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I first raised the general idea of my essay for this exhibition in 1984 in a paper that was commissioned by *The New Criterion* and its editor, Hilton Kramer. After two revisions, it was never published. I was asked to write about an exhibition curated by Barbara Haskell at the Whitney Museum in New York. The exhibition was called, "BLAM! The Explosion of Pop, Minimalism and Performance, 1958-64." I believe I have both refined and expanded the argument I made there and with much less qualification. In the present essay I have also incorporated, in the discussion of Walter Benjamin, certain ideas I explored in an essay published in 1983 in the October issue of ARTFORUM. An anecdote attaches to this article too. It originally bore the title, "Walter Benjamin: The Work of Art After the Age of Mechanical Reproduction." However, all of the titles of all of the articles in what is now a Special Issue of the magazine were removed by the editor, Ingrid Sischy, so that, I believe, the entire issue would appear seamlessly "mechanical." Set in a variety of typefaces and in as many layouts, the issue was a *tour de force* of production and a demonstration of what is possible these days in publishing given the technology, especially the computer, available. Retrospectively I see that such production values relate to the theme of this exhibition insofar as the authorial "hand" (and the ancient typewriter on which I wrote the essay on Benjamin, a beloved office machine that was manufactured by Underwood perhaps fifty years ago and which weighed about thirty (or forty pounds) was subordinated to the prerogatives of technology.

As for the exhibition, it is meant to suggest or even to define, within reasonable limits, a "style" of what I call mechanical representation. I won't apologize for either the presumption or the expedience of this categorical designation. To hopefully deepen the discussion of the esthetics of the "mechanical" I have also included several items from my collection of specimens of photomechanical processes as examples of "reproductions" that are "beautiful" in their own right.

A reproduction of an art work is certainly not a substitute for the real thing, but very often a reproduction of a photograph is, if not a better image (which it sometimes is), an interesting and unique variant which besides has no author unless it is the "process" itself. The printing of photographs is usually controlled by the photographer or a hired hand whereas photomechanical reproductions can, in theory, be produced in virtually unlimited numbers. This was not the case with A.A. Turner's *Villas on the Hudson* (New York, 1860), a masterpiece of photolithographic incunabula. Turner's photographs were developed directly onto large lithographic stones and then worked up and printed like lithographs. The edition must have been limited since the stones were done down over only a few hundred impressions (which included stones to print at least two colors in flat tints and clouds in the sky). But the offset color reproductions in the *Women's World Edition of The American Women's Cookbook* (1940) went through as many as nine printings between 1938 and 1950. Finally, in F.P. Garretson's *A Snap-shot in the West Indies* (Newport, 1902) the half-tone reproduction of amateur snapshots acquires the status of a kind of vernacular art through ornamented reproduction in two colors.

The attempt to replicate photographs for the purpose of book and periodical illustration commenced virtually with the invention of photography itself. The daguerreotype was almost immediately employed as a source of art and documentary illustration, but the mezzotint by T. Doney, after a daguerreotype for *The American Review* in 1845 is a spectacular example of near facsimilization by hand and represents a craft which was rendered obsolete by the perfection in the 1890s of the engraved relief process which reproduced...
It goes without saying that all the facts and opinions expressed here are my responsibility and not those of the College or the Art Division.
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This exhibition is dedicated to the late Raymond Dooley, still missed.
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Once upon a time the art world was divided into two parts — the figurative and the abstract. The preeminence of Abstract Expressionism and, for a while, Color Field abstraction relegated most "straight" figurative art to a kind of critical purgatory. There was a lot of it around — by Fairfield Porter, Larry Rivers (early on), Alex Katz, Richard Diebenkorn (who returned to abstraction), Philip Pearlstein among many others. However, it was not perceived as advancing a specifically modernist and, I think, post-war American view of advanced art. It lacked a shared scheme of stylistic principles. For a while it was even thought that artists who did not pursue or follow the lead of abstraction or who abandoned it suffered from what was called a "failure of nerve." This was the 60s, after all.

