In this particular volume the issue of art as interference and the strategies that it should adopt have been reframed within the structures of contemporary technology as well as within the frameworks of interactions between art, science and media. What sort of interference should be chosen, if one at all, remains a personal choice for each artist, curator, critic and historian.
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**Interference Strategies: Its Ant in the Middle?**

If we look at the etymological structure of the word "interference," we would have to get back to the construct that defines it as a juxtaposition of two Latin words: *inter-,* which in Latin means "between," and *ference,* derived from the verb *fero,* to carry, which would bring together a definition of interference as a sum of the two Latin words, *inter-* and *ference.* Interference is a word that assembles a multitude of meanings: interpreted according to the perspective of an aesthetic, it is a constructive element of the intertextual, a literary manifestation, and a manifestation of itself as a manifestation between two parties. In this book, there are a series of images representing those interference dynamics, as well as a series of perspectives and questions on what is the possible contemporary form of interference in digital, scientific and aesthetic matters and what are the strategies that can be adopted in order to actively interfere.

The complexity of the strategies of interference within contemporary political and aesthetic discourses appears to be summed up by the perception that interference is necessary and urgent. This perception appears to encapsulate the fact that sometimes the very existence of art as an activity, as a form of media, can be understood as an interference, nature, or an aesthetic that has come to be as necessary as consonant to and, hence, interfering with a political project.

Interference is a word that assembles a multitude of meanings, interpreted according to the perspective of an aesthetic, it is a constructive element of the intertextual, a literary manifestation, and a manifestation of itself as a manifestation between two parties. In this book, there are a series of images representing those interference dynamics, as well as a series of perspectives and questions on what is the possible contemporary form of interference in digital, scientific and aesthetic matters and what are the strategies that can be adopted in order to actively interfere.

**Interference Strategies: Its Ant in the Middle?**

This book titled *Interference Strategies: Ant in the Middle?* was published in 2007 and is a collection of essays and articles that explore the concept of interference in contemporary art and culture. The book, edited by Marilia Brasileiro and Léa Fanelli, was published by the Leonardo Electronic MANAC and features contributions from a diverse range of scholars, artists, and critics, including Daniele da Volterra, Umberto Eco, and Michelangelo Pistoletto.

The book is part of a larger exhibition titled *Interference Strategies: Ant in the Middle?* that took place at the Leonardo Electronic MANAC in 2007. The exhibition explored the concept of interference in contemporary art and culture, and featured works by a range of artists, including Daniele da Volterra, Umberto Eco, and Michelangelo Pistoletto.

The book features essays and articles that explore the concept of interference in contemporary art and culture, and features contributions from a diverse range of scholars, artists, and critics, including Daniele da Volterra, Umberto Eco, and Michelangelo Pistoletto.

The book is part of a larger exhibition titled *Interference Strategies: Ant in the Middle?* that took place at the Leonardo Electronic MANAC in 2007. The exhibition explored the concept of interference in contemporary art and culture, and featured works by a range of artists, including Daniele da Volterra, Umberto Eco, and Michelangelo Pistoletto.

The book features essays and articles that explore the concept of interference in contemporary art and culture, and features contributions from a diverse range of scholars, artists, and critics, including Daniele da Volterra, Umberto Eco, and Michelangelo Pistoletto.

The book is part of a larger exhibition titled *Interference Strategies: Ant in the Middle?* that took place at the Leonardo Electronic MANAC in 2007. The exhibition explored the concept of interference in contemporary art and culture, and featured works by a range of artists, including Daniele da Volterra, Umberto Eco, and Michelangelo Pistoletto.
Interference Strategies: Is Art in the Middle?

If we look at the etymological structure of the word interference, we would have to go back to a construct that defines it as a sum of the two Latin words inter (in between) and ferro (to strike), but with a particular attention to the meaning of the word ferro being interpreted principally as to wound. Albeit perhaps etymologically incorrect, it may be preferable to think of the word interference as a composite of inter (in between) and the Latin verb ferro (to carry), which would bring forward the idea of interference as a contribution brought in the middle of two arguments, two ideas, two constructs.

It is important to acknowledge the etymological root of a word not in order to develop a sterile academic exercise, but in order to clarify the ideological underpinnings of arguments that are then summed up and characterized by a word.

This book, titled Interference Strategies, does not (and in all honesty could not) provide a resolution to a complex interaction - that of artistic interferences - that has a complex historical tradition. In fact, it is impossible, for me, when analyzing the issue of interference, not to think of the Breeches Maker (also known as Daniele da Volterra) and the coverings that he painted following a 1559 commission from Pope Paul IV to ‘render decent’ the naked bodies of Michelangelo Buonarroti’s frescoes in the Sistine Chapel. That act, in the eyes of a contemporary viewer, was a wound inflicted in between the relationship created by the artwork and the artist with the viewer (intento operis and intentio auctoris with intentio lectoris), as Umberto Eco would put it. Those famous breeches appear to be both: a form of censorship as well as interference with Michelangelo’s vision.

