

Blau, Eve. "The Third Project."

In *Olafur Eliasson: Your Chance Encounter*. Concept by Olafur Eliasson, Andreas Koch, and Caroline Eggel. Exhibition catalogue. Baden: Lars Muller Publishers; Kanazawa: 21st Century Museum of Contemporary Art, 2010: no page numbers.

The Third Project

Your chance encounter – like all of Olafur Eliasson's exhibition titles – is charged with meaning. What is being staged is an event, a coming together, a meeting, a collective experience. It is *your* encounter. How it unfolds and what you take away from the encounter depends on what you bring to it. Experience, Eliasson reminds us, is never unmediated. It is conditioned by what precedes and follows it, by memory and expectation, modes of sensory organisation, culturally conditioned habits of mind and countless other factors that are both historically and socially produced. Experience, in other words, is multiply mediated and infinitely variable.

But, experience can be shared. That possibility and its transformative potential are the all-important *chance* on which *your encounter* turns. But what does *chance* signify here? Does it signal that the encounter is fortuitous, happenstance, without design? Or is *chance* to be understood as active, productive, designed – a possibility offered, a risk taken, an opportunity created? The ambiguity is clearly intentional. It is *your* chance. Seize it and shape it.

Words are important to Eliasson. They add layers of reference and complexity to the work and in doing so they condition its reception. Like actions, they have consequences. Certain tropes appear repeatedly in the titles of his works, exhibitions and books – engagement, negotiation, experience, expectation, mediation – words that convey dynamic and mutable conditions such as intentionality, process, strategy. They constitute a lexicon of nouns derived from verbs – 'things' that contain actions and suggest relationships. They are matters of concern that describe acts rather than objects. Usually, they are accompanied by a possessive pronoun – *your* – that places agency with the (collective) user, who is cast as actor and protagonist in shaping the engagement, performance, negotiation, or, as in this case, the spatio-temporal encounter with the physical world instigated by Eliasson's interventions. The purposefulness and intensity of the encounter give it the quality of a controlled experiment.

In Kanazawa the experiment includes another protagonist: the intricately interwoven and highly performative spaces of SANAA's 21st Century Museum of Contemporary Art. That encounter is the central experiment staged by Eliasson's work in the museum. 'It is my ambition', he states, 'to exhibit both the artworks and the structure of the museum ... the context of the artworks is as central to the exhibition as the works themselves'.¹ In other words, what Eliasson is staging here is an inversion of the traditional relationship between art and museum. Rather than the architecture providing a neutral setting for the display of art objects, it is the artwork that displays the architecture, or more accurately, the individual pieces in the exhibition actively engage the forms, spaces, and materials of the building so as both to reveal the physical and spatial properties of the architecture, and to conscript them into a 'comprehensive artistic project'.² Together, art and architecture generate a third project – a project that extends beyond the parameters of either artwork or architecture individually.

The installation spills out of the museum's galleries into its circulation spaces, occupying and redirecting passage through them. Eliasson's carefully calibrated interventions populate the public areas with projected images, shadows, and refracted light, absorbing and transforming them from quotidian spaces of everyday use into performative spaces of art. Throughout the building, light, colour, and atmospheric suspensions of fog-like density take possession and reshape interior volumes, adding layer upon layer of visual information and spatial complexity to

the existing transparencies and opacities of the building's multilayered volumes and surfaces. Rather than merely occupying its exhibition spaces, the artwork *inhabits* the architecture, absorbing its infrastructure and engaging its spatial logic.

Chance, in this encounter – in the meeting of Olafur Eliasson and Kazuyo Sejima and Ryue Nishizawa / SANAA in the spaces of 21st Century Museum – is clearly active, productive and designed. It is an opportunity that creates opportunity: the intensive engagement of two practices – one in art, the other in architecture – both of which are conceived in terms of ongoing experimentation and open-ended exploration, and both of which push the boundaries between them. This is the conceptual ground they share. That ground establishes the terms of the engagement. Let us begin there.

