

3 Views

The works of the exhibition *Hard Facts, a Closer Look* are divided into three series of pigment prints. The title of the show is a loan from Charles S. Peirce (1839-1914). This is not to say that I am in any way an expert on Peirce's philosophical thought. He has, however, achieved much in a multitude of scientific fields. I have acquainted myself with his semiotics and pragmatist thinking, a line of philosophy Peirce established during the latter part of 19th Century in the United States. For those interested in furthering their knowledge of Peirce, I suggest embarking on a rewarding voyage into his life and work. His philosophy has gained an ever growing repute in the last decades.

Peirce makes a distinction between *facts and fancy* by separating two ways of experiencing reality: either as something that has a material existence or is in another way real to us. Peirce's own thinking switches during his philosophical career between nominalism and realism. Realism - and reality - is tested by experiencing the world as resistance and as a reality that demands exertion and the use of power. We have to define knowing and meaning according to the kind of consequences things have and not justify definitions on a level of idealist theory. Hard facts exist regardless of what we think about them. They are also real and require that we experience the world often in other ways than what we expect in our anticipations of them. Our habits and conventions are complemented with how we adjust to surprising situations and to everything we cannot change into our liking. An example of a hard fact could be a steep, uphill road, a sudden rainstorm, a physical ailment or even bumping into a street pole. Our surprises do not necessarily turn into instant discoveries that would help us in a similar event in the future. Nevertheless, our experiences accumulate and some are bound to require force and stress us.

Hard facts influence our precognition, our dreams and feelings. We do not always know what hit us, and for example a snake in our fancy may turn out to be a stick in the forest. It still releases adrenalin into our whole body. We are fear-stricken of the menacing unknown, anything surprising and new to us, but easily relax in front of something well known to us. That is, until hard facts bring us again back to the ground.

Art is often thought to be a kind of professional practice of imagination or, as some kind of visual thinking and is compared to important forms of analysis, like philosophy or mathematics. Artists bring

their fantasies together and then we have to explain them. A second option, that art can not be understood, only experienced, takes us closer to pure fancy and the world of impulses like dream or, more professionally, closer to domains of freedom and fiction. Visual thinking is a pair of words that defies logic. There is no certainty that visual or any other sensory experience relates to thinking. And furthermore, how should this topic be dealt with in philosophy?

Modifying the concept of experience as thinking, feeling and imagination onwards to experiencing of hard facts, Peirce ponders the relation between human experience, thinking and reality, on the difference and sameness between senses and the conceptual realities. The pragmatist philosophy of meaning combined with Peirce's phenomenological ideas challenge Husserlian phenomenological tradition especially pertaining to the Cartesian division between the mind and the body. Peirce positions habits and action as general experiences along with thinking and consciousness. The general class is not only of abstract notions.

When the philosophical motive is connected to how everything - that is, philosophy itself - could be discussed and written - which is philosophy in its entirety, as well as how anything can be displayed and used at all as tools in our discussion, we soon end up asking questions about the nature of art. An artistic ethos, recently titled as the educational turn, within contemporary art offers a framework for this. Art has served notions of beauty, truth and politics or faith, so art in the service of philosophy is not necessarily that strange. The history of aesthetics has pondered art philosophically for a long time. Why can art not ponder aesthetics? Shortly put, the formalism of modernism could be treated as a historical case of an exception when art ponders itself. It is here that I return to pre-modernist ways of thinking, of the possibility to link up visual forms to model philosophical statements, distinctions, even contexts as in allegorical baroque art long ago. I am admittedly kicking some half-open doors somewhat wider here. In such a moment, placing texts besides images on the level of text seems natural.

It is in my opinion comfortable to think of art as an expanded field of rhetoric and communication. My shortest label would be that art is indirect speech. I do not assume, however, that art will be responded to by speaking and writing. Neither is art itself in the visual register of speaking and writing. This much said one should add that neither is contemporary art altogether visual. And, referring to the significative response, for the commercially minded (artist or purchaser) expectations might refer to acquisition. Having an exhibition might mean an expectancy of a good feedback. In a more cynical vein I believe I am only partaking in a continuation of a habit. I keep the tradition of art alive one more stretch with my contribution. The tradition I am upholding could well disappear. So much has changed even during the short period of my career as an artist. If art is language, the system

contains arbitrariness, rules change and new expressions and signs are born while others are cast into oblivion.

