

## The Given (Interior) World

Stephen Loo : University of Tasmania, and Ross Gibson : Sydney College of the Arts, Australia

### ABSTRACT

*The following is an attempt to write, following Derrida, to illustrate (if at all possible) the parergon; a supplement, fragment, detached from and outside of the main exposition (that is framed by, and framed as, the interior of the project), the latter being an artwork called K2-02 that is nothing more than a voidal space. This writing, as parergonal, demonstrates that it is itself another territory with an interiority; but because it is in an ensemble which makes up the artwork, the writing is also a part of the innermost territory of the project. The interior territory of K2-02 can paradoxically be nothing other than an incessant parergonality.*

### PARERGONALITY, OR WRITING THE OUTSIDE

The possibility of interiority given by the existence and nature of the frame is a common refrain in the study of interiors. However, in her essay 'Chaos, Territory, Art' in the 2005 issue of this very journal<sup>1</sup> – an essay that is always already a frame for this current issue on *Interior Territories* – Elizabeth Grosz notes that it is the frame's capacity to partition, divide and demarcate the earth as chaotic substance that allows art to emerge. However, the frame does not define what art is, or define art as that something which can be found within its enclosed interior; because here, the demarcation by the frame to produce spaces that can be named inside and outside is deferred. The frame nevertheless demarcates, but in the process of doing so as it cuts into a milieu or space, enables particular intensifications in the flows of substance, so affect, sensation and thinking can come into being, producing what Grosz calls the 'extractable qualities which become the material and formal structures of the art.'<sup>2</sup>

In speaking about the frame in this way, the status of the interior as an identifiable territory cannot therefore be straightforwardly given, as it is not beholden to an inside-outside demarcation. And in the present case, whereupon the interior in question is an artwork with a voided interior; the question of territory, and interior territory in particular, becomes positively aphoristic.

Writing (about) this interior territory is constantly deflected to the margins whereupon we encounter the frame that is no less the inside (containing traces of the interior; in this case an artwork that has to do with interior space) or the outside (inscribed by supplemental, ornamental

and/or unnecessary preoccupations of the work, in this case includes a public art work in China, other writing outside the work including the present essay, and another altogether different artwork in the artwork). The frame as the actual bounding mechanism is beginning to show that it itself possesses an interiority.

Note here that the frame defines territory as much as the frame is itself territorial. Territorialisation (which is a constant fibrillation between deterritorialisation and reterritorialisation) is the process of provisional delimitation that depends on the modes of organisation undertaken by each form of life and each cultural form, unleashing qualities that make artistic (and design) endeavours possible. Territorialisation is not related to bounding, but more accurately to distancing,<sup>3</sup> as it is a process of differentiation that gives an openness for new sensations and thinking to be abstracted from the located body or bodies.

### PASSE-PARTOUT, OR WRITING (IN) THE FRAME

When territory frames it does not necessarily make something visible and extractable as its interior. Territorialisation explodes the frame as it inhabits it, so what constitutes the interior is constantly deferred. How do we write about this frame, this impossible interior territory? We cannot. Writing about interior territories is always already writing the frame, writing in the frame: all writing is marginalia.

In *The Truth in Painting*, Derrida writes on writing on the frame. His metaphorical plane of composition in the *passe-partout*, the mat, is usually cardboard, with a cut-out for the 'work', placed under the glass in a frame. The *passe-partout* serves two purposes: distancing the work from the glass (viewing plane), and to enhance (as an ornament) the visual appeal of the work. Derrida says:

