

ANEXO C: SIMPOSIOS

1. Transcripción del Simposium: *Primary Structures*, realizado en el Jewish Museum de Nueva York el dos de Mayo de 1966, participaron Mark Di Suvero, Donald Judd, Robert Morris, Barbara Rose y Kynaston McShine como moderador.
2. Transcripción del Simposium: *Is Easel Painting Dead?* realizado en la Universidad de Nueva York el diez de Noviembre de 1966, participaron Walter Darby Bannard, Donald Judd, Larry Poons, Robert Rauschenberg y Barbara Rose como moderadora.

THE NEW SCULPTURE

SYMPOSIUM ON "PRIMARY STRUCTURES" HELD MAY 2, ^{1966,} JEWISH MUSEUM

Participants: Kynaston McShine, moderator and organizer of the exhibition; Barbara Rose, critic; Robert Morris, Donald Judd and Mark Di Suvero, sculptors.

BR: I think one might begin this discussion by ~~opening~~ ^{remarking} that the sculpture in this exhibition broke down quite clearly into two groups of work: the open, linear, flat and planar works, mainly by the English sculptors such as Anthony Caro, Phillip King, Gerald Laing, Michael Bolus, and David Annesley; and on the other hand, the volumetric sculpture, mainly by Americans, which depended on single indivisible volumes. Most of the work of the former was polychromed. Some of the American work was painted, but often only one color was used.

KS: I knew that color would be an important factor while selecting the show. I also realized that the intrinsic color of the material would often be significant, not in

that is definitely going to ^{influence} ~~get into~~ our art activity. I do not think art is just a simple deliberate act. I think our exposure to new experiences is important. (One used to have to go to the movies to see movies, ^{now} one can have a movie at nine in the morning when you are running out of coffee.)

The availability of everything is definitely going to change the situation.

DJ: I think it would be best of all if the material had its own color which was intrinsic and not applied. But there isn't much color of this sort to work with. So far, the only thing that really has a lot of color is plastic. For example, Larry Bell's coated glass boxes are really pale. And most of the metals are gray in one way or another.

KS: Bob Morris seems to be against color in sculpture, but I'd like to ask him why gray isn't a color, since his pieces are gray.

RM: I think gray is a color. And as I said before, I think things do not exist without color, but I want to restrict my use of it to as neutral as possible a range.

KS: In other words, that's your purpose in confining yourself to gray, whereas your objection to the use of color is a more general one. Of course we can distinguish between applied color ^{and} intrinsic color. In Judd's wall piece, for example, the transverse rod has been colored blue, while the galvanized aluminum boxes have been left in their original state. In the similar floor construction, which faces it, there is no applied color. Since the pieces are quite similar, I wonder how you decide about color?

DJ: I don't work from any general principle. I select what happens to be in accordance with my purpose. As I said, I'd rather they'd color the material than paint it, because by adding paint you're adding some other standard or authority which is somehow redundant. But it gets pretty tricky as to what color to use. In fact, the

bare tube is not uncolored; it's been anodized. Therefore it has an extra layer which has been oxidized. But all that tends to become picayune...

BR: To change the subject, I wanted to explain the appropriateness of the participation of Morris, Judd, and Di Suvero in this symposium. They were among the first to establish and make explicit new positions in sculpture which made possible some of the developments this show has focussed upon. In Di Suvero's work there is a kind of dynamic tension of structural relationships, and a directness of impact that have influenced many young sculptors, particularly those in the Park Place group. Morris was one of if not the first to use simple unitary volumes rather than to make sculpture that depended on a relationship of parts. Several works in the show ^{by other artists} derive directly from prototypes he executed in plywood from 1961-65 which were exhibited at the Green gallery, and widely reproduced in photographs. In these works he used the room as general environment for works which related to floor, wall, and ceiling in unprecedented ways. Judd was among the first to use identical or repeated elements and to work with mathematical sequences, particularly those extendable to infinity. Like Morris, he too used simple volumes and non-relational composition. I think it is important to point out how these three artists developed precedents which prepared the way for the kind of work we're seeing now. Di Suvero's work, although more romantic than the sculpture in the show must be counted as part of the general

context in which it developed. And on that score, I want to ask Mark whether he agrees with Hilton Kramer that the new sculpture is anonymous and impersonal, and whether he finds this objectionable, since it is an aesthetic position opposed to his own.

M. Di S: I think Primary Structures is the key show of the sixties, and that it has introduced a new generation of artists. As for whether the work is anonymous, all work is anonymous that doesn't have any name. Some of it is beautiful. The Ron Bladen, for example, is a great piece. It expands our idea of scale and really changes our knowledge of space. Some of the work presents itself as manufactured object: and the very sense of objectness eliminates it from what I think is the most crucial part of modern sculpture. I think that my friend Don Judd can't qualify as an artist because he doesn't do the work. And there is more and more of this kind of thing, which to my mind is the negation of the object by making an object. But this is not grappling with the essential fact that a man has to make a thing in order to be an artist. As far as I'm concerned, those works which give me that sense of radiance which I find I need in a work are those that have been actually worked over by an artist. I think that all those pointed up bronzes, the pointed up marbles, the expanded bronzes from the casts, are meaningless.

DJ: Now wait a minute. The point is not whether one makes a work oneself or not. The point is that it's all a case of tech-

the old sense of the patina of a bronze, but in such a way that color and structure are unified.

BR: In a recent article, Bob Morris implied that color was something that didn't properly belong to sculpture. Do you still feel that way?

RM: Yes, I don't think it's part of the physical nature of the work.

KS: Does the hard, bright color in Ellsworth Kelly's sculpture act in more or less the same way as ~~it~~^{color} does in the neutral gray of your work?

RM: I think Kelly's color works, but I think it works for different reasons. ~~His piece~~ is a flat cut-out, it hardly has any dimension to it at all; it's almost a pure sheet of color, and the statement doesn't concern itself with volume.

BR: In other words, you think his color is used pictorially rather than sculpturally?

RM: Yes, I've said that, too.

BR: It's true that Kelly paints his ~~pieces~~, but Don Judd uses color by coating aluminum with commercial metallic glazes, or by using the intrinsic color of the metal. Of course that gives quite a different effect from his earlier painted wood or painted metal pieces.

nique that makes the thing visible, so that I don't see in the long run why one technique is any more essentially art than another technique. And there are presumably an infinite number of techniques. I don't see why someone shouldn't go out and find the one that it suits him, whether or not it conforms to the manipulatory technique that's been going on for some time or to a new one.

BR: Here is the crucial question: whether an abstract aesthetic conception which may be manufactured or fabricated ^{is as much} art as the personal manipulation of materials. I think ~~that~~ the heart of most of the objections to the new work is that people feel that since they can't see the artist's fingerprints, it's not a personal statement.

RM: I think that's a ridiculous issue, and I don't think whether you fabricate it yourself or have somebody fabricate it for you has anything to do with making art. My interest is in having the work as well executed as possible.

M. Di S: No, in a sense it's a question of the ability to be terrific ~~in~~ one procedure, or the willingness to make mistakes. You never discover broken color by just sitting there analyzing color charts, although theoretically you could. But it has to happen with actually working with paint on canvas. That doesn't mean I don't like work that doesn't have fingerprints. For example, there is Carl Andre's line of firebricks. It is really

nihilistic, but because it is beautiful, it gives you a sense of joy, as few of the works in the show do. But that is because I think that at the core of modern sculpture is space, and most of the artists in the show have avoided dealing with space, although some of the British ones have tangled with it.

