

Alexis:

.....Lately you have been posting 3D animations (I presume in Blender) that I find delightful and fascinating...I feel that there is a convergence happening here and would very much like to hear more regarding your thoughts.

Me:

.....The inspiration of these practices came from my daily life, my memories, even from news. Therefore, some idea of them may not through rigorous study, they are not conveying deep meaning or thoughts neither. Sometimes I am just trying to have fun. I'd be happy if someone thought my animations are hilarious or funny. I agreed with Baldessari's thought about making interesting works.

Alexis:

.....Very interesting, it makes me think how ephemeral moving images are, how will they survive into the future? Perhaps they are more for a given moment, like a performance. You mention about having fun, I find that often my best work comes spontaneous, from the subconscious, the result of what has gone before catalysed by something new. You say that the work do not convey deep meaning, I would disagree. I think they hold a lot of undisclosed promise. Maybe you think they are not important because they are not complex?

Baldessari is influential but I must say, I do not know much about him. Not making boring art appears obvious but it is not easy. What is boring for one is interesting for another. If an artist is bored with their art, it is time to change.

I like your idea of having fun. To not take things too serious is one way of loosening up and allowing the inner self to emerge through work rather than being encased in what one feels should be.

Me:

Thanks for your advice. I would like to use some elements of these gifs to assemble an animation. It is a good question about the timing of moving image, they are not as long as film, but some of them leave me an much more impression than film. I think it is moving fast in digital area, but one advantage of them is convenience and easy to keep and spread. But yes, I would prefer my work to be a accomplished animation rather than a short moving image.

In fact, I don't regard these practices as not important, on the contrary, I like these kind of strange thoughts, they contain my thinking in daily life and they are telling who I am, what do I like. What I mean is some of them may be only meaningful for me. For instance, the head one, it was showing my mood and condition. it also connected with Chinese internet term. Therefore people in different culture may not understand it. Anyway the whole meaning for this gif is to show "I'm upset". It might be meaningless for viewers. About Baldessari, I have been thinking of the relationship between 'interesting' and 'meaning' in art. I think he is a good explanation for me.

I really agree with you about the subconscious idea could tell what you really want. And I didn't realize that I used organics as objects so frequently. It is also another purpose for these daily practices plan - to find what I really want to do.

Alexis:

When you say that the short animations leave more of an impression than film, why do you think that is? I feel that a simple animation is like a moving logo, it is easy to remember and the meaning is not one dependent on sequential narrative. In fact, there is no narrative in your short animations, only meaning. That is why, if short animations were shown together on separate screens, a narrative of sorts would emerge from each instant. The important thing here might be how the animations are sequenced so one causes a thought in another.

You say that your animations are 'strange' thoughts containing your thinking during daily life and that this may not be meaningful or important to others. I believe that art cannot be *made* important, only perceived as such. I feel that you probably underestimate how your gifs transmit a sense of something. You mention Baldessari, interest and meaning. I see it more as significance and meaning. Significance is about how something affects whereas meaning is more about content. Something may be full of meaning but not be significant in a particular context. Conversely, a work that has little meaning could be significant for other reasons. The relationship between the two is a fluid one and not always reciprocal or causal. They are, perhaps, two different ways of describing something. So in the case of your head been peeled back, it is possibly more significant to you than for me, but it contains meaning for the two of us and that meaning is quite different. In time, the gif could become more significant or less so for either or both of us. Interest is quite a different thing. It is about attracting curiosity and wanting to know more about something.

Perhaps a fuller picture would be significance, interest and meaning.

I think that your daily practice with C4D is a very good idea. It appears to me that you are building a lexicon (vocabulary) of ideas and forms that could be useful. Look into what you do and find the patterns of what you do. I may be mature but I am always looking for patterns: that is why I joined this course.....

Me:

.....I have remember a gif which is a skeleton keeps running at a track in dark night. It left a very deep impression on me, because to some extend I felt empathy. I felt depressed in doing something, but I had to keep going during that time. It's significant for me. As for the GIFs, I think it's ok they are not consequence. I'll considerate narrative when I make a long animation, in a orderly or disorder way. (I quite like Jon Rafman's animation, one of his work is about dream journey, it seems to be assembled by illogical collages and montages. I like his way of telling stories.)

