Critical Cartography of Art and Visuality in the Global Age

Critical Cartography of Art and Visuality in the Global Age

Edited by

Anna Maria Guasch Ferrer
and Nasheli Jiménez del Val

CAMBRIDGE SCHOLARS
PUBLISHING

Critical Cartography of Art and Visuality in the Global Age,
Edited by Anna Maria Guasch Ferrer and Nasheli Jiménez del Val

This book first published 2014

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

12 Back Chapman Street, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2XX, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN (10): 1-4438-6041-7, ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-6041-3

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Part IV: Art and the Post-Natural Condition

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This book is the product of the enriching debates that took place at the international conference *Critical Cartography of Art and Visuality in the Global Age*, held at the University of Barcelona in April of 2013. We would like to thank the Department d'Història de l'Art at the Facultat de Geografia i Història, Universitat de Barcelona, for their support in the organization of this event; the Museu d'Art Contemporani de Barcelona, MACBA, for providing us with the space and infrastructure to conduct the conference; Dr. Lourdes Cirlot from the Vicerectorat de Relacions Institucionals i Cultura of the University of Barcelona for her welcoming address at the opening of the conference; and the Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovación for their financial support of the event.

Very special thanks go to each of the convenors of the four panels that marked the event, as well as to the keynote speakers for their addresses: Carles Guerra (convenor) and Oliver Grau (keynote speaker) on the "Media Art Documentation" panel; Anna Maria Guasch (convenor) and Jonathan Harris (keynote speaker) on the "Utopian Globalists" panel; Juan Vicente Aliaga (convenor) and Angela Dimitrakaki (keynote speaker) on the "Labour, Woman and Politics" panel; and Joaquín Barriendos (convenor) and T.J. Demos (keynote speaker) on the "Art and the Post-Natural Condition" panel. We would also like to thank all the participants in the conference, from the individual presenters to the audience members who added interesting and pertinent questions to the debate.

Thanks are also due to the Art, Globalization, Interculturality research group, and especially to Christian Madrid, Diana Padrón, Rafael Pinilla and Olga Sureda for providing the technical assistance for the event.

This publication was made possible within the framework of the research grant HAR2010-17403 / MINISTERIO DE CIENCIA E INNOVACIÓN / I + D / 2011-2013 for the research project "Cartografía crítica del arte y la visualidad en la era global: nuevas metodologías, conceptos y enfoques analíticos"; and the Beatriu de Pinós postdoctoral fellowship BP-B 2010-00021, Agència de Gestió d'Ajuts Universitaris i de Recerca (AGAUR).

The Editors

INTRODUCTION

THE SEMANTIC CODES OF THE GLOBAL CONTEMPORARY

ANNA MARIA GUASCH FERRER
AND NASHELI JIMÉNEZ DEL VAL

The recent irruption—and ensuing expansion—of the term "global art" in academia, arts practice, and curatorship has signalled an attempt to supersede the territorial limits imposed by the old parameters of Eurocentrism, Western dominance, and the monocultural project of modernity. In the early 2000s, art historians such as K. Zijlmans, David Carrier or James Elkins, driven by theorizations of the end of universal and national art histories, forwarded the proposition of a world and global art history. Following suit, curatorial projects developed by intellectuals and theorists linked to ZKM at Karlsruhe (Hans Belting, Peter Weibel and Andrea Buddensieg) introduced the concept of "global art" into art discourse as a way of going beyond the formulas of modern internationalism as well as postmodern new internationalism. In the first book of what would later become a trilogy, *Contemporary Art and the Museum* (2007), Peter Weibel and Andrea Buddensieg documented the impact that globalization has had on contemporary art in an attempt to make visible a phenomenon that in recent years had been limited, for the most part, to the so-called "peripheral biennales": the will to supersede the concept of "Euro-Americanism" by championing the alternative project of a "beyond Euro-America". Along these lines, Hans Belting and Andrea Buddensieg published *The Global Art World. Audiences, Markets, and Museums* in 2009, an exploration of the different processes of global art production. In this volume, Belting and Buddensieg distinguished between the concept of "World Art" and "global art", the former referring to the world heritage of art spanning all periods and countries; the latter denoting a contemporary development of art that, like a phoenix, rises from the

ashes of modern art towards the end of the twentieth century in clear opposition to the highly valued ideals of Western progress and hegemony.

