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**Abstract**

While the *post-political* paradigm in architectural discourse may lay claim to depoliticizing architecture, a *performance* paradigm emerging from cultural studies allows us to re-politicize the field through the notion of spatial performativity: a destabilizing of architecture’s will to be fixed and durable through a concentration on the complexities of architecture as event. This realignment redresses Henri Lefebvre’s critique of architecture’s implacable *objectality* with Gilles Deleuze’s focus on the mobilized *objectile*. Such an emphasis on architecture’s temporal mutability also reinforces Sanford Kwinter’s demand for “an all-encompassing theory and politics of the ‘event’”.

This paper acknowledges the active role architecture plays in reinforcing a contemporary barricade mentality, which curtails our freedom of movement and expression in the very name of “freedom”, while suggesting that in more ephemeral gestures of fortification – seen in a proliferation of data codes, plastic tape, synthetic webbing and portable concrete fences – lies the possibility for critiquing how our public performances are limited and controlled. Positing the barricade as an architectural and social formation allows us to consider its shifting political implications seen in public artworks that are aligned with Rubió Ignaci Solà-Morales’ concept of “weak architecture”.
Constructing Barricades: Politics of the Event and ‘Weak Architecture’

In 2005 a man walked through Jerusalem carrying a leaky can of green paint that dribbled a continuous line, seemingly meandering across the 24 kilometres of ground he covered – traversing roads, buildings, backyards and historic sites. But Francis Alÿs’ *Green Line* is an artwork that deliberately follows Moshe Dayan’s ‘armistice border’ indicated on a map following the 1948 Arab-Israeli war: an abstract boundary replaced by another constructed of concrete – an other border in an other place. Alÿs’ profoundly fluid line has since been obliterated: worn and washed away by weather, feet and car tyres. The artist subtitled his durational performance *(Sometimes doing something poetic can become political and sometimes doing something political can become poetic)*. As an architect-turned-artist Alÿs inquires into the role poetic acts play in highly charged political situations, while acknowledging that the relation between poetics and politics is always contingent. Eric Herschthal recently wrote that the Jerusalem walk “achieved that rare artistic feat: chastising the political status quo without becoming either cynical or simplistic.”¹ Like Gordon Matta-Clarke, another architecturally educated artist, Alÿs turns to the profound effect of small but radical acts that critique monolithic manoeuvres in public space, and the resulting performances of these artist-architects are powerfully resonant. Tapping into the politics of the event they constitute what Ignaci Solà-Morales referred to as “weak architecture”, a concept I intend to unfold throughout this paper, with particular reference to the *barricade* as both an architectural and social formation.

Architecture as the Performance of Politics

In his book on *Architecture, Power and National Identity*, Lawrence Vale asserts that government buildings are “an act of design in which expressions of power and identity seem explicit and inevitable, both for the government client and for the designer”.² To support this statement Vale refers to Nelson Goodman’s 1988 essay “How Buildings Mean”, which insists that how architecture conveys meaning is
more critical than what meaning it conveys: a sentiment echoed almost 20 years later by David Leatherbarrow in the opening essay of Kolarevic and Malkawi’s anthology, *Performative Architecture*, where he states that it is more productive to ask not what a building *is*, but what it *does*.4

I would propose that expressions of power and identity are applicable to all our constructed environments – both real and virtual. By mutually incorporating power systems, architecture defines, regulates, and limits our daily practices,5 and, as handmaidens to power, architects are responsible: a claim reinforced by Henri Lefebvre who believed that the “logic of space” conceals an authoritarian and brutal force, “at times as implacably hard as a concrete wall”.6 Such spatial brutality is acutely evident in the West, since the defining spectacle of 9/11, after which freedom of movement and expression is purposefully curtailed – locally and globally – in the very name of “freedom”. Designers of public space are more actively complicit in architecture’s role to silently and subtly condition the competence and performance of the subject; especially in this age of a constructed “war on terror” that maintains a continual state of siege. In 2007 New York Times critic, Nicolai Ourossoff, described this new art of architectural defense as *Medieval Modern*:

The Green Zone in Baghdad, Jerusalem’s separation barrier, the concrete bollards that line corporate headquarters on Park Avenue — all are emblems of an unintended new mentality… [T]his state of siege is beginning to look more and more like a permanent reality, exhibited in an architectural style we might refer to as 21st-century medievalism. Like their 13th- to 15th-century counterparts, contemporary architects are being enlisted to create not only major civic landmarks but lines of civic defense, with aesthetically pleasing features like elegantly sculpted barriers around public plazas or decorative cladding for bulky protective concrete walls.7

As Nietzsche wrote of the architect: “His buildings are supposed to render pride visible, and the victory over gravity, the will to power.”8 Yet in our current age of liquescence—where
nothing is stable, where fiction constantly folds into reality, and where sedentary structures can no longer house the mediatized spectacle of daily life—this fatal resolve is countered by a desire to create more porous, open-ended and transparent environments. Thom Mayne of Morphosis Architects has discussed how contemporary architects are presented with solving a “highly oppositional problem” that negotiates between promoting transparency and social connectedness in the city “while in reality producing opacity or the type of protection necessary for the various performance criterion of the [required] security.” Mayne refers to how he rises to this challenge by camouflaging security elements within the structural form and décor of buildings, seen in his award-winning design for the *Caltrans District 7 Headquarters Building* in Los Angeles (2008).

Ten years on 9/11’s “grand narrative” continues to sanction authoritarian spatial control, foreclosing on ease of access and expression while asserting architecture as the art of constructing and reinforcing boundaries. However this barricade mentality need not involve the obvious gestures of fortification referred to by Ouroussoff or the covert maneuvers Thom Mayne employs. We live in an era of more ephemeral barriers; from data codes that restrict our access on and offline; to fleeting constructions of plastic tape and synthetic webbing, which file us into obedient rows in airports, banks, museums, galleries and corporate lobbies; to the more overt portable concrete fences that surround public buildings or divide contested territories. A proliferation of signs dictates our civil behavior and CCTV cameras form a network of supervisory eyes.

Although these ephemeral elements of control limit action in public space and tend not to be as transient as their ephemerality suggests, they also provide the possibility for resisting such restraint through their performativity within an event construction. While the post-political paradigm in architectural discourse may lay claim to depoliticizing architecture, a **performance paradigm** emerging from cultural studies allows us to re-politicize the field via the notion of architectural performativity: a destabilizing of architecture’s will to be fixed and durable through a concentration on the complexities of architecture as event. This realignment
redresses Henri Lefebvre’s critique of architecture’s implacable objectality with Gilles Deleuze’s focus on the mobilized objectile where the continuous and explosive phenomena of form and matter activate the built environment through an object-event, no longer framing space but overflowing its boundaries so as to annihilate the representational frame.\(^\text{10}\) This transforms architecture from a disciplinary machine to an open-ended volatile form of spatial action. Such an emphasis on architecture’s temporal mutability also reinforces Sanford Kwinter’s demand for “an all-encompassing theory and politics of the ‘event’” addressed in the following section of this paper addressing the shifting political implication of the barricade as not only a global symbol of revolt and collective action, but also a contested site of performative engagement.

Rather than architects, contemporary artists provide a key for returning the barricade to architectural discourse challenging its contemporary role of obstructing body and thought in both built and virtual environments. Engaging with the “event” these artists co-opt anti-architectural strategies, which could re-inform spatial design.

### A Performance Paradigm and Event-Space

By focusing on spatial performativity, we can recognize the built environment as a system of active forces that work on human occupation, which in turn acts back. Vale’s reference to the “act of design” posits architectural design as both a doing (the event of designing) and a thing done (the designed artefact experienced as an event): what Jacques Derrida referred to as an “event of spacing”.\(^\text{11}\) The “event” therefore becomes a means of questioning architecture’s assumed fixity, durability and monumentality as well as its political role in regulating public spatial performances. This has considerable relevance in a contemporary moment haunted by the spectre of calamity that tends to inform and reform our spatial constructions and practices. Acknowledging spacing as a creative event also recognizes the “hand of the architect” in creating affects and effects.

Linking the event to architecture, Sanford Kwinter writes:
…to approach the problem of “the new”, then, one must complete the following four requirements: redefine the traditional concept of the object; reintroduce and radicalise the theory of time; conceive of “movement” as a first principle and not merely as a special, dismissible case; and embed these later three within an all-encompassing theory and politics of the “event”.

