

ANITA VAN DOORN

WE HAVE RECEIVED BORDERS NOT TO MOVE

MASTER OF ART THESIS

KONSTFACK, 2015



Abstract

Institutions of power exert their control over us, sometimes in very obvious and grand ways, but also often in far more insidious and covert ways. This paper looks at forms of control, specifically relating to movement of individuals and populations, that are exerted on the body, internalised by the body and subsequently expressed through the body. It seeks to offer insight into the ramifications of such strategies of control on the physical and social body, for example manufacturing of shame, the other, illegality, and the body as a thing.

With the phenomenon of the border line as a starting point, this paper approaches the human ramifications of western power structures on the body through Foucault's notion of 'governmentality', and the employment of the term, (reflecting the artistic approach to the nature of this research paper), the *illegal body*.

From developments in certain forms power structures and obedience throughout western history to nationalist constructions, an analysis and critique some of the normative ways of thinking about space and place in relation to the body and identity is offered. Produced in conjunction with the practical body of work of the same title (a very conscious appropriation of the title of Barabara Kruger's work 'We Have Received Orders Not To Move', which deals with power and gender), theoretical and philosophical aspects as they fed into choices of formal aspects of the making process, and vice versa, are discussed.

What is asserted is that systems and technologies of control are very effective at deeply embedding normative ideologies into the body, in essence ideologies become hardwired into the response systems of the body This is particularly concerning when we consider that once again, national security and border protection are two of the main concerns of governments.

We Have Received Borders Not To Move

There are lines and divisions that we are not supposed to cross, categories we are supposed to fit into, ways of living and thinking that we should adhere to and others that are deemed unnatural. When these lines are crossed, our legitimacy, our agency, our right to have interests and autonomy over our physical bodies, is removed: What happens when the body crosses a borderline for example, without authorization (as an asylum seeker does) and their legitimacy, their person-hood, is questioned?

What are the ramifications when such an incursion on one of these lines occurs, how does a borderline become impregnated in the body, internalized and then expressed by the body? These lines are not mere constructs, either conceptual or physical, such as lines on maps or walls, existing externally and acting independently to the body and space. A wall is not just built outside of us or between us, it is also built inside us. 'It is not put in place, it is that place'¹(See image 1).

When a line is crossed, what happens when it is the person themselves, not just their actions, that is declared illegal? What is it *to be* illegal? And, because of this alleged illegality, is that grounds for processes of dehumanization to relegate that person to the order of 'other', a thing, to be dealt with as a thing?

I am not seeking to define what I have termed the 'illegal body' but am using it as a strategy or tool to encompass a broad sense of activities that an individual can perform that could be seen to cross some line or other. I do this in order to investigate what I see as finely, intricately and, most often, invisibly crafted power structures that exert control over the human body, both physically and socially, aided by active but often unconscious participation of the person themselves (inculcation) or through passive imposition, against one's will. For Foucault states, '...guiding, prescribing, and teaching, saving, enjoining, and stamping true and correct opinions on minds, proposing or imposing them, are all activities of any power whatsoever.'²

¹ Lagomarsino, R, 2010-2011, *Trans Atlantic*, Artwork shown as part of the exhibiton "Mark the Line" at Göteborgs Konsthallen, viewed 19 December 2014.

² Foucault, M. 2009, *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the Collège de France*, trans. B Burchell, 1977-1978, Hampshire and New York, Palgrave Macmillan, pg.167.

The Illegal Body vs The Authorized Body

'...one of the tasks that seems urgent... over and above anything else, is this: that we should indicate and and show up, even where they are hidden, all the relationships of political power which actually control the social body and repress it.³

If the authorized body is the body divided, subdivided, partitioned, categorized, assigned, subdued or subjugated to fit a homogeneous societal, or socially organized norm, then the illegal body defies categorization. You either have to do away with categories or infinitely multiply them.

This system of fitting in to categories is based on binary distinctions: one either is, or is not, something: normal/deviant, natural/unnatural, us over here/them over there. It is a fallacy of fixed identity at odds with the notion of constantly becoming: 'Continuous variation constitutes the becoming-minoritarian of everybody, as opposed to the majoritarian Fact of Nobody.'⁴

The illegal body reveals the lines that demarcate these categories as chimeras. If we as humans understand and come to terms with the world around us through categorization and labelling, then the illegal body creates a glitch, and in our inability or lack of will to understand, the subject of that misunderstanding is placed in limbo.

Amidst impositions of cultural homogeneity, the illegal body is the dissenting force. It is the body that will not be controlled, and so must be hidden, deported or destroyed. It must be denied things, it must be starved; of comfort, food, water, light, medical treatment, even life.

The illegal body is infectious...wherever the illegal body is allowed to exist unhindered it will afflict 'good' citizens with its disease, destroying the 'fabric of society' in its wake. It is the body that arouses discomfort, shame, and all the forbidden feelings we must not feel at any cost.

It is the body riddled with sin. It is the unchristian body, the infidel body, the heretic, the agnostic, the atheist, the apostate: The one who has turned away from God. Above all, it is the disobedient body, the deserter, dishonourable, and must be shamed, shunned, stripped and shorn.

Designating this state of illegality means to invalidate the complexity of the individual; an individual with rights, interests, autonomy, emotions. Violence, be it physical or passive, is condoned and considered warranted as punishment for disobedience or failure to comply. This concept of obedience is a key concept underlying this discussion: Not just obedience to law, but to social, moral, political and religious codes of conduct, and this concept of obedience is so deeply embedded in modern Western society; deeply embedded within us by a multitude of technologies and institutions that it is important the we understand the roots of how this came to be.

³ Foucault, M. in Chomsky, N. et al, 2011, *Human Nature: Justice vs Power. The Chomsky-Foucault Debate*, London, Souvenir Press, pg.48.

⁴ Deleuze, G. and Guattari, F. 1987, *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, trans. B Massumi, Minneapolis MN, University of Minnesota Press, pg. 106

It is a technology of stratifying the body with knowledge: of filling up the body with very specific kinds of knowledge, disguised as truth, or some kind of natural order of things. I say filling up the body because it is the learned, emotional, physical reactions of the body that are then expressed through the body often automatically. Later I will posit that a learned emotional response to a phenomena, for example a belief that something is bad or wrong, will persist even after the person no longer holds that belief. But first, a (very abridged) story about Bartleby the Scrivener,⁵ summarised here by Hartmut Böhme:

A low-level, previously always compliant copyist in a New York lawyers office begins, at first occasionally, then regularly, then persistently, to respond to any request to carry out tasks that are part of his job with the strange, but gently amiable answer: "I would prefer not to". Apparently with no needs himself, but permanently refusing to make himself useful in any way, he sets himself up in the office, where he then also lives, sleeping in the corner like a discarded thing, which in its unimposing obstinacy, causes extreme irritation, even distress to the self-certain minds of the lawyer and his employees. An uncanny guest...eventually, he is disposed of in a prison, where he refuses to eat anything and is found dead one day like some unwanted thing.⁶

Of course, Bartelby was complicit in his own demise, refusing in the end to act in his own interests and eat something, but I recount the story here to first elucidate that sovereignty over things (inanimate objects) is an almost exclusively Western way of thinking, and second to illustrate that with the development of governmentality, within its foundational roots in the Christian pastorate, came the categorization of people as subjects, or obedient servants. Obedience for the sake of obedience. Individuals were to be treated as *things*, valuable insofar as they were obedient or their usefulness contributed to the advancement or wealth of the state. Where an individual who could not prove their usefulness, or protested through non-compliance, was consequently discarded. That things are just 'there to be useful',⁷ that they have no agency of their own, is in opposition to a 'cultural truth that had been valid for hundreds and thousands of years, namely that things make their own fate and have their own sphere of action, in comparison to which man is ephemeral and weak'.⁸

Perhaps man's lust for power is just a reaction against the knowledge of this ephemerality and weakness. That question is outside the scope of this paper. For now, in order to look at the ways the concept of obedience has been elevated to such a virtuous status, and also to look at the new forms of disobedience that emerged as a result, we're going to approach it through Foucault's notion of governmentality.