BR: I couldn't disagree more. What is interesting about the good new work is that it encloses space rather than cutting into it. It works with interior volume rather than mass, changing our conventional notion about space. In fact, I began by observing that the work breaks down into two groups. Of the pieces which cut into space in the manner of Tony Caro's work, none begins to approach the level of Caro's sculpture which stands out in a way that divorces it from work derived from it. And then, on the other hand, there is the volumetric work, of which Morris's and Judd's pieces would be examples, which deals with space in an entirely different way, by displacing it and enclosing it.

M. Di S: You mean the monolith, the old-fashioned monolith. The obelisk in Central Park.

BR: No, I think that the volumetric works in the show operate differently from the monolith in the manner in which they displace great chunks of space and in that one often has the real sense that they are hollow shells and not solid.

DJ: Anyway, Mark is defining space as something that is moved

by the forms. If it isn't moved, if it's static, then, according to his definition, it isn't really space. But that space that is shifted around or activated in one way or another is not what interests me.

M. D. S: The people who change space through a new sense of scale are the ones I dig the most. Giacometti certainly does it, although he has to use the figure. But he actually changes the size of the space.

DJ: I hate that kind of space and purposely avoid it, because it's an anthropomorphic kind of space.

BR: To go on to another point, Hilton Kramer listed what he believes were the precedents for the new sculpture in the works of the Constructivists, Gabo, Vantergerloo, Calder, David Smith, and Louise Nevelson. I don't agree that their work has any kind of direct relationship to the new sculpture, except perhaps in the scale of Calder's and Smith's works or in ~~the~~ ^{their} relative simplicity. The roots of the new work, it seems to me, lie more specifically in painting, ~~but~~ in that it grows out of a dissatisfaction with the limitations of painting. I know, for example, that Don and Bob were both originally painters. Let me ask you then, why did you stop painting and start making sculpture?

RM: I couldn't say. I stopped painting and I didn't do anything for two years and then I started making sculpture.

DJ: I became very tired of several major aspects of painting and

felt that I couldn't do anything I would ever like with any of them. In the first place I was tired of the fact that it's a rectangle, and in the second that it's so many inches from the wall, and that no matter what you do you have to put something within the shape of the canvas. For example, if you put a series of circles within the canvas, that leaves all that border around the circles. On the other hand, if you decide you want to emphasize the rectangularity of the canvas, then you have to use elements that enforce it, that is, correspond to the edges in some way. That really leaves you no choice. And also, paintings are invariably canvas. And I'm very tired of that particular surface, and of oil paint, too. So it seemed a good thing to give up. Painting seemed very restricted. No matter what you did you couldn't make it strong enough and clear enough. So there was nothing to do but quit on it. A propos of sculpture, I never took sculpture as a model, although I was impressed, not influenced exactly, but pushed somewhat by quite a few people, for example, by Bontecou and Chamberlain, who at one time I thought did stronger work than I could possibly do. And one of the reasons I stopped painting at the same time was that Oldenburg's work was much stronger than anything I could possibly make in a painting. So the new developments in sculpture don't exactly amount to a revolution. It didn't come overnight. I think it's had a pretty normal development. And you don't want to get saddled with a lot of people who are supposed to have influenced you who didn't influence you. For example, even though I admired Smith's work, I never seriously considered it as an influence. But Kramer mentions that Smith's last show was an influence. Now

chronologically that's impossible, because it was last year, and everybody was pretty well along in what they were doing by then, so Smith's late pieces could not have been an influence. In fact, sculpture always looked archaic to me. It always had the kind of space Mark talked about; and it always had related forms and a certain hierarchy of parts--the major part, the minor part, and so forth. ~~These were~~ things I wasn't interested in and which I certainly was trying to get away from in painting.

BR: But that's what I mean about painting being a primary source for a number of the ideas in the new sculpture. For example, the elimination of internal compositional relationships was accomplished in painting by Pollock and Newman. That is why I feel the antecedents for the new sculpture can be found in painting rather than in sculpture.

DJ: Yes, but I'd say at least for myself that those antecedents are extremely general, and that they mostly concern scale. Almost everybody assumes that broad scale is desirable now. Nearly all the best works have it.

KS: How about the Russian Constructivists. Were you interested in their work?

RM: No, I never paid any attention to it. The first sculptures I made were a portal and a column. I copied both forms directly out of the Zoser complex in Egypt.

DJ: I think everybody considered Constructivism, Neo-Plasticism, and Cubism past history by the time Bob and I were developing our work. Mondrian was dead and gone and an old master when I thought about painting. Recent American painting seemed much more actual.

KS: In the new work, repetition is a very strong element. Why do you think this is so?

BR: Repetition is a method of structuring; rhythm is important to art. The three repeated diagonals in Ron Bladen's piece give a particular kind of emphasis and the impressive sense of monumentality or static majesty if you like.

KS: But it's not really static because part of the experience consists of just walking around it.

BR: Let's put it this way... the viewer moves but the forms don't leap or jump around. They remain, at least in comparison with open welded or assembled work, relatively static. They really stand still. That's one of the big differences between Mark's position and the new aesthetic. And the content of the new work is quite different from the more emotional and romantic content of earlier work.

DJ: Mark states that sculpture imitates movement in a way. You know, the gist of it is that a certain anthropomorphic attitude runs through his work. One finds it not only in his work, but in the general history ^{of art} for the last several hundred years. Although I like his work very much, I would object to this quality if I were doing it. Smith, too, I think does a great deal of alluding

to other things. The general structure even in the last pieces is rather figurative. He has a box there and a box there, which is very relational and allusive. And that particular quality I find pretty unbelievable philosophically and pretty uninteresting. I'd like work that didn't allude to other things and was a specific thing in itself which derived a specific quality from its form. But I think that my work and Bob's work is art in the same sense that work has always been art. It intends to have a certain quality which deals with what you think about the world, and whatever art is, and I don't think it is essentially any different than art has always been in that respect. And it's certainly not impersonal, anonymous and all that sort of stuff. I'd rather stay clear of the ~~word~~ ^{word} of spiritual since I don't like its old meaning. I think that a given thing creates an interesting space but that you don't need to set up a certain amount of motion to make it interesting, that a surface in itself is interesting. You don't have to set a form at an angle and relate something else to it. If you have a rectangle of a certain size and certain surface and material, and it has the quality you want, then it's sufficiently interesting and you don't have to work it into some other context to make it interesting.

M. Di S: You talk about your art in a pure ^{rational} ~~relational~~ fashion while the formation of values as you know excellently well is not based upon this rational cognizant sense. And when you talk about space, you're ignoring the mathematical perception of space. That

space which we perceive is untrue. We've learned it, yet you're still operating in its terms. When you talk about my space and say that it's suggestive, that is right. But that shows a weakness on my part because I think that space should be warped. And the mere idea that man could not find one side of its infinite surface until the eighteenth century is incredible. This is knowledge we must have like a part of our fingertips.

DJ: Those kinds of things are very tricky in application to art. Art is not science and whether it is behind science or not is a very complicated question. If it's dealing with a specific scientific problem certainly it's following, but on the whole it is not doing that. Usually science is just a mine for technique. Nothing much else.

M. Di S: They used to talk about the interchange between art and science. I think that it meant something then and it still means something now. It's a special kind of approach to a problem which is explorative. I mean in a true sense art does explore as opposed to the tools which you use. You use a man as a tool. And I object to that because I think that we should use everything we have in the communicative world.

