

> On 11 April 2010 08:00, Fiona Macdonald wrote:

>

>

> dear alex,

>

> i have been thinking about how my text for light projects began with a thinking around the problems of conceptualism and how that practice of marking limits to material thinking produced *aporias* of conceptual determinations and conceptual analysis of practice that have neutralised that practice into categorisations. this neutrality is several things, one of which is a recourse to the teleological desire of the Symbolic presenting itself as “necessary” components of the art-world--art criticism, art history, art commerce--which is also to say the reception of practice. this neutralising that occurs through reception is also an exclusion of what is not seen to be neutral. I don't mean here the signs of the political as they are already neutralised, but the activity of the political in the work/practice as event.

>

> derrida talks about the *aporia* being understood as ruin, limit, impossibility etc. but asks why this understanding cannot be applied to the *aporia* itself i.e. that the *aporia* is also an event of its own impossibility. he says that if the *aporia* is not just a word-game, a play of logic, then we must think of this impossibility as impossible.

>

> i need to write for the question of the *aporia*.

>

> when I talked with thérèse about the exhibition and making a work that would activate a limit of this exhibition, it was proposed that the text as authenticity would be the limit--a limit of conceptual determination perhaps. thérèse's drawing is always a mediation of a remediation, it is also drawing that proposes the event of the work--the event of the citation-- and also an event of an *aporia*. so this drawing is what will be seen within the vitrine of the gallery space: it describes and re-inscribes the space with its own context. but it also describes that recourse to the Symbolic that takes place in reception--again also the context of the space and its psychoanalytic patronage. it is a place of origins. so it is not the purpose of the work to simply reflect these neutralities. or to address them, which would reflect them. or reproduce them.

>

> this is why the text has to be silent.

>

> at first this seemed workable. "discourse as monument" is the statement then of this space of exhibition. it is the phallic mother in that sense--apart from which the image (doubly) re-presented itself (and its story) enacts both the phallus as style and the phallus as discourse (and whether Lynda Benglis is this phallic mother is not really the question--or the point). the point is not the point. rather the fold of the page, drawn (doubly) into the image, is the silence of the work.

>

> now i think that this text can only be a kind of non-passive endurance of the *aporia*-- it is also a mise-en-abyme, a structure for the overprinting of the image but a structure without a base. it is a site of politics, a politics of site.

>

> this phallic pointlessness has lead to thinking about policy: so many policies at work here. there is a need for the recognition in the text as being in the double-bind of policy, the policing of what is possible to write. for this policy/policing is both the site of the exhibition and the site of the text. inescapable. it is part of that teleological desire but it is also the recognition of the *aporia*. the story of the (original) Benglis image, its censoring, its commercial strategy, and the consequent editorial manifestos of Krauss et al. reintroduces those three teleological Symbolic necessities (art criticism, art history, art commerce). it is a museum emotion. as an event of silencing--silencing and amplifying--it reverberates in the chasm of the work as a site of politics. silence enforced. silence volunteered. is there a difference?

>

> fiona

>

>

>

>

>

>

> On 13 April 15:34, Alex Martinis Roe wrote:

>

>

> dear fiona,

>

> from looking at the attached image of the poster i can see that when you describe the categorisation of different forms of conceptual practice as a neutralising act that excludes the political effect of those practices from the Symbolic, you are referring

quite pointedly to the institutionalisation of 'text'. you say that limiting 'text' by placing it in various 'necessary' categories relating to the reception of artworks (you give the examples art criticism and art history) generates *aporias* in which what is not seen to be neutral falls from our comprehension. your proposed gesture to write a text 'for the question of the *aporia* on the back of a photographic print of thérèse's drawing and to then glue it to the wall of the vitrine/frame that is light projects could be read as respectful tombstone to *the political* in/of/by your text. The sealing up of its 'neutral' content leaves us with the gesture itself as *the political* that can survive via the mimicry of its neutralising categorisations so that it no longer exists as a legible text. rather, that you have knelt on this paper and written your text in by hand takes thérèse's gesture as a raw conceptualism in itself, a generation of categorisation that by imitating, you perform a kind of reiteration that not only deepens the limit to which the material of the text approaches image, but sharply returns it to a series of repeated hand gestures.

>  
> i would say that the collapsed narrative of the work's generation, including so many remediations (photocopying, drawing, scanning, printing, handwriting) generates this sense of impossibility that you describe when addressing the *aporia*.

>  
> 'Derrida talks about the *aporia* being understood as ruin, limit, impossibility etc. but asks why this understanding cannot be applied to the *aporia* itself i.e. that the *aporia* is also an event of its own impossibility. he says that if the *aporia* is not just a word-game, a play of logic, then we must think of this impossibility as impossible.'

>  
>  
> so in a sense we must trust that what you write does so: as it is impossible to read, that it in some way embodies the *aporia* of the exhibition itself.

>  
> the fact that thérèse's drawing points to a particular historical moment, namely the birth of the journal *October* as a reaction to the subordinate positioning of the writer in relation to the economy of the image, means that the exhibition is read in terms of the historical events that have generated the categorisation of conceptual practice itself. your gesture reads to me as a re-performance of thérèse's inversion of the conceptual categorisations of artwork and art history/criticism—a kind of correspondence.

>  
> i would say that this, my act of correspondence has done more than shed its capital letters to form a short hand with yours, it has also extended your gesture to reiterate it into what I see as a genealogy of co-dependent practice as a way to explore what is impossible to do in one gesture. instead of enacting a reception, my correspondence performs an *other* limit to your gesture.

> you say your work has to be silent in order to address (i would say) the phallus and its operation in this vitrine/frame that is light projects. As a space that is patronised by a remediation of 'talking' and 'listening', I understand this as the only way to be *not* heard that is still an authored event of the *political* text.

>  
> correspondence requires a kind of mutability of language, form and structure

>  
> alex

>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
> On 15 April 2010 04:34, Fiona Macdonald wrote:

>  
>  
> dear alex,

>  
> the poster itself is a form of address that is very particular to a reception. i have returned to this particular problem via the gestures of the inscription of my note to thérèse (redrawing policy: to think we are other than/to policy is to be doubly policed ). it is a part of our project of redrawing to perform a suspension of citation through the gestures and temporalities of drawing as an act. here my concern with the event of the suspension returns to the address of the poster as the pasted paper. the text that is also now the verso of the poster, printed as a *tain*, is an address to reception, which is also to say, the writing of the neutralisation that occurs through reception. that it reveals itself as unreadable is not to discount its address, the trace structure and empirical forms of writing are not oppositions. i see this as part of the necessary endurance of the *aporia*.

>  
> your act of correspondance and its other limit to my gesture, is also an address within this temporality. the suspension of neutrality takes place through these limits.

>  
> fiona

>

>

>

>

>On 16 April 2010 11: 20, Alex Martinis Roe wrote:

>

>

> dear fiona,

>

> the approach of your project toward impossibility is a sign of the quality and intensity of its desire.

>

> entrusting comprehension to an other generates a genealogy and shifts value placed on the integrity of the *unit*. here you have entrusted your integrity to not only the couple but explicitly two couples and through that *all* couples (you are of course one part of each of these couples: events of reception). if your reader expects to engage with you, they must actually take on all of us.

>

> I agree that these limits you/we/they have/will perform/ed excavate latent political activity and so I write that this is the last word

>

>