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Throughout the course of this paper it will become evident that the writer has drawn upon and discussed those specific and general elements which have contributed to his development as a practicing painter-draftsman. These elements, as disclosed in the text in one form or another, have had a direct bearing on (or a direct relationship to) his art and craft of painting. The particular emphasis placed on art history has been offered to convey to the reader that the influence of specifically Impressionism (namely, Neo-impressionism and Post-impressionism) has had a great effect upon the writer as a painter-draftsman. I sincerely believe that at bottom Impressionism is the "style"-prototype or the essential beginning of painting. That is to say, all forms of painting (viz., all of the great "styles") have radiated out in all directions from this central "hub" or source—had their ultimate source in Impressionism—regardless of the era or the geographic location of the said "style." This is explained further and, I think, made clearer in the text. Although I recognize that my point of view on this matter is an opinion I feel justified in bringing it to light, nonetheless. Impressionism is such a very fundamental discovery and re-discovery! Its discovery
was and is, I think, at least as fundamentally revolutionary as that of Giotto and his frescos. It is also my opinion that painting is discovery: to me, discovery -- for example, discovery of color and space -- is a meaningful form of expression.
PART I

PAINTING IS DISCOVERY

Painting* is a process of making discoveries, the result of discovery making. Painting is a process of discovering the potentialities and/or the limitations of the material substance, paint. Painting is not "invention" (to quote Vlaminck). Nor can "fine" painting occur from only the direct impact of the culture upon the would be painter; that is to say, anyone cannot decide to paint (or accidentally "fall" into the act of painting) in a given way prescribed solely from an evaluation of what he has been generally exposed to (what he has generally seen), the moment he might want to do

*I use the term "painting" as a seamstress might use the term "sewing." She would be talking about technique. Here one is talking about painting also as "technique"; however, the term "technique" for me has out-moded connotations, and so I prefer to avoid using the term whenever possible. I substitute terms like "attitude" and "approach" which, in themselves, are, I think, more encompassing and helpful. They draw upon the total, life experience of the individual as opposed to perhaps something which one learned to do effectually well, such as, in the example of watercolor painting, to render
that. He must develop, grow, discover as a practicing painter; and among doing other things he must also practice sculpture and drawing. If he were capable of painting very "suddenly," according to the way he wanted to paint his work would surely look quite unconvincing and without substance: it would look trite or hackneyed even to the inexperienced eye. In time, he would surely realize that he had probably made a mistake in his initial evaluation as to what was good in art, anyway. To improve himself as an academic painter, this painter would need—in conjunction with the said encounter with the general cultural milieu—the experiences and influences of direct action; namely, to work at painting: also he would need the intervention of a teacher with whom to form a student-teacher relationship which should at least include several instructors, over an extended period of time. That is to say, he would need to make personal discoveries which should normally result from (1) a process of doing (viz., painting); (2) a process of experiencing many formal and informal critical evaluations of his personal works, involving the so-called "group critiques"

the illusion of light reflecting off of water. The latter term, viz., "technique" connotes mechanical procedures and achievements. The former term, viz., "attitude" or "approach", has a way of allowing for personal discovery to enter into the process. Furthermore, the term "technique" has an air of limited finality about it: the term "attitude," on the other hand, seems to strongly encourage continual improvement.
and "individual critiques", often daily and by various peers and colleagues. This means, therefore, that a long, "drawn-out" process (extended at least, to over a period of several years) will, therefore, occur with regard to his repeatedly recovering from wounds received to his ego (and even elsewhere); and he will consequently begin to develop healthier attitudes—healthier approaches toward painting. Incidentally, this kind of ego-trauma, inducing experience is alien to the naive (and the primitive) artist who, seemingly, for various reasons, imparts to the critical observer the idea that he has little doubt about his innate potentialities as an artist. It is recorded that at an art showing in which (among others) Henry Rousseau and Cezanne were represented, Rousseau offered his services to improve Cezanne's several paintings, there, by personally "finishing" them. This story at once reflects the differing attitudes of the naive painter. (See Haftmann)

Now, Impressionism itself, was the result, I sincerely believe, of a process of discovery (not imitation nor invention); and it is my firm belief, also, that all modern painting actually begins with the re-discovery of Impressionism: and it begins each time at the level of the individual painter. Even the whole Impressionistic philosophy of art—its very foundation for being—is directed toward making discoveries. These discoveries specifically are about paint—paint as
it is put onto a material surface (flat, textured and/or contoured), according to how the eye and the mind are affected by it. This process occurs through the vital means of manipulating paint. And with the advent of Impressionism, as a historical phenomenon—as an art movement (so to speak)—these said means in painting were employed almost solely for purposes of trying to more honestly or more objectively depict or "reproduce" mature (viz., objective reality), whether or not the said means could, in fact, potentially do the job as well as, say, the camera, in which painting, to some extent was in competition with.* The outcome of this of course, was the rather sudden deterioration of an appreciation for the "ideated" aspects of painting in favor

*An Impressionistic approach—can actually compete with the camera, so to speak, in interpreting objective reality, not only in a literal way but in a "broader" way. It can, in a single work, say something more about reality; namely, it can more fully stimulate or arouse the "magical experience" (See, Haftmann) in the viewer, without, indeed, resorting necessarily to the depiction of only an exact (or apparently exact) "duplication" of reality (of which the camera seems capable). Albeit, the photographer is selective in his approach to his art, which, in a real sense, amounts to the most meaningful aspect of his art—indeed, a very important aspect of it. But Impressionism as art is no less capable of showing selectivity, too, in terms of the kind of subject matter it may so desire to depict.

It is interesting to note that Impressionism was the direct result of many cultural kinds of interactions and stimuli, one, of which, was the technological advancement of the camera (or daguerreotype technique, as it was then called). Impressionist painters had a tendency to want to emulate (in their particular approach to painting) the value of the snap-shot—the slice of life approach—of which the newer cameras were known to be responsible and reliable for. This was a discovery of "far-reaching" significance to the painter (with regard to the general loss of
of the "autonomous" aspect of painting. This phenomenon occurred not only in the visual arts but in practically every field of artistic endeavor.

