I am a voracious reader and my partner works at the main branch of our public library; she has a brilliant knack of bringing home interesting material. In this case it was a book (I've forgotten the title) on the physiology of perception. This was my first encounter with the notion of qualia. I had never heard of the concept and it coincided my curiosity in (non-chemically induced) altered states.

Well, to me, everything has the potential to be an art project. The thing that distinguishes any potential from another is how sticky it is. Some notions fall off quickly while others keep hanging in front of me. In the case of Mary's room, further readings on qualia inevitably led to Frank Cameron's thought experiment, Mary's Room; I found the idea of Mary's room to be very sticky indeed.

First of all, I would argue against the writer's assertion that Mary's Room is a "carefully designed experience"; in hindsight it might appear to be the case however, while in it thick of it, my production seems haphazard, chaotic and mysterious to me. I'm often just tinkering away, with no thought about exhibitions or connectedness or premise when some expressive object manifests itself. I believe strongly in the idea of a subconscious energy propelling the work. I've grown to trust this process but there is always a thread of deep uncertainty running through it. If there is any "carefulness" in the method it is in the choices made *after* production is complete. I would say this show (more than any other show I've done) has an intentionally *unplanned* conclusion so, the final presentation is ultimately a continuation of this process of uncertainty.

Essentially the work is divided into two "spaces". The first space alludes to Mary's research phase in the black and white room. Here, I've attempted to convey the cool beauty of data gathering. It is not a literal space (everything B & W) but any colour present is muted. The objects in the space represent a fictional world where information is paramount. Any mystery evoked seems ultimately solvable. While it is inward looking and in a way serene, there is a tension that arises from some underlying absence.

The second space suggests Mary's experience "outside" of the room; it utilizes a video projection of a rich, moving colour field; the field is unfocused, slowly evolving, never the same; unquantifiable. Here, I use the same technology of the first room (small video cameras fixed on details of kinetic events) to create an entirely different effect. The effect is closely related to a cosmology of ephemera and of deep unknowing. It suggests mysteries unsolvable. It is my hope that the reading of these two spaces might give the viewer a chance to perceive Mary's (alleged) role in understanding the concept of qualia.

Yes, I suppose so. The notion of introversion is familiar to many and it is often allied with an idea of disconnectedness; in fact I see it as the opposite; it is a form of deep connectedness but often to the exclusion of other realities.

My knowledge around the nature of introversion is fairly new; I was reluctant to admit belonging to the one out of five persons that are wired as introverts. Apparently we *are* wired differently… brain mapping has revealed entirely different pathways of informational processing in the introvert. Some characteristics include a rapid depletion of energy around groups of people (extroverts are recharged by interacting with others) and an annoying inability to come to quick conclusions (My whole life I've marveled at those blessed with capacity for the snappy comeback… I may think of one, but often days later). This is attributed to neural pathways that favour long slow thought cycles over rapid responses.

A positive aspect of this tendency is that I can go fairly deep with my work… my conclusions are usually examined from a multiplicity of angles; whatever survives the scrutiny typically has some merit beyond the superficial.

The impact that this has had on my practice is significant. As the result of these slow thought cycles my output is fairly modest; I seem to be able to generate a new body of work in a space of about 3 to 5 years. During much of that time it feels like my abilities lay fallow. I've learned to focus on other outputs like writing, music or my teaching practice.

The other main effect has to do with my ability to network. I just finished reading Sara Thornton's Seven Days in the Art World; an critical read for any artist but particularly relevant to those starting out. It's apparent the much of an artist's success relies on their ability to interconnect with other artists, curators and galleries; it is truly an extrovert's game. I can't tell you how many times I've allowed opportunities slip through my hands because of my inherent need to be alone.

I've done installation work for my grad project under Deborah Koenker at Emily Carr, and "Nocturne" (a show curated by Clint Roenisch at the Kitchener-Waterloo Art Gallery) was installation based.

Typically, my sculpture tends to be small in scale with a "staged" quality to it; as if you are witnessing a miniature performance complete with beginning middle and end. Sometimes these works go together; like an edition of short stories and I can title a show based on the vibe of these stories. In Mary's Room (Conditions for Qualia), the individual works are called upon to

provide a larger narrative and installation is the best way to employ them.

---It's written in the essay that you are drawn to the "physical nature of being through the constraints of chronology, kinetic sculpture and the moving image." What was it that caused you to gravitate to this practice? And what keeps you at it?

I've always found obsessively difficult work based on obsolete technologies attractive. Even before I studied art, Ed "Big Daddy Roth" was a hero of mine. Roth's vision was unparalleled at the time; he was able to make something completely new out of existing automotive arts. He created stunningly beautiful (and at times awkward) "moving sculpture" that was completely cinematic in nature. So in art school, when I finally "discovered" Tinguley, Duchamp, Hawkinson and others, I knew I wanted to contribute to the dialogue these artists embodied.

What "keeps me at it" is a deep affiliation with compulsion. A wise old friend once told me the key to a happy and productive life is to be "where your hands are". My hands are maniacally-compulsively self-directed; at times they exhaust me. At the end of installing Mary's Room I thought to myself "never again", but I know something will trigger me in a few years and I'll gather steam for another run at it.

---How is it that your "exhibitions are experienced as though decoding the history of an object-based world and its social circumstances." I know you didn't write it, but what do you take it to mean and do you agree?

I suppose it has something to do with our relationship to our materiality and how that manifests in our behavior. We are at a profoundly materialistic stage in our development as a species; what I find most interesting is how incredibly *new* this stage is; we are experiencing a profound shift in our social reality that is directly related to technology.

My great Aunt recently passed away at 99 years of age. A few years ago I asked her what the most important invention was in her lifetime; she concluded it was the telephone (remembering having to run over a mile to fetch a doctor for her ailing sister).In a *single lifetime* we have gone from the telephone to personal computing, to the internet and all that that implies; clearly this illustrates how *early* we are in this unbelievably propulsive technological state/space.

In the beginning of my practice, I devised work meant to reflect the shortness of this time span. I would use materials from another time to create contemporary works. Unfortunately, these pieces were often misread; they would be seen as quaint or quirky and my initial intent would be undermined. In part, this is a failure of the work but it also has something to do with our limited perception of the brief history of technology.

---Obviously frank has some trouble with this problem. I feel that lends credence to the difficulty of the initial idea. After speaking to frank did you view the project differently?

I "spoke" with Frank Cameron as we are; through email. He surprised me with how intensely focused his responses were. There seemed little room to "play". Initially I thought we (Vicki Moulder and I) should drop the whole interview idea but she (like you) thought his response

added to a discourse surrounding the divide between the role of artist and philosopher/scientist. I still can't help but feel the poetry of Frank's hypothesis is either intentionally downplayed (for fear of being lumped into some flakey art camp) or that he genuinely cannot see the beauty in its form.

I like the idea of having something to rub up against. There are many artists active today that use another artist or piece of art to inform their works. This would not work for me. There is no friction in it. I prefer to pursue work that harnesses *other* disciplines (like philosophy or theology) as a motivating force. After my contact with Frank and seeing the installation up in the gallery, I feel even stronger about this approach.