

Panel discussion Kind of Blue at the Northeastern University

AAA_wilsjudi_8170_m

EDMUND BARRY GAITHER: I will do the following: I will introduce the panelists, and then I will invite Charles to make an additional statement, uh, concerning his thinking in organizing "Kind of Blue." And then I will frame these initiating questions for the other panelists, which will be perhaps broader than the four artists who are shown here, and which will perhaps look at contextual and [kind of?] related (inaudible). At the far end (inaudible) Charles Giuliano, whom you will know, since he's a curator at the exhibition, and, uh, a longtime observer of the [00:01:00] visual arts life here in the city, and also with a profound and long interest in jazz, as well. And he's also a philosopher, uh, so between (laughter) philosophy, aesthetics, jazz, and visual arts, he covers quite a gap there. Next to him is Dana Chandler. Dana Chandler is a painter, and also a professor of art, uh, here at, at Simmons, and he is the founder and, uh, director of the African American Master Artist in Residence Program here at Northeastern University, and he is known internationally for his contribution in Afro-American art since the latter '60s, which is now almost a 20-year span of time. Next to me is Pat Hill [sic], [00:02:00] who directs the gallery at Boston University, and who has, uh, a well-documented interest in American art, and in particular in American art that is sensitive to social themes and to contents that have to do with what sometimes, uh, one thinks of as the, uh, uh, social history of art. She is an art historian, and I don't know if she is also a painter. Uh, not to my knowledge --

PATRICIA HILLS: (inaudible).

EDMUND BARRY GAITHER: -- but I will -- so I'll leave it at that. I'm Edmund Barry Gaither. I direct the Museum of the National Center of Afro-American Artists, and I also work in the Curatorial Department in the Museum of Fine Arts, and, uh, I'm moderator of this program for today, which, as I have said several times to my associates on the panel, means that principally I get to shape questions [and aim at?] other people. I'm not one to resist a passion to, uh, plow into any of them [00:03:00] myself. I think the first order of business would be if, uh, Charles could share with us, uh, his thinking in putting together the show, and his vision of what its impact (inaudible), and, and what his intentions were. So you'll share that with us, Charles, (inaudible).

CHARLES GIULIANO: Okay, thank you, Barry. (inaudible) made a reference to me as a philosopher. Uh, that's the first time anyone has called me that since I was 13 years old. (laughter) I thought it was a phase that I had outgrown. Uh, this exhibition, [one might say?], started, (clears throat) started in 1968, and I was reminded of that in a very curious and, uh, amusing way recently by Judith Wilson, who has joined us here this afternoon and is seated in the audience, and she's in the process of, uh, researching a doctoral dissertation on Bob Thompson for Yale (inaudible). And, uh, on her bibliography, or something or other, she had found or resurrected two ancient articles of mine I wrote in 1968, uh, and I prevailed on her to send them back to me if she would, and she kindly did so. I'm absolutely shocked, stunned, amused, and amazed at what I had to say in 1968 about Bob Thompson. And, essentially, you might say that I did two versions of Bob Thompson: I did the straight version of Bob Thompson for *Arts* magazine, and I think that that has stood up fairly well, and I think I've pretty well identified what I felt then and feel now; and, uh, in *Avatar*, which was an underground newspaper that some of you might remember, Boston in the -- in that period, 1968. I did, uh, what [was then?] (inaudible) the gonzo journalism [00:05:00] version of Bob Thompson, and it was very, very amusing to, to see that as a kind of vintage piece of writing, and the -- almost the sense of a reminder of my own, uh, artistic development, uh, both as an art historian and someone concerned with the arts, and also, uh, in the kind of fledgling stages of my own career as a journalist. Uh, I also, in New York, knew Earle Pilgrim personally. Uh, he, he had been a very, very good friend of, uh, a writer for whom I had a great deal of respect, uh, a personal friend who, interestingly enough, shows up as an image in this show, uh, of Bill Cardoso, who is considered to be one of America's premier gonzo journalists, and formerly, um, editor of *Boston Globe*. And, uh, he had been a, a close friend of Earle's, and had always told me about Earle as being a, you know, very important and dynamic person in the kind of Boston subculture in the, [00:06:00] uh, you know, 1960s, shall we say. He had his own loft, uh, in -- on South Street, down, um, in the Financial District of Boston. He built sets. He designed costumes. He, uh, produced things that we would today call, uh, events or happenings. Uh, he was, you know -- he did a kind of art that would later be called psychedelic art. He did things with blacklight and DayGlo, and, uh, all kinds

of strange things. As a matter of fact, uh, uh, he was a tremendous influence on the thinking of Tim Leary, who was [a product of?] that time, ingesting, uh, psychedelic substances, and, uh, (laughter) uh, Tim Leary used to come down and, and, uh, hang out at, at Earle Pilgrim's studio, was always amazed what was going, going on, and this wife, uh, called it, quite amusingly, that, uh, they used to refer to Leary as The Professor. You know, "Here comes The Prof," you know. And they would be going about their activities. Earle, Earle, by the way, [00:07:00] never did experiment with psychedelic drugs -- I wanted to make that very clear -- uh, but he was -- Tim Leary felt that Earle was a naturally psychedelic person. Uh, Earle was enormously self-destructive, and so very little of the work has survived; it's all, uh, in the -- in the collection of his, his widow, [who's in?] Washington, D.C. Uh, he moved a lot. But I think that, uh, it was a special pleasure to be able to bring his work to this exhibition because he's an artist that basically nobody knew about, um, who, who was really kind of an important presence for that generation of, of Black artists in Boston, and someone that, you know, later generations -- I'm sure that, that Barry and Dana have seen this artist for the first time and were unaware of his existence. Um, Benny I met a couple summers ago, Provincetown. Uh, we were both houseguests for a weekend at the home of Rhoda and Will Rossmore in, in Provincetown, and I immediately, uh, [00:08:00] took a liking to Benny. He's a, a forthright, very amusing and witty, uh, highly opinionated, extremely controversial, uh, pungent artist, shall we say. He's a very flavorful individual in every sense. I think that his work has a kind of, uh, dynamism and power and intensity to it, uh, kind of raw imagery. And, uh, Benny, of course, is, is nationally known and respected as an arts administrator and a former, uh, visual arts coordinator for the National Council of the Arts and Humanities. Uh, what -- the sense you're getting here, which I think is interesting, is a -- is a show of Black art, or Afro-American art, that is perhaps different than a number that happened (inaudible) in the sense that there's, there's much less of the presence of the social and political context, and, uh, much more of what I would call kind of personal or visionary or humanist context that one sees very, very evidently [00:09:00] in the work, particularly, uh, in the work of Bob Thompson, who I would really describe as a visionary artist, and, uh, one of the greatest humanist visionary painters of his generation in American art. I think that

he ranks with the, you know, very, very, very best figurative artists of the, uh, late '50s and 1960s. Uh, his work really took two tacks, shall we say, w-- there -- and, uh, I'm sure Ms. Wilson has some, some things that she could add to this, but I, I would essentially say that there's kind of two main directions in his work. One would be inspired by European painting, and he spent a lot of time in Europe, in museums, looking at Poussin and the Masters, and then deriving variations of that. And also in this exhibition you see another kind of personal, private symbolism, uh, images coming from Dante's *Inferno* and that kind of thing, that are more self-generated and derived. [00:10:00] And I think that it -- this is really the direction that we see in the work of Emilio Cruz, uh, who has taken this kind of personal symbolism and, and, and, uh, expanded it. Uh, Emilio and Bob Thompson are very, very close friends. I think the, the influence between them is very direct and very evident, and, in that sense, it's nice to bring them together in this show, uh, 'cause I think that, uh, uh, you know, Emilio represents the kind of continuation of that idea, right up into the present time. And, uh, I think that's probably enough for preliminary remarks. I don't wanna dominate the discussion or overwhelm it. But, uh, Barry, back to you.

EDMUND BARRY GAITHER: All right. Uh, I will ask Ms. Wilson if she will agree to come in, perhaps, at a slightly later point, and, uh, uh, at this point I'll try to [00:11:00] step backwards a little bit from your description of how this particular group of four artists came to be in this show, and to pose a broader question, which, uh, I would like both Dana and Pat to comment on, which I may also comment on. Uh, it's one which...

__: [A-ha?]. (laughter)

EDMUND BARRY GAITHER: It's one which really seeks to, uh, uh, t-try to get a fuller sense (clears throat) of the larger context in which, uh, Black American artists were shaped. Uh, that will apply for this group of artists, as for many other artists, even though the particular experiences vary widely. There are elements of commonality that have to do with the, uh, roots [00:12:00] of Black American experience, and the kinds of manifestations in art that it's taken. So I would invite, uh, a couple of quite broad comments just on the, uh -- a sense of the source of these kinds of works in historical terms. Uh, Dana, you want to...?

DANA CHANDLER: You want a historical dissertation on that particular subject from me? (laughter) Okay.

EDMUND BARRY GAITHER: Well, you have actually two, two things that make you good for this. One is you can speak, to some degree, from your own experience (inaudible). It's not unrelated, even though it's a slightly later generation (inaudible) people. But also, you have been very involved with the community of artists, uh, nationally over the last decade and a half, and you've distilled from that some salient observations, and we'll hear them now.

DANA CHANDLER: [00:13:00] (inaudible). Um, (laughter) the catchword, I guess, these days, uh, in terms of being active, is being proactive. It's proactive, and one doesn't react to what is going on around them --

EDMUND BARRY GAITHER: Uh, you have to be louder.

