Zeitschrift für Medien- und Kulturforschung

SCHWERPUNKT Schalten und Walten

Mit Beiträgen von

Max Bense, Pauline Chasseray-Peraldi, Emanuele Coccia, Noémie Etienne, Alexander R. Galloway, Nicole C. Karafyllis, Adam Knowles, Ulrich Meurer, Lisa Parks, Kathrin Peters, Claus Pias, William Stewart, Christina Vagt, Alexander Waszynski

Inhalt Heft 11 (2020)

Schwerpunkt: Schalten und Walten

Dear readers,

What you are about to read is the very last issue of the ZMK. Since our overall research enterprise, the IKKM, has to cease all of its activities due to the end of its twelve years' funding by the German federal government, the ZMK will also come to an end. Its last topic, *Schalten und Walten* has also been the subject of the concluding biannual conference of the IKKM, and we hope it will be a fitting topic to resume the research of the IKKM on *Operative Ontologies*.

Although this final issue is in English, we decided to leave its title in German: *Schalten und Walten*. As it is the case for the name of the IKKM, (*Internationales Kolleg für Kulturtechnikforschung und Medienphilosophie*), the term seems untranslatable to us, not only for the poetic reason of the rhyming sound of the words. *Switching and Ruling* might be accepted as English versions, but quite an unbridgeable difference remains. In German, *Schalten und Walten* is a rather common and quite widespread idiom that can be found in everyday life. Whoever, the idiom stipulates, is able to execute *Schalten und Walten* has the power to act, has freedom of decision and power of disposition.

Although both terms are mentioned together and belong together in the German expression *Schalten und Walten*, they are nevertheless complements to each other. They both refer to the exercise and existence of domination, disposal or power, but they nonetheless designate two quite different modes of being. *Schalten* is not so much sheer command over something, but government or management. It is linked to control, intervention and change, in short: it is operative and goes along with distinctive measures and cause-and-effect relations. The English equivalent *switching* reflects this more or less adequately.

Walten, on the other hand, is not articulated. It is not divisible, is not based on distinctions or decisions and does not come in the form of interventions or distinct operations. *Walten* is not a technique of domination, but rather dominance or dominion as a given state of being, a form of existence without outside, without any question, or alternative to it. *Walten* has neither origins nor causes. Where the German language seperates *Walten* from *Schalten* precisely by drawing them together, the English *ruling* includes both sides, both that which is simply there and therefore rules, and the technique of domination, such as the setting of rules.

Schalten und Walten, to us, seems to be a core double concept of what we have called *Operative Ontologies*, since *Operative Ontologies* as we have pursued them at the IKKM are grounded in one leading observation: assessing our situation today, we cannot ignore the fact that whatever is given in our environment is more and

more down to technical operations. Whatever exists is made, and the making of what exists requires tools and techniques, in short: (technical) media. This sharply contrasts the ways natural things exist, by *physis*, i.e. growing by themselves into being. Things like synthetic organisms do not reveal themselves in their own right and by their own agency but are called into existence by technology. The ruling (*Walten*) of nature as well as the ruling of the social reside under the command of technology, which as increasingly digitized technology is based on switching operations (*Schalten*). This holds true more and more for the natural and social things themselves as well, which are at hand to us only by technologies of engineering, design, management, and prediction, as for instance the achievements of bioengineering or the computational models of planet Earth teach us. Not only has nature itself turned into a »standing reserve« (*Bestand*) to a degree that Heidegger was unable to dream of, but this standing reserve is pervaded by technical (and increasingly digital) operations which determine how and what things are.

The condition that whatever exists is not simply present or given, but has been called into being through media and their operations in the most general sense demands a reconsideration of the traditional ontological questions (of the type *What is 'x'?*, or *Why is there something instead of nothing at all?*) and a radical remodeling of ontology: the difference between the ontological and the ontic re-enters the ontic. Although the term *Operative Ontologies* sounds self-contradictory—either operative, and hence ontic, or ontological, it seems—, any attempt to adequately describe the prevailing situation challenges exactly the paradoxical interrelation of the ontological and the ontic. The last issue of the ZMK is thus devoted to the exploration of the ways in which ontic and embodied operations establish ontological orders. Although the paradigm of operations which defines the highly technologized ontology of the 21st century is the electronic switching operation (*Schalten*), the topic embraces many ways and concrete situations in which objects are *switched* into being.