DJ: I think there's a big gap between the discussion of Euclidian and non-Euclidian geometry and art, and that the two should be left in the different areas in which they are. The sort of

connection you're making is exactly the kind of analogy-making that I object to.

BR: Do you feel your work has expressive quality?

DJ: Yes of course. I don't exactly like talking about spirit, mysticism and that sort of thing because those words have old meanings, and I think they may as well be dumped because their old meanings are stronger than the new meanings.

M. Di S: It's true that what I do really like in a piece of sculpture is to feel from it that sense in which it is not an object, in which it possesses that thing which is not visible to our eyes, which you may call mystical or spiritual. For example, the rock at the Met isn't a rock, it's truly an archaic Apollo. I find that this object art, this ABC art, is often a special kind of commercial acceptance of the technological world that disavows all of the joy and the tragedy and accepts regimentation, which is what you mean by repetition.

KS: Don't you think it's a criticism of the regimentation, though?

M. Di S: I think it's as much a criticism as anybody who wears a gray flannel suit.

BR: Essentially what Mark is saying is that the joy and the tragedy should be in art, whereas what those who accept the aesthetic of abstract art feel is that the joy and tragedy should be in life, and that the aesthetic emotion, which is different, should be in art.

But I want to return to the question of scale. You are obviously creating problems for the collector who lives in high rise apartments and for the museums which have limited space. In one sense, the refusal to compromise on the issue of scale becomes a part of the quality of the new work, which is clearly monumental sculpture and not coffee table knick-knacks or lobby art. But where can this oversize art be accommodated?

RM: Why does the artist have to make a decision about that. If he wants to make something, then he makes it. It's shown in the galleries and people have finally accommodated themselves to it to some extent.

DJ: I agree. I don't think you worry about where it's going to go. I think if you worried about that you wouldn't get anything done.

M. Di S: You use the word scale very loosely. Size is meaningless, size is stupid eventually. The biggest man in the world is probably the stupidest man in the world.

After the panel discussion, questions were solicited from the audience:

Max Kozloff: I have a question for Bob Morris. I think there is a curious paradox at times in the idea of reductiveness ~~simplicity~~ ~~simplicity~~ in recent works because it seems that although we speak of the monolithic or the inert or the static relationships and so forth, in the new work, rather than austerity, it seems to me you

get a kind of incredible preciousness, artiness. The same is true of your use of gray. How would you defend yourself against an accusation like this?

RM: That gray becomes precious?

MK: Well, the whole attitude is precious. Of which gray is a part.

RM: Can you be more specific about what it is that makes it precious?

MK: All right, we'll try. I'm not talking about that preciousness which has been associated with the kind of highly worked or refined surface. I'm talking about conceptual attitudes whereby one thing becomes a kind of inflated metaphor for an experience. It becomes sufficient unto itself, which is the height of decadence, so to speak.

RM: Well, it doesn't become a metaphor for some people. For example, me.

Leo Steinberg: I'd like very much to know from Don and from Robert Morris whether the knowledge and the sensation of the hollowness of their pieces are part of their aesthetic presence?

RM: Let me answer for Don first. I think it's ^{much clearer in} his work because at least from my experience, and I assume that this is true for a lot of people, sheet metal is a common enough material that one does know certain things about it, so that in looking at Don's pieces you have to be aware that they are hollow. In my work,

in some cases the pieces look more like solids to me than in other cases, and I'm not quite sure what the determining factors are. Especially now that I'm using a material like fiberglass which doesn't seem to reveal any joints or give much of an associative kind of quality that brings to mind what you know about other materials you've experienced. And it seems also that it's the particular shape that determines whether the piece gives the impression of being a mass or a solid or a hollow thing; and it seems to vary from piece to piece.

DJ: I intend my pieces to be hollow. The sheet metal is obviously only so thick, and everyone knows how thick it is so that you are aware of this big space inside. That's also why the tube in the piece with the four boxes is open, in order to show that it is hollow.

M. Di S: I find the two pieces that are clearly hollow inside the most interesting in the show. For example, one has a sense, as one looks inside the Larry Bell, of knowing that it's hollow and one experiences a visual contact which you get neither in painting nor in ordinary sculpture. You know that it is hollow and you see it constantly reflecting. On the other hand, knowing that Ben Bladen's piece is hollow, you still sense that it is not. ~~What~~ What he has done is worked with the center of gravity which is a really invisible point, and he's managed to do something that gives me a sense of awe.

p18

Frank Stella: I would like to ask Don how he feels about the difference between the way the volumes are experienced in the wall piece and the floor piece.

DJ: The volumes are the same of course. But I think the one on the floor looks larger because you see all the sides. And the sense of the volume is probably changed some what by the fact that you don't read the dimensions the same way in the wall piece since you're lacking one side to look at. This has the effect of flattening the piece which decidedly has a face, while the one on the floor can be looked at from all sides, making you aware of just how large that cube is. So there is a difference. Some will prefer one over the other. But it seems to me that any place you put the piece is all right, whether it is on the ceiling, wall, or floor. And I don't think that the ones I have on the wall are reliefs, nor do they have the same kind of format that paintings have. For a while I didn't know what to do with the wall pieces; then I figured out that if they project a certain distance and are a certain size, then they get outside of the whole display effect that you have in painting which I dislike. And while it's true that the position does change the shape, I don't think that one is especially more sacred than another.

Corrected

IS EASEL PAINTING DEAD?

A symposium held at New York University in November, 1966, as part of the series "The Critic's Colloquium," moderated by Barbara Rose. Participants included Darby Bannard, Donald Judd, Larry Poons and Robert Rauschenberg.

BR: Last night I was speaking with Barnett Newman about the topic of this symposium: "Is Easel Painting Exhausted?" He said, who paints on an easel? I guess that's the point-- nobody. Artists today paint either on the wall or on the floor. The real question then must be broadened to ask not only if easel painting itself is dead but what do we mean by easel painting in this context? We mean simply an art object that hangs on the wall, that is painted on a two-dimensional cloth support with brushes.

BR: The work of Darby Bannard, Robert Rauschenberg, Donald Judd and Larry Poons seems to me to represent a position, either pro or con, in terms of the question, is painting dead? Rauschenberg's last show was ~~a show~~ of sculpture. Recently he has devoted himself increasingly to making mixed-media theater events. Judd, who began as a painter rejected painting on some grounds which he has made very clear in various theoretical articles. Both Larry Poons and Darby

Bannard were working for minimal, reductive solutions in their paintings in the early 60's and recently have turned away from such reductive solutions toward a denser, more complex art. Obviously, they think there is still a large potential for easel painting. On the other hand, many artists, ~~who~~ turning away from painting in the direction of either three-dimensional structures or shaped canvases or various kinds of hybrids, seem to have certain dissatisfactions with the convention of easel painting. ~~I thought we might possibly probe some of these tonight.~~ To begin the discussion, I'll ask Bob Rauschenberg why he stopped painting?

RR: I didn't really stop in the sense of just stopping. I found that by doing something other than painting in the studio, ^{I had} some experience that seemed to me to be useful just in the general category of keeping alive. I never was convinced of the divine space of the canvas. I always recognize any canvas as a piece of cloth. It is just through the economy of lumber and structure, ^o that a fabric is woven horizontally and vertically and that it stretches most expediently in those directions. But I never had a concept to change that shape.

BR: Was it pictorial space that you were dissatisfied with or was it just the sacrosanct idea of the painting as a two-dimensional object?