Interference is a word that assembles a multitude of meanings interpreted according to one’s perspective and ideological constructs as a meddling, a disturbance, and an alteration of modalities of interaction between two parties. In this book, there are a series of representations of these interferences, as well as a series of questions on what are the possible contemporary forms of interference - digital, scientific and aesthetic - and what are the strategies that could be adopted in order to actively interfere.

The complexity of the strategies of interference within contemporary political and aesthetic discourses appears to be summed up by the perception that interference is a necessarily active gesture. This perception appears to exclude the fact that sometimes the very existence of an artwork is based on an interfering nature, or on an aesthetic that has come to be as non-consonant to and, hence, interfering with a political project.

Interfering artworks, which by their own nature challenge a system, were the artworks chosen for the exhibition Entartete Kunst (Degenerate Art) exhibitions to the many images of pompously strutting corporate tycoons and billionaires in museums and art fairs around the globe, glancing with pride over the propaganda, or - better - over the breeches that they have commissioned artists to produce.

Today’s contemporary art should be interfering more and more with art itself, it should be corrupted and corrupting, degenerate and degenerating. It should be producing what currently it is not and it should create a wound within art itself, able to alter current thinking and modalities of engagement. It should be - to quote Pablo Picasso - “an instrument of war able to interfere.”

If art should either strike or bring something is part of what has been a long aesthetic conversation that preceded the Avant-garde movement or the deconstruction of the Body Politic of the time, and of war in general, and therefore had to be classified as ‘degenerate’ and condemned to be ‘burnt.’

Art in this context cannot be and should not be anything else but interference: either by bringing something in between or by wounding the Body Politic by placing something in between the perfectly construed rational madness of humanity and the subjugated viewer. An element that interferes, obstructs and disrupts the happily decorated and carefully choreographed itinerary that the viewers should meekly follow.

In this case interference is something that corrupts, degenerates and threatens to collapse the vision of the Body Politic.

In thinking about the validity of interference as a strategy, it was impossible not to revisit and compare the image of Paul Joseph Goebbels viewing the Entartete Kunst (Degenerate Art) exhibitions to the many images of pompously strutting corporate tycoons and billionaires in museums and art fairs around the globe, glancing with pride over the propaganda, or - better - over the breeches that they have commissioned artists to produce.

Today’s contemporary art should be interfering more and more with art itself, it should be corrupted and corrupting, degenerate and degenerating. It should be producing what currently it is not and it should create a wound within art itself, able to alter current thinking and modalities of engagement. It should be - to quote Pablo Picasso - “an instrument of war able to interfere.”

If art should either strike or bring something is part of what has been a long aesthetic conversation that preceded the Avant-garde movement or the deconstruction of the Body Politic of the time, and of war in general, and therefore had to be classified as ‘degenerate’ and condemned to be ‘burnt.’

What sort of interference should be chosen, if one at all, remains a personal choice for each artist, curator, critic and historian.

If I had to choose, personally I find myself increasingly favoring art that does not deliver what is expected, what is obvious, what can be hung on a wall and can be matched to tastepieces. Nor can I find myself able to favor art that shrouds propaganda or business under a veil with the name of art repeatedly written in capital letters all over it. That does not leave very much choice in a world where interference is no longer acceptable, or if it is acceptable, it is so only within pre-established contractual operative frameworks, therefore losing its ‘interference value.’

This leaves the great conundrum - are interferences still possible? There are still spaces and opportunities for interference, and this volume is one of these remaining areas, but they are interstitial spaces and are shrinking fast, leaving an overwhelming Baudrillardian desert produced by the conspirators of art and made of a multitude of breeches.
In this introduction I cannot touch upon all the different aspects of interference analyzed, like in the case of data and waves presented by Adam Nash, who argues that the digital is in itself and per se a form of interference: at least a form of interference with behavioral systems and with what can be defined as the illusory realm of everyday’s ‘real.’

Transversal interference, as in the case of Anna Munster, is a socio-political divide where heterogeneity is the monster, the wound, the interfering and dreaded element that threatens the ‘homologation’ of scientific thought.

With Darren Tofts and Lisa Gye it is the perusal of events are linked historically and inform interesting experiences marked a point in time that created a unifying current discourse on images. The publication brings together researchers, artists and cultural thinkers to speculate, contest and share their thoughts on the strategies for interference, at the intersection between art, science and culture, that form new dialogues.

In October 1927 the Fifth Solvay International Conference marked a point in time that created a unifying seepage between art and science and opened the gateway to uncertainty and therefore the parallels of artistic and scientific research. This famous conference announced the genesis of quantum theory and, with that, Werner Heisenberg’s uncertainty principle. These events are linked historically and inform interesting experimental art practices to reveal the subtle shift that can ensue from a moment in time.

