

**“SEEING DOUBLE”:
OPENING THE PARENTHESES ON NON-PLACE AND WARPED SPACE IN
THE RECENT PHOTOWORKS OF DENIS FARLEY**

Diplopia, commonly known as double vision, is the simultaneous perception of two images of a single object. These images may be displaced horizontally, vertically, or diagonally (i.e. both vertically and horizontally) in relation to each other. (1)

-- Wikipedia (1)

Vision seems to adapt itself to its object like the images that one has of a town when one contemplates it from the height of a tower; hearing is analogous to a view taken from outside and on the same level as the town; touch, finally, relates to (the understanding) of whoever comes in contact with a town from close up by wandering through its streets.

-- G.W. Leibniz (2)

For almost a quarter century, Montreal-based photographic artist Denis Farley has sought to test the epistemological underpinnings and definitional limits of contemporary photographic practice while interrogating his viewers' perceptual mores. His is a concerted attempt to dismantle our prejudices, preconceptions, ruts and predispositions throughout the act of seeing. His lifelong project from series to series, work to work, has been to explore the still largely uncharted territory of vision itself.

In his recent work, the so-called 'Double Vision' series of diptychs, Farley has invoked a form of *diplopia* ideally suited for his own creative ends, and this summoning of 'double vision' from which the series playfully takes its literal title, refers to the simultaneous perception of two images of a single object. These images are usually displaced horizontally in his work. Beyond the perceptual stigma/stigmata in question, Farley also touches on the issue of stereoscopy in the history of the photographic medium, yet also reminds us that it, in fact, preceded photography itself. Giovanni Battista della Porta (d. 1615) executed binocular drawings. In 1613, Francois d'Aguillion (d. 1617), invented the word "stereoscopique". Farley brings back into the order of photographic discourse 19th "stereo-views" in which two copies of a given photograph were produced on a

letter-sized oblong card and viewed through a hand-held viewer so that the image in question could be seen to true 3-D effect. (The stereoview is still a ubiquitous artefact at flea markets and antique stores worldwide.)

Farley invokes both the stereoview and the phenomenon of double vision as useful instruments for exposing and questioning the binary signifiers of non-place and warped space that thread sinuously throughout the architecture of Supermodernity like the interlocking double helix of a DNA sequence. This basic paired structure – with its spatial and temporal strands—articulates the parameters of Farley’s work like a floppy disk of binary code. Employing an ancient photographic model and an optical disorder to shed light upon these more contemporary phenomena, Farley reminds us that inhabitation of contemporary urban spaces in the consummately singular tense we now inhabit is not without a measure of challenge, stress, uncertainty and perceptual risk. Most of the time, we may be only barely aware of it; at others, we roll with its punches, but the accompanying angst takes its toll, exacts its price.

Using techniques of induced rupture/appraisal and displacement/suture, his work brings us round to recognizing the real nature of that challenge, for his work at its best induces an appraisal on our part of our status as embodied subjects in the lived world with optics fully in play. It further spotlights our psychological implication and investiture in a contemporary architectural environment that somehow defies holism and sanity even as we are required to process it successfully in order to survive. Yes, it is a truism to say that these environs hold sway over what is in mind to say, at least within the anxious ambit of sight’s ‘sovereign’ array.

Farley seizes upon strategic urban locations and proceeds to make the resultant images consequent by wedding them through often-minute structural displacement and marginal asymmetry, inducing spatial uncertainty and a certain prevailing alien ethos that distends itself from the extravagant contents of what is seen to what lies underneath the mantle of the processual interiority of “seeing” itself – thus representing for us a sort of shadow show on the dark convex side of our perceptual experience of the built world akin to that of our own silhouettes lengthening in the midday sun. The longer we spend with his work, the more acute the claim it stakes upon us.

Employing ostensibly straightforward techniques of radical juxtaposition and resonant recombinant imagery, Farley encourages his viewers to reappraise his or her own socio-cultural, psychological and emotional references while experiencing this work.