⁵ The full title is "Bartelby the Scrivener: A Short Story of Wall Street", written in 1853 by Herman Melville.

⁶ Böhme, H. 2014, *Fetishism and Culture: A Different Theory of Modernity*, Berlin and Boston, Walter de Gruyter Inc. pg.21.

⁷ Ibid, pg.23.

⁸ Ibid, pg.24.

The Obedient Body: The emergence of obedience as a virtue in itself

Governmentality is in essence the management, manipulation and formation of the behaviour of individuals, to the point where individuals self-regulate and self-correct, by the production, dissemination and internalization of knowledge. It is a concept that comprises questions of precisely who and where power comes from. Who has 'the right to govern men, and to govern them in their daily life and in the details and materiality of their existence... and what control is exercised over each other.'⁹

Governmentality or the Governmentalization of the state, is founded, to paraphrase Foucault, on three major points of support: One, the the archaic model of the Christian pastorate; two, drawing support from a diplomatic-military technique; and three, being exercised through the set of very specific instruments called, in the seventeenth and eighteenth century sense of the word, police.¹⁰

Up until the institutionalization of Christianity and its proliferation throughout the Western world, the Greek state had provided the dominant model of governance and power. Foucault notes a distinction between a kind of respect for and adherence to the law as it functioned in the Greek State and the model of "pure obedience"¹¹ of the Christian pastorate: it is a distinction between that of self-mastery and of servitude. He argues that respect of the law in the context of Greek state-ship is what in essence directed the actions of the citizen; law and rhetoric (ie, allowing oneself to be persuaded or convinced by someone), but with the ends of arriving at some form of importance, or truth, or result. One is not subordinate to someone else. Whereas in the Christian pastorate "pure obedience" is practised, often to absurd extremes, the ends of which is simply to be obedient, and this in itself is meritorious. One is subordinate to someone else. It is within this institution that we see the individual management of every action in daily life emerge.

In the Western world I think the real history of the pastorate as the source of a specific type of power over men, as a model and matrix of procedures for the government of men, really only begins with Christianity... [constituting] itself as a Church [and laying] claim to the daily government of men in their real life of on the grounds of their salvation and on the scale of humanity, and we have no other example of this in the history of societies.¹²

We have been normalized to this kind of meritorious, pure obedience to laws and regulations. Those who are disobedient or dissenting acquire designations of immoral, bad, wrong, inferior and illegal. It is in the distinction between someone's actions being immoral, illegal, etc., and the person themselves being given the attribute of immorality or illegality, that we see forms of disobedience

⁹ Foucault, M. 2009, *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the Collège de France*, trans. B Burchell, 1977-1978, Hampshire and New York, Palgrave Macmillan.pg.149.

¹⁰ Ibid, pg.110.

¹¹ Ibid, pg.174.

¹² Ibid, pg.147-148.

having direct impact on the body and its autonomy. One obeys in order to be obedient, in order to arrive at a state of obedience...the end point to which is humility...knowing that any will of one's own is a bad will.¹³

From pure obedience within the Christian church to new a form of obedience, evidenced in the field of the diplomatic/military organization, when war was no longer waged over what was just or who had right on their side and was inevitably determined by the judgement God, it was now a war of state, of diplomacy and politics: 'The balance is jeopardized... there is too much power on one side and can no longer be tolerated.'¹⁴

It was only after the eighteenth century that military desertion became a form of disobedience. To paraphrase Foucault, he contends that desertion was an absolutely ordinary practice in all the armies of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, But when waging war became not just a profession or even a general law, but an ethic, and the behaviour of every good citizen of a country; when being a soldier was no longer just a destiny or a profession but a form of conduct, refusing then appears as a form of moral counter-conduct; as a refusal of civic education, of society's values, and of a certain obligatory relationship to the nation and the nation's salvation.¹⁵

At this point in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the shift to desertion as equivalent to counter-conduct mirrored the shift in what policing involved: Originally the term policing encompassed the '...management of the roads, conduits, channels and movements of goods and men, to...stimulate, determine and orientate this activity in such a way that it is in fact useful to the state.'¹⁶ But after the eighteenth century increasing the state's powers while respecting the general order was dismantled in favour of a mechanism which simply 'eliminates disorder'.¹⁷ Policing and militarization of national borderlines will be discussed towards the end of this paper, but let's continue now with this idea of pure obedience and look at its development, distribution and enactment throughout society at large, through the term 'fabric of society'.

¹³ Ibid, pg.177.

¹⁴ Ibid, pg.300-301.

¹⁵ Ibid, pg. 198.

¹⁶ Ibid, pg.323.

¹⁷ Ibid, pg.354

The fabric of society as ideological normative

The politician will bind the elements together, the good elements formed by education; he will bind together the virtues in their different forms, which are distinct from and sometime opposed to each other; He will weave and bind together different contrasting temperaments, such as, for example, spirited and moderate men; and he will weave them together thanks to the shuttle of a shared common opinion...In this way, with his specific art, very different from all others, the political weaver forms the most magnificent fabric.¹⁸

Technologies of internalizing knowledge such as obedience, ritual, normalization and shaming are important to understand when deconstructing a phrase like 'fabric of society' or 'moral fibre'. something that is often seen to be under threat from disobedient bodies. It is also important to see just how invasive these technologies are, and how they permeate society, the social body and the physical body so that self-regulation and self-correction become automatic.

'Normative' relates to knowledge presented as truth, or behaviour representative of the majority and therefore natural. The fabric of society is a concept comprised of an image of harmony and virtue that can be arrived at through adherence to normative behaviour and thinking. Norms negate the multiplicity, diversity and complexity of individuals in favour of binary oppositions: normal/deviant, natural/unnatural, us/them. They are presented as the desirable, natural, correct and moral ideals and attributes that everyone must aspire and adhere to, in order to hold the fabric of society together. We are normalized to these ideals through repetitive propaganda, ritual, text, image, and language so that we are indoctrinated into a specific subjectivity; a specific way of understanding and experiencing the world that we must conform to in thinking and behaviour, or risk being an outsider. Governmentality, as a concept of control of the behaviours and actions of individual bodies is based on disciplinary power. Lisa Blackman states that disciplinary power is not a power of repression, 'constraining what we might take to be our 'true self', but rather 'acts on and through individuals' self-forming practices so that individuals come to want or desire certain ways of being or doing for themselves'¹⁹ She goes on to draw on Foucault's proposition that it works '...through the ways in which norms and regulatory ideals become incorporated into subjects' internal forms of self monitoring and self regulation...achieved not through imposition but rather their inculcation...one has to actually *actively* participate.'²⁰

Auto correction and auto-regulation of the self apply not only for social codes we must conduct ourselves by in public spheres, they also invade private spheres. The justification that is commonly given for the control of the social body; that is, the body that is constructed within ideological and

¹⁸ Foucault, M. 2009, *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the Collège de France*, trans. B Burchell, 1977-1978, Hampshire and New York, Palgrave Macmillan, pg.146.