The simple yet highly developed double slit experiment identifies the problem of measurement in the quantum world. If you are measuring the position of a particle you cannot measure its momentum. This is one of the main theories that have been constantly tested and still remains persistent. The double slit experiment, first initiated by Thomas Young, exposes a quintessential quantum phenomenon, which, through Heisenberg theory, demonstrates the quantum universe as a series of probabilities that enabled the Newtonian view of the world to be seriously challenged.

If the measurement intra-action plays a constitutive role in what is measured, then it matters how something is explored. In fact, this is born out empirically in experiments with matter (and energy): when electrons (or light) are measured using one kind of apparatus, they are waves; if they are measured in a complementary way, they are particles. Notice that what we’re talking about here is not simply some object reacting differently to different prologues but being differently.

In the double slit experiment particles that travel through the slits interfere with themselves enabling each particle to create a wave-like interference pattern. The underlying concepts upon which this publication is based see the potential for art to interfere, affect and obstruct in order to question what is indefinable.

This can only be demonstrated by a closer look at the double slit experiment and the art that is revealed through phenomena of improbability.

REFERENCES AND NOTES

Transversal interference, as in the case of Anna Munster, is a socio-political divide where heterogeneity is the monster, the wound, the interfering and dreaded element that threatens the ‘homologation’ of scientific thought.

With Darren Tofts and Lisa Gye it is the perusal of interference: at least a form of interference with the ordered lines of neatly defined social taxonomies; within which I can only perceive the role of the thinker as that of the taxidermist operating on living fields of study that are in the process of being rendered dead and obfuscated by the very process and people who should be unveiling and revealing them.

With Brogan Bunt comes obfuscation as a form of blurring that interferes with the ordered lines of neatly defined social taxonomies; within which I can only perceive the role of the thinker as that of the taxidermist operating on living fields of study that are in the process of being rendered dead and obfuscated by the very process and people who should be unveiling and revealing them.

With Brogan Bunt comes obfuscation as a form of blurring that interferes with the ordered lines of neatly defined social taxonomies; within which I can only perceive the role of the thinker as that of the taxidermist operating on living fields of study that are in the process of being rendered dead and obfuscated by the very process and people who should be unveiling and revealing them.

The role of the publication, as a vehicle to promote and encourage transdisciplinary research, is to question what fine art image-making is contributing to the current discourse on images. The publication brings together researchers, artists and cultural thinkers to speculate, contest and share their thoughts on the strategies for interference, at the intersection between art, science and culture, that form new dialogues.

In the double slit experiment particles that travel through the slits interfere with themselves enabling each particle to create a wave-like interference pattern. The underlying concepts upon which this publication is based see the potential for art to interfere, affect and obstruct in order to question what is indefinable.

This can only be demonstrated by a closer look at the double slit experiment and the art that is revealed through phenomena of improbability.

REFERENCES AND NOTES

Interference Strategies

The theme of ‘interference strategies for art’ reflects a literal merging of sources, an interplay between factors, and acts as a metaphor for the interaction of art and science, the essence of transdisciplinary study. The revealing of metaphors for interference “that equates different and even ‘incommensurable’ concepts can, therefore, be a very fruitful source of insight.”

The role of the publication, as a vehicle to promote and encourage transdisciplinary research, is to question what fine art image-making is contributing to the current discourse on images. The publication brings together researchers, artists and cultural thinkers to speculate, contest and share their thoughts on the strategies for interference, at the intersection between art, science and culture, that form new dialogues.

In the double slit experiment particles that travel through the slits interfere with themselves enabling each particle to create a wave-like interference pattern. The underlying concepts upon which this publication is based see the potential for art to interfere, affect and obstruct in order to question what is indefinable.

This can only be demonstrated by a closer look at the double slit experiment and the art that is revealed through phenomena of improbability.
When particles go through the slits they act as waves and create the famous interference pattern. The concept is that one particle going through the slit must behave like a wave and interfere with itself to create the band image on the rear receptor.

Interference Strategies looks at the phenomenon of interference and places art at the very centre of the wave/particle dilemma. Can art still find a way in today’s dense world where we are saturated with images from all disciplines, whether it’s the creation of ‘beautiful visualisations’ for science, the torrent of images uploaded to social media services like Instagram and Flickr, or the billions of queries made to vast visual data archives such as Google Images? The contemporary machinic interpretations of the visual and sensorial experience of the world are producing a new spectacle of media pollution, obliging the viewers to ask if machines should be considered the new artists of the 21st century.

The notions of ‘Interference’ can stand as a mediating incantation that might create a layer between the constructed image of the ‘everyday’ given to us by science, technological social networks and the means of its construction. Mediation, as discussed in the first Transdisciplinary Imaging conference, is a concept that has become a medium in itself through which we think and act; and in which we swim. Interference, however, confronts the flow, challenges currents and eulogizes the drift.