The reflective qualities of water and glass panels, for example, act as visual triggers stimulating the passage from physical to mental states. The quasi-symmetry of the structures depicted along with body image/postural schemata and the possibility of optic fatigue are closely and even seamlessly aligned in a mediative/meditative high-wire act on the photographer’s part.

If stereoscopic photography, founded upon the illusion of depth, is an analogical trope for that high-wire act in the art making, the spaces that Farley invokes, and which are synonymous with architecture-as-lived itself, are also rife with warps and woofs that induce reflective and introspective states in the viewer. Farley has hit real pay dirt in seizing upon various *aporiae* and thematized gaps in the seeing/seer/seen triad that only advertise themselves when the problem of seeing his images as meaningfully symmetrical/asymmetrical crops up.

When Sir Charles Wheatstone described, in the course of a June 1838 address on the phenomena of binocular vision to the Royal Scottish Society of Arts, the enabling instrument in question, he said: “I...propose that it be called a Stereoscope, to indicate its property of representing solid figures.” (3) Farley uses his own doubling of images to explore phenomena that, on the one hand, are not solid figures at all, but phantasmal gaps or intervals or ‘folds’ in perception and, on the other hand, all too, too solid—I mean images of the architecture of our time that is anchored in our hectic experience of an ever-accelerating future tense.

Farley’s remarkable diptychs are meant to remind us of the stereoscopic anaglyphic process, a method of printing two images on to one sheet that was developed by Louis Ducas du Hauron in the late 19th century. He put paid to the conventional method of viewing stereoscopic photographs in which the handheld viewer contained a pair of identical images that were then fused together to create a three-dimensional field. Instead, du Hauron printed his so-called ‘anaglyphs’. They consisted of two negatives printed onto the same paper, one in blue or green and one in red to form a stereoscopic image. (One would then use colored glasses with blue or green glass for the right eye and one with red for the left eye. The eyes would register both as black, creating a 3-d image.)

Now, Farley provides us with a spectroscopy-like conundrum in which the subtlest possible disparities/misalignments/disruptions must be “solved” within the ambit of seeing, and over time, through considered looking and methodic appraisal and reappraisal – and final judgments based on the empirical data supplied in two images of subtly differing structural persuasions.

We all know that binocular *diplopia* refers to the phenomenon of double vision arising as a result of the misalignment of the two eyes relative to each other (such as *esotropia* and *exotropia*). In these cases, while the fovea of one optic is directed at a specific object, the fovea of the other optic is directed someplace else, and the image of the object of regard effectively falls on an *extra-foveal* area of the retina.

The cerebrum effectively calculates the ‘visual direction’ of an object based upon the position of its image relative to the fovea. Should the eyes fall out of perfect alignment at any moment, the cerebrum perceives two images of one ‘target’ object, as the target object stimulates non-corresponding, retinal areas in either eye with simultaneity, thus effectuating a *bona fide* case of double vision. In

Farley's work, the non-corresponding nature of his images is, at first, barely perceptible, and each image has to be examined in its turn. In other words, one has to willfully release oneself from the double reading that the two images, by virtue of their very sameness, seem to require. Hence, the continuing play on "double vision".

Correlation of particular areas of the image with those in another—mirroring such correlation between the retina in one eye with the same areas in the other and which is known as 'retinal correspondence' – in Farley's work and subsequent collation has a dark epistemological undertow. This relationship also gives rise to an associated phenomenon analogical to binocular *diplopia*. (Because the fovea of one eye corresponds to the fovea of the other, images falling on the two foveae are 'projected' to the same point in space. Thus, when the eyes are misaligned, the brain will 'project' two different images in the same visual direction.) Farley induces a similar 'confusion' prior to our identifying garden-variety *aporiae* and disparities, and thus places the emphasis for a successful holistic reading not on correspondence *per se* but rather on a contrariety, that is, a contrarian perceptual hypothesis, that adds considerable "depth of field" to his recent work.

