

Issue 12

---

April 2007

*Αρχαί* [ a r k h a i ]  
www.arkhai.com

## model ve sembol

*photos Katja Eydel*

*text Bülent Tanju*





















### Photographies:

*page 67*

1. National Sovereignty and Children's Day (anniversary of the establishment of Turkish Grand National Assembly): in the First Parliamentary Building, Hasip Bey, 23.4.2005, Ankara.

*page 68*

2. Kızılay Government Precinct, Hermann Jansen/Clemens Holzmeister, 1928–60, Ankara.
3. Saraçoğlu Officials' Residential Quarter, Paul Bonatz, 1944–46, Ankara.

*page 69*

4. Anıtkabir (Atatürk Mausoleum), Emin Onat, Orhan Arda, 1942–53, Ankara.
5. Youth & Sports Day/Atatürk Memorial Day: May 19 Stadium, 19.5.2005, Ankara.

*page 70*

6. Social Security Department Headquarters, Sedat Hakkı Eldem, 1962–64, Istanbul.
7. May Day, 1.5.2005, Diyarbakır.

*page 71*

8. Girls' High School, Ankara.
9. Hotel Hilton, Skidmore, Owings and Merrill/Sedad Hakkı Eldem, 1952–55, Istanbul.

*page 72*

10. French Street, Istanbul.



**Do you see what I see or am I only dreaming?**

**0.**

**0.1.**

*I have written an essay on Katja Eydel's images, which focus in the visual economy in the cities of Turkey. However, I have written is not the right expression of how the things actually happen. It is maybe more accurate to say that her images have been perceived and processed by the virtuality of my memory and then been expressed by me as a text. The memory is a set-up, which forms what is seen and said but it is also deformed by what is perceived and expressed. This is the set-up on which the production of the narratives of truth constitutes; this is the eternal return in which the only thing which returns is the difference.*

**0.2.**

*This text is made by the cut, paste and delete functions of the modern technology from the essay in the book with some additional writing. It may seem to the reader that it is a shorter version of the same essay but it is not. Neither the former nor the latter is the original one; the text returns to the reader in a very different form. Compared with the essay, which includes references to the names and historical events and which is presented together with the whole images in the book, the text here offers a much more abstract path to follow [1]. The statement, it makes or the truth it presents, is put here in a sort of test with 10 of the images. It is definitely not a test in the sense whether it represents the truth or not but it is a test in the sense whether it presents any truth to the reader or not.*

**0.3.**

*So, do you see what I see in these images or am I only dreaming? The answer is after a short break...*

## 1. [Set up]

### 1.1. [Loss]

What it is used to call modernity is a loss of the illusion, which enables any discourse to control the production of all that is called the truth. It is a positive loss for discourses have undergone a deprivation of power to claim the access to transcendental truth. Everything that appeared as given, absolute and non-negotiable has dissolved. The epistemological regime governing the production of truth has lost the power to totalize the multiplicity of practices in a society around a hegemonic discursive center, which is the *given home*. Modernity is the loss of the *heimlich* as illusionary discursive center of practices; it is the affirmation of the immanence.

### 1.2. [Difference]

Practices, material or immaterial, start from a definite position and end somewhere different; they present differences in repetition. The idea of pure repetition of the *Same* without difference is the transcendental plane on which the world as *the given home* of human beings is founded. With modernity the illusion of a pre-written text of life conducting the practices of shadowy figures in an universal stage disappears. If the shadowy figures impersonate the possibilities of the pre-written text, then the modern actors and actresses improvise or experiment with the virtualities of memory. The former represents the *Same*, the latter presents the different; modernity presents the text as virtual memory. Modernity is the epistemological shift in which the only possible script of life is a text written into the folds of memory as it is lived. It is the past in the present, displacing any practice in any given moment through its virtuality and every displaced practice is again inscribed into the memory.

