroughly obeyed. The Muslim women compromised and started wearing a more Westernized version of the veil (common dress code for Muslim women in some other parts of the Balkans), which is a unique combination of trench coat and scarf. It also covers their bodies and head but is not as obvious as the veil.

24 Ibid.
25 Ibid., 55.
26 Although there is no evidence of historic relations between the photograph taken in Bitola and the protests in Skopje, it is clear that the photographer could make the photograph only in the aftermath of the protests (the backdrop in the studio dates between 1908 and 1916).
27 Vera Veskovik-Vangeli researched the agonistic history of women in Macedonia and in her encyclopaedic entry she mentioned for the first time the records of the 1908 event of protests against the veil. Vera Veskovik-Vangeli, “Macedonia,” in Borbeni put žena Jugoslavije (Belgrade: Leksikografski zavod “Sveznanje, “ 1972), 119.
28 Ibid., 120.
The Balkan Subjectivity: Neither

Although acknowledging her gratitude to Edward Said for some aspects of his Orientalism, the renowned Balkanist scholar Maria Todorova has strongly criticized him for essentializing not only the East, but also the West. She tries to distinguish Orientalism from the discourse on the Balkans, what she calls “Balkanism,” starting out from the point of view that it is difficult to have a clear-cut definition of the term “Balkan” in a historical, geographical and political sense. Todorova continues with her even more critical views on the application of the word “Oriental” in the Balkan context:

Whenever employed, its persuasive power was based on its haziness in combination with emotive component. Moreover, it was used alongside other generalizing catchwords, of which Oriental was most often employed, to stand for filth, passivity, unreliability, misogyny, propensity for intrigue, insincerity, opportunism, laziness, superstitiousness, lethargy, sluggishness, inefficiency, incompetence bureaucracy. Balkan, while overlapping with Oriental, had additional characteristics as cruelty, boorishness, instability, and unpredictability.31

In Todorova’s view, the term Balkan is so vague and full of stereotypical classifications that its characteristics can also be applied to other regions and peoples.32 Other differences, in her opinion, are related to geopolitical factors (e.g., the Balkans as a strategic region distinct from the Near or Middle East) and also due to the absence of a Western colonial legacy. She reminds the reader that before the Ottoman Empire dissolved and succumbed to colonization in 1912, starting with the proclamation of the Constitution following the Young Turks’ Revolution in 1908, and ending with the Balkan Wars, the Ottomans were engaged in the continuous expansion of their territorial control in Europe and Africa. Having power over a big part of Southeastern Europe and the Ottoman Empire was itself established as a colonial force. The Empire governed not only foreign lands, but also governed the inhabitants of these countries, the subaltern Others—so-called raya (Turkish for “people”). Furthermore, Todorova points out: “In short, the Balkan Peninsula is, broadly speaking, land of contradictions. Everything is exact opposite of what it might reasonably be expected to be.”33 She concludes that “finally, the construction of an idiosyncratic Balkan self-identity, or rather of several Balkan self-identities, constitutes a significant distinction: they were invariably erected against an ‘oriental’ other.”34

By noting that “unlike orientalism, which is a discourse about an imputed opposition, Balkanism is a discourse about an imputed ambiguity,” Todorova argues that the “in-betweenness” of the Balkans, due to their transitory character, “are considered dangerous both being in themselves and emanating danger to the others.”35 Especially influential is her idea that “this in-betweenness of the Balkans, their transitional character, could have made the simply incomplete other; instead they are constructed not as other but as incomplete self.”36

Instead of appropriating the usual concept of the Other where the East and West are understood as mutually dependant terms, but still isolated from each other, I choose the conceptualization of the Balkans as “neither.” It is a different theoretical concept that results from all sorts of numerous encounters taking place during the Ottoman rule that escape simple definitions. “Neither” enables the construction of a different kind of subjectivity, especially among the local female population. Neither Western in their inherited culture (the five centuries of the Ottoman dominance became deeply embedded in the Balkan culture), nor completely Easternized for their preservation of the Christian and Slavic origins, women in the Balkans cannot be defined only through their own cultural background, regardless as to whether they belong to any one of the Balkan ethnicities.

The negative logic of the concept of neither differs from the Aristotelian logical model where the Self and the Other are mutually excluding each other through either/or logic. Such dialectical models attempt to overcome binary logic with the category “both.” With these two terms being endlessly interchanged with one another (and thus still retaining the distinction of the other of the pair) both are circumvented by the concept of neither. In this respect, it works similarly as queerness by denying a stable identitarian definition. Neither actually enables the chronopolitics of the event that opposes the symmetric and contrasted definition of space and time as mutually exclusive and distinguishable concepts.

In this respect neither should be understood as an agent for negotiating different aspects of subjectivity in the Balkans that arise through various cultural, social, and political links to either the West or East. The definition of any of the two terms, “West” or “East,” is not given as a positive statement (“this is …”) but only through a chain of negation of what “this” is not. There is no comfort of a resolution at the end, but the pursuer of meaning is forced to...

29 Deleuze and Guattari, A Thousand Plateaus, 291.
30 For an expanded discussion on the communist policy toward the veil, see: Veskovik-Vangeli, Macedonia, 88–89.
31 Maria Todorova, Imagining the Balkans (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), 119.
32 Todorova states that the category was utilized mostly to signify some regional characteristics and clichés, like hospitality, dirtiness of the rural environment full of peasants and mountaineers, etc., that can be easily attributed to other peoples; in ibid.
34 Ibid., 20.
35 Ibid., 17.
36 Ibid., 18.
follow the operation and to come to a conclusion through this motion of following the endless chain of negative determinations.

While being faced with the danger from the different cultural entity that entailed all sorts of different policies toward women, it was inevitable that women started taking part in the local rebellions against the Ottomans. It was partly in order to protect the general religious and cultural specificity, but also the different mode of patriarchy. The struggle to preserve Christian and Slavic identity therefore was also an act of aiding the preservation of the already existing patriarchal order, only that there was a difference between the two patriarchal orders: the Christian and the Muslim one. The participation of women in the rebellions was ambiguous in its nature. On one hand, women leaving their families to assume the radical role of a woman soldier, and on the other hand, women acting in a most conservative way to reproduce and confirm the patriarchal order. This would be the neither-ness of the Balkan woman: neither an obedient family woman, nor a radical rebellion against patriarchy.

When discussing the case of the Balkan situation and the construction of female subjectivity by the end of the nineteenth century, the model of the Orientalist understanding of the East had inapplicable. In its attempt to explain the different phenomena that derived from the intertwining of the Christian and Islamic religion and the impact this had on cultures and on gender relations, the reoccurrence of wearing the veil can serve as a catalyst of different views and arguments of feminism even outside of the Balkans. It only shows that Orientalism actually relies on its own definition, in a vicious circle of argumentation and that Orientalism as a moral negative of the West tells us more about the West than about the East. For Yegenoglu, “the ‘truth,’ identity, or ‘reality’ of the Orient as well as the declaration of its exteriority to discourse is constituted by the very discourse of Orientalism as founding principle of its claim to legitimacy.”37 In a remark in passing about the Deleuzean concept of fold, Yegenoglu, as with many other critiques of Western philosophy by feminists, focuses on Deleuze’s “overlooking of sexual (and cultural) difference in the fold/veil.”38

The protest against the veil is an encounter, an event that marks the question of the veil with a quest for its disappearance, and simultaneously opens up a possibility for its duration and return. It also reveals the continuous existence, its durée, during the Ottoman rule in the Balkans without questioning it by any institutionalized oppositional structure. The veil/event can be understood as “neither,” as a kind of residue that always demands new and different attempts at interpretation.39 Each event of appearance or disappearance of the veil, each time the veil is put on, or it is taken off, is taken as a form, of a chronopolitics of restructuring, re-sedimentation or refolding of the space-time takes place.

Event C: The Return of the Veil

In 2002, in Tetovo (the second biggest Macedonian city inhabited mainly with citizens of the Albanian minority), several protests took place in favor of wearing the veil in high schools. Especially after these protests in Macedonia and elsewhere, it seemed important to me to reassess the question of the veil.40 Instead of the veil being a predictable historical event, it positions itself in the middle of the entangled knot of events interlinked in the realm of the real, imaginary and symbolic:

Then, they started to notify us. We were given a certain time limit.
—What sort of notifications? Not to come to school, I mean not to attend class wearing head-scarfs. They tell you it is forbidden and that it is not suitable to attend school like that. Not that we wanted to, we had to, we were given a time limit. A little later, they said they could no longer let us in like this.

We started thinking of ways of being accepted, of going into the university. Some of us came up with the idea of berets. They thought of wearing berets. They.

This way, they managed for a couple of days. I don’t know how they did this, but it was unacceptable for us.

We thought of wearing wigs, so as not to feel remorse. Not showing our hair, this was, we would at least feel better.