I write right on the *passe-partout* well known to picture-framers. And in order to broach it, right on this supposedly virgin surface, generally cut out of a square of cardboard and open in its 'middle' to let the work appear. The latter can, moreover, be replaced by another which thus slides into the *passe-partout* as an 'example.' To that extent, the *passe-partout* remains a structure with a movable base; but although it lets something appear, it does not form a frame in the strict sense, rather a frame within the frame. Without ceasing (that goes without saying) to space itself out, it plays its card or its cardboard *between* the frame, in what is properly speaking its internal edge, and the external edge of what it gives us to see, lets or makes appear in its empty enclosure: the picture, the painting, the figure, the form, the system of strokes [*traits*] and of colors. ... What appears, then, and generally under glass, only appears to do without the *passe-partout* on which it banks [*fait fonds*]. This would be almost the place for a preface or a foreward [*sic*], *between*, on the one hand, the cover that bears the names (author and publisher) and the titles (work and series or field), the copyright, the fly leaf, and, on the other hand, the first word of the book ... with which one ought to 'begin.'<sup>4</sup>

## MARGINALIA / FORWARD

The written work *within* this paper which follows, the work framed by the writing of the frame in a practice of parergonality, stands as one element of a collaborative ensemble artwork by Stephen Loo and Michael Yuen for the University of South Australia's SASA Gallery, 25 March – 24 April 2009, called *K2-02*.<sup>5</sup>

*K2-02* is an investigation of the limits of gallery as a space of and for art, or more accurately, the framing as the condition of possibility of what can be named art. The framing limit of the gallery is firstly geographical, and is located at the physical boundaries of its spatial containment that sanctions what is art by virtue of being in on the interior. This interior space is in counterpoint to that which is without conjuration, without project, the very ordinary, on the outside. It is literally the walls, floors and ceiling of the gallery, as already given, and the seemingly absent presence of its interior; that is the artwork.

The second limit is territorial, whereby the art practice, by virtue of negotiating the interiority of a space called a gallery, always already implicates a multiplicity of relations on the outside. More specifically, every object made, every movement enacted, within the gallery is an inflexion point of territories that defy the bounding of space by the gallery walls. In fact, the actual performative public artwork (or that which counts as the art in artwork) of *K2-02* lies outside the gallery. The public is invited to rent and wear simple black T-shirts with a single glowing blue LED light sewn with transducing thread on their backs, producing a poetic performance of nine small lights wandering the city. *K2-02*, the physical gallery space, is no more than a clearing house for the T-shirts, a banal shopfront for the actual work. (Furthermore, the idea of T-shirts already arrives from outside the work as it is based on another series of public artworks by Yuen.) In this way, objects and movement appear as what Bernard Cache would call 'images',<sup>6</sup> light and sound that are polychromatic and polyphonic territories of relations already in play between the interior and exterior.

By investigating the relations between geography and territory, *K2-02* is interested in the gallery as interiority outside of functionalisation in, by or as art; that is, in the internal mechanism of the gallery as a dis-used space, as leftover, as a ruin of the future, with its vicissitudes re-presented within its own space. This leftover space is a gift back to the university, a sudden opening of a space able to be time-tabled in an environment of space shortage. The work invites others to fill the space, unplanned and unsolicited, leading to the gallery being used for tutorials, a slide night event, a launch of something altogether unrelated to the work and to the gallery, and another artwork called *The Poetics of Brine*, a performance work by Stephen Loo, Emily Potter and Robyn Tucker, as part of a project funded by University of South Australia's Hawke Research Institute of Sustainable Societies.

So, even what is innermost to the territory does not belong to the work; it is an interiority displaced that becomes the productive territory. The gallery as the interior can only be seen as a presentation or demonstration of itself, and of its 'communities' and their empathic performances. This is Maurice Blanchot's unavowable community, of things, spaces and people that happen to arrive within the geographical frame of the gallery as territory, perhaps unannounced, and thus merely there 'beyond any utilitarian gain.'<sup>7</sup> The ordinary fact of such being together in their vitality is a democratic constellation that makes up a dense spatial body, whose ethics and politics, of appearance challenges the practices of art that rely upon the spatial framing of the gallery.

### 'THE INTERNAL EDGES OF A PASSE-PARTOUT ARE OFTEN BEVELED'<sup>8</sup>

This essay is written territory. The work in collaboration with sound, light and performance artist Michael Yuen, started as a gift: 'giving back', of what was most interior to the possibility of an artwork – the space *for* the work itself. The space for the work in the SASA Gallery, Adelaide, South Australia, is the space of the work, namely the SASA Gallery.

