

Catagorical Etymology, etymology means form and shape over a period of time, the research and history involved in this.

Artifice is our demand that we perceive the forming of a thing in it. It participates of an apriori catagory of this. If something isn't a thing we do not expect nor demand that artifice be present.

Color has to have a sense of bodyness. It must feed in a sense. Stella never does this but for the very early works.

Crit. "It doesn't feed." "THAT doesn't feed."

What these elements bring with them. if touching a solvent that bonds with your hand how do you separate the solvent from the stickyness when you are describing it? the same solvent wouldn't be sticky somewhere else. We always use a standard when we measure things. A general code, so much of this means that, everytime this happens that means this. etc. But expressionary theory says that we empathize with the thing we could describe because we have an analogous experience with this subject. You are what you eat, in a sense.

Its all about color and scale

The reason it's so hard to make a piece sound like the composer i.e. Monk, Hendrix, Parker, etc. is that the composition was made through the player himself. In otherwords the structure of the composition also is an aspect of the player, it is an investment in the composition of the piece. The better the piece the more this occurs and the harder it is to duplicate.

Another way to look at it is that since there are things so small and specific to a players natural style that make it up and since these things are in part responsible for the generation of the composition they are not in the composition in notes or in easily recognizable sounds even. That is the part of art that goes beyond catagory and is metaphysical or at least unreadable.

Perception isn't perception. This is because it is what we call a construction or apparatus of memory which forms a complex that represents and conveys experience via the functions of memory.

The begining of the problem of seeing was not a problem. They were stacking rocks on the beach before they were makings paintings in Lascaux. The other thing is that It takes an artist to see art.

I think Joseph Beuys was correct in two very important ways; one that everyone is an artist. The proof of which is that everyone who "isn't an artist" but can "see" art correctly is this. Two, that we can take this principal and foster it to the degree that it re polarises the existing infrastructures of culture i.e. economics, industry, politics, via the media mediums.

It's misleading to use the word perception at times. Aprehension might be better.

The only true abstraction is the shadow of structure.

All real sculpture is transparent.

Paint is just misleading, I'm not anti-paint.

Descarte is being bashed these days. But few of these writers have read Descartes. His notion of thought is indeed a notion of aprehension, he never excludes the extention of mind, via body based thought and perception.

Judd speaks about existence, this is telling.

Calder and Arp are underrated as sculptors.

Crit. That artwork is like a trial, rather than the event that brought it about. But ironically it is by a kind of trial that we can only be sure of something, or by waiting to see what it does, whether it effects.

Good art is effective art. What's effective both changes, and does not change.

I challenge anyone to find an artist who's work is existential, experientially humane and fundamentally cannot draw or the inverse.

Bring.

Art might just be the artificial concentration of nature by an artist. Equivocal things to it exist in nature but they're not effective, they don't demonstrate in the same way because these things aren't mediated by the body of the artist. It's just a point of specification and focus.

Without Hoffman no Pollack, unfortunately. Without Duchamp no Beuys, without Beuys and Duchamp no Johns or Rauchenberg, without these no Nauman. Without Oldenburg and Westerman no Artschwager. It becomes pointless to pursue sources.

Again, as soon as you have a sign, you have the physical or phenomenal fact of the sign, and then so the content of that. Take for instance, a symbol, its existence precludes the absence of it in some medium, whether the medium of imagination, mark on paper, vague gestalt, impressionistic anecdote, etc. Because of this existence the "format" or "medium" it is constructed by has its existence too. Therefore we a priori include the content of this medium in its designation or baggage if you will, to some degree.

Take the example of a painted sign with some character on it. Just by virtue of having a sign physically there (wherever) we include in our "reading" of it the authoritative facts that some one made it, that it has been maintained (we recognize that it is of a certain age), that its message shows us whether the motive to make it and maintain it and place it are nervous things to do or justifiable things to do or greedy etc. all these things and many

more things in a sense are preloaded into the actual lettered character or words. If they weren't loaded into the message we would dismiss the message altogether as we do a dictionary, or sack of sign makers letters.

Since the subjective is

The tradition of complexity in visual art painting and sculpture has its root in the pragmatic design of memory. Memory insists that large varieties or menus to make choices of or selections of suitable for making a memory or representing some impetus lie in their storage in a compact and efficient way. Another words, complexity being the lucid yet contrasting coexistence of alternate premises even contradictory premises in the same envelope is a fundamental structure of memory, perception systems, and thus visual art for pragmatic reasons.

