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**Abstract**

This work explores alternative ways of doing research within the field of art and design; ways that respect complexity and acknowledge the expansive, relational and performative nature of signification in arriving at ‘new’ knowledge.

Through processes of designing in-between, I have been moving through opposites, connecting connections, and de(re)constructing structure. I have used my immediate locations as triggers to forge relations between an array of seeming disparate, albeit kindred, concepts. The scope of the work seems to have perpetually broadened, while theory and practice have dissolved in mercurial in-between states. Such exuding expansiveness has, at times, unsettled and unnerved, but ironically it has also intensely resembled our everyday ‘realities’. Designing in-between - compared to traditional, science-based research methods operating in barricaded systems of thought - thus allows for more faithful interrogation of the complexity of the world we live in. I believe this can be of great value in any attempt at innovative knowledge production, but especially attempts from within the field of art and design - a field often defined by its ability to challenge conventional ways of knowing.

My work should not be regarded as yet another predetermined guideline for future research. It should rather be read as an example of a “conceptual tool” or “thought strateg[y]” (Hurst, 2010:242) suited to the complexity of the open systems we form part of every day. Neither the challenging, nor the advantageous, aspects of my work should be regarded as superior and exclusive to the other. The existence of dissonance and contrast is productive; a life force propelling the search for new significance and knowledge.
ABSTRAK

Hierdie werkstuk ondersoek alternatiewe maniere van navorsing doen binne die veld van kuns en ontwerp; maniere wat die kompleksiteit en ewig-groeiende, verhoudingsgebaseerde en performatiewe aard van betekenis-konstruksie in die soeke na 'nuwe' kennis erken en respekteer.

Deur prosesse van tussen-in ontwerp, het ek my weg probeer baan deur teenoorgesteldes, het ek konneksies gekonnekteer, en strukture gede(re)konstrueer. Ek het my onmiddellijke omgewingskonteks as stimuli gebruik om verhoudings tussen 'n verskeidenheid van konstruksie-ontwerp te herken en konsepte te bewerkstellig. Die omvang van hierdie navorsing het sodoende gedurig verbreed, terwyl teorie en praktiek in verstrengelde tussen-in toestande ontbind het. Alhoewel hierdie uitgestrektheid, deurdringende kompleksiteit my dikwels ontsenu en laat weifel het, versinnebeeld dit ironies genoeg ons alledaagse 'realiteite' redelik getrou. Tussen-in ontwerp - in vergelyking met meer tradisionele, wetenskap-gebaseerde navorsingsmetodes wat binne begrensde gedagtesisteme funksioneer - laat 'n mens dus die ruimte toe om die onvoorspelbare wisselwerking tussen die magdom veranderlikes aktief in die wêreld waarin ons leef, in ag te neem. Ek glo dat so 'n benadering tot navorsing van besondere waarde kan wees in enige poging tot die innoverende bou van kennis, veral in pogings vanuit die veld van kuns en ontwerp - 'n veld wat geken word aan sy/haar vermoe om gedurig konvensionele maniere van verstaan uit te daag.

Ek wil nie hê dat my werk as net nog 'n voorafbepaalde riglyn vir toekomstige navorsing gesien word nie. Dit moet eerder gelees word as 'n voorbeeld van 'n konseptuele instrument ("conceptual tool") of gedagtestrategie ("thought strategy") (Hurst, 2010:242) wat geskik is vir die kompleksiteit van die inherente, doorgestane probleem wat ons alledaagse lewens defineer. Die uiteindelike, nog die voordelige, aspekte van my werk moet as superieur en eksklusief tot die ander geag word nie. Dit is juist die bestaan van teenstrydigheid en kontrast wat produktiwiteit bewerkstellig. Dit voorsien 'n lewenskrag wat die soeke na nuwe betekenis en kennis voortdryf.
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Judith Butler has recently referred to academic knowledge as providing a “grid of possibility” stretching far beyond any fixed boundaries. She believes that ideas are produced from individual locations and then set free in the world to make unanticipated connections with others. She states that “alliances” are made in the process, and that these do not merely refer to interaction between individual forces with the goal of arriving at solutions, but to working together amidst potential challenges; to mobilising possibility. She holds that it is precisely this “transposability” of knowledge between various locations that bears a zestful spirit to life, and that this can be deemed as positive. (Butler, 2011).

Butler’s view echoes my sentiments regarding research in the field of art and design. I understand research as grounded in acts of appropriation while being embedded within the everchanging social ‘realities’ we daily face. I have accordingly rooted my research in my immediate locations. These include my academic frame of reference - the field of art and design - my home, family, friends, colleagues, students, pets, as well a great range of everyday activities. I am continuously seeking to make active connections between emerging events, theories, emotions, thoughts and ideas. From amidst the interaction between these variables, more have sprung and multiplied. I have become increasingly aware of how I seem to have been set adrift within a fluid, in-between realm; a space of relations, of being “without” any fixed certainties (Rogoff cited in Springgay, Irwin & Kind, 2005:898). Irwin, Springgay and Kind qualify such a space as, “a space of active participation where one discovers that previous methodologies are not sufficient while simultaneously resisting the formation of specific criteria to replace them” (2005:898). They refer to this kind of research process as a/r/tography, or arts-based educational research (ABER) (2005:897). Luna Maurer, Edo Paulus, Jonathan Puckey and Roel Wouters speak of conditional design (sa). It also resembles Nicolas Bourriaud’s relational aesthetics (2002) as well as Grant Kester’s dialogical art practice (2004). I would simply like to call it designing in-between.
This work will attempt to embody designing in-between through a process of designing in-between. I want to not only describe the process in written form, but want the text to communicate from between its lines in physical as well as metaphorical ways. “You can only understand that of which you become a part, when the Subject that searches and observes becomes inseparably integrated with the Object searched and observed”, said Max-Neef (2005:15). I do not simply want to represent ‘findings’ in interesting and creative ways. I want to use art and design to further interrogate what I have found to be open to the various contexts it might be situated in at present as well as in future times (Leavy, 2009:4). Patricia Leavy has rightly said that, “arts-based practices [are] predicated upon evoking meanings, not denoting them” (2009:14). This indicates, in the words of Merleau-Ponty, a shift from, “what does it look like, which emphasizes a product driven representation of research, to an active participation of doing and meaning making within research texts”; to “a rupture that opens up new ways of conceiving of research as enactive space of living inquiry” (cited in Springgay, Irwin & Kind, 2005:898-899). Merleau-Ponty said this in 1962, and many have since theorised in similar vein. Although perhaps not always referring to research directly, postmodern and poststructural theories in a range of fields have been, and still are, propagating discourses exemplifying a more complex, open and process-based respect for the boundaries of knowledge. Regardless hereof, the impeding power of scientifically-based research, whether quantitative or qualitative, is undeniable. Patrick Slattery has voiced his concern in this light. He holds that many theorists now ironically seem to spend their time deliberating these more open trains of thought in still restrictive, tightly bound ways (2003:194-195). Seago and Dunne have corroborated and said that such “methodological intimidation” can lead to severe restraint of creative drive (1999:12). I do not want to fall prey to this trap, and will accordingly experiment with a range of creative techniques in an attempt to enliven my research. I aim to put forth an alternative approach to doing research in the field of art and design; an approach revering complexity, acknowledging the expansive, relational and performative nature of meaning creation in arriving at ‘new’ knowledge, and allowing theory and practice to continuously infiltrate one another throughout the process. Patricia Leavy succinctly translates the aim of my work as follows:

[I am] not discovering new research tools, [I am] carving them. And with the tools [I] sculpt, so too [my hope is] a space opens within the research community where passion and rigour boldly intersect out in the open. (2009:1).

I believe that, irrespective of widespread debate concerning the differences between art and design, these fields share an innate tendency to innovate and provoke the status quo. I am thus convinced that research in this field should particularly welcome critical experimentation and create space to transpose and make novel connections between seeming diverse ideas. Experimentation of this kind can however be a dangerous endeavor. Its embeddedness in the contingent realities of everyday life necessarily involves acknowledgement of one’s scope of study as ever expanding. With boundaries continuously shifting, one can easily run the risk of losing academic depth and becoming incoherent (Labaree in Piantanida, McMahon & Garman, 2003:182). How can this danger be overcome? Academic knowledge, although ever-changing, nevertheless needs to be well-founded and respected.
1 I understand ‘locations’ to refer to an individual’s specific frame of reference and context, whether physical, mental and/or social (Lefebvre, 1991:11).

2 Reality has always been a contentious concept (hence my use of inverted commas). The delicate interplay between its concrete and abstract dimensions continuously render it confounded and elusive. It has been proposed that it is perhaps best to understand reality as composed of various levels or parts as well as the consequent interaction between these components. In this sense reality becomes a combination of individually as well as collectively constructed ideas. Dependent on external influences from the environment, these ideas are open to constant modification. Reality becomes malleable and caught in constant transformation. (Max-Neef, 2005:11-12).

3 Art and design have traditionally been regarded as separate fields of practice (Brady, 1998; Varanka, 2006). The boundaries between these fields are however not as stringent anymore (Buchanan, 2007:43). Art is busy moving from a “poetic grounding in aesthetic expression to a rhetorical grounding in persuasive or confrontational communication” (Buchanan, 2007:40), while design is edging away from having solely utilitarian purposes (Brady, 1998) and instead moving towards addressing more attention to the “intellectual gravity” (Rosenberg cited in Buchanan, 2007:43) underpinning the process of design, as well as the “quality of experience” (Buchanan, 2007:43) awakened in viewers.

4 A/r/tography is an acronym for “artist-researcher-teacher” and, according to Pinar, these individual parts are assimilated into a “third space” in a/r/tography (cited in Leavy, 2009:3). Within this third space theory and practice become an indistinguishable whole. It embodies an all-encompassing way of doing social research (Leavy, 2009:3).

5 Conditional design refers to a process-based view of, and approach to, design. Logic is used to explore input/s from the complexity the world brings. The focus remains on the present, and transdisciplinarity is paramount (Maurer, Paulus, Puckey & Wouters, so).


   (A)rtistic practice... resides in the invention of relations between consciousness. Each particular artwork is a proposal to live in a shared world, and the work of every artist is a bundle of relations with the world giving rise to other relations, and so on and so forth, ad infinitum. (Bourriaud, 2002:22).
A possible answer might lie in acknowledgement of the complexity of the world we live in. This complexity exists within the relations foraged between the myriad of constituting components making up most natural, social and artificial systems (Johnson, Alexiou, Creigh-Tyte, Chase, Duffy, Eckert, Gascoigne, Kumar, Mitleton-Kelly, Petry, Fen Qin, Robertson, Rzevski, Teymur, Thompson, Young, Willis and Zamenopoulos, 2007:129), and not solely in the components themselves. Paul Cilliers has said that, in complex systems, “the interaction among constituents of the system, and the interaction between the system and its environment, are of such a nature that the system as a whole cannot be fully understood simply by analysing its components” (1998:viii). One has to shift one’s focus to what transpires in between these units, and so allow space for what lies outside one’s immediate frames of reference. This can very often extend to levels where comprehensibility refracts and dissolves due to the infinite number of variables impacting simultaneously.

Traditional research structures mostly ask of one to delimit one’s field of interest stringently. This creates a closed system of study which omits a tremendous range of complex variables from the research equation. To describe the relations between remaining elements becomes much easier and often leads to simple, well-formulated conclusions. Such conclusions are valuable, and I want to use this opportunity to stress that I am not in any way trying to disprove the worth of systems of thought that have proved successful for many centuries. I am however wary as to such research’s relevance amidst the unforeseeable complexity of everyday social reality. I want to enforce my belief that, in doing research, one should continuously reiterate an awareness of one’s inability to fully comprehend complexity; one should concede that, “the need for experimentation and pluralism needs to be accompanied by a request for a certain critical generosity” (Latham & Conradson, 2003:1904). In this light, as Barnett has said, “a new epistemology of the university awaits, one that is open, bold, engaging, accessible, and conscious of its own insecurity. It is an epistemology for living amid uncertainty.” (2000:409).

I want to imagine a possibility where boundaries are complex and permeable; where they do not limit, but open up. I want to propose that, instead of research in art and design focusing on processes of simplification, perhaps strategies of brokering complexity can be developed - of embracing, playing with, and experiencing complexity in creative ways (Johnson et al, 2007:131). Such strategies must necessarily pay heed to the characteristics of complex systems. It should involve relentless negotiating and relation of various components to one another. It must always already be looking beyond. Research in art and design should never be based on an unchangeable preconceived plan of action, it must forever remain in process (Leavy, 2009:11&12). This does not however preclude the construction of various products along the way. “Art [and design] is a process and a product”, says Stephanie Springgay (2002:12). Maurer et al shares this opinion (sa). Leavy also corroborates in saying that, “[t]he capability of the arts to capture process mirrors the unfolding nature of social life, and thus there is congruence between subject matter and method” (2009:12). The very moment a ‘solution’ (or product) has been proffered, yet new interactions might arise between it and yet other components of relevant systems, and all will have to be negotiated anew. The process can continue incessantly. “It is a tool for constructing meaning” (West cited in Springgay, 2002:12); “a locus of discursive exchange and negotiation” (Kester, 2004:12). I believe it is the experience of the process that embodies the process and consequently holds value. As Gilles Deleuze has said, “[p]rocesses are becomings, and aren’t to be judged by some final result but by the way they proceed and their
Grant Kester derived his concept of dialogical art practice from a range of similar ideas, albeit termed differently. Dialogical art practice stems specifically from Mikhail Bakhtin’s argument that, “art can be viewed as a kind of conversation - a locus of differing meanings, interpretations, and points of view” (2004:9-10).

I understand designing in-between as follows: The prefix de- implies taking away, breaking down, removing, reversing, deriving from and completing signs (Collins English Dictionary 1999. Sv. ‘de-’) - a process of simultaneously piecing apart and together. A sign refers to anything that stands for and represents something else; anything that carries meaning for that matter (Longhurst et al, 2008:29). I believe the process of design can henceforth be described as making sense of the world through a continuous process of ‘unbuilding’ various external stimuli, relating them to each other as well as to our own thoughts and ideas, and accordingly producing new knowledge and objects of knowledge that recycle into the equation yet again as new stimuli to be internalised and negotiated. Through a process of design we are thus forever adapting and evolving; forever occupying a state in-between. Lorenzo Imbesi’s view of design succinctly encapsulates my reading of designing in-between. He describes the process as traversing the world freely and playing on its physical as well as mental borders; as continuously moving between the worlds of the physical and the abstract (2011:271). Imbesi is of the opinion that the process is productive; that it produces:

...transversal thinking; mindful (and politically positioned) innovation; driving force (in the processes of transformation and innovation); it goes beyond the (disciplinary and academic) boundaries; it works on the quality of (social and individual) interaction; it creates community and involvement (and furthermore develops new cultural models of reference); it is part of the geopolitical and global framework (creating added value, connective flows, processes and forms of organization). In few words, it produces knowledge. (2011:276).

In using the word ‘text’, it is important to recognise that I use it in a poststructural sense; that it refers not only to what is written in words, but to any combinatory representation of signs that carry meaning. It refers to what Umberto Eco terms an “open work”, a work that, “reject[s] the definitive, concluded message and multipl[i]es the formal possibilities of the distribution of their elements” (2006:20). It refers to a work where manifold readings are possible.

René Magritte was probably one of the first to question the power of art to represent reality with his (in)famous painting, The treachery of images (1928-1929), showing an image of a pipe annotated with the text ‘This is not a pipe’. Since then many have followed suit arguing that, “the highest function of the sign is to make reality disappear and, at the same time, to mask that disappearance” (Baudrillard cited in Smith, 2003:76). Jean
power to continue” (cited in Gothlünd & Lind, 2010:209). Research in the field of art and design can potentially become art and design. It can dissolve any clear boundary between the traditionally separated strands of theory and practice, and so render itself performative\textsuperscript{15}.

If one regards research in the field of art and design as process, theory and practice necessarily become indistinguishable as praxis. Christopher Crouch’s comment serves as succinct recapitulation hereof:

> When the creative practitioner adopts praxis, it encourages the act of reflecting upon, and reconstructing the constructed world. Adopting praxis assumes a process of meaning making, and that meaning and its processes are contingent upon a cultural and social environment. Because praxis is not self-centred but is about acting together with others, because it is about negotiation and is not about acting upon others, it forces the practitioner to consider more than just the practicalities of making. (2007:111-112).

I believe praxis to be performative. In this case it was J-D Dewsbury who mastered his words well. He said that, “both our thought (ideas) and action (practices) assemble the relations of human and nonhuman and announce the discourses through which we exchange and, through description, make our experiences meaningful” (2000:477). Dewsbury has specifically related his ideas of performative knowledge production to Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari’s theory of the rhizome\textsuperscript{16}. I find this an appropriate and insightful metaphor. Performativity is the act of relating things to one another (Dewsbury, 2000:489). Through performativity connections are thus performed in-between theoretical ideas, ‘real’ life events and artistic/design practice. Performativity allows for seeming contradictory elements to momentarily coexist in relation and accordingly bud new ideas into the future. It is inherently tied to the present moment. It is “the gap, the rupture, the spacing that unfolds the next moment allowing change to happen” (Dewsbury, 2000:475). Gothlünd and Lind have specifically conducted research investigating what they call a “double-perspective: Theory and Performativity” (2010:197). They explored how scientific theoretical methods of research can be combined with artistic practice to further knowledge production in the Department of Visual Art Education at Konstfack, University College of Arts, Crafts and Design in Stockholm, Sweden. They have also concluded with ideas appropriated from Deleuze and Guattari’s work, and have said that this kind of research praxis is productive and necessary given the contemporary drive towards constant negotiation of democratic relations\textsuperscript{17} prevalent in global society. It can open up space for “an un-exact knowledge that is not seeking the essential, general or ideal but the experimental and marginal, invisible or excluded, that which remains in the event... the intermezzo...” (2010:210).

