

German philosopher Peter Sloterdijk states that politics, in its classic conception, referred to the art of co-ownership in cities-the art. He also quotes a statistic from 1993 in which "one out every five.

German youths feel like an artist they no longer mean the artist as creator, but rather the last human being whose aura is defined by a permanent flow of experiences". Breakdown in consensus makes us wonder about the possibilities of politics in a society of artists where personal experience prevails. Do not ask yourself what the city can do for the artist. Ask the artist what he or she can do for the city. But let us view broadly this power of the artist what the artist is able to do. Let us of course question authority, but maybe beginning with the authoritarianism implicit in the very notion of the "creator" he or she who has control over what he or she can do. Let us assume the political power of art and the art of politics beyond such issues as permits and regulations, interventions and monuments, grants and recognitions prizes. Many or all of us here would like the politics in the plural, in lower case and in between quotation marks (which may not be a bad idea) or policies of our various city administrations to give us a Richard Serra instead of a Sebastian, or even worse, five upright snakes spitting out water. 12 And so what? What are the political- in caps? Implications of the fact that some of us want this sort of thing in public space everybody's an nobody's space and that others do not? What policy in the singular? might induce art in public space to be precisely that: public?

**FROM THE CITY TO THE CAMP BARE
LIFE AN URBAN POST. POLITICS
Bülent Diken**

In a joke from the times of the German Democratic Republic a German worker gets a job in Siberia and knowing that his letters will be read by the police he makes a deal with his friends. Let's establish a code if a letter you will get from me is written in ordinary blue ink. "Everything is wonderful

here stores are full, food is abundant, apartments are large and properly heated movie theater show films from the West, there are many beautiful girls ready for an affair the only thing unavailable is red ink" (Zizek 2002: 1).

Slavoj Zizek starts his recent book on September 11 with this joke and the "red ink" in the joke is of course a symbol of politics, of the missing link in today's "post Political" society. Like the term "trans politics" popularized by Baudrillard and Virilio years ago, post politics signals the lack of a shared language in which individual problems can be translated into a collective, social terminology. So to say, a post-political sociality is a sociality. That is the end of society, of the city and of politics. To discuss this idea I would like to open up with six short cases or examples

First, let us imagine the situation of a refugee, that is of a person who has lost all his political rights. The refugee is reduced to being a "human being as such" to a politically "naked body" and therefore he is the very subject of human rights. Yet paradoxically as Giorgio Agamben, following Hannah Arendt, writes, this figure "that should have embodied human rights more than any other mark(s) instead the radical crisis of the concept" (Agamben 2000: 19).

What is of interest in this context is that the refugee is excluded (he has for instance no citizenship rights in the country in which he seeks asylum) but not really -outsidel (he is absolutely subjected to the power of the juridical political framework of the country in which he seeks asylum) In other words, in the figure of the refugee -Inclusion - an exclusion are mechanisms that operate simultaneously in a gray zone, making the distinction of inside outside obsolete.

Second example could be a symmetrical one: gated communities 'public' space do not exist, the "gates" are controlled by private police, and the most basic citizenship rights

such as the right of free movement are denied outright see Rifkin 2000, ch7) Along with other solipsistic urban scapes such as shopping malls, theme parks, tourist sites and so on, gated communities represent a particularistic understanding of ethics and politics and of course of the city seen from the gated communities the city is made of fragments and fragments alone. It is no longer a common good thus no longer a city in the classical sense.

Third example: rape camps in ex-Yugoslavia. As is well known, the classics on warfare have sought to theorize -regular warfare that is, situations in which one army of men encounters another in a battle to conquest or defend a territory. Recently, however, much attention has been paid to what is called "asymmetric warfare" and accordingly to phenomena such as guerrilla tactics, terrorism, hostage taking and so on. War rape is an exemplary case of asymmetry in which the enemy soldier attacks a civilian woman rather than another male soldier.

The prime target here is not to hold or take a territory but to inflict traumas thus to destroy family ties and group solidarity within the enemy camp. Rape in this case is a fundamental way of "abandoning" subjects to "state of nature" war rape stamps the mark of sovereignty directly on the body. War rape is essentially a bio-political strategy aimed at abolishing the distinction between the self and the body, reducing, in this case, the woman's identity to "bare life".

