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Looks for the underlying constraints whose material, technological, and procedural potentials have been dismissed by interpretational conventions.

??

I’m saying that these are not painted wood panels. I’m saying that they are sculptures made from a “new” or unique material manufactured for the purpose of making these sculptures. I’m asking the viewer to consider if that is true. Are these woven strings in fact different than a sheet of plywood with paint on it?

Are they cut up lumber or folded space?

What to call them? I call them quilts. Are they painted wood panels or quilts? Is it a pleat, a dart or a mixed media collage?

How far can this comparison go before the answer is obvious? Is the comparison even justified?

These are sculptures of folder space made from wooden quilts. These are paintings of digital textiles. These are the combination of string into fabric. This fabric will be folded. This fabric is representing a simple fold in space. What is the edge of folded space. How does space bend , what does a fold look like ? A fold looks like quilted wood sawn in half and tied together with stitches of rope. That’s how space can fold. Is this a painting cut into pieces or is this a fold in space, represented in sculpture?

Nearly anything cutup and weaved back together will look interesting. So, why even paint? To prove that bad paintings look good cut up. Actually no, that’s not true. It take a good material to work with. It takes may of the approaches found in a good craftsmanship. Once the machine is setup, good materials come to light, but a weave is not a guarantee for good materials. I could fold paper, but that doesn’t challenge the notion of what is a fold. Not what is fabric, but what is a fold in space.

I did not care for the binary numbers. I enjoy the weave patterns of Posslets, but they do not represent the type of strings that I’m using. My strings are different and therefore my loom produces different types of materials then other looms.

This material has it’s own logic, it’s own way to form. How do we define materiality? Can you make matter? Using another process will get you a different material or maybe not even a material at all.

The process for this material strats with strings. Strings of intergers passed through a special loom. The loom drafts the blueprint for a weave. A way to tie together two separate elements, or objects. Using this blueprint we weave one item into another item. The result, like tying string into a net, is a new material with new possibilities.

What are the possibilities of this new type of quilt, the once wood and now fabric material? It folds. It quilts. It’s not that the quality of the wood is missing, it’s that by working one type of material a new one emerges and this allows for new interpretations and explorations. The fold for instance, something more common in textiles and dress-making, what does that look like in the material that acts between a board and a cloth. If we image a fold in space why imagine cloth? The mathematical representation would not need the analogy, it’s just the transformation of coordination space. If space was folded what would hold it in place? String?

Should I just fold a painting? Should I just fold black on black. Like folded Frank Stella? Does it matter what I fold. I guess I might try folding nothing. I’m thinking I need to produce more sculptures to 1) demonstrate my argument about materialality and to stay away from comparisons to painting. 2) I want to create environments with this new material and I want to demonstrate my intention to go that path.

I’m not folding construction materials. I’m not folding paintings. I creating a material to demonstrate a fold in space. I’m perfectly will to allow these works to appear as they may to others, but for me in all seriousness I’m working to create expressiveness in space with a material made from a studio manufacturing process.

I am purposely exploring new materials that are low energy. I do not think art needs to be judged in any certain political manner, I do however believe that materials carry the politics of how they are made. We can measure in calories the energy it takes for a person to complete work. And we can measure that same energy it takes for machines to do. Machines use more energy, lots more energy. They are very ineffective (I actually should verify this, but pretty sure it accurate). So by taking common materials and tooling them by hand I do, via my material express the idea that a great many people could access this material. If an artist desired to create things with materials of higher energy, or have the work built with systems of higher energy, I personally believe there remains a certain message that either that artist believes he or she is above the need for sustainability or they don’t care or they are simply part of the era of 20th centaury and before that maintained a concept of unlimited nature resources, even when they are by nature scare. I do not promote an unbounded technology just because it would be cool if that where the case.