As already stated, I believe research in art and design to be grounded in acts of appropriation while being embedded in the everchanging social ‘realities’ we daily face. It is performative and hence caught in-between. I therefore find it difficult (perhaps impossible) to position my arguments within any rigidly defined theoretical framework. There are too many strands of thought that seem relevant and interact at the same time.

In the introduction of On deconstruction: theory and criticism after structuralism, Jonathan Culler compares an attempt at compiling an exhaustive list of recent theoretical arguments in critical discourse to, “flirt[ing] with an unsettling glimpse of the infinite” (1994:17). Two prominent and overarching strands of thought in this infinitude have been structuralism and poststructuralist thinking.
Baudrillard is at the forefront of theorising such ideas. He uses the concept of *simulacra* (simulations) to expound his thinking. Baudrillard moves through four levels of *simulacra* to reach a state where he feels everything is mere imitations of imitations and nothing has any association with reality whatsoever; where everything becomes “hyperreal” (Dictionary of Critical Theory 2000. Sv. ‘simulacra’). Many have latched on to Baudrillard’s ideas, for example Marc Augé with his concept of non-places (1995), and Nigel Thrift with his of nonrepresentation (Smith, 2003:68). Nonrepresentation has also been appropriated as methodology in performative research. It is believed that performance, being bound to the present, escapes representation due to its fleeting character (Swann, 2002:58-59). Opinions on these theories differ. Some regard it as nihilistic (which the strength of the prefix ‘non’ might rightly imply); I, however, recommend reading the work of these theorists with caution. As Richard Smith said, perhaps “nonrepresentational” should rather become “antirepresentational” (2003:68). It is essential to keep in mind that the language used to describe these ideas is also representational and, considering these theorists’ views, perhaps hyperreal. What is important is the dialogue created surrounding the topic of representation and its relation to reality; that one becomes aware of its complexity and incoherence, and that we realise what we perceive as being real, perhaps springs from what we have learned to be real through presentational means and vice versa.

11 Scientifically-based research is generally characterised by rigorously defined methods. Structure is all-important, and this is designed to ensure validity, reliability, replicability and generalisability of results (Piantanida, McMahon & Garman, 2003:187).

12 Relationality refers to the activity/process of being not in any one position at all, but continuously exploring in-between any two or more points of reference. As Irit Rogoff has said, “[i]t is the effort of arriving at a positionality, rather than the clarity of a position, that should be focused on” (2000:1). The concept of relationality is embodied in Springgay, Irwin and Kind’s interpretation of a slash:

The slash is particular in its use, as it is intended to divide and double a word - to make the word mean at least two things, but often more. It also refers to what might appear between two points of orientation, hinting at meaning that is not quite there or yet unsaid. This play between meanings does not suggest a limitless positionality, where interpretation is open to any whim or chance. It is the tension provoked by this doubling, between limit/less that maintains meaning’s possibility. The slash is not intended to be one or the other term; it can be both simultaneously, or neither. The slash suggests movement or shifts between the terms. (2005:904).

13 Considering complex systems, it is vital to acknowledge that the components constituting the system are actually most often complex systems in their own right. This indicates a digression
The ‘post’ in poststructuralism may appear to imply succeeding - and hence replacing - structuralist thought. It may seem to create the impression that, if structuralism is found inadequate, its opposite - poststructuralism - will replace it. According to Homi Bhabha, the prefix ‘post-’ should however rather be taken to express apprehension, and an active drive towards reconsidering the current state of affairs (1994:4).

Culler’s research has substantiated Bhabha’s opinion. He has shown that, through the years, structuralism has been interpreted in a variety of forms, from being a purely scientific, rational and rigid system of thought, to being irrational and open-ended, allowing the reader/viewer to create significance through individual experience. It has been proposed that perhaps the very existence of such contrasting views is what lies at the heart of the matter; that the “primary quality of ‘structuralism’ is an indeterminate radical force” (Culler, 1994:22). Culler’s research moreover found that many of the past’s so-called structuralists were also the present’s poststructuralists (1994:25). He takes Roland Barthes as an example. While Barthes’s text *S/Z* follows a structured approach on the one hand (breaking up a whole into small pieces, naming, classifying etc), he also “explore[s] [a text’s] difference from itself, the way in which it outplays the codes on which it seems to rely” (1994:26). Jacques Derrida translates similar ideas in his essay *Structure, sign and play in the discourse of the human sciences* (1966), arguing that the seeming essential structure of structure in fact involves a complex, fairly ill-structured, and open play of differences (2001:278-282). This seems to demonstrate that structuralism and poststructuralism are not necessarily two opposite sides of a coin. Opposites do not provide one with clear differentiation, it focuses attention on the relation between poles, and thereby shows that it is as important to be able to distinguish between a variety of elements as it is to be able to subvert those very distinctions (Culler, 1994:24-26). It is within the midst of this wider theoretical framework that I would like to position my work.

How does one negotiate such an in-between theoretical position? Irwin, Springgay and Kind have developed six renderings of a/r/tography that I have found relevant to my research process. They have positioned these renderings as providing opportunities for active participation:

*To render, to give, to present, to perform, to become - offers for action the opportunity for living inquiry. Research that breathes. Research that listens. Renderings are not methods. They are not lists of verbs initiated to create an arts-based or a/r/tographical study. Renderings are theoretical spaces through which to explore artistic ways of knowing and being research. They may inform the doing of research, the final representation, and/or the ways in which viewers/readers understand and access an a/r/tographical text. For renderings also return and/or give back.* (2005:899).

These renderings - contiguity, living inquiry, openings, metaphor and metonymy, reverberations and excess (2005:900-908) - although not premeditated, have materialised in the doing of my research. I deem this as proof that I have based my work on adequately open theoretical spaces that have allowed the praxis of designing in-between to unfold in the form of a rhizomatic map.
from representing complexity in the form of a network consisting of solid interconnected nodes. Like Deleuze and Guattari’s rhizome, everything might rather consist of only lines continuously traversing and reconfiguring space:

Unlike a structure, which is defined by a set of points and positions, with binary relations between the points and bi-univocal relationships between the positions, the rhizome is made only of lines: lines of segmentarity and stratification as its dimensions, and the line of flight or deterritorialization... changes in nature. (2004:21).

A border is usually seen as the thin separating strip between two distinct geographical areas. Viewed from another perspective, it can however also be seen as the section binding two areas together. The term ‘liminal’ encompasses both of these viewpoints. It refers to a “zone of blurring and juxtaposition” (Smith, 2001) between opposing forces. The term was first used by Arnold van Gennep in describing the phenomenon of ritualistic tribal processes transforming people from one social state to the next (Friedman, sa). This term is now being applied in a variety of contexts, but still refers to a space of transition; a threshold (Sibbett, 2004:1; Marshall, 2007:35). The concept is often linked to ideas surrounding performance, and it is in this light that Victor Turner has described it as a, “fructile chaos... a storehouse of possibilities, not by any means a random assemblage but a striving after new forms... a gestation process” (cited in Broadhurst, sa). In a similar vein the liminal is characterised by a “shift-shape style”, where meaning is created through “inter-semiotic significatory practice”; ie meaning arises through and beyond language as we know it (Broadhurst, sa). The liminal so encompasses aspects of reality that continuously seem to elude us.

Performativity was first described by John Austin. It forms an important part of speech-act theory and refers to the idea that, in saying/doing something - in declaring it - it becomes ‘real’ (Dictionary of Critical Theory 2000. Sv. ‘performativity’). Brad Haseman claims that, “[t]he name performs itself and in the course of that performing becomes the thing done” (2006:6).

Traditionally a rhizome refers to a specific kind of plant stem which grows horizontally under the ground and from which new roots and stalks can continuously sprout. Through making connections, a rhizome produces ever-changing and heterogenous multiplicity. Deleuze and Guattari have appropriated the characteristics of a rhizome and use it to represent complex productive systems. The making/breaking/re/making of connections is one of the key characteristics of this metaphor; “the fabric of the rhizome is conjunction, and...and...and...” (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004:25). These traits render complex systems as continuously opening up, adapting, changing, growing, breaking, linking, mapping and creating texture. It relies on contingency and so feeds on freedom of movement and space for experimentation. A rhizome is in a persistent process of becoming. It moves in-between. It is designing in-between.
I want to take some time to briefly guide you through my research process. This should bring my thinking process, as well as the conceptual renderings mentioned above, to light. My current work sprung from a vested interest in how people perceive, understand, represent and engage with spatiality. A day in the life of a few locals of my home community was traced by means of Global Positioning System (GPS) and photographic material. This was accompanied by in-depth discussions regarding their spatial views and experiences. Participants also constructed mental maps of the space. I was engaged in a process of living inquiry (Springgay, Irwin & Kind, 2005:902). What resulted could not be read as formal results. It was processes of “becoming” (Springgay, Irwin & Kind, 2005:907); mere spatial vignettes in unceasing conversation with one another (Perold, 2009). I became aware of how meaning was constructed in an in-between realm and this accordingly became my focus.

Immersion in the in-between propelled me through a range of transdisciplinary fields and practices. This has sparked a (limited) list of concepts I believe to encompass the in-between. Included in this list is translation, complexity, dialectics, Deleuze and Guattari’s rhizome theory, relationality, visual perception, language, design process, representation, the Other, structuralism/poststructuralism, space, liminality, figure/ground, and movement. Consequently I have engaged in a process of explicating these ideas and consciously relating them to one another, as well as to my experiences in/of my immediate locations in various combinations. As the ideas were brought into proximity with one another, yet new concepts were revealed. This refers to the rendering of contiguity (Springgay, Irwin & Kind, 2005:900). I have responded to the continuous unfolding of ideas, and have come to realise that each of these concepts is in fact utterly complex in its own right. The amount of variables present is enormous, and the potential for new relations to be forged seems infinite. I can do nothing more than attempt to describe my experience of continuous movement (or reverberation) and an excess of unreachable signification awaiting beyond, through a few examples (Springgay, Irwin & Kind, 2005:906-908). I have resorted to (re)presenting/becoming/performing these relations in ways directing thought, while still extending an invitation for viewers/readers to read differently. I have employed techniques of metaphor and metonymy in an attempt to make accessible what is difficult to express in clear terms (Springgay, Irwin & Kind, 2005:904). I have tried to create openings in meaning and not close it down (Springgay, Irwin & Kind, 2005:905). Even though no simple conclusive remarks can be made, various insights have transpired in the process.

I believe I have been designing in-between; that I have been performing a rhizomatic map or metaspace. I have mapped the different aspects that resulted from my research and explored a process of relating these concepts with one another to come to new knowledge. These insights have helped me understand the complexity involved in doing research in the social world. An exposition of the connections forged throughout my rhizomatic mapping process now follows to assist in guiding you through the rest of this text.

Relation 2:14 relates complexity with figure and ground. It sprung from experimentation aimed at collapsing the boundaries between foreground and background through engaging in a playful process of connecting lines to one another. This experiment embodied my research process. What started as a single, tiny line (or idea) on a sheet of paper, has branched out dramatically. The resultant detail seems to be overwhelming. It physically hurts one’s eyes. The experience awakened can
I believe democratic relations call for what Burbules and Berk have termed an "alternate criticality" (1999); a criticality that, in short, can be described as non-hegemonic. This implies an acknowledgement of revolutionary ways of knowing, and a willingness to move between apparent conflicting ideas in search for other possibilities. Dialogue and openness are paramount, and not only in relation between oneself and others, but also within one's own mind. Such a criticality becomes, "a way of being as well as a way of thinking" (1999). bell hooks seems to share in the thought of Burbules and Berk. She says that, "critical thinking requires us to use our imagination, seeing things from perspectives other than our own and envisioning the likely consequences of our position" (2010:10). Critical thought has the potential to help one live a determined life regardless of hampering complexity and the fact that complete understanding forever seems to elude one's mind (Barnett, 2000:409). I believe this ability to be of extreme importance to all human beings. It can have a "general humanising effect, across all social groups and classes" (Burbeles & Berk, 1999). I think this is especially relevant in a country such as South Africa, where the remnants of a previous unequal society still linger.

According to Nicolescu, strong transdisciplinarity is based on the belief that multiple levels of reality exists, that it is possible for seeming opposites to exist simultaneously, and that complexity is all-encompassing (cited in Max-Neef, 2005:10). Trans-disciplinarity "recognizes as simultaneous modes of reasoning, the rational and the relational" (Max-Neef, 2005:10).

I want to reiterate that the concepts I mention here are not comprehensive to the topic at hand. I in fact doubt the possibility of ever being comprehensive, as I understand complex systems to continuously expand and change. I can thus merely provide snapshots from a personal explorative process.

It has been said that, "[f]olding holds out the potential to diversify endlessly without falling into the logic of binary oppositions. This sense of the fold thinks matter as doubling back upon itself to make endless new points of connection between diverse elements" (Meskimmon cited in Springgay, Irwin & Kind, 2005:901). Jacques Derrida also used the metaphor of the "play of folding" (cited in Doel, 1999:160) to shed light on similar ideas. Through folding a sheet of paper it can continuously be transformed into evermore shapes, figures or beings. Within the "betweenness" of the folds therefore lies the infinite possibility of constant metamorphoses and knowledge production. Folds can be undone, reversed or folded over. The emergent is never fixed. It is always ruptured and stirring (Doel, 1999:27&135, Perold, 2009).

I believe visual language holds potential to not only illustrate what is said in words, but to create alternative perspectives from which information can be negotiated through a process of
thus be regarded as similarly embodying the inherent complexity involved in constructing knowledge. As connections are made, one’s scope of practice grows, and complexity increases. This relation can consequently also be read as a continuation of my work’s contents page; it can be seen as standing in for all the connections I have missed, as well as those I might still make in the future.

A conversation with a stranger at the European Academy of Design’s conference, The Endless End, in Porto, Portugal (2011), connected the concept of translation with my interrogation of designing in-between. Consequent exploration of translation led me to make further connections between it and Deleuze and Guattari’s metaphor of the rhizome. This connected my thoughts back to research done in my physical location. I became aware of how seeming similar ‘realities’ in the place/s I occupy are described and represented in a variety of ways, and of how these understandings change over time. I will translate these connections in relation 1:4.

It was from this starting position that I was directed to investigate the richness of signification arising from the basic use of language and representation. Each individual I came in contact with during my exploration of designing in-between, used language to represent his/her personal experiences. The interaction between these individual voices, together with those of the theoretical sources considered, as well as my own, constructed an intertextual machine which awakened assorted emotions and insights in me. This has consequently not only shaped, but has become my research. I have become aware of the multiplicity and openness inherent in language and representation, and especially of the way they interact to create significance. Relation 7:9 should be regarded as a mere snippet of this part of my research, as it is most certainly impossible to ever provide a comprehensive account of all aspects involved. The acute awareness of this impeding impossibility has urged me to explore the possibilities of going a step further and relating 1:4 to 7:9. What resulted in 1:4:7:9 is my attempt at writing this relation.

As I have consciously become more aware of the intricate interplay between language, representation and translation, I have experienced how significance is created in-between independent voices, objects, places, etc. This has led me to explore the theoretical concept of dialectics. I became intrigued by what happens within the relations between what is being said by individual forces, whether in words or other media. I have accordingly explored this through juxtaposed conversations with myself in relation 3:5. I have extended this conversation with the documented Google search history of my just passed research period. I believe this allows readers partial access to sections of the relations forged in my mind while engaging with the research process from amidst the various locations I have found myself in throughout the past two years. I have represented this in relation 3:5:12:13.

On a sensory plane my research process has confronted me with a wide range of contrasting elements; from serene views of nature, caring, colour and play, to chainings, hurt, conflict and decay. This has inspired equally contrasting emotions in me, as well as in many of those I conversed with, and has hence instilled a strong awareness of the complexity and delicacy of human nature. I have decided to use these experiences to relate the concepts of relationality and complexity to one another in 2:5, rhizomatics with structuralism/poststructuralism in 4:11, complexity with visual perception and movement in 2:6:15, as well as visual perception with complexity in 2:6.
translation (Leavy, 2009:215&233). Walter Benjamin’s definition of translation is powerful in this regard. He holds that the process of translation is an attempt at finding some sort of essential meaning, but that while each attempt provides some insight into what went before, it also diverges into yet new directions and consequently provides fertile ground for imaginative unfolding (1923).