Room name: *K2-02*.

I started following Michael Yuen's art practice work, including a public work called *Follow*. The following is a quote from his artist's essay:

In June 2008 *Follow* was created in downtown Shanghai. I hired fifty people to follow me for a day as I went about my usual activities. The crowd was under no special instructions other than to follow me. When we stopped the group swelled to a hundred at times, as bystanders joined in. The crowd temporarily blocked streets and sidewalks as we progressed through the city. It was a pilgrimage, a protest, bought stardom, a human roadblock, a labour strike, a fanatical pack, a mob and a march. *Follow*, for me, is foremost a public action resonating throughout a city. It is the hiring of a crowd's services.<sup>9</sup>

The act of following is sustained by anticipation of the fulfilment of curiosity, of a gift to come, the shape of which is unknown. The result of my curiosity is an essay in two voices called 'Follow Follow', which became Yuen's and my artists' essay for *K2-02*. Ross Gibson, who was the external scholar to the exhibition, wrote the catalogue essay that followed *K2-02* as a work following *Follow* as its outside condition, to which it paradoxically owes its being and its innermost territory.

The following is yet another spacing of the work. The recombination of my half of 'Follow Follow' with Gibson's catalogue essay is writing after, and therefore outside, *K2-02*; a re-territorialisation that is performative of its interiority; the return gift.



Above  
Stephen Loo and Michael Yuen, *K2-02*, Installation View with Michael Yuen, SASA Gallery, University of South Australia, 2009. Image: Josh Crossin

Under no special instruction other than to *follow*, the crowd came to be because of a social contract that binds without announcing what it bounds. The exchange is purely economic: 80 Chinese Yuan for the mere presence as human beings. Through word of mouth – small announcements, Chinese whispers – the social contract emerges seemingly without origin, as minute gestures unite in what Erin Manning calls pre-acceleration,<sup>10</sup> or the a-perception of the potential of common movement, causing disturbances within the urban refrain that somehow manages to build and swerve the smooth flow of the large city.

According to the Epicureans, matter falls endlessly through the void, but every now and then, without warning, at no regular interval of time or space, these bits swerve from their downward path, bump into others, and so form the assemblages that make up the physical world as we know it.<sup>11</sup>

Here, they are an assemblage of corporealities with the potential to block, strike, and resonate, but also to disperse, diffuse and disappear. The *public* appears in space; a common appearance of human beings that de-functionalises designed space. The hired crowd has an evacuated citizenship (other than one bound by an simplistic monetary exchange), which paradoxically by its appearance alone manages to evacuate the hierarchical stratification of the city.

As it appears in the streets, the crowd suspends order at that instant purely because of its appearance; it is an event that evokes pure empathy of itself as an event. Michael Yuen's experiment with a crowd in the street is public, not because of the crowd or the street being inherently public, but because it is an experiment that generates a public, curious onlookers and their resulting puzzlement.

The result is a traffic jam of consciousness for no particular cause; fibrillating between frustration and release, anticipation and disappointment or satisfaction, instant gratification and deferred understanding – the sheer plainness of the event and the depth of deception.

Architects might call it 'negative space', the two-thirds of the gallery that Stephen Loo and Michael Yuen have given back to the landlords (the University of South Australia) for the duration of their exhibition at the SASA gallery. As a result of their paradoxically decisive passivity, everything that is not present gives shape and significance to the other space – the 'positive' space – which is the slender fraction of the Gallery that the artists have actively chosen to use.

So you can see already that tricks are at play. And it's real play that you can apply your energies to, not just something flippant. For there is some definite use envisaged in the artists' decision not to be useful, not to take full and explicit advantage of all the displayed privileges that usually go with winning the right to exhibit in a desirable and competitively esteemed venue.

