

Ruins, Bodies, and Other Palimpsests: Performative Memory in Francesc Torres' Installations

Mercè Picornell

In the last decade, contemporary ruins have awakened great interest in the different social and human sciences fields, broadening the very concept of the ruin and its meaning, both aesthetically and politically.¹ The wastelands on the outskirts of cities, as well as abandoned factories, hotels or public shelters, have become the motive of an inquiry that affects key dichotomies in the study of contemporary culture, such as those of memory and history, trauma and oblivion or nature and culture. When these new ruins are portrayed in the arts and literature, they force us to rethink the possibilities of converting the rubble and wastelands into an object of contemplation or the possibilities of beautifying processes of abandonment and degradation that often reflect complicated social circumstances. In this article, I aim to show how the artistic portrayal of dilapidated settings can have great political potential and contribute to defining what I refer to as a *performative memory*. To base my study on a specific case, I examine a number of installations by Catalan artist Francesc Torres (Barcelona, b. 1948), whose work currently enjoys widespread international prestige. Far from the classic theme of ruins as structures that are associated with the evocation of past times, I argue that the use of objects and the portrayal of fragments or silhouettes of human bodies within the framework of a ruin aesthetic enables Torres to transmit a complex and heterogeneous concept of memory, which could be qualified as

Mercè Picornell is is Lecturer of Comparative Literature and Catalan Studies at the Universitat de les Illes Balears. She has published essays on testimonial and ethnographic writing, experimental literature and catalan contemporary culture. She is the author of *Discursos testimonials en la literatura catalana recent* (2002), and *Continuïtats i desviacions. Debats crítics sobre la cultura catalana en el vèrtex 1960/1970* (2013) Her current research interests include the cultural context of experimental literature and the poetics and politics of modern ruins. As a member of the LiCETC (Contemporary Literature: Theoretical and Comparative Studies) research group she is co-author of *Transformacions: literatura i canvi sociocultural dels anys 70 ençà* (2010), *Literatura i cultura: aproximacions comparatistes* (2009), *Poètiques de ruptura* (2008) and *Textualime i subversió* (2007). For more information or contact, see: <http://www.uib.cat/depart/dfc/litecont/equipmercepicornell.html>

¹ For insight to the circumstances of the studies of ruins in the most recent decade, see Caitlin DeSilvey and Tim Edensor (2012): 463-483 or Julia Hell and Andreas Schönle (2010).

performative. In the installations that I will be analysing, memory cannot be subject to reification or fetishisation. Rather, it eludes univocal and teleological perspectives on the past, to redefine itself as performative in two different senses: as an equipped memory inhabited by lived experiences; and also by taking on meaning, as it inscribes itself in a present where it prepares people today for political action. In Torres' works, these two senses of performative memory are associated with the portrayal of the remains of bodies or of the marks left behind by people who are no longer there. This will enable me to classify some of his creations as 'in absentia' performances.

Torres' installations that incorporate the use of dilapidated materials offer a complex reflection on power and history, and specifically on the history of Spain in the 20th century, a scenario of ruptures and unclosed wounds: those of the Spanish Civil War, the Franco dictatorship and a democratic transition that is often described as "exemplary" yet which was built at the cost of the memory of the defeated and the victims of reprisals of the dictatorship. The presence of ruins in Torres' work has been underscored in by Antonio Monegal. For Monegal, the ruin is construed as the "tracks of history, the material memory of the event. And at the same time, a reminder of the fact that the future also devours the present" ("Acróstico" 26). In the extensive critical studies on the Catalan artist, many scholars have identified as a recurrent theme in his work a freestanding political commitment dissociated from the "grand narratives" and engaged in the reflection on the power and the fragility of the human being.² Without denying the validity of these readings, I wish to reposition some of Torres' works within the framework of the motif tied to ruin aesthetics. I understand the concept of *motif* as a set of recurrent conventions in the treatment of a theme, which provides authors and receivers with a context for understanding; in other words, it positions them in a place of common knowledge or at a shared point of encounter. That "common place" can have a political dimension: a dimension that opens up the opportunity to draw on the shared memories that shape the creation of a convention and convert them into a place to stage or *perform* the possibility for dialogue and understanding; making them a place "in common."

² For further insight to Torres' work, see anthologies such as *Da Capo* (2008), *La Cabeza del Dragón* (1991) and *Francesc Torres: Works from the Field. A Selection* (1982). For a more comprehensive and contextualised analysis of Torres' work than the one offered here, see John Hanhardt, "Francesc Torres: The Limits of Discourse" (1982), and "La Excavación de lo Real: El Arte Multi-media de Francesc Torres" (1991); Victoria Combalá, "Francesc Torres. Biografía, Biología, Historia" (1991); and Pilar Parcerisas, "'Memòria històrica' contra 'amnèsia col·lectiva'" (1991). Similarly, the study by McEvelley "Francesc Torres or the Man with Three Brains" (1993) is not as broad, though it offers a particularly deep analysis of the compositions of the installations and their effects on the receiver.

Framework: poetics of ruins and conceptual aesthetics

The discussion of the human being's fascination for ruins is a recurring motif in philosophical, artistic and literary discourses, whether such attraction is spurred by the evocation of a splendid past or by the vertigo of our awareness of the passage of time. It is also known that beyond the motif, it is actually never the ruin in itself that causes that magnetism; rather, it is the desire to ennoble the past from a specific present time that brings about the definition of a given object "as a ruin." Hence, for example, the decision of a given government to refurbish bombed buildings may be indicative of the wish to or not to have ruins. The decision not to restore the Saint Luke's Church in Liverpool or the Ministry of Defence of Yugoslavia in Belgrade is a strategic option that is not strictly based on the lack of the necessary economic resources. Converting them into public spaces, as is the case of the former example, or handing them over to the hands of private capital for subsequent economic profits, in the second example, involves another political decision on how a community interacts with its past and projects its existence into the future. The border between rubble and ruin, between debris and memorial, is by no means clear and gradually becomes blurrier the closer we draw in to contemporary ruins. The same occurs in Torres' work, where the debris and the rubble that are portrayed or incorporated into the installations respond to diverse degrees of recognition, which will make it difficult for me to opt for one term over another—rubble/ruin, debris/memorial—when it comes to their classification.

Ruins communicate precisely through what they are missing. As Davide Luglio has noted, they interact with the past as traces. According to Emmanuel Lévinas, traces or vestiges communicate obliquely, as opposed to the direct and complete meaning that is conveyed by signs. Hence, the ruin challenges the perceptive research of Gestaltic completeness, placing the individual that observes it before an undefined past that is open to a multiplicity of histories. That opening—which becomes an irrecoverable absence, according to Luglio and other critics on the ruin motif—is actually a space impregnated by myriad subjectivities, a palimpsest conditioned by the previous gazes that have sought in it possible pasts, or where they have attempted to identify different ancestors from which to inscribe a given identity in the present. Hence, from this perspective, the ruin is not so much the trace of a void as it is the link (in the almost hypertextual sense of the term) of a rhizome of more or less inter-connected performances or readings. The manner by which it signifies would not be too distant from that which according to Jacques Derrida, places any ambition of meaning within the framework of an implacable *différance*, yet where such *différance* is not only positioned in the signifying chain but also along a diachronic axis that diversifies, and in doing so, makes it impossible to draw teleological lines from the past to the present.