HARD FACTS A CLOSER LOOK

The point of origin of these works is a set of works with a collective title, *Hard Facts*, from a larger installation of prints, *Tabletop Shortline - we all want to see our railroad go somewhere*, in 2010. The new works were developed as an imaginative map, an allegory and a fantasy landscape to be viewed from a high vantage point. Fictitious cameras orbiting a certain moon are looking for biological and cultural signs of life.

My prints are based on a number of interests. One of them is my background as a maker of drawings and paintings. Another comes from the idea of image as illusion, but also as a starting point for discursive thinking or a propositional sentence. I am following in the footsteps of Charles Sanders Peirce, the developer of a triadic sign theory based on the icon, the index and the symbol. Images that may be interpreted in many ways, base their ambiguity on parallels that spectators notice. I am inspired by images that function like maps and landscapes, set in symbolic frameworks but also serve as icons. We cannot manage without sign-processes. Political as well as cultural power needs signs - as do we all. When working with these drawings, I used to wonder how it is even possible to try to hold on to different associations that stem not only from looking at the images but especially when drawing them. Drawing is a certain kind of action that draws its motive from imitating another action in the artist's imagination. The act of imagining in itself does not, however, substantially differ from, for example, the thought of going to fetch the morning paper from the mailbox.

Forgetting things is part and parcel of consciousness. The way, in which these lost things leave traces, scars, and delicate details, and how this change takes places as if right under our noses, is the other possible context (out of endless other possibilities) for this series. I can maintain several contexts, both one at a time and simultaneously, since they are not in the artefact. The sources of my interpretations are in any case the change taking place in the drawing, the new traces and the effect of the older traces upon the new ones. The interplay of these new and old traces is, byte by byte, mathematically, which is present as a hard fact of the artefact. Certainly layers gradually change into others. The question if there is something else there besides is the visible - say a memory of the past - is left unanswered. There are actually two alternatives: one, the memory is saved into a calculated string that can be retrieved in case the marker is found, in which case, the space of bytes saved

remembers the differences in my work and second, it seems, is that things are possibly lost forever. Such a result also belongs to the nature of hard facts, even if I were compelled to state that the elements probably still exist, but in some other, unidentifiable form.

It is easy to imagine all manner of things, for example, the imagery I mentioned as a landscape of irretrievable changes of time and place. Nothing stays invisible. Everything is visible and the only thing missing from the artefact is its meaning. That is the image we see. When the image claims ownership over these possibilities and simultaneously while real to us does not exist like hard facts do, how do images then connect to hard facts? As a hard fact, my digital file can vanish as a result of an electrical failure. Blobs on the paper eventually fade away. The paper burns and turns into ashes. The astonishing thing to me is that which connects hard facts and images. It is likeness, an order of semblance that makes an icon possible. The iconic order perceived and interpreted is restored as image in the interpretation of the observer.

Hard facts establish a field of conditions for knowing, feeling and thinking. The way in which the context as image should be displayed is a particular problem. How to make a hard fact into an image is, itself, a hard fact. Impossible. I "solve" this problem through two ideas. The first one is that I imagine a situation, where an unknown world is subjected to surveillance taking place far and high above the possible atmosphere. This requires a method of surveillance, specific viewing angles, distance, and possibility of taking samples from the surface. A method of taking samples should be developed, for hard facts are impossible to show in representation, like indexes without symbols. We need a sample, the thing itself, but also research on the qualities of the sample, hence of its meaning. Pictorial work relies on representation in need of icons. Icons, however, do not prove anything. We have to collect samples at some stage for additional knowledge.

My plan for the work is to thematically embed that foreign world under surveillance, the retrievals of samples, and regularly obtained "photographs" into the representation of work and image. These images show the scenery slowly changing. Is there life? Of this, there seems to be no evidence.