22
As humans we tend to make sense of our thoughts through processes of simplification. We make lists, diagrams, build models, and devise theories. We try to structure what is perhaps not structurable in an effort to understand more clearly. Raoul Bunschoten describes the space created through such processes as metaspace. He says that,

Metaspaces are spaces of signs in which correlations can be demonstrated, connectivity mapped and planned. Metaspaces are diagrammatic expressions of the organisational form of dynamic conditions that can be fed back into physical space and temporal processes. A metaspace contains a proto-language of dynamic behaviour. (2001:37).

23
Denis Wood and John Krygier have found that, through the years 1649 to 1996, the great many definitions of the word ‘map’ that have existed are almost identical. Maps have consistently been defined as “representation[s] of a part of the earth’s surface” (2009:421). Given this definition, maps become nothing more than objective representations of reality at any specific time. Mapping or map making accordingly becomes something equivalent to a science. This belief was predominantly held, and is still quite widespread, in the academic fields of geography and science, as well as by the general public (Wood & Krygier, 2009:421). The effects of this belief include the map and map maker being imbued with power, of them fixing space-time into static slices of life (Certeau cited in Ljungberg, 2009:310), while disregarding the part mapping can possibly play in constructing the social fabric of societies. In this regard the map has become a hegemonic political tool constructing the dominant discourses ruling society (Wood 2006; Wood & Krygier, sa). In recent years an alternative approach to cartography has however evolved. This is widely referred to as critical cartography, and, although not limited in its scope, it generally encapsulates the following:

Critical cartography challenges academic cartography by linking geographic knowledge with power, and thus is political... Its purpose is to understand and suggest alternatives to the categories of knowledge that we use... (It) does not seek to escape from categories but rather to show how they came to be, and what other possibilities there are. (Crampton & Krygier, 2006:11&13)

Critical cartography uses mapping to provoke the status quo. The map becomes performative (Ljungberg, 2009:309); it actively engages people and so, “stimulate[s] us to interact by figuring, conceptualising or recording the world again” (Ljungberg, 2009:309). Mapping provides one with an apt tool
On my way home, a billboard advertising a planned residential development creates a sense of unease (see Addendum, Figure 29). It can be seen as a clear attempt to construct a specific image of the place in the minds of all who enter it. It seems to propagate the community as a place where racial and cultural differences are merged into a unified whole, and where middle class lifestyle eradicates any economic differences that might have existed before. I find the location of the billboard ironic, as it is neighboured by an informal settlement where lower class lifestyle is evident. Such juxtaposition of opposites in terms of culture, race, class and space has led me to explore the relations between relationality, the Other, space and liminality in 5:10:12:13, as well as between space and movement in 12:15.

When people ask me how I experience life where I live, it is possible to give them a clear answer, even though the answer may admittedly differ each time I give it. We make sense of the world through constant processes of structuring what seems complex and instructurable at face value. This awareness has steered me into the relations between structuralism, poststructuralism and the design process (8:11a-c). In these sections I hope to show how, through organising, naming and relating (whether in written and/or visual form), one can open doors for signification instead of closing them down. One has to:

\[
\text{[A]llow thought to think for itself, to go beyond or to disrupt dualisms, and to think the difference between them. It is to introduce the paradox. It is not to stop defining, but to multiply the definitions. (Pinar, 2007).}
\]

My research attempts to combine a selection of fragments springing from the variety of facets of my everyday life. This combination of bits and pieces does not necessarily lead one to a clear endpoint or conclusion. To the contrary, it constructs (or perhaps deconstructs) a complex and constantly changing picture. The world of knowledge emerges as a sea of stories linked to one another with strands of sense in a range of combinations and ways. There exists not only one conclusion, but many. Ironically such open-endedness awakened in me a growing longing to resolve matters succinctly. I have settled on concluding through personal reflection; to conclude inconclusively in the form of a postscript.

My research challenges traditionally accepted ways of doing academic research in the field of art and design. It does not merely illustrate this in written form, but also through the relationship between the content and the structure of the work. The work becomes “both a tool and a project” (Max-Neef, 2005:12). Readers of this text will necessarily partake in alternative, unexpected processes of signification. Being led off the beaten track, I have deemed it advantageous to provide the necessary context from which to approach the work. I have explicated my thinking process - a philosophical “logic-of-justification” in Piantanida, McMahon and Garman’s words (2003:185) - in this preface. My hope is that this will spark interest as well as insight into my commitment to creative experimentation with research in the field of art and design, and also guide and transform future work in similarly broad fields.
to digest and convey the ever increasing complexity of the interplay between our physical, social and mental worlds (Lefebvre, 1991:3-7; Ljungberg, 2009:308). Through mapping we can combine structure while breaking down structure. Christina Ljungberg adequately comments on maps in this light:

As processes of mapping rather than finite objects, they (maps) become ‘protocols of cognition’ informing us about their own processes of creating meaning - and their attempts to shape the meaning of others - as well as demonstrate the extent to which all maps are cognitive. (2009:309).
Designing in-between: a rhizomatic map

2:14 Complexity: figure/ground
Meaning is served far better - and literature and language far worse - by the unrestrained license of bad translators.

(Benjamin, 1923)
The translation is a process that took place in the Middle East. One of the gestures, verbal or otherwise, such as the UK to South Africa, language or visual language from one language to another language the English version. Designed according to Benjamin (Year: 1923), other aspects of the original text by hand, “Basic” is meant to describe. Text, images, sounds, gestures, and an important cornerstone of the implied meaning of this mysterious trend appears as “essential elements and relations between them.” No attempt to distinguish between them. Take the different aspects of the relationship. The importance of communication, a copy of the original intention, it seems that there is no official version. What is important “behavior, while continuing to grow in a new report always seems to escape the “next world”. (Benjamin, 1923 Lendl, 1997:153). In this sense, the significance of the rhizomes. The increase in the growth of new life sprouting buds it. It is divided into. The setting and diversity. (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987:4-8).

Deleuze and Felix Guattari, however, the division is not a fixed text written reports, travel search, mapping and with this system, more abstract thinking (1987:12), move the dialogue between the various points of the standard. Process, clear liquid, just as you can connect more than convenience / time - in the sense that translation. Substance or object is not limited to text, can not be determined in this way. Layer, where it is still possible to put the traditional line of thought, just more in touch with each other. This process will continue, all events (re) General Assembly, physical changes, such as multiple connections with romantic flowers. You can decide in advance the meaning and significance of ecological relationships. Awareness of the importance of the existence of abstract space, (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987:8-9).

If the translation is higher than in the original language, not content, violence and the foreigners left and right fracture, to prevent the translation, it is unnecessary, but ... this is a translation of the original graft -. Ironically, the - increasing importance and other displaced again, but only up to him, the last of language. (1997:158, Lendl).

The translation is to put meaning in the language as if it is considered an abstract machine? Follow the rules and regulations - - What is the possibility that the language restriction of meaningful relationships, or should be used to clean and safe? Element of the language to cover up, perhaps the most neglected room in the provision to create a link if it is possible to keep potential romantic thought, a clear connection, you may want to use them?

“I do not carry the necessary material is not right” (1997:152, Lendl): Walter Benjamin’s “poor translation” (line 1923) refers. I have this idea, I think it is an open experimental field of language games. The roots of the creative play of words between the development of the case (within the meaning of reproduction, but “core”) can be very simple. (1997:163, Lendl) “free, at work, insist on rewriting the language,” - - I’ve met so potentially believe the translation work.
Translation is a process occurring in-between. It transports one from one language to another, for example from English to Afrikaans, from one version of English to another, or from linguistic to visual, gestural, aural, or whatever other form. Its goal, according to Walter Benjamin, is to illuminate the “essential” meaning of the original text at hand in other ways (1923). Words, images, gestures, sounds, etc, seem to be the implied building blocks, and the relations between these elements the key to unfolding this mysterious “essential” meaning. Each attempt at translation produces another set of elements with different relations in-between. The meaning that transpires within these relations does not seem to be an exact replica of the originally intended meaning, but an evolved version. “Essential” meaning so seems to forever elude while new meanings continuously sprout in “afterlife”. (Benjamin, 1923; Rendall, 1997:153). It is in this sense that translation is a rhizome. It grows, produces seeds, buds and shoots: burgeoning new life. It divides and becomes many. It is an assemblage, a multiplicity (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987:4-8).

According to Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari writing is not about assigning fixed meaning to text, but about negotiating the relations between various points of reference; about travelling, exploring, mapping and moving through evermore abstract mechanisms of thought (1987:12). In this sense writing becomes translation - a fluid process providing only brief moments of intelligibility that can be connected to any/all other such moments at will. No finite subject or object of the text can so be determined. Layers, strands, and lines of thought are continuously assembling and become meaningful only due to their relations to one another. This process continues forevermore and with each (re)assembling event, the nature of the resultant multiplicity changes as novel connections flourish. The relationship between a translation and its meaning can accordingly not be predetermined. Meaning exists only in an abstract realm of consciousness (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987:8-9).

For translation indicates a higher language than its own, and thereby remains inappropriate, violent, and alien with respects to its content. This fracture hinders any further translation, and at the same time renders it superfluous... Thus translation transplants the original into an - ironically - more ultimate linguistic domain, since it cannot be displaced from it by any further translation, but only raised into it anew and in other parts. (Rendall, 1997:158).

If translation is regarded as an abstract machine of signification, where does that leave language? Should language be employed in clear, fixed terms - according to established conventions and rules - or will that limit the potential significant connections to be made? Should language perhaps be used against itself; in a way that obscures the obvious relations between elements and provides room for making links that would perhaps most often go by unnoticed, but hold novel thought potential?

Walter Benjamin refers to “bad translations” (1923) as the “inexact transmission of an inessential content” (Rendall, 1997:152). I believe this concept opens the playing field of language to experimentation. Through rhizomatic creative play between words, the evolution of meaning (compared to the reproduction of “essential” meaning) can be facilitated. I believe the task of a translator - “to liberate the language imprisoned in the work by rewriting it” (Rendall, 1997:163) - can so potentially be fulfilled.
What you have just read are two versions of a text I wrote relating the ideas of translation and rhizomatics to one another. One is my own words, while the other was produced by Carl Tashian’s *Lost in translation: cross-language computer translation* (2000). Tashian developed software that makes use of Babel Fish Translation - an electronic, internet-based translation tool produced by Altavista.com (http://babelfish.altavista.com) (USC School of Social Work, 2005). It translates English text to five other languages and back to English intermittently each time. Although the final English text shares some key concerns with the original, it is clearly not an exact replica, or “tracing”¹ in the words of Deleuze and Guattari (1987:12). I believe it to be what Walter Benjamin calls a “bad translation” (1923), or the “inexact transmission of an inessential content” (Rendall, 1997:152). It breaks logical streams of thought haphazardly and makes unusual connections between disparate ideas. It noticeably goes against convention and dominant discourse as it dismantles standard significatory systems. Language functions in strange ways. Some sentences are left undone and contradiction and ambiguity prosper. But amid thriving confusion, moments of seeming clarity fleetingly surface. Through the employment of the structural systems of thought the world has taught us, we (re)read and (re)connect elements from the muddle to arrive at fresh insights. The voices of “interlinear versions” (Benjamin, 1923) sporadically echo from the surrounding noise.

In the translated text I can hear that there is no official version of language. There are numerous illusions to a different reality which is made up of connections. These links evolve continuously. Perhaps diversity is the “essential” Benjamin refers to, and therefore everything will always be proliferating and escaping. Can the “essential” be subsumed by the non-essential as it can never be contained? I have been led to deduce this because of my previous life experience, and especially the information I have been engaging with during the writing of this text. Processes of signification are clearly context dependent and its results hence change as time goes by.

The five representations of my home community (Figures 2-6) seen above can be seen as translations of the same information. I would like to further explore the relation between the concept of translation and Deleuze and Guattari’s metaphor of the rhizome in this light. These mental maps were constructed by independent individuals when confronted with the same task: to represent the space they call home in visual form. Even though these representations were all drawn with the same medium and all embody the same thing, they differ drastically. Responses range from being linear and scientific to engaging complex narrative, history and more poetic forms. The makers of these maps clearly imposed their personal experience into their drawings. Key significatory elements of individual everyday life were used as reference points between which unique, meaningful connections were made. These had particular significance for the makers of the maps at the specific moments they were constructed, but now, in the minds of others reading these maps, their meaning has evolved. The resulting maps possess “multiplicity”. They have no finite being, “neither subject nor object”, only proliferating possibilities that will consistently transform in character; ceaselessly emerging forever more. Signification is never fixed. The maps are, “open and connectable in all of its dimensions; it is

¹ Deleuze and Guattari distinguish tracings from maps. “What distinguishes the map from the tracing is that it is entirely oriented toward an experimentation in contact with the real. The map does not reproduce an unconscious closed in upon itself; it constructs the unconscious...” (2004:12). Tracings hence resemble re-presentations of existing elements, while rhizomatic maps construct/present new elements by continuously forging relations between existing elements.
detachable, reversible, susceptible to constant modification" (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987: 7-12). Not only can these five maps be read as translations of one another - different ways of saying the same thing - they also demonstrate how various translations (or readings) of each individual map can continuously be formed. In this way the process of translation renders itself rhizomatic. It involves constant processes of signification.

I believe all translation, whatever the kind of language used, to be inadequate to the effect that essential meaning will probably never be realised. If it would have been possible to do so, translation would be rendered unnecessary. "For what does a... work 'say'?", in Benjamin's (1923) words, "[w]hat does it communicate? It tells very little to those who understand it." Translation is a “mode” (Rendall, 1997:152), a continuous process of making sense. It is designing in-between. It is to this effect that I feel safe in describing the various sections of this work as a whole as translations of one another. I am in the process of translating my research into a variety of forms. The different sections will not all cover the same topics, they will most certainly not all be rendered through the same media, some will perhaps be mere fragments of some of the other. I however believe that the relations between the elements of each section, as well as the relations between individual sections, will hold something unexpected and potentially productive concerning the topic of designing in-between as an experimental approach to research in the field of art and design. To quote myself as translated by Tashian (2011):

Element of the language to cover up, perhaps the most neglected room in the provision to create a link if it is possible to keep potential romantic thought, a clear connection, you may want to use them?
The relations between language and representation seem to be so tightly entwined that it becomes difficult to discern the one concept from the other. Language seems to enable representation and representation to enable language. The interaction between these forces somehow produce meaning.

A theory of representation is essentially a theory of meaning. It is an attempt to explain how the words of our language or the structures in our brain become meaningful, by trying to define the relationships between these words or structures and the world. (Cilliers, 1998:58).

The nature of such relations seem dubious, the concepts involved to be mutually referential. Complexity surfaces inadvertently. In describing the relations between language and representation, one necessarily has to use language to represent it. One enters a meta-realm of reflection which is equally intricate.

Language and representation seem to put themselves forth as mediating and connective forces always already operating in-between. They do not function as a static intermediary - as glue fixing two or more independent forces together - but are perhaps more like those leashes for dogs that can extend up to a point to allow the dog a certain amount of freedom in motion. They connect flexibly. The dog is contained while able to move in any direction at will. The leash may however obstruct freedom by twirling around itself and around you in the process. In time it will also reach a critical point where the dog cannot go any further. This demonstrates language and representation's ability to limit itself. One can easily entangle oneself with linguistic representation - in uttering (performing) something, it in effect becomes ‘real’. This can be a dangerous as well as liberating liaison. Language and representation are simultaneously what allows us to access and produce knowledge about the world and ourselves in it, but also what limits us in formally knowing whatever may lie beyond, beneath and/or inside it. Even though we can only know through language and representation, we often become aware of some kind of extended ‘reality’. Words frequently seem incapable of expressing emotion, and awareness of relations between oneself and whatever other, are often difficult to manifest concretely. Language and representation embody this inherent contradiction in their complex interaction.
The interactions between language and representation are complex, and henceforth cannot be represented in any simple way (that would propose it to be something that it is not) (Cilliers, 1998:70). Paul Cilliers accordingly argues for rather focusing on “distributed representation”\(^1\) (1998:11). I will try my hand at constructing a distributed representation through bringing the links between language and representation - the meaning it produces - to the fore. I will do so through blatantly constructing this text as an \textbf{intertextual machine} (Cilliers, 1998:85-86). Through creating a bricolage of direct words from various theorists as well as from people in my immediate locations\(^2\) throughout my research process, I will attempt to construct the following:

\[\text{[A] multidimensional space in which a variety of writings, none of them original, blend and clash. The text [will be] a tissue of quotations... The writer [I] can only imitate a gesture that is always anterior, never original. His [or her] only power is to mix writings, to counter the ones with the others, in such a way as never to rest on any one of them. (Barthes, 1977:146).}\]

I want to (re)create a conscious experience of how language and representation operate in the complex world we form part of. I want to use language and representation against itself and expose how meaning is not generated in one or the other, but in the momentary (and often fragmentary) relations in-between. Meaningful value will thus not necessarily surface inadvertently. The potential for making new connections, and so creating new significance, can however possibly be multiplied through the seeming incoherence that prospers. I realise that the complexity inherent within these concepts in fact renders it impossible to represent it in any simple way, but I believe there lies value in the process of trying to plot some of the possible “patterns of interaction” (Cilliers, 1998:5). We negotiate these kinds of situations every day. Why should formal attempts at constructing knowledge - at doing research - be structured any other way? My attempt at making sense of the complex relations between language and representation follows as a distributed representation; an intertextual machine.

