

The titles *Analog Feedback Loop* and *Undead (prototype)* are conceptually literal: they *are* analog feedback from digitized source material, transposing an ethereal recorded loop in temporal motion into optically activated, physical recordings of motions circulating atop the canvases. Forms used for *Analog Feedback Loop 000 A* (monochrome index) + *Analog Feedback Loop 000 B/C/D* (suite of three paintings), -- acrylic on canvas, 50" x 32", 2013 -- are stills taken from *Undead (prototype)* -- painting-in-motion video projection, dimensions variable, 2013 -- digitally collaged together into one composition, then altered to create three more compositions for rematerialization using paint on canvas.

Painting-in-motion *Undead (prototype)* is made of real paint marks digitally collaged then sequenced into a timeline. Paint marks which make up *Undead (prototype)* and the *Analog* collages were originally small scale (programmatically executed on 9" x 12" paper and scanned), but by scaling them up and putting them into motion, details likely missed become present. Also, gestural marks get expanded into/reclaim movement, rather than remaining records of gestural movement.

The *Analog* paintings are made from real paint marks aspiring to the scale of the projection *Undead (prototype)* which they are displayed aside, in a linear order which begins (from left to right) in the middle of the series/sequence. The *Analog* paintings apply color systems to the marks using a concept of relational aesthetics: color systems at first appear literally, as signifiers; when color systems' applications are broken down into value (light/dark, warm/cool) decisions, they gain elegant complexity beyond exuberance.

I'm asking a series of questions with these paintings. What does it mean to employ and combine a video color palette with a flesh color palette? What does it mean to make large scale marks in the context of action painting, which in many cases are historically made from a collection of small marks? What does it mean to make abstract painting from a video-based abstraction, to sample oneself? How does meaning change as conditions (order of application of color, composition) change from painting to painting?

An initial observation when making the paintings was their proximity to graffiti writing in terms of the scale and speed of the marks filling the face of the canvas. This notion of graffiti is also pronounced in the context of writing-over -- the way the canvases' backgrounds are divided in a David Salle-type fashion which is then denied by an overwriting which unifies the field of the canvas. This idea of overwriting vis-a-vis covering the canvas in these marks to the edges links to the concept of all-over painting as espoused by the AbEx movement, but in an alien way, as the marks are huge, are sometimes transparent, and have gaps which reveal a painted background -- a color field-- beneath rather than the nap of the canvas itself bouncing to the foreground. The overwritten marks also appear, on first glance, to be a kind of simplified and nastily rendered Asian language character set. This is ascribed to a psychological bleed into the mark-making from personal experience of living in Singapore and the conceptual/critical influence of contemporary Japanese artist Hanae Utamura on the practice.

Some commentary on the marks in the *Analog* paintings related their brushwork to the brushmark paintings of Roy Lichtenstein. The conceptual issues behind those assertions, in addition to the surface observation, are way off the mark related to what my work is doing. Firstly, Lichtenstein was literally drawing representations of brushmarks and monumentalizing them in a memorial fashion. The brushmarks I'm using are not representations; they ARE brushmarks. Even the appearance of contour around my brushmarks comes from a gestural move -- it may be repeated, but it is never drawn / DEPICTED as in Lichtenstein. Lichtenstein was also mocking the Abstract Expressionist tendency to monumentalize their own gestural marks by making cartoons of those marks. What Lichtenstein and I have in common conceptually is in our use of scaling up the physical size of our marks; but I would argue that my scaling up is more of a desire to see where the mark, both conceptually and physically, breaks in size due to material limitations.

In this way I am attacking a perceived dominance of my video work over my painting work by attempting to match a characteristic easily produced using ethereal projection despite material limitations present in painting. Lichtenstein is satirically attacking his forebears while lamenting the fact that a fashion/style he was a primary architect of -- American Pop painting -- actually limited him ideologically from letting paint be paint. Lichtenstein stylistically railroaded himself into making PICTURES, with all the historically existential narrative damage that brings -- I am making PAINTINGS intended to be far more open system in that my work **questions** the meaning of gesture -- in the condition of our technological sublime -- when and where the dual meaning of the term digital contests, evolves, compresses and simplifies our conceptions/ perceptions of space, time and action. *Analog Feedback Loop 000 A-D*, if/when comparisons to Lichtenstein can be made so easily, fails in that regard.

Paint marks used in *Undead (prototype)* and *Analog Feedback Loop 000 A-D* are hard edged and gestural: stroky, scapy, splatter, and stripes (*AFL 000 A-D* only). In these paintings gestural marks are painted atop each other and atop a hard edged background. Gestures are mostly layered repetitions in place using 2 or three colors. They are also often repetitions of marks in one place to build up their forms. As such they are constructed gestures subject to changes in meaning as color systems are applied. **Unlike my previous paintings there is no weave or interplay between the hard edged marks and the gestural marks. The background plane was prioritized in terms of textural activation but unsuccessfully deployed in terms of interplay / interweave with the top side marks, which is necessary to confound the order of things (marks, operations, expression) when the painting is complete.** The background plane does succeed in creating optical vibration, constructed depth, mild textural interplay and a pop exuberance to the paintings in final form.

Transposition of color to marks was accomplished by combining two color systems: one of video color bars and another of flesh tones, with warm + cool blacks and whites used as monochrome extremes. *Analog Feedback Loop 000 A* (the monochrome) functions as an index as to how the painting is made from the collage and illuminates how the next three will be made using color integrated into repeated marks. When color

systems are applied literally/illustrationally, abstract forms begin to take on narrative connotations such as fingers, blood, sky and bone; actions become of severing, flight, aerial combat, explosions, spattering of blood, etc. as seen in *Analog Feedback Loop 000 B*. **Only when a conceptually non-representational system was employed to apply the color did the colors become more complex in their combinations.** In other words, color was applied using directives or commands in a non-hierarchical order (ex. light outside w/dark inside, middle outside with light inside, dark outside w/ mid-light inside; repeat). Then, paradoxically at that point, connotations from color system combinations went out of control in terms of relational aesthetics: associations became less linear and narrative, more alien and oblique if not opaque in their orientations.

Analog Feedback Loop 000 A reveals an order of 8 layers (counting background) which are applied in a fragmentary "work the entire drawing at once" manner, with less and less strokes applied to the top layers. **Every decision made impacts upon the positioning of the next set of marks within one layer and on to the next.** The after-effect of this production-wise is a loosening of the paint applications even though they are referencing a gridded print of the intermediary collage source: **tightness of marks present in the background acts as foil for the increasingly more gestural applications present toward the front.** Although a value system of decisions/application is applied to *Analog Feedback Loop 000 C + D*, results appear more spontaneously relational even though they are not.

In 2013 gestural painting may be a cliché, but TOUCH has become alien at the same time. When using video, I am limited to the texture of the wall I'm projecting on or to the skin of the monitor surface; only painting allows me freedom to make my own surfaces. Exploring the intersections, conceptual iniquities, and conflicts between these aberrational paradoxes gives me reason to make abstract painting.

Analog Feedback Loop 000 A-D and *Undead (prototype)* were exhibited in *Unpredictable Patterns of Behavior*, a group show organized by curator Ombretta Agró Andruff at Art Center South Florida's Project Space 924, Miami Beach, FL from 1 June - 28 July, 2013.