

MORGAN A. CRONEY

ADVISOR WILL INSLEY

SCHOOL OF VISUAL ARTS

MASTER OF FINE ARTS THESIS

APRIL 2005

LIST V1.0

List v1.0

Morgan Croney

April 2005

INDEX

- 000. Overview
- 001. Culture
- 002. Philosophy
- 003. Values
- 004. Transparency / globalism
- 005. Further dimensions / perspective / light
- 006. On signing works
- 007. On writing equations on the object
- 008. Why be an artist
- 009. What is art
- 010. With respect to math
- 011. Getting outside time and culture
- 012. Related artists
- 013. Quotes
- 014. Images
- 015. Statement

000. OVERVIEW

List v1.0 is broken down into sixteen parts, each focusing on a specific area of my work and practice. Sections 001 through 011 are written in an auto-interview style where I ask and answer questions regarding my work. Sections 012, 013, and 014 are in list form and present artists, quotes, and images that relate to my current thinking. List v1.0 culminates with my statement in section 015.

001. CULTURE

How is culture (popular culture) playing into your work, if it is at all?

The other day I was thinking of Baudelaire. My work comes from a very structural place – math, numerical relationships and such – then there are colored mirrors and glitter at times. Maybe Baudelaire was right. I mean, why not use what we find elegant and beautiful at the moment.

Beauty is made up of an eternal, invariable element, whose quantity it is excessively difficult to determine, and of a relative, circumstantial element, which will be, if you like, whether severally or all at once, the age, its fashions, its morals, its emotions. Without this second element, which might be described as the amusing, enticing, appetizing icing on divine cake, the first element would be beyond our powers of digestion or appreciation, neither adapted nor suitable to human nature. I defy anyone to point to a single scrap of beauty which does not contain these two elements.

(Charles Baudelaire, *The Painter of Modern Life*)

I do not think beauty must necessarily have the second, circumstantial element that Baudelaire talks about here; rather, I am most interested in the eternal beauty but maintain that this interest is not at the exclusion of a beauty of our time. Or put another way, transitory beauty is not necessarily used at the expense of an eternal beauty.

So, to answer the question, I live in a culture with a strong popular culture influence. MTV's *Pimp My Ride* is one of my favorite shows. I have been told that there is a west coast influence in my work and I think it is from that television show.

What about nostalgia?

I remember *Transformers* (a cartoon about robots in the 1980's). I've never gotten over their blockiness. It's so cool. The clunking sound as they transform... I see my work that way some times – it makes a few clunks then falls or stops or breaks or fails.

On the radio and at bars there seems to be an increased interest in 1980 pop songs. I was growing up in the 80's, so I think it left an impact on me / shaped my perspective. I look back to my childhood and look back to the 1980's. I don't miss it, but I do have a certain fascination with it.

I have a fascination with things that no longer have a use. I did a series of painting of electrical outlets that had been painted over. Maybe it's like art where the function has been removed so they can be appreciated in a new way.

This is almost a personal question.

I'd like to keep it about the work. There is a reference to money and pop culture with the blockiness. Yes, there's a bit of 80's in here.

While we are talking about the past, you must have something to say about Judd, Flavin, and crew?

I have nothing to “say.”

Do you like their work?

I think it is very relevant and society has found a use for it.

I have a new measure for successful art: if an artwork ever gets used in the fashion world, especially in a store window, then the artwork is a success.

Slippery...

Let me be fair. I think about Donald Judd and Dan Flavin. Flavin is a terrific artist. He takes over an entire space, which is what happens now – artists function by gallery space rather than within group shows. He moves to a spiritual and experiential area. No one needs me to say Judd is a great artist. I just think we need to move past his theory. I try to make boxes that are more interesting to look into.

“Interesting” is one of Judd’s words.

That’s true. Maybe in a way I am picking up where they left off. Or, minimalism has changed our world – advertising, design, architecture. And it comes back around where responding to the way we experience the world is linked to minimalism in a very real way.

And so Judd is pop culture?

Our culture has made use of his work.

Try again.

Video games?

There are some artists that I really admire using video games. I think of the new MoMA as a sort of video game Doom-like layout. Video games incorporate an interesting blend of illusionism and minimalism. That is, minimalist forms which create a perspective space to play within. How do these fit?

Virtual reality is a concern of mine. I wonder if art can be experienced through virtual reality. If art is purely visual then it seems possible. MoMA makes me think about this. It could have something to do with a nonplace.

What do you mean by virtual reality? Isn’t there something that can’t be reproduced about an artwork?

It’s a question of technology. I’m imagining some sort of goggles that would allow moving around and looking at an object, much like we do everyday, but without having to be in front of the actual object. This idea scares me. I don’t think it has to do with an obsession with art as an object. But it is troubling because it puts another layer between perception and physical reality. Also, I am concerned that there is something in a work that can’t be reproduced or measured: wouldn’t this be lost if the work is broken down to purely light rays emitted through a virtual reality? What if art becomes regularly consumed through virtual reality? Such a situation would be good if people found a use for it, but it would be a shame to lose sight of some third meaning within a work that might be lost. The more I say, the less I agree with what I am saying... I am all for new technology... Maybe I am just anticipating where art is moving...

You mentioned “nonplace.” Is that the main concern? What is a nonplace?

Like an airport. You go to New York, Charlotte, or even internationally and there is a standardized experience. It’s discussed in the book *Supermodernism* by Hans Ibelings:

“National borders and time zones are, mentally at least, no longer a barrier to any kind of interchange. In this respect, the 1990s can be seen as the superlative of the modernist 1950s and 60s which in turn represented an amplification of prewar processes of modernization and internationalization.” (Page 33)

“Nowadays the contention that we all live in one world is supported by pointing to the fact that in today’s global society the same products can be bought everywhere and the same television stations can be received everywhere... Back then [in the 50s and 60s], the idea of the emergence of a global community was based on the idealist hope that after the Second World War a new era of lasting peace had dawned.” (Page 41)

“The boundless space is no dangerous wilderness or frightening emptiness, but rather a controlled vacuum, for if there is one thing that characterizes this age it is total control. The undefined space is not an emptiness but a safe container, a flexible shell.” (Page 62)

“To say that architects are searching for an architecture without symbolic or metaphorical allusions is not to imply that there is no meaning at all any more. Just that the tendency of postmodernists and deconstructivists to look for hidden meanings everywhere has been largely superfluous for the simple reason that, more often than not, there is no hidden meaning.” (Page 133)

McDonald’s. Starbucks.

What I mean is a place that is universal, that can be experienced anywhere, so that in a way it is not specific to one place and in that way isn’t a distinguishable place.

This is where I start to think of virtual reality – would that be the ultimate nonplace?

002. PHILOSOPHY

Where does philosophy enter your work? What role does it play?

I am interested in philosophy not as a trick but as an expansion – pointing to the unknown.

It goes back to my childhood. I could never figure out why I am me and you are you. Why aren’t I in someone else’s body/position/viewpoint? It doesn’t make sense from an experiential viewpoint.

That’s where the absurdity might come in. Our situation, everything’s situation, in life hits me as random but then you search for connections. Why put a mark on this spot of the canvas? How did I end up here? Why am I me?

One question I can’t answer: is everything knowable? Is there a fact of the matter about any question you ask even if we can’t grasp it?

Through thought, I begin to believe we have little choice.
Through experience, I am more optimistic and seem to choose freely.

This sounds bad. I mean, these things are too big to talk about. Or, everyone else gets it and I sense that and know I shouldn’t talk.

In an attempt to keep open, if I have thoughts while planning a piece I will write them down so that another layer of thought ends up on the piece.

Are you a philosopher?

I like to walk in the park, read Wittgenstein and think on my own terms. I once read that there is a common phenomenon to hear an idea, then forget having heard it, to later use it and believe you came up with it yourself. Here I found it: May 23, 2004 issue of the New York Times Magazine:

“Cryptomnesia,” a process by which things are learned, forgotten and then mistaken for original inspirations when recalled.

Are you a philosopher?

As a matter of occupation? I reach my limits and feel sick. Thought is great, but so is how we experience the world. If philosophy is the space between thought and experience, then I’m interested.

Can you talk about rational vs. logical thinking.

When I began using math more opaquely in my work, what’s rational and what’s logical came into play.

Logical is not necessarily rational, though it can be rational to use logic. Logic can become absurd when carried out in the physical world and that’s when it becomes interesting.

Is that the area Sol Lewitt explores?