As the series advances, a doubling of metaphor is created. In the first one, I am still in the clutches of a fantasy landscape. I am looking at this world from above. Ascending pillars of smoke tell of geological or biological phenomena taking place. Strangely, parts of this phenomena position themselves frontally vis-à-vis the spectator ("tree", "smoke"). Warm steam, it seems, arises, forming clouds. The planet has some kind of an atmosphere. Next, it is about to become more complicated.

As for the second, that other world perhaps does not exist at all, but reflects my (own) mind as it is constructing itself, or its events, memories, layers, its lapses of memory or blocking off of things from its consciousness, smoothly or by force. The world that is being observed is the observant himself!

I could as well add a completely different interpretation, just as fictitious: the vision is about anyone, for example of myself. Removing bits and pieces of the surface, border areas change as I fabricate new, regenerative mesh and scar tissue. It is a matter of time, of the abrasion of layers, of their removal. I play the creator of a world, but not just of an alien moon or a planet, but of my own consciousness and memories the metaphor of which drawing and its making is able to represent.

The fact that I draw with an eraser is far from insignificant. Its trace resembles a mesh made by knitting or crocheting. In fact nothing is repaired, only black color is removed. A web of light full of tears fills the pictorial space. The series of works presents the "repairs" as changes from one work to the next. Now I am writing my notes, but can add my comments directly into the images. The first mesh, an alien world, is complemented by a descriptive layer. In this interpretative version, the description creates an illusion of surveillance and its corresponding signs.

2. SOURCES

"O wonder!

How many goodly creatures are there here! How beauteous mankind is!

O brave new world

That hath such people in't!"

The Tempest, Act V, Scene I Miranda's speech

William Shakespeare

My contribution to the exhibition of Icon@BraveNewWorld at the Prague Mánes gallery, 2008, could be twisted into the context of Aldous Huxley's famous 1932 book, Brave New World, but with a tone of hesitation. I try to emulate the inertia between two themes, the nominal umbrella for the exhibition and my work, or, rather create a link between Huxley's ironic dystopia and my artistic endeavor. This is, as is standard, tried out in the theoretical sphere of interpretation if not in aesthetic *ekphrasis*. This attempt would be the usual option, trying to decipher the content of image and text and musing on the whys and wherefores of textual form. This is a possibility, in my opinion, but to do so you need collateral experience, so, be patient.

In a modern work of art, no collateral knowledge is supposedly needed. Only an appreciation of color, lines and planes – while at the same time, of course, a fair amount of contextual familiarity, was and is necessary in order to pass some serious time in the art gallery. Contemporary art does not want to play around that much, at least, not to indulge in implicitness. On the contrary, direct messages are favored like those on the street, where the demand for collateral experience of the rules of the game is obligatory.

Probably some readers might ask why the artist chooses to reproduce this philosopher and not another one? Furthermore, why not some other topic or issue? This reaction is the result of the fact that the text, being a direct reproduction without any distortion, could, supposedly, contain a specific viewpoint towards what should be target of deconstruction, irony, comment, and whatever else. If nothing has been changed, one might think that the artist must be trying to propose his message in complete accord with Peirce. That is, the artwork presents the philosophical fragments of this particular thinker for a reason. The artist functions as a medium for a philosophical discussion but this cannot be the case since the work, as such, is not a discussion in itself.

Artwork can be a starting point or aid-memoire for such a discussion, however, the responsibility of a discussion on philosophy is given over to the viewer. This responsibility, actually, does not differ from the one given over to the viewer of any other kind of work of art. The discussion does not belong to the artwork. It may cause one, without itself being anything else than, here, an icon of Peircean thought and a possible interpretation of something seemingly pictorial.

Famous for his ever- growing standing as one of the founders of modern semiotics, besides a number of other things (geodesy, logic, mathematics, pragmatism), Peirce does not appear an ironic person. Anyway, to find such modes you need to be a real scholar. As for other visual forms shown, an image does by itself not mean anything unless somebody interprets it in some respect. Where's the dystopia and who calls Brave New World a dystopia?

