The world's in search of 'the truth' (the answer to all questions), we reason with logic, so we search 'the truth' with logic. This we call science. We already know that science can't bring us 'the truth' because the world's too big for us to understand. Although we know we'll never understand 'the truth' we still believe finding it with logic and science.

Logic has evolved so much in our systems that we can reason that it's also possible to find 'the truth' without using logic. This is what I believe is the purpose of art; find the truth without logic. The best artwork would be a work that all people would 'understand'. The reason why can't be explained because it's truth is based in non-logic.

It's my believe that it's impossible to do anything without reason and so it's impossible to make the perfect artwork. So just like science searching for 'the truth' and knowing never to find it, art has the same problem.

But both worlds develop and discover new things.

My problem lies in the non-logic part of art. I reason with logic, and my philosophic ideas are based on them, but within a good work of art there's no need for logic. So for me I can't decide when an artworks is a good one or not because there's a lack of checkpoints.

My position toward art is ambiguous; I believe it's not possible to make a perfect artwork, but still I am an artist making artworks, believing in myself. And that's a conflict. Besides that, I dislike the artists that believe in themselves without questioning their own work. But I'm an artist too that believes in himself so what reason can I find to conclude that my work's better then anybody else? I can think of the opposite reason too.

It's this dilemma about art that's the theme in most of my works; me questioning my own work, questioning my own opinion and, at the other hand, still being able to produce new works. This is a conflict that I'd like to show. And doing so I want to trigger the discussion about these questions.

Example of the dilemma;
In search of a good work I try to make the most stupid thing I can imagine, but this stupid thing should not just be stupid, it should be interesting too; it should be interesting because it is stupid, not 'just' stupid. But by making the stupid thing interesting, it can't be stupid anymore.

It's this conflict I use in my works:

-The Wig made of my own hair is made to make a parody of myself; the works directly questions the maker and by doing so it questions the seriousness of it's own existence.
-The painting on top of the Canvas Repaint becomes more interesting because there are a number of paintings below it. This doesn't make the painting itself better, but it changes the way one looks at it and in advance makes it an interesting painting. Are you watching the painting or the canvas with all the paintings on it?
-DAAN IS TOF (Daan is Great) is a statement showing the arrogance of the artist. I used to think that's the basic of every artist work, so why should I make a work if I can pronounce the slogan without making a work. But the slogans became artworks to.

My philosophical 'problems' are the subject of my work in which I create objects, installations and situations where the viewers are confronted with or involved into the same dilemma's.

Daan den Houter