

Programa de Doctorado  
TEORÍA E HISTORIA DE LA ARQUITECTURA  
Escuela Técnica Superior de Arquitectura de Barcelona  
Universidad Politécnica de Cataluña  
Departamento de Composición Arquitectónica

Tesis presentada para obtener el grado de Doctora para la Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya

2/2

**DONALD JUDD ILUSIONISTA**

Anexos

Lourdes Peñaranda  
Director: Josep María Rovira  
mayo 2010

# ÍNDICE

---

<b>ANEXO A: DOCUMENTOS .....</b>	<b>337</b>
<b>ANEXO B: ENTREVISTAS .....</b>	<b>339</b>
<b>ANEXO C: SIMPOSIOS .....</b>	<b>375</b>
<b>ANEXO D: MANUSCRITOS .....</b>	<b>434</b>

A continuación se anexan fotocopias de los documentos inéditos utilizados de los Archivos de Arte Americano en el Smithsonian Institution en Washington, D.C.

## **ANEXO A: DOCUMENTOS**

Carta de Virginia Dwan a John Canaday con fecha 13 de Octubre de 1966. Dwan Gallery (Los Angeles, Calif. And New York, N.Y.) records, 1959-1971.

October 13, 1966

Mr. John Canaday  
The New York Times  
229 West 43 Street  
New York, N.Y.

Dear Mr. Canaday:

Because we were not able to get the ten artists in our current exhibition, "10", to arrive at any sort of manifesto (manifesto being appropriate only to cohesive groups with mutual intent) we were not able to send you a press release which would in any way sum up this aggregate of work. So much has already been said about "Primary Structures", "ABC", "Reductive Art", etc., that at first glance this show may appear to be simply another statement of these ideas. Not one of the artists participating in "10" will identify himself with these terms. However, there are some things inherent to all these works which make them rest easily with each other. It may be stillness, methodology, or "the non-visual (mathematical) made visible (concrete)", as Mel Bochner puts it. Above all, it is non-expressionistic, and, with the possible exception of Agnes Martin, impersonal. It is phenomenological. It is art ~~as such~~ without mystique, empathy or readable content.

The exhibition was coordinated by Ad Reinhardt, Robert Morris, Robert Smithson and myself. I feel that these works have an *immutable* quality, a stubborn reality divorced from "our times", or jazzy pidgeon-holing titles, done "10".

I would like very much for you and/or Mr. Kramer to visit this show as, although the work may be "timeless", the exhibition is not. It will be coming down on October 29th.

Regards,

Virginia Dwan

## ANEXO B: ENTREVISTAS

1. Transcripción de la entrevista realizada por Bruce Hooton a Donald Judd el 3 de Febrero de 1965, Archivos del Programa de Historia Oral que se inició en 1959 para documentar la historia de las artes visuales en los Estados Unidos.
2. Transcripción de la entrevista realizada por Richard Stankiewicz a Donald Judd de la que se utilizaron segmentos para el documental *Four Sculptors* realizado en 1973. Richard Stankiewicz papers, 1948-1984, microfilm, carril 3748.

TAPE RECORDED INTERVIEW WITH DONALD JUDD  
February 3, 1965

INTERVIEWED BY BRUCE HOOTON

DJ: Mr Judd

BH: Mr. Hooton

BH I don't understand the new geometric art. Norman Mailer complained the other day in the New York Times about the square look of things, you know, everything is simplified and square, and too simplified.

DJ Well, I really only know about myself, my reasons for doing it. They certainly aren't connected with the old geometric art. My work isn't geometric in that sense. One of the reasons, I guess, that my stuff is geometric is that I want it to be simple; also I want it to be non-naturalistic, non-imagistic, and non-expressionistic. The simpleness goes all the way back through my other paintings, almost to when I first started working.

BH Where did you first work?

DJ I was born in Missouri and lived around the Middle West, moved to Philadelphia during World War II - no, just before it, before Pearl Harbor. And then we moved to New Jersey and I went to the Art Students League.

BH How long did you study at the Art Students League?

DJ For about three years - three and a half years.

BH With whom?

DJ With Louis Bouché the first two years; one year with Louis Bosa; about a year with Will Barnet; and summers with several people - Marsh, Hale and Johnson. I don't know if you remember him, he used to teach contour drawing. I don't remember his first name, he's dead now. And Bernard Klonis. Yes, I went to school here. I began studying art in '48 or '50, then I moved here in 1953. Before that I commuted in from New Jersey to save money because I was doing both Columbia and the Art Students League.

BH Did you take a degree at Columbia?

DJ Yes.

BH In art?

DJ In philosophy. I figured I had a major in effect at the League.

BH You must - - Reinhardt, when did you first meet Reinhardt?

DJ A couple of years ago.

BH Were you painting or working more or less the same way before you met him?

DJ I don't remember being directly influenced by him. I admired his work, but also that of quite a few other people. One thing, I was a painter until maybe '61 or '62 - I'll have to figure out the dates - and then I started doing 3 dimensional things. The paintings are not exactly geometric, but its there.

Geometric art as such doesn't mean all that much to me. A lot of the people I admire aren't doing it. I don't feel the connection is that way.

BH A drawing I saw of yours had a kind of inverted Stonehenge feeling. There was a certain monumentality even though - - -

DJ It was blatant.

BH What?

DJ It is a post and lintel arrangement.

BH There's no kind of philosophical point to the whole thing? I mean, what would one say if one decides to cut out certain things in the same way? One decides to throw paint; one decided not to throw paint; or to simplify things. I mean, - - -what?

DJ Well, I am not interested in the kind of expression that you have when you paint a painting with brush strokes. It's all right, but it's already done and I want to do something new. I didn't want to get into something which is played out and narrow. I want to do as I like, invent my own interests. Of course, that doesn't mean that people who, like Newman, still paint are worn out. But I think that's a particular kind of experience involving a certain immediacy between you and the canvas, you and the experience of that particular moment. I think what I'm trying to deal with is something more long range than that in a way, more obscure perhaps, more involved with things that happen over a longer time perhaps. At least it's another area of experience.