Interestingly, in real life situations, double vision is deemed inimical to our very survival. The brain thus instinctively guards against its occurrence. Farley's employment of it analogically reveals just how much we "lose" in an attempt to avoid double vision. Apparently, the brain can sometimes ignore the image from one eye; a process known as "suppression". The ability to suppress is to be found particularly in childhood when the brain is still developing. As a young child, I suffered from *strabismus*, so-called "lazy eye" in which the two eyes went their own way, as it were (and which was successfully corrected in surgery).(3). But it seldom fazed me prior to the operation. I revisited the disorder as an adult, when a gunshot, cutting across the ambit of my left eye at close quarters, effectively pulled asunder the uniform gaze of the eyes in tandem, and I then found it almost unbearable.

Farley creates a spell-binding (but not maddening) situation of "seeing double" in order precisely that we not suppress perceived disturbances or deliberate misalignments in symmetry and that, in being so open, we might thus be more sensitive to the extravagant demands of the warped architectural spaces we all inhabit today with such seeming nonchalance.

In order to 'solve' the disjunction between the two images in a Farley photowork, we must identify the structural disparities, however minute – no prism lenses allowed or necessary, mind you – and Farley thus requires on our part an assumed double vision and then a deliberate rupture as a dual function of seeing *into* his work as an unfettered whole. This is certainly the case with *Serre No. 4* (2007) in the three drums are reflected against a glass wall, and in the first frame the apex of the building to the rear of those drums cannot be seen, while in the second we can see it, but only just enough to register a structural detail that

constitutes the disparity. In *Serre No. 1* (2007), it is more difficult to discover the disparity, but we ferret it out over time. In *Serre No. 2* (2007), the apparent midway point is asymmetrically given, but this is not immediately apparent and must be 'solved' by subsequent confirmation. Farley effectively alerts us to our own handedness and thus his work draws us to consider not only the epistemology of conscious experience, but also *aporiae* in our visual perception of the constructed (built) environment and possible implications for the computational function of visual processing.

His works are also akin to *stereograms* rather than just stereoviews—in the sense that they offer an almost palpable example of how the brain constructs perceived images of the world, and how we may be misled by warps in space and time that, whatever the extent of the resultant falsity, still yield clues once discovered as to how and why our experience of that world is constructed.

Farley's people-less places (aside from those that include his own portrait as witness and iconic presence and an exception like *Bus Shelter* where an elderly man sits inside, but enjoys only the empirical status of measuring instrument and depth-marker) bespeak isolation and alienation from the built environment. Their 'beauty' stems from the fractures in seeing which stem from their very facture. When the photographer's own image is integral, we are reminded of how Timothy O'Sullivan sometimes pictured himself within the scene in his Wheeler and King Western government survey photographs of the 1870s.

If the scenes in Farley's photographs remind us of the non-places that the French anthropologist and theorist Marc Augé developed in his seminal book *"Non-Places: Introduction to an Anthropology of Supermodernity,"* it is because they register a potent thematic of estrangement built up from bifurcated tropes of the built world and nature that requires deconstruction on our part as viewers complicit in the making of meaning. (4) But while human agents are conspicuous by their absence in many of these photographs, they are energized by the presence of the viewer's own restless optic, which projects into them and fulfills their register of meanings through felt/perceived disjunction and the overcoming of differences. In other words, they have ontological as well as epistemological implications that stem not from theory but from visual perception itself.

Like the photographs of fellow traveler Lynne Cohen, Farley's enigmatic spaces remind us of the territories occupied by the dubious protagonists of British novelist J.G. Ballard's disquieting apocalyptic speculative fictions, even if the protagonists themselves are now nowhere to be seen.

The idea of Supermodernity and non-place has its necessary complement in Anthony Vidler's notion of warped space. (3) He says: "Fear, anxiety, estrangement, and their psychological counterparts, anxiety neuroses and phobias, have been intimately linked to the aesthetics of space throughout the modern period." (5) P. 1

He posits a dualistic idiom of warped space. There is a wholly psychological space, an inventory of sundry neuroses and phobias that reaches within and beyond subjectivity *per se* and inhabits the postmodern landscape hand-in-glove. This space, which is not void but disquieting experiential plenum, is fraught with features that ensure angst and uncertainty. The other order of warping, according to Vidler, is produced when artists rupture and transgress the borders of genre orthodoxies with different media (photography being one) to treat space in new and unforeseen ways. And the photoworks of Farley certainly qualify for inclusion in this second category, although they cannot be easily subsumed altogether under this rubric (perhaps because their debt to the history of the photographic medium is always deeply felt). He certainly employs the medium of the photographic image to insert the lexicon of spatial reference back into the lived world as “criticism and comment”. (6) (P. 11).

