

The Man Who Could Walk through In-Between Positions

SUREYYA EVREN

Despite Nietzsche's recognition of the interconnectedness of the forces that make up both people and the rest of the world, he replicates the perspective of one who must exclude becomings that do not originate from within that perspective. Although he is willing to risk the dissolution of stabilised forms of life, he has yet to invent a language that invites participation and the mutually constitutive production of a dialogical text. In attempting a dialogue with Nietzsche, Irigaray attempts to open up the representational system of Western thought to its unrepresentable other.¹

Turkey holds currently a candidacy for membership to the European Union, along with a few other countries. It goes without saying that there are some exceptional conditions specific to Turkey. But what I want to address in this text is not the uniqueness of Turkey's potential accession to the EU and the prospective consequences of this accession for regional and global politics. My main argument is that these kinds of major decision-making processes on the international scale compel us, the 'ordinary people', to think as diplomats do. Moreover, we are losing our authority and ability to transform our own living conditions. The necessary task of transforming our locality is totally overshadowed by the prospect of being granted EU membership, and being integrated into a much more democratic and wealthy territory ; imagined as an exquisite paradise that will warmly welcome us with the promise of mental and material salvation.

The differing views on this issue are shaped to fit two totalistic options, fit into two totalistic rooms: Yes to EU or No to EU. And it is identical on the other side of the

negotiation as well: Yes to Turkey or No to Turkey. Some critical views posit the problematic of this debate as the central issue with regard to the future expansion of the EU. However, this synthetic double bind has a more distressing impact on the side already experiencing the dread of prospective exclusion, namely Turkey.

My argument in this section of this essay focuses on the stories of 'ordinary people' and how their everyday practices relate to the ongoing diplomatic debate. I want to inquire into the ways in which major political decisions affect daily life. How do we react to these 'pyramidal' developments, with the governing elites at the apex making all decisions with regard to the governed masses at the base? What clues we can get about ourselves through examining our reactions to this formation?

Unfortunately it is not only political actors, but also intellectuals, artists, writers and philosophers who sometimes uncritically identify with the position of 'consulting for the state'. By the term 'state consultancy', I mean the act of using and mobilising knowledge for the benefits of the state. "What should the state do?" is the central concern in the rationale of such consultancy.

In these circumstances, the traditional role ascribed to the intellectual ; to reveal and communicate, in the larger social interest, the hidden truth about social reality ; disappears. In the domain of consultancy, we see the intellectual as an expert working for the benefit of those in power. Truth is no longer about either life or politics as they actually are. Truth has been imprisoned within the tight constraints of diplomacy^a

The experts hired by television channels and mainstream press are actually manipulating everybody to think this way. We watch them, believe in them, and follow their views on what should the state do. We find ourselves in this game of trying to find out which expert is closer to the truth that is in the state's best interest. Left in shadow are our lives, our decisions and our empowerment^a

The representational pressure wants to lock us into the strict dilemmas of conventional protocols. We find ourselves stuck between either 'this' or 'that' in terms of our choices. Very much like the 'love it or leave it' motto of Italian, and then US nationalists ; which has been frequently used by Turkish nationalists as well. This political logic combines with the logic of social engineering, and everything is coded by mega diplomatic projects that have little or no link to our daily lives.

By insisting on abstract questions, the consultancy-driven process forces people both from Europe and Turkey to take sides: "Do you or don't you support Turkey's entrance into the EU?" "Should Turkey be in the EU?" "Tell us which side you support^a "

We are discouraged from thinking in terms of alternatives, from deconstructing the repetitious, recursive strategies of the politically performative^a Instead, state officials 'consult' with us, and we ask the state for interpretations.

However, we can reformulate our own questions with multiple perspectives. For instance, we can ask questions such as: how does the EU process affect daily life in Turkey? How does the EU process affect the mechanisms of leftist politics, especially 'horizontal' (i.e., heterodox, grassroots, non-'pyramidal') leftist politics that disseminates the motto

Another World Is Possible ? How does the EU process affect the left's ideological core, that promises to transform our very lives? And reciprocally, how will the process of Turkey's accession to the EU affect the daily life of Europe?

Discussions run in such a way that they make people in Turkey (even figures from the left) conceive of the EU as a homogenous block; similarly, EU citizens conceive of Turkey as a homogenous entity. When we say "Turkey" or "EU", we can either understand these to mean the EU governance and the Turkish state (government and other governing elites, state, military and financial decision-makers); or quite the opposite, i.e., we can understand these to mean everyday life in the country called Turkey, and daily life in the countries under the umbrella of the EU.