BH In other words, you're trying to lay the foundation for sort of thought. I mean, one might say that you try to kind of stop time for a minute, or stop certainly Abstract Expressionism in its lesser form of a great teaching gimmick across the country, because anybody can do it. It's like a great thought - anybody can throw paint.

DJ Well, that can be said of drawing or anything. It depends on - - anybody can do it if it isn't too good. But I'm not against Abstract Expressionism. I think it's just as difficult and just as good as other forms have been. As usual, it had a superfluous number of followers.

BH As any group does.

DJ Yes, and that certainly helped to run it down.

BH IT gave ammunition to people who were totally against it.

DJ Yes, and it was accepted too rigidly and I think that - -

BH That's actually what killed it.

DJ No, several of the main people failed. I think Kline's painting went down hill, and de Kooning's. Pollock died, of course. And Pollock, Kline and de Kooning are considered the typical Expressionists. But even if Pollock had lived and de Kooning had kept up his work, new things would have come along. Those people seem pretty tolerant. Now it's only some writers and followers who are rigid. Newman, whose work I think is great, and Rothko, are not characteristically Expressionist.

BH They include themselves.

DJ And I don't think there's been any public reaction against them.

BH Against Abstract Expressionism?

DJ Well, against Newman and Rothko, or that - they've been very influential with a lot of people my age.

END OF SIDE #1

BH About the idea of simplicity?

DJ Usually when someone says a thing is too simple they're saying that certain familiar things aren't there, and they're seeing a couple maybe that are left, which they count as a couple, that's all. But actually there may be those couple of things and several new things to which they aren't paying attention. These may be quite complex. At the moment when someone says it's too simple they mean that it doesn't have the composition that the Abstract Expressionist painting, or Cubist, or whatever - going back - had. It doesn't have a lot of parts working against one another, a lot of colors working against one another. If it doesn't have this it's simple to them. Now it may have other things which are really pretty complex. They may be read all at once. This is important to most of the best work going on now. It has to have a wholeness to it that previous work didn't have, but still, within that, it's not all as simple as you say.

BH If you're going to do a box the line has to join at the right spot.

DJ Yes. Boxes are pretty simple.

BH But I mean it has to join with something like - there's a Chinese phrase for it that I can't remember, but the totality which the line does - it has to complete itself.

DJ The corners all have to join. Even in a box you have, after all, just on the top four edges. And there are four more down the side and four around the bottom. It really isn't all that simple. And that's just plain box. But one of mine has subdivisions in it - a trough is made of a lot of subdivisions. Well, those subdivisions are progressive and the progression in there is really pretty complicated. It looks like a trough with a lot of arcs along it and it's very simple if you don't start to think about the progression and the number of arcs. But if you take that into consideration it's reasonably complex.



- BH Just what little I saw of that box show last night and the Whitney show - I hate to say that I was kind of impressed with both shows, and even the box show, what little I saw of it, was very impressive. I mean, it's kind of overwhelming, but you know the tremendous activity going on.
- DJ There's a lot of interesting things, pretty good work. I think if you say a lot of very good work you cut it down quite a bit, but if you say there's a lot of fairly good work - -
- BH Fairly good work - -
- DJ There really is an enormous amount.
- BH And it's incredibly varied. I mean, the whole - - -
- DJ Yes.
- BH Did you see the Whitney show?
- DJ Yes.
- BH What did you think of it?
- DJ Well, it was better than usual. More current.
- BH I did too. It's silly to say this, but I think it looked like what a Whitney Annual ought to look like, even though I may or may not like it.
- DJ Yes, that's about the first time it has - - -
- BH It's true. I really felt that too, but they need money now, you know. They've got to be good now.
- DJ Yes.
- BH I mean, I went to George's for awhile last night. Went to Beacham - Bob Beacham - whose paintings I don't like too much.
- DJ I don't either.
- BH But his drawings I think are extraordinary and he has a whole drawing show that is worth looking at. They really are kind of interesting. I mean, they are really good. And then George pipes up and said he thought they were good too, and he said, "If America had 60 more years of peace, or 50 more years of peace, we'd produce an art that is overwhelming," and I think that is true.
- DJ Peace and money.
- BH Peace and Money. Well, yes. Peace without depression. Well, that's not his problem either. He really is kind of interested in art, he's an art lover.

DJ I very much don't think the supposedly simple work is simpler in quality. If anything it's perhaps more complex in quality.

BH But in what way?

DJ I certainly think it's stronger in quality. The strongness is one reason why they're somewhat simpler. They have to work all at once. The older painting - well, it does have an effect all at once, I suppose, but it's of a lesser intensity than a lot of the American work in the last ten or fifteen years. You only comprehend it after you look at it part by part. I think most of the best new work is intended to have much more impact at once. You certainly see things later. I think it's meant to be understood more as a single thing - from Pollock's paintings on to the present.

BH Well, Pollock actually worked very simply and he worked very directly.

DJ Yes. Pollock is not an ordinary painter, he's not an Expressionist in the usual sense.

DJ He's always been pulled in with them, but I think he's a much more radical artist - more than de Kooning. As far as the second generation goes, I think they missed the whole boat on his nature and importance.

BH Pollock?

DJ Yes.

BH What about Gorky?

DJ Oh, he's a nice painter, but - - - Some of the drawings are very nice, but I think he's a pretty old-fashioned painter. I don't think he did anything as unusual as Pollock. Pollock looks unusual and radical even now.

BH Yes, there's no question about that. Well, a genius is a genius, there's only about five geniuses in every fifty years.

DJ Not so few as that.

BH Hopper may be one, and Homer one, and Eakins.

DJ I'll take Hopper out - I'll leave the other two.

BH What?

DJ Hopper's a good painter, but take him out of that rank.

BH Well, Eakins and Homer - -

DJ

DJ Eakins and Homer, I think.

BH Eakins and Homer, Hopper, and maybe Pollock - there aren't many more.

DJ Not Hopper.

BH Not Hopper? He's out?