I think so. But it’s not only him. There’s a connection to ancient Greek philosophers. I haven’t been inspired by these sources as much as I have run into them. I am trying to start at the beginning, at the ground and I think that’s where the Greek philosopher’s were coming from.

Metaphysics seem to play a role in your work?

I think of the work as starting in black space. No inputs, nothing to draw from. Then the work comes from within. I latch on to a pattern of thinking (mathematics). I want to push myself into that black space – where I could be falling but not know it because there is no point of reference (outside of the work, of thought).

003. VALUES

Are you drawn to a certain set of values?

Is this part of the discussion? Where do my values come in... I would hope that making the artwork reveals to me what I value. Pushing to the point of catastrophe/challenge/unknown and ultimately wanting it to reveal a personality/belief/something about myself.

I really like Mr. Rogers.

Optimism seems good.

Craft

Authentic

Quiet

Eloquent

Integrity

Power of quiet vs. seduction of surface/loud

Pleasure

It seems important to me that the works are not imposing in a way that stops people. I’m not trying to tell people how to think. It is up to the viewer how the artwork is used.

You say “optimistic” – do you think your work is optimistic?

Yes. But, I wouldn't pigeon-hole the work that way. At times.

Are you always this hard to pin down? Do you have trouble speaking normally?

Sometimes I am absolute and answers come easily. Often, I try to take care in how I answer in an effort to be most accurate in what I say. I would rather take it slowly with words... it's bumpier terrain for me.

I sometimes speak in blips. It's like being on a campaign trail and having the one line that the news picks up on and plays a hundred times over. I feel like my speech is a string of those lines strung together. The difference is my blips aren't tailored and prepared beforehand. I try to use economy with speech. I find this works best for me. Best for observation... My work keeps coming back to the idea of observation... That's what my work is about if observation = sight + thought.

How does observation entail thought? Or what about observing?

For me, really observing something in detail means letting go of notions and finding out what my eyes tell me. In a way taking away the normal filters we use when seeing the world. So, observing is a conscious attempt to subvert thought and rely purely on sight.

An observation is making thought from something observed. This is where it crosses from visual to mental or conceptual in some sense.

Maybe it's as simple as observing is to experience and observation is to think.

004. TRANSPARENCY/GLOBALISM

You talk about transparency in your thesis show artist statement. Would you talk about transparency?

That's not a terribly specific question. I'm a bit of a robot on this issue. Here it goes again...

Transparency seems to be a value or trend that has grown in the past decade in our society. This is true of political, public and private institutions. There is a push for more information to be available and technologies such as email, websites, and cell phones have made in depth information more prolific. These are all examples one can pick, like searching the internet and picking one out of a million results for a search. As for particular examples... Well, there is too much information and not enough time to get caught up citing. I read the paper everyday and live in New York City and this is the sense I get.

I get the sense that a leader can make a bad decision so long as the decision is made publicly or not hidden. This is an interesting value for a society to hold if indeed it does so.

So, where does art fit into this?

That's the question.

Looking to artistic practices in general, there seems to be much room to reveal what heretofore has been hidden.

There are decisions made in making a painting - why not make those decisions as transparent as possible? It's about holding artwork to a higher standard. To see into the thoughts. To see the thoughts themselves. To reach a point we could not anticipate.

What about work of 60's and 70's - isn't much of that work transparent? Take Mel Bochner for example.

Yes that work is transparent in a certain way. Minimalist or literalist work is transparent as to what it is. That is, it is fairly straightforward to understand through experience that an angle is 90 or 45 degrees or easy to count how many boxes Judd has on a wall. But I don't feel the thought process is there. There is not enough information about how decisions were made within the work itself. I want to know how their minds were moving, not just a purely visual object.

Bochner gets closer to where I am interested. His piles of rocks are great and point to a way language and thinking and function intersect. But they are too refined, too reduced, too clean. They make a good, clear point, but I don't think his mind was that direct and straightforward.

Why? What's important about having thoughts visible?

It's about having a face behind the work. To let the viewer know that there is an artist on the other side of the work. Not to say that we are not alone, but that someone exists. I'm trying not to hide as much. And this has to do with color and sparkles – it points to my personal tastes and desires beyond a timeless ideal. Making a work that is made by someone living, thinking, seeing now.

Looking into someone's eyes.

I heard once that the sublime has moved from the church, to nature, and now is in personal contact.

Do you think that is true?

It seems possible, but not all the time. I've had some pretty awesome moments in nature. Nature is a refuge – it's always there to turn away to. It's refreshing to look at something that is not conscious.

That's funny. Isn't that the opposite of your work?

It's my condition. I'm a part of nature but conscious. I see no problem in enjoying escaping to nature and then returning to the focus of thought in work.

Something is wrong here. Need to think more...

Go back to transparency. What do you think that word means?

Part of my investigation might be built into our language.

Here's the dictionaries take (follow the bold words):

Transparent (adj.)

1. Capable of transmitting light so that objects or images can be seen as if there were no intervening material. 2. Permeable to electromagnetic radiation of specific frequencies, as to visible light or radio waves. 3. Of such fine or open texture that objects may be easily seen on the other side; diaphanous. 4. Easily understood or detected; obvious: *transparent lies*. **5. Guileless;** candid. 6. Shining through; luminous.

Guileless (adj.)

1. Free of guile; **artless**.

Artless (adj.)

1. Without guile, cunning, or deceit; ingenuous; naïve: *an artless child*. 2. Free of artificiality; natural; simple: *artless affection*. 3. Lacking art or skill; crude. 4. Uncultured; ignorant.

This quick jump through a dictionary makes it seem our language has built in that being transparent is artless. Be careful, my work does not reduce to a reaction against dictionary definitions. But, the way words are used is important. That is, our language informs how we perceive the world and maybe how we shape the world... so a reaction to the world we create can be (at least) incompletely or partially reduced to how we use language.

Another definition of transparent:

1. <jargon> Not visible, hidden; said of a system which functions in a manner not evident to the user. For example, the Domain Name System transparently resolves a fully qualified domain name into an Internet address without the user being aware of it.

Compare this to what Donald Norman

(<http://www.atg.apple.com/Norman/>) calls "invisibility", which he illustrates from the user's point of view:

"You use computers when you use many modern automobiles, microwave ovens, games, CD players and calculators. You don't notice the computer because you think of yourself as doing the task, not as using the computer." ["The Design of Everyday Things", New York, Doubleday, 1989, p. 185].

2. <theory> Fully defined, known, predictable; said of a sub-system in which matters generally subject to volition or stochastic state change have been chosen, measured, or determined by the environment. Thus for transparent systems, output is a known function of the inputs, and users can both predict the behavior and depend upon it.

To what degree is transparency up to the viewer? If the viewer does not believe you are you still being transparent?

Maybe it's more magical if the viewer is not sure. There is trust on both ends. I trust the viewer will really look at the piece as much as the viewer must trust that I am sincere or honest. Taking something for what it is. I don't like the question of "well, is this math real?" That's your job to answer; or, that's your curiosity, not mine. I'm not trying to prove my mastery of math... If I thought in a different way, I would write that down. Math is the most useful way to proceed for me at the moment. It's a tool. It points to what's going through my mind in a visual way.

It seems that math in and of itself is not important to you. Is that what you are saying?

Math is extremely important because it is part of the thought process; however, if I were thinking in a different way then math would not have to be part of the discussion. So, yes, it's not the fact that I am using math that I am interested in but that I am putting the creative thought process in more direct, visual contact with the viewer. But, since I am using math that brings up issues that become another part of the work.

(MORE TO EXPLORE)

TRANSPARENCY/GLOBALISM

-SPACE BETWEEN GETTING RIGHT OR NOT

Contradiction or passage from nonphysical idea to experiential?

GLOBALISM

Supermodernism – making the building disappear.

Fitting personal/subculture but interwoven into global culture, local and global interacting with each other.

Creating a non-place

Reason to go back to minimalism b/c we are in a time when accountability, truth, justice, idealism are sought after.

Letting viewer see the journey, unlike Ellsworth Kelly
Boy scout, Norman Rockwell honesty vs. true transparency
Overload of information – making viewer select (like experience of internet)
Will – need to also be uniquely intelligent.
Description – readable, translated (some loss), after the fact. Transparent to what it is but not how it got there.
Process – less readable, less translated (more accurate), part of the creation. Transparent as how it came to be. My struggle and method is presented.

005. FURTHER DIMENSIONS / PERSPECTIVE / LIGHT

I get the sense that time and dimensions are subjects of the work.