Although man can play, so to speak, on old ideas--old themes--he may not actually discover (or re-discover) the prototypes of those ideas until after many centuries of taking those ideas for granted. It is conceivable, especially in modern times, for a discovery to occur without first the appearance of its prototype--namely, the most important, logical "step", leading up to the ultimate discovery. To illustrate my thinking, I first became conscious of this possibility when I "stumbled" onto the ostensible prototype of the Jungle Gym, a climbing device used on modern playgrounds as playground equipment.* The first of its kind (as far as I could tell when I made it) is in our back yard--a 20' x 25' x 11\(\frac{1}{2}\)' "playground sculpture,"--randomly assembled, but organized around an aesthetic and functional premis, from natural, tree logs.

*It should be of value to include some examples of my accomplishments in art; so I have done it here as an incidental matter--even if it is of sculpture.
This discovery was the result of an endeavor to prove (among attempting other things), that scale has aesthetic value in 3-dimensional art forms. In the meantime, I felt qualified in saying that a discovery was made—a certain connecting "link"—which exists somewhere between the idea of the primeval forest as likened to a playground, and the idea of mass-produced steel or concrete, symmetrical constructions typically seen on modern city playgrounds.

After man rediscovers these certain prototypes, long taken for granted, he may actually reject them again; but ultimately he will make use of them, employ them, make new discoveries from them. I believe that painters for centuries have basically understood at least some of the important factors which involve Impressionistic attitudes, methods, tendencies. But these said factors as used according to an expressive means in Academic art were never appreciated nor allowed to come to the fore—certainly not prior to the middle of the 19th century. They were rejected, probably for the reason that the dictates of certain prescribed notions and norms about the nature of beauty in art would not tolerate them. Certainly the said factors were never isolated, identified, given a generic name, nor allowed a fair chance to become, in any way, significant—-at least, not until certain, coincidental, historical combinations
arose.*

Impressionism (its very naive nature) which reflects the changes of society and changing humanistic values has always been latent in painting, waiting to become manifested. Indeed, to suppress these latent tendencies would be to deny paint an identity, as it were.--would be to deny it the right to exist as paint. In the past, prior to Impressionism, as an art "movement," the means to the representation of thematic material was subdued, broken down, consciously and utterly destroyed--sterilized--in order to successfully achieve the purest in regard for the ideated impulse. If one were to analyze the historical significance of art (and from one.

*Briefly and in a general way these combinations include:
1. Delacroix's variety Davidian Neo-classicism (often termed Romanticism--though against Delacroix's wishes) as a positive reaction against Ingres' variety Neo-classicism, viz. what Delacroix regarded as "sterile" and very un-like Classical art, which Ingres was in a very real sense generally trying to imitate. Whether or not Delacroix gave Ingres any credit for the following innovations which had an important bearing in future art, namely, that he used color more fully, and in a way contrary to the then prescribed traditional means, i.e., the usual monochromatic approach, as employed by most of the other Neo-classicists, it is, nonetheless, true, I believe, that Ingres deserves more credit here than is normally given him. Although Ingres' paintings became, indeed, very colorful, it is a fact that Delacroix is the man most noted for his unprecedented use of color. Delacroix eclipsed Ingres not only in this regard but also in another way, in his facile method of rendering with paint. This facility is generally considered to be a "looser" or "freer" or "sketchier" method of rendering with paint. We are brought to mind Delacroix's words from the Journal about the "value of the sketch in the finished painting." This painterly approach combined with a coloristic approach served to enhance Delacroix's historical position: certainly his achievements had teleological preference
point of view, regarded as "advancement"), he would become conscious of a process of change—an evolvement (if you will) from a linear "style" toward a painterly "style"—which leads finally into Impressionism, Fauvism, and German Expressionism. (See Wolfflin) Since the time of Impressionism, as an art movement, the 20th Century has brought with it many trends—a process of "speciation." And so, especially since about 1940 (and earlier), painterly

over the more refined qualities in Ingres' works, which, again, lead naturally in the direction of Impressionism. Both Delacroix and Ingres had a firm "hand"—through the Impressionists as a group, in determining the direction Twentieth Century art would take. Van Gogh spoke highly of Delacroix and his works, and was not influenced lightly by his paintings and of his Journal. And Manet's superb draftsmanship ability—his sensitive, precise line, his clarity of form—reflect the highest demands of the Ingresian tradition which, indeed, anticipates concrete art which would occur 60-80 years later. 2. Courbet's Realism, a firm reaction against Delacroix's Romanticism, had momentous, historical results. Courbet's famous words—"Show me an angel and I'll paint it"—reflect the feelings beginning to prevail in small "circles" by around the sixth and seventh decades of the 19th Century. These small groups were strongly opposing Romantic content in art. Neo-Impressionism was ready to become demonstrated. Briefly, (1) the advancements made in science and technology—e.g., light physics, the camera, improved transportation and communication, etc. (2) a gravitation of people from a rural to an urban environment; (3) a faster "pace" of living, all combined, contributed to an attitude in people which refused to tolerate the reactionary, escapist tendencies contained in Neo-classicism and its "off-spring" Romanticism. 3. Manet's shock inducing violation of illusionary, 3-dimensional space—when he introduced his "flat" canvases (e.g., Olympia) to the Academy—became like a gun-shot at the starting line. The concrete surfaces now became of aesthetic importance in painting.
9.

attitudes have again, actually, begun to diminish in importance; these freer attitudes with regard to the application of paint are becoming superceded by some rather recent transitions in art, which were introduced by Kandinsky; the Bauhaus Academy in general; Cubism—to name only a few segments—which ultimately lead straight into Concrete painting. (See Haftmann). But even Concrete art (Concrete painting) could never have come into existence without first the occurrence of some venerable, old ideas and attitudes derived essentially from Impressionism—including for one, an understanding of the "autonomous" canvas, as before mentioned (one of Manet's important contributions), and the rediscovery of Realism (not to be confused with Romanticism), which was actually introduced earlier by the works of Courbet (witness the Stone Breakers and Burial at

The ideated—namely, recognizable, thematic material, which exists automatically within an illusionary, 3-dimensional environment—in the objective non-art world—became, accordingly to the mid-20th Century point of view of secondary importance. (It has occurred to me that a later historical evaluation of this phenomenon will undoubtedly come about.) The "autonomous canvas" was born. This concept produced many variations in art: many phases passed and led to its ultimate conclusion in Concrete art, which has been around now for the last 30 or 31 years. The next phase in visual art will be Naturalism. This has been demonstrated already in Pop art and the movie media.
Ornans). These old ideas and attitudes also include "after" versions—a Matisse-like and Vlaminck- and Derain-like "brand" of Fauvism; a Braque-and Picasso-variety of Cubism; a Nolde—Munch—Kokoschka-variety of German Expressionism.