¹⁹ Blackman, L. 2008, *The Body: The Key Concepts*, EBL E-book, Bloomsbury publishing, pg.25.

Retrieved from <http://ez-proxy.konstfack.se:2153/patron/FullRecord.aspx?p=533053>.

²⁰ Ibid.

social processes,²¹ and the physical body in private as well as public often rests on the notion of 'moral fibre', but the particular kind of morality on which this control is founded is not simply based (but does not exclude) on concepts of good and bad or right and wrong, but that there is a certain way one *ought* to behave or conduct themselves because to do otherwise is unnatural. If one goes against the *natural order of things*, for example non-hetero normative sexual behaviour, or one's position in society as dictated by constructions of class or ethnicity, then the fabric of society is placed under threat and moral fibre is compromised, according to normative rhetoric, becoming infected, corrupted or destroyed.

The disobedient body, seen as deficient, abnormal, as a canker on society, must be cut out. The idea that homogeneous culture must prevail and be enforced through policing and regulation in order to hold the fabric of society together is a fallacy, and is only heralded by the institutions of power because diversity of culture and opinion is a direct threat to power. Free culture limits the reach of power, and power will always seek to clamp down on diversity of culture.

The state welcomes only those forms of cultural activity which help it to maintain its power. It persecutes with implacable hatred any activity which oversteps the limits set by it and calls its existence into question. It is, therefore, as senseless as it is mendacious to speak of a "state culture"; for it is precisely the state which lives in constant warfare with all higher forms of intellectual culture and always tries to avoid the creative will of culture.²²

The regimes under which intellectuals and educated members of society; the artists, philosophers etc were sought and and deported, imprisoned or executed knew this, know it still: '...the less people take thought seriously, the more they think in conformity with what the State wants.'²³

Any individual that falls outside the norm is a threat, but not to the population and its wellbeing, as propagated by any nationalistic, protectionist ideology, but to the institutions of power themselves. The ruse employed to accomplish this is the idea of a constantly impending threat against which one must always be vigilant; threat posed by non-normative or dissenting persons, threat to national security, threat to the fabric of society, threat to the livelihoods, wellbeing and personal safety of authorized citizens, ie the 'real' Swedes, the 'real' Australians. It should go without saying that indigenous peoples are never included in any nationalist permutations of for example 'Swedish-ness' or 'Australian-ness', and these kinds of nationalistic identities are always constructed to protect or further power agendas.

Auto-regulation and auto-correction of the self has become so embedded in individual behaviours not least through technologies of surveillance. In order to keep up appearances of normality one must constantly keep in check their behaviour. We are not only being watched from above but

²¹ Ibid, pg.28.

²² Rocker, R. 1997, *Nationalism and Culture*, Montreal, Black Rose Books, pg.85.

²³ Deleuze, G. and Guattari, F. 1987, *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, trans. B Massumi, Minneapolis MN, University of Minnesota Press, pg.376.

observed from everywhere, at every level. It is through the presence of the omniopicon, of everyone surveilling everyone, that regulation becomes self-regulation.

Surveillance serves political ends. The objective is control, and we are the controlled. The logic of government is the logic of normalization. Only that which can be seen can be normalized. We must always be watched. If we are not watched, government cannot work. This has been true throughout history.²⁴

From the panopticon, where one surveils the many from above, we have graduated to the omniopicon effect, where the many surveil the many. We help each other keep our behaviour in check by reminding fellow citizens of public and private codes of conduct, pointing out the line when we are in danger of trespassing or transgressing.

Rituals of Internalization: Stratifying the body.

The dogma of obedience and conformity is ritually ingrained and impregnated within us. We are not just passive receivers but active participants in the rituals of indoctrination, and we are usually unaware that such a process is taking place, let alone critical and questioning of it. But even so, beliefs and ideologies are instilled into the body and are expressed through the body. Laura Stark calls the subsequent expression or output of such internalizations the 'body schema', which comprises...

[...] our unconscious organization or style of bodily performance, as distinct from the body image, which is the conscious, conceptual construct of the body, informed by both experience and mythic or scientific understanding. [...] Whereas the body image is a conceptual representation, the body schema refers to the way in which this image, once internalized, is operationalized in everyday behaviors, most of them minute and intuitive.²⁵

A ritual is a technology of inscribing knowledge or a social or cultural practice: an action carried out by the body with a certain mindfulness. It embeds knowledge and patterns into the responsive body systems, not just the mind (as Foucault's theory of docile bodies purports), and is reinforced through repetition.

²⁴ McCarthy, S. 2015, *Learning to Live with Perpetual Information Warfare*, weblog, viewed 15 January, 2015, <http://smarimccarthy.is/blog/2015/01/08/learning-to-live-with-perpetual-information-warfare/>

²⁵ Stark, L., 2006, *The Magical Self. Body, Society and the Supernatural in Early Modern Rural Finland*, FF Communications 290, Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, pg. 152.

What is important is how social or cultural processes inscribe or speak through individuals. These processes are also manifested in the thoughts, actions, bodily dispositions and habit of subjects that they appear natural and automatic.²⁶

A ritual could be as benign as drinking a cup of tea, or may not be so benign, such as military drill marching or singing the national anthem. Disciplinary power in the form of corporeal “lived practices”, that is, rituals, do not simply mark themselves on people's thoughts, but permeate, shape and seek to control their sensuous and sensory experiences.²⁷ Paraphrasing Blackman, she states that 'Muscular bonding' is one such concept that problematizes the 'body as inert mass' theory of cultural inscription, or the body passively written upon. Muscular bonding comprises types of affective or emotional experience that are often produced when people move together rhythmically in time,²⁸ for example military drill marching (of the kind we see when training soldiers or in displays of military power alike); dancing, such as in ecstatic or shamanic cultures or the Mevlevi order (more commonly known as whirling dervishes); or singing, revival meetings and chanting to name a couple (see images 2, 3 &4).

Of particular interest to me for the practical body of work (still in progress at the time of writing) accompanying this thesis are religious rituals, particularly those where one symbolically eats and drinks the body and blood of Christ: the wine and the wafer. Drink this wine, for it represents my blood, eat of this bread, it is my body. Belief is internalized and fortified literally by ingesting signifiers of Christ's body and blood in a ritual act.

This raises two important aspects for the practical work. Firstly, the question: In what forms, and in what ways, do we ingest or internalize, not just religious faith and dogma, but other beliefs and ideologies, such as nationalism? (However one could consider nationalism to be a form of religion as well). And secondly, that church vessels, containers or other paraphernalia used in religious rituals are of utmost relevance in the decision making process regarding what form the work will take on, because the work must adhere to the categories of 'corpus' or 'jewellery'. Corpus, meaning “body”, is the traditional word Scandinavian silversmiths used to define their work and includes hollowware, tableware, church silver, reliquaries and treasury art amongst other things. The specific forms I identified and chose to work with are the chalice and the pyx, the chalice being the cup that holds the wine, and the pyx being a small round container in which the Eucharist is carried to the sick or immobile who cannot partake of the ritual in church (see image 5 &6).

