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Mike Cloud was born in 1974. He received a BFA from the University of Illinois-Chicago and studied at Yale University, where he received his MFA in 2003. He has had solo exhibitions at the Max Protetch Gallery in 2003, 2004, and 2006. His work has been featured in National Projects at PS1 Contemporary Art Center in Long Island City and in Frequency at the Studio Museum in Harlem. He lives and works in Brooklyn.

"So a lot of painting for me is just trying to find out what is believable and what kinds of painting can be honestly generated."

"The subject of a map is what it maps; the subject of a chart is what it charts. So I feel the chart form...is a good one to put painting into because it has this ability to nail down a subject. Once nailed down, it's easier to figure out what we believe or don't believe about its relationship to other things."

"Extremes can be seen in the paintings, perhaps extremes of intuition and logic. I think of the extremes as being those of conceivability and physicality, the physical and the mental, or the physical and the metaphysical. The act of painting, for me, is about constantly proposing and denying that opposition."

"I'm interested in how the compression of an essentially random world (through mediation) has altered my perception of both images and objects."

"Belief is a major obstacle in painting."

"Painting is simultaneously concrete and conceptual."

"An algorithm is a way of compressing things into a finite set of instructions with a clear beginning and ending."

"The work of art is a specific experience embodied in particular aesthetic form that is appropriate to that particular experience."

"Making art is part of the process of answering the questions, "Who am I?" and "How does this 'I' relate to the world?"

"Mike Cloud’s new paintings are systems of meaning and significance."

"It offers new forms that express new experiences on common experiences."

"Belief is a major obstacle in painting."

"His paintings explore how a painting becomes believable as a painting."

"He analyses aesthetically the contents of a painting. His work asks, what makes a painting?"

"He turns paintings inside out and reveals the systems and structures, literally and metaphorically, which have brought them into existence and continue to sustain them."

"The work of art is a specific experience embodied in particular aesthetic form that is appropriate to that particular experience."

"Paint - Clarendon. Mike Cloud

Pint - Orator: Daniel A. Siegell"
THIS EXHIBITION IS ORGANIZED BY DANIEL A. SIEDELL FOR THE SHELDON MEMORIAL ART GALLERY

SPONSORED IN PART BY:
- NEBRASKA ARTS COUNCIL
- BONNIE CASHEM FUND AT THE NEW YORK COMMUNITY TRUST
- PETER NORTON FAMILY FOUNDATION
- MAX PROTETE GALLERY

4 APRIL - 25 JUNE, 2006

MIKE CLOUD: SYSTEMS
With all our technologies that seem to assure our existence, we think we can banish belief. But in the practice of painting, belief inevitably returns. It is required of the painter who must convince himself that making marks of paint on a canvas is worth doing. It is also required of the viewer who must convince herself that taking paintings seriously is worth the trouble.

Mike Cloud’s paintings are critical, even skeptical, investigations into what makes a painting a painting. Grids, algorithms, art supply catalogs, and other frameworks serve to isolate the parts of a painting so he can scrutinize them separately before he puts them back together. He hides nothing in his paintings; everything is exposed: the canvas is stapled on the front of the frames; unpainted and unprimed canvas remains at the edges; and stretcher bars and tears in the canvas remain starkly, even disconcertingly, visible.

The images he paints (in this exhibition, mazes in the form of signs and symbols that include children’s game components) force us to acknowledge the plethora of conventions that make a painting believable as a painting. All painting requires this belief. What but belief can transform canvas stretched over and stapled onto wood frames, smeared with oil paint, and a toy slapped onto it into something of significance, into something worth our attention, our reflection?

These “toy” paintings defy you to disbelieve them, to turn away. But you cannot. Perhaps Cloud is right: his paintings don’t mean anything. But that doesn’t mean we don’t believe in them.

Daniel A. Siedell

---

Six Toys on a Maze
2005. Oil on linen with toy from children’s game.
Collection Joey Schamm, NY.

Chicken with Two Pentagrams
2005. Oil on linen with toy from children’s game.
Collection Max Protetch Gallery, NY.

Elephant on Heart Maze
2005. Oil on linen with toy from children’s game.
Collection Susan Goodman, NY.

Don’t Wake Daddy on a Maze
2005. Oil on linen with toy from children’s game.
Collection Joey Schamm, NY.

Mule on Cloud Maze
2005. Oil on linen with toy from children’s game.
Collection Rob and Stacey Goerger, NY.

Untitled
2005. Oil on linen.
Collection Liz and Kent Swig, NY.

Frog on Lightning Maze
2005. Oil on linen with toy from children’s game.
Collection Sue Hancock, Winter Park, FL.

Blank Album
Dimensions variable.
Collection Max Protetch Gallery, NY.

Annie Liebowitz: Women
Dimensions variable.
Collection Max Protetch Gallery, NY.

Mike Cloud’s paintings are critical, even skeptical, investigations into what makes a painting a painting. Grids, algorithms, art supply catalogs, and other frameworks serve to isolate the parts of a painting so he can scrutinize them separately before he puts them back together. He hides nothing in his paintings; everything is exposed: the canvas is stapled on the front of the frames; unpainted and unprimed canvas remains at the edges; and stretcher bars and tears in the canvas remain starkly, even disconcertingly, visible.

The images he paints (in this exhibition, mazes in the form of signs and symbols that include children’s game components) force us to acknowledge the plethora of conventions that make a painting believable as a painting. All painting requires this belief. What but belief can transform canvas stretched over and stapled onto wood frames, smeared with oil paint, and a toy slapped onto it into something of significance, into something worth our attention, our reflection?

These “toy” paintings defy you to disbelieve them, to turn away. But you cannot. Perhaps Cloud is right: his paintings don’t mean anything. But that doesn’t mean we don’t believe in them.

Daniel A. Siedell