Thinking of what happened to those before us, we bought wigs.
—Kutlug Ataman, Women Who Wear Wigs, video installation, 199941

37 In her critique of Said’s Orientalism, Yegenoglu refers to the concept “mental character of discourse” borrowed from Chantal Mouffe and Ernesto Laclau. According to Yegenoglu, Said falls into the trap of opposition between realism and idealism when he claims that there is no correspondence between the real Orient and its constructed image. She supports her argument by referring to Mouffe and Laclau’s statement that “to suggest that the object of discourse is constituted does not imply a rejection of the materialist idea that there is a world external of thought.” Meyda Yegenoglu, Colonial Fantasies: Towards a Feminist Reading of Orientalism (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 19; see also p. 42.

38 Yegenoglu suggests that the Melek Alloula offers an appropriate way to discuss the fold in the cultural and gender framework: in ibid., 42.

39 Ibid., 43.

40 The news from the local daily newspaper reported that flyers calling for return of the veil for girls and wearing beards for boys at school were found in the yard of a high school in Tetovo. “High School in Tetovo,” Dnevnik, Skopje, September 11, 2003, www.dnevnik.com.mk.
This extract is from the beginning of the third video included in the installation of four documentary video interviews by the artist Kutlug Ataman. The work is devoted to four different women who for various reasons had to wear wigs at certain stages in their lives. The voice of a young female student explains her reasons for wearing a wig at the university. Her religious beliefs oblige her to wear a veil outdoors, but she is not allowed to wear it at school by the school authorities. A compromise had to be made: for her it was the choice to wear a wig (a case remote, but related, to the one of the Tetovo high school where one can expect similar clashes between the pupils and authorities in the near future).

After making the interview, in order to preserve the girl’s anonymity, the artist actually chooses not to show her face so that all we see in the fourth installation screen is a blank background with the English translation—the subtitles change continuously while we hear the Turkish language of the original story narrated by the young girl. Several times this narrative is interrupted by questions from the artist but the answers do not hint at the complex patriarchal relations and hegemony behind the decision to wear the veil.

However according to Hamid Naficy, in Islam women must not only veil their bodies from unrelated men but also to some extent their voice. Veiling of the voice includes using formal language with unrelated males and females, a decorous tone of voice and avoiding singing, boisterous laughter and any emotional outburst in public other than expression of grief or anger.

It is very difficult to grasp how any agency of subjectivity could have ever developed despite the suppressed production of face and voice.

The Archive as Veil/Event

The territory of the archive is not a stable site where all the levels and segments are given at once and forever. Whenever a researcher enters an archive, the content of the archive is replaced and re-sedimented, re-veiled/revealed, or unravelled. The force that influences the internal preestablished order of the archival material each time creates new inflections in the interpretation. The guardians of the archive are always suspicious toward the intruders, the newcomers who threaten the “order of things.”

The archive performs itself exactly through its disappearance, through its eternal return and repetition, the endless rituals/events of entering its folds and when leaving them. The archive takes place in the form of a subject who is constituted, constructed differently each time when the subject/re-searcher tries to find his/her subject for a research or text.

The inevitable questioning of the need for such research, the difficulties in defining the subjectivity of the Balkan woman as the Other of the West, or neither the West nor the East and many other more specific historical and cultural issues, became tied together with the questioning of the personal motivation and the contemporary relevance of the research of the effect of the return of the veil in the everyday life of women in the transitional societies.

Some artistic perspectives and strategies dealing with the veil in the Middle East emphasize a perpetual veiling machine that creates different meanings and archives. Some of them were presented at the exhibition “The Veil: Veiling, Representation and Contemporary Art.” For example, the photographs of Jananne Al-Ani from the series Untitled (1996) show five women of different ages and cultural origins in different stages of veiling and unveiling. They create a kind of archival machine of veils/events. A series of three photographs, Self-portraits or Virgin Mary (2000), by Zineb Sedira (also exhibited in the exhibition) points to more complex aspects of the veil and veiling. Sedira looks into an interesting entanglement between gender and religion. The artist is photographed dressed in a long white veil, stating neither the Christian nor the Muslim origin of the outfit. The photographs are to emphasize the incredible similarity of the female outfits of these so distinct religions. Thus, the artist tries to transform the separation between the two faiths into a possibility for communication.

The series of films Me (2002) by the Iranian artist Ghazel usually involves a woman engaging in certain activities that one does not readily imagine to be easy to perform when one wears a veil (for example, smoking, ice-skating, trying shoes on, or motorcycling). The events in this short-film series (consisting of forty-eight minute-length films) are ordinary everyday events that look odd and at times cynical only because of the additional garment.

41 The four-screen video installation of Women Who Wear Wigs presented at the 48th Venice Biennale in 1999 was shown in the framework of several more recent Ataman’s solo exhibitions in Vienna (2002) and in London (at the Serpentine Gallery, 2002/2003). For a more comprehensive interpretation of this and other works, see: Kutlug Ataman: A Rose Blooms in the Garden of Sorrows, ed. Christine Kintsch (Vienna: BAWAG Foundation, 2002); exhibition catalogue with text by Irit Rogoff.


44 The exhibition “The Veil” that toured in different venues in Walsall, Liverpool, and Oxford during 2003 and 2004 was accompanied by the publication Veil: Veiling, Representation and Contemporary Art.
The humor of these films is not that innocent, though, when one takes into account that in Ghazel’s country women can be hanged for smoking or for being “fashion victims.”

Ghazel invents a completely new performative vocabulary; according to Naficy, she is “an active woman rather than a politicised or aesthetised sign system, and because the veil does not totally represent, subjugate, or define the woman, Ghazel’s films widen the rather narrowly defined discourse of the veil.” In the shift from representation to subjectivity and agency lies the potentiality of these short sequences.

Event D: Naming the Bridge

The discussion about the work Naming the Bridge “Rosa Plaveva and Nakie Bajram” by the young Macedonian artist Hristina Ivanoska is extremely relevant in this context. The artist got the idea for her project after reading in the local newspapers an open call for submission to name a new bridge that was to be built between the south and north bank of the Vardar River in the center of Skopje. Ivanoska’s project is imagined as a unique initiative devoted to the first women protestors against the veil in Macedonia. Instead of putting emphasis on the veil as an object, Ivanoska uses another strategy in her project. She deals more with the event itself and her aim is to use this event as a kind of trigger for another event—namely, the naming of a bridge. Therefore, she puts forward a formal initiative for naming the new bridge.

Naming the Bridge “Rosa Plaveva and Nakie Bajram” officially started on April 28, 2005, when Ivanoska submitted her proposal to the Committee for Naming Streets, Squares, Bridges and Other Infrastructure Objects. In parallel to the proposal/request, she arranged numerous public appearances on local TV and radio shows. In addition, the artist kept a journal of the events taking place concerning the project. In her personal journal, she kept records of private discussions, official meetings, interviews, and all other instances when the protests are brought up and the names of the two women are mentioned.

Several issues are simultaneously present in Ivanoska’s project that I find relevant for the archive of veils/events. The first is the procedure of naming. For Ivanoska and her project, it is as important to assure a media airing of the story, and the issue of the veil, as is whether the proposal will be accepted as it is. The main aim is actually to open up the question in the domain of public discussions. The naming has a certain effect in the realm of the real in particular because the bridge at this very moment has not “received” any other name yet. The frequent circulation of the names, Plaveva and Bajram, before any other name, establishes a new agency as an effect of an agreement, and this is what Ivanoska attempts to establish between herself, the committee, and public opinion.

Taking into account that the Vardar passes through the city dividing it into two parts, one mostly Macedonian (Orthodox-Christian) and the other predominantly inhabited by Muslims (mostly Albanians and some Turks), Ivanoska’s concept is very clearly pointing to the need to reestablish the silenced communication between these two recently strictly divided parts of the city. Since the conflicts between the Albanian ethnic minority troops and the Macedonian Army in 2001, the trust between the two previously cooperating communities has been further shaken. Some more recent incidents of fundamentalist origin (after both sides of the conflict signed the Ohrid Agreement, an international document enforced by the international and local political leaders for reconciliation between the Macedonian and Albanian sides of the conflict) do not help the ethnic and religious tensions.

It is very possible that in such a politicized context Ivanoska’s proposal, although it is based on a public call for submission of proposals for naming the new bridge, will not even be considered, as has been hinted during one of her interviews with the president of the committee. Ivanoska has not given up.

45 Naficy, “Poetics and Politics,” 158.
46 One thing that women wearing the veil cannot really do is any work that points to the question of class—actually wearing the veil could also be interpreted as a certain class privilege of women who do not need to work to make their living.
47 Hristina Ivanoska, “Rosa Plaveva and Nakie Bajram,” Forum (May 2005), 162.
She continues to write texts in newspapers and magazines, gives interviews, and plans other events in connection with this project.

