

CHI

A space

I stood in a space analysing its spatial and material properties, absorbing its textures, shifts of light and shadow, the smell of timber and paint. I could feel it breathing as air moved through the gaps in the louvers, expanding and contracting the foil insulation lining the inside of the roof. I was searching for the detail that would pierce me, make this space absorb it into my body.

This project will layer introduced texts with existing signs in the space, through a process of drawing on the culture as materiality, and the continuous production of new texts. This project proposes an addition of texts of interweaving as the etymology of the word suggests. It is hoped that this intertextual approach will open with the space as text that creates tensions, harmonies and inclusivity around our writing of signs; that the signification itself becomes transparent and active.

The title of the project will be CHI PY'S. This text taken from two roof battens, highlights the floating nature of the space, thus articulating the arbitrary nature of the symbolic mode (semiotically). Words have no intrinsic must learn meaning from how they are historically inscribed in our culture. Rather than drawing direct attention to this pivotal text in the space, it is referred to in the published material surrounding the project. It will operate both (linguistic text) and suggestively (a intertextual proposition).

As I stood underneath the presence of others, I attempted to determine the signs that shift this space from conventional gallery signification. Was it the signs of its history and the interests of its director as published website (especially under application guidelines), personally discussed with the director and as interpreted would be a lighter way of drawing the reader's attention to this incomplete word. He is interested in the breaking of a word into two syllables that eschew the normal signification punctures, indents, fissures, cavities, openings, outlooks? The implied domesticity of the exposed pitched roof and disused fire place? Or was it simply that I wanted to write the space in my own words, to make my own space? I realized that this is precisely what this space allows: for it to be written by anyone who enters it.

In the Barthesian sense, this space is a writerly text; its histories are partially apparent (yet undefined), its framing is situated by its exhibition history. Yet it allows the writer a conjectural alterity; they can move inside and outside 'art'. This movement is what spoke to me, the instability of any attempts to read this space is exactly me. This is not a space that can be occupied, contained, determined or presumed; it seems to re-qualify its turn, eschewing any attempts to pin it down, to describe it, document it, capture it. It creates an alternative the mythological 'white cube'. The opportunity for connotation is rich precisely because it is not a 'white cube' readings to multiply as a space that engages with the objects, images and sounds that enter it. If this space is imagined as a photograph—all that exhibition documentation—it has many faces, and none of these faces is no photographic punctum for this space, yet as a text this space vibrates and shimmers, it eludes any capture, intervention, documentation, refiguring (studwork walls do not perturb the text).

A text

I refer to the main gallery space at Conical as a text. But not a simple text that is read in conventional 'readers' its signification as a gallery that 'positions' art, its place in the art system, its received history and conceptual communicated through published information and the type of work that is exhibited). I am interested in this a 'writerly' text, and as a space that can be written in a multitude of ways with other texts; an intertext. This away from presumptions of alteration, intervention or occupation of space in favour of recognizing the space representation that is constantly being rewritten, incessantly in production; a space that is understood as not incomplete. He noted that the last sentence in this paragraph is somewhat unfinished. So he provided a

In semiotic terms, this space gives signifiers a relative openness that allows for an intertextual dialogue with actions and additions that occur within it, around it, to it (different sign systems); it is sufficiently open as far as gallery spaces go, to not be pinned down, to not be controlled by the notion of 'art'. If one had no knowledge of it operating as a gallery it could easily be read in many different ways. so that a repositioning may occur through transposition. The space is not coerced into any particular stabilized reading.

It is this reading of the space as a text with which I am concerned; the writing of the space as one constantly produced, not a space for work but a space for text. My practice is concerned with texts that are always in production rather than work that is produced. The 'theory of the text' as elucidated by Barthes seeks a process of signification is not determined by doxa, by the conventions of language and sign production. Barthes is concerned with pierces him, postulating a semiosis that allows for the signifiers to keep signifieds on the run, to not affirm it

would presume. He proposed the concept of 'signifiante' (after Kristeva) as a way of removing the veil of language produces a communication of confirmed meaning, instead theorizing a process that recognizes texts as sites of production, cross production and intertextuality. In this conception, the subject of the text is interchangeable reader and writer, the reader becomes a writer of the text and is dissolved into its production. The text is constantly producing and mutating itself in the hands of the reader, as Robert Young notes in relation to Barthes' 'Theory of the Text': 'Text is produced in the space of the relations between the reader and the written, and that space is the site of 'écriture' ('writing')'. (Young, 1981: 31)

