comforting closures, but also to the hijacking of the workers' movement by new social groupings ("despotic bureaucracy" or "labour aristocracy") whose *interest* was involved in closure. This began in the nineteenth-century socialist parties—ironically, when both poetry (Heine, Baudelaire, Rimbaud) and serious philosophy (Marx, Kierkegaard) had abandoned rigid systems—but came to a head in Stalinism (and in parallel though overtly pro-capitalist ways in Fascism). Dealing with this multiple closure is indispensable for lessons to be drawn from twentieth-century Fordism (ca. 1890–1973), for which central Marxist insights are still needed.

Notes

1 All historical references to "system" have been taken from *The Compact Oxford Dictionary*, under that entry. *The Compact Oxford Dictionary* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991).

2 Chris Hables Gay, *Postmodern War* (New York: Guilford Press, 1997), 142–43, 149–65.

3 See Les Levidow and Kevin Robbins, *Cyborg Worlds: The Military Information Society* (London: Free Association Books, 1989), 28, 56, 152; Andrew Ross, *Strange Weather* (London: Verso, 1973), 174 and passim.

4 Karl Marx, *Grundrisse*, trans. M. Nicolaus (New York: Vintage: 1973), 471.

—Darko Suvin

talk

:{ t(ender) a(ny) l(ittle) k(ernel) }

—Vivian Selbo

Tattoo

The tattoo of course has always been commonly discerned as making meaning. Those who have studied the body marks of so-called "primitive" peoples tell us that the primary purpose of these inscriptions is one of differentiation. These marks assert the difference between what the anthropologist Claude Levi-Strauss (like the Roro) also names "the raw and the cooked": the difference between nature and culture, between animal life and human life. They also act to discriminate and characterize the uniqueness of one culture from another, and within each culture, one individual from another. These marks are individualist expressions—of community, of age, of sex, of status—but they are also the differential marks of society's law set upon the body. The societal order, its meanings and its structure, is inscribed upon the epidermis, linking it permanently, physically and visibly to that which must be felt and obeyed. In this way, the

body politic is made both internal to the individual and co-extensive to the social group. It is a collective medium of human thought and human flesh.

In constructing its identity in opposition to the "primitive," "modern" society is thought to mediate its symbolic order in a space external to the individual and to codify this order anonymously. The law of "civilized" society ceases to be publicly and crudely figured upon individual bodies; instead, it is transcribed upon the sophisticated parchments of video tape, radio waves and newsprint, and their codification and creation calls upon the subjects of consciousness. These then are the incognito inscriptions of ideology; the benevolent means by which normative values, behaviors and reasons subtly take hold within the psychic life of the individual. The living body is thought to remain untouched, to stay safely within the sanctuary of the pre-social.

Franz Kafka's story "In the Penal Colony", however, is an expressive portrait of the brutality with which a "civilized" codification of the law is written upon the body. The device which the officer of the penal colony proudly shows the traveller is a particularly horrific "drawing machine," within whose mouth full of shiny needles a convict is laid. The purpose of this machine is to inscribe into the convict's body the law which he has broken, driving it deeper and deeper into the skin for a tortuous six hours. The convict knows not what is being written; he knows not what his sentence is. The needles strike into his body in such a complicated way that they are impossible to decipher. "'Read it', said the officer. 'I can't', said the traveller." Only at the last moment of life, at the last minute of the sixth hour when the pain has left his body, can the convict read the law in his own dying flesh.

Nothing else happens; the man is simply beginning to decipher the text, pursing his lips as though listening, it's not easy, as you saw, to decipher the text when looking at it; our man, remember, is doing it with his wounds.[1]

Like Kafka's drawing machine, the mechanisms of society work with an illegible grace, its needles extending and permeating invisibly across the social body. Michel Foucault has observed that "the law averts its face and returns to the shadows the instant one looks at it; when one tries to hear its words, what one catches is a song that is no more than the fatal promise of a future song."[2] The law is felt and obeyed: with the economy of power it works its way invisibly into the skins of its subjects. Yet it is never seen, until it is felt, fatally, (to be) too late.

Notes

1 Franz Kafka, "In the Penal Colony," *Franz Kafka: Stories 1904–1924*, trans. J. Underwood (New York: McDonald and Co., 1981), 224.

2 Michel Foucault, "Maurice Blanchot: The Thought from the Outside," *Foucault/Blanchot*, trans. J. Mehlman and B. Massumi (New York: Zone Books, 1987), 41.

