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I would like to warn the reader that this is not a thesis that I am proud of; that it is not what I would have written had I had the freedom I wished; and that it bears tenuous relation to what I feel is the most efficacious method of communicating, in words, my stance as an artist.
This thesis is fondly dedicated to Pam Venz who helped me to retain my point of view against those who would destroy it.
Those mysteries, I don't even know what I don't even know.
They're hanging around and around and around,
Those mysteries.

—Sparks

As we walk hand in hand,
Let's add to what we know and what we understand,
While we talk about joy,
Let's talk about the metaphors that we employ.

—David Thomas

This is the crisis I knew had to come,
Destroying the balance I'd kept.

—Joy Division
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For those of us sensitive to our environment; those of us not content to walk through the world in "our own world"; those of us who try to see things from the other's point of view; those of us who are puzzled by things that others seem to accept; those of us who wonder about things that seem insignificant; those of us who see unexplained and unexplainable contradiction; for us, the world is a strange and enigmatic place.

It is a world that doesn't really make any sense; a world of too many answers; a world of too much information; a world of many plausible choices; a world where both sides make sense; a world of theories, hypotheses, propositions, suggestions, formulae and systems; it is a world that is almost overpowering in the demands that it makes on our discerning consciousness.

We try to make sense of it all. And we try again. We try to correlate this mass of information; to make the correct choices; to deal with the flood of sensory data. We try to bring it all together. And we fail. So we ignore certain parts of the world which just won't fit in. Nonetheless, we would go crazy in a world of unrelated, disparate events, explanations, and objects. So we work on making as much of the world as we can, as intelligible as we can.

Those of us who ask such questions of our puzzling world, often go into fields of study such as chemistry, sociology or philosophy. Some of us become artists. Each of us is asking the question: "Is this a valid way to correlate the morass of tangled information that we have experienced?"
Because artists speak to a different part of the mind than the other fields of inquiry; because we have a little more latitude in how we present our conclusions, we can come closer to "saying it all". It is no coincidence that shamanic practice which to us often appears art-like is really a way of relating a belief system to the world in a manner coherent to its practitioners. The fact that this is done in a symbolic and metaphoric manner point to the power of such tools, and why they are especially the tools of the artist (although no field of inquiry is entirely free of metaphor).

What we find in our search is that there are multiple ways of of organizing and interpreting reality, and that many conflict. The artist is in a unique position to deal with all of this. Artwork doesn't have to say "This is the answer," it can give choices, leave room for the perceiver to reach his or her own conclusions. The choices and methods of dealing with and relating these different systems, I find to be especially exciting. I feel that my artwork comes out of my struggle with these issues. What follows is an expanded discussion of these points, and then an exploration of how this relates to my thesis show No Material Existence.

According to Conrad Fiedler "artistic activity begins when man finds himself face to face with the visible world as with something immensely enigmatical; when driven by an inner necessity and applying the powers of his mind, he grapples with the twisted mass of the visible which presses in upon him and gives it creative form" (Fiedler, p.48). To update
this quote we may replace the word "visible" with sensual". Clifford Geertz wrote that art attempts to provide orientation for an organism which cannot live in a world that it is unable to understand" (Geertz, p.436). We can define the word artist very loosely, as it seems clear that people in many other fields of study would qualify. The first step of the artist facing this enigmatic world is to delve into the nature of the world. By doing so the artist begins to do research. The research itself can take many different forms, and by the form that it takes we give the researcher different names. Some of these names are "scientist", "historian", "philosopher", "anthropologist", "economist", "political scientist", "shaman", and of course in the narrower sense, "artist".

Each of these researchers is grappling with the enigmatic, to organize it into creative form. We are long past the day when we thought, to take one example, that historians relate inviolate truth. Anthropology has gone through several different methodologies, each one emphasizing certain aspects of human social interaction. Even science is not as absolute as some would like to think. Albert Camus has written: "Science that was to teach me everything ends up in a hypothesis, that lucidity founders in metaphor, that uncertainty is resolved in a work of art" (Camus 1955, p.15). If we accept this, then pragmatically there is little difference between art and science, or for that matter, between art and any field of study. Although I disagree with some of Fiedler's philos-
ophy (a discussion of how has no place here), I see this statement as valid. "Art as well as science is a kind of investigation, and science as well as art is a kind of mental configuration. Art as well as science necessarily appears at the moment when man is forced to create the world for his discerning consciousness" (Fiedler, p. 46).