The questions posed in this volume, include whether art can interfere with the chaotic storms of data visualization and information processing, or is it merely reinforcing the noxious nature of contemporary media? Can we think of ‘interference’ as a key tactic for the contemporary image in disrupting and critiquing the continual flood of constructed imagery? Are contemporary forms and strategies of interference the same as historical ones? What kinds of similarities and differences exist?

Application of a process to a medium, or a wave to a particle, for example, the sorting of pixel data, literally interferes with the state of an image, and directly gives new materiality and meaning, allowing interference to be utilised as a conceptual framework for interpretation, and critical reflection.

Interference is not merely combining. Interference is an active process of negotiating between different forces. The artist in this context is a mediator, facilitating the meeting of competitive elements, bringing together and setting up a situation of probabilities.

In response to the questions posed by the conference theme, presentations traversed varied notions of interference in defining image space, the decoding and interpretation of images, the interference between different streams of digital data, and how this knowledge might redefine art and art practice. Within that scope lies the discourse about interference that arises when normal approaches or processes fail, with unanticipated results, the accidental discovery, and its potential in the development of new strategies of investigation.

In "[The case of Biophilia: a collective composition of goals and distributed action]" Mark Cypher highlights the interference in negotiations between exhibit organisers, and space requirements, and the requirements for artist/artworks, resulting in an outcome that is a combination generated by the competition of two or more interests. As part of the final appearance of Biophilia, the artwork itself contained elements of both interests, an interference of competing interests, comprising a system in which the artist and the artwork are components, and the display a negotiated outcome. Each element interferes with itself as it negotiates the many factors that contribute to the presentation of art. In this sense the creation of the final appearance of Biophilia is the result of the distributed action of many “actors” in a “network.” (To put this in another form all actors are particles and interact with each other to create all possible solutions but when observed, create a single state.)

In summing up concepts of the second Transdisciplinary Imaging conference, particularly in reference to the topic of interference strategies, Edward Colless spoke of some of the aspirations for the topic, entertaining the possibilities of transdisciplinary art as being a contested field, in that many of the conference papers were trying to unravel, contextualise and theorise simultaneously.

The publication aims to demonstrate a combined eclecticism and to extend the discussion by addressing the current state of the image through a multitude of lenses. Through the theme of interference strategies, this publication will embrace error and transdisciplinary new visions of how to think, theorise and critique the image, the real and thought itself.

Paul Thomas
Contaminated Immersion and Thomas Demand
THE DAILIES

by
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ABSTRACT
If, as Oliver Grau has stated, immersion “is characterized by diminishing critical distance to what is shown and increasing emotional involvement in what is happening,” any artwork might be thought of as potentially immersive. Arguably, immersion is a condition contingent upon the viewer responding to the artwork, rather than an inherent quality within the artwork alone. Considered in relation to some art historical contexts, the relationship between immersive experience and interference will be discussed in order to contextualize Thomas Demand’s Kaldor Public Art Project, The Dailies. Demand’s project both relates to and departs from some of the key aspects of what is conventionally thought of as immersive art. It is useful to consider this in order to engage with the implications of immersion in art, and reflect on the possibility of strategic interferences operating within what might be described as contaminated immersion.

IMMERSION AND INTERFERENCE

Oliver Grau has stated that immersion “is characterized by diminishing critical distance to what is shown and increasing emotional involvement in what is happening.” In that sense, any artwork might be thought of as offering a potentially immersive experience, inviting a level of engagement best described as a kind of absorption, engrossment or immersion. Does a large-scale installation or virtual reality environment offer greater immersion than the experience of being transfixed by a small painting on a wall? Arguably, immersion is a condition contingent upon the viewer responding to the artwork, rather than an inherent quality within the artwork alone.

Writing about the pictorial tradition of still life, Hanneke Grootenboer draws upon the notion of conflict, as identified by Victor Stoichita. This ‘conflict’ exists as a schism (or cut, as Stoichita refers to it), between the foreground and background in paintings such as Joos van Cleve’s Holy Family (1513). The objects on the shelf in the lower portion of the composition are distinct from the space of the Madonna and Child with Saint Joseph. Although the still life objects are relegated to a minor position within the image, they complicate the pictorial space because of their ambiguous location between the viewer and the scene beyond. Grootenboer argues that the notion of the conflict between foreground and background continued to have ramifications throughout the development of seventeenth century Dutch still life painting. Pieter Claesz’s Little Breakfast (1636) can be seen in this context, as Grootenboer demonstrates. Both Pieter Claesz and Willem Claesz Heda were the primary exponents of the breakfast still life, an art form that occupied a relatively brief period of Dutch painting during the 1630s and 1640s. Such works are distinct from the more abundant banquet pieces of the seventeenth century Dutch era. Grootenboer writes, “Not afraid of empty spaces, Claesz and Heda allow a void to appear in a genre where horror vacui once ruled. There is no compensation for this emptiness.” Focusing her attention on the nondescript background, Grootenboer interprets the void in such a work “as a commentary on the complexity of spatial representation.” The void here could be said to operate on the level of interference. Where one would conventionally find the articulation of more objects, a narrative scene or an architectural context, the artist has chosen to paint a soft enveloping haze. The schism between foreground and background is articulated in the absence of the background. While this painting belongs to a tradition of illusionistic representation, it also signals a turning away from the ‘view.’