Language can be described as a system of signs. Where, “Saussure still understands language as a closed system... Derrida wants to argue for language as an open system” (Cilliers, 1998:43). For Saussure, “the meaning of a sign is present to the speaker when he uses it, in defiance of the fact that meaning is constituted by a system of differences... Die reuk van grond. Breyani. Aarbei. ...The language as a system does evolve, but it remains in a state near equilibrium.” (Cilliers, 1998:42). For Derrida, “[i]n a way, interaction is only possible if there is some ‘space’ between signs... I am in-between as I keep everything linked. All the different networks stay connected and have a connection through me. ...There are always more possibilities than can be actualised... Baie koek, melkterk, baie poedings, baie parties. ...The meaning of a sign is the result of ‘play’ in the space between signs. Signs in a complex system always have an excess of meaning, with only some of the potential meaning realised in specific situations.” (Cilliers, 1998:42).

\(^1\) A distributed representation refers not to a separate metaphoric entity standing in for something else, but to what arises from amidst the interaction between a range of elements (Cilliers, 1998:11).

\(^2\) In this case I have included the following as part of my immediate locations: people in my home community, teachers and students at my place of study, students and colleagues at my place of work, as well as family members and friends (Anonymous locations, 2010-2011).
"The play of differences involves syntheses and referrals that prevent there from being at any moment or in any way a simple element that is present in and of itself and refers only to itself. Whether in written or in spoken discourse, no element can function as a sign without relating to another element which itself is not simply present... Span drade tussen bladsye ipv dak en vloer. ...This linkage means that each 'element' - phoneme or grapheme - is constituted with reference to the trace in it of the other elements of the sequence or system. This linkage, this weaving, is the text, which is produced only through the transformation of another text... Ek sal sé sag. ...Nothing, either in the elements or in the system, is anywhere simply present or absent. There are only, everywhere, differences and traces of traces." (Derrida, 2004:24).

"The frontiers of a book [or text] are never clear-cut: beyond the title, the first lines and the last full stop, beyond its internal configuration and its autonomous form, it is caught up in a system of references to other books, other texts, other sentences: it is a node within a network... Pak die bladsye uit, speel met hulle, bou nuwe betekenis. ...The book is not simply the object that one holds in one's hands... Its unity is variable and relative." (Foucault, 2005:23). "In the play of differences meaning is generated... Ek dink nie dis duidelik genoeg nie. How can you represent it differently, not illustrating? ...However, as this play is always in progress, meaning is never produced finally, but continuously deferred." (Cilliers, 1998:44). "The bricoleur," according to Lévi-Strauss, "works with signs, constructing new arrangements by adopting existing signifieds as signifiers and 'speaking' through the medium of things' - by the choices made from 'limited possibilities' (1974:20-21). You are like a bad lawyer... Or perhaps a mad gardener. "The signified is nothing but another signifier that has to take its position in the endless interaction between signifiers... En net so kort toet as jy verby ry. Dis 'n vinnige manier om iemand te groet. So dis toet daar is hy, toet daar is hy, toet, toet, toet oral. Dis eintlik nogal nice... Daar was vantevore meer aan die verbeelding oorgelaat, dalk moet jy weer teruggaan soontoe... I don't have a fixed location. The one is influenced by the other. ...we cannot escape the process of interpretation..." (Cilliers, 1998:42-43). Jy het dan belowe?

"The play of signifiers does, however, create 'pockets of stability'" (Stofberg, 1988:224), "otherwise communication could not get started. Within these pockets a more rigorous analysis of relationships is possible, as long as it is understood that the stability is not permanent or complete, that meaning remains a result of the process of interaction between signifiers" (Cilliers, 1998:43). "If I were to find a common point shared by all these concepts [these pockets of stability] I would say 'frontier', or even better 'threshold'... [T]he threshold, that in-between zone Hannah Arendt spoke of, is able to render not only a temporal connection or a spatial point of contact, but also a social melting spot, a political openness and most of all a mental plasticity" (Kristeva, 2002:9).

"Saussure (1974) [thus] presented us with a system of distributed semiotics by arguing that the meaning of a sign is a consequence of its relationships to all the other signs in the system... However, since he maintains the distinction between signer and signified, his system remains representational." (Cilliers, 1998:81). Meer goudeel. Nagal min blou... Reghoekig maar met die hoekies gerond. Dis soos klei. According to Sterelny, "[t]here can be no informational sensitivity without representation. There can be no flexible and adaptive response to the world without representation. To learn about the world, and to use what we learn to act in new ways, we must be able to represent the world, our goals and options. Furthermore we must make appropriate inferences from these representations." (1990:21). In opposition,
“Derrida explicitly denies a theory of representation... [a]n argument against representation is at the same time an argument for the textual nature of the image itself” (Cilliers, 1998:81-82). “Structuralists saw signs as windows to a trans-empirical world of crystalline order, of identities of form that maintained themselves over time and outside history, of codes of meaning that seemed exempt from the differences entailed by the contingencies of living examples. Post-structuralism claims all such orders are strategies of power and social control, ways of ignoring reality rather than understanding it. It was time, they argued, to burn down the signs and with the signs, all the orders of meaning and or reality that signs help maintain.” (Rivkin & Ryan, 1998:334). “Even signs must burn” (Baudrillard, 1981:163). “It is no longer a question of imitation, nor of reduplication, nor even of paradox. It is rather a question of substituting signs of the real for the real itself, that is, an operation to deter every real process by its operational double, a metastable, programmatic, perfect descriptive machine which provides all the signs of the real and shortcircuits all its vicissitudes... A hyperreal henceforth sheltered from the imaginary, and from any distinction between the real and the imaginary, leaving room only for the orbital recurrence of models and the simulated generation of difference.” (Baudrillard, 1984:254). Die wetenskap forseer gevolgetrekkings uit. “For Baudrillard, the distinction between true and false, or image and reality, has vanished into one substance... Dierbare diep koortjies word very offkey, bad sound quality...

“The precession of the image (or map, or theory) has four stages (one and two being representational, and three and four being nonrepresentational) and moves as follows: from the first (where the image reflects a basic reality and stands for some truth) and second stages (where the image masks and perverts a basic reality and truth), in which signs dissimulate something (that is, feign not to have something), to the third (where the image masks the absence of a basic reality and truth) and fourth stages (where the image bears no relation to any reality and truth whatsoever), in which signs dissimulate that there is nothing.” (Smith, 2003:70).

Following in Baudrillard’s thought, the relations between language and representation is seductive: “Seduction cannot possibly be represented, because in seduction the distance between the real and its double, and the distortion between the Same and the Other, is abolished” (1990:67). “Suppose that all the major, diacritical oppositions with which we order our world were traversed by seduction, instead of being based on contrasts and oppositions. Suppose not just that the feminine seduces the masculine, but that absence seduces presence, cold seduces hot, the subject seduces the object, and to be sure, the reverse. For seduction supposes that minimum reversibility which puts an end to every fixed opposition and, therefore, every conventional semiology” (Baudrillard, 1990:103-104).

There has been a “shift to the situation where signification has replaced reality to such an extent that the world is no more than a giant simulacrum or simulation where signs refer only to other signs within a closed system” (Smith, 2003:69). But, “[m]eaning is the result of a process, and this process is dialectical - involving elements from inside and outside - as well as historical, in the sense that previous states of the system are vitally important. The process takes place in an active, open [not closed] and complex system.” (Cilliers, 1998:11). One should hence, “shift from control and prediction to understanding,” and allow for “distributed representation [where] the elements of the system have no representational meaning by themselves, but only in terms of patterns of relationships with many other elements” (Cilliers, 1998:11-13). The transition of time, the moving from one place to another, the
moulding and shaping of me as an individual, thus also then the way I impact on others. “It [distributed representation] again argues that there is nothing outside the system of signs which could determine the trace, since the ‘outside’ itself does not escape the logic of the trace... Maar jy voel dan nou soos my ma. ...Should you attempt to find the origin of the trace outside, you would be confronted with the same fragmentations, movements and erasures. Inside and outside refer to each other in a ‘generalised reference’; we have a distributed representation confined to the level of the signifier.” (Cilliers, 1998:82).

“We are living in a society in which our perception is directed almost as often to representations as it is to ‘reality’” (Lash, 1990:24). “Intertextuality blurs the boundaries not only between texts but between texts and the world of lived experience. Indeed, we may argue that we know no pre-textual experience. The world as we know it is merely its current representation.” (Chandler, 2003). “We schedule our lives, making of them representations, measuring our encounters temporally with minute exactitude, becoming impatient with the present ‘whose duration restricts our access to a future event that we desperately need to make real’” (Crocker, 1998:486). In this sense Nigel Thrift’s critique of representation is of importance: “the emphasis... should be on practices - either on their reproduction (stable repetitions), or on the production of new practices (perhaps inspired improvisations) - because it is practices (performances using materials to hand) rather than representations that are at the root of the geographies that humans make every day” (Smith, 2003:68). “Linguistic behaviour is therefore a form of structural coupling, and the primary purpose of words is the conservation of adaptation through coordination of behaviour; the word’s meaning is only secondary” (Regan, 2008:28) “Representation fails to capture [this]... It mediates everything, but mobilises and moves nothing. Movement for its part, implies a plurality of centres, a superposition of perspectives, a tangle of points of view, a coexistence of moments which essentially distort representation.” (Deleuze, 1994:56). “We cannot deal with reality in all its complexity. Our models [concepts] have to reduce this complexity in order to generate some understanding. In the process, something is obviously lost. If we have a good model, we would hope that that which is left out is unimportant.” (Cilliers cited in Hurst, 2010:246-247). “Yet, as Cilliers (2001:137) warns, reiterating Derrida’s (1992:28) insistence that such marginality marks a violation of sorts, ‘(n)o matter how we construct the model, it will be flawed, and what is more, we do not know in which way’.” (cited in Hurst, 2010:247).

“In journeying nothing adds up, there are no equations, and no summation. Hindsight, pretending to step outside of language and the simulacrum, creates the retrospective illusion of things coming together into ordered systems, but there are no unities or stable identities. Knowable structures do not underlie empirical events; reality is a play of forces in differential flux with no order, logic, or meaning. All is contingent, nothing has any meaning, all thinking is groundless, all we can do is throw ourselves into the play of the world and dance with it.” (Smith, 2003:82). “For Riffaterre as well as for Freud, meaning [the relation between language and representation] is not a unity that comes before or after the text [a linguistic representation], but an irruption, an always unstable revelation on a more or less undermined ground embedded in a plural unity; it paradoxically imposes itself through the recurrence of non-sense, distortion, ambiguity and contradiction.” (Kristeva, 2002:11).
Figure 7. Karolien Perold, *Untitled* (2011). Paper, plant material and thread, 265x600mm.
(Perold, 2011).
perceptual semiotics
It's not easy to see the grass in things and in words.

(Deleuze & Guattari, 1987:23)
The word ‘dialectic’ stems from the Greek word dialéktiké which translates into, “the art of conversation, dialogue, discussion, controversy and debate” (Doel, 2008:2632). While the original assumption was that the dialectic is concerned with rational thought, logic and attaining ultimate truth, the nature of such conversation has become a much disputed concern in recent decades (Sheppard, 2008:2603). It seems that dialectics as theoretical framework has evolved along with the developments in philosophical thought that have characterised modern and consequent postmodern history. Dialectics has thus been reformulated to suit many aims. The resultant relations between it and other strands of thought are accordingly numerous and interrelated. This causes great difficulty in describing and/or representing it. This research aims to design in-between through a process of designing in-between; it wants to foster connections in-between an array of theoretical and practical concepts by designing (unbuilding and rebuilding) those very connections. In this specific case I will attempt to illustrate the relational development of dialectics in conversational style.

This text is structured as a conversation with myself. I will reflect on the use of my home community as a source of data for my research, and juxtapose it with a more formal theoretical discussion between myself and my interpretations of various theorists work concerning dialectics and relationality. Attention should be focused not purely on what is said, but on how and why it could produce specific responses. A great deal of the message in fact lies within the seeming blank spaces between the words on the page; a space which will most probably never be occupied by anything tangible, but will be filled with prolific processes of signification in the minds of those who read/view the text as they forge relations between a range of individual elements. I trust that reading these texts in combination could potentially lead to the construction of bountiful meaning in the spaces between that which would singly perhaps have remained hidden. What it will awaken in others’ minds will most certainly differ from what it aroused in me, but it will nevertheless demonstrate how blankness can quickly transmute into fullness through dialectic designing in-between.
The place I call home was founded by a German missionary and a local butcher around the turn of the century. They bought a portion of a well-known vineyard in the Stellenbosch district, and divided it into 25 long strips of land (Figure 8) which were then leased to 25 families from the surrounding areas for the purpose of smallhold farming. The initial lease contract (Figure 9) extended from 1 May 1902 until 30 April 1910, whereafter the individual families had the option of buying the land on condition that they adhered to the terms stipulated. Strawberries were the main crop cultivated as the land was passed down from father to son/s for generations to come. This created a strong sense of family and collectivity in the community. The community developed homogenously. Subdivision of family property however became inevitable as families rapidly expanded. Around the 1980s the municipality officially cut up land and lay down crossroads for the first time (Figure 10).
In short, what is dialectics?

Dialectics is a process of relating opposing conditions with one another. During this process the ‘positive’ (so to speak) gets entangled with the ‘negative’, and through what Friedrich Hegel termed “aufhebung”, or “sublation”¹, one arrives at a third heterogenous condition of “absolute Wissen”, or “absolute knowing” (Sheppard, 2008:2604). The generally accepted Hegelian assumption is that dialectics can be described as a rational process where, through order and structured thought, one works through difference in an attempt to move beyond and surpass it. In line with Enlightenment thinking, Hegelian dialectics is accepted to be driven forth by a teleological and positivist worldview (Sheppard, 2008:2604-2605).

Will I then be correct in assuming that a positivist worldview relies on the negative to ensure its future existence? This seems to contradict the very basis such discourse is built on.

Those who attend to a more finite view of Hegel’s dialectic most probably regard it as a fixed process being cut off after the first round of sublation has offered its positive synthesis. This synthesis will, yes, have been speckled with the negative through the process of sublation. Given the current theoretical climate, such a view does however open itself to many counter-arguments. For one, it holds little room for the role of contingency, and many accordingly ask how the notion of unpredictability can be united with the existence of ultimate truth (Colligne, 2008:2615).

Many have admitted that Hegel’s dialectic is shot through with “unspoken violence and uncertainty” (Gidwani, 2008:2579). I believe those who interpret his theorisation in this way, view sublation as a continuous process affecting each seeming positive result emerging from within the play between seeming opposites. Dialectics so seems to evolve as a never-ending process continuously forging new relations between all that exists. Marcus Doel is of the opinion that dialectics viewed from this perspective involves reality being “discharged” from all positive and all negative; that, “being vanishes into nothingness, and nothingness into being, but between the two vanishings there is a transversal moment of becoming” (2008:2634).

Roy Bhaskar shares a similarly open view of the dialectic, but however illustrates it by laying emphasis on the negative being all-encompassing (2008:xv). Bhaskar developed his ideas from those of RM Hare who, in the early 1990s, claimed that essentially positive being is a mere legend and in fact “non-being” lies at the heart of understanding existence. Hare has been quoted in saying that the positive is “a tiny, but important ripple on the surface of a sea of negativity” (cited Bhaskar, 2008:xv).

¹ In Hegelian terms sublation refers to when a “term or concept is both preserved and changed through its dialectical interplay with another term or concept” (Webster’s Online Dictionary sa. Sv. ‘sublation’). It springs from the German verb ‘aufheben’, which can be translated into “to cancel” and “to keep” (Webster’s Online Dictionary sa. Sv. ‘sublation’).
It seems that even amidst greater openness towards dialectics, differing opinions exist. Is contradiction escapable? Or is it, as John Llewelyn has said, “the principle that moves the world”? (cited in Doel, 2008:2631). I am interested in more open readings of dialectics, but its reliance on opposites seems to be such a limiting force - closing down instead of opening up.

I think it is not so much a question of replacing the dialectic’s reliance on binary opposites with a new (no matter how open or closed) version, but coming to know that nothing one poses can ever remain unchanged through the passage of time. It is all a matter of how context affects the signification process. In acknowledgment of others’ views, one comes to know - one forms one’s own views - but always in relation to what lies outside of oneself. (Sheppard, 2008:2605).

A few theorists (of whom I have already introduced some) have busied themselves with such ideas during recent years. Most took Hegelian dialectics as a base and used current ideas from a variety of fields to enrich and develop the theoretical phenomenon of dialectics. There are many bones of contention, but the critical dialogue created in-between is alive and keeps knowledge moving forward. It becomes a dialectic.

Tell me more about these theorists’ ideas.

Jacques Derrida did groundbreaking work in this regard. Through the use of poststructural deconstruction, Derrida laid bare the dubious nature of some of Hegel’s central phrases. He showed that many of Hegel’s concepts were ambiguous and that, in his own words, they, “can no longer be summed up or ‘decided’ according to the two binary oppositions nor sublated into the three speculative dialectics... they destroy the trinitarian horizon” (cited in Colligne, 2008:2617).