²⁶ Blackman, L. 2008, *The Body: The Key Concepts*, EBL E-book, Bloomsbury publishing, pg.60.
Retrieved from <http://ez-proxy.konstfack.se:2153/patron/FullRecord.aspx?p=533053>

²⁷ Woodward, K. in Blackman, L. 2008, pg.28.

²⁸ Blackman, L. 2008, *The Body: The Key Concepts*, EBL E-book, Bloomsbury publishing, pg.30.
Retrieved from <http://ez-proxy.konstfack.se:2153/patron/FullRecord.aspx?p=533053>

The Disobedient Body: The Body Riddled With Sin

From here we take the discussions on obedience and ritual and link it with a specific notion of space: of the inner space of the body being filled up, being 'stratified'. As we will see later we can also apply this thinking, (fed in part by investigations I made with regard to the impact of the line on the body, see image 7) to ramifications of the border line on the physical and social landscapes.

Rituals in the Judeo-Christian sense are acts of obedience, for example, there are certain things that the body must carry out, or must refrain or abstain from in order to show that you love and/or fear God. Laws and commandments must be followed, Sabbaths and holy days must be observed, certain foods and certain activities must be abstained from. Failure to comply constitutes sin, and invokes its consequences.

The disobedient body is the body riddled with sin: the unchristian body, the infidel, the heretic, the agnostic, the atheist, the apostate. The sinful body is the disobedient body, and wherever it goes it will infect good God-fearing people and destroy the moral fibre. It must obey, or pay the price: It will be shamed, shunned, stripped, shorn, stoned, burned, flagellated, exiled, cast out, cut off or sacrificed.

When a body crosses a line and commits a sin, something happens. It is physically transformed. Disease and malady used to be, and still is considered within some religious denominations, punishment for sins committed.

The consequences of the Fall for the first humans were catastrophic. They were not only deprived of the bliss and sweetness of Paradise, but their whole nature was changed and disfigured. In sinning they fell away from their natural condition and entered an unnatural state of being. All elements of their spiritual and corporeal make-up were damaged: their spirit, instead of striving for God, became engrossed in the passions; their soul entered the sphere of bodily instincts; while their body lost its original lightness and was transformed into heavy sinful flesh....After the Fall the human person 'became deaf, blind, naked, insensitive to the good things from which he had fallen away, and above all became mortal, corruptible and without sense of purpose'.²⁹

In Greek mythology Medusa married Poseidon, reneging on her vows of celibacy as a priestess of Goddess Athena, and was punished by the goddess and turned into the snake haired, stone-eyed, gaze fixing monster we know. In the bible, when Lot's wife was disobedient and looked behind to the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah she was turned into a pillar of salt. Disobedience of God, or the gods, always comes with consequences. According to Deleuze and Guattari, the body that belongs to God is the organism, subservient and a signifier of His power. From the 'Body without Organs' (the BwO) He makes the organism, fills it up, stratifies it, and claims it.

²⁹ Alfeyev, Bishop Hilarion, *An Online Orthodox Catechism* adopted from 'The Mystery of Faith' viewed 25 September, 2014, <http://orthodoxeurope.org/page/10/1.aspx#23>.

The judgement of God, the system of the judgement of God, the theological system, is precisely the operation of He who makes an organism, an organization of organs called the organism, because He cannot bear the BwO, because He pursues it and rips it apart so He can be first, and have the organism be first. The organism is already that, the judgement of God...³⁰

The organism is the body (or, if we use the term of Deleuze and Guattari, the Body without Organs (BwO) which has been indoctrinated, filled up with strata, reorganised, had His will imposed, the body trained into obedience.

Can the body ever be free of this strata? If the BwO is the autonomous body free from the strata of ideology, then I understand the organism to be the body that is programmed to react through the organs and glands, manufacturing the chemicals that control our emotions, which in turn determines behaviour. Within the paradigm of sin, where one fears the judgement of God, even when one no longer believes in God, it is the strata filling the body, the conditioned physical and emotional reactions triggered by doing something supposedly wrong or bad, that remain. The physical reactions and expressions of internalized ideology do not dissolve just because the belief does. Stop practising the rituals and the belief falls away, but the strata never dissolves. Stratification is the hardwiring of knowledge into the body's systems. If the organs manufacture and operate the chemicals which in turn drive the emotions, then the body that has no organs (the Body Without Organs) cannot be imposed upon or inculcated. To me this is speaking, in a very poetic sense about true freedom of expression. A body free to express, to deviate, to be original, where identity has not been constructed, indeed, where identity of the self is not fixed.

“...we haven't found our BwO yet, we haven't sufficiently dismantled our self.” Find your body without organs. Find out how to make it. It's a question of life and death, youth and old age, sadness and joy. It is where everything is played out.³¹

Be under no illusions, the self, identity, is constructed from pieces and fragments of the milieu of dominant ideology, or as a reaction against it, making up for a lack of something, compensating for something. To what extent do we choose our traits and attributes? To what extent are they determined for us? Obedience for the sake of obedience, disobedience for the sake of disobedience. *No-one tells me what to do.*

The organism is not at all the body, the BwO; rather, it is a stratum on the BwO, in other

³⁰ Deleuze, G. and Guattari, F. 1987, *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, trans. B Massumi, Minneapolis MN, University of Minnesota Press, pg158-159.

³¹ Ibid, pg 151.

words, a phenomenon of accu-mulation, coagulation, and sedimentation that, in order to extract useful labor from the BwO, imposes upon it forms, functions, bonds, dominant and hierarchized organizations, organized transcendences... We are continually stratified. But who is this we that is not me, for the subject no less than the organism belongs to and depends on a stratum... The BwO howls: "They've made me an organism! They've wrongfully folded me! They've stolen my body!" The judgment of God uproots it from its immanence and makes it an organism, a signification, a subject. It is the BwO that is stratified.³²

Who is this we, that *is not me*?

Where is *Me* in all of this? These lines, this strata, marks out the internal volume of my body, but where is the real me in all this stratified flesh, with actions and reactions and neurons firing off, triggering chemical release and re-uptake in my organs, where is the me that is not determined by these reactions, where is my body, myself, without organs? If the ideologies which we internalize, actively or passively, are expressed by way of the chemical processes carried out by our organs in reaction to stimuli, which in turn steer our behaviour, then the body without organs is imagined as a body free from inculcated and imposed ideologies.

From the internal space to the external space, the lines we can't see, won't see, to the lines we can see, on maps, structures and strata partitioning the landscape, dividing one person from the next. The lines are built outside of us, between us and within us. The line is marker of volume.

The Line as a Marker of Volume

Francis Alÿs is an artist who has done several what could be called performative interventions on the border line. Examined in depth here is *The Green Line* (2004).