Many of my works begin with imagining what a fourth or fifth spatial dimension would look like. There's a tick – a sense or feeling that there is more but not being able to see it. Science tells us there is much we can't see. This leads to thinking about systems of perspective. Looking/experiencing nature. Light, shadow, reflection, transparency, diminishing light. Math is a good tool for investigating things we can only imagine or sense or can't perceive visually.

Your final work is purely visual though, right?

Well maybe it's taking a thought, an idea of what is out there but we can't see and then making it visual. So, yes, the final piece is a visual experience, but a squirrel or bear would experience it differently than a person would. Squirrels and bears have eyes. So it seems there is a non-visual component to the work. Then again, squirrels and bears experience everything and anything differently than us.

I think what you're talking about is a jump or disconnect.

The work passes from thought to experienced object, where thought has no dimension and experience happens within our constraints of perception and physics. The work requires imagination or understanding of some sort. Maybe it could remind us of what we sense is true.

This is getting very theoretical. To bring it back to more concrete I ask: there is light that travels through, hits a mirror and changes color again – what do you want from me?

First, what is wrong with theory?

I see your approach... There is light. Light makes the piece work.

It's important that the Plexiglas is colored. It turns it into a plane that makes the writing read as writing on a surface as opposed to writing that floats. This brings the piece back towards painting in a way because there is a medium applied to a support. Also, on the closed pieces, the color changes how light behaves, like how the velocity of light slows down when going through water. So the space is contained and an inside / outside relationship is set up when light behaves differently inside the contained space than it does outside it.

This too happens with the colored mirror. It creates the illusion of another space and the color sets it off as different from the space we inhabit.

With the mirror time enters. Or how time works as a function of us experiencing space. When you stand here there is a certain view, then at another time there is another view. With the mirror, time travels, or allows for simultaneous views. It has something to do with optics... a mirror can act as an extension of the eye in that it allows the eye to see something from a different direction.

Shadows also seem to have to do with time. What is the difference between shadows and reflections?

I ask this question too.

Compare reflection in water, to reflection on a window, to reflection on metal, to reflection in a mirror.

Compare shadows.

The shadow of an object can overlap the reflection of that same object on certain surfaces.

A reflection has to do with what is reflected and changes more quickly as we move than a shadow does.

Compare shadows and transparency and translucency.

Shadows result from a light source being blocked. So this can be read as time since we are used to a sun that moves and light changing sources. If we did not move and light came from a constant position, shadow might not be linked to time.

Take reflections, though. They read as time so long as your eyes can move. If light sources moved, but your eyes did not, then shadows would interact with time while reflections.... Well, maybe we couldn't know reflections in the same way.

Let me go into this more...

How we learn shadows. You see an object. The object is between the light source and the darker area (shadow). You move and the shadow does not change (unless you are between the light source and the object). You move the object and the shadow moves. You move the surface the shadow is on and the shadow changes shape. As the light moves/changes, the shadow moves/changes.

How we learn reflections. (Say looking at water). You see the sun. You see bright areas (almost as bright as the sun) on the water. Where the surface of the water changes, the reflection changes. As the sun moves, the reflection changes.

You see an object. You see the object backwards on a surface. As you move, what you see in the mirror changes. Behind the mirror is not what you see looking into the mirror.

(MORE TO EXPLORE)

- Why perspective system?
- Why colors?
- NATURE OF LIGHT
- reflective white = transparent white?
- Brightness vs lightness
- Green light and Flavin?
- OBSERVATIONS
- Shadows vs. reflections
- Reflections in water
- Reflections in buildings
- Reflections in mirrors
- Reflections in metal
- Clouds moving in layers – point of reference
- Space between buildings
- NATURE OF ENERGY
- Work on something until it emits something back
- MIRRORS
- Systems of perspective
- Wittgenstein

Old systems acting on old systems

FURTHER DIMENSIONS

Is it possible to paint illusion of more than 3d?

Creating illusion of 3d on 2d... 4d on 3d?

Projection – shadows of 4d on 3d on 2d.

Tesseract – go in one side out another. Four-dimensional equivalent of a cube.

Imagining things you couldn't see or couldn't know (Dana Schutz)

Drawing in space

Chemist uses periodic table, I use munsell color system?

Creating a world vs. creating an object vs. creating an object within a created world.

How perception turns corner – possible to make it turn again?

Going into a different time – how we experience the world – diff points of reference

Reflecting the viewer back to himself – you are here. Lonely?

Psychological... maybe it's someone else?

Looking in while looking out.

Do mirrors lose their effect the more times they reflect on each other – why is this?

006. SIGNING WORKS

Why do you sign your works?

I don't see it as a signature. Signatures come at the end. I begin each work by writing my name and the start date on the top left corner. This is a convention designed to be readable and upfront. I want to be open. It lays out a fact of the matter of the piece.

Then, why not sign on the back of the piece?

There is a cost for signing on the back: a loss in transparency.

I do not sign on the back because it is a hidden move. It hides, first, who made the piece. It adds a layer of separation between the viewer and the artist. It also denies the situation that an artist faces. It denies the personality, personal way of thinking and ego that goes into making a work of art. There's the idea that by making an artwork, the artist is saying that he is best fit to make a painting; otherwise, why not have someone else paint? I heard someone say that once and it didn't sound good.

There are also market factors at play. I think for an artist to deny these factors is at best a denial. I have dreams, aspirations, am proud of whom I am, and choose not to hide.

I trust that if I am honest and myself and open then something will be revealed that could not be planned, anticipated, or feigned. This is where I want to be and I see the challenge as setting up a situation in which I can act in this way. Writing my name is part of opening up to the front.

What about the experience that a viewer has with the piece: doesn't the signature detract from this experience?

I am interested in a thought process, how thought moves and how a work comes to be. If this is the focus, then I say it is most important to have information open and available. The more a viewer sees where and how the thought is coming, the better.

At some point you have to decide what is most important. For me, how an object comes to be is as interesting as the actual product.

Say that is true, then why make the object at all?

There are four reasons.

1. The physical object serves as a proof of the thought. It shows that the calculations and thought have a correlation to our experiential reality.
2. I believe it is the artist's responsibility to intrigue the viewer. The plans and object together bring forth a more dynamic and unique visual experience, which hopefully will pull someone into the work. It's a little bit like color choice where given the choice, I will choose to make a presentation elegant.
3. I personally need to work towards something. If the plans are not working towards something, then it isn't real for me. I can't fool myself and make it keep the rigor and passion for the work; I need to know that my ideas traveled through to the physical.
4. Objects are important to me. I remember picking up a shell on a beach. I was alone and somehow that object captured my feeling. Somehow my thought and feeling jumped and connected with the physical object. I couldn't take the shell. There is something important about that. Not holding on to things...

007. ON WRITING EQUATIONS ON OBJECT

Are equations utopian? Is the use of math utopian?

Math is a language system, a tool for investigation. Is that utopian?

Utopia has a political connotation. Math operates within a certain ideal.

I am not interested in math as an end. Where math becomes interesting is how it can bridge thought to reality. "Utopia" doesn't come to mind when thinking about this bridge.

How can math bridge thought to reality?

I don't know. It's magic.

Magic?

Maybe not. I am always amazed how numbers turn into something you can touch.

Ideas flow very freely with numbers – it's a sort of measured thought.

Measuring thought with numbers.

Numbering rulers for a set scale of measure.

Measuring physical lengths with a ruler.

(thought to physical) – numbers are very useful for this function.

Are numbers a way of measuring thought?

How big (or small) would a ruler need to be to measure thought?

Try imagining measuring thought with a ruler.

If numbers measure thought, then what measures numbers? What contains numbers?

There is a jump from number to measure. Number is abstract, measure is scaled?

Can't you measure something abstractly?

I think there needs to be a scale for it to be of use.

You can imagine a number. The ruler gives it scale in the physical world.

This is what amazes me:

You can think the number “14” and then you can measure “14”.

Go back.

A number only has meaning as we define it. So, it is possible to imagine a square with sides measuring, 4, 7, 3, and 1. This isn't physically possible unless we define 4, 7, 3, and 1 to be equal.

I don't think this is cause for stop.

There is still substance in the idea that we can imagine numbers (say 12, 34, and 10) and grasp in our minds what they mean to each other, but then we can represent those numbers in something we can experience in the world. Experience breaks down the logic formed in our heads.

That is to say, imagine 2 and 1. 2 is twice as long as 1. Say you use this to make two sticks, one length 2 and the other length 1. Straight on when they are parallel they make sense, but then rotate one of the sticks and you experience something much different than the idea “2 and 1.”

That's an interesting concept; however, none of your pieces are that straightforward. Why make your pieces more complex?