Describing the impact of the window view implied by linear perspective, Joseph Nechvatal has pointed...
out “there has been a de-emphasis in the peripheral and the ambient as vision has become restrained by the habits of linear perspective; pre-established habits now encoded in the methods and expectations of photography, video and film. Thus vision has increas- ingly taken on the attributes of a focused, singular, narrow vision which is staring straight ahead.” While Nechvatal identifies strategies of immersion that uti- lize digital virtual reality environments to expand the image and lead the viewer toward a more comprehen- sive spatial awareness, I would challenge the notion that such an awareness is entirely the domain of the computer and identify a work such as Claesz’s Little Breakfast as very much concerned with the peripheral and ambient.

In the Hugh Lane Municipal Gallery in Dublin, we are able to literally peer through a window into a painting space. Here, we find the studio of Francis Bacon, post- humously reconstructed after having been relocated from its original site in London, where the artist lived and worked from 1961 until his death in 1992. The entire contents of the London studio, including the dust on the floor, were catalogued by archaeologists and moved into the museum in Dublin with painstaking attention to detail. Bacon accumulated detritus to the point of filling his studio to impractical proportions. Here perhaps is an expression of the horror vacui whose two key works Osmose (1995) and Ephémeré (1998) are exemplars of immersive technology. Davies contends that immersive virtual space can “redirect attention from our usual distractions and assump- tions to the sensations of our own condition as briefly embodied sentient beings immersed in the flow of life through space and time.” A key strategy behind immersion seems to lie in the purging of interferences, by which I mean any distraction that might call one’s attention away from the sovereignty of the work of art over its environment. These interferences occupy the space between the art and the audience, or the peripheral space around the art. An immersive envi- ronment might be described as one that removes or diminishes the presence of that which is extraneous to the artwork (e.g. surrounding architecture, furniture, other people, etc.). The head-mounted display for im- mersive virtual environments is an effective means to deal with this, even obscuring the participant’s own body. In the aforementioned works by Char Davies, a participant is able to navigate through digitally con- structed space in real time through the control of breathing and balance.

However, the experience of immersion is always contingent upon a participant’s responsiveness and susceptibility. According to Jay David Bolter and Richard Grusin, an immersive medium is one “whose purpose is to disappear. This disappearing act, how- ever, is made difficult by the apparatus that virtual reality requires.” Francis Dyson points out “there are multitudes of technical and circumstantial impedi- ments to forgetting the presence of the apparatus.” Referencing Char Davies’ work in particular, Dyson quotes Richard Coyne’s remarks regarding “the heavy headset, the low image resolution, the noises in the museum, the time constraint, and so on.” If one regards interference as an inevitable component of immersion, immersive methodologies might logically incorporate strategic interference, allowing for the peripheral, incidental environment to encroach upon the immersive experience. Writing about virtual reality, Bolter and Grusin refer to the technology’s “many rup- tures: slow frame rates, jagged graphics, bright colors, bland lighting, and system crashes.” In the terminol- ogy employed by Bolter and Grusin, such ruptures in- terfere with the ‘transparent immediacy’ of a medium, instead contributing to a condition of ‘hypermediacy,’ multiplying the signs of mediation and making them more apparent. Strategic incorporation of such ruptures or interferences that disrupt the ideal of a pure immersive experience might be best understood as contaminated immersion.

While digital technology has been implemented to simulate the sensation of entering the image, such a strategy is not unprecedented. As Oliver Grau has demonstrated, there is a long history of immersive art practices that can be traced back to classical an- tiquity, and the nineteenth century panorama is worth considering in this respect. The term panorama is a combination of words of Greek origin: pan, meaning ‘all,’ and horama, meaning ‘view.’ In a publication to commemorate the centenary of the Mesdag Panorama in Den Haag (constructed in 1881 by Hendrik Wil- lern-Mesdag), Paul A. Zoetmulder wrote, “the secret of the panorama lies in the elimination of the possibility to compare the work of art with the reality outside, by taking away ‘all’ boundaries which remind the specta- tor that he is observing a separate object within his total visual field.” In practice, however, the image of the panorama does not constitute the totality of the visible space, and strategies were employed to address the transition between the viewer and the image. One such strategy is the placement of extraneous objects in front of the panorama as props to aid the illusion, expanding the image into the three-dimensional space of the interior that the panorama encircles. The objects in this zone were known by the French term ‘attrapes,’ and Zoetmulder attributes this innovation to the French panorama painter Jean-Charles Langlois, also known as ‘The Colonel.’ Zoetmulder writes, “Gradu- ally this technique was further refined to the extent that the tri-dimensional attrapes faded perfectly into the bi-dimensional canvas, thus creating a very realistic effect.”