May/18/95, ran into a girl on the L train wearing a pipe clamp on her finger. I smiled and explained why to her, saying, I smiled because when I was seven or eight years old I took one of those from a hardware store, and wore it for about two years. Later I recalled getting stuck under the refrigerator with it on.

Deep structure being always outside of things. Inherent structure meaning this. Nothing being inherent in the inside sense, but always in the inherent external sense. This being a more accurate definition for what's "concrete," - material.

Check Smithsonian on this.

I do notice a tendency when artists seem to jump on bandwagons thinking that the movement will be a part of history, to be associated with that.

People are excited to be in group shows in hardware stores. When I was a boy, I used to look at the things in hardware stores as art. etc. I'm thirty three, why would I

want to go celebrate that in the silly way that puts "art works" in the hardware store.

Most of the stuff in hardware stores is better than art will ever be. Duchamp via Picabia saw this.

Some of the most exciting things to me when I was a boy were the pipe threaders, chain wrenches, pipe clamps, soldering guns, double headed nails, bullets and shotgun shells, guns, etc.

The female instinct to "bring people together" is similar to the instinct in sculpture or other arts activities to make things that go somewhere. On a small level even using elements that go somewhere. How this relates to the Foucault understanding that problems are what drives culture.

What's the thing women speak of about feeling good to have so and so departed's clothes in their closet? I've never heard a man speak this way.

So many pieces have to do with the mousetrap

Next time somebody walks in and says: have you seen the work of so and so? I'll say No, but I've seen the work of, ... and name some artists who I'm really interested in and influenced by, who that named artist couldn't hold a candle to.

There's that thing when the viewer hasn't anything to say that's really abstract and they try to get an angle on the piece, demean it by saying some thing like - is that some kind of special glass? or, You didn't know that it would do that, come out that way did you? And you pick up on the motive right away, one common come back is to go above or below the scale or level of what their saying. If they say you didn't know it would come out that way you say, I spent thirty thousand dollars on that material and thought about it for five years and all the pieces have the effect of... because the chemical molecular com-

ponents of the material are C2 OH3 etc. with a molecular weight of...

Or you go above the head of the angle they have, saying, Everything in the universe is thermoformed. or given the proper venue I would be able to do it like such and such.

A great piece would be a coil of five foot heavy hardware cloth, with mole traps shoved into it variously.

For me to say: there are things I can talk to Dan about that I cannot talk to anyone else about with isn't only to say that we will talk about certain different subjects but mainly to say that we will use a different kind of talking, a different form, and that will allow or form only certain subjects, and be a kind of subject of its own.

The reason a Duchamp is so good even though the original doesn't exist anywhere and there are only reproductions of remakes available is that he did make one, and that one was at the right time, and had a strong deep structure - the look of the idea inter-connects to larger issues further sources, etc. Take an Oppenheim for instance, if you look at one of his in a catalogue or something, an early work or mid work it may look about as good reproduced, but when you spend the time thinking about the piece, or really get to see it somewhere it doesn't hold up physically or intellectually, it's not as generative, provocative, enigmatic, instructive, etc. etc. It all adds up it all goes together in that.

There's also the dialectic Duchamp has to History, the other work that's out there, done, he understands this deeper in a formal sense than Oppenheim for instance, and pop issues, and perception, etc. the gestalt rolls it into one of course.

So this is how you can explain how there can be a photo document of a sculpture and the sculpture doesn't exist and the photo is only documentary, not a "great

photo" and refer to the "sculpture" as if it exists, critique it comparatively etc. this distance this never never land is always a part of perception, even in the "presence" of a sculpture etc.

One can say that a piece of art is a sum of what holds it together. By this I mean that when a piece is "finished" it is that which has been left alone, that which works and is important to itself, therefor the components are in actuality holding the thing together. That's a kind of structure too, image too. Aesthetics becomes engineering. Engineering is information. Information is code too, but becomes abstract. etc.

Yes sculpture has to do with puzzles, and humor. I recall impressing Miles one day when helping him and his girlfriend place things into their storage locker, condensing really well and that. And saying well, I'm just good at puzzles.

Morris really just did big Duchamp's, took his kind of historical and removed conceptual approach and did it to other genres of sculpture and art. His failing is the attention he pays to current art movements. Duchamp never cared about that. The other main problem is that he really cannot draw and wasn't operating in a deep structural way like Smithson was so that it didn't matter whether he could draw or not.

The point is that any object or image,(documentation) is a compilation of readings, and images. Any. So it becomes moot to talk of a purity of image or object, information, symbol vs. form image, structure etc. The issue becomes cobbled, *representation*, what is the net effect of these contradictory components, and it always is generalized, juried, multiple depending on point of view, etc. In an interview Chuck Close speaks of a painting always being more than what it is. This is absurd. A thing is always what it is and what it isn't

image there is the component of image in every "form"- "object", etc. He makes the purist assumption.

