

configurative and could be regarded as being field based. Behind such an understanding is a sense that the entirety of space is known, such that a precise location can be defined. The interior-*entity* of the constructions, inside these points, constitutes a coming into focus of a patch of space or a drawing attention to a specific area of a larger space. The specific references to location within spaces, points of attachment, etc. in Michael's constructions directly draw upon this convention.

volumetric space

On the other hand, *de Sijff*'s notions of spatially regarded the definition of boundaries as a creation of space through the creation of volumetric mass. This view privileges the object over the field, regarding the field as being created by the object, as its exterior state. Mass, for *de Sijff*, was not necessarily a physical state, but rather an implied internal strength, the exterior thus becomes a vacuum. As such, the boundary is a wall to stop the escape of space. The frames of Michael's constructions operate in this manner.

In Michael's constructions, there appears to be some sort of uncomfortable union of these two conceptions, that seems unrooted, precisely because each implies a certain type of conventional usage that is somewhat dichotomous: the configurative would seem to imply suspension and stretching, while the volumetric registers the effects of gravity, suggesting a 'rootedness'. The field, the space in which the constructions are configured, displays the attitudes that one would expect of a specific place; perturbations, disturbances, unevenness, 'dirty realism'. The objects themselves, conversely, exhibit the purity of form that one would expect of immaculate volumes: fetishised, pure, sharp, attendant. Thus the spatiality of Michael's constructions comprise a play upon these paradigms, a making explicit of the tension between object and field.

conventionalities of spatial representation

It is through their representation that these two spatial conceptions become readable, and it is representation that conditions their utilisation as filters through which to view the concrete world. As twentieth century conceptions, photography has been the representational proof of their existence, utilising standardised users, relational and perspective, corresponding to the configurative and volumetric conceptions, respectively. These representational modes are not autonomous of their subjects, and as such exclude or make active their subjects.

relational representation

The configurative relies, in representation, on something's location in relation to other things in the photograph, and is thus again field based. Because its identity is solely validated by other things, the object is constituted as having an equal status with any other thing captured by the photograph. This is, of course, a subtle nuance because the issue with photographic capture is that which is not represented, however this selectivity is better discussed by other sources. The relational is also the mechanism by which the object is scaled. In Michael's pieces, the relational is the context of the constructions, the interior space, walls, textures, etc. It is through representation that the somewhat inert, quantitative aspects of configurative space are activated or subordinated and made to become qualitative as context for something. In a historiographic sense, *perspectival representation*

While hardly new at the time of photography, the registering of perspective as a spatial descriptor in photographs became a proof of its concrete existence, and similarly a proof of its accuracy in reading volumetric space. In this representational mode, reading of the size of the front plane in relation to the diminished size of the rear plane gives a reading of volumetric mass. This mode is object oriented because rather than necessarily registering in relation to other things to describe mass, its properties are read somewhat self-referentially in relation to a conditioned understanding of optics. Other contextual things become a confirmation of the correctness of the optical condition, rather than interwoven subjects. The frames of Michael's constructions are a self-consciously simplified means of registering this representational condition.

Critical to both these representational modes is the relation of the photographer to the photographed. The conditioned understanding of this relation means that the photographer is taken as being implicit rather than explicit to the constitution of the photograph. The photographer is thus objectified in a scientific manner, as a recorder. Considering that both of the spatial conceptions described above are completely reliant on being activated by the objectivity of this photographer, their status, and the attendant trust of them constitutes the central *a priori* condition of the capture of space by photography. The trust equals a trust in the accuracy of representation of phenomenological experience of space, and the making objective of the photographer ensures that their own personalised idiosyncrasies do not tamper with the rightness of the photograph as viewed.

A component of this trust in the unadulterated state of the representation is a certain quality of timelessness, that is also critical. Subjective modulations due to mood, emotion, attachment, etc., can occur over time, so the photographer must encapsulate the image to be exempt from this fickleness. Correspondingly the photographer must be regarded as being as static, both spatially and temporally, thus they must be pre-supposed to be imbued with the same level of fixity as the objects being represented. The interest of this investigation is how Michael utilises these conventions, and through his procedural methodologies, problematises them, fundamentally subverting the authority of the photographer by displacing the fixity of their location and exposing the temporality of the moment of capture. It is these trusts that Michael pieces attempt to expose.

Julian Raxworthy

11 April to 10 May 1997

CCP
CENTRE FOR
CONTEMPORARY
PHOTOGRAPHY

Centre for Contemporary
Photography

205 Johnston St Fitzroy 3005
Tel (03) 9417 1549 Fax (03) 9417 1605
E-Mail: ccp@weirple.net.au

michael goldsmith

Thank you to:

Megan Marshall, John Billan, Andrew Wilson, Sharon Meade, Julian Raxworthy
& Amanda Ahmed.

CCP gratefully acknowledges the assistance of the Victorian Government through Arts Victoria, Arts 21 is the Victorian Government's strategy for the Arts into the 21st century. CCP also acknowledges the support of the Commonwealth Government through the Visual Arts/Craft Board of the Australia Council, Isaacs funding and advisory body.

