

## 'Potemkin village'

The aesthetic of the 'Potemkin village' interests me. My work is made with the aesthetic of the 'Potemkin village' and not with 'Ruin-aesthetics'. I don't work with the aesthetic of ruins because a ruin is 'form'. The 'Potemkin village' refers to Governor Potemkin who, in 1787, built fake villages along the Crimea peninsula before the visit of his ruler the Czarina, in order to hide the area's real situation. The goal of the 'Potemkin village', which functioned then as much as today, is to show a better situation than it really is. To be precise, my work and its 'Ruin-form' is a 'reversed Potemkin village'. This means that it shows a situation at its worst and not as it should be, at best. The goal of the 'reversed Potemkin village' is to show and make visible - through destruction - the hidden links, masked connections and unseen assemblage. I have in mind the words of Antonio Gramsci: "Destruction is difficult, indeed it is as difficult as construction" (Prison Notebook no.9).

## No ruin is 'innocent'

My interest in ruins comes from the fact that they say something. Their meaning is multifaceted and complex, even hyper complex. Before showing us 'why', each ruin shows us that it 'is' a ruin. A ruin points to: archeological ruins, corruption, natural disaster, fire, water, construction failure, cultural-, political-, aesthetical-, or economic collapse, material weakness, neglect, accident, bombing. And what counts is: no ruin is 'innocent'. All ruins connect beyond time and location - a ruin is universal and timeless. The charged and complex meaning of a ruin gives it - as a form - its density, dynamic and, above all, its necessity.

## Ruin as form

A ruin is a form. A ruin is something which has been shaped, it's not an aesthetic, it's not a reproduction or a reconstruction – a ruin is pure form. There is nothing to gain from speculating or questioning: what was there before? Why does it look like this? A ruin 'is', a ruin 'is' itself, it stands on its own, a ruin is 'Ruin'. Because it is a beginning, a ruin is an affirmation and affirms its form as 'Ruin'. Could it be that everything, the entire universe, came from destruction, and started from a ruin and chaos? Could it be that everything developed from chaos? Could it be that, before, there was nothing but 'Ruin'? Therefore, the ruin I am interested in is nothing other than the form 'Ruin'. Regarding this, the quote of Antonio Gramsci's Prison Notebook no. 8: "The content of art is art itself." Art is not journalism or an illustration of a fact. Confronting a work of art means making an experience. A new experience, an experience you may not want to make, but an experience nevertheless. As an artist, I want and must work out the conditions that such an experience can happen. Therefore I cannot operate suggestively with examples or comparisons, I have to work it out, I have to work, fight and engage, I have to give a form coming from myself. Only a complete commitment to my form, can give me a chance to touch truth. Truth is the 'Ruin' which stands on its own, it is the ruin which asserts itself as a Form.