What the artist has in common with the scientist is clear: intent, research and creative form. To find the difference we can put art, science and the other fields of study on a continuum based on the distinguishing factor of validity systems. An important issue for the scientist is the repeatability of the experiment; without it, the creative form is not valid. In art this is not an issue. The strength of any scientific formulation is found in its consistency with the body of related facts. The strength of artwork is found in its internal consistency; it need not have any relationship with any other artwork (although it often does). When judging artwork we look to our own gestalt systems of representing the world and see how they correlate. We are irrational, emotional, ideological and prone to metaphysics, and we allow this a place in art, but not in science.

Thus, we see that the artist and the scientist have similar intent, and differing validity systems. But the step in between, the research, is for me a critical issue. Where many don't see a relationship between research in art and that in science, I have always felt that there is little difference, and indeed judge my art making process as one of research.
Where the scientist does his or her research and then publishes a paper, I do my research and then produce a piece of artwork. I see two types of research: that which is done consciously and that which is done sub-consciously. Conscious research can be seen in the testing of an hypothesis. It can also be seen in reviewing the works and conclusions of others. Sub-conscious research is done on a level that the researcher is consciously unaware of. All of us are constantly absorbing information that we are not entirely cognizant of, but which can surface in the creative act with or without our consent. In science the emphasis is squarely on the former type, although the importance of the latter cannot be denied. I believe that for most artists research is done sub-consciously. However, for me, conscious research plays a very large role. After I have resolved the issues that I am concerned with in a piece of artwork I have to go out and research some other stuff. As an artist I can choose anything to look at and incorporate into my artwork. I guess that my (entirely unrealistic) goal is to resolve the mystery of the entire world in a piece of artwork. The more research I do, the more I can include, and the closer I can get.

In resolving the mystery of the world, or "grappling with the enigmatic" we are saying that in the face of meaninglessness we look for meaning. However, it is a meaning imposed. It is imposed on a collection of disparate significata. It is each perciever who does this, and it is done by unifying that disparate phenomena into a system that is necessarily a
personal one. Thus, to orient is to put us in a relationship with the phenomena. This is research. To understand, we relate the information that we have found. Camus wrote that "Whatever the play on words and the acrobatics of logic, to understand is, above all, to unify" (Camus 1955, p.13). He also tells us that this urge for unity is the essential impulse of humanity.

There are some problems with this search. First of all in my quest for answers I necessarily find new questions, and this is represented in my artwork. Some of these questions cannot be answered. Camus explains that it is impossible to unify the whole of the universe. We have to know where the walls are —the limits of our rational thought— and to accept them and work within them. To do this is to appreciate the "absurd". The absurd is "born precisely at the very meeting point of that efficacious but limited reason with the ever resurgent irrational" (Camus 1955, p.27). The crucial point is this: "I don't know whether this world has a meaning which transcends it. But I know that I do not know that meaning and that it is impossible for me just now to know it. What can a meaning outside my condition mean to me? I can understand only in human terms. What I touch, what resists me —that is what I understand. And these two certainties —my appetite for the absolute and for unity and the impossibility of reducing this world to a rational and reasonable principle —I also know that I cannot reconcile them" (Camus 1955, p.38). But this does not mean that we are to ignore
the transcendental, Camus also says that "to a man devoid of blinders, there is no finer sight than that of the intelligence at grips with a reality that transcends it" (Camus 1955, p.41).

This sort of duality has echoes in Taoism, and if not in my artwork itself, it has echoes in my approach to my artwork. Lao Tzu has written:

The Tao that can be told is not the eternal Tao.
The name that can be named is not the eternal name.
The nameless is the beginning of heaven and earth.
The named is the mother of ten thousand things.
Ever desireless, one can see the mystery.
Ever desiring, one can see the manifestations.
These two spring from the same source but differ in name; this appears as darkness.
Darkness within darkness.
The gate to all mystery.

(Lao Tzu, p.11).

My work has ranged from the "named" to the "nameless" and I think that this sort of dichotomy has its roots in the type of problem raised by these two authors.

