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INTRODUCTION

Art is like religion in many respects. Its development does not consist of new discoveries which strike out the old truths and label them errors . . . Its development consists of sudden illuminations, like lightning, of explosions . . . This illumination shows new perspectives in a blinding light, new truths which are basically nothing more than the organic development, the organic growing of earlier wisdom which is not voided by the later, but as wisdom and truth continues to live and produce.1

This statement by Kandinsky is an appropriate introduction to this thesis because it coincides with my beliefs regarding my artistic achievement. Even though the "sudden illumination" perhaps does not yet have its equivalent in my development, I accept the basic premise, that growth evolves out of previous artistic behavior, as the ground for my present artistic level of development. For it is a fact without question that my present direction as well as my commitment to action is in great part the result of my past realizations of artistic involvement.

Thus it is my intention in this essay to present a brief chronological description of personal growth, citing pedagogical direction, personal interests and the influences of other artists within the matrix of my higher educational training.

I shall highlight those factors which were most pertinent and nourishing to the development of my artistic process. First, my initial activity as an undergraduate student will be examined as well as the consequential reactions to this behavior. Second, I shall review those attitudes which interested me most as a graduate student, namely—the adoption of a specific "kinesthetic" approach to painting, the concern for pictorial organization and the intrinsic relationship of drawing to painting. And third, I shall discuss the expansion in the choice of my imagery with major influences from Picasso and Pollock.
PART I

Without any previous artistic training I was exposed as an undergraduate to two distinct avenues of pedagogical theory at two universities, one a particularly large institution and the other a relatively small one. There was at both schools an extensive art curriculum that included studio courses in drawing, painting, sculpture, etcetera. I chose the area of painting as my major field of interest within the framework of a liberal arts education.

As is the "custom" in almost all universities, drawing precedes painting within the context of education in art. Therefore, as a beginning art student, I was obligated to take drawing as a prerequisite to painting. I was instructed to draw for two semesters in a manner that was fundamentally an affirmation of those techniques developed during the High Renaissance. It was instruction oriented to drawing "the object," with such illusionistic devices as perspective, chiaroscuro (with the single light source) and the local color schema of blue sky and green trees. Craftsmanship was desired and advocated within this instructional approach; the "preferred rightness" of the drawing was dependent on how well it related to its referent in

---

2This is not to imply that one or the other theory was indigenous to either Indiana University or Youngstown University, on the contrary both institutions offered the divergent approaches.
description under set conditions. All in all the situation was comfortable and secure since I was merely copying what I perceived "out there."

When I shifted my attention to oil painting the instructional emphasis was oriented toward non-representational abstraction and some of the discoveries of the Twentieth Century. The talk was about complex color and shape relationships on a flat two-dimensional surface: there was little recognition in the vocabulary of instruction for subject matter and the devices of perspective and modelling.

The accent was on freedom, yet freedom for what purpose other than personal expression was never clearly defined. At any rate I accepted this new approach rather naively and began acting on the canvas in a very free and crude manner. This action produced clearly and freshly contrasted shapes and colors that appeared interesting during the first quarter hour of the process, yet as the painting progressed the clarity and freshness would evaporate leaving its residue of mud in a monotony of similar shapes. This procedure was repeated on innumerable occasions with invariably the same results.

I was in a completely unexplored and uncontrollable situation. I had come from one extreme of modelling the object to the other of attempting to order abstract patches of color--there was no bridge between the two, no transfer or learning. That is to say the concept of gradating color from light to dark had very little if any relationship to the idea of juxtapositioning one color against another.
Candidly, I received very little instructional training that was directly concerned with increasing my personal sensitivity regarding contemporary shape and color organization.

With the termination of my first level of higher education I had committed myself to further study in the area of Fine Arts, particularly painting. The experiences of working with paint however naively captured my interests as a maturing adult not as a novel situation but rather as a mysterious set of problematical circumstances that provided a motivation for personal solution. I was aware of the fact that my pictorial statements in abstract color were not fully realized, that their intrinsic quality was generally confusing and often uninteresting, yet I was determined to probe for a personal development that would provide a resolution.

I had no romantic illusions of creating art, only a genuine desire to realize more fully the experience of painting.