Questions about inaction and vacancy occupy your mind when you ponder what Loo and Yuen have actively *not* done here. The nothingness of their gesture grows big in the mind and becomes something more hefty than just a gesture. The artists are making an almost-not-there show of abjuring the governed space of the institutional gallery, giving it back to the owners, politely calling their bluff, throwing them a riddle and working a new hustle in a system where usually you grab everything you can.

When you think about it, the vacuity of the idea is downright compelling. Seeing nothing in the idea at first, you might say it sucks. But on pondering the vacuum that Loo and Yuen make for you as you approach the show that they proclaim to be *really there* on the far side of the absence, in the smaller installation space, you notice that the larger space has become *attractive* in the way it hauls your body and your mind along to the other place. This puts the emptiness into a whole other category: two-thirds negated and one-third engaged, the entire Gallery is a zone of provocation crossed with intrigue and promise,

garnished with some sly humour.

Drawn into the Gallery like this, you keep trying to grasp the significance of the non-space. You see nothing and try to parse the insignificance that underwhelms you at the same time as it overwhelms the entire space that has been set aside and scheduled for this particular show called *K2-02*. Declaring its institutional name by nominating its place in the large logistical compendium that is a university campus, the *K2-02* show is like one of those mesmerising ruses that is sometimes set up in a political contest, where a complete deal gets designed cunningly so that all options are already imperceptibly slanted well before negotiators arrive at the table. Set up like this – as some shenanigan that is both less and more than it seems – the surrounding, negative space is a blithely managed context of non-assertion that paradoxically shapes the result even before you can get inside the zone where you would expect to be doing the real business.

A quick story might make this feinting clearer. I once saw a television interview with the German philosopher and media activist, Alexander Kluge. Whenever a question touched on issues in such a way that Kluge fundamentally disagreed with the premise and intention of the question, he charmingly, politely, passively declined to answer. He just sat there inert, albeit attentive. Opting out of the talk-show system that thrives on rhythm, noise and repletion of apparent information, Kluge simply took the fuel out of the machine. He did this *obviously*. It was breath-taking and fascinating to see. He made himself into a forceful negative space warping all expectation by making arrhythmic time, and thus he explicated and simultaneously obliterated the meanings that were set up and intended by the surreptitiously hostile interviewer.

The crowd is frequently deemed political by the State by virtue of its form and not its intention, and this is certainly the case in China. But remember, the crowd in *Follow* was formed for the inane reason of the promise of a bit of money. Can this teleology be construed as political? What is this space opened up by the event of the crowd, the absurd appearing together of human beings? Is this space already inscribed by politics, or can it be made political? We ask with Jean-Luc Nancy, 'Is Everything Political?'<sup>12</sup>

So many acts in everyday life in China are small pieces of civil disobedience.

To explain why I think the actual *form* of the crowd, rather than any common intentions of its individual members, or intentionality inferred from the form of the crowd, is political, allow me a cycling analogy. (Michael wrote, unexplained, the word 'peloton' in the margins of a draft of this essay.)

The peloton is the large main group of cyclists bunching in the centre of a road race using the slipstream to reduce drag. The form of the peloton emerges from slight adjustments by each rider responding to the complex behaviour of riders around him or her.

Conventional wisdom has it that there are about 450 million bicycles in China.<sup>13</sup>

The thing about the form of the peloton is that it can only arise when the front riders relinquish their lead, slipping off to rejoin the pack at the back, leading to a fluid situation where the centre of the peloton appears to push through its own leading edge. The riders who slip back do so not entirely in an act of selfless giving, but an intentional giving. At the front they are exposed to higher loads, and they need to slip to the back to balance energy conservation with tactical manoeuvring (move back at the wrong time and you will not have sufficient time to reach the front near the finish line). Also, there are teams in road racing: here the issue becomes the tactical arrangement of giving so that the strongest rider arrives in the right place at the right time to sprint for the finish.

The peloton is a dynamic gathering of a crowd that continually self-adjusts by the enactment of intentions of its members. The value of the intentions (to give (way) and drop back) however, cannot be measured with reference to what is received (an opening to move back to the front) because of the emergent nature of the form of the crowd. The behaviour of members of the crowd, led by irreducibly complex interactions of exhaustion, curiosity, boredom, distraction, determination, failure, and mimicry, gives an openness of being by virtue of not having been inscribed by an overarching (political) teleology.