Both Eliasson and SANAA are concerned with exploring the cognitive possibilities of their work, with exploring how works of art and architecture can impact the way in which we know ourselves, and our world; the processes by which knowledge and understanding are acquired through experience. Both are concerned with expanding the agency of their respective practices by pushing the boundaries between them. 'The term "art" doesn't add anything to the spatial experiments we're involved in; our experiments are anchored in the tissue of society to such an extent that labeling them "art" or "architecture" becomes superfluous ... we should instead explore the overlapping interests between the two', Eliasson suggests.³ The optimal site for that exploration, they both agree, is the museum. 'Museums of the future cannot be built solely by architects. Architects, artists, curators, and visitors should come together in creating a museum', Kazuyo Sejima insists.⁴ 'The challenge', in Eliasson's view, 'is to integrate and use a model for the communication of art that – besides the communication itself – also shows itself as a model: the model as model'.⁵ So, the museum as locus and model of communication. But, Sejima stipulates, 'What happens inside the museum cannot be easily predicted. In fact, we have to make something that realizes the unpredictable ... every encounter will bring forth another new image of this museum.'⁶ So, the museum as a communication model and an 'open work' (in Umberto Eco's dialectical sense: flexible and dynamic, but also coherent and purposeful) – materialised through use, and the collective experience of users.⁷ What is at stake here is the social and cultural role of the museum, which is conceived by both artist and architect in the active terms of communication, of information flow, and the interactive performance of architecture, artwork, and users. The museum, in other words, as a site for the production of art and architecture, not merely for their consumption.

It is in this sense that we can understand the respective practices of Eliasson and SANAA as open-ended experiments. The organisation of the work in both Eliasson's and SANAA's studios is almost purely experimental: concepts are developed, options are tested, studied, and redesigned in countless physical and digital models that are examined under 'laboratory conditions'. SANAA's studio is piled high with study models, hundreds of which are generated for each project. Every stage in the process of conception, every change in design, each decision is worked out in the studio and on site, in three-dimensions and at different scales. Sejima explains the process: 'We try to find many reasons for any decision, and then finally we can decide. But still, I think there are always other options'⁸ The scheme that gets built is not the ultimate 'solution', but rather one among many, equally viable, options.

In his Berlin studio, Eliasson and his associates work at architectural scale. Each project is conceived as a controlled experiment: the conditions generated are examined, altered, their consequences studied, new tests launched. Often a single experiment will spin off multiple works that become parts of larger projects and installations. For both SANAA and Eliasson, the experiment does not end with the design and construction of the work. Instead, the work, as such, only fully exists once it enters the world of lived experience. 'SANAA', Yuko Hasegawa has

said, ‘simply want to place their architecture and observe what will happen, rather than predicting and planning what effect it will have on the surrounding environment. They cannot possibly grasp the “whole” by completing the physical building. The architectural design reveals itself in time and is given its “wholeness” through the relationship with the people who use the building and the surrounding environment.’⁹ Eliasson also prefers to identify the museum visitor as the ‘user’ rather than ‘viewer’ of the artwork. The implication is that the work has utility, instrumentality – that it *does* work. It constructs a set of conditions and sets in motion a process that demands action on the part of the viewer/user.

For Eliasson, that process constitutes a ‘negotiation’, an active engagement between user, work, and the time and space that both inhabit. Negotiation has a very particular meaning in his lexicon. It links engagement to responsibility: ‘engagement has consequences and these entail a heightened feeling of responsibility.’¹⁰ To act, in other words, is to assume responsibility for shaping our understanding of the world, and acting in it – a position that is social, political and ethical.

Experimentalism conceived in this way has more in common with scientific than with avant-gardist practices. Indeed, as Manfredo Tafuri pointed out, there is a deep contradiction between the avant-garde and experimentalism. ‘For the avant-gardes, the problem of checking the effects on the public has little importance ... Experimentalism is on the contrary constantly taking apart, putting together, contradicting, and provoking ... Its innovations can be bravely launched towards the unknown, but the launching pad is solidly anchored to the ground ... [The] real task [of experimentation] is not subversion but widening’¹¹ Experimentation is about discovery and designing experiments that push the boundaries of knowledge. But in art and architecture, just as in science, it is not enough to design the experiments: one has to study and act on the results if the experiments are to generate new knowledge.