The state-consultant nexus wants us to look at Turkey and the EU through the eyes of the managing elites or their consultants. This interpreting machine allows itself the convenient pleasures of strategising, pushes today's urgent political agenda to a distance, escapes into the fictive realm of planning for the future.

An editor of a Turkish socialist magazine recently said, "As long as we become more democratic at the end, it doesn't really matter who leads us there". Yet the counter-argument is that it actually matters, the path is more significant than the destination^a

These days we are witnessing how recently introduced revisions to the Constitution are being crippled by devolutionary measures, with some democratic rights being withdrawn due to pressure from the military apparatus. And sadly, there were no prominent reactions to this negative development. 'Rulers' grant some rights, some freedoms, and after a while they whimsically retract parts of these. Everything remains on paper, in closed rooms, far away from our will. Maybe the EU will keep on exerting pressure and the local government will grant some freedom again ; playing yo-yo with democracy^a

The emancipatory vision is the property of the left, we generally assume. The left aims at transforming and transvaluing life, turning it into something else, 'another world'. But in the case of Turkey, when the responsibility of transformation is ascribed to the authority of a larger political entity such as the EU ; operating absolutely from the top down, through the pyramidal formation of government hierarchy) ; the project of the left starts to lose its meaning. Why should people actually engage in a struggle to transform their locality if the EU is going to accomplish this task for them anyway? They simply feel as if they should sit and wait. ^aAfter the EU finishes this job, then we can push the democracy further^a is the kind of reasoning in charge here ; the logic of and why bother to react so fiercely to undemocratic laws, our government will have to change them anyway, if it wants to get into the EU ^a And the transformative potential of the left is generally swept away.

So, the problematic for us is not the one put forth in the familiar rhetoric of strategists giving their professional opinion as to whether Turkey should join the EU or not. Rather, the problematic concerns what action we should take during the process of contemplating and actualising another world . How are we going to refuse the false loyalties and abstract affiliations, and thereby disrupt representative politics? How can representative politics be effectively disrupted? What action is possible, when all the decisions are taken by strategists,

when we are excluded from the decision-making processes, when we are led to the illusion of inclusion, and permitted to express ourselves only through pre-formulated options?

The promise of relative democratisation coming with the bid for EU membership might even harm leftist politics, since partial, contingent, conferred freedoms are not an authentic mode of social empowerment.

Irigaray characterises the contemporary paradigmatic relationship between the masculine subject and the feminine other as based on an illusion: if the active subject were to acknowledge what 'really' happened, he would see that in the other he is changed and becomes other without recurrence.²

Isolation is not the answer to this situation, for sure. But again, obviously the left (and specifically what we conceive as the 'horizontal' left, needs to be empowered. And this would be difficult to achieve in Turkey, where various strands of nationalism and conservatism hold sway. The case of the 'nationalist left', the boosted fraction that nowadays claims the lead role in maintaining the status quo and organising the anti-EU block, is particularly repulsive. Everywhere, one witnesses the weakening of actively democratic stands and the simultaneous intensification of reactionary politics.

The *Jyllands-Posten* Muhammad cartoons controversy has also reinforced reactive sentiments against the EU. The facts of the case are now notorious: 12 editorial cartoons, most of which depicted Islam's Prophet Muhammad, were published in the Danish right-wing newspaper *Jyllands-Posten* on 30 September 2005. The controversy escalated at unimaginable speed, as some or all of the cartoons were reprinted in newspapers in other countries, leading to violent protests, particularly in the Muslim world. We soon found ourselves in a virulently polarised ethos, which threatened the courageous critical voices at both ends ; the people supporting and struggling for freedom of expression in Muslim countries, and the people who strive for improvements in immigration policies and minority rights, and who sympathise with no-border campaigns in Western countries. The fantasy about the 'clash of civilisations' gained more and more committed followers.

The 'idealism' of the *Jyllands-Posten* ; trying to 'resist' the self-censorship of political correctness and 'defend' freedom of press and freedom of expression ; ironically turned into a totally negative function for 'freedom fighters' in both Western and Islamic contexts. Such an inversion quite resembles the condition of the doctor in Danish film director Lars von Trier's *Epidemic* ; the idealist figure who is not the cure, but is in fact the source, of the epidemic. Dr Mesmer (played by von Trier himself) is inadvertently spreading the very disease against which he is fighting. Since *Epidemic* (1987), over the last two decades Trier has continued to explore the theme of idealism and has been truly critical of a particular set of idealist visions and attitudes. His latest criticism is revealed in *Dogville* (2003) and *Manderlay* (2005), both with a backdrop of US history.