This then is at the core of the absurd (or Taoist) artist—the search for unity with the realization of its impossibility. Can this idea be a part of one's artwork? I believe that it can be. Fiedler told us that art appears when man is forced to create the world for himself. Camus adds to this the idea that the act of artistic creation is the purest act of rebellion. It is the act of refusing the world as it is and replacing it with a more coherent one. "In every rebellion is to be found the metaphysical demand for unity, the impossibility of capturing it, and the construction of a substitute world" (Camus 1956, p.255). He
goes on to say that the artist tries to give the world the style that it lacks, rejecting reality at the same time as exulting certain aspects of it. The problem is that in this search for truth we find the multiplicity of truth. It is to this that we turn to next.

One difficulty is that the same set of information can be unified in different ways. Is the number series "1,3,5,7" the first four positive integers, the first four prime numbers, or the four smallest numbers that 105 is divisible by? Another problem is that with the same set of information different things can be taken as pertinent. Is a given third world nation in danger of being taken over by communists, or not? Does a set of information point to a cause and effect relationship, or is it just a series of temporally related events? Is the universe in a constant state of flux, does it have a beginning and end, or is it a repeated cycle? The way that we answer questions such as these, is in large part due to our cultural conditioning. An exploration of such can give us some insight into the idea of multiplicity of truth.

James Fernandez has done a great deal of research on the Fang, an African society. The Fang feel that vitality is created by the balance of opposition. Their villages are arranged with "two long rows of huts facing each other across a narrow barren court" (Fernandez, p.59). This arrangement occurs, because amongst other things, Fang family lineages encourages it. Families will build their houses side by side when they feel strong allegiance to each other. When they no
longer feel this way they will build across the court. This is viewed as a good thing; breaking bonds and social antagonism are supported. "It is better to shout insults across the court of the village to your distant brother, than whisper them in his ears as your neighbor" goes a Fang saying (Fernandez, p.60). The Fang also have a kinship system designed to balance opposing forces. This system is called "complimentary filiation —the tendency to trace relationship of ascending generations alternately to male and female progenitors and progenitrix" (Fernandez, p.60). Thus, they balance male characteristics with female ones. Male/female oppositions can be seen in "dualistic sets such as hot (male) and cold (female), night and moon (female) and day and sun (male), earth (female) and sky (male)" (Fernandez, p. 61). Thus, like the yin and the yang, balanced opposition is a good and necessary thing for the Fang, and gives their lives meaning and vitality.

Their artwork reflects this. Their reliquary statues are human figures carved out of wood. For the statues to be judged a good representation of human beings, all the opposing parts and the relationships within the carving must be balanced. This kind of balance and symmetry which for Westerners is usually dull and lifeless, is precisely the opposite for the Fang. For them the statues show the vitality of human beings and are therefore lifelike. "The Fang recognize well enough that the proportions of these statues are not the proportions of living men —that what the statue represents
is not necessarily the truth, physically speaking, of a human body but a vital truth about human beings, that they keep opposites in balance" (Fernandez, p.56). So here we see two "truths", the Fang and our own, which directly contradict each other.

Looking at this example we can be more sensitive when looking at different sets of truths put forth in our own society. But what's the big deal? Most of us are aware of this on one level or another. The deal is that to the artist who is aware of and interested in this, there is the realization of the impotency of attempting to simply recreate a personal view of reality, no matter how unified. I feel that it is not a question of creating one substitute world, but of trying to grapple with all of them. Furthermore, I feel that reality is constantly shifting between each of these views, being recreated at every moment; that even contradictory views can coexist and not be seen as contradictory; and that each shift for the artist does not necessarily correlate with those perceiving the artwork. Thus it seems that it is a question of producing a framework for understanding multiple realities; that it is futile to try to fully organize and unify these systems; and that the overlaps and the relationships are to be created by the perceiver of the artwork, each to be done in a different way. I should guard against representing the information in a personal, arbitrary method of organization, and instead, present things in such a way as to get the perceivers to create their own
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systems. Why? Because this way is the closest way to approach that transcendental truth as it really is.

