

HECTOR DIAZ

Edgar Mendoza

The Legacy Narratives | Vol. 4

Edgar Mendoza

The Legacy Narratives | Vol. 4



Edgar Mendoza

Edgar Mendoza:
Mastery in realism

By Héctor Díaz

Introduction

Globally, Mexico stands out in figurative art, due to its artistic universes full of narrative-imaginative richness.

One of the most important contemporary realist artists in Latin America is the Mexican Edgar Mendoza, recognized as one of the greats of Spanish realism (while being from Durango, Mexico).

Realism without a voice is merely technical skill, but when technical ability and the creation of unique universes are combined, then we are talking about art.

Mendoza is a northerner from the desert in Mexico, and an exile in Europe, but a master in the complex and competitive world of art, his true home.

Admired by collectors, artists, gallerists, curators, critics, and journalists, he does not waste time on the banality of fame; he takes refuge and finds solace in the noble craft of painting.

His work is an invitation to oneiric worlds, to visual poems; he is, in my opinion, the most important living Mexican realist artist. See his work, period.

It is important, necessary, that we appreciate and value Mexican art, since artists like Edgar hold Mexico in high esteem on the international scene of the so-called "art industry."

Leonora Carrington, Remedios Varo, Rafael Cauduro, Rafael Coronel, Francisco Toledo... Edgar Mendoza.

I am proud, as a gallerist, to represent a great figure of Mexican art.

–Héctor Díaz
July 2025

Interview

What is Realism? Realism in painting could basically refer to the observation and representation of reality as it is, objectively. Through time and the evolution of painting across its diverse periods and eras, Realism has shown examples of this truthful representation. Did not Paleolithic art, the funerary portraits of El Fayum from the Roman occupation of Egypt, or even the murals of Bonampak or Cacaxtla in Mexico, show details of that need to express reality from the vision of their time and circumstances?

But painting as a science in its historical trajectory, especially in the cultural movements of Western Europe, is where "Reality" stands out as an important expressive motif in each of its periods, ranging from Greco-Roman art, the Middle Ages, the Renaissance, Classicism, the Baroque, or Neoclassicism.

In the mid-19th century, "Realism" was postulated as an artistic and cultural movement, fully acquiring the adjective and manifesting the representation of the reality of daily life of its time without embellishments or pretense, in a society full of great contrasts between social classes. The movement demanded depicting reality without any idealization.

As a background, it is important to mention the rupture that occurred in the 19th century between the "Realism" and "Romanticism" movements. While "Realism" sought the real, concrete, and "objective," "Romanticism" conversely aimed at the idealized interior of the “subjective."

As a movement, "Realism" degenerated into other variants that attempted an evolution but ultimately began to become repetitive, being replaced by the vanguards of the early 20th century. However, "Realism" and its sense of representing reality continued to express itself outside the vanguards, following its own path until interacting with modern or contemporary art of the 20th and 21st centuries. For that reason, why should we not also categorize and classify "Realism" in painting as a modern and contemporary art?

The interaction with various artistic manifestations and scientific and technological advances after the second half of the 20th century restructured a new model towards "Contemporary Realism," which no longer merely seeks the representation of a "Reality" as it is in an "objective" manner, but can also be expressed "subjectively" in a broader range of expressive and technical possibilities. Its two flourishing realist variants that use photography as a tool, "Photorealism" and "Hyperrealism," are undoubtedly a territory in which this breadth of proposals managing the interpretation of "reality" can be displayed.

How do you decide what to paint? I decide what to paint after going through a process where I first imagine the idea and then visualize it through a sketch. I generally construct the designs starting from these manually drawn sketches, and then refine them in Photoshop. This tool allows me to visualize the intended scene more accurately, developing the design and project calculations practically to the end before transferring it to the painting in a very calculated way.

I make the decision to paint something carefully and deliberately because executing a "Realist" painting requires investing a lot of time, dedication, and discipline. That is why I need to thoroughly study my idea of what I am going to paint beforehand, because I will live with that idea for a long period.

When you are a "Realist" painter, you must be very clear about what you are going to paint and how you are going to develop each stage of the process. You must even anticipate unforeseen events and adverse modifications to the original idea that will undoubtedly arise. The technical and conceptual construction of my projects and ideas are the result of a journey I have walked as a painter for 35 years, a path that has developed the identity and discourse manifested in each of the works I execute, whether in a drawing or in a schematic or very elaborate and precise painting.

