

Heterutopia

In my works, I use modernist means to a postmodern end. How can this be understood?

The use of modernist means serves me to push through to an extreme and to open the view for a residuum through this extreme. Attention should be paid to the fact that these modernist means are within the limitations of the respective discipline, but are in a reductionist way at the limits of this discipline. Beyond this limit is the transition of painting to sculpture (for example) as a postmodern end. The postmodern end is antireductionist and goes beyond the modernist scope.

The modernist part of my works is applying something universal without exposing the result to a postmodern indifference. The utopia of modernism is kept in check by the heterotopia of the postmodern and vice versa, but without checkmating each other. This whole system is for the game being played, not for the game being won. It is an oscillating and ambivalent balancing act between modernism and the postmodern.

The parallel/intertwining of the disciplines shows the equi-validity without falling prey to indifference. Being equal without equalizing. And being equal, not identical. It remains a matter of perspective that you occupy. But each discipline has its own and equal right to coexist with the other.

Now, it should be clear that the position I would like to occupy is between modernism and the postmodern. While modernism is assigned to utopia, in the postmodern this utopia gave way to heterotopias. The utopias of subject, truth and freedom became less important in heterotopias: they moulder and fragment. I want to get something out of both topoi without losing something to them and from them. I will refer to this in-between-position that I described as an oscillation between modernism and the postmodern as "Heterutopia/s" and my works as "heterutopian works". The heterutopian of my works is an absurd momentum in transition from modernism to the postmodern. This absurd momentum is the freedom of choice to which I am damned and for which I have to bear responsibility as a humanist.

But in the aesthetic sphere of my works, the decision is an easy one: the perspective that I am able to withdraw from or revise anytime I want. My artworks are attempts of visions, on which you can practice revision.

The heterutopian being is an unavoidable minimum of being. This minimum of being is to be located between the universal being and the residual being. The residual being is always in an opaque conflict with the universal being: this is the conflict that modernism and the postmodern culminates in. I try to transfer this conflict into a dialogue by showing as an artist that modernism and the postmodern are not incommensurable.