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“Bad” Painting

Marcia Tucker

Valgour prejudice has it that deformation, primitive as well as avant-garde, is the result not of a particular vision or an expressive maneuver, but of faulty execution. Even admitting that some peripheral style or other derives at least partially from what Bernard Berenson called “the originality of incompetence”—that is, from the executing hand’s involuntary transgression, unable as it is to reproduce perfectly the exemplary model the mind intends to reproduce—it always remains a maxim, as Malraux maintains, that "a clumsy style does not exist."

—Renato Poggioli

Have fun. If not, you’ll bore us.

—Marcel Duchamp

This exhibition has its genesis almost ten years ago, at Joan Brown’s studio in Oak­land, California. Nurtured on the East Coast in the Minimalist tradition, I was both shocked and delighted by Brown’s lack of consistency; her paintings were of all sizes, executed in many styles, and the subject matter was so wide ranging that there seemed little to identify any of the works as the product of the same hand. Early in the visit Brown pulled a portfolio of drawings out from under the bed. To my surprise, these were almost all classical figure drawings, done over a period of years at weekly drawing sessions with several other artists. Most disconcerting of all (especially in 1969) was the intensely personal nature of the subject matter—Brown at work; Brown dancing; Brown with her children, household objects, pets—incredible juxtapositions of homely and sophisticated images, all insistent upon their own individuality.

Other incidents come to mind—mostly having to do with my response and the response of others to certain situations—which, in part, inspired the show’s title. One such event was a fairly recent visit I made along with several other museum people to Earl Staley’s home, which is also his studio, in Houston. I was intrigued by the enormous amount of work hanging in such a small space. Staley makes paint­ings, watercolors, ceramics, craft-objects, and sculptures. He voraciously collects the work of his peers, as well as artifacts from Mexico, thrift-shop objects of various sorts, and a variety of plants—mostly cacti. The paintings and drawings are hung on the walls from floor to ceiling with no apparent attempt at arrangement. The effect of Staley’s house is one of extraordinary visual energy. When we left the studio, one of the visitors commented that his work “needs editing” in order for one to see and appreciate it. The implication was that Staley had been self-indulgent in his unwillingness to “weed out” the less interesting paintings.

On another recent occasion, I was in a Chicago gallery where a dozen paintings by Robert Chambless Hendon were leaning against the walls. When I asked an artist friend what he thought of them, his first response was that they were the worst paintings he had ever seen. An hour later he was still sitting in the room looking at them.

And a final anecdote: a very short time ago, I was describing this exhibition to several friends, all artists. One of them said that she liked the premise of the exhibition, and asked if I had any examples of the kind of work we were thinking of including. I showed her a sheet of James Albertson’s slides, and her distressed response was definitive—“But these are really bad!”

This, then, is the ironic nature of the title, “bad” painting, which, as Albertson himself said in his catalog statement, is really “good” painting. It is figurative work that defies, either deliberately or by virtue of disinterest, the classic canons of good taste, draftsmanship, acceptable source material, rendering, or illusionistic representation. In other words, this is work that avoids the conventions of high art, either in terms of traditional art history or very recent taste or fashion. Nevertheless, “bad” painting emerges from a tradition of iconoclasm, and its romantic and expres-
Personally, I would rather this exhibition was entitled “good” painting because I think good painting more aptly describes what I do. If the works herein were bad in the sense of inept there would be no point to the show. (And surely the rejection of naturalism in figuration is not the same thing as being inept.) Bad in the sense of naughty implies breaking the rules, but in art-making, terrifyingly enough, there aren’t any rules to break. So I am left with the idea that if this painting is indeed “bad,” it must be morally perverse, which, whether true or false, doesn’t have anything to do with its quality as art.

I believe that the particular forms art takes are the products of individual sensibilities in various times and places. I do not believe that art progresses—only that it changes. Consequently I don’t concern myself with any ideas about what I should be doing, but only with making something that will excite me and give me pleasure, feeling that if I can keep the damn thing alive for myself, the work will both find and deserve a larger audience.

One way I do this is by expanding the painting’s significance through purposeful ambiguity, references to subjects people care about (sex, death, religion…), the use of familiar art-historical themes, and occasional quotes or borrowings from the masters and conventions of past time. Another way I strive for vitality is by seeking to avoid the mere rendering of images by rote; ideally each brush stroke is a purposeful, unpredictable gesture. Finally I seek to reconcile both form and content in an aesthetically complete but not entirely satisfying way. The psychological tension thus set up, like the tension in Mannerist painting (my favorite period in the history of art)
find unnerving, challenging, and beautiful.

I loved the rough energy I felt in Chicago, where I received my B.F.A. from the School of the Art Institute in 1966. I admired the work of the monster school and the newly formed Hairy Who, both of whose examples reinforced my own bent toward subjective painting.

Having decided it might not be good for my artistic development to spend my whole life in one place, I cast about for another area that might have some sympathy for my work. A number of artists living in the San Francisco Bay Area appeared to display a similar individualistic waywardness in their attitude toward art making, so I moved to Oakland to complete my education.

I have been happy working in northern California, sharing its interest in figurative work. I follow admiringly the production of many of the area’s younger painters, especially women such as Judy Linhares, Elaine Wander, and my own girl friend, Louise Stanley. However I have kept the raw edge in my work that I picked up in Chicago (or perhaps through the example of Edward Munch and Max Beckmann, or my own Scandinavian ancestry) and which is so evident in the region’s art.

My work is my work. It contains no moral lessons or political messages, nor is it the expression of a specific artistic creed, or, in any direct sense, an autobiography. I do not try to be either tasteful or tasteless, but rather attempt to make art that colors existence instead of being an already overly familiar and redundant backdrop to it.

-James Albers

Figurative distortion as an aspect of avant-garde work...
At Joan Brown's request, no statement is included.
was anticipated by Poggioli when he noted that
modern civilization has achieved a representational technique so perfect that the artist
can easily become a pedagogical monstrosity. . . . The classical principle of "vanquished
difficulty" has thus lost any meaning for the art of our period. . . . [The artist's] aim is not
what we once called imitation, it is deformative representation. or, indeed, just that
abstract art which polemically gets labeled nonrepresentational. 7

Interestingly, we seem to have come full circle, so that completely non-objective
work shares with eccentric imagery the possibility of being radical, depending upon
the context from which it came and in which it is to be seen.