Fourth example might be a kind of sextourism. Let's imagine for instance Ibiza also called -the Gomorrah of the Mediterranean - What attracts the tourist to Ibiza is a combination of music cheap drug and sex plus sun and the sea a "carnavalesque" mixture swayed from the constraints of daily life. A site in which it is made infinitely easy to experience a temporary metamorphosis a transformation

from the citizen into a naked body in search of enjoyment. This transformation of course is not less bio-political than that of women in rape camps. The same bio-political process is experienced as repression in one context while it is embraced as liberation in the other, however the diagram of power is in both cases the same in both cases "form of life" is suspended in a biopolitical metamorphosis.

Example 5: Let's imagine the standard situation of being watched by the Bio Brother.

This can of course take place everywhere: in Los Angeles ghettos, in the airport, or in the shopping mall. The point in this context is that technologies of surveillance do not recognize a person as a citizen but as a biological body, or even as body tissues. To use Deleuze's (1995) concept, one is not an individual with respect to these technologies of control but, as I will develop in the following an individual. Which means that "bare life" is at the very center of the city today, at the place hitherto occupied by the normalized citizen. Even when we refer to environment, human rights and other "sacred" values of our time, we refer to the biological body of man.

The last example: the popular reality-TV show. Big Brother. Whereas "social life" was hitherto defined in terms of democratic rights and duties, today, with increasing privatization and with the demise of panopticism, -society increasingly turns into a spectacle. When "society" loses the weight once attributed to it by Durkheim at a time it was impossible not to feel the pressure of "social facts" that is when "society" no longer can repress or promise salvation, it can only be staged as a spectacle as a simulacrum of a "society" that still somehow exists, masking the anxieties that follow the disappearance of "society" and the privatization of issues that were hitherto perceived to be political. In this new form of society anxiety seems to arise not from being watched by Big Brother, but from the

prospect of not exposed to the Others gaze all the time (Zizek 2001. 249 51 The spectacle becomes the only guarantee for the -existencell of a society around the individual. Further, the actors, in reality TV are perceive either as fascinating objects of desire or as disgusting objects, and needless to say -bare lifel is nothing else than this juxtaposition of the object and abject in a zone of in distinction . A grey zone of ambivalence in which reality and spectacle also become indistinguishable (see Baudrillard 1994 Baumanj 2002, 159-60 in this threshold the city is dissolved into a state of nature and to quote Hobbes man (becomes) a wolf to man.

What these 6 examples share in common is the following Firstly in all of them the political subject is produced in a zone of in distinction that makes differences such as biological/cultural, natural/social, irrelevant. In all the examples, the distinctions between private/public, exclusion/inclusion, civilization/ barbarism, inside/outside tend to disappear. Secondly, in all the examples what is politicized is the -bare lifel of the naked person. The principle of sociality is no longer the city but, as I argue in the following what Giorgio Agamben (1998, 2001) calls the "camp".

Historically, the city has been imagined as a disciplinary space entrenched by "walls" originating in an act of inclusion/ exclusion. However, the underlying fantasy behind contemporary urban life is that the city is an unpredictable and dangerous site of survival an indistinctive "urban jungle". Which brings us to Agambens primary claim that the concentration camp as the prototype of zones of in distinction is the hidden matrix of the modern, its nomos.

As is well know in political philosophy, Carl Schmitt argued that the "nomos of the earth" is constituted through kinking localization and order to each other. Order is conceptualized in spatial terms as homes towns and nations. Outside, disorder reigns.

But there is an ambiguity in this in the state of exception the link between localization and order breaks down The concentration camp, however, emerged when the unlocalizable (the state of exception) was granted a permanent and visible localization, signaling the advent of "the political space of modernity itself" (AGAMBEN 1998: 20, 174)

With the camp as a permanent space of exception, "to an order without localization (the state of exception, in which law is suspended) there... corresponds a localization without order". The location of the "unlaw" within law transforms society into an unbounded and dislocated biopolitical space. The camp, in this sense, signals that the state of exception has become the rule illuminating how sovereignty works and how political space is constructed. In other words, the camp illustrates a logic writ large. In Kierkegaard's words, later appropriated by Schmit and Agamben, the exception explains the general as well as itself. The camp was originally an exceptional, excluded space , enclosed and surrounded with secrecy. However, the production of "bare life" that is life stripped of form and value, is gradually extended beyond the walls of the concentration camp today as the inside outside distinctions disappear.