In the Balkans, the issue of the veil is still not discussed openly and its cultural and political importance is not very clear to the authorities dealing with the issues stemming out the multicultural environment. Many regulations still have to be adjusted to the recent reactualization of the veil. Until recently, before the Balkan countries started the application process to enter the European Union, the question was completely neglected and treated in a way comparable to how it was treated during the communist period: the authorities could still get away with unwritten practices or restrictive laws being voted without discussions in the public realm. In these terms, Ivanoska’s project is still a rare example of individual initiative, and not only artistic, for looking at this issue with sensitivity that would not be burdened only by the conflicts from the past, but also looking for some historic examples of women’s political engagements. That the project was controversial became evident during different events through which many contradictions and different stances toward the veil were revealed in the conflicting intellectual and cultural camps, Muslim and Christian.

The case of Tanja Ostojić’s work, the performance Integration Impossible, in which the artist performed dressed in a veil made of camouflage fabric (shown in "[prologue] new feminism/new europe" at Cornerhouse, Manchester, and curated by Marina Gržinić in 2005) brings the issue of production of face to yet another level. The artist does not identify with the predetermined feminine role although she over-identifies with the new measurements of surveillance, control, and other biopolitical mechanisms that the government introduced in the United Kingdom after the bombings in Central London in July 2005, including the frequent stop-and-searching of veiled women. The artist reinvents herself as a site for provoking discussion and a negotiation of the process of subjectification. By miming and even exaggerating how the system works, her masquerade using the two unexpectedly intertwined codes, the Islamic burqa and the military-used camouflage pattern, enters the very complex realm of political and state power that does shape gender and its politics. For example, in Robin Lee Riley’s transnational feminist analysis she reveals the transnational sexism toward Muslim women in general and Afghan and Iraqi women in particular and how this has led to a new form of gender imperialism.48

The face remains unknown in terms of features, but can we really say that it is not “socially produced”? The demand for a return of the veil in the high schools in Turkey, the call for re-covering of the face, is an event demanding the production of a face, but also the covered face. The eternal return/repetition and chronopolitics of the veil is not the permanence and “the subject of the eternal return is not the same.”49 The eternal return of the veil is never the return of the veil without a difference, and here I do not refer to the different ethnic versions of veils, with more or less folds, transparent or opaque, covering more or less flesh, etc. It is certainly no return to any realm that one could interpret as primitive or as some kind of Eastern “wisdom.”50

According to Arun Saldanha, capitalism continuously seeks new ways for generating profit from faciality, by proliferating databases, face recognition programs, and multiplied screens. He points out that faciality can be temporarily dismantled but its other side is dangerous because it is unknown:

Defacialization brings forth “probeheads” (têtes chercheuses), little faceless fragments looking forever for an owner, which can be temporarily reassembled into a collective becoming.51

Regardless of whether the veil is put on or taken off, it produces subjectivity and makes the veil each time different, but only when and if a woman decides about wearing it. The production of “face” is not about visible or invisible, inclusion or exclusion; it is about subjectivity and agency that has many different manifestations, folds, and temporalities.

---

50 Deleuze and Guattari, A Thousand Plateaus, 186–89.


Veils/Folds/Events
If an individual’s subjectivity is in great part constructed by institutions, as Michel Foucault described, how can the feminist project advance when marriage is still at the core of our value system? My work aims to intervene, counter, and rework the chronopolitical and heteronormative narratives of constraint, omission, and dominance that institutions like marriage still retain.

Looking at history in terms of sexual politics, I’m beginning to formulate conversations between, for instance, the radical utopian voices of the former free-lovers with those of the present moment, in an effort to illuminate a freer future-subject. Marriage, since its inception as a patriarchal concept of ownership, inheritance, and property law, perpetuates and retains ghosts of its discriminatory beginnings. Such apparitions are readily seen in the United States where over one thousand laws are dependent on marriage status. While gay-rights activists fight to legalize same-sex marriage to match these privileges, I question whether we shouldn’t instead open up recognized affinities to include more than singular romantic partners—so that one may assign different people as beneficiary or proxy to the various health, tax, and inheritance laws. Challenging the legitimacy of linear, normalizing constructions, my project seeks to link voices across time, to present a synchronous conversation of feminist utterances that reveal a sense of always having been present. I’m also evaluating how nonmonogamous forms, like that of polyamory, might influence and shift perceived values at both individual and social levels.

Free love refers to a nineteenth-century movement that heralded a right to having many lovers outside the artificial constraints of marriage. My interest in this nonmonogamous movement is that it was intrinsically tied to politics. The movement’s beliefs were formalized in the egalitarian structures of many contemporaneous intentional communities, like that of the former Oneida Community of New York State—a group that believed marriage was slavery for women; subsequently, each member was married to the group, and to maintain the group allegiance, members were encouraged to change sex partners frequently so as not to develop special bonds with any one member.

Polyamory is a recent term (from 1990) referring to the nonmonogamous practice of having many special relationships in which, ideally, all partners are open, honest, and care for one another a great deal. While it has not yet been theorized much, what I’ve found so far is a discussion of subjectivity related to gender and power as they operate within polymorous relationships. Only little discusses the larger framework of potential social and cultural implica-
Fig. 32
Andrea Ray, installation view of Utopians Dance, 2013

Fig. 33
Andrea Ray, video still from Utopians Dance, 2013
tions, and the practice itself isn’t political in the way that the early free-love movement was.

With less and less people getting married, could the privileges connected to marital status dissolve within our legal system? How might the sexual freedoms of nonmonogamous relationships be useful to feminism? How might the concept of chronopolitics be a useful strategy for feminism?

My research, interests, and voice are organized into individual projects of multiple installations. I build environments where ideas may play against one another to produce spaces of simultaneous knowing and unknowing. A recent project, *Utopians Dance*, is composed of two installations—*A Reeducation* and the titular *Utopians Dance*. The project simultaneously engages moments of the past, the present, and the future, exploring an individual’s journey through the lens of the social, while calling across histories of social experimentation to speak with subjectivities of today.

*A Reeducation* evokes a turn-of-the-century reading room. A bookshelf (holding books about utopia, feminism, and economics), antique rugs, photographs, a painting, and natural objects comprise the environment.

A small table displays a book I’ve written and hand-bound (Fig. 31). The book is titled *A Cure for the Marriage Spirit* and incorporates a bit of time travel. The main character, through her research into nineteenth-century feminists and her experimentation with polyamory, resists a linear concept of time as she imagines communing with the dead—comrades who enable her to dream up alternative social conditions in her own time, to rethink marriage, questions of equality and sexual politics, and to challenge what is considered normal. It is my hope that the text’s nonlinear temporal construction enables viewer-subjects to similarly engage in formulating future possibilities.

Surrounding the walls are photographs, one of a book that lays open to a poem by Henry David Thoreau about free love, and two others that reference Charlotte Perkins Gilman’s *Herland*, a utopian feminist novel from 1915 in which three male explorers discover an all-female civilization—a frame within which to contrast gender discrimination with social alternatives. My photographs present evidence of that civilization, of the former persisting in the present. Moving beyond this example of early twentieth-century binary politics, I’m interested instead in productive dissent among non-fixed subject identities—a model to replace that of the center/periphery.

In a larger open space is *Utopians Dance* where wood flooring, music, and video create a space of levity that encourages dance under a series of strung lights (Fig. 32). The video monitor displays dancing feet with subtitles that
convey messages combining fringe, caring-based economies with contra-
dancing calls (Figs. 33, 34). In both models cooperation is embraced, and
competition, and therefore power relations, are discouraged. The atmosphere
of Utopians Dance evokes the desire for joy and freedom, and asks whether
we’ll join the dance.

Propped up on the dance floor is an album cover titled In My Utopia (Figs. 35,
36). It represents a future not yet realized. I haven’t written or recorded the
songs yet. No vinyl has been produced. The album sleeve is empty. The song
titles correspond to my interest in feminism and utopia and the liner notes are
taken from my book A Cure for the Marriage Spirit.

Viewers enter the open dance floor space and find that they occupy a dual
position, one of observing while being observed. Who am I? Who is she? I’m
considering this dual position of subjectivity and how it relates to larger
notions of belonging and community.

Within both installations comprising Utopians Dance, viewers are invited to
imagine themselves as the protagonist, and to participate in meaning-making
while standing (and perhaps dancing) on the floor/stage, projecting what
music might come from the absent vinyl, or while reading the book’s third-
person narration and nonsequential series of voices. It is my hope that a
collection of radical moments and proposals across time may result in an altered
perception and reevaluation of the monogamous-normative state—a state of
politics that rules our health care, family laws, and much more. The project is
not simply a rejection of gender difference and marriage. The focus of the
project is the desire for our value system to root somewhere else.

Utopians Dance seeks to create an open position from which a subject is
placed in the possibility of dreaming through the disruption of linear time
while also citing alternatives to the normative. My related PhD research
project departs from here with the desire to establish a new ground of resis-
tance—refusing the positions we think we must assume—so that perhaps
then, we may begin anew.
I am interested in losing control.

In autumn 2012, I started a series of lectures I do not prepare/rehearse. What does it mean to not prepare/rehearse?

