FCJ-101 How can you be found when no-one knows that you are missing?

Lisa Gye, Media and Communicatons, Swinburne University.

‘What the reader sees will not be what he hears’

James Joyce may have said this of Finnegans Wake

‘Since we have already said everything, the reader must bear with us if we continue on a while. If we extend ourselves by force of play. If we then *write* a bit…‘

Jacques Derrida, Dissemination, 1981:65

Script https://www.youtube.com/embed/qBe84QgVU6A?feature=oembed [- 6 -] Don't get me wrong. Australians make a lot of very fine and worthy films. In the torrid vernacular of Baz Luhrmann's *Australia* The Movie, [- 7 -] *Crickey, you'd have to be a drongo not to know that Aussies make a shitload of bloody ripper flicks – strewth, they're bonza mate, they're really fair dinkum yarns with the best scenery and actors and stories that this bloody great big brown land has to offer. They're absobloodyfuckinlutely faaaaannnntastic. Mate. Cobber.* [- 8 -] The only problem is nobody actually seems to want to see them. Now, none of the following will be news to most of you but for the sake of the argument let's look at some figures. [- 9 -] Australian-produced feature films have accounted for an average of just 5.1 per cent of gross takings at the Australian box office in the past 15 years. That's $511 million out of a total of $10.5 billion. Only once in that period did the Australian share reach 10 per cent and that was in 1994, and largely due to the success of *The Adventures of Priscilla, Queen of the Desert* and *Muriel's Wedding*. In 2001, a record $63.4 million was spent at the box office on local features, including *Moulin Rouge*, *Lantana*, *The Man Who Sued God* and *Crocodile Dundee in LA*, but this still represented only 7.8 per cent of the total box office for that year. In 2007, the Australian box office share was 4 per cent (that's $36 million), a decrease from 4.6 per cent (or $40 million) in 2006. [- 10 -] *figure not held by this archive*		**Inscription** [- 50 -] How does one link the different registers within which critique is possible – in which 'research functions, by way of allegory, as the *inventio* for an expressive text (thus producing both scholarship and art)'? (Ulmer, 1991) This question lies at the heart of any attempt to understand reflexive remix practices as research and research as a mode of reflexive remix. [1] It was also the driving force behind the "paper" I delivered at the *B for Bad Cinema Conference* at Monash University which sought to explore questions of national identity, genre filmmaking and national cinema. [2] The "paper" took the form of a multi-channelled media performance, in defiance of (and with the full intention of disrupting) the tendency at such academic events to deliver in person a mode of writing that only distinguishes itself from other kinds of academic writing by virtue of being 'read aloud'. [- 51 -] This writing (the writing that you are reading now, whenever that may be) takes place both before and after its own inscription as an event, as the performance of what was written and which can be viewed (performed, read) again in this space as a supplement to its performance. It is not meant to explicate that performance but rather to draw attention to its status as, what Greg Ulmer has named, a discourse of "immanent critique" – 'a reasoning capable of operating within the machines of television and computing, in which the old categories (produced in the book apparatus) separating fiction and truth are breaking down.' (Ulmer, 1991) Similarly, the "paper" of which this writing speaks was itself driven by the same desire to work through the problem of what happens

The Fibreculture Journal (ISSN 1449-1443) — Issue 15, 2010-02-19. This article is published under CC BY-NC-ND. The author retains copyright.
This PDF is an archival offprint generated from the journal's text archive on 2026-11-15. It is not the publisher's version of record; the published article is at https://fifteen.fibreculturejournal.org/fcj-101-how-can-you-be-found-when-no-one-knows-that-you-are-missing/. Page numbers here are not the published pagination. Where paragraph numbers appear in the margin they are the journal's own and are the citable unit.