disait-il, responsable de la beauté des œuvres parce qu’il a un rapport intime et privilégié à l’artiste.

Il ressort donc de ces considérations que sans la religion, l’art ne pourrait arriver à présenter un véritable sentiment « moral ». La culture qui fait en sorte de vivifier les sentiments moraux est donc elle aussi religion. Voilà la raison pour laquelle Schleiermacher affirme dans son introduction au Brouillon que toutes les théories de l’art doivent procéder de l’éthique. Ajoutons que si le sentiment présenté par l’art doit éveiller le sentiment d’autrui, c’est qu’il devra contenir en lui le lien très étroit partagé par tous les êtres constituant la communauté entre l’univers et l’individu. L’art est ainsi rattaché immédiatement à l’éthique puisque le premier vise à éduquer et à faire progresser l’individu vers la beauté (beauté du sentiment individuel) « formée » et construite par la morale et devenue commune à tous; c’est-à-dire la beauté produite, présentée et reconnue par chacun. L’éthique philosophique de Schleiermacher refuse ainsi de se laisser entraîner dans un travail de prescription; en cela elle s’oppose aux éthiques de Kant et de Fichte qui l’ont précédée. Elle cherche, en effet, à démontrer la moralité qui habite les formes d’organisations humaines dont l’art, tout comme la religion, l’Église et l’État, compte au nombre des plus brillantes.

MORGAN GAULIN, Université de Montréal

Rhetorics of Surveillance from Bentham to Big Brother
THOMAS Y. LEVIN, URSULA FROHNE, AND PETER WEIBEL, Editors

This volume was published on the occasion of a major exhibit of the same title that took place at the Zentrum für Kunst und Medientechnologie (ZKM) / Center for Art and Media in Karlsruhe, Germany from October, 2001 to February, 2002. Both projects look at surveillance strategies and their political consequences for civil society. Curated by Thomas Levin, the exhibition’s website (http://ctrlspace.zkm.de/e/) provides reams of additional material on the artists as well as an interview (in German) with the curator.

The book/exhibit aims to explore the entire range of the “Rhetorics of Surveillance from Bentham to Big Brother,” “i.e., from the paradigmatic notion of controlled space articulated in the architectural model of the panopticon to the new episteme of control in state of the art dataveillance invoked by the reference to the ‘ctrl’ and space-bar keys of the
computer interface.” The Foucauldian concern with power is obvious, but the main focus is the Deleuzian one of the surveillant control that arises out of the new information technologies of the twenty-first century: “open systems of control no longer centralized around single authorities, but rather functioning according to a multitude of corporate interests in a global network of information flows” (11). Levin, in the “Curatorial Statement,” says that the exhibition took its cue from the central role played by the architectural model in the genealogy of surveillance, and concentrates therefore on “the complex relationships between design and power, between representation and subjectivity, between archives and oppression” (12).

This is a large and attractive book: 8 1/2 x 11, with cloth binding, a slick textbook cover, glossy paper, and many color images in its 665 pages. It includes seventy-nine artists and twenty-eight essayists, including Foucault, Virilio, Zizek, Deleuze, Baudrillard, Robert Darnton, Steve Mann, Bruce Nauman, Dan Graham, Peter Weibel (note the NASCAD connection), Rem Koolhaas, Julia Scher, Warhol, Lennon/Ono, Sophie Calle, and Harun Farocki.

The editors divide the work thematically into eight sections: “Phenomenologies of Surveillance,” “Surveillance and Punishment,” “Politics of Observation,” “Surveillant Pleasures,” “Controlled Space,” “Tracking Systems,” “Control, Surveillance, and Everyday Life,” and “Recastings: Surveillant Subversions.” Each section begins with several essays which are then followed by the “Projects” or artworks. Some essays appear to be written specially for this volume, while others were seemingly chosen for their relevance. The historical movement throughout is from sovereign society (taking a cut of production and condemning to death—Astrit Schmidt-Burckhardt, “The All-See: God’s Eye as Proto-Surveillance”) to disciplinary society (organizing both production and life—Michel Foucault, “The Eye of Power: A Conversation with Jean-Pierre Barou and Michelle Perrot”), to control society (metaproduction: organizing organization—Deleuze’s “Postscript on Control Societies”).