The latter film is about an imaginary plantation (*Manderlay*) in rural Alabama in 1933, a site where the practice of slavery is still deeply entrenched. The ethos of *Dogville*, a story

of harrowing violence and abuse in a small American town, continues in this film, which hinges on the historical facts of slavery and segregation. In *Manderlay*, the character Grace appears at a cotton plantation where the black workers are still treated as slaves, 70 years after their legal emancipation. Full of idealism, she steps in to help them take control of their own destinies, teaching them to vote on community decisions. Grace could easily resemble an idealist from the young Turkish Republic, a Young Turk, or a Turkish 'Kemalist' character from the first half of the 20th century, who goes as a 'saviour' to a underdeveloped traditional, poor village to enlighten the illiterate villagers and revolutionise their lives.

Confidently carrying the knowledge of freedom in her hands, Grace does not feel the need to listen to other opinions. She feels her first duty is to teach the residents of the farm that they have a right to speak for themselves. Even while she facilitates group meetings and encourages the collective voice, Grace continues to believe she is the only source of information about a free world and privileges of assembly, into which she has to initiate these unlucky, disenfranchised, uncivilised 'other' elements. This scene of training the supposedly less human to be sufficiently human can be seen in the history of many different modernisation movements all over the world, but most violently and relentlessly in colonialist confrontations.

The most disturbing aspect of the political stance exposed in *Manderlay* is the sequence of documentary photographs at the end of the movie, condemning US imperialism as well as warlords, etc. Without these direct addresses to US international crimes, the film can be read as not just a scathing attack on US foreign policy or its militarist inventions,³ as but a general critique of idealism. If we 'subtract' these references to the US, the director's critique becomes applicable to certain kinds of ideologies found everywhere, and imposed for given historical periods.

*In a way, then, she does turn around an axis; she continually returns to the masculine subject who calls her, she does not abandon him, she is there when he calls. He may withhold acknowledgement and refuse to see her sacrifice ; the sacrifice of her own flesh.*⁴

Austrian director Michael Haneke's 2005 film *Caché* (Hidden) depicts the colonialist notion of dialogue in a different manner. *Caché* is set in a totally postcolonial, post-industrial environment. The main protagonist George, a well-known Parisian TV anchor, receives menacing, mysterious 'surveillance videos' that show scenes from his private and family life. This plot element is combined with political allegory: *Caché* is partly an evocation of France's "repressed memory of *la nuit noire*"⁵, the night of 17 October 1961, when hundreds of Algerian demonstrators in Paris were beaten, and many killed, by the police.

Caché exploits the trope of the panopticon, of the Orwellian "big brother" gaze. George ; a TV anchor, someone whose image is celebrated and always seen by many people ; feels tense when he is personally watched, as opposed to being viewed by the public while he does his professional work. The intervention of the surveillance camera leaves him no room to hide. The hidden cave, the hidden corner, is under camera control.

In this film, the French are in the position of controlling and watching ; they are fated to a sterile life that sees everyone through a well-organised social system symbolised by a surveillance camera. Haneke, working on the power of the scopic drive and the politics of viewing, first turns his gaze upon an ignored national crime of 1961: a sin of civilisation, a sin of racist exclusion, which has left its trace but has receded from public memory.

George is no visionary teacher of the postcolonial era. He doesn't care to 'enlighten' Algerians, or 'free' oppressed Algerian women, or 'civilise' immigrants, or 'organise' a free society, as Grace attempts to do with the slaves in *Manderlay*. Freedom is not a relevant issue. As a director, Haneke is not a critic of idealism in the von Trier manner. George is only interested in distancing himself from the 'other', here in the form of the character Majid ; in throwing him, as he says, "into the Seine of his own life", just as the bodies of Majid's parents were dumped into the river by the police during the 1961 violence.

Haneke, who has always been very critical of Western middle-class values and lifestyles, successfully shows how sterile bourgeois social relations extend their disgust for touch into all dimensions of social life, and paradoxically, how this sterile environment itself makes us sick. This is symbolically rendered through the metaphor of sleep in the film. Sleeping in a sterile environment is the most hygienic of all possible situations.