There is much in common between this notion of experimentation as a process of widening and Eliasson’s notion of generative negotiation. Both, I would suggest, can also be understood in terms of the socio-spatial dialectic described by Henri Lefebvre as the ‘production of space’. Space in Lefebvre’s formulation is neither an object nor a subject, but rather ‘a social reality ... a set of relations and forms’.¹² Space, in other words, is a concrete abstraction with material consequences. Its social production, according to Lefebvre, is negotiated in terms of a ‘three-part dialectic’, *une dialectique de triplicité*: perceived space (*spatial practice*), conceived space (*representations of space*) and lived space (*spaces of representation*).¹³ Lefebvre’s perceived-conceived-lived triad describes the processes of everyday life in ‘social space’, in which their integration generates a *third space* – a new form of experience. Tafuri’s concept of experimentalism and Lefebvre’s theory of the production of space provide useful frameworks for understanding the significance of the encounter between Eliasson and SANAA staged at 21st Century Museum and the terms of engagement of that encounter. In short: both Eliasson and SANAA are interested not only in how experiments begin, but also in how they end – the results they produce. The results have consequences; they make a difference.

So what is the experiment conducted at 21st Century Museum? Let us return to Eliasson’s exhibition statement: ‘It is my ambition to exhibit both the artworks and the structure of the museum, not least the patterns of art communication facilitated by the institution; the context ... is as central to the exhibition as the works themselves. Thus, not only museum galleries are used, but also its corridors, courtyards ... the artworks – often of an ephemeral nature – seek to expand the core concepts of the SANAA museum architecture itself.’¹⁴ The experiment begins, in other words, with the building.

As Sejima and Nishizawa explain it, the structural organisation of the 21st Century Museum operates in terms of an inherently contradictory (double) spatial logic that is predicated on combining the maximum independence of parts with the closest possible interrelation among them. The tension between these logics generates the geometry of the plan, the proportions of the volumes, and the material properties of the structure. The dialectical logic of independence and interconnection, flexibility of use, and intensity of experience, operates at all levels of the work. The closed geometry of the perfectly cylindrical building sets it off from the natural landscape and urban fabric around it. Yet, in terms of access, the building and all its parts are open to each other as well as to the park and city beyond. The museum has three public entrances and one staff entrance, and these make it accessible from all directions. The transparent-glass outer walls give unobstructed views of the public zones around the central core, and even allow one to see deep into the centre of the building, and, in places, through to the opposite side. In the interior, each programmed space – whether exhibition gallery, courtyard, library, restaurant, shop, or lecture hall – is shaped into an independent volume with its own distinctive proportions, visual access, and scale in relation to the spaces around it. At the same time, each particularised space is intricately interwoven with those around it through a transparent gridded network of interconnected corridors and passageways. All of this can be read from the building itself.

The museum, in other words, has a non-hierarchical structure. Its plan is a field configuration characterised by independent volumes that are connected by active interstitial spaces. This is an organisation that combines coherence and legibility with an openness that allows for the unpredictable to occur. It is also a configuration in which the information inscribed in the plan – the physical organisation of the spaces – often seems to contradict the visual experience of those spaces. Because of the many layers of glass, the surfaces of the building not only reflect and refract the spaces they enclose but they also visually project those spaces onto, through, and beyond one another. The effect is visual complexity and spatial layering. But the multilayered transparencies also serve to ‘articulate’ the architecture and its social agenda; they show the potential of each space to be both open and closed, connected and separate from the others, to offer solitude and society, glimpses of nature and self-reflection, places of rest and activity: ‘People can see each other, communicate, and also understand their position in relation to other people.’¹⁵ It is a spatial organisation that gives agency to both the work and the user. The multiple readings it produces are intentional and instrumental. ‘One receives suggestions from the building up to a certain point, but after that one discovers the building oneself so that one can freely walk around in it.’¹⁶ The multiple layers of visual information provide a compass, a tool to help the user in exploring the flexibility of the structure; they supply the organisational information for the interactive performance of the architecture. It is a configuration that is both carefully orchestrated and radically open to variation and interpretation.