I think it is an American tendency that I embrace. Take television. It is getting more complicated: text scrolling on top of news broadcasting, picture-in-picture TV's. Video games also are getting more complicated, more variables, more intense. Maybe we are so used to getting entertained that the entertainment value has to be that much greater. Or, something being highly entertaining is more of a norm and, therefore, does not preclude it from being serious or rigorous.

I read a newspaper article on how a secondary school is revamping its libraries with brightly colored decorations. I saw that and said, “this is what my work is about.” Taking very high, serious ideas, and presenting them in an entertaining, exciting way. I don't feel I must be super serious in order to present a serious idea. It's okay, and very much a part of my personality, to smile and laugh in between serious thought.

Maybe part of my endeavor is to make the cube not only interesting, but also exciting, fun and entertaining.

You threw in the word “fun.”

Again, entertainment does not preclude rigor.

Is there a way of thinking (since that is what you are interested in) that might be involved with culture in some way?

Maybe we think in a disjointed way on a more regular basis and my work comes out of this type of thinking. Take:

Flipping through television channels

Browsing the internet

Having conversations through email, phone and instant message at the same time

The way your mind can move while driving...

There are these constant interrupts, so it is a fight to have a private thought. This means the thought has to be more intense, more impact, more entertainment. More people seem to have ADD... I have a suspicion that is a partially conditioned disorder...

More and more I am looking for a short viewing time that is very intense and then repeated. I think this is how we are experiencing the world in a very real way. This is different than a piece designed for one long

viewing time or a piece that has a short viewing time and once you see it you no longer want to look at it again. I think Dan Flavin masters the area of viewing time that I seek.

Why paint/build only the final result? Why stop where you do?

It seems a little backward... It goes back to the balance between creating an exciting visual/physical experience and having the thought process be the focus.

Stopping at the final result keeps the relationship between the thought and the physical creation at the forefront. If the physical result lead to something else in the piece then it might be less clear because there would be a mental to physical jump and then a jump from experience back through mental to the physical. I guess that would be fine.

The reason I have stopped where I have in the past is to build/create just enough to prove the thought/mental process. Why go beyond this? Or, maybe in future investigations I will build towards that, but there has been plenty of interest in the way I have worked so far.

(MORE TO EXPLORE)

-WHY WRITE ON OBJECT

Makes it a support... therefore, acknowledges literalness rather than simply being literal (in the sense that Michael Fried would use the term)

Crack into the universe from floating space of thought – seeing through someone's whole head not just through someone's lens.

Metaphysical space – where composition doesn't matter in a sense

Discovery through the process.

Color as decorated vs. having a function for the thought process... being colorful part of the process?

Color: the organic link to our logical thinking?

Tools/building – nature of thinking. Interest in the way we act not just the result.

Cognitive mapping becoming visual.

Diagram vs. illustration vs. representation

Visual record of thoughts – thinking through a problem, not just the solution to a problem

Thought art- not finished revised... show mistakes unlike Lewitt

Why precise and sloppy lines together? They have different uses – attached to different parts of thinking. I don't think thinking can vary in precision.

Our minds dream and focus... Both are part of humans and human thinking and both coincide in our minds so it seems an extension of thought to have that happen on the piece.

The board's being used as a tool in thought – it's both a result of thought and an active player in thought that impacts future thought.

One page, all-inclusive "sketch book"

Thought is grounded but is also part of a construct – we create it while it creates us.

Thought is timeless in a way and at the same time linked to our present culture.

What about learning? Knowledge required to read, etc...

Pollock swings his arms, I swing my thoughts. Both create an intuitive composition based on actions. My thought-actions are less restricted by physical.

Showing backend – like the html behind a web page (maybe I should make a program?)

Proof of the experiment – theoretical essence is within it.

Person behind the idea – people looking at Vito Acconci plans. Minimalism/formalism deprives the viewer of this?

Energy → object + light + space = shadow... thinking + materials + action = object

What if thought is creating the shadows? Transparent shadows... chalkboard vs. dry erase vs. projection?

Fresco remains – seeing underpainting

We know what they are b/c we know how people work... If we saw Beethoven's sketches for music we would know what they were because people have been composing for years. There is no difference here.
Series of fragments
Witnessing the creative act.
How do you bring the creation and the product together? Creation and the created
Relationship of hands and mind.

008. WHY BE AN ARTIST

Why did you choose to make art?

That's an interesting question.

There seems to be an implicit trap because for me I don't know the use of my art until it is made. It's sort of like the inventor who tried to make highly adhesive glue and ended up with the post-it note. The post-it note is a great invention but can we ask the inventor why he chose to invent it?

In this way, it is an in-retrospect question.

Yes, but one can still ask why that inventor chose to start inventing in the first place.

I choose to make art because of many personal reasons that I find of little interest to the actual investigation. But maybe I am wrong, so I will share what I think. I like to work and think independently and rigorously. Art provides an excellent forum. I like to make a contribution and connect with people. There is ego involved: the desire to leave something behind after my death. But the actual making of artwork frees me of my ego in some way...

It is very strange behavior. Artists sit in a room. Think. Make decisions and create something.

Making art is the best way for me to work through my thoughts and continue going on. I find it the most challenging way to use my time and thought and the most rewarding.

It is not a decision out of laziness. I could work less and make more money in other professions. There is a drive inside of me to think. To think.

I feel I can think and act on my own terms while still having an impact/conversation through art. There seems to be the least amount of compromise and least amount of need for b.s. This is where I stray from Baudelaire, I want to dig to the inside and not get bogged down in too much surface.

To be alone and together simultaneously.

I can be thoughtful and explore in art and help others and myself at the same time.

There's something where I will be an artist no matter what I do.
It's part of my personality or way I act.

I'm not satisfied. Would you choose to not make art?

Choice is a very iffy subject. I would say that I could do something other than art. It's an addiction though.

I can do other work well but I feel like I'm wasting my time. Most work isn't significant or lasting enough to capture my interest.

I still don't understand. Is it privileged? You have skills that can bring you greater wealth yet you choose to spend your time making something many consider useless?

Yes I am privileged to be able to create art. To have the space, time, materials and freedom to make art is a miracle in itself. I wouldn't agree with you, though. I think people know art is important. Art is a sort of rejection of the capitalist world but it can function within the system but out of it.

The fact is art has a value for people and society as a whole.

Money is a matter of survival and competition.

Art is more of a contribution. Maybe we need to contribute in order to survive? It's an upper-level question... Like what contains space?

Do you think it is selfish to be an artist?

I asked my ex-girlfriend that question and she said it's not selfish if you are able to make a living doing it.

That's a very pragmatic, concrete answer. It dodges the real ethics or something deeper, though. I guess there are different types of artists just as there are different types of lawyers and architects.

Related to being able to make a living but one step away might be whether society/people find use for your work. I heard the term "use-value" once and really like it.

If you are adding value to people's lives by making art then that is not selfish.

On a personal obligation level, maybe you need to not only add value to other people's lives but also add (financial) value to you and your family. If these two facets are met, I can't see it as being any more selfish than any other profession or activity.

It seems like whether other people get value from your work is out of your control to some extent. What if you make work that does not, then is it a selfish act?

Well, this is getting into intention. If you truly believe it will add value then it is not selfish although it might seem to be... Maybe you need to look at it and if it is not adding value, change your approach – give more information about the work, get into situations where it can be seen and understood, really look at the work and see where it needs to go. From a practical standpoint, I'm not sure how much control over my practice that I have – my art seems to resist being told what to do.

Are artists good or bad or is artwork good or bad?

Both, if I had to choose. I want to say that all that matters is if the artwork is good or bad but that is tied into who the artist is. It's about information. If any artwork is good and you don't know about the artist then the artwork is good. If you learn the artist is not good then that becomes part of the work... But in the end, I want to say, it is up to the artwork to stand or fall. Something good can come from someone 'bad'.

Does your art just show that you are good enough to make these?

That is one reading of them. I would think it is a pretty boring way to look at it.
More....

009. WHAT IS ART

What is art?

I was asked this question in eighth grade and sometimes wonder how I would answer the question now.

Here's one thought that I've had: art is to look inward and to react outward (physically).

Here's another: art is where eternal intuitive logic becomes visual beauty.

This question doesn't lead far for me. Once you have defined the term 'art' then you still have to decide how to proceed. Or, as an artist I am not concerned with what art is as much as I am concerned with how to approach my practice and investigation.

(MORE TO EXPLORE)

Art as a handle on a bundle.

Art as something to prove to aliens we exist

Third meaning – putting the inside out.

Imbedding thought into material.