The particular nature of the ruins as a motif in Western tradition resides in this deferred opening up of possible meanings over the past. Far from the continuation of diverse updates of their use within the framework of a tradi-

tion, the ruins have survived as a motif precisely through the reassignment of meanings that enables their lacking or incompleteness which has led to their use as a backdrop for the defeat of paganism in the religious adoration and nativity scenes of the 16th century, to evoke classical excellence in the Renaissance portrayals and to ennoble musings on the fragility of human work in the face of the grandeur of nature and the ruthless passage of time, as viewed by the romantics. On the other hand, it is also through this opening up that the ruins have gradually become not only an object of artistic portrayal, but also an allegorical device in the field of theory. Hence, they have served as the framework for Sigmund Freud's thought on the complex structure of human conscience and for Georg Simmel's reflections on the relationship between nature and culture; they have conveyed fragmentation and allegory in the telling of history for Walter Benjamin; and they have served to transmit Maria Zambrano's reflections on the possibility of a tragedy without an author.

In post-World War 20th-century art, literature and cinema, ruins would no longer be caused by the passage of time or the effects of nature on human productions, which according to Paul Zucker, made them "aesthetic hybrids." The so-called "new ruins" or "ruins of the present," would be the results of a destructive instinct that technology had perfected, which, as Marc Augé has also observed, would distance them from the pure temporality of "historical" ruins. In both photography and the cinema, the ruins would become metaphors for the destruction that can be seen from documentary realism or apocalyptic science fiction. They have also taken the form of places and objects in disuse that were produced by a post-industrial capitalism and a consumer society that did not typically view re-use as a productive activity, but rather as a waste of a productive effort. As we shall see in the case of Torres' installation *Scenography of labor* (1977), the abandoned factories move us to reflect on that which is no longer productive in the world of a global capitalism, the productive structures of which have been moved to favour the economic profitability of a select few. The different perspectives on the management of these new ruins as heritage—their conversion into museums, their re-use or their demolition—display the underlying ideological impulses in the consideration of these types of ruins. Yet, perhaps the most radical thought on the new ruins is spurred by the artistic use—and particularly by the photographic use—of rubbish, an abject element by definition, far removed from the ideals of beauty of the classical ruins. The abandoned or second-hand materials that we see, for example, in the photos by Allan de Souza as studied by David Lloyd or in R. Wentworth's photos of second-hand flea markets, which Harriet Hawkins analyses, become metaphors for the things that no longer have their place in society; yet they also represent the permanence and transformation of materials in a contemporary world that is evermore given to the virtual and digital spaces.

The ideological impulse, as well as the material and at the same time evolving nature of the ruin make it an interesting object, as it is considered in relation to the productions tied to conceptual art. By placing the work of

Francesc Torres in this framework—which, like any other label, is by no means enough to classify his diverse and ever-changing work—we can bear in mind that in the Catalan milieu in which the artist first became involved in the art world—Barcelona of the late 1960s³—, conceptualisms have a particular history of their own. That history is characterised on one hand by their delay in relation to the Anglo-Saxon world, and on the other hand by their political spirit, in opposition to the dictatorship of the Franco regime.⁴ The same “delay” and the same political spirit would emerge in the conceptualist art movements of Latin America.⁵ I’m using the term *conceptualism* in the broad sense assigned to it by Pilar Parcerisas, the main scholar of its development in the Hispanic context, where she defines it as a “hybrid and formally rupturist trend [that] accepts dematerialisation yet is conceived far more connected with reality and with the socio-artistic circumstances of the time” (*Conceptualismo(s)* 13). Placing the ruin aesthetics in relation to the concept of *dematerialisation* can lead us to interesting thoughts that, as I argue, link it also to the concept of *performance*. In its full sense, the dematerialisation that converts the idea or the action into an objective of art frequently generates writings where this notion or action is textualised, writings that are at once “conceptual” and form part of an artistic product that is not strictly perceived through the eyes. In a more lax sense, *dematerialisation* refers to the use of fragmentary objects, to the resignification of found objects or to the use of poor or ephemeral materials, which ultimately and despite their precarious nature, are also materials, as Lucy Lippard herself acknowledges in the preface to *Six Years*.

As Simon Marchán states in his manual on conceptual art,⁶ a pioneer publication in Spain, *dematerialisation* entails a reflection on the borders between objects of art and objects of everyday use, which correlates to a broader questioning of the limits between art and life. It also expands the links between action and art, not only introducing performance as a form of creation, but encouraging the active implication of art consumers in the un-

³ For information on where Torres fits into the Catalan conceptual art of the 1970s, see Combalá (1991:18-19), as well as the chronicle written by the artist himself in “El Accidente Contextualizado” (in *La Cabeza del Dragón*, 1991). Despite the fact that most of the works that I will be analysing here were produced while Torres was living in the United States, many of his creations focus on the history of Spain during the 20th century, which was marked by the Spanish Civil War and the Franco dictatorship. Torres began his education in the arts in Barcelona, where he would return after spending the May 1968 events in Paris. In the Barcelona of the 1970s, he came into contact with the “Grup de Treball”. In 1972 he moved to the United States, where he would develop much of his art work, until 2002.

⁴ One such emblem is the task of the so-called “Grup de Treball”, which brought together artists, filmmakers and writers in a politically active artistic group between 1973 and 1979 and in which Torres occasionally took part.

⁵ See Luis Camnitzer, *Conceptualism in Latin American Art. Didactics of Liberation* (2007).

⁶ Simón Marchán, *Del Arte Objetual al Arte de Concepto: las Artes Plásticas desde 1960* (1972).

derstanding of the *dematerialised* creations. The re-used objects that are put to service in the diverse manifestations of conceptual art (assemblage, the ready-made, *arte povera*...) are *practiced* objects, in a similar sense to that which Michel de Certeau (1980) attributes to the *practiced* spaces (*lieux pratiques*). As Catalan artist Ferran García Sevilla writes, “they are objects that reveal testimonial desires, collective memories, possible symbolic and ritual values; yet because they belong to a lived present, they take on a double meaning: they additionally signify time” (cited in Parcerisas *Conceptualismo(s)* 146). The found object is therefore in and of itself a historical material that accumulates uses and that changes its meaning and its context, taking on new functions in addition to its original utility. As a result, it is ruinous in its survival through time, yet also in terms of its state as a trace of the presence of those who once used it in the past; it is the vestige of a use that was once inscribed in the material and which has now been re-contextualised as an aesthetic object. It is that use inscribed on the object appropriated as a work of art that will enable us to speak of a performative memory in the installations of Francesc Torres.