What is the difference between preparing and thinking about a coming lecture?

My intention is not to be provocative. It is a way for me to collect data related to the articulation of my thinking. I talk in front of an audience, record everything I am saying, transcribe, then rework the material and create written material in this way.

In this series of lectures I am challenging the perception of and reference to time: my own, but also the perception others can have of duration. For that, I am using different ways of referring to and measuring time, such as: the time needed for a piece of brown sugar to melt in seventy-degree water, the time needed for three cigarettes to consume on their own, a collection of egg timers (I am using five of them in the context of “Not Now! Now!”: the black egg timer has a duration of three minutes, the other black egg timer is one minute, the red is two minutes, and the blue is four minutes).

This system is supposed to facilitate my relation to time, but also to distract me from the articulation of my thinking. I am invited to leave and come back to it each time I have to check the time, or take care of the installation measuring it. This setting facilitates a loss of control. It requires a perpetual attention, alternatively central or peripheral/parallel.

For the improvised performance lecture I did in the summer of 2013, I did not prepare/rehearse. I did not write out a text to be read, use as a track, or learn by heart; nor did I practice talking for a specific amount of time. However, I was thinking about it. And, unfortunately, I consider that thinking about a situation, a context, a theme, a specific content is a form of preparation. Keywords come to my mind and become potential tracks I could follow. Then a vision is created that could be a projection of what one could go through. For “Not now! Now!” I was really fighting with myself not to think (even when lying in bed)—a fight with myself to not be prepared.

What is important to me in that context is the title “Not Now! Now!”

It activates my thinking about a project I am doing that has to do with the action of “standing up.” Not the one from sitting to standing, but a multidirectional way of standing up. The drawing is a model I am using to talk about a
I started to “surf” in the subway.

Standing and trying to read the movement of the wagon and all the information one can get from the environment that can help to anticipate movement and keep balance. It is based on micro movements.

I am also surfing real waves.

The stand up is important. However, I would say that reading and choosing a wave is what is the “not now, but now” factor. It is challenging for me to read the ocean. Every time one surfs/tries to surf in a different spot, the waves will be different. At some point, a decision needs to be made regarding taking or not taking the wave that is coming.

When I have been waiting for a long time, I start to question, to doubt, to tell myself that I should take the next one, as I have already been waiting for such a long time. This could be considered as a sort of complex of non-productiveness ...

As if my relation to time should be more effective, and I am not allowed to let myself wait so long. However, I noticed that if one hesitates, one will fail. One has to be convinced that it is the right wave. More than that, one has to be convinced that it is the “right” decision and put into action everything needed to succeed. When the decision is taken, and you are convinced it is the right wave, you will have to paddle and feel the extremely short moment, when the wave pushes the board: The moment to stand up. If you start to paddle too early or too late, you will fail.

What captivates me with surfing is that it is a difficult activity for me, and I am not used to this. I started to dance when I was two-years old, to play basketball when I was two-years old, to play basketball when I was two-years old, to play basketball when I was two-years old, to windsurf and practice waterskiing when I was five, to do athletics when I was ten, to play tennis when I was eleven, to play volley-ball when I was fourteen, and so on. Accumulating the different activities, competing for some of them, but never really cleaning/removing the ones I did not want to practice anymore ... more is not less ... and all this background and the skills acquired are not enough. Surfing a wave is a real challenge for me. I cannot do it without learning, training, practicing, as I have been used to with the different activities/practices I met with in the past.

When am I going to be able to surf a wave for real?

I also started to ski when I was three-years old and I can snowboard. When snowboarding, the head and the feet are moving in opposite directions: if you draw a line from the top of the head to the feet, when the head is on the left side of the vertical axis the feet will be on the right side. The ground is not moving. You are sliding on it because of the slope. When surfing in the tube, the feet stay on the same spot and the line in between the head and the feet move from the left to the right according to the movement of the car. If you want to surf in the tube, I noticed and consider that it is more appropriate to face the rear of the train than the front of it, as the inertia created by the forward movement of the train is more similar to the slope of the mountain.

The acceleration of the train can also create something similar to what I call the moment of suspension the wave creates when pushing the board. This moment when I can feel the wave is amazing. An impulse. A short moment you have to catch. Now!

To feel this moment—when the wave is pushing the board—is essential. It is possible to learn to feel it. When lying on the board, one has to paddle. To know when to start to paddle is something I have not yet really learned. What I noticed is that I have the tendency of doing it too soon, too early. So I have to accept to wait. Wait, be patient ...
To feel the pushing. I can. In the learning process you also have to be patient, to process step-by-step, especially to accept step-by-step. When lying on the board and paddling, one has to be attentive to what is happening in-between the different forces: the propulsion initiated by the paddling, the floating of the board, and the meeting between the wave and the board. When the moment of suspension happens, when the wave pushes the board, one can stop paddling and open his or her arms to the side (like the wings of an airplane). It is like being an airplane, but not in the air: floating. To accept letting the wave push the board demands a certain acceptance of losing control. One can even try to do it with closed eyes.

Then one has to catch the wave. It is so surprising to feel the moment of suspension created that one can be distracted by being able to perceive it. To stand up one has, more than feeling this moment, to react to it, to take the impulse given and push up the board in order to initiate the movement of standing up. All this happening in such a short time challenges both perception and feelings. Now! No, not anymore, it was too late. The right moment is the “now.”

My intention with learning to surf is a way, a strategy (maybe a method) for me to learn to accept to lose control. Two other notions are important to me right now: they are “chaos” and “nonsense” (larifari in German, which is a word I really like in itself).

This is a rework of material taken from an improvised lecture performance. I am interested in challenging the transcription of oral into written material. To work with the written format is a challenge I am taking up in order to go against my tendency toward immateriality.

This improvised lecture performance does not have a title.

An improvised lecture performance is for me a situation of challenging both the position and positioning of both the artist (me in that case) and the audience (spectators, viewers). In the presented text I was trying to be factual when it comes to the content and not to play with the position of the reader. I am, at a same time, questioning (maybe removing) the aliveness of the performer and limiting the dramaturgy a written material can have.

Each time I am transforming oral material to written material I am thinking and challenging what a text/publication is and can be. A current question I have is: How does one edit a physical work and play with/challenge the traces of the presence and the performativity of the performer in a printed matter?

Three notions are essential in my work: situation, presence, and performativity.

I am working on the format of improvised lecture performance to challenge the performativity of my speaking in the meeting with an audience. How important is the presence of the performer/speaker in the facilitation of communication? Can and how can the absence of body language be compensated in a written format? Can a written material be as performative as an oral one can be?
Dormancy
Notes on Sleep, Criticality, and the Poetics of Suspension in and around Henriette Heise’s Darkness Machines

Mathias Danbolt

Politics is not just for genres of demonstration and demand. It requires also genres of checking in to provide a little breathing space that allows for redistributing and disturbing negative affect, de-isolating ourselves-in-damage, and hatching strategies for not reproducing the violence, for moving the scene of life to an alter-real.
—Lauren Berlant, “A Consultation”¹

In the fall of 2011, inside a small window used by Galleri Image in Aarhus as a street gallery, a sculptural form was on show: a large piece of black fabric, carefully folded into a square. Describing the work as black is not really accurate, as the textile was stained with soil in shades of gray and brown, and small tufts of dried grass protruded from creases in the fabric. This object had obviously spent some time in a garden, and it seemed to have been carefully prepared for the task: numerous meticulous seams were visible on its surface, signaling the labor gone into shaping the fabric. On an electrical junction box beside the gallery window, a poster was glued up showing a
Dormancy usually describes the suspension of activity in living organisms or organic systems. As a “resting state” or survival strategy, dormancy designates a position in-between activity and passivity, life and death—a state of latency with an indeterminate potential for a sudden change in conditions, as in dormant viruses or volcanos. Hence, states of dormancy often tend to generate anxieties due to temporal and ontological uncertainty. But the suspended activity in Heise’s *Darkness Machine—Dormant* made me less anxious, and more curious, to find out what kind of work this artwork had undertaken and could engage in again if awoken from its slumber.

“Darkness Machine—Dormant”: The title contains a tension between organic and mechanic concepts that invites reflections on the ontological status of the work, as well as questions on its agency: if the use of the word “machine” suggests an instrumentalized relationship between the artwork-as-apparatus and artist-as-operator, the notion of a “dormant machine” complicates the distinction between the human and nonhuman worker. The designation of the artwork as dormant suggests that this machine has a life and agency of its own, with a differentiated temporal rhythm of activity and productivity, as well as periods of inactivity and rest. Speaking of an artwork as having life and the need to rest might sound like a naive gesture of anthropomorphization that imbues inert matter with human traits. After all, Heise’s *Darkness Machine—Dormant* is made of a piece of seemingly “dead” textile, and not, for instance, living tissue cultures or other organic life-forms featured in biotechnological art. But it is precisely because *Darkness Machine* appears so static and non-organic in its dormancy that I see it as an interesting site for reflecting on the normative frameworks that inform the understanding of the time and timing of the matter of art, and the art that seems to matter.