Derrida’s idea of *différance* is what is believed to have enabled this shift from an apparently closed to a more open regard for dialectics. Through *différance* opposites are not understood as being fixed in contradiction, but as being in continuous interplay with one another. This leads to resultant meaning being shifted along an endless chain of signification. (Colligne, 2008:2617).

Derridian *différance* questions the existence of an essential ‘reality’, and so necessarily also the power of representation to mimic reality (for if no reality exists, how can it be represented?). Language, as a representational system, hence comes under question. Derrida holds that semiotic signs can never hold fixed meaning as their meaning is always dependent on the context (and hence other signs) surrounding them (Colligne, 2008:2617). In our minds, then, all signs contain “traces” of other signs with which we have encountered them before. We thus see something in the present that is not necessarily there anymore. Derrida argues that, “[n]othing, neither among the elements nor within the system, is anywhere ever simply present of absent. There are only, everywhere, differences and traces of traces” (cited in Anderson, 2006:410).
CODE OF REGULATIONS

(Referred to in annexed Lease, and under Paragraph C of Section 7 thereof, incorporated therein)

I. WHEREAS I the Undersigned

of Stellenbosch, in the Colony of the Cape of Good Hope, have on this 1st day of May, in the Year of Our Lord One Thousand Nine Hundred and Two (1902) become the Lessee of Lot No. \_ \_ \_ \_ of the farm "oooooo" portion of the farm "oooooo", situate in the district of Stellenbosch aforesaid,

II. AND WHEREAS I have, by virtue of Section No. 4 of the said Lease, acquired the right, for certain consideration, to purchase the said Lot No. \_ \_ \_ \_ in course of time,

III. AND WHEREAS it has been found necessary for the better maintenance of peace and order on the said farm "oooooo", that certain regulations be enacted whereby the various tenants or owners of the twenty-five Lots comprising the said farm "oooooo" shall be held and firmly bound,

IV. AND WHEREAS it has been mutually agreed upon by and between the said tenants or lessees of the aforesaid 25 Lots, that the following offences, omissions and neglects shall be and are hereby strictly prohibited, in respect of each of the aforesaid Lots, to wit:

1. Washing in, or in any manner defiling or polluting the water of any stream or watercourse, wherefore the said tenants or owners shall have acquired a common right.
2. Making a fire in or upon any unauthorized place, or letting off fireworks upon any such place.
3. Wilfully or by any neglectful act depriving any person of the water to which such person is entitled at the time proper for the use thereof.
4. Unlawfully diverting or appropriating the water to which any other person is entitled.
5. Encumbering any road or thoroughfare, or obstructing the free passage along the same, by means of any wagon, cart or other thing whatsoever.
6. Swearing, or making use of obscene, abusive, insulting, or threatening language, or swearing, shouting or screaming, to the annoyance of the said tenants or owners, or any one of them, on the said farm "Jamestown."
7. Allowing any night soil or other offensive matter to be spilt or cast into or upon any road, street, footway or other place, to the annoyance of any one or more of the said tenants or owners.
8. Neglecting to clean all private yards, ways, passages, or avenues, by which neglect a nuisance by offensive smell or otherwise shall be caused.
9. Suffering or permitting to be at large any unmuzzled ferocious dog.
10. Wilfully trespassing in any place, and neglecting or refusing to leave such place after being warned to do so by the owner or occupier, or any person duly authorized by or on behalf of the owner or occupier.
11. Keeping a house of ill-fame or brothel, or being privy to the keeping of such house.
12. Permitting drunkenness or dancing to take place upon any Lot of the farm "Jamestown."
13. Suffering fowls, pigs, poultry, dogs, sheep or goats or cattle to stray or roam upon the Lot occupied by any other tenant or owner.
In relating *différance* back to the Hegelian structure of dialectics, I believe one must reconsider the nature of the seeming fixed structural points of reference between which sublation occurs. These points of reference are nothing more than signs, and as just mentioned, from a Derridean point of view, signs consist of a range of traces; of relations to other things. These points of reference are hence multiple and ambiguous from the start. They are already sublations to a certain extent.

So dialectics, from a Derridean perspective, is in fact a circular process - sublation of sublation of sublation ad infinitum?

One can probably see it as such, yes. I, however, want to caution that such a view might easily lead some to nihilistic perspectives, to believing that, in line with Jean Baudrillard, nothing is meaningful as everything is mere regurgitations of more of the same (Anderson, 2006:414-415). This is not what Derrida implied, for during the play of differences the (im)possibility (Anderson, 2006:412) of new connections to be made is ever present.

The play on the word ‘(im)possibility’ is significant. It illustrates the ambiguity embedded within the concept of difference. Derrida views possibility as, against popular belief, a limiting force. He believes that what is possible will always be measured against what human-kind knows to be feasible, what we have set to be feasible through the context of language and representation (Anderson, 2006:414). In this sense possibility is always already known. He said that, “it is the invention of the law, invention in accord with the law that confers status; invention of, and accord with the institutions that socialise, recognise, guarantee, legitimate, the programmed invention of programs; the invention of the same through which the other amounts to the same” (cited in Anderson, 2006:414). Derrida feels that we create meaning through representative context; that we create the realm of possibility through the construction of discourse. He then goes on to say that the context we use in this construction is in fact dependent on contingent factors. As a result of contingency “every event turns out to depend upon a network of conditions from which no one condition can be privileged” (Colligne, 2008:2617). Context is thus rendered as something we have control over to a certain degree, but also something simultaneously “open and mobile” (Derrida cited in Anderson, 2006:415). The only fixity we thus seem to have, is that things are not fixed (Sheppard, 2008:2609). This led Derrida to believe that “context, by making possibility possible, also makes possible the impossible” (Anderson, 2006:414). This promises productive potential and thus counters any argument that *différance* extends nihilism (Anderson, 2006:415).

The sublation of sublation of sublation so perhaps rather becomes what Derrida terms “dissemination” - instead of two binary opposites being transcended into an ultimate third concept, dissemination adds another category: that of “the more or the less” (Derrida cited in Doel, 2008:2637). Marcus Doel corroborates by saying that poststructural deconstruction robs Hegel’s three-part system through dissemination, and adds this as a fourth dimension (2008:2637). The heartbeat of poststructural dialectics is accordingly described by Doel as, “not that there is always a multiplicity of antagonistic positions, nor that these positions may...
be arrayed so as to contradict and negate one another, but that every position can be shown to contradict itself by being drawn out into a series... Every position is given in motion and set in motion" (2008:2634-2635).

It seems that context, contingency and mobility are key concerns. Did other theorists, mentioned before, touch on similar ideas?

Yes, they mostly share in a broad poststructural perspective while each person looks from a specific, more narrowly defined point of reference. Roy Bhaskar, for example, speaks from a critical and meta-realist² perspective (Hartwig cited in Bhaskar, 2008:xiii). Eric Sheppard concisely summarises Bhaskar’s view as, “argu[ing] for the possibility of a dialectical imaginary that, while holistic in approach, avoids the traps of stageism and teleology, and can embrace *différance*” (2008:2608). The key elements of Bhaskar’s dialectic are “non-identity, negativity, totality and transformative praxis or agency” (Bhaskar, 2008:xxxi). A detailed account of these is not directly relevant to this discussion (refer to Bhaskar’s book *Dialectic: the pulse of freedom*, for further information), but I do want to highlight Bhaskar’s idea of totality. This is relevant as it relates quite directly to the ideas of context, contingency and mobility mentioned above.

In hearing the word ‘totality’, most would assume an affiliation with Hegel’s notion of “concrete totality” - that things are fixed and that the “there is no alternative maxim” applies (Sheppard, 2008:2606). Bhaskar breaks open this assumption by arguing for a dialectic within which numerous forms of totalities exist simultaneously and continuously interact. He argues for a dialectic as a “pulse of freedom” within which one needs to “see things existentially constituted, and permeated, by their relations with others... to see the causality of a upon b affected by the causality of c upon d” (the use of italics is the author’s own) (Bhaskar, 2008:125).

According to Sheppard, this general idea is applied to varying degrees in the work of, for example, David Harvey on relational dialectics, in Deleuze and Guattari’s concept of assemblages³, and on work concerning complexity theory. All of these theories hold that all objects and objects of knowledge are constituted by the relations between its constituent components as well as between itself and other surrounding objects and/or their components. (2008:2606-2607).

---

2 Roy Bhaskar’s approach to philosophy is geared at arriving at an in-between ontology that combines critical thought of the natural with that of the social world. It tries to merge scientific thinking with postmodern and poststructural discourse.

3 According to Deleuze and Guattari, an assemblage forms while a multiple entity forges evermore connections with others and thereby constantly transforms in nature. It is hence a term referring to a continuously metamorphosising being (2004:48).
This, in conjunction with the impeding financial strain resulting from the growing large-scale farming industry stealing locals’ business, resulted in families reverting to selling sections of their property to ‘inkommers’. This has continued at increasing pace ever since, and has led to significant changes in the community’s demographic characteristics. People from a variety of sociocultural and economic backgrounds currently inhabit the place, and this has inevitably led to a process of continuous (re)construction of cultural identity and spatiality. (Williams, 2009).

This area can currently be regarded as a hybrid community; a small-scale rainbow nation, some might say. In many ways it might thus seem to be an ideal location within which to embed research concerning in-between processes of signification in South Africa. When I initially started my research process, I therefore used it as a lived example of the theoretical concepts regarding the in-between I studied. I was an outsider and felt like an intruder in the space. This

4 ‘Inkommers’ is a local term referring to people entering the community from the outside. They have no family ties to the place.
These ideas seem very complex. What is the use of seeing dialectics in such intricate, confounding ways? The ‘old’ ways seemed more simple and straightforward.

I think Bhaskar put it well when he said:

"Thinking of totalities as intra-actively changing embedded ensembles, constituted by their geo-histories (and/or their traces) and their contexts, in open potentially disjointed process, subject to multiple perspectival switches, and in structured open systemic flux, enables us to appreciate both the flickering, chameleon-like appearance of social being and the reason why narratives must be continually rewritten and social landscapes remapped. (2008:126)."

Derrida supports such a view, but just in different terms. He is of opinion that the relations between differences necessarily lead to “moral dilemma and conflict”, but that it is exactly such contention that leads to the construction of “ethical possibilities” (Anderson, 2006:415). “Decision and responsibility are always of the other” (Derrida cited in Anderson, 2006:419).

You mention the ‘other’ here, and difference has been a key concern throughout our discussion. I assume there can be close relations between poststructural dialectics and postcolonial theory?

Frantz Fanon, well known in the field of postcolonial theory, reacted quite strongly against Hegel’s dialectic, arguing that it positions the black person as always already negative and defined against its superior and white Other. He said that:

"The dialectic that brings necessity into the foundation of my freedom drives me out of myself. It shatters my unreflected position. Still in terms of consciousness, black consciousness is imminent in its own eyes. I am not a potentiality of something, I am wholly what I am. I do not have to look for the universal. No probability has any place inside me. My Negro consciousness does not hold itself out as a lack. It is. It is its own follower. (cited in Gidwani, 2008:2578)."

I think this quote speaks for itself. Fanon clearly springs forth as an anti-essentialist. Such overt opposition may ironically affirm the very belief that the world is perhaps structured in rational, absolute and clear oppositional terms. Although holding strong views, Fanon is not necessarily opposed to more open ideas. Engaging with his work extensively and in depth will provide a much more variegated regard for it. This is however not directly indicated in this discussion.

Perhaps the most important aim of postcolonial theory has been (and still is) to create space for dialogue and to so be able to move through destructive difference to arrive at a more constructive regard for and of it. This requires a more open, poststructural dialectic process. Arun Saldanha argues for such a process in the article Reontologising race: the machinic geography of phenotype (2006). He describes the complex interactions between selves and others as being like a viscous, contingent chain. Connections between elements are not fixed and permanent, they merely pull on each other continuously. Such connections ensure that each node stays an independent functioning element of the complex system at hand. Nodes cannot be subsumed into broad categorical groups. That would be to diffuse difference.
experience curbed the research process and led to critical reflection. Since I have consequently made the community my home, my sense of intrusion has dissipated, but my doubts as to whether I should use the space as an exclusive source for formal research has increased. It is as if the space has become more human. I have built relationships with people, places, sounds and smells, and experience active negotiation of differences every day.

This has instilled critical awareness of how South Africa’s history has infiltrated each and every person in his/her own way; of how people are products of the interactions between their individual contexts.

We are always already engaged in processes of evolution and change. I have hence decided to back away from formally studying this community.

I feel that this might result in highlighting differences rather than shedding light on how the current negotiation of differences (whether positive or negative) is in fact indicative of productive growth.
(Saldanha, 2006:18). Saldanha speaks of “a thousand tiny races”, and claims that, “[r]ace should not be eliminated, but proliferated, its many energies directed at multiplying racial differences so as to render them joyfully cacophonic” (2006:21). I believe this should be the nature of a postcolonial dialectic.

I want to conclude by supporting what has already been said: Conflict facilitates interaction, which facilitates relations to be established, whether willingly or not. This ensures dialogue about relevant issues and can serve the development of responsible and ethical behaviour well.

As you have already started concluding, how would you like to conclude this discussion of dialectics as a whole?

I want to equate this discussion of dialectics to a dialectic process. Relations were consistently made in and between various concepts. Questions led to answers which sparked other questions in turn. The structure of this conversation was not predetermined. Its train of thought probably did not always follow logically. Contingent factors played a big part even though the contextual position one was speaking from most definitely directed thought. Choice of words had an impact. The resultant processes of signification are not fixed. It moves as these factors come in conflict with one another in individual minds. Complex networks form and can continuously be reformed.

As Gilles Deleuze has said, with anything in life one “begins with concepts that, like baggy clothes, are much too big” (cited in Doel, 2008:2637). From there one starts forging more intricate relations between differences which allow meaning to evolve forevermore. This has been (and still continues to be) the dialectical historical development of dialectics.
3:5:12:13 DIALECTICS: RELATIONALITY: SPACE: LIMINALITY
Complexity, or complex systems, are remarkably difficult to define. A general first attempt might consist of comparing the concept to its opposite - to simplicity. If simplicity implies clarity, understandability and logic, complexity can possibly be characterised by vagueness, incomprehensibility, and random, non-sensical trains of thought. These ideas might be valid to some extent, but I do not believe they are comprehensive of the concept. This might be because such a definition fails to take into account the triggers that can be held accountable for the exuding perplexity. Paul Cilliers, the author of *Complexity and postmodernism: understanding complex systems* (1998), is of the opinion that something might appear simple if viewed at a distance and as isolated from its surrounding environment, while if the entity is observed from close by, the interactions between its constituting components, and between them and surrounding factors, become prominent. What was once observed as a single object might in fact reveal itself as a complex system composed of multiple units in constant interaction with each other and what lies beyond (Cilliers, 1998:3). Cilliers seems to be implying that it is the existence of intricate and ever-changing relationships between elements that produce complexity. Haggis corroborates this opinion by saying that relationality is very well the phenomenon that enables complex systems to exist (Haggis, 2008:165). Complexity and relationality thus seem to be inherently entwined concepts. I want to use this section of my work to explore this entwinement in greater depth.

I have turned to my immediate frames of reference for possible cues to spark this exploration. In this case my focus has fallen within the field of art and design. I have considered the work of creatives who, in my mind, explore the complex and relational nature of knowledge production in a range of alternative ways. The work of the local artists Lien Botha and Josh Ginsburg, as well as the international designer Bruce Mau, and architect Raoul Bunschoten, demonstrate how art/design can function as

---

1 The scope of this work does not allow for in depth discussions of the all the examples looked at. Please see the Addendum for selected excerpts from work of Ginsburg (Figures 35-36), Mau (Figure 42 & 44), and Bunschoten (Figures 37-41). Also refer to Mau’s book, *Life Style* (2006), especially the section on his studio’s work on Zone Books, and *Urban Flotsam* (2001) by Raoul Buschoten, for more detail. I will however discuss Mau’s manifesto for his design practice in greater depth in relation 8:11b.
a noun, as discourse, as research activity, as a puzzle-like process, as representation, as an art form, as part of industrial process and business, as an image-making practice, as involving serendipity processes, and as multiperson (Johnson et al., 2007:134). Their work shows how, in practice, these categories can intermingle and interact while the creator and/or the reader continues to forge relations between a range of impulses. I have accordingly deemed it appropriate to critically discuss selected work of these creatives, specifically Lien Botha’s Amendment (2006), as well as my own work, as I believe it may provide insight into how exactly such multidimensional, interactive and relational complexity can be embodied.

Before I delve into this discussion, I however want to declare that this exploration of the intricate relationship/s between complexity and relationality is not an attempt at representing, or defining, complexity. If this could be done - if complexity could be represented in simplified form - it would prove that complexity is not complex after all (Cilliers, 1998:9). I rather want to use this discussion as a process of mapping some critical tools/techniques that can be employed to facilitate experiences of the relational nature of complexity.