BR: There was never any doubt that one was manipulating an

object. So it was very easy to move out off of that surface, out into the room. Once you're in the room, well, then, your medium can take any shape.

BR: I have always seen your ^{combine} paintings ~~to an extent~~ as a reaction against flatness in painting. I felt that the reason the contents of your work finally spilled out into the room was because the space of the painting was inadequate to hold them. ~~I don't know whether that's right or not, but that is one of the ways that I see it.~~

RR: I was already out in the room. By the time you stretch the canvas you are out in the room.

BR: I guess that's true. But specifically, can you see yourself painting again?

RR: I can't, but you could, maybe. It's not that I wouldn't want to paint again. ...I will. Right now I like the criticalness of doing something live and the difficulty that one runs into doing theater. That doesn't eliminate painting or the possibility of painting. But painting is just one thing that you do.

DB: If a convention or tradition or method of making pictures is to remain vital, then the artists contained within that convention have to paint vital paintings. And if the tradition is exhausted that means that the artists within that tradition are painting bad paintings. ~~That would~~ ^{This} mean that there would be no good easel painting done within a recent

period of time, which you could make arbitrarily, ^{the} the last year, or two years, or six months. This in turn would mean that artists such as Ken Noland, Helen Frankenthaler, Frank Stella, Olitski, Lichtenstein, Larry Poons, etc.--you can supply your own--have not painted good paintings in the last year. If they have painted good paintings in the last year, then easel painting as a convention of art-making, is not exhausted. Now it might be better to ask if easel painting is a convention that is doomed because other conventions will supercede it. I think the answer to that is no, too, because the combinations that can take place between paint and canvas are infinite.

BR: ^{But} Are they infinitely viable, that's the question?

DB: They are as infinitely viable as ~~the~~ people want to make them.

BR: But if we look at it in a total historical context, we see that easel painting has not been a permanent convention ^{of Western art,} that it is in fact about 500 years old. It dates from the time ^{when} ~~that~~ painting came down from the walls and off the manuscript page and became a portable object. Therefore, why can't we see a point either in the immediate, the near or the distant future, when it will be an outworn and exhausted convention?

DB: It is possible that everybody will give it up tomorrow. But the point is that people are using it now well. Consequently,

there is no reason for them to give it up, because you can do a great deal with it.

BR: Don, two years ago you said, "Oil paint and canvas aren't as strong as commercial paint and as the colors and surfaces of materials, especially if the materials are used in three dimensions. Oil and canvas are familiar and like the rectangular plane, have a certain quality, and have limits. The quality is especially identified with art. Three dimensions are real space. That gets rid of the problem of illusionism and literal space, the space in and around marks and colors which is riddance of one of the salient and most objectionable relics of European art."

DJ: That's all true enough. But let me explain because it's a very complicated subject and I don't want to answer yes or no. You have two cases: one, the social one that Darby was just talking about, in which you prove that it is still alive because so many people have done good work in the last year or ten years or whatever. Obviously, it is true that there has been good work done in that time. So if you take just that, it is obviously proven that painting is still alive and kicking. Then, there's what I think about my own work and painting--which is something else. Clearly, I don't want to do it myself and have a number of objections to it. But I like painting done by a number of people. In many cases, I like that painting better than three-dimensional work that would supposedly have some affinity with my work; so, it's a

complicated situation. And whether something is a painting or is not a painting, that is, a certain kind of form, is not the only thing involved. There are other kinds of forms, other techniques involved, other qualities involved and all of these balance against one another. Both Stella and Poons have a certain kind of order that I like which, unlike painting itself, is radical and new. In other words, I may like the order, but feel sorry too that it's in painting. So my feeling is ambiguous.

BR: Why are you sorry it's in painting? What is wrong with painting?

DJ: It is somewhat contemplative, slightly passive.

BR: And you see three-dimensional objects as more aggressive and active?

J: I guess so, but anyway we need a better definition of painting because obviously it is changing and it can change.

B: Yes, it has changed. In his drip painting, Jackson Pollock stopped using the technique of hand painting with brushes. Since then, Morris Louis^r has spilled and stained paint; Jules Olitski has done painting with spray guns. Do you think that these technical innovations are enough to reinvigorate the tradition?

DJ: I would consider all of that still painting. To define it simply in its most conventional way, I'd say a painting

is a rectangle on stretchers an inch or two from the wall using oil paint on canvas and usually something within the rectangle. The minute that you have a variation on one of those aspects, such as it being shaped, or such as the surface being metal or wood or something other than canvas, then you're somewhat away from traditional painting.

BR: The point is, I suppose, that the tradition of easel painting has been breached the moment that you have a shaped canvas.

DJ: Easel painting was breached with Pollack and Newman.

BR: With the mural-scale picture?

DJ: Yes.

BR: In other words, you feel that one can date the end of the easel convention to the late 40's.

DJ: Yes, they did, I guess, and I would agree with that.

BR: And you feel that the painting done now is beyond that convention, is different.

DJ: It's a different kind of painting. I guess you can call it painting. It's certainly very different.

BR: But if I've understood statements you've made elsewhere, you've felt that there still was something implicitly limited about paint on a two-dimensional support. If I understand it correctly, it was the space, the illusionistic space of painting that you were objecting to.

DJ: Yes, I object to it a great deal.

DB: The point is that just because you have an annoyance with the idea of a rectangle on a wall, that this has to be extended into making a materially different kind of art. In other words, it is mixing quality and materials, it seems to me. Judd is saying that because this thing has a certain appearance or factual existence and you can describe that existence, the next step is that it is irksome.

DJ: Its quality comes from its shape and material in part. And it is that shape and those materials which I object to. It's not an annoyance--it's a real thorough dislike. I think it has emotional, philosophical, and social implications.

RR: I don't think art ^{can} ~~could~~ ever be defined negatively. Everything that you could want it to do that it is not doing is historic.

LP: Why do you keep referring to reviving something as if something is dead? That is what struck me about the original question. I started to ask myself, how could this question be asked in a serious way?

BR: One reason I asked the question was because I was doing some reading and I came across ^{statements} ~~quotations~~ like this^e one, written thirty years ago by John Graham: "The problems of pictorial forms have been all solved and easel painting for private patronage is dead. The generation which has seen

this take place is as usual not fully conscious of it." Now that was thirty years ago. Many things have developed in the interim--new materials . . .

LP: Certainly, and I think that the things that have happened in the interim, especially, in the last five years, have led to the asking of this question. But it is generally an uninformed public, who do now happen to comprise the majority of the so-called art scene, which is asking this question. These people, I feel, are not inspired when they see what you might call traditional two-dimensional painting, whether it be Rembrandt or Louis. They are not moved by it. Luckily for them, they were able to grab hold of something in pop art that began to make them feel that art really is not evading them. It made them feel that if they like pop art they are interested in art. Yet they still run up against people like Louis or Noland or Newman and they run into a blank wall with them. So, it seems to be a natural impulse for them at that point to ask if painting is dead, because they don't really dig it. I agree with Darby when he made the inference that if easel painting is dead, then all the people that are making easel paintings are exhausted. If easel painting is exhausted then it means that Darby is exhausted, it means Noland is exhausted, it means that a lot of great painters are exhausted, and that's not true! The question that comes up then is: why is this a question, asked in a serious manner? I can only relate it back to the large scene that art now more or

less belatedly enjoys. I guess there is a lot of money floating around, but that's about it; the uninformed public is asking this question because they are not really moved by traditional art. And I'm not saying that just because they do not like Louis or Noland. I also feel that a great many, or the majority, if they came face to face with a Tiepolo would not be moved by that either; they would rather look at some extreme example of pop art and grab hold of something there.