Since the industrial age and the possibility to digitally design objects only made obvious the technological processing of the ontological, *Schalten und Walten* refers to a broad variety of operations. The proposed move towards *Operative Ontologies* within media philosophy assumes that different ways of generating or manufacturing also propel different modes of being. Hence, *Operative Ontologies* inquire into the generative and procedural, the medial and the instrumental, the technical and the operative aspects of the *givenness* of that which is given. They investigate the given with regard to the procedures through which and with the help of which it has been made possible, produced, set up, brought into the world and called into being—or in short: *switched on*—in the first place. Through the technical modes and operations of calling something into being the respective mode of being is placed under material conditions.

This is why the topic of *Schalten und Walten* is so suitable to conclude the eleven years of the ZMK and the IKKM six-year research program on *Operative Ontologies*. The latter was structured along polar, complementary or gradual pairs of operations, which in themselves function as dualities or duplicities. Opening and closing, framing and sewing, appearing and disappearing, coupling and separating, compressing and dispersing, pointing and causing, reproduction and multiplication, or recursion and reflection were each examined as interrelated couples of ontological operations. As a continuation of and finale to this pairing method, we now turn towards *Schalten und Walten*.

So far, though, it might appear as if the concept of *Operative Ontologies* was based on a sound asymmetry between *Schalten* and *Walten*: whatever used to be accepted as just being given, for instance nature, or *physis*, is now increasingly dominated by being called into being through technologies, and mainly digital technologies. *Schalten* prevails to the detriment of *Walten*, it seems. *Walten*, in contrast, is obviously nothing more than a residual category. This asymmetry could be very much in conformity with the foundings of (especially »German«) media theory. None other than Friedrich Kittler himself coined the famous sentence: only what is switchable is at all. We cannot deny that this statement is true in more than one respect. To give just one example, we could say that all electric and electronic images only exist by virtue of their ability to be switched (and to switch), and that hence in the world of the image, only that which is switchable exists at all.

But nonetheless, the concept of *Operative Ontologies* does not necessarily imply the vanishing of the mode of existence of *Walten*. We can show this with reference to an early precursor of Kittler's powerful statement. As early as in 1969, not just by mere coincidence in the year of the flight to the moon, the philosopher and aesthetician Max Bense wrote the following lines:

»Civilization is not a state, but a process (obviously an allusion to Norbert Elias). A process we prefer. It shifts the world from a metaphorical state to a mathematical one, and it will not stop transforming problematic realms into calculable ones. Only worlds that can be anticipated are programmable, only those that can be programmed are constructible and habitable in a human way«.

In their simple radicality and with respect to the ongoing production of desasters and catastrophes of all kinds from natural hazards to violations of human rights even in the increasingly controlled world, Bense's sentences today can probably only be justified historically. But let us take them seriously for once. In this case we can say that in its nearly twelve years' existance the IKKM has struggled continuously to work on adjusting this point of view and supply a suitable alternative. Nevertheless, this alternative should not ignore anything of what Bense's sentence, in all its dogmatism and stubbornness, nonetheless correctly describes.

We can grasp this with the help of the concepts of *Schalten* and *Walten*. All we have to do is read what Bense captures with the *metaphorical state* and the *problematic areas* as what we mean by *Walten* here. On the other hand, according to Bense, the state that can be calculated, anticipated, programmed and constructed would be the opposite or complement. By the way, concepts, conceptual thought and the conceptual world, are to be included into Bense's mathematical state, in so far as they are *clara et distincta concepta*, logically sharp and precisely operable concepts, the *p* and *q* of analytical philosophy, for example. Anyway, in the sense of our research context, we can compare them with what we call *Schalten* here.

The world has got under a mode of switching, and everything that is has been brought into being by operations of switching. Whatever is, is a result of switching operations. This gives rise to concern oneself with the *operative ontology* of switching. And it is precisely here that the path taken by the IKKM in its research diverges from what Bense is proposing. For the IKKM has resolved not to exclude or overcome what is metaphorical for Bense, the problematic, the contingent, the historical and, in short, the material, but, on the contrary, to integrate it.