By way of making an analysis of what I mean by the idea that man first accepts, then rejects the rediscovery of the prototypes of inventions, permit me to discuss Renaissance art, as an example.

The Italian Renaissance in painting began around 1200 AD with Giotto as its leader; but the highest peak of it did not finally occur until well over two-hundred years later—perhaps closer to three hundred years later, with the advent of the works of Leonardo, Michelangelo, and Raphael. After Giotto's immediate influence dispersed and became only immitated, the actual progress* of the Renaissance was delayed: it even digressed during the first one hundred years or so. Finally it was Masaccio—prior to his untimely death—who probably helped most to get the Renaissance thoroughly underway. Thus, Giotto's influence waned, only to come into being later. (See Jansen, p. 272)

*Technically the Renaissance was a reactionary, not a progressive movement.
Impressionism is barely one hundred years old. Similarly, as with our quick examination of the Renaissance, Impressionism (its obvious features) also digressed (was actually modified by a kind of necessity), almost the moment it became understood. Then, of course, the many variations or "styles" which constitute the Modern Art movement of the 20th Century became, from then on, the central concern of Academic art. Certainly the very beginnings of Modern Art not only had roots in Impressionism but had roots, as well, in those elements which came immediately before Impressionism—namely, those elements which helped to induce the movement.

Impressionism is a "loaded" phenomenon bringing with it far greater potentialities in painting than even the radical Impressionists could have had in mind. (See, Haftmann). It is a dual-edged phenomenon. On the one hand, it is clearly inclined toward an attitude of respect for the values of purity in realism; i.e., it contains very little Romantic, idealized, stylized, or abstract content; and, on the other hand, it lends itself favorably to a state
of unlimited potentiality for freedom of expression: and
indeed the evolvement of that, from one viewpoint, is what
20th Century art is all about. (See, Haftmann) This kind
of realism or naturalism (with just enough Romantic and
abstract content in it to keep it from becoming pure
naturalism) contains the "seeds" of future kinds of expression.*
But nothing in Impressionism is yet identifiable as clearly
French Fauvism, clearly German Expressionism, clearly French
Symbolism, or clearly the abstractions and stylizations
of the Jugendstil— four movements in art and particularly
painting, which occurred immediately after Impressionism.

The element of personal expression became developed
in Impressionism— aside from the sociological influences—
because of (1) the rather sudden realization by painters
and other kinds of artists that representing classical,
literary, and Biblical thematic material in painting (or
in art generally) was not so important after all— i.e.,
doing everyday scenes was more honest and yet demanded
less in terms of the immitative qualities of the hard-core
traditional approach to drawing and painting; (2) there
occurred as a result an important discovery, namely, the

*Freedom of expression, like Impressionism, is a very
"loaded" concept. Indeed, from one very cogent point of
view the whole approach to the study of art history is
directed toward observing "progress"— progress leading away
from the various kinds of restrictions imposed upon
individuality of expression.
potentiality for a purer kind of expression in the experimental use of paint. This autonomous factor in painting could now develop since there was now a lighter emphasis on subject; and, indeed, the individual painters exploited it. "Color is expression" it has often been said; and, of course, Impressionism is, indeed, all very much involved with the use and effects of color.

The purely objective element in art is, what the Impressionists strived consciously to achieve above all else. Cezanne made the comment (I think, to Derain), pointing to a stove-pipe, to the effect that one would be successful as an artist if he could convey by means of paint that very same stove pipe. And, as was mentioned, there were clearly subjective, expressionistic, "side" affects. But the Impressionists made very deliberate observations of nature. With the deliberate, methodical manner of the scientist they tried to translate as accurately as possible what the eye could see—namely, color—as light fell on objects. Seurat was very extreme in this regard and developed Divisionism (Pointillism) for which he became famous. Virtually all of the Post-impressionists learned something from him. Certainly Van Gogh benefited greatly by his strong orientation toward "constructionist", organizational approach.*

*Van Gogh could not tolerate the studio-laboratory restrictions of Seurat's "pointillist" methods for very long and finally rejected Seurat's basic approach. (See Dear Theo)
They found that the textural use of pure pigment was more conducive to the representation of forms, anyway. Of course, they used color—warms and cools; intense and greyed color; color complements—in the process. Indeed, they found themselves organizing their pictorial ideas in "terms" of contrasting color elements instead of according to the "fashion" of the, heretofore, only "recognized" method; viz., in "terms" of value contrast (dark and light contrast).

Probably it is true that the most salient characteristic of Impressionism, if one had to narrow it down to a basic explanation of it, is quoted, in effect, from the "old" Pissaro: He said an Impressionist is one who paints a new painting with every new canvas. (See New York Times.) The reason for this, of course, is simple: The Impressionist tries to ascertain the object. He tries to depict the character of the object, and every object is different. The same objects change with the transient behavior of light.

*Value contrast is so "powerful" that when it is used even in small amounts it drowns out the "sound" of the color—the "sound" which color could make if (1) the values were kept "close" together in terms of value contrast, (2) purer colors were used, (3) if the colors were all kept in a higher range—what is commonly known as the "lighter palette." Delacroix, whom the Impressionists both greatly admired and were greatly influenced by, declared in his Journal that painters should "Banish all earth colors!!"
Witness the life of Van Gogh as a painter. He interprets nature, without any artifice. Basically he is a very humble sort, who sees beauty in nature; people. He is basically a genre painter. He is plebian, vulgar, direct.

POINTS IN IMPRESSIONISTIC CONTENT: (IT GENERALLY CONSISTS OF "EASEL" PAINTING.)

1. A direct, approach method in the handling of paint, in the rendering or in the execution of subject matter is imperative.
2. The means remain as a tangible—visible (even tactile)—and necessary contributing factor in the end product.
3. Paint is enjoyed for its own sake, as color, texture, material consistancy; it is applied usually with a stiff, long-handled, pig-bristle brush.*
4. Not only the choice of subject matter is important, viz., everyday, commonplace scenes—but the need of sheer subject matter is clearly an important criterion.

---

*Van Gogh, in effect, claimed that to be an Impressionist one needed, among other attributes, a long arm (in order to increase the physical distance between the canvas and the eye, increasing his powers of observation.)
5. Subject matter is objectively conceived: it is neither idealized nor stylized.*

6. The use of another media, such as turpentine, oil, or egg, is, as a rule, neglected or avoided; that is to say, paint tends to be applied as it comes straight from the tube. In some instances it is squeezed out of the tube directly onto the canvas and perhaps modeled with the brush later on.