How do Eliasson’s works engage and expand this architectural project? The first thing they do is to put to the test the programmatic flexibility of the architecture by refusing to be confined to the museum’s designated exhibition spaces. As much, if not more, of the artwork is installed in the circulation and public areas. By appropriating the museum’s infrastructure, Eliasson not only adds many square metres to its exhibition space but he also redraws its plan, demarcating the new, expanded boundaries with two linear works at either extremity. These are the 52-metre-long sequence of *Eye activity line* (2009) paintings, and the narrow strip of daylight in *Less light horizon* (2009) which effectively draw a horizon line and vanishing point – a line picked up in *Your watercolour horizon* (2009) in the cylindrical gallery. Immediately, this sets up a dialogue between the programmatic order of the architecture and the performative intervention of the artwork, a dialogue in which art and architecture collaborate in articulating the space of exhibition.

The exhibition itself moves in and out of the galleries and the interstitial zones between them. Like the architecture, it offers many points of access. At critical points it also offers alternative routes, demanding active decision on the part of the visitor, while providing partial views and reflected images of works and spaces: prismatic banks of *Starbricks* (2009), mirrors, projected images, kaleidoscopes, glass prisms, and other interventions that take possession of the network of glazed passages and corridors between the galleries. Eliasson negotiates the architecture in ways that change not only how the spaces are used, but also how they relate to one another.

The negotiation unfolds in terms of transformative encounters between individual works and spaces. It operates in the way that visual memory, or the mind's eye, works: in terms of duration. Each work engages the space in which it is located and sets up the transition to the next. For example, the two interconnected galleries near the main entrance foyer are deployed as cubic volumes for the observation of carefully staged optical experiments. In the first, *Your chance encounter* (2009), rotating bands of light and shadow, cast from a lamp with three revolving semi-cylindrical walls in the centre of the room, scans the gallery, washing across walls, floor, and ceiling, generating a rhythmic dance of proliferating planes advancing and receding in space. The result is a complete fluidity between figure and ground: what reads as ground at one moment, suddenly morphs into figure, and back into ground again. From this space one enters the second gallery, which is filled with yellow light that reduces the colour to a duotone: yellow and shades of grey/black. The sensation on entering *Room for one colour* (1997) is of compression and contraction – the yellow light seeming to reduce not only colour but also depth of field to the binary terms figure and ground, with nothing in between. It also produces an afterimage that turns the strip of daylight in *Less light horizon*, visible just outside the room, into a bright blue line. As one moves into the corridor, the blue line morphs back into a strip of daylight. A narrative is constructed as each successive work modifies the experience of the last and of the next.

The cinematic unfolding of this narrative demands sustained attention; it cannot be grasped on the run. Thresholds, points of transition from one environment to another, become intervals of temporal shift. They slow down movement and allow time to fill the moment of uncertainty. Each threshold also triggers a 'double take' – a delayed reaction – that at first (take one) registers the transition within the narrative space of the exhibition, and then (take two) situates it in the imbricated spaces of SANAA's building: orientation, disorientation, and reorientation. With each new intervention, Eliasson also takes the viewer/user behind the scenes, revealing the techniques of its production and operation – making it clear that the encounter, the experiment being conducted, is 'designed' and that its outcome is a matter of concern. In this way, multiple layers of information are made transparent and projected onto one another. Transparency here operates in terms of projection and accumulation; not of images, or even of spatial planes, but rather of lived experience. Transparency as projection also constitutes a model of space as relational and contingent: that is, both objectively and subjectively constituted over time, and therefore in a perpetual state of 'becoming'.

The instantiation of this durational projective transparency connects Eliasson's work to the experiments of artists and filmmakers in the 1920s, László Moholy-Nagy in particular, with the creation of 'abstract space'. Moholy-Nagy theorised the capacity of film to generate space that is 'expressed' rather than occupied or contained, through 'volume relationships [that] are virtual ones, but also visible'.¹⁷ In his diagram of 'a simultaneous or poly-cinema', three films – three temporal-spatial narratives – are projected simultaneously onto a concave screen. The superimposed layers of visual information result in a thickening and deepening of both space and time. This 'time-thickened space', Moholy-Nagy claimed, produces a new kind of 'optical knowledge'.¹⁸ For Moholy-Nagy it was the social implication of this notion of 'articulated space' that made it radical and important.¹⁹ It gave agency to both the work and the viewing subject, who is forced to engage with the ambiguities of the sensory information received and to act upon

them. Moholy-Nagy himself was only able to represent, not realise, his conception of time-thickened space.