In short, our findings indicate that the operation of switching cannot be done without *Walten*. In order to be effective in the world, to be precisely operative, they must be implemented into the world. Bense's construable worlds must first be built, erected and even furnished. They are literally contaminated with the material and metaphorical worlds. And when viewed in light, the mathematical state of the world itself or the programmable, switchable mode of existence, is also by no means a bodiless and immaterial one. Calculation, programming and anticipation themselves require an apparatus. They depend on instruments and tools, on computers, for example. They remain attached and even stuck on the *res extensa*. That is exactly the difference between traditional ontology and *operative ontology* as we imagine it.

For Bense, aesthetics and anthropology are undoubtedly metaphorical undertakings. In relation to the human body as a ruling carrier of philosophical operations—which means: switchings—however, there have already been extensive efforts to promote and research the different bodies of thought. These investigations focus on the material conditions and the interactions between philosophical and organic operations, switchings and rulings. Media philosophy now adds to this the consideration of the technical and medial bodies.

We would like to show this briefly by a very simple and everyday cultural technique—the venetian blinds. Logically or conceptually, one could say that the venetian blinds as a cultural technique make a distinction between the inside and outside, which they themselves embody at the same time. The venetian blinds are also a switch; they let the light in or out, make the outside visible from the inside or not. They regulate the access to what we see or do not see through it. As for

the extent this kind of access to something determines its state or mode of being—a basic conviction of media philosophy—the venetian blinds thus also transform the world, namely the world of the visible, from a simply given state into a regulated state. The venetian blinds would be a very simple Bense apparatus.

And it would be all the more so as the venetian blinds repeat the regulation that they impose on the world of light and visibility. They make their own function, which they perform in the medium of light, visible precisely in light. They make visible the invisible, the medium, namely light. On the inside of the distinction, in the space in which we find ourselves and which they delimit from the outside, venetian blinds create light and dark stripes. In this way they repeat and show the binary distinction between the visible and the invisible, and the inside and the outside, which they themselves implement. In this respect, the venetian blinds are not only a recursive, but to some extent a reflexive, a logical-philosophical machine in the realm of *Schalten*.

In fact, however, the highlight of the venetian blinds lies precisely in the fact that they are not just this, but a metaphorical and problematic machine in the sense of Bense as well. The nice thing about the venetian blinds is that they know intermediate states between open and closed. The stripes of visibility and light are changeable, manipulable. Exactly this change between the states is what the venetian blinds, in contrast to a simple window shutter, executes. Thus the venetian blinds also generate a time of their own, which is more than, and different from, the mere, sharp, reversible and even expansionless distinction between before and after. The adjustment of the venetian blinds, like any operation, for example that of the departure of a ship, has a course. It takes hold of time and costs time. The venetian blinds do not simply implement the logical operations of separation, differentiation and repetition, but the aesthetic operations of coupling and transition between states or even transmission. They are, in short, a metaphorical machine, and yet and at the same time still a switch, technical and, if you like, mathematical and logical in caracter and function.

In addition, of course, the venetian blinds themselves have a body that extends in space. This is shown by the fact that it wears and wears out, that the handling lines can tear, the lamellas can bend and must be cleaned regularly. It is also directed at our biological bodies, it requires a certain handling. Only these transfers and overlaps of different bodies and materials make the venetian blinds a philosophical apparatus in the sense of media philosophy.

What applies to the venetian blinds probably applies to all switches. They all consist of something material, metal, plastic, semiconductors or other materials. They produce not only mathematical distinctions, logical negations, but also metaphorical contacts, touches and transitions, but also heat and sometimes noise. They generate the *Eigenzeit*, which they need for their execution, and reach out

into space. If complex semiconductor circuits can finally take over thought processes such as arithmetic or even speech, then they are still bodies of thought.