Pop Art changed all that. Trafficking in the dematured imagery of the media world of comic books, newspapers, periodicals and advertising, Pop Art concealed its transgressive, reactionary character behind a wall of irony that seemed to mock the representational content it employed. It was hip, it was cool and it was a relief from the majestic alienation of abstraction. It did not appear regressive because it seemed subordinate to a conceptual strategy and was emphatically design oriented. It was about a representation displaced by a code. It did not depict things perceptually. Rather, it borrowed imagery that came with printed codes from the world of mechanical reproduction (Roy Lichtenstein, Andy Warhol) or which took as its models the representational techniques of commercial art (James Rosenquist, Tom Wesselman and somewhat later, early Malcolm Morley). In Claes Oldenburg and George Segal different degrees of facsimilation and fabrication were involved. Art had begun to engage "production."

This sounds — and is — formalist, but the idea was simply to produce a representation that was not only plausible but which could hold its own against any kind of modern and postmodern art. All the talk in recent years about "media" and "mechanical reproduction" in art is simply about a stylistically acceptable form of representational art. Because postmodernism is committed to the total repudiation of any "deterministic" definition of style, every humanistic discipline from psychology and philosophy to political science and sociology has been appropriated to provide a foundation other than the esthetic for a new representational discipline. Who has not heard of revisionism? But if in some fundamental way the issue was not style then why would there be, rather suddenly, a renewed ideologi-

ical investment in and a proliferation of exhibitions here and abroad quite nakedly promoting abstract art again? One year Roberta Smith in The New York Times suggests that abstract art seems moribund, the next year, hey, it's coming back. But if we have to choose, no choice is acceptable.

To all intents and purposes, Pop Art was the beginning of postmodernism in visual art. The "postmodern" was not, however, the accomplishment of Pop Art alone. The photosilkscreens of Rauschenberg (the early ones from 1962 to 1964 were recently shown at the Whitney Museum), the flags, maps and cast objects by Jasper Johns and Frank Stella's black paintings with their repeated pinstripes anticipated the conversion to a new pictorial syntax. Nor is it entirely a stretch to include Jackson Pollock's drip paintings whose emphatic materiality radicalized art production.

There was an analogous tendency in sculpture as well, in the minimalism of Donald Judd, Carl Andre and Dan Flavin whose constructions proceeded part by literal part, obviating any formal hierarchy. Though I am not very familiar with the field, I suspect it was also happening in dance. I remember an evening in 1966 when I saw a dance — perhaps it was a performance — choreographed by Yvonne Rainer, who went on to become a
filmmaker, in which the dancers, upon instruction, picked up slabs of styrofoam and, following prescribed, robot-like movements, rearranged them. That, as I recall, was it.

What was happening in art, in other words, was the appearance not of a new set of formal conventions but of procedures and practices that employed reproduction, literally or by simulation, repetition and fabrication. There was even a performance which was actually a “copy.” I have in mind the bronzed and patinated Gilbert and George, robotically programming their movements as they lip-synched “Underneath the Arches,” a British music hall song, at the Sonnabend Gallery in 1971. When I saw them again in 1991, an image of Jasper Johns’s Ballantine bronze set to music flashed through my mind. Finally Conceptual Art eliminated syntax entirely with a tedious and tendentious didacticism that was actually a Duchampian form of self-reference. In short, and to put it another way, the manual, authorial aspect of artmaking was displaced onto the literally mechanical or a surrogate. A thing no longer had to be made entirely by hand; it was just as important, as Judd implied in his writing, that it be well-made.

It is hardly surprising, then, that photography should emerge later in the 60s as an unprecedented force in art and art for the first time. Photography became the generic form of representation, free of idealizing artifice, only to quickly confront its own crisis of representation by opposing the conceptual to the straight, documentary photograph. Photography as both art and representation abounds in contagious ambiguities that have affected virtually all postmodernist discourse. Not the least is the subordination if not marginalization of the camera by the conceptualizing of the photographic image as a “text” or, with an actual text, visualizing the caption. Through the layout of such photographs, the aura of the mechanical is increasingly displaced by the echo of the manual.

Similarly, great ironies have attended the adoption, again in the mid-60s, of Walter Benjamin’s acclaimed essay, “The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction,” as the canonical text of postmodernism. First published in 1936 in French, Benjamin’s essay has been used to virtually institutionalize the “mechanical” as the paradigmatic metaphor of postmodernism, both as an emblem and a code, at once a criticism and a process. Yet it seems to have had an effect opposite to the one intended.