Nonrepresentational art, in the literal sense of the term, can be figurative: indeed,
the deformation of the figure in the work of artists whom the painter Gabriel Lader-
man called "unconventional realists" 8 is one indication of their disinterest in
representation per se. They are, as Laderman points out, attempting "to control the
associative levels as well as the structural level in their paintings." 9 The stylistic con-
cept of deformation itself has a long history. The deformations in so-called primitive
art served as a stylistic source for so much advanced painting and sculpture of the
early twentieth century; the distortions of the figure in Etruscan and Egyptian art
are now seen as essential aspects of a style. Now, as at the beginning of the century,
"it was the painters who wished to be most modern, which means most committed
to the future, who rummaged most furiously in the past," said Malraux. 10

The variety of deformation of the figure by the artists in this exhibition reflects
the extraordinarily wide range of their sources. Joan Brown, for instance, has used
an Egyptian theme in an autobiographical context in a recent series of paintings
based on her travels, real and imaginary, to that country. Eduardo Carrillo's work
not only has Egyptian figures but figures that resemble the monumental statuary of
Mesopotamia as well. Joseph Hilton combines images from early Flemish painting
with those of Etruscan sculpture and early Roman frescoes. Earl Staley has often
alluded to the kinship between Mexican Indian art and artifacts and his own way of
seeing; likewise, the skeleton images of Judith Linhares are derived from Mexican
icons, and a large part of Carrillo's imagery throughout his career is based on an-
cient and modern Mexican art and folklore.

Describing the ritual and allegorical deformation which is proper to religious
and liturgical art, Poggioli says of Byzantine painting:

The distortion of effigies and the human body sometimes functions as the "objective cor-
relative" of the sense of the unspeakable and transcendent proper to the mystical vision,
as in the case of El Greco. . . . Then the paradoxical task of such a distortion is a transfigur-
ing figuration. In some exceptional cases the deformation appears as an involuntary
deviation from the norm, the direct and unconscious expression of the ingenuous, as in
the case of the "downier" Rousseau or other modern primitives. 7

The fourteen artists in this exhibition are not "modern primitives"; they are, rather,
especially sophisticated people, each one intentionally seeking specific results in a
unique, highly individualistic style. Although, in some instances, such as in the work
of Joan Brown or Charles Garabedian, the only stylistic consistency is inconsistency,
even within a single work, each of the artists has been influenced by a specific kind
of imagery from the past, so that their willful and informed borrowing from the
past separates them from a truly primitive sensibility.

P. Walter Siler is formally influenced by Chinese brush paintings, and Charles
Garabedian has often utilized themes and images from Greece and China. Shari Ur-
quhart incorporated a Buddhist temple with Chinese characters in a recent painting,
and Cply (William Copley) has often combined classical motifs—such as a Greek
pediment—with his pin-up figures.

Joseph Hilton, of all the artists, borrows most outspokenly from early sources,
and is especially influenced by early Flemish and early Italian religious painting.
Hilton shares with Duccio, the late thirteenth-century Siene painter, a predilection
for detail which "overrides the demands of the scene as a whole. He is happy to
abandon an all-over visual logic to describe an object or an individual gesture per
sc. . . . Duccio's vision encompassed the drama of the whole and of its constituent
parts, but he was not prepared to submit both to the same logic. The unifying factor
is his imaginative intensity." Hilton seems to have a similar transcendent quality in
his own work. His catalog statement is a clear expression of his spiritual intent;
although the meaning of the word "religious" for him is specific, he does not share
in an already existing single "system of belief."

Distortions in the use of the figure are related to the element of fantasy, of the
difference between the way the mind imagines things and the way they are actually
seen. Judith Linhares' strange elongated or enlarged figures come from an almost
direct translation of her Jungian explorations of the unconscious, which she has
systematically used for source material in the past few years. By remaining "faithful
not to a photographic reality, but to what I perceive to be the essence of the ob-
cject," she achieves a directness and spontaneity in her work which is moving and
often profound. Eduardo Carrillo, in Las Tropicains (1974), creates a metaphysical
sense by radically altering the perspective illusion, so that the figures are, for the
most part, seen at a sharp angle from below. Juxtaposed with this specific perspec-
tive are figures situated in another, ambiguous kind of illusionistic space. His work
combines an extraordinary intensity of color and a wealth of rich surface texture
with a startlingly luminous, majestic, otherworldly quality of light.

Distortion can be used for a variety of purposes, however. In the instances of
Joan Brown and Cply, it expresses an anti-intellectual, antirationalist attitude. While
Brown's work "combines a solemnity about art with a total rejection of standard art
attitudes," Cply's outrageous humor is enforced—and made unfrivolous—by his
"disregard for all painterly tricks such as perspective, modelling, chiaroscuro." His
pictures, according to Roland Penrose, "are immensely skillful because they are so

FROM BAD TO WORSE

PEOPLE, PARTICULARLY PERTURBED POETS,
PRIZE PERCEIVE PAINTING,
PLEASURE PAIN,
PASSIONED PRINCES PASSÉ PAINTERS.

BAD PAINTING, BROADLY, BAEDEKER, BAJA CALIFORNIA,
BATTLES BALANCES, BARBARIC BALLAD BANDITS,
BARELY, BANDWAGONERS BANKROLLING BASIC
BAUHAUS BAUDELAIRE.

WORSE YET! WORLD WIDE WARSHIPS, WRATH, WREAK,
WRONGING WILEY WYOMING
WOOTAN, WU CHANG, WORMS,
WATSONVILLE AND WINOOSKI.

—Eduardo Carrillo

Eduardo Carrillo, Las Tropicana. Oil on panel. 84 x 132”
I take an antagonistic stance when I paint, either because it’s the way I am or because I can’t do any better. I’m not interested in developing techniques. This doesn’t indicate intelligence on my part, but impatience. 17

The work of James Albertson is another example of antagonism turned to esthetic ends. It is often extremely offensive to viewers because Albertson deals directly, and often frighteningly, with incisive and bitter humor—with forbidden subjects. These are forbidden only in terms of the supposedly innate “good” taste of high art, but also because they make a mockery of traditional American habits and values. Albertson does not try to make moral or political statements; 18 he does, according to his catalog statement, “avoid the rendering of images by rote; ideally, each brushstroke is a purposeful, unpredictable gesture,” resulting in a lurid, fiercely romantic, and improbable style of painting which has its precedents in the work of Chaim Soutine or Max Beckmann. But it is the jarring incongruity of style and content that renders Albertson’s work offensive to some, outrageously funny to others. The objects of his parody range from children’s book illustrations such as that suggested in The Big Blue Bunny Lies in Wait (not in the exhibition), with its enormous, menacing rabbit waiting for two children skipping down the road (the title painted onto the picture in the manner typical of the form it parodies), to Italian Baroque and Mannerist allegorical compositions such as that seen in The Triumph of Chastity (1976). His subjects are sex, death, racism, religion and violence—subjects he says “people care about” but are literally taboo in our society as he presents them, which is why they are both shocking and funny.