Vidler argues persuasively that the affinity between these two orders of warping draws its radius across all artistic and architectural practices in modernity, inside the space of the inner city. He brilliantly identifies and tracks the trajectory of a psychological idea of space from thinkers like Pascal and Freud to the clinical identification of agoraphobia and claustrophobia in the nineteenth century and from thence to twentieth-century theories of spatial estrangement, and associated feelings of angst and estrangement. He cites seminal figures like Georg Simmel and Walter Benjamin in developing his argument. In naming contemporary conditions of displacement and placelessness in the development of his thesis as the necessary consequence of inhabiting the built world, he examines ways in which contemporary artists and architects have produced innovative forms of spatial warping. He examines how they have radically transformed both the experience and the subject of contemporary architecture.

One such artist is James Casebere. Elsewhere, Vidler relates his theory of warped space to the work of this photographic artist to great effect and with wonderful clarity.(7) (Fn jc) One might further relate the theory to the work of Denis Farley who has, for at least as long as the former artist has been at work, constructed increasingly complex stereoscopic situations in the built world that impact the viewer as decisively as Casebere’s small-scale architectural models meticulously built, lit and documented in his studio.

Whereas Casebere’s arresting “sites” invoke prisons, tunnels, factories, and other archetypal architectures and non-places of duress in Supermodernity, in the wake of the late great present tense, that is, Farley’ equally captivating sites invokes less specifiable, more indeterminate locales which still fuse the Supermodern tense we inhabit with the warped spaces of architecture that inform it. Both play with tropes of non-place as integers of alienation – and defining characteristics of aspects of the built world. Farley is working the same fertile terrain of the collective unconscious that Casebere works is in his vacant interiors, seemingly voided of all reference to human existence but which still possess “aura” (in the sense that Walter Benjamin once defined it) (fn). Absence,

not presence, is critical therein, but aura is all, and the work of both Farley and Casabere invokes a postmodern unconscious rife with angst and fraught with specters of uncertainty, with an auratic halo hanging over all.

In terms of Denis Farley's wholly maverick vision, one is tempted to suggest that his work is more romantic and subjectively utopian than that of some of his brave confreres, but in fact he is after the same governing anxiety of displacement and spatial rupture that Lynne Cohen and James Casabere are seeking to install in our experience. His images combining nature and architecture seem at first more human, more knowable, more assimilable than Cohen's clinically ideal and sterile environments or Casabere's meticulously constructed models.

Usually composed of several juxtaposed photographs, Farley's works are radically over-determined, auratically speaking, and fraught with an angst not always immediately evident. It is only after slow assimilation, after we have been waylaid, as it were, that they begin to work their own black magic – and we begin to understand something of the true nature of his dystopian esthetic of *diplopia*. The optic in reading his work is poised to reconcile what is, in fact, radically irreconcilable. The irreconcilable differences are not only between one image and its almost-identical twin; they also obtain between both eye and mind and the non-places and warped spaces that the Other really does play and work within every waking moment. Here is a harbinger of what we might well term the post-human environment.

In his earlier but related *Displacement* series, photographic panels portraying nature are interposed between other panels and suggest a giddy sense of vertigo, anxiety and disruption. Presumably, Farley is attempting to convey the effect of the collision of place and non-place, the wild natural world and the warped built world in the inner consciousness of a human subject – oftentimes, himself.

That earlier work was the necessary prequel to the *Double Vision* works. Only there he isolated nature in single panels and meaningfully juxtaposed it with the built environment. His purpose in his viewers compare the two is to discover the folds that, imperceptible at first like spider's silk, exist between one image and another, between the viewer and the landscape, between one eye and its Other.