Everyone is familiar with Benjamin's notion of “aura” defined as the mystifying effect of distance in a work of high art that he claimed was eliminated when such art was “reproduced.” Reproduction, he said, detached the artwork from its original place in time. However, Benjamin was more interested in the concept rather than the processes of reproduction (photography was just one and very different from the others) and failed to account for the often estheticizing effect of mechanical reproduction itself. The ultimate irony has been that Benjamin’s essay appears to have stimulated the use of both photography and mechanical reproduction for auralic ends.

Despite the fact that it is now taken for granted that photography is art — no one brings the question up anymore, said Victor Burgin quite a while ago — the differences between photography and what I would call process representation are as fundamental as they were between photography and painting at the beginning of photographic practice. Principally, pictorial art is inevitably and innately more abstract. By that I mean that the image in classic visual art relates to the surface in a totally material way. Plastic art begins with the surface, photography effaces it. This is true even when a painting or drawing is not literally abstract. Certainly the distinguishing feature in the work I have chosen to demonstrate my thesis of a post-modern representation is the fact that it is the marks that depict illusory space. Things also define a tactile surface or space where I make an exception, in tactility through the atomization of th into points of light.

In addition to that of Warhol's recoded and redesigned representation commences, the practice of artists as Richard Artschwager, Warhol’s companion, and such younger figures as Mark Ellen Brooks and Joseph Nechvatal movement among them all share certain tactics of traction and displacement which, while equally or totally “mechanical,” retain information and thus the illustrative of their art. The decorative element v: explicitness, but the dramatic conte of the image, when banal, is made to refer to its theatricality by the distance from it through the use of a mechanical process where in the course of production. I instance, Brooks, who is less a photo than a maker of what I would call phon pictures, implies sublimity by transfor common images she starts with into gl chromatic icons. Similarly, Artschwager actual makes his paintings by hand, rough Celotex ground to produce the lent of a mechanical code that both
in a work of high art that he claimed initiated when such art was "reproducible," he said, detached the from its original place in time.

Benjamin was more interested in the processes of reproduction rather than the outcomes of reproduction itself. The ultimate significance of Benjamin's essay is that photography and painting are fundamentally different, and photography is inevitably and more abstract. By that I mean that in classic visual art relates to the a totally material way. Plastic art with the surface, photography on the other hand, is less a photograph than a more photographic picture, implies sublimity by transforming the common images she starts with into glowing images.

Similarly, Artschwager, who actually makes his paintings by hand, uses the rough Celotex ground to produce the equivalent of a mechanical code that both stylizes the image derived from a photograph and literalizes the surface with acrylic scumbles. Warhol's early silkscreen paintings have, to my knowledge, never been considered as having abstract properties (except when the images were virtually abstract) nor has this property been considered as an aspect of the represented "content." The emphasis has always been on the social, the cultural, the political, in keeping with the vindictive postmodern agenda against "formalism." But the silkscreen is a veritable stencil of flat shapes deposited, in Warhol's case, in often intense hues that obscure the photomechanical screen used in transferring the image to the porous mesh through which ink is pressed. Warhol exploited off-register printing, superimposition, accidental blots and other forms of manipulation that kept the grid layout from becoming static. The blank area he left at the sides or bottoms of the best early paintings showed considerable discernment. As I've said elsewhere, his practice amounted to a form of colorization, the process subsequently invented to tinct black and white films for television viewing. The result was an intensification of iconic effect in which the naturalism of the photograph was replaced by the abstraction of a sign. The social weight of Warhol's best pictures is probably rooted in a process that fetishized celebrity, divinity in its most secular form.

Though hardly the iconic artist Warhol was, and perhaps better known for his pungrily wry sculptures that fuse minimalism with furniture, Richard Artschwager makes paintings — I would call them painted drawings — that are important for another reason. Being the figurative half of a dialogue with his more "abstract" sculpture, they retroactively make Artschwager America. It is the question of the social, the cultural, the political, in keeping with the vindictive postmodern agenda against "formalism." But the silkscreen is a veritable stencil of flat shapes deposited, in Warhol's case, in often intense hues that obscure the photomechanical screen used in transferring the image to the porous mesh through which ink is pressed. Warhol exploited off-register printing, superimposition, accidental blots and other forms of manipulation that kept the grid layout from becoming static. The blank area he left at the sides or bottoms of the best early paintings showed considerable discernment. As I've said elsewhere, his practice amounted to a form of colorization, the process subsequently invented to tinct black and white films for television viewing. The result was an intensification of iconic effect in which the naturalism of the photograph was replaced by the abstraction of a sign. The social weight of Warhol's best pictures is probably rooted in a process that fetishized celebrity, divinity in its most secular form.

