

Dear Hudson,

Feb/29/96

Thanks for the note back. I have always respected the spirit with which you tell it as you saw it, and that then you actually take the time to get it to the people involved. You know in '89 I think you wrote me an encouraging note to respond to some slides I left, then I brought in a few small relief pieces of which you said- "The third element, I don't see it in this work, but the slides in the lower part are mysterious and intriguing."

You were right in noticing that I found it odd that you didn't have a comment. I've noticed that you are usually concise and reticent but I did feel that this was different somehow. But it seems like you weren't upset by the work even in terms of dislike, nor bored, I mean you must have seen the extent of slowness in it, specificity, the experiential in it. The things partake in a kind of field theory; pointillism, like coral can be shell like, or dappled like Monet, structured like Cezanne. The thing with me and the work is that I believe that wonder and these existential things that can come out of abstract work is synthetic ultimately. I mean, my project as I see it is that this market economy has realized an indoctrination of vacuity - this is of course relative - onto the public. The jobs people have these days, the quality of life no longer consists in truly practicing experience, skill, perception, the meaning in these things is no longer needed. The down side of it is that this animal that we are needs these things, so being this way for too long makes people and this world out of it. Vacuity, repression, jaded, all the cliches.

Psychology can be engineered into materials to manipulate them, fake them out. B.M.W. dashboards for dignified safety, toys to feel like toys etc. I never saw space in paintings i.e. push pull, flat, cubist, etc. I only always saw different psychologies between the forms how they were revealed but inseparably from the way this revealing occurred is the feeling of it.

I was trained as a craftsman so I don't want to get craft in it in the normal way, I was a painter for years so I want to make sculpture that shows that sculpture can be a colorist thing and with light. Freud said that sometimes it's just a cigar and I show in the work that its the degree to which a cigar is a cigar - I mean a bolt in a Ryman functions pragmatically and rationally and formally, but I noticed early that the image

of the bolt can be just as "structural" and all three kinds can be in the same piece if the piece works. For me the work really is like Bergson meets Studs Terkel or Gaudi and Andre. Icons are made up of "fields" they are consecutive to the ends of each other, Hess got into it this way, Beuys.

How can formalism be radical? Radical compromise, I mean extreme specificity and generalization in the same piece. This occurs seldom, there no reason its less likely than anything else in art. I mean most species in the plant and animal kingdom come about through these designed in contents which if your were to isolate them would present themselves as contradicting each other. How can different motives make for each other in the same functioning form.

Ambiguity has to do with a lot of it for me, its how more can come of less its the foundation for how pieces can go out and connect to more. Masterpieces always connect to more, and more. You come back and you see it differently again and again, you see different things. You go and see it with another person and you see it differently too. This basically is just complexity, the whole heterogeneity thing with Picasso, Duchamp, Beuys, Smithson, Hess, Nauman, all the rest is just more of this complexity. Evolution and Development. How to deal with series, with how to figure out avoiding the programmatic and the anti-programmatic simultaneously.

I'm really a blue collar boy at heart but a geometrician, a believer in the perception of third world, elements are relative. White boxes are pragmatic, painting never really existed it was just pragmatic. We just perceive low relief frontal objects as views, we perceive them with different parts of the brain than we use for objects we think we can walk around. How often does the intrigue of the back of the Velasques' pop into your mind when you look at it.

Insects show how symmetry is least about matching sides. Psychology by geometry. Carcasses, they're structural like vessels, molds to cast - viscera, they're actually images of the animal, supports for skin, surface - metonym. Living icon through means to making it up in and of itself. Premises premises, syntax. blood and guts syntax. Bataille or Derrida - Toutoula, the plumber. Westerman just worked and didn't have to worry about these things though he knew. Ivan Albright and Gaudi- popular mechanics. Is Dylan Thomas *really* horizontal to her vertical - to Emily Dickinson?

Dekooning used to read philosophy every day and never said a word about his work leaving that purposefully to the talent he surrounded himself with. No comment.

It's.

p.d. - what about the Cantos?