010. WITH RESPECT TO MATH

How did you come to use math?

It was a fluid move for me, stemming from a genuine interest and noticing a pattern in my way of thinking. I have excelled and been interested in math as soon as I began learning it in grade school. This interest carried through high school and shifted towards a focus on economics at Davidson College. I had worked in finance prior to deciding to work on art fulltime, and, upon doing so, I began to feel a part of me unused, unchallenged.

At the same time, I noticed that the compositions of my drawings were beginning to be based on a loose set of rules having to do with proportions. Simple patterns of mathematical relationships were being used on some level to power my decisions. Once I noticed this, it was a natural move to focus on the proportional relationships by focusing on how I was deciding them. I began with some small works using simple, explicit, mathematical equations such as $2.5 * x = y$. Where, say, one length is x and one is y . I then divided the drawing into two sections, one being 2.5 times longer than the other. I chose 2.5 because it's not 3 which seemed like a traditional design trick and it's not 2 which is an even number that serial artists often used (maybe somewhat in opposition to the design quality of three). So, 2.5 was neither even nor odd from a certain perspective. From there, the equations grew more complex, as did the application of those equations.

Now I am making another turn realizing that my interest in math is, on a higher level, an interest in seeing the thought process and investigating how decisions are made. So, this is where my investigation now lies: a thorough investigation of how to make decisions.

How do you use math to create artwork? Could you go through the process?

There's no one set method. Generally, I begin with algebraic equations, numbers, and sometimes geometry and explore in a very free way. Once I arrive at an equation, I create a system on which to apply the equation. Then I execute the result. Now I will explain in more detail:

I start by creating an algebraic relationship. Listing numbers and then choosing certain ones in a very intuitive manner. It is hard to explain, but if I focus hard enough, numbers themselves can be used as a form of expression and exploration. The creation of the mathematical relationship is very intuitive and flows freely between numbers, variables, algebra, and geometry. I am beginning to play with how the equations are created, using different decision-making techniques.

I take this relationship and apply it to a system I create. Sort of creating a problem to solve. This is where ideas of further dimensions come into play. For example, creating a system to imagine what a distorted

cube will look like. Or, what the shadow of a four-dimensional distorted cube will look like. Often I start with a cube and then apply the mathematical relationships to the lengths or angles of the shape.

Getting lost in the system

(MORE TO EXPLORE)

MATH

True investigation vs. design decisions

LW. Wide agreeability of math. Transferring this to art where there is no consensus.

Bringing math to art, then downgrading consensus to level of art or somewhere in between?

Linking to undisputed.

-RELATIONAL

Absolute relationships

Significant (not just formal)

Related rates

Everything measurable being mathematically controlled...

Mystery within viewer – the piece knows

-ABSURD, RANDOM, SURPRISE

Randomness of equations – abex (but don't consider composition the way they did?)

Making visual art with nonvisual decisions – downplays relationships in a way makes them absurd and unimportant – leaving them to systemic.

Creating new – surprise as it forms

Oulipo

Geometry vs. algebra: pictures vs. words?

Creating something that doesn't compute with experience.

-FAITH, BEAUTY

Decisions with math – how far can it go? How many aspects? (“point of surrender”)

“When I am working on a problem I never think about beauty. I only think about how to solve the problem. But when I have finished, if the solution is not beautiful, I know it is wrong.” R. Buckminster Fuller

Aesthetic of math

Iterating the equation

Point where sense breaks down – need for greater structure/understanding. Emphasizing re-emergence of need for religion?

-EMOTIONAL SIDE

Emotion through numbers

Einstein, Mozart – passionately working at formulas in areas stereotyped as boring but to the people in the process this is getting to the meat. The questions of who we are, why we are here...

Lost in the system – when the system is smarter than I am.

Excitement of search – math's link to philosophy, science, art, religion. Brings to question what we can't see.

-RATIONAL?

Uselessness... creating and solving the problem...absence of reason for it/logic is cool.

Math – logical not necessarily rational.

Greeks (Plato/Socrates) based math on axioms (truths in our minds a birth). Now math based on observations/assumptions.

Once heard that the most disturbing to humans is when it's close to reality but something's not quite right.

-STARTING POINT TO MULTIPLE

If we can't agree on the starting point, does the fruition past that point matter?

Regeneration – DNA, how someone is made from two.

Being able to trace the piece back to one point – the equation : before and after the equation is limitless.. How does simultaneity fit into this?

Random to specificity, like life.

Finishing a painting like running – set/reach a certain mark and go further each time.

011. GETTING OUTSIDE TIME AND CULTURE

(MORE TO EXPLORE)

Imagining things you couldn't see or couldn't know
Getting outside of time/culture – creating something that can even effect/influence me
Has to do with math and having faith in what it will produce.
Idea of setting up a system then that system creating something unpredicted
What happens when you encounter a box that “does not compute”
EXPERIENCE – informs feeling with numbers/ideas of systems →
THOUGHT/NONPHYSICAL – leads to decisions/actions → VISUAL OUTPUT →
back to experience...
Does the translation exclude physical experience?
Is there a way to make a system not based on experience? Based on math?

012. RELATED ARTISTS

These are some of the artists I have considered in 2003-2005. Names preceded by an asterisk are ones in which I am especially interested or think about often. The list is ordered alphabetically by last name:

Tomma Abts

Where does commerce and art intersect? I don't dislike commerce but there is no content to this work as far as I can tell. Surface.

*Ricci Albenda

Warping architecture, challenging perspective -- has the environment and the artwork act in unison. Moving beyond installation to “site co-optive.” Ricci defines this term to mean when an artwork merges or takes over its site. His *Projects 74* work in MoMA in 2001 is a great work that seems to do this. I had an idea for a similar project where the floor, walls, and ceiling would all be warped to mathematical equations to create an environment you could enter. We share an interest in creating systems, which then create something else. His work is based much more in experiential where want to reveal the thought behind the created experience. As he says: “every concept cannot exist purely as itself – it always has roots in experience.” While I agree that concept and experience coexist and are intertwined, it does not, however, follow that concept cannot exist on its own once it has been created. I also wonder whether experience has roots in concept (I'm not alone here).

Josef Albers

Albers is interesting because he has concept and he is very explicit in how it is grounded in experience. So it goes experience → theory → create → experience...

David Altmejd

A recent graduate of Columbia who makes architectural constructions with Plexiglas mirrors. There are often cracks in the material; he is not concerned with seamless construction. What I like most about his work is how he starts at a small scale and continues building until it takes over the room. In addition, it is refreshing to see creativity with materials used in minimalism while not getting caught in a finish fetish. I see these works as painting in three dimensions.

Kevin Appel

Shusaku Arakawa

I really respect his writing. Many artists have used the golden ratio, Arakawa included, which is great but I am trying to be creative with not only the application but also the creation of mathematic equations.

Milton Avery

Touch. Paint.

Francis Bacon

Nairy Baghramian

Chris Balantyne

Chris paints scenes of man-made structures that contain space. Serious observations about how space is used, presented in a light-hearted spontaneous way. This is what I get out of the work and really like. Sometimes cuteness gives the ideas a fresh impact but it goes wrong in some... I'm thinking about when a cartoon writer goes blank but must still give something to the paper. That is, when it looks like it should be funny but lacks the punch line(s). These works seem more like commodities without critiquing their state as such, which is where our work diverges.

Bauhaus

"Ultimate aim of all creative activity is a building!"
Unites architects and artists, "must all return to crafts!"
"Art and technology – a new unity"

Jake Berthot

Jake suggested I read Ludwig Wittgenstein. I think there is a similarity in my work and his when the grid/understructure shows through in parts of his finished paintings. Concept and final painted resolution are simultaneously visible. It is very different to look at his work and mine, though... something about how an image reveals itself. How light emerges.

*Charles Biederman

He has work in the Met and other collections, but its overlookedness is appealing. It's amazing how he is in his own world and follows his own vision in the middle of seemingly nowhere. There's some weird appeal. Is he crazy? Did he think he was crazy? For the same reason I also hate him. Maybe he said fuck you to the world without exploring/learning about the world. His work is definitely funky, though, and explores a place many have overlooked. He's my partner in Plexiglas gone painting.

*Mel Bochner

My relationship to Bochner is important to me... I think I am trying to make the actual thinking process visual rather than thinking and coming up with one finished piece that hides the way in which it was conceived... Letting my mistakes and wondering thoughts show through more. His work strikes me more as a diagram or illustration. His work is right on, though. The space between thought and physical, number and measure is what I am thinking about.