Farley at once narrows and deepens this thematic in the new work. He now encourages a close reading for structural and spatial disparities between any two panels that at first read as being virtually identical. Whereas contrasts and similarities emerged in terms of shapes and volumes between different panels in the earlier work, now we look to disparity and cropping and non-repeated motifs or foreshortened ones. However, what remains constant throughout the series is the wholesale absence of unruly nature in the built environment, generally speaking, and of architectural tropes in the nature panels.

In Farley's still earlier *Irradiations* series of black and white photographs and video installation, he came closer to naming the non-place and the warped space

in their very specificity and in a far more graphic manner. The photographer appears within the photographic space clothed in a curious red and white checkerboard outfit – a Hasmat uniform. In this costume, he photographs himself in a true non-place—the so-called *Diefenbunker*. This structure, a truly warped space of late Modernity, was once a nuclear shelter for Canadian political leaders and support staff. The artificial light and sense of confinement bring back awkward memories of countless school drills in underground shelters during the Cold War, when the fear of Russian missiles raining down from above was at its zenith. Farley’s work triggers nostalgia and *frisson* in exploiting the palpable tensions between place and non-place, nature and culture, innocuous space and warped space.

What is strikingly missing – but no stray, happenstance lacuna this – is any indication that any of the Farley territories in question are meaningfully *occupied*. As various critics have noted, there are no untidy remnants of human passage, no detritus left by inhabitation like mute ciphers of the human fact. Herein, one presumes, only the pushbutton order rules supreme. In his *Irradiations* forays, Farley inserts himself in a checkered biohazard suit as though to suggest a given non-place is toxic and the idea is to remain uncontaminated by the site in question. While Lynne Cohen’s empty places speak eloquently of absent presences, enigmatic Others who hide in plain sight (I mean, of course, inside her viewers’ consciousnesses), Farley plays a Houdini-like sleight-of-hand magic which brings the viewer into close contact not only with the *aporiae* that crop up in observation, but the binary phenomena of architectural warped space and non-place in the tense of Supermodernity.

The writings of Augé, former Director of Studies at the Ecole des hautes études en sciences sociales in Paris, and an important French anthropologist, are important for identifying the nomenclature of non-place. Augé brilliantly assays the topological and psychological particularities of site, both local and exotic, which are at one and the same time everywhere and nowhere today. (8)

In his aforementioned book, he argues that Supermodernity is a new tense that effectively generates non-places like locusts in the midst of a whirlwind as the natural environment falls away in the wake of brick, mortar and stainless steel. The principal trope of supermodernity is *excess*, after all, and this new tense is created through the logic of sheer excess. This thinker defines non-places as possessing no identity or identifiable history. Non-places are purely transient. Augé identifies three species of accelerated transformation. In terms of temporality, he specifies an “acceleration of history” which ineluctably brings on an overabundance of events. (9) He identifies a palpable surplus in the realm of space: “the excess of space is correlative with the shrinking of the planet” (10) which brings on spatial overabundance. Finally, he identifies a specific figure of excess, as “the figure of the ego, the individual”. (11) The photographic works of Denis Farley imply all three orders of transformation, and their unavoidable consequences.

Farley photographs non-places with the viewer as reference pole and subject so his work is more illustrative, metaphorically speaking, of the effect of non-places on human agents. After all, his work is all about the experience of the experiencer. Yet we find the reverse may be true – he creates the living interface, as it were, between the lived and the purely liminal. In some earlier work, he juxtaposed the non-place with the natural landscape, with arresting glyphs of nature itself, as if to show through counterpoint the alienation of humans in the whirligig that is the built world. But one might further suggest that it is the very tense of Supermodernity itself – with all its excesses, all its constraints, all its acceleration—which we inhabit today that makes the works under consideration so topical and so pressing in presentation and implication.

Farley, like Lynne Cohen, might well be called a documentary photographer of non-place and warped space alike. (12) Call Cohen an ethnologist of the near and Farley an ethnologist of the far, if you will. Or vice versa. Indeed, one might hazard that Cohen and Farley offer a dialogical critique that dovetails with Augé's negative definition of the non-place: "If a place can be defined as relational, historical and concerned with identity, then a space which cannot be defined as relational, or historical, or concerned with identity will be a non-place." (13) In Cohen's work, the sheer wealth of such non-places shows that Supermodernity accelerates their proliferation just as Farley shows that the human being is always displaced by or at odds within them, and includes the viewer in that equation.