7. Forms in nature are objectively analyzed, scrutinized; and with small exception (Gauguin included) these forms are directly copied from nature. I.e., the painter paints on "location"; taking his canvas and easel.

8. The analytical observation of color in nature becomes, as it were, an all-consuming preoccupation. Color actually usurps the traditional role of light—becomes a substitute for light. In Impressionistic (and Fauvistic) language, "Light is color."**


*The Fauves (if not the Jugendstil followers) were the first to consciously "stylize"—to introduce subjective, symbolic, abstract elements.

**Light, in fact, can be scientifically broken down into its color components.
10. Canvases tend to become organized more in terms of contrasting color elements, such as, in the use of color complements, than in "terms" of contrasting value variations, such as, in the use of black and white, and earth colors.

11. To "draw" with the brush is clearly important.

12. To utilize certain impasto, textural "devices" is, of course, necessary.

My point is this. The painter who rejects the values of Renaissance painting and its derivatives—Manneristic tendencies, the Baroque, Neo-classicism, etc., rejects the ideated impulse—namely, the impulse toward an expression of the representation of historical phenomena—literature and poetry, Greek mythology, the Holy Bible, etc.; but he does not necessarily reject painting. On the other hand, and in no uncertain terms, the painter who rejects Impressionism rejects painting—rejects experimentation and discovery and, therefore, academic expression at the level of the material means of painting. Walter Keene (though he has made "millions") has long stopped experimenting or working toward making discoveries at the level of the material means of painting. Leonardo, though a product of the Renaissance
(and a product of the influence of the importance of subject matter and thematic material) often thought of the material means before he was certain about what subject or theme he would portray. One important Roman official who commissioned something to be done by his hand, noticed that Leonardo, before he even began to paint, was trying to discover a better, material substance—namely, a varnish to finish his final work with. The official considered him incompetent and "fired" him.
PART II

A PERSONAL, SUBJECTIVE, CRITIQUE (OR EVALUATION)
OF MY MAJOR AREA OF CONCENTRATION, PAINTING.

Upon a perusal of the appendix it might appear that the writer has been, at once, talking about a highly structured system of drawing and painting which definitely dictates certain limitations on the basic potentiality for producing discoveries: and, with regard to painting alone upon a perusal of Part I the writer may seem to be inclined to offer only the goal of complete freedom for the purpose of producing the right potential for making discoveries. To a great extent both of these elements exist and it may therefore seem like one is involved here in a duality of objectives. But these apparently different objectives, in an important way, are combined. My approach to painting, then, springs from two clearly different kinds of metaphysical systems.

The first system recognizes the importance of the "play"* element in art. This "play" element is directed

*See, Bauhaus.
toward making discoveries; it recognizes the crucial importance of growth; progress and improvement through originality of work produced. Through a process of being constantly exposed to various materials it demands that the student discover. It does not, for example, ask him to go to the library and research a given "master" on a particular subject (such as the subject of oil painting or of paper sculpture, to see how the "master" solved given problems, thereby); but instead it demands that the student relate personally and directly to the materials which he is confronted with and that he become aware that it is, indeed, the materials themselves—not to mention what he does with them—which determines not only the quality of his art but gives rise to (1) a crucial growth process in the student; and (2) a certain growth process at the level of society.

This system emphasizes that one try to understand the nature of materials, that he must become a producer who utilizes available, accessible, raw materials. The concept about economy is, therefore, important. In due course, the student will begin to realize the limitations of materials. There is nothing new about the economical use of materials. It has its major roots in human survival: man responds to economy, accordingly. It is a factor fundamental to his
existence. Therefore, this first system is oriented toward encouraging the student to find sheer enjoyment in "pushing" materials around and forcing "things" to happen. Eventually, a vague element of predictability enters into this vital process. There is an element of discipline involved in this system.

The other system which is a highly disciplined phenomenon seems to announce that, for example, within a reasonable time span one shall achieve in making some sort of statement; that, to do so, he must not reveal any noticeable compromise, hesitation, doubt or indecision in the process. At this point there would seem to be some sort of conflict as to the compatibility of the two systems. The second system leaves one with but little choice except to immediately arrive at some sort of statement about either/or subject matter and paint. But, as opposed to the first system (viz., the "play" element), which offers perhaps little in the way of a "direction," the second system provides one with a few concrete, possible means (concepts or notions)—ways which actually help (and to reinforce) the making of various discoveries (See, appendix). It offers something concrete as a "point of departure." I.e., one no longer needs to drift aimlessly and indefinitely; but to some extent he can rely upon a certain discipline, a set of standards, which can begin to indicate to him some meaningful
ways to prevent the occurrence of total chaos and virtual visual nonsense from happening—from happening either every time or at an average of, say, twenty-four times out of twenty-five. In painting one must learn to both feel and see; think and sense. But he must also learn to make decisions—to decide what he is going to try to do and then explore those areas with complete thoroughness.

In this second system an element of research is very desirable: One should attend art shows and galleries regularly and/or go to the library and look at pictures in art books; read; take a "gutsy" interest in art history. Indeed, one in fact needs a workable system, a direction, a working body of knowledge, an attitude which will force him to produce and become "involved." This system gives rise to an ominous interplay of forces,—terrific tensions,—like piano wire in a serviceable piano. But "sterility" is potentially the result of such a system when it is not combined with greater freedoms. The intervention of the first system is necessary to counteract the potentially "sterile" qualities of the second system; i.e. the two systems will actually tend to compliment each other.

The major drawback of the first system when it operates alone—and this applies more I think to drawing than to painting, though perhaps not ultimately so—is all too susceptible to escape methods—vagueness, incompleteness—
a non-committal approach with no apparent direction. It even becomes tempting in this system to justify the existence of undesirable qualities—like pretending that "bad" stew is "good." It is a state of limbo and a lack of sophistication of expression. And, so, without the intervention of the second system which presents the need for clarity of purpose and ideas, clarity of form, clarity of statement and presentation, this state of "limbo" is of little or no consequence, beyond perhaps becoming a therapeutic "device." Both systems, functioning well together, however, are absolutely necessary to the processes of my personal existence as a "painter-draftsman" and sculptor.