RR: You are implying that there is some kind of standard.

LP: Yes, there is a standard of quality you can't ignore, which is still continuing in easel painting, and if it wasn't continuing, or if I didn't believe it, I wouldn't say so.

RR: If it were continuing you wouldn't have to say so.

BR: All right, why is this a question now? It occurs to me that it is a question not only for the large uninformed public, but also because in the art schools one sees students turning away from the convention of easel painting. One sees them either making three-dimensional objects, or various kinds of kinetic work, or any number of things other than paintings. Painting seems to be capturing the imagination of the young less.

LP: I don't believe this is true.

BR: It may or it may not be. It has just been my observation

that carpentry kits and spray guns have come to take the place of paint and canvas in art schools.

LP: You certainly do not object to Jules Olitiski using a spray gun or put him into a different category simply because he uses a spray gun. He also still uses a brush.

BR: No, I think that what has emerged so far is that perhaps the specific convention of easel painting is dead and has been dead since the late 40's. Since Pollock, at any rate, ~~but that's what we mean by painting at large.~~

DJ: Easel painting is a cut-and-dried case by now. It is decidedly gone, and gone for twenty years, and there is no question about it, ~~and~~ the question of whether painting ^{in general} is in good or bad shape is something else, ^{and} it is certainly very debatable.

DB: I think there is another simple way of looking at it. Art has gotten to be very popular.

LP: I would not say abstract art, ~~and~~. Only a certain portion of art has become very popular. I am not talking about op art either. What we would term traditional art, or the carrying on of the tradition of flat, two-dimensional painting, is not essentially any more popular than it ever was.

DB: I was not talking about tradition. I just mean that there are more people numerically who have a great deal more interest in art than they did before, ~~and many many times more~~

~~people are interested in art.~~ This generates a certain kind of environment. It is an environment in which art gets publicity and money and lots of other attractive things. This attracts young people to go into making art. You get many more people making art than ever before, and you get many more people making more variations on art than ever before. You have many ~~more~~ people going into painting, for example, who might not really be interested in painting. But they are interested in the fact that this is an exciting environment. Eventually, those people do something other than painting. Some make objects, some go into the theater, ^{and} each person does the things that his talent leads him to do as soon as he finds his talent. Then the people who do the other things turn around, and see where they have been before, (that is, painting), and they say, "I think painting is no good because it was limiting me." But the people who are still painting look at the painting that they are doing and say, "this is what I like because I know how to do it, and I know how to handle paint."

RR: I have heard very often lately that art has been over-publicized and so many people are interested in art. Even their credentials have been doubted because of snobbish breakdowns about who is interested in what for what reasons. I think that it's a kind of self-consciousness that makes one talk about that aspect of art because that's really the way nearly everything is.

DB: ~~It~~, I was not saying it was bad.

RR: I'm not saying that it is bad or good. I'm saying that I don't think that it is unique to art. I really don't feel smothered by too much attention and understanding and appreciation and interest in art. But that's because I am not setting up ~~these~~ hierarchies where you can say that this person does have an interesting attitude about art or a serious one. I don't think it was ever that simple. You read art history and you see that great patrons existed all over who had all kinds of peculiar relationships to art. And I think that art is just as useless today as it ever was.

LP: But it is certainly not useless to somebody capable of appreciating it on a very intense personal level.

RR: I don't mean useless in that way.

LP: It is certainly not useless categorically. It is very essential to some people in regard to making it or viewing it.

DB: It is overtly useless; in other words, it has no substitute.

RR: It can't really last for you. One painting that may have absolutely cut your life in two might not work three years later.

P: Well, I once mentioned something to a painter friend of mine. I said it seems that I no longer get a great kick or charge out of making a painting, and that it is really getting

to be a lot of work and not much excitement involved in doing it any more. His answer was that there are plenty of other places in life to find excitement. And I believe it. It's true. To try to justify one's whole life and existence in the studio, you know, is a kind of useless and senseless thing to do.

BR: I want to get back to something that was implicit in what Larry was saying, which is, that there are really two publics now for art. There is the general public, willing to seize on things that are not painting, things like, say, kinetic art or whatever the new gimmick of the year is at the Museum of Modern Art. But, on the other hand, there is a more limited public that is interested in traditional art. Do you agree that there are two publics for art and does it make any difference to which you address yourself?

LP: I definitely think there is a public that is intimidated by paintings such as Louis's. These are the same people who are also intimidated when they walk into, say, the Metropolitan ^{Museum} and are forced to look at a Cezanne. They really feel intimidated by it because there is no rapport between them and the painting. And I would say that the majority of people now, because the art scene is too large, fall into that category.

RR: There are lots of people that just make you sick to your stomach when they are talking about your work or friends'

work or any work. They might not know that what they say might not be what they are going through, but perhaps they are just inarticulate.

LP: I'm not talking about social articulation, I'm talking about the emotional response that these people deal with when they view art. I'm not really talking about whether somebody is articulate or not. I'm talking about whether someone is genuinely moved by a painting. Because ~~what~~ what has happened in the last five years in art, ^{it} opened the door, really, to a lot of people who had never before been interested in art. ^{All} of a sudden, because they could grab onto things, literal things, literary things, about the art, ^{they} got in the door.

DJ: I agree with what Bob said. The public is a very bad thing to talk about in regard to any discussion of art. In the first place, you really don't know anything about it. It is the public, and that involves people who know a great deal about ^{art,} as well as a lot of people who don't know much about it. You don't know anything about what is being thought about your work, on the whole. I don't see that references back to the public or politics and museums or markets or any of that really is very useful. I think one of the big faults of a lot of criticism is that it does refer back to those sort^s of things a great deal.

BR: You may object to it as a discussion of art, but it is part of the total picture.

J: But I think it usually doesn't say much about the work involved.]

BR: Easel painting was painting made for middle-class domestic patronage. It was made for conceivably a different social milieu. Today, you know the difficulty of getting large canvases into people's houses.

LP: That's not a problem.

BR: It's really not? You still feel that it is private patronage and not public art that you are interested in, despite the scale of your work?

LP: The origins of the money for purchasing the paintings are different from the intentions of the artists and the results that he achieves. As a matter of fact, most of the ~~painting~~^{work} being done in this country today is quite evidently still 24 x 30 paintings which are meant to hang in people's houses. I'm sure there are more paintings being painted now for people's living room walls and over the fireplace than ever.

RR: But there are lots of other things though that weren't being done ^{before,} ~~then~~ too. At a certain point it seemed that the painter became conscious that someone was going to see his work. And he couldn't any more rely on a kind of ~~eternal~~ sentimentality or ^{eternal} familiarity or classic concepts which were more or less historical. Instead ~~we~~^{he} realized he wanted to try something else. There is no need for paintings to get

so big if you really are taking it into consideration that someone has to remove the staircase or break out a window to get it into their house; or, ^{if you} take it into account that in order to see the whole painting, they'll have to walk from one side of the room to the other. That's no coincidence, ~~—~~ something happened, ~~—~~ those are not large easel paintings any more.