What is not seen in a photographic session with models for your works? For the creations I imagine to be realized in a painting and to express their meaning, I need to create scenarios in which my stories unfold. These settings are the best way I have found so far to transmit my narratives or my ideas.

I use all the resources within my possibilities to create the designs as resolved as possible. The more finished the details are in my projects, the more accurate the process will be to paint them without distractions. I can sketch and draw from my imagination because I have done so all my life, and I have no inconvenience or prejudice in using images I need or ideas that seem interesting to me in my sources of inspiration. For me, it is of utmost importance to be clear that everything that contributes to and enriches my own ideas will be necessary to use, provided I maintain total respect not to supplant the intellectual property of others. To give a reinterpretation to all that material that I decide to resume or borrow, it is fundamental that my own idea remains original in its own approach and uses that external tool only as a collaboration.

Part of the diverse capabilities of a professional artist is also reflected in how they utilize external influences or the inspiration transmitted to them by other sources. We all influence each other mutually; I believe it is necessary to broaden the possibilities of thought. We have used this resource throughout history so that our symbols and beliefs, ideas and concepts can be part of the language we all speak and understand. This is how evolution happens—by exchanging and



Visitor, 2020, Oil on Canvas, 89 x 130 cm © Edgar Mendoza

sharing ideas.

Once my first design is finished, I replace any borrowed elements with new elements that are truly my own. I reorganize a second design, and by this point, I am clear on the authentic models I will use to star in my story. Photography is an indispensable tool in my paintings.

It is very important for me to take the photographs of my models myself, mainly because the aesthetic I find in them, since they are generally women, is part of the expressive stereotype that my inspiration needs. I usually find it in the women in my close personal environment or, for example, when I have just met them, I find in their physique the sufficient characteristics to play the role that my concept requires. I assume this same mechanism is used by all my fellow painters. In this way, I feel that I am not fabricating false characters but rather flesh-and-blood people, with blood in their veins or qualities to transmit humanity or dehumanization.

All my photographic sessions with my models only show the details I need to appear in my paintings. Except for the likeness of the model that I want to transmit as faithfully as possible, because that is why I chose her to paint her, creating a portrait of her, the rest of the photograph I can modify at my convenience or according to the needs of the design. I mainly modify the environments, a resource widely used with Photoshop, which is another indispensable tool in the elaboration of my designs.

I am a creator of scenarios, and the designs of my environments need to fabricate an illusion that can range from objective reality to a fictional or subjective reality. I integrate my models by cutting and pasting them like in a collage; there are no great mysteries or sophisticated special effects in their elaboration other than the creative instinct I have practiced since childhood, which has been perfected by my observation of reality and the development of my natural perceptive instincts and senses. But even though my limitations prevent me from handling the full potential of photographic technique or sophisticated design programs like Photoshop, my paintings, even so, manage to convey the illusion of a kind of "Trompe-l'oeil" or a romantic and primitive “Diorama."

How important is composition? Composition in a painting is the visual organization of the elements—how they are technically distributed in the scene to display the meaning and purpose that the author wants to express. It is important because composition establishes a goal and a guide for visual traversal, allowing the discourse or purpose of a work to be read better.
Artists and viewers instinctively perceive when a composition is coherent throughout its whole, capturing the rhythms and the orderly presence of the elements that the painter technically composed. The very structure of the composition in a work is an art in itself and a fundamental individual value that unmistakably reflects an artist's capabilities.



***Silence**,* 2018, Oil on Canvas, 20 x 20 cm © Edgar Mendoza

A practical example of what composition is for can perhaps be better understood practically in "Abstract" painting, because in this style, our visual attention focuses only on how the shapes, colors, rhythms, and location of the elements are organized. Our attention is not distracted by identifying real forms; therefore, it concentrates more on distinguishing whether harmony or discordance exists in the compositional proposal of those elements that have been painted to transmit a certain sensation to us.

How important is the theme? The theme displays the subject and topic we want to address and how we want to explain it. These topics can speak to the intention, concept, and symbology in a painting. The theme is important because it favors the meaning of our discourse and the reasoning we want our images to express. The theme largely contributes to the message of a work. If we establish a theme from the beginning in a painting and the elements we have painted coherently reference that theme, it will be easier for a viewer to interpret our discursive proposal, whether it is a simple idea or a complicated concept.

How important is the palette? The palette shows all the knowledge about color that a painter has experienced and learned. Eyes educated in the universe of color know how to distinguish the capabilities and limitations that an artist has regarding the science of color. Understanding color for a painter is a personal experience whose conclusions are obtained only through keen observation and constant technical experimentation. In this exercise, time is the main factor in perfecting the why and how we choose a specific palette.

A painter's palette displays their personality in each pictorial stage they execute and reinforces the meaning and objective of their discourse. Colors grant character to a work and, depending on how we use them, they will adequately transmit the message we want to convey in a congruent way. To develop the technical knowledge and selection of a palette, one must understand theoretically, but above all practically, the structure and functioning of color, and how to manipulate it and drive it to our interests. It is very important to select and mature that palette because this way there will be greater coherence in the whole set of the discourse that is intended to be expressed and transmitted.

How important is the play of lights? Light makes objects and bodies appear in a scene so that they manifest their presence and protagonism, giving meaning to their own roles. The play of lights grants the degree of chiaroscuro and the different levels necessary to establish the degree of dramatization we want to insinuate.

Lights are another very important factor for a painting to express itself correctly and in harmony with the rest of the structures used to build a design. As "realist" painters, our proposals and interpretations of "reality" need to show and establish a logic of illumination in those designs so



***Submarine**,* 2018, Oil on Canvas, 71 x 61 cm © Edgar Mendoza

that their scenarios are consistent with the concept.

How we manage the lighting in those scenarios, where many objects and elements often interact, will impact the reading we provide to the viewer for them to interpret our discourse. Through light, its play, and its variations, we can better express actions that need to transmit a specific emotional state, as well as contribute to reinforcing the meaning of a pictorial genre.

What are the most complicated works to paint? The reasons can be varied, and each author chooses what seems more or less complicated to them, but for practical purposes, the more elements a composition has, the greater the challenges to solve. Commissioned paintings and imposed themes that do not freely inspire the painter also tend to be complicated to execute.

And of course, it will always be complicated to paint a work that imposes a technical or conceptual challenge on us as artists in our own personal work. These challenges are perhaps the most difficult and complicated since they are self-examinations we perform on ourselves to demonstrate our worth before the mirror.

To be a little more specific, I currently think that the most difficult and complicated things to paint are figures with little contrast; to successfully resolve their scarce chiaroscuros and generate a reality effect, one must have great technique and enormous observational capacity. Similarly, I believe that the concepts that seem simple but actually express complex thought structures are more complicated and interesting to express.

A painter faces various stages throughout their career. In my opinion, the vision of complexity in elaborating a pictorial work will depend on many factors. But it is the maturity and experience of a painter that I believe most influence whether an artist resolves painting something complicated or simple, depending on the perspective from which it is viewed, will be more or less difficult to execute. At this moment, as a painter, I find it much more complicated to synthesize my ideas and cleanse them of excessive ornamentation.

"A painting is a poem without words," said the poet Horace. I knew practically nothing about the great poet Horace and his immensely significant texts that reflect a great capacity for synthesis in the face of exceedingly complex philosophical reflections, but perhaps his main virtue is the poetic precision to synthesize. It is enough to analyze his famous phrase "carpe diem"; it could be said to be a perfect phrase in its simplicity and precise in being so compact and yet so complex. I certainly add Horace's works to my list of pending readings, even though I am not an avid reader, much less an expert in poetry.

Now, let's develop the proposed phrase, "A painting is a poem without words": The main



Death, 2017, Oil on Canvas, 81 x 114 cm © Edgar Mendoza

reflection this phrase provokes in me is the analysis of whether a painting should only be appreciated for its mere observation as an artistic object, without reflecting or taking into account a conceptual discourse or explanation for its understanding.

On one hand, we have a physical painting as an artistic object that needs no further explanation to be appreciated; simply looking at it is enough to delight in its visual and aesthetic perfection. On the contrary, we have "the concept" as the main value over the object; here we find a very current phenomenon where there is a radical part of the criticism in current institutional art, that is, the so-called contemporary, modern, or avant-garde art, from which radical critiques arise particularly against painting, dictating that nowadays the word is more important than the work. For this radical criticism, painting is proscribed, excluded, and its language is now obsolete, insufficient, and incapable of belonging to this elite of the contemporary. But it is above all in "realist" painting and even more so in its variants of photorealism and hyperrealism where this negative criticism increases, considering these pictorial styles vacuous and empty.

Are seemingly simple works actually the most complex? I increasingly identify with the phrase "less is more."

The passing years surely influence this, and with them, we perhaps acquire a perception and a need to divest ourselves of what we do not need. This reflection on the great and small things in life and how they intervene in our existence makes us consider getting rid of excesses. But the deep concept and practice of cleaning up our lives are exceedingly difficult tasks, and only through long periods of maturation and process do we begin to understand the meaning of this necessity.

Based on this reasoning and applying it to painting, I observe that the more mature painters are, the more they need to synthesize not only in the entirety of their technical procedures but also in the meanings they want to transmit. The act of synthesizing is a very difficult task; therefore, and with good reason, seemingly simple works generally enclose great complexity in mature painters. Of course, I am not saying that a young artist does not have the capacity to synthesize; let us not forget that in the art world, there will always be brilliant precocious talents.

Not all realist works express something, why? As I have described, among the enduring fundamentals of Realism as a movement, objectivity in itself plays a fundamental role that persists in many of its artists up to the present day. For that group of painters, objectivity is sufficient for the interpretation of reality as it is, without embellishments or explanations. For example, in many cases of "Photorealist" paintings, the only conscious purpose is just to imitate the photograph as such, and not the reality that the photograph captured. In many "Realist" works and their derivatives of "Photorealism" and "Hyperrealism," we will find only that need to imitate a



Nest, 2015, Oil on Canvas, 82 x 105 cm © Edgar Mendoza

mechanically obtained image, even to copy a real natural model without more.

But I ask myself, is not the mere act of imitating or copying in painting just another way of expression? I personally believe that with only the technique of imitation and copying, we do express ourselves in that abstract language of the material itself.

Is it necessary for a work to tell a story? Why? I certainly do not believe it is necessary to narrate or tell stories for a work to transmit an emotion to the viewer just by observing its objectivity. But in my case, as a painter, I do need to narrate my concepts, creating a language of reflections that can go beyond what is observed at first glance in my paintings. In my work, I also need to express the subjective.

Can a drawing be as good as a painting? Drawing is not only the structure that supports a painting.

Drawing in itself is an autonomous expression with independent versatile capability. Through a drawing, the most complex symbol and thought can be expressed, as well as the most elemental languages for communication in all areas, not just art. By means of drawing, we invented writing and synthesized our concepts. Drawing has its own reading in an abstract language.

To establish the structural value of both a painting and a drawing, we must first consider the objective of why and what they were made for, and whether those objectives manage to express the proposed expectations. We must keep in mind that the value of an artistic piece does not depend on whether it is much more or less elaborate to show its quality.

A drawing therefore has the same capacity to compete in quality and expression with a painting. The flexibility of a drawing is so rich and varied, ranging from painstakingly elaborate drawings through precise planning to simple drawings that with just a sketch have the capacity to move as much as great works. Drawing can perfectly compete against a painting, and it is of vital importance to promote its great possibilities, raising awareness against the harmful prejudices it faces. A very important point to consider is the manner and environment in which the worth of a drawing is displayed and promoted compared to other techniques like painting.

Drawing must have its own separate niche so that it can be analyzed on its own. Promoters and artists must work together to create that niche for drawing and position it in the place it deserves.

What do you believe in spiritually? *Does your work express it?* I believe in God, a God very similar to the one my mother believed in and the one my father continues to believe in. So far, I



Symphony No. 1*,* 2014, Oil on Canvas, 162 x 220 cm © Edgar Mendoza

have not felt the need to reflect my belief in God and what it means to me in my work. My relationship with God is, for the moment, an experience only between Him and me.

What is the difference between European and Latin American Realism? To analyze these possible differences between the two worlds, it is necessary to make a general overview of painting and its circumstances in each place.

First, we should start and agree that "Realism" in painting has its main foundations in a colossal historical structure traditionally "European." We could metaphorically say that the DNA of Realism is "European" in its general canons.

European Realism is one of the direct heirs of a millenary artistic tradition that has given rise to impressive periods and movements in universal art. It has millennia of advantage in its own evolution and scientific investigation, and therefore its structure is extremely well-constructed theoretically and technically. Its teaching is based on a millenary tradition endorsed and confirmed over centuries by its great painting geniuses; its museums and academies are living testimonies and stages of all this. Having direct access and being able to see the masterpieces face-to-face is a potential resource for training generations of very well-trained and outstanding painters. All of this combined are very important factors that directly influence the characteristics of "European" Realism up to this moment.

"Latin American" easel painting began in the 16th century, the so-called "colonial" painting existed until the 18th century. Among the independences, republics, and revolutions that occurred in the American continent around the 19th and 20th centuries, the academies were updated and continued to base themselves on the direct influence and methodological "European" principles.

But at the end of the 19th century and throughout the 20th and 21st centuries in the American continent in general, a phenomenon arose that would provoke differences with "European" art. The peoples who became independent needed to strengthen a new identity of their own. The richness of our pre-Columbian roots in combination with the syncretisms between two civilizations produced an identity with languages and purposes different from those of the so-called Old World. Latin American painting is the daughter of European painting, but its anthropological and historical circumstances or its cosmogony have created different needs for the why and what for it is executed.

The differences specifically between realism in European and Latin American painting are found in their technical execution and conceptual purposes.



Mutant, 2013, Oil on Canvas, 162 x 114 cm © Edgar Mendoza

"European" realist painting is elaborated through a refined technique that has directly inherited all the knowledge produced in the history of painting. Its technical execution is simply impeccable. Worldwide, every realist painter seeks to emigrate to Europe to learn directly from its techniques and masters.

"Latin American" Realism attempts to produce a good painting that is well-constructed technically, but unfortunately, there is a lack of an adequate Academy in its countries of origin that trains its artists in elementary technical structures such as material methodology, composition, color, or drawing, to name just a few. By not having academies that provide knowledge for the formation and production of realist painting, the rise of Latin American painters called "self-taught" has been generated; I myself belong to this group that has fortunately overcome certain deficiencies thanks to the closeness to the world of European painting. But even with all these limitations, there are definitely extraordinary Latin American realist painters, great masters like Cláudio Bravo or Guillermo Muñoz Vera. Another great possibility in the American continent is the North American schools and academies. Their high-quality teaching is based on the 19th-century academy with extraordinary professors and first-rate artists, so necessary for the formation of a painter with a realist inclination. Furthermore, we must not forget that it is in the United States of America where flourishing realist styles like "Photorealism" and "Hyperrealism" originate.

Now let's move on to the other fundamental structure in both European and Latin American Realism, which is the discourse and the language. Undoubtedly, there are differences caused by a series of distinct sociocultural factors. The expressive needs of one continent and the other reflect problems so different that while something might be outdated or retrograde for Europeans, for Latin Americans it would be a current issue in their developing circumstances. The necessary motifs for some are unnecessary reasons for others. These examples are only one part that directly influences the language that each form of Realism may be interested in transmitting, depending on where it is made. More and more we emigrate and with it, we globalize our criteria mutually. But even in this whirlwind of communication in which we can connect so easily without needing to be in the place, and this never-before-seen resource of being able to access all types of sophisticated information just by looking at it on a cell phone. The reality is that the virtual world is very different from the real worlds in which we are born and develop.

The differences in language between the two Realisms are established from the way they are technically constructed: for Europeans, a painting must first be executed perfectly in all its canons so that it then expresses meaning.

The Latin American realist vision, even when it may show technical limitations, for us it is of vital importance to narrate and describe our entire worldview of the world around us.



Phenotype II, 2013, Oil on Wood, 86 x 140 cm © Edgar Mendoza

Finding the balance between the two and understanding the motives that inspire each one will definitely enrich the influence on new generations, giving rise to a Realism with broader capabilities.

Is classical painting overshadowed by contemporary painting? Everything that encompasses and is understood as "Classical Painting" and its influence on current realist painting will continue to have a powerful presence against the painting denominated contemporary. But is not "current Realist painting" contemporary painting?

Let's look at a bit of history about painting in general. The so-called "Classical Painting" has been around for millennia, adapting at every historical moment to continue functioning as a cornerstone. Its structure begins with the Greeks and Romans, and is later resumed in a long neoclassical journey that gave great artistic periods like the Renaissance or the Baroque. Realism, as I mentioned before, is an heir to the "Classical," and current realist painting and its variants of photorealism or hyperrealism continue trying to reflect several of its standards of beauty that have endured for centuries.

"Modern Painting," which emerged at the end of the 19th century, gives way to contemporary painting, which could approximately begin in the 1960s of the 20th century. If we reason it out, what we classify today as contemporary painting has only been around for half a century. Given this single comparison, could it be affirmed that the contemporary is overshadowing the classical? Let's return to the point.

"Contemporary Art," in short, is the art of our time that attempts to reflect current reality. It is characterized by being "heterogeneous" in its practices and its own contemporaneity is always in motion (meaning it always seeks to be constantly updating). But if "Contemporary Art" is "heterogeneous" and seeks to reflect a current reality, we should not hesitate to also classify "Realist, Photorealist, or Hyperrealist painting" as "Contemporary Art."

Current "Realist painters" really do not need validation from the other apparently dominant artistic currents, because we are a "Contemporary" reality, whether anyone likes it or not! But I do consider it very important to discuss self-critically and rigorously how we are reflecting that vision of current contemporary reality with our pictorial technique, reasoning, and discourses.

Do you paint for pleasure, loneliness, to live, to transcend... why do you do it? I paint because I continue to have ideas I want to paint, whether modifying and updating my own past projects or showcasing my new technical and conceptual concerns in the present. I greatly enjoy imagining everything I carry inside, and the ability to carry out the realization of my ideas excites and thrills me immensely. I like my craft more and more, perhaps because as I mature, I believe I



Phenotype I, 2013, Oil on Wood, 86 x 140 cm © Edgar Mendoza

feel a greater capacity for observation—now I see what I did not see before in the same things, and it is like rediscovering a new world in what I thought I had already lived. I have come to accept my shortcomings and limitations, stopping the voracious pretense, which makes me experience greater freedom. Throughout all my previous stages, I painted because I liked it; today, I continue painting because, fortunately, I still like it.

What is the difference between an artist and a painter? For me, there is no difference in the practical meaning of the definition between one and the other. The historical evolution of what it means to be an "artist" is defined up to the present day as "Anyone who is capable of creating from their own inspiration." In this classification, "artists" will be all those who dedicate themselves to "creating" in an activity considered "art." Among those activities, the "painter" is classified as an "artist."

But there is a different idea that categorizes the "artist" as a superior figure to an inferior or suspicious figure attributed to the "painter." The differences consist of separating the capacities attributed to each: the "artist" is the one who creates authentic works with their inspiration, and the "painter" only has the capacity to reproduce or copy.

In my view and based on my own experience, both qualities, that of creating and that of reproducing, are a vital part of the growth process of what I will call an "artist painter," as I prefer to unify and value both figures as part of a whole. Successes and failures are experienced only by practicing them technically and conceptually; it is a long race of trial and error necessary to define our identity as artists.

The "artist painter" must go through a diversity of stages that allow them to mature to better create their own needs for self-searching and engagement with their environment. The "artist painter" is both one and the other at the same time, in constant renewal and learning throughout their career.

I personally do not feel comfortable making judgments about what others should do. However, in this topic, perhaps a more fitting critical term than differentiating between an "artist" and a "painter" would be the figure of the "pseudo artist." Simply put, all those who pretend to show an image of what they are not and yet declare themselves as if they truly were, incurring in lies or claiming to be the creators of an idea or the technicians of a procedure that they do not actually practice.

Do you consider your works eternal moments of beauty or reflection? My work has given me and continues to give me great satisfaction. It used to be difficult for me to recognize its true value, but every time I meet one of my paintings face-to-face in the places where my collectors

exhibit them, I realize that I have indeed painted details and sets of images defined as "beautiful" and, in some cases, with discourses that still seem very interesting to me to reproduce and add in my new reflections.

I suppose that if my work provokes such pleasant re-encounters in myself when I observe them, why could not other viewers react similarly to one of my paintings? The tendencies of current art and the criteria they apply in their new codes of appreciation will influence the opinion of current viewers toward my painting. Only the viewers have and will have those answers about whether my work generates the sensation of moments of beauty or reflection for them.

In life as in art, nothing is perfect, but is everything perfectible? Things can always be improved depending on the area we find ourselves in. To better perceive the concept of "perfection" and not overvalue this term, we need to move within a framework that is humanly possible. And art is a merely human expression; only we can execute it consciously.

Everything we have considered perfection in art throughout history is better viewed from the perspective that it had to be devised and carried out by one or a group of physical people, as is often said, "they did it with their own hands." No matter how much something in art may surprise us or seem incredible, someone has done it.

Specifically in the realm of art, one can indeed be "perfectible," being capable of further perfecting what one sets out to do, provided, of course, that one considers the capacities and strategies of will to achieve it. A difficult task, but I believe that what has been done by man can always be surpassed if the need is felt. What better example than that of current "Realist" painters, who are constantly seeking to be "perfectible" in the face of their own technical and conceptual challenges.

HECTOR DIAZ

Cover:
Edgar Mendoza © Edgar Mendoza

Back Cover:
Mutant*,* 2013, Oil on Canvas, 162 x 114 cm © Edgar Mendoza

–

This interview is for reference only and not for purposes of publication.
For more information, please contact the gallery.

Copyright © 2026 HECTOR DIAZ & Edgar Mendoza. All rights reserved.

www.hectordiaz.art


www.hectordiaz.art