I (1) work with materials which have resistance—explore their inherent or latent potentialities, and limitations; (2) copy, actually, interpret nature objectively. This means that I usually work directly from nature, almost always employing an objective approach in trying to understand what I see in terms of the natural effects of light reflecting from natural form, for example. I am not at
this level (or as yet) interested in symbolic content. I also try to think in terms of the shear craft of painting—color, value, texture, line, shape—to achieve an organization of the total page—an organization of the whole into various harmonious spacial qualities. Obviously, space and materials are what one is working with all of the time while painting. Frankly, it would probably be impossible to totally negate the existence of either. In painting we normally try to enhance space—"create" it: make it pleasing, harmonious and appealing enough to prevent it from fatiguing our vision, our feelings. So-called space in painting is produced through this use of COLOR, LINE, VALUE, TEXTURE and the various combinations of SHAPES. Matisse said that a painting should be like a favorite arm chair to a man who regularly comes home tired from working all day: it should provide him with a kind of comfort and relaxation.

This seems to me to be a worthy goal. How can this occur in painting? Very assuredly if this is indeed the goal there should probably be in the painting a rather pleasing arrangement of the spacial areas (or units)—a certain clarity, simplicity and economy of means. These things tend to provide a certain refreshment to the viewer. Crowded shapes, a jumbled, highly involved use of color can turn a painting into a soupy, sour, grey and a very ugly,
dead thing quickly enough.

There are, of course, two basic kinds of space in painting: (1) "illusionistic" space and (2) "flat" space (See, Appendix B). I have been mostly interested in the exploration of "illusionistic" space (as should be witnessed in my slide transparencies). But, at the same time, I try to avoid "violating" the basic, picture plane--i.e., I try to keep the various compositional elements "tied" to the surface, as it were. (See Mondrian's work. He made a thorough-going and very successful study of preserving the basic "flatness" of the picture plane.)
This part of my paper--pertinent I think to the general paper (in the form of the following questions)--is mainly about drawing--not art, not design, not painting, not printmaking, not sculpture, not ceramics: though, as a whole, and to some extent these questions do, indeed (even if vaguely so), apply to all of these; they apply not only to visual art but to art in general, and only very tentatively and indirectly to aesthetics.

I have inserted this part to my paper because I think that I have something valid to say and something of interest to say about drawing--not only as a practicing "painter-draftsman" who is voluntarily confronted with the task of drawing, but as one who has something to say about drawing, through a process of verbal communication. It is important to communicate ideas in academic art through the common language: clarity of verbal communication is extremely important in Academic art. This is so because of the high standard (or the high demands) being imposed on academic painters and draftsmen; and, because in order to meet those demands or standards, the practicing artist (and/or teacher of art) needs to both literally and figuratively possess a
"good" working vocabulary—one which pertains directly to the production of art—the art object. For example, it would be unfair for the student of drawing not to become exposed to such a vocabulary, when, indeed, the measure of success in academic art is directly dependent upon the nature of ATTITUDE, viz., that which springs ultimately from the said two vocabulary.

The following questions are given without answers, because in so reading them one becomes subjected to an attitude or an approach to drawing which is definable enough (or self-evident enough) without including answers. These questions, I think, reflect "solid" drawing attitudes. They reflect a combination of contemporary, modern, Renaissance, Classical, even Antique ideas.

1. What is meant by the exclamation: "Go to Nature!"?
2. What is a pictorial idea?
3. What is meant by an economy of means?
4. What is meant by shape and shape relationship?
5. What is a turning edge?
6. What is a continuous line approach?
7. What is a pure contour line approach?
8. What is a selective line approach?

9. Can these various approaches be mixed or combined effectively?

10. What is meant by a wash and line?

11. What is meant by a line and value relationship?

12. What is a dry wash? a wet wash?

13. What is meant by a figure and ground relationship?

14. What is the significance of so-called visual information?

15. What is meant by line quality?

16. What is an overlapping plane?

17. What is meant by anatomical detail?

18. What is meant by economy of line?

19. What is meant by depicting the character of the model?

20. What is gesture?

21. What is meant by clarity?

22. What is meant by simplicity?

23. What is meant by statement?

24. What is a compositional idea?

25. What does it mean to assume an attitude?

26. What does attitude have to do with drawing? music? poetry?


28. What is the significance of the phrase "light and dark patterns"? "color patterns"? What is the essential difference between these two approaches?

29. What does it mean to cover an area? cover an area quickly?
30. What is cross-hatching? Is there a proper way to cross-hatch? If so, what is the proper way, as opposed to an improper way?

31. What is meant by harshness? Is harshness desirable? When?

32. How is rendered form softened?

33. Is smudging desirable? When?

34. What is an implied line?

35. What does space mean in visual art?

36. How can space or qualities of space be manipulated, changed, "pushed" around? How is space apparently "created"?

37. What is "flat" space? Illusionistic (or illusionary, "3-D") space?

38. What is meant by the development of form through contrast?

39. What are contrasting elements?

40. What does the term-phrase mean, "tied to the surface"?

41. What is meant by the term-phrase "autonomous" canvas; what is the historical significance of this concept?

42. What is meant by the statement, "Drawing should have a certain logic to it?"

43. What is meant by a consistency of attitude?

44. What is rendering?

45. Under what conditions do darks have the illusion of receding? advancing?

46. What is so important about understanding the illusionary potentiality of materials?

47. What does it mean to develop a healthy attitude with materials?

48. Is it helpful to think of negative, spacial areas as shape? positive spacial areas as shape.
49. What is meant by a commitment to an idea or attitude?

50. What is concrete art? abstract art? realism in art? naturalism in art? romanticism in art?

51. What is meant when it is said that something has been over-worked? under-developed? not "pushed far enough?"

52. What is a sensitive attitude with regard to the use and choice of materials?

53. What is meant by limiting factors? What is meant by material limitations (the limitations of materials)?

54. What other kinds of limitations are there?

55. What is the importance of understanding limitations?

56. What is meant by the idea of "exploiting" materials?

57. What is meant by craftsmanship?

58. What are the "ideated" aspects vs. the autonomous aspects (namely, craftsmanship) in art? Are these two elements normally compatible?