LP: It almost goes without saying that certain possibilities for painting are definitely the possibilities of scale. Instead of saying big paintings, I would rather say large or small-scale paintings, because bigness is really not the issue. It can be, if the painting is just big, period. ^{But} If the painting happens to be a remarkable painting, you cannot separate that from its physical dimensions. Therefore, it is a marvelous painting or a remarkable painting despite its size, meaning the size really is of no importance. ~~But~~ ^{Large-scale} ~~is~~ become necessary for an artist for one reason or another. I have two reasons for using it, but I do not care to talk about the second reason. The first reason is the reason that I operate on in my studio. The second reason is a social reason which is of no importance to anyone except myself.

B: But that's one of the things that I was asking about before. However, if I can't get an answer, I can't get an answer. Nevertheless, you have been working on a large scale.

LP: I mean to put it in the simplest sense: 12 square inches

of cobalt blue is one experience, 100 square feet of cobalt blue is an entirely different experience. Now if I want to deal with the experience of a one-square-foot blue painting, I will paint a one-square-foot blue painting and vice-versa.

RR: But that is not a familiar academic idea in art.

LP: Well, I don't know, why are those Tiepolos at the Metropolitan so enormous?

RR: Probably because they were commissioned for a particular space.

LP: Well, you might say in a certain sense the artist still is working on commission nowadays, except he is commissioned through a gallery. So, therefore, the artist does in a certain sense, limit or restrict his work in the galleries. If I definitely want a painting to be shown in a gallery, I'm certainly not going to make it 16 feet tall if the gallery is only 9 feet tall.

BR: Would you make a 16 foot painting anyway?

LP: ^{yes, but} The question of making a large painting is not just blowing up a small painting into a large painting. The painting could not exist in the same sense, being smaller than it is, or any other dimension, than it is.

BR: What I'm asking really is, do you think there is any going back to easel painting scale, or do you think we are stuck ^{for the present at least} with mural-scale?

RR: One is never stuck with anything in art. I mean, look, there are people everywhere doing all kinds of things. Art isn't something that ^a few artists do and cram down the public's throats.

BR: But it does seem there comes a point past which there is no going back to what was done previously.

RR: Nearly always.

DB: You cannot have an irreversible material position. The only material change is that materials get better, and I think it is unlikely that people will use inferior materials.

BR: How about the new materials? Do you think they make a difference? ^{For example,} Do plastic-base paints make a difference?

LP: They certainly have made a difference in that certain things now are possible ~~which~~ which were impossible to do with oil paints. For example, it was pretty much impossible with oil paint to paint 120 square feet of an area and have it be the same color. And have it absolutely soaked into the canvas, so that there was no surface shine or light reflected off the surface of the painting. Now this is possible with acrylics and water-base paints. You could, of course, paint 120 square feet with oil paint, but the result would have a sheen to the surface. Now it is possible to work overall on a painting in a much different and more quick and immediate fashion than was possible with oil paint.

BR: I think we have unanimously decided that painting, even easel painting, if we define it simply as painting on a two-dimensional support, is not dead. Perhaps we can now talk about what you feel are the central problems facing painting today, then, having concluded that it is a very lively and viable tradition.

DB: The basic problem is not the basic problem of painting because painting does not have problems. Only painters have problems. The basic problem is that nowadays, you have to absolutely start from scratch. Everything you do has to be invented by yourself. This gives painters problems because they don't have any tradition to work with. They can't work under a master, and then paint like him, and improve a little bit on him the way they used to do. What you have to do is invent; in other words, you can't even start with painting any more. You might say you want to start with structural objects, or you might want to start with any combination of any materials or events or things that can make an artistic entity. You have to make decisions at such a low basic level that it takes you about twenty years to even decide what kind of medium you want to work in. And this is a problem for painters, no doubt about it, and for all artists today. Once you get up to a certain level of development in the kind of art you have chosen, you have to continually refine and choose, refine and choose, refine and choose--on and on until you have a mature style. It is such a problem because it is so long

and so tedious and so difficult.

BR: Do you think, then, that there are more possibilities open to the artist today, that there are simply more choices?

DB: There have always been the same number of choices. But there have not been the same number of choices that people knew about. There are more things being done by more people today, so you can look and see them being done. Like this whole business of happenings and all the rest, this instant or self-motivated theater, theater on a scale where you don't have to go through all the problems that theater entailed before. This is something fresh and new, and it is a choice that people can take and a choice that a lot of people will take from now on.

B: Do you think there is any pressure brought to bear from this sort of proliferation of choices? Is painting, for example, being pressured by, say, the kind of three-dimensional structures that Don makes?

DB: No, because people that don't want to paint, don't paint any more, that's all. In other words, if somebody isn't interested in painting, in what you call the traditional way, which is painting of a flat surface, then they do something else.

BR: Don, do you have any of the same concerns as painters?

DJ: To some extent--the kind of order involved and certainly

measuring vitality comparatively, then it's impossible. But if there are good paintings being made, as I said originally, or good structures, then whatever the tradition or sphere of art making, it is functioning, and it is vital.

RR: I do not know whose business it is whether good paintings are being made or not.

BR: It's the critics' business, presumably.

RR: The critics don't have much business. The other thing is that I don't see this dramatic breakdown of painters stopping painting and doing something else. Some of the most incredible pieces of sculpture in the world were done by painters or were done in a time when one didn't care whether one were a painter or sculptor. It seems to me that a painter just starts whatever he wants to, just as a sculptor does.

BR: I am getting the impression from what you say that you feel the arts are closer together than perhaps they once were.

RR: Yes, I do think that, but I think they weren't ever as far apart as has been implied by this exaggeration about whether you are doing three-dimensional or you're doing flat something. Usually someone has an idea or has a reaction or a feeling and it concerns him so much that he does something about it.

BR: There is one question which it seems to me concerns all of you, although in different ways; and that is the question of pictorial space and what that means in terms of what is possible in a painting. If I understand the direction of current work, it has been for a time an anti-illusionistic direction. It has been in the direction of making the object more actual and more concrete. It has led Bob, for example, to ~~have~~ ^{allow} objects ^{to} spill out into the room. It has led Don into three-dimensional work. It has led Darby and Larry into something quite different. Do you agree that the question of the kind of space or illusionism that painting offers is a central one today?

DB: It may be a central question, but ~~is~~ saying it's a central question today ~~is~~ implies that it's on everybody's mind. Of course, you have to make a spatial consideration. I do for myself. I make a spatial division of a certain special sort on the canvas and this is a consideration for me, but what it is is part of building a painting. I don't worry particularly about spatial consideration that don't have anything to do with the painting. I don't worry, for instance, about whether I should be involved in this kind of space because I find this space comfortable. Consequently, I continue to use it. If I found it uncomfortable and limiting, well, then, I would use another kind of space.

BR: I am very much interested in the concept which Sidney Tillim used in talking about the space in Larry's painting.

He called it "bulk space," meaning that there were no longer positive and negative areas, but rather that the whole space seemed to be positive, that it seemed to be a new kind of space. Is the space in painting today different?

LP: It seems to me that the issue of positive and negative space just somehow has always been resolved in paintings throughout history. The way positive and negative space is resolved today is still essentially the same way; that is, you really don't have any positive or negative space. It is all one space, so to speak.

DB: I think the critics are very worried about space more than anything else because they have a history of spatial paintings. But I have never seen a critic come out and say there is a blue-green, I have never seen a blue-green in a painting before and that's a red-hot item and I'm going to write it up as being blue-green bluegreen. Rather, it turns out that they talk about the space and the different things that are happening in the space and use such terms as positive and negative and so forth because recent art history has been a history of what you might call a spatial revolution beginning with Impressionism and Cubism and Abstract Expressionism. We have always been worried about space, so it's space, space, space all the time. But space is just one part of a painting. The size and the space in the painting is just one little ingredient.