—Beth Seaton

Excerpted from "The Depth Inscribed on Surfaces," *Public 8: The Ethics of Enactment,* 1993.

Tear

"A world has to be overthrown; but every tear that is wept, even if wiped away, remains an accusation. To crush a poor worm underfoot while one is hastening to vital deeds, is a crime." {Rosa Luxemburg}

—Paul Kelley

Quoted from 1918 citation in the film *Rosa L* by Marguerite von Trotta.

Technoetic City A to Z

Architect: The initiator of open-ended, evolutive systems and structures in interspace.

Behaviour: Classical Architecture dealt with the behaviour of forms, technoetic architecture deals with forms of behaviour.

Biohaus: The biology of building. Seeding should replace designing, buildings must be planted and allowed to grow.

Body: The site of bionic transformation at which we can recreate ourselves and redefine what it is to be human.

Connectivity: The technoetic architect must combine the connectionism of cognitive science and the connectivism of the artist in the Net.

Cyberception: The emergent human faculty of technologically-augmented cognition and perception. All buildings need this.

Cyberself: We are made up of many selves: de-centred, distributed, and constructively schizophrenic. They all need housing.

Design: Formerly a top down affair with blueprints, master plans and models. Now a bottom up process, involving seeding and nurturing.

Double gazing: We see, hear, and feel in ways unknown to biological man. The environment must see, hear, and respond to us. Our gaze is returned; the walls have ears, and buildings will speak volumes.

Five-fold path: Connectivity, immersion, interaction, transformation, emergence.

Hypercortex: The global network of collective cognition and holomatic mentation.

Interspace: Between the virtual and the material, where reality is renegotiated and the new consciousness is embodied.

Interstitial practice: Architecture at the meeting place of bio-electronics, nano-engineering and the science of consciousness.

Ki: Consciousness in artificial systems, machines and architecture. Spiritual energy intrinsic to technology.

Noetic networks: Mind city is where our neural network flows seamlessly into the neural nets of the environment.

Radical Constructivism: Forget representation in architecture, think only of connectivity, complexity and the construction of reality.

Technoetic Architecture: To support the realities of cyborg living, the distributed self, and our technoetic ecology, architecture will have to become more conscious, anticipatory and responsive.

Structural Analysis: Psycho-therapy for intelligent buildings may be more appropriate than putting ourselves in analysis. Think of all the psychotic and schizophrenic places you know.

Telenoia: Telenoia celebrates the networked consciousness of global connectivity. It replaces the paranoia of the old industrial culture: anxious, alienated, secretive and neurotically private.

Wormhole: As essential to urban systems as to galaxies, facilitating our passage between real and virtual spaces, and between natural and paranatural worlds. Modelled in hypermedia.

Zen: The new necessity in architecture of watchful preparedness: standing back in a Zen-like state of readiness to allow new structures and systems to emerge from the hyperconnectivity of the Net, then to cultivate, nurture and reseed them.

—Roy Ascott

Terrain Vague

Besides usual locutions like "vacant lot" or "no man's land," the use of the French expression *terrain vague* (Chateaubriand, 1811) seems to be increasing in the international community. Would it be because the *terrain vague*, beyond negativity or casual descriptions, evokes more than any other lexical assemblage the paradoxical condition of space and territoriality in contemporary culture? Between nomadism and sedentary, the *ter-*

rain vague keeps the question and its potentialities open—concrete virtualities. While the term *vague* links to flux, indetermination and void, *terrain* refers rather to the idea of the border and of ground that can be imprinted upon. Can we preserve this unusual coexistence without reducing it to one term or the other? This is the stake suggested by the figure of *terrain vague*: to open the territory without dissolving its constructive qualities.

Rather than the normative vacuity associated with hygienist planification, the *terrain vague* speaks about porosity. Its void constitutes the counter image of the functionalist city, the Achilles heel of its prophylactic and ostentatious phantasms. The pore is both cavity and passage, a place propitious to the development of processes that escape control and contaminate representation by transversal infiltrations. As an indeterminate zone, the *terrain vague* destabilises the clarity of the urban figure and resists the "spectacular." In a world more and more mediated and virtualised, it offers the possibility to tame and to experience the raw reality of a new type of impure Wilderness.

—Luc Lévesque

Terror

See "Sublime."

Theme

Recurrency in exchange.