In the following notes I think alongside and around *Darkness Machine—Dormant* in order to consider how dormancy—a temporary suspension of activity—might function as a fruitful framework for examining chrono-political conditions for artistic and political engagement. *Darkness Machine—Dormant* provides an opportunity for discussing the value of what I suggest to call an “aesthetics of dormancy”—a slow aesthetic that sidesteps the dominating political economies of attention and visibility. By zooming in on the dormant state of a piece of neatly folded black fabric, I seek to give some texture to queer theorist Lauren Berlant’s recent observation on the importance of remembering that politics not only involves “genres of demonstration and demand,” but also forms that “provide a little breathing space.” Berlant’s comment works as a reminder of the potential value in aesthetic gestures of withdrawal and suspension from an accelerated present—gestures that often stand at risk of being seen as a retraction from the political. Heise’s proposal of a dormant artwork is an apt opportunity to consider how the aesthetic can work against the increasing demands of constant activity and availability in the “non-stop worksite” that visual culture theorist Jonathan Crary argues characterizes our
current “24/7 capitalism.” In a time packed with mindful attempts to train people to be content with inhabiting a present that is just not just enough, I’m drawn to artworks like Darkness Machine—Dormant that confuse my habitual assumptions about the temporal and agential lives of art in a way that forces me to slow down the pace of my critical machinery in order to think differently. My interest in the aesthetics of dormancy is thus motivated by the sense that the poetic can create “microclimates of hope” as Ann Cvetkovich calls them, in times of increasing exhaustion and political depression.

On pocketsanddrawers.net, one of Henriette Heise’s numerous homepages, one can read:

Henriette Heise is a visual artist, working with video, film, TV, photography, the web, posters, lino-cutting, fabric, papier mâché ... Actually I am writing this myself, so I won’t pretend I asked someone else to do it: I work together with others or alone, but always as part of something—I mean I am not alone: I am inspired by others: artists or just other people who give me a sense of hope.

Heise’s artist statement gives an indication of the central role that relations, collaboration, and exchange play in her practice. Over the last two decades, Heise has taken part in establishing a number of different self-organized institutions, including the art-activist Info Center (1998–99) in London and the local artist-run TV station TV-TV (2004–06) in Copenhagen. The best-known collaborative project she has been involved in is perhaps Copenhagen Free University (2001–07), an artist-run educational institution located in Heise’s and her former collaborator Jakob Jakobsen’s shared flat in Copenhagen. Exploring the porous borders between the intimate and the public, the domestic and the political, and the role of art in the changing knowledge economy, Copenhagen Free University worked on carving out spaces for “knowledge that are fleeting, fluid, schizophrenic, uncompromising, subjective, uneconomic, acapitalist, produced in the kitchen, produced when asleep or arisen on a social excursion—collectively.”

Alongside these large-scale collaborative projects that traverse the borders of art and social activism, Heise has created a large body of work that, in comparison, might read as discrete given their object-based character veering toward abstraction. And while her collaborative work with, for instance, Copenhagen Free University has gathered much critical attention, the quiet and queer force of her individual practice seems to have gone under the radar of most critics. In a way this is perhaps not surprising, given that Heise’s work seems to work against the operative logics of the “attention economy,” as Crary describes it, that propels constant and competitive forms of (self-) promotion within and beyond the art world. Heise’s practice can as such be said to simultaneously examine and exemplify the challenging conditions of visibility and audibility for aesthetic-political gestures of the quiet and non-spectacular kind.

Fig. 41
Henriette Heise, Darkness Machine, 2007
Heise made her first series of *Darkness Machines* in the context of the Danish artist Marianne Jørgensen’s ambitious project on urbanization *love alley* (2007–11). Jørgensen invited twenty-three artists, architects, poets, and theorists to help her occupy an unused lot of land in a suburb of Aarhus, Viby, and turn it into an artistic experiment in alternative city planning. Around a miniature asphalted street, shaped to spell out the words “love alley,” Jørgensen demarcated thirty-five parcels of land of approximately three by three meters in size, which she allotted to the different contributors. The participants soon turned *love alley* into an anarchic housing-garden project, and the alley was filled with ephemeral shacks, walls, garden beds, and other installations. Heise installed four large *Darkness Machines* on her two pieces of land with tent pegs. Made of carefully sown together circular pieces of a permeable “weed controller” textile that people use in their gardens to prevent plants from growing in unwanted places, the dark cloud-shaped *Darkness Machines* covered the grass like a carpet, stopping rays of light, while letting water and air through.

Even in “action,” Heise’s *Darkness Machines* are slow workers, and might not seem to be doing much, at least not if we expect something eventful, spectacular, or loud. But their slow pace doesn’t equal inactivity. Plugged into the turf, the machines prohibit the sun from reaching the ground, producing a darkness that makes the grass slowly deteriorate and dissolve underneath. The machines are therefore forceful in their own way by slowly shaping and transforming the ground. The four *Darkness Machines* laid on the grass in Viby for over two years, until the municipality reclaimed the land, and Jørgensen’s *love alley* project came to an end. When unplugged and removed, the *Darkness Machines* left behind a series of cloud-shaped prints of bare, brown soil on the otherwise green lawn.

Heise’s use of a weed controller fabric for her *Darkness Machines*—a fabric available in most hardware stores in Denmark—is characteristic of her investment in what she calls “material thinking,” an approach Heise describes as an attempt to enter into conversation with the specific materials she engages with, attending to the “swarm of social, cultural, political, historical, physical, personal meanings and potentials” embedded in them. The weed controller fabric is interesting in this regard because it brings along an array of connotations to Danish middle-class values of order, control, and cleanliness. Normally used below patio slabs or around flower beds to prevent weed growth, this type of fabric, in wide demand at home-improvement stores, speaks to the prevailing desires and expectations of the ideal garden appearance for Danish homeowners. The *Darkness Machines* use the weed controller differently than in most gardens; Heise puts it to use to rupture the normally wished for grass mat. Within the context of Jørgensen’s *love alley*, the destructive act performed by the *Darkness Machines* not only reads as a negation of the domestic nuclear family machinery symbolized by perfectly tended gardens and green yards.

9 The number of participants increased over the course of the project. For information about the project and its contributors, see Marianne Jørgensen’s homepage for *love alley*: lovealley.dk.


11 Heise’s *Darkness Machines* were not the only works in *love alley* that resisted the romantic rhetoric of community building. For nuanced reading of the *love alley* project, see Rune Gade, “Labor of Love: Contesting Normative Urbanization in Marianne Jørgensen’s *love alley*,” in *Performing Archives/Archives of Performance*, ed. Rune Gade and Gunhild Borggreen (Copenhagen: Museum Tusculaneum Press, 2013), 418–31.
opened an exhibition at the small window gallery die raum in Berlin that fea-
tured all four Darkness Machines from love alley in a dormant state laying side
by side in neatly folded squares on the gallery floor.12

During the time when these four Darkness Machines were still at work on love
alley, Heise started to make another series of Darkness Machines intended for
indoor use. Similar in size and shape, Heise made these works out of circular
pieces of black canvas roller blinds, the kind one can buy at IKEA. These indoor
machines also produce darkness, but they work vertically rather than on the
ground. Installed in front of windows, doors, or as room dividers when exhib-
ited, the indoor Darkness Machines work on shaping the viewer’s perception
and movement in space.

In the group show “Det personlige er ikke et privat anliggende og anonymitet
en mulig offentlighed” [The Personal is Not a Private Affair, and Anonymity is
a Potential Public] at Møstings Hus in Copenhagen in 2010, three large Dark-
ness Machines covered the main windows in the gallery and obstructed the
flow of daylight.13 Even though the electric lights in the room were off, the ef-
fect was not a total absence of light. In contrast to artworks of immersive
darkness in works like Miroslaw Balka’s 2009 installation How It Is at Turbine
Hall in Tate Modern, Heise’s indoor Darkness Machines involve elements of
luminosity. When seen against the light from the outside, the holes around the
stitches that keep the circular pieces of fabric together appear luminous, like
stars against a dark sky. Instead of refusing the visual, the subtraction of light
instead invites slow and careful movement. The altered conditions of visibility
in the dim room works as a reminder of the important role of support that light
plays in the securement of the image of the white cube as a space for clarity
and focus. Standing in a room with Darkness Machines, I am forced to adjust
my vision—not only spatially, but also conceptually and metaphorically—of the
dark.

12 Henriette Heise’s show “Darkness
Machines—Dormant” was on show at die
raum in Berlin, November 27, 2011–January
7, 2012.
13 The exhibition “Det personlige er ikke et privat anliggende og anonymitet en mulig
offentlighed” [The Personal Is Not a Private
Affair, and Anonymity Is a Potential Public] was held at Møstings Hus in Copenhagen
between February 2 and March 14, 2010.