The anarchistic sensibility infusing Albertson’s work constitutes a strongly antipolitical stance, usually associated with the avant-garde and having its most specific precedent in Dadaist antiauthoritarianism. Antagonism and nihilism also have served as the impetus for such other generative movements as late eighteenth-century Romanticism, Surrealism, Abstract Expressionism, and the so-called American “regionalism” and Social Surrealism of the mid-1930’s. All these movements or schools were, at one time, characterized as neoprimitive, and this neoprimitivism is clearly an aspect of the romantic tradition, albeit the most unpopular one. 19 It usually manifests itself, as in the present instance, as a refusal to give lip service to the traditional canons of good taste or refinement, as an interest in the natural, unfettered, and spontaneous expression of the self and the world it perceives. Significantly, the history of criticism indicates that anti-avant-garde critics are nearly always also antiromantics. 20 Robert Goldwater, in his Primitivism in Modern Art (1967), observed that primitivism, like romanticism, is an attempt to put new life into art by breaking away from current and accepted formulas 15 and emphasized the anti-intellectual attitudes and emotional intensity of romanticism as a common bond with primitivism. Thus, it is not surprising to find Joan Brown’s work, for instance, linked with and inspired by Rembrandt, Picasso, and Jackson Pollock, all romantic and primitivistic artists. 22
I want my art to have the morality of a few, the playfulness of a queer, and the backing of the mob.

—James Chatelain
The a-formal hierarchy of images found in the work of Earl Staley, in which the size and pictorial emphasis of a given element in a painting depends not upon its formal contingency but upon its personal meaning and importance, is also primitivistic. His giant, lurid mermaids washed up onto mountains or fields, which are dwarfed by their unwilling inhabitants, are formally incongruous and emotionally direct. *Xochimilco* (1977), with its absurd and touching romanticism, is in turn sinister, moving, and outrageously funny because of the dislocation of images according to their personal rather than formal importance. The desire for the direct and unselfconscious expression of meaning in such paintings is shared with true primitives, who are, however, not subject to artistic or art-historical influence. Staley, on the other hand, exhibits a wide range of knowledge of both past and recent art-historical sources in his work, and in fact teaches art history as well as painting.

Staley, Linhares, Urquhart, Brown and others wish to present their subject matter with as little psychic distance as possible, avoiding those formal aspects of a work that would deflect the spectator from the direct absorption of the intended meaning. The directness of a broad, crude painting style and large, flat areas of intense color is put to use by the artists in various ways. Joan Brown’s work, for example, shows a strong Fauve influence: the generalized forms and a brilliant juxtaposition of hues give the work an immediacy and spontaneity which enforce the emotional impact of the images. Like the Fauves, Brown manipulates her imagery by means of the most simple and immediate use of paint, forcing the viewer’s attention toward seeing and feeling the “world” that the painting sets up, but she also wants direct awareness of the painting as a flat surface on which a physical material has been applied by someone’s hand.

The tension between focus on the material surface of the painting and the content or subject matter involves an intriguing interplay of realism and illusion. Like Manet’s use of the figure against a flat, highly painterly, and nonillusionistic background, Brown’s thick, expressionistic painting surface evokes the materiality of pictorial illusion, and her isolated frontal figures become poignant metaphors for states of being.

William Wegman’s drawings have a similar characteristic. Like Brown’s paintings, they are nostalgic, but Wegman’s nostalgia is witty rather than painfully personal. His drawings run a wide gamut from painterly and expressionistic to barely visible, fragile pictorial puns on the nature of line itself. By using inexpensive paper and pencil, ink or magic markers, Wegman plays with the tension between our inclination to see an image on the page as illusionistic and his insistence on the actual, simplistic nature of the act of drawing as opposed to “rendering.” His work seems to adhere to the dictum, “Never neglect the obvious.” The drawing, *I Used to be Ashamed of my Striped Face*, with its crudely drawn woman with a red-striped face situated in the center of the typewriter-sized page and its title inelegantly written in capital letters at the bottom of the page, plays with literal words and images that are the subject of cartoons rather than high art. Wegman’s work does not have a cartoon character, however; even as it addresses itself to the literal and obvious, it subverts its own humor with a kind of intense self-mockery aimed at the conventions of all kinds of art. Whereas cartoons appeal to the popular audience through shared humor, and high art appeals to an elite by virtue of its mystery and elusiveness, Wegman’s work appeals to and avoids both audiences. Sometimes he utilizes stick figures, awkward lines with an animate character, and captions that are haphazardly written out. The dated, 1950’s imagery of a drawing like *Not Bad* (1974) is a wonderful commentary on the parallelism of hair styles and art styles; likewise, the literalism of *Woman with Two Hairs* attacks the problematic and profound nature of art, illusion, and reality with deadpan humor. Rather than using children’s drawings as a point of departure, Wegman uses teenage drawing styles to subvert yet another venerated (though recent) tradition of drawing upon the art of children and the insane. Similarly, in *A Large Living Room*, his prototype is *Better Home and Gardens*—or, rather, *McCall’s*—not Janson’s *History of Art*.

The isolation of the figure characteristic of so many of Wegman’s drawings is found, with less humorous intent, in the work of Neil Jenney. Jenney thinks of his paintings (especially those from 1968-69) as illusionistic. These narrative pieces about the relationships between objects (car and man, girl and broken vase) share with Brown’s figures the frontality and painterly quality that originated with Manet. Unlike Manet, Jenney’s works are sometimes comic and grotesque, obsessive visual equivalents of a narrative situation in which an event that has just occurred is depicted. Like other artists here, Jenney is aware of the illusionism inherent in the use of a naturalistic image and uses a frame to set up tension between the crudely painted image and this illusionism.