Augé holds that the word 'non-place' for him "designates two complementary but distinct realities: spaces formed in relation to certain ends (transport, transit, commerce, leisure), and the relations that individuals have with these spaces." (14) Farley documents both the former and the latter, and yet the former, architecturally speaking, is his own creative Ground Zero.

As some commentators pointed out, the real strength of Vidler's work lies in its overall engagement with recent developments with the hopes of reaching new understandings and definitions of "space." *Warped Space* is not atropaic, after all – it is itself, of course, profoundly *diplopiac* – it is a phenomenon of the built world that impacts directly, by virtue of urban and spatial pathologies, Farley explores anxious visions of the modern subject caught in spatial systems beyond its control as it attempts to make representational and architectural sense of its predicament.

If we see that there is, in Farley's recent work, the kind of "warping" Vidler speaks of so eloquently, we can also see his passionate search for this truth, and we recognize that it has informed and driven his whole body work over the course of the last quarter century.

While Vidler is correct in his assertion that:

"While it is true that the gamut of representational techniques has apparently increased, it is also the case that little has changed in the framing of space itself

over the modern period. Perspective is still the rule in virtual reality environments; objects are still conceived and represented within all the three-dimensional conventions of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century practice.” (15)

We find that, in fact, Farley the practicing artist identifies radical spatial paradigms through the use of techniques that, while ancient, have lost nothing of their usefulness in identifying ways and means that are relevant, applicable and understandable, given our current conditions, to understanding the underlying realities of warped space and non-place. Ways and means that move photography forward into the future. Farley’s work opens the parentheses on the spatial, architectural, social, and cultural issues that preoccupy Vidler, who helpfully identifies for us the changing role and perceptions of modern space. In his words:

“from the late nineteenth century to the present ... space [was considered] a projection of the subject, and thus as a harbinger of and repository of all the neuroses and phobias of that subject. Space in this ascription, is not empty, but full of disturbing objects and forms, among which the forms of architecture and the city take their place.” (16)

Contemporary lived space is thus, at least insofar as architecture is concerned, somehow inimical, worthy of our fear and respect. If space becomes something to be avoided, in contrast with the stability of place, well, non-place is just as destabilizing a phenomenon, temporally speaking, as the warped spaces that inform it, and is as potent a prey for our phobias and as a worthy a depository for our angst.

Taking up Gilles Deleuze’s development of a formal theme for contemporary architects later in his book, Vidler discusses the notion of the fold or *pli* and seems to be naming an inhering characteristic of Farley’s work. (17) When we read and re-read the lateral narrative of images, the division between discrete panels reads as a folded space. Of course, the fold in Farley’s work privileges the interiority of the image – and that of the optic itself, which works relentlessly to solve lateral asymmetry.

In opposition to a more orthodox reading, Vidler offers the following:

“No literal interpretation of ‘folding’ or of material folds, whether of fabric, facade, or space, can perform the Deleuzian/Leibnizian function; it would not be so much a question of illustrating complex folds, with all the geometric rigor of computer-generated images, as it would be of discovering the equivalent ‘form’ that might join the two floors of the material and immaterial. Deleuze is clear on this: our monads are no longer closed interiors that contain the entire world: they are opened up, prised open “as if by a pair of pliers”. (18)

Similarly, in Farley’s split-screen spatial images of the built world, the fold is paramount, even if it is only suggested in the gaps between images, and the disparities obtaining between them. His work is not *monological*, nor *monadological*, but profoundly, *nomadological* – always on the move. In this

sense, his work is kindred in spirit to that of his compatriot Isabelle Hayeur, that brilliant nomadic heroine of contemporary photographic practice.

