

Michael says, in his endearing, self-deprecating way, that he sees the pieces in this series as representational explorations into the constitution of space or rather as explorations into the representation of the constitution of space.

Michael is a photographic artist, although one senses that this is his profession, but does not delimit his sphere of interest. The discourse of the professor is one that is characterised by a range of thematics, devices and methodologies that constitute the *prior* understandings that are, in themselves, the profession.

The ability to demonstrate anything whatsoever within such a tight framework, means that more often than not one is essentially being judged on ones juggling ability. The very successful practitioners are those who manage to redefine just what it is that they are juggling.

Michael's is an interest not in the juggling, but in the *prior* understandings themselves. He is interested in the basic spatial understandings of his profession, photography. His work is therefore first interested in how it might register within those understandings, but not in such a way that they would tell him about his work, but rather that these understandings are exposed, at the moment they judge. The work itself is thus *aprove*.

Since this is an investigation, and each piece a specific experiment contributing to that investigation, there is some sense in which Michael wants answers. It could be said that in the discourse of art practice, answers take the form of a personal refinement, a honing of the practitioners sensibility. In terms of ones ability to conclusively state such answers, however, it would seem that one would have to be something of an amateur psychoanalyst. Interestingly Michael has something of this quality. If Michael is positioning his work as an investigation, then he is desiring answers that are more clearly articulated or the sort of answers he is getting out of psychoanalysis are not ones he is entirely comfortable with. If the project is truly an investigation, within a broad range of thematics, then the question becomes: how are the objects themselves positioned or constituted? -as Art Objects or as 'Maquettes' or as 'Studies' or as 'Installation Components'? For this exercise, we shall assume that they are constituted as studies, in a way that subordinates their status as Art Objects, to their role within the investigation. This is not to say, however, that they are not nice looking.

Because one is dealing with a body of work, what is being examined is a character, a series of occurrences that repeat through-out the work. Since Michael is undertaking an investigation, these trends constitute a recurrent methodology, or perhaps structure (as is of course necessary for a proper experiment), while the differences, or perhaps modulations, in each piece are the variables, which test the structure, under differing circumstances. Since Michaels investigation is about 'space', what is of interest is what each piece contributes to such an understanding. The regularity and chronological order of the operations involved in the works suggest that the essence of the spatial investigation exists in those operations.

These operations are actions, so that rather than a traditional experiment, where one tests for a reaction against a "natural" condition after analysis has suggested this condition as a possibility, Michaels investigation begins as a speculation that starts by creating a reaction. Rather than examining the reaction for its success or failure, taking the reaction as a success initially and then examining the structure and its modulations gives a way of seeing space that avoids an absolutist search for (right)ness.

The methodological basis of this investigation consists of the utilisation of conventional understandings of space, in terms of definition and representation, within the structures and modulations mentioned in the attached table. These two are entirely intertwined. Whether one subscribes to a Balthus understanding of space as that 'ether' which exists when contained by a boundary, or to Heideggers conception that it is after their boundary that things begin their presencing, the role of the boundary to a physical notion of spatial definition would appear to be critical to Western understandings of space. Correspondingly as bounded physical entity, any ability to perceive space beyond the phenomenological is entirely reliant upon its representation. Because space as a concept is arguably abstracted from existential experience, conventions of representation become conditioning mechanisms that then inform spatial definition, and vice-versa.

Michaels spatial investigation is based primarily around the tension between the definition and representation of space, that ends by positing the reliance and interchangeability of each. To allow his pieces to register within this conditioned spatial understanding, Michael has self-consciously referenced these conventionalities in his work, as if to provide a consistent and arguable basis for his investigation. Given this interchangeability between definition and representation, broadly speaking the mechanisms of spatial definition have been taken as being the 'constructors', including their configuration, while those of representation have been taken as being the stages indicated as 'mediations'.

**conventionalities of spatial definition**  
As mentioned previously, Michael has based the spatial definition of his constructions on various interpretations of a boundary condition. Michaels, in these constructions, specifically referencing a convention of spatial boundary, that is fundamentally architectural. This convention has two components: location or configuration and volumetric construction. It is, as a type, one that has a historical lineage that is based on a combination of cartographic (as a derivative from Cartesian) location and, by extension, volumetric mass and Michael is referencing two twentieth century architectural movements that are undoubtedly interlinked but still somewhat distinct, in their prioritisation of both these aspects: *Constructivism* and *de Stijl*, respectively.