In the documentation video³³(see image 8) of the Green line we see Alÿs walking and traversing Jerusalem, carrying a can of green paint, which, due to a hole in the can, leaves a green line, tracing his ambulation. He walks the route of the green line that was drawn on a map after the ceasefire between Israel and Arab forces on November 30, 1948, separating Israel and Arab territories and splitting the city into East Jerusalem and the West Bank. The most interesting thing about this line was, when blown up from the map scale of 1:20 000 to real space, it spanned a width ranging between sixty and eighty metres. "Who owned the width of the line?"³⁴

Alÿs' act draws attention to several aspects of the line in relation to space: One, the way the line was internalised by those it affected; and two, the kind of space and difference between spaces the line demands and that the line acts to designate or stipulate. It forces a binary distinction: illegal versus authorized.

As Alÿs walks he attracts little attention apart from the odd stare or double-take, even soldiers at

³² Ibid, pg 159.

³³ <http://francisalys.com/greenline/original.html>

³⁴ Benvenisti, M. 1998, *City of Stone: The Hidden History of Jerusalem*, Oakland CA, University of California Press, pg.57.

border checkpoints show only mildly confused interest, and at no point is he stopped. It's received by passers by as a kind of benign action, no-one seems to understand what he is doing or why. In addition to the video documentation, a number of Israeli and Palestinian figures give commentaries as the footage is playing. Rima Hammami who grew up in the West Bank, is one of them. She makes note of the way in which he is walking, and comments on his gait and gesture:

A Palestinian man..to do anything under this regime, has to walk the way you are walking. When you cross over there, you always feel like a sneak, there's always this way in which you can't just be relaxed and natural walking through a city...Because as a Palestinian here now you are always a criminal, you just are...because just by dint of you being here you are somehow illegal.³⁵

If we look back at Laura Starks notion of body schema on page nine and relate that here, what Hammami is describing is an operationalized behaviour, a behaviour set in motion, automatically or otherwise, when the border line is crossed.

[For] Palestinian men walking around Jerusalem, it's a complete nightmare. I mean they have to be so buried deep in themselves, to walk across that line, to go west. They have to pull their whole being deep down into themselves, in order just to be able to walk across that line where they are going to get stopped.³⁶

The borderline. There is nothing neutral about this line, just like there is nothing neutral about a map. A line on a map is proposal, an argument, says Eyal Weizman, architect and the second of three people whose commentaries offer crucial, poignant and very different points of view on Alÿs' intervention.

...treating Jerusalem as a surface loses a lot of the complexity of it. Whereas so much of the conflict is actually based on the idea of volume. You flatten the city into a canvas, you turn it into a map. A map, by definition, is a two-dimensional abstraction of a three-dimensional topography.³⁷

The line does not simply trace a path on a surface, the line is a marker of volume, of three dimensional space, the line is an interrupter of the smooth continuum. It is drawn horizontally; bisecting and striating the surface into conduits: authorized channels of movement and flow, and vertically; dissecting, stratifying and heirachizing perspective and personhood. Weizman continues:

³⁵ Hammami, R. in Alÿs, F. & Deveaux, J. 2005, *The Green Line*, (video documentation),
retrieved from <http://francisalys.com/greenline/rima.html>

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷ Weizman, E. in Alÿs, F. & Deveaux, J. 2005, *The Green Line*, (video documentation),
retrieved from <http://francisalys.com/greenline/weizman.html>

Geddes...walked Haifa as a means of separating it from the lower Arab part of the city...essentially he gave the guidelines for the main principle of Zionist planning which sought, in many areas that were on mountain terrain, a kind of vertical separation. Then another discourse entered into that vertical separation, and that is the messianic. That is the ascent as a kind of transcendental return to the idea of holiness...it solidifying trajectories or vision. So it organized vision around itself and mainly towards the Arab neighborhoods or towards the Arab villages, which are projected downwards.³⁸

'The [Green] line is erased but everything is embedded in this line... everything they try to bury in it, the horrible secrets, the *let's pretend* is all in that line...[The two states]-They've become implanted in our body, and the operation to dis-implant them, I just think is impossible.³⁹ The line finds concreteness in the body like concrete walls split and separate cities, insinuating themselves into the inner spaces of the body's response systems, appearing in the outward expressions of the body with real, prolonged and far reaching consequences that spans the mental and emotional spaces of generations of a multitude of peoples. Everything is embedded in the line, and the line has become implanted in the body. These lines cut deep into the terrain of the heart and the land : '...were I to talk about lines, I'd want to talk about the lines in people's hearts...the traces of the longing for an unending occupation.'⁴⁰

It cuts down into the land, it draws the altitudes of hills and valleys, it assigns airspace. It is an apparition, but with very real manifestations. Something happens in the shift from one side of the line to the other. Society looks different, things sound different. A language change, strange looking alphabets and street signs, differences in the exteriors of houses, in customs, in belief systems. And if you keep going until you reach another line and you cross that, it will be a clean cut again. There is no gradation or diffusion, complexity has been discarded in favour of something else, the strictness, ease and exclusionariness of categories: one side and the other. To draw a line is to request a difference:

...drawing a line...implies that you are requesting two kinds of spaces on two sides. You request a difference between the right and the left side of the line. You project a difference... creating a barrier that requires that the two sides are no longer a part of a kind of smooth continuity.⁴¹

The line has obliterated any kind of smooth continuity in the mental conceptualizing of the landscape, just as a wall incises a strict demarcation between one territory and the other, for what is

³⁸ Ibid.

³⁹ Hammami, R. in Aljys, F. & Deveaux, J. 2005, *The Green Line*, (video documentation), retrieved from <http://francisalys.com/greenline/rima.html>

⁴⁰ Aberjil, R. in Aljys, F. & Deveaux, J. 2005, *The Green Line*, (video documentation), retrieved from <http://francisalys.com/greenline/ruben.html>

⁴¹ Weizman, E. in Aljys, F. & Deveaux, J. 2005, *The Green Line*, (video documentation), retrieved from <http://francisalys.com/greenline/weizman.html>

on the other side of the wall is always 'other'.

The Space of The Other

Hamami remembers the time in her childhood, before she left Palestine, just after the six-day war of 1967:

My Jerusalem was East Jerusalem and the old city...And there was a wall, and there was some other place behind that wall. But I had no idea what was the place behind that wall. It was like a whole other universe. It was, that somehow this whole place that I'd known, it had this sort of mirror opposite, this whole other culture, society, language...these other strange beings, whose existence I had never even imagined. And all the time they'd been behind that wall.⁴²

The line and the wall have made space sedentary, where the land is deposited, distributed to a population: A national borderline, whether a physical wall or a line on a map, creates a disconnect of understanding between people. Sedentary space, striated space, allocated parcels of land distributed to a population, ...so much space is allocated to this population; no more, no less, and on the other side of the border, the line, is something, someone, else.

...sedentary space is striated, by walls, enclosures, and roads between enclosures, while nomad space is smooth, marked only by "traits" that are effaced and displaced with the trajectory. Even the lamellae of the desert slide over each other, producing an inimitable sound. The nomad distributes himself in a smooth space; he occupies, inhabits, holds that space; that is his territorial principle.⁴³

Place as territorialized space (space+borderline), nation as allocated place (territory+body). The sedentary mindset is one where it could be said that 'we draw limits and boundaries around what we are willing to recognize.'⁴⁴ The nomad versus the migrant: Two different mindsets on the way space is occupied and how place functions as territory, or occupied space. To the migrant a closed space is allocated, as the chess pieces occupy the closed space of the board, whereas the nomadic trajectory...distributes people in an open space...a space without borders or enclosure.⁴⁵ ...Nomad

⁴² Hammami, R. in Alÿs, F. & Deveaux, J. 2005, *The Green Line*, (video documentation), retrieved from <http://francisalys.com/greenline/rima.html>

⁴³ Deleuze, G. and Guattari, F. 1987, *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, trans. B Massumi, Minneapolis MN, University of Minnesota Press, pg.381.