It is important in this context to recall that sovereignty works through an act of abandoning subjects, reducing them to bare life. Bare life is the life of the homo sacer, which belongs to humans in so far as it cannot be sacrificed but, at the same time does not belong to it in so far as it can be killed without the commission of homicide the homo sacer is inscribed in a zone of indistinction situated between the Greekzo? The natural life common to humans, gods and animals, and the bios which is the life proper to humans.

Lets now go back to the camp The Nazi concentration camp is a obvious example of

Hobbes state of nature. Reduced to animal existence, the inmates had no other concerns than survival. The camp was placed outside the rule of law. The guards could punish the prisoners randomly, without taking any consequences for their acts. However, the exclusion of the Jews the Gypsies and other enemies took place from within the real of law. It was a case of "inclusive exclusion" that is sovereignty was established after the state of nature. The state of nature is nothing else than "the being- in potentially of the law" (Agamben 1998: 35-36) The originally sovereign act establishes this ground zero of civilization through an act of "abandonment" of (form of) life (Agamben 1998-29)

Significantly in this context, modern sovereignty does not only work according to the disciplinary logic of exclusion. Disciplinary confinement, and thus exclusion and normalization constitute only one of the three spatial principles embodied in the camp. The camp is, to be sure a disciplinary space, but also a space of control organized according to the logic of flows manifesting another biopolitical paradigm. Control does not demand the delimitation of movement but rather abstraction and speed. Significantly, in the Nazi camp, there was no pace for rest; reflection and comfort work, finding something to eat and survival were parts of a daily battle, which mean that the prisoners were in permanent movement. What interrupted their "controlled flow" was terror in contrast to discipline and control which operate, respectively, in terms of enclosure and flow, terror functions against the background of uncertainty, insecurity and unsafety. The inmate of the camp could be hit, at any time, by the guards anger the greatest terror being of course the shower. Terror immobilizes through fear. It is thus disciplinary without the spatial confinement of discipline and the functional regularity of flows.

In this context mobility and its ever increasing significance in contemporary societies is a central issue (see Urry 2000) in today's control societies, one no longer moves from one closed site to another but is subjected to free floating nomadic forms of control (Deleuze 1995 178) Inclusion and exclusion thus take place through continuous, mobile forms of surveillance. Whereas discipline worked as an instrument of immobilization, post panoptic forms of power target the conduct of mobile subjects (Bauman 1998 51 2) Neither demanding nor promising normalization they engage in pre-motivational risk management (Rose 1999 234)

The city as a complex technological artifact illuminates the logic of control. No doubt that the systems of control are urban phenomena (Lyon 1999) yet this might be misleading because the -conventional cityll no longer exists. The contemporary city is no longer founded on the divide between the inside and the outside. The city of control is Rem Koolhaas fractal "generic city" which cannot be measured in dimensions. (Koolhaas et al 1995 1251) With Derrida, the city of control cannot be Whole, with Baudrillard, it cannot be Real, and with Virilio, it cannot be There (see Koolhaas 1995 et al : 967)

Within the disciplinary diagram of exception, single central authority watches individuals immobilized on the "edge" of the society with the diagram of control (for instance , the global market) multiple, deterritorialized authorities watch the mobile "dividuals" the multitude, through generalized bio politics. Yet control is prone to immanent problems the complex global interdependencies of flows bring forth inherent dangers. As Deleuze wrote the nightmares of the disciplinary society were entropy (that is, lack of centralized co-ordination) fund sabotage (or, opposition) in control society the dangers are noise and viral contamination "Noise" emerges, as Luhmann would put it, as a problem of miscommunication between the codes and the

programs of the differentiated function systems (see Luhmann, 1989) The -virall on the other hand emanates indifferent to control, bringing with it what Baudrillard called "transparency"

Transparency is a flattening process characterized by the intensification of indifference and the indefinite mutation of social domains. When everything becomes political, politics disappears, When every thing becomes urban, the city disappears, Transparency is disappearance.

