PAINTINGS by RAYMOND PARKER at BENNINGTON COLLEGE, December, 1961

- 1 Untitled Painting 59 x 71 1959
- 2 Untitled Painting 71 x 73 1959 Collection Mr. Richard Brown Baker
- 3 Untitled Painting 6h x 68 1960
- 4 Untitled Painting 60 x 70 1960
- 5 Untitled Painting 66 x 62 1960 Collection Mr. William S. Rubin
- 6 Untitled Painting 66 x 62 1960 Collection Mr. William S. Rubin
- 7 Untitled Painting 70 x 73 1960-61
- 8 Untitled Painting 65 x 71 1961

This exhibition was made possible by the kind cooperation of Mr. Samuel M. Kootz.

(1) The process of painting is improvisational - excluding set method, plan, sketch as study, drawing as preliminary to coloring, or relative stages of finish. It may be fast or slow in tempo, impulsive or thoughtful in character. Changes are made in-process; nothing can be fixed up, no additions or corrections made. The whole painting may be in error, never a part...

The working attitude of the painter is critical. He is suspicious of anything appearing in the painting that he recognises; he questions the already-known. This is antistylistic in bias and bars quotes or allusions. While the painter tries to be aware of what he is doing during its occurence, he values as fully the painting event discovered on another occasion...

The painting is both a thing and an event. Ontologically, it exists as a part of nature, not only as an 'aesthetic' object, but as behavior in the form of a significant record. While the painter's subject is the painting, the painting's subject is the artist himself as his experience is consummated in the making...

(2) The content disclosed in painting should be what the artist intends. He is wronged by deviant interpretations of his work, dishonest if he accepts them...

To intend to control content implies controlling viewers' responses. But every response to painting is partly pre-conditioned, reflecting the viewers' associations in meaning which range from individual psychological quirks to what the humanist would think of as the traditions of the culture. The intent painter does not pretend to reorganise all this, he simply deprives the viewer of it. He eliminates old and used imagery which would stimulate known responses. He replaces the known with the new...

Clarity in painting depends on knowing other (past) art well enough that it can't reappear even in the cleverest disguise to allow confusion. Artifacts are facts; the intent painter respects their content too much to subject them to his quotation. Among other kinds of authority of art history the artist is most actively responsible: it is his work which initiates and eventually effects changes in the way people look at, and in what they see in, painting during the period of his influence...

The artist's relation to society, and the art-world in particular, is a product of his own integrity and of his viewers' learning. His image is validated when it has been learned and is in use. Until that time the motives of the intent painter seem anti-social. His 'integrity' means an effort, with an insistence that is nearly moral in its intensity, to reject in his work all images known and accepted by society. At first, the presentation of an image seemingly stripped of meaning and value causes reactions of shock and irritation. Then as the image comes to be learned and is accepted in its isolation, it begins to unfold its meanings, revealing values and gaining the power to gather to itself ideas previously scattered.