DJ He's too late on that and also - - -

- DJ I think he's good, but I think he was too late to do what he was doing and do it first rate, for a lot of reasons.
- BH There's a point in that.
- DJ He's a good painter and I think he's got a lot that is pertinent to American art generally and even to, oh, Newman, maybe, almost anybody. I think that sparseness and simplicity is pervasive. Not only Hopper, it goes all the way back to Homer and beyond. There's probably more in the American tradition than people give the place credit for. I think there are certain elements you could probably trace back, maybe as far back as - I've forgotten his name - Feke, I guess.
- BH Feke?
- DJ Or those people. Or Copley, especially something like Copley's portrait of Paul Revere where he made a right-angle triangle. The thing is blunt and relatively uncomposed compared to European work of the time. I think it would have been somewhat irritating to Europeans of that time.
- BH It didn't carry all the capitals.
- DJ Yes, it was too simple, too.
- BH I've always kind of defended Hopper in the sense that if one had to find a painter of, say, from 1910 to 1950 that really represented America, that really described America, say, 60,000 years from now, one would see in Hopper all the literary series in art too, I mean like Dreiser, Hemingway, Wolfe, Dos Passos, all the loneliness of America and the sparseness - - Hopper represented what literature talked about, assuming that literature speaks the truth from time to time, then Hopper is it. And I always ask who are the writers that are describing what the Abstract Expressionists are about.
- DJ I don't think description is all that important as to art representing a period much later. For one thing, you really don't understand very much about any period from its art. I think you overestimate that.
- BH Well, they either glorify it or attack it.
- DJ Well, I think even if you like it you're bound to miss a great deal that was in it at the time.
- BH That's true.
- DJ You see it considerably pared down. You don't know its associations and what it meant in all sorts of ways. But especially, you see the force of it and, I think something more complex than just description. Well, for example, Asia House has Chinese bronzes now.
- BH I saw them.

DJ And they are thoroughly unintelligible as far as their reasons go. They don't say anything about China at the time; but they're extremely powerful things. Somehow there is something this powerful in the culture at that time; that's all you know. I think that's all you can deal with and I don't think the fact that Hopper shows what the place looks like is all that important.

BH Very good.

DJ I sort of - I like it, I have a certain nostalgia for it. I recognize very much in Hopper that it does look like the United States; it looks like the 30's and my first impressions of everything, all of which I have to deal with and which gets mixed up in my work and probably gets mixed up in everybody else's work too. But I think it can come out in more complex ways. I think some of the things I deal with, Hopper probably has dealt with also, since it's somewhat the same environment and I have pretty strong reactions to what this country looks like. It looks pretty dull and spare, and you like this and dislike it and it's very complicated. I'd like to present this more forcefully than Hopper, but not as description. But I think you have to - whatever the environment looks like it does enter into peoples' art work one way or another, it's very remote or it isn't. It's remote in my work but it has to have a certain degree of ordinariness. I admire work that is exotic, such as Bontecou's and Samaras', but I suppose I work in a way within limits of ordinariness. Those limits come from what's around you, and you know what the range is. I think an artist like Bob Morris may have this problem too; it may have something to do with what everything looks like - simple shapes, and - - -

BH There's a certain validity in what you say - in the Cubist period the cube was really what artists were interested in, not the look of Paris, which is what really killed the school of Paris, even though it looked like Paris. In Hopper certainly a strip of road with trees (couldn't be anything else than America.

DJ Well, I think there are artists who are more or less contemporary with Hopper who are more relevant. Stuart Davis has more to do with what the United States is like than Hopper. But also you have the big problem that you don't very exactly represent the United States, or the culture. You're in it and it gets mixed up in what you're doing, but you're one out of the other 200 million and you only know little parts of it and I think no one is going to represent it in a very broad, grand way. Anyway, the culture is not only American.

BH I guess that comes from being literary in nature. Tolstoy, to my mind, represents Russia.

DJ Tolstoy may not be showing that much of Russia at that time even. It's hard to tell. You tend to associate the quality of the period with what's lasted - what's still good. And that quality becomes the whole period. Whatever didn't get written about or painted just goes and - but I don't much like the idea of representing the United States in my work. It's just that you live here and you are involved in your sense of what's around you - your sense of what's ordinary, for example, that I talked about.

BH Is that true of most artists you know?

DJ Is what true?

BH I mean, about your feeling - do you think they would all agree with that?

DJ Well, I don't think anyone now would say that they're painting the state of the culture of America. I think that's too grand and pompous a thing for anybody to claim. You're only dealing with whatever you know, which is a very small part of it, and later on it'll look like it has something to do with the period. Obviously, the artists have something to do with one another. They tend to set up certain common qualities among themselves.

BH Did you meet then, after you started painting?

DJ After I started painting?

BH Well, I mean in this whole thing - Stella - I mean, for example, I remember a few years back in '60 a kind of showing - -

DJ Yes.

BH '60, '61?

DJ I met him maybe - - -

BH Your first show was just last year, wasn't it? Did you meet painters working in a similar manner before your show, like Frank Stella or Dan Flavin?

DJ I might have met Stella four years ago, but I didn't especially know him. I got to know him somewhat in the last couple of years. I've known Flavin for about four years, and of course he didn't show until last fall. I don't know how it may look to other people, but I think their work looks pretty diverse. Stella is opulent, for example, some other - - ?

BH Opulent?

DJ - - some other area you know I don't - -

BH Silver paint and - -

DJ And the purple, in general, and the weight and opulence of most of his paintings, which I like very much but which is very alien to me.

BH What do you think of Louise Nevelson?

DJ Nice but nothing special.

BH Quite an opposite to - - do you like her son Mike Nevelson? Have you seen his sparse pieces of wood?