The exhibition is a bit like that interview. Hiding obviously in plain sight, the unoccupied and wasted space made by the art show named *K2-02* is an idea so not-there and so perverse that its negativity gets positively stamped on your thinking. The tricky gift offered by this nonspace – the idea of giving the room named *K2-02* back to the forces from whom it has been so hard-won in the past – this paradoxical inaction-idea has a power out of all proportion to its immateriality and inanity. Not inept, not jejune or naive, it's actually an elegant and forceful idea. An idea of space made absent and time made wasted by its unscheduled laxity.

Here's another story brought to mind by the *K2-02* show. I recall the moment – the most potent instant in an entirely engrossing pageant – when Muhammad Ali held his hand back and clearly chose NOT to hit George Foreman as Foreman let go of consciousness and headed toward the canvas in Round 8 of their 'Rumble in The Jungle' in Zaire in 1974. Ali's decision to do nothing in that decisive moment was a proclamation of his trickster supremacy. I remember watching it live in a university bar and hearing the entire beery hall gasp, laugh then applaud the way you would at a magic show.

The Rumble was also the occasion of a differently brilliant and vacuous scam, namely Ali's drawn-out and bewildering choreography of inaction, which he dubbed the 'rope-a-dope' manoeuvre. Using the disengagement and intentional passivity that define the rope-a-dope, Ali spent several rounds just leaning limply backward and hauling all Foreman's aggression out so that Foreman poured his destructive power exhaustingly into the ether rather than into Ali's endangered person. It was ugly, clumsy and brilliant, because who could believe that Ali, the consummate showman and aesthetician, would choose to be so leaden. Only in the exhausted aftermath did Foreman understand what had been done to him – NOTHING! Ali did nothing. Ali became a vacuum and Foreman surged into it. Negative space.

Derrida never lost sight of Cixous's speed in *H. C. for Life, That is to Say ...* which begins with the letter 'v' which begins 'vitesse' (speed) and 'vie' (life): 'life in life (a life which is no more death than the opposite of death, a life which does not know death)'.<sup>14</sup>

This condition gives the capacity and desire for crowd members to fall back, or surge ahead, or wander. Here the condition 'gives', as the event of being is given. Heidegger interprets *Ereignis*, the Event of Being, as *es gibt*, which in German means it is / is given. The gift given in this circumstance is not framed by an economy of exchange because it cannot be made present: once the gift is recognised as the gift, it is no longer a gift because its being made present becomes an obligation which demands reciprocity. 'The gift, like the friendship from which it derives, has the character of an excess (*hyperbole*) such that it cannot be measured by any calculation of its value.'<sup>15</sup> The gift is *for* ...

Derrida works on the proposition *for*, as the infinite speed, of obligation ... *for* life: already the definition of life does not need to be defined, instead it is the *for* that organises, it has a might.<sup>15</sup>

These two astonishing ruses of passivity – plainly poetic in their creativity and audacity – are why so many artists, from Norman Mailer through to The Fugees and the brilliant writers of the *West Wing* TV series, have been fascinated by the Rumble in the Jungle.

Now, it's a ridiculously long way from the bloodsport in the Kinshasa Stadium to a quiet little gallery in Adelaide, but both theatres of non-assertion operate with the same logic. And as we've seen, real smarts can lurk inside something ostensibly ridiculous.