59. What is meant by a sensitive quality of line.

60. Can a linear approach be compatible with an attitude of employing strong, light, and dark, contrasting areas?

61. What is so important about learning to make decisions?

62. Does vagueness have any place in art? If so, what?

63. What is an evasive attitude?

64. What is meant by an attitude of looseness? of tightness?

65. What are the advantages of exploring the possibilities of each attitude?

66. What is meant by an exploratory approach? a direct approach?

67. What does this mean in terms of line?

68. What is meant by surface quality?

69. What is meant by a close, value relationship?

70. What is meant by the exclamation, "think of the total page!"?
71. What is meant by paging? Paging the model, for example?

72. What is meant by the compartmentalization of subject matter?

73. What does it mean to be selective with subject matter.

74. What is the significance of scale or surface area?

75. What is meant by a "violation" of the picture plane?

76. What is meant by developing environmental information?

77. What is atmospheric perspective? linear perspective? color perspective? How important is a knowledge of these? Would knowledge of these affect, for example, Mondrian and his work?

78. What is meant by a "symmetrical" design (or symmetrical composition)? How valid is making one's work symmetrical; what would be the advantages of avoiding symmetry?

79. What is meant by a "mechanical" approach to drawing? When is a mechanical approach justified?

80. Can a seemingly "healthy" attitude (say, one of freedom or looseness) at some point actually become a detriment, particularly if the said attitude becomes a "crutch"?

81. Can "drawing" by a certain manner or means actually become a form of "painting"? Does the use of charcoal, for example, (wet or dry) lend itself to becoming "painterly"? Would this necessarily be unhealthy?

82. What is meant by the statement "paint with a rag!"? "Draw with a rag!"?

83. What is the importance of the so-called "sustained" drawing? the "short" drawing?

84. How important is shear knowledge (knowledge of anatomy and perspective, for example) in aiding the eye to see?

85. What advantages are there in doing drawing exercises which employ the pure, contour, line approach? How do these exercises help develop improved habits of seeing?
36. What is meant by the exclamation, organize the lights and darks together! Tie the lines together!

37. What is meant by the term-phrase "a unified whole"?

38. What is meant by disjointedness--disunity?

39. What are considered to be the two, most, basic, physical, compositional units in drawing, not to consider materials?

40. Can there be any variation on the above? Can, for example, a drawing consist just purely of line? of value?

41. How can line and value be effectively combined? Should the line compliment the value and vice versa?

42. What is the significance of the catch-phrase, un-learn to draw?

43. Does one actually learn to draw? Does one learn to draw effectively? Does one learn healthy habits or attitudes in drawing?

44. How important is a familiarization with materials?

45. How important is it to concentrate for a given length of time (say, at least two or three weeks) on one material approach in any given 12 week course? Or is it satisfactory to move from one material approach to another in rather rapid succession?

46. What is meant by a "point of departure"?

47. Should it be made clear to students that they must decide whether or not they will use the model as a point of departure? Should this not be made clear to the instructor?

48. Should one use the model as a point of departure frequently? Otherwise, how often should one try to depict the character of the actual model, directly?

49. What is meant by a personal style or personal evolution of approach.

50. What is meant by a natural evolvement of an individual "style."

51. What is a healthy attitude? Or what are healthy attitudes in general?
102. What is the purpose of doing "fast" drawing exercises? How fast should fast, individual drawings be? For what duration should the exercises be?

103. How long does a sustained drawing normally last?

104. What is meant when it is said that two or more compositional elements relate? Or don't relate?

105. What does it mean to think in "visual terms"?


107. What is meant by a "break-up" of space?

108. What is meant by negative and positive spatial areas? Is negative space less important than positive space?

109. What are trite attitudes? What does this have to do with being indirect?

110. Does one go to school to become a primitive or naive artist?

111. What does it mean to work in a contemporary vein?

112. How important is the "selective" type of line?

113. How important is objectivity (according to the traditional meaning of the term) to the academic painter. What is objectivity?

114. What is a sterile approach? Is it almost invariably associated with imitation?--how to draw a nose; how to draw an eye; how to mix flesh colors, etc. with the emphasis put on how rather than on discovery and observation.

115. What is the value of making personal discoveries?

116. Of what value does the "play" element have in art?

117. What is meant by the term-phrase to "push materials around."

118. What is the meaning of content in contemporary art?
119. What is social comment (or social statement) in visual art?

120. What is decorative art?

121. What is meant by decorative content?

122. Drawing is "vision"—a way of "seeing." More specifically, or concretely, what else is it?

123. What term or terms is more all-encompassing than the somewhat outmoded term, "technique"?

124. What value is there in making a habit of trying to finish at least certain works?

125. How does one know when a certain work is complete?

126. What does it mean to "push harder"?

127. What does it mean to explore various "avenues"?

128. What is meant by stiffness and awkwardness? How can one begin to get rid of these ugly traits?

129. What is meant by the term "flow"—a drawing should flow, for example?

130. What is meant by "things" should flow together—should "grow" out of each other?

131. Can this concept or condition about "flow" become so over-done to the exclusion of everything else, that it can actually become a hindrance to the drawing—become tiring—for the viewer to look at it? What counter effects can be created to alleviate such monotony?

132. What does it mean to slow down?

133. What does it mean to gage one's time properly.

134. What is meant by the term valid and invalid? How does one begin to know what is valid and what is invalid?

135. What is the difference between a subjective approach and an objective approach—according to the traditional meanings of those terms?
136. What does it mean to "loosen" up? to "tighten" up? What is the value of alternating between doing both? What are some of the ways to help loosen up?

137. How many ways are there to render?

138. What is judgment in art?

139. Why is it so important to try to develop the "gesture" of anything?

140. Should every drawing become a totally new experience even though one maintain a singular kind of goal in the process?

141. What is an ugly drawing? What is the meaning behind doing an ugly drawing purposefully?
142. What is a weak drawing? Is a weak drawing truly not the same thing as an ugly drawing?

143. What is the difference between design and composition? What is composition?

144. How are the concepts composition and expression related?

145. What is meant by student growth? What is meant by a healthy student-teacher relationship?

146. What is an evasive approach? When, if ever, is an "evasive" approach justified?

147. Why use a live model in drawing classes, anyway, unless at least half of her time is employed for the purposes of trying (and learning) to depict the character of that particular model?

148. What significance does the concept (or attitude) about employing large, open areas of color have to do with so-called, concrete art. How has this attitude affected modern art since c. Kandinsky's later period, 1940?

149. What was the significance of Courbet's statement which said in effect: "Show me an angel and I'll paint it"? What bearing (or relationship) does this statement have on the art of the latter part of the 19th and all of 20th Century art? What bearing on Romanticism? Realism? Impressionism? Modern art in general?