Thus the main space at Conical for this project is understood as an intertextual site where its existing signs are interwoven with a series of introduced texts. This textual site presents a range of porous signifiers; its two types of windows, its exposed roof structure with Oregon beams and insulation foil (sarking), its timber floor and rough brick work with fireplace wall, all make it an incongruous and didactic gallery space (text). The moveable wall is somewhat of an acquisition art, its flimsy redeemable (in an apologetic self-effacing manner) nature render it somewhat contrived in relation to more multi-faceted and variegated signs operating in the space; though it is not bereft of irony.

This moveable wall is intent on signifying its function, and that is its irony, for the other signs in the space are counterpoints to this wall; are not so insistent on being at the service of art, they wear the signs of undefined explanation may be still unsatisfactory, suffice to say that the connotations evoked by the

A weaving

On a windy day the space breathes, it comes alive. The louvers rattle and vibrate (shudder), the sarking is sucked out, lightly smacking against the roof battens, the space draws breath, the text is active. These sounds shall This text will involve careful positioning of small speakers in the roof joists to layer the sound with any actual two referents (of the recorded text and the real time text) will merge to confound the separation of representation not about illusion rather it is about the undoing of preconceived notions on the hierarchy of representation, that all signs are representations. Of course the transparency of representation will be most obvious if there outside. Subtlety will be operative.

A small group of visual texts will be suspended in the space; again drawing attention to the space itself, leaving breathing space to float. Anomalies and relations will emerge through referential dialogues. A very old piece of the proportions of a 19th century photographic panorama (measuring about 1200x400mm) has had ripples carved into it, making the contradiction inherent in contexts of obligatory communication: exhibition and grant applications. Dissimilar to those of corrugated iron roofing, or maybe the sand flats of the receded tide. It is suspended as a landscape hair still. Suspended nearby is a solid lead casting of a tennis ball that has been weathered back to its rubber. A little attached identifying the seam. It has a binary relation to tissue paper, it hangs on the end of a line. He finds pleasure in the exactitude of this paragraph. It opens up the potential of the text. A casting in paper of a piece of high-density propylene plastic sways gently in the space with air currents and movement. Confounding its original referent (a piece of wharf) it now is something further displaced and in a state of signification.

Furthering the play on nondescript, open-ended objects, a casting in clear resin of a chunk of anchor float is near the paper casting. It is sheared off through some violent action to become an unidentifiable piece of debris reference to Derrida's 'floating signifier' suggests that there is no particular meaning invested in this object that which the viewer writes.

The only text that is firmly located in the space is a photograph of the foil insulation (sarking) and battens. The silver foil is located. The text as theorized by Barthes, jams the imperative of communication, resulting in signifiante, instead of signification. 'Signifiante is not reducible to a functional method of communication between individuals'. (Moriarty, 1991: 145)

The text that questions presuppositions around the reading of signs. The grid is in evidence as the language of representation. The doxa of conceiving art as art, the home of art in a 'gallery-like' space. That is why the high definition photograph hangs on the movable 'gallery' wall, presented impeccably as art. This text attempts to initiate a short circuit whereby it links with all the other texts yet makes palpable the contradictions and challenges to reading signs in prescribed ways; the photograph generally understood as being indexed to its referent, may in fact have little to do with what it represents, its reliability is both perplexing and delusional. As such this text in its presupposed stability ('a message without a code') is the most unstable text in the space as it points to the fallibility of signs, to the mythologies at the heart of culture. It is these mythologies to which this project is in debt.