Amendment (2006) by Lien Botha (see Addendum, Figure 30-34), a South African artist and photographer, immediately strikes one as serene and strangely beautiful. Engaging with the work at closer range seems to however shift one’s experience into evermore perplexity. Tension rises as one is confronted with a grave sense of mystery. The work is composed of fourteen photographic triptychs. The first is titled Amendment 1: the case of beginning at the end, while the last is Amendment 14: the case of ending at the beginning. Immediately a clear circular and relational structure is awakened in the viewer’s mind. One consequently expects equally clear relations to emanate between the three images in each triptych, as well as between the fourteen works as individual entities. One is however left in the loop; cold and confused. Whereas here and there a (seeming) clear link can be made, the impeding realist surreality (Dorfling, 2010:69) of the imagery maintains in one a constant awareness that each attempt remains mere conjecture.

The experience described above effectively illustrates some of the key characteristics of complex systems as highlighted by Paul Cilliers. Firstly Botha’s clear reference to circularity, or looped interaction, echoes Cilliers’s argument that interactions in complex systems always hold the ability to feed back on themselves, whether in a positive or negative fashion (1998:4). Does the last frame of Amendment 14 showing Adam and Eve walking out of the art work perhaps feed back to the first frame of Amendment 1 where a singular tree (perhaps the biblical Tree of Knowledge) is shown in the distance? Could this perhaps imply that corruption will continuously perpetuate itself as Adam and Eve will metaphorically always end back at the tree and eat of its forbidden fruit?

Furthermore Cilliers holds that complex systems are characterised by interaction among a great number of constituent elements. These interactions, he claims, are dynamic, rich and non-linear (1998:3-4). The overwhelming sense of intriguing incomprehensibility experienced when confronted by Botha’s Amendment, bears proof of the great number of variables actively interacting in the work of art. Amendment does not merely consist of fourteen times three single elements and their statistically calculated amount of relations in-between. Each image encapsulates a complex system on its own. The landscape seen in Amendment 2: the case of the flowering drought, for example, shows
an entrance way to what seems to be a farm. A driveway has been trodden in by what must be a good many years of coming and going. People must occupy the homestead visible in the background. They must somehow make a living. They all have their own memories. They all have some special and not so special bonds with a range of others. They are all influenced by the blue sky (or the changing of the skies as times pass by). The scene displayed is pregnant with possibilities. The carefully articulated title in each case additionally bears the brunt of the complexity inherent in language (Cilliers, 1998:5). Image plus text sets alight new routes for meaningful connections to be made. The minute details of each image converse with each other and with details of other images. Individual images converse with one another three-three. Each triptych converses with its accompanying text. And the triptychs converse with one another as well as with the artist's comments about her own work and viewers' and critics' opinions about the work.

*Detail is everywhere, ubiquitously distributed and continuously variegated in collaboration with formal and spatial effects... [this] intricacy implies complexity all over without recourse to compositional contrast.* (Lynn cited in Mennan, 2009:317).

As contrast between figure and ground is limited, the scope Botha's complex system operates in, is open (Cilliers, 1998:4). The artist succeeds in creating permeable boundaries for her work. Although framed and structured externally, the images exude “a non-directive relationship, based on a form of fruitful indeterminancy that is call[ed] 'in between' ('entre-deux') and which puts the onlooker in the position of becoming 'equally responsible for the work'” (Criqui in Fried cited in Dorfling, 2010:72).

The relations forged are also dependent on what went before. History and previous life experience of those involved necessarily impact (Cilliers, 1998:4). Botha pertinently described this work as perhaps “just fourteen pages from a personal chronicle” (cited in Lamprecht, 2006). The resultant relations are nevertheless not bound to the past only - they evolve as time ticks along. Each moment captured is nothing but a moment to be surpassed by another and another. Botha provides the viewer with ephemeral snapshots of such seeming mundane moments. The manner in which these moments are composed and related to one another, however also sets the images free and opens the potential for emergent properties to be revealed (even if only momentarily) (Truter, 2010; Cilliers, 1998:12).

Each change, or emergent property, the system reveals, affects it not only locally, but also at a distance (Cilliers, 1998:4). An interpretation of the relations between elements in *Amendment 6: a case of waltzing with the moon,* might very well shape consequent interpretation of *Amendment 11: a case of extinct threats.* Is technological advancement perhaps leading to the destruction of our natural environment and the extinction of species?

Botha ironically succeeds in using photography - a medium traditionally associated with truthful and realistic documentation (Corrigall, 2009) - to break down conventional mimetic and semiotic codes and move beyond seeming cognitive limitations (Dorfling, 2010:24) to an experience of complexity.

---

2 Emergent properties can exist because of the plasticity of complex systems. This refers to complex systems' ability to, when new connections are made between elements, display properties that none of the original constituting components could. Such properties emerge as a result of the self-organization of a system when confronted with new conditions (Cilliers, 1998:12).
A state of equilibrium is never reached (Cilliers, 1998:4), as no ultimate translation of the work in fact exists. As Chris Roper said in a review of Amendment in the Mail & Guardian, “[t]hose hoping for a clearer explanation than that provided by Botha’s exhibition notes - the work is a metonymic reflection of our genesis: murmurings lost to fractured atonement - didn’t get it” (2006).

In Amendment, Botha clearly makes use of a range of tools to open up space for complex interrelations to be made, broken, and/or remade again and again. Botha employs seeming simple structure and positions a range of elements in careful relation to one another. The power of the work seems to reside less in the physical objects traditionally regarded as works of art, ie the photographs, and more in Botha’s sensitive spatial design - in the way she constructs the abstract relations between the photographs, as well as between the photographs and the audience. What results is a rich experience of fascination and bafflement. Amendment is, in the words of Harold Nelson, “simply complex” (2007:115). Ashraf Jamal said it beautifully when he described this work of art as “the aperture through which to glimpse the mystery of what it does not reveal” (2002:2). Many may feel that there is no use in investing energy in something when it does not promise any generalising deductions to be made. It is however when one starts to explore the realm of possible reasons for, and characteristics of, the connections between disparate frames, that I believe some insight into complexity may start to surface (Haggis, 2008:172). Such insight will never be complete or ultimate, as Botha’s work apparently shows, but that is not what one is after. The focus should rather be on gaining experience of, and accordingly insight into, the ever-evolving relational nature of complexity.

Experiencing the relational nature of complexity has been one of my main aims with the work you are currently reading, Designing in-between: A rhizomatic map (2010-2011). The process of constructing it has forced me to make connections between a range of elements, and to some extent it feels as if I have been caught amidst these interconnections. I therefore intentionally want to use the term praxis when referring to my work. I want to clearly position it as occupying an in-between state; ie in-between what is traditionally regarded as academic theory and artistic/design practice, in-between theoretical frameworks, in-between traditionally distinct disciplines, in-between individual frames of reference, in-between the physical and the abstract, and in-between people and their environment/s, etc. Through processes of designing in-between I have become in-between. I have been driven forth by a desire to highlight the relations between elements, and so allow seeming opposites to move through one another to exist in entangled dynamic equilibrium. With this as my motor, my tool could be nothing but engaging the play of differences. I have extensively been trying my hand at structuring non-structure, bringing figure and ground in closer relation to one another, simultaneously making small scale large and large scale small, creating intense sensory experiences, combining various media, etc. In short, I have been challenging and deconstructing conventional ways of reading and writing in an effort to stimulate alternative processes of signification.

3 In Jacques Derrida’s seminal essay Structure, Sign and Play in the Discourse of the Human Sciences (1966), Derrida interrogated the “structurality of structure”, and concluded that what lies at the heart of structure is simultaneously what governs the structure and what escapes it. He argues that this presents the center of structure not as a constant present in a metaphysical sense, but as a “function” which constantly changes and adapts as contextual factors have an impact on the complex equations it forms part of. This inference is what led Derrida to conclude that the structure of structure boils down to a continuous play of differences (2001:278-282).
Designing in-between: A rhizomatic map consists of a range of relations, or chapters, if you like. Each chapter maps the relation/s between a range of concepts in different ways. I have continuously tried to write it in open ways. I do not want to close meaning down. This is why I have made extensive use of visual language as well as non-standard typographic form, scale, and multiplication.

In relation 3:5, for example, I mapped the relationship between dialectics and relationality. I have represented this through juxtaposing a conversation with myself with a personal reflection on the use of my home community as a source of data for my research. This could have been a mere two columns of text positioned next to one another. I have however tried to add more layers of signification by playing with the typographic layout of the reflection. By adjusting the kerning of the text, I have consciously hampered legibility. Reading becomes more difficult, frustrating and time-consuming. The process of signification is further disrupted by the inclusion of aerial photographs and an excerpt from a legal document pertaining to the historic origin of the community under question. By adding more, and increasingly far-related, variables, the amount of potential connections to be made in and between multiplies. This accordingly results in experiences of increasing complexity and the potential for richer processes of signification.

In relation 3:5:12:13 I have mapped the relations between dialectics, relationality, space and liminality. I have done this through visually representing my Google search history since the beginning of my research process. Given the technological and information driven society we currently form part of, I have found my search history to be not only a fairly accurate logbook of my everyday activities and interests, but also - ironically - a linear text that allows one glimpses of the overt non-linear connections being made in and between its ever-expanding range of components. Through what it physically allows us to see, it opens suggestive spaces which enables one to partially read some of the possible connections being made in a more abstract space throughout my research process. In this sense my work can be regarded as an “open work”, to use Umberto Eco’s term (2006:20). I purposely decided to challenge readers’ sensory systems in representing this history. The text is minute, but it covers a sweeping amount of space. As one tries to make sense of the proliferating detail through forging relations between individual elements, one’s eyes take strain. The experience of physical effort, perhaps even pain, can be read as symbolic of the impossibility to ever represent or fully comprehend complexity. There are just too many possible relations to be made within the always expanding scope of the world we live in.

I have related complexity to visual perception and movement in relation 2:6:15. In this chapter I have combined a range of media to create a multisensory experience in readers. I have represented a stopframe animation in static form while attempting a composition, and possible performance, of white noise to accompany it. I have also attached a digital translation of this work in the Addendum. My hope is that the unusual combination of stimuli and the interactive element of this section might engage readers on a different level, and therefore trigger unexpected connections to be made and processes of signification to transpire.

I must admit that I have experienced some limitations in putting together this work as it is presented here. Due to the fact that this work will have to undergo formal examination procedures, I have been limited to translating it into transportable, and mostly two-dimensional form. As a relation can only
be made between two or more entities, it automatically occupies space. I thus feel that my work should similarly occupy space. I want it to engage multiple dimensions and facilitate active negotiation of space on behalf of the reader. I did accordingly not bind the work in finite form. Although the individual pages are numbered, they are loose, and therefore the possibility for it to become something more than a linear, fixed narrative exists. The work is clearly not finished. It will in fact never be complete. It is alive and will remain forever in process.

My hope is that *Designing in-between: A rhizomatic map* succeeds in embodying the productive capacity connections hold for signification; that it creates experiences of relational complexity (or complex relationality) through a play of differences. I will be happy if experiences of my work can, as Botha’s *Amendment*, be described as an exchange of senses: tasting with one’s skin, hearing with one’s eyes, and feeling with one’s ears (Truter, 2010).
4:11 RHIZOMATICS: STRUCTURALISM / POSTSTRUCTURALISM
Figure 13. Karolien Perold, *In memory of* (2011). Mixed & multimedia, dimensions variable. (Perold, 2011). (see Addendum for *In memory of* sound file)
2:6:15 COMPLEXITY:VISUAL PERCEPTION:MOVEMENT
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in ch in my way we go to our dreamed places
"Yes, it's in the attic, right there..."
Images seem to speak to the eye, but they are already addressed to the mind. They are ways of thinking, in the guise of ways of seeing. (Duff cited in Hobgin, 2000:10).

The above quote from Duff seems to introduce the field of visual perception as a multidimensional phenomenon. It seems to imply that we are under the impression that we see the blue sky, while perhaps we are merely thinking that is what we are seeing. Some, for example, see a dog tied to a chain and interpret it as animal abuse, while others may regard it as providing safety and security for a family who has experienced a recent criminal attack. This seems to indicate the presence of vital intermediary processes continually moving between the realm of the sensory and that of the mind; between the physical and the abstract. Rosalind Krauss corroborates this opinion. She states that vision, and hence visual perception, is produced in the play between differences (1994:14). Lupton and Miller highlight interpretation as a vital ingredient in perceptual processing (1996:62). Perhaps this is the necessary ‘play’ between opposites enabling perceptual outcomes.

Interpretation, or rather signification, can be defined as a process through which meaning is generated (Collins English Dictionary 1999. Sv. ‘interpretation’). Such a process cannot function outside of language, as without any means of translation, thought, communication and meaning creation can not occur. Individual context, previous life experience, and learning also affects the processes of signification (Lupton & Miller, 1996:62). Understanding the process of visual perception in this light thus necessarily adds numerous layers of subjective meaning which explain the richness and complexity of perceptual processing.

During the height of Modernism1, visual perception was to the contrary regarded as purely biological. It is said that the Dutch artist, Piet Mondrian, attempted to produce a language to relay this vision

---

1 Modernism in visual art was characterised by abstraction, a process of breaking up reality to its bare essentials (Dictionary of Critical Theory 2000. Sv ‘modernism’). This drive most probably corresponded to the Enlightenment belief that man can control nature through rational and scientific thought and methods (Dictionary of Critical Theory 2000. Sv ‘modernity’).
with; that he attempted to represent perception in its ‘purest’, most basic sense. In his neoplastic phase, Mondrian used only essential opposite forms in his art. He used exclusively horizontal and vertical lines and mostly only black and white. When he used other colours, it was sparingly, and only the primary colours: red, yellow or blue. It is clear that Mondrian engaged in processes of stripping down the visual field to its bare essentials. It can accordingly be understood that his minimalist, abstract approach echoed the Modern belief in essential truths. I am however of the opinion that Mondrian’s work illustrates not only pure opposites, but also their interaction with one another. I detect experiences of complexity lurking behind (or rather inside and amidst) the austere facade of Mondrian’s work, and believe that the very simplicity of it also creates space for multiple readings.

I want to use my personal experience of perceiving Mondrian’s artwork, Ocean 5 (1915) (see Addendum, Figure 43), as a basis from which to expound some of the dynamics of visual perceptual processing. My hope is that it yields some insight into the complexity of this phenomenon.

The room was white and airy. The artwork was installed against an outside wall. Through the large windows adjacent on either side, one saw the wintry-gray Grand Canal of Venice, Italy; splatters of rain silently and intermittently breaking the surface of the water. A glaring and luminous fogginess seemed to seep through and fill the internal gallery space. The white gouache highlights became tangibly cold and bright; the vertical and horizontal intersecting lines shifted with the natural ebb and flow of the canal’s water. The ‘sea’ outside and the representation thereof on the inside became one, even though both still seemed to clearly exist independently too.

Light reflected intensely from the white walls of the room onto the retinas of both my eyes. Without light, no vision, and hence no perception, would be possible. “Light,” as Hogbin says, “is deceptive, even magical, because it cannot be seen until it strikes, touches, or transmits back from the surface it has engaged” (2000:26). My corneas focused the image while my irises determined how much light to let through. Light receptor cells received these physical stimuli which caused electro-chemical changes to occur in my eyes. These stimulated nerve impulses, which were then propagated along my optic nerves towards my brain. My brain then responded by interpreting the information in a multiplex way (Hogbin, 2000:14-15). A range of thoughts was awakened in me. The whiteness created openness and freedom, but also a sense of exclusivity; that this work of art is reserved for sophisticated Western art enthusiasts only.

In situating Ocean 5 in space, my brain had to fuse the two different images reflected on each individual eye (Grossberg, 1996:3). This is done through a process termed “contour salience” and creates the impression of continuity in space (Westheimer, 1999:8). Whether such continuity truly exists or is nothing but optic illusion, however remains a question unanswered.

Mondrian seemed to have carefully placed short horizontal and vertical lines asynchronously, but in close proximity to one another in Ocean 5. This, according to Exner (cited in Westheimer, 1999:6), constructs a perceived sense of motion. One line by itself would have been perceived as static, while, would many have been placed far apart, the focus would probably have been on each line individually. Perception per se, it is held by Gallese, only occurs within an active relationship between two or more visible elements (Gallese, 2007:12). Max Wertheimer, one of the key Gestalt theorists,
expanded on Exner’s research and found that when two separate lines following one another are seen together, the resultant experience exceeds the sensory effects they would have yielded individually (cited in Westheimer, 1999:6). This altogether enhanced effect was clearly felt as the rhythmic breaking of the water in the arrangement of mere horizontal and vertical lines in Ocean 5.

It seems that perception is given significance metaphorically. It should then be no surprise that Lupton and Miller refer to perception as relying on the visual and the linguistic (1996:63). The mind seems to act as a glass prism - it accepts initial sensory input, and then immediately refracts it into a variegated range of stimuli leading to multiple connections being made and responses created. Although the initial sensory source may be similar for all human beings, everyone will process the information differently and arrive at their own meaningful descriptions thereof due to individual sets of knowledge, culture and experience (Lupton & Miller, 1996:63). We practice selectivity in observing according to Hogbin; we are constantly trapped in a process where we weigh up the odds against what we have previously learned to be ‘true’ (2000:21-27). It has been proved that the neurons in our brains do not respond to sensory input in linear ways - one plus one does not necessarily equal two. The neuronal network in our brains’ cortex consists of multiple interconnected paths, and which options are chosen in which events depend on previous or concurrent stimuli as well as influences from other parts of the brain (Westheimer, 1999:8-11). The frontal lobe of the brain, for example, is responsible for transcribing sensory input into emotion. It attaches meaning and associations to language used (Lehr, 2011). Paul Cilliers describes the brain as being a prime example of a complex system, as the relationships in and between various parts of it are many and constantly shift, thereby leading to new qualities continuously emerging (1998:viii-ix).