So *Schalten* on its turn brings with it *Walten* like its own shadow, and, of course, media theory is interested in this remaining ontological shadow of digitization and of mediatization in general. But there is even more than the necessary pertinence of *Walte*n even under digital conditions. *Walten* is not only the unavoidable substrate of *Schalten*, it can also emerge from it. One striking example can be seen in what Raymond Williams called the *flow.* The flux of images on TV is, due to the switchability of the screen picture, continuously and constantly interrupted in a most abrupt way by switching over to other images, most heterogenuous image types, TV genres, broadcast formats. They interfere with each other in a way to only leave caleidoscopic meaningless fragments, tiny bits and pieces of what used to be for instance, news, advertising, wheater forecasts, sports, shows, episodes, fictions, live transmissions, announcements, wrap ups, and so forth. There is no coherence of whatsoever quality, especially if it comes to semantics, to meaning or to any form of Gestalt. The term of coherence (or of interruption) loses any significance. Switching operates, as Hartmut Winkler once put it, an operation directed against any kind of context and hence of text.

But, Williams observes, a strange kind of rhythm, or of surfing on the surface of the fragmented sequence of distinctions and of switching operations that comes into being. Based on highly frequent interruptions, a *flow* of plasticity and viscosity arises, a state of experience or even existence, a mode of being, which integrates viewers, images, switchable pictures, sounds, and the world beyond. *Flow* is a bodily and hence physical, material phenomenon, not just a structure or a sequence of otherwise disembodied distinctions. It hence brings *physis* back into the game. *Flow* emerges from switching, *Schalten*, but it rules in the sense of *Walten*.

What can be found in the switchable picture may also emerge elsewhere. The Maltese Cross in the movie camera (and projector) could also be adressed here, or, even more general, language. In what André Martinet called *la double articulation du langage*, the articulation or segmentation of what has already been articulated or fragmented, the coherent dominion of sense emerges as both an artifact, and hence on the side of switching, and an unavoidably and unquestionably ruling condition of existence. Signals, discernable and switchable entities, as they emerge from ruling noise may on their turn, if sequenced, generate a kind of second order flow-like noise and as such turn into given conditions of existence. The cloud, or looped CCTV Systems, or the pervasion of the habitat with computers, and hence switches, may be regarded in a comparable way as modes of turning *Schalten* into *Walten*.

In this sense, with the topic of *Schalten* und *Walten*, the last issue of the ZMK endeavors to investigate the entry or implementation of the mathematical, switch-

able (or conceptual) world into the metaphorical, ruling (or material) world. It is not the replacement of one topic by the other, which is our topic, but rather their coupling and their turning into each other. Thus we suggest that some *Walten* always prevails in all *Schalten*. If only what is switchable can exist, then all *Schalten* requires a *Walten* which it itself generates.

Weimar, February 2020   *The Editors*

Abstracts

Emanuele Coccia: **Das Museum für zeitgenössische Natur**

Im letzten Jahrhundert hat sich das Museum von einer Institution, die sich auf die Vergangenheit und ihre Bewahrung konzentriert, zu einem Instrument der Wahrsagerei über die Zukunft von Kunst und Gesellschaft gewandelt. Der Aufsatz schlägt vor, ebenso die Museen für Naturgeschichte zu transformieren und für das Konzept einer Zeitgenossenschaft der Natur mit den entsprechenden Untersuchungsinstrumenten zu öffnen, sodass sie sich zu neuen Museen für zeitgenössische Natur entwickeln können.

During the last century, art museums evolved from institutions focussing on the past and its preservation to instruments of soothsaying about the future of art and society.
This article suggests transforming museums for natural history in the same way, introducing them to the concept of a contemporaneity of nature via proper investigative tools in order to help outdated museums transforming into modern institutions, showcasing contemporary nature.

Noémie Etienne: **Through the Looking Glass. Dioramas, Bodies, and Performances in New York**

Dioramas are multimedia installations used in museums and popular culture since the 19th century. I study two sets of anthropological dioramas: the ones made for the Museum of Natural History in New York by Franz Boas; and the ones fabricated at the New York State Museum in Albany by Arthur C. Parker. As I will show, dioramas are not only visual displays but also installations with a proper materiality and temporality: they are the stage of multiple performances and work as contact zones between objects, models, makers, and beholders.

Lisa Parks: **Global Networking and the Contrapuntal Node: The Project Mercury Earth Station in Zanzibar, 1959–64**

In 1960, the US government and British protectorate of Zanzibar signed an agreement that allowed US contractors working for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) to build an earth station that would support Project Mercury, the first manned US satellite mission. This article focuses on the development of the Project Mercury earth station in Zanzibar during 1959-1964. To historicize the earth station's establishment, the focus lies on the geopolitical and sociotechnical relations that resulted in the Zanzibar station.