- DJ Well, they're all right. I don't think they're remarkable. There are some other people along that line. He's not too far from Gabe Kohn and he did those things a long time ago.
- BH No. That's true. Raoul Hague, what do you think about Hague?
- DJ Nothing special. I don't think they're unusual artists. Nevelson's, they're nice, I guess is the word. I think they're good secondary artists. I don't know how to evaluate them.
- BH Pastiche in one way or another - sort of put together.
- DJ No, it's on the level, but I'm not interested in all that composition within the little boxes, and then the black monochrome is a little swank and easy. I like - I guess the things by Newman are the best around.
- BH That's certainly a switch from what I heard in New York in the fifties. Newman was not mentioned as much as Pollock, de Kooning and Kline.
- DJ Yes, I know. I don't know too much about that. It's sort of interesting. Well, you see, I suppose he looked a little geometric. I guess that was against that. But again, I don't think - I don't quite understand the different attitudes, for example, toward him and Pollock. They probably thought Pollock was acceptable because it looked like Expressionism.
- BH Yes. And came out of Surrealism.
- DJ Yes. And that Newman wasn't, and yet to me Pollock is just as radical and unlike Expressionism as Newman.
- BH I never thought about that before.
- DJ And I sure don't think Newman has anything to do with old-fashioned European geometricism, which I assume they linked him with. I think his development at that time was connected with Pollock's.
- BH You know they always say about Ad Reinhardt, who works in a purish manner, that he is a kind of Lutheran minister. Is there something like a certain morality involved in your attitude towards art?
- DJ Well, there's a morality in that you want your work to be good, I suppose. I think most of the art now is involved with a denial of any kind of absolute morality, or general morality. I think most of us in one way or another are involved in ideas of a fairly loose world, however it's expressed, whether obviously as in Chamberlain or just accidentally, or, oh, like Newman - his paintings are so open, you know, that they can't be read in the old ordered sense that Mondrian and other European painters had. But I don't think that geometricism is any more moral or serious than loose painting, or works like Oldenburg's, or Lichtenstein's or Westerman's. I don't think there's anything pure about being geometry.

- BH You remember Plato, of course, on art, about the representation of objects as being the death of culture, or death of civilization, so in that sense there could be a coincidental morality implied. Oldenburg making hamburgers and trying - - because hamburgers we have, and tables, and they represent things and they had them and he wanted to do away with artists.
- DJ Well, I am extremely uninterested in Plato's idea of form, pure form. I don't think geometric art is - - I don't like to call it that. I don't think it's any more pure than pop art or anything else. It doesn't have anything to do with purity. There's a certain type of quality involved that can't be gotten any other way. I haven't sufficient interest in objects or anything I can see around me to do what Oldenburg does. Obviously Oldenburg's interest in what he can see around him is more immediate than mine; he has to deal with that sort of thing. I like his work a lot but I don't have that kind of interest and I don't want to be descriptive or naturalistic in any way - Oldenburg isn't in the usual sense - so for the time being I am left with fairly geometric possibilities, since they don't have any of these things. I can't tell, it might prove, I don't know - - -
- BH Yes.
- DJ The geometry is partly by default. I never worked that way; I never had anything to do with the usual geometric art; I didn't know that much about European development along that line - neo-plasticism, constructivism, or any of those things.
- BH I met a man in a show a long time ago in New York - three or four years ago - who came in, I mean I talked to him. He had a little shop in North Carolina, I think it was, and his family made furniture. He was the son of a wealthy furniture manufacturer whose name I don't remember, even his. And he was very open and straight and he started talking and he said, "I cracked up and I was in Connecticut in a mental hospital and they taught me - part of the therapy was making frames." And he said, "I knew when those two ends joined, I knew I found them." And he set up a frame shop, a little gallery in North Carolina somewhere - Greensboro or something like that. As I say, is there anything to that, I mean, two ends join, is that - -? Do you enjoy building your pieces - making a perfect joint?
- DJ Well, in any art there are a lot of technical things that you can get to like. Building is just skilled labor, I suppose. It's a lot of work. I don't mind other people building them, but the way things go together and are made is interesting to me; I like that a lot. I pay a lot of attention to how things are done and the whole activity of building something is interesting.
- BH When you do it actually do you feel the edges of the wood go together?
- DJ Well, it's very exasperating when you can't get it right. Usually it's just work; occasionally fun. After all, the work isn't the paint; the piece is. I've had a tinsmith make a few when I've gotten hold of some money. I am just as satisfied with their joints - maybe more so, as I am with mine. Also, I can't make as many as I could conceivably buy.

BH Do you know the work of Ernest Trova?

DJ Yes.

BH What do you think of it?

DJ I think it's - - I didn't see the last show. I saw the one before that.

BH It's obviously being sold - a lot of money in bronze.

DJ It's expensive.

BH A thousand dollars.

DJ I can get a pretty large galvanized iron piece for \$150.

BH How does his work fit it? Is that kind of surrealist?

DJ Well, I didn't see this show. I saw the one last year. It was played up as pop art.

BH I don't remember that one.

DJ But so far no particular invention.

BH It seems so easy.

DJ I guess so.

BH Even though it's complex and difficult to do, it seems like anybody could come in once you had the idea and do it. That's not true of really good art, I think.

DJ Well, it's good if it's unusual. I don't know about difficult. Maybe it's difficult to understand important things. I don't think it necessarily has to be difficult to make. Obviously, I think that's irrelevant.

END OF TAPE



JUDD SCULPTURE

Roll 1, Scene 1, Take 1, Action

STAN: Well, a before we get on to you and your particular work  
a, I would like to open with the most general thing of  
all, which is why anybody bothers to make sculpture in  
the first place?

JUDD: A, that's a question. A, well-basically, I guess, I'm  
making it for myself. which a well, Neuman has a sort  
of famous statement where he said he ~~made~~ <sup>made</sup> paintings  
because he wanted something to see, so that's the main  
thing that I want those things to exist and I want to  
be able to see them. And a in spite of all the complications  
of money and showings and all that, a the fact that they  
go somewhere else and become public is sort of a by-product.  
And one of my big problems, which is one of the points  
of this building is to have space to see things. Just  
to have one left for one time and there wasn't very much  
room to have very much there. So, we have a lot of things  
around up there to look at.

STAN: What do you have, four floors?

JUDD: There are five and two basements.

STAN: So, a, making sculptures, a is a self-serving, to be  
frank.

JUDD: ~~It is~~ It is ~~very~~ highly self-serving.

STAN: Well, a,

JUDD: It is hopefully having non-serving as far as everybody  
else goes.

2

STAN: Yes, a well, as far as anybody else goes. Could it be the opposite? A, a I don't want to use a antagonistic and hostile. is a little too war-like, but a, is there some kind of aggressive element in relation to everybody else? A, you know?

