

ARCHITECTURE, TERRORISM, AND ENLIGHTENMENT

AN E-MAIL

CONVERSATION BETWEEN

KATHRIN MEYER (NEW YORK) AND

ANDREAS BUNTE (BERLIN)

KATHRIN (June 20, 2008): I watched your film *Loboda* and listened to the sound piece *His Living Voice* over and over again and marveled at the mysteriousness of the two works. If I remember correctly, you exhibited them in a hut-like setting along with maps. Can you say something about the background of these two works?

ANDREAS (June 23): Both pieces are part of the installation *May the Circle Remain Unbroken*, which—as you mentioned—also consists of a series of altered maps and an altered print. All these elements are centered around issues connected to back-to-nature movements, like self-sustainment, anarchic freedom, self-awareness, and a fundamental criticism of industrial society. *Loboda* was, somehow, the starting point for this installation. The film portrays a solitary hut from different angles which I found during a holiday in Poland in 2005. It had something of the ideal place out in the country about it, beautiful, romantic, and calm, but there was also something disturbing. It was as if you could imagine that something really bad might have happened in there. There was no way to have a proper look at the inside, just a peek through a tiny slot between the window shutters that didn't really reveal anything. So the film somehow reflects this ambivalence. It can be seen as an amateur holiday film, a documentation of some sort of crime scene or of a historical place. *His Living Voice* is like an independent sound track, not only for the film but also for the installation as a whole. It consists of a transistor radio on a stand transmitting a fake radio broadcast that is something in between a ghostly voice and a pirate radio station with very bad

reception. Occasionally you can understand fragments of what seems to be an endless monologue about aristocracy, nature, freedom, the genius, and the genius' relation to those who are not. I edited it from audio recordings of speeches by Frank Lloyd Wright to the community of apprentices and architects who worked and lived with him in his self-designed resort named Taliesin.

KATHRIN (June 25): The Lloyd speeches are interesting! He does not speak about architecture here—or at least not in the excerpts you chose—but about the uncommon man, about an aristocratic individual who subscribes to an idea and the meaning for American society. Here is an excerpt:

“Liberal conditions will grow the American aristocrat because the world cannot live without aristocracy. The world cannot live without distinctions, superiorities, and inferiorities. They are bound to occur because they are planted there in nature. All nature seems to be a race for the superior, for the excellent, for the finer specimen of the thing whatever it may be. And we cannot escape it in civilization. [. . .] Never have I thought of an educated man as a cultured man, a cultured human being. Well now, Thomas Jefferson regarded him as such. That was our American aristocrat: the man cultured by this ideal of freedom and by the growth of his own conscience to become not a yes man, not a committee meeting mind, but a single man, as Emerson described him. A single man. A man who could stay put on an idea that he had of his own and believe in it and work with it and for it. [. . .] So it occurs to me that the best way to describe the uncommon man, in the sense that I am using the term, is the man who can fall in love with an idea, the man who can subscribe to an idea and who realizes the nature of an idea.”

Not long ago I read the novel *The Fountainhead*, whose protagonist Howard Roark is an architect who is molded in exactly the same sense of the “uncommon man,” and it is said that Frank Lloyd Wright was the model for this character, though both he and the author denied it. In any event, the Lloyd quote also made me think of the book because architecture serves in it as an image of the corruption of society and as a background in order to illustrate the battle of aesthetic ideals against the common, the accepted, and the safe. Architecture is much more than a profession here—instead, it is employed as a symptom for the state of a society.

Architecture is a recurrent motif or theme in your works as is the fact that there are always certain historical or sometimes fictional personalities who stand in the background. Here Frank Lloyd Wright and your press text also mentions H. D. Thoreau and the Unabomber. I guess I have several questions in mind. Here is the first one: Were you already thinking of Wright, *Walden*, and the Unabomber when you shot the film of the hut? Did the collaged and altered maps already exist, or did they take shape during the research?