The present volume aims to contribute to this field of study through its engagement with, and problematization of, the new status of art and visuality in the context of global contemporary art. Resulting from a series of conversations that took place during the international conference *Critical Cartography of Art and Visuality in the Global Age* (Universitat de Barcelona, April 2013), the present anthology considers current debates in the context of cultural and identity-based histories as a way of expanding the territory of art into the field of culture. This volume also takes into account new approaches for the analysis of artistic practice within the context of a global cartography, and the (re)definition of the current parameters that shape contemporary art-theoretical discourse. The book seeks to locate new models of methodological interdisciplinarity that can serve to foster dialogue among scholars and practitioners from a variety of fields, such as art historians, film theorists, cultural geographers, anthropologists, sociologists, philosophers, and cultural practitioners. In short, the volume aims to provide the reader with the coordinates for current debates in global art and to develop a cartography of the various conceptual and methodological intersections that global art studies is addressing today.

In order to approach "the global contemporary" as a condition that has defined the study of art and visuality throughout the 21st century, it has been necessary to exercise a will to supersede all exclusionary forms of knowledge production in order to reclaim a presence in the art world that expands around the globe, challenging old geographical borders, and vindicating place and displacement narratives. In other words, *Critical Cartography* actively seeks out new forms of cultural practice that can transfigure the relationships between what is global and what is local, and that can serve to articulate the discourse of difference.

Temporal dimensions and relational experiences bring to the fore new issues for the production and dissemination of art. As Nikos Papastergiadis suggests, the coda for contemporary artists is defined by the artist's desire to be "in" the contemporary sphere, more so than to produce a reaction to the everyday. To be in the place of the "here" and "now", to work with others in simultaneous and concrete practices, to contemplate the achievement of work through the experience of a connection, all this means to elevate the value of the "performative" aspect of arts practices and to displace the reflexive role of cultural production.[1] In the current moment, contemporary artists no longer need to choose between remaining in a local context or participating in transnational dialogues.

Once she penetrates the context of contemporary art, the artist becomes part of a complex process that circulates around the world and that is defined not only by the issue of difference, but also by the different ways of "being in the world". Artists, continues Papastergiadis, widen the limits of their practice by defining their context and their strategies as the sum of paradoxes: museums without walls, cities as laboratories, living archives, the narratives of movement. These slogans are frequently used in the art world; they reveal a shared desire to extend the parameters of art by incorporating new technologies, new places and new perspectives. And in doing so, they expand the category of "the contemporary".[2]

While it may initially seem that globalization is the new and improved version of postmodernity, insofar as both incorporate a clear will to periodicize, globalization is far from being a simple substitute for postmodernity. The differences between the two are notable, as the cultural theoretist Imre Szeman argues through his provocative observations regarding the role of culture in globalization understood as a neoliberal political project.[3] Globalization, in contrast to postmodernity—considered an aesthetic category used to describe architectural styles, art movements or literary strategies—is a reality that has little to do with the concepts of aesthetics and culture such as they have been understood from a postmodernist viewpoint. There is no one "globalizing culture" in the same sense that we can describe a "postmodern culture" (nor a global architecture, a global art or a global literature). And if postmodernity seemed attractive because of the diverse formal innovations that it introduced, globalization inverts this relationship by emphasizing the restructuring of relations of power and politics, as well as re-dimensioning economic production from the national to the transnational in light of the operations of financial capital.