150. How does an intellectual kind of line differ from an emotional kind of line?
151. How important to the student are group critiques? Individual critiques?

152. How important is a knowledge of art history to the studio artist? What is its importance?

153. Should work be criticized on the basis of what it is trying to accomplish? Should we ask, then, whether or not a given work was successful according to that criterion? Does the work generally "speak" for itself, as to what it is trying to achieve? or does the artist always need to be present to defend his work? What would be a relevant defense? an irrelevant defense by an artist who is present? How should the artist present/or give his defenses?—objectively or subjectively? What is a subjective vs. an objective defense?

154. What is meant by the cliché: Rules in art were meant to be broken?
There are generally established facts about some of the important properties of color in accordance to the way color relates to our visual sensory perception. These are generally about the illusionary properties of color, as discovered or rediscovered and defined by the Impressionists and others.

This part of my paper pertains more immediately to painting than to drawing, printmaking, sculpture, ceramics, art in general, or aesthetics, etc.

A knowledge about some of the properties of color (and/or paint—paint as a textural device) would, of course, seem to be very helpful to the painter, since the painter at least deals with paint, with color. I am a painter and this would seem, of course, appropriate to my paper. I offer this bit of information which I have learned from my own practice and from studio training.

Color has three important visual properties. (1) the color, or namely, the hue or chroma—i.e., the said color as it can be seen when light is broken down into its visible color components, for example, yellow, orange red, violet,
blue, green.); (2) the value or the dark and light aspect of color. The value of the color is best understood and seen through demonstrating it in black and white photography. Although the camera will not exactly represent values correctly it can demonstrate that different colors actually have different values. The painter can squint his eyes at a given color to help to more objectively perceive the relative dark and light value of that color.

There is a third important aspect of color, namely, purity of color. This aspect of color has nothing to do with the dark and light value of the color but has everything to do with the color of the color. This aspect of color is called color intensity: it has to do with the amount of grey in the color.* I personally like to make a chart which looks like the following example.

**VISUAL PROPERTIES OF COLOR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPECTRUM-COLOR</th>
<th>VALUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Chroma, hue)</td>
<td>(dark, light aspect)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COLOR INTENSITY**

(Purity of the spectrum-color namely, the amount of grey in the color, giving the strength of the color.

*It must be remembered that the color grey can be produced through the mixing of appropriate colors (even pure colors). For example, pure grey is produced through an appropriate mixture of complementary (opposite) colors, such as red and green; yellow and violet; etc.*
To the general reader a knowledge of these properties of color is meaningless. One needs to personally demonstrate the existence of these properties in the studio-laboratory before the full meaning and psychological impact of the logic behind color theory can become meaningful.

**ILLUSIONISTIC PROPERTIES OF COLOR**

Warmer colors (those colors which remind us of the colors of those basic elements in nature which offer physical warmth, such as, the sun and fire) tend to advance (have the illusion of advancing) ahead of the relatively cooler surrounding areas of the picture plane. Cooler colors (those colors which remind us of the colors of those fundamental elements in nature which offer coolness or coldness, such as, large "bluish" bodies of water; snow, with its bluish-violet reflections) tend to recede (have the illusion of receding) "back" into the surrounding areas of the relatively warmer picture plane. (Because

*It is presupposed that the reader have a general understanding of the color wheel.*)
yellow is warmer than orange, all else being equal, yellow seems to advance ahead of orange, and so on.) More intense colors tend to advance (have the illusion of advancing) ahead of the relatively less intense color areas of the picture plane. Colors which have been greyed down (impure colors) tend to recede back into the more intense surrounding color areas of the picture plane. Colors darker in value—all else being equal (i.e. if everything is of equal intensity and warmth, and so on)—have the illusion of advancing ahead of the picture plane. Often this phenomenon works in reverse, however, because darker colors are so frequently either diluted (or greyed) down, and/or are so dark that the color simply cannot "project;" in which case, the color will recede—become a "hole" in the picture plane.

When white is added to a color it is called a "tint" (termed "tinting"). White both lightens a color (with respect to its value) and diminishes its intensity; though in no way does it change the original chroma or hue. When black is added to a color it is called "shading" the color. Black both darkens a color (with respect to its value, of course) and diminishes its intensity; though in no way does it change the original chroma or hue. These kinds of colors—tinted and shaded colors—are of great value to the painter. This approach lends itself rather effectively to
the kind of painting which places an emphasis on form rather than on color such as in the case of Cubism and representational painting.

When observing nature one should learn to pick out which of the colors are reflected in the lighter (lighted) areas and which of the colors are reflected in the darker (shadowed) areas. The shadowed areas reflect the blues and purples (or cooler colors) and the lighted areas reflect the yellows and oranges (or warmer colors). In painting it should not be overlooked that this phenomenon can be translated into simply warm and cool respectively. In painting one must interpret but simplify: simplification and selectivity are crucial elements: color should in many cases be seen simply in terms of warm and cool combinations, etc. It must be remembered that color in painting is what it is as compared to other color: Color "changes" can be easily produced. Blue can look purple, for example, within a given color field; yellow can literally look its opposite, etc., depending on the colors which surround it.

Texture (smoothness and roughness) also has an important function with regard to the illusionary properties of color. Heavily textured surface areas tend to advance ahead of the relatively "smoother surrounding areas of the picture plane. Smoothly textured surface areas tend to recede, accordingly.

The use of a line defining a given spacial unit tends
to flatten that unit out. This applies to any image which the line describes or defines; the line produces the illusion of flattening out the image (giving it the illusion of "flatness") especially if the line circumscribes the total image.* Color may be applied "flat" or otherwise, in a painterly manner. "Flat" color is put on the surface "evenly", all over a given area, like one would paint a wall. It always has "hard" edges; i.e., whenever two "flat" colors meet or "join" the so-called "edge" which is the result is finite, clear, pure, unbroken. It is not freyed or adulterated with a mixture of the two colors. In a painterly use of the paint, however, any painted areas may be splotchy, scumbled, uneven, adulterated with other colors, and edges will be soft and broken. The latter use of the painted areas is more conducive to producing illusionistic space (the illusion of "deep" space). The former is conducive to producing the illusion

*Incidentally this is not necessarily the reason why many painters object to the use of line to define form in painting. They object to line for a simple reason of economy. Paint and its illusionistic potentiality does not "ask" for line. It doesn't need it. Line has a tendency to get in the way, as it were? it overburdens the composition. It is unnecessary. Paint (color) can do the "job"—can stand on its own two feet very adequately when exploited (as it should be). In drawing, however, line can compliment the end result, wherein only simple value patterns are used. Color has a "loud voice," as it were, and when used, (and by used it is meant "exploited") it doesn't need the help of a line. Just the use of a simple middle tone and light color pattern, however, may benefit greatly by a "strong" black line.
of "flat" space.