Performative memory: strategies for transmission and incorporation

In what sense, though, can we speak of a performative memory? And how do ruin aesthetics tie into it in contemporary art and literature? In the chapter on the concepts of “performance” and “performativity” of her book *Traveling Concepts*, Mieke Bal (Performance 174-212) asserts that what connects the two is not the derivation that gives rise to the addition of the suffix to the next word, which would give the first word an abstract meaning. Rather, for Bal, it is in fact a third concept, that of “memory”, that connects the first two. To define such performative memory, which I aim to detect in Torres' work in connection with the ruin aesthetics, I will take Bal's considerations as my point of departure and expand on them in keeping with the thoughts of other scholars who I believe can help to complete the lucidity of her initial thought. To finish, I will add to Bal's triad a fourth concept, that of “corporeality,” which, as is well known, has also been productively tied to the initial triad in contemporary criticism.

We must recall that for Bal, *performance*, which is understood as a performance of theatre, music, dance, etc., is inconceivable without a memory, for two different reasons. Firstly, all performances respond in a more or less predetermined manner to the updating of a text or of a plan of action by the person performing, and therefore stage a process that morphs from the composition or the idea of the *performance* to the activation of the memory of the same idea, which must be conveyed by those who stage it. Even in the case of improvisation, a stage or venue is specified or set up Francesc Torres — whether it is a theatre, a street, a house — and there is an envisaged potential audience that is expected to view that action — whether it is a collective receiver, a private audience or a video recorder. Secondly, the performance is tied to the memory in the sense that the viewer interprets what he/she sees

on the stage by calling on his/her own memory. In other words, the viewer evokes the multiple layers of personal and cultural memories that are activated by the play or performance.

Hence, all *performances* rely on the memory to take form meaningfully in a present time, to *do* something, and therefore to be *performative*. To link performativity to memory, we need only evoke Derrida's opposition to the concept as previously defined by John Austin. Let us recall that for Derrida, what enables any code to function is its *iterability*; in other words, the possibility of deciphering the utterance that is expressed independently from the context and in absence of the speaker who has produced it—that which for Austin would determine the "(un)happiness" of a performative utterance. The success of a performative utterance therefore depends on a coded repetition—and hence, forms part of the baggage of another person who is or may be familiar with the repeated model—as well as on another—*iter*, in Sanskrit, reflects the notion of *alterity*—who can share such knowledge. The performativity of an utterance therefore does not (solely) depend on the context—in fact, for Derrida, it has nothing at all to do with context—, but also on an agreement among the people involved in its comprehension; in other words, it depends on a consensus that enables an utterance to be decoded. It is in the creation and activation of that consensus that the memory participates, as a framework within which the norms of social conduct are coded.

Bal additionally notes that memory is always performative in and of itself; it exists by virtue of the fact that it manifests itself in a present time where it serves a specific purpose and where it can be staged in different manners. Across the board, the countless essays published on the concept of memory since the late 20th century acknowledge the present and community nature of memory. "Memory," writes Enzo Traverso, "is always conjugated in the present, which determines its modalities: the selection of events to be stored in the memory (and of testimonies to listen to), their interpretation, their 'lessons', etc." (18). Todorov in *Les abus de la mémoire* asserts that the mere possibility of a use or abuse of the memory is an indicator of this prospect of the present-day manipulation of vestiges of the past. The performative nature of the memory is particularly explicit in some of the forms of presentation of the trauma about which Dominic LaCapra has theorised. For LaCapra, if a traumatic memory is not integrated into the experience of the individual, it can manifest in the form of *acting out*. In that form, the wounded memory constantly manifests itself in the present and destroys it, along with the prospects of projecting ourselves with any hopes into the future.

I believe that this repetitive and spectacular condition of the traumatic memory is in fact no more than an extreme manifestation of a condition that is inherent to the memory's tendency to serve as a social framework. And in citing the concept of the "social framework" of the memory, I am not only referring to the sense that Maurice Halbwachs attached to the term (*cadres sociaux*), but also to a more generic sense. I am referring to the mechanism by which the shared memory of a community becomes part of its culture, and in doing so, determines the modes of conduct—which can be more or

less ritualised or naturalised—that form part of the repertoire of a community. It is through the repetition of a more or less conscious pattern—from major historic events to mealtimes—that the memory is collectivised and becomes a cultural rule that regulates actions and conduct in society. Hence, herein resides a new link between memory and performance: the performance—understood as the acting or interpretation of a role—is dependent on the memory for meaning while at the same time contributing to the transmission of a cultural memory. This is precisely how Diana Taylor (*Hacia una definición*) views it, in her reflections on the connections between performance and intangible heritage: “Performances function as a vital act of transfer, transmitting social knowledge, memory and a sense of identity through reiterated behaviour.” Therefore, performance generates memory and recognition, based on the shared acts in which it manifests. According to Taylor (Performance 91-104), whether it becomes tangible will depend on the ability of those who share it to repeat it, cite it, appropriate it or transform it.

The naturalisation of that cultural use occurs in its *incorporation* (this term, as we know, stems from the Latin lexeme *corpus*, body), in other words, when it has a bearing on our way of being in the world as bodies through which we perceive that world and conceptualise our private personality, among other things. This enables us to add to Bal's conceptual triad the concept of corporality, which has been irremissibly tied to that of performativity by Judith Butler. Performativity, as Butler writes, “is not a singular act, but a repetition and a ritual, which achieves its effects through its naturalization in the context of a body, understood, in part, as a *culturally sustained temporal duration*” (xv, emphasis added). The last syntagm, in fact, could serve to define shared memory as a presence of the past in the present thanks to the will of a group to sustain it, to *re-enact* it. Bodies bear meaning only thanks to the cultural and social inheritance of a memory that they sustain at the same time, by acting it out and continuously updating it.

Tying the memory to the body and to an inter-subjective transmission that is updated in an ever-changing present enables us to speak of a *performative* memory. Though the term may seem redundant, I believe it is necessary to set it apart as an opposite of the fetishised memory that has spurred the governmental obsession with the institutionalisation of certain looks back on the past. “Today's obsession with memory,” writes Traverso, “is the product of the decline of the transmitted experience, in a world that has lost its referents; it has been disfigured by violence and spread by a social system that erases tradition and fragments existences” (16). The conveyance of the memory through performative acting out enables one to speak of a new model of transmission that does not erase the subjects of the memory, which maintains the traces of the acts of those subjects, which prevents the memory from reifying itself. The ruins in which that memory is aesthetically coded can no longer be simple landscapes. Rather, they will have to be settings, backdrops for action. They will have to be places or objects that evoke presences; that incorporate into their matter past experiences and uses.



Fig. 1: *Construction of the Matrix* (1976). Photo © Francesc Torres, VE-GAP, Barcelona, 2015, used courtesy of the artist.