Before I go into (one of my) preferred areas of interpretation, something that is on par with the title of the work given by the artist, I will share with you my gratitude towards an interpretation of Peirce's philosophy out of which the texts in my images are excerpt citations, surrounded by inspiring and clarifying comments. This exegetic and readily accessible feat completed by the Finnish Peirce scholar, Mats Bergman, whose work: *Fields of Signification, Explorations in Charles S. Peirce's Theory of Signs* (Vantaa, Philosophical Studies from the University of Helsinki 6, 2004) forms the milieu of the Peirce texts. He applies a context of communication to the corpus of Peirce's thinking and raises an interest in the hypothesis that "*Peirce's conception of sign and sign action is intrinsically communicative; that his often obscure and abstract reflections on sign and sign action can beneficially approached from the point of view of communicative relations....I intend to show that there is a pertinent sense in which Peirce's basic sign-theoretical concepts can be said to be abstractions from ordinary communicative practices (cf Colapietro, 1995, 25).*

My work should be accepted as an intuitive icon of that sphere, where Bergman's context sets off the area of rhetoric communication of art as icons. An icon, by itself, is a degenerate sign in Peirce's theory. In order to fulfill their function in a complete sign-relation, icons must be surrounded by other signs and elements of interpretation. Interpretative processes must surround art as pieces of furniture in an art space. This is a necessity of art in order for it to be art. As such, art is never just mere iconographic figures and pieces of the world, but communicative praxis within a shared set of habits of action in visual culture.

In the **Sources** works, I combine Peircean fenomenological proposals with the utopian and thoroughly modern visual formalities of non-figurative imagery. The discrepancy between a scholarly perspective and the context of modernity seen through Huxley's interpolations and artistic modernism, will be an iconic adventure. The following writing will try to travel that distance, a completely virtual, potential and hypothetical area – an irony if there ever was any since we do not have a complete trust of philosophers as in older days of Hegel, or the hubris of artists like Joseph Kosuth for that matter. To the advantage of Charles S. Peirce, he did not trust philosophers either. Peirce (1839-1914) believed that the experience of the diversities of life is the starting point of philosophic enquiry.

The concepts of communication and meaning were deeply questioned within modernist art, some of the results of which were motivated by and committed to both utopian and subversive symbolism (say Malevitsh, Mondrian, and Beckett, for example). Others entrenched in utopian modernity, as poets and

scientists, like Roman Jakobson, Claude Levi- Strauss or Samuel Beckett, tried structuralism and eventually ended in deconstruction, defusing old notions in art as in science. Either a positive endeavor, like Jakobson, searching for the units and polyphony of *parole* against systems of langue, or a negative one, like Barthes and Derrida, in deconstruction and demythologizing semiology. To create a system, another one, preferably the “old system”, must be defused.

I will not separate existential and absurd deconstruction, or even theosophical idealism from each other. The deluge of industrial and political revolt, urban disorder and capital management, made both artistic and social utopias and dystopias into convincing icons, were accompanied by both pessimistic and optimistic reactions which took place in relation to the changes in the modern societies of 19th and 20th centuries.

I have another, more personal image, if you will, of Peirce, related to my thesis work (*Seitsemän maalauksen katsominen/Maalauksen maailman osana*, Helsinki LIKE 2005). Therein, I introduced a possibility in Peircean sign theory, beginning from the phenomenological perspective behind the theory, concurring with what Bergman introduces in his work on Peirce’s ideas forwarding a theory of communication (in 2004). In retrospect, since I presented my thesis work in 2005, I will finally take my potential clues from Bergman (potential because my view still seems altogether preliminary), and propose that Peircean phenomenology (and his semiotics) could be helpful in designing a view on artistic praxis as a sign process. This is not the context of my artwork, though. Artwork do not make research, artists may. The research is done in the discourse upon, say, artwork.

