

An act of hospitality can only be poetic
Jacques Derrida

REFUGE STATES

Refuge, flight, to escape. Re-fuge. The idea of refuge implies a perpetual movement and the existence of an other: the escape movement itself, which is always *from* or *to* something, and therefore implies at least two elements: what escapes and from *what* it escapes. But the refuge, which is always a place (and never a non-place, we will see why), still contains a paradigm: on one hand, to consider a refuge as such, it's always required a certain fixity of the place, since it is either a host space and a meditation space, therefore must be safe and stable. On the other hand, - and we're now thinking about the figure of refugee - the refuge will never cease to be the place where one escapes, so even if someone remains *there*, the refuge is a fluid space regarding identity. Refuge as a place in-between, as a movement of continuous demand, sometimes smooth space, sometimes striated space. The refuge then appears to us as a space capable of simultaneously interweaving the methodical and harmonic organization of the *deleuzian* striated space, fixed and exiguous, sometimes even concentrated (see refugee camps), and the potentially deterritorializing nomadic distribution of the smooth space, which allows the existence of, precisely, lines of flight, lines of life.

Refuges: when Michel Foucault thinks heterotopias, it's about these other spaces, non-hegemonic, ephemeral or not, counter-sites; places (outside of place) or real objects that reflect the surrounding space, representing it, transforming it, inverting it. Mostly, the heterotopias are, for the French philosopher, places without place, closed upon themselves, with an inherent connection to the infinitude of the territory. Such as the concentration camps, such as refugee camps, that are more precisely heterotopias of deviance, like prisons, in which individuals are confined, ordered, apparently in non-places - as proposed by Marc Augé -, but exactly at the border of the political and social upheavals of society.

In a similar movement, the inter-wall globe designed by GA estudio, on the one hand, calls for stability, through the two structures that support the centerpiece, and on the other, there's instability caused by the circularity of the wrapping. In fact, the device ends up resembling a celestial dome. Bearing in mind the lessons of art and architecture history, but also the thought of Walter Benjamin, that fact should not be ignored if we consider this hemisphere as an auratic device, constraining the sense of the individual gaze. There is, so, a certain verticality that is imposed - sometimes by the vault, sometimes by the walls (which are nothing but fortifications) - and that is opposed by the holistic, transparent globe crossed by the gaze. In the conventional place of the frescoes of the classical dome, instead, we will see the forms of Goethe's clouds - temporary, in formation/ deformation, dense and simultaneously floating and

crystalline matter - or the Bataille's dazzling sun - that warms and burns, illuminates and blinds.

An atmosphere always requires a spatiality, territory and geography for a micro-climate located by latitude and longitude. Latitude is made of wideness and freedom of action. It's also made of distance from a place (*topos*) to the equator of the Earth - this virtual boundary of *dimension 1* which function is to create two halves, two surfaces: the northern, or boreal zone - *the territory and order* -, and the south, austral zone - *deterritorialized and nomadic*. Latitude is boreal or austral, as it refers to a point located in the northern or southern hemisphere. *It is absolute but relative*.

It is, therefore, a globe-aquarium, a *globalium* effectivated as a zone of intensive and involutive transformations; a space-time, or rather a-space-of-time global and local, corporeal and incorporeal, that has the properties of internal space, threshold space, and self-space. The last one revealed as the space where everything fits and that fits in everything: universe.

The aura then falls on the ground, through a dome that no longer protects or hides, but reveals what is already *there*: landscape. However, it's not about inhabiting space, it's not an habitation and, once more referring to the religious temples, this will be a refuge of passage - not to death, but always in transit, ephemeral, event and celebration. Individual, contemplative, meditative experience. A paradoxal space, closed and opened, a refractory shelter insofar as it resists to its expansive force. Closed because it protects from the storms, it allows moments of life, of survival, of intimacy always fragile and tenuous. Opened, because anybody sees and is seen, as the first caveman, in Lascaux cave, which, by printing on the inner walls his own body, inaugurates the whole world spectacle that lies outside the refuge. The one who remains will be the Homo-spectator, refugee, exiled, welcomed or celebrated, in this double movement of seeing and show.

Sphere's translucency, however: it's on the soil that land is rebuilt. The landscape leaves the center of the refuge and opens to the vertical and horizontal horizon, in all possible dimensions of an hostile nature that forces the walls to rise and sustain the circularity of this spectacle-transparency.

From one heterotopia to another, sometimes on the boat, sometimes in the field, stateless people are deported to a new expressive world: people of the grass who claim to be incorporated, even if in a gradually way, even losing an identity to temporarily occupy a process of singular individuation (each of us) or collective (as people to come). Jérémy Pajeanc tries to square the circle: rectangular geometry for a tubular device, mirroring-camouflage that privileges invisibility instead of recognition, reversion of the internal in external voyeurism, concealment of interior and fragmentation of the surrounding atmosphere: landscape.

What can a refuge, which transmutes itself in contractive and expansive movements, propose as a hosting space? Is the Jérémy Pajeanc refuge adaptable to the number of occupants it can host? Will it hide what is in it? Let us start with the second question to clarify what it means to park and stop for a certain time in a

certain place, that is, to be in a certain situation, for an indeterminate, temporary, ephemeral time, a season. To be, for a season, stationated in a (in)certain space. Accepting this proposal, how can this refuge, if we still accept the second question, hide who stops in it?

Here comes the double feature of this project, a harmonium, retractable and expansive fold construction, made of glass and mirrored on the outer face of its walls. Will the stationed ones, in this refuge, be the walled couple that Mário Cesariny talks about: *between us and the words*? Rather, will they be the wonder-eyed girls standing in front of the mirror, as on the edge of Wonderland? What's the wonder of Alice that Lewis Carroll throws into an underground bunker, guided by a stylish rabbit, or in another facet, in front of a mirror that reflects not the subject who is reflected, but, as in this *cabanon*, the other side of the mirror - in this case, the outer and superficial reflection that hides, keeps, and hides, as a *camera obscura* with inverted mirrors, the ones that stopped inside the cave, the cavern, the *bunker*?

These are some more questions that tell us the answer can only be multiple and made of folds over folds, significant layers of a mirroring that resembles the fragmentary device par excellence, the kaleidoscope, but also another optical device, that is more interesting in this context: the telescope. With two lenses at its both extremities, it folds and unfolds itself, widening, dilating, expanding, and in the same movement, obtaining the inverse movement of the space around it: the further the internal distance between the lenses, the wider the view of outer space observed. In this refuge, those who stop inside can experience a sensorial expansion preserved from the outside that will dilate the camouflage of its own extension. Safe place, cloaked, magical and speculative box that preserves the place of intimacy on the other side of the mirror - *through the looking glass* - in which, reflected in the outer walls, *only those who see themselves can be excluded*, as who is seen is only possible to be excluded. This inclusive-exclusion idea was noted by Agamben in the revival of Foucauldian biopolitics in the context of modern politics, determined by the cision between citizen and man.

Back to the first question: will the number of walled people have any relation to the expandability of the refuge? Perhaps we should drop out this question, which is no longer relevant after observed the second proposal. The expansion of this impossible kaleidoscope-parallelepiped-inverted telescope depends only on an optical play which, in architectural terms, reduces space to the place of the visible and the mirroring, hence the specular, that is, the speculative space.

To speculate, therefore, on the expansive possibility of a refuge that offers to its occupants the seclusion that only exists within the fantasy world, where all monsters and dreams can live, where all possibilities of meaning begin to exist and start making sense, abolishes at one time the stable and mensurable referential of euclidean spatiality to open the intensive, oniric and poetic space, where all possibilities of meaning begin to exist.