The performativity of absent bodies in Torres' installations

The aesthetic ruins of Francesc Torres' installations display three different uses: a) demolition as a metaphor for violence; b) practiced spaces and objects; and c) fragmentary portrayals of bodies. Here, I will address all three uses when speaking of a performative memory in his, although it is the two latter groups that interest me most. In the first case, the ruins appear decontextualised, as a symbol of the destruction caused by violence and war. This can be seen in *Construction of the Matrix* (1976), where sitting on top of a pile of rubble are two lit up metanarrative texts that have sought to explain the way the world works: the Gospel according to Saint John and *Capital* by Karl Marx. Silhouettes of bodies with scissors on top accompany these texts, which, according to Hanhardt (6), make reference to the birth of the individual, in contrast to the death brought about by violence. In another work, *Paths of Glory* (1985), the rubble portrays the remains of trenches, with jugs, wire and other abandoned objects. Still more interesting is the use of the demolition materials in *Clausewitz's Classroom and/or Yalta Begins at School* (1984), which were taken from a neighbouring building to the museum. The rubble symbolises the remains of the war, over which the depicted leaders—Churchill, Roosevelt and Stalin—aim to form a new power, and with it a new delimitation of the borders between the nations. If we consider the soundtrack that accompanies the installation, in addition to the image, the remains become a more polysemic sign. Hence, for example, the soundtrack

says: "Vatican City has a nuclear bomb shelter for the Pope. This serves to ensure that the words 'thou return unto the ground; for out of it wast thou taken' are applied to the herd yet not to its shepherd"; or "The earth lacked nations. It was a place, not a territory" (*La cabeza* 180-1). The territory is made up of demolitions that *are no longer* buildings, which have 'returned unto the ground'. Those demolitions are in an intermediate state that affords different modelling of the space: it can be fenced in with certain borders or it can become new nations that will justify those borders with their individual histories.⁷

Much to the contrary of this case, the rubble utilised in the installation *Plus Ultra* (1988) came from a very specific and highly meaningful space and it is precisely by virtue of that location that it acquires its meaning. That space was the Spanish embassy in Berlin, which was bombarded during World War II and subsequently abandoned. Whilst the installation is too complex to discuss in detail here, it interests me because its constituent objects—which are either physically present or portrayed in video or photographic images—are, in their ruin state, significantly independent, stripped of an explanatory context that only becomes explicit in the leftover bits of the building and the remains housed within it. With no apparent time coordinates, those vestiges speak of power and its expiration, with no need to utter the names of Hitler or Franco. As the artist would later write, these materials:

comprise an unequivocal meaning as far as what they represented fifty years ago, hence making the presence of Hitler and Franco inseparable from the objects (while at the same time standing out for their absence, for to top it off, they are both dead). The installation generalises the meaning of the objects from the assumption that the social evil, to use a derogatory term, cannot easily be compartmentalised in historical, geographic, national or cultural terms. (*La cabeza* 244)

Yet it is the other two ruin mechanisms that I have mentioned above that will enable me to speak of a performative memory in the works of Torres: the appropriation of objects or settings in disuse or the function of which has been modified through time, and the silhouettes or fragments of bodies that he incorporates into his installations. Both the objects in disuse and the traces of bodies are indicative of a lost presence that art enables him to underscore. Torres' installations emphasise this loss; they place the viewer in front of an absence to which he/she must necessarily attribute a meaning. It must be born in mind that throughout the 1970s, Torres had staged a number of live performances in which he himself took part as an actor, before the audi-

⁷ The notion of destruction, prior to the creation of ruins, can be seen in other striking installations by Torres such as *Tough Limo* (1983), where a scale replica of a tank driven by iguanas is about to destroy an auditorium of chairs; or in *El Continent de Cristall* (1994), where a steamroller is about to crush a set of wine glasses. This concept is also conveyed to a certain degree in the fragile stability of the houses of cards in some of his installations from the 1980s.

ence—*Image's Identity* (1974) and *Almost Like Sleeping* (1975)— and based on the exhibition of films or photos of his actions—*An Attempt to Decondition Myself* (1974) and *Under the Kitchen Table* (1975). In an article published in 1976, Ferran García Sevilla distances these works by Torres from body art due to their use of the body, which in itself is not the objective of the works, but rather simply another part of the assemblies in which other materials were activated. According to García Sevilla, the notion of the body presented by Torres is the result of a social and cultural conception through which it is not the body in itself that is important, but rather the body as a space for the appearance of “the ‘invisible’ ideological conditionings of the acquired roles, the programmed behaviour” (22) that exist in the framework of a society and of a culture.

By the end of the 1970s, the image of Torres and his performed actions would disappear from the installations, which would nevertheless not be left unpopulated. Many of his works would include the imprints of bodies, indirectly portrayed presences that create a space of tension that interrogates our memory. And even in the 1970s, the installations *Everybody's House (Is Burning)* (1976) and *Residual Regions* (1979), for example, depict inhabited spaces in different eras. The former is the result of Torres' work on a site, a process that he would subsequently photograph and exhibit. The site is an old bunker from the Spanish Civil War, a place that was particularly meaningful one year after the death of Franco, and which Torres would fill with furniture and household objects from a conventional living room (paintings, lamps, magazines on the table, pillows for the armchairs). Once the building was furnished and henceforth ostensibly disassociated from its military condition, he set it on fire and recorded the process. In the Galeria G in Barcelona, the artist then exhibited the event that he had filmed in a Super 8 video—where the images of the fire alternated with war scenes— alongside the burnt furniture and objects. The exhibition included a water heater, to generate the heat given off by the materials. As would occur in many other installations by Torres, here the objects, videos and photographs were combined with recorded or written oral texts. In this case, the most emblematic item was the story about the artist's mother's smuggling practices after the war, which he reproduced on a sheet of paper hung high up on a wall, forcing anyone interested in reading it to go up a ladder and raise his/her head high. All of these objects speak of the potential to symbolically re-use a space, drawing correlations between apparently different scenarios such as those of the war and those of daily household life. Along these lines, Torres describes: “An inhabitable space reflects the traits of the body that occupies it. Both are the armour of an internal activity that must be hidden from others.” The work is set up as a study of the behaviour “that underlies human issues, during both war (organised violence) and peace (unorganised violence)” (*La cabeza* 74).

The correlation between state conflicts and domestic conflicts in terms of their effects on the life of the individual was present early on, in *Almost Like Sleeping*, and would also be manifest in *Belchite/South Bronx* (1988), where

images of abandoned buildings in the slums of New York are juxtaposed with those of the Aragonese town of Belchite, which was bombarded and abandoned during the Spanish Civil War. Yet what most interests me about these images is the manner in which they symbolically manipulate these devastated sites to speak of the behaviours of those who inhabited them. They are portrayed as places and objects that history has saturated with variable meanings. In and of themselves, those items are trans-historic sites, which, due to the diversity of their past functions, along with those assigned to them by the artist, project themselves in the present as uninhabited spaces that are nevertheless teeming with presences. In *Residual Regions* (1978), the chosen backdrop was an estate in Serrallonga, an archaeological area that had never been excavated according to scientific standards. Torres says that "I was particularly fascinated by the unofficial nature of the information, which led me to view the site and its remains vaguely, in a way, on the margin of academic history" (*La Cabeza* 94). The estate, which was photographed by Torres, contained pre-historic remains that coexisted with a house that had been built in 1889 and was later used as a headquarters for the republican forces at the end of the Spanish Civil War. The photos reveal the manner in which the human footprint has gradually marked the geography of this site. According to Torres, the identity of any group is accumulative and present. In the installation, the photos were accompanied by three videos with three channels, one of which showed the hands of the artist handling objects found in the house, and a table with four chairs of different styles, which served as a support for the display of the same found objects, and particularly the remnants left behind by the republican militants who once inhabited the site: soil, tins, a tyre, and most notably, the boots and canvas sandals that had been worn by the militiamen.