LP: It is also the space created within the painting. Maybe there has been a tendency in the last five years to treat space from the edges of the canvas towards the center rather than working from the center out to the edges. I think there might be that tendency now, but it is all essentially to the same purpose.

RR: And one is as big a trap as the other.

LP: What kind of trap are you talking about?

RR: How can painting from the center out be any better than painting from the edges in?

LP: I didn't say one way or the other was any better. I just said there has been a tendency starting with Pollock in which the edges are really relatively free, very much less dense than what is happening on the inside of the painting. Somehow the painting seems to start at the edges and grow in.

BR: Let me put it this way: in older art you get space behind the picture plane. The feeling, the sensation, I often get about the new abstract work is that there is a kind of illusionism, but that some forms, because of the nature of the interaction of adjacent colors, are being projected forwards in front of the picture plane. And it is not value contrast that is doing that. It is the power of colors to either recede or go forward. When I first saw Larry's paintings I had the sensation that the dots were actually suspended

between me and the ground. And I got that same feeling about the centers of Darby's new paintings--that they were coming forward.

DB: That's a tool to use. Because it makes another complicating factor. Just as you use a different color. One thing goes in front of another visually. If you use something that goes in front of another visually, and then you've got something else in your roster of materials. I like things shuffling ^{around,} ~~behind,~~ curling behind, and forward.

BR: But do you feel that this shuffling goes on behind the frame or in front of the frame?

LP: It might be an intricate balance arrived at, where it is neither in front or behind. You know it is behind and in front at the same time, so to speak. There is a deep space involved. You can see it as deep space one second, and as absolutely flat space the next second.

BR: So you like that interchangeability. Do you also like that ambiguity?

RR: That's nothing new for painting.

BR: I just want to know whether the ambiguity is deliberate. These are effects that I perceive and I want to know if they are deliberate.

LP: It is new in the traditional sense, ^{because} ~~that~~ where there really was a background and a sky twenty miles off in the distance,

~~and~~ that sky was always way back there in the distance no matter what you did because you had a figure in front of it, proclaiming the space there, and the sky proclaimed its space back here. In the past there was the illusion of perspective and distance between these two points. I'm saying these points exist today in painting except that they intermingle, meaning that there is a balance reached between going back and going forward.

~~RR:~~ RR: Like Albers.

BR: Like Hans Hofmann? It sounds like push-pull.

LP: I don't know because I never studied with Hofmann or read anything like that.

RR: I think that things like this are so strict in your painting that such an element is no longer just simply part of your material or your decision, it is actually your content. It is your content. You are certainly not interested in little dots!

LP: No, certainly not. Dots are a means to use color and color is a means to produce what I've been talking about.

BR: I think that one question we might consider is the question of simplicity versus complexity. I got the impression from Darby's remarks that he thinks that art should become more complicated.

DB: Overtly complicated. I think my paintings should become

more complicated, so I'm making them more complicated. I made lots and lots of very simple paintings about five years ago which consisted of, say, a circle on a background. I ran through all my colors doing this, and I'd decided that I had had it within my power to make more complicated paintings, so I did.

BR: Larry, why have you been using more complex systems recently?

LP: I have become interested in this backward and forward thing and in the equivocal balance between these two things. In order to get that equivocal balance I needed to use more color. You might say the only basic change from the paintings five years to now is the use of more color, from basic two-color paintings to now eight or nine or ten colors in a painting.

BR: There are different shapes, too, aren't there?

LP: No different shapes. The first paintings were all dots. But during the first year the ellipses come into the painting.

BR: I just wonder if the point at which you and Darby and others were using fairly simple solutions came out of that original reaction to abstract expressionism, and whether now perhaps we are witnessing another kind of reversal where things are going to start getting complicated again?

DB: If you want to use color, you have to think about it

beforehand, because if you use color right on the canvas, it gets all muddy, and if it gets all muddy, it doesn't show like the original color as you planned it. If you want to use twenty colors in the canvas and you want each color to be distinct so that people can recognize it, then you have to make each of these colors separate. If you mix it up, the color is going to get lost. Consequently, that is part of the reason our paintings look the way they do, with many distinct separate elements.

RR: I know that you can put on paint without thinking about it. You can just see a can of red and without making a sketch for it, can predetermine its relationship to the entire thing. Do something about that and it isn't necessarily muddy.

BR: Your art strikes me as fairly complex and I wonder whether you feel that there is a kind of superiority to the notion of complexity.

R: I never felt that making a painting was very simple and that probably shows.

BR: Don, do you think there is such a thing as a flat painting?

J: No, there isn't, so far. I think it's probable that someone will manage to make one. You might make the sensation so definite and specific ~~enough~~ as to stay on the surface and not negate it; but so far, no one has. I think Frank Stella's paintings come closest to being actually flat. ^{But} You can't have

any illusionism in any sense without getting back to ~~this~~^{the} old quality that painting has had all along, which I think is not especially credible.

RR: Aren't you saying then that the reading of the painting is where the correction should take place?

DJ: No, it's decidedly in the painting.

RR: When I look out here, I can certainly see the red blouses and the orange dress more quickly than the bright blue and green back there. Now are those people sitting in the wrong seats?

DJ: Those people are not paintings out there. That's not a painting.

RR: But you're talking about a kind of morality about . . .

DJ: If you are going to use just an optical effect, it has to be made so definite that you don't have an illusionistic surface so that you don't somehow destroy the surface you are working on.

DB: But there is actually the other possibility that some things we've inherited from the European tradition are just fine and that they are very good things to use. They remain with us and we can handle them and we can use them in our own context.

DJ: It is a question of credibility and what you believe. I can't believe any of it.

DB: You'd look at a Flemish painting for instance, and you wouldn't believe that person was really in front of the background, because I wouldn't believe it either. But I wouldn't make any decision about the quality of the painting related to the belief I had. In other words, I don't feel undermined or fooled about the . . .

DJ: But your credibility, your belief in the painting and its qualities are in a way two different things. Again, it's a gradation. The only work you really believe in completely would be your own. (LP: That's nonsense.) After that it shades off in various ways depending upon the time and the period and the people involved so that you believe certain elements in someone else's works and you disbelieve certain elements. I believe something of the order that Larry has in his paintings, but I disbelieve the kind of illusionism.

DB: Belief is a function of words, isn't it? It's a function of a question that is formed. I have to believe that something is a certain color, believe that ~~there is~~ a fact or believe that an event happened in Chicago, let's say. I have a certain degree of belief that it is true because the newspaper says or doesn't say so. But when I'm looking at a painting I don't have any such thing as belief, I only have observation of the ~~the~~ facts that are there.

DJ: That seems a contradiction of the whole experience to

me, because it is very much a question of the belief in it and just what's believed and what kind of enthusiasm you have for it.

DB: In other words, when you look at a painting you form questions about it, and then decide whether you believe the answers that you give the questions.

DJ: It's often not that verbal, it's visual, pretty much.

RR: What about the distortion ~~of~~ when the light passes through the glass and hits the wall and all of a sudden you have the illusion that this box is closer to you than that one, because of the size or density of its shadow? Because that happens too.

DJ: Which boxes are you talking about?

RR: The ones you had at Leo Castelli's against the wall. The shadows were really quite extraordinary and I tried to ignore them, but they certainly defeated what you wanted.