Piet Mondrian’s work, especially his Compositions (see Addendum, Figure 45), demonstrate sensitivity to the two characteristics Krauss feels the optical sense opens onto: “the infinitely multiple on the one hand, and the simultaneously unified on the other” (1994:6). According to Raoul Bunschoten, Mondrian managed to transform the space between an object and the horizon - the in-between - into something ‘real’ by including the viewer in its perceptual construction. He does not represent perception in its truest sense, but models, or diagrams, the relations between opposites (or figure and ground2) that enable perception to exist (2001:262). Figure and ground, although still distinguishable, seem to become one, or perhaps one should rather say that they become indiscernible from one another as their relation with one another yields a third space betwixt. In viewing Mondrian’s work, one finds oneself somewhere amidst the concrete and the abstract; engulfed perhaps by what Ouspensky termed “hyperspace philosophy”3, what Plato referred to as “forms”4, and Kant as “noumena”5 (cited in Kruger, 2007:24, 29).

---

2 Figure and ground refer to “the fundamental law of gestalt that helps us identify objects (figure) as distinct from their background (ground)” (Graham, 2008:3).

3 Hyperspace philosophy refers to the manifestation of three-dimensional bodies existing in perpetual time (Kruger, 2007:31).

4 Plato’s forms refer to the more real than the material world essences of reality which are the source of what we perceive in our daily lives (Kruger, 2007:25).

5 Noumena are “things-in-themselves”, “the external source of experience... [but] not themselves knowable” (Flew cited in Kruger, 2007:25).
Mondrian’s art can be seen as demonstrating an interplay between worldviews many might regard as opposing one another. While such views could have been regarded as contradictory during the Enlightenment, we are now in a different epoch which warrants different interpretation. To echo Nicolas Bourriaud in his text *Relational aesthetics*, “[i]t is not modernity that is dead, but its idealistic and teleological version... art was intended to prepare and announce a future world: today it is modelling possible universes” (2002:13). In playing with figure and ground relations, Piet Mondrian’s art seems to ironically occupy the past, the present and what lies in-between. It is capable of taking on different forms of signification depending on its given context while inherently remaining the same.

I think it fair to say that this interplay, what was once referred to as a different dimension, exists in a figure-ground shift; a “pop” in Lunenfeld’s terms. According to him, every now and then, “some ‘thing’ emerges from the ground, while formerly prominent figures sink back into the amorphous periphery” (2001:29). Theories of perception seem to have evolved to incorporate possible understandings of such a “pop”.

While Merleau-Ponty initially described perception within the realm of the actual, he later proceeded to work in a field he termed depth. According to him, depth functions outside of reality as we commonly know it. Gestalt, or forms, should be read as process, and not physical entities. Time so enters the equation. Merleau-Ponty consequently seems to move into a meta-realm. He moves “beyond the world of perception to the conditions for the experience of perception”; a seeming contradiction in terms, some might say (Somers-Hall, 2009:214-216).

If there is ever a person to thrive on contradictions it is Gilles Deleuze, and he does not disappoint in this regard. In terms of perception (or the study of forms) it is said that he “move[s] to a language at which the Gestalt itself is already broken, or rather, is yet to be formed... the level of the dissolved Gestalt” (Somers-Hall, 2009:217-218). This, I feel, is in line with what Merleau-Ponty described above as the “conditions for the experience of perception” (cited in Somers-Hall, 2009:215-216). According to Somers-Hall, Deleuze’s *The Logic of Sensation* describes visual forms as being in constant modes of flight trying to get beyond itself (2009:218). Figure and ground consequently subsume one another in an attempt to open up and exceed its own boundaries. This movement of “de-actualisation” seems to “release the presences beneath representation” (Somers-Hall, 2009:219) and allow acknowledgement of complexity to surface.

These ideas are complex, and instead of trying to simplify, it seems theorists continuously add to the seeming chaos and leave things evermore undone. Research on Gestalt theory in complex visual systems has concluded that the perceptual processing of the complex images we are daily faced with
occur through a continuous process of sectioning which produce yet new, smaller wholes. This is referred to as “serial gestalt”. In an attempt at simplification, we become aware of the complexity of the system actually increasing and flooding our perceptual capacities (Mennan, 2009:314-315 & 319). This relates to the feeling many experience when confronted with Mondrian’s work: that it is so simple it becomes disconcerting.

The obscure phenomenon of simple complexity fascinates me. I have decided to play with complex visuals encountered during my research process in a range of ways. I am in the process of consciously experimenting with serial gestalt (see relation 2:14). I am attempting to construct figure-ground pops, and am hereby trying to stimulate visual perceptual experiences that embody the experience of complexity. I am also playing with the idea of translating these artworks into repetitive patterns and creating a range of wallpaper and/or fabric designs. I believe this is what we as humans do with complexity: we render it as complicated - a mere repetitive pattern - in our attempt at arriving at some sense. I believe this can signify a pop not only between theory and practice, but also between fine art and commercial design. It can perhaps demonstrate how what can in some sense be regarded as esoteric art, can also be (re)constructed to serve a much more mundane and practical purpose. I believe this to be another form of designing in-between.

I want to conclude by posing that becoming consciously aware of how we perceive the world around us - of experiencing how forms move through one another and how we negotiate meaning in an in-between realm of uncertain and complex connections - might afford great insight into the depths of the social fabric that drives our current societies. When an unfamiliar person angrily confronted the people about their dog tied to a chain, and when the dog was not there anymore the next day, my heart broke. There lies substantial value in discarding an either/or mindset for a both/and disposition (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004:25) - for a position acknowledging the multiple processes of signification that exist simultaneously.
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part system of self/relation/other, where the relation is not merely or the sum total of opposing parts, but a process that “transforms either/or to the dialectically open logic of both/and also...” (Soja, well as the relation, evolve together and is to be related to yet other three dimensions. It so occupies space. It in fact seems to become space. much richer than mere physical landscape. It seems to be composed scious awareness surfacing amidst daily interactions between an surrounding him/her. It is a combination of physical, mental as well 11); a “trialectics of spatiality”, to quote Edward Soja (1997:64). possibility for opposite forces to exist simultaneously.
tioned that I have rooted my research in my immediate locations,
explained that I spent time exploring how people perceive, under-
the intricate concept of space in this location. Upon revisiting the views conducted with locals, I became acutely aware of how all seemed to contradict themselves. This text has been flanked with to serve as illustration. I have found what radiates from between telling than what is stated in clear terms. A clear discrepancy between something, whether emanating from specific word choice or affective to be left unsaid. These inconsistencies do however not invalidate contrary, happens to generate proof of active (although most often tion - within the relations between the various selves and all other.

En ek bedoel dis nie ons (Anonymous, 2009).

This statement clearly brings guilt between which meaning is nego- seems to hint at a reality where she translates that both sides are A strong indication is given that the process of negotiating the

Dis 'n negte gemeenskap

This statement demonstrates sense and be accepted into the heart of the participant however seems to proof of the boundary between tion, but a more fluid thirdspace.

Such a thirdspace forever moves (Naum, 2010:201). A border or of new territory and so holds the degger has said that, “[a] boun the boundary is that from which is not merely a physical line drawn (Lefebvre, 1991:11). Homi Bhabha bridge between the self and the the Other, it creates a space where different to what it has been before habits the rim of an ‘in-between’

I believe South Africans are conti in negotiating thirdspace - as the I however suspect this process to

1 The clear distinction between existence of pairs of mutually
where difference is acknowledged seems to be revealed (Bhabha, 1996:13). Magdalena Naum describes it as uncertainty and multiplicity, but... also empowering, creating possi-

skuld of hulle skuld nie, dis maar net hoe dinge gebeur het...

of belonging as being a spatial determinator. One can either belong the community, or be cast outside. The careful choice of words used by imply that a process of moving inward is being negotiated. This bears the inside and the outside of the community not being a rigid obstruc-

nie dat dit ’n slegte ding is nie...

into play. By implication there is a ‘right’ side and a ‘wrong’ side' tiated. Guilt is however posed as escaping the equation. The subject either both sides are right, or both sides are wrong. Or perhaps he/ right and wrong simultaneously, although maybe in varying degrees. the person speaking here occupies a thirdspace where he/she is in present amidst the past and the future.

waarvan ons nou nog nie regtig deel is nie... (Anonymous, 2009).

of wat wit mense doen wat reg of verkeerd is nie, dit gaan nie daaroor nie, dis net ’n ander kultuur...

in-between and can also be described as a liminal space or frontier boundary does not indicate limitation, but also represents deliberation potential for innovation and change (Bhabha, 1994:34). Martin Hei-
dary is not that at which something stops but, as the Greeks recognized, something begins its presencing” (cited in Bhabha, 1994:4). A boundary on/in the landscape, it has a great mental as well as social component describes the liminal as a process of symbolic interaction; a connecting Other. This bridge does not merely allow one to cross from the self to parts of the self and the Other can meet, gather and become something (1996:5). The space becomes,” a difference ‘within’ a subject that inreality” (Bhabha, 1996:13).

nuously involved in processes of “thirding-as-othering” (Soja, 1997:60) - quoted transcriptions show. This makes sense given our political history. mostly occur subconsciously. I doubt if the potential power inherent in it

nie dat dit ’n slegte ding is nie...

en groot huise deurmekaar...
en waarnate ontwikkel word in die toekoms is ’n sensitiewe saak...

right and wrong is an example of a binary opposition. Structuralists believed that the exclusive opposites enable the creation of meaning (Chandler, 2002).
is extensively realised. It seems democracy, a unified rainbow chical system imitating the very this way thriedspace can be nothing authentic, as ‘home’, a secure re divided up” (Massey, 2005:6). I as third and liminal - of “splace”, individual agency and facilitating plagued by the legacy of apart particular way can shake up the tribute to political arguments al in the imaginative structure which litical” (2005:9).

In relation between differences - ends and missing links” (Massey rather to realise that we are alrea between becoming a conscious said that, “[w]hat happens in space of a design (in both senses of the mental activity (invention) and
that the focus is often on the future; on the attainment of a 'perfect' nation. Diversity is so propagated, but also contained in a rigid hierar-
system it is simultaneously trying to escape (Rutherford, 1990:208). In
but a place; it can only be perceived “as closed, coherent, integrated,
treat, of space as somehow originally regionalised, as always-already believe that when one, however, becomes consciously aware of space in Marcus Doel's terms (1999:9) - it can contribute to strengthening transformative change (hooks, 2006) - vital factors in a country still heid. It is as Doreen Massey has said, “thinking the spatial in a manner in which certain political questions are formulated, can con-
ready under way, and - most deeply - can be an essential element enables in the first place an opening to the very sphere of the po-
between self and Other - space emerges as liminal and third; with “loose 2005:12). It is up to us to continuously connect and (re)construct anew, or dy busy doing just that. I believe there lies great value in designing in-
practice in all South Africans. Henri Lefebvre has described it well. He lends a miraculous quality to thought, which becomes incarnate by means word). The design serves as a mediator - itself of great fidelity - between social activity (realization); and it is deployed in space.” (1991:27-28).

or “de-realized”, view of democracy. He proposes that one should imagine it outside of its not its failure but its frailty, its fraying edges or limits that impose their will of inclusion and sidered - on the grounds of their race, culture, gender or class - unworthy of the democratic

maar enige iets verander as tyd deel is daarvan...
maar dis 'n baie geslote gemeenskap.
maar is daar iets soos 'n emosionele ruimte?
Ja, daar is. Dis meer toe. Dis my ervaring...

en dit is nie noodwendig so nie.

For and against...

(Anonymous, 2009)
8:11a DESIGN PROCESS: STRUCTURALISM/POSTSTRUCTURALISM
A lack of clear definitions, or perhaps rather murky overlap between paradoxically similar though completely different ideas, has characterised much of contemporary discourse. The influence of this indiscriminate climate of thought has been widespread, not only in academic circles, but also in everyday society. Such indeterminacy can result in extremist interpretations of either of the oppositional poles enabling any original dispute. Andrea Hurst has described this phenomenon as “the modern era’s still influential ‘binary’ paradigm, exemplified by the law of the excluded middle, which entails a discursive split between modernism’s ultimately predictable cosmos and postmodernism’s insistence on fundamental chaos” (2010:233). In the same vein Jonathan Culler is of opinion that the regular feud between structuralist and poststructural thinking, for example, may result in “blind, programmatic structuralism” on the one hand, or “celebrations of the irrational and the unsystematic” on the other (1994:28). Either of the positions held in opposition holds potential danger. History has timeously proved that whenever a specific opinion is defended as being ultimate, power is often misused to the detriment of an opposing other (Hurst, 2010:237-238). I want to trust that such an outcome is out of line with what most structuralists and poststructuralists believe. As mentioned in a preceding section, structuralism and poststructuralism should not be regarded as contradicting one another, but rather as being complementary. I believe the process of design demonstrates the delicate interplay between the above mentioned theoretical foundations in what Derrida termed the “plural logic of the aporia” (cited in Hurst, 2010:244). If clarity is what one is after, I am of the opinion that design can help one to construct a third, or in-between, framework; an “included middle” (Max-Neef, 2005:12-13) with “the right amount of indeterminacy, anomaly... chaos, disequilibrium, dissipation, lived experience” (Doll cited in Pinar, 2007), as well as the “right” amount of order.

1 An aporia translates to a dead-end, and Derrida used this concept to illustrate how one pole of a binary opposite can in fact refute the opposing pole and so lead to a lose-lose situation. Hurst describes it in terms of the binary pair of freedom and security: “Freedom is necessary, but too much freedom leads to an imprisoning paralysis, where nothing can be achieved.” (2010:244).
Bruce Mau devised a framework guiding the design process of his studio entitled *Incomplete Manifesto for Growth* (1998). It consists of 43 points, each succinctly expounding a particular concept illustrating how a third, in-between framework can be engaged with during creative work. Given the fact that the broad field of art and design is one of the locations I have embedded this research in, and that my work can most probably be labeled as 'incomplete', I have found it fitting to use Mau's manifesto as skeleton for my discussion.

A numbered list structurally propagates the strong tradition of linear thinking, and this might perpetuate the belief in readers that once steps 1 to 43 have been completed, absolute growth should have occurred. The title, *Incomplete Manifesto for Growth*, however ironically contradicts this belief, as does the content of the text. Point 3, for example, states that:

> Process is more important than outcome. When the outcome drives the process we will only ever go where we've already been. If the process drives the outcome we may not know where we're going, but we will know we want to be there. (cited in Maclear & Testa, 2005:88).

I believe Mau played with seeming opposites purposefully. A numbered list creates a sense of comfort in readers. It draws one in and creates unobstructed space to engage with content that is not straightforward after all. Mau paradoxically declares himself in point 30 where he says: "Organisation = Liberty. Real innovation in design, or any other field, happens in context..." (cited in Maclear & Testa, 2005:88). It seems that what Mau is implying is that one needs to be consciously aware of one's playing field (where the boundaries, hurdles and open spaces are), before one is able to operate freely.

> Avoid fields. Jump fences. Disciplinary boundaries and regulatory regimes are... often understandable efforts to order what are manifold, complex, evolutionary processes. Our job is to jump the fences and cross the fields.

> Coffee breaks, cab-rides, green rooms. Real growth happens outside of where we intend it to, in the interstitial spaces - what Dr. Seuss calls 'the waiting place'. Hans Ulrich Obrist once organised a science and art conference with all of the infrastructure of a conference - the parties, chats, lunches, airport arrivals - but with no actual conference. Apparently it was hugely successful and spawned many ongoing collaborations.

(Mau cited in Maclear & Testa, 2005:91)

Although Mau clearly propagates openness, he does not wholly do away with limiting structures. He acknowledges their existence and value, and then urges one to move beyond them if growth is what is aimed for. Such acknowledgement serves responsible growth. It aids in, "realis[ing] diversity, liv[ing] in contradictions, think[ing] globally, and pursu[ing] justice" (Connell, 2004:26). It also allows for creative impetus, as without knowledge of what has gone before, how can innovation unfold? Maurer, Paulus, Puckey and Wouters corroborate in their *Conditional Design Manifesto* (see Addendum, Figure 48) by emphasising the important role logic plays in the acknowledgement of, and play with, the unknowable. They have said that "[a] clear and logical setting emphasizes that which does not seem to fit within
it... [c]onstraints sharpen the perspective on the process and stimulate play within the limitations” (sa). This both/and principle applied to the seeming opposing and mutually exclusive constructs of structuralism and poststructuralism can be seen as the grounds in which I would like to embed my work.