Constantin Brancusi

Henry Brown

I address this artist's work only because it is based on "numerical formula". My concern here is that the application of the formula is not very interesting or creative. Why stop being creative after creating the equation – the results looked predicted and predictable.

Chris Burden

Badass.

*Ian Burns

I have so much fun with this work. It's a party and I hope my work has a bit of that. Also, his work occupies a space between imagination and the physical. You can see the underlying setup of the scenes and how the final screen (if it were a video) looks. And the small scale engages your imagination to enter the space. My smaller pieces seem to do this.

Sam Cady

Brian Calvin

I like these paintings in short viewing. I've heard people say he has fallen into a style or repetitive pattern, but I think there is an interesting conversation between the content of what's going on in the scenes and what the color is doing. What's in this work for me is it's relationship to pop culture – the paintings capture the feeling of our time.

Mary Cassatt

Having it both ways... I don't feel there's a need to reject this artwork. I enjoy it.

Vija Celmins

I love looking at waves and the ocean and simple everyday appliances. Vija did not teach me this nor did she inform the experiences. I am seriously interested in what she is investigating but not how. That said, I really like these paintings but I always expect to love them and then am let down slightly.

Paul Cézanne

Cézanne's paintings show thought interacting with physical. It's all there on a canvas.

Christo

Tony Cragg

Ronald Davis

Ron Davis shows the underlying geometry beneath architectural forms. My work differs by using math in a visual way. Algebraic thinking is much different from geometry. But Ron is in a way revealing a system of construction and perspective, which I find an interesting move.

Honore Daumier

Stuart Davis

Andre Derain

Rackstraw Downes

Some of the best compositions I've seen. Highways and architecture he explores is fascinating and I am impressed by the perspectives he finds/creates. They remind a bit of great cinematography... a lot of thought goes into camera position and lens. I'm not sure if they move beyond that. The actual paint application is impressive but not original.

Marcel Duchamp

Benjamin Edwards

As much as there is stuffed into these landscapes, they want more. I prefer Al Held's new work. This artist seems a bit derivative.

Olafur Eliasson

Richard Estes

Lyonel Feininger

Eric Fischl

I went to a lecture of his and he compared art to a good sports game. Viewers don't care who wins, they just want to see a good game. When I see shadows from blinds in my apartment I think of the world he created.

Kim Fisher

I share some of Kim's interests but from a different angle. The work seems sarcastic in some way as it discusses jewelry, fashion, minimalism, beauty, power, style, glamour and success. I find the works interesting... it seems like an updated 80's. The sarcasm seems to be in a 90's tone. And the paint application seems current. Where these bring up object hood in a shop window way, my work comes from a love of objects in nature, not specifically commercial. Lighting is more important to me.

Tommy Fitzpatrick

A flat out good tape painter.

*Dan Flavin

"The composite term 'image-object' best describes my use of medium."

Literal does not correct the illusionistic; rather, it is subsumed by it.

Moves from measurable to experiential.

Flavin is one of the best artists right now. Working with minimalist dialogues of objecthood and specific industrial materials and forms but it becomes experiential, taking over entire rooms. As I write I can't think of artwork that I'm more into right now.

Tom Friedman

Carl Fudge

His series of called *Rhapsody Spray* "is based on the image of Sailor Chibi Moon, a Japanese anime character endowed with shape-shifting, transformative powers." I can relate to the attraction to this type of cartoon (I still think about Transformers the cartoon). My work has moved away from digital technology in a way... My work has been focusing on the human hand and thought. But I am not opposed to the technology used in Carl's work.

Buckminster Fuller

Alberto Giacometti

His drawings and paintings are incredible in how the mark reveals subtle mind shifts where I can sense the connection of hand, thought, sight.

Teo Gonzalez

I don't want to be another abstract painter with an interesting process. I want to go higher, further, more.

Philip Guston

Courage.

Keith Haring

*Al Held

Herbert Hinteregger

Edward Hopper

*James Hyde

Very good paintings. His work is three dimensional, but I still consider it painting like my work and Charles Biederman. Maybe this has to do with hanging on the wall? I really like his investigation of the mechanics of a painting. There is humor and entertainment inside. One critic commented how Hyde is not making paintings but trying to make painting – reconstituting it. I share this dream/aspiration. More people need to consider this work.

Will Insley

I feel weird putting Will's name here since he is my thesis advisor – is it unethical? No.

Robert Irwin

“Light has good physical properties for the question... of the substance of existence... One of the things that I like about light especially is the degree of its actual physical energy and the minimalness of the identity: as bit information, it has almost none, and yet it has a very, very elaborate, very compound physicality to it.”

“My pieces were never meant to be dealt with intellectually as ideas, but to be considered experientially.”

Bronlyn Jones

Donald Judd

Shirley Kaneda

Paul Klee

Dean Kessmann

Turns the end of a magazine into abstractions.

Ellsworth Kelly

The difference between my work and Kelly's is that his work hides the process that leads to the final result. There is a mystery to his work that I find draws me in and brings me back.

*Paul Klee

Klee's imagination and creation and playfulness are great. Finding his own world and creating it fully with fun... it's where I want to work.

*Martin Kobe

The spatial shifts in these paintings are very interesting. Video games come to mind.

Willem de Kooning

*Jeff Koons

Joseph Kosuth

Dimitri Kozyrev

*Sol Lewitt

Sol is similar to Bochner in that the final piece presents a thought or logic but it is reduced from the way we really think. By showing the plans, Lewitt seems to be saying that the idea is an important as the object. I'm saying that the thinking is as interesting and important as the idea and object that proceed from thinking.

Roy Lichtenstein

Jacques Lipchitz

Jorge Macchi

Loren Madsen

Aristide Maillol

Mark Manders

*Robert Mangold

Brice Marden

John Marin

Agnes Martin

Henri Matisse

Amedeo Modigliani

Paul Mogensen

*Laszlo Moholy-Nagy

Part of the Bauhaus. Made the *Light-Space modulator* in 1930. This kinetic piece explores light and movement. My Plexiglas pieces are happiest in natural light near a window where light changes orientation. Changing light has to do with perspective, phenomena and physical structure.

Piet Mondrian

Ian Monroe

Another very good tape painter who uses geometric/special forms in an abstract expressionist way.

Giorgio Morandi

Francois Morellet

French.

Robert Morris

Robert Moskowitz

Barnett Newman

Georgia O'Keeffe

Nathan Oliveira

Oulipo

Math as a chosen constraint – tool to trigger ideas

Seems less committed

Similarity to me: using math to get somewhere unexpected

*Roman Opalka

Smart, obsessive use of numbers.

Julian Opie

Oscar Palacio

Graham Parks

Cesar Paternosto

Paintings do have sides. Cesar starts off with a great question and application, but the investigation did not move very far. Still I like at least one of his paintings.

Jackson Pollock

Martin Puryear

David Rabinowitch

Jennifer Reeves

Ad Reinhardt

Anselm Reyle

Mathew Ritchie

Ritchie has more of a narrative going on and explains everything, but connecting science and art is a similarity. He looks things up rather than creating within the realm of sci/math. Seeing his work makes me realize that it is not science that is the subject of my work, but rather the thinking, motivation and exploration that drives scientific investigation.

Bridget Riley

Tony Robbin

Explores further dimensions using math to create paintings.

Mark Rothko

Michal Rovner

These pieces get me interested despite my disinterest in ancient relics that are housed in museums.

To me they are about money and ants and change.

*Robert Ryman

*Tom Sachs

David Salle

*Fred Sandback

Contains space, collapses space, opens space. Very interactive.

David Schnell

I want one of his paintings.

Richard Serra

Charles Sheeler

Kate Shepherd

A graduate of SVA MFA. The slick tactile feeling in front of these paintings is right on. The lines float and canvases align to make subtle spatial shifts that delight. They are happy but explore something seriously and thoroughly. You can see the artist's hand. I can look at these for a long time and then go back. They don't want to let me leave. The key seems to be using more than one canvas and placing them together. It gives the crack. The missing suggestive. The middle of a magazine, book, or space.

*Katrin Sigurdardottir

Builds model size walls that increase in height until they are human scale. Recalls horizons and mountains. It's such a unique idea and the forms are unique. It brings to attention our relationship to boundaries and questions how walls should or could be. A little hallucinogenic... It messes with the viewer and I like that. Magic.

*Dana Schutz

painting what I want to paint – not worrying about being sappy. Her own world maybe cool because freedom, but maybe not cool because looking away. (In my mind it's fine as long as you still look at what you are turning away from).