With globalization, representation (the central category of postmodern debate) seems to have been suspended. In contrast, the relations that have always been considered to precede representation are made visible through globalization, and in this regard culture would only be one of the multiple aspects of the production of goods and commodities.[4] Importantly, what marks the clearest difference between globalization and postmodernity is the public ambition of the concept itself:

> There is clearly more at stake in the concept of globalization than there ever was with postmodernism, a politics that extends far beyond the establishment of aesthetic categories to the determination of the shape of the present and the future—including the role played by culture in this future. Even if both concepts function as periodizing terms for the present,

> globalization is about blood, soil, life and death in ways that post-modernism could only ever pretend to be.[5]

How do these issues affect the areas of literature or art theory? Perhaps in this sense globalization's major contribution has been to redefine its practices in light of a world of connections and transnational communications that supposes, to a certain extent, the end of the nation-state and the provincialism implicit in national culture. Consequently, many of the theoretical and visual practices of globalization are directed towards the transference and movement of culture: change from one place to another, recently discovered mobility, the de-contextualization and re-contextualization of new places, and the new concepts that this entails: diaspora, cosmopolitanism, the politics and poetics of the "other", as well as the languages derived from postcolonial studies in general.[6]

As Terry Smith argues, the parallelism between contemporaneity and globality should suppose a stage in which the planet, its people and the things living in it can imagine a constructive mutuality based on the sharing of our differences:

> Contemporaneity and planetarity open us up to multiple interactions through which we constantly build our worlds-with-the-world, a world that is still in the process of being globalized but that, at the same time, displaces itself quickly beyond globalization.[7]

Here, Smith is referring to the art of "transnational transitionality" that includes at least three phases within the global contemporary: a reactive and anti-imperialist search for a national and local imaginary; a rejection of simplistic identitarianism and corrupt nationalism in favour of a naïf internationalism; and, finally, a broad search for a cosmopolitanism in context with a permanent transition between all types of things and relations. It is precisely the third phase—which must not be understood as a style, period or tendency—that proliferates under the radar of generalization. There is a noteworthy increase in the number of artists worldwide and in the opportunities that new technologies offer millions of users, directly affecting tentative explorations of temporalities, place, affiliation, and affect—the increasingly uncertain conditions of living within the contemporaneity of a fragile planet.[8] Smith suggests, therefore, that contemporaneity is a phase in which the planet and everything within it (people and things) can imagine a constructive mutuality based on the adequate distribution of our differences:

> Contemporaneity and planetarity are words that I believe should be reserved for these kind of reflections. They open up multiple interactions through which 'worlds within worlds' can be created, a world that—as it is being globalized—seeks to go beyond globalization itself.[9]

With this theoretical framework in mind, the present anthology aims to provide the conceptual tools to understand globalization as *the* category of contemporary art that has characterized the past two decades. It is a type of art that expressly distances itself from postmodernity and, in doing so, requires the deployment of new narratives in order to write a new art history that takes into account cultural identity over aesthetic feeling, and geopolitical and institutional issues over matters of style, innovation and progress. It is a type of art that highlights the complicity between art and the social, religious and cultural realms. In this sense, *Critical Cartography of Art and Visuality in the Global Age* groups a series of debates arising from the current state of global art studies through an interdisciplinary approach forwarded by academics and arts practitioners from a range of geographical, disciplinary and institutional contexts.

Seeking to mirror the structural and cultural dynamics of a globalized world, rather than focusing on geographical areas or following an area studies methodology, the book has deployed a topical approach that has allowed the contributors to locate points of intersection between their work and the work of others coming from different disciplines and/or analysing other geographies. In order to achieve this, the book's main body is structured around four major theoretical *topoi* that inform current global art studies: 1) archives and networks, 2) utopian globalists, 3) women and labour, and 4) the post-natural condition. Each section is headed by a text authored by a renowned specialist in the area under discussion, and then followed by shorter essays by individual authors that consider specific problematics within the topic examined.

Section One on archives and networks opens with Anna Maria Guasch's essay "Deconstruction, Relational Aesthetics and Techno-Cultural Networks: 1990-2010", in which the author considers the importance of the archival turn, with a special focus on the archive as the expression of a desire "to transform hidden, fragmentary or marginal historical material into a physical and spatial fact characterized by its interactivity" (1). This chapter is followed by Celeste Ianniciello's essay "Postcolonial Art: A Living Archive of Border-Crossings and Migrant Matters", which looks at the relationship between the aesthetics of border-crossings and the importance of a politics of remembrance through her analysis of artist Mona Hatoum's work. The collective "El Colectivo" addresses the importance of reconfiguring and playing with the archive in

their chapter "Re-Performing the Archive. A Feminist Act" through their proposal to "re-mix" the *Re.act feminism* archive. Elpida Karaba explores the centrality of archive art to the construction of resistances in the context of the Greek crisis in her chapter "An Art of Condensation, a Political Relationship: Archiving the Crisis, Claiming the Future".