ANDREAS (June 26): I didn't have any of that in mind when I was filming the hut in Poland. That all came up later when I was back in Berlin and started to do research on huts and things connected to them. I found that the ambivalence of the Polish hut was actually mirrored by historical events and figures. H. D. Thoreau and Ted Kaczynski (the Unabomber) were, in this respect, the most extreme personifications of this ambivalence. But besides all the differences, there was a strange kind of symmetry between these two, a kind of common starting point that somehow turned into radically different stories. The idea to use maps resulted from one of the similarities between Thoreau and Kaczynski. Both had drawn maps of the environment around their huts—in some regards, they made accounts of a more or less uncharted territory. That brought up the whole issue of cartography and of controlling the territories which it incorporates. So I decided to alter maps into some kind of weird manifesto for a fictional dropout The whole piece pretty much shaped itself during the process of research. The recordings of Wright's voice, however, I had discovered some time earlier on, and while I was reading *Walden* and the manifesto of the Unabomber, it appeared to me that, in his morning speeches, Wright had actually framed an intellectual perspective that probably both Thoreau and Kaczynski would have drawn upon. Wright was looking at crucial questions such as those surrounding power, the importance of personal experiences or beliefs, democracy, etc., with an intellectual radicalism but from the demilitarized field of art/architecture. He would never have gone as far as Kaczynski, but it's interesting that you brought up *The Fountainhead*, because I think if you were to merge Wright with Kaczynski, the result could be Howard Roark.

KATHRIN (June 27): Before we go on with that thought, could you speak a little bit about your practice? On a pragmatic level, I mean. How do you develop your projects, what steps do you take, and how is the final outcome conceived?

ANDREAS (June 28): Well, actually the process is quite intuitive and differs from piece to piece. With the hut in *May the Circle Remain Unbroken*, the path was already pretty laid out, because I had the film *Loboda*, which was a strong anchor. But typically in the beginning things are much more blurred. The beginning of my research is usually very broad and erratic and doesn't follow a concrete path. It's not like having one thing in mind. It's more like a collection of things I'm interested in—filming techniques, buildings, theories, people, etc. Often parts of this collection are leftovers from previous pieces, things that didn't make it into that piece. It's kind of a constant recycling and mixing of such fragments with stuff I recently found in newspapers, archives, on the Internet . . . it takes a couple of months, though, to sort things out, to organize this pool of material toward a possible subject for a piece. During that time I would constantly cut things out, add something new, reconnect the chopped off stuff in order to find out what belongs where and how or if these things can be combined. It's quite similar to editing or making collages. It's not an entirely rational or intellectual process, and I feel that I don't have complete control over it. It's more as if I have to create a situation where things can fall into place—it's very much dependent on coincidences and on me spending enough time with the material. When I start filming, the piece usually has a quite precise outline and structure, even though I do not necessarily know every detail. The course of filming can take several weeks to months, and during that period I often continue to gather material. For me, there is no clear-cut line between research and production, especially when I work on installations, as they offer more possibilities to distribute content.

KATHRIN (June 29): The reason why I brought up *The Fountainhead* and architecture before was also because I noticed that architecture plays a role in one way or another in most of the works that you've made to date. Be it the hut as the smallest unit of a living space in *Loboda*, research on Étienne-Louis Boullée, or the design of the exhibition set-up. All this gathered material seems, and you just described that process, to enter into the works to some extent. But, more specifically, what role does architecture play for and in your works? Is it a background or a starting point or something that is a constant aspect in your thinking? With this question I am thinking of *Die letzten Tage der Gegenwart* [The Last Days of the Present], an installation that comprises two 16 mm films and several collages and in which one of the films consists entirely of views of different buildings and monuments, *O.T. (Architekturfilm)* [Untitled (Architecture Film)].

ANDREAS (July 2): Architecture definitely plays an important role, and it is often a starting point for my research. But it is not necessarily a particular building that occupies the center. Architecture can also provide a perspective onto something else. You mentioned the installation *Die letzten Tage der Gegenwart*. In this installation I used architecture as the angle of deflection for my approach toward German terrorism of the 1970s. The core was the image of the apartment as an “étui for men,” a phrase that Walter Benjamin uses in his writings on Charles Baudelaire in order to characterize the bourgeois apartment as something that envelops the inhabitant and produces a certain pressure toward the inside. For *Die letzten Tage der Gegenwart* I radicalized this phrase in the sense that a space might also shape the way one thinks. I was interested in the normative power of architecture and how this is integrated into every detail of architecture, an architecture that accommodated the German “Spießler” [petty bourgeois] as well as the terrorists who were in hiding. The mental counterpart to this space is the conspiratorial perspective. For the terrorists, it allowed them to misuse architectural surfaces as hideouts, in reverse, it demanded from police officers that they read the interiors of an apartment in a completely different way. Once applied, this changes the meaning of every detail—every scissor suddenly becomes a document of the terrorists’ ideology, and of course, this works both ways. For the terrorists, every building outside of the conspiratorial apartment turns into a symbol for the false ideology of the “pig-system.”