Even if it is just the way I do it, and to hell with tradition and everything else. Well, it probably what I'm saying means that it has that aspect that doesn't necessarily mean, it's meant its aggressive which is definition in terms of other people. A, the main thing is that I don't think you can think about what other people thinks since it it's you don't know that much about ~~it~~ <sup>(what)</sup> they think. You don't know who's involved and just as a practical matter it isn't possible to consider what they think anyway. I only know what three or four other artists think and I'm not too sure about that even so, a.

STAN: I know, so really it isn't

JUDE: Yes, yes, you know it's somehow as with anybody's art, ~~and~~ <sup>and</sup> ~~you know~~, all art it turns out to be somehow partially at least intelligible to other people.

STAN: yes, yes

JUDE: ~~But the~~ <sup>But the</sup> ~~what is~~ <sup>what is</sup>, base premises that it's, I guess, it's intelligible to no, then it will be.

STAN: Yes

JUDE: You don't really know why it works that way.

STAN: || A, would you agree that, a as a communication the thing works in proportion that a your responses are like other

STAN: peoples rather than different?

JUD: Yea, probably you know, one thing is that people aren't that different from one another. So that, a despite considerable peculiarities, there's still alot of thing in common.

STAN: Yea, I think...

JUD: That works, you know, for very old art compared to new art and so forth. It's it's mysterious that you can get *anythings* at all out of it, ancient Chinese art or something. I assume that people are pretty much alike.

STAN: What's that?

JUD: I assume that the people are relatively similar.

STAN: Yea, well, I think that it is the thing though that lots of people forget or don't think about and also this ~~is~~ recent romantic tradition that the artist is a very different person. And, I wanted to see if if you agreed that an artist succeeds in getting through to other people only because he's like them and not because he is different from them.

JUD: Well, the fact that he gets through to them is, I guess is because he is like them but the capacity to do that maybe is being different.

STAN: Yea

JUD: I measure that probably the difference between people, you know, or between people who are artist and people who are not artists. You know, it's just a measured percentage or something, a very small percent.

STAN: Right.

JUDD: But that small percent seems to be pretty ~~crucial~~ crucial.

STAN: Yea, I think it is. Yea, but we all belong to the same race. What generally is the reason?

JUDD: Generally, you know, some necessity for having again something to look at. You see what I mean.

STAN: Um yea

JUDD: It's very important ~~when something~~ <sup>what</sup>, something happens visually to me.

STAN: .... well I know alot of people who have seen your work and a, and not everybody likes it and a

JUDD: (laughs)

STAN: And a lot of people say well, I don't see anything nothing is happening. What's happening?

JUDD: It means they think that nothing is happening. I mean, there's nothing you can say to that, that's their judgment about it ~~is~~... which is perfectly reasonable and there's no answer to that I guess.

STAN: A... what's your feeling about, a, the kind of sculpture that involves all kinds of dynamic movements and asymetry and a shooting up in different directions, a your\* much more ~~posture~~ <sup>posture</sup> in that ~~and a bit a~~

JUDD: I was, you know, I don't want to do that kind of sculpture.

A...

STAN: My thinking was ~~not~~ <sup>in relation to that type of</sup> sculpture.

JUDD: Not

STAN: Not

JUDD: Yea, so, a you probably know that I did paintings for a long

(3)

Judd: time and went right from the paintings to three dimensional work. And it had very little to do with any of the sculpturing that was going on. And I never thought of myself as being a sculpturer.

STAN: uh.

Judd: I... like to. still like David ~~Smith's~~ <sup>SMITHS</sup> work and Posouvrows and so forth and I like Posouvrows a great deal but that's sort of a definition of what I didn't want to do in to for as three dimensional work goes.

STAN: You like it but you didn't want to do it.

Judd: Right. but... it has to do with imitation of movement and the number of parts and all that sort of thing.

STAN: Yes.. you don't ~~mean~~ really get involved with it.

Judd: No.

STAN: ... your work, a, it would appear to be conceived entirely, before its fabrication.

Judd: Pretty much so..

STAN: you send it ~~away~~ <sup>OUT</sup> and have it made for you

Judd: Yes, but a we do alot of talking before it actually gets made because we usually have alot of problems.

STAN: we:

Judd: the guy at the factory and myself, Ed Burnstein

STAN: oh.

Judd: But a, I think about how it is supposed to look and then, a we have the problem of how do you put it together. And a, it's the material that we have, how long it is, and how wide it is and how clean it is and how much does it cost and all that stuff.

STAN: Yea.

JUDD: But, a since there really isn't any room to work on it change it while it's being made, you have to get it all figured out ahead of time.

~~STAN~~ Do you think that you ~~might~~ miss something?

Judd Yes, yea sometimes they're wrong. But, a , but a, you make a guess at ~~a~~, you know the proportions the measurements and a how thick the material should be and so forth. Now and then it's all wrong.

STAN: In what way?

JUDD: The size, size is wrong. Well, we have all that sort of thing too, but, a the sizes can be wrong, it's in proportion.

STAN: So, a

JUDD: And sometimes it's just a dumb idea and a you didn't realize ~~for something~~ it was so dumb

STAN: But, it's it's a go for broke everytime then isn't it because there's no, a

CUT Roll 2, Scene 1 action

STAN: Well, with this fabricating system that you have then it's pretty much go for broke everytime, a you present your design and the guy makes it and you don't have the adventure the accident in the process or changing your course in mid stream so ~~a~~ to speak.

JUDD: Yea, it can't be changed while we are working on it.

STAN: Yea.

JUDD: But, a see I'm not interested in changing it either. Like, a, if I were to change it, it would be a correction, just a correcti

of a mistake.

um um

It is certainly not away of working on it. And the, ~~lets see, the~~ way you work or Transouve works or Smith  
the process of actually working on it is crucial  
to the thing.

Yeah.

because something is happening at every point.

yes.

You're thinking about it. But, a

Yes, well, a you

(went to think it out ahead of time.)

the advantages in my own work. a my process is what I  
...describe as a series of embarassments you don't  
know what is going to happen next and when I do it only  
presents a problem that I have to solve.