Jonathan Harris opens Section Two on utopian globalists with an examination of austerity globalism and the possibilities for an utopian globalism as explored in the contemporary art of the 1970s in his text "Utopian Globalists, Modernism and the Arts of Austerity in the 1970s". His essay is followed by "DiY Utopias: The Rebel Urbanism of Madrid's 'Acampadasol'", Julia Ramírez Blanco's discussion of the aesthetics of resistance in the context of 2010's Acampadasol in Madrid, Spain. Artist Laura F. Gibellini explores the possibility of reconfiguring the map as a means to visualize utopian worlds via her alternative cartographies in the essay "WeltKarten. Panorama". In "The Ut(r)opian Globalization of Contemporary Central American Art", Sergio Villena examines the "ut(r)opian" impulse of Central American contemporary art in its aim to achieve worldwide projection and insert itself into the global networks of art.

Angela Dimitrakaki leads Section Three on labour, women and politics, with a study on the relationship between gender and labour in the works of several contemporary artists. Her chapter "Leaving Home: Stories of Feminisation, Work and Non-Work" sheds light on the ideological investment in the feminisation of women's work in general, and in women art workers in particular. Elke Krasny further elaborates on this topic in her text "The Domestic Is Political. The Feminization of Domestic Labour and Its Critique in Feminist Art Practice", where she discusses the links between urbanisation and the feminisation of labour through four case studies: Vienna, Hartford, Hong Kong and Mexico City. In "From Pseudo-Emancipation to Outright Subjugation. The Representation of 'Women's' Work in Contemporary Hungarian Women's Art", Erzsébet Tatai focuses on "shy feminism" and the representations of labour in contemporary Hungarian artists Ágnes Eperjesi, Erika Baglyas, Kriszta Nagy, Anna Fabricius, and Luca Gőbölyös. Lynda Avendaño highlights a decolonial approach to the state of women artists and the politics of authenticity in her essay "Decolonization: Women and the Politics of Authenticity". Artist Mau Monleón Pradas discusses her own work in relation to the struggle against gender violence in the Valencian and global contexts in her text "Towards a Socio-Political Ethics of Art and Technology in the Era of Globalization".

Finally, in Section Four on the post-natural condition, T.J. Demos analyses the role of bio-aesthetics and eco-futurism at dOCUMENTA (13) by focusing on the post-natural condition of contemporary art in his chapter "Gardens Beyond Eden: Bio-Aesthetics, Eco-Futurism, and Dystopia at dOCUMENTA (13) and Beyond". In "Global Latin American Art: An Eye on Earth", Andrea Díaz Mattei focuses on the "globe"-alization of the Earth following Borges's metaphor of the intelligible sphere. Juliana Gontijo considers the monstrification of art in the works of Mariana Manhães and the collective Oligatega throughout her essay "The Mechanical Monsters of the Cyber-Technological Imaginary: Technological Disfunctionalities in Contemporary Art". Mariella Franzoni's chapter "Towards an Ecological Hermeneutics of the Exhibition Space" looks at Alberto Carneiro's *envolvimientos* and their links to a post-natural condition and new ways of thinking of an ecology of culture and technique. The final chapter in this collection of essays is Salim Malla Gutiérrez's "The Transformation of the Gaze through Technology and Its Application in Contemporary Art Practice"; in it, Malla Gutiérrez describes the production of his piece *Correspondencias*, which exemplifies the new ways in which artistic practice can engage with the global condition.

Notes

[1] Nikos Papastergiadis, "Spatial Aesthetics: Rethinking the Contemporary", in *Antinomies of Art and Culture: Modernity Postmodernity, Contemporaneity*, eds. Terry Smith, Okwui Enwezor and Nancy Condee (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2008), 363-364.

[2] Ibid., 364.

[3] Imre Szeman, "Imagining the Future: Globalization, Postmodernism and Criticism", http://individual.utoronto.ca/nishashah/Drafts/Szeman.pdf. Accessed 25 February 2014.