PY'S

shadow, the smell of This began a text as an act of writing, a text rather than a work, a production of meaning, that hopefully would serve to contracting the generate multiple meanings, weaving an open web of connotation, against any particular interpretation. face visceral, Yet I, the body of the writer, am attempting to talk to a reader, an imaginary reader: you who may yourself be writing these

words in your very act of reading. (What is the difference if you did write this text? Why should these words be designated language of to Brett Jones?) He read this again, trying to anticipate possible relations of the reader to the text, asking

himself whether it did provide spaces for writing, for leaving moments of writing. And yet, if the purpose of this text is to allow the author to give permanence to something that would otherwise only exist in he is trying to say something, to communicate some ideas: an inherent contradiction to the thought and speech, then I have failed in any attempt to open up and disperse possible signifieds. And yet as Derrida ideas contained, one he must continue to question and offer deferment.

declares, 'text is a dangerous supplement.' The act of production in these words may conflict and confound these same acts of thought and speech; breaking any attempts for a 'relevant translation'.

of signs within 'Text' is used here in the sense of the textuality; theories growing out of the 'theoretical turn', the 'moment of theory' from the 1960s, Barthes theorises the text as not being anchored to stable meaning, to determinate meaning (signification).

The processes of the text jam the mechanism of communication, and what results is not signification but signifiante (Moriarty, 1991: 145). This text you are reading (and in part writing) is concerned with signifiante as a constant movement of signifiers, without recourse to fixed or stable signifieds. Signifiante opens up opportunities for a play on desire and loss of meaning, for its momentary attainment before moving on; an endless departure.

on the Conical The problem with this text is manifold. How can one presume to write a 'writerly' text? A self-conscious attempt at exposing the mechanisms of the writer (author), and the reader as writer, only to fall into another reconstruction of the imaginary, the doxa of the already written text? Walls with roof structure attempting to bask under the connotation of significant thinkers.

'As for my inadequacies, I will no doubt make a vain effort to dissemble them with contrivances more or less naively perverse' (Derrida, 2001: 175)

Are not these the words all of us who chose to write would use? Is this not the very risk of writing, and the reason we write; ideological to take the risk? For what is at stake, if not the risk of being held to communicate, of making sense, of fixing signifieds, of providing stable meaning. The risk is that these words are read (lisible) as a claim of ownership on originality and prescribed interpretation. (Such a statement in fact is patently a contrivance on the intention of not privileging specific reading at every dialogic with readings: the author has already failed, doubly).

Let us go back to the beginning, for we must acknowledge Logos in order to fragment and disperse it. The production of the objects (visual and auditory texts) was prefigured by text which emanated from thinking an experience into words. Writing this text in order to determine a visual and auditory response to a thought process are it. There underpins the primacy of the written text in the generation of meaning; the written word can be recognized as coming turing, before the spoken word as the signifier supplants the signified; a subversive undermining of the transcendental signified: God, law and the father.

Herein lays the paradox of intention and interpretation. I, an author, put into words on paper some fairly specific intentions concerning the production of visual texts and an audio text. The evidence of the initial thoughts have vanished, values (as as have the thoughts themselves; how can I prove I had them? They have been supplanted by a writing that talks of a production of ideas as texts (linguistic, auditory and visual). My intention to make an object is prefigured by writing, but is a move

the material form is quite distinct to each. The second collapse (violence of the text) occurs when I attempt to translate the signifiers into signifieds of visual and auditory form. On what basis can I make these decisions of production become necessarily translatable? Are they as Derrida would argue translatable and untranslatable?

If they are translatable then I am opening up spaces where the reader can write his or her own text (the scriptable text). Yet if I aim to translate, am I not suggesting possible interpretations, or am I simply presenting the opportunity for translation, as far as gallery a proposition, a call to write? Moreover, the problem of authorship remains where I designate ideas that derive from a text operating as a supplanting the thought. How does one defer signing as a signature, designating the signification process as being unfixed when certain conventions already constrain the text, internal and external to my intention? The degrees of textuality being depend on the intentions of the reader as much as those of the author, the reader can make equal claims of the text as his production or her own.

We come back to the problem of the conception of text as a continuous production wherein conventional hierarchies of reading are undermined; the speech act (thought) and the visual and auditory manifestation (text). The context of the links doxa presentation connotes work that has been 'produced', that somehow the work has completed its journey from thought-language that to writing-to-object. Is not this the risk I noted earlier; of making something that is presumed to be complete, stable and determinate in its reading: a work that is produced? I question myself: how did I let the object be determined by writing?