I'm trying to create artwork that shows truth to be a fragmentary, ambiguous, shifting and contradictory creature. Perhaps my artwork seems to be impersonal because of this; because I refuse to submit my own idiosynchratic beliefs as being worthy of viewing. Kathleen Raine wrote that the art of William Blake came "from a source deeper than the individual experience of poet or painter . . . . To our superficial selves this is a source of the 'obscurity' of visionary art; to our deepest selves of its lucidity" (Raine, p.7). The artist's own personality is of no consequence. I feel that like the artists of the past, and the "artists" of so-called primitive societies, my role is as a conduit, a transmitting filter between the "reality" perceived, and its public. Of course, some personal idiosyncracies will seep into my artwork, but these are flaws in an imperfect being's approximation of perfection.

Before going any further I would like to summarize the major points that have been made.

1. The artist tries to find orientation in an enigmatic universe.

2. All fields of study are trying to do this, but the artist can take the results of others to incorporate into his or her artwork.

3. Artwork, in a more complete fashion than those other fields of study, can answer the question "Is this a valid way
of representing the world". The others are more or less hamstrung by their validity systems.

4. In asking this question we are attempting to unify the world, but this attempt is replete with limitations.

5. One of these limitations is the multiplicity of truth.

6. Artwork ought not to be a personal answer to this search, but a framework for others to create their own answers.

An analogy to this can be found in free jazz. In the jazz of musicians such as Ornette Coleman each of the many musicians playing together is expected to follow his or her own muse, playing in whatever key or fashion he or she wishes. Connections exist as they always will, and listeners have to find their own. James Lincoln Collier points out the difficulty in this. He does not however, invalidate it.

"The difficulty is that most people find exposure to a random environment anxiety provoking. To be unable to put the parts of our world together in some rational way, to be unable to understand how the pieces fit together, to be faced with total disorder, is for some of us an intolerable condition. Music in which we cannot find some principle of order, which seems to lack relationships, will make us anxious" (Collier, p.476). (It must be pointed out that this is not the same as the chance music of John Cage). Some listeners appreciate this feeling of anxiety. They are stimulated by feelings which make them question the unity of the world, and make them look anew for relationships that might exist. This is
an effect that I would like to create in my own artwork.

A literary analogy can be found in the work of Philip K. Dick. In many of his books there are several "protagonists". They each have their own psychologies and uniquely perceive the events that occur. What makes his books especially interesting is that by the end of the book we have not been told whose view is the "correct" one, and we have nothing to base that sort of decision on. We are left with a feeling of insecurity. There are several different viewpoints, each one as plausible as the next, but often contradictory. We miss a unifying conclusion. We are forced to create one on our own. We have to look for overlap in characterization, or places where two views can be combined into a bigger view. But our own psychologies and perceptions of reality are called into question. Each reader can create a different novel owing to the way that he or she relates to the characters. Although this is possible, to some extent, in many other books, in this case it is the point of the book. However one reads it, by the end of the book we are wary of our own sense of reality. One also questions the validity of a book which presents only one reality. By the same token I question the validity of artwork that represents one reality.

Norman Spinrad has written that "In a Dickian universe, there are many realities, most of them equally valid, but none of them an overview of the whole. If his plots sometimes seem contradictory, they are deliberately so. To keep all the loose ends tied up would violate verisimilitude in
the service of consistency, for the Dickian universe has ambiguity and indeterminacy at its core" (Spinrad, p.v).

(emphasis added).

I have extensively argued elsewhere, that art is a form of communication with language-like characteristics. An important similarity is the use of metaphoric structure. It is to this that we must turn to next in order to find a method to achieve the goals that I have set for my artwork.

The most valuable sources for a definition of metaphor will be found in the books The Said And The Unsaid by Stephen A. Tyler and Models and Metaphors by Max Black. Black describes an interactive view of metaphor. It begins with a sentence containing two subjects (or arguments): the principle one and the subsidiary one. He explains that in our general use of metaphors (the exceptions will be noted in a moment) there is a "system of associated commonplaces" for each subject. This system contains the general and commonly known ideas and references that most people in a given culture would share regarding that subject (word). Literal definitions of the subject would be of little use in a metaphor. Next, the system of the subsidiary subject is applied to that of the principle one, and "the metaphor selects, emphasizes, suppresses, and organizes features of the principle subject by implying statements about it that normally apply to the subsidiary subject" (Black, p.45). Thus the metaphor acts as a filter organizing pertinent details into a certain viewpoint. Along with this viewpoint
comes a shift in attitude toward the principle subject. The exception previously mentioned regarding associated common-places can be seen when a writer purposely will create other implications to be added to the words used in the metaphor.