Eliasson, who is well acquainted with the spatial experiments of Moholy-Nagy and other Constructivist artists and filmmakers in the 1920s, significantly advances their transformational project, expanding it into a fully three-dimensional exploration of the multilayered co-existence of space, time and consciousness in human perception, relations, and actions. In *Life is lived along lines* (2009) wire sculptures (with formal similarities to Constructivist works) are suspended from the ceiling. As they slowly revolve on their own axes, they cast moving shadows onto a translucent screen. The work is first encountered from the opposite side of the screen, and is perceived as a series of projected images that seem continuously to change their shape and in the process to generate three-dimensional space. At first glance, therefore, the work seems to operate very much like Moholy-Nagy's experimental films, but, there is a major difference. The wire sculptures, and the mechanisms by which they rotate, the spotlights that illuminate them, the screen on which the moving shadows are cast, and their projected images on the reverse side of the screen are all evident. The viewer/user is made a party to the entire process of production and reproduction. S/he can enter into the work itself, can occupy the space of transformation between light source and screen, and can, along with the moving sculptures, be translated into abstract spatio-temporal projections on a flat screen. Rather than *representing* the process of spatial creation, Eliasson *enacts* that process.

In other works, Eliasson inserts the user directly into the work and the role of subject and co-producer. In *Slow-motion shadow in colour* (2009), *Slow-motion shadow* (2009), and *Colour shadow theatre* (2009) there are no objects, only bodies moving between the lights and projected images. As more people congregate and move in the space, the projected images superimpose, merge, detach, and proliferate, their colours intensifying or shadows deepening as they draw closer to one another, lightening as they pull away. No stable image is created; the visual phenomena are ephemeral. It is pure performance, pure event.

Among the most interesting interventions are those in which the work is co-produced with the architecture; where particularly complex spatial conditions are engaged, as for example at the exact centre point of the museum: the irregular triangle generated by the intersection of Courtyard 3 (in which the covered glass corridor cuts through Patrick Blanc's *Green Bridge*) and the curved outer wall of the cylindrical gallery. Here, Eliasson strategically positions a series of mirrors: two sets of vertically stacked discs, round and elliptical, one set mounted on the opaque surface of the curved wall, the other on the flat surface of the transparent courtyard wall – *Rotating circle and the space in-between (facing west)* (2009). Two more mirrors are mounted in the wheel frames of a bicycle propped against a third wall (*Kepler was right bike*, 2009). As one walks through the space, the mirrors pick up each other's reflections as well as those of the glass walls around them. The cascading discs begin to spin and at the same time to spin-off a collage of Euclidean fragments of space. The effect is to heighten the sensation of movement and to make the transparencies and translucencies of the architecture both 'present' and active as they capture and refract the changing conditions of light, views of buildings, trees, and bodies moving in and around them.

These interventions 'actualise' the architecture; they make one aware of the museum's spaces in a new way. Eliasson uses the German word *Umsetzung* to describe the process. Like so many of his favourite words, *Umsetzung* has multiple meanings that range from 'conversion' and 'ignition' to 'permutation', 'transposition', and 'translation'. *Umsetzung* describes a process similar to that which Peter Sloterdijk describes as 'explicitation', the process by which some latency is rendered explicit through engagement.²⁰ Sloterdijk has, in fact, referred to Eliasson's work (in the exhibition *Surroundings Surrounded* at the ZKM / Center for Art and Media Karlsruhe, 2001) in

terms of this process: ‘The natural environments shown by the artist are already surrounded surroundings through and through, that is, they are natural phenomena signified by science and technology.’²¹ For Bruno Latour, explication offers a means of conceptualising design as *intervention* in terms of a ‘theory of action’ that encompasses the natural as well as the social, and is tied to evolving technologies of communication and production.²² Explication is also a concept in the field of Translation Studies, which holds that translations tend to be more explicit than non-translations. Two things are interesting about this concept. First, it suggests that explication is not a two-way process, but travels in one direction (from original to translation); second, it suggests that its purpose is communication, to bridge a gap, to connect.²³