⁴⁴ Blackman, L. 2008, *The Body: The Key Concepts*, EBL E-book, Bloomsbury publishing, pg.59. Retrieved from <http://ez-proxy.konstfack.se:2153/patron/FullRecord.aspx?p=533053>

⁴⁵ Deleuze, G. and Guattari, F. 1987, *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, trans. B Massumi, Minneapolis MN, University of Minnesota Press, pg.380.

space, smooth space, involving the 'permeability of boundaries.'⁴⁶

One of the primary materials I began to work with in order to construct the Corpus objects, before I came across this phrase, *the permeability of boundaries*, was the membranes from the insides of eggshells (see image 9, 10 & 11). Having previously worked with apple skin, I knew I wanted to work with some other kind of skin-like material in order to express a human quality. As I researched this thesis more, it became clear that this material was not only appropriate, but perhaps quite singular in its ability to express this idea of permeability of boundaries as the natural state of the human condition, (as opposed to normative binary oppositions), and also of transitional or liminal space, which I will discuss later. The egg membrane is porous, it is not an impermeable barrier. It facilitates a transition, much like a hinge does. Once removed from the shell and left on its own to dry it leaves its odor and slightly repulsive texture and sliminess behind to become something beautiful but very fragile. I found I could not work with it or act on it in this state without its qualities being destroyed in the process. The only way to work with it was act upon it, to make it comply, as the law partner in the office tried to bend Bartelby to his will. And so I pressed the thin membranes into paper, oppressing it. In essence, I stratified it. Applied my will to the thing. Even so, it remains fragile. It is not an everlasting material, it is mortal, like the physical body.

The membrane is a hinge, a joint, it facilitates a transition between one state of being and another, acquiescing to osmosis, allowing for a smoothing out of the differences on either side of the barrier.

The membrane for me is metonymic of the human body: internalize, externalize, balance out, constant negotiation and renegotiation, fluidity, liminality. Constant flux facilitating homeostasis. Press it, subject it to hostile conditions, and cracks start to appear. How else can the body respond to such changes in external conditions? If the physical body no longer has autonomy, how does the social body kick in when conditions become hostile, to ensure survival of both?

In the Genocide museum in Vilnius, Lithuania, and in most museums of occupation in Eastern Europe, there is a collection of objects, made by deportees and prisoners, sentenced to labour or death for their difference, their dissidence, their non-compliance. I became fascinated with these objects, and they became the material inspiration for jewellery in the practical body of work.

At the root of our humanity is the need to create, and to communicate. When everything has been stripped away, when someone has been forcibly removed from everything they know, they find a way. These deepest aspects, creativity and communication, of humanity flourish even in the most dire of situations. When the Baltic countries were occupied by the Soviet Union, to give one example, and thousands upon thousands of people were deported, sent to prisons, labour camps or ultimately to their deaths, they used whatever materials and tools they could get their hands on. Not only were letters, notes, books and drawings made, but also, and I think more profoundly, talismanic objects, including jewellery. Pendants and crosses carved from plastic toothbrush handles, rosaries and small animal figures made from dry bread. Embroidery done with long thin fish bones in place of thread, vessels formed from tree bark. What we always see in such dire circumstances is a re-appearance in the way objects were viewed for hundreds and thousands of

⁴⁶ Blackman, L. 2008, *The Body: The Key Concepts*, EBL E-book, Bloomsbury publishing, pg.59.
Retrieved from <http://ez-proxy.konstfack.se:2153/patron/FullRecord.aspx?p=533053>

years before our modern notions of individualism and separation of man from nature: That objects have agency and fulfil a magical, protective purpose. These objects were then often gifted to someone else...they were a form of communication, not about status or position or wealth, but as a gesture, from one person to another. When everything is about survival, creativity and human connection becomes the means and the ends to survive.

It is from here that I gained the initial inspiration in material choices, of discarded, overlooked materials. Materials that could be procured on the move, but it is also where I decided to approach the jewellery pieces from a different angle to that of the Corpus work. If I was using Corpus to speak about ingesting ideology and filling up the body with strata, then I wanted the jewellery to focus on the expression through the body, the ramifications on the body. Intrigued by the phrase, 'the salt of the earth', and feeling it somehow as some kind of intrinsic nature of humanity, I chose the materials of clay and salt. Clay for the earth, the land left behind, salt for tears. Tears of loss. The body in limbo is the body permeated by loss and shame. It is the body in waiting.

The extent to which the body is regulated, controlled or ideology is inculcated; from behaviours and emotional responses to where and how the body is allowed to articulate, to migration of peoples, tends to wander into the realm of absurdity. Deportation, forced relocation, exile, immigration, jaywalking, dancing, expressions and manifestations of sexuality, responses of moral indignation when we find something offensive, why we feel shame; when we feel ourselves not just to have *done* something bad, but instead internalized the meaning as *being* intrinsically bad. Someone who steals *is* a thief, someone who does not hold a visa *is* illegal. All the forms of disobedience which now somehow constitute the entirety of a person's character and qualities. It is a strategy of manufacturing difference, of hierarchizing personhood, of othering, that as a rule serves to justify the imposition and inculcation of 'regulatory ideals'.⁴⁷ As long as an individual is obedient, they retain the rights and autonomy of a person, but disobedience relegates an individual to the category of *thing*, just as we saw in the tale of Bartelby.

Processes of othering do not simply exist on a mundane interaction level between social subjects. They are also enacted and reproduced across a range of material and social practices that position actual bodies in relation to regulatory ideals. This positioning produces certain bodies as inferior, lacking, dangerous, deficient and abnormal.⁴⁸

In seeking a way to transpose these questions and explore them through jewellery, where the body plays an intrinsic and direct role in the reading of the work, in fact where the work would lose most of its meaning were it not on the body, I began to look at postures and gestures of vulnerability and shame. Precisely how and where shame is felt in the body and expressed through the body to

⁴⁷ Blackman, L. 2008, *The Body: The Key Concepts*, EBL E-book, Bloomsbury publishing, pg.59.

⁴⁸ Ibid.

determine appropriate locations on the body. What I discovered was that it is felt as a burning sensation around the eyes, and anxiety in the stomach. The physical gesture of shame is of a body curled over, eyes hidden and face buried in the hands (see image 12).

Where guilt tells us we have *done* something bad, shame tells us we *are* bad. Of course there are many different ways to interpret the concept of shame across many different cultures, and not all of them are as destructive as the kind of shame I want to address here.

If you recall Foucault's statement from earlier that 'any will of one's own is a bad will,' what follows is that deviation and failure to comply invokes shame and incurs the demotion from personhood to thing, and what we then see the emergence of is a body *in limbo*, 'limbus' coming from the latin and meaning 'border'; it is the the body *in the border*.