Upon entering the graduate program at The Ohio State University I found conditions more favorable to my learning. Constructive instructional criticism combined with adequate facilities provided the stimuli for a more concentrated effort and increased conviction in my approach. I continued to paint in oils without the use of subject matter in a free and spontaneous manner much like the approach established by the Abstract Expressionists or to use Harold Rosenberg's more accurate term, "action painters." I found that such an unpremeditated and automatic kinesthetic marking was in direct accord with my temperament.
Perhaps a segment of the article entitled "Direct Painting" by Ray Parker, the post-abstract expressionist painter-critic, best described my attitude while in the process of painting.

Painting terms are given in the nature of the medium; the only forms acceptable are directly inherent in the artists materials. This means no representation or programmatically chosen limitations or formal elements, as in "abstract" painting. The process of painting is improvisational--excluding set method, plan, sketch as study, drawing as preliminary to coloring, or relative stages of finish . . . Changes are made in process; nothing can be fixed up, no additions or corrections made. The whole painting may be in error, never a part . . . Craftsmanship is optional. The working attitude of the painter is critical . . . The situation is confrontational. 3

It is not surprising that I was directly influenced by the work of De Kooning, Pollock and Hofmann. Fundamentally these three artists acted in a very painterly and brutal manner incorporating within their paintings what appeared to be a wide range of color and shape complexities. It was their strong complex configurational character that interested me most. However, I did not wish to imitate their particular style of painting, instead I wanted only to evoke within my pictorial statements a personal meaning and invention through the use of complex shape configuration. Yet such complexities were not readily attainable for me for two reasons: first, my maturation level could not accommodate such a complicated task and second, I was unaware of the inherent discipline of this free invention on the picture plane.

3Ray Parker, "Direct Painting," It Is....., No. 1, Spring, 1958, p. 20.
It was only after considerable visual and literary investigation that I understood more clearly the historical ground for this "action approach" to painting. One scholar in particular, Sam Hunter, in his book Modern American Painting and Sculpture, wrote about the relationship of Pollock and the "action" group to the movements of Surrealism and Cubism. He stated that:

The Surrealists, by their presence in America during the war, were to offer some very crucial hints for a new synthesis of abstract form . . . Their "automatism" and rehabilitation of instinct provided a vital alternative to the geometric design . . . of Cubism and Abstract art. The impact of the Surrealist liberties on the American avant-garde was sharp if somewhat oblique.⁴

To the Surrealists he [Pollock] owed not so much the form of his own distinctive "writings," but the notion that the painting was to be ejected as a "stream," in one seeming burst.⁵

While Hunter associates the spontaneous and instinctive approach of the "action" painters to the automatism of the Surrealists, he also concludes that their formal structures are associated with the inventions of Cubism. He confirms this by further stating:

Also paradoxical are the facts that the general style shows a deep regard for formal structure while apparently chaotic and indetermined in appearance.⁶

It is the persistent concern with impersonal plastic problems . . . qualities that link it to such early twentieth-century movements as Cubism.⁷


⁵Ibid., p. 143.

⁶Ibid., p. 150.

⁷Ibid., p. 143.
Once I perceived visually the synthesis of shape and color in the Abstract Expressionists' paintings, I began to work with a pictorial process that was to last the duration of my first academic year. Any ideas regarding the use of novel subject matter were completely sacrificed at first for the following concerns: to gain increased tactile sensitivity to the two-dimensional plane, to minimize the temptation of "local" color in the pictorial statement, and to suppress the tendency to render objects. What was most important in my painting process at this time was to create a harmony of color and shape relationship.\(^6\)

Working in a very painterly and opened manner, color and shape were inseparable in my process since the choice of one would inevitably produce the other. My painting process was an interaction of these two elements, they were always relative and sequential from the very first mark on canvas until the last. Conceivably, the composition could be changed or disrupted at any point in process. There was neither a security of final outcome nor a formula for its production.

My desire was always to integrate, to establish a hierarchy of contrasting relationships that would arouse, rather than deaden the visual perception of the observer. I wanted to create a visual tension in my pictorial statements through the use of variety and dominance of shape. The psychologist D. E. Berlyne appropriately describes my fundamental objectives of pictorial interest and unity.

