

Donald here are my answers. Call me if any need clarification.

1. The centrally placed figure serves a number of purposes for me. Composition becomes a given and therefore I can concentrate on the painting of the image. It also allows me to take apart the figure to a far greater degree while still retaining a readable sense of it. Eliminating composition in this way I can frustrate as much as possible design aesthetics.

2. Yes, but only time combined with labour. Time and labour are part of the subject of the work. Working in series comes from my seeing the work as having a documentary function, a recording of a kind of typology. But I don't think this is visible in the work itself it is really only a way for me to enter into and think about painting.

3. I would hope it would be someone like Don DeLillo who can speak about the coincidental and fragmentary nature of life in the late 20th Century but connects all those contradictions and fragments in a way that is coherent without pretending to be definitive.

4. Yes I think there is eroticism in the paintings. The eroticism is variously disguised as mortality, contingency and decay.

5. Well I would like something like "Penetration" by The Stooges to leak out but I don't think it would. What would leak out would probably be something like Sylvestre Revueltas or Penderecki's music in the 60's and 70's.

6. That would depend on whose painting and what language.

7. I think Rothko's work has a sense of longing or yearning in it that could be termed spiritual. Some people are more gloomy than others but I don't think gloom is a sign of spirituality.

8. If there is an irreducible sign it would be carnality.

9. I don't know.

10. Necessity causes me to experiment till I recognize one of my paintings. I think my paintings are images on the edge of my consciousness and all the marks I make are mnemonic devices to help me remember the image. The painting is finished when I recognize it.