Shoes would also take on an emblematic meaning in a far later project, *Dark is the Room Where We Sleep* (2007), which follows the process of the opening of a mass grave containing the executed victims of the Francoist troops.⁸ Torres explains his fascination as follows:

Everyone worked distantly and professionally but there was anguish inside. I took photos and let the camera create that necessary emotional distance to be able to do my work. But, whether we know it or not, we all have a weak side, a crack in the shield of our soul that our emotional strength sneaks out of. The feet of the victims with their shoes still on is what got to me. It had happened to me before in the Ebro, on finding the remains of boots in a trench, or a couple of soles near some bones, a meter and a half away from a blown up hand grenade. In Villamayor, however, the shoes were still on the body that wore them. Their last fateful steps were imprinted, still, on those soles. (*Dark* 25)

⁸ For images of this installation, see <http://www.icp.org/exhibitions/dark-is-the-room-where-we-sleep-a-project-by-francesc-torres>. Torres himself explains the history of these objects for *The Economist* at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZOAXcGPrq-k>. For a study on this installation see Ferran (2013)

Footprints and the remains of shoes are also present in pieces such as *Sculpmetal* (1984-5), *Belchite/South Bronx*, *Residual Regions*, and *Memory Remains. 9/11 Artifacts at Hangar 17* (2011). The footsteps are imprinted in the soles of shoes that are on display, to evoke the suffering of those who once wore them. The photos that we see in *Dark is the Room Where we Sleep* also include bullets and bones, and they gradually reveal the skeletons of the buried victims, some still in their shoes, holding change purses or wearing a watch that has stopped, virtually certifying the hour of their death. In addition to the remains, the artist has photographed the scientists involved in the opening of these graves, the direct descendents of both the executed victims and their neighbours, who observe and discuss the entire process, which closes with a proper burial for the recovered bodies. The entire project places us before the vestiges of an iniquitous murder, remains that make it possible to partially recover a presence: "Along with many of the bodies in the ditch, personal objects appeared among shreds of clothing, a toothbrush, a comb, a mirror, a pencil, coins, a watch that probably kept time for a while even after being interred" (*Dark* 24-5). As Antonio Monegal has noted in relation to the politics of memory and their display in museums, they are not mere objects, but rather ruins that patently bear witness to the loss of bodies in front of our own bodies, which are present and projected in Torres' gaze as well as in that of our contemporaries who are looking at the grave.⁹ It is what DeSilvey and Edensor refer to as "experiential ruins," those ruins in which the absent bodies that once inhabited a space or handled a set of objects "are made present through an imaginative 'embodied exchange' with history" (8).

This also occurs in the installation *Memory Remains*, which features photos of the remains of the ruins of the Twin Towers held at JFK Airport.¹⁰ This installation includes everything from large metallic structures to personal objects, which the artist underscores in the introductory texts:

⁹ Monegal writes: "In the installation version of this project at the International Center of Photography in New York, Torres chose only one object to be shown among the photographs of the exhumation: a pocket watch without hands found next to one of the corpses. This watch inside its display case in the middle of the room anchors all the images in reality and lends them the aura of its physical existence. It is an exhibit in more than one sense: an exhibition item and forensic evidence. And it signifies in a variety of ways: it is an index to the event and a metonymy of the victim who owned it, as well as a metaphor. Its missing hands can mean time stopped in death, or the confluence of past and present in the action of excavating the grave, or the impossibility of recuperating the past. All these meanings are not a given of the object, but are extracted from it by the discursive construction of the installation" (*Exhibiting* 242). Below, I will discuss this discourse construction, which I will evaluate as a narrative.

¹⁰ To view images of this installation, see this collection at *National Geographic*: <http://www.nationalgeographic.com/remembering-9-11/pictures-memory-remains/>

Finally, in one corner were clothes, not from stores, but from some, very few, of those who were there that day, presumably both victims and survivors. Cataclysmic destruction tends to homogenize human bodies and their external identities; what we use to protect ourselves from both meteorological and social exposure, the outward signage that defines each of us as cultural, professional, social, and even political beings. Although individual victims are by no means interchangeable, once massive violence has been inflicted, there is very little qualitative difference between what was left of human physicality in Dresden, Rotterdam, Nanking, Leningrad, Beirut, Sarajevo, or New York City: broken and quartered bodies, shredded clothing, and someplace, in the middle of that field of chaotic devastation, a miraculously intact, fragile object such as, for example, an American Airlines courtesy slipper. (*Memory* 13)

As William Judson noted, it is a use of the objects that respects “the implicit recording of an earlier human activity that has been inscribed on both the scars and the shapes of the archaeological object” (12). It is this patent loss that stirs us before the objects and forces us to imagine as subjects those who used them. It places us as present subjects before an intersubjective tension that is associated with the exchange proposed by the performance in its theatrical sense, the pull that stems from the co-presence of the audience and the actors who are staging it. Yet here, the actors are no longer present; our presence is orphaned as we stand before the stage upon which an action took place some time ago.



Fig. 2: “Paper and Files.” *Memory Remains* (2011). Photo © Francesc Torres, VEGAP, Barcelona, 2015, used courtesy of the artist.

Other installations by Torres portray bodies or their fragments, which in some manner connects them with the practices of body art. In the book *Body Art: Performing the Subject*, Amelia Jones conceived the concept of body art as an inclusive category that incorporates performance, yet without demanding from the artist the full presence of a body in the demonstrations, which, since the 1960s, have been using the body as a tool, a theme or an artistic material. For Jones, the body is a "locus of a 'disintegrated' or dispersed 'self', [an] elusive marker of the subject's place in the social, as a 'hinge' between nature and culture" (13). Its main contribution to art history stems from the fact that it underscores not the corporality of the artist, but rather that of the viewers who perceive the work of art. Hence, Jones writes:

Body art rather than performance art that specifically opens out the closed circuits by which the art object was determined to have significance within modernist criticism. Body art proposes the art 'object' as a site where reception and production come together: a site of intersubjectivity. Body art confirms what phenomenology and psychoanalysis have taught us: that the subject 'means' always in relationship to others and the locus of identity is always elsewhere. (14)

In these intersubjective manifestations that Jones believes to be fostered by body art, it is not only unnecessary for two bodies to be present; to a certain degree it is actually impossible. The full presence of the meaning of a body is always an illusion that performance art theorists have constructed in order to use the body as a political emblem.¹¹ As we have seen above, the identity of the bodies is performative and it is determined by an incorporated social memory, by a *habitus*, as Bourdieu would assert, that governs our ways of being in the world.