The show was curated by Jacob Lillemose,
and also featured works by Pernille With
Madsen and Nikolaj Recke.
The dormant Darkness Machines don’t generate the same kind of physical and phenomenological effects as the active machines. They merely lie there on the gallery floor, as a soft and soiled echo of Kazimir Malevich’s pristine painting Black Square (1915). But even in such a period of rest, Darkness Machines—Dormant work on me as a viewer, aesthetically, conceptually, and figuratively. The dormant machines’ modest demeanor makes the poetic and metaphoric qualities of the works’ title come to the front. After all, Heise uses the words with the same material attention as she does with textile, photography, video, and paper. This weed-controller fabric is thus not the only “conversation partner” at play in Darkness Machines—Dormant. The words in the title have, similarly, a number of social, historical, and political meanings embedded in them.

The word “darkness” is particularly “sticky” in this regard (to borrow Sara Ahmed’s important concept of stickiness). The word darkness gives rise to a host of connotations and symbolizations of mainly negative valence—a negativity cultivated by a number of different traditions of thought across centuries: from Christian theology, where darkness was connected to the absence of God, to Enlightenment thinking, in which darkness was a racialized symbol of negativity, danger, and death, an important counter figure for the construction of what Toni Morrison has called the “white imaginary” of the modern rational subject. Apple’s dictionary for Mac gives an indication of how these sticky histories still inform the connotative grasp of this word:

**Darkness, noun. 1. The partial or total absence of light (night; the quality of being dark in colour). 2. wickedness or evil (unhappiness or gloom; secrecy or mystery; lack of spiritual or intellectual enlightenment; ignorance).**

The dictionary suggests that darkness is still imbued with fascination and repulsion: the exotification of the mystic and dangerous “heart of darkness,” as Joseph Conrad calls it, remains present.

The Darkness Machines put pressure on myriad types of work that darkness performs in the cultural, social, and political imagination. Its play with shadows call attention to the darkness of night with its alternative structures of perception, movement, and sensibilities—a darkness that some imbue with potentialities for sleep, dreaming, and sex, while others equate it with labor on the streets, in bars, in factories, in cleaning up after the rest.

What kind of material conversation takes place in the encounter between the tricky history of negativity that the word darkness brings about, and the darkness at play in Heise’s Darkness Machines? As I pondered this question, a status update by Sara Ahmed popped up in my newsfeed on Facebook: “Stop using the word ‘dark’ as if it can be disentangled from its racialised history! Yes it is a command! Yes I know those doing this won’t hear the command!” Although the context for the update was unknown to me then, I couldn’t help but hearing the urgency of the call as directed at my considerations about how to understand the kind of work that darkness performs in Darkness Machines. How to understand this command? Some might be tempted to read the insistency of the call as a demand to step away from the word “dark”; the exclamation marks sounding like “hands off.” But leaving the word behind

---

18 Sara Ahmed quoted from status update on Facebook on October 13, 2013. Used with permission from author. Ahmed’s comment was made in a response to, among other things, the surge of colorblind philosophical discussions of vitalist “Dark Materialism.”
would risk leaving behind the unfinished histories of racism that this word brings along as well. Avoiding the word would merely feed the colorblind disentanglement that the call speaks up against. The command could instead be heard as a call to avoid reproducing decontextualized uses of the word dark that trade on and perform racialized forms of “denigration” (in the word’s proper sense, “to blacken”), where dark is used to signal something always already bad, problematic, and negative—as in phrases such as “dark times.”

Given the normalization of structural racism that conditions the radically unjust present in Denmark and beyond, it seems futile to think that we can disentangle the word darkness from its racialized history. But do the racialized connotations that this word brings about mean that the word always performs racist effects?

Destruction, death, and negativity are all central to Darkness Machines. But the darkness at work here cannot be said to trade on racialized negativity in any clear sense—the darkness produced by these machines is too strange and ambiguous. The material complexity and contextual specificity of the installation further prohibits the fixation of darkness to a figure for something always already bad. But this doesn’t necessarily mean that the racialized connotations of darkness are irrelevant. Darkness Machines have, after all, been produced in a context and time when Danish political debate has been strongly informed by racial-based discourses that repeatedly posit immigrants of color, especially so-called muslimke mørkemænd [Muslim Men of Darkness] as a threat to Danish lives and values. The visual rhetoric by right-wing Dansk Folkeparti [Danish People’s Party] is an example. Take, for instance, their 2011 poster campaign with the caption “Danmark på den sikre side—Hold daren åben, men landet trygt” [Denmark on the Safe Side—Keep the door open, but the Country Safe] written above an image of a large gray safety deposit box with its door ajar. Inside the safe was the Danish flag blowing in the wind above a beautiful green meadow.

It is tempting to see the destruction of the idealized and unspoiled green grass at play in the outdoor Darkness Machines as a comment on the racist symbolism in Danish national imagination. Darkness Machines’ short-circuiting of the romantic image of unspoiled Danish nature might be taken as an invitation to mine the unfinished history of racist and racialized modes of signification and beyond Denmark. Although this could be seen as an example of how the aesthetic can be used to disturb and remediate symbolic networks and chains of associations, I hesitate to leave it at that, as I cannot help but think that my own politicized reading of Darkness Machines is too quick. If my previous argument on how Darkness Machines cloud perception, vision, and knowledge is to hold, then shouldn’t I also allow these machines to slow down and complicate the clear trajectory of my own critical readings? If Darkness Machines gestures toward other ways of seeing and feeling (in) the dark, how can such gestures be captured and secured in words?

In the press release for “Darkness Machines—Dormant” at die raum in Berlin, Heise touches on the challenge of explaining and interpreting the darkness produced by Darkness Machines:

The darkness produced by a Darkness Machine is the kind of darkness that attracts us and scares us at the same time—somewhere between radical openness and no change whatsoever (sex and death). They take us to a place on the borderline between submission and perdition, where the system of the visible and understandable no longer rules. […] To even get started to write this text I had to trick myself: How could I write about something which in it’s core is unrepresentable? The trick was to think of the text as a woodcut or a lino cut—a graphic image in only black and white.

Heise describes how difficult it is to write about the Darkness Machines without locking their darkness to a specific purpose or meaning that often falls on either side of a chain of binaries like stasis/change, openness/impenetrability, eros/thanatos, fear/attraction. Like Heise, I find the act of writing about the Darkness Machines challenging. The work performed by these machines continually eludes my attempt to translate them into words in a way that doesn’t flatten the works’ material and conceptual complexities. As I have been writing this essay, I have been thinking of Goethe, who, in his Theory of Colours, is concerned about how he can “keep the essential quality [of the thing] still living before us, and not to kill it with the word.” Simultaneously, I have also worried that such concerns grow out of a rather aggrandized sense of the power of one’s words, and of writing in general. Could my writing really “kill” a work of art? And what kind of death would this entail? “For better or worse, I do not think that writing changes things very much,” poet and critic Maggie Nelson notes in Bluesta in her comments on Goethe. I think she is right, in this context at least: Any attempt to translate the work of the Darkness Machines into words will always leave something behind, an excess that exceeds the

19 For a discussion of racialized histories of the uses of words “dark” and “black,” see Robert B. Moore, “Racist Stereotyping in the English Language,” in Race, Class and Gender: An Anthology, ed. Margaret L. Andersen and Patricia Hill Collins (Belmont: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning, 2004).


framework of signification. Artworks are hard to contain, and even the most tight analyses have leakages, creases, and cracks.

Bringing questions of racialization and racism into the picture in a reading of the metaphorical suggestiveness of Darkness Machines might come across as contrived and reductive, at least in a Danish art context. Questions of race are hardly ever brought to the fore in discussions of the metaphorical and symbolic meaning-making practice of artworks, unless the works explicitly respond to debates about race and racism, or unless the artist is an artist of color. While works by white artists, like Heise, are seldom or never brought into the space of racial representation, this is almost always the case with artists of color. As art historian Darby English makes clear in How to See a Work of Art in Total Darkness (2007), work by so-called black artists in the United States is seldom allowed to represent more than black experience or ideas about black culture.25 The metaphorical range of aesthetic practices framed by terms like “black art” remain constrained by interpretive paradigms that grounds the proper viewpoint of the work in the imagined identity of the artist. English’s example of the discourse on David Hammons’s site-specific installation Concerto in Black and Blue (2002) is relevant in this regard. In the 2002 iteration of Concerto at the Ace Gallery in New York, the audience entered a series of totally dark rooms, except for the lights from tiny blue flashlights that viewers could collect upon entry. Despite the fact that Hammons’s piece in itself did not harbor any directions for how to interpret its symbolism, critics immediately reduced the capacious darkness in the piece to what English calls a “racially black darkness” connected to African-American culture and experience. “But,” he writes, “what other than racism can secure this reference?”26 English highlights how Concerto puts pressure on the ways in which darkness and blackness are “relational[ly] defined and erratically constituted in the social”27 as the installation works to exhibit the viewer’s and critic’s expectation and projection of darkness.