Many of the panoramas popular with audiences in the 19th century are no longer in existence, however, firsthand experience of one of the few surviving 19th century panoramas, the Mesdag Panorama, leads to questions regarding the supposedly perfect integration of attrapes into the illusion. Indeed, it is possible to dis- cern a rupture between the intermediary terrain where the attrapes are situated and the illusory space of the painting. Viewing the panorama at its perimeter, an angle not normally visible to the spectator, this rupture is revealed as an actual chasm. In fact, a gap big enough to fall through separates the foreground terrain and the painted panorama beyond it. Mesdag’s panoramic painting is disrupted, or contaminated, by the surrounding environment, calling one’s attention to the space that separates the viewer from the image as much as contributing to a sense of immersion.

While digital technology has been implemented to simulate the sensation of entering the image, such a strategy is not unprecedented. As Oliver Grau has demonstrated, there is a long history of immersive art practices that can be traced back to classical antiquity, and the nineteenth century panorama is worth considering in this respect. The term panorama is a combination of words of Greek origin: pan, meaning ‘all,’ and horama, meaning ‘view.’ In a publication to commemorate the centenary of the Mesdag Panorama in Den Haag (constructed in 1881 by Hendrik Wil- lern-Mesdag), Paul A. Zoetmulder wrote, “the secret of the panorama lies in the elimination of the possibility to compare the work of art with the reality outside, by taking away ‘all’ boundaries which remind the specta- tor that he is observing a separate object within his total visual field.” In practice, however, the image of the panorama does not constitute the totality of the visible space, and strategies were employed to address the transition between the viewer and the image. One such strategy is the placement of extraneous objects in front of the panorama as props to aid the illusion, expanding the image into the three-dimensional space of the interior that the panorama encircles. The objects in this zone were known by the French term ‘attrapes,’ and Zoetmulder attributes this innovation to the French panorama painter Jean-Charles Langlois, also known as ‘The Colonel.’ Zoetmulder writes, “Gradu- ally this technique was further refined to the extent that the tri-dimensional attrapes faded perfectly into the bi-dimensional canvas, thus creating a very realistic effect.”

Many of the panoramas popular with audiences in the 19th century are no longer in existence, however, firsthand experience of one of the few surviving 19th century panoramas, the Mesdag Panorama, leads to questions regarding the supposedly perfect integration of attrapes into the illusion. Indeed, it is possible to dis- cern a rupture between the intermediary terrain where the attrapes are situated and the illusory space of the painting. Viewing the panorama at its perimeter, an angle not normally visible to the spectator, this rupture is revealed as an actual chasm. In fact, a gap big enough to fall through separates the foreground terrain and the painted panorama beyond it. Mesdag’s panoramic painting is disrupted, or contaminated, by the surrounding environment, calling one’s attention to the space that separates the viewer from the image as much as contributing to a sense of immersion.
At the New Imaging conference held at Artspace in Sydney in 2010, Stephen Little recounted his experience of being intrigued by the wall space between two paintings, in which holes indicated that a painting had possibly been removed from the exhibition. The experience correlates with Little’s strategies to critique painting through “a refusal of traditional means.” He remarked that the blank space “had offered a more fulfilling and informative encounter with painting than any of the works on show.”

While this may be interpreted as an indictment of the paintings in that particular exhibition, it also evidences the potential significance of the environment extraneous to the art on display. If the wall-space between two paintings can be valuable contemplative terrain in competition with the adjacent art, it is apparent that no space is entirely neutral, just as no space is inherently immersive.

THE DAILIES

Thomas Demand’s exhibition The Dailies could be said to activate the space between, calling attention to the peripheral and ambient. The project occupied the Commercial Travellers’ Association club at Sydney’s MLC Centre, [Figure 1] a building designed by Harry Seidler and specifically selected by Demand to house the installation. As the 25th Kaldor Public Art Project (March 23 – April 22, 2012), The Dailies is one of a series of Kaldor-sponsored major projects by international artists in public spaces primarily located in Australia, beginning with Christo and Jeanne-Claude’s wrapped coast in 1969 and including the work of Gilbert & George, Jeff Koons and Bill Viola.

Installed throughout hotel rooms on the fourth floor of the building, the surrounding environment of the Dailies was integral to the reception of Demand’s photographs, and taken as a whole, the project may be considered an immersive installation. The idiosyncratic design of the hotel was at the forefront of the viewer’s experience of the exhibition. The artist did not try to dominate the space; rather, the installation was more like a series of understated interventions designed to assimilate with the environment.