These are some of the many factors a painter faces, deals with, and utilizes to finally produce the final quality or final effect he wants. There is "real" value in becoming aware of the illusionistic properties of color, because, in the final analysis, this amounts to a matter of "dealing" with space, the manipulating of space, the composing of space. Man is endowed with the capability of experiencing space (see, Bauhaus); and this, then, --i.e., the composition of "space"--becomes an important means of expression.

Matisse talked about "Spiritual space"; Kandinsky and Mondrian picked "up" the concept and "took" it from there: they "played" with the idea and determined that a use of pure, spacial qualities--a manipulation of space--could become a pure means of expression. This is evidenced in their later works, now commonly known as Concrete art. Space, composition, and expression are three very closely allied terms in regard to Twentieth Century art. This has been so since about 1940 (see, Haftmann).
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SLIDE TRANSPARENCIES

SLIDES OF GRADUATE THESIS SHOW—OF THE PAINTINGS AND DRAWINGS, April 2nd-17th, 1970

1. Oil, "Portrait of Jean"* (c. 20" x 24", 1970); Pencil and Silver point, "Studies"; mixed media, "Nude Fantasy" (1969-70)

2. Oil, "Just Another Nude" (c. 3' x 4'; 1970)

3. Oil, "Family Portrait" (c. 4' x 5¾'), and "Blue Fantasy" (c. 3' x 4'; 1970); also Furniture, made out of black birch, (1968-69)

4. Oil, "Family Portrait" (see above); also, Furniture (see, above)

5. Oil, "Blue Fantasy" (see above); "Figure and Ground Fantasy" (self-portrait; c. 3½' x 4½'; 1970); Pencil, "Fantasy sketch" (c. 14" x 18"; 1970); Oil, "Pink Elation" (c. 3 3/4' x 4'; 1970)

6. Oil, "In the Love Chair" (Family Portrait; c. 3 3/4' x 4'; 1969); Pencil drawing of "Nude Bending" (17" x 24")

7. Oil, Pink Elation (see above); Pencil, "Genra Sketch" (8" x 12"; 1970); "Fantasy Sketch" (see, above); "Just Another Nude" (see, above); Oil, "Yellow Fantasy" (c. 3' x 4'; 1970).

8. "Blue Fantasy" (see, above); "Figure and Ground Fantasy" (see above); furniture (see, above)

9. Pencil drawing "Railroad Cafe, 5:30 AM" (c. 9" x 11"; 1970); "Family Portrait" (see, above); "Blue Fantasy" (see, above); "Figure and Ground Fantasy" (see, above) furniture (see, above)

10. "In the Love Chair" (see, above); "Nude Bending" (see, above); "Portrait of Jean" (see, above); "Studies" (see, above)

*Labeled from left to right: Slides on file in the Art Department.
11. Furniture, "Rocker" (see, above); "Just Another Nude" (see, above); "Yellow Fantasy" (see, above)

12. Furniture (see, above); "Blue Fantasy" (see, above); "Figure and Ground Fantasy" (see, above); "Pink Elation" (see, above); Furniture (see, above)

SLIDES OF GRADUATE THESIS SHOW—OF THE PLASTER SCULPTURE, April 2nd - 17th, 1970

1. Plaster, wire mesh, and hemp sculpture, painted in oil; life size: shadows, or single light source, painted on plywood 4'' x 4' x 8' in oil. The figure sits on an actual chair—and pillow repainted in oil.

2. Plaster Sculpture (see, above)

3. (See, above)

4. (See, above)

5. (See, above)

SLIDES OF LOG PLAYGROUND SCULPTURE; LOCATION, 1953 Ernest Street, Missoula; Size: 20' x 25' x 11.5'; 1969 Constructed with logs, 3/8" bolts, washers, 3/8" nuts, nails, no surface finish.

1. Log Sculpture, with children; summer (made Summer, 1969)

2. Detail (see, above)

3. Log Sculpture; at sunset; Summer season.

4. Log Sculpture; Detail with children; early Spring season.

5. Log Sculpture; Winter season.

6. (see, Above).
7. Log Sculpture; aSun rise; Fall season.

8. (See, above)

9. Smaller log sculpture (c. 7 1/2' x 12' x 5'); made, Fall 1969; early Spring season)

10. Smaller log sculpture; Winter season (see, above)

SLIDES OF GRADUATE PAINTINGS, 1968-70

1. "Figure after Albinus"; c. 3' x 4'; oil; 1968

2. "Just Another Nude"; first stage as photographed in three stages of development; c 2 3/4' x 4'; 1968-70

3. Second stage (see, above)

4. Third and Final Stage (see, above)

5. Back Study in oil; c/ 2 1/2' x 4'; first stage as photographed in two stages of development; 1970

6. Second and Final Stage (see, above).

7. "The Wedding"; oil; c. 2 3/4' x 4'; First stage as photographed in two stages of development.

8. Second and Final Stage (see, above)

9. "Yellow Fantasy"; oil, c. 2 3/4' x 4', 1970; First stage as photographed in two stages of development

10. Second and Final Stage (see, above)

11. Pink Elation; oil; c. 3 1/2' x 4'; 1970


13. "Blue Fantasy"; oil; c. 3' x 4'; 1970

14. "Red Fantasy"; oil; c. 3 3/4' x 4'; 1970; First stage as photographed in two stages of development.
15. Second Stage (see, above)

16. "Figure and Ground Fantasy" (Self-portrait"; oil; c. $3\frac{1}{2} \times 4\frac{1}{2}$; First stage as photographed in two stages of development.

17. Second and final stage (see, above)

18. Self-Portrait; oil; c. 20" x 24"; 1970.


20. "Portrait of Clark"; oil; c. 2 3/4' x 4'; First Stage as photographed in three stages of development.

21. Second Stage (see, above)

22. Third and Final Stage (see, above)

23. "Family Portrait"; oil; c. $3\frac{1}{2}' x 4 3/4'$; 1969.