Eliasson moves into new territory at the 21st Century Museum when he engages these issues directly, as for example in *Your making things explicit* (2009) and *Your atmospheric colour atlas* (2009). In the first, a darkened room is filled with a dense fog that obscures the extremities and dimensions of the room and turns the bodies circulating within it into ghost-like presences. The only illumination is a single beam of light projected from one end of the room through a transparent cube made of acrylic onto the opposite wall. As it passes through the fog, the light materialises into a solid beam. At midpoint, however, where it penetrates the sealed (fog-less) cube, it becomes invisible. By altering atmospheric conditions, the immaterial is materialised, the invisible becomes visible, what was absent becomes present. Space itself is rendered, not only visible, but palpable, substantive. The cognitive instrumentality and social significance of these inversions is made explicit by *Your atmospheric colour atlas*, a fog-filled room in which thin columns support a light grillwork fitted with RGB (red, green, blue) lights. The lights turn the atmosphere into a dense multicoloured fog. As bodies move through the space, the RGB primaries mix and change value. Space becomes not only visible and tactile but also responsive to human action, contingent and inseparable from the material substance of the moving bodies that generate it. The dynamics of exhibition and experience structured by the museum are no longer to be understood in the binary terms of object-subject relations, but in the multiply diffuse terms of environment and ecology.

Eliasson’s original intention was to fill the entire building with fog. In a series of controlled experiments in the public zones of the museum he was able to do so (albeit temporarily), and in so doing to blur boundaries not only between object and subject but more broadly between the physical and the social. The intention relates to SANAA’s desire to ‘invent new hierarchies’, non-narrative structures without beginning or end.²⁴ For Sejima, the invention of new hierarchies constitutes an engagement with ‘the world of information’ – information society – with its porous boundaries and invisible, omnipresent networks. ‘Although information society is invisible, I think that architecture must have some sort of relationship with such a society’, she insists. ‘I don’t know what type of answer there might be, but I think there must be some interesting possibilities of change.’²⁵ For Eliasson, the blurring of boundaries has to do with communication, with connecting the personal and the collective, the local and the global. As such, the fog experiments expand and project the ‘model for the communication of art’ explored in the spaces of the museum, beyond the parameters of the building and into ‘everyday life’ – setting in motion ‘reflections on the museum, the park, and its urban surroundings as constructions themselves’.²⁶

Both conceive their practices as situated at the intersection of the material and the virtual, as continuously negotiating and interacting with dynamic and mutable physical and social environments. But what differentiates the practices of Eliasson and SANAA from those of many of their contemporaries is the fact that they appear to be more interested in the cultural significance of the new digital media and global networks – the social environments they create – than in assimilating either the technologies or forms of the new media in their work. At the same time, both also use the possibilities that digital technologies afford to explore and test options.

But most of all, the work of Eliasson and SANAA, in different but complementary ways, is profoundly engaged in exploring the irreconcilable contradictions – the cognitive gaps – between the worlds of *information* and *experience* that the new technologies of communication and visualisation seem to generate and proliferate. That engagement is spatialised in the encounter staged in Kanazawa. Together, the art and architecture create an environment to which no one portal provides access, in which any piece of information exists in multiple planes and is viewable at multiple scales and in different contexts. It is an environment where public and private are relational and contingent rather than absolute conditions, determined by use or actions rather than discrete volumes. Public space is generated by interaction; private space by withdrawing from company. Both can occur anywhere. The project, like the process, is incomplete and interactive. It is a platform from which multiple programmes can be launched.

¹ Olafur Eliasson, 'Your chance encounter', in exhibition folder (Kanazawa: 21st Century Museum of Contemporary Art, 2009), p. 3.

² Ibid.

³ Olafur Eliasson, 'A: Architecture', in *Studio Olafur Eliasson: An Encyclopedia*, ed. Olafur Eliasson and Anna Engberg-Pedersen (Cologne: Taschen, 2008), pp. 49–50.

⁴ Kazuyo Sejima quoted in Kanazawa Nijūsseiki Bijutsukan, *The Encounters in the 21st Century: Polyphony – Emerging Resonances* (Kanazawa: 21st Century Museum of Contemporary Art and Tankosha Publishing Co., 2005), p. 151.

⁵ Olafur Eliasson, 'I: Institution', in *Studio Olafur Eliasson: An Encyclopedia*, ed. Olafur Eliasson and Anna Engberg-Pedersen (Cologne: Taschen, 2008), p. 195.