___: [I think so, too?].

DANA CHANDLER: I'm getting there. Um, I would say that much of what has occurred in African American art over the last 25 years has been reactive rather than proactive, uh, in terms of those artists who spoke socially about the kinds of things which were happening to African American people in America. Certainly, in my own work, that's -- that has been my direction, and still is my direction, largely, to be more reactive to the kinds of oppression that one finds still in the United States, and funny little acts of racism which occur every day to African American people. Um, but there are some [00:14:00] things which were occurring lately which make me feel really good about what's -- what the result of all of that striving of so many people who have been able, I think is the word -- not allowed, but more [like?] able -- to come to intellectual and, um, and, um -- what's the word I'm looking for -- skills maturity, I guess. An example of that was that on my way here I had the occasion to see Don Still, who was standing in front of a new T, um, extension, [the Ruggles T?] extension. And it just amazed me and thrilled me to see so large a -- an example of the works and the creativity of an African American architect, uh, as well as [T station?] of someone who may, may (inaudible). And I can remember, uh, clearly that during the '50s and the '60s that one could not expect any of those kinds of things to happen, or for Blacks to [take?] those kind of positions, uh, in development of architecture in the United States. [00:15:00] So it was also true that one could not expect to see the works of African American artists anywhere in the museums and galleries of, uh, America, if -- unless, uh, perhaps they were -- how should we put it -- unless perhaps they were, um, part of a collection, and then only if the works were not necessarily reflective of the Black

experience. I mean, you might see them appearing in, in an exhibition, and I'm particularly speaking to a print exhibition that was in the Museum of Fine Arts in the '60s, some years back; it wa-- it was [both Calvin?] (inaudible) and, uh, Wilson had pieces. Um, and I -- hmm. I'm really not sure how I want to comment on this exhibition, except to say that I'm delighted to see the works of people I don't know. Um, I don't know, uh, Earle i-- Pilgrim's work, and I don't know very much about Thompson's work, and so it's exciting for me to see, um, so many examples of their works, uh, which I have never seen before. And I certainly don't know [00:16:00] any of the recent works of Emilio Cruz, so... And they're -- to me, they're quite astounding. [I think they're just?], uh... You know, I'm very, very happy and pleased to see them. Um, and as I think more about what it is I want to say, I'll, I'll get back to you, so I'll let Pat take it from there.

PATRICIA HILLS: Well, first of all, um, Charles is [to be commended?] for actually putting together a very exciting show.

CHARLES GIULIANO: Thank you.

PATRICIA HILLS: And when he asked me to be on the panel, he assured me that there wasn't gonna be any political art, as if he automatically assumed that I would expect more overtly political art. Actually, I think that he's also, uh, uh -- I think you've done a rather daring thing to, in a sense, not emphasize the overtly political art of many Black artists. I mean, it's almost as if we've sort of gone full circle, [00:17:00] and that we went through a phase where -- I mean, "we": I mean the art world; I mean the sort of visible art magazine, art world; I don't mean real art world, which is -- consists of a lot of artists, but the sort of art world of the art magazines and the major galleries -- we went through a period where you saw no Black artists, and then in the 1960s, with, uh, the Civil Rights Movement, artists were making demands of the -- on being shown, and a lot of the art that was expected of Black artists was art that was very angry. And there was a lot of really good angry art. Uh, Benny Andrews, I've seen a lot of really pungent, angry work that he has done. And then it's more or less the, uh -- there was a period -- and I think that the Women's Movement used this phrase: the personal is the political. And I think what you see -- at least what I get from these kinds of works -- is that maybe that phrase, "the personal is the political," can be applied to what's going on here, [00:18:00] that these are, in many ways, personal

statements. But I wouldn't say that the political is really removed from them, and I think that the question of, uh, what is the relevancy of that phrase, "the personal is the political," in terms of this kind of art, and what is the element of politics in works like this. Uh, I mean, maybe I can -- I -- certainly of Benny Andrews, you have one called *Oppression*, which I think is very, uh -- I mean, obviously is making a political statement about the oppression of a man who is wounded, with a chain [over?] there on the side. Uh, the, the figure back there, uh, called *Ecstasy*, with the, the child that's being born, that one might be able to maybe read something into it. There's something rather disturbing as a image of that baby that's being birthed, perhaps, that doesn't have any legs, you know. It's sort of truncated. Um, [00:19:00] but, I mean, one can read a certain amount of symbolism into them. Uh, I think that that's the kind of the question... I mean, in Cruz's work, you have, uh, [images?] that kind of come out at you, that relate, at least in our minds, to all kinds of early Northwest Indian art, and then also the eagle. Now, the eagle, of course, is an image that is -- relates not only to Northwest Indian art, but also one thinks of the bald eagle of, uh, sort of America. Again, I think maybe you have to sort of unravel these pictures, and maybe not put too much -- I mean, not read too much into them. But, uh, there are other qualities... I mean, certainly they share a lot of qualities, but they have a great number of differences.

EDMUND BARRY GAITHER: Now I get to comment before posing the next question. (laughter)

PATRICIA HILLS: All right.

EDMUND BARRY GAITHER: (clears throat) I, I think that, uh, this particular set of works [00:20:00] allow us to pose, uh, a question that really has to do with existential freedom, uh, which is ultimate personal decisionmaking. Uh, I think that, uh, when we look at artistic production, we're looking at at least three elements that are accounted for in one wise or another, not necessarily in a fixed relationship one to the other. They are the context in which things happen, and it's the context which is the essential forge, uh, as an external, uh, pressure on the shaping of American experience, and, and of Black American experience within American experience. I think it's impossible to be born Black in America, and to be socialized in America, and be Black and not know it. And it is not newly that way; it has been that way for a long [00:21:00] time. So I think the concept of identity, in

fundamental racial terms, is virtually a foregone in the context of American experience. The next consideration becomes what's done with that. What's done with it really has to do with the arena of personal decisionmaking, with how the individual forms a self in dialogue with the context. And it's that formation of self, and the struggle to form a self in a shifting set of circumstances, that is, in a certain sense, the catalyst for creative activity, not just in the arts but in music and any area that you find yourself directed towards. I think the third factor is that there are preexisting, [00:22:00] uh, technologies and traditions in the arts. Uh, these men have taken, appropriated to themselves, technologies for making pictures, which already were there before, whether it's canvas and brush, or, in the case of Benny, who has been more inventive, collage techniques, still utilizing approaches to existing materials. So I tend to look at the show and to say, what does it tell us about how, uh, three different -- four different, uh, men, in slightly different contexts, but with a shared root context, responded to the problem of becoming themselves, where they were. For some people, like Benny, the process of being self is [00:23:00] an actively political process, and Benny organizes other artists. Benny challenges things straight ahead. Benny works with themes that are charged themes, with sexism, racism, militarism, with the great isms of our times, and that is a mode of involvement which he has both manifested in his public person and expressed in, in his artistic person. Uh, it seems to me that in the case of Bob Thompson, that he has a closer parallel to what a number of Black writers and musicians have done, which is to, in a certain sense, create, uh, an identity that belongs to a smaller concentric circle, to a kind of circle of people [00:24:00] of very similar ideas and passions. And in your little -- your di-- the discussion of Pilgrim, and we're talking about this world in which, uh, Tim Leary came, it's a little bit an ultimate kind of world that's created, in which you can define on personality a reality which is within the larger one, but not entirely dictated from the larger one. So I think in that context you're looking at very personal resolutions that are expressed more essentially in the person as artist than the person as, as, as politician. Uh, I don't, myself, have a fear of mentioning politics, because I think to be alive is to be political, and we are all involved in, uh, promoting one thing or another, if nothing more than ourselves, as a [00:25:00] condition of terms of survival, so we're all

involved in prejudice in things, in ways that are affirmative to us. So I think that that kind of issue is also, uh, raised, and in the case of Mr. Pilgrim's work, I really don't know him, and I'm grateful to be introduced to him, because I'm, of course, interested to know everybody who belongs to the story, and not, not knowing him before, and, in fact, not having encountered in Boston, uh, among the artists whom I know very well, anyone else who has mentioned him, he comes like a vision, uh, that was both there and not there in the same setting at the same time, and that is itself worth a little bit of thought and exploration, because Boston is not a large city and is not a large community of people involved in things. That's [00:26:00] using up all of my time for end comment. Now, let me --

__: You didn't say about Cruz in your...

EDMUND BARRY GAITHER: Okay, for Emilio... (laughs) Well, uh, the work of Emilio's which I actually knew best were the works similar to the ones that I presented in 1970, which were more, uh... Well, they were less, less profoundly expressive than these. They were more controlled works. In fact, I think that the works which I showed in '70 were, uh, were large hard-edged works, and very precise. They were not, not this gutsy work. In this work, uh, the two things that stood out to me were, one, that they have an immense vigor in the surface, in the actual working of the medium, in the turn of the material, [00:27:00] and the globs of the color, which I, uh, take to be part of the kind of, uh, passion that he himself has. So I take it to be a very directly expressive, uh -- a, a -- you might say a [mode of?] expression of internal energy. The iconography, the symbols, uh, interesting to me, but I have not studied them, uh, sufficiently that I would assert what they mean. I have a response to them, on what they present. The response to the eagle, I think, is inescapable. I don't think it's very possible to encounter, uh, such a brave eagle without it, uh, being interpreted to reference to American experience. So I, I think that, uh, unless Emilio's saying you absolutely got the wrong thing, I would stand by that. [00:28:00] The -- well, you can't always believe what artists say, anyhow, you know. (laughter) The first thing you have to learn is to always take what artists say with a grain of salt, because if there's anything that speaking about yourself has built into it, it's a certain personal vision of the best light in which you ought to be seen, which is not always -- not the job of the critic. The job of the critic

is really to try to see in a larger light, and to be informed by the thought of the artist, but not governed by it. Uh, the second, uh, work, which has the Pacific Northwest images in it, it, uh, calls to my mind the rather considerable interest in, uh, ritual that has been a large feature for a number of American artists over what is now at least a half decade, uh, both from, uh, performance arts people, who want to [00:29:00] recreate rituals, and other people who want to create masks of various sorts. And I think that, uh, that interest is related to spiritual vacuum, uh, I mean, at a larger level, because I think there is a general feeling in American life that, uh, we don't always touch base with the heart of things, and still a certain tendency to think that other people, who are especially non-Western, have done better at it than we have. It remains to be seen if that's true. They certainly haven't made any atomic bombs to get rid of us. Now, for, uh --

___: They're workin' on it.

EDMUND BARRY GAITHER: They're working on it? (laughs)
Uh, I, I, I think, uh, in the case here, I mean, this is, again, looking at the mask, and I think it allies more nearly to what I said for the previous one, and that's as much as I would be willing to say without [00:30:00] doing more. Now, Pat wants to add something, so here she's going to...

PATRICIA HILLS: Well, I want to, uh, be the moderator for a moment. (laughter)

EDMUND BARRY GAITHER: All right. This is --

PATRICIA HILLS: And say that --

EDMUND BARRY GAITHER: -- a revolving panel.

PATRICIA HILLS: And say that, as you were describing these four men, what I'm hearing, although you're not using these words, is that somehow you don't consider them, quote, "mainstream," end quote. Maybe it's a word that's not terribly relevant, but on the other hand that's what I'm sort of getting from what you're saying, that, uh, Thompson is working in smaller and smaller concentric circles, a sense of personality. What I'm hearing is that you're saying that they're not mainstream, and does that -- is that what you're saying?

EDMUND BARRY GAITHER: Well, no, that is not what I'm saying.

PATRICIA HILLS: And if you're saying it, [is it a validity?]

EDMUND BARRY GAITHER: It's not what I'm saying.

DANA CHANDLER: But before he responds, I would like to ask

you, then: what is mainstream?

PATRICIA HILLS: Well, that's what I'm asking him, too.

DANA CHANDLER: Okay. (laughter)

EDMUND BARRY GAITHER: Okay, well, I'll, [00:31:00] I'll respond, because it's a nice question. Uh, no, it is not what I mean. I, I don't generally refer to mainstream. I don't think that it's a particularly meaningful con...

END OF AUDIO FILE

AAA_wilsjudi_8171_m

EDMUND BARRY GAITHER: -- one and the same as the sum of what is creatively vital and important at any particular point. So I wouldn't, uh, have raised it in terms of the mainstream. I would -- I, I talk about the works in two, two ways. One, I think that people do, in fact, belong to communities that ultimately support them, and that are small. So to belong to a community that is a community of artists, let's say, which is a necessarily small community, does not reduce you or take you out of anything; it merely says that there is a community of sustenance based around some idea or motivation or set of experiences that people pull together around, and I think that that is a vitalizing factor. The, uh, question of mainstream, I think, does not matter [00:01:00] so much, because I can't imagine who would want to think of his work or her work as secondary. The, the fact of producing the work and putting it forward is the affirmation of the work as having a central value that then may not be stratified. So I would reject, uh, thinking of works in terms of mainstream and not mainstream, and consider those as unfortunate devices that have done lots of damage to the contemporary discussion, not only of work of Black American artists but of the work of any artists who have not found themselves at the top of discussion and, uh, dominating the marketplace. Charles?

CHARLES GIULIANO: I'm interested in the, uh, notion you brought up about, uh, subcultures, or cultures within cultures, and that -- and this -- and your whole point about [00:02:00] personal decisionmaking, and, and how that relates to these artists. Uh, when you said that you feel that you have kept up on who's who in Boston, in terms of the, uh, the Black art community, and that --

EDMUND BARRY GAITHER: I said I try to.

CHARLES GIULIANO: Or you try to, and then everyone you talk to, um, has said that they didn't know Earle Pilgrim, I, I think that that raises an interesting point, because, uh, Earle was a celebrity in Boston, an absolute celebrity,

but he was in a subculture that was not necessarily the main body of what you would consider the Black community, that, uh, Bob Thompson and Earle Pilgrims would be examples of, of, of Black artists who were really in the kind of subculture we call a hipster jazz literary subculture, in the sense that I think it's very, very important to realize that Jo-- Bob Thompson's world was almost fluidly equally [00:03:00] a jazz world --

EDMUND BARRY GAITHER: Mm-hmm, yeah.

CHARLES GIULIANO: -- and an art world, and the, the jazz world was not talking to the art world, and the art world is not talking to the jazz world. They're two entirely separate entities. And one of the things that's quite amazing is that there has always been a lot of racial contact and interaction and crossover in the jazz world. Uh, you know, I grew up in Boston going to jazz nightclubs, and, and, uh, having integrated experiences in a city that is notorious for its racism, and yet if you went to Storyville, uh, what I used to -- I remember my uncle took me to see Duke Ellington when I was 16 years of age, and I remember s-- that room, uh, in the old Copley, uh, Hotel, that room, uh, painted in black, brown, and beige, which is the theme of a very famous composition by Duke Ellington, and that they had Black waitresses and white waitresses, and they had Black couples and white couples, and that there were [00:04:00] tables where you had, uh, you know, interracial couples, and that was something that was very, very, very striking, and natural if you were involved in the jazz world, as opposed to the art world, which had a huge rift between the white art world and the Black art world, and they had not, uh, had any confluence or crossover at all. Uh, and, as a matter of fact, uh, Bob Thompson was a celebrity in the jazz world, that when he died, isn't it true that albums were dedicated to him, and, and record jacket covers, and so on and so forth? And yet, by the same token, the, the, the artists that were part of his entourage were, were not capable of making the crossover into his world. It was a -- it was a guy -- almost a schizophrenia of working in two worlds. One world was the drug hipster subculture world of, of musicians. If you see that wonderful painting that was shown [in Hartford?] in the summer program, *Garden of Music*, which has the whole [00:05:00] cast of characters in there -- Coltrane and Coleman and, uh, uh, Charlie Haden and, and, uh, all the different kinds of people. And people in the jazz world weren't looking so much at color of skin, you know, like that, uh, Charlie Haden, for instance, was in

that painting, who was a friend of Bob Thompson's, very intimate friend of Jackie McLean. They were part of the, the bebop culture. And I think that, uh, uh, a play that, that always encapsulated that feeling for me wonderfully was, uh, if you ever saw Jack Gelber's play at the Living Theatre in the 1960s, a play called *The Connection*, fantastic play, and it was all about that kind of subculture. So I'm not surprised that you're not aware of Earle in that sense, 'cause Earle's world was not the world of the Black community or the white community. As a matter of fact, uh, Benny commented to me this summer that he felt that, that artists like, uh, Earle Pilgrim and, and Benny Andrews -- [00:06:00] uh, I'm sorry, Bob Thompson -- even Sam Gilliam and, uh, Elizab-- uh, Ellen Ban-- um, Ellen --

___: Banks?

___: Banks?

CHARLES GIULIANO: -- Banks, the Black artist here in Boston, that those artists have suffered for the fact that their work was not identifiably Black, and that Bob Thompson's work was not identifiably a Black art, uh, during the social protests of 1960s. And it's very interesting that you did not put Bob Thompson in your (inaudible) --

EDMUND BARRY GAITHER: [I wouldn't?] (overlapping dialogue; inaudible).

CHARLES GIULIANO: -- in 1970.

EDMUND BARRY GAITHER: It doesn't really have -- uh, uh --

CHARLES GIULIANO: So that in a sense, uh --

EDMUND BARRY GAITHER: -- I don't think that's --

CHARLES GIULIANO: -- you know, the -- what -- what's interesting is that even, you know --

___: Mm-hmm.

CHARLES GIULIANO: -- what we have here is an interesting question of what is Black art -- you know, is Sa-- is Sam Gilliam Black art; is Bob Thompson Black art; is Emilio Cruz Black art; is Earle Pilgrim Black art --

EDMUND BARRY GAITHER: That certainly is a question, but I, I think that you, uh, uh, [00:07:00] misframe a little bit --

CHARLES GIULIANO: Oh, I'm sure.

EDMUND BARRY GAITHER: -- the --

CHARLES GIULIANO: I'm sure.

EDMUND BARRY GAITHER: -- the comment that, uh, that you made, vis-a-vis, uh, the difference between the jazz world and the art world. I think that the difference is really very -- uh, the structural difference, which is not to say

all of the elaborations but the structural difference, I don't think it's too hard to put a finger on. The structural difference was that in the visual arts world there were not institutions giving a focus to the people who were working, so they were mainly working as, uh, individuals where they could find an alliance with a particular supporter, and then they were with that supporter, and they were introduced into that supporter's circle. And people were trying to find a gallery, hit or miss, on various terms, some [00:08:00] fair and some quite compromised. But essentially they were working more as individuals in a sort of linear way. Uh, if you looked at, in Boston, a career like that of, uh, for example, John Wilson's career, which is a career starting in the beginning of the '40s, uh, I think you would tend to see that it goes that way, and the absence of an institutional support to create a forum that would have pulled together groups of people was the central absence. In the case of the jazz world, the jazz world is also a commercial world. It's pulled together around the night spot where the event happens and the money is made, and much of it spent, so, in a certain sense, it is, uh -- it is its own patronage, and, and that's the difference. The difference is a question of patronage --

__: (overlapping dialogue; inaudible) --

EDMUND BARRY GAITHER: -- because patronage is fundamental [00:09:00] to, to what things belong to.

__: Jazz is entertainment.

EDMUND BARRY GAITHER: Well, that it's entertainment is fine, but, more important, that it's commercial.

__: It's commercial.

DANA CHANDLER: I'd like to (inaudible). I'd like to add to the issue.

EDMUND BARRY GAITHER: Okay.

DANA CHANDLER: You go where you get fed. Okay, now let me explain what I mean by that. If you're a visual artist, and you -- your ego is such that you want what you do to be seen, then there are two determinations that you make: either you make a world where you get fed, or you go where you get fed; and if you go where you get fed, then very largely what you will do will, will reflect the world in which you travel, and if the world in which you travel has institutions that will allow your work to be seen, then perhaps you will create things that you think will be acceptable to the world, uh, that will allow your things to be seen. If, however, your ego is such where you do not intend to create works, um, that will, uh, reflect the

world in which you travel that will allow you to get fed, then [00:10:00] maybe you have to work on getting -- creating that world. Maybe you have to struggle and strive and push and, and, and, and challenge everything that goes on. I think that Benny belongs to the category of people who created a world in which he could be fed. And I cannot speak to the other people because I don't know enough about their works to comment on that, but I do know that an example of what I'm talking about sits presently over in the Museum of Fine Arts, and is called Boston Collectives. And when you wander through that, uh, exhibition, you don't see the works of, of a large number of African American artists. You see --

___: [There's one?].

DANA CHANDLER: I think there's one. There's one piece by an African American. I'm trying to remember the man's name now. Uh, he recently had a very excellent article (inaudible) in the *Globe*. Um, he usually painted in black and white, does black and white paintings? (inaudible), but that's not the point that I'm tryin' to get at. What I'm tryin' to get at is that you don't find the Benny Andrews as part of a collection. These are [00:11:00] not just Boston painters, and you -- these are painters that have been collected nationwide, and you don't find, uh, Emilio Cruz's work, and you don't find Bob Thompson's work, and you don't find a number of other people's work, and that -- and that may be a reflection of the people who curated the show; it may be a reflection of a lot of things. But the point that I'm trying to get to is that artists, like most other people, want to be recognized for that which they do. And if you take a particular tack in your work, which talks about reflecting the imagery, um, of a people who have -- who have never been and are not in the -- in, in the near future likely to be in the economic position where they can create the institutions where the things that speak to their own culture can come about in a large and visible way for the entire [great?] community, then you go somewhere else with your thing, you see. And what I'm seeing a lot of, of African American artists do is go somewhere else with their thing. Uh, I think of people [00:12:00] like Basquiat and some other folks, um, whose work I don't think reflect the Black American experience but do reflect a larger experience, and I'm not really sure whether that larger experience is real or contrived, you know, to, to fit or suit whatever, uh, is necessary to get food in one's mouth --

EDMUND BARRY GAITHER: What is --

DANA CHANDLER: -- and food in one's mind.

EDMUND BARRY GAITHER: What is your response to, to artists like Sam Gilliam or Ellen Banks, vis-a-vis the question of --

DANA CHANDLER: Well, uh, you know --

EDMUND BARRY GAITHER: -- of Black artists?

DANA CHANDLER: -- I, I think I took some umbrage at the, uh, (laughs) statement that they suffered, uh, because of their, their, uh, choice to not really work in, in a Black American vernacular.

EDMUND BARRY GAITHER: Now --

DANA CHANDLER: That's what I heard.

EDMUND BARRY GAITHER: -- bear in mind that I'm quoting Benny Andrews.

DANA CHANDLER: All right, no, I'm saying that I (overlapping dialogue; inaudible) --

EDMUND BARRY GAITHER: I'm quoting -- I'm quoting Benny Andrews, 'cause I (overlapping dialogue; inaudible) --

DANA CHANDLER: Fine, and I, I still take umbrage. I take umbrage to the statement --

EDMUND BARRY GAITHER: I think -- I think that he -- I think he meant --

DANA CHANDLER: Because I think --

EDMUND BARRY GAITHER: -- in the sense -- in the sense of whether, whether he was (overlapping dialogue; inaudible) --

DANA CHANDLER: -- uh, let me (inaudible) Charlie (inaudible) finish, Charlie.

CHARLES GIULIANO: Okay.

DANA CHANDLER: Thanks, Charlie. What I'm saying is that, um, that we all suffer, and artists [00:13:00] in general in this country suffer, uh, because this is not a country that's about art, you know, at least not for anything that I have seen. I think it's a country that uses art for one purpose or another, as decoration, or to make, uh, people look good, but I don't see it as, as, as being as important, say, for instance, as a (inaudible) -- as it being an integral part of the cultures, uh, out of which it comes, like in Africa and, as a matter of fact, in Europe and places like that. So I think everybody suffers when they choose visual arts as a field, generally speaking, and I think that some people suffer more than others, and I -- you know, in terms of, of noting artists trying to survive off their own work, I note the Black American artist has suffered more than most. Uh, I note that the Black woman artist has suffered more than most women artists, and they're still suffering in terms of the whole idea of

finding, uh, their work acceptable so that it comes into the purview of the whole American economic thing. So I, I -- what I, you know, um... I guess what it really boils down to is that while I can feel great delight, um, at seeing an ex-- exhibition of works such as one sees here, one knows that it is an exhibition of the works of Black artists, and one also knows that one -- we cannot expect to see it, um, as part of what the mainstream is, which, of course, is what exactly is over at the Museum of Fine Arts right now. That is the mainstream. And the mainstream, that word really connotes just one thing: acceptable. Okay? And, uh, um, we have not managed -- if we have an interest, which I don't -- uh, in becoming acceptable in, in the larger American context. And that's really what [I'm commenting on?].

PATRICIA HILLS: Um, I just want to (inaudible). You're -- you, uh, are choosing to be outside. That's what you're saying?

DANA CHANDLER: It's not so much of --

PATRICIA HILLS: Outside of a group, mainstream, i.e. the show, contemporary, at the, um, you know, Boston --
___: Choosing?

PATRICIA HILLS: -- (overlapping dialogue; inaudible).

DANA CHANDLER: No, no, I'm not [00:15:00] choosing (inaudible). I just don't see how many of us will get inside without pushing [through?].

PATRICIA HILLS: Well, what about the word "compromise"? I mean, it's not just... You know, one goes where there's -- you know, you, you made the comment that you go where you get (inaudible) that you can get food, you know, where you can get fed, where you make a world, where you can get the... I mean, isn't there a time when one chooses not to eat in order to make certain statements, or...?

DANA CHANDLER: I think it's exactly what artists have done, and I'm particularly speaking of artists of color, who have chosen not to eat very often in order to make the kind of statements we thought were pertinent to what was going on around us, because [we're?] artists, so artists are largely affected by what's going on around them, and often react, uh, [proact?] and interact, as well. Um... But I don't think that any -- 'cause all of us don't... Most of the artists I know who work in a [00:16:00] social vein don't only just do social things, okay, and have found that whether or not they do social things, of course, or things which fit into the larger, um, um, American picture (inaudible), uh, still find themselves in the same position. I don't see how artists who have done things

which are socially relevant have done any worse or better than artists who have not. You know, um, I just haven't seen it yet. I don't -- I don't find (overlapping dialogue; inaudible) --

EDMUND BARRY GAITHER: Yeah, you know, vis-a-vis this business of the mainstream, that two really big points I think ought to be made, because, uh, it can be a recycling discussion, but it's not really useful. From my point of view, the fundamental obligation of an artist in shaping creative expression is to be personally honest, and to feel what is to be said. If nothing is felt, there's nothing vital that's [00:17:00] going to be said. What is felt is not the function -- uh, at, at least, I don't think should be the function -- of a calculation of how to, uh, be viable, uh, [one place?]. I think there has to be some internal strength and reason and [community?], and I think when that's missing, you experience it as missing in the work that is, is finally [entered?]. So I think that there's a passion that is fundamental, and that relates to, to the observation I made at the beginning about existential freedom, because you cannot become your own person, and have your own voice, and put something out that people can respond to as real, unless it, in fact, is real, and comes from within. That is a separate issue than the issue of mainstream. The issue of mainstream belongs to the world of curators and critics and journalists and writers and [00:18:00] galleries. It belongs to the world that is about the thing and not the thing itself. It is a world that is orchestrated, that is like any market, an orchestrated item. So to work with a sense of, of how to belong to the mainstream, I think from the point of view of where the artist must come from, is, is a wrong position. I think the obligation falls to those of us who don't necessarily produce art, but are in the business of talking about it and presenting it, to try to put forth the visions of what we believe are the works that are important to be seen, and to try to generate the maximum impact that those can generate, and to try to demolish the tendency to close the doors of what things are appropriate at particular points in time, and who [00:19:00] is valid and who is invalid. Those are not meaningful notions, and if you accept them as categories, you accept having a great [uphill?], which is the acceptable, and then having everybody else in some kind of basement. And whoever has made a valid creative statement belongs to this level, no matter whether a critic says so or not, no matter whether a particular institution puts them there or not. They belong

there, because they spoke truthfully. They found the right container for the thing contained, which is the job of the artist: to make the picture right to contain what it has to contain. And when we see it, we will have a dialogue with it. The language around the art, which is -- I mean, the language is, in a certain sense, almost superfluous. I remember when I was in graduate school, if I can be tolerated one short story, [00:20:00] uh, I had to, to do a, a paper. Uh, this was in criticism. And I think we got issued an ashtray, a quite simple little glass ashtray, like millions from all over the place. Well, you could write 12 pages about it. All you had to do was posit a starting point, and make it... It's like law: it doesn't have to do with the correctness. You posit a position, and then you extrapolate from the position. And that is detrimental to the meaning of things, but it is, unfortunately, often the case in criticism that you wonder if the person really saw the work, because it's about the language, not about the thing, Charles, [because who?] uses language. (laughter) He's a journalist.

CHARLES GIULIANO: I thought you -- I thought you were just going to be the moderator. (overlapping dialogue; inaudible) --

EDMUND BARRY GAITHER: I-I-I'm returning my role as moderator.

CHARLES GIULIANO: Uh, [00:21:00] I'd like to make a comment. This, this is a mainstream exhibition, and it was curated by a mainstream critic, a wheeler and dealer, a powerbroker in the art world, such as the world [has ever known?]. Uh --

__: (inaudible). (laughter)

CHARLES GIULIANO: -- you're not the only person that can have their own fan club. And I think my membership's a little broader, too, but nevertheless.

__: I just wanted you to be specific. (laughter)

CHARLES GIULIANO: Okay, well, no beating around the bush. But I, I think that's an important point, and I think that it's very -- that I'm very honored to have, uh, Pat here with us today, because Pat's a mainstream powerbroker, heavy-duty wheeler-dealer in the art world today, vis-a-vis the fact that the *New York Times* went through the trouble today to, uh, to review the Sargent exhibition that she curated for the Whitney Museum of American Art, is bringing 7,000 [00:22:00] people a week to --

PATRICIA HILLS: A weekend.

CHARLES GIULIANO: -- uh, a weekend -- to the Whitney Museum of American Art, that; that Pat Hills is such a

powerful powerbroker in the art world today that the *New York Times*, in their review in the Sunday [*Times?*] today went so far as to take the trouble to completely leave her name out of the review. That's power. (laughter) When they're -- when they're so -- when they're so afraid of the -- of the threat that you represent to, to their assumptions, that they had to go to all the trouble to, to disinvite you from the review, then I think that's a comment. I think it's a very, very important comment that, that, uh, people like Pat and myself, who are, are part of the white world of, uh, the power establishment of the art world, each in our own little ways, are interested and make the commitment to doing exhibitions like this, or Pat's involvement this summer with the, uh, traveling exhibition of, of [00:23:00] Jacob Lawrence, and, and contributing a catalog to, to that effort. But I think that, that it's efforts like this that, that make these issues part of the mainstream, and increase the likelihood that, uh, that these works do get into important collections.

EDMUND BARRY GAITHER: Charles, what is the --

CHARLES GIULIANO: And that, for instance, I would add to that, also, uh, for instance, another example would be this past summer, for instance, I think it was tremendously important that the, uh, Wadsworth Atheneum in Hartford mounted Bob Thompson in, in its MATRIX program, and that Bob was, uh, reviewed in the *New York Times*, and said, uh, in effect, this is a very, very important artist. And *Art & Antiques*, in the current issue, lists, uh, Bob Thompson among 25 most neglected, undervalued artists in America. I think it's a matter of time before the, uh, art establishment, quote-unquote, works up to the -- wakes up to the fact that these are important artists that are existing under their noses, and that they're unaware of them, [00:24:00] and my response to that is to hell with them. Let them drop dead. You know, when they wake up, uh --

EDMUND BARRY GAITHER: I want someone to tell us what the other stream is.

CHARLES GIULIANO: What stream?

EDMUND BARRY GAITHER: I mean, you said the mainstream. What's the other stream? This is like people that say "the third world." Is -- what's the other world? This is one world. So, again, I want to hear what the other one is, since we're --

PATRICIA HILLS: (inaudible) --

EDMUND BARRY GAITHER: -- talking about...

PATRICIA HILLS: All right.

EDMUND BARRY GAITHER: I mean, uh, uh, I know --

DANA CHANDLER: (overlapping dialogue; inaudible) --

EDMUND BARRY GAITHER: -- in a narrow sense what that means, but I want to hear what it means, really.

DANA CHANDLER: I would also want to hear, [just with that?], uh, just what exactly is meant by "compromise." Compromise with what? With whom? Under what circumstances? To what purpose? Just, just for some clarity, (inaudible).

PATRICIA HILLS: All right, uh, well, when I use the word "compromise," compromising in terms of not being so concerned about getting fed -- I mean, getting fed. And when you were talking about getting fed, I think you meant --

___: Mm-hmm.

PATRICIA HILLS: -- getting fed in terms of, you know, getting rent money and getting food to put in your mouth. I mean, there's other ways that one is being fed, and, [00:25:00] you know, and maybe you, you make... When I'm saying -- when I talk about compromise --

___: (inaudible).

PATRICIA HILLS: Well, okay, when you talked about you go where you get fed, and you m-- or you make a world where you get fed, are you talking about sort of getting money to feed yourself and your family, or do you mean that kind of spiritual food that, that sustains you? I mean, that (overlapping dialogue; inaudible) --

DANA CHANDLER: Well, absolutely, uh, because one can't... There are -- there are a number of artists who are here presently --

PATRICIA HILLS: Right.

DANA CHANDLER: -- who have spent many years making sure that they are physically fed, and have done very well at it.

PATRICIA HILLS: Uh-huh.

DANA CHANDLER: You know, that was not necessarily the reason, um, for them remaining artists, visual artists. It was a spiritual feeding --

PATRICIA HILLS: Uh-huh.

DANA CHANDLER: -- and a, a, a social feeding, um, and a -- perhaps a community, uh, feeding that we are more interested in. Also, there's a feeding that has to do, in a sense, [00:26:00] with ego, with ego in its place and in its context with culture. That is to say, when one comes -- when one fin-- finally comes to understand that one comes from a culture that values art as an interest part of, of the being, uh -- of being on the Earth, and then

comes to a culture which does not value art, there's an integral part, uh, of the being of the world. And I don't mean value in the sense that, that everybody in the culture doesn't value art, but I mean the larger culture itself doesn't. It's a very difficult, uh, place to be. But if you are a survivor, then of course you find the things that are necessary to feed you, physically, and if you're also a survivor then you begin to work on creating the places where you can be fed, in all the other ways that you can be fed. And I'm saying that the struggle is an intense one, it's a long-term one, that sometimes it's a life-lasting one, where you finish up and you haven't gotten that emotional [00:27:00] thing happening for you, uh, but then all of a sudden when you die, which is one of the ma-- uh, favorite American things for all artists is when we die, your work suddenly achieves some of the importance that it never had when we were living, which can be hilariously funny if you're not the one that died. Um, and so I'm speaking about all of those kind of things. I'm not speaking about the, the, the -- it's obvious that I have gotten myself fed. You know, I mean, no one can deny (laughter) that I, you know... All my life I've been about this size. You know, I was a chubby little boy, and I grew up, and, and I'm still chunky, so that's never been the problem, but there has been an ongoing struggle to make sure not only that I was fed spiritually, but that I was of some resource to other artists to help, uh, to ease that struggle for them. Doesn't necessarily mean it was always appreciated or seen in the right way, right? That was part of that, [that struggle?]. That's what I'm talking about. So I'm curious of what we're talking about in the word "compromise." That's why I asked [00:28:00] the question.

PATRICIA HILLS: Well, I, I, I want to, uh -- maybe I'll get back to this, but I want to raise another issue that has been a kind of, uh, pet peeve of mine, and that is that I see -- I've talked to a lot of artists who are involved with political art and social art, art that makes a social statement, and it always strikes me as really strange. And I have one particular artist in mind. I won't mention his name. He's a Boston artist who does these political paintings, year in --

DANA CHANDLER: I know.

PATRICIA HILLS: -- and year out. (laughs) Those poli-- not you, Dana, but, uh --

DANA CHANDLER: I know, and that -- then that leaves one other choice. (laughs)

PATRICIA HILLS: Year in -- year in and year out he does

these enormous political putting-- paintings, and then he puts a price on them of about \$5,000, \$6,000, and I'm not saying that they're not worth that much --

___: Mm-hmm.

PATRICIA HILLS: -- but the people who got the money are not gonna buy those pictures, because they don't like the message. The rest of us who likes those paintings can't afford it. So I said to this one particular artist, "Why don't you do [00:29:00] silkscreens?" Because he does a kind of art that would translate very well into silkscreen. You know, "Why don't you do silkscreens, and then sell them, you know, 70 -- you know, \$50, something that maybe somebody can afford?" And he said no. He says what he wants to do, he wants to do in paint; he's not interested at all in the silkscreen. So there (inaudible) kind of, uh, uh, you know, a puzzle. I mean, if you want to reach people with a certain kind of message, or have an audience, then why not do something that people can afford, or why not...? Maybe --

DANA CHANDLER: Adjust to the needs of the audience.

PATRICIA HILLS: Of, of the audience that you're looking for. So you find -- I mean, this is a kind of problem. There's another artist, a New York artist, whose show was canceled at a large museum because of the political... It had to do with New York's real estate, had to do with political content. So I suggested to him, "These are nice pictures. What you've done is terrific. Let's set this up

outside, you know, on Fifth Avenue and 110th Street.

[00:30:00] You get a lot of people walking by who might be interested in the way you relate real estate interests and the Rockefellers and the, uh, United Baptist Church." He wasn't interested at all. He wants to have his work shown in a museum context; otherwise, he's a political artist. He's been a political artist for many years. So these two incidents kinda stick in my head as to who do artists think their audience are, and how can they really reach them? And you can't reach them if you're going to make that art inaccessible to them. I mean, that's one of the nice things about a university art gallery: you get a lot of students here.

DANA CHANDLER: But, you see, most of us -- most of us -- and you're, you're saying "artists" -- most of the artists that, that I can think of have exhibited in all the places that you're talking about: on the street, in churches, uh, in Y's, uh, in parks, in basements, in attics. We've exhibited everywhere that was open for us to exhibit, and

when there weren't places open for us to exhibit we created the [00:31:00] places, okay? AMARP is a creation. You know, and that says, okay, we're going to create a space for people to exhibit where there was none before, you know, and one does thank God that there were some people who were men-- who were amenable to it that don't belong to [the context?] where you find yourself --

CHARLES GIULIANO: Well --

DANA CHANDLER: -- but... (laughs)

CHARLES GIULIANO: -- some people -- some people are leaving, and I want to make a comment before they go, because, uh, this is Leonard and, and [Annemarie?] Lewis who, uh -- here, and who are, are joining us today, who have donated to us...

END OF AUDIO FILE

AAA_wilsjudi_8172_m

CHARLES GIULIANO: You are --

PATRICIA HILLS: Oh, that's the point! That's the whole point!

CHARLES GIULIANO: The -- uh, you're taking my --
__: (overlapping dialogue; inaudible).

CHARLES GIULIANO: -- you're taking away my punch-- punchline, and I apologize to Dana for interrupting, because I know that they're, they're leaving, and, uh, I wanted to catch them before they went. But I think they raised a very, very important point. They, they have (inaudible) over 30 Emilio Cruzes in their collection. They are among the most active collectors of Emilio Cruz. They have a, a very representative Andrews. They have, um, the five superb Bob Thompsons that we see here. They have been very, very deeply committed to Expressionist, Humanist artists over a long period of time, are very, very deeply committed collectors, and have joined us here today as a part of that commitment. Uh, they were among the 90 collections that were seen by the Museum of Fine Arts, and last night we were commiserating with each other -- we had a dinner of the (inaudible), (laughter) uh, that, uh, [00:01:00] that I was not invited to the, uh -- to the opening, because I am the persona non grata at the Museum of Fine Arts because of my outspoken position. And the, uh, Lewises, who I consider to be among Boston's most unique collectors, in terms of having a very specific point of view and not just, um, picking up art magazines and looking at what they see, but what I suggest is that one of the things that I think is very, very important is that

there be more interaction and networking of people that have mutual interests, that that is part of what it's all about, is that, you know, if you want to see these artists in the Museum of Fine Arts, if you want to see progress, there has to be more interaction between people like the, the Lewises that are committed collectors, and, uh, you know, more exchange with -- between people like Barry and Dana and myself and, and Pat, and, and, you know, other people that are colleagues, in terms of, of making more visible and raising these issues, and, and making more of [00:02:00] an awareness [and a presence?], that basic-- uh, when, when Leonard said to me last night, "Can ya believe that?" That, you know, they came, they, they saw it, they came back, they looked at everything, they looked at the house, the office, the house on the Cape. They saw every single thing that was in their collection. They extended every courtesy, and that it's really -- in itself, it's an insult. It's a blow. It's something you take personally, uh, because, you know, again, it comes down to the question: why is the mainstream -- if, in this case, we mean the Museum of Fine Arts -- why are they simply not interested in artists of this kind, you know?

PATRICIA HILLS: (inaudible) [new work?] that they were interested in.

DANA CHANDLER: Let me do a quick -- let me do a quick commiseration, because, I mean, I really do understand how you feel, because there was a recent exhibition called *Boston Expressionists*, of which I had been one for more than 20 years, and exhibited all over the country, and I wasn't in it.

CHARLES GIULIANO: You didn't read my review (overlapping dialogue; inaudible).

DANA CHANDLER: (overlapping dialogue; inaudible) --

CHARLES GIULIANO: I said you should've been in the show.

DANA CHANDLER: [00:03:00] Thank you very much.

CHARLES GIULIANO: I paid you a compliment and you didn't even know about it. (laughter)

DANA CHANDLER: That's true, I didn't know. But I -- I'd like --

CHARLES GIULIANO: But I, I said that you and [Earle?] should be in that show?

DANA CHANDLER: -- I'd like to make you an offer, in terms of your, your collection. Uh, when AMARP opens over at, uh, at 11 (inaudible) Street, we're going to have a total of five galleries, and I want you to, one, go over and just take a look at the gallery spaces, and if you think they're interesting enough, and you wanna have an exhibition of the

works that you have in your collection, you got it. Check it out. Okay, and (inaudible)...

M1: Can I say something?

EDMUND BARRY GAITHER: Sure.

M1: We were about 15 minutes late here, 'cause we walked through that *Boston Collects*, and, um, when I finished walking through, if you'd said to me, "What would you like?", I had difficulty getting over four pieces, literally. And I think that one thing, the way we were trained, and trained to understand art, is that you ought not separate it [00:04:00] as black or white. If I had my wish right now, I would pick this whole collection up and set it right down in that room, and then like to see the look on people's face as they walk by, 'cause I think the vigor that's walking around in this room would demolish what's over there.

___: Mm-hmm.

M1: So that it's not a color line, and it's not a sex line, whether it's male, female, Black, or white. That disappears. We're talking about a certain vigor and a certain truthfulness, as Barry and you had pointed out, in the painter, in the painting. That stuff over there is pretty sweet, and glitzy, and it's all passive, whereas this has got a certain passion, anger --

___: [I know?].

M1: -- gentleness, and yet emotion to it. And that's what you're talkin' about.

___: [And also artists?].

M1: Oh, that's, that's the fundamental bridge.

EDMUND BARRY GAITHER: Thank you for coming. I know you were about to...

M1: [00:05:00] Thank you for (inaudible).

PATRICIA HILLS: I loved the word you used when you said there was no angst. No angst.

M1: No angst over there at all. I mean, now, there's some very, very good pieces there, but if you listen to what Peter Saul will tell you, they bought what they should, but that doesn't necessarily make it good.

___: [Right?].

PATRICIA HILLS: Well, I think what Barry was talking about --

___: (inaudible).

PATRICIA HILLS: Well, it's just, you know, that, uh, y-your criteria is what is felt, you know, and you've -- you used the words "must be," and "internal reason" or "commitment," [a passion?] that is fundamental. And I think that what you do get in the so-called mainstream art

is a passionless art, a correctness --

___: Mm-hmm.

PATRICIA HILLS: -- a formalism, you see. And one, uh, would not think -- the first thing you think of when you look at these Cruz paintings is not the formalism, but the message, the intensity, [00:06:00] and, as you say, the vigor, and, and the, the passion. Afterwards, you begin to look at the formal qualities, whereas over there, there's something very correct. Even in that room, where you've got the Clyfford Still and the Rothko, with the black and white in between, I don't think of those paintings, I think, oh, this is a wall that has black and white in the middle, and sort of yellow-ish paintings on either side, (laughter) you know, and then this wall... You think of it in terms of the wall rather than these individual works.

DANA CHANDLER: Which is probably how it was hung.

PATRICIA HILLS: Which is the way it was hung. It was very -- it's very tasteful.

___: [I wish?] (overlapping dialogue; inaudible) --

___: (inaudible) indict formalism under that (laughs) context.

PATRICIA HILLS: What?

___: I said I wish you wouldn't indict formalism as not felt.

___: Thank you.

___: There are formalists --

___: Thank you.

___: Good luck.

___: -- (inaudible).

PATRICIA HILLS: Right. Well, thank you.

___: (inaudible)?

EDMUND BARRY GAITHER: Well, yes, as, as soon as you give the chair back to the moderator (inaudible). (laughter) I, I think I would like to ask Judith Wilson [00:07:00] if she would like to make some comments, vis-a-vis (inaudible) advanced degree on Bob Thompson, and, uh, [this?] little research, and thinking about him." And then I would like to make the opportunity for anyone else to add or raise other issues or questions.

JUDITH WILSON: Well, um, I guess the one thing I would s-- want to throw in, and, and I'm saying all this, and I would like to make clear very conditionally I'm in the middle of my research, uh, the middle of my writing. I'm sure that this time next year I will look back on many of the things I am saying and, you know, with great distress. Um, but I'm struck, um, with this show, um, as a whole, um, in the way that it bridges certain known and unknown, or known and

less known, phenomena [in recent?] art. Um, and I'm thinking of this in terms of [00:08:00] how, um, how I think we have generally conceived of the recent history of Afro-American art, um, as well as the recent history of American art across the boards. I think a show like this is filling in the gaps in both of those histories, and raising questions about our understanding of both of those histories. Um, and I think, you know, there's room for revision on, on every level, and on all sides. Um, I'm struck by, uh, what Charles was saying a while ago about Bob Thompson, and this question of operating in more than one world. And I'm also struck with what Mr. Chandler was saying about this issue of going where you get fed, or making your own place to be fed. I think that's a real valuable distinction between what has happened in Afro-American art in, say, the past 20 years. Um, I also, [00:09:00] though, feel like a word needs to be put in edgewise for a kind of historical context in that I would just want to maybe throw in that perhaps before the mid-1960s the conditions weren't there for most Afro-American artists to have quite those options, that before, say, the mid-'60s --

___: Absolutely, yeah.

JUDITH WILSON: -- before the Civil Rights Movement coming to a certain kind of peak and pressure, um, you might have wanted to make your own place to be fed, but it would've been a whole lot harder. Um, and I think that that's something that makes the character of what Black American painters have done since 1965 very different. And, for me, um, part of the reason why I chose Bob Thompson was 'cause I wanted somebody who was very close to that critical moment, that what to me is a turning point, um, in the history of this tradition, and I do see it as a [00:10:00] tradition. Um, he's -- for me, his career is right before that moment, and yet one of the real excitements for me of my research is that I'm finding out how much earlier things were starting to take off than I had previously realized. Um, Bob Thompson, some of you may or may not realize, was very close to Amiri Baraka, uh, the writer, the poet. Um, he was close to Archie Sheep, um, Ornette Coleman. Um, some of these literary and musical figures had, by the early '60s, begun to become concerned about issues of Black consciousness that, in the rest of the culture, we think of as not emerging until the late '60s. Um, so he was in contact with all of that, and yet, from what I've been able to hear so far, um, he refused to take a certain kind of position. He refused to take an activist position. Um, he

[00:11:00] supposedly said that his feeling was, you know, he wanted to be about the painting; that was his activity. He didn't want to be about the politics. Um, and yet, at the same time, I feel like there's a real struggle, an attempt, perhaps not fully realized -- 'cause we're also talking here about an artist who died very young -- he died a month away from his 29th birthday -- um, I think that there was a struggle to begin to bring his own ethnic experience into that work, at the same time that he's using traditional Western, uh, themes, Old Master compositions, et cetera. That time with the jazz world, uh, that time with some of these younger generation of Black poets, um, was an attempt to pull something out that was uniquely his own as a Black American artist, and inject that into this other [00:12:00] tradition that he had learned in art school in Louisville, et cetera. Um, so, I don't know, that's probably my two cents for the moment.

EDMUND BARRY GAITHER: Thank you very much. I have (inaudible) else in the audience wants (inaudible). I don't think more than one more round from here [can come?], and then we'll be done. Anyone else? All right, then, why don't we sort of make a concluding statement, in which you may pull any of the several previous issues, but which may not exceed about three minutes? So I'll let you know when the three minutes are up, but then you won't get (inaudible) too much, except in my case.

DANA CHANDLER: (inaudible) something that [you?] just made some comments on when you talked about the timing, um, because it's interesting for me to be able to say that my [00:13:00] becoming what I became as an artist was directly related to people like Malcolm X, and the whole movement of, of Islam, uh, at least the Black Islamic movement in the United States, and what was going on at that time; and my inability to, to really deal with the fact that although I was -- had a leaning towards Martin Luther King, and what Marth-- Martin Luther King was trying to do, there was so much opposition from people who didn't look like me towards that whole -- that whole idea of not so much, uh, integration, as people w-- were, were, were, were calling it at that time, which simply meant the assimilation of Black culture into white culture, so that there's some, some sort of smooth brownness rather than differences, uh, but, but the whole idea of the integration of cultures, of the joining of cultures who could -- which could sit side by side, and exist as their -- as themselves, and seen [00:14:00] as being, being as valid as anything else. And,

I mean -- I meant African American culture, Asian American culture, and, and, and so on. You know, it's -- it still reminds me of the -- of the travesty of an exhibition, uh, that, that recently was at the Museum of Fine Arts, that was supposed to be about American painting, in which there were no Asian American artists, and there were n-- and there were no Indian American artists, because their imagery didn't fit into a European American ideology about what imagery was supposed to be about, and it was as though they didn't exist at all. It wasn't -- I mean, it was bad enough that there weren't African American artists, but there were no Asian and no Native American. It's just incredible. So that a whole lot of that stuff has not yet ceased, but that -- the recognition of the -- of, of the visualness of the struggle of Black folks being Black folks began very early, you know, began around 1959 and '60, I mean, in terms of being public within the Black community. [00:15:00] And then it became public large-- uh, largely through the efforts of the Nation of Islam, because of Malcolm X. But there were whole bunches of folks who were not connected to the Nation of Islam who were raising their voices and, and making a lot of noises about the validity of, uh, of the Black experience during that -- during that time. So I can understand why, why, you know, Bob found himself leaning towards that, and a whole lot of artists found themselves leaning towards that. And I can remember sitting with Sam Gilliam, and have him tell me that he was very insulted because people who were Black didn't think that he was part of the Black experience; it's just that he chose to do with his work something different than what they were doing, and they didn't understand it. And I knew how he was feeling, 'cause I was one of the people who told him I didn't think he was doing anything that was, wa-- was related to the whole Black experience until I came to understand that everything in this country relates to the Black experience, and it's all one experience. You know, it just happens to, to have -- uh, it's all one experience from a different perspective. [00:16:00] So it's all one experience for me, and it's all one experience for Charles, and it's all one experience for everybody that's sitting in here. Just -- it just has a different perspective, and we're all part of that oneness, and I'm still waitin', you know. And that's real-- I guess really w-w-- part of what I'm doing is a -- is a [burner?]. I'm still waiting. But at the same time, I think it's important and it's valid for us to have our own -- be within our own cultural context within this whole sphere, and there's nothin' wrong with

it, you know, and I think I'll still be waiting when, when, when I'm gone, and my children have gone on to their grandchildren. I think I'll still be waiting for that sort of thing to happen, but I have some hope. That's my statement.

PATRICIA HILLS: Go ahead, Charles.

EDMUND BARRY GAITHER: Charles?

CHARLES GIULIANO: [You tasked me with?] (inaudible) Pat. (laughter) Uh, I'm glad that, uh, that Judith made the comment about Bob's decision, which was a controversial one when he made it, to concentrate on the art, and to [00:17:00] basically not deal with the social and political context of, of trying to necessarily make a direct statement about, uh, being a Black person in America, in the sense that, uh, we have discussed Benny Andrews as an example of an artist who is socially, politically -- totally socially, politically connected in every breath he takes through the day, you know, every, uh, thing that he puts on the canvas, every act and statement and movement that he makes as a person, as a (inaudible), as a humanitarian, uh, as opposed to, uh, the artists who are Black that, that pursue a more personal, uh, muse. And I think that, that every artist should have the right to, without -- you know, with impunity -- to pursue their own personal vision, and that's what I think Dana's talking about in terms of Sam Gilliam. What I meant when I said that, uh, artists like Sam Gilliam and Bob Thompson suffered, uh, because they were not [00:18:00] identified with the Black community, with that struggle, in, in terms of what it meant politically in the 1960s in the Civil Rights era, when, uh, you know, Barry mounted the, uh, exhibition at the Museum of Fine Arts in 1970, that was an enormously important political statement, and, uh, o-- uh, as one saw quote-unquote "Black art" shows in the 1960s, they were primarily emphasizing the political context and the social context, and the -- there, there was a mood that was very confrontational about those exhibitions.

EDMUND BARRY GAITHER: Uh, Charles, I have to say one thing, 'cause it will remind you of our exchange in the BAD in 1970, I think, which Dana will also recall. (laughs)

CHARLES GIULIANO: Oh, you want to bring that up again. Oh, God.

DANA CHANDLER: I noticed that you didn't --

EDMUND BARRY GAITHER: You said --

DANA CHANDLER: -- you didn't -- you didn't state the history correctly. You said that, that Barry mounted an exhibition in 1970, but that exhibition came about because

of a -- of a document that was delivered by me, that talked about the [00:19:00] eradication of institutional racism at the Museum of Fine Arts, (inaudible) have the historical context correct, and then we can proceed.

EDMUND BARRY GAITHER: The point, uh -- the pointed I wanted to, uh, [put my one catch?] on -- Dana sidetracked, and not I've forgotten it, (laughter) but it, it had to do with just a turn of --

CHARLES GIULIANO: BAD exchange in [nineteen?] (overlapping dialogue; inaudible)?

EDMUND BARRY GAITHER: No, no, no. No, no, it, it really had to do with, um, with something you had said just prior to, uh... I can't -- I, I lost it when Dana was speaking to me [here?]. I'll think of it again.

CHARLES GIULIANO: So can I pick up [my side?]?

EDMUND BARRY GAITHER: Yes, go right ahead.

CHARLES GIULIANO: Well, I, I guess what I'm talking about is the fact that when I -- when I said that --

EDMUND BARRY GAITHER: Ah, I remember what it was. (laughter)

CHARLES GIULIANO: Shoot, what is it?

EDMUND BARRY GAITHER: You said that, that the exhibitions mainly had to do with political and social themes, and the point I wanted to make was that that reflects the perception of the shows, because if a show was 90 percent nonpolitical work, [00:20:00] and 10 percent political work, it was discussed in terms of the 10 percent, as if the 10 percent were the 90 percent.

CHARLES GIULIANO: Mm-hmm.

EDMUND BARRY GAITHER: So if you look at the discussion, it has no relationship, really, to the balance between these groups of works, so I just wanted to, to alter your statement to say that, that it was discussed against that perception, rather than that fact. Because it was not always true that that was the fact.

CHARLES GIULIANO: Well, I, I, I would fully concede that, but there was a political exigency that, that caused those shows to exist --

EDMUND BARRY GAITHER: Yes, that certainly was.

CHARLES GIULIANO: -- in the first place, and that's --

EDMUND BARRY GAITHER: That's a -- that's a different --

CHARLES GIULIANO: -- and that --

EDMUND BARRY GAITHER: -- dynamics --

CHARLES GIULIANO: -- that was, uh --

EDMUND BARRY GAITHER: -- than what was on the wall.

CHARLES GIULIANO: That was, uh, what we were talking about. But the point that I'm trying to make (laughter)

is, is, basically, what I would see as a kind of sophistication and growth and change, in the sense that in 1986 it's possible for a white curator to do an exhibition on Black art, [00:21:00] and to not do it to, to basically raise a social, political comment, so much as to raise an important aesthetic comment, that my whole purpose of making this exhibition was that I think that this is first-class art. It deserves to be looked at as art, and to be looked at as, as -- for its quality, its beauty, its expressiveness, and to... In that sense, I think that, uh, what we're talking about is perhaps a modification of how we look at Black art, uh, that maybe this is -- this is something to consider as we move into the '80s and '90s, in terms of, of, uh, you know, that term that we've been struggling with today, of coming into the mainstream, and, and having these artists take their place in the museums and in the collections and in the full history of what has happened in America, not to be pushed off, isolated, and ghettoized into, [00:22:00] you know, a, a kind of packaged notion of what Black art is supposed to be and supposed to look like.

EDMUND BARRY GAITHER: Pat?

PATRICIA HILLS: Well said. I don't have really very much to say as a sort of windup, except that I think what Dana was saying before, that there is a great deal of racism in our society. There is sexism, also, and that's important, but the racism I think is very fundamental. And I think whatever people can do to sort of eliminate that is all for the best. And I think that constant pressure needs to be brought on the Museum of Fine Arts. It was good when we made that -- mounted that protest about the New World exhibition for not even including Henry Tanner, a major late nineteenth-century American painter. People saw that exhibition, uh, (inaudible) not only did the exhibition before the insertion of Tanner, not only did it not have [00:23:00] any, you know, sort of Afro American artists, or American Indian artists, but there weren't any images of these. There were no real -- there were no Black faces. There were some Indian faces in the bushes --

EDMUND BARRY GAITHER: In the Cole.

PATRICIA HILLS: -- in the Thomas Cole [sprume?] mountains, but, uh, a woman who is a -- the librarian at the Schomburg, uh, Library in New York said she'd walked through that exhibition and saw no Black faces in a show that was supposed to be called *The New World*. And, uh, well, uh, you know, I think constant pressure needs to be brought against these big institutions. They probably are

never really going to change, but at least, you know, that, you know, as many concessions as you can get, [all for the better?].

EDMUND BARRY GAITHER: I think [Peter?] wants to say something.

M2: Uh, (clears throat) I'm just struck by the fact that how apologetic [00:24:00] the group is concerning, uh, the need not to have a political message, uh, in, in Black art. Uh, I'm -- I was just thinking, uh, for example, uh, uh, when you think in terms of the late eighteenth-century French art, or, uh, the 1830s, I think, uh, Géricault, David, or Delacroix would have been, perhaps, very upset if, um, he is -- if their works would not have been seen sufficiently in a critical light. I think that what I find very exciting about the 1960s, that Black art, in fact, reminded America that political art, in fact, is a tremendously important part of art, the visual arts. And, and, and, in fact, I think one is really amazed how depoliticized [00:25:00] art has become, uh, since the 1940s. Um, and, and also one has to remember that in 1960s, during the height of Abstract, Abstract Expressionism, and, uh, Minimalism, it was, uh, at the time when, when, uh, it was not proper to, um, talk about political issues, and it was considered to be something less than valid, mainstream. I mean, the mainstream was nonpolitical, not abstra-- I mean, uh, not representational. And, um, I, I think that, um, w-what we see here is, is a kind of a synthesis, I -- actually. Uh, it, it -- it's, it's, uh, a synthesis between the strong representational political on the one hand, uh, and the other -- on the other hand, uh, [00:26:00] which is very exciting, and I don't want to minimize its value, but I simply want to just stress the fact that, uh, what was exciting about the 1960s is that, in fact, there was so much political art being created that was not mainstream, or it was not at the time when it was generally accepted to do political statements. And, and I think that, uh, um, i-i-it, it... It is something which I hope will remain always a very strong element of Black art, because as you ch-- uh, uh, (clears throat) Dana said, that there -- you know, that, that we should also focus on, on, I think, the, the, the, the very special issues of Black communities, and whether this community or that. But I think these, these ideas, these [00:27:00] concerns, ought to come through in a strong way. And, and, uh, I'm also struck by the fact that, that Black art really began -- visual arts -- began to take shape in the '60s, I'm learning, also to some

extent inspired by the two I would almost call parent arts in the Black context: music, uh, and literature. And I think, uh, one should always remind oneself, since I was not born in this country -- I'm very conscious of that -- that America has not had a visual tradition. I mean, this was pointed out often. It's only very recently that America has become the number one sort of visual culture in the world, but this is a very, very recent phenomenon, uh, not since -- uh, n-not, not since -- uh, not until about the, the '40s and '50s has this really, uh, become, uh, a reality. And, and in, in American [00:28:00] tradition, uh, literature and -- was more the, the, the, the mode of artistic expression, and, um, what is again remarkable that what was the unique contribution of the Black culture before the visual arts is, is that it was, in fact, expressing feelings, ideas through music. And I think that that, that i-in the '60s it seems that visual artists became more, uh, clearly a vehicle to communicate the Black experience, as opposed to the writers and the musicians prior to that time. And, uh, I think that next to the, the political statements, [00:29:00] what I find exciting is, uh, paintings in which really that musical, um, experience is merged with the -- w-with the visual sensibility. So, uh, it seems that, that, uh, what was strongest in the Black culture then began to affect the visual arts, and, and fertilize it in a very, uh, productive way. But, uh, this was more than just a question, but I think that the reason I felt perhaps, uh, I should share my feelings is because I think we ought not to, perhaps, be apologetic about, um, social messages and social --

EDMUND BARRY GAITHER: Who's apologizing?

M2: -- content. Well, there was a s-- feeling, uh, I'm thinking --

EDMUND BARRY GAITHER: I'm not apologizing.

M2: No, no, no, but I, I, I, I got the [00:30:00] sense that, that --

EDMUND BARRY GAITHER: (inaudible).

M2: -- you know, uh, that there was, uh -- that we are now seeing something that is -- transcends the social/ political, uh, level of art, which, in fact, can be just as, as, as provocative, and, and visually just as, uh, strong as art that doesn't necessarily deal with social/ political issues, but perhaps, uh, deals with other issues, which these works do. Uh, I'm just --

EDMUND BARRY GAITHER: (overlapping dialogue; inaudible)

--

M2: -- puzzled -- I, I, I think I'm just...

EDMUND BARRY GAITHER: (inaudible).
M2: No, no, no, I mean, just -- I mean, just in general.
I'm not --
EDMUND BARRY GAITHER: Sam?
M2: -- talking about any --
M3: Just [as important?], generally, what I think was
against was agitprop, political statements for political
statements' sake. I think great has to be strongly felt,
and has to be a personal vision, and has to be a
commitment, but I think the second part of that has to be
the ability to externalize that personal feeling, and, and
to communicate it, uh, and use the language, [00:31:00] uh,
to communicate it well. I think what was happening was
that there was, uh, almost a dictatorial quality to, to
politicizing, uh, the Black movement, and reflecting that
in a politicized visual art, that didn't necessarily equate
with quality, and that that's the other side of the -- of
the issue.
EDMUND BARRY GAITHER: (inaudible) determine (overlapping
dialogue; inaudible) --
M3: Well, that's another thing. [See, they're invested?]
--

END OF AUDIO FILE

AAA_wilsjudi_8173_m

CHARLES GIULIANO: -- [make?], but it's a different and
more subtle one than perhaps we're used to seeing.
EDMUND BARRY GAITHER: I think it's now time to bring
this to an end, (laughter) and, uh --
CHARLES GIULIANO: I will try to [hear?] that with
[great?] (inaudible).
EDMUND BARRY GAITHER: Oh, okay, (inaudible). (laughter)
CHARLES GIULIANO: No, it's really a couple -- a, a couple
of strands that, that I think might be helpful closing out.
One is I think that the central fact of being Black in
America has been the battle to be. To be is a political --
EDMUND BARRY GAITHER: [Here we are?] (overlapping
dialogue; inaudible) --
CHARLES GIULIANO: -- problem, and, and it has, uh... It,
it has, in a poly-cultural, poly-racial society, it has
profound, controversial implications. It is -- the easiest
place to see the nature of the [00:01:00] problem, though,
in degree different, is in the Soviet Union, with the case
of Jews. For Jews to be Jews in the Soviet Union is to be
anti-Soviet, and a (inaudible) of that. In the (inaudible)
-- in the Western experience that is our common experience

in this country, the will to be raises always problems of how to be, on whose terms to be, and the commitment of the artist has, has to be the one which is true; that is to be one's self. And I think that that is, uh... When you are yourself, you have a voice. Whether it's political in an overt way or not becomes irrelevant. What is relevant is whether it's the right container for the thing contained, and when I look at, for example, uh, the nineteenth century, and we see [00:02:02] all the people who expatriated, like Tanner or Edmonia Lewis, the early twentieth century there are another group of expatriates, like Albert Smith and others, working in Spain and in France. There's a long tradition of dealing with the problem of how to be by changing settings, and going to a different setting. It is a more common solution after the Second War to make another community which is in the same one, and to become a member of another piece, of a sub-community, which is, in a certain sense, uh, illustrated in the case of Pilgrim and Thompson. I think that those are all responses to how to be where you can find your voice, and I think that's perhaps a good point on which to close. I have more things to say, but I will drop them out in the interest of not upsetting Dana. (laughter)

EDMUND BARRY GAITHER: Is there any final comment? Yes, (inaudible)?

M4: [00:03:00] (inaudible) what you're talking about is historical artifact of political struggle. If you have a political struggle, and, and there are comments made on that struggle, or expression of that struggle, that results in historical artifact, but not necessarily art, great art. Uh, I just -- it's a qualifying point (inaudible).

EDMUND BARRY GAITHER: Well, you know, great is [one of those?] --

M4: That's another issue. (laughs)

EDMUND BARRY GAITHER: -- (overlapping dialogue; inaudible). I mean, what...?

CHARLES GIULIANO: That's a subject for our next (inaudible).

M4: Possibly depends on (inaudible) --

PATRICIA HILLS: That's like talking about mainstream art.

M4: Yeah.

CHARLES GIULIANO: What is great art? Based on whose --

EDMUND BARRY GAITHER: Thank you very --

END OF AUDIO FILE