Bruce Mau’s *Incomplete Manifesto for Growth* puts forth the process of design as supplementing structuralist with poststructuralist thought, and poststructuralist with structuralist methods. Instead of focusing attention on the structure itself, interest shifts to how and why structure changes over time; structure becomes enabling of movement rather than restricting (Connell, 2004:20-21). In line with Mau, Iain Mackenzie shares the belief that clear structure is an integral component of poststructuralist freedom, movement and change. He makes a strong case against “post-ies”, as he calls those who he believes unfairly use the label of poststructuralism to hide their own inabilities to articulate a clear understanding of the concept’s implications (2001:332). Mackenzie however translates the need for structure in terms of (re)defining poststructuralism. ‘Definition’, in his terms, is not an inherent property of an object or idea, but involves the integration and refinement of previous knowledge about the topic (2001:335). He feels that previous knowledge pertinent to poststructuralism includes ideas concerning structure, difference and criticism, and, after carefully deliberating these ideas, concluded that poststructuralism entails, “a virtual conception of structure\(^2\), an empirical conception of difference\(^3\), and a constructivist approach to criticism\(^4\)” (2001:331).

No definition of poststructuralism can fail to mention Jacques Derrida’s concept of deconstruction\(^5\). Even though the term is not explicitly used in Mackenzie’s definition, he certainly alludes to its general characteristics. According to Lupton and Miller, deconstruction refers to a literary technique aimed at revealing how meaning is communicated not through the superficial structures of objects represented, but rather through “the linguistic and institutional systems that frame their production” (1996:3). Deconstruction seeks to unearth opposition (Lupton & Miller, 1996:3) and move “between what [a text] manifestly means to say and what it is nonetheless constrained to mean” (Norris cited in Harley, sa). It digs deep, and “asks how representation inhabits reality” (Norris cited in Harley, sa). It seems to seek the structure in nonstructure. The design process (and my research) shares this aim. In this regard Bruce Mau’s *Incomplete Manifesto for Growth* states:

> Work the metaphor. Every object has the capacity to stand for something other than what is apparent. Work on what it stands for.

> Break it, stretch it, bend it, crush it, crack it, fold it.

---

2 A virtual conception of structure refers to the complex nature of any structure not as an inherent characteristic of the structure, but as a result of the connections evolving between composing elements; of that which is not visible or tangible (Mackenzie, 2001:336-338).

3 An empirical conception of difference refers to seeing negativity as the consequence, and not the cause, of difference. Interaction in complex structures first and foremost constructs new, positive elements which are then able to develop its own sense of negation (Mackenzie, 2001:338-341).

4 A constructivist approach to criticism refers to understanding criticism as necessary to enable the construction of novel growth potential (Mackenzie, 2001:341-343).

5 “To deconstruct is to reinscribe and resituate meanings, events and objects within broader movements and structures; it is, so to speak, to reverse the imposing tapestry in order to expose in all its unglamorously dishevelled tangle the threads constituting the well-heel’d image it presents to the world.” (Eagleton cited in Harley, sa).
Capture accidents. The wrong answer is the right answer in search of a different question. Collect wrong answers as part of the process. Ask different questions.

Make your own tools. Hybridise your tools in order to build unique things. Even simple tools that are your own can yield entirely new avenues of exploration. Remember, tools amplify our capacities, so even a small tool can make a big difference.

(Mau cited in Maclear & Testa, 2005:89-91)

Lupton and Miller illustrate typography as a tool that can possibly be used to interrogate how representation inhabits reality (1996:5). They propose that the typographic medium has the potential to uncover some of the hidden structures enabling signification through the design process. As Bruce Mau has said, “[t]he purpose of typography... is to build a bridge from one mind to another. The nature and quality of that bridge determines what travels across it” (2007). Typography can hence “challenge the traditional opposition between seeing and reading by treating the surface as both theoretical content and sensual form, as both text and texture” (Lupton & Miller, 1996:8).

In this light, I have continuously used typography as a tool to enrich my praxis. Creating texture - near perfect imperfection - has been a key consideration. Each page appears to be structured similarly. This is however not the case. I have experimented with constant shifts in form, position, colour, scale etc. I want to create a sense of dynamic equilibrium, of difference within sameness, an “included middle” (Max-Neef, 2005:12-13). Through playing with the basic elements and principles of design, I want to bring to light how the design process enables one to dissolve harshly defined borders and create significance in-between order and seeming chaos. I have consciously been following a structured deconstructive approach, so employing structuralist as well as poststructuralist thinking. I have attempted to create what the Japanese philosopher Koji Take calls “poetic exactness”, that is the relaying of meaning in a succinct, but also creative and open way (cited in Bunschoten, 2001:26). I can testify that the experience has been rewarding. It has allowed awareness of the complexity of signification to surface. The intricacy and multiplicity of language and human life has become apparent. It has led one to necessarily take a step backward and think twice about effects one can potentially have on others, whether as a designer or just a fellow human being. This step in reverse provides a chance to see differently. Moving backwards can be moving forward. One should, as Bruce Mau said:

Allow events to change you. You have to be willing to grow. Growth is different from something that happens to you. You can produce it. You live it. The prerequisites for growth: the openness to experience events and the willingness to be changed by them.

(cited in Maclear & Testa, 2005:88).
Love your experiments (as you would an ugly child). Joy is the engine of growth. Exploit the liberty in casting your work as beautiful experiments, iterations, attempts, trials, and errors.

(Mau cited in Maclear & Testa, 2005:88)

Pie chart

Pie chart
3 Designing in-between: a postscript

It is often said that hindsight provides the most accurate vision. I have hence decided to take time and reflect briefly on the research I have done. I have set out on my research process with a broad theme in mind: I wanted to explore alternative ways of doing research within the field of art and design. I immersed myself within my immediate locations and started to cultivate a critical process of becoming more aware of what transpires in-between. The process guided me to identify a select set of relevant concerns. I could have analysed each of these concepts in depth and made a few conclusions which could have led to generalising future effects. I have however purposefully engaged in a more organic and wide-ranging strategy. I have experimented with ways of doing research that respect complexity and acknowledge the expansive, relational and performative nature of signification in arriving at ‘new’ knowledge. I have termed this approach designing in-between. Designing in-between has led me on a journey of complexity; an experience simultaneously insightful and muddled. As Edgar Morin has said, “[t]he difficulty of complex thought is that it must face messes... interconnectedness among phenomena, fogginess, uncertainty, contradiction” (cited in Hurst, 2010:233). Designing in-between can however also be seen as providing fertile ground for developing new ways of brokering such apparent convolution.

I did not limit the scope of my research to a closed, independent system, but tried to do away with harshly defined boundaries. In an open system, the amount of variables impacting on one another is infinite, and how, why and when they will interact, becomes unpredictable. In approaching my work through acknowledgement of such complexity, I was provided with the opportunity to make a range of connections between the selected concepts I have identified. The connections made led to new ideas emerging which were related back to initial concepts in turn. I realised that there exists relations within relations within relations, and that new knowledge is produced within these intricate interconnections. The process evolved rhizomatically, and an intricate map of designing in-between came to be. This rhizomatic map is, in the words of Deleuze and Guattari:

[O]pen and connectable in all of its dimensions; it is detachable, reversible, susceptible to constant modification. It can be torn, reversed, adapted to any kind of mounting, reworked by an individual, group, or social formation. It can be drawn on a wall, conceived of as a work of art, constructed as a political action or as a meditation... it has multiple entryways [and] has to do with performance. (1987:12).
These features of the map brought about a range of challenges in my work. It fortunately also allowed for the necessary tools to deal with these challenges to be constructed.

Seeming opposite ideas appeared to dissolve in mercurial in-between states and led to experiences of being overwhelmed and feeling ungrounded, confused and frustrated. Critical reflection, defined by Mezirow (1991:87) as the process by which an individual brings assumptions and premises into his/her consciousness and vigorously critiques the process, led to thinking that I have perhaps been moving too far across theories and not gaining enough focused, in-depth knowledge. I also became critically aware of the limitations of representation. I experienced the temptation to fall back on established structures in doing and translating my work. It has been a great challenge to come up with innovative ways of dealing with complex interrelations and representing the research in a way that does not render simple what is in fact complex.

In processing these challenges, I have, however, continuously been led back to where I started. I realised that the open structure of my work - that which can unsettle and unnerve because of the impeding expansiveness it promises - is the very thing that also provides clarity and focus if one accepts the responsibility of becoming an active part of the research process. My work can therefore be nothing but performative. In approaching research in the field of art and design as designing in-between, one must continuously be designing in-between.

The mantra of designing in-between through a process of designing in-between has kept me grounded. It has provided the, however open, structure necessary to keep producing sense and purpose. It has steadily shed light on the traces within traces (Derrida, 2004:24), the relations within relations, so that I could continue making connections. It has merged what could traditionally be seen as separate theoretical and practical components of my work into a living whole, ceaselessly undergoing change. I have experienced the exuding complexity, the seeming incoherence, the expanding scope, the obvious inter-textual nature, and the challenges the work has brought, as intensely resembling the ‘realities’ we daily face. I am therefore of the opinion that designing in-between - compared to traditional, science-based research methods operating in barricaded systems of thought - allows for more faithful interrogation of the complexity of the world we live in.

[C]omplexity thinking does not take vagueness in a concept and difficulty when trying to work with it to be points of criticism but points of realism. To deal with a complex concept is never to settle on any kind of clear, final definition. Instead, one must think in terms of the complex mapping of concepts. (Hurst, 2010:246).

The process of designing in-between has forced me to develop a great range of critical skills. I have learnt to look beyond what I initially imagine to be necessary, and to consistently thread seeming distinct ideas together to arrive at novel meaning. Designing in-between has forced me to actively seek innovation. I am convinced that this is an essential quality of any work in the field of art and design. The research has provided an unsurpassable richness which has afforded me with an immense amount of new knowledge. It has allowed for integrative perspectives to emerge, and has contributed to a greater sense of critical awareness. In providing me with more apparent freedom, the research process has yielded more agile focus. I have learnt to embrace opposites. I have also learnt to embrace modesty. “Reflective positions”, as Paul Cilliers has said, “are careful about the reach of
claims being made and of the constraints that make these claims possible” (2005:256). I want to believe that the process of designing in-between - of making modest connections - has contributed to instilling a greater sense of empathy in me; a more open and critical regard for, and of, all other. Cilliers (2005:256) and Hurst (2010:241) have validated this belief in agreeing that failure to acknowledge the complexity of the world when constructing knowledge/doing research, can result in “ethical mistakes”. It is therefore imperative - especially in a country still struggling to escape the effects of a previous unequal political dispensation - that work be done to facilitate a more conscious regard for the complexity of our social world. I believe processes of designing in-between hold the power to make valuable contributions in this respect.

I set out to explore and experiment with an alternative approach to research in the field of art and design, something that has been described by Morin as, “productive play, sometimes vital, of complementary antagonisms” (cited in Hurst, 2010:242). I do not want my work to be seen as yet another predetermined guideline for future research. I intend it to rather be read as an example of a “conceptual tool” or “thought strateg[y]” (Hurst, 2010:242) suited to the impeding complexity of the open systems we form part of every day. I thus cannot position either the challenging or advantageous aspects of my work as superior and exclusive to the other. I regard the existence of dissonance and contrast to be productive; a life force propelling the search for new significance and knowledge into the future. This, I believe, is what research in art and design should be: movement through opposites, building apart and together, connecting connections, designing in-between.
4 End matter
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Figure 34. Josh Ginsburg, Walkabout (2011). Electronic invitation to event. (Available e-mail: karolienperold@gmail.com).
Josh Ginsburg is a young artist with undergraduate qualifications in engineering and a Masters degree in visual art. He will present on his Masters research project, entitled 'Walkabout', which he describes as follows:

The word walkabout is commonly used within the context of fine art to denote the guided discussion of an artwork, often lead by the artist, while in the presence of it. Walkabout is in one sense just that, however it involves no walking and there are no material objects to which the discussion directs. Rather, the artwork to which Walkabout refers occupies an essentially mental space of ideas and thought – immaterial and constantly in flux.

During the presentation, I act as an interface to the ephemeral artwork, first presenting a digitally projected tour that traces its evolution and then providing the opportunity for conversation born from questions or comments. The ambition of Walkabout is to conjure the artwork in the minds of the participants; for an impression of a process to emerge through contact with the many discrete elements presented in the encounter.

Figure 35 (above). Josh Ginsburg, Walkabout (2011). Artist statement. (Available e-mail: karolienperold@gmail.com).
Figure 36 (right). Raoul Bunschoten, Hélène Binêt & Takuro Hoshino, from Urban Flotsam (2001). Editorial print, 228x297mm. (Bunschoten, Binêt & Hoshino, 2001:157).
**Lost Paradise:**
Adam, seduced by Eve, could not resist the apple. He took a bite and ...

A rotten apple after fifty-four days decreases in volume and loses twenty per cent of its weight.

Only at that stage does he decide not to eat the apple any more.

The skin folds, cracks and the pips emerge at the surface.

**APPLE:**
In 1998 Apple Macintosh came up with a new product line – the iMac, which saved the company from financial meltdown.

After fourteen days a chemical decomposition starts to take place.

\[ \text{C}_6\text{H}_{12}\text{O}_6 + 2\text{CO}_2 + 2\text{C}_2\text{H}_5\text{OH} + 26\text{kcal} \]

It transforms the apple as a nutritious object for the human metabolism into a qualitative fertilizer for agriculture.

Newton discovering gravity.

... and both Adam and Eve were chased from Paradise.

**Process of mitring:**
Flies are attracted by the rotten apple and swarm around it.
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A basic set of four processes:

Erasure: the removal of things
Origination: change initiated at a single point in time or space
Transformation: continuous change from A to B
Migration: things moving through

This basic set of processes enables the schematic articulation of complex urban dynamics. It is a framing device to filter out emergent phenomena.
E: It was not possible for the early Christians in Lucca to build churches within the existing Roman grid.

O: The churches were instead built around the existing city.

T: Through the pedestrian flow between the churches, the rectangular grid was slowly broken up and curved streets formed.

M: The curved streets are extended into the rest of the city.

E: An area outside Helsinki with limited public access is set aside for a bird reserve.

O: A conservation society is formed that looks after the reserve and establishes the legal foundation to maintain it in the future.

T: The nature reserve offers a home to a wide range of animals and plants, helping to increase the biodiversity of the city.

M: Migrating birds have found a place to halt temporarily on their journey south.
Figure 39-40 (above & right). Raoul Bunschoten, Hélène Binét & Takuro Hoshino, from Urban Flotsam (2001).
Editorial prints, 228x297mm.
special thermodynamic conditions necessary for the emergence of order out of chaos. At equilibrium, he says, matter is blind, but in these “far-from-equilibrium” conditions, as he calls them, it becomes capable of

Figure 41 (above). Bruce Mau, from Life Style (2005). Editorial print, 207x245mm. (Maclear & Testa, 2005:193).

Figure 42 (right). Piet Mondrian, Ocean 5 (1914). Charcoal and gouache on wood-pulp wove paper, 876x1203mm. (http://www.guggenheim.org).
Figure 43. Bruce Mau, from Life Style (2005). Editorial print, 207 x 245mm. (Maclear & Testa, 2005:103).
Figure 44. Piet Mondrian, Composition No. 1; Composition with Red (1938–39). Oil on canvas, 1052x1023mm. (http://www.guggenheim.org).
Figure 45. Maurits Cornelis Escher, Crab Canon (1965). (Hofstadter, 1979:198).

Figure 47 (right). Luna Maurer, Edo Paulus, Jonathan Puckey & Roel Wouters, Conditional Design Manifesto (sa). Online publishing. (http://conditionaldesign.org/manifesto).
Figure 46. Maurits Cornelis Escher, *Tiling of the plane using birds* (1942). (Hofstadter, 1979:168).

Conditional Design
A manifesto for artists and designers.

Through the influence of the media and technology on our world, our lives are increasingly characterized by speed and constant change. We live in a dynamic, data-driven society that is continually sparking new forms of human interaction and social contexts. Instead of romanticizing the past, we want to adapt our way of working to coincide with these developments, and we want our work to reflect the here and now. We want to embrace the complexity of this landscape, deliver insight into it and show both its beauty and its shortcomings.

Our work focuses on processes rather than products: things that adapt to their environment, emphasize change and show difference.

Instead of operating under the terms of Graphic Design, Interaction Design, Media Art or Sound Design, we want to introduce Conditional Design as a term that refers to our approach rather than our chosen media. We conduct our activities using the methods of philosophers, engineers, inventors and mystics.
Process

The process is the product.
The most important aspects of a process are time, relationship and change.
The process produces formations rather than forms.
We search for unexpected but correlative, emergent patterns.
Even though a process has the appearance of objectivity, we realize the fact that it stems from subjective intentions.

Logic

Logic is our tool.
Logic is our method for accentuating the ungraspable.
A clear and logical setting emphasizes that which does not seem to fit within it.

We use logic to design the conditions through which the process can take place.
Design conditions using intelligible rules.
Avoid arbitrary randomness.
Difference should have a reason.

Use rules as constraints.
Constraints sharpen the perspective on the process and stimulate play within the limitations.

Input

The input is our material.
Input engages logic and activates and influences the process.
Input should come from our external and complex environment: nature, society and its human interactions.

Luna Maurer, Edo Paulus, Jonathan Puckey, Roel Wouters
SOUND FILE for In memory of (2011). (see Figure 13, p75)