KATHRIN (July 4): This ambivalence comes across really well in both films, especially in *O.T. (Wohnung)* [Untitled (Apartment)]. It is silent and consists of shots of several set-ups of different props in an apartment including a suitcase, instruments to falsify documents, and a table with other diverse objects. This film was shot in an apartment complex from the 1960s in West Berlin, in Gropius-Stadt. Gropius-Stadt is a social housing project that embodies all the negative aspects of these projects and was a very problematic district for a long time—the architecture there is quite horrible, actually. It’s all gray and fortress-like, and the houses seem to be containers for people but not spaces to live in. So after working with figures that leave society, that turn toward nature with *May the Circle Remain Unbroken*, you went on to look at figures who turned their backs on society but tried to violently alter and continued to live—though undercover—in the circumstances they hated. Was that a logical continuation of the first project? Did you come across material then that you used for the installation *Die letzten Tage der Gegenwart*?

Or was the project a reaction of some sort to the RAF exhibition that was at Kunst-Werke in Berlin in 2004? Or was it simply the outcome of a fascination with the RAF?

ANDREAS (July 6): Of course, in a lot of regards, *Die letzten Tage der Gegenwart* is a logical continuation of *May the Circle Remain Unbroken*, but it was not conceived as a follow-up. One piece reflects the other like a distorted mirror, and there are various overlaps, like the theme of architecture, the conflict between the individual and society. Through the figure of the Unabomber there is also an overlap in the subject of terrorism, but my approach toward the RAF was not so much based on these overlaps or in regard to *May the Circle Remain Unbroken*. My interest in German terrorism from the 1970s had its starting point in a book by Margrit Schiller, an ex-terrorist from the first RAF generation. I had read this book some time ago and, while I was thinking about the next piece, it suddenly came back to my mind. The really stunning thing about this very honest and merciless account of her time in the RAF was how utterly banal and normal her daily life as one of the most wanted terrorists had been, and how absolutely clueless, in a political sense, she had been. Her approach to terrorism was motivated by the hope for a deeper meaning in life and the solidarity of a group rather than radical political convictions. The reality of the underground for her, however, was conditioned by boredom, isolation, and fear, and only a few rather random actions. What I became interested in was the fact that even though the terrorists had formulated the most radical denial of so-called normality, they still couldn’t fully suspend or escape the normative power it yielded over their lives, and that was only partly because of camouflage reasons.

KATHRIN (July 11): The terrorism thread is really interesting—especially since your film is not about terrorism as such. It doesn’t show any terrorists, or look for reasons, but instead, it looks at terrorism as one element in a picture that is informed by thoughts about the myth and reality of the RAF, about terrorism and banality cohabitating, and by, again, architecture and its readings from a social standpoint, as a sign and a symbol. This made me think of a conversation we once had about Walter Benjamin and his *Passagen-Werk* [*Arcades Project*], specifically about his method of gathering material around one term, which then becomes one point in a network of relations. Your films work in a similar way, I think: They are the visible manifestation of a chain of related terms and concepts, and this is only too understandable, since they are the filtered outcome of a large collection of images, texts and

thoughts gathered throughout the research process. For instance, the sequences of buildings and the views of the apartment in the two 16 mm films from *Die letzten Tage der Gegenwart* don't function as documentary material. Nor do the images and texts that make up the collages. Instead, they trigger questions, for example, regarding the significance of buildings as places to hide, as manifestations of power or utopian ideas, and the ways to read these buildings as such. A lot of the research also enters into the collages you usually exhibit with your films—we talked previously about the maps in which this happens, and in *Die letzten Tage der Gegenwart*, there are collages that comprise text, messages about society, and the people. They resemble generic slogans but at the same time reference encoded messages that were passed on to the RAF terrorists while they were in prison. I also thought about your decision to shoot in 16 mm and whether your works are nostalgic; nostalgic in the sense that they look back very comfortably, with a discomfort for the present. How do you see your works in respect to nostalgia, the present, and progressiveness? (Here I am thinking specifically of *La Fée Electricité*, an anthological film about the battle between light and darkness and the time surrounding the invention of electricity.)