[4] For a more detailed discussion of the relations between postmodernity and globalization, see Szeman, "Imagining the Future".

[5] Szeman, "Imagining the Future", 8.

[6] See also Douglas Kellner, "Globalization and the Postmodern Turn", http://pages.gseis.ucla.edu/faculty/kellner/essays/globalizationpostmodernturn.pdf. Accessed 25 February 2014.

[7] Terry Smith, "Contemporary Art: World Currents in Transition Beyond Globalization", in *The Global Contemporary and the Rise of New Art Worlds*, eds. Hans Belting, Andrea Buddensieg and Peter Weibel, Ex. Cat. (Karlsruhe: ZKM/Center for Art and Media, 2013), 192.

[8] Ibid., 188.

[9] Ibid., 192.

PART I:

ARCHIVES AND NETWORKS

CHAPTER ONE

DECONSTRUCTION, RELATIONAL AESTHETICS AND TECHNO-CULTURAL NETWORKS: 1990-2010*

ANNA MARIA GUASCH FERRER

It was not until the nineteen-nineties that a genuine turn, impulse or tendency was detected among artists, theorists and exhibition curators who began developing a view of the artwork "as an archive" that co-existed with other tendencies or turns focusing on the ethnographical or the micropolitical.

This archival turn finds expression in a desire to transform hidden, fragmentary or marginal historical material into a physical and spatial fact characterized by its interactivity: "Archival artists make historical information, often lost or displaced, physically present," in the words of Hal Foster.[1] In this sense, in allusion both to the architecture of archives (or physical collection of information) and to the logic of archives as conceptual matrices of quotations and juxtapositions, the materials of the artwork as archive can be found (images, objects and texts), constructed, but also public and at the same time private, real and also fictional or virtual. In this case, the medium typical of archival art is digital culture or the network of the Internet, which forces a displacement of "archival space", together with its architecture, into "archival time" tied to the virtual nature of the Internet. At this point, archival data lose their spatial immobility in favour of adopting a dynamic operability and becoming a temporal index.[2]

This "immaterial information" follows a rationality that differs from material systems of memory, typically organized on linear principles. According to Joke Brouwer and Arjen Mulder,[3] this alternate rationality is much closer to the labyrinthine and fuzzy logic of oral culture, that is, a culture without written records. Stories change as they are told and continue changing with each retelling, just as personal memories do. This process resembles how digital databases are made accessible through complex, interconnected technologies that work randomly based on the

principles of flexibility and instability: "Digital archives are unstable, plastic, living entities, as stories and rituals were in oral cultures".[4]

In addition to the earlier "archontic" quality of archives, digital culture generates a new "memory culture". The digitization of stored materials involves trans-archivization: the organization of memory yields ground to arenas of circulation that are more constructive than reconstructive. And if we assume that the question of memory is only an effect of the application of memorization techniques (recall), then we may even reach the conclusion that in reality "there is no memory": "The networked databases mark the beginning of a relationship to knowledge that dissolves the hierarchy associated with the classical archive. […] The generative archive, the archival paradigm, in genuinely digital culture, is being replaced by sampling—direct random access to signals".[5]

Moreover, the constant of the archive goes hand in hand with the recent history/memory debate not only as a disturbance in our notions of the past, but also, as Andreas Huyssen notes,[6] a fundamental crisis in our imagination of alternative futures. According to Huyssen, the price of progress, one of the most active impulses in modernity, has been the destruction of past modes of life. There was no liberation without active destruction. And the destruction of the past brought forgetting. Amid this "hypertrophy of memory" inherited from modernity, Huyssen reasserts memory (and forgetting), but not in any way as a complaint or wistful gesture (as occurred among the Romantics who saw memory as one of the best weapons against undesirable industrialization, urbanization and modernity). Rather, Huyssen claims them as resources to address cultural, political and social matters of global magnitude. After all, Huyssen maintains, the act of remembering is always a symptom of our cultural present.