Demand enlisted collaborators to contribute to his installation. Having noticed the Prada store in Martin Place from the window of one of the CTA hotel rooms, Demand invited Miuccia Prada to manufacture a fragrance for the exhibition. Every room was installed with a scent dispenser that emitted an aroma made from a synthesis of green leaves. The scent was subtle and difficult to discern. Also for the exhibition, the novelist Louis Begley wrote a short story, Gregor in Sydney, entailing a series of experiences in the CTA hotel narrated by a fictional business traveler. Fragments of the story were disguised as menu cards and inconspicuously placed in each room.

The venue of the exhibition significantly informed the reception of the work. The central shaft of the tower houses the elevator and rises from the underground bar and function rooms up to the floors above on levels four and five. Level four consists of 16 single hotel rooms, 15 of which were used for the installation.
of The Dailies. Visiting the exhibition on a typical day in March or April 2012, one exited the lift on level four and entered a circular corridor punctuated by a series of closed hotel room doors. A volunteer was there to welcome visitors and encourage exploration of the environment. Selecting a door and entering, a visitor could look through the curved window in the outer wall of the building to a view of buildings and streets in the vicinity. (See figure 2.) On the wall above each single bed was a framed photograph by Thomas Demand.

ENTERING THE IMAGE

Demand is known for his process of photographing life-size paper models constructed in his studio. A characteristic feature of his practice is the use of the Diasec-mounted photographic process, in which photographs are face-mounted onto acrylic glass, producing images of high gloss and brilliant color. Speaking in conversation with Judy Annear at the Art Gallery of New South Wales in 2011, Demand commented on the rationale behind the format of his work: “It's kind of a way of making the photographic print invisible... I wanted people looking at the thing I made, not the thing somebody else printed for me... I want to have them like windows, basically... you look through a window... you look into my studio. And that’s why they don’t have a frame, they don’t have any edges.” Demand's description of the experience of looking at his photographic prints aligns closely with Bolter and Grusin's notion of a medium effacing the self. When I walk around them I feel a strange sense of destabilization. Once such a space is finished you are very cautious in it, because you know that you would destroy everything if you took a wrong step. Yet it’s the idea of the space that you remember; even if you can’t yourself experience the memory of it. That’s the strange thing – you transpose yourself to a time and place in which you could never be. Yet you can of course be there in your imagination. You are standing in the midst of the thing that arose in your imagination and then it’s all gone and the photo takes over.

Navigating one’s way through the hotel and observing the photographs on the wall, it is almost as though the immersive ideal of an image that one can enter has been realized.

PARERGA

Demand's models are typically based on found photographic images from the media and are often charged with historical or political content. The artist undertakes careful research to find out as much as he can about his source photographs. He has commented, “I try to find the photographer, the publisher, how it came to the photo-agency. And I often discover even more interesting photos in the process.” The significant historical events or newsworthy incidents behind many of the images to which Demand is drawn give credence to Robert Storr's description of Demand's practice as “reviving ‘history painting’ by other means.” It is rare for Demand to seek subjects that have had no prior incarnation as images circulated in public. An image “sufficiently devoid of significance,” as he described Sink, a work from 1997, is considered by the artist himself to be “a precious counterpoint to my other works.” The fact that the artist once more turned to quotidian subject matter for The Dailies may be considered another such counterpoint within his oeuvre.

The Dailies, a project the artist had worked on since 2008, initiated from a series of photographs taken with his own phone camera, capturing images of ordinary things the artist observed on his travels: a power outlet detached from a wall in an Ethiopian airport, an ash tray full of butts, a screwed up piece of paper in the gutter. These photographs became the source for a series of paper reconstructions built in his studio, which were then photographed. The images could be classified as hapheography, defined by Norman Bryson as “the depiction of those things which lack...
importance, the unassuming material base of life that ‘importance’ overlooks.” In relation to the historical emergence of still life as a genre, Grooteboom refers to still life objects as ‘parerga’; in other words, subsidiary or peripheral. As she points out, still life objects traditionally “appear at the border of representation, at its margins, on its frame or verso.”