Here Kwinter is rendering mobile the static architectural object, reinforcing architecture as a political act of spacing. Aligned to temporality, gesture and mobility, the evental undermines the traditional role architecture plays as a stable, enduring object designed to order space and those who occupy it. By recognising performance as action-in-space and architecture as space-in-action, event-space provides a means of challenging the part power plays in our constructed environments. The spatial event is complex: cited (as significant historic moments that shift thought), sighted (as dramatic spectacles, shows and displays) and sited (as multiple quotidian spatiotemporal performances).

Irruptive of the status quo event-space makes room for the new, while confronting us with the abiding presence of the catastrophic, which architecture is designed to elude. In Architecture and Violence I discussed this through an analysis of the 2002 Moscow Theatre Siege, which, as a spectacular international event, exposed the inherently disciplinary nature of the contemporary cookie-cutter auditorium found in performing arts centres world-wide. Designed to control the public’s performance as prototypical passive observers, conventional theatre architecture proved an ideal site for barricade hostage taking, capturing spectators, performers and Chechen guerrillas as well as a global media audience. This violent event revealed an inherent violence of the architecture, but in its conformity rather than its radicality.

**Journée des Barricades**

This study was provoked by Journée des Barricades, a large transitory construction erected in Wellington that was developed for the One-Day Sculpture series, a New Zealand-wide project commissioning national and
international artists to create 24-hour long place-based artworks. Created by UK-based artists Heather and Ivan Morison *Journée des Barricades* (December 14th 2008) confronted Christmas shoppers in New Zealand’s capital city with a monumental installation “made up from the detritus of Wellington,” which inhabited and bifurcated a street in its downtown area.\(^{15}\) This colossal mass of inorganic rubbish borrowed from local recyclers and the dump inhabited the street for a single day: constructed the night before and totally disassembled the following evening; hence its title *Journée des Barricades – The Day of Barricades*.

Returning to performance, described by Elin Diamond as “a risky and dangerous negotiation between a doing […] and a thing done,”\(^ {17}\) the *barricade* – an unstable and ephemeral architecture originally built as a communal act of camaraderie and defiance – presents a powerful concept for spatial performativity. Like the words “construction” (a structure and the act of its making) and “refuse” (that which is rejected and a mode of resistance), “barricade” (a temporary obstruction and its swift formation), as simultaneously noun and verb, represents both object and action. A barricade constructed of refuse is therefore potentially an active and activating thing, However an inconsistency resides at the heart of the Morisons’ project – the place where noun and verb fail to cohere – thereby withholding the barricade’s promise as both object and action.

*Journée des Barricades* – which translates *The Day of Barricades* (objects) as well as *The Day of Protest* (action) – refers to the Parisian revolt of May 12th 1588 when the populace successfully enacted a spontaneous uprising against the King and his troupes by hastily constructing street blockades. Parisians have since
utilised this improvised architecture as an effective means of public insurgency during a number of 19th-century revolutionary events (influencing the design of Baron Von Haussman’s 2nd Empire Paris), as well as those of 1968 – commonly referred to as *Année des Barricades (The Year of Barricades)* – where street obstructions were created by literally uprooting the urban environment (trees, cobblestones and street furniture) as well as disgorging and hastily reassembling household contents. Revolutionary events therefore signalled a shift in attitude against monumental architecture, for which architects such as Gottfried Semper (1803-1879) were renowned. Yet Semper designed and supervised the construction of a makeshift wall of carts and domestic items outside his house during Dresden’s 1848 revolution, referred to by Richard Wagner as the “famous ‘Semper’ barricade,” which resulted in the architect’s banishment from Germany. Mikesch Muecke points out that Semper’s temporary architecture of resistance was “significantly not a conventional building but rather an intervention between buildings”: as well as an intervention between theory and practice, art and architecture, the status quo and resistance. 19

When regarding the Morison’s barricade in New Zealand (a country officially ranked “the most peaceful country in the world” in 2009 and 2010),20 such radical events in which streets are torn apart and domestic environments are emptied out to create lines of defence seem far away and long ago. Yet Wellington’s *Journée des Barricades* followed hard on Thailand’s airport blockade; an eight-day public siege in which demonstrators against the government paralysed cargo shipments and stranded thousands of travellers by setting up an encampment around the airport. The project directly coincided with riots in Athens (in protest against the police shooting of a teenager) where clouds of tear gas were blanketing the city while protestors hurled paving stones at the police and set Christmas trees alight. These extended moments of public insurgency force us to question the value of an aesthetically constructed barricade in downtown Wellington during the Christmas season.