The darkness at play in Heise’s Darkness Machines could be said to work in similar ways to Hammons’s Concerto, insofar as it exhibits the range of critics’ interpretive frameworks and understandings of darkness. But in contrast to Hammons’s work, questions of race have never been highlighted in discussions on Heise’s artistic engagement with darkness. This fact might draw attention to the racialized structures that inform the economy of attention in the field of contemporary art in the global north, where certain artists’ work gets contracted to a racial “compulsory representativeness,”28 while other artists’ practices are allowed to operate far more capaciously. English makes a convincing argument about the loss entailed in making race the only entry point to works by artists racialized as being colored or black. Discussing race in relation to works by white artists seldom produces loss of the same kind.

My reading of the metaphoric suggestiveness of the Darkness Machines in racialized terms is unaccompanied in a Danish art context, and this gives an indication as to how white artists seldom need to worry about being reduced to a specific racialized representational regime.

Like Hammons, Heise refrains from giving the viewer suggestions on how to understand the darkness at play in her works, and instead positions the Darkness Machines as gesturing toward the unrepresentable—the destruction of meaning and understanding. There is an openness in this gesture, one that insists on the potential in the aesthetic encounter for starting material conversations of radically different kinds. In order to remain attentive to the diverse conversations that the Darkness Machines can ignite, it is necessary to slow down the interpretive machinery and pay heed to the durational process of meaning-making.29 The Darkness Machines’ dormant aesthetic not only puts pressure on questions of time, it also works durationally in time, and thus takes time to engage with.

The aesthetic tableau of Heise’s exhibitions of the Darkness Machines—Dormant—where the carefully folded pieces of dirty textiles are neatly laid on the floor and safely secured behind glass—invokes the representational traditions of still life art. The genre of still life is usually associated with the mediums of painting and photography, where captivating scenes of “things standing still” were seen to function as “life models” (as a literal reading of the Dutch term Still Leven suggests) for reflections of mortality.30 But in contrast to the tableau of objects captured in a still life painting or photograph that appear static in their representation, and thus allow for repeated contemplated viewings of the same object, Heise’s Darkness Machines—Dormant present us with a tableau that in many ways is still living. The status of these works as dormant indicates that the Darkness Machines are only temporarily standing still and might be reanimated in ways that will give them a different life in times to come. The Darkness Machines—Dormant are, as such, durational objects that lack any kind of

24 Nelson, Bluets, 74.
26 Ibid., 4.
27 Ibid., 2.
28 Ibid., 26.
The Darkness Machines—Dormant are no sleeping beauties. Their death-as-sleep does not trade on the same uncannily fascinating undecidability that helped make, for instance, Tilda Swinton’s performance installation *The Maybe* into such a media attraction. Made in collaboration with sculptor Cornelia Parker at the Serpentine in 1995 (and reiterated at MoMA in 2013), the installation featured Swinton lying on a white mattress inside a large vitrine in the gallery during opening hours, appearing to be sound asleep, while the audience flocked manifest” in itself, to borrow Michael Fried’s famous terminology—to work. In a similar vein to Lawler’s photographs, Heise’s act of exhibiting the Darkness Machines in a dormant state emphasizes the importance of situational context and framing in the production of value and attention to art.

While dirt and soil on the fabric of the Darkness Machines—Dormant highlight the durational character of the works in ways that break out of the modernist freeze-frame of the timeless art object, the exhibition of objects with traces of former use might also make them prone to enter into a more recent fetishizing machinery, namely, the one that transforms performance documents into precious historical relics. But the proposed dormancy of the Darkness Machines seems to work against this. Unlike a relic that gains relevance through its ability to speak about a dead past, the Darkness Machines—Dormant seem to play with what Roland Barthes, in his book about the historian Michelet, calls “death-as-sleep”—a form of “death” that does not possess the “revealing virtue which discloses the style of an existence.” Such ambiguous objects that are neither living nor dead “are the worst,” Barthes explains, “for they cannot enter into the historian’s resurrectional system.” While Darkness Machines—Dormant refer back to previous engagements, as on the field of love alley, their itinerary does not stop there. Instead, they leave us in the middle of art’s messy durational life.

---

32 Ibid., 54–55.
37 Ibid., 85.
around the glass case. The Maybe presented the viewers an artwork that posed questions on the vulnerability of the sleeper through the encasement of a body presented in an in-between state of subjecthood and objecthood, the sculptural and performative, life and death. But many of these aspects were overlooked in the media hype around the The Maybe that reduced the work to overlooked in the media hype around the The Maybe that reduced the work to the fetishized presence of a celebrity.38 Unlike The Maybe, Heise's Darkness Machines—Dormant have not had to struggle with sensationalist media attention, but the works share Swinton’s interest in the poetics and politics of sleep and suspension of activity.

“Sleep is one of the few remaining experiences where, knowingly or not, we abandon ourselves to the care of others,” Jonathan Crary argues in 24/7.39 “As solitary and private as sleep may seem, it is not yet severed from an interhuman tracery of mutual support and trust. [...] In the depersonalization of slumber, the sleeper inhabits a world in common. A shared enactment of withdrawal from the calculus of mutual support and trust. [...] In the depersonalization of slumber, solitary and private as sleep may seem, it is not yet severed from an interhuman connection, but the works share Swinton’s interest in the poetics and politics of sleep and suspension of activity.

Swinton’s The Maybe and Heise’s Darkness Machines—Dormant might be read as attempts of enacting the paradoxical agency and political resistance found in Crary’s figure of the sleeper. The fact that both projects put the act of sleeping on display complicates the notion of withdrawal at play. While Swinton exhibits her sleeping body in the opening hours of the galleries where The Maybe has been shown, Heise has exhibited the Darkness Machines—Dormant in street galleries available and accessible 24/7. Are these acts of display not simultaneously a reminder of how even an inactive, sleeping body can be made into a capitalized object of attention, if it is considered valuable enough (as celebrity, as an artwork) and framed in the right way? The numerous pictures on Twitter and other social-media sites last year of Swinton asleep in the 2013 iteration of the The Maybe at MoMA might give an indication of this. In contrast, Heise’s Darkness Machines—Dormant are no money machines, but their unsuspecting and quiet existence in public highlights some of the paradoxes at play in attempts to mobilize through forms of suspended agency.

The Darkness Machines’ paradoxical display of nonproductivity resonates with the growing interest in strategies of withdrawal and slowing down in critical theory as of late: from interest in historical texts—like Herman Melville’s short story “Bartleby, the Scrivener” (1853) and its protagonist’s mantra of “I would prefer not to” and the Marxist revolutionary Paul Lafargue’s manifesto The Right to Be Lazy (1883)—to more recent examinations of what Autonomia philosopher Franco “Bifo” Berardi has called modes of “radical passivity.”42 In his book After the Future (2011), Bifo suggests the need for abandoning stultified modes of activism in order to embrace modes of passivity that can “threaten the ethos of relentless productivity that neoliberal politics has imposed.”43 Central to Bifo’s analysis of the embodied effects of the changing semi-capitalist structures is an examination of how the “infinite acceleration of informational stimuli” produces exhaustion, depression, and desensitized bodies that lack the ability to interpret signs that are not verbal, that exceed the finite form of informational syntax.44 The poetic is central to his call for an active withdrawal from participation in the violence of capitalist exploitation, as he suggests that the sensibilities involved in art are central for the “creation of spaces of autonomy where solidarity can be rebuilt.”45 Bifo’s invocation of the power of the poetic has similarities to Crary’s investigation of sleep as a modality that distorts speedy capitalist logics founded on a masculinist culture of productivity. Bifo’s understanding of radical passivity provides a useful framework to consider how Heise’s aesthetic of dormancy troubles the temporal and agential expectations of activism and politics through its paradoxical form of withdrawal.

“Maurice Blanchot said that political impatience makes criticism warlike,” Rosalyn Deutsche notes in her recent book Hiroshima After Iraq.46 “Driven by the urgency of human-inflicted disasters, we want to proceed straight to the goal of social transformation, and so, writes Blanchot, the indirection of the poetic—and we might add, the artistic—displeases us.”47 Deutsche turns to

39 Crary, 24/7, 125.
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Deutsche's discussion of impatient criticism is important and makes me wonder whether my own insistent attempt to explicate the political potential in the Darkness Machines is related to a similar restlessness with the aesthetic. My desire to make a case for how Heise's work complicates dominant vocabularies of political legibility and activity by engaging with slow, sticky, and dormant temporalities is structured around making the work of the Darkness Machines legible as a form of knowledge. Even when trying to describe how Heise's work cannot be contained in writing, I want to reclaim this gesture as a political gesture. But then again, the politics I'm after are not those that operate within the "genres of demonstration and demand," as Berlant would call it; rather, they are paradoxical politics that work within genres that seek to provide "a little breathing space."