Some of the cases that Jones draws on to exemplify her thesis are based on the absence of a subject and the effects generated by such absence. For example, it is the imprints of bodies in the soil that Ana Mendieta leaves in the images of her series *Siluetas* (1973-8) to speak of roots, the return to the earth and identity. Similarly, Terry Fox's imprint in the ground serves as the foundation for his *Levitation* (1970), an exhibition of the impression of his back obtained after spending five hours lying on a mound of soil in an exhibition hall. The invisible body of the artist also appears in absence, in *Bed* (1980-1), by Antony Gormley, which consists of a block made of bread and wax, imprinted with the figures of two bodies. The result of this impression is similar to that of the work of Janine Antoni in *Eureka* (1993), the imprint of her body in a bathtub full of lard. In relation to these installations, the absent bodies of Francesc Torres present two differences: first, they underscore the historical and political significance of the distance that is always implicit in absence; second and more importantly, the body evoked by its

¹¹ Paradigmatically, in feminist performances, this is conveyed by using the present corporality as a form of reappropriation through the body of the identity of the woman.

marks is not the body of the artist himself, but rather the bodies of others. The intersubjectivity unfolded by Torres' installations does not place us before the artist (as his early performances did); rather, his works position us before another distant person in history that we can only call to presence through the imagination or through research and inquiry as to who that missing person might be.



Fig. 3: "7.62 caliber Mauser bullet used in the executions." *Dark is the Room Where We Sleep* (2007). Photo © Francesc Torres, VEGAP, Barcelona, 2015, used courtesy of the artist.

The most extreme case is undoubtedly that of *Dark is the Room Where We Sleep*, where the skulls of previously executed victims gradually fill the presence as they come to light; in other words, as they come into view before the scientists who investigate how they were murdered, and above all, before the relatives and neighbours who identify their names, their surnames and their personal histories. In other installations, those absent subjects are portrayed through reproductions and fragmentary images of bodies.¹² In *Scenography of Labor* (1977), a piece assembled in an abandoned textile factory in Sabadell (an industrial city near Barcelona), the labourers who no longer worked there were represented by thirty small men made of bread dough and hung on strings from the ceiling. During the period of the exhibition, each day a hungry German shepherd was brought to the factory to eat up the little dough men. The factory remained in a state of abandonment, with no additional details other than the strings, the graffiti on the walls, a shelf with

¹² In this manner, they form part of an entire trend of portrayals of fragmentary bodies, the origins of which are sketched out by Linda Nochlin in the essay *The body in pieces: the fragment as a metaphor of modernity* (1994).

three dishes of lentils and a text featuring an observation on history and power, which was placed in the lavatory (which according to Torres was the only place where the workers had enough privacy to read). In *Sculpmetal Pieces*, the works titled "Brave Citizen" display abandoned bits of clothing and drawings of wounded bodies over bunks, images that we also find arranged in reproductions of bunks in the rear of the gallery, which housed the exhibition of *Paths of Glory* (1985), an installation about war, featuring different war-like videogame machines, sitting amid rubble and wire and framed by images of the victims of armed conflicts. The fragility of the bodies is manifest in the bread dough figures that appear in foetal position in *(A)historical Prologue to the Burning of Life* (1996), a position also used by Torres before in *The Construction of the Matrix*, and which appears to be tied to the origins of life, and hence to that moment in which we are not yet affected or shaped by social conditionings; the only time that we are ever ahistorical beings.



Fig. 4: "Brave Citizen" *Sculpmetal Pieces* (1984-5). Photo © Francesc Torres, VEGAP, Barcelona, 2015, used courtesy of the artist.

In both the representation of bodies and the artistic resignification of practiced objects and landscapes that we have seen above, what marks the meaning of the objects is not so much their recovery within the framework of an exhibit, but rather precisely what they are missing; that aspect which leads them to evoke an absence, a void. Given that they place the viewer before an absent subject, I propose considering them performances "in absentia," although I understand that this term may appear to be an oxymoron. In these installations, where the defining co-presence of the performance is impaired, we find ourselves before a presentation where the space of the actor, that of the subject that ought to be present in front of us, is not empty per se, but rather marked by loss, by a feeling of *not here anymore*, which necessarily implies that *it was here before*. This perception is characteristic of the hermeneutic activated by ruin aesthetics, ruins which take on the shape of

abandoned landscapes, old shoes or decaying bodies and which, in Torres' works, always conserve the footprints of those who once inhabited them. These assemblies generate an inter-subjective tension similar to the tension noted by Jones in body art; yet in the case of Torres, the subject is left in a position of anticipation, awaiting the answer of another person who can no longer provide it. The dearth of the bodies, whether absent or fragmented, makes us aware of our need for historical otherness and forces us to call on our memory—personal and collective—to reconstruct that void.

Therefore, when placed before one of Torres' installations, the viewer is questioned about a phantasmagorical presence that forces him/her to re-think his/her perspective of the materials and texts on display. Hence, the function of the viewer is activated in the full sense assigned to him/her by Jacques Rancière, in his reflections on performance. For example, in "The Emancipated Spectator," Rancière refutes the passivity traditionally associated with the viewer's gaze and position. In light of the theories on theatrical performance that have sought the way to purposely activate the viewer's position by breaking down the fourth wall, Rancière reassesses the opposing approaches that identify action with the author's function and passivity with reception:

Emancipation starts from the opposite principle, the principle of equality. It begins when we dismiss the opposition between looking and acting and understand that the distribution of the visible itself is part of the configuration of domination and subjection. It starts when we realize that looking is also an action that confirms or modifies that distribution, and that "interpreting the world" is already a means of transforming it, of reconfiguring it. The spectator is active, just like the student or the scientist: he observes, he selects, he compares, he interprets. He connects what he observes with many other things he has observed on other stages, in other kinds of spaces. He makes his poem with the poem that is performed in front of him. She participates in the performance if she is able to tell her own story about the story which is in front of her. Or if she is able to undo the performance—for instance, to deny the corporeal energy that it is supposed to convey here in the here and now and transform it into a mere image, by linking it with something that she has read in a book or dreamed about, that she has lived or imagined. (277)

In defending the notion of the active participation of the viewer, Rancière's contention does not exclusively have to do with the need for personal involvement in all hermeneutic tasks, which in literary studies was already underscored by reception theorists; but rather with his own theory of pedagogy regarding the ignorant schoolmaster (*le maître ignorant*). According to his theory, learning always begins with the detection of a space of ignorance that the student learns to fill, eliminating the distance between his/her own ignorance and that of the purported scholar. In this process, a specific knowledge is activated: that of the pupil who draws on it to build his/her own wisdom and who does not necessarily have to identify with that of the teacher. According to Rancière, the case of performance is similar to this:

"What we have to do is acknowledge the knowledge performed by the ignorant one and the very activity of the spectator. Every spectator is already an actor in his own story and every actor is in turn the spectator of the same kind of story" (274).