Some fine tuning to this definition can be found in Tyler when he states that metaphors work both ways. He writes "Every metaphor thus has a dual function: It illuminates and emphasizes something about the original argument to which it is extended, and that extension to that argument illuminates and emphasizes something about the original argument. That is why we understand a word never so well as when we have used it metaphorically" (Tyler, p.331). Tyler also says that like all speech, metaphors are relative to a context. Metaphors are not just created analytically to compare objects. They have a necessary purpose and function in the context in which they are created. They would lose some of that meaning if taken out of that context.

The last point and perhaps the most important one when dealing with art is that, as Fernandez puts it, metaphors explain the inchoate. This is echoed by Tyler who says that metaphors make the ineffable effable. Basically, this is to say that we often use metaphors to explain words like love or freedom, that can't be easily defined or catagorized. Because these words represent concepts that are vague and amorphous sorts of things, they need to have "parts" related to things we understand more concretely. Fernandez says that metaphors work from the concrete to the abstract. This is
where both specificity and creativity come into the use of metaphor. We can combine subjects which may seem light-years away in order to draw out that valuable aspect of that complex and intangible concept. Fernandez has said that metaphors lie at the base of inquiry. George Lakoff and Mark Johnson have written that "New metaphors are capable of creating new understandings and, therefore, new realities" (Lakoff and Johnson, p.235).

As one can see there is significant overlap between the functions of metaphor and those of art. Lakoff and Johnson have also written that "metaphor is not merely a matter of language, it is a matter of conceptual structure. And conceptual structure is not merely a matter of the intellect —it involves all the natural dimensions of our experience, including aspects of our sense experiences: color, shape, texture, sound, etc." (Lakoff and Johnson, p.235). From Jane C. Goodale and Joan D. Koss we have: "Art forms depend, primarily, on a particular kind of connectedness that is metaphoric, involving two or more widely separated domains of experience brought into relation with one another" (Helm, p.176).

One should hear echoes here of my earlier statements concerning my goal of unifying (understanding, cf. Camus) the universe, and see that I might pay particular attention to the use of metaphoric structure in my artwork.

It seems to me that there are three ways that art communicates: through symbols, metaphors, or formal properties
(or preferring to use a less "loaded" term, I call it innate nature). Symbols are exceedingly culturally specific, as we have already seen with our example of the Fang "human being" symbol. We can define symbol as follows:

An object or event that generally represents or stores a cluster of related and not so related concepts. It can be simple or complex depending on how much "meaning" it has. It may have any level of arbitrariness although it generally has some natural reference. There are no natural symbols, all symbols are man-made, that is, have their meaning applied to them. It is created within, created by, and meant to function in a specific context.

Symbols have considerable weaknesses in art today. Because symbols have their meaning applied to them, they function best in a cohesive society where the underlying metaphoric structure is understood. For example, for the Fang, the underlying metaphoric structure is "vitality is symmetry". The problem is that in contemporary "western" art we have lost the shared metaphoric structures to enable us to properly understand the artwork. Perhaps Pop art was the last convincing breath of symbol in art; symbols based on advertising structures which have appeared to take over western culture. Today we have artists who create or borrow symbol systems of which we have small chance of appreciating. I try to avoid symbology that could be construed as personal or arbitrary in my artwork.

Some materials or phenomena seem to communicate based on an innate meaning. This is also apt to be somewhat culturally specific, yet likely runs much deeper than symbol systems. Fire for example, seems to have some meaning that
almost anyone would understand —warmth, light, burns, cooks. Mirrors are another example, one of which I have extensively explored. The mirror "means" the phenomena that it creates, even if that phenomena is only to be understood conceptually. Mirrors can distort space, reflect light, reproduce imagery (albeit in a "reversed" form), create infinities, be transformed into windows and each one of these communicates what it is "doing". For example, a mirror or several that are set up to visually distort a space communicate that —distortion. In my piece of artwork "Two mirrors, and a piece of glass" where two mirrors face each other with a piece of glass sandwiched in between, we understand conceptually the effect that is occuring, and that leads to our understanding of the piece. Because of their ability to create multiple imagery, one can see how mirrors would appeal to someone interested in "multiple realities".