It's so not about that.

Structure is referenced always. What it is, really is an illusion. For convenience sake it is the interrelationship of forms and systems, phenomenologies etc. but even that disappears in good art. But it is referenced. Good art is a radical kind of structure. Wittkenstien put math back into Philosophy, this has something to do with it, Edelman too.

Part of the problem is that these guys find one good idea, and then they get programmatic about it. Replicate it over and over. The work I'm doing (not *My* work) is about the impossibility of doing this. Picasso really preceded Duchamp in doing this.

Touching the different poles of expression. To cite the example of music is always an easy way to illustrate how patterns can become meaningful and experiential, art. Info theory.

Of course the mock up or proposal can be an emotional state and a strong finished work. It just depends. Tiling besides, manifold, or, multiplicity. Plateaus.

One of the obvious things about all the evolution and development is that it suggests to me that that is where meaning or content lie. In their deep structure, in the sense that it can be discussed in juried assesement only. Somehow the problems of this deep structure are out there, symptoms are observable only, inflections, trails, indexes.

When I spoke of the one instance "piece" or idea in 1990 It was by itself. That we can see-imagine-project the rest, so it is unnecessary to do the rest. The degree to which the instances of a thing dictate what

art that is projected, that is participating in evolution and development in a different way.

You know when a person says some comment, and you really know they were thinking about it for a very long time? They really developed it, and it really means something to them. That's one of the things a piece should be.

So you've reduced art to being a tool, or an organism. Then what if you get a mismatched one, a mutation of that design etc. is it necessarily art. No. It may be one of the furthest things from it - straight permutation. Stereotypes and Allegories.

Often times its just gun metal.

There you go, Andre never shows you that there's gun metal, and then can't go even beyond that to show that that's only a portion of what it's about anyway.

A great piece of writing can never hide the fact of whether or not it is *saying* anything. Inclusive of the fact of it's being concrete word writing, or allegory, etc.

The thing is that it is quite possible that it's a question of whether or not we can perceive or read/perceive evolution in an object. Can it be discriminated apart from it's development or formation? If not, do we project evolutionary readings or perceive them despite this fact, onto the object? It is possible to imagine that we learn the codes of this and have pre-learned them to be able to do this?

Isn't the primary metaphore model for us the model of life? Therefore death, and development and evolution? And isn't it a primary aspect of the world? Nature, culture, technology? etc. Therefore isn't it the primary procedure? The platform that makes all things technological.

Then the question of how broad a definition on can bring to what is technology.

If high tech is a relative term to a culture, i.e. a steam engine is no longer high tech, then isn't the avant guard likewise? Impressionism is no longer avant guard. And therefore isn't that the argument that art doesn't need to be avant guard in the sense that that term suggests to be unique and an important even a revolutionary contribution? Schivelbush shows that evolution isn't linear, that it leapfrogs, and backtracks when we are speaking of culture and technology at least, and this too can illuminate the way the real time art history plays out.

And getting back to the point I was making about art not being required to participate in the avant guard to be revolutionary. The issue with this is of readability, in other words accessibility, even pragmatics, what does it effect ultimately. The driving principal of representation being a detonation. [sic] Revolutionary or effective art always just the procedure of a new problem.

The procedure of a new problem.

An art work is always the intended scale at which the procedure of a problem is represented.

Language, even reflective thought is ill equipped to participate in the complex make up of things. Art forms a conduit between the viewer and work which solves this problem, itself being of a language which works in the ambiguities and complexities, but ushering, even formed to a collaborating with the viewer.

Originality is so puzzling, what is, but isn't, what isn't but is.

The degree to which hope is represented in a thing - focus - the quality rule. Specificity. Hope is a future unspecified with a positive outcome.

Not to mention complexity. Which Bergson names heterogeneity, or magnatude, in -

the sense of increasing the volume of an instrument but of adding more varieties of instrument as in an orchestra.

The problem of the natural tendency to quantify instead of qualitatively understand, is central to Bergson. It is our natural method to take what effects us differently than something else and notice that it affects us in a certain way, seeing this leads us to use this information as a kind of measurement. Whereas the true nature of the thing which affects us is really what's usually the active factor, of course. A kind of holistic empathetic understanding is itself made up of many many of these kinds of measured affective assessments but is at such a degree of participation, that resonance and a mediumistic result occur.

Counting, numbers may be the way that thought and perception lead to language originally. Bergson shows that numbers are abstract completely, and always represent convention in space discontinuously.