46

STAN: And so I stumble on from one emergency to the next until it's finished then, a your process is radically different. a by the time your done thinking about your thing, presurable then it's predetermined and the making is out of your hands.

JUDD: Yea ~~inde~~ there's some of that in thinking about it. When I first think of the piece, well, like that piece there that will probably make the Copenhagen Museum A one of the things that I don't know about it. it's just a sort of general idea that finally sort of comes together. And then you may not know the size, material a alot of things have to be figured out especially how to make it.

STAN: u...  
JUDD: so, so, some of that thinking is like the process, actually working on a piece, and changing it. Except you don't have anything there to to see yet and you maybe very wrong, it may turn up to be very wrong, ~~to be very wrong~~ when it's finished.

STAN: Well, it would seem to me that since you do plan everything in advance in the making and you know there must not be any mistakes, ideally, a it would seem to me this kind of pre-determination would limit a, the amount of complication in the work. A, I should think that they're a very restricted a amount of a complication and inter-relationships of parts that you can predict.

JUDD: Yesm well a see I'm not interested in them anyways so... it's no loss... ~~I~~



STAN: ~~It's~~ ~~them,~~ is intentional regardless of the process.

JUDD: Yea.

STAN: It's it's not a result of ~~your~~ your method.

JUDD: Yea, so it would be that way anyway. Even a

STAN: If you made them in clay and modeled them, you know ~~cube~~, it would still be a cube.

JUDD: Yea, well there's a piece down stairs that is set up now that oh I first did three or four years ago. And sort of a big aluminum box with a second top on it. And first made it and I thought the top was to be 1 1/4 inch sheet of aluminum to be three or four inches above the box. Well, when we set it up it was terrible.

STAN: Why?

JUDD: Well, it was the space it just didn't work. It was enormous space the second top looked too thin and sort of shrank back from the edge of the tubes. From the edge of the box so that instead of it coming out as a box it sort of came out of the box with an inward slope at the very top.

STAN: ha, um.

JUDD: So, a <sup>then</sup> it was in storage ~~for~~ a long time and then, a <sup>couple</sup> we set it up a ~~few~~ months ago. I started to move the top up and down then a couple of inches and one inch then 3/4's and ~~left~~ the 1/4 inch then I finally decided it had to be a half inch sheet of aluminum. So all that monkeyin g with it, in a way is similar to the way you would work or ~~D~~ausouverow or somebody.

STAN: Yea. I was just thinking that this is a very close

FD

STAN: and sensitive concern with relationships.  
JUD: Yea, but that doesn't show finally. Like that no one when the piece is finished nobody will know that I monkeyed around with it all that. The process of working on it and the way of thinking doesn't show, which is what I want.



STAN: Um. mmm  
JUD: But, a, the points in the work that sort of thing happens and that's not so different. But, anyway I'm not interested in complicated art. I can see that someone could make a very complicated kind of art that didn't involve composition or part by part working or the process of working. But, probably you know somebody will but a it isn't within what I can think about.

STAN: Did you write a piece once about a relational and nonrelational work?

JUD: It was a general article. It was a in the Yearbook for Arts Magazine, I think.

STAN: Yea, I read it but I can't quite place it.

JUD: It was pretty general because they wanted me to sort of talk about what was going on, at the moment, which covered quite a lot of ground.

STAN: Yea, do you care to sort of characterize the idea of relational...

JUD: You know, I consider almost all sculpture in painting up to palloq is to be as relational, a in that one

JUDD: in the thing can't be taken out of the context, it's  
it's the way of working and so forth. But, it drove  
me nuts when I was trying, you know I didn't get into  
this in sculpture but when I first started painting  
it was sort of vaguely ignorant or cubist or some-  
thing and, so a ~~time~~ <sup>long</sup> was a lot of juggling and  
playing of areas in relation to one another and all  
that and eventually it developed a dislike for all  
that fiddling around.

Some: Gun

Judd: In the way of working

STAN: Yes, I can see that it can get sort of messy,

off three. ACTION

STAN: Well, there are other kinds of relationships besides  
a. the relationships of sizes and directions of parts  
in <sup>the</sup> sculpture and ~~is~~ called visual dynamics. People  
are introducing things like movement, sound, a proximities  
sensing and reaction and so on, do you have any notions  
about that?

JUDD: A, that's fine; it depends on how you use the word  
relation, and composition and so forth. I just always  
used them, a in connection to the previous work so  
that a I didn't use them for my own work. Which a, in  
some light or sense had relations too, I guess. I know  
the proportions and a sizes are very important. A.  
I don't know it's just any end of connections, I guess.

STAN: Well a I just wondered what your thinking was about the

STAN: introductions of other elements. Like sight, light, sound and movement. Can you imagine yourself ever working. Lets say with movement, moving?

Judd: No. but it's fine for other people to do it.

STAN: Yes.

Judd: A: I don't know quite why I ~~think~~ <sup>or anything</sup> but I wanted to be static apparently.

STAN (laughs): your anti-movement and anti-relational.

Judd: Well, the original anti-movement was the imitation movement as again in the previous painting and sculpture. And, a I'm certainly not against people making sculpture that moves, which I think is a great idea and probably sometime will develop far beyond what it is now.

STAN: um. um.:

Judd: And, as far as light goes I think that Flaven is the best artist around.

STAN: um.

Judd: A. it's just a case of my not understanding it not being able to use it. so, that has no principles or anything involved that's just a matter of what I can do.

STAN: Many years ago, I remembered Lasole was talking about the best use of rockets being used to take luminous bodies out into space and to compose great sculptures and then you take weekend rocket excursions through the ~~the~~ <sup>in the stills</sup> sculpture. (laughing) Let's hold up a second

12  
STAN: I'm dry here, for a minute.

ROLL 3 SCENE 2, ACTION

STAN: Well it appears that the use of elements like light sound, movement, so on, are not your thing to do as you feel it and yet presumably you won't always be working exactly as you do now. Do you have any, a ambition for future work or what direction do you think it will take or would you like it to take.

JUDD: Well, I'm pretty much inclined to work in the present so that ~~the~~ I usually don't have ~~any~~ predictions.

STAN: You don't?