There are pockets, she said; pockets of time when I can bear it. Watching television for a little while or a conversation. The rest of the time is madness. This text is drawn from an article in the Guardian some years ago that quotes a woman fighting to survive devastating grief. The pockets of time she describes are textured and paradoxical. They are contained envelopes in the flow of time that provides small moments of respite. These are pockets not of escapism or neglect, but of possibilities for conversation and connectivity, of care for self and others. Pockets of time, or rather, time-outs from the humming present where it is possible to engage in the world, encompass and engage the surrounding madness differently.

Heise borrowed the title of her 2010 solo show "There are pockets, she said," at Overgaden—Institute for Contemporary Art in Copenhagen, from the Guardian article. As it gave space for examining the possibilities for slumbering and dreaming in a time where demands for efficiency, productivity, and legibility rules, the exhibition can be seen as a continuation of Heise's examination of what I have called an aesthetics of dormancy. In the first room of the exhibition, four lamps pulsed slowly in a breath-like rhythm that set the slow pace of the show. The lamps were directed at a series of colorful rectangular curtains that covered the gallery's main four windows. The curtains were made of a collage of well-used duvet covers in different patterns carefully sewn together with a number of circular patches. The material association to beds and sleep was further emphasized by the title of the installation: Dreaming softens you and makes you unfit for daily work, a sentence taken from the diaries of Louise Bourgeois. The title suggests how dreaming can work as a pocket of escape as it makes one drift to another place, a drifting that can be as scary as it is beautiful, but that doesn't necessarily follow the social scripts of a Protestant capitalist work ethic.

But the dreamscape wasn't the only form of pocket Heise engaged with in this show. The exhibition also included a number of other pockets: small linocuts of people with their hands in their pockets (figures also blown up to enormous proportions painted on the wall) and two large photographs of the insides of a person's jacket or trouser pocket printed on wallpaper and mounted to a corner in the back room of the exhibition—a room left almost in the dark due to the two Darkness Machines working in front of the windows. The wall-sized photographs of the inside of pockets opened up spaces that normally remain out of sight, a gesture that puts pressure on the boundary between the public and the private, as Mikkel Bogh notes in his text about the "methodological intimacy" in Heise's series of photographs of the inside of people's pockets and drawers. The act of magnifying the inside of closed pockets can be seen to reference the controlling curiosity of the police who in Denmark in recent
years have had the freedom to stop and search “suspicious targets” on the streets, an act that follows a clear racialized profile. But Heise’s photographs of the insides of pockets do not follow the dramaturgy of exposure of some hidden weapon or secret identity. Heise’s photographs show pockets that are half empty or contain only the most conventional things, like a key or a chestnut. Instead of opting for the spectacular, Heise’s enlargement of pockets calls attention to the texture of everyday life in a way that highlights the importance of recalibrating the scaling of things that matter.

Heise’s pocket aesthetic in “There are pockets, she said” is one of jumping scales, one that in a discreet but methodological way works with the tensions and connections wherein the private is folded into the public and the singular touches the collective. Heise’s tactful, tactile, and tactical use of figuration in the form of pockets and dream curtains gives texture to the problem of scaling that informs the affective politics of everyday life under 24/7 capitalism.

In the back room of the exhibition “There are pockets, she said,” on a wall left almost in the dark because of the Darkness Machines at work in the room, Heise mounted nine small linocuts of black octagons and abstract figures floating in space on a white background. The title of the works, Lens Flares, suggests a figurative reading of the forms: lens flare is a term for the optical effect that happens when stray light enters a camera lens, creating an often unwanted reflection in the images that reduces contrasts and color saturations, giving the images a washed-out look. While lens flares are often removed in retouch, or added as an effect that underlines the presence of a camera, Heise has removed all except for these visual “distorters” and translated them into a series of linocuts. This concentration on the effects of marginal stray light—stray light that tends to be unwanted—speaks not only to an interest in technologies of mediation and representation that shapes the vision of the world, but also speaks to the political economy of attention. This careful attention to lens flares in these linocuts insist on the value of the minor and the conditions for how the small matters come to the front and get distributed within the field of the visible.

In an interview, Heise describes how she sees the lens flare as a figure of resistance to the working of the current attention economy:

In the middle of the most boring and profane TV programme about real estate or something like that, you might suddenly see a lens flare occurring in the picture. It will move over the screen without caring whether house prices are going up or down. With its beautiful transparent colours and geometrical shapes it seems like a doorway to something else and my mind wanders of from the world of finance and speculation.53

Heise approaches lens flares as agents that disturb the dominant optics of visibility by reorienting the attention away from the already legible toward different imaginaries—imaginaries that are different from those clustered around real estate and financial speculation. By figuring the lens flare as a doorway for daydreaming, Heise highlights the importance of desire in the production of alternatives to the present—and time, time for imagining ways of seeing and inhabiting the world differently.

In the article “The Sense of Watching Tony Sleep” (2007), queer theorist José Esteban Muñoz examines the queer potential of what he terms “sleepy recognition”: “a certain associative mode of composition” that seeks to effectuate new forms of “opening[s] in comprehension.” “Sleep,” he writes, “like sex and alongside sex, gives us a sense of the world that potentially interrupts practices of thought that reify a kind of ontological totality—a totality that boxes us into an intractable and stalled version of the world.” In his suggestive notes on an artist-book by the painter Elizabeth Peyton that includes a series of drawings of her partner Tony Judt asleep, Muñoz considers how Peyton’s use of soft lines and fay colors makes the drawings “convey a dreamy romanticism that resonates queerly.” For Muñoz, the queer potential in Peyton’s work is in other words not to be found in either the artist’s biography or the specific subject depicted, but within what he calls “affective taxonomies—as shared ways of looking and feeling that offer us a different sense of the world.”

Although the soiled and mucky textiles that Darkness Machines—Dormant present us with seem far from the lightness in Peyton’s dreamy drawings, Heise’s work shares a queer attentiveness to the “ontological humility” in sleep. The aesthetics of dormancy I have been gesturing toward is thus one that is less characterized by the representations of sleep than by the use of art in carving out space-times for calibrating dreamy senses of other worlds. I see a queer utopianism at play in Heise’s practice, a utopianism that has nothing to do with creating blueprints for the future or programs for collective action. Heise’s aesthetic provides opportunities for enactments of what Jill Dolan beautifully calls “utopian performatives” in the form of momentary glimpses of a different sense of the present. This insistence on making space for such affective visions of a different world seems perhaps more relevant than ever. At least if Crary is right in his argument that one of the central disempowering forces in the 24/7 environments we inhabit today is “the incapacitation of daydream or of any mode of absent-minded introspection that would otherwise occur in intervals of slow or vacant time.” Heise’s Darkness Machines—Dormant work in the interval of slow time, and it can remind us that perhaps it is time to rest, to slow down and dream.
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It was her who had come to look for me. Somebody had told her that I was interested in photographs from the camp. She came up to me saying: “I heard you were looking for photographs. Whenever you have time come to my house, I have a bag full of them ...” And she went on telling me that during the wars in the ‘70s and ‘80s, the first thing she would do when the bombings started was to bring the bag somewhere secure. She said her house was destroyed twice, but the photos were still intact.

When I arrived at your house, the house was full. Full of crying women: in the living room, in your room, in the kitchen, even in your little atelier. And suddenly I saw all these images we had looked at together revive. I could go toward each of your sisters and greet them by their names, even though I had never seen them. I knew what they looked like when they were ten, when they were twenty, thirty and even when they were forty. And now they were standing in front of me as if these various photographs you had recalled again and again had become lively. It was as if they were stepping out of the photographs, and for a moment I was not sure anymore in what temporality/time I was moving.

Ideally this digital archive of photographs from the Burj al-Shamali camp should contain all these photographs: the ones people entrusted me, the hidden ones, the imagined ones, the ones from the past, the present, and also the ones from the past possible futures. Let’s not impose the paralyzing weight of the past on younger generations. Let’s allow perspectives and vision to unfold.
The two images and video still come from the artist’s digital collection of family and studio photographs, which also includes videos and audio recordings, gathered mostly in collaboration with camp residents from Burj al-Shamali between 2005 and 2011.
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Not Now! Now! engages with the politics of time in art: historical narratives and memory, the unforeseen rhythms of time, and the challenge of visualizing time. The book connects the postcolonial and queer debate around *chronopolitics* with artistic strategies that introduce breaks, stutter time, use citations and anachronisms, and introduce deferrals and collapses between time and meaning. They thus challenge orderly and rigid temporal concepts and their effects on bodies and the social. Contributions by art theorists, artists, and artistic researchers highlight how temporal norms organize our biographies and intimate relations, as well as the handling of capital or the continuation of colonial relations. The book instead suggests to focus on a particular non/moment in time: the not-now/now. It indicates a possible break in the temporal order, a meaningful gap between “not now!” and “now!” Or: the past and the future (“not now!”) uncannily but promisingly showing up “now!”
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