---

\(^6\)Harmony here connotes both color that has a quality of "likeness" and color that has a quality of "dissonance." Likeness refers to color which is analogous in the spectrum, that is color such as blue, green, yellow-green, etcetera. Dissonance refers to opposing colors in the spectrum such as complimentary hues or other hues which are opposed to one another.
"... Visual conflict or tension, also called opposition, contrast or variety, is used to produce stimulus or interest... unity demands that the conflict be resolved and integrated by dominance, the principle of synthesis. This integration is effected by subordinating the competing visual attractions to an idea or plan or orderly arrangement." Dominence is achieved when one quality—a hue, line, or shape—occupies appreciably more of the design than others.  

Berlyne's concept of pictorial interest and organization is based on the premise that "contrast" of various elements produces "interest" and "dominance" of these same elements produces "unity." Intellectually, this concept is easily comprehensible, however its translation into actual experiential behavior is often extremely difficult.

I soon realized that the situation was paradoxical: my concern for form, the desire for organization was in fact preventing that very synthesis to occur. My involvement with the work was being infected by a self-conscious intervention. I was frequently trying to make "a painting" instead of allowing the painting to emerge out of the undisturbed interaction between it [the canvas] and myself. These self-conscious attempts always resulted in works that were complicated and unclear with many similar shapes, values and saturations. The lack of discrimination not only produced boredom but also personal fatigue and frustration.

Only when I abandoned my "goals" did the activity produce a meaningful and interesting statement: this discovery occurred when I least expected it. It was only after a long period of trial and error with painting procedures, accompanied by visual investigation of other

---

paintings and constant drawing that I began to experience some order and clarity in my pictorial statements.

More may be said at this point about the relationship of drawing to painting. It is not necessary to enumerate artists prior to the Twentieth Century to substantiate the fact that drawing on paper has provided the means for evoking unique experiences of invention just as painting on canvas. Such artists as Picasso, Klee, Matisse and Pollock, to name just a few, have used drawing as a channel of artistic expression. It is true that they have used it as a means of study and sketch for specific paintings, however, it is also true that they have accepted drawing many times as complete artistic statements.

I have approached drawing as a complete entity with no pre-determined usage for subsequent paintings.\textsuperscript{16} My attitude while drawing has been one and the same with that of painting, that is complete involvement with the activity, a one to one relationship between myself and the page always attentive and responsive to the marks while imaginatively projecting configurations. The rapidity and facility of acting on sheets of paper (usually \(18'' \times 24''\)) with water base paints, inks, chalks and crayons has provided a controllability and readjustability not readily inherent in the oil medium applied to canvas. I have been able to destroy and rebuild, creating an entirely new

\textsuperscript{16}Drawing itself has been the end product of my expression since I have not used it as a means of sketch or study for paintings. Drawing however has prompted ideas of imagery and general formal structures of color for paintings, especially when I have worked with subject matter; namely, animals, human figures, and such items as trash cans.
pictorial situation with one bold stroke. Constant drawing has also increased my sensitivity to color and shape relationship which in turn has increased my confidence in executing the proper mark at the correct moment in process. Furthermore, drawing has been most important in my artistic growth because it has permitted me to expand my visual attention to include the "total construct."\(^{11}\)

Near the end of my first year's work, I felt an unconscious provocation to invent new imagery, imagery that vaguely and awkwardly described portions of human or animal figures. I wanted to create configurations of shape that were crude, distorted, and primitive in appearance yet also indicative of a subject. I had no concern for seeking a direct referent in my environment, only an imaginative exploration of wierd and fanciful inventions of images. Pictorial statements consequently emerged with figurative and animalistic elements that were to be "hints" of more explicitly defined subject matter later. I found that my attitudes and actions while in the process of painting were more personal as I began to search and wait for events to occur that would in turn provide a direction for resolution. I responded unconsciously to the needs of my painting. I was never concerned with literal or symbolic projections of meaning, only an awareness of some new experience, a discovery.

This new interest in evoking more descriptive imagery initiated what can be considered a major directional change in my attitude about

---

\(^{11}\)The term "total construct" refers to the entire pictorial area that conceivably can be worked upon by the artist. I believe that the resolution of a pictorial statement is achieved by respecting the demands of this total area.
creativity. I previously had rejected subject matter as a vehicle of expression, regarding it as necessary and appropriate for other artists but clearly unauthentic for my working needs. This was no longer the case as I began contemplating the idea of allowing the painting or drawing to assume the character of a representative subject, for example, in the form of a portrait. There was now occurring an unprecedented pre-determined decision making of positioning a figure against a ground and establishing a "drama" of expression. With this new interest in portraiture I began to investigate the work of Pablo Picasso, particularly that period from 1927-1940.