Debatte: **Medienwissenschaft ohne Medien**

Der Beitrag von Claus Pias geht von zwei Beobachtungen aus: einem Zurücktreten des Medienbegriffs innerhalb medienwissenschaftlicher Forschung und eines Desinteresses sogenannter ›Digitalisierung‹ ihr gegenüber. Er untersucht, inwiefern Medientheorie (von McLuhan und Kittler bis zu den sogenannten Digital Humanities) durch einen starken Medienbegriff an der Herausbildung von Zeitsemantiken und Narrativen von ›Digitalisierung‹ beteiligt war und von ihnen profitiert hat. Als Konsequenz fordert Pias zu medienwissenschaftlicher Grundlagenforschung auf, die mit einer strategischen Revision und

Aktualisierung von ›Medien‹ als Begriff und Gegenstand einhergeht.

Der Beitrag von Kathrin Peters stimmt mit dieser Lagebeschreibung nur teilweise überein. Die Skepsis gegenüber den Zukunfts- und Dringlichkeitsrhetoriken gegenwärtiger Digitalisierungsoffensiven wird von ihr geteilt, dass allerdings vor allem eine Medienwissenschaft des ›medientechnischen a priori‹ eine Antwort auf den gegenwarts- und anwendungsfixierten Digitalisierungsdiskurs liefern könnte, erscheint Peters als zu kurz gegriffen. Andere medienwissenschaftliche Ausrichtungen sind dazu ebenso in der Lage: medienwissenschaftliche Analysen zu Kolonialität und Postkolonialität, feministische, gender- und queertheoretische Fragestellungen, eine medienwissenschaftlich informiert Wissenschaftsforschung und Affekttheorie – um nur einige zu nennen. Es geht um Konzepte von Medienwissenschaft als Fragestellung, die ihre Gegenstände in den verschiedensten Bereichen hervorbringen, dabei aber zugleich als Mittel und Mittler immer wieder unsichtbar werden.

Debate: **Media Studies without Media**

Claus Pias' article starts out from two points of observation: a recession of the term media within the field of media studies and a disinterest of the so-called digitalization in this particular term. Pias examines the impact media theory (ranging from McLuhan and Kittler to the so-called Digital Humanities) had on the development of time semantics and the narratives of ›digitalization‹ due to the use of a strong media term, and how media theory profited from it.

As a result, Pias calls for establishing basis research in media studies, going hand in hand with a strategic revision and update of media, as a term as well as a subject.

In her article, Kathrin Peters only partially agrees with this evaluation. She shares the scepticism concerning future-rhetoric as well as priority-rhetoric, both featuring heavily in current digital offensives; however, in her opinion it is not enough to hope for answers on today's digitalization-discourse from media studies hailing the media-technical *a priori*.

There are other approaches in media studies which are able to offer these answers: analysis of colonialism and post-colonialism, feministic, gender- and queer-theoretical questions, a media-informed science of knowledge and affect theory, just to name a few of them. It is all about concepts of media science being perceived as problems which bring forth their own subjects in various areas of research, yet as a tool as well as an intermediary, they are frequently overlooked.

Alexander R. Galloway: **Medien und Mathematik**

Unter Bezugnahme auf Philosophie und Mathematik schlägt dieser Artikel allgemeine Formeln für das Digitale und das Analoge vor, wobei das Digitale als das Verhältnis der diskreten Terme (a/b), das Analoge als eine Verhältnisgleichung (a/b = c/d) definiert sind. Mit diesen allgemeinen Formeln zur Hand werden wir in der Lage sein, zwei der häufigsten operativen Ontologien (Digitalität und das Analoge) zu erforschen und gleichzeitig ein ontologisches Szenario zu enthüllen, in dem keines der beiden zutrifft.

Taking into account both philosophy and maths, this article suggests general formulas for both the digital sphere and the analogue, defining the digital sphere as a relation of discrete terms (a/b) whereas the analogue is described as a proportion (a/b = c/d). Falling back on those general formulas, one will be able to study two of the most frequently used operative ontologies (the digitality and the analogue) while at the same time unveiling an ontological scenario to which none of the aforementioned ontologies apply.