Two words have chimed through my essay already: 'trickster' and 'gift'. Attending to these special words, some readers might have discerned a theme: my text is written in dialogue with the writing of Lewis Hyde, whose two quite wondrous investigations of creativity – *Trickster Makes this World* and *The Gift*<sup>17</sup> – help us see into the ruses and transformations that play in Loo and Yuen's use of the SASA Gallery. Hyde's writing is full of bracing moments of definition, where seemingly familiar notions get spun around so that you can see them from a fresh perspective. For example, Hyde reminds us that the word 'art' derives from linguistic roots concerned with connection, joints and border conditions. Hence we have terms like 'articulate', 'artifice' and even 'arthritis' (which is, of course, a condition in a joint). An artist can make a connection

and define a distinctive frame, saying 'this is inside my art while all that is outside'. The artist thereby establishes a contentious difference or line or demarcation between a given, natural phenomenon and a made, cultural artifact. Think of Marcel Duchamp. The cunning articulator. Think of his obsession with conjunctions, his fascination with what can happen where readymade normalcies meet in an unaccustomed proposition. Think of that mysterious but compelling quality that Duchamp said he always sought: the 'infra-mince' (or 'infra-thin') epiphenomenon or non-event that lurks inside a Duchampian artwork. Think of the irony and befuddlement and exquisite sense of designed banality that Duchamp can assemble.

The crowd in *Follow*, ironically the common presence of human beings as an appearance in a radical self-organising motility, is a gift of itself to itself that arises from the refusal to accept determination. The space of the crowd is the space of deferral: an opening up of time for delayed reciprocation that is no longer simply a return and therefore escapes the relations of a simple exchange. The gap which opens between intention and action is the bases for Rancière's productive 'disagreement':

politics is about wrong names – misnomers that articulate a gap and connect with a wrong.<sup>18</sup>

For Derrida, the gift can never be present, but is coextensive with a forgetting.

The gift is nothing,  
organised by a perpetual

deferral,

Every artist can be a trickster like this, presenting objects, intentions and circumstances in ways that overturn common sense. An artist can intervene in an ordinary scene to articulate some proposition around which your everyday understanding might turn until a revelation emerges on the other side of the frame that joins the habitual world to the artistically refreshed world. Along these thin lines of conjunction, an artist can help us see things anew.

One of the most compelling and tricky turns an artist can perform is the act of gift-giving. Occurring as it always does along some connective meld, art is a transaction. But art is different from commerce, Hyde observes, because an artwork generates its true worth only so long as it continues to connect the larger world to the people who engage with the challenges, stimuli and surprises inherent to the artifact. Whenever an artwork gets locked away because of its monetary or commodity value, it tends to lose its social or gift value. In a move of trickery that can be wondrous when done well, the artist can generate a particular type of wealth (which Hyde deems 'erotic') by receiving the gift of tradition, then aligning it to individual talent and training to produce something new which is then paid forward to the world in the form of a fresh gift thrown into widespread circulation. In this act of giving, the trickster can stir a society's defining energy, the

the prerogative in

Aristotle's *potentia*

to not-

be

lost (in) the crowd.

Helene Cixous writes about writing her not taking place, her permanent availability.<sup>20</sup>

The promise of payment obligates the participant in the crowd to work. However the correspondence between material worth of the gift (after all it seems like free money as there is nothing asked to be done for it) and the counter gift (impossible to measure because there is no brief other than to follow; and there is really no obligation to follow) is ambivalent. The work maintains a misalignment of the economic worth of the material reality in the work, by making irreconcilable a finite monetary sum with the infinite possibilities for action, if not inaction. The affectual and cognitive dimension of misrecognition is to me the ethico-aesthetic work of *Follow*.

The exchange of money, in reciprocity, usually guards against the fear of loss of something already in possession. In *Follow*, this condition is made ambiguous. In agreeing to give – the promise of money at the beginning of the work obligates the crowd to give – but what needs to be given in return, is unqualified. If

trickster can generate new psychological and social urges out of the tension that arcs between having and availing, between containing and releasing, managing and transmogrifying, wasting and growing. When art moves us it also moves the world, granting energy and increase to the factors in the world that encourage vitality and ingenuity to emerge rather than contract. The artful impulse is generative, it is the opposite of the hoarder's anxiety. Hyde is blunt about this: 'Anything contained within a boundary must contain as well its own exhaustion.'<sup>19</sup> When artists plough their processes and products back into the world, they offer gifts back to humanity's ever-increasing common wealth of culture and memory, which is where all artists' first inklings of their own creative abilities necessarily come from. Thus art makes a join and a turn that can be understood as a feedback loop insinuating everyone into a connection between past culture and the burgeoning world. Artists pay their gifts forward in this dynamic, and with their trick of giving it all away they take part in a wealthy world of increase, an ingenious world that refuses exhaustion.