Transparency is the answer to the question put forth by Baudrillard in the late 80 s -Why does the World Trade Center have two towers? The twin towers of the WTC were perfectly smooth surfaces, which merely mirrored each other, confirming the irrelevance of distinction and opposition in a postmodern world. Canceling out difference, upon which politics is based, the WTC was a symbol of transpolitics. An obscene system in which dialectical polarity no longer exists, a simulacrum, where acts disappear without consequences in indifferent -zero sum signs (Baudrillard 1994 16. 32)

Yet for all that transpolitics is not a peaceful order. The foreclosure of the political and the implosion of the social provoke new. Obscene forms of violence. Terror, which is not a product of a clash between antagonistic passions, but the product of indifferent forces. Small wonder that it is terrorism naked violence, which demolished the WTC.

Transpolitics and terror mirror each other in a smooth space of indistinction, they are the twin faces of the contemporary control society. Bin laden, created by the CIA and wanted by the FBI, versus state terror. When the difference between terror and state disappears in a post political obscenity, they start to justify each other, terrorizing the political itself by transforming it into a hostage.

The figure of the subject produced within the disciplinary dispositif was that of the prisoner. With control, we have the "dividual" the subject controlled on the move through multiple systemic inscriptions and codes. The figure of the subject regarding terrorism is that of the hostage an anonymous figure that occupies a radical state of exception beyond the principle of exchange. The hostage is a naked, formless body. Which is absolutely convertible anybody and everybody can be a hostage.

In the disciplinary era, exception was enclosed inside the panopticon and the "ghetto" camp in the form of an island of disorder amidst order in control society, there emerges a smooth space of discipline beyond the ghetto walls. Yet at the same time, due to the problems of noise and the viral, anarchy spreads too. As disorder is generalized across the smooth space, the disciplinary situation is reversed what has hitherto been exceptional becomes normality. Consequently, there emerge islands of order amidst disorder. These gated communities refer to particularistic orders, while outside, in the urban jungle, horror lies in wait.

In short, we are witnessing a cyclic process of creating spaces of indistinct discipline followed by control, followed by terror, and then the return of discipline as the reversed panopticon, as the politics of security.

Discipline establishes sovereignty by creating zones of exception through confinement. Control reverses this realizing the fantasy generated by the disciplinary society that of breaking through the wall. Free movement becomes a necessity. This however, brings with it an even more sinister, mobile power. Freedom of movement along strictly regulated flows comes to coexist with confinement and fixation. Thus the utopia generated by control society is that of an unregulated flow. Terror emerges here as the utopia specific to control society as its line of escape it invests in fear turning citizens into hostages,

to *homi sacri*. In the transpolitical war against terror, the state extends exception as a permanent state along a totalitarian line of flight from terror. The fantasy generated by terror is in other words based on the promise of security, certainty and safety. | Which brings us back to disciplinary confinement as protection against terror. Discipline opens the space for control, control for terror and terror for discipline.

Where does this, then, leave us regarding the question "Are public art policies necessary? As I argued, we live today in a time of increasing mobility, which is also a time in which populations' ontological status as legal subjects is suspended (Butler 2000) Concomitantly, the location of un/law (state of exception) within law tends to transform the urban space into a dislocated biopolitical space in which modern political categories (such as right/left, private /public, absolutism/democracy) are entering into a post political zone of indistinction and thereby dissolving (AGAMBEN 1998 4)

Even more fundamental a question is thus: how is it possible to re-invent politics and the polis? But regarding aesthetic (ist) approaches in this context, the camp does not bring with it good news. Hitherto the artistic critique of capitalism has emphasized ideas such as hybridity, nomadism, subversion and transgression against power, Post-structuralist French philosophy for instance, loudly and proudly opposed capitalism and power with an aesthetic critique, nomadism versus sedentariness, situationism versus the society of spectacle and so on. The problem today, however is that aesthetic critique seems to be accommodated by power, which itself goes nomadic in the "space of flows".