Though hardly the iconic artist Warhol was, and perhaps better known for his pungrily wry sculptures that fuse minimalism with furniture, Richard Artschwager makes paintings — I would call them painted drawings — that are important for another reason. Being the figurative half of a dialogue with his more "abstract" sculpture, they retroactively make Artschwager America. It is the question of the social, the cultural, the political, in keeping with the vindictive postmodern agenda against "formalism." But the silkscreen is a veritable stencil of flat shapes deposited, in Warhol's case, in often intense hues that obscure the photomechanical screen used in transferring the image to the porous mesh through which ink is pressed. Warhol exploited off-register printing, superimposition, accidental blots and other forms of manipulation that kept the grid layout from becoming static. The blank area he left at the sides or bottoms of the best early paintings showed considerable discernment. As I've said elsewhere, his practice amounted to a form of colorization, the process subsequently invented to tinct black and white films for television viewing. The result was an intensification of iconic effect in which the naturalism of the photograph was replaced by the abstraction of a sign. The social weight of Warhol's best pictures is probably rooted in a process that fetishized celebrity, divinity in its most secular form.
them "meaning." The subjects submit to "deconstruction" but acquire the metaphorical meaning of a relevant style while the image remains frozen in its photographic moment, reifying a milieu. The class differences between the plain dwelling of House, 1966 and the upscale indoor-outdoor lounge of Bush, 1971 (not in the exhibition) are, meanwhile, eliminated by making both images uniformly document the artistic strategy as well.

Warhol similarly commented on class in his representation of The American Male (for Watson Powell), 1964. Powell was the Chief Executive Officer at the time of the American Republic Insurance Company of Des Moines which owns a thirty panel version of the portrait. Warhol's attraction to celebrity was hardly a secret, but obviously it is Warhol's celebrity that rubs off on Powell. Powell is really not up to such cultification which is what makes the painting — even a single panel — so fascinating.

Perhaps there is something Duchampian in the act of employing commonplace images for artistic ends, but purveyors of the Duchampian connection overlook, as did Benjamin, the capacity of the "reproduction" to infiltrate standard canons of beauty and reference with revised esthetic content. Indeed when a younger generation of artists also recycle found images, something like a historical continuum is being established.

What is at stake is not the fate of high art in the late capitalist era, as theorists assert, nor the latest critique of modernism and the collapse of the painterly tradition but an ongoing form of surrogate representation. Is it simply fortuitous that this should occur during the generation in which the controversy over surrogate motherhood has occurred, widening perhaps the cultural implications of a displaced representation in art? But it does not mean that we live in the Age of the Simulacrum as the disciples of Jean Baudrillard insist but in an age, if any, of mechanical representation. The original is in some way, if only inferentially, its own replication.

Orwell understood that a cliché is a sometimes more efficient way of stating the obvious than rephrasing an idea or sentiment that is no more genuine for having respecting a rule while trying to revise it. Truisms are often true, or truer when employed at the right time and in the right place. The obvious, however, has the property of being fundamental and provisional at the same time, requiring when invested in a cultural artifact the complexity that is necessary if it is to be a reflection of more than taste. Brooks, Tansey and Nechvatal infuse the disposable, but archetypal signs of media representation with degrees of social and philosophical self-consciousness. Tansey but especially Nechvatal are practicing theoreticians, both students of linguistic theory and deconstruction, while Brooks' fascination with the "social" in the form of what might be called the periodical culture of houses, gardens, golf courses and the like (though she is working with the figure now) suggests the possibility that photomechanically illustrated books and journals are the illuminated manuscripts of our time. Sort of.

Still, these artists find it necessary to render their subjects with different degrees of "abstraction" to clarify transitions from or, as is usually the case, between the manual and the mechanical. The result in every instance is an individual strain of recombinant syntactical imaging. Sorry. This is what happens to prose when one starts to think about the visual as if it were a "text" and I am rather pleased to be momentarily victimized. Strictly speaking however, that is what their images embody. They recycle information in personal ways as they translate the ethos of the mechanical into a pictorialism that will I think seem less exotic in time.