In her investigation on the emergence of post-revolutionary social space,
Kristen Ross suggests that the bricolage construction of the 19th-century barricades – where quotidian objects are recycled – provided an antithesis to the autocratic. As a radical form of architecture continually fashioned from the debris of assault, the barricades transformed the concept of space from sedentary environments, designed to contain and control our lives, to more dynamic structures we helped create.

Five centuries after the first *Journée des Barricades* in Paris we find ourselves living in an era of architectural, technological and ephemeral barriers. No longer constructed as revolutionary acts of resistance, these shifting obstructions are directly associated with the status quo. The Morisons’ barricade reminds us that in this current condition it’s critical we question the many obstructions (real and virtual), which are created as a means of public protection.

So now that the tables are turned, what role can we play in this new era of the officially erected bureaucratic barricade? Less than two weeks after Wellington’s *Barricade* was constructed and dismantled, Israel attacked the Gaza Strip where Hamas were resisting being fenced in and blockaded by building tunnels below the borders. The anonymous artist, Banksy, shows us that the artwork can still do battle in the face of power’s brutal obstructions. His graffiti images on the West Bank walls – silhouettes of children lifted into the air by balloons, ladders inviting escape or apertures showing views onto more idyllic landscapes – remind us that these barriers form what Bansky names “the world’s largest open prison.” Such guerrilla activities, which challenge the status quo, do not require permission or negotiation with the authorities.

The paradox of the Morisons’ project is that, despite its associations with political resistance (involving radical, hostile or unexpected manoeuvres), the erection of their barricade engaged in neither spontaneous nor furtive action. Theirs was a carefully planned installation that required exhaustive negotiations with the authorities in order to close off a city street, erect a blockade and comply with health and safety issues – all with minimal disruption to the city’s traffic and negligible damage to its urban fabric. This pacified both the object and its
historical objective, rendering the artwork monumental, sculptural and totalising rather than durational, subversive or communal. The giant barricade – perspectivally framed by some of the most European buildings in Wellington – also resembled a scenic backdrop. Once you approached the spectacular assemblage, you realised it was not possible to engage with it, other than to look and marvel at its epic scale or enjoy the carefully arranged objects within objects. Discretely placed stewards discouraged any physical contact.

As a distanced, static object, Journée des Barricades foreclosed on the element most critical to the barricade as a “global symbol of revolt” – what Mark Tragoutt calls the “repertoire of collective action.”

Diana Taylor takes up this notion of the “repertoire” as opposed to the “archive”, maintaining that the former is predicated on “being there” as a necessary part of the transmission. The performance of public artworks calls upon the public to participate as social actors in the scene: “as witnesses, spectators, or voyeurs […] What is our role ‘there’?” – how are we ethically and politically implicated?” Yet it is in Journée des Barricades’ archive (the place in which the repertoire is banished to the past) where we find its true action. These images of the barricade being erected by a team of volunteers who willingly took on hard physical labour – expending a huge amount of energy to create something so transitory – are more compelling than viewing the work after they had departed. This was witnessed “live” by those few who happened upon this “happening” – Nuit des Barricades – in the small hours of Sunday morning.

The question therefore remains, how can the barricade become a site of critical and constructive encounter for a potentially performing public? We therefore return to the West Bank wall that Banksy and Alÿs attempted to breach and critique with their unsolicited markings. This spectral reality, which negates the line marked by Dayan has been referred to as a “security fence”, “separation barrier” and “apartheid wall”. Its seemingly temporary and mobile aesthetic renders it a barricade that plays into the state-of-emergency mentality but ends up barricading the possibilities of constructive negotiation. Yet this wall has been creatively breached in two projects outlined below, not by
overwhelming physical force but by a will to make it transparent through immaterial means that inherently resist physical boundaries – sound and data – and is dependant on an active performative public.