Joining History: the installations as incomplete tales

One of the mechanisms of spectator integration into the performance, according to Richard Schechner, is that of allowing the spectator to form part of the story (44). In the installations by Torres that we have mentioned above, this model, which Schechner has coined "democratic," is manifest not only in the physical sense that guarantees the co-presence of the conventional performance, but also in a figurative sense tied in with the narrativity shared by the installations and historiographic tales. Torres himself has insisted on the narrative nature of his installations. Along these lines, he asserts: "an installation is essentially a three-dimensional collage that 'happens' in time, with the reading of a book. However, it does not occur in a linear fashion, but rather like a book of variable geometry with loose pages that are placed in order (for lack of a better word) as they are read" (*Da Capo* 35). The installations present the spectator with materials, recordings, images and texts that fulfil diverse functions in relation to the other materials or the installation as a whole. Hence, we find mural texts—in *Mental Dirt...*, *Scenography of Labor*, *Everybody's House (is Burning)*—, recorded texts—*The Repository of the Absent Flesh*, *John Doesn't Know What Paul Does*—, and utterances that virtually operate as found objects, such as the expressions one might hear in the street projected in *Almost Like Sleeping*. Torres has affirmed that he needs to write out his installations before physically bringing them into being. He writes them in order to describe their future components, yet also, as Hugh Davies states, to form "a conceptual narrative that serves as a foundation for his works" (*Conversación* 20). "The important thing," Torres says, "is to write a story about the work that you want to make and suddenly everything ends up falling into place" (*Conversación* 20). Hence, the stories do not connect with the other elements in the form of a paraphrase ekphrasis, but rather support the installation from its very beginning.¹³

In a particularly interesting analysis of the role of history in contemporary art, Miguel Ángel Hernández-Navarro has seen in the profuse history-

¹³ On this, McEvelley asserts: "It is a thesis art, with literary implications, as though he considered the possibility of a new philosophical genre that could be defined as a 'three-dimensional multimedia essay'. Actually, although some sort of complimentary text is generally helpful for these displays, such text (when it exists) does not say it all on its own. The work is not a mere visual illustration of a preceding writing, but rather something else. Torres usually makes a description or a plan in writing, before developing each installation, yet that writing is an internal material (targeting the heads of museums and the directors of the institutions that support the arts) that aims to describe the piece that the artist intends to build and provide an estimate of the corresponding costs" (33).

evoking images that we find in Torres' work a negation of the notion of history as a tale, which would bring the concept of the artist's history closer to the concept proposed by Walter Benjamin:

Although the memory is activated by a scent... what one recalls are images. As is the case for Benjamin, for Torres, history appears to us in images, rather than in stories. Images that must be brought to light so that they end up forming part of the collective imaginaries or of the visual conscience of the country, as he prefers to call it. (42)

Hernández-Navarro bases his thought on a notion of story which is limited in three different manners, at least when applied to describe Torres' installations: first, because it implies that an image cannot be narrative or tell part of a story; second, because it does not bear in mind that virtually all of Torres' installations are accompanied by texts, as we have seen; and third—the aspect that I wish to underscore the most—, it must be borne in mind that the completeness of the story does not necessarily have to reside in the work in itself. Narrativity, as noted by transmedia narratology theory, is not necessarily linked to the manifestation of an oral or written linguistic statement. It can be expressed through diverse media and it can depend on the narrative impetus inherent to the gaze of the viewer who interprets those media. If Torres' notion of history is connected with that of Benjamin, I believe that it stems more from the idea of the fragment and staging than from a negation of historical narrativity. Fragmentation, in fact, is an idea that we find in Torres' texts, as well as in his installations. As we have seen, he upholds the notion of history as the set of remains from a shipwreck:

The history of the peoples, the history of the pieces of the world that we call countries, are no more than the remains that float on the ocean's surface after a shipwreck; the treasures, secrets, betrayals and many truths remain on the floor of the sea, forming an artificial reef. A similar thing occurs when the memory is bombarded and left to sink into the abyss of consciousness. (El accidente 33)

In *The Head of the Dragon* (1981), this fragmentary multiplicity was conveyed through the puzzle of a broken up world map on the floor of the display hall, which the visitors gradually reconstructed. Very seldom, however, do Torres' installations anticipate the physical intervention of the viewer. In fact, in the piece that I have just cited, the spectators' activity was spontaneous. Their action had more to do with the assignment of an epoch to the work, a temporality that stemmed from the historical indicators of the many pieces, although the causal connections among them remained in the hands of the viewers. The audience, says McEvelley, is invited to be "like the artist: a poet, a *bricoleur*, a fan of puzzles and an irascible archaeologist" (39). Hence, the performativity of the piece does not reside in an action performed by a person in front of the viewer. Rather, it stems from the viewer's responsibility to convert a set of objects, recordings and texts into an occurrence

that takes place at a specific point in time. As a result, the viewer is the subject involved in the conversion of these materials into history. His/her memory becomes the context in which the statement of the installation attempts to become performative, where it can undertake an action. And here I would say that this form of performativity might reconcile the assertions of Austin and Derrida: the memory of the other that ensures the iterability of the message is the context where the performative expression can be successful, a context as variable as the alterities that inhabit the historical experience.

Conclusion: performance and art *for* politics?

I believe that it is in this sense that Torres' art is what Mieke Bal calls an art *for* politics (Arte 39-65). Not because it covers themes that might seem political to the receiving audience, such as war, violence or power, among others; but rather because it spurs the active involvement of the viewer within this framework. As John G. Hanhardt asserts, there is no specific political programme in his work, nor is there any single closed meaning.¹⁴ Instead, what we find is an open invitation to participate in the performative art of the possible, which is politics, according to Torres. Politics and art, writes the artist, are very similar activities in the sense of their spirit to shape the social reality. Torres writes, "My reasons to associate the political processes with the processes of art are based more on the phenomenology of the two than on a particular ideology of my own. In both politics and art, we base ourselves on intangible propositions that can only prevail by consensus or imposition" (*Da capo* 45-6). From this perspective, an art for democratic politics ought to be one that does not impose meanings, but rather creates open forms to generate consensus. If we place this idea within the framework of Torres' installations that focus on the themes of the shared memory or history, the use of a ruin aesthetic takes on an innovative sense. The ruin functions as an incomplete display of the past, making the portrayal of the past as a coherent whole impossible. As we have seen above, it is an indicator of a past often inhabited by unnamed people who through time have instilled in it different meanings. Allowing for this diversity, this *entropy* in the generation of memories, as Torres refers to it, is a way to challenge the institutional control of the collective memory and its recording in history. By identifying the traces of the lived past, we can convert memory and history into a foundation for democracy, as opposed to their service as the base of a doctrinal discourse that guarantees the power of a limited few.

¹⁴ Hanhardt states: "Torres' art is not an 'easy read', it does not decode simply. It is a body of work that traces the edges of meaning and understanding, the limits of discourse. Within the framework of the installations the artist creates and brackets the materials which the viewer reworks in a transaction that constructs meaning. Torres' skepticism does not allow one reading or ideology to determine its meaning" (7).

