

## JOSÉ MALDONADO | *DIXLOCODA*

*Dixlocoda* is a project arising from intuition dealing with the likely existence of a close and not hidden relation between two sentences and a learning disorder, dyslexia<sup>i</sup>. Focusing also on its deeply human relationship, regarding several reading and writing codes, through which its aesthetic and meaning potential can be shown.

The sentences open a window of opportunity to observe, beyond darkness, *the distance that separates us from any approach* to a language accurately expressing any possibility of reality.

The inspirational sentences are the following ones:

*The difficulty of reading can never be taken for granted*<sup>ii</sup>

*No local hidden variable theory can reproduce all the predictions of quantum physics*<sup>iii</sup> (of language\*).

The first sentence is a *mishandled* translation by José Luis Brea of an already misadjusted translation by Jacques Derrida, in turn, of a phrase by Paul de Man. Intrinsic difficulty in reading, as well as contempt or reluctance that such difficulty causes, are emphasized by the three of them. Regarding the second sentence, it is a *metatheorem* by John S. Bell. In substance, it is a phrase that distils all the mathematics behind, and, after its empirical evidence, which tells us that predictions of quantum physics are not intuitive ones. They are the result of reading's own difficulty, faced by deterministic theories when they have to choose between *reality and locality* (nothing travels faster than light). We are always surprised by reality. Bell's theorem states the *impossibility* of a merely local reading: reality seems to give more, as language gives beyond all appearance and significance. As Derrida stresses, *illegibility is not an outer boundary to legibility*. Being a *difficulty*, dyslexia arises as a rare, terrible and exotic trace element, allowing the coexistence of multiple states and language predictions, changing effort into resilience to any disrespect. Aesthetically *read* dyslexia, full of cruelty and *obstinacy*, is a tongue twister that becomes a baroque *trompe-l'œil* with light, sound, interference and emptiness.

\* I replace *quantum physics* with *Language* (science of language) with the intention of highlighting the field in which the project tries to focus: aesthetic production of sense within the field of visual studies and artistic practice. This is not the case in quantum physics, which is a clear source of inspiration to observe aesthetic and language processes in a different, displaced and probabilistic way, without immanent determination.

In linguistics, language is a plot of signs that warn of a conventional system in a community. Therefore, each community has its language and what Jacques Lacan states is that, despite this, there is another language, to go farther, *the Language of the Other* that intervenes in each person, making it unique for each human being-speaker. As shown, language is located between speech and the unconscious. The latter being the product of psychoanalytic consideration -since there is no unconscious without psychoanalysis-. *Language* can be defined as what structures the subject from symbolic, language, as the way in which language is embodied in a body and then becomes a body. Language affects us, at first, for all that it entails as effects being affections... These affections are those resulting from the presence of *the language* while, knowingly, articulates things going far beyond that only being the speaker holds the knowledge stated... the unconscious is a knowledge, a know-how towards *language*. (Braunstein, 1982:220).

Every reading is a measurement process. It involves measuring what worries and interests us, using all the available tools. We measure in order to fix and to stop what appears to be incomprehensible, threatening or *supposedly* juxtaposed, lurking in the dark: feelings, reasons, images or poems and stories... the most sensible and precise logic or the most dislocated nonsense and many other things (the community as a whole, the world). To measure is to leave things alone and within our grasp, which are *stored or imprisoned*, to use them when, and as we would please or would need, to master them however it is, even in spite of losing credibility.

Therefore, every reading is foremost measure. It is a measurement of our lack of knowledge and, therefore, an essential absence of information and pure entropy. Reading undoes us bit by bit, and that is a terrible paradox, *festina lente*, until we will be *diluted* in reality and dispersed across universality: reading at the end of the end, but not regardless of the events.