Giving a big portion of the SASA Gallery back to the parental institution of UniSA, Loo and Yuen work an artful, additive, trickster move that shifts preconceptions about authority and permission, about right behaviour and accepted values. Politely giving the Gallery back, but doing so mysteriously and wittily too, they cause re-definitions and re-negotiations about the place of artistic programs within institutional systems and within the city. With the gift of emptiness, Loo and Yuen offer a frame with which to contemplate all the presumptions that govern habitual experience within institutionalised patterns.

All these ideas rise up from the negative space in *K2-02*. Now you get to the tiny positive space. What does it have for you? Here the artwork is revealed to be a ceremony of some kind. It seems to be nothing more than a garment that gets offered to you. It's almost nothing, almost immaterial. An attendant gives you a clean shirt which you sense has been washed and

anything, the money is recompense for the gift of the self, in its openness (as the 'loss' of self) owing to an absence of an imperative to function, or *ratio* for action.

The return gift, or more accurately, 'work' in exchange, is uncertain. The 'practice' that emerges in such an asymmetrical relation of energy and capital that defy an exchange logic are, following Bourdieu, 'acts of cognition' (recognition and misrecognition, hesitation and conclusion, of worth), socially constituting a subjectivity that takes form to become the objective reality of the crowd as an unavowable community.<sup>21</sup> What emerges is a new public whose absolute presence in a work opens up a space – admittedly one predisposed to taking photographs and videos (of what exactly?) – as a concession to doing something for the money, or believing something worthwhile is happening.

*Follow* creates an economy – an *oikos* (home) – that is political, not in the common sense of a 'political economy', but politics where the self-sufficiency of human beings is shown for its incommensurability (of value, of ontology): an articulation of a non-unity, the non-figure, therefore a space-opening, of the human being as the public being. *Follow* is political because it spaces.<sup>22</sup>

## NOTES

1. Elizabeth Grosz, "Chaos, Territory, Art" in *Interior Design / Interior Architecture Educator's Association IDEA Journal* (2005). This essay is included in a subsequent book with the same name. Elizabeth Grosz, *Chaos, Territory, Art: Deleuze and the Framing of the Earth* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2008)
2. Grosz, *Chaos, Territory, Art*. 16
3. Grosz, *Chaos, Territory, Art*. 11
4. Jacques Derrida, *The Truth in Painting*, Geoff Bennington and Ian McLeod (trans.) (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1987). 12-13
5. Please see K2-02 SASA Gallery exhibition catalogue for aspects of this writing that have previously appeared as Ross Gibson, 'The Given World' and Stephen Loo & Michael Yuen, 'Follow *Follow*' in Knights, M. (ed.), *K2-02* (Adelaide: UniSA, 2009)

offered to strangers several times already in the recent past. Then you are turned around and sent – subtly disguised and re-charged – back out again to the world. You wear now a trickster's guise and carry a trickster's intent, ready to redraw yet again the boundaries that distinguish ordinary existence from the creative performance of moment-by-moment ingenuity.

In other words, having negotiated the trickery of the negative space, having made it to the other side of the framing division between useless space and used space, you get an artful role. It's like something you've earned. It's like an infra-mince initiation.

Accepting this shirt, which is a ruse made material, you take it to the world, knowing by now that Loo and Yuen's project has given you a sly and portable frame with which to examine and re-articulate the ordinary world, to make the world anew at every moment.

It's a big idea – that art joins you to the everyday world of habit, power and compromise – and when you first find this idea refreshed for your delectation in the SASA Gallery, it's almost nothing, but at the join between the *K2-02* and all the institutions, rules, habits and permissions that bind the room in space and time every day, there's a thin trick you can find that helps you reframe and refocus so that, moment by moment, you might re-make the given world.