Peripheral played a key role in The Dailies. The installation directed one’s attention toward the extraneous and tangential. To experience the exhibition was to experience a series of digressions. In the context of the installation in the hotel, one cannot consider Demand’s fifteen photographs in isolation. Clearly, Demand intended to trigger a range of experiences within the installation, not only by commissioning the Prada scent and Louis Begley’s short story, but also by mounting the exhibition in Harry Seidler’s distinct architectural space and selectively modifying the décor. Beyond the intentionality of Demand’s highly considered installation in the CTA building, remain the unexpected conditions that rupture any possibility of a hermetically immersive experience. Instead, a complex set of associations between the photographs and the surrounding environment were to be detected. Amelia Douglas of the installation in the hotel, one cannot consider Demand’s fabricated worlds had extended beyond the photographs themselves and had somehow spread into the space of the viewer. Beyond the immediate space of the hotel interior were further associations to be made with Demand’s photographic images. The view outside the hotel windows could often be found to have a visual resonance with an aspect of The Dailies. For instance, Demand’s photograph depicting a ceiling with missing panels related to the trace of removed signage from a nearby building façade. The connections between the photographs and the surrounding space were there to be found by astute observers. Demand has spoken about his Kaldor Project as leading the viewer to discover “constellations” which expand the image beyond the frame and blur distinctions between art and non-art, emphasizing the viewer’s agency to locate hidden or unanticipated connections in the surrounding environment. Moving through the series of uniformly designed rooms around the circular building elicited a sense of disorientation. Once inside a room, there was little about the interior to distinguish one from another aside from Demand’s photographs. To aid one’s bearings, the visitor would be better served to be attentive to the series of views through the windows, which cumulatively amounted to a 360-degree view. In this respect, the design of the CTA building’s design has obvious parallels with the enveloping space of the 19th century panorama, as does the panopticon, Jeremy Bentham’s prison design. From the vantage point of the fourth floor of the CTA building, one is well positioned to surveil the pedestrians below.

It is noteworthy that so many features of Demand’s Kaldor Project appeared to comprise peripheral details, or parerga. Shifting the format of his photographic process, particularly in terms of presentation, Demand moves away from the immediacy that characterizes his Diasec-mounted prints. This shift marks a deflection away from the photograph’s immersive potential, directing the viewer towards a more hypermediated condition in which the viewer is made all the more conscious of the photograph as a framed print on a wall, a single item among a multitude of diversions within the environment of the CTA hotel.

CONCLUSION

The subjects in Demand’s photographs reveal themselves as ersatz objects, like the atropes of the panorama, designed to misdirect and confound. Upon scrutiny, the paper-thin veneers that constitute Demand’s tableaux reveal themselves as lacking in substance and weight; they are all artifice and pure contrivance. Regarding the space surrounding the photographs in the CTA hotel rooms, everything became contingent. The Dailies simultaneously courted immersion and interference, to disorienting effect. Expanding the image beyond the confines of the frame, Demand’s installation blurred distinctions between art and ‘non-art,’ emphasizing the agency of the audience to locate hidden or unanticipated connections in the surrounding environment. Upon entering the fourth floor of the hotel from the lift, the viewer encountered the cumulative experience of moving from room to room, finding oneself in the contradictory situation of an immersive space that incorporated diversions as an integral component of the installation. The exhibition presented multiple layers of experience in which it was unclear where the work began and ended. It was a hypermediated environment that required connections to be located across a fragmented terrain. Bolter and Grusin state, “the logic of hypermediacy acknowledges multiple acts of representation and makes them visible.” Demand’s hypermediation is apparent through the remediation of source photographs into paper sculptures and back into photography. In the Sydney presentation of The Dailies, hypermediacy extended into the environment of the CTA hotel. Enlist Seidler’s architecture, subtly manipulating its décor, introducing a manufactured scent and a fictional short story, Demand asks us to notice that which lies outside the photograph. The size and color of the frames around the photographs closely matched the window frames, as though to draw a close comparison. Demand directed attention toward an all-inclusive experience related to Bolter and Grusin’s description of hypermediacy as offering “a heterogeneous space, in which representation is conceived of not as a window on to the world, but as ‘windowed’ itself—with windows that open on to other representations or other media. The logic of hypermediacy multiplies the signs of mediation and in this way tries to reproduce the rich sensurium of human experience.”

Roland Barthes wrote about an element that will “break (or punctuate)” a setting. “It is this element which rises from a scene, shoots out of it like an arrow, and pierces me. A Latin word exists to designate this wound, this prick, this mark made by a pointed instrument.” Barthes’ word for this is punctum, which he likens to a “sting, speck, cut, little hole—and also a cast
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of the dice.” Barthes indicates that the punctum is an element of chance, outside of the photographer’s control: “the detail which interests me is not, or at least is not strictly, intentional, and probably must not be so; it occurs in the field of the photographed thing like a supplement that is at once inevitable and delightful.” The highly controlled scenes constructed and photographed by Demand might be better understood as falling into Barthes’ other category, that of the studium: “To recognize the studium is inevitably to encounter the photographer’s intentions.” Michael Fried has highlighted the role of intentionality in relation to Barthes’ distinction between the studium and punctum, commenting, “the detail that strikes him as a punctum could not do so had it been intended as such by the photographer.” Demand’s highly controlled tableaux in The Dailies are opened up to the more contingent condition of the punctum through the context of the installation. It is this contingency that contaminates immersion and highlights the potential for the role of interference, operating as a cut, or rupture, as in the schism of the breakfast still life or the chasm of the Mesdag Panorama.