The fold in a Farley photowork is a well-nigh seamless thing. If the eye seems to bridge it with alacrity, it is only because it folds into itself our perception of the work, affording a subterranean passage or at least *a sub rosa* leap from image to image that implies another kind of passage altogether – that of initiation. Self-knowledge is the prize at rainbow’s end. So if the fold exists here in a purely liminal space that underscores, directs and subsumes our perceptual ploys and maneuvers as we try and come to terms with his work, wrestling it into stasis and simultaneity, it also allows for an ongoing trans-referential dialectic between the optic and the images it perceives -- and that liminal space between them understood as a phenomenal, hermeneutic hasp or hinge. Somewhere between the material – what is represented there—and the immaterial – I mean, the innermost workings of vision itself, which transcend representation even as they reify it, lies an inner truth that Farley has always been in hot pursuit of over the long years. He wants to prise open the viewer’s optic like a proverbial oyster shell, wresting free its pearls of empirical truth, and testing it in the context of his “double visions.” Those “visions” are defined by the binary code of warped space and non-place, and his effort has as its erstwhile goal our ‘cultured ‘ but not ‘cultivated’ seeing without impediment in the light, as it were, of a first day.

Denis Farley wants to turn seeing inside out, in a very Deleuzian spirit, and put paid to the condition of eyes wide shut.

In his photoworks of urban spaces, these latter-day anaglyphs that speak to us so powerfully of our own anxieties and displacement in the built world, Farley offers us accordion fold -like vistas that bring warped space powerfully into play and site it in the foreground of the myriad “non-places” of Supermodernity. Here is a brave dream of broken symmetry for a world gone mad, in a perpetual double bind, as it were, but not yet blind.

If non-place exists in uneasy contradistinction to place, it does so because it exists within the parentheses of a forced solitude. Non-places putatively flourish behind locked doors, in confined spaces accessible only to those who know the right combinations, possess keys in the form of coded credit and ID cards, and journey through them or work inside them (think of Winterbottom’s brilliant film *Code 46*). But many do, nowadays. The nearly unassimilable truth is that, today, they are found to be widespread—and spreading like wildfire across the full array of the Social where they are the perfect breeding ground for Vidler’s negative (and positive) paradigms of warped space. They speak, above all, to exploding our solipsism. They ignite a fuse that leads not to a reciprocal estrangement from the self, in effect, but lead us into the open space beyond all division. In this sense, they illustrate, allow and even induce a sense of profound displacement.

Farley reminds us of our continuing confinement in this accelerating tense of Supermodernity. His work alerts us to the fact that we are pinioned within an

increasingly in-folded spatial matrix. The palpable alienation that non-place induces in us, even as it continues to fascinate and to facilitate the ever-widening and co-extensive phenomenon of warped space, is cause for reflection. Warped space and non-place as pervasive phenomena in Supermodernity come back to haunt and inform us as a result of Denis Farley's crisp, deft, radiant and overwhelmingly topical investigations into the condition of our being here; of being, that is, in a world that is always a site for sore eyes.

James D. Campbell
Montreal, March 18, 2008

Certain portions of the preceding essay have been excerpted from the author's article in CV. Reproduced by kind permission of CV.

Endnotes

1. See Wikipedia, diplopia entry, online text..
2. G. W. Leibniz, letter to Jacob Thomasins, cited in Anthony Vidier, *Warped Space: Art, Architecture and Anxiety in Modern Culture* (Cambridge. MIT Press, 2001), p. 81
3. Charles Wheatstone, June 1838, address to the Royal Scottish Society of Arts, online text, stereoscopy.com FAQ
4. Marc Augé, *Non Places – Introduction to an Anthropology of Supermodernity* (London:Verso 1995)
5. Anthony Vidier, *Warped Space*, p, 1.
6. Ibid, p. 11.
7. See Vidler, with Jeffrey Eugenides, and Chistopher Chang, *James Casebere* (Charta, 2001)
8. Augé, *Non Places*, p. 26.
9. Augé, p. 31.
10. Augé, p. 36.
11. Ibid.
12. See Lynne Cohen,
13. Augé, pp. 77-78.
14. Augé, p. 94.
15. Vidler, op. cit.
16. Ibid.,
17. Ibid., p. 219
18. Ibid., pp 232-33.