### 1.3. [Crisis]

The crisis is the *unheimlich* house of modernity; it is a house which continuously needs to be *presented* in order to become a house but cannot be *represented* for it is not a given being. It is a continuous becoming; it is a decisive moment which never ends. To decide without given, absolute criteria is to criticize using the virtual power of memory; it is the affirmation of the powers of immanence. Even the most powerful disciplinary or controlling narratives of multiplicity in modernity are part of the deprivation of totalizing discourses since they present a specific form of multiplicity; the discursive multiplicity of reactionary forces. Criticality is the quality of any practice which pushes disciplinary narratives back into the crisis, not through resistance, but simply through the power of transistance.

### 1.4. [Form]

Modernity does not have a given form. The forms of modernity are temporary, contingent and as infinite as the folds of memory. They are multiple processes of framing, de-framing and re-framing by conflicting

powers of immanence. The lost center is also the center of the transcendental frame of the form. The disorder it causes, reveals immanence. There is no essential path to or form of modernity, but only inevitable encounters with it. Within every encounter there is the possibility of developing a particular kind of socio-machine, which is the multiple processes of both de-framing and re-framing.

## 2. [Particularity]

### 2.1.

There are numerous disciplinary practices in modernity which try to organize the immanent multiplicity around a transcendental center anew, but the success of the hegemony they achieve is always limited and transitory. The epistemological shift in the production of narratives of truth is also the critical house of the modern practices of production of truth; the folds of this fleeting milieu house multiple narratives produced by science, philosophy and art. Even the most reactionary narrative produced in this milieu is open to the forces of immanence. They are never able to cause an iconic representation of a given truth. In that sense, every attempt to crystallize the substance of the immanence is doomed to fail. The modern narratives inevitably leak. The practices which merit the adjectives *critical* and *modern* are the ones that try, on the one hand to force every narrative more and more to leak, and on the other, to affirm and to actualize the multiplicity produced by the virtuality of memory.

### 2.2.

Herein lies the particularity of the encounter with modernity in Turkey: It is one of the most fertile grounds of desire of a crystalline transcendental center. Although the illusion of a discursive center dissolves, it is hardly an epistemological shift towards modernity. Here, the crisis is not considered to be a necessary condition of modern practices but a temporary condition to be cured. Without the affirmation of crisis, it is impossible to present any modern or critical narrative of truth and they don't exist in this particular case. It is possible to find some exceptions, but still, until recently no modern or critical work of science, philosophy or art belonged to the inventory of the resulting forms of this particular encounter. The total energy of the social is invested into the efforts to satisfy the desire of a center hoped to be represented by the modern practices. This is the paradoxical concept of modernity as a project, which is the cure of the crisis, and nevertheless, it is also the self-destruction of modernity for without crisis there is no such thing. The modern or critical exceptions are what leak from the limits of disciplinary gravitational vectors of *the project of modernity*. But any affirmative actualization of the virtuality(ies) of memory(ies) affected by this particular encounter is hard to find.

### 3. [Orphans]

The living multitude in Turkey are the kids longing for their lost fathers. The dissolution of a given truth has transformed them and their practices into orphans and the whole cultural geography into an orphanage. Without a father figure nobody is able to talk because only a central power legitimizes any enunciation; there is nothing left to represent. They are well aware that the totalizing power of the old center and its practices had already become useless. With the energy invested into the satisfaction of the desire of a center they succeed to transform every critical practice of modernity into a disciplinary one. While modern practices present the truth of variation to the people yet to come, the orphans try to find a way of representing a given truth (the truth of the father). They can only speak in the name of the father. In a sense they are the iconic shadowy characters living the disaster of the loss of the pre-given text and presenting the impossibility to live with the crisis. Without crisis there is no immanent production of truth and without an enunciation nothing leaks.

### 4. [Limits]

The idea of the *home* as universal, pre-given stage of practices with a pre-given script is the limit. As an organic bond it limits the narratives of truth; it gives everybody its face. It never leaks. The limit of the *home* is also the limit of the project of modernity. The figure of father externally representing the legitimate limits of the multiplicity does not simply impose its orders. Without the submission of the kids there is no imposing father. It is a patriarchal *home*, it belongs to the father but also to the kids who don't intend to leave *home*.