ANDREAS (July 14): I like how you said that my pieces are visible manifestations, the filtered outcome of a research process At the time of our conversation about Benjamin and the *Passagen-Werk*, I think I was intrigued, and still am, by the fact that he seemed to have no restrictions or hierarchies for the aspects of a subject that he looked at and gathered material on. I thought about your question regarding nostalgia over the weekend, and I think it's quite interesting that you brought this up. There are obviously several concerns connected with 16 mm and its being a so-called "old" technology, which I think I cannot really say anything about, as this involves other people's opinions on a certain technology, which is totally out of my hands. Every method of production has its benefits and each of them has a certain influence on the final result, and I like to think of them as equal possibilities. When I first came to Berlin I worked on a lot of commercial film productions to earn money. This is probably the best realm to observe how strongly production methods influence the final outcome. But the smallest part in this net of influences (client/agency/production company . . .) is probably the camera system you are choosing. My turn towards 16 mm was based on the experiences I had during these years, with various available formats. The most important experience during this time was digital editing, which offers

endless flexibility in how you deal with recorded data. It took me a while to discover that this was actually not the way for me, as it limited my practice to the realm of the screen instead of expanding it. Of course, there were all kinds of possibilities to experiment with (e.g., with the connection of sound and images), but in the end I felt that this was producing endless variations, but not results. I was actually looking for a way to bypass this process, to make things simpler, which I achieved by turning to a process of filming with more restrictions (it was obviously more than once that I cursed myself for that). So for me, starting to work with 16 mm was a re-reading of the possibilities of analogue production from the digital realm, and this is actually very similar to the way I see the conceptual side of my work.

You mentioned *La Fée Electricité*, which is a faked, essentially non-chronological anthology of the nineteenth-century that focuses on events and figures connected to the advent of electric light, which, at the time, began to drastically change life. The film uses the trustworthy format of a chronicle and borrows its look from late nineteenth century film, but the perspective on the manipulated and made-up events, their selection as well as the combination of text and images, is fundamentally not nineteenth century. This perspective is interested in the ambiguity of the invention of the electric light and the various ways that people responded to it. There was everything from hysterical belief and optimism to hysterical fear and demonization, which was not only an unenlightened rejection of the new, as certain light sources actually caused injuries. Blindness is not one of the inventions of my chronicle, but a real side-effect of arc light, which was one of the first very powerful electric light sources. While I was working on this piece I was not so much driven by nostalgic feelings about gaslights, fireplaces, Paris, the good old times, but rather I was absolutely stunned that a theoretical concept, like *Die Dialektik der Aufklärung* [*Dialectic of Enlightenment* by Theodor W. Adorno and Max Horkheimer] mirrored itself in the history of the electric light. I was really intrigued by this reverberation . . .

KATHRIN (July 15): I like that you think about such things over the weekend! I also like the fact that you suffer, but endure, working with 16 mm—it's so worth it and, actually, *La Fée Electricité* would be something totally different in a digital format. Also, the whole point of electricity and light as a basis for film would come across from pretty far away, if at all. As it is, it is also a film about film itself, about the elementary technical disposition of the medium, and I would even say it's a bit of an homage. *La Fée Electricité*

is set up as a chronicle of the “event” of electric light but exists only through light and shows numerous varieties of light: candles, a fireplace, a chandelier, light bulbs, etc. You use the ability of the film material to catch and reflect all that light and it’s beautiful. As you say, the material and the characteristics of 16 mm play a big role. I also wanted to ask one thing about the conceptual side of your work that you mentioned in your last e-mail: You said you re-read the possibilities of analogue production from the digital realm and that this is similar to the conceptual side of your practice. Can you say a bit more about that?

ANDREAS (July 15): There is probably not so much more to it. For me the idea of re-reading is kind of connected to that of reconstruction, whereas the latter is more interested in historical correctness, which I find a bit restricting. My practice has a strong speculative element, even though it is heavily based on research and historical facts; it constantly crosses the border to fiction in some ways (I described that a bit earlier). So in a way, re-reading implies that one needs to look at things again from a somewhat unnatural or uncommon perspective: mapping the facts differently, or making odd connections. In opposition to the idea of reconstruction, this process is based on an intended deflection of the facts.