Hence, today's contemporary obsessions with memory can be viewed as an indication that our way of living and understanding temporality is itself undergoing significant change. This is the context in which "historians" and "memoirists" wage battle, a battle that reproduces the academic debates of history vs. memory and that, in turn, should be understood in terms of the "seduction of the archive" and the desire for narratives of the past as felt by a large number of contemporary artists. Rather than a canonical way of doing history or using historiography as a tool of domination and ideology, artists seek to work with "discourses of memory" as essential to imagining the future and contemplating life and imagination in a consumer society.[7]

For all of these reasons, we can affirm that the archive has become one of the most universal metaphors for all types of memory and of records and storage systems. However, the archive lacks narrative memory. In other words, the concept of memory under consideration has little to do with "telling stories", with grand, all-encompassing syntheses or with the "exhaustive narratives" specific to modernity. Hence the importance of "secondary narratives", which only become coherent by means of their discontinuous elements and a way of thinking that is both deconstructive and semiotic in nature. This explains the prominence of the index over the icon and symbol, the importance of serial photography and the value of the concept "now-time". With respect to this last aspect, Walter Benjamin in the nineteen-thirties opposed the notion of the discontinuity of the moment ("now-time") to homogeneous, linear time. Art, as a result, must not claim to affirm the tradition, but must find "something new" in each moment, a moment understood as "now-time" (independently of the causal nexuses established by historicism) that compresses within itself the history of the past.

Jacques Derrida and "Archive Fever"

In the nineteen-nineties, the archival impulse (or fever) arose among artists, theorists and curators partly out of one of the most profound reflections on the concept of the archive proposed by Jacques Derrida in a lecture entitled "Le concept d'archive. Une impression freudienne".[8] In his lecture, Derrida sought answers to questions like: why should we, today, re-elaborate a concept of the archive in a single configuration that is at once technical and political, ethical and legal? Is it not necessary to distinguish the archive from what has all too often been reduced to the experience of memory, the return of forgetting, but also the archaic and archaeological, recollection or excavation; in short, the search for lost time? This lecture may be also be seen as one of Derrida's most controversial essays on psychoanalysis, which grew out of debates between Derrida himself, Michel Foucault and Jacques Lacan in response to two works by the American historian of Judaism Yosef Haim Yerushalmi, *Zakhor: Jewish History and Jewish Memory*[9] and *Freud's Moses: Judaism Terminable and Interminable*,[10] as well Sigmund Freud's own text *Moses and Monotheism* (1939).

The Material Condition of the Archive

Derrida began by distinguishing the archive from what it is all too often reduced to, that is, the experience of memory and the previously mentioned return to the origin, to the archaic and the remembered. In Derrida's view, the archive (from *arkhe*, which means both the commencement and the commandment) must not only be deposited in some place (exteriority of location), but this must also be a place of authority (the *arkheion*, i.e., the State) and have a method of consignment. For this to happen, however, we must first find the meaning of the word "archive". The archive, Derrida says, represents the "now" of any type of power exercised in any place or time. It names both the commencement and the commandment and its name coordinates these two principles in one: the principle according to nature or history, there where things commence—i.e., the physical, historical or ontological principle—and also the principle according to the law, there where men and gods command, where authority and social order are exercised, the place from which order is given—i.e., the nomological principle.

As with the Latin *archivum* or *archium*, the meaning of archive comes from the Greek *arkheion*: a house, a dwelling, an address, a residence of the chief magistrate, the Archon. Archons not only wielded power and stored official documents; they also had hermeneutic jurisdiction: the right to interpret the archives. Hence we can speak of the principle of "house arrest", whereby a residence is assigned to stand between the private and the public, which is not equivalent to saying between what is secret and not secret.

"There is no archive," states Derrida, "without a place of consignment, without a technique of repetition and without a certain exteriority. There is no archive without an outside".[11] It is necessary for the archontic power to draw on the principle of "consignment", a principle governed by the act of "gathering the signs":

> Consignment tends to coordinate a single corpus into a system or synchronous relation in which all the elements are articulated into the unity of an ideal configuration […]. The archontic principle of the archive is also a principle of consignment, in other words, of gathering (which connects it to one of the senses of archive as hypomnema, a mnemotechnical supplement or representative, auxiliary or memorandum, which is associated with the compulsion to repetition in opposition to the so-called living or spontaneous memory, the mneme or anamnesis).[12]

Hence the archive is not only a collection of documents gathered and guarded in one place, but also a system articulated in signs, without fissures, without discontinuities or distorting elements.