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ Umberto Eco, *The Open Work*, trans. Anna Cancogni (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1989).

⁸ Kazuyo Sejima quoted in Alejandro Zaera-Polo, 'A Conversation with Kazuyo Sejima and Ryue Nishizawa', in *El Croquis* 77 (February 2000), p. 19.

⁹ *Kazuyo Sejima + Ryue Nishizawa / SANAA 21st Century Museum of Contemporary Art, Kanazawa*, ed. Meruro Washida (Kanazawa: 21st Century Museum of Contemporary Art, 2005), pp. 100–1.

¹⁰ Olafur Eliasson, 'Your Engagement has Consequences', in *Experiment Marathon: Hans Ulrich Obrist & Olafur Eliasson*, ed. Emma Ridgway (Reykjavik and London: Reykjavik Art Museum, Koenig Books, and Serpentine Gallery, 2009), p. 20.

¹¹ Manfredo Tafuri, *Theories and History of Architecture*, trans. Giorgio Verrecchia. (New York: Harper & Row, 1976), pp. 104–5.

¹² Henri Lefebvre, *The Production of Space*, trans. Donald Nicholson-Smith. (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 1991), p. 116.

¹³ Ibid. pp. 38–39.

¹⁴ Eliasson, 'Your chance encounter', p. 3.

¹⁵ Kazuyo Sejima quoted in Zaera-Polo, 'A Conversation with Kasuyo Sejima and Ryue Nishizawa', p. 16.

¹⁶ Yuko Hasegawa, 'New Flexibility', in *Kazuyo Sejima + Ryue Nishizawa / SANAA 21st Century Museum of Contemporary Art, Kanazawa*, ed. Meruro Washida (Kanazawa: 21st Century Museum of Contemporary Art, 2005), p. 102. First published in *GA Sejima Kazuyo + Nishizawa Ryue Dokuhon* (Tokyo: A.D.A. Edita, 2005), p. 280.

¹⁷ László Moholy-Nagy, *Malerei, Photographie, Film*, Bauhausbücher, no. 8 (Munich: Langen, 1925), p. 34.

¹⁸ László Moholy-Nagy, 'A New Instrument of Vision', *Telehor* 1 (February 1936), p. 35.

¹⁹ László Moholy-Nagy, *The New Vision and Abstract of an Artist* (New York: George Wittenborn, Inc., 1947, 4th rev. ed.; original 1928), p. 64. Regarding relations between architecture, including the work of SANAA, and 1920s experiments in art and film, see Eve Blau, 'Tensions in Transparency. Between Information and Experience: The Dialectical Logic of SANAA's Architecture', in *Harvard Design Magazine* (Fall/Winter 2008/2009), pp. 29–37; Eve Blau, 'Transparency and the Irreconcilable Contradictions of Modernity', in *PRAXIS* 9 (2007), pp. 50–59.

²⁰ Peter Sloterdijk, *Sphären*, 3 vols. (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 2004).

²¹ Peter Sloterdijk, 'The Absolute Island', in *Olafur Eliasson: Minding the World* (Aarhus: ARoS Aarhus Kunstmuseum, 2004), p. 165.

²² Bruno Latour, 'A Cautious Prometheus? A Few Steps Toward a Philosophy of Design (with Special Attention to Peter Sloterdijk)' in *Networks of Design: Proceedings of the 2008 Annual International Conference of the Design History Society*, ed. Fiona Hackney, Jonathan Glynn and Viv Minton (Boca Raton: Universal-Publishers, 2009), pp. 1–13.

²³ See Anthony Pym, 'Explaining Explicitation', in *New Trends in Translation Studies. In Honour of Kinga Klaudy*, ed. Krisztina Karoly and Agota Foris (Budapest: Akademiai Klado, 2005).

²⁴ Ryue Nishizawa quoted in *El Croquis* 77[1]+99+121/122 (2004), special reprint: *Sejima Nishizawa SANAA 1983–2004*, p. 25.

²⁵ Kazuyo Sejima quoted in Alejandro Zaera-Polo, 'A Conversation with Kazuyo Sejima and Ryue Nishizawa', p. 14.

²⁶ Eliasson, 'Your chance encounter', p. 3.