KATHRIN (July 16): Before I ask you about your latest film *Der Garten des M. Leretnac* [The Garden of M. Leretnac], I want to address modernism because it is so present at the moment, maybe even more so in Berlin than in New York at this time. I think of the works of Bernd Ribbeck, Claudia Wieser, David Maljkovich (at the 5th Berlin Biennial), Bojan Sarcevic, and Eva Berendes. There seems to be a common interest in working through modernist forms and their implications regarding models of society, the history of forms, technology, and the prefiguration of spaces. Going back to your works: *La Fée Electricité*, for instance, has animated titles comprised of a year (in numbers) and little moving mechanisms that are reminiscent of Duchamp’s rotoreliefs. The animations don’t have a practical function here, though they do play a number of roles: While functioning as an intertitle and showing the date, time passes, made visible through the moving forms. They evoke associations to the rotating film reel and eventually to the film’s subject, technical progress exemplified by electric light. As I understand it, your reference to Duchamp’s rotoreliefs as “image-machines” alludes to film as a machine-based image system as well as to modernism/modernity and their attributes. *Der Garten des M. Leretnac* is set in a park and brings (domesticated and planned) nature together with machines, combining technical dreams and garden

architecture (social visions). Here, all the questions are “built” into the material of the film and, again, it is a kind of homage or a comment on aspects of modernism—and on histories of ideas, on ideas becoming ideologies and/or fictions.

ANDREAS (July 17): The self-reflexive moment of *La Fée Electricité* that you mentioned earlier is quite important: from a materialist or minimalist point of view, the film is, in fact, a chronicle of light itself, of various light sources that have left an imprint on the material, all reanimated by the light of the projector. From the beginning I actually liked the idea that these two readings coexist and that they cannot be separated from each other. This double bind was something I wanted to follow in *Der Garten des M. Leretnac*, for which I researched old analogue trick techniques. I had already used single frame animations for the diagram plates and some other scenes in *La Fée Electricité*, but these remained separated from the rest of the footage that I shot in my studio or in technical museums, old houses, etc. The world of the flat geometric animations and the real scenes remained separated and were only connected by means of montage. In opposition to montage, one could call *Der Garten des M. Leretnac* a collage film. It consists entirely of tableaux vivants-type scenes in which graphic elements, little animated processes and landscape, have been collaged together. By means of multiple exposures and corresponding positive/negative masks, the images’ various elements were successively captured onto a single negative. The resulting footage is almost unedited in the film.

The piece draws on a number of ideas and phenomena in connection with machine fantasies of the nineteenth century, the landscape and sculpture park as *Gesamtkunstwerk* and the representation of these things in literature and painting. For me, two novels provided the starting point: one was by E. A. Poe, *The Domain of Arnheim*, and the other was by Raymond Roussel, *Locus Solus*. Both these narratives revolve around eccentric landscape gardens as manifestations of an ideal location, where the transformation of elemental nature into an overarching artwork has been a complete success. Whereas in Poe’s story, the connection to the machine as a tool for the perfection of the landscape is only implicit (the geometrized design of the vast garden described here could obviously not be achieved without the use of machines), it is explicit in Raymond Roussel’s. In *Locus Solus* the machine is the principle actor, while the landscape of the park is no more than the backdrop for its performance. The interesting thing about Roussel is that the machines have a double connotation. They are not only fictional

inventions that refer back to the genius of their equally fictional creator, Martial Canterel, but they also refer to Roussel's writing technique, which is based on formal language operations like sound associations and puns. This formal approach, and the restraints derived from it, determine the construction of the mechanics of *Locus Solus*, and they are probably as important as the story that it tells. The intertwining of the two layers turns the book into a kind of hybrid narrative, a story in which both the fiction and the process of its generation remain equally visible. With *Der Garten des M. Leretnac* I tried to achieve something similar. The dreamlike world presented in the film is a result of the analogue trick film techniques I used. The flaws, and the lack of precision that come with it, add to the already very artificial collage of three dimensional and two dimensional material. It's obvious that the resulting images are absolutely not the product of current state of the art visual effects techniques. The issue of artificiality gets further emphasized during the transitions between different scenes, where the filmic collages again and again break up into their constituent parts. In this process, the various exposure stages briefly take on an independent existence and create new, almost abstract, images.