A reading should lead us to another reading, just as a measure involves a new measure (*Measure for measure*<sup>†</sup>). Reading has no end, measuring either, almost. However, reading transforms and supplements all the previous and the subsequent ones. Predictions are not entirely reproducible by any hidden-variable theory. What cannot be seen are language predictions. Probability will considerably save from the difficulty of reading. Difficulty agitating and animating the *dark* heart of both sentences might refer to the cooling and dissolution to which we are exposed when we read or we measure, with the aim of breaking the illegibility, in a conscious or unconscious way: we break the natural state of juxtaposition of the world and reality. This will cause it to collapse in front of our viewpoints, opinions, tastes or criteria, transforming this reality into something that will be *possible (possessable)*, verifiable, clear, precise and precious, able to be, even sensible and exciting, that is to say, a solid and profitable exchange value that will guarantee our existence and a constant and resonant plus. And, nevertheless, what is transferred is always another intangible, evanescent and fleeting, erred and erratic thing. The difficulty is not being able to stop reading life being alive, the challenge is not ceasing to measure, approaching, thus, slowly, to a fate as fatal as imagined, which is written and (dis)proportionate. Even so, in reading and measuring, that is its own, lies what will save -or at least will delay- time and space, by adapting it to our experience and capabilities. Measuring, as well as reading, is narcotic.

Reading, legibility and illegibility (and *hindrance* measurability in their different versions) tend to occupy an increasingly enigmatic, fundamental and probabilistic position in relationship between grammar of description and rhetoric of persuasion and, therefore, in forming objects with aesthetic meaning.

*Dixlocoda* is a project which is tentatively structured on a series of techniques and means whereby to develop both the possibility of writing fixation, its reading difficulty, as well as the potential for randomness that those materials (text-Morse, Braille, painting, schemes and concepts, light, sound, electromagnetism, dyslexia) and their introactions and interactions are capable to unfold.

*Dixlocoda* is a painting action building a series of *erratic* transcription devices -unconscious language- that are displayed in polyptychs, showing juxtaposition states arranged to be collapsed by the viewer's point of view. The work remains in all possible states until the viewer observes, reads or measures it, from the uniqueness of his/her temporal space position. Even so, the painting object states the difficulty of its reading, the illegibility of its state itself, through the colour interferences produced by the micro fields that constitute it as resistance and trace of its natural state.

***No theory of local hidden variables can reproduce every prediction of language***, the first work is constituted as a polyptych in A3 format, a standard, with 13 elements -all the words that constitute the text-. Each of them is a window without *swinging leaves*, neither open nor closed, in which the frame of each one is made with four interference colours, A, B, C and D. They were painted with the *intention of not following a pattern*, delimiting a black space on which we register-write, using mechanical die letters, thud-writing the text by hammering. Each element contains one of the words which form the polyptych: no local hidden variables theory.

The sheet is magnetic, and, on this sheet, there are two magnets, point and line, placed in a random way (meta-mannerism, if this was possible). One of the elements of the polyptych is a *dyslexic Judas* (it goes beyond what it should... but it *can*).

This is a key!

The environmental metal powder will adhere to the 13 sheets.

***The difficulty of reading can never be taken for granted***, the second work is a pseudo-suite composed of 9 elements showing a grid made on the templates-schema of 9 structures (platforms) with essential works by Mark Rothko... Intervened and faded by the 7 colours of *interference* (titanium pigment) that generate the grid: A, B, C, D, E, F, G (seven notes, seven colours). On this grid, a failed attempt of painting emanates, intending to go further *but that, as a principle, will not proliferate*. One last layer *interacts* with the rest: blocks of luminescent paint, dot/ line, writing and transmitting in Morse, in the dark, each one of the different words that give a title to the work: ***The difficulty of reading can never be taken for granted***, I must reiterate. Captured energy allows reading in the dark: radiation.

Finally, in between, the third work, which is a musical composition with its musical score:

***No local hidden variable theory can reproduce every language prediction + The difficulty of reading can never be taken for granted***, the score being made in Braille code and performed in Morse code. A white musical score highlighted with indications of the Spanish Braille code and the international musical Braille code. A tape recorder executes, looping, again and again, the ten altered voices, variations, that make up the chaotic Coda. This marks the beginning and the end of every difficulty and illegibility, without drawing any outer limit, being opened to all language predictions, and all its meaning series, sliding smoothly, entropically.