DJ: All I can say is that they don't seem illusionistic in that sense to me. You are bound to have a certain amount of reflection, and you are changing position when you look at a three-dimensional thing. In a sense that is an illusion just in the technical meaning of the term. I distinguish between that, and illusion which I think is a perfectly matter-of-fact illusion and has no connection to the other kind. ~~the~~

~~the other kind of illusion~~

During the intermission, questions were submitted by the audience. The following are some of the questions and answers.

Q: Can Donald Judd explain the difference between illusionism that is related to anthropomorphic space and concept of a man-centered universe and simple perspective?

DJ: The perspective that makes possible the kind of illusionism that I have been jumping on does come out of the philosophy of a man-centered universe; in this it is wrong and not credible.

Q: Is it foreseeable that there will be a revival of humanistic values in painting?

LP: It seems to me that any artist's sensibility is of extreme humanistic value. ~~And~~ After all, an artist paints a picture from his sensibilities. There is no other way to paint a picture, and that is extremely human. Does the question refer perhaps to social realism?

DJ: Larry is using the word in a very general way. If you use the word in that way, then I would agree. If you use "humanistic" as ordinarily used in its more precise meaning, then I would say it is thoroughly dead. If you take humanism with a capital "H" it's long gone and out of the question.

RR: Nothing is ever out of the question. It is only out of the question today. Something is going on right this very

minute that is making a lie out of that. Somebody is doing something else. We have no business assuming whether something is through or whether it is over. If it turns up again, it is going to be something different. To make decisions like that, you have to draw a line someplace and say this is all we've got.

BR: Are humanistic values with a capital "H" expressed in your art?

RR: Not in the way Judd puts it. I'm trying to get around it some other way by increasing the physicality of the work so that one is not caught up in psychological choices and limitations. But the fact is that people will have to make decisions in any event in relation to exactly what they will see. Now I think that's another form of humanism.

DB: I think you could say without using the word humanistic that painting has a human value because what paintings are, after all, are a record of decisions that the artist has made in a medium that doesn't demand any straightforward, practical use. In other words, he is making something as perfect as he can without having any use for it other than that it's supposed to be looked at. I find, or I found, that as I paint and as I change or develop style and so forth, that the decisions I make have a kind of correlation with the decisions that people make in everyday life. But they are not identical with those decisions obviously. I cannot, when

I'm painting, make a decision not to walk in front of a truck, but I make decisions of a similar sort. For instance, I decide, is something going to give me greater adaptability in the face of my canvas? In life, you make decisions involving other people, careers and things of that sort. They are the same kind of decisions as in art but using different materials. You can make a decision, for example, to restrict yourself. You can make the same kind of decision in everyday life. I think these decisions correlate, and I think that is why a successfully made painting stands for coming to successful terms with the environment. This is a terribly complicated idea which I cannot articulate any further than that. But I think that's why paintings have their value, because they do have this relationship to life.

DJ: I think that is true, more or less. The terms are somebody else's, and I wouldn't exactly think in them. But there is certainly a correlation.

LP: It seems to me that there is a correlation between any action you do and any aspect of life relating to other aspects of life. It is inescapable that you do not work in a vacuum. You don't close yourself off and become a different person when you begin painting.

Q: Do you consider that the experience of LSD is having or is going to have a strong effect on the perception and therefore the future conception of art?

RR: Yes.

LP: Certainly not any more than alcohol.

DB: Again, it is in a sense something that has to be viewed in context. Obviously, somebody who is on LSD all the time and is struggling to paint a painting while on LSD is going to paint a different kind of painting than he is going to ordinarily, but I don't think LSD is going to make ~~anybody~~ of any kind of articulate artistic work that is going to influence anything anyway.

RR: You can't separate one influence from another. Obviously a lot of people are concerned with LSD. Its area is perception. It is not like mayonnaise or something, and it's going to change things.

DB: LSD produces perceptions, but it doesn't produce paintings.

BR: Well, it has, unfortunately. But those paintings were very traditional looking paintings, which is what's interesting about them.

RR: But the question says influences, doesn't it? The question is whether perception influences conception? And I think it necessarily does.

DB: If the same people who are painting paintings are also taking LSD, then LSD will have an effect on making their paintings. The question is, will this happen, which we don't know.

RR: You don't have to actually sense all those things, you

don't have to be a soldier to have some idea about what war is. There are a lot of children growing up who don't know what war is. They have some idea about the horror and the fear and all that business. You don't have to do it yourself. We have been tremendously influenced probably more by what we haven't done than by what we have. Now, how do we have any relationship to all those things we haven't done? We do that through an exchange, an awareness^{of} and a response ~~to influence~~
~~and~~ other people's perceptions.

LP: I think a point to be made is that there is a great deal of difference being in a turned-on state ~~and~~ your response to certain stimuli whether they be color or form or what-have-you, and your response to what would be the same stimuli under normal circumstances of not being turned on. That is where the real crucial difference lies as far as applying and trying to say anything ~~that is overall~~^{general} ~~about~~ about this LSD thing. I think if a person takes LSD and produces some marvelous work, it is going to be marvelous work with or without LSD. But so far, this situation has not come to pass, simply because of the great discrepancy between the turned-on state and the normal state of being. Unless, of course, the whole world is turned on and everybody else is turned on and is capable of being stimulated by this thing. The only things worthwhile talking about are the results; as far as I have seen they are rather commonplace and ordinary things. Yet in the turned-on state, I can imagine them being terribly interesting.

BR: To what degree do you think that everyday experience changes perceptions? For example, we come into contact with all kinds of things--TV, widescreen movies, that a former generation didn't. Do you think that this has changed perception in any way?

LP: Yes, I think so very definitely, but the changes are very subtle. Environmental changes from generation to generation are subtle things. The turned-on state of LSD or any other kind of drugs that produces these kind of illusions is not a subtle distinction. You might relate the subtle distinction from Cezanne on in painting back to environmental changes, but you can look at the whole history of art as being a gradual change and not the abrupt change that seems to occur in a turned-on state or on LSD. I think that environmental changes certainly do exert influences, but they are subtle influences. They lead subtly to new developments in art and in all other fields of endeavor.

Q: ^{or} Is it good or psychologically healthy to put such emphasis on absolute innovation in art?^{re}

DB: I don't think it is bad, I think it is stimulating. I think the artists who are going to make good art will do so despite ~~the good or bad~~ or any of the influences they have in their environment as long as they can keep on working.

RR: Innovation, I think, is better for the artist than for the public. It keeps him from falling asleep at the easel.

DJ: I think innovation is necessary. I can't see any other alternative. I think that's the way art operates and that any claim for it being stable or staying with the past is a contradiction of what happens.

DB: There will always be innovation because a good artist always makes up his own ways of doing things, ~~and~~ statistically, the chance is too infinitesimal that two artists are going to do things their own way at the same time. A good artist is going to make up his own way of doing things, he is going to innovate. He is going to create quality in his pictures, and the other people are going to see this quality and do it themselves. Then his work will become an innovation.

BR: I'd like to ask Bob Rauschenberg, do you think quality is important in art? If I understand you correctly, you think it is not important.

RR: I don't think it is. I think it's too simple a relationship to have with anything. If what one means by quality is a standardization of values, I don't think we can afford it. I really think we need more worse painting. There is nothing new about an artist using everything he can get his hands on. There is something quite old about an artist assuming virtue in the fact that paint and canvas ~~are~~ ^{have} more significance than other materials. We are living at a time when we are exposed to so many new materials every day. I think