My proposal to connect a theoretical perspective such as Peirce ‘s with an usually aesthetic-oriented undertaking, such as the artistic praxis, did not explicate the distance between these two “habits of action”, the practical and the theoretical. Initially, the invitation to take a look at the conglomerate of semiotic pragmatism represented by its founder Peirce, was given to me in a short but intensive tutoring session by Finnish philosopher Pentti Määttänen (Määttänen 1993). Advantageous for me was, as well, was the synthetic view of the Finnish sociologist Risto Heiskala (Heiskala 1997) in trying out an inclusive framework of discussing and linking macro- and micro- level semiotics with structural framing theory of social semiosis. Määttänen and Heiskala favor a hybrid structure of the viewpoints created to discuss phenomena of aesthesis, semiosis and power related interpretation in culture. With Määttänen, his naturalist view combines the spatial and embodied interaction with the environment together with construction of relations between percept/perception in perceptual judgments, that is, as a semiotic process of interpretation on several levels of action/cognition.

As an artist constantly in need for manipulation of the environment, small or big, a hybrid and inclusive set of theories must be adopted to discuss and describe the event of artistic planning – exactly as other human activities in societal context. In this respect, art is never outside society, but inside it and partaking in the

changes of society and its surfaces/meanings. Is meaning then, superficial? Yes, convincingly so since meaning is a social condition, not anything tied to the particular individual. The themes of Brave New World deal with the embodied beings in context, in society and in interaction with each other. The crucial subtheme, for any utopia/dystopia, consists of the state of the art of those technological constraints and possibilities we encounter – to create and destroy, create the new by destroying the old. It's a very binary metaphor, utopia/dystopia. Things have gone wrong and may go, but often seen gone wrong only in hindsight. That is why we need dystopian scenarios.

My series of Peirce texts are from the outset easily seen as a dichotomy between text and image, something interpretable by reading and something less understandable but visual, firing at our synapses. They are, as usually art works are compared to life events, much less sublime, but more beautiful, and will be found wanting in life size experience. The art experience, contrary to many testimonies, feels diluted from the life experience. The main reason for this must be the lesser scale and lack of repetition available in white cube environments compared to other environments.

Both parts in the works of the Sources-series, the text and the image, form their particular abstract, hence, less an iconic result than an iconic starting point. The finish will always play out in the symbolic, as suggestion for conventional interpretation. But the starting point can be iconic possibility. Not lesser potential will be offered by the texts. But, however, only a thorough acquaintance with Peircean thinking will reveal their fuller meaning. The elliptic content is exactly what creates meaning. That is the theme of the Peirce citations. But before this stage of understanding is reached, if ever, both sides of the diptych express a modern dichotomy between text and image. In my opinion, they have still much in common, initially and eventually, when we start to mediate our contemplation into conceptual and critical thought.

A basic and poetic notion tied to the idea of the Brave New World, or utopia/dystopia, is its binary determination. Irony and horror must turn either towards light or into darkness. The black/white mode of both image and text is not without its association to the dichotomy of utopian dreams. The second notion is tied to the general abstractedness or abstraction of both image and text. If we could have a key to the deciphering of the images – to what they depict – and, on the other hand, if we had a deeper knowledge of Peircean interests and terminology, then the pictorial and theoretical perspective could be complemented with understanding, of meaning in its diverse sense – or grades, which Peirce discusses in his writing. Meaning is suspended, eventually, until further experience shapes and helps us to understand what we have felt and undergone in life. This applies to theory as well.

A more complicated association, which arrives while the artist runs his agenda and gives in to interpretation, is the cultural fact of the distinction between modern art (modernism) and contemporary art. The series of images/texts include a possibility to reflect on what seems different between these two discourses or habits

of thinking and doing. In my opinion, modernist art is mainly interested in itself, its own forms, its own media. Modernists experiments seem to end in deconstruction, transgression and poetic irony and abstraction which is resolved only in a conceptual sphere, like in conceptual art, which allows for constant change of media and form within a general and abstract theme. In modernism, this theme was art itself.