During this period, Picasso had exploited a new central tendency of invention in his painting and drawing that can be related to the discoveries of the Surrealists. He often utilized certain devices to link heterogeneous elements and levels of reality within the same composition. He also subjected the human figure and animals to an extreme degree of Surrealistic metamorphosis. This plausible cultivation of his unconscious provided an extensive range of descriptive and expressive statements of great physical and emotional violence.\textsuperscript{12}

\textsuperscript{12}The following reference to Alfred H. Barr, Jr., reinforces my conclusions about Picasso's art of this period and his association with Surrealism.

The metamorphic Three Dancers is in fact a turning point in Picasso's art almost as radical as was the proto-cubist Demoiselles d' Avignon. The convulsive left-hand dancer foreshadows new periods of his art in which psychologically disturbing energies reinforce
I was interested in achieving a similar expression of distorted subjects in my own manner. I consequently executed a series of portrait derivations choosing heads of women and animals as my basic motif. I did not use a direct referent of Picasso's in an effort to minimize the problem of my pictorial statements assuming the character of his "signature." My intent was to expand my experience of invention.

Within a short time this concern for descriptive subject matter caused a gradual confinement of my kinesthetic response. The once free approach to configuration became increasingly rigid and sharply defined. My actions again were becoming goal-directed, that is, self-consciously oriented to the making of a painting.

Thus, in an effort to re-establish a more unconscious attitude in my working process I discontinued using specific motifs such as figures and heads and once more began imaginatively projecting shape configurations that represented no explicit subject matter.

Again I approached painting without any predetermined decision concerning general positioning or ultimate solutions. As this

or, depending on one's point of view, adulterates his ever changing achievements in the realm of form.

"Convulsive" and "disquieting" were favorite adjectives of praise among the Surrealists whose leader, Andre Breton, had published his first Manifesto of Surrealism in 1924. A year earlier Picasso had twice etched Breton's portrait.


13While working rather exclusively with portraiture my marking ability became increasingly limited to a selected number of shapes. It seemed to me that I was not exploring fully the possibilities of invention because I was overly concerned with subject description.
reinterest in a more abstract syntax began to crystalize, I became dissatisfied working with the canvas attached to the wall. Too, the use of the brush in applying paint was inhibiting a desired spontaneity and freedom. Reflecting on my painting process, I realized that a change in technique might afford the needed catalyst to establish a deep involvement with the painting. I therefore placed the canvas on the floor and attempted to confront it from all sides, dripping and spilling paint and then modifying some of the shapes that had been created in an effort to gain desired formal relationships.

I executed a series of six paintings in this Pollock tradition. However, this technical change in my painting process was not prompted by a sudden reinterest or derivation of his drip method. It was only the need to become extremely free once again after the encounter with the comparatively limited action produced by the work with portraiture.

Once this freedom was firmly established I sensed again the need to introduce subject matter into my painting. For the first time I began to explore my environment for stimuli. My daily experience plus the range of possible referents within my studio area created an almost unlimited choice of possibilities. I began to draw and paint such things as trash cans, shoes, automobiles, etc. I was searching for things "out there" to induce a personal interest for discovery. At one time this attitude would have been a sacrilege to my working process, however, it was necessary and appropriate for the expansion of my imagery at this point in my development. Yet even within this new search I was concerned with abstracting the shapes that stimulated me, that is distorting them and creating a new invention of form.
In retrospect it is evident that my painting has evolved within a context that has been varied in form and subject yet has maintained a continuity of development. Perhaps most responsible for this continuity has been my adherence to a free and bold kinesthetic approach to invention and a disregard for "in" styles and novelties. Such an approach has provided the means for a wide range of choice regarding pictorial imagery. I have been able to move from purely abstract statements of color and shape to statements that dealt with subject matter in various degree and kind. Moreover, my kinesthetic approach has enabled the form of my pictorial statements to emerge congruently with my chosen imagery.

Since I have explicitly described my development from the beginning days as a student to the present, it would be appropriate, in conclusion, to ascertain my present position, to examine the convictions and direction that have been molded by my temperament and cognitive attitudes as well as my past artistic experience. Therefore, I have chosen the following series of aphorisms to summate my present beliefs.

