

For me art always is a specific thing in a specific place, it starts there and if it sparks the lasting impression on our imagination, memory, that's because it got its start somewhere real. Stereotypes always begin with something, in the subject and in the the object, Surfeits, Surfactants is this kind of specific place.

In the ensemble installation at Lombard Freid I have physically melded the various components of what makes sculpture for me: image, medium, object-piece, surface, armature, context-site, brokenness/repair. These components are amorphous and may premise themselves in many unexpected ways to create the syntactical solution to the work that ends up being a kind of problem but in a different way.

Like most of my works this gets its start with the materials I cull from usually industrial sources: Crystalized salts, powdered plastic, low density flake board, thermoformed siding or roofing materials, wide polypropaline stretch wrap, sprayed cement and wood putty, etc. The materials I use are always suggestive inherently or incredibly neutral when they lend themselves to diverse applications and slight changes in their handling usually result in dramatic divergences in effect. With industrial materials because of the pragmatic design decisions which go into their evolution I have a-priori both anthropomorphic scale and a kind of content which could even be thought of as worldly and pedestrian.

My priorities are with perception and necessarily then with issues of gestalt or even "illusion" which is understood to be body based, a visceral perception. Abstraction is always the language necessitated in these issues even when images or words or thinking is in a work. Effects and images carry as much weight and meaning as anything else. Image and substance, concept and percept are two sides of the same flip coin. Notice the rigorous thought in great abstract art, the important formal construction to the best conceptual works and art involving documentation or language.

Surfeits, Surfactants might be likened to entering an abstract painting but the issue of sculpture out of painting and painting out of sculpture is a mute question at this point in history. I believe rather, that there never was painting. If you read the writings of the great painters it is always about physicality, craft, the things sculpture is more involved with. I myself was a painter for many years and I know that when you look at great paintings as a painter it is differently than a "viewer" you see it with the eye of a maker. You see why it works because what was done with what, every thing is made! even "found objects." Even getting into the transparency or illusion in some painters the most "painterly" part of visuality is the physical behavior of light through those made layers of specific mixes of specific minerals and oils etc. The makers of paint only speak of the "effect" directly as the outcome of the consecutive characteristics of the way specific materials are treated. Ideas, narratives, messages have always been in our head anyway

and not in paintings.

The pragmatic legacy of painting as a tradition and successful art form with all of its artistic accomplishments speaks for itself, but that's a separate issue to my mind. That's the same kind of evolutionary success that I demand from the materials I use in my sculptures but it's not anything special, it's not a replacement for any great work of art, it doesn't guarantee anything.

The work for me really has no beginning or end, it has to be the product of editing but it's the system property of sculptural issues I'm involved with. What is an idea? what is a good idea executed badly? or vice versa, what is too specific, too general, broken, the modus operandi can be entered in a sense. It becomes relative at a certain point, almost anything seems a possibility, and pieces of the same materials can contradict the premises and arguments of another example of them.

There are visual and structurally surprising ways that pieces can work themselves out. Some act more as props for other pieces, and others as righteous and autonomous enigmas some seem to be documents of themselves, some demand to be multiples, others to be left alone as forever the sole example in my work. I have never thought it necessary to make all the pieces that one good fertile piece suggests for its future, one instance is enough. If I can see this in that first piece, then you're seeing it, this isn't the patent office. Art books cause the problem of making it seem like the first version of something only is good because of the later versions of the idea.

My art has to be the thing itself, but the thing itself depends. If a work is partially about gravity and you take an elevator ride up to go see it on some cheap plywood floor it's not the same piece as it would be on the street level. I need to use every means at my disposal to get to that point and shed the rest of the expectations and baggage of "art viewing," whether I have to be tricky or slow or break things with the viewer, whatever it takes. It usually has to be unexpected in some way to do that, and an artist has to be free to be unexpected. Obviously a lot of it has to do with how to keep opening that up, I have nothing inherently against the programmatic in an art practice if it's complex enough, it ends up being about the same thing. Great minimalist art is as complex as the most bizarre Jean Tinguely or Pollack, I firmly believe that, it's always a kind of equation to be formulated by a certain premise that keeps opening up, a work for me ends up being a kind of problem different but of course related to the problem which started it, for me this is just a radical view of formalism and perception, qualia.

Copyright 1995 Paul Dickerson