Brooks' approach, for instance, is to insert the manual between two mechanical phases. She photographs an image in a magazine or has a laser copy made of it, paints over print to generalize color and mass and rephotographs the "model" through a screen, producing a new negative from enlargements, often huge, are made. Images are partly constellations of the required to photograph them, speckle luminous. In United, 1992, a spotlight becomes a kind of conceptualized and a Milky Way evoking spatial immensities still yielding a recognizable configurative interplay of representation and metap informs all of Brooks' photographic pi whose transcendent glitter occurs in a darkness that becomes identified with pictorial surface. Brooks rejects, and so, any characterization of her technical "pointilliste" since the granulation is co to the positive masses and not the negative surround. Her pictures are not a high form of pictorialist photography but representations that subordinate the expressivity of the photograph to the dra of visual phenomenon it becomes as styl subject meet and concord.

Brooks' pictures are "theatrical," ev "spectacular," but only insofar as they in the cultural fantasies buried in mundane images just as, momentarily, in her execution, they release her from conventional
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tographs an image in a magazine or
has a laser copy made of it, paints over the print to generalize color and mass and then rephotographs the “model” through a black screen, producing a new negative from which enlargements, often huge, are made. The images are partly constellations of the light required to photograph them, speckled and luminous. In Untitled, 1992, a spotlight beam becomes a kind of conceptualized and colorized Milky Way evoking spatial immensities while still yielding a recognizable configuration. The interplay of representation and metaphor informs all of Brooks’ photographic pictures whose transcendental glitter occurs in a total darkness that becomes identified with the pictorial surface. Brooks rejects, and rightly so, any characterization of her technique as “pointilliste” since the granularity is confined to the positive masses and not the negative surround. Her pictures are not a high-tech form of pictorialist photography but hybrid representations that subordinate the expected veracity of the photograph to the dramatic visual phenomenon it becomes as style and subject meet and concur.

Brooks’ pictures are “theatrical,” even “spectacular,” but only insofar as they release the cultural fantasies buried in mundane images just as, momentarily, in her conception, they release her from conventional esthetic obligations. The commonplace when looked at in a certain way can be as transcendental as nature; that is, it can shed the very irony that enables it to be recognized as a subject in the first place. Brooks’ photographs might actually represent a wish for capitalism, and perhaps for herself, that has not yet been realized.

Joseph Nechvatal’s technique is the most complex in this group and his pictures the most “abstract.” Generally speaking he starts with a handmade drawing, photographs or videotapes it, feeds it into a computer and, using the keyboard, moves the marks around and colors the image of which a considerably enlarged version is spray painted by a robotic assisted acrylic process onto a canvas that is wrapped around a rotating drum. As the initiating image undergoes transformation from hand to computer to robot the digitized code implies translation and through translation one recovers the subliminal traces of representation that are implicit in the very act of “drawing.” It is as if each of his pictures is a historical model of what happened to both representation and abstraction in the course of the deeply troubled evolution of modern culture. “It is,” Nechvatal writes in a recent statement, “the representation of representation in ruins” which he combats “by overload-

ing content to the point where it becomes non-representational.”

Everything I have written so far argues the contrary. Whatever its “content,” the work is a sign, a surface enriched by conceptually deployed materials that reproduce the traces of, and therefore something like, a nostalgia for or memory of, a narrative that is both psychological and esthetic. As cultural artifacts Nechvatal’s paintings defy, perhaps paradoxically, assumptions of impoverishment which, by the way, can also “inspire.”

It is true, however, that Nechvatal’s pictures tend increasingly toward the abstract. Onic Aid, 1989, depicts a mutant figure that seems inscribed, like a projection, in space that is interiorized by the dramatic lighting which is more specific than the allusive android. Whereas, in Figure, 1990, all that is left of the figure is a lavender mirage (though the title might be meant figuratively).

There is the possibility that technology is limited, not to say trivialiszed, when its “economy,” so to speak, is redirected from the outside — imposed upon — in order to produce a more artistic product. But just the word — “technology” — evokes something cosmic, expanding, accelerated, whereas pictures have limits. Perhaps there is an allusion to this in a very recent Nechvatal, a
painting that at first glance suggests a color field until the traces of a fractal image fed into the computer and modified, emerge to render the field more allusive while the saturated red plane, retouched here and there by hand, palpably resonant, suggests a Futurist Barnett Newman. A two-inch or so wide strip on the left protects us, as any composition does, from the void.