Point being that most art also follows these cues, assumptions of determinism, and associationism. The best writing on art is that points out the unverbally unspatial and unmeasurable aspects of art. That shows that ex post facto is misleading. That things change when different conscious subjects are exposed to them.

That the consciousness (it is misleading to use the word mind) readies the world of experiences and sensations for language by interpreting these experiences and sensations via convention, measure, analyses, symbol, and through the context of objecthood - therefor assuming space to locate it within is also a preparation for the social. The social being the ballast of the human species in general.

Once again it becomes an issue of pragmatics. Encryption for social currency, representation for a "reality" that isn't real.

The maintenance of duration, the real flow and participation with the organism of life, to serve no motivated ends, becomes an uncommon, even "anti social" stigma. Yet what is needed by the public, by the politic, etc.

To be instructive on these matters would be responsible.

A great example would be the one of scanning an image into a computer with three dimensional software. The interesting fact is that you cannot distort or rotate it unless it has been built from scratch, or that information has been generalized and encoded in some other matchable repository. This is a great way to show that things must occur from the inside, and take time, that to segment the scanned image and animate it by moving the collaged segments isn't the same, doesn't have the mass of information that the developmental way has at its disposal. Though both methods are analogous to methods of the mind, and to consciousness, one makeshift, and one original. This relates to history, and to creativity, and to source path goal schemas. But also to the problems of culture, image, capitalism, etc.

This also has telling explanation to the methods of perception and gestalt, holism, and assemblage, or collage, etc. Again, everything is made, we pick up quickly the method it was made by, slick hands off stamped out, or cultured one of a kind, patchworked, coopted, etc. All have their appropriate psychological states, stereotypes, assumptions built in, projections built in, scenarios built in, etc. Our various histories interpret them this way or that.

D.D's. Oquossic, Maine, 1995, 7/9

Paint was developed to imitate, to create a convincing illusion of nature, reality. It was practical, and was plastic, portable, lightfast, lasting. Ironically paint is seductive for this reason. High tech, in a sense. If it went through development and desi

gn evolution. It carried the M.O. that went into it. This explains the seduction of it, it is one of the first large products of simulation. One of the first major simulacral systems, therefore a certain technological buzz goes with it wherever it appears quite removed from what it is doing in any particular illusionary way, as in a rendering or spacial representation, realistic or abstract. Therefore the misconceptions and misleading aspects of paint in sculpture and in the more process oriented paintings.

Very interesting to think again about the methods of Ramond Rousell. Especially in light of tautology and image manufacture, showing that infact the most bizzare things always come out of the same thing split or metamorphosed - tautology. Taking for example two versions of a line in having them poetically rhyme and be equivilants and then making them be the beginning and end of a book, perhaps taking one of the concepts of the first sentence and changing it to make it the second to last etc. Symmetry again.

Symmetry and backwardness. And Rousell claims his deepest interest in Jules Verne.

No coincidence he was later a specialist in chess, like Duchamp, reviews of plays he did were published in surrealist magazines. Picabia, Duchamp borrowed, heavily.

Insight that Duchamp initiated the Rose Selavy works as a way to solve the misleading messages the other Surrealists were sending with their works involving the female body as creature and sexual and subconscious talisman. Duchamp takes it to heart and bares the responsibility showing that he the elder spokesman of Surrealism and Dada will be one with it. This results in maintaining the respect and authority of the female things the surrealists were commenting on without objectifying them.

The key to much of the problems I am presently working on is the effect of second party conveyance. In other words when something is represented it often is more striking or intriguing when a party other than the object itself does the conveying. This because there is an implicit sponsorship and thus value attributed by this act. A note is drawn.

Conceptual art is always like writing a semblance of symbols, it is signalled by a set of codes. Thus being so it must be held to its form - it participates in a form therefore cannot escape its grammer and syntax. This being the case the aesthetic editing, the equivilants of font printing quality and of course style or voice are imminent as in any form or format. If one can discern the differences of quality among several instances of the artists work then one must discern the admittance of syntax differences, grammar differences, style differences and their impact on the meaning of the work, therefore the work also has experience.

Even if my story is only told by a freind who I told it to then it is variously influenced concretely by who that freind is, where they tell it, how, and of course who they tell it to, what that person had for breakfast. Tie always goes to the gene pool.

Juried asesment.

If I show you how I make it its A kind of negative camoflage or negative contrast. It will slow

Picasso's Quote, who are all these people who understand painting but yet are not painters?

The pile is the oldest form of organization

earlier than anything else, I am working presently on the most future form of organization.