Contemporary art strategies abstain from the modern deconstructivist strategy – well exemplified by, say, concretism, abstract art and minimalism - regardless of the manifested attitudes of the artists. Situationism and conceptualism form a kind of transition area or a threshold where modernist deconstruction moves into its last phase, by their respective interests of politics and philosophy, in a shared expression of transgressing the border art/life – a sincere step of any modern avant-garde. Contemporary interests in political and personal affairs or the publishing of opinions on the political/personal in art, taken as a space of power and discursiveness – which it is, promotes the development of art as a discourse on important issues. This development might have already started on the basis of the modernist disruption of art disclaiming its own autonomy. The results of, for example, the contemporary sculpture as what happened with the so called Young British movement in the beginning of the 90's, driven as it was by Saatchi & Saatchi sponsorship and a sense of street credibility, scale and volume based realism, not irony, subtlety or deconstruction (with perhaps one exception, Rachel Whiteread), we might arrive at the conclusion that contemporary directness of speech, albeit through rhetorical methods, is a result of the deconstructive drive itself! In any case, the return to textual and overtly communicative intents entails completely new demands on what and how art should move around in society.

Modernist reflections on the formal features and media of art, and its deconstruction, transforms into narratives of contemporary art, admittedly, with a large repertoire of ways of presentation and representation. If an artist trained in modern methods of mise-en-scene wants to state a clear question – or a clear answer – he/she is in trouble. Modernist deconstruction as a tool for political or personal narratives does not make for clearness. In practice, we have to give in to a long tradition within visual culture, its established means of presentation. Thus, no small aesthetic fee is paid to modernist history and its aesthetic tradition whatever the contemporary issue at hand. Here, I stress the dichotomy between modern and contemporary. Modernist schemes serve as practices of presentation also for contemporary attitudes, which makes for trouble, unless we settle to accept ourselves as modernists, albeit with a postmodern and emancipated view on each and everything.

My small contribution to the evanescent distinction between modern and contemporary is, simply, the fact that there is no added modernist deconstructing additions or flavors manipulating the Peirce texts. It is the real, unreconstructed form, exactly as Peirce wrote it. This is probably my version of the "educational turn". When I started my first mix of drawings and diagrams in 2000, I had no idea of any educational turn. *Oratio recta* was, in my mind, no way for art. Art is about *oratio obliqua* and still is, but things are changing. No

playing with words, syllables, forms, here, just direct speech, demonstrations and pitching thrusts of manifestoes and comments to us viewers/readers.

The question is left open if the text in “as it is” form can be treated as part and parcel of an artwork and thus legitimately reproduced without permission from the publishers. My preliminary opinion is that the text is part of the artwork physically and contextually thus, free to be read as any text in an art work. Is this replica of Peirce, both art and philosophy? I would answer yes, both and. There are, since it is surely possible, in-between modes of hesitation and ambivalence. With the Peirce texts, the space of art is turned into a scholarly place, a spot where discussions can be made, not deconstructions of meaning but construction of meaning. If such an opportunity for a discussion will take place, is wholly another question.

That is why our immediate, intuitive encounter with the visual, regardless of symbolic possibilities of meaning, is more or less the same toward image as text. It depends on collateral knowledge and familiarity with the symbolic meaning. The immediate encounter with the moment of aesthesis, or percepts drenched in iconic beauty, carry not one definite meaning by themselves and require collateral, symbolic and conventional knowledge to be judged useful and interpretable. Admittedly, we usually start looking for familiar clues, for an icon of some sort. But the habits connected to textual form and typography does not give rise to an exception of such immediacy. The requirements of contextual knowledge to pin down the lines of a text, say, Peirce in exegesis, does mean that a text cannot be deciphered by itself. It demands other texts and collateral knowledge in order to be useful. Here, then, is the last link between image and text. The formal history of the topological order in text and image respectively, differs, but is of the same category, a visual form that conveys meaning if other contextual aspects are fulfilled.