—Ken Allan

Things

Amidst so much talk about the imminent disappearance of cultural artefacts—of books, records and videotapes—within systems of electronic distribution, it is worth noting the ways in which these artefacts continue to accumulate within the spaces of the city, of domestic life, and of the institutions of urban commerce. The last decade of the twentieth century brought an incredible expansion of sites in which physical artefacts were gathered together and made available. Retail institutions devoted to new commodities have assumed gargantuan scale, through the development of the superstore and the so-called destination entertainment centre. At the same time, however, and to less comment, we have witnessed an ongoing expansion of those commercial institutions and events which make up the informal or secondary economy. Charity shops (or pseudo-charity shops,

like the Value Village chain)—are expanding throughout Canada and the United States, amidst a significant resurgence of the pawnshop. In the United Kingdom, so many charity shops have opened in recent years that there is now a shortage of second-hand items, forcing charities to import such items from other European countries. The sense of information disappearing into virtuality goes hand in hand with a sense of being surrounded by objects, the accumulated residue of a century or more of material production.

—Will Straw

Time

"With the advent of modernity time has vanished from social space. It is recorded solely on measuring-instruments, on clocks, that are as isolated and functionally specialized as this time itself. Lived time loses its form and its social interest—with the exception, that is, of the time spent working. Economic space subordinates time to itself; political space expels it as threatening and dangerous (to power). The primacy of the economic and above all of the political implies the supremacy of space over time.... Our time, then, this most essential part of lived experience, this greatest good of all goods, is no longer visible to us, no longer intelligible. It cannot be constructed. It is consumed, exhausted, and that is all. It leaves no traces. It is concealed in space, hidden under a pile of debris to be disposed of as soon as possible; after all, rubbish is a pollutant." {Henri Lefebvre}

—Susan Lord

Excerpted from *The Production of Space*, trans. Donald Nicholson-Smith (Oxford and Cambridge: Blackwell, 1991), 95–96.

Translation

Will translation be a keyword for the twenty-first century? And if so, in what semantic networks? Variable and contradictory these may well be, as a historical semantics shows. Will translation's salience for the next millennium create continuity between past and present, or effect radical change? Should one characterize translation as *confusion*, under the sign of the Babelian fall into languages mourning the loss of an Adamic identity of names and things or awaiting the perfect comprehension of an Apocalypse with its gift of speaking in tongues? Or, translation as *transmission*, under the sign of Jeromian accuracy in the "sense for sense" reproduction of the meaning of a text so as to render faithfully the "mystery" within syntax—the perfect transfer of a stable meaning from one language to another so as to redeem the scattering of tongues? Or further,

translation as *production*, under the sign of Pandoral heterotopic spaces whose box released the gift of proliferation, variation, source of all the world's woes, according to some versions, or of all its wisdom, according to others?[1] In loving Pandora, Hermes, the trickster, god of passages, mediator between worlds, and god of liars sowed ambiguity in human words, placing creativity at the limits of treason.[2] *Traduttore, traditore.* Translator, traitor. Representing the multiplicity of knowledges and facets of existence and the manifold ways in which these knowledges may be received or interpreted, Hermes is paradoxically both god of hermeticism and of hermeneutics, of mystery and of interpretation. Or, Translation as...?

What precisely is translation? These myriad myths of translation from the previous two millenniums still orient diverse notions of translation each offering an explanatory frame for, and an evaluative response to, the diversity of languages and the problems in cross-cultural communication that plague the dream of human community. Accounts of translation speak of dislocation, of displacement (of psychic energy, according to Freud) in which the play of similarities within differences of metaphoric condensation releases an uncanny series of differences within similarities. Responses to this double play have varied depending on whether emphasis is placed on figurative or literal meanings of the term. In sixteenth-century English, translation was a rhetorical term for metaphor, a reminder that *metapherein* was one of the Greek words for the operation of producing a version of something in a different language. Yoking together differences in a single figure, metaphor, or trope forges connections, linkages. Translation in this context is often considered a "bridge" helping to overcome cultural differences by facilitating the circulation of ideas beyond language. John Glassco phrased it in what has become a powerful trope of translation in the English-Canadian context as "a bridge of sorts." Nonetheless, a bridge is not the desired invisible "conveyance...of the vision of reality" received in a "religious sense" from one poem and achieved in another[3]—a perfect translation in the sense of being carried away or enraptured—but is rather a terrestrial bricolage. In its literal usage, translation means to transfer or transport from one place to another, placing an emphasis on the heterotopic movement rather than on the structures relating diverse spaces, states, or expressive forms. This derivation from Latin frames the common sense English understanding of interlingual translation as the conveyance of sense translinguistically, meaning posited as separate from the language in which it is expressed. Translation consequently is thought to be a transparent medium for interlinguistic communication. In French, the etymological sense of being brought to justice associated with *traduction*, in addition to its literal sense of carrying across, reinforces an understanding of the necessity for