I am convinced that there can be no short cuts, no instantaneous methods or solutions to the creation of art.

Painting must be treated as a game—a game that will at times be won and at times be lost, but always a game that will present the challenge of discovery.

Painting is "a confrontation" between myself and the canvas with "discovery" existing as the spoils of victory if I am the victor.
This discovery can only emerge if the canvas is confronted by a genuine commitment to action.

The creative illumination never occurs before the act nor after the act, it is only during the act that the 'explosion,' the realization of a new construct appears. It happens only when the organism is interrelated in all its complexities, when there is complete interaction between all physical and psychological parts. The final product is only a record of this experience, a record that can never be truly replayed or translated.

What is important in my painting is neither a convention nor a style, it is the search for illumination in process, this is the "meat" of art. While it is true that I must control the events that occur when I am painting, I can never fully predict the steps I shall take in process since this very process is completely relative. In this sense painting is difficult, it can never be planned and there are many obstacles which will prevent its completion, yet these insecurities are out-weighed by the commitment to action and the search for illumination.
PART II

The following plates are photographs of paintings, drawings and prints that were done at The Ohio State University from September, 1964, to May, 1966. They are assembled in chronological order to best illustrate the changes in my development. A selection of these works (marked with asterisks) was exhibited at The Ohio State University, School of Art from July 31 to August 6 in partial fulfillment for the degree Master of Fine Arts.

Catalogue

1. Toilage, Fall, 1964. Oil on cotton canvas, 47 x 60 in. This painting reflects my early interest in working with complex shape and color relationships. The lack of discipline presents a complicated and unclear pictorial statement.

*2. Aztec, Winter, 1965. Oil on cotton canvas, 47 x 47 in.

3. Totem Imagery, Spring, 1965. Oil on cotton canvas, 45-1/2 x 45-1/2 in. While this painting is without explicit subject matter, there is a change in the imagery that suggests the interest in vague subject description.

*4. Male and Female, Summer, 1965. Ink and wash on 70 lb. drawing paper, 19 x 24 in. Although this drawing is somewhat ambiguous in subject description, it is one of the first works making use of definite subject matter.

5. Man in the Yellow Shirt, Summer, 1965. Oil on cotton canvas, 32 x 34 in. This painting marks my beginning interests in portraiture and the work of Picasso.
6. Study of a Horse, Fall, 1965. Black soybean paint, charcoal and white chalk on 70 lb. drawing paper, 18 x 24 in. This drawing and the following one are the most successful works of animal portraiture.


8. Woman Undressing, Fall, 1965. Charcoal on 70 lb. drawing paper, 18 x 24 in.


10. Red Flower, Fall, 1965. Oil on cotton canvas, 26 x 34 in.

11. Rosie, Fall, 1965. Oil on cotton canvas, 17-1/4 x 23 in. This painting and the following drawing represent the most personal and non-derivative achievements in the series of portraits.

12. Lady with Hat, Fall, 1965. Charcoal on 70 lb. drawing paper, 18 x 24 in.

13. Schoolboy, Fall, 1965. Oil on cotton canvas, 24 x 32 in. This painting is the last work in the series of portraits.

14. The Misfits, Fall, 1965. Black soybean paint, crayon and chalk on 70 lb. drawing paper, 18 x 24 in. This drawing reflects an interest in inventing shapes which were not obviously related to subjects in my environment.

15. The Family, Fall, 1965. Oil on cotton canvas, 64 x 64 in. This painting like the previous drawing represents a reaction to portraiture.

16. Deep Involvement, Winter, 1965-1966. Oil on cotton canvas, 70 x 70 in. This painting and the following one represent the most successful statements during the period when I worked with a drip technique.

17. Big Valley, Winter, 1965. Oil on cotton canvas, 32-1/2 x 59 in. Purchased by Mr. and Mrs. Frank Krake, Columbus, Ohio.


19. Bucket, Winter, 1966. Charcoal, ink and wash on 70 lb. drawing paper, 18 x 24 in. This drawing represents my first interest in environmental stimuli. In the collection of Professor Robert D. King, The Ohio State University.


25. Trick or Treat, Winter, 1966. Oil on cotton canvas, 21 x 22 in.
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