Throughout the film, George is forced to enter the realm with which he does not want to have any kind of direct contact or contiguity. The surveillance camera's watching eye takes him into the 'other' neighbourhood, the 'other' house of Majid, the 'other' position of having to talk with Majid in the latter's flat. A politically reversed 'grand tour' for the rulers, where the 'education' for the 'nobleman' of our times is enforced contact with the physical domain of that which is 'other', devalued and despised. In George's case, he decides what is to be forgotten, what is to be remembered, what is to stay hidden and what is to be projected 'on screen'.

When Majid tries to talk with George using different tactics of communication, he is always calm, and constantly invites a dialogue. But this never takes place because George never listens, he is always accusing or threatening or hiding. Evidently no dialogue. Nothing reciprocal. He only speaks, does not hear. At the end, we see Majid dying under this suffocating pressure of being deflected, denied, evaded, neglected, erased as an entity. And interestingly, Haneke makes us think of suicide bombers as well. The only exit Majid can visualise involves killing himself, and thus forcing George to at least briefly acknowledge 'other' presence.

Unlike von Trier, who clearly retains the US as the target of his critique, Haneke does not want to confine his critique into the French situation ; the proximal sin of a specific local wound in 1961, or the distant sin of a suppurating colonial memory. Instead, he leaves it open so that it may diffuse into other geographies, other culpabilities^a

A potent earlier example of these inversions is Jean-Pierre Gorin and Jean-Luc Godard's 1972 film *Tout va Bien* (Everything's Fine), which shows a strike at a sausage factory, during which the manager is held hostage within the factory by the workers. In one scene, we see manager in a desperate search for a toilet. This frantic activity is his reversed 'grand

tour'; the workers ensure that all the toilets are occupied, and the manager finds himself in a state of increasing distress. Like George in *Caché*, he is forced into unavoidable, unwanted close contact with the 'other'; and his only solution to the problem of not finding a toilet is to finally break a window of the very property he is responsible for, and urinate through it.

Where *Tout va Bien* is a satiric rendering of the theme of violent racial/social 'othering', *Caché* is tragic; we are shown George witnessing Majid cutting his own throat. These images are interventions in unjust and traumatic historical contexts; they are climactic screams, naked protests that express profound despair at what is experienced, and also at the inability to visualise possible solutions to the root of such despair. For some viewers, Haneke may even be ominously "announcing a coming catastrophe"⁷.

*Irigaray contends that in appropriating all creative power to himself, Dionysus replicates the illusion of masculine self-sufficiency. Although Dionysus identifies with sensual becoming, he loses the passage between self and other truly feminine becoming.*⁸

The Austria-based artist collective WochenKlausur⁹ sees their activity as not just confined to the exploration of aesthetic form, but also as a dynamic means to evolve specific interventions applicable to contemporary social issues. One of the group's projects in 1994 aimed at creating a shelter in Zurich where drug-addicted women earning their money through prostitution could sleep, relax and seek counselling. Women working the strip had nowhere to sleep during the day, as Zurich's shelters were only open at night. WochenKlausur decided to establish a women-only facility in which sex workers could rest during the day.

The collective arranged a kind of alternative, inverse 'grand tour' through bringing politicians, journalists and other citizens together with these sex workers in a boat on Lake Zurich, thus setting up the space and opportunity for direct dialogue between 'respectable' folk and those stigmatised by Swiss society. The effort was not to shock or sensationalise, lament or castigate, but to actually reach a 'solution' to the problem of the women having no shelter when they most needed it. Of course, the very concept of 'solution' here is controversial. Nevertheless, WochenKlausur successfully created an environment for interpersonal engagement and dialogue.

As they noted, during the boat's daily trips, groups of experts were able to exchange information and discuss their opinions on the state's drug policy without having to deal with the pressures of fulfilling a public role. There were about 60 participants: the secretaries of all the Swiss political parties, Zurich city counsellors, prosecuting attorneys, newspaper editors, experts from the fields of prevention, therapy, and medically controlled narcotic distribution, police directors, and the drug users themselves.¹⁰

In such boat-laboratories, we see efforts to experiment with dialogue between people who are normally imagined to have stances in opposition to each other, or who are subject to increasing polarisation by conditioned media discourse and the thrust of cultural

hegemonies. People who are normally inhabit separate social segments, sitting in separate rooms, including those of their 'otherness', are able to cross some socio-political boundaries through the strategies of WochenKlausur and meet in a defined space for interaction ; actually a boat travelling on Lake Zurich. On the other hand, in cases such as Turkey's EU bid or the *Jyllands-Posten* Muhammad cartoons controversy, where open dialogue is an urgent social and political necessity, we are generally forced to inhabit our bounded opinions, where in time we become less able to see alternative, in-between positions and paths. We remain stuck in claustrophobic rooms, whereas the critical need is that we walk through walls, compelled by 'other' presence as well as of our own exploratory volition ; as in Marcel Aymé's exquisite and disturbing short story *Le Passe-Muraille* (The Man Who Could Walk through Walls, 1943).