translation to submit to the law of the receiving culture's rhetoric. Translation then is a strategy of naturalization which does violence to the linguistic forms of the translated culture, as is implied in the venerable adage of linguistic as sexist conquest, *les belles infidèles*. A good translation like a beautiful woman is inevitably unfaithful. What is emphasized in the German term, *übersetzen* (to set beside) are reciprocal relations of two elements so positioned that both are changed in the course of the interaction. *Anuvad*, the Hindi term for translation, underlines a conflict between, and similarity of, the two related elements.

This list is endless, for each language has a different term for translation, associated metaphorically with the interlinguistic operation while denoting diverse other activities. Nor does this semantic multiplicity function as in the Middle Ages, when a different name was applied to each type of text written in a specific language, whether these be religious, philosophic, and scientific texts in Latin, or literary texts in the vernacular. Consequently, to translate into Latin, *latiniser*, was not the same as to translate from Latin, *volgarizzare*, *enromanchier*, etc. Moreover, the boundaries between one person's speech and another's were not as sharply drawn in the mediaeval period as they were subsequently. When everything was discourse on another discourse, when every text was the reworking of a previous text redoubled by commentary, translation was not perceived as a specific kind of textual production distinct from any other form of recreation, adaptation or commentary. The specificity and subordinate status of translation as a textual practice gained ground during the Romantic period with its emphasis on the author as isolated genius, and on the expressive, rather than the mimetic or imitative aspects of the literary text. This fostered a hierarchical paradigm regulating cultural value in a distinction between writing and translation, between productive and reproductive work, that established a gendered model of translation as repetitive, feminine labour in contrast to the originality and creativity of writing associated with paternal authority. Sometimes, as in Dryden's celebrated preface to his translation of Virgil's *Aeneid*, this hierarchy was represented in terms of the relations of slave to master in the discourse of imperialist projects of colonial (trans)plantations.

What is translation? As these multiplying terms each with their varied theories and methods imply—according to the spirit or the letter, to the source or the target culture's norms—it is impossible to fix translation in any single or stable definition. Rather, a relational term itself and often linked presently with such correlatives for contradiction, doubleness and slippage as paradox, parody, and parataxis, translation must be situated within a field of meanings or site of struggle in which contending social processes manifest themselves in language and instantiate relations of ruling. In such a historicized pragmatics, where meaning is correlative to the

ever-changing instance of enunciation on the borderline between languages, cultures, the "word in language is half someone else's"[4] and so continuously reworked, refracted, from a different and often competing angle of perception.

How will translation signify in the next millennium? Will it continue to function as trope of a praxis of trans/formation? And if so how--by retrospective nostalgia or surprise proliferation? Translation will most certainly be of great importance at the beginning of the millennium with respect to current topical issues regarding the problem of knowledge and the shrinking of distances between languages and cultures, problematics most concretely raised by the "information age" of telematics and the project of European unification. Whereas the first holds out the dream of total communication and omniscience to overcome the failure of Babel, the labyrinthine library transposed into an electronic network invisibly linking the entire globe, the second contains the promise of reversing the Renaissance scattering of the peoples of Europe by transposing the *translatio* and its transference of political power back to the metropolis which will democratically now assume the mantle of Roman authority. Speed multiplies contemporary possibilities for interrelation under the name of "globalization" through technological innovations that have facilitated the mobility of people (who are refugees from, or agents of, multinational capitalism) or that have accelerated the pace of communicative exchanges through the Internet. Such increased proximity by means of digital technology and/or governmental apparatuses forcefully raises the question of difference: how will people speak to each other?