As Luc Boltanski & Eeva Chiapello argue, since the 1970s, while the social (e.g. Marxist) critique of capitalism has been silenced, "the new spirit of capitalism" has found new forms of legitimization in the aesthetic critique, followed by transfer of

competencies from leftist radicalism toward management. The aesthetic critique has in other words, dissolved into a post – Fordist normativity as the notion of creativity has been re coded in terms of flexibility and difference has been commercialized This is needless to say, also the point at which the aesthetic approach itself should be re evaluated in relation to the city and public life.

It is significant in this respect that the aesthetics design ideologies of New Urbanism have hitherto justified the post political reality of the camp. Hence i would like to reformulate the discussion topic once more as is it possible to re politicize urban aesthetics today) Or is it possible to re invent the city as a common good -Or , is it possible to return from the camps? And to repeat the old Marxist question. "What is to be done" if return is impossible?

References

Agamben, G (1998) *Homo Sacer, Sovereign Power a Bare Life*, Stanford. Stanford University Press.

Agamben. G (2000) *Means Without End Notes on Politics*, Minneapolis. University of Minnesota Press.

Baudrillard. J (1994) *Simulacra and Simulation* Ann Arbor. The University of Michigan Press.

Bauman Z (1998) *Globalization . The Human Consequences*. New York Columbia University Press.

Bauman Z (2002) *Society Under Siege*. London. Polity.

Boltanski, L. & Chiapello E. (1999) *Le Nouvel Esprit du Capitalisme*. Paris GALLIMARD

Butler, J (2000) *Antigone s Claim KINSHIP Between Life & Death* New York Columbia University Press.

Deleuze, G (1995) *Negotiations*, New York
Columbia University Press

Koolhaas, R, (1995) *S, M, L, XL*,
New York The Monacelli Press
283

Luhmann, N (1989) *Ecological
Communication* Cambridge: Polity PRESS.

Lyon, D (2001) *Surveillance Society
Monitoring Everyday Life*. Buckingham.
Open University Press.

Rifkin, J (2000) *The Age of ACCESS. How
TO Shift from Ownership to Access is
Transforming Capitalism* London Penguin.

Rose N (1999) *Powers of Freedom
Refraining Political Thought*. London
Cambridge.

Urry, J (2000) *Sociology Beyond Societies
Mobilities for the Twenty-First Century*.
London Routledge.

ORCHID ARCHITECTURES

Neil Leach

One of the best known works of the Baroque
is *The Ecstasy of St Teresa*, the exquisite
sculpture by Gian Lorenzo Bernini in the
Cornaro chapel of the church of Santa Maria
della Vittoria in Rome. This work has caught
the interest not only of enthusiasts of the
Baroque, but also of contemporary theorists
from the world of psychoanalysis and
philosophy. Why then has this piece proved
of such interest to these theorists and how
might their thoughts on this sculpture begin

to inform a discussion of contemporary
architecture?

ST. Teresa of Avila (1515-1582) was a
Carmelite nun and religious mystic. She
was a reformer who established her own
order, and who set up seventeen new
convents throughout Spain. She was
regarded
As a saint in her own lifetime, and was well
known for her ecstatic religious experiences,
of which Bernini would no doubt have been
aware when he captured her so vividly in his
exquisite sculpture. -*The Ecstasy of ST
Teresa*, in the Cornaro chapel of the church
of Santa Maria della Vittoria in Rome.
Certainly St Teresa's – visions had been
cited when she was canonized in Rome in
1622, within thirty years of when Bernini
began his sculpture.

To the contemporary world she is most
famous for her vivid and incisive accounts of
her ecstasies or raptures that are recorded
in her autobiography.

...Rapture is, as a rule, irresistible. Before
you can be warned by a thought or help
yourself in any way, it comes as a quick and
violent shock, you see and feel this cloud or
this powerful eagle rising and bearing you up
on its wings.

The eagle is, of course, God and a
fundamental aspect of the rapture is the
feeling of being raised aloft by God.

One sees one's body being lifted from the
Ground and though the spirit draws it up
after itself and does so most gently if one
does not resist, one does not lose
consciousness. At least I myself was
sufficiently aware to realize that I was being
lifted.

The majesty of one who can do this is so
manifest that one's hair stands on end, and
a great fear comes over one of offending so
great a God.