

My work relates to ambiguity. I try to portray a kind of *either or*. Nothing is resolved and if there are conclusions, they are many, not one.

To judge work by the standards of a bygone age seems absurd – hence the absurdity of Hughes' attacks on the art market. I think there's a historical view of art that is seen more or less through rose-tinted spectacles and then there's a realistic critical view of art right now. I really think that despite the intellectual rigor of Hughes there is a glaring absurdity in his appraisal of art history. For when art has become history – it's over! Putting my painting next to Cezanne or Titian is absurd. It totally misses the point of what art is. Art can be an elitist game or it can be something else. There is huge leeway in art. Hughes can write volumes and volumes about how bad mine or Basquiat's or Warhol's art is but it still doesn't change the fact that looking at my painting may be a pleasurable and rewarding experience for someone or for many people. In the end you have to hand it to the painters of kitsch – their work gets looked at by a hell of a lot more people than Lucian Freud's and he ain't doing too bad either. The intellectually elitist end of the art spectrum is a tiny world of Hughesian brainboxes and other artworld professionals with a vested interest in talking up or down the importance of this or that feature of art. The artist makes his work because he more or less has to. That is what he is!! As Barnett Newman said 'Art history is for artists what ornithology must be for the birds!' Amen to that I say.