Tony Smith

Robert Smithson

Frank Stella

Wayne Thiebaud

Wolfgang Tillmans

Hayley Tompkins

Sketchbook-size three-dimensional wall pieces. No crutches... Brings creativity to the forefront.

Henri de Toulouse-Lautrec

James Turrell

Explores light in an interesting way. The work is caught up in the sublime. Maybe that's a way of saying ego. Turrell is at the far end towards experience... pushing until there is little room for concept. I think this is part of the sublime – pushing the viewer past their wits. In a way, trying to create the sublime is trying to change the viewer. I don't want to change the viewer or exert power over them. I would rather be persuasive, which means the viewer's free will is not denied. One could say that ultimately the viewer still has control over how to perceive James Turrell's work, but Turrell is throwing punches... experiential punches... light punches? That is, the work is designed to confuse the viewer's senses. Here it is: Turrell is trying to confuse while I am trying to challenge the viewer. I have a lot of respect for a viewer... I'm on his or her side.

Cy Twombly

*Keith Tyson

"beautiful mind" and how it moves across a page. The limitless expanse of a mathematic/scientific mind that's not bound by just what we see. Challenging and exploring basic philosophical questions.

Confluence of arbitrary and determined facts – how to deal with the wonder/horror of this between everything and nothing – no matter how many factors, they are not infinite.

Equanimity

"I feel sorry for the person who has to put it down in a paragraph."

"I don't see myself as being scientifically oriented. Science is just a language by which we understand nature, and so it's a language that I use."

Mozart and Einstein's output is very emotional, great human outputs not just cold

"The great thing about being an artist is you can do things inconsistently. You can hold two contradictory ideas in your head, and believe them both. Science isn't a discipline that allows you to do that."

Art as detritus from an artist's activity.

"A natural outpouring of the way I think."

History of art as math proofs

Corban Walker

Lawrence Weiner

Neil Welliver

Tom Wesselmann

Terry Winters

abstract systems/structures that create a visual image. Connection of abstraction to how we experience the current world - grid of arch/streets/design etc.

Lebbius Woods

Robert Yoder

Combining Legos and geometric abstraction is cute.

Kevin Zucker

013. QUOTES

These are quotes I have found interesting and useful for my practice. Items in bold frequent my thinking.

Ludwig Wittgenstein (*Remarks on the Foundations of Mathematics*)

7. Now what does it mean to say that one proposition *can* be derived from another by means of a rule? Can't anything be derived from anything by means of *some* rule—or even according to any rule, with a suitable interpretation? ...

46. The new proposition has as it were come to be out of nothingness. Where there was nothing, now there suddenly is something.

73. I could also have said: it is not the property of an object that is ever 'essential', but rather the mark of a concept.

82. (I once wrote: "In mathematics process and result are equivalent.")

109. For I want to say: "One can only *see* that $13 \times 13 = 169$, and even that one can't *believe*. And one can—more or less blindly—accept a rule". And what am I doing if I say this? I am *drawing a line* between the *calculation* with its result (that is to say a particular picture, a particular model), and an experiment with its outcome.

168. The mathematician is an inventor, not a discoverer.

Ludwig Wittgenstein (*On Certainty*)

35. But can't it be imagined that there should be no physical objects? I don't know. And yet "There are physical objects" is nonsense. Is it supposed to be an empirical proposition?— And is *this* an empirical proposition: "There seem to be physical objects"?

36. "A is a physical object" is a piece of instruction which we give only to someone who doesn't yet understand either what "A" means, or what "physical object" means. Thus it is instruction about the use of words, and "physical object" is a logical concept. (Like colour, quantity,...) And that is why no such proposition as: "There are physical objects" can be formulated.

Yet we encounter such unsuccessful shots at every turn.

55. So is the *hypothesis* possible, that all the things around us don't exist? Would that not be like the hypothesis of our having miscalculated in all our calculations?

80. The *truth* of my statements is the test of my *understanding* of these statements.

83. The *truth* of certain empirical propositions belongs to our frame of reference.

137. Even if the most trustworthy of men assures me that he *knows* things are thus so, this by itself cannot satisfy me that he does know. Only that he believes he knows...

150. I should like to say: Moore does not *know* what he asserts he knows, but it stands fast for him, also for me; regarding it as absolutely solid is part of our *method* of doubt and enquiry.

177. What I know, I believe.

205. If the true is what is grounded, then the ground is not *true*, nor yet false.

206. If someone asked us “but is that *true*?” we might say “yes” to him; and if he demanded grounds we might say “I can’t give you any grounds, but if you learn more you too will think the same”.

212. In certain circumstances, for example, we regard calculations as sufficiently checked. What gives us the right to do so? Experience? May that not have deceived us? Somewhere we must be finished with justification, and then there remains the proposition that *this* is how we calculate.

221. Can I be in doubt at *will*?

222. I cannot possibly doubt that I was never in the stratosphere. Does that make know it? Does that make it true?

253. At the foundation of well-founded belief lies belief that is not founded.

309. Is it that rule and empirical proposition merge into one another?

375. Here one must realize that complete absence of doubt at some point, even where we would say that ‘legitimate’ doubt can exist, need not falsify a language-game. For there is also something like *another* arithmetic.

I believe that this admission must underlie any understanding of logic.

427. We need to shew that even if he never uses the words “I know...”, his conduct exhibits the thing we are concerned with.

430. I meet someone from Mars and he asks m “How many toes have human beings got?”—I say “Ten. I’ll shew you”, and take my shoes off. Suppose he was surprised that I knew with such certainty, although I hadn’t looked at my toes—ought I to say: “We humans know how many toes we have whether we can see them or not”?

471. It is so difficult to find the *beginning*. Or, better: it is difficult to begin at the beginning. And not try to go further back.

508. What can I rely on?

550. If someone believes something, we needn’t always be able to answer the question “why he believes it”; but if he knows something, then the question “how does he know?” must be capable of being answered.

Richard S. Field on Mel Bochner (*Mel Bochner: Thought Made Visible 1966-1973*):

The fact that these pieces were intended for the wall rather than the floor not only denied anthropomorphic (metaphoric) interpretations, but also avoided commerce with traditional ideas about gravity, rigidity, and surface (traditional properties of sculpture).

...

his interest lay *between* visual and intellectual structure.

Bochner once said that reading was closer to thought than speech.

Bochner... found the kind of friction – the wedge in the phenomenological model between thought (linguistic component) and experience (physical component)...

What Bochner meant was that there is no thought without language, and that in the visual arts there is no language without a physical embodiment.

Bochner sought to construct physical situations that invoked language.

Michael Fried (*Art and Objecthood*)

What matters is that, as I remark, “all judgments of value begin and end in experience”; the task of the critic is, first, not to flinch from making such judgments, which are nothing less than the lifeblood of his enterprise, and second, to try to come up with the most telling observations and arguments on their behalf.

Page 18

...I believed and perhaps still believe that modernist works of art exist or aspire to exist in a void.

page 32

The essence of painting is not something irreducible. Rather, the task of the modernist painter is to discover those conventions that, at a given moment, *alone* are capable of establishing his work's identity as painting.

page 38

...but because *at every moment the work itself is wholly manifest*... It is this continuous and entire *presentness*... that one experiences as a kind of *instantaneousness*, as though if only one were infinitely more acute, a single infinitely brief instant would be long enough to see everything, to experience the work in all its depth and fullness, to be forever convinced by it.

page 45

...there is a war going on between theater and modernist painting, between the theatrical and the pictorial—a war that, despite literalists' explicit rejection of modernist painting and sculpture, is not basically a matter of program and ideology but of experience, conviction, sensibility.

page 160

...the experience in question *persists in time*, and the presentment of endlessness that, I have been claiming, is central to literalist art and theory is essentially a presentment of endless or indefinite *duration*... It is though one's experience of the latter [modernist painting and sculpture] *has no duration*... because *at every moment the work itself is wholly manifest*.

page 166-167

Mel Bochner:

A work of art by its existence is a fabricated reality. As an object which is man made (or chosen), and also part of inanimate world but not natural and also not utilitarian, it has an ambiguous existence. Phenomenon are impenetrable by thought and exist non-ambiguously as they exist preceding definition. But a work of art is the product of thought which precedes the actual work... Is ambiguity inherent in the thing or is it created by ambiguous elements?

Mel Bochner (arts magazine, Nov 1966)

...it was my realization that sculpture exists in the space where the mental and the physical overlap.

Bochner

My intention is to change the work of art's function for the viewer. Art would go from being the record of someone else's perception to becoming the recognition of your own.