It is in carefully orchestrated events such those of Dutch composer and theatre-maker Merlijn Twaalfhoven’s *Carried by the Wind* (2008) and the *Transparent Wall* (2004) created by Artists Without Walls that estranged communities are united for brief moments of joyous commune. Twaalfhoven and his partners utilized rooftops and balconies either side of the barricade upon which 75 professional and amateur musicians from Ramallah and Bethlehem performed with children from Palestinian West Bank refugee camps. Unable to be contained music proved its inherent resistance to boundaries, briefly bridging and uniting the separated zones.

Artists without Walls are a group of Palestinian and Israeli artists and architects who meet in Ramallah and East Jerusalem, devising alternative means to what they see as the repeatedly failed protest strategies against the separation wall, described by them as “a monument to failure and a testament to pessimism”. In 2004 they selected Abu Dis as a site for creative rebellion: a Palestinian village cleaved in two by an eight-meter high concrete wall, separating families, jobs, hospitals and schools. They set up video cameras either side of the barrier, passing the technology through the small holes designed to allow machinery to lift the heavy units into place, and then projected the live transmissions from each sector on the opposite side of the wall, briefly reuniting the village’s inhabitants. In his essay ‘Primitive Separations’, Dean McCannell described witnessing this event:

> When both sets of images were projected simultaneously the effect was a very large virtual hole in the wall. We were able to protest together, singing, dancing and cheering as though the wall was not there. With a prodigious act of the imagination, even this most forbidding wall can be used as a device to bring people together.

The potency of *Journée des Barricades* lay in its scenic splendour
as a sculpture that fleetingly linked the theatrical and the quotidian with the catastrophic. Confronting the public with an image that suggests some sort of epic failure (social, political or ecological) recalls Walter Benjamin’s conflation of the “moment of enchantment” with the “figure of shock.” And yet this transitory construction at the end of the world could have reminded us New Zealanders that we are not so peaceful; that we have had our own share of suicide bombers, violent protests, contested territories, ecological disasters and dispossessed peoples; and that we need not merely consume art as part of our Christmas shopping. Perhaps if the public were invited/permitted to dismantle the construction an alternative economy could have been put in place, recycling and reactivating dead artefacts and permitting the barricade to be more action than object.

The Art of Weak Architecture

To conclude we return to Nietzsche who separated artists – as “visionaries par excellence”—from the wilful architect implicated in the construction and expression of history’s powers.

Although Nietzsche was mindful of architecture’s potential, as a form of power, to mediate between the creative and destructive forces upon which his philosophy was built, the Nietzschean architect (working for the status quo) forecloses on Nietzschean architecture (working against the status quo). The philosopher desired to undermine monumental architecture by introducing what Una Chaudhuri calls a “rule of disorder”. It is for this reason that I have focused on performative events enacted by artists: provocateurs for an alternative architectural porosity: achieved through an accumulation of refuse; a line leaking over contested territories; the mimetic force of guerrilla graphics; utilizing sound as an element that recognizes no borders; or by piercing a concrete wall with digital technology in order to momentarily dematerialize it and the power it represents.

Brian Massumi writes: “What is pertinent about an event-space is not its boundedness, but what elements it lets pass, according to what criteria, at what rate, and to what effect.” For architect and author Ignaci Sola-Morales this is achieved by “weak architecture”; a utilization of the fleeting, vestigial and ephemeral, to
construct a new type of monumentality “bound up with the lingering resonance of poetry after it has been heard, with the recollection of architecture after it has been seen”. Solà-Morales refers to the tendency for architectural modernism to foreclose on chance by attempting to create itineraries of control. In order for architecture to be transformed into an event, the aleatory and temporal, as found in the aesthetic event, must be admitted: “This is the strength of weakness; that strength which art and architecture are capable of producing precisely when they adopt a posture that is not aggressive and dominating, but tangential and weak”.36

Contemporary Feminist Philosopher, Elizabeth Grosz, suggests that we “make architecture tremble”. By doing so perhaps power can also tremble. Through performative moves against coherent structures, sites can be de-territorialised and communities both fragmented and cohered. Moshe Dayan’s green pencil line on the armistice map was not a line of defence but, when considered to scale, forms a thick smudgy zone, reminding us that a border is a space between people and how we creatively open, activate and inhabit that space can be achieved through a poetics of weakening conventional architecture.
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