José Maldonado (in Valencia, September 29, 2019)

---

† Bible, Matthew 7:2: "For in the same way you judge others, you will be judged, and with the measure you use, it will be measured to you". I refer to the work of William Shakespeare (1603/1604) which in turn was inspired by, at least, three or four previous authors.

i Dyslexia is a disorder of literacy learning, which is persistent and specific, and that occurs in children who do not present any physical, psychic or sociocultural handicap and whose origin seems to derive from an alteration of neurodevelopment. According to ICD-10, dyslexics characteristically manifest difficulties in reciting the alphabet, naming letters, performing simple rhymes and analysing or

classifying sounds. In addition, reading is characterized by omissions, substitutions, distortions, inversions or additions, slowness, hesitation, visual tracking problems and comprehension deficits, (PAHO, 1997). For authors Etchepareborda and Habib, 2000, dyslexia is a difficulty for decoding or reading words, so that some of the intermediate cognitive processes between the reception of information and the elaboration of meaning would be altered.

<https://www.disfam.org/dislexia/>

About DISFAM:

DISFAM is a Spanish non-profit organization established in 2002. It is made up of families with children with dyslexia, dyslexic adults and professionals from different fields who have decided to join us, being concerned and aware about learning difficulties during childhood and adulthood and also about emotional consequences that this disorder entails.

Disfam belongs to the European Dyslexia Association (EDA), the Spanish dyslexia federation (FEDIS, *Federación española de dislexia*) and the Ibero-American Organization for Specific Learning Difficulties (OIDEA, *Organización Iberoamericana de Dificultades Específicas de Aprendizaje*).

ii In an interview where he acknowledges his debt to de Man, Derrida comments as follows: "Paul de Man wrote somewhere that the impossibility of reading should not be taken too lightly... This illegibility is certainly not a limit outside the readable... it is not in the reading where illegibility appears as *readable*".

In "Jacques Derrida: leer lo ilegible", interview with Carmen González-Marín, *Revista de Occidente* 62: 3 (1986), 168. To a reading of the concept of memory in de Manian work, see J. Derrida, "Mémoires: for Paul de Man" (New York Columbia University Press, 1986).

See Paul de Man, "Blindness and Insight: Essays in the Rhetoric of Contemporary Criticism". *El ciclope*. Page LVII. Editorial Universidad de Puerto Rico, 1991.

Paul de Man's original quote is found at:

"The Rethoric of Blindness: Jacques Derrida's Reading of Rousseau", by de Man, Paul. *Blindness and Insight* (page 100). Taylor and Francis.

"Prior to any generalization about literature, literary texts have to be read, and the possibility of reading can never be taken for granted. It is an act of understanding that can never be observed, nor in any way prescribed or verified."

iii This theorem has been called "the deepest one of science." Bell's influential article of 1964 was titled "On the Einstein Podolsky Rosen paradox". The Einstein Podolsky Rosen paradox (EPR paradox) demonstrates that the Particle characteristics have defined values regardless of the act of observation, on the basis of the assumption of "locality" -physical effects have a finite propagation velocity- and of "reality" -physical states exist before being measured-. Bell showed that local realism leads to a requirement for certain types of phenomena which is not present in quantum mechanics. This requirement is called Bell inequality.

The original inequality deduced by Bell was:  $1 + C(b,c) > |C(a,b) - C(a,c)|$

Where C is the "correlation" of the pairs of particles and a, b and c are the device settings. This inequality is not used in practice. On the one hand, it is only true for genuinely "two outputs" systems, not for those of "three outputs" (with possible zero outputs in addition to +1 and -1) found in real experiments. On the other, it applies only to a very restrictive set of hidden variable theories: only those for which the outputs on both sides of the experiment are always anti-correlated when analysers are parallel, in accordance with the prediction of quantum mechanics.

There is a single threshold to Bell's inequality, which has the virtue of being completely intuitive. If the result of three statistically different coin tosses, then A, B, C have the following properties:

1. A and B are the same (both heads or both tails) 99% of the time,
2. B and C are the same 99% of the time,

then A and C are the same, at least 98% of the time. The number of discordances between A and B (1/100), plus the number of discordances between B and C (1/100), are the maximum possible number of discordances between A and C.