However, the archive is not simply a place where a plurality of signs is gathered against a single backdrop. The archive contains the principle (*arkhe*) on which the law rests, in the sense that it is the place that you must go to consult the law, making direct or indirect use of the Archon's power of interpretation. The archive is the exteriority to which we must turn for knowledge. The right of access to the archive is a privilege: the privilege to interpret the signs to recognize or "re-know" them. From this standpoint, the Archons not only act as guardians, ensuring the physical safety of the repository and its material supports, but also assume a hermeneutic jurisdiction: they possess the power to interpret the archives.

At the same time, we need to consider the archive not as something aspiring to stability or perfection, but rather as something moving and unstable, an infinite and indefinite process. Rather than defining something specific, the archive may be explained as a tendency or an attempted form of being. Archives are never complete, because they are not a place or corpus in any absolute sense, but rather a tendency toward being one. The archive can be defined as a precise structure without a complete meaning, a structure associated with terms like institution, authority, law, power and memory.

In brief, the archive's condition as a material artefact stems from this necessity of a physical place for the existence of the "archive-continent". By way of Derrida's thinking, we then arrive at the metaphorical use of a place as museum or of a material artefact as artwork.[13]

The Immaterial Condition of the Archive

Derrida himself added a further dimension of the archive, its "immaterial" condition, which related Freud's psychoanalysis with the "spectral" nature of the archive in the Internet. In the same way that psychoanalytic theory turns a technical model of a machine-tool that represents the "outside" of memory, according to Freud, into a theory of the archive or, in other words, a theory of memory (through what is known as the *Wunderblock* or "magic slate"), so also the digital archive in the Internet is characterized by a constant flow of data (equivalent to the "impressions" in Freudian psychoanalysis), without geography or temporal restrictions, but with the resulting displacement of the notion of information storage and classification toward navigation and hyperlinks that relate distinct pieces of the same information. As Derrida noted: "In

the past, psychoanalysis would not have been what it was if email had existed. And in the future, it will not be what Freud and so many psychoanalysts have anticipated, because email does exist now".[14] As Derrida says: "Likewise, I single out email as of special importance because electronic mail is on its way to transforming the entire public and private space of humanity, and first of all the limit between the private, the secret (private or public), and the public or the phenomenal.[15]

Theories of the Archive Following Derrida

The archival turn is the subject of an expansive critical literature. In recent years, it has given rise to various theoretical reflections and curatorial projects that I will proceed to discuss in the following sections.

Allan Sekula: The Photographic Archive

Allan Sekula was one of the first writers to address the problem of the photographic archive from the standpoint of the history of photography, situating the archive in aesthetic, political and historical contexts. Sekula wrote two landmark papers, "Reading an Archive: Photography Between Labour and Capital" (1983) and "The Body and the Archive" (1986).[16] Drawing on Michel Foucault's thesis from *Surveiller et Punir: Naissance de la prison (1975),* Sekula began by acknowledging that "archival ambitions and procedures are intrinsic to photographic practice", then went on to analyse the honorific function (linked to bourgeois portraiture) and the repressive function (linked to police mug shots) in portrait practice in the nineteenth century, leading to what he called an all-inclusive "shadow archive" that situates individuals according to a socially proscribed hierarchy. This shadow archive ranged from the bodies of heroes, leaders, role models and celebrities to the poor, the ill, the mad, criminals, racial minorities, women and all other embodiments of the indigenous. Everything is measured according to two closely interlinked disciplines, physiognomy and phrenology, which use the body and especially the face and head to translate outer signs into inner character. Together with this general archive, Sekula argues, another, more sophisticated type of archive exists and it corresponds to the way in which the police used photography in the late nineteenth century and to the resulting loss of faith in the optical empiricism specific to generalist photography. The camera was now part of a system of bureaucratic / administrative / statistical intelligence, whose aim was no longer the camera itself, but the filing drawer: "The institution of the photographic