This makes for a final point. Interpretation of both would-be images and texts are mediations of communication, which always implies a community. Communication per definition is engagement within a social context of speech and action. Modernist art and culture partakes in the deconstruction of communication, many times driven by critical, utopian, or political interests. To harass ways of communication, to break down elements used in communication in order to find the universal unit of inner and outer realities has deeply influenced the forms and surfaces of modern society as icons of modern thinking. To destroy conventions and look at the matter of contemporary society, we seem to need both modern irony and contemporary pathos, as legitimate heirs of new brave worlds of experience. You will find my dichotomy unsuccessful and temporarily out of order, something never happens in the brave new world. Looking back, I tend to see the pioneers of modernism less ironic than what I would like them to be. The more it is nearer to my own awareness and history the stronger the feeling of irony gets. So be it, let's believe that Peirce was as un-ironic as was Kandinsky or Malevitch, or Jakobson, not to mention Mukarovsky or Trubetskoy, on the occasion of this exhibition in Prague, which gave its name to one of the most famous schools of semiotics. In their commitment that sign theory arises from the applied functions

within communication, they advanced the concept of art as a special rhetoric of communication – something useful to our understanding of contemporary art discourse, if not modernist rhetoric of non-communication (which is a great irony, of course).

Reading sources

Those sources on art, semiotics and aesthetics, which clearly should be mentioned here, are not mentioned here due to the low grade of academic ambition in my writing. I will focus only on noting the Peirce sources. Otherwise, I just write to remember what to return to if needed.

Bergman, Mats, *Fields of Signification, Explorations in Charles S. Peirce's Theory of Signs*, Vantaa, Philosophical Studies of Helsinki University 6, 2004

Heiskala, Risto, *Society as Semiosis, Neostructuralist Theory of Culture and Society*, Helsinki, University of Helsinki 1997

Määttänen, Pentti, *Action and Experience*, Helsinki, Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1993

Huxley, Aldous, *Brave New World*, London, Chatto and Windus 1932

Orwell, George, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, London, Secker and Warburg 1949

Sources of excerpts from Peirce as in Bergman, 2004

Charles Sanders Peirce texts are indicated by abbreviations, following Bergman (2004):

CP v:p refers to The Collected Papers of Charles Sanders Peirce; v indicates volume number, p paragraph number.

EP v:p refers to The Essential Peirce: Selected Philosophical Writings; v indicates volume number, p page number

MS m:p refers to an original manuscript, see Bergman, 2004, 7.

W v:p refers to Writings of Charles S. Peirce: A Chronological Edition; v indicates volume number, p page number

SS p refers to Semiotic and Significs: The Correspondence between Charles S. Peirce and Victoria Lady Welby; p indicates page number.

Peirce bibliography mentioned above:

Collected Papers of Charles S. Peirce (1931-58).. 8 vols. Ed. By C. Hartshorne & P. Weiss (vols 1-6), & A. Burks (vols 7-8). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press

The Essential Peirce: Selected Philosophical Writings. (1992-8). 2 vols. Ed. By N. Houser & C. Kloesel (vol1), & The Peirce Edition Project (vol.2). Bloomington: Indiana University Press

Writings of Charles S. Peirce: A Chronological Edition. (1982-). 6 vols. to date. Ed. by The Peirce Edition Project.

Bloomington: Indiana University Press. Semiotics and Significs: The Correspondence between Charles S. Peirce and Victoria Lady Welby. (1977). Ed. by C.S. Hardwick. Bloomington, Indiana University Press

Texts sources mentioned and reproduced in art works:

Jan Kenneth Weckman: 1. "*Three grades*", pigment print on paper, 50 x 70,5 cm, 2008 MS 649: 1-3 - 1910

Jan Kenneth Weckman: 2. "*Essay on Pragmatism*", pigment print on paper, 50 x 70,5 cm, 2008 text source EP 2:256 - 1903; cf SS 159 -1903

Jan Kenneth Weckman: 3. "...*unless the Phaneron*", pigment print on paper, 50 x 70,5 cm, 2008 text source, EP 2:363-364 – c. 1905

Jan Kenneth Weckman: 4. "*Directly experiencing*", pigment print on paper, 50 x 70,5 cm, 2008 text source CP 1.349 – 1903; MS 462:84-86 – 1903