Bochner (1971)

**Every process presupposes a system.
Bochner (Data Magazine 2, Feb 1972)**

From Morris Kline, *Mathematics for the Nonmathematician*

In mathematics I can report no deficiency, except it be that men do not sufficiently understand the excellent use of the Pure Mathematics...
Francis Bacon

**I have often said that it is good to make the attempt, but not to use our forces: so that I would not take two steps for mathematics...
Blaise Pascal (Aug 10, 1660 in letter to Fermat)**

Mathematics then discloses by reasoning secrets which nature may never have intended to reveal.
(page 5)

More Quotes:

To sum up, what I signify by *Implex* is that by which and in virtue of which we remain contingent, conditional... I mean *we* in the gross, and *we* in the particular.
Paul Valéry (*L'idée fixe*, 1932)

Ideas are one thing and what happens another.
John Cage

To see one's own sight means visible blindness.
Robert Smithson

Control is necessary if the variables of object, light, space, body are to function. The object has not become less important. It has merely become less self-important.
Morris Louis

**The object of art is not to reproduce reality, but to create a reality of the same intensity.
Alberto Giacometti**

**I tell you, the more I think, the more I feel that there is nothing more truly artistic than to love people.
Vincent van Gogh**

It's only a guess at the beginning, and then I try to refine it.
Roy Lichtenstein

The fact that people break down and cry when confronted with my pictures shows that I can communicate those basic human emotions... the people who weep before my pictures are having the same religious experience I had when painting them. And if you say you are moved only by their color relationships then you miss the point.
Mark Rothko

Drawing is like making an expressive gesture with the advantage of permanence.
Henri Matisse

Don't look for obscure formulas or mystery in my work. It is pure joy that I offer you. Look at my sculptures until you see them. Those closest to God have seen them.
Brancusi

An empty canvas is a living wonder... far lovelier than certain pictures.

Wassily Kandinsky

Work out of your work. Don't work out of anybody else's work.
Richard Serra

The reward of a thing well done is to have done it.
Ralph Waldo Emerson

Modernity is the transitory, the fugitive, the contingent, which make up one half of art, the other being the eternal and the immutable. This transitory fugitive element, which is constantly changing, must not be despised or neglected.
Charles Baudelaire

Do not fear mistakes, there are none.
Miles Davis

You like it, that's all, whether it's a landscape or abstract. You like it. It hits you. You don't have to read it. The work of art-sculpture or painting-forces your eye..
Clement Greenberg

Nothing in art should seem accidental, not even movement.
Edgar Degas

When I am working on a problem I never think about beauty. I only think about how to solve the problem. But when I have finished, if the solution is not beautiful, I know it is wrong.
R. Buckminster Fuller

I'm not precious about my work. If you get it out into the urban field it's going to be used or misused but it'll also probably provide a way of people acknowledging what the aesthetic is about because people have to confront it every day.
Richard Serra

Art is much less important than life, but what a poor life without it.
Robert Motherwell

Art cannot be modern... Art is primordially eternal.
Egon Schiele

Life belongs to the living, and he who lives must be prepared for changes.
Goethe

Have no fear of perfection, you'll never reach it.
Salvador Dali

Reality is merely an illusion, albeit a very persistent one.
Albert Einstein

My painting is visible images which conceal nothing.. they evoke mystery and indeed when one sees one of my pictures, one asks oneself this simple question 'What does that mean'? It does not mean anything, because mystery means nothing either, it is unknowable.
Rene Magritte

Painters must speak through paint, not through words.
Hans Hofmann

Only one who devotes himself to a cause with his whole strength and soul can be a true master. For this reason mastery demands all of a person.

Albert Einstein

We are shaped and fashioned by what we love.

Goethe

All artists are vain, they long to be recognized and to leave something to posterity. They want to be loved, and at the same time they want to be free. But nobody is free.

Francis Bacon

Great art is the outward expression of an inner life in the artist.

Edward Hopper

A lady friend of mine asked me, "Well, what do you love most?" That's how I started painting money.

Andy Warhol

An artist is an artist only because of his exquisite sense of beauty, a sense which shows him intoxicating pleasures, but which at the same time implies and contains an equally exquisite sense of all deformities and all disproportions.

Charles Baudelaire

My contribution to the world is my ability to draw. I will draw as much as I can for as many people as I can for as long as I can. Drawing is still basically the same as it has been since prehistoric times. It brings together man and the world. It lives through magic.

Keith Haring

The most beautiful thing we can experience is the mysterious. It is the source of all art and science. He to whom this emotion is a stranger, who can no longer pause to wonder and stand rapt in awe, is as good as dead... his eyes are closed.

Albert Einstein

It's all autobiographical, everything is, all of it.

James Rosenquist

The search for color did not come to me from studying paintings, but from the outside.. that is from the revelation of light in nature.

Henri Matisse

It is not the language of painters but the language of nature which one should listen to, the feeling for the things themselves, for reality, is more important than the feeling for pictures.

Vincent van Gogh

To create one's own world in any of the arts takes courage.

Georgia O'Keeffe

Where I was born and where and how I have lived is unimportant. It is what I have done with where I have been that should be of interest.

Georgia O'Keeffe

I have a hatred of habit and routine. And what dogs love is just that. They like regular everything, and I don't have regular anything. I have a timetable, but no routine.

Lucian Freud

The attitude that nature is chaotic and that the artist puts order into it is a very absurd point of view, I think. All that we can hope for is to put some order into ourselves.
Willem de Kooning

If I could say it in words there would be no reason to paint.
Edward Hopper

It is only after years of preparation that the young artist should touch color.. not color used descriptively, that is, but as a means of personal expression.
Henri Matisse

As an artist I'm most concerned with what art means to me, how it defines my life, etc. And then after that, my next concern is my actions, the responsibility of my own actions in art in regard to other artists, and then to a wider range of the art audience, such as critics, museum people, collectors, etc.
Jeff Koons

The making of superior art is arduous, usually. But under Modernism the appreciation, even more than the making, of it has become more taxing, the satisfaction and exhilaration to be gotten from the best new art more hard-won.
Clement Greenberg

The whole world, as we experience it visually, comes to us through the mystic realm of color.
Hans Hofmann

I don't get into "because." When you come into a studio you see a number of works. My habit is to go to the one I like most. If you start to say "because" you get into art jargon.
Clement Greenberg

Art is to me the glorification of the human spirit, and as such it is the cultural documentation of the time in which it is produced.
Hans Hofmann

I try to be a truthful artist and I try to show a level of courage. I enjoy that. I'm a messenger.
Jeff Koons

I'm basically the idea person. I'm not physically involved in the production. I don't have the necessary abilities, so I go to the top people..
Jeff Koons

Create like a god, command like a king, work like a slave.
Constantin Brancusi

If I accept you as you are, I will make you worse. However, if I treat you as though you are what you are capable of becoming, I help you become that.
Johann Wolfgang von Goethe

I may seem to be passionately concerned with the 'hows' of representation, how you actually represent rather than 'what' or 'why'. But to me this is inevitable. The 'how' has a great effect on what we see. To say that 'what we see' is more important than 'how we see it' is to think that 'how' has been settled and fixed. When you realize this is not the case, you realize that 'how' often affects 'what' we see.
David Hockney

Whatever an artist's personal feelings are, as soon as an artist fills a certain area on the canvas or circumscribes it, he becomes historical. He acts from or upon other artists..
Willem de Kooning

The life which is not examined is not worth living.
Plato

You are lost the instant you know what the result will be.
Juan Gris

Personally, I feel that in my own work I wanted to look programmed or impersonal but I don't really believe I am being impersonal when I do it. And I don't think you could do this.

Roy Lichtenstein

To become truly immortal, a work of art must escape all human limits: logic and common sense will only interfere. But once these barriers are broken, it will enter the realms of childhood visions and dreams.

Giorgio de Chirico

You have to systematically create confusion, it sets creativity free. Everything that is contradictory creates life.

Salvador Dali

To give body and perfect form to your thought, this alone is what it is to be an artist.
Jacques-Louis David

A good painter has two main objects to paint, man and the intention of his soul. The former is easy, the latter hard as he has to represent it by the attitude and movement of the limbs.

Leonardo da Vinci

014. IMAGES

On the next pages are images I have run across in recent articles. These images pick up on something of which my work is a part.

015. STATEMENT

Part God-like transubstantiation – Part revealing the gap:

think – write – read – interpret – measure – build – experience.

Plans and objects simultaneously visible, so

Not only “what is this object”,

Nor only “how did this object come to be”,

Rather more specifically “how do these thoughts become this physical object/experience”.