

Method (February 21, 2003)

METHOD NIGHT VOL. 2
BY HIDEKI NAKAZAWA

Tonight's Program:

Performance Piece "Mass Measurement" for about 30 min.

- intermission for about 5 min. -

Open Discussion for about 30 min.

Small Party

To subscribe for the email-bulletin "METHOD," email: nakazawa@aloalo.co.jp Also visit: <http://aloalo.co.jp/nakazawa/>

Radishes and Weights and Brushstrokes by Hideki Nakazawa [Appeared in "Method No. 8," published on July 7, 2001]

When you put a radish on a scale and say, "this radish scales such and such grams," it has the meaning of measurement. But, it has no meaning of measurement when you put a 200-gram weight on a scale, as it only makes the divisions indicate 200 grams. The sight of a weight on a scale is dadaistic.

When you put radishes on a scale one by one and repeat saying "this one scales such and such grams" and "that one scales such and such grams," the meanings of measurement are juxtaposed. The juxtaposition in this case resembles the impressionists' way of painting. Because the impressionists juxtapose the meanings of physiological senses by repeating putting one brushstroke after another recognizing "the shade of a tree is purple" or "the next shrub is blue." But it has still no meaning of measurement when you put weights on a scale one by one and repeat saying "a 200-gram weight scales 200 grams" or "a 100-gram weight scales 100 grams." However, there is a meaningless repetitive juxtaposition, which resembles the impressionists' way of painting as in the case of radishes.

When you put many radishes on a scale at one time and say, "these radishes scale such and such grams altogether," it also has the meaning of measurement. In that case, the whole radishes produce a single numerical value like "such and such grams," which resembles the fact that a painting made of many brushstrokes is a sheet of canvas. Because, the meaning of a painting is produced from the whole of a sheet of canvas. However, it has still no meaning of measurement when you put many weights on a scale at one time, as it only makes the divisions indicate the total weight. However, it produces a single meaningless numerical value, which resembles a sheet of canvas, as in the case of radishes.

At my latest solo exhibition held recently, I declared those many weights put on a scale to be a work. As dadaistic comicalness was self-evident, the impressionists' way of drawing and the singleness of a canvas were put together with dadaistic meaninglessness. What I am interested in is an issue that exists before a stage where meaningless recalls meaningfulness. Dadaism developed by means of the standard of form's singleness or small numberness, like an objet d'art or a collage, which opposed to the impressionists' aesthetics that aimed at pixels' multitudinousness. However, dada in the level of pixels does not contradict the impressionists' way of painting, and even obtains ultimate singleness.

My works made of many weights on a scale treat an issue of not eclectic but essential togetherness of the impressionistic paintings and anti-paintings. What lies at the basis is reality of this computer days where there is no sense of incompatibility in treating radishes, weights, and brushstrokes as the same pixels.