Movement is restricted or stifled, and the body, up against the State, hides in the border, is detained, deported, sent away, thrown around, like a thing. The body that is compelled to encounter and breach, traverse or enter the line is permeated with shame and loss, most of all a loss of agency, of autonomy. And just as the body incurs on the line, so the line incurs on and permeates the body.

What is so threatening about the body that moves, is on the move? The passport, originally a document of safe conduct, became a tool of the State for the surveillance and restriction of movement of individuals, ostensibly for protection against 'dangerous individuals.'⁴⁹ 'The history of the modern passport is associated not only with the paranoia of modern states, but also governmentality.'⁵⁰

Quality of person-hood is signified by the passport, but being in possession of a passport, being endowed with a legitimate nationality, or encumbered with a *particular* nationality is not a real attribute of any body, in the same way that 'freakiness [or otherness] is not a quality belonging to someone, but a normative perspective socially constructed and applied to a person.'⁵¹ Those that don't have passports or are paperless are also demoted in person-hood because of their non-compliance to the great system of organization, migration and surveillance.

The nature of the passport reveals both faces of modern power. On the one hand, it represents a system of surveillance typical of the Police State and functions as a tool for the continued observation of a population and the aversion of dangers issuing from 'dangerous individuals'. On the other hand, it contains relevant knowledge of individuals comprising a population, supplying thereby a cognitive basis for the unfolding of governmental power...The emergence of the nation-state and the mass mobility of populations in the wake of the Industrial Revolution made it all the more necessary to mark out individuals and channel their movements.⁵²

⁴⁹ Rehm, H. in Mazumdar, P. 2014, *Understanding Surfaces: On Jewellery and Identity*, lecture transcript, retrieved 5 December 2014, http://www.die-neue-sammlung.de/blog/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/mazumdar_dns.pdf

⁵⁰ Mazumdar, P. 2014, *Understanding Surfaces: On Jewellery and Identity*, lecture transcript, retrieved 5 December 2014, http://www.die-neue-sammlung.de/blog/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/mazumdar_dns.pdf

⁵¹ Pontoppidan, K. 2014, *Jewellery Freaks*, course lecture, Stockholm, Sweden, Konstfack University College of Arts, Crafts and Design.

⁵² Mazumdar, P. 2014, *Understanding Surfaces: On Jewellery and Identity*, lecture transcript, retrieved 5 December 2014, http://www.die-neue-sammlung.de/blog/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/mazumdar_dns.pdf

This channelling of movement implies conduits for laminar flow, one must follow the proper channels, so to speak. Don't go against the grain. Disobedience could be defined as not acting according to the norms of what one *should* do, not only non-compliance with law. However, humane-ness and justice are not inherent in law and normative thinking. Even if norms *do* exist because they reflect and represent the majority (but I don't think this is true), disobedience can still be an ethical and real moral imperative.

A good deal of what the state authorities define as civil disobedience is not really civil disobedience: in fact, it's legal, obligatory behavior in violation of the commands of the state, which may or may not be legal commands. So one has to be rather careful about calling things illegal.⁵³

Not following established immigration channels, non-adherence to the proper, or even the *preferred* asylum seeking or immigration protocol, incurs the designation of illegality, as though there is now a certain inherently bad quality belonging to an individual as a direct result of non-compliance.

The border aims to negate the universal and generate the binary. Through its segmentation, division, polarization and duality, the establishment of the border denies all claims of a universal humanism... where one subject is coded as a citizen while another is not, but also generates a 'good' on this side of the line and a 'bad' on the other. This moral power is predicated on the division of space.⁵⁴

The line, it's sole purpose to hinder transition, stem movement, in either direction, does not allow for the reality that we each exist each on our own point in the spectrum: you have to either do away with categories, or infinitely multiply them.

So much is embedded in the line. The complex intricacy behind the state's sledgehammer of polarization versus the complex intricacy of humanity, with all the anger, pain, discomfort and indeterminable multiplicities within ourselves, shamed into conforming, obedience for the sake of obedience, any will of one's own a bad will. We are sedated by the comfort of normative propaganda, always dichotomized: This is how one should or shouldn't feel, act, think, react, one is either in or out, you are either with us or against us, you can have welfare or immigration, the security apparatuses against the threat of 'invaders', the body versus the state, the boat people versus the battleship.

⁵³ Chomsky, N. in Chomsky, N. et al. 2011, *Human Nature: Justice vs Power, The Chomsky-Foucault Debate*. London, Souvenir Press, pg.55-56.

⁵⁴ Paul, I.A. 2011, *Border Machines*, <http://www.bordermachines.net/rhizome5.html>

For the refugees who cross the line by boat into Australian territorial waters and claim asylum, it is debated whether this is legal behaviour or not, as it is unlawful to arrive, according to national policy without proper authorization, by whatever means, but it is not illegal to enter without the proper visa if they then claim asylum. Despite the fact that of all the groups of people claiming asylum, people who arrive in this way have the highest rate of protection visas granted. It is this group which has being singled out, demonised, turned away, forcibly repatriated to their persecutors and conditions they were fleeing, or detained indefinitely, by four successive governments, and all to act as a deterrent to others who are desperate enough to try this route, and to win the popular vote under the rhetoric 'Stop the Boats'.

This label of illegal, which is also given to undocumented migrants into the United States, (originally it was to control the flow of migrant workers, opening the borders when cheap labour was needed, and then closing them again in times of depression, even granting and then renouncing citizenship) is applied for no other reason than a process of 'othering'. The rhetoric of illegality is employed to invoke a reactions in general public consciousness and feeling that undocumented people are criminals, economic exploitationists, that there is a threat to morality, to the fabric of society, to the wellbeing of the obedient, law-abiding population. To call someone, and not just their actions, illegal, removes the personhood of an individual. The illegal body is in state of stationary oscillation, the body physical is subjected to stasis, must be hidden, must go unseen, must be detained when discovered, unable to rest, it is moved, or held in place. But the body social oscillates between categories: physically in (a space, a territory) but socially out (unauthorized, undesirable, *persona non grata*). Is is a contradiction. The line is a contradiction, as Eyal Weizman, if we go back to the Green Line, stresses:

If you are mentioning the 1947 Partition Plan as a result of the 181 UN resolution you would see that it has two very interesting points in it. And these are points where the borders of Israel and Palestine actually cross. There are two of them. They're called the 'Kissing Points'. The 'Kissing Points' are basically kind of an x...where the border is no longer a line, but becomes a point. From a one dimensional entity it became a non-dimensional coordinate, it becomes a point. And at these points are embodied the whole paradox of the occupation and the attempts to draw lines... the reduction of the border from a one-dimensional to a coordinated point necessitated the break of space from a two dimensional surface into a volume...the collapse of space from one-dimension to zero- dimension necessitated the three-dimension...and embodies the contradiction.⁵⁵

The Nomad. The body that refuses to *belong to* a bounded territory, refuses to be allocated territory but instead will distribute themselves according to its needs and the surrounding conditions, distributing fuzzy, de-categorized identity over an undefined space rather than having an identity that is bound in a specific notion of place deposited onto it . Identity, tied to nationhood is constructed for us, deposited on us... 'individuals are inscribed in relation to the border.'⁵⁶

⁵⁵ Weizman, E. in Alj's, F. & Deveaux, J. 2005, *The Green Line*, (video documentation), retrieved from <http://francisalys.com/greenline/weizman.html>

⁵⁶ Paul, I.A. 2011, *Border Machines*, <http://www.bordermachines.net/transborder2.html>

We could draw associations here between the phenomenon of the border being inscribed in the individual and the sedentary mindset, to reiterate Lisa Blackman, that draws limits and boundaries around what we are willing to recognize.