If I make Brooks and Nechvatal sound like sci-fi visionaries, it is because they both use “machines” to make highly charged pictures that are visions, both literally and figuratively electrifying.

With Mark Tansey, however, the tension between the conceptual and the visionary is particularly explicit in his so-called “toner” drawings. Tansey uses a machine — a Sharp copier — to underscore the role of the hand — both its effacement and restitution — through a series of mutually subversive acts. Tansey’s procedure is to prepare a “master” which is, so to speak, camera ready like copy prepared for offset reproduction. The image to be “restored” is often a collage of other copied matter, be it pages from a text or figurative motifs that he clips from his vast picture library and recomposes to form an allusive rather than specific narrative. If one is sometimes reminded of Max Ernst, Tansey would argue that it is by way of Derrida or de Man, or both. In Derrida Queries de Man, 1992, these two heroes of deconstruction wrestle over a chasm whose mountain walls are lined with garbled passages of text. Tansey intercepts the “master” after the toner has been deposited as a powder image on a sheet of typewriter-size paper but before it has been fixed by heat and made permanent. Tansey then reworks the image with a variety of tools like brushes, erasers, feathers, whatnot.

In the early days of photomechanical reproduction, photoengravings were often retouched by engravers whose profession had become all but obsolete because of the growing use of process reproduction. Tansey, however, does not merely retouch the mechanical copy but totally reconstitutes it. In one case a landscape drawing he made from a photograph underwent mechanical copying and then was revised by hand to more closely resemble the photograph while looking very much like a drawing made from nature.

Tansey’s drawings usually resemble his well-known paintings though they are not nearly so compositionally complex. In his paintings, however, he uses the copier to compose and recompose his pictures. It is an editing tool that facilitates conception and revisioning. It certainly influences the final “look” of a painting, but the painting is executed entirely by hand. Whereas in the toner drawings, the copier is virtually humanized by collaboration. It is also there to be sacrificed on the altar of art. What is “under erasure” in a drawing by the same name (1989) is not only the language-lined cliff that is also being eroded by a waterfall (a reference to an erosion of meaning perhaps); it is not only, in A Bridge Over the Cartesian Gap I, 1990, the ontological uncertainty of meaning that is portrayed by four tiny horsemen galloping across an immense natural bridge seeded with bits of text. It is the role the “machine” plays in both conception and execution that is denied (but not obscured). As in the corollary myths of sacrifice the sacrificial lamb — a copier — must be beautiful to excite the pathos that is lodged in exquisitely mysterious drawings.

Tansey hazards the most regressive form of representation here because it is the most illusionistic and illustrative. Warhol, Arstschwager, Brooks and Nechvatal all employ strategies that refer to the abstract surface. Tansey’s substitute is the toner, a powder that is tactile “stuff.” Tansey thus dramatizes the degrees to which all of the artists seek to infuse their mechanically informed representations with tactile properties that have for the most part been elided from the figurative form. In every respect tactile, inferring figuration, is a way of recovering the history of Western representation without recourse to the more traditional aural conventions observed today by figurative artists as different as Eric Fischl and under-acknowledged Gabriel Laderman.

The tendency today, among theorists least, is to claim as “representational” qualified postmodern art, abstract or figurative. This is a representation in which its conception is semantically as embracing “codes” of representation rather than of actual images. One hears instead of “sign” and “signifiers.” It’s really an ideological balancing act, designed to rescue theory suddenly unfashionable “endgame” straw in effect trying to overcome the Hegel closure of art history without embracing it calls “Kantian idealism,” or its pretentious modernist equivalent, “Greenbergian formalism.” The idea is to obliterately “differ in the esthetic sphere while insisting on the social realm. The contradictions, I say hypocrisies, of much of this are simply gargantuan to untangle.

In fact it is not at all clear if the old ideological antagonism between figurative abstract art has disappeared, Critical diff
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in effect trying to overcome the Hegelian
closure of art history without embracing what
it calls "Kantian idealism," or its presumed
modernist equivalent, "Greenbergian for-
malism." The idea is to obliterate "difference"
in the esthetic sphere while insisting on it in
the social realm. The contradictions, not to
say hypocrisy, of much of this are simply too
gargantuan to untangle.