JUDD: ~~My~~ my work has slowly changed and it's very sort of unevenful sort of thing. I never feel that I have to change it never seems to be a I don't know some sort of point you're working toward or which you have passed or something like that. So, it just sort of goes along.

STAN: So, you can, a you feel you can plan your individual works but a, you don't try to determine your evolution thinking. Large a..

JUDD: I ~~think it takes~~ let that take care of itself, ~~it~~ you want.

STAN: Alright. What goal has a boredom got in your scheme of...

JUDD: Well, a obviously you get bored with a certain type of work..

STAN: Um, um

JUDD: So, you don't want to do it anymore. And, a if so

Judd: you can't even think about it anymore so it doesn't  
get done anyway. Instead it moves you along a little.

STAN: Yeah

Judd: ~~but~~ that happens pretty naturally. I'd say, sort of  
~~with~~ <sup>with</sup> me, maybe a complex or sort of a group of ideas  
~~last year~~ <sup>last year</sup>. And if the pieces don't get made, which  
often happens because of the money involved, then it  
a begins they begin to seem too alien to think about.

STAN: Um, well I just wondered about that.

Judd: Well, you haven't thought very much about it because

STAN: a, a, I feel rather warmly towards the idea of boredom  
as a creative force.

STAN: (laughs)

Judd: I also would agree with that. I think you can, you  
know you can do just so much in a certain. A, I sort  
of have, I always have a group of related pieces.

STAN: ummm

Judd: And, a when it's finished that's it. Like the a in 60's.  
I don't know '64 or '65 I did a couple of what we call  
pergressions. And a long horizontal pieces on the wall,  
and at the time there wasn't much money so that was  
it, one small one and one large one got made and one  
out of wood, I think and metal. And there <sup>was</sup> a great  
many possibilities both in <sup>decided</sup> ~~cutting~~ material and a the  
kinds of pergressions, the numbers involved.

(pause in tape)

One small one and one large one got made and one out  
of ~~wood~~ <sup>I think</sup> and metal. And there's a great many

Continuation of roll number 3, action.

STAN: What you're saying reminds me of something that Hans Hoffman once said which was I ~~was~~ <sup>want</sup> not to know what I'm doing and a, a it sounds a little bit funny in relation to your work, maybe, but a, I would like to ask you what do you think the role of the unconscious is in in the making of your works, conceiving of?

JUDD: Well, I don't really know ~~what~~ <sup>how</sup> the unconscious ~~is~~ <sup>it</sup> but it can't be too cut and dry or it isn't interesting it's just ~~an~~ <sup>a logical</sup> ~~optical~~ thing. A, if the pieces you know, to evident or a in a way you're too sure of it then your not going to be interested in it, because it's really the thinking about it that's interesting.

STAN: Um..um..

JUDD: Um, I'm especially figured out what's unconscience and conscious but through my idea of it is that a when your developing your work, after a while alot of finally alot of things that all seemed to be separate, wouldn't didn't work together finally sort of ~~con~~ <sup>cessed</sup>. And, it begins to make sense and certainly many things you don't know about which

JUDE: I guess is the unconscious part. But, alot of it is conscious and it's just history and you just settled it and it's disappeared. And, it becomes, just say, your ordinary way of working. But, alot of things that were crucial problems for me at one time..

STAN: ~~But~~... start, we'll pick it up:

JUDE: crucial

STAN: roll number 4, action.

JUDE: Perhaps the whole point is to a for your way of working is to get to the point where it is natural. So, that a it's not a case of extremely, extreme problems from point to point. Which when I was doing paintings was always the case. There was one painting by one painting and each one a was sort of a separate thing and wouldn't lead to similar ones or there ~~wouldn't there wasn't any~~ context never developed in which you could think. And, in each painting would have things that I liked a great deal and things that I thought were necessary and the next painting would be the same thing but they weren't the same things I liked and you can never put the two things the two sets of things you liked together so that it was sort of a square wheel going on, you know.

STAN: yea, a..

JUDE: It's very difficult and highly unnatural and when I started to do three dimensional work it also came:



JUDD: together and seemed to be a lot of possibilities  
and a lot of room to think.

STAN: I'm interested in the idea of a trepidation  
in painting <sup>and</sup> sculpture, a, the idea of terrible fears  
and courage and so on. Part of it is <sup>writing</sup> the way you do  
if you have ambitions. But, having the courage to  
work as you work regardless, you know, and a, a, the  
<sup>other</sup> is a kind of internal courage of the kind  
indicated in the story <sup>about</sup> of Picasso who said when he  
was in a jam about a painting he would decide what  
it was he liked about it and what he didn't like  
in the painting then it was a simple matter to erase  
the part that <sup>he liked, well</sup> ~~isn't~~. You ~~see~~ his working process  
a, that might be individual to him, but a, a thing  
like that takes <sup>an awful</sup> lot of courage because you're really  
hanging on the cliff when you do that. And, I wonder  
if you had these crisis, surely you must have, but  
what are they like?

JUDD: Well, a, I never think it's too great of a crisis,  
but a you do get to know what you like and ~~you can~~  
you can be wary of that, also, I think as far as  
Picasso goes, you have to be wary in both directions.  
~~To see you have to~~, You <sup>can't</sup> sort of <sup>come</sup> destroy what  
you like just to try something new ~~...~~...

STAN: Um, well, you can reduce it to a kind of a logical  
puzzle, game, or game of some sort. Where you can say  
that well in that case you can say he likes what he

24  
STAN: doesn't like and he doesn't really like what he likes and so he's choosing what he likes and a (laughing) and a..

JLDD: The main point is, I think, that you don't really want to play safe all the time.

STAN: *yes*

JLDD: *A, a-* the my work, I think probably most people didn't develop by playing safe and if it's related to boredom too, you just don't want a sure thing.

STAN: Yes.

JLDD: So, you like I like the chance of make a piece and seeing how it will turn out.

STAN: *has to be adventure*  
Yeah, I ~~don't want~~ sure thing ~~is~~ sure death.

A, but I don't know your early work or anything like it. Was it simpler, if it's possible, or more complicated than it is now and a,

JLDD: Well, the paintings before the end of the painting ~~was~~ *are* pretty simple. The real early work was a, as I said before, sort of half baked cubicism.