To inhabit a sedentary space I would posit, means to bind your identity with a sense of right of exclusivity, where not just social practices and ways of seeing the world (subjectivities) but also surface differences (appearances), are hijacked and employed by power to differentiate between and designate types of people (undesirable, inferior etc) for the determination of habitation rights. The border 'enables [or forces] the operation of agencies and subjectivities in relation to it,⁵⁷ acting as a cultural inscriber and as such we can glean from this that a border line, and all that it contains and connotes is deeply internalized.

A border's effectiveness, therefore, could be said to rest not in its physical manifestation, a wall, or a line on a map, but in its reinforcement of difference, deeply internalized, from one side to the other, where the other is consistently presented as hostile.

Borders and walls function to create both an imaginary homogenous moral interiority and to conjure the specter of an infectious and violent exteriority that constantly threatens to invade. To say that the border wall is ineffective at halting illegal crossings is to miss the true function of the border entirely. A border's effectiveness rests in its affective qualities, and the subjectivities that they project and enable.⁵⁸

And for such an emotionally charged subject of the self, as it is often deeply rooted in national identity, it acts as a conduit and re-enforcer for confirmation bias, also known as 'myside' bias: The 'tendency of people to favour information that confirms their beliefs or hypotheses... The effect is stronger for emotionally charged issues and for deeply entrenched beliefs.'⁵⁹ Such beliefs, ideologies, or opinions of nationality and difference are proposed and imposed by institutions of power, indeed, as we saw from Foucault earlier, are activities of any power whatsoever.

From my point of view, and for the purposes of the related body of jewellery and corpus work, this raises important questions of where and how the individual is allowed to exist in the present day world, in what way is place determined in relation to this, and how could we look at place and belonging in a humanistic way? For it seems that there is no space left where simply anyone is allowed to be. All is occupied, all territory is owned. Or if it is international space, then it is international waters, not land, or it is the transit places: Airports and seaports. Our entire conception of national identity is based on a sedentary way of thinking about space, bordered by seemingly impermeable and unforgiving boundaries of our own subjectivity.

⁵⁷ Ibid.

⁵⁸ Ibid.

⁵⁹ <http://www.worldheritage.org/article/WHEBN0000059160/Confirmation%20bias>

Though the boundaries of societies and their cultures are indefinable and arbitrary, the subjectivity inherent in each one is palatable and can be recognized as distinct from others. Subjectivity is in part a particular experience or organization of reality which includes how one views and interacts with humanity, objects, consciousness, and nature, so the difference between different cultures brings about an alternate experience of existence that forms life in a different manner. A common effect on an individual of this disjunction between subjectivities is culture shock, where the subjectivity of the other culture is considered alien and possibly incomprehensible or even hostile.⁶⁰

In the smooth spaces of the sand and sky, desert and forest, earth and salt, skin and bone, these borders dissipate and fall away. We must seek out ways to re-imagine space, and the body in space so that both become de-occupied, de-stratified, de-territorialised: Distribution without division, constantly in re-negotiation, de-lineated, de-centred, fuzzy, rhizomatic. Where we don't draw limits around what we are willing to recognize. Without this kind of space we will continue to make people, and their bodies, illegal.

⁶⁰ <http://www.worldheritage.org/articles/Subjectivity>

Image 1

Runo Lagomarsino, 2011-2012, *Transatlantic*.

Image taken by Anita van Doorn at Gothenburgs Konsthall, 2014.

Image 2

Image 3

Image 4

Image 5

Image 6



Image 7

Image 8
Still image from The Green Line video documentation, 2005



Image 9



Image 10



Image 11

Image 12

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aberjil, R. in Alÿs, F. & Deveaux, J. 2005, *The Green Line*, (video documentation), retrieved from <http://francisalys.com/greenline/ruben.html>

Alÿs, F. & Deveaux, J. 2005, *The Green Line*, (video documentation), retrieved from <http://francisalys.com/greenline/original.html>

Alfeyev, Bishop Hilarion, *An Online Orthodox Catechism* adopted from 'The Mystery of Faith' viewed 25 September, 2014, <http://orthodoxeurope.org/page/10/1.aspx#23>

Benvenisti, M. 1998, *City of Stone: The Hidden History of Jerusalem*, Oakland CA, University of California Press.

Blackman, L. 2008, *The Body: The Key Concepts*, EBL E-book, Bloomsbury publishing, retrieved from <http://ez-proxy.konstfack.se:2153/patron/FullRecord.aspx?p=533053>

Böhme, H. 2014, *Fetishism and Culture: A Different Theory of Modernity*, Berlin and Boston, Walter de Gruyter Inc.

Chomsky, N. Foucault, M. and Elders, F. 2011, *Human Nature: Justice vs Power. The Chomsky-Foucault Debate*, London, Souvenir Press.

Deleuze, G. and Guattari, F. 1987, *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, trans. B Massumi, Minneapolis MN, University of Minnesota Press.

Foucault, M. 2009, *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the Collège de France*, trans. B Burchell, 1977-1978, Hampshire and New York, Palgrave Macmillan.

Hammami, R. in Alÿs, F. & Deveaux, J. 2005, *The Green Line*, (video documentation), retrieved from <http://francisalys.com/greenline/rima.html>

Lagomarsino, R, 2010-2011, *Trans Atlantic*, Artwork shown as part of the exhibiton "Mark the Line" at Göteborgs Konsthallen, viewed 19 December 2014.

Mazumdar, P. 2014, *Understanding Surfaces: On Jewellery and Identity*, lecture transcript, retrieved 5 December 2014, http://www.die-neue-sammlung.de/blog/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/mazumdar_dns.pdf

McCarthy, S. 2015, *Learning to Live with Perpetual Information Warfare*, weblog, viewed 15 January, 2015, <http://smarimccarthy.is/blog/2015/01/08/learning-to-live-with-perpetual-information-warfare/>

Paul, I.A. 2011, *Border machines*, Masters thesis, viewed 22 February, 2015, <http://www.bordermachines.net>

Pontoppidan, K. 2014, *Jewellery Freaks*, course lecture, Stockholm, Sweden, Konstfack University College of Arts, Crafts and Design.

Rocker, R. 1997, *Nationalism and Culture*, Montreal, Black Rose Books.

Stark, L. 2006, *The Magical Self. Body, Society and the Supernatural in Early Modern Rural Finland*, FF Communications 290, Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia.

Weizman, E. in Alÿs, F. & Deveaux, J. 2005, *The Green Line*, (video documentation), retrieved from <http://francisalys.com/greenline/weizman.html>

Woodward, K.(ed) 1997, *Identity and Difference*, London, Thousand Oaks CA and Dehli, Sage.

World Heritage Encyclopedia, 2014, *Subjectivity*, viewed 2 March 2015. <http://www.worldheritage.org/articles/Subjectivity>