*configurative space*  
Broadly, *Constructivism* could be said to have defined space as that entity that occurs in-between enough points to define an interior and an exterior. Critical for such a conception is the specificity of location of those points, and as such its central interest is

Chronology of Production

Present		Chronology of Production		Past	
Order of Images	2nd Image	1st Image	Initial Thing	Trust	
Extent of presence	Real	Transitory	Virtual		
Generalised stages of production	Mediation	Mediation	Construction 2.	Construction	
Specific stages of production	Slide	Configuration	Construction 1.	Construction	
	<i>the context of the work, as represented</i>	<i>where the work is located within the space</i>	<i>the proportion of the work (width x length x depth)</i>	<i>the presentation of the image</i>	<i>where the work is located within the space</i>
<b>PIECE 1.</b>	piece in the centre of the image, taken from the left, looking straight, showing depth of 1 side	an interior, on a side wall, 1.6m off the ground, walls white, hung with back face flat on wall	square, flat in profile, 1 x 1 x 6	negative print, straight reproduction of angular measurement diagram.	<i>the proportion of the work (width x length x depth)</i>
<b>PIECE 2.</b>	piece in the centre of the image, taken from the left, looking down slightly, showing depth of 2 sides and bottom	an interior, on a side wall, 1.4m off the ground, walls white, brick courses showing, hung with back face flat on wall	wide rectangle thin in profile, 1 x 1.25 x .1	positive print, piece just below centre, 3 pieces taken looking straight at central piece, addressing the corner, showing perspective UP in upper piece, FLAT in middle & DOWN in lower piece	3 identical units each square, medium in profile, 1 x 1 x .5
<b>PIECE 3.</b>	piece in the centre of the image, taken from the right, looking up slightly, showing depth of 2 sides and top	an interior, on a side wall, 1.6m off the ground, walls white, brick courses showing, hung with back face flat on wall	wide rectangle thin in profile, 1 x 1.25 x .1	positive print, piece just above & left of centre, 2 pieces taken looking straight at lower piece, addressing the pier, showing perspective UP in upper piece, FLAT in lower piece	2 identical units each square, medium in profile, 1 x 1 x .5
<b>PIECE 4.</b>	piece in the centre right of the image, taken from the left, looking straight and slightly down	an interior, on a side wall, 350mm off the ground, walls white, hung flush on wall		positive print, piece centred, piece taken looking straight, showing perspective BLOCK in legs	a table, overall proportion is a cube, 1 x 1 x 1, frame suggests a structural depth of members
<b>PIECE 5.</b>	piece in the lower left of the image, taken from the right, looking left and slightly down	an interior, in front of a side wall, angled 45 degrees from wall, floor patternation showing	the Wassily chair by Breuer, overall proportion is a cube, 1 x 1 x 1, frame suggests a structural depth of members, organised within a distinct compositional system		
<b>PIECE 6.</b>	piece in the top centre of the image, taken from diagonal opposite of the corner	an interior, 1m below the ceiling, spreading from the corner, around the walls, 250mm from side walls	a false ceiling, composed of 6 discrete, identical units, each a thin rectangle, 1 x 2.5 x .1, frame suggests a structural depth of ceiling slab		
<b>PIECE 7.</b>	piece in lower centre of image, taken from directly in front, above & looking down	an interior, along a back wall, top is 500mm off the floor, sitting on the floor, shadow gap of wall junction showing	an ornamental interior planter box, deep rectangle, inflated frame with ply-wood, 1 x .25 x .25, legs protruding below		
<b>PIECE 8.</b>	piece centre of image, taken directly in front, looking straight	an interior, along a back wall, sitting on the floor, angled less than 45 degrees from wall, leaning against the wall on one leg	extruded square, .1 x 1 x 2, with extended legs, front-left longer than back, to suggest support		
<b>PIECE 9.</b>	piece centre of image, taken directly in front, looking down at piece.	an interior, sitting on the floor, angled less than 45 degrees from centre of image, fragment of wall showing, bare concrete floor surface	extruded square frame, .1 x 1 x 1, 2 segments missing, forming continuous strip		