6. See Bernard Cache, *Earth Moves: The Furnishing of Territories*, Anne Boyman (trans.) (Minneapolis: MIT Press, 1995)
7. Maurice Blanchot, *The Unavowable Community*, Pierre Joris (trans.) (New York: Station Hill Press, 1988) 29
8. Derrida, *The Truth in Painting*. 13
9. Michael Yuen, 'Follow' in *Broadsheet*, vol 37 no 4 (Adelaide: Contemporary Art Centre of South Australia: 2008)
10. See Erin Manning, 'Grace Taking Form: Marey's Movement Machines' in *Parallax*, Vol. 14, No. 1 (London: Taylor and Francis, 2008). 82-91 (87)
11. Jane Bennett, *The Enchantment of Modern Life: Attachments, Crossings and Ethics* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001). 99-100
12. Jean-Luc Nancy, 'Is Everything Political? (a brief remark)' in Project Muse, Philip M Adamek (trans.), (Michigan: Michigan University Press, 2002) at [http://muse.jhu.edu/login?uri=/journals/new\\_centennial\\_review/v002/2.3nancy02.html](http://muse.jhu.edu/login?uri=/journals/new_centennial_review/v002/2.3nancy02.html) To Nancy, everything may be political only if 'everything' is not total or totalised but de-territorialized.
13. "China Rises" blog entry by Tim Johnson, the Beijing bureau chief for McClatchy Newspapers. [http://washingtonbureau.typepad.com/china/2007/05/more\\_on\\_electri.html](http://washingtonbureau.typepad.com/china/2007/05/more_on_electri.html)
14. Jacques Derrida, *H. C. for Life, That is to Say ...* Laurent Milesi, Stefan Herbrechter (trans.) (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2006). 96
15. Robert Bernasconi, "What Goes Around Comes Around" in Alan D Schrift (ed.), *The Logic of the Gift: Toward an Ethic of Generosity* (New York and London: Routledge, 1997). 267
16. Derrida, *H. C. for Life, That is to Say ...* 86
17. Lewis Hyde, *The Gift: Imagination and the Erotic Life of Property* (London: Vintage, 1998), and Lewis Hyde, *Trickster Makes This World: mischief, myth and art* (New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux, 1998)
18. Jacques Rancière, "Politics, Identity, and Subjectivation" in *October*, Vol. 61, *The Identity in Question* (Summer, 1992). 62
19. Hyde, *The Gift: Imagination and the Erotic Life of Property*, 189. "The increase does not appear until the gift moves to the third party." NOTE: how the *K2-02* situation is one of returning the gift – kula ring style – keeping the energy in circulation rather than locked up – get the impulses moving.
20. Hélène Cixous and Catherine Clément, "Sorties: Out and Out: Attacks/Ways Out/Forays" in *The Newly Born Woman*, Betsy Wing (trans.) (Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press, 1986)
21. Pierre Bourdieu, "The Logic of Practice" as published in Alan D Schrift (ed.), *The Logic of the Gift: Toward an Ethic of Generosity* (New York and London: Routledge, 1997). 215. Bourdieu states that misrecognition produces a new logic of the gift that blurs the economic and the non-economic, and therefore becomes part of the social realm.
22. This argument comes from Jean-Luc Nancy's explanation of politics, and the necessity to move from an economical model of politics, which relies on commensurability and thus equivalence and exchange). The concept of a 'political economy' comes from the notion that the 'well being' in the home (*oikos*), interpreted commonly as the self-sufficiency of the human being, or the consistency of and confidence in the (e)valuation of human life as a totalism (for example as part of nature, or an assured place in the 'world'), is extended to the polis. Therefore 'political economy' in capitalism generally becomes enacted as the sustenance of wealth creation rather than of well being in the polis as it is in the *oikos*. See Jean-Luc Nancy, 'Is Everything Political?'