Works Cited

- Augé, Marc. *Le temps en ruines*. Paris: Galilée, 2003.
- Bal, Mieke. "Arte para lo político." *Estudios Visuales*, 7 (2010): 39-65.
- . "Performance and Performativity." *Travelling Concepts in the Humanities*. London, Toronto, Buffalo: University of Toronto Press Incorporated, 2002. 174-212.
- Benjamin, Walter. *The Origin of German Tragic Drama*. London & New York: Verso, 1998 [1928].
- . *Selected Writings*, vol. 4. Cambridge, M. A.: Harvard University Press, 1999.
- Butler, Judith. "Preface." *Gender Trouble*. New York: Routledge, 1999 [1990]. vii-xxvi.
- Camnitzer, Luis. *Didáctica de la liberación. Arte conceptualista latinoamericano*. Murcia: Cendeac, 2009.
- Combalía, Victoria. "Francesc Torres. Biografía, Biología, Historia." In Francesc Torres. *La Cabeza del Dragón*. Madrid: Museo Nacional Centro de Arte Reina Sofía, 1991. 17-26.
- DeCerteau, Michel. "Récits d'espace." *L'invention du quotidien*. Paris: Gallimard, 1980. 170-190.
- Derrida, Jacques. "Signature Event Context." *Margins of Philosophy*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1985[1971]. 307-330.
- DeSilvey, Caitlin, and Tim Edensor. "Reckoning with Ruins." *Progress in Human Geography*, 37: 4 (2012): 463-483.
- Ferran, Ofelia. "Grievability and the Politics of Visibility: The Photography of Francesc Torres and the Mass Graves of the Spanish Civil War." *Memory and Postwar Memorials: Confronting the Violence of the Past*. Marc Silberman and Florence Vatan (ed.) London and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013. 117-136
- Freud, Sigmund. *Escritos de Crítica de la Cultura*. Barcelona: Laia, 1984.
- García Sevilla, Ferran. "Análisis de los Trabajos Conceptuales de Francesc Torres." *Artes Plásticas 4* (1976): 15-18
- Halbwachs, Maurice. *Les Cadres Sociaux de la Mémoire*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, (1952 [1925]).
- Hanhardt, John G. "Francesc Torres: The Limits of Discourse." *Works from the Field. A Selection*. F. Johnson Museum of Art and Cornell University, 1982. 4-7.
- . "La Excavación de lo Real: El Arte Multi-media de Francesc Torres." Francesc Torres. *La cabeza del dragón*. Madrid: Museo Nacional Centro de Arte Reina Sofía, 1991. 11-15.
- Hawkins, Harriet. "Turn Your Trash into... Rubbish, Art and Politics." *Social and Cultural Geography*, 11:8 (2010): 805-827.
- Hell, Julia, and Andreas Schönle (eds.) *Ruins of Modernity*. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2010.
- Hernández-Navarro, Miguel Ángel. *Materializar el Pasado. El Artista como Historiador (Benjaminiano)*. Murcia: Micromegas, 2012
- Jones, Amelia. *Body Art. Performing the Subject*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1998.
- Judson, William D. "Text i Apropiació: Un Lloc en la Història." *Francesc Torres: El Carro de Fenc*. Barcelona: Generalitat de Catalunya, 1991: 10-15.
- LaCapra, Dominick. *Writing History, Writing Trauma*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001.

- Lévinas, Emmanuel. "La trace de l'autre." *En Découvrant l'existence avec Husserl et Heidegger*. Paris: Vrin, 1967[1963]: 187-202.
- Lippard, Lucy, R. *Six Years: The Dematerialization of the Art Object*. London: Studio Vista, 1973.
- Luglio, Davide. "'Profond Jadis, Jadis Jamais Assez'. La Ruine: De la Trace au Signe." Silvia Fabrizio-Costa (ed.). *Entre Trace(s) et Signe(s). Quelques Approches Herméneutiques de la Ruine*. Berlin: Peter Lang, 2005: 53-68.
- Lloyd, David. "Ruination. Allan deSouza's Irish Photography." *Third Text*, 18: 3 (2004): 263-272.
- Marchán, Simón. *Del Arte Objetual al Arte de Concepto: las Arte Plásticas desde 1960*. Madrid: Alberto Corazón, 1972.
- McEvelley, Thomas. "Francesc Torres or the Man with Three Brains." *Too Late for Goya. Works by Francesc Torres*. Tempe. Arizona State University Art Museum, 1993. 8-55.
- Monegal, Antonio. "Acróstico." *Da Capo*. Barcelona: MACBA, 2008. 21-27.
- . "Exhibiting Objects of Memory." *Journal of Spanish Cultural Studies*, 9: 2 (2008): 239-251.
- Nochlin, Linda. *The Body in Pieces: The Fragment as a Metaphor of Modernity*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1994.
- Parcerisas, Pilar. "'Memòria Històrica' contra 'Amnèsia Col·lectiva'." *Francesc Torres: El Carro de Fenc*. Barcelona: Generalitat de Catalunya, 1991. 16-23.
- . *Conceptualismo(s) Poéticos, Políticos y Periféricos. En Torno al Arte Conceptual en España (1964-1980)*. Madrid: Akal, 2007.
- Ranchière, Jacques. "The Emancipated Spectator." *Art Forum* 45/7 (2007): 270-282.
- Schechner, Richard. *Environmental Theater*. New York: Hawthorne Books, 1973.
- Simmel, Georg. "Las Ruinas." *Revista de Occidente*, 76, (1987 [1911]):108-117.
- Taylor, Diana. "Hacia una Definición de Performance." *Revista Teatro Celcít*, 30 (2002).
- . "Performance and Intangible Cultural Heritage." *The Cambridge Companion to Performance Studies*, Tracy C. Davis (ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008: 91-104.
- Todorov, Tzvetan. *Los Abusos de la Memoria*. Madrid: Paidós, 2008.
- Torres, Francesc. *Sobre el comportamiento. Tres trabajos*. Barcelona: Edicions Alternes, 1978.
- . "Absolute fire." *Belchite/South Bronx. A transcultural and transhistorical landscape*. New York: University of Massachusetts at Amherst, 1988: 74-104.
- . "El libro de la historia del olvido empecinado (anotaciones manuscritas a margen de página)." *Too Late for Goya. Works by Francesc Torres*. Tempe. Arizona State University Art Museum, 1993: 56-77.
- . *The Repository of the Absent Flesh*. Cambridge. List Visual Arts Center, MIT, 1998.
- . *Dark is the Room Where We Sleep*. Barcelona: Actar, 2007.
- . *La Cabeza del Dragón*. Madrid: Museo Nacional Centro de Arte Reina Sofía, 2011.
- . *Memory Remains. 9/11 Artifacts at Hangar 17*. Washington D. C. National Geographic, 2011.
- Torres, Francesc, and Hugh Davies. "Conversación." *Circuitos cerrados*. Madrid: Fundación Telefónica, 2000: 15-31.
- Torres, Francesc, and Antonio Monegal. *Arte, Política y (Po)ética*. Valencia: Universitat Politècnica de València, 2008.
- Traverso, Enzo. *El Pasado. Instrucciones de Uso*. Madrid. Marcial Pons, 2007.
- Zambrano, Maria. "Las Ruinas", *El Hombre y lo Divino*. Mexico: FCE, 1973 [1955]: 246-252.

Zeitlin, Marilyn (ed.). *Too Late for Goya. Works by Francesc Torres*. Tempe: Arizona State University Art Museum, 1993.

Zucker, Paul. "An Aesthetic Hybrid." *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, 20:2 (1961): 119-130.



This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/>; or, (b) send a letter to Creative Commons, 171 2nd Street, Suite 300, San Francisco, California, 94103, USA