Alexander Waszynski and Nicole C. Karafyllis: **Re-Collecting Microbes with Hans Blumenberg's Concept of »Reoccupation« (*Umbesetzung*): from Isolating/Cultivating towards Digitizing/Synthesizing**

Based on Hans Blumenberg's philosophical concept of »reoccupation«, the study analyzes why the microbe has never really been situated in the world, demarcating ontological shifts in modeling microbes. The shifts are related to techniques such as sequencing and digitizing, to microbe banks acting as world models, and to metaphysical vacancies co-created. These can be operated on a historiographic level, as highlighted by the world formula of bacterial photosynthesis. It allowed for imaginations of the Early Earth and an Iron-Sulfur-World. In sum, collecting and cultivating are shown to be crucial pre-operations for operative bio-ontologies, exemplified by a case study on the *German Collection of Microorganisms* (DSMZ).

Christina Vagt: **Predicting and Shaping or How to Close the Future**

Behavioral design of so called »persuasive computer technologies« is the result of a merger between psychology, economics, and computer engineering. The article discusses its genealogy from the strategic response of military, governmental, and academic players to the general problem that the behavior of complex systems such as humans, societies, or markets is difficult to predict, and that controlling these complex systems means shaping them by designing their technological and social environments.

Adam Knowles: **Martin Heidegger: Force, Violence and the Administration of Thinking**

In 1929, Martin Heidegger announced a new fundamental term in his thinking: *Walten*. Heidegger uses *Walten* to designate the primal ontological force of nature, but also brings it into connection with administration (*Verwalten*), specifically linking it to university administration. The article argues that in the Black Notebooks Heidegger develops a philosophical conception of administrative practice in the midst of his own administrative practice as university Rector in the era of *Gleichschaltung.*

Pauline Chasseray-Peraldi: **Something that Disturbs: Encounters between Animals and Recording Optical Machines**

Images of encounters between animals and drones or Google Street View cars are quite viral on the web. This article focuses on the different regimes of animacy and conflicts of affects in these images using an anthroposemiotic approach. It investigates how otherness reveals something that exceeds us, from the materiality of the machine to systems of values. It suggests that the disturbance of animal presence in contemporary digital images helps us to read media technologies.

Ulrich Meurer: **Invading/Inviting: From Surveillance to Byzantium**

While border surveillance produces geopolitical realities and distinctions between types of human life, Richard Mosse's video installation INCOMING (2017) uses a military high-grade thermal camera to challenge this onto-political project. Recording refugee camps and crossings via the Mediterranean into Europe, his techno-images' specific mosaic structure, tactility, and luminous flatness evoke the visual mode of Byzantine icons, thus switching from a paranoid, invasive world/view to an economy of mediation and contact with the Other.

Autorinnen und Autoren

Max Bense (1910–1990) war Professor für Philosophie und Wissenschaftstheorie an der Universität Stuttgart und Leiter der Abteilung Information an der Hochschule für Gestaltung Ulm. Arbeitsschwerpunkte: Kybernetik, Wissenschaftstheorie, Logik, Ästhetik und Semiotik. Ausgewählte Veröffentlichungen: Konturen einer Geistesgeschichte der Mathematik (Hamburg 1946/1948); Aesthetica. Einführung in die neue Ästhetik (Baden–Baden 1965); Ungehorsam der Ideen. Abschließender Traktat über Intelligenz und technische Welt (Köln 1965).

Emanuele Coccia ist Professor an der École des hautes études en sciences sociales in Paris. Arbeitsschwerpunkte: Geschichte der europäischen Normativität, Konzeptionen des Lebens, der ontologische Status und die normative Kraft von Bildern in der Mode und der Werbung. Ausgewählte Veröffentlichungen: Das Gute in den Dingen. Die Werbung als moralischer Diskurs (Berlin 2017); Die Wurzeln der Welt. Eine Philosophie der Pflanzen (München 2018); Sinnenleben. Eine Philosophie (München 2020).

