The subject of this body of work is the relationship, not only to painterly traditions but also to the construction of its history, its limits and boundaries; the theoretical conventions and philosophical mediations that enact upon the perception of the visual image. Aligned with this, the aspirations entangled within visual determinations, and how the image does not always add up in a way we might suppose.

Each series of works appear to announce their own unique posture in regard to the image, painting and appropriation.

It is not always clear what is at stake in this. Is it a case of cultural exhaustion; a reminder of the speeds in which culture circulates around itself, devouring the possibility of extension as it does so, or a reminder of the endlessness of signification embedded in these works and the potential for a release of the image cast anew?

In a time when globalist populist politics and the legacies of a post-structuralist century have buried agency, and faced with the predations of post-modernisms's erasure of the subject, a once critical surrealism has lost its potency within late modernity due to the proliferation of the use of the found object or appropriated image, having become the normative off-white noise of the advertising world. Closing the gap between art and life could now be read as a secret manifesto of nihilism, and it is against this that these works struggle to find another trajectory, not in an attempt to resurrect lost meanings lodged within tradition, but they do attempt to unpick the ruins of various traditions in order to militate against the snatches of vision that constitute the spectacle of art.

What are the various vectors opened between the memory image, the repetition of this image within the present and the leap into an unmarked future?

How can 'that' time become 'this' time? Can such work be knowing and telling at the same time or can it both show and say? Art conceives of anticipated futures but also of pasts as they never were; on the one hand, an idealised notion rooted in nostalgia and assumed to be recoverable and its counterpoint, a more creative notion that the representation of the past is in fact something new which dialogues with it - fact and fiction. This might imply that art exercises a stubborn disavowal of the time it actually exists in or is a perpetual desire for that which is other than the time we are in.
As an art we are given over to such insoluble tensions, and this is where the impulse of the work hovers, around a relationship to borderlines that order such things as the sensible and intelligible, language and image, method and aporia, and so on.

What is offered on the surface is an art that promise the co-extensivity of the two orders, but instead delivers the tensions of their workings and the uncertainty of both, as though both orders are being corrupted. Through a disruption and delimitation of such boundaries, this in turn hints at a confrontation or frustration with the impossibility of transparency which also acts as a motor force for their becoming in the first place.

While we might readily wish to grasp hold of a naming process - is this a case of neo-romanticism, allegorical painting, post-surrealism, post-avant garde revisionism, or a trace of all of these things? - we are reminded that concepts are in part defined by what is exterior to them, namely the non-conceptual objects from which they arose, and as such, a painting can never be subsumed by the concept. What is tested in this body of work is the distress that such a proposition might arise in the first place. Ideation is the means of securing distance and distance is the means of securing a system that in turn provides the rule or measure. It should be noted that the working process is not borne out of method, but rather plays with the logic that desires or rests on the possibility of a credible authoritative method, and tropes of ambiguity and the perpetual 'instability of the image' over invention, containing some of its gestures in order to enact a relationship and/or expose to the dangers it wards against. Something akin to a self-aware pluralism takes shape. A sign, if you like, of a subversion on my own working procedures; of thinking doubling-back, folded in on itself, marking the exhibited traits with such inscriptive movement, scrutinising its condition of signifying.

Compiling lists might serve as evanescent records of thoughts passed over, but they might be the means of finding another trajectory. As opposed to this schema we are presented with methods unravelling and the shortfalls of such coded devices of exposure; a scattering of points that illuminate latent interior traces, sedimentations of the past, and the re-animation of forgotten vectors all in search of particularity, moving towards form and intelligibility at once encoded and supplementary. To pursue this sense of touching upon we might have a border region in which the imagination provides that momentary opening, a form of bliss in which vapour appears to dissolve boundary.

Defamiliarisation together with a respect and warmth for the achievements of the past are finally what characterise the actual works themselves. The past and present
perception, the unstable essentiality of the classical reference point we thought we knew is transformed into the becoming of re-engagement. Critical thought and historical craft/painterly practice seem to cross over to somewhere else, elusively freed from their mutually alien worlds. That is because antimony is dissolved in the best practices of true dialectic. We end up somewhere else than could have been anticipated in the polar contradiction, in the static play and irony of paradox. To be historically orientated is to be truly contemporary. In facing the delirium of contemporary reality, the fashionability and ubiquity of the heterogeneous, to distance oneself is to be more fully present. In the white noise, there is still a small voice.