In fact it is not at all clear if the old,
ideological antagonism between figurative and
abstract art has disappeared. Critical difference
has largely been stifled by the need, nay the
obligation, to satisfy contending constituencies
in the art world. Instead an easy, reflexive
acrimony is reserved for obvious targets like
Hilton Kramer and Jesse Helms. Some opinion
eliminates painting entirely and one can
interpret the current rash of exhibitions about
abstract painting as seeking to preserve the
genre as well as proselytizing in behalf of a late
postmodern product.

Transgression is by now just an extension
of what Harold Rosenberg once called the
"tradition of the new," but mechanical
representation makes it clear that abstract or
figurative art renews itself syntactically, not
ideologically or politically. As Rosemarie Beck
once said, if I remember correctly, "Not a style
but Style." Whatever the style, we have been
shown how anesthetic practices — in this case
the "mechanical" — can be employed to
refresh esthetic impulses. Art is a survivor.
Duchamp didn't figure that out until it was
too late to cash in on it.
Mark Tansey, *Bridge Over the Cartesian Gap I*, 1990

Richard Artschwager  (b. 1923)

*Horse*, 1966
acrylic on celotex
57" x 43"
collection John Torreano

Ellen Brooks (b. 1948)

*Reel Entry*, 1990
cibachrome
70" x 39"
loaned by the artist

*Untitled*, 1992
cibachrome
45" x 35"
loaned by the artist

Joseph Nechvatal (b. 1951)

*Optic Aid*, 1989
computer/robotic assisted acrylic on canvas
48" x 66"
courtesy Brooke Alexander Gallery

*Figine*, 1990
computer/robotic assisted acrylic on canvas
76" x 38"
courtesy Brooke Alexander Gallery

Mark Tansey  (b. 1949)

*Under Erosure*, 1989
toner on paper
8" x 6¼"
courtesy Curt Marcus Gallery

*Bridge Over the Cartesian Gap I*, 1990
toner on paper
6¼" x 9½"
courtesy Curt Marcus Gallery
Richard Artschwager  (b. 1923)
House, 1966
color on celotex
57" x 43"
Collection John Torreano

Ellen Brooks  (b. 1948)
Rear Entry, 1990
cibachrome
70" x 39"
loaned by the artist

Untitled, 1992
cibachrome
45" x 35"
loaned by the artist

Joseph Nechvatal  (b. 1951)
Optic Aid, 1989
computer/robotic assisted acrylic on canvas
48" x 68"
courtesy Brooke Alexander Gallery

Figure, 1990
computer/robotic assisted acrylic on canvas
76" x 38"
courtesy Brooke Alexander Gallery

Mark Tansey  (b. 1949)
Under Erasure, 1989
toner on paper
8 1/2" x 6 1/2"
courtesy Curt Marcus Gallery

Bridge Over the Cartesian Gap I, 1990
toner on paper
6 1/4" x 9 3/4"
courtesy Curt Marcus Gallery

Derrida Quotations of Man, 1992
toner on paper
8 1/4" x 5 1/8"
courtesy Curt Marcus Gallery

Landscape, 1992
graphite on paper
5 3/4" x 7 1/2"
courtesy Curt Marcus Gallery

Landscape, 1992
toner on paper
5 3/4" x 7 1/2"
courtesy Curt Marcus Gallery

Andy Warhol  (1928-1987)
The American Male (for Watson Powell), 1964
synthetic polymer paint and silkscreen ink on canvas
16" x 16"
courtesy The Andy Warhol Foundation for the Visual Arts

The Electric Chair, c. 1963
silkscreen ink on paper
35" x 47"
Bemidji College Collection

Freedom Tree
half-tone, from F. P. Garettson
A Snapshot in the West Indies
Newport, 1902
author's collection

Henry Clay, I
merzotint by T. Doney from daguerreotype
The American Review, January, 1845
author's collection

Residents of Thomas Cochran, Dobbs Ferry
photolithograph
A. A. Turner
Villas on the Hudson, New York 1860
author's collection

Fruit Salad
three-color offset from
Women's World Edition of the American Woman's Cook Book,
Chicago, 1940
author's collection