You are right. I couldn't know if a little Gif is meaningful for others. It's not what I can decide. I mentioned Baldnesseri, I think what I am confused before is 'interesting' and 'significant'. After knowing his works I began to know they are not contradictory. It's not easy for me to make art with both characters. As you said I have to find my patterns. Hope we could find new patterns through works in this course.

Alexis:

I was not familiar with Rafman's work although I have heard him mentioned many times. It is not my cup of tea but I get what he is saying. However, I find the lack of aesthetic control and constant appropriation more in the style of an essayist than artist. His

Wikipedia page introduces him as an artist, filmmaker and essayist which would be consistent with that feeling. I am not that keen on the collage school of art like Christian Marclay and others. Perhaps it is because they are more engaged with contemporary short narratives, sound bites, Instagram and slogans. It is hard for me to engage with something that is continually breaking up other than saying it represents the fragmentation of... whatever.

When making, I think of interesting as, does this attract curiosity? I think of significance as, how important is this idea in this or that context? These two terms do work together but they are not the same just as a ball and racket do. One needs the other.

A pattern is often found when things start repeating. Then you know that there is a framework underlying one's work. This is why making is so important as is writing and documenting what one does.

Me:

I wouldn't think Rafman's work is the lack of aesthetic control. They are 'rough' but it is ok to keep this style. In fact I don't regard 'beauty' as a necessary element of an artwork. I think Christian's work is not just about breaking fragmentation, but also a new conjunction. Also the concept of 24 hour one is excellent. His works also convey themes. I mentioned both, though they are different, but I like their narrative way. I'm trying to find the logic, rules, order behind.

I agree with you about the relationship between interesting and significance. For me interesting is more like a sense of humor, surprise and wonder. I'll keep thinking and exercising to find the patterns.

Alexis:

Neither do I think beauty is a necessary element of an artwork. However, aesthetic consideration is important to me, and aesthetic appreciation varies from person to person. Your point about conjunction is a very good one; remaking and reforming; fragmenting to recompose. I have used that in my work. I have found in my work that often the spontaneous recombination of a fragmented whole is more satisfying than trying to deliberately compose the parts. I have come to the conclusion that it is because, not given the choice, my mind accepts the outcome and tries to find patterns and create a novel aesthetic. In trying to achieve an aesthetic deliberately, the outcome can disappoint on account of the component parts not being optimal for the paradigm set up in the mind. It is a balance between spontaneity and judgment.

I suppose my problem with some appropriated collage work is the amount of appropriation employed. I do not like to appropriate much because it takes away from the sense of discovery and genesis that comes from making and originating. However, I do understand where such artists are coming from. The concept of 24 hours is good as an idea or rather method but I do have problems with the authorship. But then Marclay would probably agree with that. I think that collage is very much in step with contemporary living and ways of perceiving. But I also think it is important to slow down and allow the mind to work invisibly on its own production from primary sources.....

Me:

I totally agree with you. Sometimes the spontaneous process is better than deliberately arranged. Especially unexpected mistakes in software may lead to a surprise result. I totally understand the disappointment when fail to achieve a perfect outcome after trying thousands of times setting up.

I think the charming of collage work is to endow a new meaning of old stuffs. Although they may be appropriated from existing works, but by different approaches of conjunction it no longer has the same meaning and appeal. In my opinion, the standard here is whether a new creator has a different conception and how he/she conjuncts them. But also authorship is another problem. This kind of topics often appear in internet art. In my work 'Isolacity' I collect people talking without their permission, then fake a conversation. Can it be seen as appropriation? But I will still insist this is a 'original work'. However I like to do primary works as well. I think whether to make original work or appropriate other materials, the methods of doing a work depend on the purposes or theme.

Alexis:

I don't think that what you did with 'Isolacity' is appropriation because you recorded the conversations and reconstructed them from the original conversations. It is like taking a photograph of someone, drawing a portrait, or writing a dialogue scene in a book; This is far from appropriation. And the idea of constructing a conversation from the recording is really interesting. This is quite different to you taking recordings from say, a film or record and putting them together. That is appropriation because you are using someone else's creative work directly to construct something new.

I know a lot of people would not agree with me. What Marclay, Prince and others do, although I understand the paradigm and there is a place for it, is not something I feel quite so comfortable with. To be quite honest, I think it is too easy to make work using the work of others directly. I guess that each artist needs to look in themselves for their own authenticity. If that is how they are, then who am I to say. I can only speak for myself.