KATHRIN (July 18): Right, but let's go back to modernism for a moment. Or maybe I actually mean modernity here. *Der Garten des M. Leretnac* and *La Fée Electricité* deal with technical fantasies and realities, *May the Circle Remain Unbroken* refers to dropouts, back-to-nature movements, and ideological implications that find a continuation in *Die letzten Tage der Gegenwart*, where architecture and its ability to predetermine space play a big role. It seems that modernity—understood as describing a social order that is conditioned by the striving for control over nature, for information, for looking into the future and not back into the past—and modernism, as the aesthetic messenger of modernity, do play a role in your works. Is it a conscious decision of yours to work with these moments in time, with sources and events that go back to some cracks, to points where modernity began to take shape?

ANDREAS (July 19): Well, modernism and modernity are very important topics for my work. I think of them almost as a kind of general framework. The cracks inherent in this very framework are probably the most interesting part, as they open it up to an indeterminate amount of uncertainty, which I find very important. But it is not that I particularly look for cracks in order to find my next subject. It's more like I maneuver in a certain terrain which makes me stumble upon them. In this context I

find it particularly interesting that even though film is completely intertwined with the history of modernism and modernity, it also bears the potential to serve as a tool to investigate these topics. I can look at modernity through the means of a modernist practice, so to speak. During my time at the art academy in Düsseldorf, my interest was very focused on modernism and how to continue that line through something like the post-modern. It was a very intense but internal perspective that was cultivated at the time. After I left the context of the academy, this idea gradually lost importance, and I was driven to a more distant position which brought the notion of modernity more into focus. It's intriguing that this was also the time when I became interested in film as a medium for my work. One can say that this is an obvious development, because film is the appropriate technology to look at modernity, but you can also argue that modernity came into focus because I chose film as a medium . . . It is an interesting quality of film, in particular, that it allows for the incorporation of such questions about the relationship between language and content. Looking at the works we've been talking about, one could ask, for instance, if a film like *La Fée Electricité* was entirely motivated by my desire to make a film about the advent of the electric light, or if this subject inevitably came up because light is an inherent subject to the medium of film. The answer of course would be a bit of a speculation, but I like the idea that there are topics that derive from the medium itself and that my work is, to a certain extent, driven or altered by them, that it is affected by a constant feedback between language and content. What I mean is, there is no neutral territory from which you can look at things. And given that, my choice of subjects is probably limited . . . ❏

This interview was originally conducted for North Drive Press #5. It has also been printed in: Andreas Bunte, May the Circle Remain Unbroken and Other Works With Film, Berlin: argobooks, 2009.

Films and texts mentioned in the interview:

Films by Andreas Bunte:

Loboda, 2005

16 mm, b/w, silent, 2:06 min

His Living Voice, 2005

sound piece, radio, CD-player, stand

150 x 50 x 26 cm

both part of the installation

May the Circle Remain Unbroken, 2005

16 mm film, maps, audio piece, wooden walls, etching

O.T. (Wohnung), 2006

[Untitled (Apartment)]

16 mm, b/w, silent, 6:40 min

O.T. (Architekturfilm), 2006

[Untitled (Architecture Film)]

16 mm, b/w, silent, 6:04 min

both part of the installation

Die letzten Tage der Gegenwart, 2006

[The Last Days of the Present]

two 16 mm films, wall elements, collages

La Fée Electricité, 2007

[The Fairy Electricity]

16 mm, b/w, silent, 12 min

Der Garten des M. Leretnac, 2008

[The Garden of M. Leretnac]

16 mm, b/w, sound (fragments of Charles Ives'

Universe Symphony, 1911–1928), 8:45 min

Texts (in order of appearance):

Ayn Rand, *The Fountainhead*, Indianapolis, IN, 1947.

Henry David Thoreau, *Walden; Or, Life in the Woods*,

Boston, MA, 1854.

Theodore Kaczynski (*The Unabomber*), "Industrial Society and its Failure" (also known as *The Unabomber Manifesto*)
The New York Times, 19 September, 1995.

Margrit Schiller, *Es war ein harter Kampf um meine Erinnerung. Ein Lebensbericht aus der RAF. Hamburg*, 1999.

Walter Benjamin, *Passagen-Werk*, (approx. 1926–1939),
Frankfurt/Main, 1983.

Theodor W. Adorno and Max Horkheimer, *Dialektik der Aufklärung. Philosophische Fragmente*. Amsterdam, 1947.

Edgar Allan Poe, *The Domain of Arnheim*, 1850. (First published in 1847, in the *Columbian Magazine*, under the title "The Landscape Garden", and republished later in revised form under the new title).

Raymond Roussel, *Locus Solus*, Paris, 1914.