Artwork which functions metaphorically is also something very interesting to me. Perhaps the collage is the best way of seeing this. In a collage we have imagery that may be far apart in conceptual domains, but which because of their proximity have entered into some relationship. It is a relationship where the perceiver must find whatever it might be that connects these two phenomena, and it should be clear that this is of a metaphoric nature.

This leads into the role of the perceiver which so far has only been suggested. I have already said that I see my role as creating a framework for the perceiver to draw
personal conclusions. For the perceiver the artist is simply not an issue. The perceiver approaches the artwork, and judges it by whatever standards are seen to be appropriate. Ultimately, even the artwork itself is unimportant. After the perceiver has been stimulated to grapple with the phenomena of the artwork, the artwork can be left behind. It need not even be remembered any longer. The artwork is useful insofar as it points to a new "reality", a new arrangement of the world. This is not to say that the perceiver cannot return to the artwork to try to glean new meanings. As they change the perceptions that they have and the connections that they will make may change. Thus, we can see that ultimately it is the perceiver who creates the artwork. The perceiver puts it into a context that is personal and uniquely created to comprehend his or her own world. Although much artwork has a certain latitude in potential responses, the artwork described here, if successful, ought to have considerably more. Thus as the same phenomena can create considerably different responses in the "real" world, artwork can do the same. That is not to say that anything is allowed. The artist still must point to the issues and questions raised throughout this paper in the framework that is created. The perceiver will however, often subvert these larger metaphysical issues into a more personal set of questions. And this is fine, for as Oscar Wilde has said, "It is the spectator, and not life, that art really mirrors."

At this point perhaps a discussion of my thesis show
No Material Existence might help to bring some of these points into focus. I have stated that all fields of study ask "Is this a valid way of representing the world, or some aspect of it?" In No Material Existence we have many equally valid ways of doing this, yet there is conflict. This is important, for it allows the perceiver to make his or her own choices. We try to relate, to unify, the phenomena of the world. The Perceiver of No Material Existence will try to take each one of these systems of information, along with all their preconceptions regarding such systems, and try to find some common threads with which to string it all together into one unified vision. Naturally each person will do this differently. Although I feel that No Material Existence parallels one's experiences with the world, I also feel that I have exaggerated or left out certain things in order to give the world "the style it lacks".

I believe that the dichotomy mentioned previously between the task of unifying the world and its impossibility is seen, amongst other things, in the opposition between the "critic" videotape and the "artist" tape. One says "I can do this"; the other "It can't be done." Of course, as I have shown they're both correct.

I have also said that reality is shifting and fragmentary. This can be seen in No Material Existence in at least two places. One is the mirror wall, which indeed fragments the "reality" that it reflects. The other is the cacophony of sound that one experiences from five video monitors and
an audio tape playing all at once. Different parts become audible at different times, yielding a constantly changing aural landscape.

The way that No Material Existence operates metaphorically is also important. As we have seen, metaphors connect conceptually distant domains in order to create new realities. All of the things in No Material Existence can connect to each other metaphorically. An example is the relationship between the discussion of the Grand Unified Theory and the Zuni Creation myth; and either of those and the Soviet Revolution. Another example is the relationship between the binary code and the congressional record; and either of those and the Elizabethan World Picture Pyramid. It is up to the perceiver to find what they see as shared characteristics. This is typically metaphoric. I feel that many such connections exist, and finding such can lead one into new and exciting interpretations of reality.

I have tried to avoid personal symbology, and each image in the piece is one of common knowledge such as the binary code; images that are easily understood such as the congressional record; or images like the mirror wall which function according to its innate nature. The case could be made that the earth disc on the floor is a personal symbol. To this my response is perhaps, however, it does work formally in the space and people can respond to it that way.

I hope that this in some way clarifies the relationship between all of my intellectualizing and the product created.
from such. But I have to repeat and stress that I feel in
the final review none of this is or ought to be important
to the perceiver of the artwork. I like to think that I know
the import of what I create, but this is hardly necessary.
I use aesthetic tools that make sense to me, and I would do
the same with or without an audience. Taking an audience into
account, the question is simple: Have I created a structure
that sufficiently stimulates the viewer to reach his or her
own emotions, questions, conclusions, what have you, so that
they leave pondering something that they hadn't beforehand.
This is all that should matter to them. All that should
matter to me is if I have resolved a problem that bothers
me in a way that makes sense to me. There is scant relation
between the two.
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