The text “rhizomatically” (in Deleuzian terms) reflects this historical movement. Throughout, the anxiety about time, which characterized sovereign society, continuously interacts with an anxiety about space characteristic of disciplinary society, which, in its eternally recurrent turn, interacts with a “future perfect” anxiety about time that is characteristic of control (see Winifried Pauliet, “Video Surveillance and Postmodern Subjects: The Effects of the Photographesomenon—An Image Form in the ‘Futur antérieur’”). Indeed, this book is as much about time as it is about space. Trying to understand how people let themselves be run by pleasure requires providing a vocabulary for describing the proleptic
structure of panoptic control. The philosophy of time is thus the key to understanding how Big Brother changed from an icon of totalitarianism to the symbol of panoptic science.

It is not all doom and gloom: the third section (Weibel, Zizek, Frohne, Brandon Joseph on Warhol) is, after all, devoted to pleasure, while section eight deals with subversion (Thomas Keenan, Levin on “real time” in cinema, Tom Holert on George Michael, cyborg Steve Mann on seditious tactics). The overall impression, however, is negative. Essays like those found in section six, ”Tracking Systems“ (Lev Manovich and Mackenzie Werk on visual vectors of power), and section four, “Politics of Observation” (Duncan Campbell on global surveillance), seem to carry more weight than the odd light moment from Mann or the dizzying rhetoric of Virilio. Even the dark irony of Robert Darnton on the Stasi files or the fascinating brilliance of Baudrillard and Zizek on “reality” T.V. tends to be somewhat depressing.

The art provides some relief, but the criteria for inclusion are not specified. The book/exhibit’s genesis is given, rather confusedly, in the opening “Editorial,” but there is much left unsaid. Both the book and exhibit are connected to the annual international media/art award given jointly by the ZKM and the Sudwestrundfunk broadcasting network (SWR) in Germany. Weibel, chair and CEO of the ZKM, chose as the theme of the 2001 awards and concurrent exhibition and, at the suggestion of Ursula Frohne, invited Levin to curate the show. Unfortunately, we are told nothing about the international media/art award itself—who won, how it is organized, or even what it is—nor are we told exactly how the book/exhibit is connected to it.

For the record, the international media/art award is a competition that takes place yearly on both television and in the ZKM. Each year the chair of the ZKM chooses a theme and puts out a call for artists’ submissions in video and interactive media. Fifty pieces are chosen and SWR’s program planners organize a coordinated thematic focus by scheduling program segments, movies, and interviews relevant to the theme for television and radio broadcast. Other broadcast partners are also involved: Swiss TV (SF DRS), ARTE, and RTV Slovenia. Parallel to this, the ZKM presents exhibitions and lecture series dealing with the theme of the year. From the fifty finalists, an international jury of experts chooses the winners, usually four in all: two main prizes, a special award, and a non-monetary viewer’s award.

How any of this is related to the 2001 project, however, is left unexplained. It is clear that not all the seventy-nine artists included in the book/exhibit entered the competition, and not all of those listed on the
award's website as among the top fifty contestants for 2001 are included, most notably Istvan Kantor.

Despite these problems, the material contained here is still first-rate. The book is to be highly recommended as much for its visual appeal as for its value as an introduction to contemporary visual politics.

DARREN HYNES, Memorial University

**Bodies of Meaning: Studies on Language, Labor, and Liberation**
DAVID McNALLY

Language has been the paradigm for the human sciences for a sufficient time now that critiques of the linguistic or discursive turn have started to weigh in. This is one such critique. When a certain activity—be it language, labor, education, whatever—stands as the paradigm for knowledge of human activity, there are at least two interrelated issues that require some degree of separation: how is language itself understood, and what is clarified, and what obscured, by language standing paradigmatically for human activity outright? McNally's intentions address both these questions, though the emphasis is on the first. His main issue is to develop a materialist theory of language. He describes his project as "thinking about language through the body. ... Any attempt to understand language in abstraction from bodies and their histories can only produce an impoverished knowledge" (10).

The touchstone of materialism here is neither technology (which would yield an orthodox Marxist technological determinism) nor physical science (which would yield an equally orthodox Marxist scientism), but the human body. This brings his project close to phenomenological Marxism and, more specifically, to Merleau-Ponty due to the importance of the gesture, though this connection is not followed up at all. Rather, McNally rests his concept of language on interpretations of Voloshinov-Bakhtin and Walter Benjamin. However, the constructive attempt at a materialist theory of language pales beside what seems to be the main concern of this work: to criticize what he calls the "new idealism" of the "postmodern fetish of language" in which "mind is de-materialized, while the body is de-subjectivized, reduced to a mere thing" (2, 15, 5).

These manifold concerns rather overburden the work. It rushes through five chapters, including a critique of postmodernism, linguistic theory from Saussure to Derrida, attempts at a positive connection to