This fantastic text, one of Aymé's most important literary contributions, was written while France was under Nazi occupation. The story is about Dutilleul, a timid clerk in the revenue office who discovers he can pass through walls with perfect ease. Using this remarkable gift, he totally changes his predictable life; first he becomes a very famous burglar, and then steals the heart of young blonde who has a brutal and jealous husband. But misfortune strikes after he takes pills the doctor gave him; one day when he was on his way to his new lover he gets stuck within a garden wall, and stays immobilised there. Aymé declares, "He is there to this very day, imprisoned in the stone" (Jean Marais' sculpture of the pinioned, paralysed 'walker' can be seen today in Montmartre, Paris).

Aymé's stories were themselves walking through walls, for they had to pass through Nazi censors, and were even published in collaborationist periodicals such as *Je suis partout*. "The texts themselves became a *passe-muraille* and Marcel Aymé a *passeur*: not only for the texts, but for his readers whom he conjurally ushered into a space of phosphorescence"¹¹.

WochenKlausur's interventions can also be seen as various acts of walking through walls. This group too is interested in conversations immobilised inside the walls of the 'other'. Maybe we also have to work out strategies and ways of freely walking *within* walls, not only *through* walls^a

In the final episodes of Michael Haneke's *Caché*, we see George forcing himself into an artificial sleep. He comes home in the daytime to his hidden bedroom, closes the curtains, takes pills and gets into bed. An uninterrupted amnesic circuit, blissfully closed, is his aim ; the function of a hegemonic forgetting mechanism. Sleeping that very moment instead of living it. The paradoxical freedom that comes from walling the self in sleep, which allows one to walk through dream after dream.

On the other hand, we have the legend of the Seven Sleepers of Ephesus. Persecuted during the reign of the Roman emperor Decius (around 250), seven young men were accused of being Christians. They were granted some time to recant their faith; they gave their worldly goods to the poor and retired to a mountain to pray. There they fell asleep. Furious at being defied, the emperor ordered the mouth of the cave to be sealed.

Decades passed. After a certain time, during the reign of Theodosius (379-395), the

landowner decided to use the cave as a cattle pen. He opened up the sealed mouth of the cave and found the sleepers inside. They woke, convinced that they had been asleep for only one day.

Maybe because Ephesus is near modern Selçuk in Turkey, or maybe because the miracle of the Seven Sleepers is also cited in the Quran (Surah 18, verses 9-26), in Anatolia you can hear many versions of the legend, and the location of the cave is different in each one. And in some of these local imaginings of the miracle, the Seven Sleepers awoken in a cave other than the one they had gone to sleep in! Their sleeping is in itself a powerful act of resistance to oppression, whereas George's choice to take pills and go to sleep in *Caché* was an index of surrender.

The Seven Sleepers are walking through the walls of caves and through time. And they might well form a network underground, linking each node of 'resistance'^a