Is it possible to reconcile the need for a common language and the need to sustain linguistic diversity and a cultural heritage of complexity? The machine language of bits and bytes offers a contemporary form of an *a priori* universal language with its criteria of rationality and transparency as a communicative medium. But the long history of such international artificial language projects of philosophers and mathematicians who have sought through a "perfect language" to redress the Babelic event reveals them to be lacking in the intertextual richness and everyday resonance of "natural" languages which in their unique ways of organizing and interpreting the world transmit cultural values in excess of the rational. Machines may well speak to each other in this "common language." But how will people address the machines? In what *lingua franca*? Since the abandonment of Latin, many natural languages have been used as mediums of international communication in different geographical zones or for limited functions. Historical contingencies of dominance turn specific languages into vehicular languages. They in turn reproduce domination by hierarchization. Already the acronym WWW positions English as the language of "globalized" communication, excluding from interaction those

not already minimally competent in this tongue. The problem of translation has only begun to be raised in relation to the Internet, often by francophones. Development of the Universal Network Language is underway at the United Nations to enable Internet users to communicate using any two languages. Already, though, the parameters of this debate may be detected in the history of translation politics within colonial empires as these highlight the exclusionary practices of power which contradict the inclusionary promise of world-wide conversation.

Translation promises to be an issue for the future in European reunification. If the organizational operations of the last fifty years may be seen to culminate in the declaration of the Ecu as its common unit of economic value, the struggles of the next fifty years of the European Union will undoubtedly be waged on the terrain of language in an effort to arbitrate the question of linguistic value. Economic union seems to be just a step in European integration. The role of language in creating a "common identity" has been an historically important aspect of legitimation for the nation-state. How will it operate in an inter-national polity? What remains unchanged in this arena, despite the new rhetoric of mutual co-operation to overcome the historical legacy of intra-continental wars that have created barriers between the European nations over the last millennium, is the conflict between philosophies of language underpinning analysis of, and policy for, changing the linguistic walls between nations into porous membranes. These competing visions have, since the end of the seventeenth century, organized the thinking about language in opposed traditions. Anglo-American analytic philosophy remains largely indebted to the view of Locke that language—the word, and later the proposition—is a mere instrument for conveying ideas from the mind of one person to another. In such a transfer-approach, the effectiveness of the technology renders linguistic diversity invisible. Indeed, such a theory of signification oriented translation around naturalizing strategies that camouflage the labour of transfer and render the translator invisible. An opposing position, derived from German Romanticism and which underlies the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis and much continental post-Saussurean theory, emphasizes how languages uniquely structure the way we perceive and act in the world and so are central to cultural and national identity. Given the incommensurability of languages, translation is thought to transform meaning. These theorizations have given rise to competing accounts of the nation-state as contractual and cultural, a binary that is ultimately confounded.[5] The cultural nation is defined by a common relation to a number of elements including language and is conceived in particularist and collective terms in that each is inimitable and its members cannot live outside of its society. The contractual nation is on the contrary artificial, universalist and individualist, in that it is founded on the basis of rational

debate and consensus and constituted by individuals agreeing to submit to the implicit contract of its laws.

Translation poetics, approaching languages(s) from the perspective of a relation with an outside, poses the question of (in)finitude, of limits, those of the self, the other, the collectivity, of the medium, the *teckne*, the nation, of modernity even, and of knowledge. What remains a matter of ongoing debate is whether translation is a process of enfolding an outside, or of unfolding to an outside in a movement of expansion with the potential for enhancement or dispersal.

Notes

1 Karen Littau, "Refractions of the Feminine: The Monstrous Transformations of Lulu," *Modern Language*, Notes 110, 4 (1995): 888–912.

2 Michel Serres, *La Traduction* (Paris: Éditions de Minuit, 1974).

3 John Glassco, "Introduction," *Poetry of French Canada in Translation* (Toronto: Oxford, 1970), xxii.

4 Mikhail Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination,* trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981), 293.

5 Brian Singer, "Cultural versus Contractual Nations: Rethinking their Opposition," *History and Theory 35,* 3 (1996): 309–337.

—**Barbara Godard**

Ultrasound

"[I]n the nineteenth century, [there was] a long period when a woman was not sure if she was pregnant. At a certain point, there was quickening and she gained certainty and then became a pregnant woman socially. If a woman did not want to be pregnant, she did not have to deal with the destruction of life in the uterus because that life stayed within the central experience of her own body. This is very different from women who are pregnant today, and who as many doctors report, do not feel "certain" that everything is alright until they have seen an image of their uterus through the ultrasound scan." {Barbara Duden}

—**Janine Marchessault**

Excerpted from "History Beneath the Skin" (transcript from *Ideas*), CBC Radio (Oct. 7–8, 1991).

Utopia

Last night a thick mist shrouded the city of Corrientes in a mysterious cloak, a physical manifestation of the intrigue that swirls through narrow colonial streets and spills into the plaza where the utopians wait, hopeful,