STAN: Half way what?

JLDD: Cubism, sort of naturalistic half baked cubism. A, but, the paintings for the last couple of years before I quit doing them which was '61 or so were pretty simple and certainly were connected to the painting that was going on. But that sort of, I *also said* guess ~~was also~~ *simplicity* that sort of simplicity that I'm especially interested in.

STAN: Do you think a in general, for most people do you

23

STAN: think that the natural tendency is to work from complication down to more and more simplicity? Reduction?

JUDD: ~~Um~~ not really; a, it looks that ~~when~~ <sup>way</sup> you're developing your work because your early work is unclear and therefore commonly created with complexity.

STAN: um. um..

JUDD: And, when it becomes clear then almost everybody's work seems to be simple. ~~an~~ <sup>an</sup> early ~~stage~~ <sup>begin</sup> is muddled and the middle one is clear ~~the~~ <sup>or late</sup> ~~that~~ one. So, that looks like complexity is simplicity. But as far as what's actually say in my work or I think anybody's work once it's underway. That the attitudes and the conscious, unconscious or whatever you're talking about is highly complex. Much more than his earlier work.

23

JUDD: It's rather hard to get anything into what you're doing. So, and also I think that any art that all good art is about the same as far as complexity or like the same degree regardless of whether it is visually complex or visually simple. ~~which~~ which means that is if someone came along and did exceedingly complex work, visually, that finally it would have the same degree of simplicity or complexity that a most work has. It seems to be some point at which it is intelligible or makes sense to you.

STAN: A..

JUDD: A certain quality that you see in the work which is intelligible to you regardless of whether it's complex ~~work~~ or simple work.

STAN: In other words, do I get it right, that a it can be embroidery but its main image ~~was~~ <sup>is</sup> likely ~~simple~~ <sup>simple</sup>.

JUDD: Yea, I think it is unfair to it perhaps to say that its embroidery ~~is~~.

STAN: ~~Yes~~ actually ~~what I mean by that is~~ <sup>many many details</sup>

JUDD: ~~I don't didn't mean by that..~~

STAN: ~~Yea~~ details

JUDD: ~~Well, it's just you know, a. a. anyway~~ taking the Northwest coast art of which we had a big copy upstairs. It's highly complicated work.

STAN: Are you thinking of Toby and Graves?

JUDD: No, no

STAN: ~~And those kinds of art~~

(27)

STAN: ~~As you as a model or sculptor,~~ <sup>material</sup> anyway I take it you don't believe in the gesture the ~~gesture~~ <sup>offense</sup> doing of something. You like to think.

JUDD: I like it ~~to~~ <sup>to last</sup> I like to think alot about it before doing it. Yea, I guess so.

STAN: But, your notion about the process of making your sculpture as long as you get what you imagine in the end: it doesn't matter whether if you make it or the factory makes it or anything of the sort. Well, alot..

JUDD: Well, alot more is alot.

STAN: A lot more is involved in process.

JUDD: Yea, alot of people want their..

STAN: Yea.

JUDD: <sup>a lot of people</sup> They're certainly different from me, ~~they~~ want their pieces to last awhile, like you do or ~~Drauseauvrow~~ or persumably David...

STAN: Yea, yea I'm sort of indifferent to a things lasting. I'm willing to accept the death of my sculpture (laugh) and the death of anything else, but (cough)

JUDD: (mumbling) They, actually, people kill at an awfully great rate because a it wears out in all of the shows.

So, a, but that only last, you know, as things do last which is for awhile.

STAN: Yea, well what I was starting to get at, though, was a you seem not to be concerned with the process of the actual making of the sculpture. Some sculpturers

JUDD: You know, I guess not.

STAN: Are involved in in the material and the modeling of

Judd Intervention at Four Sculptors part I

STAN: Your work, it would appear to be conceived entirely before its fabrication.

JUDD: Pretty much so.

STAN: You send it out and have it made for you.

JUDD: But we do a lot of talking before it actually gets made because we usually have a lot of problems.

The guy at the factory and myself,

Ed Burnstein

I think of how it is supposed to look  
and then, a we have the problem of how  
you put it together. And is the ma-  
terial available and how wide is it  
and how clean is it and how much does  
it cost and all that stuff.

But, since there really isn't any room to work on it, change it while it's being made, you have to get it all figured out ahead of time.

STAN: Well, with this fabricating system that you have then it's pretty much go for broke everytime, you present your design and the guy makes it and you don't have the adventure the accident in the process or of changing your course in mid stream so to speak.

JUDD: Yea, it can't be changed while they're working on it.

But, see I'm not interested in changing it either. If I were to change it, it would be a correction, just a correction of a mistake.

But it is certainly not a way of working on it. And the way you work or DiSuvero works or Smith a, the process of actually working on it is crucial to the thing. Because something is happening at every point.

STAN: Yea

JUDD: You're thinking about it. But, a

STAN: Yea, well, a you

JUDD: I want to think it out ahead of time.

STAN: The advantages in my own work, a, my process is what I .. describe as a series of embarrassments because I don't know what is going to happen next and when I do it only presents a problem that I have to solve.

And so I stumble on from one emergency to the next until it's finished then,

a your process is radically different, a by the time your done thinking about your

STAN: thing, presumable then it's predetermined and the making is out of your hands.

JUDD: Yea, there's some of that in thinking about it. When I first think of the piece, well, like that piece there that I will probably make the Gugenheim Museum.

A one of the things that I don't know about it, it's just a sort of general idea that finally sort of comes together. And then you may not know the size, material a alot of things have to be figured out especially how to make it.

So some of that thinking is like the process, actually working on a piece, and changing it. Except you don't have anything there to to see yet and you maybe very wrong, it may turn up to be very wrong, when it's finished.

STAN: I did intend to come to the point of movement at some time and just ask you what -- in a very general way, what you feel about kinetic art -- sculpture that moves, or is adjustable by the audience, whatever.

SEGAL: I like it enormously. You see,

I have in the standard traditional sculpture which is on a pedestal the idea of movement is implicit in the movement of the spectator.