Translated from the Turkish by Erden Kosova

NOTES

1. Tamsin Lorraine. *Irigaray and Deleuze: Experiments in Visceral Philosophy* (Cornell University Press, 1999, Ithaca/London), pp. 56-57.
2. *Ibid*, p. 63.
3. In a November 2005 interview conducted by Katja Nicodemus for the German weekly newspaper *Die Zeit*, Lars von Trier said it is quite clear his film can be read as an allegory of President Bush's efforts to impose democracy in Iraq. "The parallels to Iraq are just begging to be drawn. I'm convinced that in the Iraq of Saddam Hussain there were morals of a sort. Of course, these morals killed a lot of people or put them in prison. But you can't simply do away with the old rules, introduce new ones and believe that it's all going to work. Moral traditions have to develop from within society. And I still find it unbelievable that we think that the way we organise our societies is the only right way^a That's why I was not remotely surprised by what happened in New Orleans. It was as if the storm [Hurricane Katrina] had to come along to open the Americans' eyes. To show them the conditions in which the black population lives".
For interview transcript, see <http://www.signandsight.com/features/465.html>
4. Tamsin Lorraine, *op. cit.*, p. 63.
5. The reference is to a massacre in Paris on 17 October 1961, during the Algerian War of Independence (1954-62). Under orders from the police prefect Maurice Papon (later convicted for his collaboration during Vichy), the French police attacked an unarmed demonstration of 30,000 Algerians. Some were thrown by the police in the Seine river and drowned, while others died later in the courtyard of the Paris police headquarters. Bertrand Delanoë, the current mayor of Paris (and member of the Socialist Party, PS), has put a plaque in remembrance of the massacre, on the Saint-Michel Bridge on 17 October 2001. How many demonstrators were killed is still unclear, but estimates range from 70 to 200 people. In the absence of official estimates, the street plaque stated: "In the memory of the many Algerians killed during the bloody repression of the pacific demonstration of October 17, 1961". In 1961, the police prefecture only talked about "2 persons shot dead". In 1998, the state acknowledged that the massacre had occurred and that 40 people had died. In 1997, Minister of Culture Catherine Trautmann (PS) allowed limited access

to historian David Assouline to consult part of the police documents (which were supposed to be classified until 2012). With only limited access, he found a list of 70 persons killed, while the texts confirmed Einaudi's comments that the magistrates seized by families of victims had systematically acquitted the policemen. According to *Le Monde* in 1997, which quoted the director of the Paris Archives, the register would list 90 persons on the second half of October. The massacre was not officially confirmed until 1999. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Paris_massacre_of_1961

See also http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/world/monitoring/media_reports/1604970.stm

6. In a January 2006 interview conducted by Dominik Kamalzadeh for the German daily newspaper *Die Tageszeitung*, Michael Haneke remarks: "How do you behave when confronted with something that you should actually admit responsibility for? These are the sort of strategies that interest me: talking yourself out of guilt. It's like this ; we all believe we're so fantastically liberal. None of us want to see immigration laws tightened. Yet when someone comes to me and asks if I could take in a foreign family, then I say, well, not really. Charity begins at home with the door firmly shut. Most people are as cowardly and comfortable as I am^a I'm always amazed when people talk about problems like this as if they were something new. I was amazed when everybody started saying that the world was different after September 11. People with views like this must be incredibly naïve. To my eyes, the world looked remarkably similar before. It's the same with the riots. What this is really about is the primal legacy of colonialism and the nations involved labouring with the consequences. And there is no one solution to this^a There's such a thing as a sort of emotional memory for evil deeds. When a Proustian *madeleine* appears by coincidence, then it all re-emerges".
For interview transcript, see <http://www.signandsight.com/features/577.html>
7. As Peter Bradshaw wrote in the *Guardian*, 27 January 2006: "^a*Hidden* is partly a parable for France's repressed memory of *la nuit noire*, the night of 17 October 1961, when hundreds of Algerian demonstrators in Paris were beaten and killed by the police. As such, it is a cousin to events just 11 years later, dramatised by Steven Spielberg in *Munich*, but utterly without Spielberg's need to find resolution and common ground. *Hidden* is incomparably darker and harder. It is about the prosperous West's fear and hatred of the Muslim world and those angry pauperised masses once under our colonial control, and over whose heads a new imperium is being negotiated in the Middle East and beyond. Haneke is often described as the 'conscience' of European cinema: but he is more a Cassandra, announcing a coming catastrophe and fervently imagining its provocation, acting out the cataclysm's tinder-spark. Haneke's vision is as cold and unforgiving as the surface of Pluto^a"
8. Tamsin Lorraine, op. cit, p. 56.
9. Since 1993, WochenKlausur has been carrying out social interventionist projects at the invitation of art institutions. The name roughly translates as "weeks of closure", *Klausur* sharing the root of the English words "enclosure", "seclusion" and "cloister". The group's projects take place within a few weeks in the focused atmosphere of a closed-session working situation. A strictly limited timeframe gives rise to an unusual concentration of the participants' energies, allowing the interventions to be realised quickly.
10. For a detailed account, see <http://www.wochenklausur.at>.
11. Jonathan Horn. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Alabama, 1997. For Marcel Aymé's story in English (The Man Who Could Walk through Walls, transl. Karen Reshkin), see <http://www.stresscafe.com/translations/pm-final.pdf>