### 5. [Project]

#### 5.1.

Modern practices are made up of what leaks from the disciplinary framings of the *home*. Everything excluded from the *home* is presented by them. To present the different in the father's *home* is an impossible task like entertaining the death; it belongs to the street. Street is *unheimlich*; it is beyond the reach of the father, thus it is the territory of people yet to come.

#### 5.2.

Then there are practices as a project; modernity as a project. These are practices to be performed at *home* under the rule of the father. Modernity as a project is the Turkish version of disciplinary practices; it is a stripped down to the bone version of modernity without crisis, without anything which is unhealthy for the kids. It is a modernity rendered *heimlich*, familiar and crystalline. Every anxious encounter with modern practices is familiarized by the *project of modernity*.

## 6. [Fear]

### 6.1.

Fear is the primary mechanism of control. It is an emotion caused by the loss of the father and felt by the orphans in the orphanage. And most importantly the fear turns into terror if the orphans can't or don't want to find a way out of the speechlessness caused by the loss of the father. Fear is also the loss of courage to present without a discursive center.

### 6.2.

For the *project of modernity*, the most fearful thing among the modern events is the city, and especially metropolis because a city is a continuum of layers of extended stratification/destratification processes of practices. It is both density and mobility; it is the territory where multiplicity proliferates; it is the house of modern crisis. There are always many cities in a city.

### 6.3.

The *project of modernity* as self-claimed stepfather leaves the city and takes her orphans in order to find a fertile territory for the healthy future of youngsters.

## 7. [Orphanage]

### 7.1.

The new territory is supposed to be Ankara.

### 7.2.

But she – like every other city – in actuality presents herself profoundly different than she is represented in the design of her designer. Therefore the new territory is not Ankara in actuality but Ankara as represented in the designer's plan. The plan is basically a garden city with everything low, especially with low density and low mobility. It represents an idea of a well segregated city both functionally and socially. Although there are zones for industry, housings of industrial workers and commerce, it is hardly an industrial or commercial city. These two most powerful evils of the modern urban life are dominated by the heavy centrality and representability of the governmental zone and related housing area of state employees. It is an antiurban plan of a walking city for a projected 300'000 people for the next 50 years living in low rise detached houses in gardens. The plan is a perfect example of the fear of modern urban multiplicity and matches beautifully with the discourse of the *project of modernity* trying both to control the urbanization and to promote peasantry and rural life. It also matches with the limits of *the home* and renders the street *heimlich*.

### 7.3.

The limits set by the *project of modernity* are transgressed by different practices easily within a short period of time not because of any effective critical practice but just because of the multiplicity of reactionary desiring machines working throughout the society longing for centrality and

homogeneity. Their collective effect is a scarcity caused by the fear of modern multiplicity which makes every practice, institution, value and especially every identity crystalline.

## 8. [Classic]

### 8.1.

Crystalline is the abstract frame of classicism. A classicist is someone who speaks in the name of the father in modernity, someone who practices and justifies what she has done in the name of a given center of values held by a given people which happen to be her people. She knows the incitement addressed to her; shares it in her existential capacity as being one among the given people and answers it in her practical capacity as an author.

### 8.2.

The *home* or orphanage is a classicist spectacle. The way to create the illusion of an iconic representation of a center in modernity is spectacle. It functions as if there were a point of central control, as if all practices were directed by a single power even though they are not. The *home* is defined by lack of strata. Layers of stratification and destratification processes are effects of the passing time; they present continuous transformation of form caused by the variety of forces. In order to be a spectacle of centrality, a *home* should be able to create an illusion of representing pure original substance which ontologically precedes historical strata.

### 8.3.

Any spectacular practice creates crystalline forms of desire that are intimately wedded to fear of the loss of center. They indeed work through the communication of evil which is the virtual auto-differentiability of modern urban society.