Jan Kenneth Weckman: 5. "*Consider that*", pigment print on paper, 50 x 70,5 cm, 2008 text source MS 1135:2 - 1897

Jan Kenneth Weckman: 6. "*Just as the first*", pigment print on paper, 50 x 70,5 cm, 2008 text source W 6:171

Jan Kenneth Weckman: 7. "*Let us say*", pigment print on paper, 50 x 70,5 cm, 2008 text source CP 7.619 – c. 1903; CP 7.643 – c. 1903

Jan Kenneth Weckman: 8. "Phenomenon", pigment print on paper, 50 x 70,5 cm, 2008 text source CP 2.197 – c. 1902; MS 337s:10

Jan Kenneth Weckman: 9. "The idea of the absolutely first", pigment print on paper, 50 x 70,5 cm, 2008 text source W 6:170-171

Jan Kenneth Weckman: 10. "Terms" pigment print on paper, 50 x 70,5 cm, 2008 text source W 2:50-51 - 1867

Jan Kenneth Weckman: 11. "Phaneroscopy" pigment print on paper, 50 x 70,5 cm, 2008 text source CP 1.286-287 - 1904

Jan Kenneth Weckman: 12. " Looking at the matter", pigment print on paper, 50 x 70,5 cm, 2008 text source MS 805:19-20;cf MS 804:22; CP 8.368n23 cf. MS 1135:7-8 – c. 1897 CP 2.357 – 1902; MS 797:10

3. DIAGRAM

DIAGRAM is an on-going series of works based on diagrammatic icons as tools for discussing and writing. These works are examples of situations when I am trying to make a visual note in order to explain my thoughts about art, signs and images.

The need for such explications is simply because of my work as an art teacher. Unfortunately, pondering such ontologies (what an outdated word, ontologies) is seldom useful in studio discussions, when standing around my own or a student's work. And contemplating a work-in-progress only serves to add to the complexity. It is the reason why you obviously have to ask the same questions at a later stage. The continuous feedback and dialogue eventually create a force that molds your approach to your work and sticks in your mind. Having said this, I have to add that the sort of mind I refer to here is not something abstract, but more a set of certain actions in a corporeal sense, actions that recall memories of past phases pictorially as well as technically, simultaneously as the choices of the following steps in the procedure are being made .

Sketching a diagram about a process is probably useless from the start, if you think that it will create an accurate picture. Is it a picture in the first place? What is an image, if it is a diagram, a sort of a visual equation comparable to a mathematical formula? At least for me, diagrams are a set of mnemonics that help me remember what to say. It does not help me to achieve a deeper understanding. It is a kind of binary system construed from multiple binary systems, and hence, very sketchy indeed. If the elements of the diagram are forgotten it means that we do not see what thought or idea they refer to. That is why a diagram is a symbolic key for a list of thoughts. And if there is no restriction to the list, it becomes form without a symbolic meaning. We can, in that case, only appreciate its form and have a vague idea, or rather a feeling about what it could have meant for those that used this symbol. In this way we wind up in a time warp, in fiction.

By enacting a symbolic aide-memoire and producing non-figurative embellishments, ornaments that bear no traces to nature, the diagram becomes food for the visual in two different ways that we may shift between while moving our gaze onwards. Diagrams need other texts to be used in a particular way, or then they mean nothing and can be put to use as "art". The fact that they are shown as artworks, however, is already one functional way of using them and thus, carry meaning such as "art" carries. If such a functional option exists, there is no end to the functionalities that can be named. For example, we can have the diagram function as a model for a completely different object by giving it a new set of explications. Or, like most visual artwork, they can become design items filling up both private and public spaces. Things that are "art" for some become "design" for others. We should perhaps even admit that these functions are simultaneous events concerning the same objects. The fact - that I like to make diagrams - does not change this at all. In this connection it's only art, but in a lecture they become heuristic memory cards to refresh a textual body of discourse. Where the interest lies, however, is when heuristic inference tries to evoke a sense of the factual and almost self-evident truth.