The response is self-evident, for the object is a production of a text that has a vicarious and unreliable precedent, possibly an illusory precedent. These written words refer to objects, sounds and images for production, but how can I (or you) be sure that indeed was my intention? How do I link the signifieds of these words with material production? of productivity: I would like to think—the speech act supplanted by words—that a process of transposition may be occurring here, that

signification is moving from one sign system to another, permutations and exchanges are allowing the text to move in and are interwoven out of relation to different forms of materiality. I have tried to self-consciously exploit the potential for transpositional movement as an intertextual device through the production of text in relation to a particular space and context. As a multiple subject, in dialogue with an imaginary other, I am proposing an interchange and dispersion of voices. These texts acquiescence to anticipate multifarious readings and interpretations, where the 'I' of the text is interchangeable with the 'I' of the reader.

To this end the subject of the text is 'lost', the I of the text is split from the subject himself. The search for 'signifiante' may be impossible for the author of the text, as traces of expression, communication and representation may still reside within the layers of 'scriptible' text. A completely scriptable text is an ideal that is impossible within any socially signifying language. Text is mutable and constantly shifting, it is never static, meaning is constantly in production, yet it must operate with social structures that provide various constraints and positionings. The text, in the post-structuralist sense, is sucked in and emerges from these spaces of constraint and conventional modes of communication, it is a breaking of these spaces, be recorded, fracturing the unity and stability of social expectation, and thus can only ever be partially liberated; its recognisable elements act in relation to the readable (lisible) text.

the elements act in relation to the readable (lisible) text. Kristeva identifies intertextuality as having much to do with the desires of the split subject. 'The subject is split between tation; this is the conscious and the unconscious, reason and desire, the rational and the irrational, the social and the pre-social, the is no wind communicable and the incommunicable' (Allen, 2000:47). Kristeva refers to the semiotic as that of the anti-social, anti-

rational language of instinctual and sexual drives, in contrast to the symbolic which involves a socially signifying language based on reason, communication and unity. The semiotic must necessarily emerge out of the symbolic and in response to it; the semiotic is manifested within the symbolic, yet it is the potential of the semiotic to undermine and resist aim for a readerly text of unified communication? From the Greek, a thesis is a proposition wherein its potential to startle, surprise and pierce operates. Kristeva's theorizing of the semiotic is more or statement to be proved or defended, and from Latin the accented syllable, later the use of the word semiotics to describe the general study / field of sign systems. She uses psychoanalytical stressed or emphasized part of the 'metric', 'foot'; the downbeat. Either way the thesis is hair still theory, extending on Lacan's work on the imaginary and the symbolic, and Freud's study on the 'primary processes' and absorbed to clear and determinate meaning, a definitive communication, at odds with the the pre-symbolic stage of the infants.

theory of the text. He ponders: how to give academic writing open and multiple voices within all signifying systems as a remnant of the pre-linguistic infant stage, the unmanageable and unfamiliar. It is when it is the imperative of determinate communication that is desired? He notes that unpredictable element that may present itself unexpectedly. Whereas thethetic-thesis of the logical symbolic text presents writers who themselves attempt to rewrite significant thinkers, are themselves attempting and unified subject, the semiotic operates with multiple voices and a fragmented subject. Barthes utilized to create a new or shifted reading that suggests another positioning, as in a certain fixing of the semiotic as a strategy in several of his later texts, highlighting it explicitly in Roland Barthes by Roland Barthes and A interpretation. Barthes worked with contradiction and conscious displacement of previous positions and theories, his writing was an act of movement of ceaseless production. We

Significance as a process is a production of the semiotic; conventional signification being undermined and fragmented cannot fix Barthes into a model of writing, unless we nominate movement and change as a through a loss of the subject, dissolution of a singular unified voice; it breaks apart the signifying systems to which it is located. The text as theorized by Barthes, jams the imperative of communication, resulting in signifiante, instead of signification. 'Signifiante is not reducible to a functional method of communication between individuals'. (Moriarty, 1991: 145)

The text creates a threat to the self, to ones' defined patterns of subjectivity. The objects, images and sounds in production attempt to defer the signified indefinitely through a constant process of displacement. There is no communication whereby it imperative, representation is relevant in so far as everything is a copy of something else, and expression has nothing to do with a self, but rather the implicitness of materiality.

Brett Jones, April 2012

Postscript: A pile of printed broadsheet pages with three different texts sits on the hearth of the fireplace. This text object provides the most defining account. He is troubled by the potential of this object to constrain the production of meaning by the reader in the space. He places it carefully on the floor (the only object on the floor) while all the other objects hang or float.