Pauline Chasseray-Peraldi is a graduate student at the Sorbonne University in Paris and currently completing her PhD in Media and Communication studies on the topic of *Before, during and after digital images of the web.* Main focuses of research: optical machines, sensory turn, ecological approach of new media. Selected publications: with Yves Jeanneret: Everywhere and Nowhere. The Body in Absentia in Epiphanic Devices, in: Béatrice Galinon-Mélénec (ed.): L'homme-trace, Inscriptions corporelles et techniques (Paris 2017*);* Processing the Territory. From Taking a Picture, to Online Archiving, in: Questions de communication 37/1 (2020).

Noémie Etienne is professor of Art History at the University of Bern. Main focuses of research: materiality and temporality of artefacts, dioramas, conservation, cultural heritage. Selected Publications: The Restoration of Paintings in Paris (1750-1815). Practice, Discourse, Materiality (Los Angeles 2017); Les autres et les ancêtres. Les dioramas de Franz Boas et d'Arthur C. Parker in New York, 1900 (Dijon 2020).

Alexander R. Galloway is Professor of Media, Culture, and Communication at New York University. Main focuses of research: philosophy, technology, and theories of mediation. Selected Publications: Protocol: How Control Exists after Decentralization (Cambridge, MA 2004); The Interface Effect (Hoboken, NJ 2012); Laruelle. Against the Digital (Minneapolis, MN 2014).

Nicole C. Karafyllis is Full Professor of Philosophy at the Technische Universität Braunschweig. Her areas of specialization are Philosophy of Science and Technology, Phenomenology, Collection Research and early 20th century philosophy. Selected publications (ed.): Biofakte. Versuch über den Menschen zwischen Artefakt und Lebewesen (Paderborn 2003); Putzen als Passion. Ein philosophischer Universalreiniger für klare Verhältnisse (Berlin 2013), Willy Moog. Ein Philosophenleben (Freiburg im Breisgau / München 2015), (ed.): Theorien der Lebendsammlung. Pflanzen, Mikroben und

Tiere als Biofakte in Genbanken (ed., Freiburg im Breisgau 2018).

Adam Knowles is an Assistant Teaching Professor of Philosophy at Drexel University. Main focuses of research: continental philosophy, phenomenology, Holocaust studies. Selected publications: Heidegger's Fascist Affinities: A Politics of Silence (Stanford 2019); A Genealogy of Silence: *Chora* and the Placelessness of Greek Women (philoSOPHIA: A Journal of Continental Feminism 2015); Hospitality's Downfall: Kant, Cosmopolitanism and Refugees (Journal of Speculative Philosophy 2017).

Ulrich Meurer ist Gastprofessor für Bild- und Medientheorien an der ›Visual Studies Platform‹ der Central European University in Wien. Arbeitsschwerpunkte: Politiken und Philosophien des Bewegtbildes, Alternative Historiographien/Archäologien der Medien und des Kinos. Ausgewählte Veröffentlichungen: Topographien. Raumkonstruktionen in Literatur und Film der Postmoderne (München 2007); Übersetzung und Film. Das Kino als Translationsmedium (Hg., Bielefeld 2012).

Lisa Parks is Professor of Comparative Media Studies and Science, Technology, & Society at MIT. Her main focuses of research are: Media history and theory; satellite technologies; media and globalization; media infrastructures; surveillance; experimental methodologies. Selected Publications: Cultures in Orbit: Satellites and the Televisual (Durham, NC 2005); Rethinking Media Coverage: Vertical Mediation and the War on Terror (London 2018).

Kathrin Peters ist Professorin für Geschichte und Theorie der visuellen Kultur an der Universität der Künste Berlin. Arbeitsschwerpunkte: Geschichte und Theorie der Fotografie, Gender und Medien, Mediengeschichte der Architektur und Planung, Film und Kunst

der Gegenwart. Ausgewählte Veröffentlichungen: Rätselbilder des Geschlechts. Körperwissen und Medialität um 1900 (Zürich/Berlin 2010); zus. m. Andrea Seier (Hg.): Gender & Medien-Reader (Zürich/Berlin 2016); zus. m. Kathrin Busch, Christina Dörfling, Ildikó Szántó (Hg.): Wessen Wissen? Materialität und Situiertheit in den Künsten (Paderborn 2018).