## 9. [Nation]

### 9.1.

The biggest and the most successful spectacle ever produced in the modern history is the nation. It is a crystalline form produced collectively by the gravitational vectors of various practices desiring a center and turns the unbearable lightness of multitude into a given people. The multitude is a heterogeneous multiplicity, an open set of relations without a representative transcendental center; it is a pure plane of immanent singularities. The people as nation, in contrast, are what is compressed into a thin single lamina of identical homogeneity without external strata. It provides a single desire that hides or eliminates the differences of the multitude. This thin single lamina is the only plane shared by all the multiple desires of the center in Turkey.



## 9.2.

Nationalism makes classicist spectacle even more *heimlich*, familiar and powerful, in short more crystalline than ever. It tries to represent the *face of the Turkish home*. The *Heimat*, on which the practices are unified and sink their roots, is the concept given by nationalism to the speechless orphans to enable them to speak in the name of the father. Since then *Heimat* is the limit of any discourse in Turkey. The concept of *Blut und Boden* is the organic given center of all practices. A center, which is considered existing even before the corruptive effects of history and still alive, should purify the blood of the nomadic multitude of modernity from the toxications of differences and should enable them to develop roots within their natural soil which is definitely not urban.

## 10. [Revolution]

### 10.1.

The concept of nation is never so reactionary when it presents itself as revolutionary. The revolutions of the *project of modernity* are obsessed with form that is supposed to represent what is formless. They are attempts to frame the fleeing multiplicity of multitude in a permanent crystal. The forms of the *project of modernity* are related to an idealized object; they are figurations of what has already been defined by external gravitational vectors.

### 10.2.

Hence, the nation as a revolutionary concept is a change of the script. More than that, the script replacing the pre-modern one is an extended *executive instructions* for all practices with no expiry date. The new script comes with a whole but restricted mise-en-scène of people, bodies, identities, sounds, cities, cloths, arts, architecture etc. and of course with a father.

## 11. [Figure]

### 11.1.

It is impossible to start painting with an empty canvas. There are prefigurations both in the brain of the painter and on the canvas. The folds of memory are always complicated and complicating. Between before and after there is the duration of painting as an act. During this act of improvising a shadowy figure liberates herself from figuration, whether consciously or not, doesn't matter. She becomes an actress and loses her father. What a critical practice does is to try to liberate its figures from figuration. It moves beyond both illustrative and figurative figuration; it pushes figuration consciously into the crisis.

### 11.2.

When the concept of nation becomes a revolutionary tool to cure the crisis of modernity, it tries to control the complicated folds of memory. But, on the one hand, the crisis of modernity is not curable; the script of the project is always open to change and it is always changed by the practices which are between the before and after. The resulting forms of the practices are mimicries of prefigured figurations that are never the same. On the other hand, the multiple desires to control the folds of memory don't allow a critical liberation of the figure from the figuration.

### 12. [Epilogue]

The frame which still continues to be hegemonic after all these years of Turkish version of encounter with modernity is suffering partly from scarcity, since the only legitimate way of difference is mimicry; and partly from a kind of impermeability since the scarcely collected differences cannot find a way to leak. And that is all that has been possible in the realm of the desire of the father. In other words, that is all that has been possible at *home*.

### 0.4.

*Curiosity causes the production of narratives: The curiosity for how these images and this text would be perceived together, processed and even maybe discussed by the readers with different set-ups, but also the curiosity for how their different set-ups would be deformed by the images and the text. However, there are two forms of curiosity; an optimistic and a pessimistic one. The curiosity just formulated at the beginning of this paragraph is an optimistic one for it assumes that the reader and the presenters of the text and the images are in the same stratum of sayabilities and visibilities no matter whether they speak and see differently. This is the condition of possibility for the text to have the chance to present any truth to the reader who has just read it. If they were not in the same stratum... Well, actually that was the test.*

### 0.5.

*So, have you really seen any of the things what I have seen in these images or am I...?*

## References

- [1] Katja Eydel, *Model ve Sembol*, Sternberg Press, Berlin, 2006, 184 pages.