James Chatelain’s paintings most resemble Jenney’s in their isolation of the image against a painterly background. However, Chatelain’s narration is different, dealing with violent encounters between people. The violence of the potential situations engaged in by two (and sometimes three) people finds a metaphor in the extreme irreverence of the broad paint handling. Like Jenney, Chatelain uses backgrounds of one color—in his case, a pale, creamy gray-white, with some variation from painting to painting. But whereas Jenney’s symbolic use of green (grass), brown (dirt), and blue (sky) is always the same, a kind of painterly shorthand intended to focus the viewer’s attention on the relationships between objects, Chatelain’s backgrounds are neutral and do not fix the subjects in any particular time and space. This kind of generalized image, found often in primitivistic renderings, serves to intensify Chatelain’s images and makes them more terrifying because they are disengaged from a specific situation and are universalized. Paint drips down over Chatelain’s frames—when he uses them—reminding the viewer that the images are pictures as much as they are events. With Chatelain, as with Wegman, Brown, and
The reason I agreed to participate in your “Bad” Painting exhibition was because I felt I could contribute to a new attitude which would make it forever impossible to receive letters such as you sent me asking a statement. It appears you do not understand the problem you have posed for yourselves. There is only bad art because there is no such thing as art. You may not print this except in its entirety.

—Cply
Jackson Pollock is reflected in the work of Carrillo, Staley, and Albertson, not only the Mexican muralists Orozco and Siquieros had a strong influence on the Abstract Expressionists, and it is significant that their influence as well as that of painters like the range of artistic experience available in New York during the 1930’s, Joshua in the 1930’s. It was a period when form was of less interest than content. In describing psychological processes occurred at the same time that the widest variety of styles existed in art—regionalism, abstraction, Social Realism, Cubism, and Surrealism. Taylor remarks that the plurality of styles and attitudes existed in art—regionalism, abstraction, Social Realism, Cubism, and Surrealism.

As in the work in this exhibition, emotional content, subject matter and idealistic commitment to a personal vision were of vital importance to artists and public alike in the 1930’s. It was a period when form was of less interest than content. In describing the range of artistic experience available in New York during the 1930’s, Joshua Taylor remarks that the plurality of styles and attitudes meant that even if an artist chose to throw his or her lot with one militant group or another, they could not avoid being affected by the various other artistic pressures of the complex environment. Nor was it simply a matter of conservatives and rebels; rebellion had many faces. Furthermore, because of the federal art projects, artists of all kinds worked together. Probably for the first time in America, art had its own broadly constituted community of fellows not determined by where they had studied or membership in an honorific organization, but simply by the fact of their being artists. Artists had their environment in which to work and, although quite conscious of society as a whole, they felt themselves to have a broader franchise to be artists on their own terms than ever before.

The style and themes of such artists as Thomas Hart Benton, John Stuart Curry, and the Mexican muralists Orozco and Siquieros had a strong influence on the Abstract Expressionists, and it is significant that their influence as well as that of painters like Jackson Pollock is reflected in the work of Carrillo, Staley, and Albertson, not only in terms of social individualism, combined with a sense of participation and active commitment to their often unpopular views. It is interesting to compare John Stuart Curry’s attitude and his work of the 1930’s with those of several artists in this exhibition. Joshua Taylor’s description of Curry’s thinking might well apply to Albertson, Staley, Brown, Chatelain, Siler, Garabedian, and others:

Curry studied hard to leave things in their place, to retain a specific, homely sense of both physical and psychological environment, almost as a rebuke to transcendent urbanism and elegant form. The painting of his mother and father sitting in their Kansas farmhouse, dated 1929, is a careful study in formal anticlimaxes. Any potential elegance or formal adroitness is carefully undermined to suggest the humble but unique character of the objects. Painterly facility, like official rhetoric, he seemed to feel, might cause one to doubt the truth. Curry’s paintings, like a proper folk song, are sung by a carefully untrained voice.

While it has a strong affinity to the work of other San Francisco fantasy painters, the work of Judith Linhares has its antecedents in the paintings of such eccentric American artists of the 1930’s as Florine Stettheimer, who, drawing on the work of children, created an intensity and brilliance of color similar to that found in Linhares’ paintings and gouaches. Situated in sparsely-painted landscapes or interiors, Stettheimer’s figures often have the same relationship of scale in the interaction of figure and ground as that seen in Linhares’ Mona is Watching (1976), an eerie, haunting interior in which a tiny odalisque is scrutinized by a giant painting of the Mona Lisa.

Despite its stylistic affinities to Matisse and the Fauves, Joan Brown’s work has also been cited for its nostalgia for the “innocent” delights of the 1930’s in America. The connection, however, is more one of the subject matter than style, since Brown’s work is often autobiographical and concerned with banal events (rather than using banal images as a source, as does Cply). One might also cite the relationship between the work of Marsden Hartley (particularly the dark, oddly eccentric New Mexico paintings of 1922-23, his most expressionistic works, which embodied his obsessive antipathy to what he called “hyper-intellectualism”) to that of Linhares and Garabedian. Later Hartley works, such as the Fisherwoman’s Last Supper (1940-41) constitute a reaction to the Dada idea that all things have equal significance; in these later years, Hartley sought a new freedom in his work by turning back to the Dada attitude, producing paintings in which the distorted and nonhierarchic image prevailed, in much the same way that it prevails in the work of Joan Brown or P. Walter Siler.

Another figure from the 1930’s, Alfred Maurer, comes to mind in this context because of his inconsistency of style and his individualistic, quirky late portraits from 1929 until 1932, the year of his death. While these paintings of Maurer’s are overtly expressionistic, they are concerned with the abandonment of traditional ideas of composition and esthetic subject matter, as were Man Ray’s paintings of that period. A strong stylistic affinity to the work of Maurer and Man Ray exists in...
While wondering about this exhibition, worrying what to use, I went down to the bathroom to shave. I looked in the mirror and my nose was bigger than usual. It was a difficult day at the studio. The studio is a wonderful place and I am losing it while trying to move from collage back to paint on canvas. My friends have been kind and I keep telling myself to be patient that everything will be fine.

—Charles Garabedian

Charles Garabedian, Adam and Eve. Collage and acrylic on canvas. 40 x 65"
Garabedian’s untitled two-paneled collage of 1977, with its juxtaposition and superimposition of naturalistic subject matter, flat background patterning, spatial ambiguity, and use of the partial figure.

Similarly, P. Walter Siler’s drawings have a nostalgic, ambivalent, darkly humorous flavor which seems uniquely American because of their particularized urban imagery, but they relate equally to a European sensibility such as that found in Dubuffet’s *l’art brut*. Siler’s sources are, in large part, the work of German Expressionist painters, sources which he shares with Brown, Albertson, Hilton, Staley, Chatelain, and Urquhart. However, the influence of a later American manifestation of expressionism resulting from the transposition of the Surrealist esthetic to America in the mid to late 1930’s, in the face of the impending Second World War, is less apparent but perhaps more important to the work of many of these artists.

Siler first painted in an Abstract Expressionist style, as did Joan Brown and Robert Chambliss Hendon. To them, Jackson Pollock is a key figure, since the absence of a skilled hand—or any direct use of the hand at all in the drip paintings of the late 1940’s—was a convention clearly shared by those eccentric figurative painters who have disregarded the conventions of traditional draftsmanship. Similarly, Pollock’s apparent lack of composition, which is actually the denial of traditional composition, has its analogy in imagistic work that springs from the same impulse. Thus, the freedom and spontaneity found in the primitivistic and homely renderings of the figurative art of the 1930’s, the rejection of “objective” standards and judgements of taste and estheticism in America as well as European Dada and Surrealism, and the rebellious, anti-traditional, emotional energy and immediacy of the Abstract Expressionists’ work all are linked as precedents to the work in this exhibition. Each of these movements questioned the idea of skilled representation as a basic issue in terms of the public’s initial ability to respond favorably to the work.33

Much of the work in this exhibition has obviously been influenced by non-high-art sources—those of commercial and popular art, children’s book illustrations, high-school paraphernalia, calendars, comic books, and thrift shop and flea market objects collected by many of the artists. Cply in particular draws his iconography from pulp and pornography magazines, comic strips, and tattoo parlor “flash.” Among Staley’s sources are *kitsch* artifacts, such as black velvet paintings made in Mexico for tourist consumption, artifacts of “bourgeois baroque taste.”34 The comics have been an especially important influence, partly because they were an early and popular form of visual narration (with a glance back at Italian predella painting of the thirteenth century). The comics have influenced, in diverse ways, almost all the artists in this exhibition. Most notable in this respect is the work of Siler and Cply, the former maximizing the black-and-white ink schematizations of the comics, the latter flattening and simplifying them even further. The impact of San Francisco’s *Zip Comix* is felt in Albertson’s use of “forbidden” subjects rather than in any aspect of his style. Comic book styles and attitudes are also implicit in the work of Wegman, Chatelain, Hilton, and Jenney because they tend to schematize figures or situations in order to present them in a more immediate way.

Cham Hendon’s exclusive use of images from calendars (Mallard with Friend and Sing, both 1977) and from television advertising (McMurphy’s House, derived from a loan company advertisement) seems, at first, odd, because the images are so relentlessly *kitsch* in origin. However, the complex technique employed, pouring paint in small segments so that it swirls into an intricate, infinitesimally marbled pattern of color, recalls not only the elegance of Florentine endpapers, but also the all-over dense patterning of Pollock. Hendon, however, uses this technique to make his paintings resemble, from a distance, a paint-by-numbers canvas. It is only on close scrutiny that the extraordinary technical virtuosity becomes evident. Just as many of the other painters in the exhibition play with the juxtaposition of spatial and situational ambiguities in their work, Hendon creates two kinds of painting at once, forcing the viewer to continuously choose between extremes of vulgarity and elegance.

The surface of Shari Urquhart’s works provides a similar fascination, but her technique and images are not at odds with each other. Her works are tapestries, which usually carry craft-oriented and popular folk-art implications. The hooked wool, silk, thread, and other kinds of yarn she uses give the work an intensity of color, an optical mix that could not be achieved except through another, more illusionistic, kind of pointillism.35 The textural beauty and vividness of Urquhart’s tapestries combine with the homely yet idealized figures, with results that are incongruous, irrational, and poetic, much in the manner of the haunting, often distressingly mysterious interiors with figures by Balthus in the 1940’s. Urquhart’s images have much in common with the brooding, perverse sexuality implied in Balthus’ work, but Urquhart adds a down-to-earth, often humorous touch by incorporating such non-art visual items as a Betty Crocker fruit salad or a white rabbit cake with jelly beans.

There begins to emerge in all this work what might be thought of as a specific iconography. Striking among the images, in their prevalence, are those of skeletons, bones, and other death images. These are particularly common in earlier work by Earl Staley and Joan Brown. The shamanistic practice of contemplating one’s own skeleton is a magical ritual, indicating the interchangeability of life and death, thereby attempting to deny the temporal dimension. Death, a taboo subject in our society—at least until very recently, when an intellectualized thanatology has become one of the America’s most popular subjects—is ironically parodied in Albertson’s *Momento Mori*, an image of a young woman proffering a skull to an old woman, with a graveyard in the background. Hilton’s *Annual Event* (1977) contains two powerful images of death: one is a field of bones (suggested, he says, by a T.S. Eliot poem) and the other a figure standing before an open grave, both images intended to suggest renewal, salvation, rebirth.

In almost all of the work of Carrillo, who is concerned with metaphysical rather than formal questions, skeletons, shamanistic images and other symbols of death are
My paintings refer to the sentimentality and bad taste inherent in my source material—number paintings, calendars, postcards—and to much that is in the folk tradition here in Wisconsin. The farmer’s daughter here holds a PhD in art history and works in a massage parlor, but her bad taste is legitimate (and not reactionary). Whether good manners dictate that modern art begins with Manet or Cézanne is for others to debate; it’s not irrelevant but restrictive. I paint cheerfully and with as much innocence as possible.

Traditional drawing problems interest me when someone else does them. I usually begin a painting by doing a tracing of my source material. This allows me to analyze that material and bring it into my studio life. Next I transcribe the tracing onto canvas and adjust it to suit the new scale. When painting I pretty much disregard the drawing. Not that it’s a matter of indifference to me that I am painting deer or ducks but rather that studio problems dictate the vocabulary that I use. It’s all there in the paintings, they are very straightforward and open.

The artistic community in which I work is incomplete. There are good artists around but no audience, no collectors, critics, museums, journalists. There is a lot of useless maneuvering as if the key to the chronometer is somewhere else and all of the charts sent from there are only half useful. It makes for a gutsy trip and a lot of freedom, but doing it the hard way definitely suggests a lack of clear thinking.

I like the title of this exhibition except for the quotation marks which enclose bad. I’m glad to see “Art Outside the Mainstream” go as I’m not sure that I know what art inside the mainstream might be right now. From my perspective it appears to be crowded; I feel more comfortable being perverse than crowded.

—Robert Chambless Hendon
found. John Fitzgibbon, an artist and writer living in Sacramento, California, described *Las Tropicinas* as “a demonic fable, which...seemed to involve ghastly Aztec astronauts performing some ritual totentanz on the future remains of Houston, New York and Mexico City.” Even Wegman, in his bizarre way, utilizes images of death, as in *Right Place Wrong Time* and *Wrong Place Wrong Time*, in which performance and the death of Jesus are absurdly combined. Garabedian’s early paintings (1965-66) were pictures of TV gangsters being shot to death. Violence and victimization are at the heart of Chatelain’s images, as is the case for Siler, whose figures often seem helpless and abused. So too does the figure in Neil Jenney’s *Girl and Vice*, an after-the-fact narrative painting. It is not social commentary that accounts for this kind of subject matter, but the metaphorical connection between the assault of the world itself on the eyes, mind, and psyche.

Death and violence are often coupled with sexuality, as in Carrillo’s *Las Tropicinas*, in which voluptuous and frightening images are mingled with nightmarish intensity. In Judith Linhares’ untitled gouache, a mermaid and a skeleton embrace. While Brown’s figures dance seductively with death, Cply’s appear to engage in acts of extreme violence while making love. Sex and death are not, of course, always equated. Albertson’s *Triumph of Christly* is serious, homely, and ridiculously suggestive; the sexuality of Urquhart’s figures is also often incongruous, while the couple in Joan Brown’s *The Journey #1* is mute and tender.

Monsters, both legendary and actual, are commonplace in many of these paintings, for example, the mermaids of Linhares and Staley or the giant sea-monster in Garabedian’s *Culver City Flood*. Brown often uses animals in her work, so that “people and animals are almost interchangeable” iconographically, as in *Woman Wearing Mask*, where it is difficult to tell whether the creature is an animal with a woman’s body or vice versa. Even Wegman’s *A Huge Deadly Snake Rendered Harmless* presents us, humorously, with an aspect of the use of monsters or otherworldly creatures as hyperbolic images. The monster or creature is an essential figure in such narrative texts as fairy tales, fables, and myths, as well as in so-called nonsense verse.

Because so many of the works in this exhibition are narrative, the use of images found in folklore, fairy tales, and poetry in them is not surprising. In both painting and literature, these kinds of images are used as an element of free association, of escape, of fantasy, and as a link to the past, especially the past of childhood. Thus, images of death, sex, violence, of the devil and other mythic beings are part of what Mario Praz calls the “romantic agony.” In these paintings, such images—both of monsters and mythical creatures, and of human beings altered, deformed, or transformed—express a taste for what Poggioli terms “the denigrating image,” commonly found in avant-garde poetry.

This type of image works not only satirically, but lyrically.... Modern poetry uses the derogatory or pejorative image not only as a vehicle for caricature and grotesque representation, but also as an instrument to disfigure, or transfigure, the object so as to produce a radical metamorphosis. In turn, this metamorphosis is intended to produce a strong emotional response, by providing an unexpected and often shocking image, such as that in Albertson’s *The Finding of the Carrot*, in which a large white rabbit is transformed into a voluptuous woman whose posture is taken from a classical annunciation figure. In Albertson’s *Sex, Violence, Religion and the Good Life*, the images are not transformed by metamorphosis, but by radical incongruity, where unspeakable acts of cannibalism are enacted in an atmosphere of cozy middle-class domesticity.

The very intention, or willingness, to épater le bourgeois is no more than one of many ways to square accounts with the public and is indeed probably the most valid acknowledgment of the presence and influence of that public.

But while this element of offensiveness is a way of addressing the public directly, it is also an aspect of the nature of parody, in which formal conventions are closely followed while subject matter or content which is entirely alien to the form is inserted, resulting in an incongruous relationship between the two. Albertson says, in this regard, that he tries “to reconcile both form and content in an esthetically complete but not entirely satisfying way,” to set up a psychological tension between the two.

Much of the work in this exhibition is parodistic. By calling the relationship of form and content into question, it examines the nature of art and esthetic perception itself, and therefore the nature of the relationship between art and life. The psychological, formal, emotional and intellectual imbalance created is part of the function of all advanced art: “Convention,” says Neil Jenney, “is the opiate of the masses.” Good parody also requires as absolute a mastery of form as the original work being parodied, so that the use of classical models in the work of Albertson, Brown, Hilton, Urquhart, and others dictates a strong formal sensibility, one that is “unlearned” or bypassed rather than sought after unsuccessfully.

One aspect of the parodistic sensibility resulting in a curious shared iconography is that of the picture within the picture. In Joan Brown’s *The Room, Part I*, a Chinese painting of figures and horses shares the center of focus with the chair and draped leg. Joseph Hilton’s *Annual Event* contains a painting within a painting, each of a different nature and drawn from a different art-historical source. A Mannerist painting and a pin-up calendar are juxtaposed in the background corner of Albertson’s *Triumph of Christly* and in one of Linhares’ gouaches, a painting of the Mona Lisa’s head dominates the room where the odalisque sleeps, a room situated as a picture within the painted frame of the picture itself. P. Walter Siler’s *Spooky Show* also plays with this kind of self-referential imagery, since the drawing is situated within a border of playing cards which is large and elaborate enough to become more than a framing device. Still another kind of painting within a painting is the use of a window image. In Urquhart’s *Interior with Aquariums or Two Tubs in a Tub* there is an idyllic, romantic and brilliantly limpid scene, ambiguously located outside a window which dominates the upper right cor-

I consider my work a religious enterprise. When appropriate I have employed art historical reference, Christian and Classical iconography, as a point of reference. Many of the people represented are intimate friends of mine and they are exactly what they represent. I apologize for the use of esoteric iconography; I know that it is unfair to those who deem my work worthy of explanation. It is my handicap to talk of my faith with no system of belief.

In response to the traditional drawing question, I am concerned with representing the “figures” as humanized icons, interested in their outward appearance as it pertains to mythical image and association, that I unconsciously recognize. I am particularly not interested in the “figure” as anatomical matter to be pictorialized as abstract relationships of volume, weight, bones, muscles, etc.

—Joseph Hilton
ner of the work. Similarly, in her *Interior with Sugar Talk* a large window off-center of the tapestry reveals the white satin image of Mad Ludwig’s Castle, creating a visual dialog between the white cake rabbit held over a man’s head, the castle, and a white furry animal in the foreground, sitting under a chair. The kitchen window in Albertson’s *Sex, Family, Violence, Religion and the Good Life* shows a quiet, mountainous landscape with a little girl playing in the road; Hilton’s *The Announcement* contains a large interior architectural element with windows, through which one can see three different kinds of weather at three different times of day and night.

The idea of art as a “window onto the world” is thus used by these artists in either an unselfconscious or a satirical way; the picture within a picture also serves as a means of pictorializing the process of self-reflection, of presenting in visual form a dialog between illusion and reality, representation and abstraction, the inner and the outer world. Finally, this kind of iconography, when used as a parody, shows us an art

in that particular state when art is turned in upon itself, when it is introverted and introspective, curious about its own being, exploiting its form for purposes of self-knowledge, concerned less with reflecting fleeting metaphysical realities than with articulating epistemological process. [Parody] represents literature when it is most literary, art at its most artistic."

Parody is thus used by artists to express the inexpressible, to create a formal and psychological imbalance which will counterpoint the corresponding paradoxes and schisms within the society in which the works are created.

In a culture where usurpation of function and confusion of polarities are the rule, the very instability of parody itself becomes the means of stabilizing subject matter which is itself unstable and fluid, and parody becomes a major mode of expression for a civilization in a state of flux."

We have emerged, stylistically, from a classicizing style which prevailed in America for at least fifteen years. Just as our society in general has become increasingly able to accommodate disparate modes of conviction and expression, the art community as a whole has become multi-faceted and nonhierarchic in its convictions and its behavior; at the same time, stylistic pluralism is flourishing. So-called “objective” value judgments no longer seem possible or even valuable, since these judgments are always dependent upon the variables of the context in which they are seen.

The work in this exhibition, by fourteen artists of disparate background, intent, age, and style, is joined only by its iconoclasms, its refusal to adhere to anyone else’s standards of taste or fashion, and its romantic and expressionistic flavor. Romanticism is, by its nature, historicism, but not of a progressive sort; rather, it is an obsessive and often idolizing view of history which is concerned with the present and future as much as with the past. Thus, the freedom with which these artists mix classical and popular art-historical sources, kitsch and traditional images, archetypal and personal fantasies, constitutes a rejection of the concept of progress per se.

Albertson, for instance, feels that art does not progress, only that it changes. In an interview several years ago, Cly replied to the interviewer’s remark that he had “made advances” in his new work:

“I don’t think there has been any progression whatsoever. One can go backward or forward, it doesn’t really matter very much. There’s no such thing as progress in art. You only change because you’re bored with what you’ve done. Duchamp, in all the years I knew him, never used the words “better than.”"

If the idea of progress is irrelevant to many of these artists, if there is in fact no specific stylistic goal toward which their work evolves, then how does one measure its value? How can we tell if this is “good” painting or “bad” painting? If these artists are not interested in naturalistic representation as a goal, nor in formal innovations, what are their intentions and what are the criteria by which we are to judge their work?

For these artists, content and form are used in a jarring juxtaposition that forces us to question not only how we see, but what we see and what kinds of image we value. These artists use a deliberate deformation of form, a subversion of the rules of good taste, in order to pose the same metaphysical and spiritual questions that artists have always posed, regardless of the manner in which they worked. Speaking of Ed Carrillo’s paintings, John Fitzgibbon has said that in the late 1960’s, when stylistic consistency and the Minimalist sensibility predominated, Ed was beginning his eclectic, archeological, cumulative but not progressive inquiry into the nature of space and time, the meaning of death and birth and the prognosis for civilization…. Ed makes a clear declaration that the real questions for him are going to be metaphysical and not….literalist issues."

Similarly, writing about Neil Jenney’s early paintings, done at the same time as those in the present exhibition, Carter Ratcliffe discussed the concept of progress and traditional art history in an analogous way:

[Jenney] invents a new and very short history for painting, one guided by intelligence…. The fact that his depictions are efficient—if only vaguely connected to anybody else’s—gives one a way to doubt that the real history of painting means anything. One’s doubts may not be convincing but they’re important because they strongly suggest the contingency of art history, especially the history of the avant-garde which has been so often presented as an inevitable progression by those with determinisms to offer."

It would seem that, without a specific idea of progress toward a goal, the traditional means of valuing and validating works of art are useless. Bypassing the idea of progress implies an extraordinary freedom to do and to be whatever you want. In part, this is one of the most appealing aspects of “bad” painting—that ideas of
1. Art is nature adjusted (1973)
2. Art is a social science (1969)
3. Good art makes society more social (1971)
4. Works of Art are objects (1962)
5. A return to realism is inevitable (1968)
6. Idealism is unavoidable (1969)
7. All Illusionistic Paintings require frames (1970)
8. Intuitively adjusted harmony is the key to spatial unity (1962)
9. Thinking is controlled by the perimeter of the brain
   Intuition is controlled by the center of the brain (1972)
10. All healthy societies have socialism
    All healthy societies have capitalism (1970)

Convention—is the opiate of the masses.
I started my series of “Bad” paintings in December of 1968.
My concern was the priorities of New Realism.
I felt that “objects relating to other objects” should be stressed
over the method of depiction.
Hence I developed this “unconcerned” style.
The series was completed in October of 1969, when I had
2 striking revelations...
1. that, even if I produced the worst paintings possible,
   they would not be good enough, and
2. that, Idealism is Unavoidable.

—Neil Jenney
good and bad are flexible and subject to both the immediate and the larger context in which the work is seen. Instead of making absolute value judgments we must confront, with our own experience, the combination of humor, intelligence, satire, parody, vulnerability, art history, kitsch, autobiography, and story-telling in these paintings. Such disparate elements are combined here to produce an art which is important because of its extraordinary energy, integrity, commitment, esthetic courage, and freedom.

FOOTNOTES

2. Painting that is nonrepresentational is more familiar to us, since the majority of avant-garde art in Europe and America since 1910 has been abstract. Our present vocabulary of acceptance includes Jackson Pollock, Kandinsky, and Mondrian, as well as such abstract pictorializers as Jasper Johns, Robert Rauschenberg, and James Rosenquist. All were at one time considered to be “bad” painters, since their work essentially established a new visual vocabulary in which form and content seemed separable, if not at odds with each other.
8. From a catalog statement by the artist; unless otherwise indicated, all quotations by the artists in the exhibition have been drawn from the statements they prepared for this purpose.
13. Robert Rauschenberg, and James Rosenquist. All were at one time considered to be “bad” painters, since their work essentially established a new visual vocabulary in which form and content seemed separable, if not at odds with each other.
15. Ibid., p. 255.
16. Ibid., p. 255.
17. Ibid, p. 177.
18. Ibid., p. 51.
23. Ibid., p. 255.
24. Ibid., p. 255.
25. Ibid., p. 255.
26. Ibid., p. 255.
27. Ibid., p. 255.
28. Ibid., p. 55.
29. Ibid., p. 55.
31. Ibid., p. 231.
33. Similarly, the work of several well-known contemporary artists such as Red Grooms, Jim Nutt, and Philip Guston (in his figurative paintings of recent years), Alex Katz, and especially H.C. Westerman (in his drawings) has often been met with initial hostility. Some of their work represents a similar, but less expressionistic (although no less romantic) tendency than that found in the work of the artists in this exhibition. For example, Katz’s because of the unifying paint surface and color sensibility, and Westerman’s because of the extraordinary craftsmanship and meticulously skillful manipulation of his carved and assembled images. Groom’s sculpture, Nutt’s paintings, and Guston’s narrative canvases appear to embody little deliberate distortion and subversion of traditional drawing modes, although their influence—Nutt’s especially—has been strongly felt in many of the works in this exhibition.
35. Urquhart’s “pointillism,” while composed of fabric, is not unlike that used by Earl Staley as a ground for many of his paintings and watercolors of Indian images, done several years earlier.
37. Robert Goldwater points out. (Goldwater, op. cit., p. 264)
There are moments when I recognized in the outside world elements that line up with feelings on the inside of me. I have a strong physical sensation when this happens. My heart beats fast and it's very much a feeling-in-love feeling. This system also functions in reverse. Feelings and sensations represent themselves as pictures in my mind, a kind of automatic translation. These pictures from the inside and outside are my sources for imagery. I make note of these times and let them brew until I feel it is time to deal with these images in painting. This is my way of gathering a kind of vocabulary.

I use illusion, the representation of space and light, to make a kind of structure, to represent the image in a more believable way, believable in the sense that the object is possessed with a kind of energy and presence. I remain faithful not to a photographic reality, but to what I perceive to be the essence of the object, its gesture, texture, and color. I combine this imagery with another kind of vocabulary, that is, a painting vocabulary, a preference for surface, color, contrast, and actual application of paint. This preference in turn affects my vision and what I would pick out to paint. For example, the fan shape has recurred in my work in several different subjects: an actual fan, spraying water, a turkey's tail. The preoccupation with certain forms and how they are placed on the canvas is an issue very much at the center of the work.

The whole process, the visualization, recognition, and the act of painting, are about discovering the unknown. The skills involved in painting and drawing allow me to go deep into the well. They are like a cup for bringing into the light things that are not yet conscious. And allow me to step out of my old skin into new ways of expression and being.

The title, “Bad” Painting seems to imply an issue about aesthetics, a kind of “bad” taste, possibly a “kitsch” oriented kind of work.

I don't feel my work plays on themes, but comes up through personal experiences rather than a manipulation of already present themes and images. I do however have little concern for “good” taste and enjoy dealing with subject matter that is loaded with history and implication. I enjoy being uncool.

I have no real objections to the title. It has a boldness that is attractive.

—Judith Linhares
JAMES ALBERTSON
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At first glance, I guess my drawing has a crude, crummy done aspect or some savage but delightful naiveté. If someone got this idea, it would be a gross misunderstanding. I am not a naive—as charming, picturesque and colorful as that might be. Everything in these pictures is planned and calculated to create a particular visual effect.

For me, the subject matter with its somewhat humorous flavor is merely a vehicle for the manipulation of plastic elements. The formal elements are of the utmost importance to me.

In the early sixties, I did non-objective, kind of "AE" painting and consider them to be a major influence. I still like this kind of painting very much.

Twelve years ago, I stopped doing painting and drawing and became involved in ceramics, which has obsessed me ever since. At that time I was strongly influenced by Chinese brush painting, German Expressionist painting, and the comics. These influences have come to bear on my work in terms of the great importance of line quality, emotional intensity, a certain boldness, simplicity and a desire for clarity.

For the most part, I take images, shapes, forms and integrate them to make an interesting formal statement. Sometimes the combination of certain subject matter elements seems rather arbitrary, however to me, they make perfect plastic sense. Lately my drawings have been presenting more of a scene, but I never intended to tell stories with these pictures.

—P. Walter Siler
JOAN BROWN
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What I make is about what I have seen, but do not know how to make. Most of the time I paint pictures. Sometimes I make shell things, wood things, leather things, and clay things. I work in acrylic, glitter, dirt, cotton, paper, watercolor, prints, and drawing. I use classical and art-historical references in all of my work. I have been going to Mexico. Idle hands are the Devil's workshop.

—Earl Staley
EDUARDO CARRILLO
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On the title “Bad” Painting and my own work:

There has been no self-conscious effort in my work to display any irreverence for traditional aesthetic or artistic concerns. Perhaps using all the images I need in a medium such as this one which seems to contradict the detailing of painting gives the work a peculiarity which to some might make the work appear “bad.”

Classical and Historical References:

Recently I have used such classical images as a classic Buddhist temple with “long life” in Chinese characters transcribed into a pattern on the altar, Ludwig’s castle, Muybridge’s horses (constructed into a repeat pattern), a classical Betty Crocker fruit salad used to construct a headpiece, etc.

I feel I can borrow any image I want and do it up any way I care to because the medium transforms it into something else anyway. In the past I found numbers of ideas in art I wanted to steal and redo. As a student I did that a lot, never getting it as good, of course. Mostly I did renditions of the Post-Impressionists—when art was really beautiful I did want to imitate it—and the problem with catching up to today is who wants to steal a big red hammer and sickle.

On Traditional Drawing and Solutions:

I think all artists in the beginning should learn to draw.
to make things look real, and attempt all or some of the
famous drawing styles—such as that of Michelangelo or
Ingres, etc. That way when they learn to reject those values
and maybe do something “far out” and they will, if they’re
serious—then they can understand that (the “far out” style)
more. It’s the old cliche—don’t knock Shakespeare until you
understand him.

Most of the very best figurative painting relies heavily on
a carefully delineated image—and either because of the way in
which the paint or materials are handled some distortion
occurs. If I started with a distorted image then it would be
something else—maybe a cartoon.

On peers and artistic community:

Although I have a few friends who paint—mostly
abstract—I am not really in an “artistic community” because
I spend the major part of my time alone in a studio in a
corporation. Artists here are essentially “free” to do anything
they want but despite the work all seems too relative to
particular movements and styles. Maybe it’s because artists
here can survive without having to experience anything much
outside of their particular isolated art community. Maybe
that’s why the work looks dull to me—some of it anyway.
And the excitement of seeing something that isn’t—well—it’s
amazing—wonderful.

—Shari Urquhart
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I hope that you will not overlook my section in the exhibition. They are the eight small drawings.

—William Wegman
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