Claus Pias ist Professor für Medientheorie und Mediengeschichte an der Leuphana Universität Lüneburg. Arbeitsschwerpunkte: Wissens- und Wissenschaftsgeschichte digitaler Medien, Geschichte der Medientheorie. Ausgewählte Veröffentlichungen: Computer Spiel Welten (Zürich 2002); (Hg.): Was waren Medien? (Zürich 2011); zus. mit T. Beyes und R. Holt (Hg.): The Oxford Handbook on Media, Technology, and Organization Studies (Oxford 2019).

William Stewart ist Doktorand am Department of German der Princeton University sowie im Princeton Interdisciplinary Doctoral Program in the Humanities (IHUM). Arbeitsschwerpunkte: Kultur- und Geistesgeschichte der deutschen Nachkriegszeit, Rezeption der frühen Kybernetik und Informationstheorie innerhalb der deutschsprachigen Avantgarde, Geistesgeschichte der Mathematik im 20. Jahrhundert. Ausgewählte Veröffentlichungen: Intertextueller Reichtum, in: Johnson-Jahrbuch 24/2017 (Göttingen 2018), S. 261–267; Human Organs: On Ernst Kapp's »Elements of a Philosophy of Technology«, in: The Los Angeles Review of Books, 2 May 2019.

Christina Vagt is Assistant Professor of German and European Media Studies at the University of California in Santa Barbara. Main focuses of research: media philosophy and history of knowledge. Selected Publications: Geschickte Sprünge. Physik und Medium bei Martin

Heidegger (Berlin/Zürich 2012); Education automation. Verhaltensdesign als Ästhetische Erziehung, in: Jeannie Moser and Christina Vagt (eds.): Verhaltensdesign (Bielefeld 2018).

Alexander Waszynski is post-doc researcher at the Friedrich-Alexander-Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg and member of the research project MIKROBIB (*Contamination and Readability of the World: Articulating Microbes in Collections*) at the Technische Universität Braunschweig. Main focuses of research: phenomenology, media and literature theory. Selected publications: Was betrifft – Lesbarkeit nach Hans Blumenberg (forthcoming in 2020).

Adressen Autorinnen und Autoren ZMK 11|2020

Pauline Chasseray-Peraldi
Sorbonne University
Media and Communication Studies, GRIPIC
76 rue de la Villette
City 75019 Paris
Pauline.chasseray.peraldi@gmail.com

Emanuele Coccia
EHESS PARIS
CEHTA
2, rue Vivienne
75006 Paris
emanuele.coccia@ehess.fr

Noémie Etienne
University of Bern
Institut für Kunstgeschichte
Mittelstrasse 43
3012 Bern
noemie.etienne@ikg.unibe.ch

Alexander R. Galloway
New York University
Department of Media, Culture, and
Communication
239 Greene Street, 8th Floor
New York, NY 10003
galloway@nyu.edu

Nicole C. Karafyllis
Technische Universität Braunschweig
Institute of Philosophy
Bienroder Weg 80
D-38106 Braunschweig
n.karafyllis@tu-braunschweig.de

Adam Knowles
Drexel University, Department of
English and Philosophy
3141 Chestnut st.
Philadelphia, PA 19104, USA
ajk358@drexel.edu

Ulrich Meurer
Central European University, Wien
Visual Studies Platform
ulrich.meurer@univie.ac.at

Lisa Parks
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
The Media Lab Complex, E15-322
20 Ames Street
Cambridge, MA 02139-4307, USA
lparks@mit.edu

Kathrin Peters
Universität der Künste Berlin
Fakultät Gestaltung
Grunewaldstr. 2-5
10823 Berlin
k.peters@udk-berlin.de

Claus Pias
Leuphana Universität Lüneburg
Centre for Digital Cultures
Am Sande 5
21335 Lüneburg
pias@leuphana.de

William Stewart
Department of German
Princeton University
203 East Pyne Building
Princeton, NJ 08544, USA
ws8@princeton.edu

Christina Vagt
University of California Santa Barbara
Department of Germanic and Slavic Studies
Santa Barbara, CA 93106, USA
vagt@ucsb.edu

Alexander Waszynski
Technische Universität Braunschweig
Institute of Philosophy
Bienroder Weg 80
D-38106 Braunschweig
a.waszynski@tu-braunschweig.de

Schwerpunkte: