POP ART

AND THE ORIGINS OF POST-MODERNISM

Sylvia Harrison

Pop Art and the Origins of Post-Modernism

Pop Art and the Origins of Post-Modernism examines the critical reception of pop art in America during the 1960s. Comparing the ideas of a group of New York–based critics, including Leo Steinberg, Susan Sontag, and Max Kozloff, among others, Sylvia Harrison demonstrates how their ideas – broadly categorized as either sociological or philosophical – bear a striking similarity to the body of thought and opinion that is now associated with deconstructive post-modernism. Perceived through these disciplinary lenses, pop art arises as not only a reflection of the dominance of mass communications and capitalist consumerism in post-war American society but also as a subversive commentary on world-views and the factors necessary for their formation.

A scholar of contemporary art, Dr. Sylvia Harrison is lecturer in art history at La Trobe University in Australia.

This page intentionally left blank

CONTEMPORARY ARTISTS AND THEIR CRITICS

Series Editor

Donald Kuspit, *State University of New York*, *Stony Brook*

Advisory Board

Matthew Baigell, *Rutgers University*
Lynn Gamwell, *State University of New York*, *Binghamton*
Richard Hertz, *Art Center College of Design*, *Pasadena*
Udo Kulturmann, *Washington University*, *St. Louis*
Judith Russi Kirshner, *University of Illinois*, *Chicago*

This series presents a broad range of writings on contemporary art by some of the most astute critics at work today. Combining the methods of art criticism and art history, their essays, published here in anthologized form, are at once scholarly and timely, analytic and evaluative, a record and critique of art events. Books in this series are on the "cutting edge" of thinking about contemporary art. Deliberately pluralistic in approach, the series represents a wide variety of approaches. Collectively, books published in this series will deal with the complexity of contemporary art from a wide perspective in terms of both point of view and writing.

This page intentionally left blank

Pop Art and the Origins of Post-Modernism

SYLVIA HARRISON
La Trobe University, Bundoora, Australia

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

PUBLISHED BY CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS (VIRTUAL PUBLISHING)
FOR AND ON BEHALF OF THE PRESS SYNDICATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE
The Pitt Building, Trumpington Street, Cambridge CB2 IRP
40 West 20th Street, New York, NY 10011-4211, USA
477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia

http://www.cambridge.org

© Sylvia Harrison 2001
This edition © Sylvia Harrison 2003

First published in printed format 2001

A catalogue record for the original printed book is available
from the British Library and from the Library of Congress
Original ISBN 0 521 79115 4 hardback

ISBN 0 511 01624 7 virtual (netLibrary Edition)

Contents

Introduction • 1

PART ONE. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

1 Post-Modernist Assumptions • 11

PART TWO. “SOCIAL” CRITICS

2 Lawrence Alloway: Pop Art and the “Pop Art–Fine Art Continuum” • 37

3 Harold Rosenberg: Pop Art and the “De-definition” of Both Art and “Self” • 68

4 Leo Steinberg: Pop, “Post-Modernist” Painting, and the Flatbed Picture Plane • 96

PART THREE. “PHILOSOPHICAL” CRITICS

5 Barbara Rose: Pop, Pragmatism, and “Prophetic Pragmatism” • 115

6 Max Kozloff: A Phenomenological Solution to “Warholism” and Its Disenfranchisement of the Critic’s Interpretive and Evaluative Roles • 146

PART FOUR. “CULTURAL” CRITICS

7 Susan Sontag: Pop, the Aesthetics of Silence, and the New Sensibility • 171

Conclusion • 208

Notes • 223

Index • 275

This page intentionally left blank

Introduction

This study is based upon the retrospective and now widespread identification of American pop art of the sixties as an expression of post-modernism.[1] More specifically, this identification concerns New York pop, the form associated with the leading centre of art in both America and the world during this period. The immediate stimulus for this study lies in the question: Did the post-modernist art of American pop art in its initial form in the sixties give rise to a corresponding critical consciousness? In other words, can critical responses to pop during this same period also be retrospectively identified as post-modernist? This question determines the central task of this study: the recognition and establishment of the nature of post-modernist features in the critical consciousness generated by American pop art during the sixties.[2] The retrospectivity of this endeavour should be stressed. What is offered by this work is a comparison between the ideas of a select group of American critics writing in the 1960s in response to the challenge of pop art, ideas that bear a striking similarity to that body of thought and opinion that is now associated with post-modernism. Hans Bertens's history of post-modernism, published in 1995, provides a precedent for this study's retrospective argument. In reference to the writings of American literary figures, namely Leslie Fiedler, Susan Sontag, and Ihab Hassan, as well as the music theorist Leonard B. Meyer, Bertens claimed that "much of what is now broadly seen as the post-modernist agenda was already more or less in place by the end of the 1960s."[3]

The findings of this study centre on the relevant critical writings of Lawrence Alloway, Harold Rosenberg, Leo Steinberg, Max Kozloff, Barbara Rose, and Susan Sontag. These critics were all key figures in the New York art world or, in the case of Sontag, literary world during the period under review. Collectively, they span a number of generations and encompass two distinct approaches to the theorization of American pop art.

Lawrence Alloway, Harold Rosenberg, and Leo Steinberg, for example, drew on critical philosophies that had been formulated or, at least, initiated in advance of the movement itself. Steinberg was born in 1920 and Alloway some six years later in 1926. The origin of their respective critical philosophies and, hence, interpretations of pop can be traced to the inaugural phase of their critical careers in the fifties. In Alloway's case, it concerned the "fine art-pop art continuum," the inclusive theory of both art and culture that Alloway had developed during the late fifties in Britain. It was dependent, in particular, on a factor that enabled Alloway to relate "high" and "low" cultural forms in the non-hierarchical manner of a continuum: the functionalist and non-essentialist conception of fine art as communication and, as reflected in pop art's subject-matter, as "one of the possible forms . . . in an expanding framework that also includes the mass arts."[4] "Other Criteria" (1972) represents Steinberg's savage, if belated, "deconstruction" of Greenberg's formalist argument as outlined in the 1965 version of "Modernist Painting." It also presents Steinberg's alternative, sociological case for pop and its anonymous counterpart in 1960's abstraction. Steinberg's decided opposition to formalism had been a feature of his criticism since 1953. It was at this time that Steinberg published his first article on contemporary art in which he argued for the centrality of representation in the "esthetic function" of all (including modern abstract) art.[5]

Rosenberg, the oldest critic featured in this study, was born in 1906. The critical philosophy that he brought to bear on his reception of pop, as with that of action painting in the previous decade, had evolved over a far longer period than either Steinberg's or Alloway's. It encompassed two ideological positions that, while distinct and while responsible for Rosenberg's alternate positive appraisal of action painting and negative one of pop, were joined by the common goal of human freedom. This concerned the "anti-Stalinism" or "Marxist anti-Communism" of the late thirties, the first decade of Rosenberg's critical career, and the "liberal anticommunism" of the fifties[6] as expressed in the tenets of existentialism.

Max Kozloff and Barbara Rose were born in 1933 and 1937 respectively. Unlike the critics discussed so far, the commencement of their critical careers coincided with the emergence of pop. The critical theories they would apply to this movement were moulded by their experience of sixties' art in both its pop-figurative and abstract forms and, integral to this experience, the failure of existing critical traditions, notably Greenbergian formalism, to meet its demands. Rose's break with Greenbergian formalism, the most authoritative critical position of the day, was far more circumspect and gradual than Kozloff's and would not be complete until the

close of the decade. The studied independence of both critics from fixed and absolute aesthetic standards, however, whether they were those of Greenbergian formalism or any other inflexible critical theory, took place under the powerful counter-influence of deconstructive philosophies – phenomenology in the case of Kozloff and pragmatism in that of Rose.

Susan Sontag was born in 1933, the same year as Kozloff. The beginning of her critical career pre-dated that of Kozloff and Rose by only a few years. Her approach to the theorization of pop, however, as it formed part of the broader and inter-disciplinary category of contemporary art, arguably sits mid-way between those discussed so far. The evidence presented by Sontag's critical writings examined in this study, especially "Against Interpretation" and "The Aesthetics of Silence" and their various arguments for the lack of authorial perspective in contemporary art, indicate that she grafted a theoretical framework, one largely drawn from an extensive knowledge of both philosophy and literary theory, onto her first-hand experience of sixties' New York art. To the extent that this framework included Alain Robbe-Grillet's and Roland Barthes's theoretical writings on *nouveau roman* and, in this mediated form, Heidegger's existential phenomenology, it illustrates Sontag's deep engagement with French post-war culture to which she was exposed during attendance at the University of Paris 1957-58.[7]

Despite differences in both the age and critical philosophy of these critics, the post-modernist features of their respective theorizations of American pop art were in all cases the result of the failure of prevailing formalist and realist critical canons to meet the critical challenges issued by pop. Briefly defined, these concerned pop art's anonymity, its erosion of boundaries between categorical and cultural realms, as evident in both subject-matter and techniques, and its depiction of not "nature" but, rather, "culture," that is, the illusory, mediate world created by mass communications in their sophisticated post-war form. Critical responses to these features of pop, now considered post-modernist, fall into two broad groups: first, pop understood as a reflection of the post-war societal form, especially of its dominant and defining characteristics of mass communications and capitalist consumerism; second, pop understood as subversive of both "worldviews" and many of the factors necessary for their formation.[8] As will be explained in greater detail in the first chapter of this study, these perceptions of pop comply with two main deconstructive post-modernist models: first, the philosophical model such as that formulated by either David Ray Griffin or Patricia Waugh;[9] the second, which is a variation of the first, the sociological model defined by David Lyon and Zygmunt

Bauman.[10] Lyon and Bauman's model posits a correspondence between the deconstructive workings of the key characteristics of post-war society (or post-modernity) – mass communications and capitalist-consumerism – and post-modernism in its deconstructive form, such as the philosophical post-modernism identified by David Ray Griffin.

In addition to the philosophical and sociological post-modernisms just defined, and in accounting for a definite regional inflection to the post-modernist critical consciousness in America during the sixties, attention also must be directed to the avantgardist model proposed by Andreas Huyssen. This is the only model to address in any depth the question of a specifically American phase of post-modernism during the sixties. As will become apparent in a more detailed examination of Huyssen's argument in the next chapter, this study, in part at least, affirms Huyssen's perception of the avantgardist character of 1960's American post-modernism. It also supports his identification of stimuli in the form of American historical factors, particularly as they concern the platforms of protest associated with the American counter-culture during this period. It does not, however, support either the coherence of Huyssen's model (i.e., its uniformly avantgardist character) or the limitation of its life to the sixties and shortly thereafter.[11] Instead, it argues that American post-modernism in the sixties as revealed in the critical consciousness generated by pop, while never completely coherent in its character, either presaged or represented a broad parallel to later formulations of the post-modern. The generally unwitting mapping of the "post-modern condition," or "post-modernity," on the part of Alloway, Rosenberg, and Steinberg is firm evidence of the first. This involved a delineation of its "deconstructive" character and, in the case of Rosenberg, a critique of its deleterious impact upon both art and "self." Rosenberg's negative account of pop art's social context prefigured the critical reactions to post-modernity, including that of Jean Baudrillard, that Charles Jencks has more recently seen as extending from approximately 1980 to the present.[12]

Susan Sontag's and, to a lesser extent, Max Kozloff's interpretations of pop art that have been cast in terms of the "silencing of language," especially as they concern the phenomenological view of human consciousness, are indicative of the second trend. In this, they represent a parallel to subsequent formulations of post-modernism, specifically those indebted to post-structuralism. The more or less contemporaneous development in France that from the time of post-modernism's mid-seventies incarnation (i.e., from the time that it assumed the status of a "world view"[13]) has provided the prime avenue of theoretical support for the dominant decon-

structive form. Post-structuralism and the "silencing of language" can be seen as alternative responses to the critique of language that had been conducted throughout the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries by the philosophers Nietzsche, Wittgenstein, and Heidegger and concerned their findings on the limitations of language, as revealed by its relationship to experience, knowledge, and "truth."

The methodology of this study is based on a close reading of critical responses to American pop art that were made during the sixties by critics working in the same cultural milieu. These are examined within contexts that illuminate their cultural and historical significance and identify their relevance to sociological and philosophical post-modernist theories. Given the clear time span dealt with in this study, the inclusion of some material requires qualification. Lawrence Alloway's *American Pop Art*, his most comprehensive account of American pop, was not published until 1974[14]; it was, however, almost completely dependent on his publications from the previous decade. Moreover, the view of American pop art that Alloway outlined in *American Pop Art*, as in all of his prior published writings on the subject, was indebted to his cultural theory the "fine art-pop art continuum." Much of the analysis of Alloway's critical response to American pop, therefore, is directed at this crucial formative influence, its sources, and British post-war context. In addition, Leo Steinberg's appearance in this study rests on the single essay "Other Criteria," which in its definitive form was not published until 1972.[15] It was, nonetheless, based on a lecture he delivered at the Museum of Modern Art, New York, in 1968, and on ideas he had formulated during the previous two decades. The more pertinent of these concern his perception of the centrality of representation in the "esthetic function" of all art, that is, including modern abstract art, and the anti-illusionist premises underlying the relationship between subject and object in Jasper Johns's art.[16]

With the organization of material in this study, distinctions are made between the "cultural" critic Sontag and the "art" critics Alloway, Rosenberg, Steinberg, Rose, and Kozloff. These distinctions, however, are unwarranted on a number of grounds. In their largely unwitting articulation of a post-modernist consciousness, almost all of the art critics identified a cultural shift that went beyond the concerns of either a particular style or a particular discipline. Barbara Rose, for example, called upon Alain Robbe-Grillet's phenomenological theorization of *nouveau roman* to account for "literal" qualities in American sixties' art that were common to pop and minimal art.[17] In reference to the same phenomenon Harold Rosenberg identified the reduction of ego, that of "'inner-directed'" man as seen in the

"'inexpressive'" stream of sixties' art in both its pop-figurative and abstract forms with the "'chosiste'" novels of Alain Robbe-Grillet.[18] Charles Jencks has termed this cross-disciplinary approach, one that will be discussed in relation to both Alloway's and Steinberg's critique of the essentialist epistemology associated with Enlightenment and by one definition modernist thought,[19] as "a motive force of the wide [post-modernist] movement."[20]

The "art" critics are divided into two further categories: the "social" and the "philosophical." Incorporation within either of these categories is determined by each critic's *dominant*, though not exclusive, method of theorizing pop. The boundaries of these groupings, as between those designated "art" and "cultural," blur at a number of junctures. Arguments central to the "social" theorization of pop, those that concern the "deconstructive" character of the post-war societal form and hence of post-modernity, are advanced also by the "philosophical" critic Barbara Rose. Although insufficiently developed in Rose's criticism, they nonetheless underpin her clear understanding of the role played by mass communications and capitalist-consumerism in both dissolving boundaries between cultural realms and discrediting traditional cultural theory. The qualitative superiority of certain cultural forms (e.g., high art) has been argued, erroneously in Rose's view, on the basis of their independence from economic concerns.[21]

In a similar blurring of boundaries, arguments central to philosophical theorizations of pop and that concern the subversion of worldviews by the deconstructive tenets of either pragmatism or phenomenology were also taken up by "social" critics. Alloway, for example, turned to philosophical pragmatism, if in a mediatory form, to discredit fixed and absolute aesthetic standards. These were predicated on the foundational beliefs of traditional idealist philosophy and, as witnessed by Clement Greenberg's "Avant-Garde and Kitsch" (1939), were unable to account for art responsive to the demands of industrial capitalism in anything other than a negative manner. Guided by both an anthropological definition of culture and a non-essentialist and functionalist conception of fine art as a form of communication, Alloway proposed instead the "fine art-pop art continuum." As indicated by its designation, this provided a non-evaluative and non-hierarchical conceptualization of relations between the full gamut of artistic forms in industrialized society. A further example is represented by Harold Rosenberg's negative assessment of pop art on the basis of the evidence it presented of the dissolution of "self" by totalitarian forces at work in post-war capitalist society. As will be expanded upon in the first and third chapters of this study, Rosenberg's harsh judgment of pop was driven by the tenets of existentialist philosophy, especially as they in-

formed the major existentialist theme of distinctions between the authentic and inauthentic life, and consequential rejection of a life lived in terms of "second-hand values" in favour of one derived from "immediate personal experience."[22]

Arguably, the most marked overlap between categories is represented by the "philosophical" critic Kozloff's and the "cultural" critic Sontag's related inquiries into the "silencing of language." Broadly described, this inquiry involved a redefinition of the critic's role in the face of "silent" art's disenfranchisement of his traditional functions of interpretation and evaluation. In the case of Sontag, it also encompassed a justification of the artist's wilful frustration of meaning. As will be explained in further detail in the first chapter, both Sontag's and Kozloff's arguments rest heavily on the phenomenological principle of the intentionality of consciousness, a principle that precludes the possibility of apprehending the world, and hence art, in any objective form and thus undermines the authority of singular interpretations of either.

Within the categories so described, a separate chapter is devoted to each critic's account of pop art or, in Sontag's case, pop as it forms part of the broader category of contemporary art. Importantly, this structure allows for a clear picture of individual contributions to the American post-modernist consciousness of the 1960s. This same structure facilitates the aims of this study that go beyond identifying post-modernist features of American pop art criticism, or, at least their identification *per se.* Prominent among these is that of deepening and, in some instances, revising our understanding of the contributions to American art criticism by the critics featured in this study. Susan Sontag, for example, has been widely viewed as a pioneering figure of American post-modernism, yet a neglected aspect of this recognition has, nonetheless, been an acknowledgment of the role played by her inquiry into the "silencing of language" in this contribution. As a case in point, Andreas Huyssen has confined Sontag's post-modernist involvement to "camp and a new sensibility" and has associated only Ihab Hassan with the "'literature of silence.'"[23] In Harold Rosenberg's case, this study aims to offset the dearth of scholarly analysis of his critical writings on sixties' art. Implicated in this neglect, no doubt, is the negativity with which he viewed "anonymous" art of this period and hence all of pop. With the benefit of hindsight, however, Rosenberg's negativity may be seen as tied principally to his perception and passionate upholding of the critic's role as social reformer and, in this role, critic of post-war "mass" society. The negative reactions to post-modernity that have arisen since circa 1980[24] have thrown welcome light on Rosenberg's writings on the "anonymous"

character of sixties' art, especially on that of pop with its overt relationship to post-war society. They reveal these writings as providing an incisive and, arguably, protean commentary on the nature and consequences of the post-modern condition.

The broader aim of this study is twofold: one, to achieve an enhanced as well as a revised awareness of the critical consciousness generated by pop art in America during the sixties; two, to increase an understanding of both the nature and the breadth of the post-modernist phenomenon by drawing attention to the significance that its concepts held in American intellectual and cultural life during this period. America's inaugural role in the theorization of post-modernism prior to its escalation into a worldview has been obscured somewhat in the dominant and over-identification of deconstructive post-modernism with French post-structuralist theory, the development of which parallels the time span of this study. This perception has been challenged only in recent post-modernist writings that have acknowledged either American philosophical pragmatism[25] or phenomenology in its existential Heideggerian form[26] as deconstructive alternatives to post-structuralism. Even these, however, have failed to acknowledge the pre-eminent role played by pragmatist and phenomenological philosophies in the American post-modernist consciousness of the 1960s. A major catalyst for the formation of this consciousness was the critical challenges posed by pop. These challenges were not met – because they could not be met – by the prevailing formalist and realist (and associated mimetic) critical modes.

PART ONE

Theoretical Framework

This page intentionally left blank

1

Post-Modernist Assumptions

The aim of this section is not to attempt to answer the difficult and fraught question "What is post-modernism?" It is rather to establish a range of post-modernist assumptions that will be used throughout this study to identify what can now be regarded as aspects of post-modernist thought in critical responses to American pop art during the sixties. Both these assumptions and their relevance to the critics under review will be discussed in a schematic manner so as not to pre-empt discussion in subsequent sections of this study.

"Post-modernist" responses to pop were prompted by those features that resisted accommodation within existing formalist or realist critical canons. The most prominent of these is anonymity, that is lack of "authorial presence" or a "centred sense of personal identity."[1] This is evident in its depersonalized technique, minimal, if any, transformation of source material, and obscure or uninterpretable "message." A further feature concerns the collapsing of distinctions between élite and mass cultural realms, evident in pop art's indebtedness to the codes, subjects, and, in some instances, technical processes of mass communications. Finally, there is that of the representation of "culture" as opposed to "nature," the province of realism, insofar as it concerns the simulation of pre-existing signs. Critics theorized these features along either sociological or philosophical lines. They viewed them as reflective of Western urban society in its post-war capitalist-consumerist phase or, alternatively, as eliminative of a world-view in the sense of an authoritative, totalizing system of thought.

The prime issue for this study is the relationship between these, in the main, sociological and philosophical theorizations of pop art and post-modernism. In constructing the post-modernist measure necessary to address this issue, three main categories of concepts of post-modernism require consideration: those formulated by critics featured in this study

(relevant only in the case of Leo Steinberg); the sporadic formulations made in the field of American literary criticism either prior to or contemporaneous with the period under review; those constitutive of post-modernism in its circa mid- and post-mid-1970's incarnation. This is the form in which it would constitute a major cultural shift and develop, shortly thereafter, into a "world view."[2] In this particular incarnation, post-modernism refers to a diversely social and cultural phenomenon as well as assumes its present inter-disciplinary form, one described by John Rajchman as "a hybrid field of social theory, literary criticism, cultural studies and philosophy."[3]

Post-modernist features of critical responses to American pop art, those that fall under the broad headings of social theory and philosophy, conform most closely to three inter-related post-modernist models or, more accurately, groups of post-modernist models. First, the "philosophical post-modernism" that David Ray Griffin has seen as "inspired variously by pragmatism, physicalism, Ludwig Wittgenstein, Martin Heidegger, and Jacques Derrida and other recent [presumably, post-structuralist] French thinkers." He has described this form as

> *deconstructive* or *eliminative post-modernism*. It overcomes the modern worldview through an anti-worldview: it deconstructs or eliminates the ingredients necessary for a worldview, such as God, self, purpose, meaning, a real world, and truth as correspondence. While motivated in some cases by the ethical concern to forestall totalitarian systems, this type of post-modern thought issues in relativism, even nihilism. It could also be called *ultramodernism*, in that its eliminations result from carrying modern premises to their logical conclusions.[4]

Charles Jencks also regarded this deconstructive form of post-modernism as not constituting a break with modernism. He termed it "Late- or Neo-Modernism" to refer to an "exaggerated and incessantly revolutionary form of Modernism."[5] Griffin's and Jencks's closely related understanding of deconstructive post-modernism invites identification with the avant-gardist model formulated by Andreas Huyssen. American post-modernism in its 1960's phase, he considered, was a revitalization of the legacy of "European avantgarde" movements and therefore of one branch of modernism. Huyssen's understanding of it in this manner was largely based on its "powerful sense of the future and of new frontiers, of rupture and discontinuity, of crisis and generational conflict" and thus on evidence of the "temporal imagination" that had been previously displayed by the "continental avantgarde," notably "dada and surrealism."[6]

The *prime* theoretical influence on deconstructive post-modernism since circa the mid-seventies has been post-structuralism. Broadly defined, post-structuralism represents the collective term for the post-Marxist intellectual movement in the human sciences and philosophy that emerged during the second half of the sixties in Paris and included among its first-generation adherents Jacques Derrida, Jacques Lacan, Michel Foucault, and Louis Althusser. A second generation, comprising Jean Baudrillard and Jean-Francois Lyotard, aligned post-structuralist theory with accounts of a new, post-war societal form. Despite the independence of their respective theoretical positions, post-structuralists were drawn together by, as Chris Weedon has suggested, shared "fundamental assumptions about language, meaning and subjectivity."[7] These assumptions will be investigated more fully where relevant throughout this study.

Post-structuralist ideas, however, made no impact on either the critical reception of American pop art during the sixties or literary formulations of post-modernism in the same period. This situation can be explained, in part, by the fact that none of the initial post-structuralist texts (identified by Art Berman as Lacan's *Ecrits* and Foucault's *The Order of Things* [both 1966] and Derrida's *Of Grammatology* [1967]) were translated until the seventies.[8] Despite the immunity of American post-modernism in its sixties' phase from French post-structuralist theory, the latter assumes an important reference point for this study. In this it is argued that the "silencing of language," to the extent that it is largely theorized by phenomenology, and post-structuralism, especially in the form represented by Jacques Derrida's deconstruction of logocentrism, are different responses as well as contributors to the critique of language and representation that had been conducted throughout the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries by philosophers such as Nietzsche, Wittgenstein, and Heidegger. Despite America's role in the naming of post-modernism, a role acknowledged by Lyotard in *The Post-modern Condition; a Report on Knowledge*,[9] it was also in such deconstructive form influenced by French post-structuralist theory that post-modernism would "re-enter" America. This is evident in the post-modern writings of the Marxist and cultural theorist Fredric Jameson as well as those of the art critics associated with the magazine *October* – notably Rosalind Krauss, Craig Owens, Hal Foster, and Douglas Crimp – which was launched in 1976.

In the course of theorizing pop art, American critics turned to philosophical sources that provided an alternative to post-structuralism's subversion of worldviews: phenomenology in both its existential and epistemological forms; American philosophical pragmatism. Max Kozloff and

Susan Sontag called upon the findings of phenomenology to justify "silent" art's invalidation of the critic's interpretive and evaluative roles and, in the case of Sontag, to account for art's silencing of language. Phenomenology, in pursuit of either the foundations of knowledge (epistemelogical phenomenology) or the foundations of existence (existential phenomenology), undermines the authority of universal accounts and hence abstract schematizations of either knowledge or experience. Both forms of phenomenology are pivotal on the tenet of the intentionality of consciousness, that is, the objects of consciousness are structured by the perceiving mind. This represents a break with the strict subject-object dualism of Cartesianism and thus with a vision-generated "concept of knowledge which radically splits us away from the world and leads us to assume the detached superiority of the scientist in relation to an overt object of investigation."[10] Existential phenomenology, consistent with its recognition of man's fundamental condition of situatedness in the world as well as the role of non-cognitive and non-rational factors (e.g., moods, sensations, and feelings) in intentional acts,[11] abolishes the further Cartesian dualism between body and mind.

In post-structuralist theory, the break with Cartesian subjectivity brings about the "death" of man and, thus, the elimination of one of the "ingredients necessary for a worldview."[12] This is argued on the grounds that the subject is constituted in language and hence from "without." Phenomenology, by way of contrast, with its commitment to the first-person standpoint, and in this sense commitment also to Cartesianism, revises the Cartesian "rational subject" Modification of this subject along phenomenological lines, central to which is the abolition of distinctions between both subject and object and mind and body, entails the recognition of man's situation as "embodied agents in a natural and social world" whose "propositional knowledge of the world is grounded in our dealings with it."[13]

Existential phenomenology, specifically in its Heideggerian form, has been seen by Patricia Waugh as responsible for a form of deconstructive post-modernism concerned with a counter-Enlightenment "critique of grand narratives and subversion of the purely rational." She has termed this critique "late modern Romanticism" because of the relationship between its mode of being and knowing – one that places emphasis on "situatedness in a world which pre-exists us (and which cannot be conceptualised through an overlay of rationalism)" – and a strain of Enlightenment critique that takes place in "Romantic writing." It is one that opposes the Enlightenment's "Cartesian separation of subject and object as a rationalising consciousness shaping an inert material object."[14] Waugh's under-

standing that post-modernism, in both its American and European forms, drew from "a theoretical or philosophical tradition" that was constituted, in part, by the "post-phenomenological critiques" of Heidegger and Derrida,[15] confirms in some measure the findings of this study: post-structuralist post-modernism and the phenomenological form identified with the silencing of language derive from as well as contribute to the same broadly defined critique of language and representation.

Waugh's counter-Enlightenment post-modernist model, with its potential for modifying Heidegger's idea of "situatedness in the world" to allow for an accent on "bodily experience,"[16] has particular relevance to Sontag's association of her call for sensory recuperation with the existential phenomenological experience of both art and modern life. This mission was necessitated, in part, by the "sensory anesthesia" brought about by "'bureaucratic rationalization'" in the modern period.[17] Sontag thus implied criticism of the "progressive" ethos of modernity, which is heir to Enlightenment thinkers' claim for "a strong necessary linkage between the growth of science, rationality, and universal human freedom."[18]

Pragmatism, America's contribution to Western philosophy, was initiated in the late nineteenth century by Charles Peirce and brought to prominence by William James in the early part of the twentieth century. Further notable American exponents include John Dewey, whose particular importance to this study lies in his application of pragmatist principles to aesthetic theory, and Richard Rorty, whose mature pragmatist writings, dating from 1972,[19] spearheaded a re-invigoration of this prominent tradition in American philosophy. Pragmatism rejects the epistemological claims of both transcendental and empiricist variants of traditional philosophy; for the pragmatist, "a meaningful world emerges through man's behavioral rapport with that which gives itself in experience."[20] William James gave a distinctive, if contentious, inflection to the practical orientation of pragmatism in his definition of truth as "only the expedient in our way of thinking"[21] (i.e., "what has fruitful consequences"[22]). Pragmatism and phenomenology converge at the point of the intentional mind-world relation[23] as well as understanding that knowledge or meaning is consequential to this relation. Unlike post-structuralism, these philosophies revise rather than eliminate the rational subject of Cartesianism: the "autonomous, self-determined" subject that is "endowed with the capability of a truth-bearing (because truth-creating) introspection."[24]

Barbara Rose turned to pragmatism in an attempt to formulate a critical system that was capable of accommodating pop, minimal and the "anti-formal" trends that followed, art that could only be negatively appraised

by the prevailing theory of art criticism: Greenbergian formalism. Lawrence Alloway also called upon pragmatism to justify the abolition of fixed and absolute aesthetic standards – those that, as in the previously cited case of Greenbergian formalism, were predicated on the foundational beliefs of traditional idealist philosophy – in his proposed non-hierarchical organization of cultural forms: the "fine art-pop art continuum." This same inclusive theory of culture would assume the theoretical basis of his subsequent interpretation of the iconography of American pop art.

Griffin's definition of "*deconstructive* or *eliminative post modernism*" encompassed its, in some instances, "ethical" motivation that he argued was directed towards refusing formation of "totalitarian systems."[25] The clearest reference to this issue on the part of critics featured in this study was made in Barbara Rose's alignment of Clement Greenberg's "judgmental criticism" – its evaluative criteria predicated on the foundational or logocentric beliefs of idealist philosophy – with maintenance of the social and economic interests of the ruling capitalist system. She saw this situation as facilitated by the media's potential for ideological cooption and, importantly, the media context of Greenberg's judgmental criticism. Rose's engagement in both social and political reform followed on from her pragmatist-directed critique of the evaluative criteria of Greenbergian formalism, its application in her view appropriate *only* in the case of "color-abstraction." It also followed on from her understanding that art informed by pragmatist principles delegitimizes the critic in his capacity of arbiter of merit. As exemplified by pop and minimalism, this same art played out an adversarial role. It refused to conform to "a defined specialized mode or medium judged by preordained canons" and thus to serve the "middle class" as either decoration or financial asset – in Rose's view, the dual role of Greenberg-championed "color-abstraction."[26]

Rose's critique on pragmatist grounds of the capitalist commandeering of Greenbergian formalism complies with a further pragmatist model: "prophetic pragmatism." Cornel West coined this term to signal the alignment of the "tradition of pragmatism" in American thought with a method of "cultural criticism" centred on the issue of power. West explained that the "political motivation" of pragmatism's "human inquiry into truth and knowledge" resided in its focus on "the social and communal circumstances under which persons can communicate and cooperate in the process of acquiring knowledge" as opposed to that of traditional philosophy on the "search for foundations and quest for certainty." Its "political substance" lay in transference of "the prerogatives of philosophers," such as "rational deliberation," to the populace. Central to the concerns of

"prophetic pragmatism," and thus to Rose's critique of Greenbergian formalism, especially as it concerned the interaction between its judgmental nature and its media context, was opposition to "power structures that lack public accountability," those that threaten the "precious ideals of individuality and democracy."[27]

The second post-modernist model, a variation on the deconstructive one just described, has been formulated in recent sociological writings. David Lyon has explained this as one in which "the culture of postmodernism is taken to be evidence of linked social shifts, referred to as postmodernity."[28] Lyon conceived of post-modernism as a category comprising "cultural and intellectual phenomena" and as identified with three key characteristics: (i) the renunciation of "'foundationalism' . . . in the philosophy of science" and, as an extension of this, questioning of the Enlightenment's central obligations; (ii) ensuing breakdown "of hierarchies of knowledge, taste and opinion" as well as shift in focus from the "universal" to the "local"; (iii) the replacement of the various forms of "word" (for example, the spoken and the visual or "printed") by "image," notably the "TV screen." The first two characteristics are, clearly, compatible with a post-structuralist conception of deconstructive post-modernism. Lyon's subsequent discussion indicated that he viewed post-modernist thought as presaged by the "intellectual phenomena" of, among others, Nietzsche and Heidegger and as constituted by that of "new luminaries": the post-structuralists Derrida, Lyotard, Foucault, and Baudrillard.

Lyon construed post-modernity as a marked social change, one heralded by either the arrival of a new societal form or the inauguration of a new phase of capitalism. Whatever the case, prior methods "of social analysis and political practice" have lost their authority. Two concerns were identified by Lyon as having particular relevance: the conspicuousness of "new information and communication technologies," including their facilitation of "globalization"; consumerism and its succession of "production" as the hub of the capitalist system.[29] In reference to the first, Lyon provided a simple, yet graphic, illustration of his claim for a correspondence between the deconstructive characters of post-modernism (the cultural) and post-modernity (the social).

> The global culture facilitated by the spread of electronic technologies . . . does much to relativize once-dominant Western ideas, while the same technologies also enable us to mix-and-match musical tastes or to channel-hop with the TV remote. The forsaking of foundationalism in science and the erosion of hierarchies of knowledge and opinion seem much less surprising or arcane in this light.[30]

Zygmunt Bauman's sociological writings illustrate the second "crucial" issue in post-modern society: the centrality of capitalist-consumerism. The major thesis of these is that reproduction of the capitalist system in its consumerist phase is achieved by "individual freedom" in the form of "consumer freedom." At this time, it no longer requires the "traditional mechanisms" of its "modern phase" (when "work in the form of wage labour" was central), such "as *consensus-aimed political legitimation, ideological domination, uniformity of norms promoted by cultural hegemony.*" Instead:

> Once consumer choice has been entrenched as the point in which systemic reproduction, social integration and individual life-world are coordinated and harmonized – cultural variety, heterogeneity of styles and differentiation of belief systems have become conditions of its success.[31]

Lyon's and Bauman's shared perception of the deconstructive workings of mass communications and capitalist-consumerism and thus deconstructive character of post-modernity was borne out by Alloway's and Rosenberg's respective analyses of pop. Alloway regarded pop as a mirror of the spectrum of visual communications as well as representative of a constitutive channel (painting). His case centred on pop art's use of pre-existing signs disseminated by the mass media in the post-war period as well as the role played by these signs in the constitution of an illusory, man-made world. Alloway's focus on mass communications, however, was distinguished by the patent recognition that this key characteristic of post-war society could not be viewed independently from another: capitalist-consumerism. In this regard, pop art's representation of the "general field of visual communications" was that also of the experience of the specator-consumer who was "free to move in a society defined by symbols."[32] To the extent that this visual field was heterogeneous (a feature that was mirrored in the multiple sources of pop art imagery), it was an expression of the diverse interests of its varied audience. More specifically, it was an expression of consumer-freedom in the sense understood by Bauman: the freedom that was "geared to the market"[33] (and therefore exercised at the level of consumer choice); the freedom that was crucial for the reproduction of the capitalist system in its consumerist phase.

Consistent with both Alloway and Lyon, Rosenberg viewed the workings of mass communications and capitalist-consumerism as symbiotically linked. He noted that under the impact of mechanical reproduction in its technologically advanced post-war form "the distinction between original and copy" had narrowed with the result that art had become part of the

"media system." This meant that it had been "brought into conformity with the total mechanism of production and distribution" and was subject, therefore, to the same "promotion and marketing techniques" as any other commodity within this system.[34] The result, or, in Rosenberg's mind, potential result, of this situation was one in which energy was deflected from creation of the work of art to that of the artist's "alter ego" (or brand-name). In the extreme case of Warhol, this resulted in the "de-definition" of art (i.e., the narrowing of distinctions between art and other commodities in the capitalist system) to the stage where all that remained of art was "the fiction of the artist."[35]

Rosenberg's understanding that Warhol's commodified art was an outcome of capitalist-consumerism has particular relevance to Zygmunt Bauman's arguments. The institutional support commanded by Warhol's art was explained by Rosenberg in terms that relate to Bauman's observation that in the absence of the authority of "universally binding standards," those that are without relevance in the consumerist phase of capitalism, "cultural authorities" opt for the only alternative: turning themselves in "market forces."[36]

Leo Steinberg's conception of the "flatbed" picture plane characteristic of sixties' painting provided the closest support for Lyon's claim of a correlation between the "deconstructive" character of post-modernism and that of the social transformation known as post-modernity. Symbolic of any surface on which information is recorded, the "flatbed" picture plane emerged in response to a "new order of experience": the mediate world created by mass communications in their advanced post-war form and, thus, role of "key simulation machines."[37] He termed this picture plane "post-Modernist" because of its decisive rupture with that of modernist painting, as theorized by Greenberg in the 1965 version of "Modernist Painting."[38] By the terms of Steinberg's argument, however, it represented an equally convincing break with the picture plane of traditional painting (in this, nullifying, or, at least, discrediting Greenberg's distinction between the two). As distinct from the "flatbed" picture plane of "post-Modernist" painting, one indicative of a fundamental shift in the major theme of art from nature to culture, both imply an order of experience that was consistent with man's first-hand optical knowledge of the organic and presumably objective world.

The third post-modernist model relevant to this study concerns the perception of a distinct and self-contained phase of American post-modernism during the sixties. The most comprehensive case was advanced by Andreas Huyssen, who described post-modernism in its 1960's American

manifestation as "avantgardist" after its revitalization of the "European avantgarde" in the direction of "the Duchamp-Cage-Warhol axis." American post-modernism's orientation towards the future, decisive break with the past and "crisis and generational conflict" he construed as strikingly similar to the "imagination" demonstrated previously by the "continental avantgarde." This "imagination," however, was enacted against a specifically American historical backdrop characterized by various platforms of protest, including those either directly relevant or tangential to critical responses to pop that are among those discussed in this study: "the anti-war movement and the counter-culture."[39]

Andreas Huyssen's account of an avantgardist phase of American post-modernism during the sixties differed in a number of respects to the post-modernist consciousness generated by critical responses to pop art during this period.[40] Measured by these, Huyssen's account simplified individual contributions to the American post-modernist character. Huyssen limited Sontag's post-modernism, for example, to "camp and a new sensibility" whereas, equally, it could be identified with the further post-modernist expressions of "genital enlightenment" and "literature of silence," which he attributed to Leslie Fiedler and Ihab Hassan respectively. To the same degree Huyssen was guilty of distorting the character of American post-modernism during the 1960s. "The technological optimism of segments of the 1920s avantgarde" – which he identified as characteristic of "early post-modernism" and as evidence of its "continuity with the international tradition of the modern"[41] – was only partly true of critics featured in this study. More commonly, this attitude sat alongside one critical of modern technological society and its products. This was certainly the case with Rose who, on the one hand, expressed keen admiration for the authentic forms of popular expression that resulted from the interaction of art and technology, as in the prime example of "rock music," but, on the other, expressed wariness of the media because of its potential for ideological annexation.[42] A similar ambiguity marked Sontag's response to technology. On the one hand, she conceived of exemplary art in the present period as that which derives spontaneously and in abundance from "science and technology."[43] On the other, Sontag was scathing of the role played by the technological reproduction of language in both the devaluation of language and intensification of its mediate state.[44] Alloway's seemingly uncritical and unqualified enthusiasm for mass communications in their sophisticated post-war form was outwardly an endorsement of the progressive ethos of modernity, the abandonment of which was regarded by Huyssen as a defining quality of post-modernism.[45] This recognition,

nonetheless, must be tempered by the realization that Alloway's approval of mass communications was in no small measure due to their crucial role in facilitating man's adaptation to his ever-transforming urban environment and therefore efficacy in mitigating the darker aspects of modernity's emphatic forward momentum.[46]

In a further example of his misrepresentation of the character of American post-modernism, Huyssen failed to acknowledge the existence of both phenomenological and pragmatist currents in American post-modernism of the 1960s and, thus, their role in providing deconstructive alternatives to post-structuralism. It is argued in this study that phenomenology represented the major theoretical source of Sontag's, and to a lesser degree, Kozloff's inquiry into the silencing of language. Huyssen's failure to acknowledge this aspect of American post-modernism of the 1960s was tied to his failure also to discuss in any detail the "literature of silence," despite his recognition that it represented one avenue of post-modernism explored by American critics during the 1960s.[47] A number of other flaws in Huyssen's account follow, including its non-observance of those aspects of 1960's American post-modernism that presaged or, alternatively, represented a parallel to later post-modernist phases. Prominent among these is the relationship between the "literature of silence" and post-structuralism. This was despite his claim that both are closely linked with the modern.[48] A further example concerns Harold Rosenberg's conception of pop as an outcome of the post-modern condition or, alternatively, of the modern condition in its distinctive post-war phase. His negative assessment of pop on these grounds resulted from the evidence it presented of the dissolution of "self" by totalitarian forces at work in post-war society.[49] Rosenberg's critique of pop and, through this, that of the post-modern condition, bears some relation to the critical reactions to post-modernity that Charles Jencks has seen as belonging to a stage in the formulation of concepts of post-modernism that has extended from 1980 to the present.[50] It can be related in particular to critiques, such as that conducted by Jean Baudrillard, that are heir to the critical stance adopted by Marxist cultural theorists associated with the Frankfurt School, notably Theodor Adorno, Max Horkheimer, and Herbert Marcuse. These theorists were unanimous in their rejection of the thesis responsible for modernity's emphasis on "progress" as well as of the role envisaged for science (in the guise of technology) in the realization of its aims. They saw it as a continuation of Enlightenment thinkers' claims for the interrelationship "between the growth of science, rationality, and universal human freedom."[51]

However, unlike the bleak view of social control presented, for example, by either Jean Baudrillard or Herbert Marcuse,[52] Rosenberg considered that totalitarian forces were opposable; salvation lay within the individual and concerned an existentialist-directed choice between a life lived in terms of "second-hand values," "the official ones of a given time or place," and a life lived in terms of "genuine values," those that must be "earned . . . in the joys and agonies of immediate personal experience."[53] Rosenberg's understanding that the "citizenry in action"[54] could bring about social reform was broadly consistent with Andreas Huyssen's description of the heady mission of the "historical avantgarde" as that of changing "life," "society," and the "world" – the "overload of responsibilities" on which it foundered. Forging a closer link between Rosenberg's existentialist social reform and the mission of the historical avantgarde, Huyssen considered that the latter "lived on in France through the 1950s and 1960s embodied in the figure of [the existentialist philosopher and personal friend of Rosenberg[55]] Jean Paul Sartre."[56] Rosenberg's view that totalitarianism could be defeated at the level of individual resistance and in the existentialist manner of the individual's realization of "his own true self,"[57] adds weight to Huyssen's argument concerning the adversarial social role and thus avantgardist character of American post-modernism during the sixties. Equally, however, it can be identified with prophetic pragmatism's critique and resistance of any semblance of subjection, the ethical motivation for which was conservation of the cherished principles "of creative democracy and individuality."[58]

In other respects, however, the findings of this study support Huyssen's avantgardist model of post-modernism, including its immediate stimulus in American historical factors. Those most relevant to this study concern the counter-culture and its program of liberation. For example, Susan Sontag's contribution to the "sex avantgardes"[59] and, by the terms of Huyssen's argument, American post-modernism in the 1960s, rested on the distinctive sexual inflection she gave to her call for recuperation of the senses. The assault on rationality that the restoration of sensory experience necessarily incurred was largely justified by existential phenomenology's elimination of the mind-body duality of Cartesianism. A more marked example of Sontag's contribution to the "sex avantgardes" took place in her review of Norman O. Brown's *Life Against Death*, in which she linked the subjects of "eroticism" and "liberty." Alluding to the liberationist and reformatory aims of the American counter-culture as well as to the provincialism that it can be argued was a requisite condition of its existence, Sontag considered that only now in America were these subjects commanding the "serious" contemplation that they have long enjoyed in France.[60] Son-

tag's equation of sexual expression with human freedom conformed, no doubt, to the "genital enlightenment" that Huyssen identified as part of the literary critic Leslie Fiedler's contribution to post-modernism in its 1960's, specifically American, phase.[61]

Barbara Rose's call for the abolition of "judgmental criticism," especially in the form of Greenbergian formalism, on the grounds of its relationship to capitalist hegemony, complied with a further characteristic of avantgardism that Huyssen identified in early post-modernism: a subversive assault on "the 'institution art.'" Huyssen, as he acknowledged, used this term in the sense defined by Peter Bürger in *The Theory of the Avant-garde* to refer "to the ways in which art's role in society is perceived and defined . . . [and] to ways in which art is produced, marketed, distributed and consumed." In reference to Bürger's argument, Huyssen claimed that the "historical avantgarde's" subversion of both "cultural institutions" and conventional representative methods could only take place in a "society" in which élite art provided vital support for "a cultural establishment and its claims to aesthetic knowledge."[62] Its example, in Huyssen's opinion, served to inspire American post-modernism in the sixties, at a time when high art had become institutionalized, even if the art domesticated in this manner was "modernism," the traditional function of which was to repel institutionalization.

Rose's and Huyssen's respective arguments, however, focused on different aspects of the so-called institutionalization of art. That of Rose was directed towards the institutionalization of Greenbergian formalism. Huyssen made clear reference to Abstract Expressionism in his claim that the rebellion of the 1960s was in response to the type of modernism that had become both constituent "of the liberal-conservative consensus" and "propaganda weapon in the cultural-political arsenal of Cold War anti-communism."[63] Within this scheme, pop assumed an adversarial role. Huyssen acknowledged the "cooption [of the "pop avantgarde"] through commodification," in this confirming the case outlined by Rosenberg in "D. M. Z. Vanguardism."[64] He considered, nonetheless, that it "retained a certain cutting edge in its proximity to the 1960s culture of confrontation." Rose expressed a similar view in the sixties in her account of pop as guided by a pragmatist aesthetic and, on these grounds, as disruptive of the social, economic, and "psychological" fabric of post-war America.[65] During this same period, however, Rosenberg regarded pop art's capitulation to the economic dictates of capitalism and the avantgarde's subversion of either this or any other prevailing system as mutually exclusive acts. He stated without equivocation that from the time of pop "no influential American art

movement has been either overtly or tacitly hostile to the 'majority culture.'"[66]

Huyssen speculated that the "temporal imagination" of American post-modernism in its sixties' phase, though displayed previously by the "continental avantgarde," responded in the first instance to a specific "historical constellation." Given that he identified one aspect of this "temporal imagination" as "a powerful sense of the future and of new frontiers,"[67] his argument was pre-figured in a further aspect of Rose's "post-modernist" theorization of pop. Rose had argued for an ideological and aesthetic polarity in sixties' art between "color-abstraction," on the one hand, and pop and minimal art, on the other. Whereas "color-abstraction," underpinned by an idealist philosophy and thus indicative of traditional values of Western culture, was representative of Europe (the past), pop and minimal art, underpinned by pragmatism, "the only uniquely American contribution to philosophic inquiry," was representative instead of American culture (the future).[68] Rose's analysis of pop and minimal art, while complying with Huyssen's loosely defined "temporal imagination," tallied more closely with certain of the "fundamental historical processes" that Cornel West in recent time has cited as implicated in the linked advent of post-modernity and "prophetic pragmatism": "the end of the European Age (1492–1945)" and "the emergence of the United States as the world power."[69]

A number of the post-modernist concepts that were labelled "post-modernist" as well as formulated in the field of American literary criticism either prior to or during the period under review are relevant to the post-modernist consciousness generated by pop. They will be discussed, where relevant, throughout the study. However, the American literary academic Ihab Hassan's writings on post-modernism, taken in their entirety, combine all of the features of deconstructive post-modernism that this study has identified as characteristic of American post-modernism in the sixties. Many of these were present as early as 1971 in the post-modernist model he outlined in "POSTmodernISM: A Paracritical Bibliography." This had been published prior to Hassan's exposure to post-structuralism (or at least reference to it in his post-modernist writings), prior to the escalation of "post-modernism" into a worldview, and prior to the greater identification of its dominant deconstructive form with post-structuralism. Hassan's 1971 account of deconstructive post-modernism demands some attention, given not only its correspondence to a number of aspects of the critical reception of American pop art examined in this study but also its proximity to the temporal and cultural parameters of this study.

In his 1971 formulation, Hassan conceived of post-modernism as a transformation in modernism, one discerned by viewing the latter in retrospect.[70] He defined it in a diffuse, encyclopaedic fashion and listed its deconstructive characteristics in a series of "Post-modernist Notes," which had been prompted by "Modernist Rubrics." Under the rubric of "Antinomianism," for example, Hassan cited the post-modernist characteristics of "Counter Cultures, political and otherwise" and "Counter Western 'ways' or metaphysics," as represented by "Zen, Buddhism, Hinduism." Included in Hassan's response to "Experimentalism" was "open, discontinuous, improvisational, indeterminate, or aleatory structures" as well as "intermedia, the fusion of forms, the confusion of realms."[71] In accord with the cross-disciplinary approach that Charles Jencks considered a stimulus to the broadly conceived post-modernist movement,[72] Hassan applied his post-modernist model beyond literature to encompass non-verbal forms of language. Under the modernist rubric of "Dehumanization," and clearly with Warhol's art in mind, he included "abstraction taken to the limit and coming back as New Concreteness: the found object, the signed Brillo box or soup can."[73]

Consistent with his initial use of the term "post-modernism" in the previous year,[74] Hassan classified "languages of silence" as among the themes of "Post-modernist criticism." In a "chronology" of post-modernist criticism, he placed his own writings on "languages of silence" in the company of those of George Steiner and Susan Sontag.[75] This association was made again in "Culture, Indeterminacy, and Immanence" (1977–8), in which Hassan described Steiner and Sontag, along with himself, as expounders of the condition of silence.[76]

In his 1971 account of post-modernism, Hassan forged a connection between the philosophers Heidegger, Wittgenstein, and Sartre, who have investigated "the disease of verbal systems" and writers from a later period, such as John Cage, Norman O. Brown, and Elie Wiesel, who "have listened intently to the sounds of silence in art or politics, sex, morality, or religion."[77] With the exception of Wiesel, Hassan thus cited key sources of Susan Sontag's justification for silent art or, alternatively, silent art's silencing of the critic. By linking the philosophers Heidegger, Wittgenstein, and Sartre with the "languages of silence," Hassan confirmed this study's finding that the theorization of "silent" language on the part of American literary and, and in the case of Max Kozloff, art critics during the sixties was part of the broader critique of language that had been conducted primarily in the field of philosophy and throughout the twentieth century.

In a separate section within his 1971 account of post-modernism, Hassan described a common modernist and post-modernist response to

"Dehumanization" as the disappearance of the "old Realism" and its increasing replacement by "illusionism" in art as well as life. By this he meant either the replacement or obscuring of objective reality by a mediate, illusory, and man-made world. Reinforcing the claims of both the "social" critics and the post-modernist theorist David Lyon about the deconstructive character of mass communications in their post-war phase and hence of post-modernity, Hassan noted the media's contribution "to this process in Postmodern society." It was alluded to once again in his "post-modernist" response to the modernist rubric of "Technologism," as it concerned "boundless dispersal by media."

The demise of the "old Realism," in Hassan's opinion, necessitated "revision of the Self." In post-modernism, this revision included that associated with "phenomenology (Husserl, Sartre, Merleau-Ponty)" as well as "*nouveau roman*" as represented by "Sarraute, Butor, Robbe-Grillet."[78] Hassan's claim has particular relevance to Sontag's linkage of "silent" language with a phenomenological view of human consciousness; Robbe-Grillet's theorization of *nouveau roman* and Roland Barthes's theorization of Robbe-Grillet's contribution to *nouveau roman* were both prime mediatory sources of phenomenology for Sontag's theorization of silent art's silencing of the critic.

Hassan's understanding of "Realism" in "art" was consistent with the mimetic belief that reality "resided in the objective external world" and that art could reflect "this objective form."[79] As with his understanding of "Realism" in "life," it implied an identification with the Cartesian subject: the "subjective self reflecting on an objective world exterior to it."[80] Hassan implied that from a post-modernist perspective the end of the "objective" world or, at least, difficulty in gaining access to it meant the end also of the authority of Cartesianism, both its "spectatorial and intellectualist"[81] epistemology and conception of the "self." In Hassan's estimation, phenomenology would provide a more appropriate and more plausible explanation of human consciousness at a time in which the objective world was being replaced, or increasingly disguised, by the mediate one created by the media. Phenomenology, pivotal on the tenet of intentionality of consciousness and thus on the abandonment of the subject-object dualism of Cartesianism, espouses the view that the world cannot be known as it is. Instead, "the object [of consciousness] is always restructured by the perceiving mind."[82]

Sontag's rejection of the realist paradigm, it will be argued, was also predicated on a phenomenological view of human consciousness. This position was implicit in her justification for the need to silence the critic and,

by these means, relieve him of his interpretive role. The continuance of this role, she considered, was particularly inappropriate in the face of art such as pop that, as evidenced by the "uninterpretable" nature of its literal imagery, was prompted "by a flight from interpretation." Sontag blamed Western critics' persistence in interpreting art on the continuing influence of "the Greek theory of art as mimesis or representation,"[83] the central assumption of which was that art could and should mirror the outer world in its "objective" form.[84]

Unlike the deconstructive post-modernism revealed in both Rose's and Alloway's critical reception of pop during the sixties, pragmatism assumed only a minor place in Hassan's 1971 formulation. Its inclusion at all rested on a fleeting reference to Morse Peckham's conception of art as "a disjunctive category, established by convention" as well as "not a category of perceptual fields, but of role-playing."[85] Hassan acknowledged the source of these observations as Peckham's *Man's Rage for Chaos*, a prime influence on Barbara Rose's pragmatist interpretation of pop and minimal art. The minor place assigned to pragmatism in Hassan's post-modernist writings at this stage continued in those produced throughout the seventies. A further if equally rare mention of it is made in the "margins" of "Culture, Indeterminacy, and Immanence" (1977). Hassan then identified William James, the pioneering pragmatist philosopher and contemporary of Nietzsche, as sympathetic to the tenets of (deconstructive) post-modernism. In the same essay, as indicated by his inclusion of major first- and second-generation post-structuralists in a lengthy list of descendants of "French Nietzsche,"[86] he accorded post-structuralism a prominent position in his deconstructive post-modernist model (far more so than pragmatism at this stage).

In Hassan's publications on post-modernism from a decade later, however, pragmatism took centre stage. The major pragmatist influence was William James, especially his concept of a "'pluralistic universe.'"[87] In "Prospects in Retrospect" (1987), the concluding essay of *The Post-modern Turn* (1987), Hassan defined pragmatic pluralism as "no philosophical system" but, rather, as "the very condition of our existence in the world." As Hassan noted: "so long as two minds seek to apprehend that universe, no overwhelming force or sweet seduction, no theory whatever, will reduce it to one."[88]

In a publication from the same year, and in implicit defence of his by now clear favouring of the pragmatist argument for elimination of a world-view,[89] Hassan sought support in the form of Yves Bonnefoy, who succeeded Roland Barthes at the Collège de France, to indicate a turn in the "deconstructive mood" in France, the home of post-structuralism. Bonnefoy,

he noted, called in his initial "address of 1981 . . . for a re-turn to being or presence," one that alluded to a realignment of "language" with "human relations" and, as construed by Hassan, a suggestion "of pragmatism."

Guided in part by the ideas of Richard Rorty, the most prominent member of the pragmatist movement in its reinvigorated contemporary phase, Hassan considered that pragmatism's "commitment to *beliefs in action* [i.e., those arising from man's behavioral interaction with the world] *rather than ironies of theory* . . . [invested it] with a moral and social concern that textualism" lacked. Pragmatism was further described as "intimate with all the uncertainties of our post-modern condition without quiescence, sterility, or abdication of judgment." Moreover, it offered "genuine possibilities of thought and action" in its avoidance of "the extremes of philosophic skepticism and ideological dogmatism," characteristics that, he noted, "Michael Polanyi believed, once joined to usher political totalitarianism in Continental Europe."[90]

Hassan's by now patent disenchantment with post-structuralism rested on two main factors. One of these, Hassan's negative reference to "philosophic skepticism," was presumably directed at post-structuralism's delegitimizing activity. Art Berman has pointed out that a common supposition of post-structuralist theorists arose from their questioning of Ferdinand de Saussure's clear distinction between signifiers and signifieds. They argued, instead, "that the chain of signifiers cannot yield irreducible signifieds." "What any signifier signifies . . . cannot be divulged except by using more words, more signifiers" with the result that language points to itself and "the idea of a knowable reality independent of language is rejected."[91] The second factor concerns Hassan's criticism of "textualism" on the grounds of its absence of "a moral and social concern." This can be construed as criticism of the "aesthetic" nature of post-structuralist critical activity that, as explained by Terry Eagleton, conceives of the "'work'" as a "'text'" and therefore not as "a closed entity, equipped with definite meanings" but rather "as irreducibly plural, an endless play of signifiers which can never be finally nailed down to a single centre, essence or meaning."[92] This narrow view of both the nature and the scope of post-structuralist critical activity, one that ignores the application of post-structuralist findings on language to a broad cultural critique,[93] complies with that of Andreas Huyssen. Distinguishing post-structuralist activity from avantgardism, Huyssen noted that it purports to comment on nothing other than "language games, . . . epistemology and the aesthetic."[94]

The ethical motivation that Hassan ascribed to pragmatism, if only cursorily indicated, invites identification with Cornel West's "prophetic" vari-

ant. Pragmatism's focus on human agency in the production of knowledge and truth is transferred in prophetic pragmatism to a critique of the alignment of forms of knowledge and oppressive social practices. Cornel West saw Foucault's post-structuralism and prophetic pragmatism as bound by a common foe: "forms of subjection . . . economic exploitation, state repression, and bureaucratic domination." Unlike the commentary and refusals of Foucault's post-structuralism, however, in which the centred subject has been banished, those of prophetic pragmatism are directed by the precious principles "of creative democracy and individuality."[95] Almost twenty years before pragmatism's capacity for cultural critique would become a feature, if understated feature, of Hassan's deconstructive post-modernism, it was one of Barbara Rose's. This concerned her pragmatist theorization of pop and minimal art, including its adversarial social role, as well as her pragmatist-directed critique of the judgmental function of Greenbergian formalism on the grounds that this rendered it vulnerable to cooption by the prevailing capitalist system.

At the very time that the uniquely American philosophy of pragmatism – in both its pluralistic and culturally critical forms – held centre stage in his theorization of deconstructive post-modernism, Hassan confirmed Andreas Huyssen's identification of the specifically American "historical" backdrop against which post-modernism of the 1960s was enacted.[96] Huyssen saw this as characterized by a "protest culture" whose appellation "counter-culture" projected "an image of an avantgarde leading the way to an alternative kind of society."[97] In "Prospects in Retrospect," Hassan noted in a similar fashion that post-modernism may well have been invigorated by, if not derived from, the "liberationist and countercultural" impulses that characterized America in the sixties. Justifying both this claim as well as that concerning the recent shift in deconstruction, and hence in deconstructive post-modernism, away from post-structuralism to pragmatism, Hassan pointed out that the American variant of post-modernism revealed it to be "utopian" and "positive" and "not only delegitimizing" as asserted by French (presumably post-structuralist) critics in recent times.[98]

In "Pluralism in Post-modern Perspective" (1986), Hassan listed decanonization as among the eleven features that defined post-modernism's "cultural field." Consciously aligning "decanonization" with Lyotard's "'delegitimation' of the mastercodes in society," Hassan considered that "this applies to all canons, all conventions of authority."[99] The critics featured in this study, however, did not engage in the indiscriminate decanonization (or "ultra-avantgardism"[100]) described by Hassan. Instead, they carried out a subversion of critical canons that, in the face of the evidence

presented by pop and, in some arguments, by further examples of "anonymous" contemporary art, could no longer compel conviction. Two canons, in particular, met this fate: Clement Greenberg's formalist theory of art, the prevailing critical mode and account of modernist art during the sixties; Realism and allied mimetic theories of representation.

Regardless of whether designated "social" or "philosophical," all of the "art" critics featured in this study challenged the premises of Greenberg's modernist and formalist canon or, in some instances, comparable canons. Three main aspects of Greenberg's canon were targeted for criticism. First, its essentialism. In "Modernist Painting" (1961), Greenberg defined the "essence of modernism" as "the use of the characteristic methods of a discipline to criticize the discipline itself . . . in order to entrench it more firmly in its area of competence." This led to the elimination "from the specific effects of each art any and every effect that might conceivably be borrowed from or by the medium of any other art." In painting, this meant stressing the inescapable "flatness of the surface" because only flatness belonged exclusively to "pictorial art." The "self-critical" tendency of modernism, Greenberg saw as an "exacerbation" of that of the philosophy of the Enlightenment figure Immanuel Kant – "the first real modernist"[101] – who had distinguished between the various spheres of knowledge: "aesthetic judgement," "practical reason (moral judgement) and understanding (scientific knowledge)."[102]

The "social" critics, without exception, argued for the irrelevance of a credo of "purified categories" (and even more for its theoretical justification in German epistemology from the eighteenth century and thus preindustrial times) during a period when boundaries between both disciplines and cultural realms had been dissolved. This, it was argued, was a consequence of the deconstructive workings of mass communications and capitalist-consumerism: the defining and symbiotic features of post-war societal form and thus of post-modernity. Leo Steinberg's argument concerning the "flatbed" picture plane, the characteristic picture plane of sixties' art that had emerged in response to the "new order of experience" effected by the mass media, was predicated on precisely this case.[103] For Alloway, evidence presented in pop of signs that were common to both this movement in art and popular culture substantiated his functionalist and non-essentialist view that art, including pop art, was a form of visual communication "not different in kind from other forms of visual communication."[104] Harold Rosenberg's argument was founded on art's reproduction by the media and subsequent absorption into the "media system" with the result that distinctions between art and other cultural forms were nar-

rowed. Somewhat pejoratively, however, it focused on art's "deformation and loss of identity," one that was consistent with its survival at the junctures of mass media, craft and "applied sciences."[105]

The second aspect of Greenberg's canon to be subjected to criticism was its underlying cultural assumptions. These were responsible for his conception of the endeavour of the avant-garde: preservation of cultural standards and association of the highest of these with "purity of medium." Moreover, they were implicit in all of Greenberg's writings on modernist and hence formalist art, including those such as "Modernist Painting" that were outwardly unconcerned with cultural theory. Greenberg's cultural position was initially stated and found its clearest expression in "Avant-Garde and Kitsch" (1939). This combined a critique of capitalist culture and concern for the survival of "genuine culture" under capitalism with a stance on both avantgarde art and its broader cultural role. Greenberg had arrived at his position by conflating an art-for-art's sake philosophy and Trotskyist ideas, those related to the belief that the absolute freedom of art was the first condition of its "objective enriching of culture."[106]

Reflecting on the situation at hand, Greenberg saw the avant-garde's survival and, therefore, that of "living culture," as under threat on two counts: the rapidly shrinking class of the "rich and cultivated," the avant-garde's necessary social base and source of income; the emergence of mass culture (the rear-garde), simultaneous to that of the avant-garde and its commodities that he termed kitsch. Kitsch, an academicized form of avant-garde or "genuine" culture, arose to meet the demands of a universally literate (literacy, in this new situation, was no longer the "exclusive concomitant of refined tastes") and industrialized society. Its inferiority was conditioned by industrial capitalism's related demands of mass intelligibility and appeal and profitability, the same profitability that Greenberg considered "a source of temptation to the avant-garde itself."[107]

The rejection of Greenberg's conception of an oppositional as well as hierarchical relationship between mass and high culture by critics featured in this study took one of two forms. First, disagreement with Greenberg's negative appraisal of the products of mass culture. Lawrence Alloway, as a case in point, strongly objected to Greenberg's perception of kitsch – Greenberg's uniformly discriminatory term for the various forms of mass culture – as "academic" in the sense of taken from the "debased and academicized simulacra of genuine culture."[108] Alloway perceived the mass arts, instead, as marked by "topicality and a rapid rate of change,"[109] qualities that he regarded were consistent with their status as products of technologically oriented "industrial civilization." In accord with his focus on

art's "human use," Alloway deflected attention from the question of "quality" in the mass arts to that of their crucial and vital role – one determined by their "topicality" – in facilitating man's adaptation to his ever-changing environment.

Barbara Rose, in an analysis of the state of culture since 1950 and in a spirit as positive as Alloway's, distinguished authentic manifestations of popular expression such as "intermedia," those that are wholly "natural, spontaneous, and unselfconscious," from "alienated *kitsch*" and its mere mimicry of "elitist styles."[110] She reserved the pejorative term "*kitsch*" for those forms of mass art that exhibited the parasitic dependence on high art that Greenberg had previously described in "Avant-Garde and Kitsch."[111] Authentic popular expression, by way of contrast, was marked by a vitality; in terms of the contemporary situation and in the supreme example of "rock music" it was one that was unequalled by art (including music) produced in the "elite" sphere.[112] In this understanding, she departed from Greenberg who saw *kitsch*, and thus mass art in total, as providing "something of merit, something that has an authentic folk flavor [and thus vitality]," only in "accidental and isolated instances."[113]

A further aspect of Rose's analysis of the cultural situation since 1950 indicates the second ground for disagreement with Greenberg's cultural theory: the "death" of the avant-garde. In Rose's opinion, the avant-garde's disappearance coincided with "the economic dissociation of art from society which defines the situation of the avant-garde."[114] Harold Rosenberg disputed the notion of "vanguardism" on identical grounds. In the case of pop art, evidence for his argument resided in its commodified character (one that blurred distinctions between élite and mass art) as well as in its public and institutional "success." The acknowledged reference point for Rosenberg's argument, however, was Renato Poggioli's account of the alienation of the artist from majority culture, as outlined in *The Theory of the Avant-Garde* (1968).

The third aspect of Greenberg's modernist canon to attract censure was the fixed and absolute nature of its evaluative criteria.These were predicated on the foundationalist beliefs of idealist philosophy and, in the form they would assume in "Modernist Painting" (1960), concerned the linkage of "quality" in art in the modern period with "purity of medium." Criticism of Greenberg's evaluative criteria on the part of critics featured in this study was conducted in the terms of the deconstructive philosophies of either pragmatism or phenomenology. Pragmatism rejects the accounts of "meaning" arrived at by both idealist and empiricist philosophies. Instead, it holds that it comes "to be in man's behavioral rapport with that which

gives itself in experience."[115] Barbara Rose interpreted John Cage's understanding of art in this pragmatist sense as "a certain kind of *activity*" rather than "a defined specialized mode or medium judged by preordained canons."[116] In Rose's view, art illustrative of the pragmatist aesthetic, such as pop and minimal art, could not be judged by a changeless standard of quality,[117] namely that espoused by Greenbergian formalism and reigning theory of art.

Pragmatism, as previously indicated, was the philosophical attitude governing Lawrence Alloway's formulation of the "fine art-pop art continuum": the inclusive theory of both art and culture that Alloway developed in Britain in the late 1950s and that in the next decade served as the theoretical basis of his interpretation of American pop art. The "fine art-pop art continuum" was an attempt to provide an unprejudiced account of the nature of artistic production under industrial capitalism in its post-war and hence technologically advanced and consumerist form. Alloway's formulation of this theory took place prior to that of Greenberg's modernist canon, at least in the refined and definitive form it would assume in "Modernist Painting." His conscious target was the "two-culture" theory responsible for the hierarchical organization of mass and high art, especially as outlined by Greenberg in "Avant-Garde and Kitsch" (1939). The inflexible nature of the evaluative criteria of this latter source – their formalist nature at this stage directed by an art-for-art's sake philosophy – was unable to accommodate transformations in the societal form and, for this reason, in art responsive to that form.

A further conscious target of Alloway's critique of traditional aesthetics comprised the "eternal truths"[118] that informed the British art theorist Herbert Read's account of art in the machine age. As indicated in *Art and Industry* (1933), Read's view of machine art was progressive to the extent that he believed that traditional ideals of beauty had little place in the machine age when the processes of production were entirely different. Ultimately, however, Read measured the art of the machine by traditional humanist values, those stemming from the belief that "the artist's power and knowledge are implicitly or explicitly analogous to God's."[119] Read could therefore claim that the worth of machine art was directly proportionate to the "sensibility and genius" of its designer.[120]

Max Kozloff's objection to the evaluative criteria of Greenberg's modernist canon was the same as that belonging to any other critical system that judged art according to pre-ordained theories and standards. With specific reference to the critics Greenberg and Rosenberg and, hence, to their respective formalist and existentialist critical positions, Kozloff observed

that they were unable to view art independent "from their own systems or ideologies."[121] In an attempt to avoid the pre-judgment of art based on an "arbitrary hierarchy of values" as well as to acknowledge those aspects of art most relevant to the critic's direct experience, Kozloff proposed a critical stance derived from a phenomenological view of human consciousness. This was calculated to free the experience of art from contamination by prior knowledge, that which obscured the critic's "verifiable consciousness."[122] His ambition in this regard is intelligible only in terms of the goal of Edmund Husserl's epistemological phenomenology: "cognition that is absolutely certain."[123]

Finally, of equal importance to this study is the target of "decanonization" represented by realism and associated mimetic theories of representation, fundamental to which was the belief that reality resided "in the objective, external world, and art was an imitation of this objective form."[124] The "social" critics without exception distinguished between realism – "the artist's perception of objects in space and their translation into iconic, or faithful signs" – and pop art – the representation of "material that already exists as signs."[125] This distinction stemmed from their common perception of the role played by mass communications in the post-war period in the proliferation of signs and symbols in society and therefore in the increasingly mediate nature of contemporary experience in which "no reality claims to be more real than its representation."[126]

The cultural critic Susan Sontag was equally concerned with subverting the authority of realism. However, as explained in relation to Ihab Hassan's revision of the subject in the post-modernist period, her objections were manifested in criticism of the critic's interpretive role that she saw as inappropriate in the modern period when art, as exemplified by the "literal" imagery of pop art, was, clearly, calculated to frustrate interpretation. To the extent that realist art rests on the mimetic assumption that it is a reflection of the world in its "external" and "objective" form,[127] it implies agreement with the "spectatorial and intellectualist epistemology" of Cartesianism.[128] Sontag endorsed, instead, a phenomenological view of human consciousness. This holds that the world cannot be known in any objective form, but, rather, in a manner that arises from the intentional mind-world relation.

PART TWO

“Social” Critics

This page intentionally left blank

2

Lawrence Alloway

Pop Art and the "Pop Art–Fine Art Continuum"

Lawrence Alloway, Harold Rosenberg, and Leo Steinberg are united by a common, if broadly defined, methodological approach to pop art. It was one that sought to explain the iconographic, stylistic, and formal features of this movement in terms of the deconstructive effect of key technological and economic characteristics of post-war Western urban society: mass communications and capitalist consumerism. In seeking authority for this approach, these critics discredited, if in varying ways, the prevailing modernist paradigm of Greenbergian formalism as well as the traditional representational paradigm in both the art and literature of realism.

Within this area of consensus each critic presented a distinct argument concerning the perceived bond between pop art and the deconstructive character of mass communications and consumerism. Rosenberg regarded pop as evidence of the "de-definition" of art; Alloway saw it as a mirror of the spectrum of visual communications as well as representative of a constitutive channel (painting) and, in its communicative function, as equally "de-defined"; Steinberg identified the "flatbed" picture plane as that characteristic of "post-Modernist" painting, including pop. Steinberg's case, as with Alloway's, centres on the pop artists' use of pre-existing signs disseminated by mass communications in the post-war period as well as on the role played by these signs in the creation of a mediate world. It is, however, more theoretical and more rigorously medium-specific, its credibility dependent on "deconstructing" Greenberg's distinction between the types of illusion inherent in modernist and traditional painting.

It will be argued in this chapter, and those that follow in this section, that post-modernist traits in Alloway's, Rosenberg's, and Steinberg's respective critical responses to pop art resulted primarily from their perception of the close bond between pop and key characteristics of its

post-war urban context. Despite the fact that their interest lay, foremost, with the "cultural" (i.e., with art), their methodology is consistent with that employed in recent sociological theorizations of post-modernism and its allied post-modern condition in which "major motifs of [deconstructive] postmodernist thought" are seen to "link the social and the cultural." The argument, here, is that post-modernism's deconstruction or elimination "of the ingredients necessary for a worldview,"[1] justified, for example, by the tenets of post-structuralism and the closely allied philosophies of pragmatism and phenomenology, is a logical expression of or, at least, complement to the workings of the social in the post-modern period.

Alloway's perception of the deconstructive workings of mass communications and consumerism and, hence, of the social in its post-war, post-modernist phase, are apparent in his interpretation of pop art's subject-matter as the spectrum of visual communications. Three of the assumptions underlying this interpretation have a direct bearing on the incidence of post-modernism in Alloway's critical reception of American pop art. First, fine art, and thus pop art, can be included in a culturally heterogeneous field if categorized in a non-essentialist and functionalist manner as communication. Two, the diversity of the communicative field mirrored by pop is tied, in part at least, to a similar diversity in its audience. Alloway understood the audience's socially and economically constituted role as that of consumer. A defining feature of this role was consumer freedom, one exercised at the level of consumer choice and necessary for the reproduction of the capitalist system in its post-war, consumerist phase.[2] Finally, mass communications and its constant "other," consumerism, have played a pivotal role in the proliferation of signs and symbols in post-war society and, hence, in the creation of a mediate world that is distinct from and presumably obscures or impedes access to that of an "objective" and foundational nature.

A further post-modernist feature of Alloway's theorization of pop art is closer, however, to the philosophical model of deconstructive post-modernism. To the extent that Alloway linked pop's indeterminacy (or ambiguity) with its depiction of the "mobility of signs, their multiple uses" and this in turn with its depiction of the "human communication" system,[3] he linked it, equally, with pragmatist semiotics. Charles Morris's pragmatist contention that the meaning of signs vary in accord with "the dispositions to behavior which they cause in their interpreters,"[4] is consistent with the central (and deconstructive) tenet of philosophical pragmatism. This holds that meaning or significance arises from "man's behavioral rapport with that which gives itself in experience."[5]

The formative phase of Lawrence Alloway's critical philosophy, while by no means immune to American influences, took place away from America. Alloway was born in London in 1926. His long and varied career in the visual arts, one that spanned more than thirty years and encompassed the diverse roles of critic, curator, and academic, began in 1948 when he took up the position of Assistant Lecturer at the National Gallery, London. Among the more significant posts occupied by Alloway in the following decade were those of Assistant Director (1954–7) and Deputy Director (1957–9) of the Institute of Contemporary Art, London, British correspondent for *Art News* (1953–7) and Contributing Editor of *Art International* (1957–61). In 1961, at the age of thirty-five, Lawrence Alloway moved to America where he worked as an instructor in the Department of Art, Bennington College, Vermont. In the following year he took up the prestigious appointment of Curator of the Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, an appointment that marked his entry into the New York art world and that he held until 1966. The more important positions occupied by Alloway after that time included the following: Professor of Art, State University of New York, Stony Brook (1968–81); Art Editor, *The Nation* (1968–90); Associate Editor, *Artforum* (1971–6). Alloway died in New York, 2 January 1990.[6]

Alloway's formal association with the emergent American pop art movement dates from the time of *Six Painters and the Object*, an exhibition held at the Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum in 1963 prior to the definitive labelling of the movement. Alloway both curated and wrote the catalogue essay for the exhibition that comprised the painters Jasper Johns, Roy Lichtenstein, Andy Warhol, and James Rosenquist, as well as the "object-makers" Robert Rauschenberg and James Dine who were represented by works that included only "moderate collage elements, but no three-dimensional appendages."[7] During the sixties Alloway penned a further catalogue essay (*Six More*[8]) and a number of articles on American pop art as well as what was, in effect, a history and a pre-history of the British variant for one of the earliest book-length studies of the pop art movement, *Pop Art* (1966), in which Lippard, the contributing editor, wrote the section on New York pop.[9]

Alloway's fullest account of American pop art (a book-length study entitled *American Pop Art*) was published in 1974 in conjunction with a retrospective exhibition of New York and Californian pop art held at the Whitney Museum of American Art. Because of its comprehensiveness, *American Pop Art* is the prime source of Alloway's views on pop art for this study – despite the fact that the time of its publication falls outside pop's time frame of the sixties. In Alloway's case, this is of no consequence;

the manner in which American pop art is theorized in *American Pop Art* differs little, if at all, from that in writings from the previous decade. Much of *American Pop Art*, moreover, is taken from earlier writings. With only slight amendment, "Popular Culture and Pop Art" (1969)[10] forms the first fifteen pages of the general account of the American movement contained in the section entitled "Definition." This article, in turn, is indebted to the Granada Guildhall lectures in London in 1969 to which Alloway, in the acknowledgments of *American Pop Art*, partly attributed the same section. He also gave credit to the publication's reliance on earlier versions of material on Johns, Rauschenberg, Lichtenstein, and Rosenquist.

Consistent with the debt of *American Pop Art* to earlier writings on pop art Alloway's views on the subject did *not* evolve. In *Six More* from 1963, Alloway identified the "combination of flatness with signs indicating things in the world" as the point of unity among a group of pop artists (Californian artists in this case) otherwise distinguished by individual styles.[11] Some fifteen years later, in an interview conducted in 1978, Alloway provided a similarly pithy account of pop art's dual formal and significatory character, on this occasion describing pop as representing "a convergence of interests of the flatness of Abstract Expressionism combined with an interest in signs of contemporary life."[12]

Despite Alloway's recognition of pop art's dual character, he regarded pop primarily as an art of iconography and as being about the signs and sign-systems that constitute the twentieth-century communication system. In *American Pop Art* Alloway cited numerous cases, including that of Roy Lichtenstein's use of Mickey Mouse[13] in which the subject has been expanded to encompass the sign-system of the comic-book in which Mickey first appeared. Lichtenstein's *Rouen Cathedral (Seen at Three Different Times of Day)* after Monet represented a different case. As opposed to switching an image that originated in one context (popular art) to another (pop art), Lichtenstein transposed an art work into a distinctly different "system of values."[14] Alloway was referring, of course, to Lichtenstein's transcription of the sensitive syntax of Monet's unique oil paintings – concerned with capturing the fugitive effects of light at a given moment in time – into the bland, reductive, and regular schema of the Ben Day dots of the printing process.

Alloway's understanding that pop was commensurate with communication was predicated on the functionalist assumption that art, including pop, was a *form* of communication "not different in kind from other forms of visual communication."[15] He thus claimed:

> Pop art proposes a field of exchangeable and repeatable imagery. It is true that every act of communication, including art, has an irreducible uniqueness; it is equally true that a great deal of any message or structure is translatable and homeomorphic. Cross media exchanges and the convergence of multiple channels is the area of Pop art, in opposition to the pursuit of an artistic purity.[16]

In order to establish that pop was concerned, foremost, with signs and sign-systems of the twentieth-century communication system, those that on the grounds "of translatability and commonality"[17] linked pop art and popular culture, Alloway needed to discredit the essentialist conception of art, namely as it informed "twentieth century formal theories" that derived "from the eighteenth-century separation of the arts from one another." He did not mention Greenberg's modernist theory by name, but, as the most recent formalist position as well as the most influential critical mode throughout the sixties (even if by 1969 when Alloway first expressed this opinion its authority was on the wane), he must have had it in mind when he contended that with the advent of pop art "the continued authority of art as pure visibility, to the exclusion of other kinds of meaning, is now in doubt."[18]

In gaining support for the view that pop was principally about the twentieth-century communication system, an equally pressing task for Alloway was that of distinguishing between the significatory characters of pop art and realism, the traditional paradigm of representation. Initially in 1969, in "Popular Culture and Pop Art," Alloway made a precise distinction between the two.

> Realism is . . . concerned with the artist's perception of objects in space and their translation into iconic, or faithful, signs. However, Pop art deals with material that already exists as signs: photographs, brand goods, comics, that is to say, with pre-coded material.[19]

Alloway's emphatic distinction between pop art and realism is a necessary one given the far from uniform character of figurative art in America at the time. Two years prior to the initial airing of this distinction, in an article devoted to the problem of discussing "art as likeness" in the current situation, Alloway distinguished between pop and a realist-oriented development he termed "Post-Pop art": a category comprising artists such as Richard Artschwager, Joe Raffaele, Malcom Morley, and Mel Ramos. This problem had been illuminated by William Seitz's account of his selection

of works for the São Paolo Biennial (as quoted by Grace Glueck in *The New York Times*, 19 March 1967), which, in Alloway's terms, demonstrated confusion about differences between pop and "Post-Pop" art. Alloway described the latter as "technically and syntactically less elaborate [the "syntactical complexity" of pop art brought about by the simultaneous maximization of "environmental references and the formality of the work of art"] and less heterogeneous" than pop. While it shared "many of the same reference sources" as pop, it used "techniques that . . . [were] closer to forms of realist painting." To illustrate his point, he compared a nude by Tom Wesselmann with those by Mel Ramos, presumably as exemplified by Ramos's *Val Veeta* (1965), which was reproduced in this article: "Wesselmann's girl will be a contour with signals for lips, nipples, and hair, one sign in an array of signs. Ramos . . . makes reference to Pop culture, but the form of his nudes is that of plausible three-dimensional solids located in an atmospherically lit space."[20]

Alloway's theorization of pop as primarily *about* communication had its genesis in the "fine art-pop art" continuum, the cultural theory that Alloway had formulated in London during the 1950s prior to the advent of American pop art.[21] This, in turn, developed out of the intellectual climate generated by the Independent Group in London during the 1950s, the formation of which took place within the Institute of Contemporary Art, established in 1946 by Herbert Read and others such as the British surrealist Roland Penrose to advance the cause of modernism in Britain. Comprising an inter-disciplinary assembly of writers, artists, and architects, the Independent Group was conceived by the Institute (the *initial* impulse coming from its younger members[22]) with the aim "of keeping the parent organization in touch with developing art and ideas."[23] It first met in 1952 at the Institute's premises in Dover Street, London, and after the initial meeting held a series of seminars that ran between August 1952 and September 1953[24] with Reyner Banham as the convenor. Alloway, who had attended only one of the first series,[25] both co-convened (along with the artist John McHale) and contributed to a second and final series of seminars, these taking place between February and July 1955. The emphasis of Banham's series on science and technology gave way in the second series to "communications, art, and popular culture."[26] Many of the meetings and activities of the Independent Group merged with those of the Institute of which Alloway, as previously stated, was Assistant Director 1954–7 and Deputy Director 1957–9. Despite this blurring of boundaries between the two bodies, the Independent Group evolved a coherent view of modernism, one that assumed a relationship between modern art and moder-

nity. Alloway's "fine art–pop art continuum" stands, in many ways, as a lucid summary of the Independent Group's position on modernism, particularly as it was given voice in the second series of seminars organized by Alloway and McHale.

Alloway outlined his theory of a "fine art–pop art continuum" in "The arts and the mass media"(1958).[27] As made explicit by its title, fundamental to this theory was Alloway's proposed arrangement of mass and fine art in a continuum as opposed to the traditional, hierarchical organization. The most pertinent features of the "fine art–pop art continuum" were: one, in response to "the pressures of the great audience," an anthropologically and sociologically guided shift in the definition of "culture . . . beyond the fine art limits imposed on it by Renaissance theory" – "something that a minority guards for the few and the future" – to "the whole complex of human activities"; two, the establishment of "the new role for the fine arts . . . [as that of being] one of the possible forms of communication in an expanding framework that also includes the mass arts."[28]

A "fine art–pop art" continuum was Alloway's solution to the problem of holding "the experiences of fine and popular art together." In an article published the previous year, Alloway observed:

> What is needed is an approach that does not depend for its existence on the exclusion of most of the symbols that people live by. Now when I write about art (published) and movies (unpublished) I assume that both are part of a general field of communication. All kinds of messages are transmitted to every kind of audience along a multitude of channels. Art is one part of the field; another is advertising.[29]

A brief mention should be made of Alloway's use of the term "pop art" in his writings on both cultural theory and art. It was coined by Alloway circa 1957 to describe "mass communications, especially, but not exclusively visual ones." "Its users," Alloway explained, "were . . . interested both in extending esthetic attention to the mass media and in absorbing mass-media material within the context of fine art." Both the "expansionist" aesthetic and antagonism towards "elite views of art" associated with this first phase of the term's use, he considered, were encompassed in the idea of a "fine art-pop art continuum." In the second phase of its use, from 1961 to 1964 it "came to mean art [i.e., a category of fine art as in the case of American pop art] that included a reference to mass media sources."[30]

Alloway's reduction of art to communication – a crucial factor in his proposed dismantling of the hierarchical organization of culture – was indebted to contemporaneous, primarily American, communication theory.

The sociologist George Gerbner, in 1967, in an article that referred back to writings on the subject from the previous decade, including his own, distinguished the communication approach to the study of behaviour or culture "from others in that it makes the nature and role of messages in life and society its central organizing concern."[31]

Communication theory arose alongside the sophistication and increase in mass communications or mass media in the post-war years. Gerbner argued after J. Gould and W. L. Kolb that

> Common to most definitions is the conception that mass media are technological agencies and corporate organizations engaged in the creation, selection, processing and distribution of communications that are (or can be) produced at speeds and in quantities possible only by mass-production methods. Mass media, therefore, provide the broadest common currencies of public interaction in a society.[32]

Their impact on society was such that it had brought about a "new industrial revolution in the field of culture." Resulting from the profound changes the "new media of communications" has wrought "in our ability to compose images, produce messages, and use complex symbol systems," "the nature of human affairs" have been transformed; among other things, they have "altered the symbolic environment that gives meaning and direction to man's activity."[33]

Sociological investigations of mass media, such as Gerbner's, were part of a broader inquiry into the issue of human communication. The Communication Research Centre, for example, was established in 1953 at University College, London, in response to the perceived need for "more systematic studies" on the problem. Members of the Centre, which included the art historian R. Wittkower, Professor of Fine Art at University College, were drawn from a wide range of disciplines in the arts and sciences represented at University College and, later, sought collaboration with Colin Cherry, an expert on information theory from Imperial College.[34] Communication theory as well as information theory were central concerns of both the Independent Group and the Institute of Contemporary Art. As part of the series of meetings convened by Alloway and John McHale, on 8 March 1955, E. W. Meyer discussed the topic Probability and Information Theory and Their Application to the Visual Arts.[35] In the previous January Alloway had co-presented *A Communcation Primer* at the Institute of Contemporary Art, a film by the American architect and designer Charles Eames.[36] On 17 January, the following year, also at the Institute of Contemporary Art, J. Z. Young, Professor of Anatomy at University College,

London, and member of the Communication Research Centre,[37] delivered a lecture entitled The Meaning and Purpose of Communication.[38] Finally, Alloway, along with fellow members of the Independent Group, the designer and writer Toni del Renzio and the architect Geoffrey Holroyd, designed an exhibit "on the use of the tackboard" (i.e., a bulletin board: a flat surface on which information from potentially disparate sources is randomly placed) for *This is Tomorrow*, the exhibition staged by the Institute of Contemporary Art and held at the Whitechapel Gallery, 8 August–9 September 1956.[39]

Despite the profound role played by communication theory in shaping Alloway's perception of the relationship of mass and fine arts to their communicative environment and, subsequent to this, his formulation of the "fine art-pop art continuum" as well as theorization of American pop art, only two sources are cited in Alloway's writings. These are Norbert Wiener's *The Human Use of Human Beings; Cybernetics and Society* (1950) and Marshall McLuhan's *Understanding Media* (c. 1964).[40] The American mathematician Norbert Wiener has been credited with being the first to use the term "Cybernetics," presumably in *Cybernetics* (1948). In *The Human Use of Human Beings*, he traced cybernetics' concern for similarities "between the brain and nervous systems and computers and other electronic systems"[41] to the initial major "revolution of twentieth century physics," which he attributed to the American physicist Josiah Gibbs (1839–1903). This concerned the introduction of probability into physics and resultant notion of a contingent universe. It was conceived, Wiener explained, as a critique of the ruling theorems of physics: the Newtonian notion of "a universe in which everything happened precisely according to law, a compact, tightly organized universe in which the whole future depends strictly on the whole past." Gibb's theories, in Wiener's view, impacted not only on science but, also, on "our attitude to life in general." Gibbs believed that "probability tended naturally to increase as the universe grows older" with the result that "the universe, and all closed systems in the universe, tend naturally to deteriorate and lose their distinctiveness, to move . . . from a state of organization and differentiation in which distinctions and forms exist, to a state of chaos and sameness." Against this general trend, however, local enclaves exist in which "there is a limited and temporary tendency for organization to increase"; within these, "life finds its home."[42]

> In the future [i.e., in the "probabilistic" world outlined by Gibbs's thesis] development of these messages and communication facilities, messages

> between man and machines, between machines and man, and between machine and machine, are destined to play an ever increasing part.[43]

The “‘part’” envisaged by Wiener (along with that of “the Augustinian attitude toward order and conduct”) is that of striving to stem “nature’s propensity for chaos by redeploying its components to diverse “purposive ends.”

Simply expressed, Wiener regarded “the process of receiving and using information” as equal to the individual’s adaptation “to the contingencies of the outer environment” and thus his or her ability to live productively “within that environment.” Unprecedented “demands on this process of information,” however, are created by the “needs and the complexity of modern life.” “To live effectively,” Wiener cautioned, “is to live with adequate information.”[44]

Indicating a similar recognition, Alloway claimed in 1960

> The bombardment of the mass media is the man-made analogue of the “sensory bombardment” of our senses at all times. It is by this bombardment that we know the world, and interruptions of this input cause disorientation, anxiety, panic. Since the media is a great carrier of cohesive information (topicality and commonplaces) lack of receptivity to its messages might be said to leave you disorientated.[45]

Presumably, Alloway makes a contrast, here, between under-stimulation and optimal, as opposed to over, stimulation. This point is illuminated by the American sociologist Alvin Toffler who, in 1965, coined the term “future shock” to refer to “the shattering stress and disorientation” experienced by individuals subjected to rapid change in a short span of time. In a fuller analysis of this phenomenon, in *Future Shock* (1970), under the rubric “Bombardment of the Senses,” Toffler claimed that over-stimulation at the overlapping levels of “sensory,” “cognitive,” and “decisional” brought about “maladaptive behaviour.” With regard to “sensory stimulation,” the “input of too much disorganized, patternless or chaotic sensory stimuli” had the same effect as insufficient input: “bewilderment and impaired mental functioning.”[46]

The second communications theorist cited by Alloway was the “Canadian Roman Catholic essayist”[47] Marshall McLuhan. Despite Alloway’s dismissal of McLuhan’s *Understanding Media* as a “cheap derivative” of Wiener’s previously mentioned text,[48] correspondences with McLuhan’s ideas can be found in Alloway’s writings, regardless of whether these resulted from the direct influence of McLuhan or, alternatively, from re-

sponsiveness to a shared range of influences. McLuhan's analysis of advertisements in *The Mechanical Bride* (1951), which Alloway recalled ordering from *View* magazine,[49] most likely, had some bearing on the cultivation of Alloway's interest in the subject. Alloway participated in the two sessions on advertising in the second series of Independent Group seminars, those held on 15 April and 27 May 1955.[50]

McLuhan's observations about the harmonious correspondence between the interrelatedness of both our senses and "technological instruments" at the present time represent the aspect of his theories most relevant to Alloway's enthusiasm about the therapeutic effect of "sensory bombardment" by the mass media. In *The Gutenberg Galaxy*, McLuhan claimed that in the present electric age, characterized by the "instantaneous nature of co-existence among our technological instruments," a better match has been achieved between our "private senses" that "are not closed systems but are endlessly translated into each other in that experience which we call con-sciousness" and our "extended senses" (i.e., those extended by tools and technologies). "Through the ages, [these] have been closed systems incapable of interplay or collective awareness," as in the case of "alphabetic and typographic culture."[51]

Alloway's attempt to create a cultural theory that did not discriminate against the mass arts must, first of all, be seen in the context of his conflation of the roles of "spectator" and "consumer." In 1957, in conjunction with his promotion of a "general field of communication" (the forerunner to the "fine art-pop art continuum") as "part of an effort to see art in terms of human use rather than in terms of philosophical problems," he defined his critical interest as that of writing about the "new role of the spectator or consumer, free to move in a society defined by symbols."[52] Illuminating this association of the two roles, in "Popular Culture and Pop Art," Alloway observed that

> the consumption of popular culture is basically a social experience, providing information derived from and contributing to our statistically normal roles in society. It is a network of messages and objects that we share with others.[53]

Alloway's perception of the socially constituted role of the consumer resembles the American sociologist David Riesman's account of the "other-directed" social type, despite the fact (for reasons that will be shortly explained) that Alloway's "consumer" does not display the same degree of "behavioral conformity" as the "other-directed" type of Riesman. In *The Lonely Crowd*, first published in 1950, Riesman explained "other-direction"

as a condition "affecting increasing numbers of people in the metropolitan centers of the advanced industrial countries." "Other-direction" gives rise to the "other-directed" social type for whom the source of direction is provided by other people, known either directly or through the mass media. Crucial to this process of socialization is the "flow of mass communications" that plays an increasing role in mediating relations with both "the outer world and with oneself." Consistent with the role of mass communications, the "other-directed" type belongs to a "group milieu" and thus responds to signals from a "social environment [wider than the family] to which he early becomes attentive."[54]

David Lyon also cited the "deindustrialization of cities" as a factor in the intensified urban experience of both consumerism and communications. It

> turned them into centres of consumption . . . [and hence] sites where social images are on display, where advertising and promotion are most intense and where the conspicuous acts of consumption are most significant. Latest looks, new waves, states-of-the-art are all to be found in the city. Style circulates swiftly.[55]

In addition to the spectator's socially determined role of consumer, Alloway's proposal for an inclusive theory of culture must be seen in the light of his understanding of the role played by the *content*, as opposed to by the technology, of communications in facilitating the individual's adaptation to the contingencies of the outer environment. As he observed in "The arts and the mass media" (1958): "The mass media give perpetual lessons in assimilation, instruction in role-taking, the use of new objects, the definition of changing relationships."[56] Alloway acknowledged the debt of this claim to David Riesman, but he failed to identify its source. It is, however, most probably *The Lonely Crowd*, in which Riesman provided examples of popular culture's use as "training in consumer orientation and group adjustment."[57] John McHale, co-convenor of the second series of seminars organized by the Independent Group, validated both Alloway's and Riesman's understanding of the mass media's essentially pragmatic role. In his view, the more complex function of mass communications is that of providing: "'usable images,' 'configurations of human experience,' [and] 'symbolic constructs of reality,' which enabled man to locate in, and deal with, his environment – both internal and external."[58] On the grounds of mass art's sensitivity "to the variables of our life and economy," those that enable them to closely "accompany the changes in our life," Alloway takes exception to Clement Greenberg's "summary of the opposition to

mass popular art": "Avant-Garde and Kitsch" (1939).[59] The crux of Alloway's objection was Greenberg's insistence that "all kitsch is academic."[60] Alloway defined "academic" as "a system that is static, rigid, self-perpetuating," and thus in a manner that excluded the mass arts that, with few exceptions (e.g., "Cecil B. De Mille-type historical epics which use nineteenth-century history-picture material"), was marked by "topicality and a rapid rate of change," the latter determined by mass art's status as an outcome of technologically oriented "industrial civilization."[61] Alloway's perception of the non-academic nature of the mass arts was borne out by John McHale's explanation of the "expendable series of ikons" created by them: "symbolic images of man which will match up to the requirements of constant change, fleeting impression and a high rate of obsolescence."[62]

Herbert Read's "all embracing theory of art and design," as well as his conception of "the artist as a leader in society, aware of eternal truths and detached from the lower order of daily existence,"[63] acted as a more immediate catalyst for the formation of Alloway's "fine art-pop art" continuum." This was consistent with the latter's status as a summary of the Independent Group's position on modernism, one that was in pronounced contrast to that of Herbert Read, the founding president and part of the older leadership of the Institute of Contemporary Art.

Read's most comprehensive statement about the art of the machine is contained in *Art and Industry* (1933). The introduction of the Fifth Edition (1966), the *text* of which had not been revised since the Third Edition (1952) firmly situates Read's claims about machine art within the broader context of cultural theory in a manner similar to Clement Greenberg's "Avant-Garde and Kitsch"(1939). The starting point for both critics was their dismay at the decline of aesthetic standards brought about by the democratization of culture under industrial-capitalism. Each critic's response to the situation, however, differed. Greenberg focused solely on élite culture, assigning it the specific task of "keeper of the flame"; explicit in his account of the state of art under industrial-capitalism is the depressing belief that the aesthetic standards of mass art are necessarily compromised by the twin demands of wide intelligibility and profitability. Herbert Read's vision of art of the machine, comparatively speaking, is utopian in spirit and, at face value, progressive. He recognized, for example, the need to do away with the "false and superannuated ideals of beauty" inherited "from other ages, when the processes of production were entirely different."

Read's model was the Bauhaus, which "accepted the machine as the essentially modern vehicle of form, and sought to come to terms with it." In

emulation of the Bauhaus, Read attempted to incorporate machine art – fully cognizant of its processes, materials, and production techniques – into an account of the "general nature of art." The latter, in his opinion, falls into two distinct types: "*humanistic art*, which is concerned with the expression in plastic form of human ideals or emotions"; "*abstract art*, or non-figurative art, which has no concern beyond making objects whose plastic form appeals to aesthetic sensibility." The utilitarian arts, he claimed, "appeal to the aesthetic sensibility *as abstract art*," this appeal conforming to the categories of "rational" and "intuitional." Read claimed that as "rational abstraction in art is measurable, and resolves into numerical laws," "the machine, which works to adjustment and measure, can produce such works with unfailing and unrivalled precision."

For objects of machine manufacture to attain the status of the "highest kinds of abstract art," however, they must "depend on an intuitional apprehension of form." In machine art, Read argued, this quality involves standardization and uniformity – "uniqueness" he saw as an "ethically unworthy impulse typical of a bygone individualistic phase of civilisation" – but due to the multiplicity and rapid change of machines not one that results in a lack of diversity.

Read's dismissal of "false and superannuated ideals of beauty," however, did not preclude the timelessness of other, namely humanist, ideals. Read went on to observe that "wherever good forms emerge from factories, a designer with aesthetic sensibility is always present and responsible." The worth of his creation (as art) varies "according to his sensibility and genius."[64] Read, in this manner, continued to measure machine art by conventional humanism "that elevates the human agency of elite cultural creators."[65]

A rare, if fleeting, mention of Herbert Read in Alloway's writings takes place in "Notes on Abstract Art and the Mass Media" (1960), in the context of the identification of "ways in which artists have handled pop culture during the 50s": "To refer to bems [i.e., bug-eyed-monsters[66]] instead of chimeras, to quote Asmiov [sic] instead of Plato, separates one from Berenson, Fry, Rey, Read"[67] and thus from apologists for traditional aesthetics. The reference to Isaac Asimov, the American scientist and author of Science Fiction literature, such as *I Robot* (1950), is consistent with Alloway's abiding interest in Science Fiction, an interest that had not been eradicated by lengthy exposure to Higher Education (Alloway's tertiary education consisted of four years of evening classes at London University).[68] This is evidenced by the two lectures Alloway delivered at the Institute of Con-

temporary Art: one on science fiction (19 January 1954) and another entitled "Monster Engineering" (21 October 1958).[69] In "The arts and the mass media" Science Fiction, which "aids the assimilation of the mounting technical facts of this century," is accorded a privileged place in facilitating man's adaptation to his immediate, urban environment. He quotes John W. Campbell, the American editor of *Astounding Science Fiction* to the effect that "a man learns a pattern of behaviour – and in five years it doesn't work."[70]

The inappropriateness of "still making do with Plato,"[71] of applying enduring values drawn from the foundational beliefs of traditional philosophy to art born of modernity, was voiced in varied ways by various members of the Independent Group: Alloway's "fine art-pop art continuum"; John McHale's "expendable ikons"; Reyner Banham's "expendable aesthetics." The philosophical attitude governing all of these attempts to formulate an inclusive scheme of art predicated on the technological and economic reality of post-war urban society was pragmatism, its basic principle being "that in order to assess the significance . . . of what we say we must examine what practical bearings it has on human activities."[72]

The abolition of fixed standards necessary for the formulation of schemes as inclusive as those listed above is a requisite feature of pragmatism. In the case of Alloway's "fine art-pop art continuum," adherence to this pragmatist ideal had been achieved by viewing mass and fine art in a functionalist sense as communication and thus, as Alloway explained in the case of a proposed "general field of visual communications," "in terms of human use rather than in terms of philosophical problems."[73] Justification for dispensing with qualitative issues in art is made explicit in Alloway's reflections on the role of the critic of fine art, those that were consequential to and predicated on the same assumptions as the "fine art-pop art continuum." Alloway considered that "information giving" – the reflection that "I'm having about something – has a little more claim to objective value than declaration of good and bad," the latter, changing "from critic to critic, from generation to generation." This needs to be viewed in the context of his understanding of stylistic diversity as the condition of modern art (one that he related to "the condition of life in the twentieth century"[74] and hence to increased industrialization) as opposed to Greenberg's notion of a mainstream. It also needs to be measured against the fact that while Alloway did not elevate fine art over mass art or, alternatively, elevate a particular style or category of art over another within each cultural realm, he did make broad qualitative distinctions. For example, he related the superior quality of American pop art to the professionalism of

the New York art world and the quality of available "information about art."[75] In "Notes on Abstract Art and the Mass Media" (1960), he claimed that American pop (meaning popular or mass) art was superior to the British version, it being "the product of less money, less research, less talent."[76] In his obvious recognition of the role played by human agency in the formulation of standards and, by extension, the role played by language (in the sense of "uttering sentences") in "the behaviour of human beings. . . in order to cope with their environment,"[77] Alloway demonstrated clear allegiance to central (relativist) tenets of philosophical pragmatism.

The most important source of Alloway's pragmatism was arguably the Polish-born American scientist Alfred Korzybski's "theory of Non-Aristotelian Systems and General Semantics," which he expounded in *Science and Sanity: An Introduction to Non-Aristotelian Systems and General Semantics*, first published in 1933. Anne Massey, in a study of the Independent Group, credited Alloway as having introduced Korzybski's "non-Aristotelian logic"[78] as mediated by the Science Fiction writer A. E. Van Vogt.[79] The Van Vogt material was serialized in the American magazine *Astounding Science Fiction* in 1945 and, in a revised form, published in *The World of Null-A* by Simon and Schuster in New York in 1948.[80] Quotations by Korzybski, from unspecified sources, preface a number of chapters of a 1969 publication, the first in Britain, and the narrative that unfolds within these centres on the superior mental powers of those trained in Korzybski's non-Aristotelian (i.e., "Null-A") methods.

There is some confusion over Alloway's source of Korzybski as mediated by Van Vogt. Massey has indicated that it was "post-war science fiction magazines,"[81] presumably referring to *Astounding Science Fiction.*[82] Certainly, Alloway read these (as did other members of the Independent Group such as William Turnbull and Reyner Banham[83]) and, in a retrospective account of the period, he referred to the English edition as among the means by which he reacquainted himself with Science Fiction writing in the 1950s.[84]

In his pre-history of the British pop art movement, Alloway cited Korzybski via Van Vogt's novel *The World of Null-A* as the source of "non-Aristotelian logic" discussed in a seminar entitled "Dadaists as Non-Aristotelians" (held 29 April) from the series of Independent Group meetings convened by himself and McHale in 1955. However, in a filmed interview with Reyner Banham conducted in 1979, he conceded that he also "read a bit of Korzybski."[85] He described Van Vogt as a "science fiction writer given to elaborate play with time and space puzzles" and explained the application of non-Aristotelian logic to dadaism as arising from "dis-

satisfaction with existing accounts of Dada (as destructive, nihilistic, illogical protesting)."[86] This last observation corresponded to the aim of the seminar, as outlined in the previously mentioned record: "to connect dada with the non-Aristotelian logic of provisional probabilities." It arose from the perception that dada, in its revived, post-war form, was "anti-absolutist and multi-valued, like advertising lay-outs, movies, etc."[87]

Koryzbski's "general semantics," which he termed the "*modus operandi*" of his non-Aristotelian system, was aimed, foremost, at facilitating modern man's adaptation to an environment transformed in the main by science. It was thus directed at ensuring his (primarily mental) well-being. Broadly defined, Korzybski's goal finds a parallel in the thesis underlying Norbert Wiener's equation of the individual's capacity to take in information from his environment with his ability to live effectively within it and, in its less rigorously theorized forms, in Alloway's "fine art-pop art continuum" and McHale's "expendable ikon," both accounts of the therapeutic value of mass communications.

In *Science and Sanity*, Korzybski explained that the non-Aristotelian system originated from the "new functional definition of 'man'" that he had formulated in an earlier publication: *Manhood of Humanity: The Science and the Art of Human Engineering* (1921). He based this on man's uniquely human "time-binding capacity," which concerned each generation's ability to continue from the point the previous one had finished. According to the revised definition,

> the reactions of humans are not split verbally and elementalistically into separate "body," "mind," "emotions," "intellect," "intuitions," etc., but are treated from an organism-as-a-whole-in-an-environment (external and *internal*) point of view.[88]

He saw this as parallelled by "Einstein-Minowski space-time integration in physics" and both as required by the progression in "sciences." Just as "non-Euclidian and non-Newtonian systems" of physics were required to accommodate the advent of electricity, so an "infinite valued non-Aristotelian system" was necessary to replace the "two-valued Aristotelian" one that was unable to cope "with the electro-colloidal sub-microscopic levels of the functioning of our nervous systems." Development in science occurs as a result of "scientific methods and linguistic revisions." However, we cannot utilize the knowledge so discovered, and thus adjust to an environment transformed primarily "by science," with the aid only of anachronistic "methods of orientation," namely the Aristotelian system.

Korzybski explained that during mankind's cultural evolution some of its "abstractions" – those that play a role in the social and cultural evolution of contrasting human societies – have become codified into systems.[89] One such case is the Aristotelian system, so-called because it places emphasis on Aristotle's "study of 'logic', of *linguistic structure.*"[90] Both the "completeness" of Aristotle's method (its supremacy the result of "its academically rationalized general verbal formulations" and, hence, "teachable" nature) and the authoritative forces that have backed it, including those of the "Church Fathers," have shaped "our orientations and evaluations" until now. In 1941, at the time of writing the introduction to the Second Edition, he considered the system as appropriate only "2,300 years ago, when conditions of life were relatively so simple, when orientations were on the macroscopic level only, and knowledge of scientific facts was practically nil."[91]

As already indicated, the Aristotelian system is characterized by "two-valued, 'either-or' type of orientations." Korzybski conceded that links to the "world outside and inside our skins" are frequently experienced as "two-valued." We attend to "day *or* night" and "land *or* water." On another plane, examples include "induction *or* deduction" and "capitalism *or* communism."[92] However, a method predicated on "*the general sharpness of 'either-or'*" is unable to cope with the more subtle questions encountered in actual existence. Elsewhere, he described the Aristotelian structure of language as "*elementalistic.*" It implies a division in that which in reality cannot be divided. Accordingly, "'body' *and* 'mind,' 'emotion' *and* 'intellect', 'space' *and* 'time', etc." can be split only "verbally" and not "empirically." Following the lead of Einstein and Minowski, who proved that "'space' *and* 'time' cannot be split empirically," the non-Aristotelian system rejects the use of "elementalistic terminology to represent facts which are non-elementalistic." In its place terms such as "'semantic reactions', 'psychosomatic', 'space-time'" are employed that dispense with "verbally implied splits, and consequent mis-evaluations."

Korzybski considered that in the development of both man and his "language" a spontaneous pattern of assessment was created wherein "facts" about existence took precedence over "labels (words)." The Aristotelian system, with its intensional (i.e., verbal) methods, however, reverses the natural order: verbiage has precedent over facts. "'Pure'" intension, concerned solely with verbal definition, is restricted to "hospitals for 'mentally' ill" as well as to "some chairs of 'philosophy.'" Extensional methods employed by the non-Aristotelian system re-establishes the natural order: "empirical facts" are rated higher "than definitions or verbiage."[93] Korzyb-

ski was concerned with man's well-being by means of his adaptation to his ever-changing environment, "man" conceived by him as "an organism-as-a-whole-in-an-environment." The key threat to his adaptation was the persistence of a system of linguistics and semantics based upon Aristotelian logic, a system that was suitable for only an earlier stage of evolution. In a not unrelated manner, Alloway's "fine art–pop art continuum" was intended to relate art to its environment, the latter understood in terms of both the technologically advanced and the topical mass media. The main obstacle in the path of Alloway's "fine art–pop art continuum" was the persistence of the idealist aesthetics and absolutist values of traditional art theory, those that in Korzybski's terms reflected the "either-or" orientation of the Aristotelian system. These were derived from pre-industrial society, were incapable of accommodating the mass arts and, on these grounds, the "facts" about art under industrial-capitalism.

Korzybski's infinite-valued system was guided, foremost, by pragmatist concerns. Fittingly, the Preface to the Third Edition of *Science and Sanity* (1948) is introduced with quotations of the founder of American philosophical pragmatism Charles S. Peirce from an unspecified source, including that which warns of the need for divesting the examination of "evidences" of the biases of thought.[94]

In addition, it must be considered within the context of the "end of philosophy" argument that has stemmed from a profound loss of faith in Western thought and language and its organizing principle of rationalism and has been addressed in various forms throughout the twentieth century. This concern is taken up in a further section of this study and should not be pre-empted here. However, broad correspondences can be seen between Korzybski's perception of an ill-fit between the "two-valued" orientations of the Aristotelian system and the "facts" of modern life and the quest of Heidegger's fundamental ontology: to pose "What is 'is'?," "nakedly," in a manner that has not been done in "Western thought since the pre-Socratics and that Western systematic philosophy has . . . done everything to conceal."[95] Arguably, of greater relevance is the acknowledged influence on Korzybski's system, that of the German philosopher Ludwig Wittgenstein.[96] Korzybski, most probably, had in mind Wittgenstein's *Tractatus-Logico-Philosophicus*[97] in which he attempted "to set a limit . . . to the expression of thoughts [i.e., language]." Wittgenstein concluded *Tractatus* with the oft-repeated remark: "What we cannot speak about we must pass over in silence."[98]

Alloway viewed the "fine art–pop art continuum" as an outcome of the experience of his generation. In "Personal Statement" (1957) he argued for

the abolition of traditional aesthetics that "separated absolutely [in the manner of "the iron curtain"] art from non art," largely on the grounds that for those of his age with an interest in the visual arts the "mass media were established as a natural environment by the time we could see them." As a result, his "consumption of popular art" overlapped with his "consumption of fine art," as distinct from the example of the presumably older "*Times*-man" whose interest in Science Fiction was kept separate from that of his serious writing.[99]

Similarly, Alloway described American pop artists as

> younger artists . . . [who] did not view Pop culture as relaxation, but as an ongoing part of their lives. They felt no pressure to give up the culture they had grown up in (comics, pop music, movies). Their art was not the consequence of renunciation but of incorporation.[100]

A well-chosen quotation from James Rosenquist complements Alloway's case: "I still think about a space that's put on me by radio commercials and television commercials because I'm a child of the age."[101] Rosenquist, along with the other American pop artists, can be compared to a progenitor of pop art, the British artist and fellow member of the Independent Group, Eduardo Paolozzi. Alloway regarded Paolozzi's example a catalyst for the "fine art–pop art continuum." His status as a "full-time artist" and his use of mass media material in his art illustrated the principle of the "touchability of all bases in the continuum."[102]

Both the American pop artists and Paolozzi thus reflected a new phase of capitalism, wherein consumer "needs [of the people] became as important as their labour power."[103] As Alloway observed:

> Post-war urban-directed art . . . postulates the artist as a consumer, not as a producer changing the world with the co-operation of the worker. Today's artist receives and accepts the media's messages and spectacles. The basic idea is that it is natural for the artist to have absorbed pop culture from the environment (. . . [understood as] a complex of variable opportunities for communication).[104]

By arguing that pop mirrored the artist as consumer's communicative environment, Alloway found a means of accounting for key critical issues posed by pop, particularly those centred on the absence or minimal presence of the artist as "author" of the work (the concern that the artist had failed to imaginatively transform source material or, at least, to a degree sufficient to qualify as art, had represented the initial critical barrier in the path of pop art's acceptance[105]). Among these there was the matter of pop

art's lack of a unified, organizing perspective, or, an authorial voice, as evidenced by the ambiguity or indeterminacy of the work's "message."

Charles Morris in *Signs, Language and Behavior* (1946), a text cited by Alloway in a publication from 1975,[106] discussed conditions fundamental to the process of communication, including the following: "the use of signs to establish a commonage of signification"; the existence of both a "*communicator*" (the "user of signs who effects communication") and the "*communicatee*" (the "organism in which the sign-process is aroused by the signs of the communicator"); the "interpersonality of language signs," that is, their possession of a "common core of signification to members of a given linguistic community."[107] The same conditions are expressed in a diagram included in the Group 12 section of the *This is Tomorrow* catalogue, the source of which David Robbins has identified as the information theorist "Claude Shannon's source-destination formula for information decoding."[108] The diagram in question depicts a central "signal" that is flanked, on one side, by the "encoder" (the source of communication) and, on the other, by the "decoder" (the destination of communication); both encoder and decoder are enveloped in an overlapping "field of experience." As explained in the accompanying notes compiled by Toni del Renzio: "In an efficient communication system the field of accumulated experience must be similar in encoder and decoder . . . because without learned responses there is no communication."[109]

As Alloway made clear in *American Pop Art*, popular culture provides an interconnected system "of messages and objects" that are common to members of a given community and thus a "field of experience" common to encoder and decoder alike. To maximize the "interpersonality of language signs" drawn from popular culture, the pop artist employs them in their pre-existent and thus untransformed form. It is in these terms that Alloway explained a salient feature of pop: "process abbreviation." This he defined as the separation of the work of art from any indication of lengthy stages of "planning" and production, as evidenced by either the incorporation of "physical objects" into the work of art or, alternatively, the literal rendering of widely intelligible artifacts; "process abbreviation," then, may exist as a "fact" or in "appearance." Alloway cited Lichtenstein as an example of *apparent* "process abbreviation." His work, while accomplished in "stages" and by hand, gives the appearance of "an all-at-once, mechanical look." The "game with anonymity," the "minimizing of invention" that arises from the "deceptive impersonality" of process abbreviation Alloway saw as purposeful, as a strategy to ensure that the art work's associations with both popular culture and the spectator's common fund of knowledge

are preserved. Following this logic, photographs (employed in the form of silk-screen prints, by Warhol and Robert Rauschenberg) seem "unmediated" accounts of the "real" world, or, alternatively, its "most iconic sign-system."[110] Alloway obviously used the term "iconic" in *American Pop Art* in the sense intended by Charles Morris's description of signs in literature and art: "as a total representation of the designated object," not as a denotation of something but, rather, as a constitution of "what is denoted."[111]

The idea of the encoder's and the decoder's overlapping fields of experience (necessary for communication to take place) was a means of explaining not only the pop artist's minimal transformation of source material but also the corresponding minimalization of his creative sensibility. This point is illustrated in Alloway's discussion about the question of style in Lichtenstein's work. Style, defined by Alloway, "as the constant form of an artist or a group," can on the one hand yield information about "personality" and on the other function "as an ordering device, as in sampling."[112] By "sampling," Alloway referred to a statistical method of analysis employed, for example, in the study of audience response in mass communications.[113] Lichtenstein, who communicated the style of "comics and Art Deco" by representing a number of salient characteristics, presumably, quantified style. Alloway related his approach to his major concern for "the cliché," the appeal of which, as it conformed to the "interpersonality of language signs," lie in its heightened communicative value. Quite rightly, Alloway observed that art's appropriation of "existing sign-systems" in this manner – one that involves leaving the task of invention to "unknown collaborators" – throws into question "ideas of expression and depth."[114]

Largely basing his case on the evidence presented by Warhol's literal brand of pop, Fredric Jameson argued that one manifestation of the decentred postmodernist subject in the realm of culture was the "collapse of the high modernist ideology of style – what is as unique and unmistakable as your own fingerprints, as incomparable as your own body." Jameson linked the issue of personal expression "to some conception of the subject as a monadlike container, within which things felt are then expressed by projection outward." The Marxist Jameson regarded post-modernism as a "periodizing concept whose function is to correlate the emergence of new formal features in culture with the emergence of a new type of social life and new economic order." Taking as his starting point the economist Ernest Mandel's identification of three stages or moments in the evolution of capital, Jameson perceived the decentred post-modernist subject as an expression of the third and final (and purest) stage, explaining that the

"once-existing centred subject, in the period of classical capitalism and the nuclear family, has today in the world of organizational bureaucracy [i.e., the third stage of capital] dissolved."[115]

While Alloway saw pop art as a reflection of the socio-historical, even economic situation of the pop artist, unlike Jamseson he did not construe its anonymity, in ontological terms, as evidence of "loss of self." Viewed from the perspective of communication theory, and thus in a functionalist manner, the artist deliberately distances himself from his work to maximize the "interpersonality of language signs" and, in this way, ensures the "commonage" necessary for communication to take place;[116] hence, the fact that the cliché, though highly predictable and therefore unimaginative, is sanctioned in pop art is because of its centrality to the "common core of signification" that belongs to "members of a given linguistic community."

In Alloway's account of pop art, the first-person standpoint (and in this sense autonomy) of the subject was crucial. Alloway was not only concerned with the pop artist's depiction of signs – the "*means of communication*" – but also with the depiction of their human use and, in this regard, with the pragmatic concern for human agency in the production of meaning. In the preface of *Signs, Language and Behavior* (1946), Charles Morris acknowledged the debt of his perspective to one first expressed by the founder of American philosophical pragmatism Charles Peirce: "To determine the meaning of any sign 'we have . . . simply to determine what habit it produces.'"[117] Accordingly, Morris described and differentiated signs "in terms of the dispositions to behavior which they cause in their interpreters."[118]

In a publication from 1975, Alloway identified "a wider interest among artists and critics in the social consequences of art" with C. W. Morris's "pragmatics": "the study of the relationship between signs and their users."[119] He cited the source of this information as Morris's *Signs, Language and Behavior* (1946). Most probably, Alloway knew of Morris's text from the time of his involvement with the Independent Group, if only through the intermediary of Colin Cherry, the previously mentioned expert on Information Theory who collaborated with the Communications Research Centre and who, as David Robbins has claimed, was "a familiar figure at the ICA."[120]

In a lecture delivered at the Communications Research Centre in 1953, and later published in *Studies in Communication* (1955) under the title "'Communication Theory' – and Human Behaviour," Cherry explained Morris's division of the field of signs into "three dependant . . . parts": (1) "Syntactics – signs and relations between signs"; (2) "Semantics – signs and

their relations to designata (the world or 'experience' – real or imagined)"; "Pragmatics – signs and their relations to users."[121]

Cherry discussed Morris's classification of signs in the context of an examination of the limitations of Information Theory.[122] Claude Shannon's model, he saw, as "based upon an ensemble of signs; signs, their probabilities (as relative frequencies), and rules of constraints relating signs." This same model, Cherry made clear, was never intended and was therefore inadequate as a theory of human communication. As measured by Morris's classification of signs, he identified it as a "Syntactic Theory" and thus

> basic to the whole problem of information in human communication, but insufficient. To any *specific* human being, on a *specific* occasion, the "meaning", value, truth, usefulness of messages are inherent in the signs themselves.[123]

Cherry further observed that the "pragmatic aspect of information is best expressed in the metalanguage, not of an external observer [i.e., who observes and describes the "physical signs passing from the source to the receiver"]. . . but of a *participant-observer*," that is, both the recipient and observer of the message.[124]

A broad correspondence can be drawn between Alloway's insistence on considering signs in the context of human use and Morris's understanding that while signs may be used in the communicative process solely for establishing communication, usually "communication is desired in order that some further purpose [i.e., "informative, valuative, incitive, or systemic"] be realized." In terms of the "*communicatee*," the "interpersonality of language signs is seldom completely achieved, and that even where a common core of signification is obtained, the signs may have to different individuals of the community different additional significations."[125] As applied to pop artists' use of signs, Alloway alerts us to the fact that while the reduction of "personal nuances" (as involved in "process abbreviation") is necessary to make clear the work's common territory "with popular culture" – that is, the establishment of the "interpersonality of language signs," vital for the process of information to take place – it, at the same time, adds up "to a game with anonymity." The pop artist, by taking "standard everyday material, familiar to his audience," and by not obscuring his modifications to this material, draws attention to "the mobility of signs, their multiple uses."[126]

Accordingly, while Alloway accounted for the "absence" of the pop artist on the grounds of his concern for maintaining the "interpersonality of language signs" he accounted, also, for the "presence" of the pop artist

to stress his status as the user of the sign. Alloway observed, therefore, the original manner in which the pop artist combined signs from disparate sources in the single work. As a specific example of the artist's presence, he cited Andy Warhol's use of the silk-screen and the variety of images he achieves from a single screen – according to both the quantity of ink involved and the "pressure with which it is applied" – in his assembly-line production methods. In reference to *Marilyn Monroe Diptych*, he noted the individualization of the repeated standard image, by means described above, as constituting a veiled, and given the quasi-mechanized methods of pictorial production, somewhat ironical reinstatement of "autographic" gesture.

In the case of Rosenquist's art, a symbiotic relationship exists between the interpersonality of the language sign – the "commonage" upon which communication depends – and the artist's status as user of the sign. Alloway interpreted Rosenquist's ploy of "derealization" as a means of equating with experience of "the world" at those times when "we lose our grip on it." Only by using popular sources (and thus widely intelligible signs) is Rosenquist able to make obvious the extent to which he has abstracted or transformed them and thus the "unique moralism" that his "celebrating America and alienation from it" involves.[127] Rosenquist can thus be seen to lend support to Morris's claim that regardless of the purpose of communication, communication is involved as a state of its realization.[128]

By demonstrating the "mobility of signs, their multiple uses," the pop artist encourages the "idea of flowing rather than arrested meaning," this, in turn, reflecting his experience of the complexity of the twentieth-century communication system.[129] In accounting for this complexity, Alloway referred to observations made by the existentialist philosopher Soren Kierkegaard in *The Present Age* (1846), including that concerning the capacity of "advertisement and publicity" to turn "everything . . . into representative ideas.'"[130]

He failed to register, however, the negative import of Kierkegaard's comments or, for that matter, examine the underlying reasons and thus place them in their intended context: a critique of the erosion of individualism by mass tendencies in nineteenth-century Danish, urban society. As opposed to the positive role Alloway accorded the mass media (and, allied with this, his refusal to see the mass audience as undifferentiated), Kierkegaard viewed the "press" as "an abstraction . . . which in conjunction with the passionless and reflective character of the age, produces that abstract phantom: a public which in turn is really the levelling power."[131] In selectively quoting Kierkegaard, Alloway, instead, seized upon those

aspects of Kierkegaard's observations that were, to his mind, still relevant: the abstract character of nineteenth-century Danish, urban society and the incalculable role played by "advertisement and publicity" in its creation. In such an age, "words and images do not merely represent things but have their own properties, which meant that as the system got more complex, discontinuities between signifiers and signifieds mounted." The greater the extent to which "advertisment and publicity" are features of our lives, the greater the opportunity "to become aware of the deceptiveness of signs and the solidity of symbols that obscure their original referents." In mirroring this complexity, the pop artist locates the "idea of process" not in the "creative act," but, rather, in "the work of art itself, where it functions as a kind of mobility of signification."[132]

The situation Alloway described is consistent with a common perception of the role of reader or spectator of a post-modernist work. Hans Bertens, in the previously cited survey of literary concepts of post-moderism, considered that, whereas in modernism meaning is "discovered as a given in the text," in postmodernism "it is created in an interactional process between reader and text." He quoted Hoffman et al. to the effect that "modernism seems to stress the relationship between the creative sensibility and the work of art, between addresser and message, post-modernism that between message and addressee."[133]

Donald Kuspit, examining the same issue of the production of meaning in post-modernism, but in a visual art context, and in a manner that is, clearly, indebted to Morris's classification of signs, discerned a similar distinction between the role of spectator in modernism and post-modernism. Modernism, he saw, as having been "involved with trying to understand the semantics and syntactics of art." Alluding to Greenbergian formalism, he defined its "concern" as "the establishment of a minimal, formal vocabulary, and the examination of the ways in which this vocabulary can be used." Post-modernism, by way of contrast, "takes us to the third element involved in understanding art as language . . . the pragmatic effect of art." Viewed from this perspective, "the relation of signifier and signified depends more upon the spectator, reader or interpreter of the sign than on a hermetic semantic and syntactic situation."[134]

Whereas modernism had taken the view "that the work of art . . . was determinable entirely in terms of fixed conventions of art meaning and fixed conventions of syntactical uses" (i.e., as explained by Bertens, the meaning was "discovered as a given in the text"), post-modernism focuses on the functionalist issue of how a work of art communicates, seeing it as dependent "upon the situation of the spectator or interpreter of the work

of art." The "looseness" that post-modern art tries to generate, Kuspit construed as an attempt "to make itself porous enough for a variety of points of view, for various kinds of spectators, so that art becomes a variety of communications."[135]

The interpretive freedom of the spectator of a post-modernist work, defined by both Bertens and Kuspit, in a sense, duplicates the experience of Alloway and his generation as "spectator or consumer, free to move in a society defined by symbols." Alloway defined the spectator's or consumer's role as "free" despite its socially determined nature and despite the conventional nature of language. The freedom Alloway referred to is that of "consumer freedom." As he observed in 1957, in his account of a proposed "general field of communication": "All kinds of messages are transmitted to every kind of audience along a multitude of channels. Art is one part of the field; another is advertising."[136] He reiterated these perceptions two years later when he denounced the "mass audience" as "a fiction," seeing it instead as "numerically dense but highly diversified." Diversification results from the groups that are differentiated from the mass as well as the preservation of the individual's "integrity" within them. The diversified interests of the audience both "reflect and influence the diversification which goes with increased industrialization." The larger the market, the greater the degree of consumer choice.[137] During the same period, John McHale expressed a similar concept of consumer freedom in his claim that the "diversity" and "mobility" of the "mass audience" ensured "that the product offered for its consumption will exhibit the same range and variety."[138]

Alloway's position is further illuminated by the sociologist Zygmunt Bauman who, in *Intimations of Postmodernity* (1992), claimed the economic character of contemporary society represented a consumer-centred phase of capitalism, one in that

> consumer conduct (consumer freedom geared to the consumer market) moves steadily into the position of, simultaneously, the cognitive and moral focus of life, the integrative bond of society, and the focus of systematic management . . . it moves into the selfsame position which in . . . the "modern" phase of capitalist society . . . was occupied by work in the form of wage labour.[139]

Bauman further explained that reproduction of the capitalist system in its consumerist phase is achieved by "individual freedom," in the form of "consumer freedom," as opposed to its prohibition. It no longer requires the conventional contrivances of its "modern" phase, those aimed, for

example, at attaining "*ideological domination*" and "*uniformity of norms.*" Instead, as soon as "consumer choice" assumes the organizational pivot of "systemic reproduction, social integration and individual life-world," its very ascendancy is predicated on "cultural variety, heterogeneity of styles and differentiation of belief-systems."[140]

Both Kuspit and Bertens defined the role of the spectator or reader of the post-modernist work along the lines of a literary model derived from reception theory. Wolfgang Iser termed this approach in which literature is seen, foremost, as communication as "functionalist." From this perspective, "fiction is a means of telling us something about reality." This differs from the "ontological" perspective by which fiction is seen as "an antonym of reality." With the functionalist emphasis on the "recipient of the message," "the reader and the literary text are partners in a process of communication," the result being that value is placed not on the "*meaning*" of the text but, rather, on its "*effect.*"[141]

Alloway, himself, was aware of this critical trend. In "The Long Front of Culture" (1959), in seeking credibility for his placing of mass and fine art within a single field of communication (the "fine art–pop art continuum"), he referred to the impact of sociology and anthropology on the humanities. This he saw in the "developing academic study of the 'literary audience,' [which] . . . takes literary criticism out of textual and interpretative work towards the study of reception and consumption."[142]

The emphasis on semiotics increased in Alloway's post-1960s writings on pop art, as in his definitive account, *American Pop Art* (1974), to the extent that he now referred to constitutive elements of the linguistic sign as understood by the Swiss linguist Ferdinand de Saussure: the signifier (the form that signifies) and the signified (the idea signified).[143] Alloway makes no mention of Saussure in his writings until 1979, and, then, only to refer to Saussure's notion of synchronicity, as applied to the "study of static linguistics," to indicate a "language-state." This was defined by Saussure as "a certain span of time during which the sum of the modifications that have supervened is minimal." Saussure considered that it was necessary to establish a "language-state" in order to reveal "the fundamental principles of any idiosynchronic system," a process that he acknowledged necessitated the "simplification of data."[144] Alloway invoked Saussure's idea of synchronicity to justify his resistance to narrowing the diverse range of art at a particular time to a mainstream as in the case of "formalism" and "expression theory." Alloway did so, however, only to misuse it. His account of the "present" is remote from Saussure's "simplification of data"; the "present," in opposition to the reductive classificatory schemes of "for-

malism" and "expression theory," is "the unsorted experience of several years, [which] is endlessly generative of signs."[145] It is possible that the greater emphasis on semiotics in *American Pop Art* resulted from contact with the Saussurian legacy as it impacted on "French theory," English translations of which became available by the early seventies. The French literary critic Roland Barthes's *Mythologies*, for example, first published in 1957, was translated into English and published in 1972. Of relevance to Alloway's interest in communication theory as both a model for cultural analysis and an iconographical as well as an iconological framework for pop art, in *Mythologies* Barthes engaged in a semiotic analysis, as informed by a structuralist model, of a broad range of popular cultural forms. He thus fulfilled Saussure's prophecy that linguistics would serve as a model of semiology as a whole; semiology was defined by Saussure as "*a science which would study the life of signs within society.*"[146]

Post-structuralists were bound, in part, by agreement over the "theoretical weakness" that had arisen from Saussure's bonding of the signifier and signified (wherein one signifier communicates one signified) and that he had determined by examining language in its static, synchronous state. Art Berman, explaining the post-structuralist position – one in which "time" is reinserted into the analysis of language, as in the case of Derrida's examination of the linguistic sign in "discursive contexts" – argued that in "a non-representational theory of language," in which the meaning of the sign is not intrinsic but established by its difference from all other signs in the system, the signified "can always be itself reduced to nothing but additional signifiers (more language)." Language within this scheme, in which there are no fixed distinctions between signifiers and signifieds, points to itself and the idea of a knowable reality independent of language is rejected. Therein lies post-structuralism's critique of representation based on the understanding that "texts do not portray a real world that exists independently of language."[147] Therein lies, also, post-structuralism's critique of foundational beliefs, those based on "stable structures, grounds or foundations"[148] such as "a knowable reality independent of language."[149] Viewed from this perspective, the unfixity of meaning or indeterminacy, seen as a defining characteristic of deconstructive postmodernism, is an expression of the ontological doubt that occurs, as Bertens explained, in "the absence of centers, of privileged languages, higher discourses."[150]

Alloway demonstrated some allegiance to the post-structuralist perception of the lack of a stable relationship between the signifier and the signified as well as the consequence of this instability – the disappearance

of or weakened link with the referent or the "real," the third term of Saussure's sign – in his previously quoted observation about the complexity of the twentieth-century communication system. This, he considered, was due in part to "discontinuities between signifiers and signifieds" and "the solidity of symbols that obscure their original referents." His observation is made specific in the case of Lichtenstein's art that, as with all pop, is a representation not of reality but, rather, a representation of a representation and thus of a pre-existing sign. In this scheme of things, "the original source" – the "signfier" – is metamorphosed into a "signified" with the result that "the original referent . . . is transformed by indirection."[151]

If only superficially, then, Alloway's account of Lichtenstein's representation of pre-existing signs bears some similarity to Jean Baudrillard's notion of an aestheticized "hyperreality," a situation largely brought about by the media's role as "key simulation machines."[152] From the vantage point of the media-saturated contemporary world, Baudrillard distinguished between the "real" – "*that of which it is possible to give an equivalent representation*" – and the "hyperreal" in which: "At the limit of this process of reproducibility, the real is not only what can be reproduced, but *that which is always already reproduced.*"[153] Thus the hyperreal is "beyond representation because it functions entirely within the realm of simulation."[154] Warhol's art, which used photographic silk-screens to reproduce pre-existing signs, is a better example of the "hyperreal" than Lichtenstein's. It conforms to the "properly serial form" that Baudrillard regarded as among the "modalities" of simulation and that he illustrated by reference to Warhol's art.[155]

Baudrillard aligned his theory of simulations with an arcane theory of social control within which simulation is seen as "the reigning scheme" of "a neo-capitalist cybernetic order that aims now at total control." It attempts this by means of "the code,"[156] which the media, in its role of simulation machine, reproduces along with "images" and "signs." Kellner gave a general definition of Baudrillard's concept of the "code": "an overarching, regulative principle or system that determines the relative prestige or sign value of commodities." Kellner stressed, however, that "it is not clear who establishes the code or how, or how it functions in specific cases."[157]

The bleaker, if similarly hermetic, dimension of his vision of social control arose from his alignment of hyperrealism with post-structuralist critiques of referentiality: for Baudrillard there is "nothing outside the play of simulations" (just as for Derrida "there is nothing outside of the text") and, therefore, "no 'real' in which theory can be grounded or radical politics reconstructed."[158] Without access to the "real," as Kellner after Baudrillard

explained, we cannot "perceive what is determining and constituting various events and processes." The "real," itself, is "presented as an effect of the code or system."[159] Without the means of "testing pretence against reality," Zygmunt Bauman grimly observed, we have no way of exiting "from our quandary."[160]

The weakened link with the "real," as effected by the twentieth-century communication system and as illustrated by Lichtenstein's art, Alloway viewed more in the sense of the abstract character of mass society, first noticed by Kierkegaard. This same characteristic is central to Ihab Hassan's concept of "immanence" or "*immances*," which he identified as one of the two "central, constitutive tendencies in post-modernism" (the other being "indeterminacy"). He defined it as "the capacity of mind to generalize itself in symbols, intervene more and more into nature, act upon itself through its own abstractions and so become, increasingly, immediately, its own environment." In the creation of this environment, and with particular relevance to Alloway's conception of "environment," Hassan noted the roles played by duplicates of man – that is, the "artificial intelligence" of cybernetics – and extensions of man – that is, technologies which "project our perceptions to the edge of the receding universe."[161]

Alloway's reticence to explore the more disquieting implications of this mediate world, and hence of mass communications and consumerism, including the erosion of "self" by technological fascism, was a consequence of the centrality of pragmatism in his theorization of the interrelated phenomena of the twentieth-century communication system and pop. Pragmatism, with its undermining of the authority of universal meaning and thus of immutable standards, was responsible for Alloway's positive appraisal of the role played by mass media (constituent channels of the communication system) in facilitating man's adaptation to the fast-changing environment. Pragmatism was responsible also for Alloway's unwavering belief in the inviolability of the first-person standpoint, or, to word it differently, the particular life situation of each individual. This was expressed, for example, in Alloway's patent concern for the relation of the network of signs defining the post-war urban environment to their users and, thus, as articulated by the pragmatist semiotician Morris for the differentiation of signs "in terms of the dispositions to behavior which they cause in their interpreters."[162]

3

Harold Rosenberg

Pop Art and the "De-definition" of Both Art and "Self"

Harold Rosenberg's writings on pop art throughout the sixties, in which he constantly demonstrates pop's questioning and blurring of the boundaries between mass and fine art, provide the most compelling evidence of *grounds* for art's anxious condition – those derived from the key technological and economic characteristics of post-war society – as opposed to evidence of the condition itself. According to Rosenberg, anxious art confronts its situation and exercises art's prerogative to make itself anew, while its anxiety is evidence of art's survival in the face of a situation that militates against its very being. Pop, in Rosenberg's terms, is evidence of a stilling of art's disquiet. With its seeming acquiescence to art's "deformation" and "loss of identity," pop renounces the "intellectual and emotional" element in modern art that stems from confronting the truth of its condition, replacing it, presumably, by a craftsman's satisfaction "in doing."[1]

Rosenberg's account of pop art's threatened merger with mass communication forms places it within the ambit of the delegitimizing interests of post-modernism, those that propose an end to categorical distinctions based upon hierarchies of taste, opinion, and knowledge as well as an end to the power of singular authorities, such as the art museum, to dictate categorical distinctions along these lines. Rosenberg arrived at this position, however, not by means of a post-structuralist critique of the foundationalist beliefs of traditional philosophy, upon which traditional aesthetic values that posit an oppositional relationship between mass and fine art are based, but, rather, by a linkage of the "cultural" (i.e., pop art) and the "social." This view holds that the aesthetic of pop is, primarily, an outcome (if not, from Rosenberg's perspective, an ineluctable outcome) of allied technological and economic factors of post-war urban society.

Rosenberg's account of pop art's relationship to its societal context is, arguably, as comprehensive as Alloway's. However, his attitude towards both pop and the society that gave it birth is remote from Alloway's uncritical acceptance. In Rosenberg's case, characteristics of post-war urban society were examined not only for the purpose of illuminating pop but, equally, pop served as a tool of cultural and social analysis, *its* characteristics alerting the spectator to both the nature of urban society in the contemporary period and the fate of both art and the individual within it.

Rosenberg was born in New York City in 1906 and lived until the age of seventy-two. He commenced his critical career in the thirties, during which time he wrote literary criticism; his initial publication was in *Symposium* in 1931, some four years after he graduated in law from St. Lawrence University. The broadening of his critical role to encompass art took place in the next decade with the rise to prominence of Abstract Expressionism. Prior to this, however, from 1938-42, Rosenberg occupied the post of "national art editor of *American Guides* series produced by the Works Projects Administration."[2] The advent of pop art gave renewed relevance to the argument that Rosenberg formulated in relation to Abstract Expressionism, especially as it concerned the threat to both "self" and "art" by totalitarian forces at work in post-war, capitalist consumerist society. The ultimately utopian tenor of this argument rested on the assumption that, whatever the source, these forces can and must be defeated at the level of individual resistance. This in turn was predicated on the findings of the existentialist philosophy of human freedom, those that reflected not only Rosenberg's extensive knowledge of this subject but, also, personal friendship with the French existential philosophers Jean-Paul Sartre and Maurice Merleau-Ponty.[3] In Rosenberg's eyes, his adoption of an existentialist critical stance represented a smooth, if not entirely seamless, transition from the (anti-Stalinist) Marxist one he had embraced in the late thirties[4] in the first decade of his career as a critic; both stances were united by a common concern for human freedom as well as belief that the assertion of authentic selfhood – regardless of the manner of its expression – was a crucial factor in the attainment of their respective goals. Finally, it must be argued that certain and, arguably, paradoxical, aspects of Rosenberg's multi-faceted career lent unrivalled authority to his insights into the workings of capitalist consumerist society, insights that if a feature of his writings on Abstract Expressionism were given far greater definition in those on pop. In the "ivory tower" role of professor in the Committee on Social Thought and in the Department of Art at the University of Chicago,[5] Rosenberg was positioned at the periphery of this society. In further roles, however, he was situated at its very heart. Rosenberg

was a member of the Advertising Council[6] and, in the capacity of advertising man, purported inventor of "Smokey the Bear."[7] During the sixties, the historical span of this study, the main platform for Rosenberg's tireless or, as one commentator has suggested, tiresome espousal of "perennial causes and grand resentments"[8] was *The New Yorker.* Clement Greenberg, in his 1939 account of the state of art under industrial capitalism, singled out this magazine as a prime example of "high-class kitsch for the luxury trade"[9] and thus of the dreaded "midcult." "Midcult," in his estimation, posed a far more insidious threat to cultural standards than kitsch (or mass culture), which at least had the distinction of being the enemy from without.

The anonymity of pop, and its allied feature of indeterminacy, resulted from two main factors: the pop artist's adoption of meticulous and, in some cases, mechanical techniques that reduced, if not eliminated, the sense of artist as maker; non- or minimal transformation of source material and so suppression of the more imaginative faculties of the artist's mind, those consistent with "self-expression" or an authorial perspective. In Rosenberg's criticism, these factors in combination were proffered as evidence of the absorption of art into the mass media and the resultant redundancy of categorical distinctions between cultural realms; the impact of mass society on the individual subject (in the role of artist) and his subsequent decentrement. This last aspect largely provided the grounds for Rosenberg's negative evaluation of pop.

Both facets of Rosenberg's analysis of pop are present in his response to Andy Warhol's extreme form in "Warhol: Art's Other Self" (1971). Rosenberg wrote this article after viewing a retrospective exhibition of "some two hundred and forty"[10] examples of Warhol's art, held at the Whitney Museum of Art, New York, in 1971.[11] Ostensibly an account of Warhol's art, it serves equally as a summary of the critical positions on pop that Rosenberg formulated during the sixties, even if the underlying premises of these positions had been set down in the previous decade in response to Abstract Expressionism.

In "Warhol: Art's Other Self," Rosenberg argued that Warhol's art *is* mass culture, if of a sophisticated kind. At one level, Warhol indicates the stage "in Western culture" when art must fight for its continued existence "against the flux of the popular media"; at another level, from Warhol's point of view, painting has already been absorbed into "the mass media." Rosenberg mounted his case by demonstrating the ways in which Warhol's art and Warhol, its producer, operated within the system of practices that govern the production of mass cultural artifacts. Two inter-related features of Warhol's art were singled out. First, those qualities that could be readily

identified with "products of the conveyor belt or the machine." He referred, of course, to Warhol's factory-type production methods (the comparison invited by Warhol's chosen title for his studio: the Factory) such as the employment of silk-screens that allow duplication of images and, in theory, the adjustment of production to demand (hence, his generic reference to Warhol's art as "multiples"). Second, Warhol's marketing of his art or, more accurately, of himself, as maker of his art. Rosenberg drew attention, here, to the overshadowing of Warhol's art by the carefully contrived persona of Warhol the public figure. Subscribing to the ethos "'I am recognized, therefore I am,'" and divesting his art of any trace of personal identity, Warhol's relationship to the art work, in Rosenberg's estimation, was restricted to that of producer of a brand-name, one that centred on "a costume of black leather jacket and silver sprayed hair and a mask of bewildered non-commitment."[12] Pop, in its seemingly passive acquiescence to mass media encroachments on art and consequently to art's "deformation and loss of identity,"[13] represents a "quieting of anxiety." Warhol's extreme form, however, in which the problems confronting art in the modern period, those constituting its anxious condition,[14] are not thought about at all, is "post-art"[15]; art has been de-defined to the stage where all that remains of art is "the fiction of the artist." Warhol's "mass production of paintings" as well as striking performance of self in this manner were accounted for by Rosenberg on a number of grounds. Important among these was the impact of mechanical reproduction on art, which had the effect of equating a "painting" with a "picture, *any* picture (since any can be reproduced), with a respected signature." Rosenberg could thus claim: "Art is a cliché given renown by a name," a claim that is as true of "the *Mona Lisa*" as it is of Warhol's silk-screened version of the same image.[16]

In "The Mona Lisa without a mustache: Art in the media age," an article published in 1976, some five years after "Warhol: Art's Other Self," Rosenberg examined the issue of mechanical reproduction of art in some depth. He drew upon the insights of the German Marxist philosopher Walter Benjamin in his pioneering account of the ramifications of the mechanical reproduction of art: "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction" (1936). These centre on the loss of art's "aura" (i.e., the factors relating to its "unique existence") and, as a result of this loss, the allowance of art to be put to new purposes such as "politics."[17] In the spirit of Benjamin, Rosenberg observed that with the perfection of the "technology of reproduction" and resultant reduction of distinction between "original and copy," "art, past and present, thus becomes available for utilization in entertainment, education (propaganda) and the marketplace, and is drawn

irresistibly into the media system." Rosenberg discussed, for example, the media characteristic of "programmed response." When applied to art, he considered that "eminence . . . has been measured as it is in Hollywood or on Madison Avenue, by the responses of crowds rather than by critical approval" (a point Rosenberg illustrated by Warhol's oft-repeated, democratic remark "that everyone ought to be famous for 15 minutes") and therefore through the application of "promotion and marketing techniques" to art.[18]

In response to "this age of reproduction," the artist's interest in the image lie in its possibilities for "renewal," as exemplified by "Manet's revision of Corregio and Rauschenberg's *Erased de Kooning Drawing* or the Pop artist's adaptations of comic strips and Coca Cola bottles." In the single culture that has ensued the "sources of inspiration" – be it the "art of the museum" or "the art of the streets" – are less important "than the transforming activity."[19]

Warhol's quasi-mechanical duplication of pre-existing images, it must be assumed, relinquished even the possibility of "renewal" of the same and, hence, the "transforming acitivity" of the artist. Without such evidence of the more imaginative faculties of the artist's mind – and so the artist's "self" – Warhol, in Rosenberg's terms, had not created art. In the introduction to *The De-definition of Art*, a collection of essays on contemporary art including "Warhol: Art's Other Self," Rosenberg elaborated this phenomenon.

> *The* artist does not exist except as a personification . . . that represents the sum total of art itself. It is painting that is the genius of the painter, poetry of the poet – and a person is a creative artist to the extent that he participates in that genius.[20]

Further grounds for Warhol's "mass production of paintings" and media staging of an identity were attributable to interrelated shifts in both the composition and taste of the art audience at the conclusion of the fifties. Both "the new, expanded art public" and the art world personnel drawn from its ranks wanted art that demanded little of them. It was therefore drawn to "images taken in at a glance," "'glamorous' colors translatable into dress patterns" and, especially, "reputations."[21]

In "Keeping Up," a study of the relationship between characteristics of sixties' art and that of its audience, Rosenberg dubbed this same enlarged audience the "aesthetic Silent Majority." Sixties' art, in both its abstract and representational forms, in its matching of "the visual and somatic effects of the industrial environment" and in its use of "new manufactured ma-

terials and industrial-age waste" reflected, in Rosenberg's opinion, current realities as manifested "in technology and the mass media." He likened the art of this period, in which artists reworked "existing styles" rather than creating new ones, to that of the Bauhaus merger of maxims of art and goals of "product design" during the "Weimar period."

Working in the role of designer and so in a role that, as understood by Bauhaus artists, does away with the notion "of the individual artist and of his metaphysics of creation," artists in the sixties incorporate modernism into objects used by and images intelligible to "the aesthetic Silent Majority." Whereas vanguard art demands the understanding of and change in the spectator, art as design tutors the individual in matters of "taste," while not disturbing "his beliefs, attitudes, and prejudices." Art forms such as "multiples" were viewed by Rosenberg as an attempt by American artists to situate themselves in the "Majority's" habitual environment by means of "products midway between art and supermarket ornaments and spectacles."[22]

The cultural category represented by "multiples," and therefore by Warhol's art, invites identification with "Midcult," the term coined by the American cultural theorist Dwight MacDonald to describe the "peculiar hybrid" bred from the "unnatural intercourse" of high and mass culture. Midcult, in MacDonald's view, "has the essential qualities of Masscult – the formula, the built-in-reaction, the lack of any standard except popularity – but it decently covers them with a cultural figleaf." Midcult, he contended, posed a far more insidious threat to high culture than mass culture: it "pretends to respect the standards of High Culture while in fact it waters them down and vulgarizes them." As MacDonald observed: "the enemy outside the walls is easy to distinguish."[23] MacDonald's Midcult is an elaboration of Clement Greenberg's "high class kitsch for the luxury trade," previously identified in "Avant-Garde and Kitsch" (1939). As with kitsch itself, "high class kitsch" feeds off the avant-garde, converting and watering down its material.[24]

MacDonald attributed the development of Midcult, along with the "more widely diffused interest in High Culture," to changes in the audience of art, more specifically to those brought about by the "accelerating increase in wealth, leisure and college education" (especially the last) since 1945. He accordingly assigned it to a variation on historical reasons responsible for "the growth of Mass Culture since the early 1800's": "Political democracy and popular education [which] broke down the old upper-class monopoly of culture."[25]

A similar analysis underlies Greenberg's account of the threat to the survival of the avant-garde and, hence, to "living culture." Two factors, in

particular, were to blame: the rapidly shrinking class of "the rich and the cultivated," the avant-garde's necessary social base and source of income; the emergence of mass culture and its commodities (kitsch) or a "rear-garde" – simultaneous to that of the avant-garde – which arose to meet the demands of a universally literate and industrialized society.[26]

In a related vein, in "Everyman a Professional," Rosenberg refuted the notion of the "existence of a mass of generic art appreciators" in the contemporary period as "a myth left over from European aristocratic and pseudo-aristocratic meditations on lost peasant cultures and noble savages." Hence, "the Public," the potential audience of fine art

> is not a single entity of high or low intelligence [that, it would seem, corresponds to either a high or a low cultural sphere] but a sum of shifting groupings, each with its own mental focus. Which intellectual category an individual belongs to is *not* dictated by his appreciation of the fine arts.[27]

Presumably, the conditions at the base of the unstable identity of the art audience are similar, in some measure at least, to those responsible for the destruction of the fixed social distinctiveness "of individuals" in the modern period which, in "Criticism and its Premises" (1966), Rosenberg cited as a factor in determining the incidence of themes centred on "identity, personal and collective," in "contemporary cultural forms." He saw it as resulting from the marked mobility of society's inhabitants, not only "geographically" but, also, "vertically (through revolutions, mass education, equalization of opportunity)."[28]

Dwight MacDonald was the only member of this group comprising himself, Rosenberg, and Greenberg who wrote extensively on cultural theory; however, all three shared the perception that, as explained by Christopher Brookeman in reference to MacDonald, "the destruction of a minority aristocratic high culture by the coming of mass industrial society . . . [was] the occasion for an irreversible disintegration and decline of culture."[29] In the case of Greenberg and Rosenberg, this perception underscored their respective if, in most respects, conflicting analyses of contemporary art.

With regard to the art of the sixties, Greenberg and Rosenberg agreed that the impact of mass culture on high art necessarily threatened the continued existence of the latter, at least in any "significant" form. A basic difference, however, exists in their respective interpretations of "significant" art. Rosenberg, for example, saw all sixties art of the "anonymous" sort as contaminated by mass culture, whereas Greenberg saw colour-field abstraction – "anonymous" art in Rosenberg's terms – as resistant to its per-

nicious influence. A further disagreement can be found over what manner "significant" art resisted the encroachment of mass culture.

Greenberg's case was argued on formalist grounds, as outlined in "Modernist Painting" (1961) and used to lend support to the colour-field painters favoured by him such as Kenneth Noland, Morris Louis, and Jules Olitski. Central to Greenberg's formalist case was "self-definition" in the arts: the emphasis on what was inherent in a particular medium. "Self-definition" was achieved by "self-criticism," the task of which "became to eliminate from the specific effects of each art any and every effect that might conceivably be borrowed from or by the medium of any other art." Quality in art as well as the independence of each art was embedded in "purity of medium."[30] Greenberg's conception of the Modernist endeavour – its role in the preservation of cultural standards and association of the highest of these with "purity of medium" – originated in his first major piece of writing, "Avant-Garde and Kitsch" (1939), and in the context of a concern for the survival of culture under industrial capitalism. "Purity of medium," in its less rigorous art-for-art's sake form, emerged in the nineteenth century as the avant-garde's means of avoiding contamination by external restraints and directives, notably those associated with industrial capitalism. The intention was to create "something valid solely on its own terms . . . in the way a landscape – not its picture – is aesthetically valid; something *given*, increate, independent of meanings, similars, or originals."[31]

Greenberg's account of an avant-garde that appeared parallel to a rear-garde, each being a condition of the other, and within the social and political framework of the "industrial West,"[32] is similar to that outlined by Renato Poggioli in *The Theory of the Avant-Garde* (1968), at least as discussed by Rosenberg in "D. M. Z. Vanguardism" (1968). Poggioli, according to Rosenberg's summary of his views, regarded "vanguardism" as a consequence of the "estrangement of the artist in modern society."

> As long as liberal-democratic capitalism remains intact, civilization will continue to be the scene of "a conflict between two parallel cultures." In the United States, the majority culture against which the hostility of the avant-garde is directed is the culture of the mass media – a "pseudo-culture" that destroys qualitative values and oppresses the artist by forcing him to produce for the market or exist as a parasite.[33]

The alienation of the artist from "majority culture," upon which Poggioli's vanguardist claims rest, in Rosenberg's view, no longer held; while the "idea" of vanguardism was more influential "in the creation and dissemination of art" than previously, "the social and psychological negations"

upon which its formation relied were no longer operative. This was evident in American art movements' unconcealed collaboration with "majority culture" since the time of pop. For this reason, Rosenberg was less than sanguine about art's ability to resist external directives, more specifically those of mass media and their associated culture. Art at the present time, he considered, is neither avant-garde nor mass culture. Instead, it is a "demilitarized zone," a "buffer area" that is "immune to attack by both vanguard intransigence and philistine prejudice" and that "provides a market for the expansion of mass culture into more sophisticated forms"[34] as exemplified by the currency of Andy Warhol.[35] This disintegration in boundaries between cultural realms, observed by Rosenberg, is similar to the situation that Dwight MacDonald saw as occurring in the "new period" (i.e., c. post-1940) in which "Mass Culture takes on the color of both varieties of the old High Culture, Academic and Avantgarde, while these latter are increasingly watered down with Mass elements."[36]

Rosenberg regarded Warhol's art as an index of the changed situation of art in the sixties in which the broadened audience of art and the broadened range of cultural forms identified as "art" were symbiotically linked. It can be argued that Rosenberg arrived at this understanding by examining Warhol's art in the context of a consumerist phase of capitalist society. In more recent times, the sociologist Zygmunt Bauman viewed postmodernism as a logical expression of present-day society that he labelled post-modernity and identified with a consumerist phase of capitalism. According to Bauman's analysis, reproduction of the capitalist system in its consumerist phase is achieved by "individual freedom" in the form of "consumer freedom." By this, he meant "consumer freedom geared to the consumer market" and represented by "the choice between greater and lesser satisfactions."

Just as the "market thrives on variety . . . so does consumer freedom and with it the security of the system" (i.e., capitalism in its consumerist phase). Neither the market nor the system benefits from the dictatorial "social system of 'classical' capitalism" (in which "work in the form of wage labour" assumed the pivotal position now occupied by "consumer conduct"), specifically its fostering of "strict and universal *rules*, unambiguous criteria of *truth*, *morality and beauty*, indivisible *authority of judgement.*"

In the absence of the authority of "universally binding standards," "cultural authorities" (presumably, including those associated with high art) have turned to the only alternative: "market forces." In this situation – one that in Rosenberg's analysis concerns both Warhol's art and the institu-

tions that support it – "cultural authorities turn themselves into market forces, become commodities, compete with other commodities, legitimize their value through the selling capacity they attain."[37]

In broad terms, both Greenberg and Rosenberg considered that "self-definition" was the means by which art could survive threats posed to its standards by the deleterious effects of mass culture. However, each critic defined "self-definition" somewhat differently. Whereas for Greenberg it concerned the artist's concentration on those qualities intrinsic to the medium he had employed, for Rosenberg it meant the artist's definition of "self."

Rosenberg's line of reasoning is illuminated by "Art and Work," an article published in 1965, in which he distinguished between art and art as craft, the latter encompassing commercial and industrial art. In this, Rosenberg advanced the thesis that "anonymous" art of the sixties – "Pop and Gag art and various kinds of pattern-making abstraction in painting" – is, in essence, art as craft, a fact not altered by its fine art context. He largely attributed the excitement caused by pop to a lack of knowledge among art world professionals about the nature of art in "advertising" and "the display industry."[38]

The artist's creation of "a single object rather than a model for machine production," is insufficient to differentiate "his work from that of the designer-craftsman," one reason being an increased sophistication in techniques for reproducing art.[39] Art as craft is distinguished by the emphasis placed "on the object and its qualities, to the exclusion of the personality of the artist, his unique consciousness, his dilemmas." He gave the example of the "accident" that is employed by potters, in the form of "splashes" and "runs," to improve "their surfaces." It is therefore called upon solely for aesthetic purposes and not as a means of giving form to "the artist's thinking and feeling." However, as Rosenberg observed, undoubtedly in reference to the decline of action painting, recently "painters" have been employing the accident in a similar fashion. Rosenberg warned that "nothing in art" can avoid being "reduced to inconsequence if understood in how-to-do-it terms": the elimination of "the intellectual-emotional motive" necessarily means the elimination, also, of distinctions "between the painter and potter."[40]

In the single culture, or approximations of it, described by Rosenberg in articles such as "Mona Lisa without a mustache: Art in the media age," and in all of his accounts of pop art, high and low cultural forms overlap in their appearance as well as in both their mode of production and mode of address. At face value, then, there can be neither categorical nor hierarchical

divisions based upon high or low cultural realms. These are established, instead, by those between art and art as craft and, in this manner, by either evidence of the "intellectual-emotional motive" or absence of the same; the status of art is relative to its categorization as either art or art as craft. Hence, in "Art and Work," and in reference to current depersonalized styles in art, including pop, Rosenberg could claim that "anonymous" art reinstates the originary "relation of the craftsman to his product," one "of skill" in producing a functional "object." However, at the present time, the term can only be a "euphemism for commercial or industrial art" that has been displaced into cultural spheres previously reserved for "serious work."[41]

The "intellectual-emotional motive" lies behind the most recent concerns of art: the role played by "its creative processes" in moulding both "the artist" and "his audience as individuals," one that is illustrated in Rosenberg's model art form: action painting. Rosenberg termed this latest interest "free work," work contracted "not in obedience to external need but as a necessity of the worker's personality." As suggested by Rosenberg's terminology, he made no distinction between its incidence "in the studio, the workshop, the laboratory or the industrial plant"[42] and so between the worker and artist as well as between artists working in various cultural contexts. It is assumed that by "free work" Rosenberg referred to that of the non-alienated worker, "alienation" understood by him in the sense that Marx used the term to indicate "the condition of the common man of industrial society" and to mean "the tragic separation of the human individual from himself." As discussed by Rosenberg in "Herd of Independent Minds" (1948), for Marx "it is the factory worker, the businessman, the professional, who is 'alienated in his work' through being hurled into the fetish world of the market." The artist – the "model man of the future" – is the only member of society to escape this fate "because he works directly with the materials of his own experience and transforms them."[43]

During the mid-thirties, in the initial phase of Rosenberg's career as a critic (at this stage, prior to the advent of Abstract Expressionism, a literary critic), Rosenberg wrote for *New Masses* and the first *Partisan Review*,[44] the latter set up by the Communist Party with the aim, as recalled by Rosenberg, of combating "Bohemianism in literature."[45] As was the case with other New York intellectuals associated with *Partisan Review*, such as Greenberg and MacDonald, Rosenberg, in response to Trotskyism, was soon drawn to anti-Stalinist Marxism. Alan M. Wald, in his study *The New York Intellectuals*, argued that the group underwent an ideological switch from "Marxist anti-Communism (authentic anti-Stalinism) to liberal

anti-Communism (bogus anti-Stalinism)," a conversion by which "the views of former revolutionaries . . . [came] into harmony with the dominant ideology of the liberal intelligenstia during the Cold War."[46] Rosenberg's writings on art in the contemporary period, with their emphasis on the artist's "self," as with those of Greenberg that also place emphasis on the artist's "self" (if only as manifest in "genuine esthetic innovation"), must be seen in the light of this conversion.

Rosenberg's reference to "free work" in "Art and Work" stands as a vestige of Rosenberg's anti-Stalinist Marxism. In "Death in the Wilderness," Rosenberg lapsed into autobiography to distance his Marxist position in the thirties from communism, claiming that in Marx's writings he discovered "a new image of the drama of the individual and of the mass."[47] A similar view of Marxism is presented by Marshall Berman in *All that is Solid Melts into Air*, in which he cited Marx's utopian vision of the situation after the revolution (when socialism has evolved from capitalism): "In place of the old bourgeois society, with its classes and class antagonisms, we will have an association in which the free development of each will be the condition for the free development of all."[48]

In Rosenberg's estimation, art discovered within its very methods and skills the means of shaping "individuality." While this discovery was linked to the acute consciousness of "man's changed relation to production," its stimulus lie in social factors such as the disappearance "of local cultures and the mass recruitments of modern industry." Near the commencement of "Art and Work," Rosenberg takes the view that "human essence" is founded "on man's handling of materials." However, this has been destroyed by "automation" and the resultant redundancy of even fundamental "operative skills." It is with this idea of the decentrement of man the maker in mind that Rosenberg claimed that art aware of "man's changed relation to production" has found in painting the "psychic experience of creation" and, in this manner, an "art for making artists."[49]

Rosenberg considered that art concerned with "self-creation" is profoundly "political," unlike "propaganda art that delivers preconceived messages through craftsman-like presentations." In its reawakening of the elementary impulse "of art as magic and celebration" (in this, departing from its past motive of fabrication) it adopts the traits "of action."[50] His account of art concerned with "self-creation" as well as the creation of artists in "Art and Work" is a shorthand one in which the idea of art as action is inadequately explained. In substance, it varies little from Rosenberg's accounts of action painting and, indeed, needs to be understood in terms of and as a continuation of the latter's principles, including the primacy of the

individual. In Rosenberg's view, "art as action" is "trans-formal" art: action painting refers to "an action that eventuates on a canvas, rather than in the physical world or in society."[51] That it occurs on canvas is the result of socio-political factors that militate against the preservation of self, those pertaining to totalitarian tendencies in modern mass society, in both their communist and capitalist forms. In the pure space offered by the "blank canvas . . . the American painter discovered a new function for art as the action that belonged to himself. . . . The artist's struggle for identity took hold of the crisis directly, without ideological mediation."[52]

Rosenberg's faith in the artist's ability to resist all threats to "self" posed by social, economic, and political forces bears comparison with observations made by Dwight MacDonald in "A Theory of Mass Culture" (1953), in which the artist is cast in a similarly heroic mould. In this, MacDonald observed that "the Avantgarde," along with the "cultural *élite*" that it created "is now dying," its decline due, in part, to "the competing Mass Culture." Its death, however, is not inevitable: "There are still islands above the flood for those determined enough to reach them."[53]

MacDonald's observations, as with those of Rosenberg, are validation of the completion of the passage from "Marxist anti-Communism (authentic anti-Stalinism) to liberal anti-Communism (bogus anti-Stalinism)" that Alan M. Wald, in his previously mentioned study, saw as the fate of "New York intellectuals."[54] As Wald observed:

> An axiom of Marxism . . . holds that total autonomy from the social institutions that shape lives and consciousness is a delusion, a myth that serves the ideological function of preserving the simulacrum of "free will" while sustaining the dominant institutions, social relations, and culture of the existing society.[55]

Maurice Friedman defined existentialism "not as a single school but as a tendency and a direction," in this acknowledging the difficulty in establishing clear demarcations between "various trends of modern philosophy," including pragmatism.[56] However, he did make clear the central feature of all modern accounts:

> An emphasis upon the existential subject in all his wholeness and concreteness – the willing, feeling, thinking person who decides and acts and does so from the limited perspective of his particular life situation rather than from some universal vantage point provided by reason or history.[57]

Rosenberg's theorization of action painting, and in this manner art as action, similarly pivots on the existential subject.

> The revolution against the given, in the self and in the world, which since Hegel has provided European vanguard art with theories of a New Reality, has re-entered America in the form of personal revolts. Art as action rests on the enormous assumption that the artist accepts as real only that which he is in the process of creating.[58]

The action painter's pursuit of the "real," Rosenberg obviously regarded as analogous to the existentialist pursuit of "truth," both realized through practical activity rather than speculative thought.

> The "existential thinker" maintains . . . that the truths of human existence he wishes to apprehend – the nature of the self, anguish, guilt, choice, and faith – cannot be known through detached observation and contemplation, but must be inwardly appropriated through the experience of personal involvement growing out of his own passionate concern.[59]

"Art as action" relates to the role that *process* plays in the action painter's pursuit of the real. Consistent with a "philosophy of action, or of history, man is defined by the fact that he acts and changes the course of things."[60]

In further reference to action painting, Rosenberg observed that paintings from New York spread their proposed solution to the crisis of identity, as it concerned art and the artist's "self," over the entire globe: "Paintings produced painters. . . . Painting became the means of confronting in daily practice the problematic nature of modern individuality."[61] In "Art and Work," Rosenberg extended this analysis to encompass not only the role played by art's "creative processes" in forming the artist, but, equally, in forming "his audience as individuals."[62] This, in turn, relates to Kierkegaard's existentialist idea of "'indirect communication,'" predicated on the belief that the "common public world of 'direct communication'" can neither communicate subjective, individual experience nor generate "self-consciousness" in another individual.[63]

In "Art and Work," however, Rosenberg did not identify art aimed at self-creation with action painting – and, deliberately so. To do so would be to ignore the central principle of self-creation or definition of self, as understood by Rosenberg, that it was brought about by "action" which need not be shackled to a specific form (e.g., art) and thus, even less, to a specific style. It would also ignore that the "trans-formal" character of action painting could be transformed into "Style," a possibility recognized by Rosenberg in his earliest account of the movement, "The American Action Painters." In this essay, Rosenberg observed that "since there is nothing to be 'communicated,' a unique signature comes to seem the equivalent of a

new plastic language."[64] He alludes, here, to the belief that action painting is concerned with "self-creation or self-definition" rather than "self-expression, which assumes the acceptance of the ego as it is."[65] This last view is a contravention of the existentialist tenet that man is "being in whom existence precedes essence, a being who exists before he can be defined by any concept."[66]

The prevalence of "anonymous" art in the sixties, including pop, one identified with craft and design, arose in response to mass culture and therefore, according to Rosenberg's thesis, in response to the escalating crisis that had brought action painting into being.[67] Hence, from the vantage point of "Art and Work," published in the same decade, art as action, while attributable to "this revolutionary epoch,"[68] in the final count can prosper only while each and every person assumes the responsibility of "their own development."[69]

Rosenberg's negative evaluation of Warhol's art concerned not Warhol's ability to express significant or, at least, relevant social issues, such as art's absorption into the media system. "Warhol's detached art-supplier [i.e., Warhol's "alter-ego"] with Hollywood-style ambitions," he accordingly observed, has to his credit immersed "himself in the realities of the current art situation." Rather, it concerned the evidence Warhol's art presents of his defeat in the face of the depersonalizing tendencies of mass society. Warhol's failing according to Rosenberg, is that he neither wants nor knows how to change the state of affairs. From Warhol's point of view, the issue is no longer moot: painting *is* mass media.[70]

Equally, Rosenberg could have formulated his charge in terms of the existentialist belief that to thrust oneself under the category of the species is evasion. The evasion, as understood by the Danish philosopher Soren Kierkegaard, is that of authentic selfhood. This is attained by "genuine values," those earned "in the joys and agonies of immediate personal experience," as opposed to the "values of inauthentic man, prescribed in advance by his social or professional function . . . simply the official ones of a given time or place."[71] To quote Kierkegaard: "the individual who evades this responsibility . . . finds it too venturesome a thing to be himself, far easier and safer to be like the others, to become an imitation, a number, a cipher in the crowd."[72]

From an existential viewpoint, Warhol's art – free of any vestige of selfhood – is validation of Warhol's inauthentic life. In Rosenberg's writings, references to this facet of existentialist thought, that which reveals the social and communal concerns of existentialism, as with any other, is alluded to in only the most general terms. It is telling that Rosenberg should single

out Kierkegaard for mention or, more accurately, citation in his writing,[73] for he is credited with having developed the prototype of existential social criticism in *The Present Age*[74] (first published in 1847), a function to which Rosenberg's own criticism, taken in its entirety, clearly aspires.

A repeated theme in Rosenberg's writings from the fifties and late forties is one concerning his spirited opposition to all attempts to misrepresent the uniqueness and particularity of each "self." In "The Orgamerican Phantasy," for example, Rosenberg voiced objection to the formulation of a social type – "personification of a behavior system" – by sociologists representative of the "new American sociology." Rosenberg had in mind, among other examples, the "Other-Directed Man" of David Riesman (*The Lonely Crowd*) and the "Organization Man" of William H. Whyte, Jr. (*The Organization Man*). He was particularly critical of their shared perception that "the flattening of personality . . . [is] a universal effect of our interrelated economic and social practices" and is indicative of "a developing totalitarianism from which there is no escape."

The prediction of American sociologists, such as Riesman and Whyte, Jr., that "the Orgman [Rosenberg's "nickname" for "the present-day American social-type"] will become everyone in a quiet, unopposable totalitarianism," Rosenberg saw as not based on social analysis but, rather, as "a projection of the fate that they have chosen for themselves."[75] The existentialist-directed thesis underlying this claim is that even if "our interrelated economic and social practices" unleash coercive, "totalitarian" forces, they are not "unopposable"; the individual chooses his or her fate. A similar idea was expressed in aphoristic form by Kierkegaard: "A crowd is formed of individuals; consequently each one has the power to remain what he is – an individual. No one . . . is excluded from being an individual, except the one who excludes himself by becoming many."[76]

In "The Herd of Independent Minds," first published in 1948, Rosenberg urged the writer to reject "formulated *common experiences* which are the substance of mass culture," the "time packages and sociology packages in which experience is delivered fresh every morning." Instead,

> he will accept the fact that he cannot know, except through the lengthy unfolding of his work itself, what will prove to be central to his experiencing; it is his way of revealing his existence to his consciousness and of bringing his consciousness into play upon his existence.[77]

It was Warhol's rejection of knowledge that was "inwardly appropriated"[78] and gleaned "from the limited perspective of his particular life situation"[79] that constituted the crux of Rosenberg's rejection of Warhol's art.

Rosenberg's analysis of the impact of mass society on Warhol's "self" lacks the social and historical specificity he brought to his analysis of the impact of the same society on Warhol's art, that is, in terms of the form it assumes as well as the audience and institutional support it commands. One reason for this is that Rosenberg imposed upon this analysis a theoretical framework inherited from the pre-pop phases of his critical career when the depersonalizing effects of capitalist and non-capitalist (e.g., communist and fascist) forms of mass society were, from Rosenberg's shifting perspectives (as previously discussed, identified by Alan M. Wald as "Marxist anti-Communism" and "liberal anti-Communism"), of equal concern. For this reason, while Rosenberg related Warhol's loss of "self" to his capitulation to the "totalitarian" forces of contemporary capitalist society, he *theorized* it in the universally applicable, existentialist terms of Warhol's choice of the "inauthentic," as opposed to the "authentic," life.

The question then arises: Did Rosenberg negotiate a resolution between his normalization of Warhol's art and, as part of this, the decentrement of Warhol as subject in terms of the social and economic character of contemporary mass society (however broadly defined) and his existentialist beliefs? He did, but only to the extent that Warhol's art is accommodated within or, alternatively, is not allowed to disrupt his inter-related, existentialist-directed theses of twentieth-century art: those concerning crisis-content and the question of identity as its overriding theme.

The first of these can be dealt with succinctly. In "Action Painting: Crisis and Distortion," published in the aftermath of Abstract Expressionism, Rosenberg stressed that action painting was the result of "crisis – individual, social, esthetic." In a veiled attack on formalism as well as in response to the hegemony of Greenbergian formalism in 1960s' American art criticism, he is critical of those in the "art world" who have obscured the "crisis-dynamics of contemporary painting" and thus the actuality of contemporary American art. This, in Rosenberg's opinion, resulted from adherence to "the academic concept of art as art" in which only "line, color, form," and not "the situation or state of the artist" is taken into account.

Rosenberg perceived a lessening of the awareness of crisis and a calming of this crisis's "political" veneer, brought about by the diminishing danger "of nuclear war." Despite this, he considered that the crisis had intensified as it concerns "the trends of mass culture, the situation of the artist and the position of art itself." However, in order to lend credence to Rosenberg's claim that "crisis-dynamics" had brought not only action painting into being but, also, "anonymous" trends in sixties' art – including pop –

Rosenberg was required to broaden the range of responses to crisis to include those of a non-subjective kind. Action painting, as already established, responded subjectively to the crisis, transferring "into the artist's self the crisis of society and of art." Non-subjective responses to the crisis he saw as belonging to the subsequent stage, to a time characterized by the abandonment of "hope and will." Rosenberg referred to the deadpan mirroring of the senselessness which is, alternately, the reality "of daily life" and the sign of its chaos. He considered the aesthetic response to this situation culminated in an art of farce, farce constituting the end state "of action in a situation that has become untenable." To this "farce of rigid anxiety," Rosenberg credited the present resurgence of "illusionism." Presumably in reference to neo-dada and pop, he cited the technique of incorporating junk from the streets or that of replicating banal mass media imagery.

Consistent with Rosenberg's perception that the crisis-content of action painting had been distorted by the application of inappropriate formalist critical ideas, he observed that the crisis-content of neo-dada and pop was "already being camouflaged in critical how-to-do-it interpretations which amalgamate the new slapstick art with an earlier esthetic [presumably that associated with the "other" tradition: dada and surrealism] of found materials and popular images."[80] Rosenberg's reference to "critical how-to-do-it interpretations" is, patently, a pejorative one and stems from his earlier criticism of "how-to-do-it" art. In "Art and Work," this was exemplified by the painter for whom the "accident" was "a category of decoration and a technical device" rather than the consequence of "imagining effort." It was further illustrated by the pop artist who, along with contemporaneous practitioners of abstract "anonymous" art, reinstated the primary "relation of the craftsman to his product" as manifest in "skill" in the fabrication of a functional object.[81] By association, critics who ignore the crisis-content of neo-dada and pop engage in a level of intellectual activity commensurate with the craftsman rather than the serious artist.

Rosenberg's second thesis, as outlined in "Criticism and its Premises," was directed at the thematic weight given to the issue of "personal and collective" identity in "contemporary cultural forms." He accounted for this prominence in terms of instability in the individual's social make-up brought about by a marked mobility in "population, both geographically (through migrations, exiles, displacements) and vertically (through revolutions, mass education, equalization of opportunity)."[82]

As previously established, both action painting and pop art were responses, if very different responses, to "the depersonalizing machine of

capitalist society," and, in the case of action painting, also to "the depersonalizing machine of the world-wide opposition to that society."[83] The relationship of pop, as well as other cultural forms in the contemporary period that were similarly devoid of personal qualities, to the question of identity was argued by Rosenberg in "Virtuosos of Boredom" (1966). In this, he viewed pop art, along with other forms of sixties' art in which the artist demonstrated emotional disengagement from his work, such as "Optical painting," "kinetic sculpture" and variants "of geometric and color-field abstractions," as a reaction to the fervency of Abstract Expressionism, especially the action painting stream. Along with Abstract Expressionism and abstract examples of sixties' "anonymous" art, pop was part of a progressive elimination of tiers of "individuality." In this particular argument, pop, and its impassive mirroring of the "artist's environment," after Abstract Expressionism and despite Warhol's status as "a veritable Leonardo of boredom,"[84] represented its least compromised stage.

> In accompanying movements the spectator has passed from the imaginative tension of Action Painting, through the amused relaxation of Pop clichés, to the dazzle of Op, to, finally, the bafflement and boredom of paintings and sculptures denuded of sensibility.[85]

The "'inexpressive' art" of the sixties, characterized by the "aesthetics of boredom," Rosenberg regarded as consistent with the overall trend in "the arts toward monotony, repetiveness, and shedding of content." He related this aesthetic to the attrition of "the mighty ego of the Romantics and of 'inner-directed' man." This is a reference to the social type identified by David Riesman who is near-extinct amidst the dominance of "other-directed" man for whom the source of direction is provided by other people, known either directly or through the mass media. Rosenberg drew support for his claim "in the 'chosiste' novels of [Alain] Robbe-Grillet," the founder and chief theoretician of the *nouveau roman* movement in France. As interpreted by Rosenberg, these expressed the following idea: "With the ultimate neutralization of the self, any choice is futile and . . . human beings and events are alike mere extensions of *things.*"[86]

By equating the "aesthetics of boredom" with Riesman's "other-directed" man, he suggests that both are sympathetic to the Marxist belief that consciousness, including consciousness of self, is not the origin but, rather, an effect of social relations and, therefore, "always historically and culturally specific." This opposes the view that "man" is a sovereign subject and defined by some essential quality such as "rational con-

sciousness," the view favoured by "classic liberal humanism," the dominant form of humanism.[87]

Rosenberg's line of argument found support, and a clearer Marxist orientation, in Robbe-Grillet's justification for the revision of the formula of the traditional novel by his "'chosiste' novels" or *nouveau roman*. "Characters" created for the novel in its customary form, he claimed, were nothing but "puppets." They belonged wholly to the past (nineteenth-century society) and thus to a period characterized by "the apogee of the individual."[88]

Robbe-Grillet's position is illuminated by an article about the avant-garde in French fiction in which the author, Jean Bloch-Michel, provided an account of both Robbe-Grillet's and Bernard Pingaud's contribution to a "round table discussion" conducted by the *Figaro Litteraire*. The given emphasis in this discussion was the idea that "character and story, in the sense of plot or anecdote" – central elements of the nineteenth century novel – related to the "coherent social order" represented by bourgeois society. Pingaud claimed that while we are still living in this society it is one that no longer compels conviction. The loss of faith in society corresponded with an equally marked one in "the characters who constitute it."[89] As Pingaud further explained:

> Sociologically . . . the individual no longer corresponds to anything. Psychologically, he has become a mask: what we know today of human behavior . . . has done away with the old notion of the singular character, sure of his individuality even in delirium.[90]

Broadly defined, Robbe-Grillet's and Pingaud's perspective complies with Marxist condemnation "of the bourgeois ideology of 'Man.'"[91] Vincent Des-combes, the author of this statement, was presumably referring to the "dominant liberal discourses of capitalist society" in which, as explained by Chris Weedon, the "oppressive relationship between capital and labour is represented as a free contract between rational, sovereign individuals."[92] The Marxist perspective was one among others (Nietzschean and structuralist) that would constitute the "debate on humanism" that, according to Vincent Descombes, took place in France 1965–6.[93]

Action painting's effort to prevail in the face of "the individual's loss of identity by" focusing "on the act of creation and self-creation" (this being the equivalent of the existentialist notion of engagement and salvation in action) was an anomaly in the arts' move towards an aesthetic of boredom. "Affectless art," a further term used by Rosenberg to describe art

characterized by the aesthetics of boredom, representative of the dominant response, resigns "itself to loss of identity" and "denies the creative act . . . as a fraud and a self-deception."[94] In addition, it attests to

> this disruption between the "I" and things in contemporary mass society. It is the mirror of the repetitiveness, unexpressiveness, the abstractness, the obsession with detail of daily life.[95]

Rosenberg alludes, here, once again to a major theme of existentialist thought: the authentic and the inauthentic life. On this occasion, however, references to these modes of existence concern relations between the individual and others in the world. Ernest Sherman and Richard Gill, after the twentieth-century existentialist philosopher Martin Buber, explained that

> the inauthentic man makes no attempt to establish true communion with the "I" of his own self and the "Thou" of another's, but instead preserves his detachment by exploiting the other as an "It," as an object or thing . . . through his alienation from his own true self, and that of others, he himself becomes one more object in a dehumanized world.[96]

Gill and Sherman, it would seem, had in mind Martin Buber's concept of "primary words," those "spoken from the being." As Buber explained:

> If *Thou* is said, the *I* of the combination *I-Thou* is said along with it.
> If *It* is said, the *I* of the combination *I-It* is said along with it.
> The primary word *I-Thou* can only be spoken with the whole being.
> The primary word *I-It* can never be spoken with the whole being.[97]

I-Thou refer to three spheres of the world of relation: "our life with nature"; "our life with men"; "our life with spiritual beings."[98]

Dore Ashton's response to pop art in the symposium on pop held at the Museum of Modern Art, 13 December 1962,[99] exhibits a striking parallel with that of Rosenberg in "Virtuosos of Boredom" on two main grounds: she saw it as exemplary of the "contemporary aesthetic," the practitioners of which include Alain Robbe-Grillet; she was critical of pop on existentialist grounds. Ashton considered that pop was "a significant sociological phenomenon" in the sense that the pop artist's relinquishment of choice – as indicated in the ceding of "his [authorial] authority to chance – either as he produces his object, or as it is exposed to the audience which is expected to complete his process" – mirrors the "reduction of individual choices" in contemporary society. His refusal to assume responsibility for

his choices she saw as an attitude parallelled by Alain Robbe-Grillet in his commentary on his filmscript *Last Year at Marienbad*, the source of which Ashton did not disclose. This same refusal on the part of pop artists is responsible for Ashton's negative evaluation of pop, which she interpreted as indicative of capitulation to the present social reality and its depersonalizing effects. Ashton graphically expressed this sentiment in her recounting of the poet Henri Michaux's nightmare in which he "imagines himself surrounded by hostile objects pressing in on him and seeking to displace his 'I,' . . . by 'finding their center in his imagination.'"[100]

Presumably, for Ashton, the pop artist's relinquishment of choice was an index of his inauthentic, as opposed to authentic, life. It was the choice between these two modes of existence, as they were made manifest in the "aesthetics of boredom" and "Existentialist anxiety" (the theoretical justification for action painting), respectively, that led Rosenberg to claim that both modes of expression derive from "the literature of alienation which has flooded Western civilization since World War II."[101]

Susan Sontag, as it will be seen, influenced in part by Roland Barthes's phenomenological (primarily, Heideggerian) interpretation of *nouveau roman*, theorized pop's indeterminacy or frustration of meaning in terms of the "silencing of language" or, alternatively, the "aesthetics of silence," and in this manner as a means of confounding the "disease of verbal systems."[102] Rosenberg was fully cognizant of the principles underlying the "silencing of language" as they concerned an important antecedent in the form of French Symbolist poetry, an antecedent that was also recognized by Sontag in "The Aesthetics of Silence."[103] He indicated this knowledge in "French Silence and American Poetry."

> Lifting up a word and putting a space around it has been the conscious enterprise of serious French poetry since Baudelaire and Rimbaud. With this "alchemy" poetry dissolves traditional preconceptions and brings one face to face with existence and with inspiration as a fact.[104]

Despite the fact that "French Silence and American Poetry" is, in itself, an index of the importance of the "silencing of language" as a topic of interest in American literary criticism in the contemporary period, Rosenberg chose not to theorize the "aesthetics of boredom," including their manifestation in pop, in these terms. Nor did Rosenberg acknowledge the phenomenological interpretation of Robbe-Grillet's "'chosiste' novels," alternative to his own Marxist-oriented one, its relationship to the "silencing of language" and thus its role in providing a further means of theorizing the "anonymous" or "boring" strain of sixties' art.

To view both action painting and art characterized by the "aesthetics of boredom" ("inexpressive" art or "affectless" art) under the same rubric of loss of identity enabled Rosenberg to marry their divergent stylistic nature to his particular cyclic view of movements in twentieth-century art. Unlike Clement Greenberg who, in an application of Heinrich Wölfflin's notion of the periodic exhaustion of style and derived, in turn, from a Hegelian conception of Art History, sought to establish a swing between the linear and the painterly in twentieth-century abstraction,[105] Rosenberg claimed instead: "a swing back and forth between extremes of individual self-searching (Surrealism, Abstract Expressionism), self-identification with groups (Regionalism, Social Realism), and technological objectivity (Bauhaus, Optical Art)." Change is brought about by "rhythms of self-affirmation and self-negation [which] arising from the dialectics of identity stimulate the formation of new modes of art through opposition, overlapping, and merger." Pop, within this scheme, was explained as a "depersonalized counterstatement to Action Painting."

Rosenberg's attempt to encompass pop art within an existentialist framework is marked by deliberately unresolved contradictions. Only by preserving the fraught relationship between his sober analysis of the fluid exchange between mass and high cultural realms in the present age – of which Warhol's art was seen as an extreme manifestation and, hence, graphic portent of the fate of both art and the individual under capitalism – and condemnation of the impact of this situation on the individual when measured by his strongly felt existentialist beliefs, could Rosenberg fulfil his prime function, that of critic of mass society. He concluded "Criticism and its Premises" with the following questions: "What but criticism can tell us what we are doing and if it is what we want to do? What but criticism can indicate other ends, explain what makes those other ends essential, and indicate what can be done to serve them?"[106]

Rosenberg's conception of the role of critic invites comparison with that of Marshall Berman in his account of the "great nineteenth-century critics" who numbered among their ranks those influential on Rosenberg's criticism, such as Kierkegaard and Marx. According to Berman, these

> understood the ways in which modern technology and social organization determined man's fate. But they all believed that modern individuals had the capacity both to understand this fate and, once they understood it, to fight it.[107]

Twentieth-century critics, who fail to display "this empathy with, and faith in, their fellow modern men and women," in Berman's estimation, compare

unfavourably; a prominent early twentieth-century example is the sociologist Max Weber (1864–1920), who thought of modern society as a "cage" and the "people in it . . . [as] shaped by its bars." They thus hold the view that "modern man as a subject – as a living being capable of response, judgement and action in and on the world – has disappeared."[108]

Herbert Marcuse's "one-dimensional" paradigm, as outlined in *One Dimensional Man*, first published in 1964, was regarded by Berman as a continuation of the Weberian perspective. Its underlying thesis was summarised by Berman in the following manner: "Modernity is constituted by its machines, of which modern men and women are merely mechanical reproductions."[109] Rosenberg, it will be recalled, in "The Orgamerican Phantasy" castigated the "new American sociology" for its similar perception of inescapable totalitarianism.[110]

Pop art's dissolution of the boundaries between élite and mass culture and its decentrement of the artist as subject, one brought about by the artist's seeming acquiescence to the totalitarian tendencies in contemporary mass society, was an eloquent testament to the state of culture and the fate of the individual under industrial-capitalism. The advent of this movement presented Rosenberg with the opportunity to extend his argument concerning the centrality of crisis-content in action painting to its centrality in contemporary art. The bulk of Rosenberg's writings on pop art, then, imposed upon it an argument whose premises were formed in advance. In articles such as "The Game of Illusion: Pop and Gag" (1964)[111] and "Marilyn Mondrian: Roy Lichtenstein and Claes Oldenburg," however, Rosenberg turned his attention to current opinion about pop art, if only to counter its arguments and, by these means, further entrench his own.

In the case of "Marilyn Mondrian: Roy Lichtenstein and Claes Oldenburg" Rosenberg advanced the argument that pop art's foremost concern was "redoing works of art." In his view, Roy Lichtenstein's work best represented the aestheticist intentions of pop. Its homogenizing of "'vulgar' art with high-art forms and high art with formal derivatives from the mass media," eliminates the "content" of each, leaving "only design." Rosenberg's claims about pop's aesthetic character, arrived at by an "overlay of 'high' and 'low' aspects of contemporary art practice," targeted "misconceptions" about pop art's relationship to contemporaneous abstraction as voiced by the New York critic Suzi Gablik and the curator of the Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum Diane Waldman in publications from 1969.[112] He aimed them also at further ideas of Gablik – equally erroneous in Rosenberg's view – about pop art's links with "real things" drawn from the pop

artist's and the pop audience's overlapping field of experience as opposed to those with "style and creative method."[113]

Rosenberg's argument about pop's aestheticism ultimately served to reinforce that central to his theorization of the movement: the pre-formed one concerning the crisis-content of contemporary art. He construed the "inherent detachment of Pop's aestheticized banalities" (a portent of the spare aesthetics of both minimal sculpture and colour-field painting) as a metaphorical expression of the upsurge in aestheticism that marked the sixties. To Rosenberg's mind, both this aestheticism and its notion "of the world as a museum" was proof of the art world's retreat from the worsening "politico-social crisis and intellectual confusion in the United States."[114] The disengagement of art described in this passage corresponds to Rosenberg's accommodation of pop art into his "crisis-content" scheme. As the "farce of rigid anxiety," pop, if we recall, exemplified the "non-subjective way of reacting to a crisis."[115]

The aestheticism of pop, Rosenberg construed as originating in the absorption of art into a global system – and with it the disappearance of "local, regional, and national traditions." A prime catalyst for this situation was the impact of the visual mass media on art. Reproductions of art, he argued, were unable to duplicate the experience of the original viewed in situ, or, for that matter, provide any intimation of the factors responsible for its birth and thus, in Benjamin's terms, communicate art's "aura." To the contrary, they had the effect of reducing art to sterile abstraction, so encouraging "academicism" and, as evidenced by contemporary art, the equating of art with design.[116]

In summary, Rosenberg's theorization of pop, especially of Warhol's extreme version, draws attention to two main deconstructive post-modernist themes: the flattening of hierarchies predicated on taste, knowledge and opinion; the decentrement or "death of the subject"[117] in the guise of artist. With reference to the first of these, in post-structuralism hierarchies of the sort just described are seen as an effect of language (or discourse) and thus socially produced. More specifically, they are taken to be an effect of the organization of its binary oppositions. Jacques Derrida's critical strategy of deconstruction, for example, problematizes logocentric texts by subverting the logic of binary oppositions, the means by which hierarchies of taste, opinion, and knowledge are constructed and maintained in such texts. Rosenberg, however, attributed the dismantling of hierarchical organization of mass and high art to the technological, economic, and social character of post-war society and its impact on cultural forms. Art's ab-

sorption into the media system, as a case in point, necessarily narrowed distinctions between art and design and craft. This situation, could not be viewed independently of transformations in the audience of contemporary art, or, for that matter, of those in the social identity of "individuals" in the modern period, largely brought about by "revolution, mass education, equalization of opportunity."[118] Art, within this situation, suffers "deformation and loss of identity" and becomes de-defined; as a term it has lost its effectiveness as a way of segregating "a certain category of fabrications."[119]

The second major post-modernist theme evident in Rosenberg's theorization of pop is the decentred subject as evident in the refusal of "the self of the artist [to be] engaged by the process of creation."[120] In its most accentuated form, it is a feature of Warhol's art in which all that remains of Warhol is "the fiction of the artist."[121] As opposed to the post-structuralist argument that "decentrement" of the subject is a process that takes place through language (i.e., in the sense that language that precedes the individual constitutes individual consciousness, including consciousness of "self"), Rosenberg regarded it as a result of the impact of the interrelated technological, economic and social characteristics of post-war society, already described. In broad terms, then, Rosenberg's argument overlaps with Fredric Jameson's attribution of the "death" of the post-modernist subject to the "world of organizational bureaucracy" in the final and purest stage in the evolution of capitalism.[122] Of relevance to this point, Richard Gill and Ernest Sherman point out a correspondence between the thinking of Marx and the existentialist philosopher Kierkegaard (both key influences on Rosenberg's critical writing when taken in its entirety), as represented by their common recognition of the role played by historical and social conditions in "modern man's alienation from his social environment."[123]

Warhol's uncompromising form of pop, in which all sense of "self" has been eradicated, is construed by Rosenberg as evidence of Warhol's capitulation to the totalitarian forces at work in advanced industrial society. Herbert Marcuse, along with other Marxist cultural theorists associated with the Frankfurt School, such as Theodor Adorno and Max Horkheimer, was critical of the thesis underlying modernity's emphasis on "progress" inherited from the Enlightenment and faith in its ability to bring about human freedom. More specifically, he was critical of the role assumed by science in the realization of Enlightenment aims. In Marcuse's opinion, far from bringing about "human freedom," science, in the guise of technology, served "to institute new, more effective, and more pleasant [and, therefore,

more insidious] forms of social control and social cohesion." Marcuse saw his case as seconded by "many unideological analyses of the facts," such as those of American sociologists that were "frequently frowned upon because of simplification, overstatement, or journalistic ease," for example, "Vance Packard's *The Hidden Persuaders*, *The Status Seekers*, and *The Waste Makers*, [and] William H. Whyte's *The Organization Man.*"[124]

These are the same subtle and, therefore, sinister forms of social control that Baudrillard, as explained in the previous chapter, recognized as characteristic of post-modernity. In his mature writings, Baudrillard argued his case by way of an alignment of his concept of "aestheticized hyperreality," brought about by the media in its role of key simulation machine, with a post-structuralist critique of referentiality (based on the premise that there is nothing outside language). Both theorists presented the bleak view that these forces were able to resist all opposition. As Marcuse explained: "In the medium of technology, culture, politics, and the economy merge into an omnipresent system which swallows up or repulses all alternatives."[125]

Rosenberg, by way of contrast, and as indicated in his criticism of the "new American sociology" in "The Orgamerican Phantasy," espoused the view that totalitarian forces *are* opposable, the choice lies with the individual and concerns an existentialist-directed one between the authentic and the inauthentic life. This concerns the choice between knowledge acquired "through detached observation and contemplation," as in the case of the rational subject of liberal humanism, upon which the Enlightenment thinkers pinned their hopes, and knowledge "inwardly appropriated"[126] from the "particular life situation"[127] of the existential subject.[128] Hence, Rosenberg's negative evaluation of pop and, especially Warhol's example, in which the eradication of all sense of the artist's self was construed as a flat denial of all that is valued in the existentialist way of life: the subjective experience of the individual – the human being in all his particularity and uniqueness who "cannot be encompassed by any pre-established categories."[129] However, if Warhol's art is evidence of Warhol's inauthentic life it is evidence, also, of the fading of boundaries between mass and high art and, in this manner, the de-definition of art.

His proposed solution to the "death" of both was to re-define art's purpose as the creation of self. In a public session on art and technology conducted at Skidmore College in 1972, Rosenberg made it clear that in present-day industrial society dominated by technology the factors threatening the continued existence of art are the same as those threatening the continued existence of the individual:[130]

Harold Rosenberg

The function of art to me is very clear. It's the one opportunity that human beings have within our society to make something themselves and that way make their own selves. In industry a type is invented and then people are made to conform to the type. People become artists in our society in order to escape being made into something else.[131]

4

Leo Steinberg

Pop, “Post-Modernist” Painting and the Flatbed Picture Plane

Leo Steinberg was born in Moscow in 1920. Formal study included that undertaken in England at the Slade School of Art and the University of London for which he received a diploma (fine arts) in 1940. He arrived in the United States in 1945, the country in which he would henceforth reside and, later, take out citizenship. Further study followed at the Institute of Fine Arts, New York University, for which he was awarded a Ph.D. in 1960. It was not until 1953, the year in which he turned thirty-three, that Steinberg published his inaugural essay on twentieth-century art.[1] Over the following eighteen years, however, he amassed a considerable body of writing on art from this period. This comprised essays and to a lesser extent reviews, the latter being a legacy of his ten-month stint as a reviewer for *Arts* magazine during part of 1955 and 1956. It was of a size and substance sufficient to warrant publication in 1972 in the form of the anthology entitled *Other Criteria: Confrontations with Twentieth-Century Art.* In retrospect, Steinberg’s writings on both modern and contemporary art were only an adjunct to those produced in his primary vocational role of academic and historian of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Italian art.[2] They provide, nonetheless, valuable insights into the critical consciousness of the sixties and shortly thereafter, the time span of this study. During this period Steinberg was a sought after and authoritative commentator on new developments in art, as witnessed by his inclusion on the panel assembled by the Museum of Modern Art for its symposium on pop art held on 13 December 1962. Steinberg’s invitation to participate, it must be speculated, followed on from the publication of his both comprehensive and pioneering account of Jasper Johns’s early work in the same year,[3] one that he later described as an attempt to stay with the “enigma” represented by Johns’ art and so “stave off the psychology of avoidable middle age for a while.”[4]

Leo Steinberg

Steinberg's relevance to this study rests principally on a single but nevertheless important essay entitled "Other Criteria." Although not published until 1972 in the previously mentioned anthology, it was based on a lecture that had been delivered at the Museum of Modern Art, New York, in March 1968[5] and drew upon ideas present in Steinberg's writings on contemporary art throughout the previous two decades. The most significant of these concerned his perception of both the centrality of representation in the "aesthetic function" of all art, including modern abstract art[6] and the anti-illusionist premises underlying the relationship between subject and art object in Jasper Johns's art.[7]

In "Other Criteria," Steinberg formulated the concept of the "flatbed picture plane": the characteristic picture plane of sixties' art, including the greater part of pop art. The flatbed picture plane symbolizes any firm "surface" upon which items are dispersed and information is recorded. "Flatbed," Steinberg explained, is derived from the printing press of the same name – "'a horizontal bed on which a horizontal printing surface rests' (Webster)." This same surface, although worked upon by the artist, does not correspond to optical knowledge of the natural world (at least that derived from first-hand experience of it), but, rather, to "operational processes." As it concerned the "psychic address" of images impressed upon the pictorial surface, the symbolic repositioning of the picture plane from upright to horizontal corresponded to a marked change in the major theme of art, a change "from nature to culture."[8] Steinberg's linkage of the flatbed picture plane to key characteristics of post-war society, notably mass communications, although an understated aspect of Steinberg's argument, is central to the concerns of this study, those which, following the lead of the sociological model described by David Lyon and Zygmunt Bauman, postulate a direct relationship between the "cultural" (post-modernism) and the "social" (post-modernity).

Steinberg's argument concerning the flatbed picture plane was conceived as a repudiation of formalist theories of modern art, above all that represented by Greenbergian formalism that dominated New York art during the sixties. In its denunciation of formalism it did not waver from the position that Steinberg had signalled in his initial publication on both modern and contemporary art: "The Eye is a Part of the Mind" (1953). At its inception, "Other Criteria" was intended as a withering, if belated, critique of Clement Greenberg's "Modernist Painting" (the 1965 version), and also, if more veiled, of Michael Fried's "Art and Objecthood" (1967) and its revision of the essentialist premises of Greenberg's modernist argument. Steinberg identified the flatbed picture plane as that of "post-Modernist

painting,"[9] which, in the course of his critique of "Modernist Painting," he distinguished from the representational character of both modern and pre-modern art. Steinberg considered that "post-Modernist painting" signalled a radically revised relationship "between artist and image, image and viewer,"[10] a relationship that was largely predicated on the ability of mass communications or media to create a mediate world of culture, one that is distinct from and, necessarily, distances man from the organic world.

The prime catalyst for Steinberg's "Other Criteria" was the negative evaluation of innovative art, including pop, by formalist critics in the sixties because of its stubborn refusal to be assimilated to the formalist paradigm of modern art.[11] Steinberg's recommended critical approach to distinctly new art was to put aside standards and "taste" moulded by the experience of earlier art, thereby delaying evaluation of it before the "intention" of the work had become sharply defined.[12] The reference, here, is to a method of evaluation that had been long-employed in the field of literary criticism. This concerns the establishment of "intention" – "design or plan in the author's mind" – as a pre-requisite for judging the work.[13] In theory at least, the establishment of authorial intention also establishes an "objective truth" and thus a means of judging the "legitimacy of different interpretations."[14] The nature of this "truth," however, varies in accord with the authorial intention of each work.

It is precisely the absence of this flexibility in evaluative criteria that Steinberg objected to in formalist theory. Steinberg would say of formalist critics that he was wary of their disregard of those aspects of art that could not be measured by the formalist gauge and that he was opposed outright to their attempt to proscribe what the artist should not do and what the viewer should not see.[15] Apart from doubting that the aesthetic value of art can be perceived as separate from, for example, the artist's "expressive intention," "culture," "irony," and "iconography," or, for that matter, can be segregated by critical evaluation – thus questioning the validity of formalism's tool for measuring quality at all – Steinberg was critical of the effect of measuring quality in a manner that led to the wholesale dismissal of a movement or style without taking into account the value or merit of individual examples. This last point is made specfic to pop.[16]

Steinberg's liberal, even relativist, attitude towards unorthodox art was initiated, prior to the advent of pop, in response to the work of Jasper Johns. In a retrospective study about the critical challenges posed by Johns's art, written in 1961, Steinberg noted the futility of responding to it with preconceived ideas about "the needs of art," particularly those deter-

mined by formalism with its blatant disregard for subject-matter.[17] His critical position on distinctly new art was tested in December of the following year, at the previously mentioned symposium on pop art, in the course of which Steinberg admitted to disliking Roy Lichtenstein's version because the subject-matter existed for him "so intensely" that he had been "unable to get through to whatever painterly qualities there may be." He was unprepared, however, to declare it as either art or non-art, despite declaring it a part of the social and psychological history of art, on the grounds that "if there is a general principle involved in what makes a work of art, we have yet to establish it."[18]

The focus of Steinberg's attack in "Other Criteria" was the focal and allied tenets of Greenberg's formalist theory of modernism: self-definition and self-criticism. Self-definition concerned the orientation of modernist painting to "flatness" as this, alone, was "unique and exclusive to that art"; self-definition was the project "of self-criticism," the task of which "became to eliminate from the effects of each art any . . . effect that might conceivably be borrowed from . . . any other art."[19]

Steinberg was opposed to the essentialist premise of "self-definition" on principle. In present-day culture, characterized by the constant appearance of inter-disciplinary fields of study (as evidenced, for example, by "psycho-linguistics" and "biochemical engineering"), he considered it reason for unease when the course of contemporary "American painting" is validated by "eighteenth-century German epistemology."[20]

In the first instance, however, Steinberg's quarrel concerned the nature of the opposition claimed by Greenberg between "Old Master art" (or, as Steinberg also referred to it, "pre-modern art") and "Modernism": "Realistic, illusionist art had dissembled the medium, using art to conceal art," whereas "Modernism used art to call attention to art."[21] Greenberg's qualification of this somewhat schematic distinction is indicated in the following extract from Steinberg's liberal quoting of Greenberg.

> Whereas one tends to see what is *in* an Old Master before seeing it as a picture, one sees a Modernist painting as a picture [and hence its "flatness"] first. . . . Modernism's success in doing so is a success of self-criticism.[22]

Steinberg concluded that Greenberg's perception of distinctions "between Old Master and Modernist art" cannot be reduced to that "between illusion and flatness" as "both are present in each" but that, instead, these distinctions stem from the particular sequence in which illusion and flatness are noticed.[23]

This sequence of perception, however, was questioned by Steinberg on two main counts. The first of these arises from Greenberg's reduction of "'objective'" variations in traditional and modernist art to "subjective" inclinations in art's audience. As Steinberg noted: Greenberg's claim that in looking at an "Old Master painting" one sees, first, an "illusion" and, second, "a picture" has credibility only as an account of *his* (subjective) viewing experience.[24]

The second objection concerns Greenberg's perception of the kinds of spatial illusion characteristic of Old Master and Modernist painting: "Where the Old Masters created an illusion of space into which one could imagine oneself walking, the illusion created by a Modernist is one into which one . . . can travel through, only with the eye."[25] Steinberg refers, here, to Greenberg's discrimination between "sculptural illusion, or *trompe-l'oeil*" and a "strictly pictorial, strictly optical third dimension," the establishment of the latter being consistent with Greenberg's perception of the role of self-definition in modernist painting as it acts in accord with the impressionist creed that the "optical" is the "only sense" that can be rightfully called upon by an essentially "pictorial art."[26]

Steinberg, however, disputed Greenberg's distinction between kinds of spatial illusion. If Greenberg's "subjective" reading of the order of perception in Old Master and Modernist art failed to recognize the "formal self-consciousness" of "historical art," his distinction between types of spatial illusion ignored the question of subject-matter in modern art. As Steinberg observed: Greenberg can envision himself travelling through a Rembrandt but not an Olitski. Surely, in a time of "space travel," the representation of an unoccupied expanse is as open to "imaginary" insight as that "of a receding landscape was formerly to a man on foot?"[27]

At this stage of his argument, Steinberg ignored Greenberg's claim that even a hint of an identifiable being evokes associations with three-dimensional space and that it is in the effort to divest itself of the "sculptural," and, in this manner, achieve autonomy and thus the goal of "self-definition," that Modernist painting has made itself abstract.[28] He did so on the basis of his belief, illustrated in his interpretation of Olitski's art, that abstraction does not preclude reference to nature. In "The Eye is a Part of the Mind," published in its initial form in 1953, Steinberg explored the idea "that representation is a central aesthetic function in *all* art [my italics]." The stimulus for this exploration lie in his questioning of the relevance of the "formalist aesthetic" to the abstract trend within modern art. Criticism derived from this same aesthetic, in his opinion, was predicated upon

"a misunderstanding and an underestimation of the art it was made to defend."

Steinberg based his argument on artists' and critics' perception of an affinity between "modern abstract art" and science, including that proposed in the suggestion from an unidentified source that "conceptions of twentieth-century science are finding expression in modern abstract art." Resulting from the "perpetual growth" of "our visual imagination," "art of the last half-century may well be schooling our eyes to live at ease with the new concepts forced upon our credulity by scientific reasoning." Indebted to the ideas of the American pragmatist philosopher John Dewey, Steinberg explained the process whereby scientific concepts are transposed into art as "the gradual condensation of abstract ideas into images that fall within the range of sensory imagination."

"Modern painting," in Steinberg's view, accustoms us to a world containing "not discrete forms but trajectories and vectors, lines of tension and strain." Just as the scientist rejects "solidity and simple location" as "illusions born of the grossness of our senses," the painter's "canvases are fields of force" and his shapes are "transient aggregates of energies." Of particular relevance to Greenberg's distinction between types of illusion employed by "Old Master" and modernist art, space in contemporary art "is no longer a passive receptacle, wherein solid forms may disport themselves, as once they did in Renaissance and Baroque art." Instead, and as exemplified by Matta Echaurren's painting, entitled *Grave Situation*, it "is an organic growth interacting with matter."[29]

Greenberg also acknowledged a relationship between science and modernist painting in the form of the latter's insistence on a "strictly pictorial, strictly optical third dimension." This recognition, however, was calculated to strengthen his case concerning the identification of the "essence of modernism" with Kantian self-criticism, this quality being more pronounced in science than in philosophy. In Greenberg's view, the correspondence between science and art confines itself to scientific practice. Visual art of the modernist persuasion takes as its frame of reference only that which lies within the realm of optical experience. Scientific practice, in a similar fashion, seeks the solution to a given condition in the very language or mode "in which it is presented."[30] What is revealed by this correspondence is not any loss of independence on the part of either discipline but, rather, the extent to which "Modernist art" and "modern science" are symptomatic of the same "cultural tendency."[31]

In addition to questioning the validity of Greenberg's findings with regard to the *outcome* of self-definition in modernist painting, as it concerns the perception of a "strictly pictorial, strictly optical illusion," Steinberg questioned the validity, also, of the self-critical mentality – the route to self-definition – as the defining trait of modernism. Self-definition he saw as the constant aim of art and its alliance in modernist art with a reductive creed of purity of medium confuses a particular instance with a fundamental requirement. Distinctions between pre-modernist and modernist art he saw as residing not in self-definition, but, rather, in the course taken by self-definition, this course being an important constituent of the work's meaning.[32]

Steinberg's second line of attack concerns his allegation of formalist criticism's compliance with industrial criteria – hence, his pejorative reference to formalism and its preoccupation with "internal problem-solving" as the corporate model of developing art. Measured by these standards, the worth of an artist in the studio, as with that of the "engineer" or "research technician" in industry, is relative to the extent to which he complies with established "professional" requirements and is resourceful in generating "answers." The pared down criteria of formalist criticism – emulating, it would seem, the economy, proficiency, and effectiveness of the consummate industrial model – brought together artists as varied as Jackson Pollock, Morris Louis, and Kenneth Noland. If these same artists were to be examined, instead, in terms of "expressive" significance, only Noland's paintings – as evidenced by "his thirty-foot-long stripe paintings" which concretize the principles "of efficiency, speed, and machine-tooled precision" – would exhibit any alliance with "industrialism."

Noland's alleged objective during the 1960s – to produce "'one-shot' paintings" apprehended in a fraction of a second – was cited by Steinberg. He considered that the sense of "instantaneity" conveyed by his pictures suggests an altered "psychic orientation" and so an altered association with art's audience. This "distinct" perspective on the viewing process, Steinberg saw as further reason for separating Noland from Pollock and Louis. When a painting is examined not in terms of its inner consistency (as in formalist criticism) but, rather, in those of its positioning with regard to "human posture," "orientation to flatness" – the crux of Greenberg's argument concerning self-definition as the goal of modernist painting – yields to "other criteria." In all of its manifestations, "'pictorial flatness'" is only the impression of flatness conjured up by the mind. Considered from the vantage point of "subject and content" and, more important, from that of the angle at which the "pictorial surface" insinuates itself "into the space of the viewer's imagination," not only Noland's "thirty-foot-long stripe[s]"

but also identifiable beings "from flags even to female nudes" advance the feeling of flatness.

In the place of Greenberg's criterion of "orientation to flatness," Steinberg proposed one based, instead, on a distinction between the renaissance and the flatbed picture plane. The principle that was operative in renaissance art and remained so until the present, concerned the idea that the picture, regardless of how abstracted, in some sense described "a world." Art that recalls the world (or, at least, first-hand experience of it) summons sensory information that is apprehended in the customary "erect posture"; thus the picture plane characteristic of renaissance art declares uprightness as its fundamental state. With this view in mind, Greenberg's distinction between "Old Master" and "Modernist" art based on that between types of spatial illusion becomes null and void. Paintings by artists as diverse as Matisse and Miró, on the one hand, and Rothko and de Kooning, on the other, all speak to a viewer positioned before them in the normal erect manner.[33]

The flatbed picture plane method of classification also disregards divisions between abstraction and representation and so between colour-field practitioners, notably Kenneth Noland, Ellsworth Kelly, and Frank Stella, and pop painters. Unlike the renaissance picture plane, its symbolically hard surface does not evoke a "prior optical event," but, instead, the "man-made," "reproducible image" that ends "at the pigmented surface" – and thus "operational processes." While works employing the flatbed picture plane may be still hung vertically on a wall, a physical placement that corresponds to the upright stance of the viewer, the "psychic address" of their images is horizontal. When the flatbed picture plane is the site of identifiable entities, they are shown to be both "man-made" (in the sense of precoded) and widely intelligible, presumably this being a crucial factor in the recognition that they do not refer to a "prior optical event." Jasper Johns and the majority of pop works are included in this category. Roy Lichtenstein, for example, conceived his images in terms of clichéd illustration and "ben-day dots," thereby ensuring their interpretation as portrayals of published material. In a further example, and presumably in reference to the photographic sources of his silk-screened imagery, Warhol avoided the direct representation of "a worldspace" by envisaging his work "as the image of an image."[34]

While characteristic of sixties' art, the flatbed picture plane had an antecedent in Marcel Duchamp's works from the second decade of the twentieth century, for example, *Large Glass* and *Tu'm*. As it concerned the New York art world, a more notable antecedent was Robert Rauschenberg's

work, beginning at the commencement of the fifties;[35] and it is upon this more recent precedent for the flatbed picture plane in sixties' art that Steinberg directed the majority of his critical attention. Steinberg's concept of the flatbed picture plane, however, had been anticipated in the previously mentioned article he published on Jasper Johns. Among the common features of subjects painted by Jasper Johns up to 1958, this being the scope of Steinberg's study, was their status as either "man-made objects" or "signs." He further explained:

> The position of esthetic anti-illusionism finds here its logical resting place. The street and the sky – they can only be simulated on canvas; but a flag, a target, a 7 – these can be made, and the completed painting will represent no more than what it actually is. For no likeness or image of a 7 is paintable, only the thing itself. A crucial problem of twentieth century art – how to make the painting a firsthand reality – resolves itself when the subject matter shifts from nature to culture.[36]

In the same year as the inaugural publication of the article in which these observations were made Clement Greenberg described the same "anti-illusionistic" features of Johns's art as "literary irony." He explained it as resulting "from *representing* flat and artificial configurations which in actuality can only be *reproduced.*"[37]

Steinberg's distinction between the renaissance and the flatbed picture plane, predicated upon the relationship between the picture's "psychic address" and "human posture," represents an oblique reference to Michael Fried's further theorization of the formalist paradigm of modern art. This was outlined in "Art and Objecthood," published in 1967,[38] in the year prior to Steinberg's lecture at the Museum of Modern Art, in March 1968, the initial form of Steinberg's "Other Criteria." In Fried's theory, both the perceptual experience of the spectator and his physical relationship to the work of art play a crucial role in distinguishing between an artistic and a theatrical experience and, in accordance with the terms of Fried's argument, between art and non-art.

Neither Steinberg in "Other Criteria" nor Fried in "Art and Objecthood" make mention of Maurice Merleau-Ponty, who one writer has called "the central philosopher for minimalist art."[39] However, in both of their accounts of sixties' art the spectator is conceived as subject in a manner reminiscent of Merleau-Ponty's "existential phenomenology." The latter is characterized by the concept of the "embodied *cogito"* in which "the true subject of perception was not consciousness as such but 'existence, or being in the world through a body.'"[40] In "Art and Objecthood" Fried distin-

guished between "color-field" painting as well as the sculpture of Anthony Caro and minimalist or literalist art, the preferred term of Fried. He presented this distinction as one between two streams of contemporary abstraction: the nominally abstract but, in fact, literalist and theatrical and, therefore, inartistic art of the minimalists; the radically abstract and antitheatrical art of abstraction on the part of both the "color-field" painters and Anthony Caro.[41]

Fried's essay built upon remarks made about minimalist art by the key minimalist artists Donald Judd and Robert Morris.[42] Literalist art, in Fried's view, locates itself against modernist painting and sculpture and, thus, against the objectives of modernist art as these concern the discrete identity of each medium. What is worked against in most modernist painting, for example, is its "relational" bent and difficulty in avoiding "pictorial illusion." Judd's solution to this problem, as given voice by Fried, was that of creating in "three dimensions" as opposed to the "single plane."[43] An idea central to Fried's thesis is that concerning the perception of "shape" as a determinant in experiencing a painting as a painting, or sculpture as a sculpture, and an object as an object, that is, shape as either a basic characteristic "of objects" or as "a medium of painting." Fried further explained that for modernist painting to stress its pictorial shape (and hence art status), it must "defeat or suspend its own objecthood (i.e., deflect awareness from its literal shape). Literalist art, by way of contrast, aims at discovering and projecting its objecthood by drawing attention to its literal shape.[44]

With his debt to Clement Greenberg's prior identification of "*presence*" as a quality of minimal art that had been achieved by either "size" or "the look of non-art,"[45] Fried likened the literalist sensibility to that of theatre and thus considered it as interested in the precise conditions under which the spectator viewed "literalist" art. Indebted, equally, to the observations of Morris, Fried further explained that "previous art" is experienced in terms of what is situated within it. In literalist art, however, "the experience . . . is of an object *in a situation* – one that . . . *includes the beholder.*"[46] The modernist endeavour is interpreted by Fried as that of overcoming theatre, an endeavour regarded by the "modernist sensibility" as the outstanding feature of "high art" in the contemporary period.[47]

"Art and Objecthood," in effect, stands as a revision of the reductive essentialist premise of Greenberg's formalist theory of modern art, particularly, as it is outlined in "Modernist Painting." As Fried explained in a footnote to his article: "Flatness and the delimitation of flatness ought not be thought of as the 'irreducible essence of pictorial art' but rather as something like the *minimal conditions for something's being seen as a*

painting."[48] The prime catalyst for Fried's reconsideration of Greenberg's essentialism was the nature of its interpretation in literalist art. In a retrospective examination of the assumptions underlying "Art and Objecthood," Fried observed that the minimalists, in accord with "Greenbergian reduction," accepted "that there was a timeless essence to art that was progressively revealed." However, they interpreted "timeless essence" as "not just the delimited flat surface of painting but the literal properties of the support."[49]

Fried considered the theatrical sensibility, one brought about by considering art in relation to the spectator's viewing experience, as a feature of only minimal or literalist art and, hence, as a means of distinguishing it from the branch of modernist art represented by colour-field painting and the sculpture of Anthony Caro. Steinberg, by way of constrast, saw this same sensibility, although not termed as such, as inherent in the experience of all art from the renaissance to now. The angle at which the picture plane symbollically instils itself in the viewer's imagination (determined in turn by the "psychic address" of art's subject-matter: either nature or culture), presented the means by which art could be grouped within one of two categories: the vertical renaissance picture plane; the horizontal flatbed picture plane. Steinberg made no attempt to pit his argument about art's relation to "theatre" against that of Fried. Its mere presence, however, challenged any authority Fried's may have had, hence Rosalind Krauss's reference to "Other Criteria" as "a stinkbomb thrown in passing into the world of 'Art and Objecthood.'"[50]

Steinberg's distinction between the renaissance and the flatbed picture plane – given that it involves further demarcations: "nature" and "culture"; "prior optical event" and "reproducible image"; optical experience and "operational processes"[51] – invites comparison with Lawrence Alloway's equally emphatic separation of realism and pop. In Alloway's case, the differences are couched in semiotic terms: Whereas "Realism is . . . concerned with the artist's perception of objects in space and their translation into iconic, or faithful, signs, . . . Pop art deals with material that already exists as signs . . . with precoded material."[52]

A further feature of Steinberg's affinity with Alloway's theorization of pop was the degree of emphasis he placed on the spectator as the perceiving subject: the recipient of the image's psychological "address" and in whose imagination the picture plane assumes, in symbolic terms, either a vertical or a horizontal position.[53] Alloway, it will be recalled, in accord with post-modernist principles, placed emphasis on the interpretive role of the spectator in pop art, that is, on his reception and, to some extent,

constitution, of the "message" of the work. Realism, "concerned with the artist's perception of objects in space,"[54] stressed, instead, the relationship between the artist and his "message."

Steinberg's concept of the flatbed picture plane – the content of which suggests "a reproducible image,"[55] particularly as given emphasis in the mass-produced imagery of pop – bears some relation to Jean Baudrillard's notion of the "hyperreal" (the real as "*that which is always already reproduced*"), if remote from Baudrillard's investment of this concept with an arcane theory of social control. Of particular relevance to Steinberg's distinction between the renaissance and the flatbed picture plane, and thus between art concerned with representation of "a prior optical event" and art concerned with reproduction of an image, is Baudrillard's claim that the hyperreal is "beyond representation because it functions entirely within the realm of simulation."[56]

The class of experience dealt with in Steinberg's flatbed picture plane is "culture" rather than "nature." As with Alloway's and Rosenberg's similar identification of "culture" and not "nature" as the subject matter of pop, it relates to Ihab Hassan's concept of "immanence or *immanences*," which he identified as one of the two ruling tendencies of post-modernism. As previously discussed in relation to Alloway's criticism, aided by duplicates of man (i.e., "cybernetics") and extensions of man (i.e., "technologies"), "*immanences*" refers to "the capacity of mind to generalize itself in symbols, intervene more and more into nature . . . [and] so become, increasingly, immediately, its own environment."[57]

Steinberg's inclusion in this study rests on his theorization of the flatbed picture plane in terms of key characteristics of post-war urban society: mass communications and consumerism. His linkage of the cultural and the social in this manner, however, differed from the previously discussed ones of Alloway and Rosenberg on two main counts. First, although the character of post-war urban society was crucial to Steinberg's argument concerning the both profound and fundamental change in the topics addressed by art – the change "from nature to culture"[58] – Steinberg, in comparison with Alloway and Rosenberg, provided, at the best, only a sketchy indication of it.[59]

Second, neither Alloway's nor Rosenberg's accounts of pop art were guided by a concept of post-modernism. Collectively, and in accord with David Lyon's and Zygmunt Bauman's respective sociological models of post-modernism, they theorized characteristics of pop, such as delegitimation, heterogeneity, indeterminacy, and the decentred subject (now understood as prominent features of deconstructive post-modernism) in

terms of the technological character and capitalist-consumerist orientation of post-war urban society.

From the vantage point of 1972, Steinberg defined the flatbed picture plane, which he saw as representing a decisive break with the picture plane of modernist painting, as that of "post-Modernist painting." His conception of post-modernist painting therefore invites comparison with those of the American critics Douglas Crimp and Hal Foster that, unlike Steinberg's, were formed after exposure to post-structuralist ideas. Douglas Crimp interpreted Steinberg's distinction between the modernist and the flatbed picture plane in the light of Michel Foucault's notion of an "epistemological field" or "*episteme*": "a general form of thinking and theorizing"[60] which is "specific to a particular period"[61] and determines what "ideas could appear, sciences be established, experience be reflected in philosophies, rationalities be formed." Foucault had in mind the identification of an "order," one that lies midway "between the already 'encoded' eye and reflexive knowledge" and which provides the "basis [upon which] knowledge and theory became possible."[62]

Crimp considered that "Rauschenberg's flatbed pictures are experienced as effecting . . . a rupture or discontinuity with the modernist past," as opposed to evolving from or being continuous with "a modernist picture surface," and are indicative "of those transformations in the epistemological field that Foucault describes."[63] Though not without relevance to Steinberg's perception of the lack of continuity between the modernist and the flatbed picture plane, each of which correspond to a distinct kind of experience, Crimp's argument establishes only superficial links between Steinberg's "flatbed picture plane" and Foucault's "epistemological field." It fails to make mention, for example, that the "two great discontinuities in the *episteme* of Western culture," identified by Foucault, do not correspond with those in the types of experience, identified by Steinberg. In Foucault's case, "the first inaugurates the Classical age (roughly half-way through the seventeenth century) and the second, at the beginning of the nineteenth century, marks the beginning of the modern age."[64] In that of Steinberg, the first begins with the Renaissance and the second with the beginning of the 1950s.

Crimp's second omission, and one that overrides consideration of the first, is that while Foucault was concerned with identifying the order responsible for a "well-defined regularity" in "empirical knowledge, at a given time and in a given culture,"[65] he rejected, emphatically, the phenomenological approach "which gives absolute priority to the observing subject, which attributes a constituent role to an act, which places its own point of view at the origin of all historicity."[66] As already explained, it is the

"phenomenological approach," at least, as it concerns the associated "priority . . . [of] the observing subject," that underpins Steinberg's distinction between the orders of experience responsible for the modernist and the flatbed picture plane. More particularly, it is the "embodied" subject of existential phenomenology, as in the notable example of Merleau-Ponty's and its understanding of "consciousness . . . [as] being towards the thing through the intermediary of the body."[67] This point is in no way diminished by the fact that Steinberg's differing orders of experience were founded on commonality in experience.

To the extent that Steinberg regarded the flatbed picture plane and therefore "post-Modernist painting" as a rupture with a specific modernist canon – Greenbergian formalism – it invites comparison with the "post-structuralist postmodernism" that Hal Foster, in an article first published in 1984, and in reference to "American cultural politics," cited as one of "at least two positions on post-modernism now in place."[68]

This form of post-modernism is opposed to the "principal response" to modernism in America after "the failure of utopian, protopolitical modernism" and "the recuperation of the transgressive avant-garde": the "apolitical, adamantly high-cultural paradigm of art, which shifted the discursive 'essence' of modernism from utopianism and transgression to aesthetic purity."[69] By way of further explanation of the "essence" of this later response to modernism as well as its relation to "aesthetic purity," Foster quoted Greenberg's Kantian-derived conception, as outlined in the 1965 version of "Modernist Painting."[70]

Foster explained that post-structuralist post-modernism's opposition to this particular "paradigm" of modernism is of an "epistemological sort" and concerned with its "ideology of purely formal innovations."[71] Post-modernist art, while a reaction to modernism of this nature is also a derivation of it in the sense of its "discursive[72] orientation: for what self-criticism is to modernist practice, deconstruction is to postmodernist practice." While modernism uses "the methods of a discipline in order "to entrench it more firmly in its area of competence," post-modernism does the same "but in order . . . to subvert the discipline."[73] Foster's perception of the "discursive orientation" of post-modernism, based on a post-structuralist model, has particular relevance to Steinberg's flatbed picture plane, that of "post-Modernist painting," and its "deconstruction" of the crux of Greenberg's modernist argument as it concerns self-definition or "orientation to flatness."

However, the relationship between Steinberg's "post-Modernist painting" and Foster's "poststructuralist postmodernism" goes no further than

their common subversion of art's "given medium . . . as an autonomous activity," save for the common assumption underlying this subversion: the redundancy of the self-critical program of the Enlightenment and its goal of "purified" classifications.[74] Foster argued this redundancy in post-structuralist and, primarily, aesthetic terms. The modernist concern for "the formal purity of traditional artistic mediums," one directed by Kantian and, hence, Enlightenment thought, gives way in post-modernism to "textual 'impurity.'"[75] Conceiving of the post-modernist work as a "text," in the post-structuralist sense as "an endless play of signifiers which can never be finally nailed down to a single centre, essence or meaning,"[76] necessarily, involves seeing the artist as its historical producer rather than its author. Presumably, this was the line of thought followed by Foster when he claimed that as a result of "destructuring the object and its field," as indicated by "textual 'impurity,'" the subject, regardless of whether in the guise of artist or audience, is decentred.[77] This is not to be confused with one further consequence: consolidation of "the central role of the reader [or audience] as a centering role."[78]

Steinberg, however, argued his opposition to Enlightenment self-criticism, on other, largely empirical, grounds. In his view, evidence presented by increasing incursions of art into areas not (traditionally) its own as well as emergence of inter-disciplinary fields of study did not tally with the interpretation of the direction of contemporary "American painting" by means of "eighteenth-century German [Kantian-derived] epistemology." The flatbed picture plane, when understood as a consequence of the altered alliance "between artist and image, image and viewer," he considered as symptomatic of a re-organization which renders impure all "purified" classifications.[79]

At this point it is instructive to recall that for Lawrence Alloway the evidence presented in pop art of the commonality of "a sign or a set of signs . . . to both popular culture and Pop art"[80] substantiated his functionalist view that art, including pop art, was a form of visual communication "not different in kind from other forms of visual communication."[81] Alloway's non-essentialist case derived less from theory and more from the revolution in communications brought about by firsthand experience of the mass media in their sophisticated post-war form. It was advanced to undermine the continued authority of formalist theories of art derived from the eighteenth century distinction between the various branches of the arts[82] and thus from an epistemology formulated under pre-industrial social conditions that, if different from those of modernity, were more markedly so of modernity in its post-war (post-modern) phase.

The same could be said of the argument underlying Steinberg's flatbed picture plane. As he observed of Rauschenberg's pioneering of the flatbed picture plane in the early fifties, it was the basis of a language in art that would give expression to a both novel and distinctive class of experience.[83] The type of experience referred to by Rauschenberg was that of post-war urban society and was thus consistent with the mediate world of culture created, in the main, by its attendant technology. Steinberg provided an indication of the role played by the mass media in the formation of this new consciousness, one that has relevance to both Baudrillard's aestheticized "hyperreality"[84] and Hassan's "immanence,"[85] in his summation of Rauschenberg's main contribution to twentieth-century art. This concerned the invention of a

> pictorial surface that let the world in again. Not the world of the Renaissance man who looked for his weather clues out of the window; but the world of men who turn knobs to hear a taped message . . . electronically transmitted from some windowless booth.[86]

This page intentionally left blank

PART THREE

“Philosophical” Critics

This page intentionally left blank

5

Barbara Rose

Pop, Pragmatism, and "Prophetic Pragmatism"

In the previous section we have seen how the post-modernist features of the critical responses of social critics to pop can be identified by the recourse to a sociological model of post-modernism, a model that posits a relationship between post-modernity, the characteristics of which are reflected in pop art, and post-modernism. This section will examine the responses of two further critics, Barbara Rose and Max Kozloff. While neither critic ignored pop art's patent relationship to the post-war urban societal form (post-modernity),[1] they accounted for the post-modernist features of pop *primarily* on philosophical grounds. In the pursuit of a means of theorizing pop and other sixties' art that was inadequately accommodated as well as negatively evaluated by Greenbergian formalism – and, hence, by its underlying foundationalist beliefs – Rose and Kozloff formulated systems underpinned by provisional values that were responsive to the value-system of each work and, in the case of Kozloff, of the critic or experiencing subject. These were predicated on either the tenets of philosophical pragmatism in the case of Rose, or with Kozloff of phenomenology.

Pragmatism and phenomenology are linked by their common recognition of the intentional ties that bind one to the world, as well as the role played by these in the constitution of knowledge about that world. Pragmatism, with its denial of "fixed principles, closed systems, and pretended absolutes and origins,"[2] and phenomenology, with its claim to be "presuppositionless and theory-free,"[3] share, if in a varying manner and if for varying purposes, post-structuralism's and thus post-modernism's "major themes of evading epistemology-centred philosophy."[4]

Rose and Kozloff's allegiance to either pragmatist or phenomenological critical principles was intertwined with ethical concerns. It resulted from their probing examination of social responsibilities of the critic, one that

they conducted alongside other critics of their generation, notably Lucy Lippard and Gene Swenson. This took place towards the conclusion of the sixties in response to social and political unrest in America, including that engendered by American involvement in the Vietnam War. A more marked aspect of Rose's criticism is that she conceived of this pragmatism as an alternative to "judgmental" criticism, specifically represented by Greenbergian formalism which, as a result of the complicated interchange between "the media and the market,"[5] served to advance the interests of the prevailing capitalist system.

Barbara Rose was born in Washington in 1937. She graduated from Smith College where her studies in art history included neither modern nor American art. During the sixties, Rose undertook graduate work at both the Institute of Fine Arts, New York University, and Columbia University where she was awarded an M.A.[6] In 1984 she received a Ph.D. from the same institution for the submission of a selection of her writings on American art. Barbara Rose's entry into the field of contemporary American criticism was heralded by the publication of her "article on pop art as Neo-Dada"[7] in *Art International* in January 1963.[8] This took place shortly after Rose arrived back in the United States in 1962 after spending the previous year in Spain on a Fulbright Scholarship. Married at the time to the prominent post-expressionist abstract painter and forerunner of minimalist art, Frank Stella, her return had been prompted by the impending birth of her first child. Rose's long and continuing career in the visual arts has encompassed the varied roles of critic, art historian, university lecturer, curator, and documentary filmmaker. During the sixties, however, that of critic of contemporary American art was pre-eminent. At the time, Rose either contributed to or held editorial positions, or both, on a number of art journals including the following: *Art International* (1963–5), *Art in America* and *Artforum* (1965-72), *ARTnews*, and *Goya*.[9] This both intense and productive phase of critical activity coincided with Rose's adoption of the role of "enthusiastic cheerleader of the art of . . . [her] generation." Her abandonment or, at least, curtailment of this capacity at the conclusion of the sixties was the result of disenchantment with not only this same art but also with the "false premise" of "Greenbergian color-field painting" and, as indicated in the opening remarks of this section, the purposes to which "value judgments" made in the name of criticism were put, especially her own.[10]

Rose's advocacy of a pragmatist criticism, then, represented the culmination of a search for a critical mode that was both resistant to ideological cooption, as far as this was possible, and appropriate for pop and mini-

malism, as well as other developments in sixties' art that were deemed insignificant by Greenbergian formalism. This search spanned the second half of the sixties and took place alongside a sustained critique of Greenberg's modernist and formalist theory of art, a critique that during its course shifted its focus from the relevance of Greenberg's theory to current aesthetic concerns *per se* to its evaluative premises and associated ethics. In addition, it revealed the estrangement of Rose's criticism from Greenberg's in three progressive and clearly defined stages: endorsement of its central tenets, in particular those concerning its ability to measure quality in art; endorsement of it as a critical theory suitable for art that, seemingly, complied with its terms, as in the case of "color-field abstraction"; rejection of it in total, the result of a consideration of the social, political, and economic context of sixties' art and art criticism and understanding that the latter could serve hegemonic interests.

At the time of writing "Pop in Perspective" (1965), Rose's position was decidedly formalist, though not blind to flaws in formalist criticism such as its inability to deal with pop's (significant, in Rose's opinion) extra-visual content. Rose made clear her adherence to the central tenet of formalism – that the quality of art can only be measured by its formal characteristics – in her acknowledgment that "the only objection [to pop] of any substance" was Greenberg's charge of formal inadequacy.[11] Greenberg explained why he considered "quality" in art as linked to its formal character, discussing this issue not only in terms of the task of self-criticism in modernist painting[12] but also in those of the experiential process by which it is recognized.[13] Rose did not question his case. Primarily on the basis of the catalogue essay Greenberg penned for an exhibition of post-Abstract Expressionist abstraction, curated by him and held at the Los Angeles County Museum of Art in 1964,[14] she questioned only the discriminatory attitude of formalist critics who refused to subject pop to the same evaluative gauge as contemporaneous abstract art, the two bound in her view by common "pictorial conventions" and "roots." In this she failed to consider Greenberg's distinction between a "strictly pictorial, strictly optical third dimension" and "sculptural illusion" (in Greenberg's terms, rightfully the province of sculpture) and the role played by figuration in effecting the latter.[15] She noted, however, that a number of critics (who remained unnamed) were making qualitative distinctions between pop. Justifiably, in her opinion, Lichtenstein was commonly singled out. His work had much "in common with the best abstract painting" being produced at present.[16] Rose's perceptions had changed little, if at all, from 1963 at which time she reviewed "Six Painters and the Object," the exhibition of pop painting that

Lawrence Alloway had mounted at the Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum. She had then remarked on the range in quality of pop art and set apart Lichtenstein for mention.[17]

In "The Value of Didactic Art," published in 1967, some two years after "Pop in Perspective," Rose anticipated her future. This concerned a pragmatist-influenced formulation of the critic's essential role: "The discovery of new critical criteria capable of evaluating fresh aesthetic developments as they occur."[18] Didactic art, according to Rose's account, cuts across dada, neo-dada, pop, and minimal art boundaries and counts among its practitioners Andy Warhol (distinguished as among the prime "didactic artists of our time"), Jasper Johns, Robert Morris, Carl Andre, Ad Reinhardt, and Marcel Duchamp. Rose defined didactic art as "art whose *primary* intention is to instruct." Very rarely, however, is instruction its "*sole* intention"; when it is, it takes such forms as Duchamp's "'unassisted readymades,'" in which there is "no intrinsic esthetic content." The value of didactic art is as "dialogue" and not as art; in its "purer form," that is, those examples with little or no aesthetic content, it is produced "only for artists and critics" and thus "for internal consumption within the art world."[19]

In an implicit challenge to the evolutionary claims of Greenberg's formalist theories, those which posit post painterly abstraction as the logical heir of Abstract Expressionism,[20] Rose made the claim that the rapid rise in concern for theoretical issues responsible for didactic art occurred simultaneously to a movement's deterioration, that of Abstract Expressionism in the case of Warhol and further sixties' examples of didactic art. Amidst this state of decline, the function of didactic art may be either destructive (or negative) or constructive (or positive), or, alternatively, it may be both in its questioning of the authority "of old canons" and in its offering of new avenues of investigation.[21]

In its negative aspect, didactic art suffices to terminate a "series," or, alternatively, to set the boundaries of "art." Rose identified Warhol as "the negative didactic artist *par excellence*," on the strength of his negation of "the uniqueness of the art object" and "its claim to originality." Warhol's "movies," as distinct from his painting and sculpture, she cited as one example of the constructive or positive aspect of didactic art. These conformed to George Kubler's understanding of "prime objects": "the original objects in the beginning of a new series."[22] Constructive didactic art, viewed in this manner, had the capacity to change the orientation of art or to pose new problems.

Formalist criticism was regarded by Rose as inappropriate for didactic art on a number of counts, not the least being its inability to account for

non-formal content. Rose pointed out the folly of subjecting "Warhol's Brillo boxes, Duchamp's bottle racks, or Andre's row of firebricks [art which is "meaningful" only as dialogue] to formal analysis." In addition, it lumped "didactic art together with literary art, whose narrative content is also extra-visual." As Rose explained: "the lessons of didactic art are visual, not literary; their realm is esthetics, not story-telling."[23] In making this distinction, she promoted the idea that specificity in art is not, as Greenberg would have one believe, the exclusive province of its material character.[24]

Formalist criticism, furthermore, offered no way of *evaluating* art that was without formal value. In the case of didactic art, comparative judgments were to be made on the basis of the value of the argument that it illustrated, value being relative to the argument's "cogency, clarity and originality." Rose, however, was either reticent or unable to put this theory into practice. She regarded "Warhol's flowers" as having dealt "with the problem of reproduction of the unique object" in a way that was "superior" to "Richard Pettibone's feebler presentation"; however, she failed to give grounds for her judgment.

While Rose proposed a means of evaluating didactic art, she stopped short of equating the value of its argument (i.e., its value as dialogue) with "quality" (i.e., its value as art). An argument "can have quality," she maintained, "only if . . . [it] can have esthetic quality." Rose, quite clearly, had not wavered from the position she had defined two years earlier, in "Pop in Perspective": quality in art, that is, "esthetic quality," can only be gauged by formalist critical criteria. As she made clear in an endnote to her article, her "quarrel with formalist criticism is not that it is inadequate to distinguish quality, but that it blurs every other kind of distinction." A further reason why Rose did not challenge the formalist assumption that "quality" in art is solely a formal issue is that pure didactic art, in her estimation, is relatively rare, encompassing, as already stated, "virtually nothing" apart from Duchamp's "unassisted readymades." Most works of didactic art are "mixed examples having both esthetic and didactic content, in varying proportions."[25] Presumably, these hybrid examples can be evaluated in terms of both the value of their argument and the quality of their form.

Despite describing Warhol as among "the principal didactic artists of our time,"[26] she estimated that "the measure of didactic content in Pop art is small . . . the central meaning of Pop is as art, not as dialogue; Pop has to make it formally or not at all." Oldenburg was singled out for his "formal innovation" and, Lichtenstein, as on previous occasions, for his "formal quality." The remainder of pop, however, she found as largely "devoid of any formal interest."[27]

Rose regarded the didactic content of pop (when present at all) as a visual embodiment of the thesis concerning "esthetic transformations" that engrossed "mainly art historians" who continued to bring "nineteenth-century concepts" to bear on art of the next century. However, she failed to explain the nature of these "nineteenth-century concepts," why their absence in pop had generated antagonism (as witnessed by an initial reluctance on the part of critics, curators, and historians to accept pop as art[28]), or, for that matter, the argument about art that pop addressed, save that it concerned aesthetic change. Carol Anne Mahsun exhausted both tasks, some two decades later, in her scholarly study on pop art criticism, *Pop Art and the Critics.*[29]

Rose's theory of didactic art provided a way of evaluating (or, more accurately, evaluating in part) a cluster of works either excluded or, partly excluded, by Greenberg's modernist canon. This "cluster," however, was small; while minimal art benefited from it (minimal artists making up the bulk of sixties' practitioners), pop art, with the exception of Warhol, did not. Because this theory did not challenge the evaluative premises of Greenberg's canon – that is, that quality in art, as opposed to other forms of value, can be ascertained only by an appraisal of form – she did little to offset either the formalists' and, thus, at this stage, her own negative assessment of pop.

"The Politics of Art. Part II" and "The Politics of Art. Part III," both published in 1969, must be seen as attempts to solve these problems. In the first article Rose proposed a sweeping re-categorization of sixties' American art as well as a revision of Greenberg's account of the relationship of American contemporary art to European art. The changes proposed by Rose did not disturb the validity of Greenberg's modernist canon as a critical mode for the "color painting" or "color abstraction" that followed Abstract Expressionism, Rose's terms for the art that she acknowledged was initially referred to as post-painterly abstraction by Greenberg; however, she now revealed it as incapable of evaluating equally prominent aspects of sixties' art such as pop and minimalism.

Rose perceived American art of the sixties as having divided into two streams, the ideology and aesthetics of which were the antithesis of each other. One pole, she identified with "color abstraction," the art that Clement Greenberg had promoted "as the 'mainstream' style, the only legitimate heir of Abstract Expressionism, and by extension, of the School of Paris."[30] Rose refers, here, to Greenberg's classification of post-painterly abstraction as the successor of Abstract Expressionism and of both as part of the same tradition that reached back to Cubism. The rela-

tionship Greenberg described between these consecutive movements illustrated his idea of the continuous and continually evolving mainstream tradition in which change first appears in the declining phase of a movement. Aimed at maintaining past standards of excellence, it takes its lead from the best art of the immediate past – in the case of post painterly abstraction, tendencies in Abstract Expressionism marked by "a physical openness of design" or "linear clarity."[31]

The second pole Rose identified with pop and minimal art, movements that she considered were bound by their heritage in "earlier 20th-century American art" as well as by their objection to modernism (as it concerns the formalist tradition in the modern period and so to Greenberg's understanding of the term) because of its "European" and hence "alien" origin.[32] Rose endorsed the understanding of a number of critics, including William Seitz, of pop art's lineage from American scene painting.[33] She volunteered the further observation that a similar relationship linked precisionism, a Cubist variant on the same art, and minimalism.[34]

Rose was at pains to stress the American heritage of pop and minimal art, in contrast to the European one of "color abstraction." The willingness of American artists, including "Kaprow, Dine, Oldenburg and Whitman," to break with the traditional art practice in their creation of "environments" out of trash and fragments of similarly discarded material in the closing years of the fifties, was, in her opinion, as much the outcome of "native pragmatic attitudes" (in Rose's view, the ideological basis of pop and minimal art) as it was of dada. Precisionism amounted to pared down, local interpretations "of Cubist volumes." However, its iconography – "the plain barns and factories" that were analogous to the austere and spare character of sculpture by, for example, Judd and Morris – followed the example set by Marcel Duchamp, the founder of the New York chapter of dada. This concerned his "ironic" embracement of future-oriented America, one that made necessary, however, a decisive break with his European birthright.[35]

By considering "native" cultural attitudes in her theorization of pop and minimal art, Rose makes an implicit address to the Eurocentrism of Greenberg's account of modernist and hence formalist art. In "'American-Type Painting" (1955), Greenberg had argued that American Abstract Expressionism was a continuation of the European avant-garde tradition and heir to the School of Paris. This line of argument reappears in "Post Painterly Abstraction" (1964), in which Abstract Expressionism and its successor, post-painterly abstraction (in Greenberg's terms, the most significant movements in contemporary art) are posited as part of the same tradition in abstract art, the roots of which lie in Cubism.[36]

In the second part of “The Politics of Art, “ Rose commented that it was the eminence achieved by “American painting” in the post-war years that fostered isolationist and chauvinistic attitudes and, subsequent to this, renunciation “of the European tradition”[37] as indicated by the ideological and aesthetic character of pop and minimal art. The endnotes to Rose’s essay reveal an important influence on her consideration of “native” cultural attitudes in the theorization of sixties’ American art. This took the form of Constance Rourke’s collection of essays, written prior to her death in 1941, and published under the title *The Roots of American Culture* in 1965. Rourke’s observation of the Eurocentric mentality of American art criticism, though it took place in 1945, was still relevant in the sixties, in the period in which Greenberg’s Eurocentric account of modernist art prevailed.

> The more or less explicit idea governing most of our art criticism has been that our art would naturally become a sequence within the art of western Europe. With enough European schooling and a sufficiently large number of civilized contacts, it has been hoped that esthetically we might at last begin to develop. We had only to catch up with Europe, so to speak, by diligent study.[38]

In Rourke’s view, regardless of how marked or subtle the degree of contrast between “artistic intentions” of American and European artists, the “‘configuration’” of the two groups differ both “socially” and “geographically.” Regardless, also, of whether or not “early motivating ideas” were of European origin, “these have been shaped to . . . [distinctively American] ends.” Consistent with this situation, criticism, in Rourke’s opinion, should acknowledge that American art “must spring from the center rather than from the periphery of . . . [the American] social pattern.” Rose, it would seem, had taken it upon herself to correct the shortcomings of American criticism as perceived by Rourke. These concerned the failure to distinguish between American and European civilization as well as insufficient consideration of “native cultural relations and implications or basic intentions” of American painting[39] or, in the case of minimal art, of American sculpture.

Rose expressed the polarities represented by “color abstraction,” on the one hand, and pop and minimal art, on the other, in a number of ways, including that between exclusivity and inclusiveness as well as that between idealism and anti-idealism. In summary of these and other differences, she proposed the image of a duel between Greenberg, the upholder of traditional high culture values and, by inference, interests of its privileged,

minority audience, and Cage, the harbinger of "the technological future" as well as of a democratic art that locates its aesthetic in "the life and environment" of everyone.[40]

Greenberg's exclusive and idealist conception of art, Rose located "in Kantian and Hegelian esthetics, modified by a Crocean acknowledgment of the subjectivity of 'intuition' on which critical judgment is based." According to this view, art is an immutable "Absolute," the worth of which goes beyond particular social and historical boundaries as well as evaluation by fixed criteria.[41]

Cage's anti-idealist and inclusive view, as it informed, for example, the previously mentioned environments created out of discarded materials by artists such as "Kaprow, Dine, Oldenburg and Whitman," by way of contrast,

> focuses on the *function* of art, on the role of the artist in society, and on the whole behavioral complex implied by the notion that art is a certain kind of *activity* rather than a defined specialized mode or medium judged by preordained canons, norms and established standards of value.[42]

Rose identified the philosophic source of Cage's view as pragmatism, the sole distinctly American addition to philosophic research. Cornel West, in *The American Evasion of Philosophy*, placed similar emphasis on the American heritage of pragmatism, describing it "as a specific historical and cultural product of American civilization, a particular set of social practices that articulate certain American desires, values, and responses." Pragmatism, in a general definition, as already indicated, shares post-structuralism's avoidance of all centred or totalizing systems of thought and thus the foundationalist beliefs of idealist philosophy upon which Greenberg's modernist theory of art is premised. At the same time, it accentuates "human powers,"[43] in this, providing a marked contrast to post-structuralism's elimination of the subject. Illuminating both features as well as their symbiotic bond, William James, the American philosopher who brought pragmatism to public prominence in the early part of this century, defined the pragmatic view of truth as "only the expedient in our way of thinking, just as the right is only the expedient in our way of behaving."[44]

It was the democratic principles inherent in pragmatism's understanding of the production of "truth" that provided the rationale for Rose's intimation that the political content of pop and minimal art was indicative of their American heritage. For example, the present employment "of standard units, 'self-sufficient' non-relational forms and non-hierarchical arrangements of equal members" (presumably, as represented not only by

minimal art but, also, by Warhol's serial imagery), she interpreted as a metaphorical expression of the democratic ideal of a non-hierarchical society. Further "political metaphors" included Oldenburg's *Store*, described by Rose as an intricate symbol of "the Utopian state, in which owner and employee are identical," as well as Warhol's conception of his studio (entitled the Factory) as a "collective" endeavour.[45]

In mounting a case for the pragmatic character of pop and minimal art, one that was most convincing in her demonstration of the links between pragmatist philosophy and statements by the minimal artist Donald Judd,[46] Rose quoted liberally from the writings of William James[47] and, to a lesser extent, from those of the founder of American pragmatism, Charles Peirce. Rose's description of Cage's aesthetic in pragmatist terms as one that emphasizes "function, behavior and concrete consequences in action," was most probably mediated also by Morse Peckham's aesthetic theories. At the conclusion of "The Politics of Art. Part II," Rose cited Peckham as the source of her "methodological structure" for the pragmatic criticism she intended to apply to present "'anti-formal'" trends, for example, earthworks, conceptual, and process art, in "The Politics of Art. Part III."[48]

Peckham's theories, as presented in *Man's Rage for Chaos* (1965), focus attention not so much on the work of art as such, but rather on the behaviour of the artist who gave rise to it. Viewed in the "anthropological sense" (the same sense that enabled Alloway to formulate the "fine art-pop art continuum" and thus dispense with a hierarchical conception of culture), Peckham considered that "culture *is* patterns of behavior; and artifacts, including works of art, are merely the consequences or deposits of that behavior." For the spectator, and thus for the critic, "a work of art is the occasion for certain behavior." Artistic behaviour he saw "as much of an adaptation of man to environment as any human activity." Art in its adaptational function attempts to overcome "the paradox of human behavior: the very drive to order that qualifies man to deal successfully with his environment disqualifies him when it is to his interest to correct his orientation." Artistic perception is that "human activity which serves to break up orientations . . . to prepare the individual to observe what the orientation tells him is irrelevant, but what very well may be highly relevant."[49] Rose, while expressing reservation about Peckham's conception of art as a "'rehearsal' for life situations," acknowledged, nonetheless, that it "tallies exactly with the demythification, desanctification and despiritualization of art that begins with Dada and ends in 'process' art."[50]

Two further inter-related aspects of Peckham's theories should be mentioned. These inform, in particular, Cage's pragmatist understanding (as in-

terpreted by Rose) that art is neither a determined nor a distinctive "mode or medium" evaluated by pre-existing standards.[51] First,

> Value statements about art [which are not "derived from works of art, but only applied to them"] are merely efforts to stabilize the world of art so that one can know in advance that whatever the task of artistic perception may be, this particular work of art will, or will not, perform it.[52]

Second, art is a "disjunctive" category, that is, it "*is any artifact in the presence of which we play a particular social role, a culturally transmitted combination of patterns of behavior.*" Of relevance to Rose's quest to arrive at a critical approach that would accommodate the host of sixties' art outlawed by Greenbergian formalism, most notably pop and minimal art, Peckham considered that disturbances sparked by "abstract expressionism, pop art, and now op art" are based on the belief "that art is a *conjunctive category*, . . . that all works of art have something in common."[53]

By arguing for a *polarity* between the philosophical assumptions of "color abstraction" (idealism), on the one hand, and pop and minimal art (pragmatism), on the other – those that Rose considered stem from the very core of the artist's beliefs, specifically those concerning "truth and reality"[54] – Rose mounted an effective case against the negative evaluation of pop and minimal art by formalist critics. As Rose observed: what was the point, let alone the worth, of evaluating an art predicated on "one world-view" by a critical system based on an antithetical one?[55]

Rose's proposed solution to a critical mode able to accommodate pragmatic tendencies in sixties' art was a "relativist criticism,"[56] the first task of which was to establish a framework within which assessment could take place. "Comparative judgments" she regarded as by no means redundant but as difficult to validate because of their departure from pre-existing canons. Instead, they will be founded on "direct and immediate experience," as appraised by "the critic's own judgment."[57]

In Part III of the article Rose further theorized this relativist criticism (now referred to as "pragmatic criticism") and applied it, if in only a general sense, to present manifestations of antipathy to formalism in American art, those represented, for example, by Claes Oldenburg's "proposals for the erection of non-existent monuments" and Robert Morris's "'sculpture' made of steam." In doing so she reiterated its retention of an evaluative function, now explaining it as "pursuant," as opposed to prior, to perception "because to be a true measure it [judgment] must proceed, not from an idealist base of fixed absolutes and mechanical theories, but from

pragmatic considerations of intention, effect and concrete consequence in practice and experience."[58]

Rose's conception of the nature of evaluation in pragmatic criticism bears comparison with, and is most probably indebted to, that of the American philosopher John Dewey, particularly as outlined in *Art as Experience* (1958).[59] Rose considered that his "ghost . . . was still hovering around Colombia" at the time she met the minimalist artist Donald Judd at a graduate seminar.[60] Dewey's aesthetic theories, more specifically those aspects that are pitted against Kantian idealism, are discussed in some detail in the third part of the article.[61] In *Art as Experience*, Dewey explained that critical judgment arises from the work itself "as it enters into the experience of the critic by interaction with his own sensitivity and his knowledge and funded store from past experiences." Judgments will therefore change in accord with the object that prompts them and, importantly, nourishes them if criticism is to be of any value (i.e., both relevant and well-founded).[62]

Dewey's "funded store from past experiences" is not to be confused with Kant's "a priori truths" (principles that correspond to a particular category of "fundamental concepts"), put forward by him in *Critique of Pure Reason* (1781) to overcome the antithesis represented by the two prevailing routes to knowledge and truth in eighteenth-century philosophy: rationalism and empiricism. Roger Scruton, after Kant, observed that "a priori truths . . . say how we must think if we are to think at all . . . how the world must be if it is to be intelligible." While these truths "do not give knowledge of a world described without reference to our perception," at the same time, propositions arising out of them "cannot be established through experience, since their truth is presupposed in the interpretation of experience."[63]

Dewey considered that while there are standards in neither art nor criticism, there are "criteria in judgment, so that criticism does not fall into the field of mere impressionism." These, however, are neither regulations nor formulas but, instead, result from the attempt to ascertain "what a work of art is as an experience: the kind of experience which constitutes it." Criteria in judgment act as vehicles

> of personal experience, not as dictations of what the attitude of any one should be. Stating what a work of art is as an experience, may render particular experiences of particular works of art more pertinent to the object experienced, more aware of its own content and intent.[64]

In their respective accounts of pragmatist criticism, Dewey and Rose explain with far greater clarity the evaluative nature it does *not* assume. In Rose's case, as already outlined, this concerns the rejection of evaluative premises based on pre-existing standards,[65] those derived from "an idealist base of fixed absolutes and mechanical theories."[66] Dewey's case, while fundamentally the same, is worded differently. He explained it as the rejection of judgment of a "judicial" or "legalistic" nature, so-called because its decisions are predicated on "general rules" of supposedly universal application.[67]

It is beyond dispute that "pragmatic criticism," as envisaged by Rose, offered a means of accounting for pop and minimal art, as well as related "anti-formal" (in Rose's terms) tendencies in sixties' art, in a more positive manner than Greenbergian formalism in which there was one inflexible means of gauging the one, unvarying artistic value: "the goodness of good art."[68]

What is *not* beyond dispute, however, is the soundness of the edifice upon which Rose's proposal for a "pragmatic criticism" was built: the shared aesthetic and ideological character of pop and minimal art and its polarization with that of "color abstraction." Rose's claims concerning pop and minimal art's connection with an identifiably American culture are, in many respects, convincing. This is certainly the case in her description of pop art as a response to its cheapness and showiness as mediated by "content-drained" mass media imagery. Not without merit is her additional claim that it is an echo of precisionist efforts to endow its prosaic (either agrarian or industrial) subject-matter with a monumental quality. Rose considered their pursuit justifiable in a country that, in contrast to Europe, was lacking in monuments and that developed a consciousness of history at a time that commemoration of this kind was out of vogue.[69]

Rose, nonetheless, is guilty of selective reasoning: in discussing the aesthetic and ideological character of pop and minimal art she ignored most evidence that threatened to undermine her isolationist interpretation of it. This evidence suggests that indexes of so-called American culture in pop and minimal art either parallel those of other cultures or, instead, are those of an international culture, as in the glaring example of pop art imagery which is drawn from the *unitary* character of the Western urban world in the post-war period.

In a footnote to Part III, Rose acknowledged that criticism of present "canons of critical judgments" on the part of "certain artists" (most probably, current "anti-formalist" artists, the subject of Part III) is shared "by

advocates of mass culture," as in the case of John McHale. He was a member of the Independent Group in Britiain during the fifties and thus contributor to the intellectual climate that, as already argued, was responsible for Lawrence Alloway's "pragmatic" critical response to pop.

According to Rose, McHale, in "The Plastic Parthenon," challenged "'past traditional canons of literary and artistic judgment' orientated to unique objects . . . [which in his view] in no way enable one to relate adequately to our present situation." Consistent with Alloway's reduction of mass and fine art to a common communicative function, that which enabled him to regard mass and fine art as merely *different* spectrums within a *single* communication system, McHale, as cited by Rose, claimed: "the arts . . . are no longer a '*Canonical*' form of communication. Their canonizing elites and critical audiences are only one sector of a network of in-groups."[70]

Rose did not acknowledge that McHale's observations were made in response to his experience of mass culture in Britiain. Nor did Rose acknowledge that it was a pragmatic attitude – central to which is not only individual but, also, historical and cultural specificity, that is, the circumstances that have a direct bearing on the way in which an individual thinks and acts – that compelled McHale to seek reconciliation with his "present situation," including the technological character of his immediate environment, primarily by means of the expendable icons of mass communications.[71] This is despite her recognition that it was a pragmatic attitude that compelled John Cage to locate the aesthetic of the truly democratic art that he championed in "the life and environment" of everyone. Rose, it should be noted, regarded John Cage as the harbinger "of the technological future,"[72] yet curiously absent from her analysis is any account of the technological character of American urban society in the post-war period as is anything more than a superficial consideration of its related socio-economic character during this same period.

The source of McHale's pragmatism is the same as that of Cage: American philosophical pragmatism. As argued in the chapter on Lawrence Alloway, an important, if not sole, influence on the Independent Group's advocacy of pragmatism was the American scientist Alfred Korzybski's non-Aristotelianism (inspired in part by the writings of the founder of American philosophical pragmatism, Charles Peirce), as mediated by the American science fiction writer A. E. Van Vogt.

Rose described the basis of Cage's aesthetic – as it informed his vigorous defence of art's function in the era of the "Machine" – as the "improbable" union between "Zen and native American pragmatism."[73] She ex-

plained neither the constitutive Eastern features of Zen, including Taoism, nor the basis of its alliance with pragmatism or, for that matter, why she considered it "improbable." In claiming a union, however, Rose most probably had in mind the Zen-inspired aspects of Cage's aesthetic that parallel pragmatism's antagonism to centred or totalizing systems of thought. As will be discussed later in this study in the section on Susan Sontag, Cage's philosophy does away with dualistic thinking, with its binarisms, or categorical antinomies, such as "good" or "bad" which lead to either the evaluation of experience, that is, the privileging of one term over another (a key target of Derrida's deconstruction of logocentric texts), or the misrepresentation of its "flow" by the superimposition of conceptualizations.

In Part II, Rose traced the enthusiasm of artists such as Kaprow, Dine, Oldenburg, and Whitman and many others in America to make art from non-traditional "materials and techniques" to "native pragmatic attitudes" rather than dada.[74] Rose distinguished between the nature of the appropriation on the part of the artists listed above and Rauschenberg. The work of the former group – as exemplified by "Kaprow's rooms, Oldenburg's street figures, as well as Whitman's rubbish heaps" – she considered as close to "primitive *bricolage*," and as characterized, therefore, by a compositional logic (or illogic) based on a down-to-earth randomness. Rauschenberg's highly ordered combine paintings which, by inference, deployed elements in accord with "Cubist 'visual rhyming,'" had more in common with collage. Presumably, Rose regarded collage as less indicative of identifiably American pragmatic beliefs than bricolage because of its association with Cubism and thus with modernism in its European form. By relating bricolage to American pragmatism in this manner, Rose viewed contemporary American art in isolation. She did not examine its relation to junk culture trends in Europe, such as *nouveau realisme*, or, for that matter, the independence of these trends from American art. Nor did she consider the extent to which collage, as opposed to bricolage, can be established as a guiding principle of non-American manifestations of junk culture.

Similarly isolationist is Rose's claim that the present refusal of metaphorical and spiritual purposes of art can be understood as directed by pragmatism and thus as uniquely American.[75] Most likely, these relate to the aesthetic biases that constantly inflect "American taste," those she identified as "natural," "uncontrived," "immediate," "direct," "honest," "physical," and "literal."[76]

We may ask further to what extent are these same qualities characteristic of the French literary movement *nouveau roman*, frequently cited as

a forerunner to the materialist consciousness of both pop and minimal art? Certainly, Rose knew of this movement. In "ABC Art," published in 1965, she called upon Alain Robbe-Grillet's theorization of *nouveau roman* as a means of accounting for (in part, at least) a new "sensibility," one that was characterized by a "reserved impersonality and self-effacing anonymity." It belonged to an inter-stylistic category of art, the practitioners of which included minimal artists, such as Judd, Morris, Flavin, and Andre, and the pop artist Andy Warhol. Pop artists, other than Warhol, were related by "their attitudes, interests, experiences, and stance," if not by their style.[77]

Rose's article was in response to the perceived need to find a means of theorizing a body of work "more related in terms of a common sensibility than in terms of a common style" and to which formalist theory did not apply.[78] The methodology Rose adopted was that of *describing* the "new sensibility," a mission that she equated with the somewhat outmoded identification of a "*zeitgeist*," regarding this approach as preferable to interpreting an art that was clearly intended to frustrate interpretation.[79]

In describing the "new sensibility," Rose quoted from a range of texts that, in her opinion, had been influential in shaping it. Following on from each quotation (or, in some instances, cluster of quotations) is an account of corresponding expressions, or "sensibility," in contemporary art. It is under the rubric "Art as concrete object" that Rose quoted Alain Robbe-Grillet, a prominent contributor to and the chief theoretician of *nouveau roman*. The passage chosen, one translated from "Une voie pour le roman futur" (1956), was taken from Robbe-Grillet's theoretical writings. At its heart is the central contention of the *nouveau roman* aesthetic: "The world is neither meaningful nor absurd. It simply is." In recognition of this fundamental truth,

> it will be through their presence that objects and gestures will impose themselves . . . [and will continue] thereafter to dominate, beyond any theory of explication that might attempt to enclose them in any sort of a sentimental, sociological, Freudian, metaphysical, or any other system of reference.[80]

Of all the sources cited by Rose, she saw "the theory of the French objective novel" (i.e., *nouveau roman*) as closest to the perspective of the artists of whom she spoke. Nonetheless, she regarded their "rejection of the personal, the subjective, the tragic and the narrative in favor of the world of things" as "coincidental," as opposed to indicating the trans-national significance of such qualities; unlike "their knowledge of Wittgenstein," she knew of no "specific point of contact."[81] As indicated by both

Rose and a number of other critics either already mentioned or to be mentioned in this study (e.g., Harold Rosenberg, Dore Ashton, Susan Sontag, and Max Kozloff), American critics, if not American artists, were wholly conversant with the literary development of *nouveau roman* in France during the previous decade and called upon, primarily, Robbe-Grillet's theorization of it to explain similarly literal qualities in sixties' American art, including the literalness of minimal art and the literal treatment of imagery in pop art.

In her analysis of the pragmatist basis of Cage's aesthetic and the idealist one of that of Greenberg, Rose touched upon, albeit fleetingly, the interaction of these two opposed philosophical currents with broader cultural concerns such as politics and economics. By implication, Greenberg's aesthetic, which manifested itself in a "decorative" art that served the middle class as both ornament and financial investment, entered into a collusive relationship with the social, political, and economic framework of post-war America. Cage's antithetical democratic aesthetic, which took as its source "the life and environment" of everyone, was accorded a disruptive function within this same framework.

Rose's understanding of the radical ramifications of Cage's pragmatist aesthetic, and thus the pragmatist one of pop and minimal art, invites identification with Cornel West's conception of "prophetic pragmatism." Prophetic pragmatism, according to West, aligns the "tradition of pragmatism" in American thought with a distinct method "of cultural criticism," one that draws attention to the "political motivation and political substance of the American evasion of philosophy," as represented by pragmatism. By "political motivation," West refers to pragmatism's manner of "human inquiry into truth and knowledge," the argument being that once "the search for foundations and the quest for certainty" (the concerns of traditional, including idealist, philosophy) is relinquished, the focus shifts "to the social and communal circumstances under which persons can communicate and cooperate in the process of acquiring knowledge." By "political substance," West refers to pragmatism's transference of "the prerogative of philosophers," such as "rational deliberation," to "the people"; "the populace deliberating," he could thus claim, "is creative democracy in the making."

While worshipping "at no ideological altars," and while tied to no "preordained historical agent," such as "the working class," central to the concerns of prophetic pragmatism is the preservation of the "precious ideals of individuality and democracy" as well as the opposition to all threats to these ideals by "power structures that lack public accountability." This last

concern is relevant to Rose's attempt, however allusive, to align a specific critical discourse – Greenbergian formalism – with maintenance of the social and economic interests of the prevailing capitalist system.

West further observed that the emergence of prophetic pragmatism coincided with the period in "North Atlantic civilization" characterized by "postmodernity." At least two of the three "fundamental historical processes" put forward by West to illuminate post-modernity have a bearing on Rose's rationale for her proposed polarity between the aesthetic and ideological characters of "color abstraction" and pop and minimal art, a polarity that, as already argued, can be alternatively described as that between European and American culture. These concern "the end of the European Age (1492–1945)," marked by "intellectual reflections such as the demystifying of European cultural hegemony . . . [and] the destruction of the Western metaphysical traditions," and "the emergence of the United States as the world power."[82]

The "prophetic" character of Rose's advocacy of pragmatist principles in criticism became intensified in the following year in a paper she delivered at the Conference on Art Criticism and Art Education, the topic of which was "Elitist Vs Popular Criticism," held at the Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, New York, in May 1970. The prime target of these principles was still Greenbergian formalism but less its idealist assumptions *per se*, including the ability of a critical system predicated on such assumptions to deal with pop and minimal art, and more the manner in which idealism served the *judgmental* function of Greenberg's criticism – that of establishing the "*qualitative* order"[83] of art – and, by such means, served, equally, prevailing social and economic interests.

Rose's critique of judgmental criticism seems indebted to observations made by the pragmatist philosopher John Dewey in *Art as Experience*, the text that Rose drew upon in Part III of her examination of the politics of contemporary criticism. Dewey considered that while criticism *is* judgment,

> judgment has also a legalistic meaning and import. . . . Following the signification supplied by the practice of law, a judge, a critic, is one who pronounces an authoritative sentence. . . . Criticism [within this scheme] is thought of as if its business were not explication of the content of an object as to subject and form, but a process of acquittal or condemnation on the basis of merits and demerits.[84]

The prevalence of "'judicial'" criticism Dewey attributed to a questionable motive: aspiration towards "authoritative standing." Presumably, this

standing is akin to that enjoyed by the judge ("in the judicial sense") who holds a position of social eminence and whose ruling decides what will become "of an individual, perhaps of a cause." In criticism of the "'judicial'" sort, perception of an art object is both impeded and curtailed "by the substitution of precedent and prestige for direct experience."[85]

Rose, in effect, adopted Dewey's argument but endowed it with historical and cultural specificity. A prime catalyst for her critique of judgmental criticism was the media context in which it occurred as well as the media's ineluctable interaction with the market. She therefore addressed the ethical issue of the consequences of judgmental criticism in the contemporary period, that is, in a period in which the dominant features of mass communications and consumerism play out their collusive and mutually supportive role. Rose, in this manner, extended Dewey's arguments beyond aesthetic issues, such as those concerning the inability of judgmental criticism, based as it is on previous "authoritative standards," to be responsive to art which is novel.[86] (in Rose's analysis, that represented by "intermedia"), to encompass distinctly political concerns. More specifically, she examined the relationship between the critic's exercise of authority or power, in particular, Greenberg's, and the interests of existing social and economic structures.

While not the focus of her argument, Rose, in a repudiation of the position she held in "Pop in Perspective" and "The Value of Didactic Art," challenged the validity of the means by which Greenberg measured quality in art: namely, the critic's taste. In Greenberg's formalist criticism, "taste" – the acquired disposition to differentiate and appreciate – is held as not only the means of ascertaining quality but also the means of achieving it. Greenberg regarded the exercise of taste as crucial to the avant-garde's attainment of the related factors of quality and genuine aesthetic innovation. If superior art "almost always" comes out of tradition, from the experience and knowledge of one comes taste that "develops *as* a context of expectations based on experience of previously surprised expectations. The fuller the experience of this kind, the higher, the more truly sophisticated the taste." Artistic innovation results from the expectation of taste thus developed: "Only as he [the artist] grasps the expanded expectations created by this best new art does he become able to surprise and challenge them in his own turn."[87]

Rose, however, questioned the premise that "judgments of taste" and those of innate quality were one and the same.[88] Ignoring the role "philosophy of art" plays in clarifying and objectifying Greenberg's "empirical judgments,"[89] those that concern the Kantian interaction of reason and

sense, she claimed that judgments predicated solely “on personal taste, subjective intuition” cannot, by their very nature, “be absolute, objective or verifiable.” Moreover, not only are the critical distinctions arrived at by the exercise of taste subjective but, also, in every respect, contingent and “culturally” qualified. Value judgments, in Rose’s opinion, can only be made in relation to art from the past. “The longer a work has survived the test of successive judgments of taste, the more likely its claim to possess that trans-historical appeal to the imagination we term quality.”[90] In Greenberg’s terms, however, the situation Rose described of “durability [of a work] which creates a consensus” is proof that “taste is ultimately objective.”[91]

Greenberg’s linking of “*quality* with *innovation*,” Rose regarded as an attempt to confirm the authority of a value judgment arrived at by subjective means.[92] She doubted the credibility of this argument, even if innovation is restricted to the “significant” far-reaching kind, that which plays a crucial role in Greenberg’s conception of a continuous and a continually evolving mainstream tradition, the forward momentum of which is fuelled by the “compulsion to maintain its standards of excellence.”[93] Rose, however, considered that innovative “form or technique” was not an automatic guarantee of quality. She cited Gentile da Fabriano’s *Adoration of the Magi* as an example of a work, that despite its *retardataire* style, had attracted favourable “successive judgments of taste.”[94]

Rose’s rejection of the formalist ruling on quality, at this time, however, was based less on perceived flaws in Greenberg’s argument and more on an ideological shift, one that caused her to reject her earlier perceptions of the critic’s essential task. In 1966, when under the sway of formalist ideas, she regarded it as concerned foremost with the “making of value judgments.”[95] By 1969 she considered comparative judgments as still necessary. Now under the influence of pragmatist ideas, in particular, pragmatist ideas as mediated by the aesthetic theories of both Dewey and Peckham, she rejected judgments based on anterior standards such as those upholding the supremacy “of flatness, purity of medium, truth to materials”[96] and thus those employed by Greenberg, in accord with the modernist goal of “self-definition.” However, in the conference paper delivered the following year, she pronounced the judgmental purpose of criticism as no longer valid.[97] The argument by which she justified this radical change in perception of the critic’s task pivoted on her perception of an equally marked change in the cultural framework of criticism in the 1960s.[98]

Rose’s paper, as already indicated, was directed at judgmental criticism’s most prominent guise during the sixties: Greenbergian formalism.

Greenberg's conception of the modernist endeavour – its role in the preservation of cultural standards and the association of these with "purity of medium" – originated in Greenberg's first major piece of writing: "Avant-Garde and Kitsch" (1939). In this – and, unlike his subsequent, narrowly focused, accounts of modernist art, notably "Modernist Painting" – Greenberg aligned his account of cultural production in the modern period with a critique of capitalist culture.[99]

Without any direct reference to Greenberg's "Avant-Garde and Kitsch," Rose disagreed, in particular, with two aspects of the cultural position represented by it, the implication being that Greenbergian formalism – the most authoritative critical mode during the sixties – was predicated on a cultural situation that no longer held. In Rose's opinion, earlier theories about differences between high and low culture – by suggestion, those of a hierarchical nature and made by Greenberg – were applicable only up until 1950. Mass communications had altered the relationship between the two, a reference, no doubt, to their ability to erode boundaries between cultural realms. The present, Rose termed undoubtedly "a mass age," one that had given rise to its own visual art form, film, and would most likely be the source of many more. Pop art, descended, as it was, from practices associated with "traditional elite art," was not a candidate; however, it symbolized a critical moment in social history given for the first time "modern artists," presumably by the simulation of commercial images and techniques, had consciously aimed their art at the general public.

Consistent with the course taken by history, Rose prophesized that "visual art" will comply more with Greenberg's "popular Avant-garde" than the "easel convention" initiated during the Renaissance.[100] Rose refers, here, to Greenberg's term for the "kind of avant-garde [which] begins with Marcel Duchamp and with Dada," although shorn it would seem of the pejorative associations intended by him. According to Greenberg, the "'popular' avant-garde" attempted to "repudiate the difference between high and less high art" by such means as the undercutting of the difference between "difficult" and "easy" art by "'transcending' the difference between good and bad in general" and thus the concerns of the "'unpopular' avant-garde."[101] In its more recent and hypertrophied form, Greenberg identified this "'popular' avant-garde" with the "Novelty art" represented by op, pop, and minimal art. Novelty art resembles the "avant-garde in its allure, its come-on, in the style of its announced ideas, but . . . is not nearly venturesome enough to qualify as avant-garde art in its actual substance and quality." It meets the needs of a "larger art public" that wants "contemporary art that looks like avant-garde art," and can be "accepted" and

"talked about" as such, by providing "emblems . . . of what it already knows and expects as advanced art."[102] The avant-garde in its hypertrophied form was final proof that the avant-garde and, along with it, "the survival and continuity of avant-garde standards," was "as unable to protect itself from the infiltration of the middlebrow as every other department of culture in our society has been." Consistent with the claim he made initially in "Avant-Garde and Kitsch" about kitsch in its insidious, "high-class" form,[103] Greenberg identified "the middlebrow, not the lowbrow" as "the avant-garde's most formidable [and traditional] enemy."[104]

Rose, however, distinguished authentic forms of popular expression that, by definition, depart from Greenberg's Kantian-derived understanding of the "purity" of modernist forms[105] from "alienated *kitsch*" (presumably including its middlebrow form) and its mere mimicry of "élitist styles."[106] She thus refers to those cultural forms that demonstrate the same parasitic dependence on high art that Greenberg had previously identified in "Avant-Garde and Kitsch"[107] and which he later intimated was the nature of the relationship between "Novelty art," or, the hypertrophied variant of the "popular avant-garde," and the "'genuine avant-garde." Her understanding of authentic popular expression as wholly "natural, spontaneous, and unselfconscious"[108] invites comparison, in spirit if not in substance, with "folk culture," the vital culture that Greenberg considered was wiped out by *kitsch* as it "flowed out over the countryside," also eradicating in its wake "geographical and national-cultural boundaries."[109] Dwight MacDonald elaborated the distinction between "Folk Culture" and, its replacement, "Mass Culture" (identical with *kitsch*) in his essay "A Theory of Mass Culture."

> Folk art which until the Industrial Revolution was the culture of the common people . . . grew from below. It was a spontaneous, autochthonous expression of the people, shaped by themselves, pretty much without the benefit of High Culture, to suit their own needs. Mass Culture ["at best a vulgarized reflection of High Culture"] is imposed from above. It is fabricated by technicians hired by businessmen.[110]

Rose, in effect, saw genuine forms of popular communication in the present socio-economic context in a manner that undercut distinctions made by both Greenberg and MacDonald between folk and mass culture. Whereas "Mass Culture," as understood by MacDonald, results from the exploitation of "the cultural needs of the masses" on the part of the "Lords of *kitsch*" (those of the capitalist order),[111] Rose regarded "rock music" –

a shining manifestation of authentic popular expression – as a flourishing business because it met the requirements of a sizeable segment of society.[112] Her perspective invites comparison, though not complete identification, with Zygmunt Bauman's perception of "consumer conduct" in the specifically consumerist phase of the capitalist system. Deployment of the "*pleasure principle*" – in a manner that overcomes "the heretofore antagonistic relation between the pleasure and reality principles" – is among the means by which the consumer exercises "individual freedom" (albeit "consumer freedom," i.e., a freedom geared to the "consumer market") and the capitalist system in its consumerist phase thus ensures its perpetuation. As Bauman explained:

> Reality, as the consumer experiences it, is a pursuit of pleasure. Freedom is about the choice between greater and lesser satisfactions, and rationality is about choosing the first over the second.[113]

The vitality Rose observed in the naturalness, spontaneity, and unselfconsciousness of authentic forms of popular communication was that resulting from the artist's first-hand experience of the cultural conditions of an identifiably mass era.[114] It is similar to that exhibited by "the newest writers," as identified by the literary critic Leslie Fiedler in his essay "Cross the Border – Close the Gap," published in 1969, the year prior to Rose's paper. Those writers who "Cross the Border" and "Close the Gap" between "High Art" and "Pop [i.e., popular] Art," thus ending the situation in which the critic was able to make judgments of quality based on distinctions between "high" and "low" culture, are able "to recapture a certain rude magic in its authentic context, by seizing on myths not as stored in encyclopedias or preserved in certain beloved ancient words – but as apprehended at their moment of making."[115]

Marshall Berman included Leslie Fiedler in a group of "writers" who comprised, among others, Lawrence Alloway, Susan Sontag, and John Cage. Berman credited this group with developing an "affirmative vision of modernism," the emergence of that coincided with that of pop art in the early 1960s. Consistent with Rose's identification of "intermedia" as a form of genuine popular communication,[116] exponents of this variety of modernism were, as Berman observed, encouraged "to break down the boundaries of their specializations" and, in this manner, create "richer and more multivalent arts." "Modernists of this variety," he acknowledged, no doubt with Leslie Fiedler in mind, "sometimes referred to themselves as "post-modernists."[117] Berman explained their "ideal" – one that he regarded as

remiss in its lack of "critical bite" – as that of opening "oneself to the immense variety and richness of things, materials and ideas that the modern world inexhaustibly brought forth."[118]

Berman's "affirmative vision of modernism" can be identified with Ihab Hassan's "postmodernism," or, more accurately, with one of his many elaborations of it. In "Towards a Concept of Postmodernism" (1982), Hassan distinguished "between three modes of artistic change in the last hundred years," identifying them as "avant-garde," "modern" and "postmodern." By "avant-garde" Hassan means movements such as "Cubism, Futurism, Dadaism, Surrealism," those which were "Anarchic . . . [and] assaulted the bourgeoisie with their art, their manifestoes, their antics." "Modernism," much of it at least, "appears hieratic, hypotactical, and formalist." "Postmodernism," by way of contrast, is "playful, paratactical, and deconstructionist"; it "recalls the irreverent spirit of the avant-garde" and yet "remains . . . cooler, less cliquish, and far less aversive to the pop, electronic society of which it is a part, and so hospitable to kitsch,"[119] a definition that could easily double for one of pop art.

Rose disagreed with the cultural assumptions of Greenbergian formalism on one further ground. This concerned Greenberg's identification of the formalist tradition with the avant-garde and thus the modernist endeavour of advancing cultural standards, its ability to do so, however, directly proportionate to its ability to resist external directives, including those of an economic kind. In "Avant-Garde and Kitsch," Greenberg declared that the "enormous profits" of *kitsch* "are a source of temptation to the avant-garde itself, and its members have not always resisted this temptation."[120] In "Where is the Avant-Garde?," published in 1967, some twenty-eight years after "Avant-Garde and Kitsch," Greenberg described a situation in which the avant-garde had all but succumbed to its blandishments. However, despite the avant-garde's clear inability "to protect itself against the infiltration of middlebrow," he then considered, a "genuine avant-garde" survives as a potential and even as a fact, if only "here and there, as an avant-garde within an avant-garde."[121] In Rose's view, one that she shared with Rosenberg, the avant-garde had gradually disappeared and, along with it, "the economic dissociation of art from society which defines the situation of the avant-garde."

Rose's concern with the end of art's economic independence from society was, however, not a question of standards in art but, rather, of the ethics of criticism. Criticism's judgmental function, she argued, was inherited from and was appropriate to the previous century when the critic was cast in the role of "independent judge" who was able to counter both mis-

conceptions of the "Salon jury" and "taste" of the unperceptive middle class. Criticism's impartiality during this period was guaranteed by the critic's inability to command "economic power." At the present time, however, criticism does affect the market; the critic's lack of independence renders him no longer free to judge. The immediate bond "between criticism and patronage" (the current patronage arrangement predicated on conjecture) means that critics cannot evade liability for the kind of patronage and the features of patronage in existence. For this reason, judgmental critics' aesthetic evaluation, and therefore efforts to sway patronage by their judgment, is always more than that because of its instant "economic and by inference social and political" repurcussions.

The vital factor in Rose's rejection of judgmental criticism was its media context, the means by which the critic exerted influence on the market. Rose went as far as to claim that attempts on the part of critics to halt the course of "popular expression" in the sixties were made by the employment of techniques that were clearly propagandistic. These were not deliberately employed but, rather, were the unavoidable outcome "of elite critics" upholding "elite art in the mass media." This particular communicative context, which speaks only to the masses and is guided therefore by the principle of wide intelligibility, is incapable of dealing in the "subtle distinctions" characteristic of "true criticism." Rose expressed the view that the content (i.e., what can be communicated) of mass media is fully regulated by their specific context, acknowledging Jacques Ellul's critique of "technological society" in *Propaganda* as its source.[122]

In the year that Rose delivered the conference paper in which these remarks were made, she wrote an article entitled "Criticism as Propaganda" (unpublished at the time) in which she again addressed the issue of the employment of propagandistic techniques in judgmental criticism, but now aligned it more closely with Greenberg's formalist criticism, in response, no doubt, to Greenberg's dubious goal of making his taste canonical.[123] Rose claimed that propagandistic techniques were employed by Greenberg to enable him to "convince, persuade, illuminate, and convert his public," arguing, as in the conference paper, that these intentions were an inevitable consequence of the media context of his criticism. Presumably, because of the demands of a mass audience (i.e., mass intelligibility and appeal), the media context demands that art writing assume either one of two forms: "simplified propaganda" which involves "the simplification of language and concepts, the flattening out of irregularities and complexities, the masquerading of opinion as fact" – the form adopted by judgmental criticism – or "unprocessed reportage," the lesser of two evils because

it lacks the ability "to formulate taste in an extended and proliferating system of art patronage."[124] In this same article, Rose linked the propagandistic techniques of judgmental criticism, as dictated by its media context, more closely with market objectives thus indicating some understanding of the intertwined consumerist and mass media interests of capitalism in its post-war phase. Whereas in the conference paper she considered that, at worst, art writing in the media is by its very nature ineluctably "propaganda,"[125] in "Criticism and Propaganda" it "is inescapably manipulative sales-directed propaganda."[126]

Underlying Rose's *volte-face* on judgmental criticism was a profound questioning of the ethical responsibilities of the critic: In what social, political and economic context was criticism being made? Whose interests did criticism serve? What was the function and purpose of criticism in the present context? In responding to questions of this nature, Rose concluded that critics could not escape the fact that "judgments in print" resulted in "market manipulation" and that critics of integrity must avoid precisely this situation. In clear reference to Greenberg, she further claimed:

> What is so disturbing, precisely because it is so symptomatic of our time, is that a critic who would hold that art transcends politics is necessarily forced to function in the service of a system of patronage dependent on a social and economic structure that very critic may once have rejected.[127]

Rose's examination of the relationship between the prevailing critical discourse in the New York art world (Greenbergian formalism) and the prevailing economic system (capitalism) in American society was not a lone pursuit. It was shared by other critics of her generation – for example, Max Kozloff, Lucy Lippard, and Gene Swenson – and its frame of reference extended to encompass further influential sectors in the New York art world, most notably dealers and museums. The fervent spirit with which this examination was conducted, most marked in the case of Swenson, as well as the strong ethical impulses that motivated it, cannot be viewed independently of the contemporaneous charged atmosphere and elevated level of social and political unrest in America. This was largely due to American economic and political policies in both their domestic and external application.

Gene Swenson, for example, as Gregory Battock has noted, aligned his criticism of the "prevailing artistic scene" with that of "a larger imperialistic system,"[128] including the shameful consequences of this system: the Vietnam War. In a paper or, more accurately, manifesto delivered at the Art

Worker's Coalition Open Hearing, held at the School of Visual Arts on 10 April 1969, the year of his premature death in a car accident,[129] Swenson made the following observations:

> Tonight our concern is specific. The institutions responsible for setting standards directly applicable to our world of art have not only failed us, they have failed the wider community they claim to serve; these institutions have become positive weapons, a cultural ABM, of that tyranny [as exemplified by war in Vietnam and "racist domination in the Senate"] which now oppresses all mankind with its balance of terror.[130]

Lawrence Alloway, in a retrospective account of the "politicization of art criticism" in America, considered that the "intersection of political and aesthetic action lacked a focus until the early summer of 1970." Rose's paper, along with Max Kozloff's contribution to the same conference, Alloway regarded as a specific response "to the domestic and external violence" represented by the "invasion of Cambodia and the shootings at Kent State University, Ohio," these events precipitating "a unified chain of protest."[131] However, unlike Kozloff's contribution,[132] topical factors, in the form of mention of specific social and political events, did not intrude on Rose's. Instead, by way of an examination of the function and purpose of evaluative criticism in the then present social, political, and economic framework, Rose demonstrated how the art world was, in effect, a sub-set of a larger capitalist system; more specifically, by placing the fulcrum of her argument on the media context of judgmental criticism, she demonstrated how it was part of the capitalist system in its consumerist post-war phase in which the intertwined factors of mass communications and consumerism play a dominant role.

Rose's probing examination of the media context of art writing and the complex reciprocity between "the media and the market"[133] during the sixties, did not leave unquestioned the aim and role of her own criticism – one that resulted in her *volte-face* on Greenbergian formalism, in particular on its judgmental function. In this regard, Hilton Kramer's response to her paper was not entirely fair. As a staunch supporter of the oppositional, "two-culture" position that underpinned Greenberg's formalist theory, Kramer trivialized Rose's contribution to the conference, masking her pertinent and deeply-felt concerns (in his terms, "political demoralization . . . carried over into an attack on . . . cultural values") by his customary brand of cutting wit: "For the art critic of *Vogue* magazine to come on like La Pasionaria, I find, to say the least, ironical."[134] As indicated by this response, Kramer was highly critical of what he perceived as a threat to cultural

values by the “politicization of art.” In a letter addressed to the “Art Editor, The New York Times,” dated 22 January 1970, and signed by Lucy Lippard, among others, on behalf of the Art Worker’s Coalition, remarks made by Hilton Kramer in the Sunday *Times* of 18 January were criticized. Among these was that concerning his objection to the “eleventh demand” of the Art Worker’s Coalition which had been made in response to the Museum of Modern Art’s adoption of a policy which meant that it acquired and exhibited “works which are no more than 30 . . . years old.” Kramer’s antagonism to this and all other attempts to intervene in existing museum policy, which in Kramer’s terms would lead to the destruction of cultural values, is conveyed in a letter by the Art Worker’s Coalition which quotes his “clarion call”: “All of us who believe in the very idea of art museums – in art museums free of political pressures . . . say loud and clear that we will not stand for the politicization of art that is now looming as a real possibility.”[135]

As Rose made clear in “Criticism and Propaganda,” and thus from the perspective of 1970, Greenberg’s eminence in criticism rests not on his ability to solve “current aesthetic problems” but on “his power, now on the wane, to dictate taste.” While Rose, in her conference paper, queried the validity of the tool by which Greenberg’s judgmental criticism measured quality in art – in the final count, the critic’s taste – the focus of both the conference paper and “Criticism and Propaganda” was the authority of Greenberg’s judgmental criticism, and, as a result of this authority, his ability to impose his taste as the norm.

Rose argued that Greenberg enjoyed this power because his criticism linked up with and advanced the interests of the reigning capitalist order. Its relevance to and, hence, co-option by the capitalist system was pivotal upon its judgmental nature: “Greenberg’s reduction of all aesthetic values to a single value – that of quality – was immediately translatable into terms of real value, i.e., dollars and cents.”[136] The *means* by which Greenberg’s criticism interacted with the market was explained in terms of capitalism in its post-war consumerist phase in which the interests of the latter were advanced by mass communications, in themselves, an index of the technocratic character of post-war society.

Indebted, as already explained, to Jacques Ellul’s study of mass communications, Rose attempted to demystify Greenberg’s power to dictate taste by exposing not only the propagandistic patterns of language he used to manipulate opinion – a consequence of both its judgmental aims and its media context – but, also, to subvert this power by exposing the way in which the judgmental premises of his criticism served capitalist as well as

allied social and political ends. Presumably, Rose's attempt to demystify Greenberg's authority as a tastemaker conformed, in some measure, to the fifth of the choices available to the critic who would reject judgmental criticism's improper exercise of power that she proposed in the conference paper. This concerned the use of "sociological analysis of the present relationship between culture and society in the service of an economic, political, social and cultural revolution."[137]

Rose's pursuit bears some comparison with the central pre-occupation of Michel Foucault's prolific post-structuralist writings: the identification of existing social forms of the exercise of power and the particular roles of certain forms of knowledge in the functioning of these apparatuses. In "Truth and Power," Foucault observed that the "central political problem for the intellectual" is not a question "of emancipating truth from every system of power . . . but of detaching the power of truth from the forms of hegemony, social, economic and cultural, within which it operates at the present time."[138] Jacques Derrida's *The Truth in Painting* and Jean Lyotard's "deconstruction of the 'metanarratives' of modernity in his *The Postmodern Condition*"[139] are further examples of post-structuralism that align deconstruction of the logocentric assumptions of traditional philosophy with that, as explained by Jacques Derrida, of "extrinsic conditions of [the] practice ["of philosophemes"]: the historical forms of its pedagogy, the social, economic or political structures of this pedagogical institution."[140]

Post-structuralism emerged as a force in France after the failure of struggles in that country against capitalism, specifically capitalism as represented by the Gaullist regime, those brought to a head in the student and worker riots in Paris, in May 1968. As Terry Eagleton observed: "Unable to break the structures of state power, post-structuralism found in [sic] possible instead to subvert the structures of language."[141] Rose's critique of the judgmental nature of Greenberg's criticism because of its service to capitalist interests in American society, as already argued, cannot be viewed independently from widespread antagonism towards American political and economic policies, as measured by their repercussions at both a domestic and an external level. In this regard, broad, and *only* broad, parallels can be drawn between the two examples of cultural activity and their underlying ethical impulse, if, in the case of post-structuralism, as shall be shortly explained, it is one that is divorced from both explicit utopianism and goals or ends.

Cornel West, in his previously mentioned study, *The American Evasion of Philosophy*, made clear that while pragmatism shares post-structural-

ism's, and hence Foucault's, "major theme of evading epistemology-centred philosophy," it rejects post-structuralism's elimination of the subject. The mode of inquiry adopted by Foucault was "genealogy." This he defined as "a form of history which can account for the constitution of knowledges, discourses, domains of objects, etc., without having to make reference to a subject."[142] "Pragmatism, by way of contrast, as explained by West, "accentuates human powers," its emphasis, in this regard, however, is not to be confused with conventional humanism that places emphasis on "the human agency of elite cultural creators" at the expense of "social structural constraints, constraints that reinforce and reproduce hierarchies based on class, race, gender, and sexual orientation."[143]

West's distinction between the post-structuralist and the pragmatist conception of the subject leads him to make a further one, this time between "prophetic pragmatism" and Foucault's work. Foucault's interest in "the operation of powers," as he, himself, acknowledged, lies not with analysis of "the phenomena of power" or elaboration of "the foundations of such an analysis" but, rather, with "modes by which, in our culture, human beings have been made subjects"[144] (the constitution of subjects, nevertheless, ineluctably tied to "the operation of powers"). West's observation is broadly consistent with the post-structuralist understanding that subjectivity or consciousness of "self" is shaped by language – in Foucault's case, by "discourses" in the form of bodies of knowledge – and thus by social forces. Prophetic pragmatism's inquiry into the same issue is guided, presumably, by preservation of the "moral ideals of creative democracy and individuality" and, by these means, avoidance of the forms of oppression that result from dominant or privileged social groups' appropriation of power.

This last point leads to a further difference: that represented by the ethical impulse and unconcealed utopianism of "prophetic pragmatism" and Foucault's devaluation of "moral discourse" and "fervent anti-utopianism" that, as appraised by West, "rejects all forms of ends and aims for political struggle," such as those represented by Hegelian and Marxist teleology.[145] Foucault's attitude can, alternatively, be described as skeptical, an attitude that is consistent with two interrelated aspects of the post-structuralist position on "truth." First, "the inquiring subject as well as the object of inquiry are both constituted within the very language of inquiry."[146] This view of the subject as well as that of knowledge is in contravention of logocentric presuppositions, such as the following: "Being can be known and experienced in its immediacy; language transfers meaning neutrally without interfering in the underlying thoughts it 'expresses.'"[147] Second, as there is

nothing outside of language, "there is no Archimedean point . . . from which the truth claims of language itself can be surveyed."[148]

Rose's denunciation of the function of judgmental criticism took place in the name of ethical impulses and moral ideals similar to those of "prophetic pragmatism." Hence, while the interaction between the media and the "market" cannot be eradicated, criticism and hence the critic can avoid serving the latter's interests by abolishing judgmental forms, those predicated on the idealist assumptions of traditional philosophy. As previously mentioned, Rose, at the concluding stages of her paper, listed options available to the critics who rejected the abuse of criticism's judgmental purpose. The first of these applied directly to the media context of criticism and concerned advocacy of neutral and inclusive reportage. "Journalism," Rose maintained, is an honourable undertaking if it remains heedful of its inherent shortcomings and restricts itself "to accurate reportage."[149]

The impact of pragmatism on Rose's critical writings and the resultant emergence of post-modernist features within it, can be traced to a time of "crisis" in American art criticism, one that cannot be viewed independently of a corresponding "crisis" in American society. It can be dated to a period in which Greenbergian formalism had passed its authoritative zenith; in its clear inability to respond positively to non-formalist trends in sixties' art, the seeds of its own destruction had been sown at the outset. This loss of faith in Greenbergian formalism as a critical mode coincided with, if anything, a more intensely felt one in the ruling capitalist system whose interests it was now seen to serve. Rose realized that in its denial of the Absolute values of idealism, those which rested on the presupposition that language "yields truth, the meta-language of philosophy,"[150] pragmatist criticism, in which questions concerning the worth of art are considered relevant only with regard to the intentions of the individual example, offered a strategy by which the critic could avoid the commandeering of his or her evaluations by extra-aesthetic (or, bluntly put, political) interests.

6

Max Kozloff

A Phenomenological Solution to "Warholism" and its Disenfranchisement of the Critic's Interpretive and Evaluative Roles

Max Kozloff was born in Chicago in 1933. In 1953 he graduated in Arts from the University of Chicago[1] and five years later was awarded an M.A. by the same institution. Subsequent study, though not completed, brought him to New York where he enrolled at the Institute of Fine Arts. After receiving a Fulbright Scholarsip in 1962, the year following Rose's receipt of the same award, Kozloff spent a year in France. By this time he had already commenced his career as a critic – primarily of American art – for which he would soon receive numerous awards, including a Pulitzer Fellowship for Critical Writing in 1962–3, the Frank Jewett Mather Award for Art Criticism in 1966 and a Guggenheim Fellowship 1968–9.[2] *Renderings*, an anthology of criticism from this period, was published in 1968. In the next decade Kozloff took on the further role of photographer and broadened his critical and writing focus to encompass photography. One-man exhibitions of his photographs were held at the Holly Solomon Gallery, New York, in 1977, 1979, and 1980, and a further one at the Marlborough Gallery, New York, in 1982. In 1979 he published *Photography and Fascination*, followed by *The Privileged Eye* in 1987.[3] During the sixties, Kozloff's prime critical platform was *The Nation* where he held the position of art critic, 1961–9. Further critical posts occupied during this period were those of New York correspondent, *Art International*, 1962–4, and contributing editor, *Artforum*, 1963–74.[4]

Unlike the "social critics" examined in this study, those whose critical responses to pop were predicated on ideas and attitudes formulated in advance of pop art itself, Kozloff's "critical judgment," as with that of Rose, was "crystallized" by the sixties. As he observed in the preface to *Renderings:* "I owe to it the voice in which I speak and the style in which I think."[5]

Broadly defined, Kozloff's "critical judgment" was moulded by the following aspects of sixties' experience: critical demands of sixties' art, that is, pop and its similarly anonymous counterpart in abstraction; failure of existing critical modes, in particular that of the prevailing critical mode of Greenbergian formalism to meet these demands; a questioning of forms of knowledge inherent in critical systems. Carried out amidst and inseparable from the climate of social and political unrest in America, this questioning was accompanied, if not motivated, by the awareness that art criticism could serve extra-aesthetic ends, namely the interests of hegemonic structures.

Prompted, in the first instance, by the anonymity and ambiguity of sixties' art – features that he perceived as calculated to invalidate the critic and for which he coined the term "Warholism," after their initial indentification in pop – Kozloff turned his attention from theorizing Warholistic art *per se* to theorizing, instead, the critic's response to it. In an effort to provide further life for the critic in the face of his threatened delegitimization by Warholism, Kozloff proposed a critical approach centred on an examination of the critic's consciousness of art, as it concerned the viewing experience. In a variation on this approach, in his flawed attempt to formulate an intentionalist methodology, he combined, if in an unclear manner, an examination of his consciousness and that of the incarnate artist, that is, the "artist" manifest in the work of art.

Kozloff never acknowledged phenomenology and its findings on human consciousness as a source for this critical approach;[6] however, he alluded to a number of its tenets drawn from both the epistemological phenomenology of Edmund Husserl, and its search for foundations of knowledge, and existential phenomenology, primarily that of Maurice Merleau-Ponty and its concern for the foundations of existence. Among the aspects of phenomenology explored by Kozloff was the central and, arguably, defining assumption that objects of consciousness were intentional objects, an assumption that overcame the strict subject-object duality of Cartesianism and its associated spectatorial and intellectualist epistemology. A further aspect was Husserl's phenomenological method of reduction or *epoché* that, when applied in the analysis of one's consciousness, forced confinement to dealing with "intentional objects of experience," as opposed to either "a construction made by philosophers or scientists, or a transexperiential object that 'common sense' teaches us to see." Finally, there was the existential phenomenological emphasis on factors other than the "merely cognitive" in intentional acts[7] as well as, in the case of Merleau-Ponty's existential phenomenology, the role of these non-cognitive factors (e.g., sensations, moods, and feelings) in a pre-reflective level of consciousness.

The impact of phenomenology on Kozloff's criticism – in particular Husserl's epistemological phenomenology with its concern for "pure description" of the contents of consciousness rather than "presuppositions" of traditional philosophical theories[8] – culminated in his adoption of a critical stance of "anti-advocacy" of all critical theories. This he allied to pragmatist and, thus by the terms of this study, deconstructive post-modernist goals. These concerned the rejection of all *a priori* judgments, that is, those made on the basis of fixed and absolute values that failed to acknowledge either the particular values of each new work or those of the critic as brought to the fore in the experiencing of the work. On both counts, this rejection stemmed from recognition of the intentional ties binding man to his world. The insights yielded by phenomenology into the nature of and reasons for critical judgment, activated Kozloff's awareness – if only fleetingly referred to in his phenomenologically oriented writings – of the relationship between art critical modes and the exercise of power. In this regard, Kozloff's pragmatist goals, as with the similar goals of Rose, encompassed pragmatism's "prophetic" concern within a cultural critique.

The reasons for the challenge to critical understanding on the part of sixties' art were initially identified in pop art. In "'Pop' Culture, Metaphysical Disgust, and the New Vulgarians," published in 1962 prior to the definitive labelling of the movement as "pop," Kozloff noted the confounding of the aesthetic polarity of figuration and abstraction on the part of Oldenburg, Dine, Lichtenstein, and Rosenquist. He saw this as brought about by means such as the employment of "blatantly familiar images from reality in a manner "so magnified as to require reinterpretation all over again." Kozloff noted, also, the active spectatorial role engendered by reversal of "the entire concept of the artist creating an image from his inner, or the outer, world." In the case of the "precreated" images in Rosenquist's *I used to have a '50*, "the artist expects us , rather than himself, to contribute the imaginative values. He poses as the agent, not the author of the work."[9]

Clement Greenberg's inability to come to terms with both these and further features of pop was indicated in his account of art after the demise of Abstract Expressionism, that outlined in "After Abstract Expressionism" and published in *Art International* in October 1962.[10] Kozloff's damning critique and lengthy rebuttal of Greenberg's article was published in *Art International*, also, in June of the following year.[11]

In "After Abstract Expressionism," Greenberg had distinguished between the "originality" of Kenneth Noland and Louis Morris, as it relates to formal innovation, and the "novelty" (and, hence, "safe taste") of neo-dadaists (with the exception of Jasper Johns), practitioners of "construc-

tion-collage" and "ironic [commentators] . . . on the banalities of the industrial environment" which "has no staying power."[12] Some nine years later, Greenberg would describe this same distinction as that between "genuinely artistic or esthetic newness," the concern of the "classic avant-garde," and perception of the effects of newness – "the shocking, scandalizing, startling, the mystifying and confounding" – "as ends in themselves," the province of avant-gardism."[13] A major thrust of Kozloff's response to Greenberg's argument was that formalist evaluative criteria had no relevance in an environment dominated not by abstraction but, instead, by "Assemblage, Neo-Dada, 'pop' or sign art," art marked by its "obsessive indifference to the dream of originality [formal and otherwise], at least as a unique accomplishment." To substantiate his position Kozloff drew attention to the didactic, as opposed to formal, purpose of pop's studied uninventiveness and its anonymity, as indicated by a lack of a "signature style" that could not be equated with a corresponding lack of "personal vision." With regard to the first Kozloff considered that "banalities and clichés" are the aspect of the new art most "problematical for the critic" and one further complicated by "the fact that the new banality is merely 'safe taste' writ large."[14] He suggested that the goal of recent forays "into the commonplace" was "subversion of the *unoriginal.*" "'New Realism,'"[15] he considered, "exhausts kitsch the way any of its imitators will eventually degrade a *genuine* innovation."[16]

Kozloff's second point concerned a reaction to the "'conceited' excesses of Abstract Expressionism" in which style was no longer a requisite of "personal vision." The result was that "anonymity," in the guise of either "would-be irony" or, less commonly, "formal tonic," had usurped "Kandinsky's . . . 'inner necessity.'" For the generation of artists who followed in Abstract Expressionism's wake, "art history" and "commercial culture" were less a point of individual departure than a "source of overt parasitic imagery."[17] He cited the "extreme" case of the sign painting of Robert Indiana that, on the one hand, affirmed a "specific configuration" but, on the other, demonstrated no committment to it. The point inferred by such art, Kozloff concluded, is that "the given image is still selected, and that disengagement from invention nevertheless signifies a new engagement."[18]

Kozloff's defence of the art deemed insignificant by Greenberg's account of Abstract Expressionism and its "aftermath" is not to be confused with approval. Kozloff branded "the assumptions of Pop art," including those concerning the status of pop artists' styles as "only style impersonations" and "their relation with market values and fashion," as "self-destructive" because of the inability of its insufficiently talented "current

practitioners . . . to triumph over them."[19] No doubt Kozloff still had fresh in his memory his initial encounter with Lichtenstein's art. In a graphic recounting of this experience in 1969, he likened it to "glugging a quart of quinine water followed by a Listerine chaser."[20] However, putting aside his personal preferences, and with a foretaste of the pragmatist principles he would later uphold, Kozloff considered that

> the solution of any artist's pictorial problem is dependent on his unique and individual temperament, not on any rigid principles or ideological imperatives . . . no one idea or the absence of it can be responsible for the success or failure of a work of art.[21]

Two interrelated ends were achieved by Kozloff's critique of "After Abstract Expressionism": it identified a common and characteristic feature of pop and associated art: a "disingenous [sic] drive towards expression in reverse gear";[22] it established the irrelevance of Greenberg's formalist theory to an art that actively worked against its ends. He did not, however, suggest a critical solution save to imply that a deflection of interest from the artist and his "message" to the spectator and his reception of it could provide a fruitful area of investigation.[23] In this, he anticipated his future: a phenomenological theorization of art.

In April of 1965, Kozloff delivered a paper at the 52nd Biennial Convention of The American Federation of Arts in Boston in which, and in response to the conference topic, "The Critic and the Visual Arts," Kozloff drew attention to an unforseen development in criticism: critical focus on criticism itself. He cited as evidence the spate of articles "by critics about criticism" since 1962 among which he counted his own refutation of Greenberg's stance, a reference to his previously discussed critique of Greenberg's "After Abstract Expressionism."

In his paper, Kozloff reiterated his perception of the inadequacy of prevailing critical modes to deal with the newer trends in art, specifically pop and its similarly anonymous counterpart in abstraction. These he saw as characterized by either fidelity to "optical data" or "evocative or poetic judgment," that is, those identified with Greenberg and Rosenberg, respectively. Though opposed, these critical methods had in common their incapacity to view art as an entity independent of "their own systems or ideologies."

In *Post Painterly Abstraction*, Greenberg aligned his formalist theories to contemporaneous abstraction, both its hard-edge and colour-field varieties, thereby ensuring, or attempting to ensure, their continuing relevance. In response, no doubt, to Greenberg's strategy, Kozloff focused his

critique on Frank Stella's *Die Fahne Hoch* (1959) rather than pop art.[24] Stella's work was a forerunner of minimalism. As had been previously the case with pop, this movement would provoke formalists, most notably Michael Fried, into further theorization of the formalist paradigm in order to accommodate new developments in art.[25] In an implicit reference to the reductionist premises of Greenberg's essentialist theory of modernism, in which "self-definition" – the aim of modernist painting – is achieved by "self-criticism," Kozloff made his most telling observation about Stella's work: "the more reductionist the visual material, the more conceptual is its nature. Far from becoming physically provocative [and, thus, amenable to formalist criticism] it becomes [in a "decidedly" dadaist fashion] rhetorically provocative."[26]

Quite apart from the failings of formalist criticism or, as Kozloff referred to it, "abstractionist theory," with regard to abstract art there was the issue of its failure to account for "Warholism," a feature of both the abstract and figurative aspects of current art. Kozloff defined "Warholism" as "a new movement of the sensibility," one that was intended to nullify

> the critic, with his baggage of lunatic distinctions, judgments, significant and insignificant forms, "second guesses," killing doubts, museum mentality – pack him off to look for "motifs" in comic strips and half the battle is won.[27]

This development, termed "anti-humanist" by Kozloff, could only be comprehended as well as given relevance from the perspective of a fresh critical approach.[28] Kozloff cited the proposal made by Susan Sontag in her celebrated essay "Against Interpretation" published in December of the year prior to the delivery of Kozloff's paper. This concerned the critic's dispensing with attempts to interpret modern art on the grounds that both its pop-figurative and abstract streams are, clearly, engaged in a "flight from interpretation."[29] In his view, one that failed to consider Sontag's case for "silencing" the critic, Sontag, far from solving the problem, only poses it.[30]

At this juncture of his paper, Kozloff proposed an "intentionalist" criticism as a way of coping with Warholism. More significant, in his opinion, than evaluation of a work in which "the categories of good and bad, the indifferent and the committed" are deliberately flouted was discussion about its "processes and intentions as they affect our experience or change our world." Kozloff acknowledged that the intentionalist approach in literary criticism was regarded as a "fallacy" on the grounds that "knowledge of intention" could only partially explain the work. It was incapable, for example, of either accounting for its "emotions" or measuring the merit of its

"statement." At the same time, he defended his adaptation of the intentionalist approach to art-critical ends, those concerning the establishment of some determinate standard for Warholistic art, on the grounds that literary critics did not have to deal with a fresh manifestation of "anti-humanism" (i.e., "Warholism") in their discipline.[31]

As Donald Kuspit has pointed out, Kozloff refers here to the "intentional fallacy," as explained by W. K. Wimsatt, Jr. and Monroe C. Beardsley[32] in "The Intentional Fallacy," first published in 1946.[33] In their essay Wimsatt and Beardsley establish what they mean by "intention" prior to arguing a case *against* an intentionalist methodology: Intention

> corresponds to *what he* [the author] *intended* in a formula which more or less explicitly has had wide acceptance. "In order to judge the poet's performance, we must know *what he intended.*"[34] Intention is design or plan in the author's mind. Intention has obvious affinities for the author's attitude toward his work, the way he felt, what made him write.[35]

Indicating some independence from either Wimsatt's and Beardsley's concept of authorial intention or, for that matter, any other known to him, Kozloff made it clear that he intended to use the term in both a definite and distinctive manner. He distinguished artistic intention from the artist's "unconscious desires," "public statements," or, for that matter, from the impact of his work, while claiming that these same features will constitute the material from which an idea of artistic intention can be crafted. On slightly firmer ground, he identified the means of uncovering artistic intention as that of subjecting the work to a detailed physical examination with the aim of arriving at its "organizing concept." The critic will achieve this desired level of awareness only by subjecting his visual reaction to the work to constant checks. In the case of the enduring contrasts fundamental to art, it involves determining whether these are in fact calculated or mere "inconsistencies and contradictions."

The question, however, must be posed, "Why would Kozloff aim to uncover the authorial intention of Warholistic work given his recognition of and, to some extent, agreement with the discredited status of the intentionalist measure? One possible answer is that in the face of this art's systematic blurring of the "categories of good and bad, the indifferent and the committed,"[36] gauging the legitimacy of his interpretations – regardless of how inconclusive his demonstration of their legitimacy may be – is the only possible path left open to the critic.[37]

This line of argument is illuminated by the American literary critic E. D. Hirsch's defence of authorial intention – as it relates to the reasonable

conviction "that a text means what its author meant"[38] – as a means of assessing the validity of interpretation. In *Validity in Interpretation*, published in 1967, Hirsch distinguished between the "meaning of the text" and the significance of this meaning "to the author": "*Meaning* is that which is represented by the text; it is what the signs represent. *Significance*, on the other hand, names a relationship between that meaning and a person, or a concept, or a situation." Hirsch made the further observation that, over time, authors alter their outlook, sentiments, beliefs and standards of value. It is not the meaning of the work that undergoes change but, rather, the author's "relationship to that meaning."[39] Hirsch's precise definition of "meaning of the text," if applied to art, means that the recovery of meaning, and thus authorial intention, of a Warholistic work presents no greater challenge than of any other.

Kozloff's conception of the role and nature of judgment in his proposed intentionalist criticism is, also, clarified by Hirsch. Evaluation, in Kozloff's opinion, should be secondary to elucidation of "processes and intentions." It should concern "the choice of what is elucidated, and how it is subsequently modified by the critical piece *per se*."[40] Kozloff implies, or partly implies, in this statement that judgment cannot be made without (a) establishing authorial intention and (b) being related to authorial intention. Of relevance is Hirsch's distinction between "understanding" and "judgment" as well as his specific definition of "judgment." Hirsch defined "understanding" as an interpretation "of the author's verbal meaning." Judgment is reserved for the activity by which we recognize "significance." Significance of the text's meaning, for example, concerns its affiliation to us, to the past and to the author's distinctive character. Judgment, however, while encompassing "value judgments," also includes those of a "descriptive" order. Hirsch regarded this more inclusive employment of the term as sanctioned by logic: judgment is the securing "of any two relata" by a type of link that determines the association. Seen in this manner: the evaluative act results in the clarification of this bond, "whether it be that between a meaning and criteria of value or between a meaning and anything else imaginable."[41]

Given that Kozloff's establishment of authorial intention (or, as he referred to it, "artistic intention") concerned his acquaintance with "the organizing concept" of the work, one that he arrived at by a questioning of what he was seeing,[42] his conception of the same bears some relation to Hirsch's understanding of the author as imaginatively reconstructed by the interpreter. Hirsch explained that the interpreter's main mission is that of reproducing "in himself" the author's mind-set, the "verificative principle"

of which is the "imaginative reconstruction of the speaking subject." He explained that the "speaking subject" is not the same as "the subjectivity of the author as an actual historical person" but, rather, corresponds to that circumscribed, if important, "'part'" of the author's subjectivity which "determines . . . verbal meaning."[43]

Hirsch's argument relies upon his understanding of verbal meaning as an important category "of intentional object." His use of intention, however, is distinct from its use in literary criticism to refer to an aspiration that may not be achieved by the "writer" and thus to the "intentional fallacy." He used it, instead, in the manner of the Austrian philosopher Edmund Husserl as "a process of consciousness."[44] In this sense, it relates to a central premise of Husserl's epistemological phenomenology: the intentionality of consciousness. Husserl's epistemological phenomenology was oriented to studying "everything as it appears to the conscious mind, as an intentional content," in other words "as directed to some item or goal."[45] "Intention," as employed by Husserl, thus refers to the "relation between an act of awareness and its object."[46]

Indebted to Husserl's concept of intentionality, more specifically as it informs Husserl's *Logische Untersuchungen: Zweiter Band. Untersuchengen zur Phänomenologie und Theorie der Erkenntnis*, *I Teil*, Hirsch equated "intentional objects" (i.e., the phenomena of consciousness as opposed to the phenomena of things[47]), "the object as perceived by me," with meaning.[48] Verbal meaning, as previously stated, he defined as a particular category "of intentional object," its most notable feature being its "supra-personal character." It is "*that aspect of a speaker's 'intention' which, under linguistic conventions, may be shared by others.*"[49] In further exposition of Husserl's idea of verbal meaning, Hirsch noted that it is unvarying as well as "interpersonal" and may be replicated by the intellectual processes of individuals. It is, however, also historical in the sense that each "verbal utterance, written or spoken, is historically determined . . . the meaning is determined once and for all by the character of the speaker's intention."[50]

Hirsch's emphasis on the interpreter's role in the imaginative construction of the "speaking subject" is, broadly, similar to Sarah Lawall's account of activities of the Geneva School of criticism. Central to her account is the School's development of "a coherent philosophy of literary existentialism," one inspired by philosophical works of existentialist phenomenologists such as Merleau-Ponty, Sartre, and Heidegger as well as those by the existentialist Kierkegaard and the epistemological phenomenologist Husserl. The critic most relevant to this development is Georges Poulet and critics

influenced by him such as Jean-Pierre Richard, Jean Rousset, Jean Starobinksi, and the American critic and academic, J. Hillis Miller.[51]

Exponents of the "criticism of consciousness" (Georges Poulet's initial description of "literary existentialism") considered that literature is "an act [the "author's" act of consciousness], not an object," in which "human experience takes shape in literature."[52] The reader's task is that of re-creating "the experience [the "original creative experience"] embodied in the text." In order to do so, he "must develop a systematically empathetic approach" in which "his own subjective personality" must be subordinate to the "new subjective identity which is gradually created and revealed in the course of the book." He must "accept as orienting indications the book's attitudes and expressions" as a means of locating himself in the text's genesis: "the existential space of the [author's] mind." Because the reader's task is only that of "extracting the work's original creative experience," he cannot impose external forms of judgment upon it, be they "aesthetic, formal, or evaluative." This "implied being," the "created 'existent'" who gradually assumes form as the text is created is not to be confused with the "historical author" who "gives birth to the text, but only by lending his skill in writing so that the book may take form."[53] This can be distinguished from Hirsch's approach in which the "speaking subject," that imaginatively constructed by the interpreter, is part "of the author's [including the historical author's] total subjectivity."[54]

Lawall stressed that the critics of consciousness, while influenced by existentialist philosophy, developed a philosophy of literary existentialism. Unlike Hirsch, she was wary, in principle, of applying the findings of linguistic analysis – either that of the "scholars" or of the "philosophers of language" – to literature with its particular problems.[55] She acknowledged, however, some affinity between Merleau-Ponty's "originating speech," which, in a manner consistent with Merleau-Ponty's existential phenomenological search for the foundations of existence, "takes Husserl's rooting of linguistic expressions in lived experience to its founding level in the perceptual or prereflective experience,"[56] and "the Geneva School's idea of an author incarnate in speech."[57]

Hirsch and Lawall shared the belief that authorial consciousness (and authorial intent, as it concerns the intentionality of consciousness) is embodied in the text and that it can only be realized by the reader's response to that text as it concerns either imaginative construction (Hirsch) or empathetic re-creation (Lawall) of the author. They thus complied with a further literary theorist, Wolfgang Iser's understanding of the phenomenological theory of art as that in which equal emphasis is placed on the factual

text and the behaviour implicated in reacting to the text. He regarded this as acknowledgment that "the reading of every literary work" involves reciprocal action "between its structure and its recipient." Because the work is more than either "the reality of the text" or "the subjectivity of the reader," Iser described it as "virtual" in nature. Because the text is virtual it is also dynamic: in experiencing the different attitudes presented by the text and in forming connections between the various concepts and arrangements, the reader "sets the work in motion and so sets himself in motion, too."[58]

As the work, in virtual terms, is located "between text and reader" and as its realization is brought about by the mutual action of both, Iser considered that there is no point in focusing solely "on either the author's techniques [the artistic pole] or the reader's psychology [the aesthetic pole]." Separate analysis of each extremity would only yield something of value if the bond "were that of transmitter and receiver," that is, that which would ensure a "a common code" and thus one directional-meaning and "accurate communication." In Iser's view, however, literary works, as distinct from signs in which the transmitter and receiver share a common code, transmit the message in two directions: "the reader 'receives' it by composing it."[59]

Iser, as a member of the Konstanz school, explored an area of literary theory known as "reader-response aesthetics."[60] Whereas Hirsch's and Lawall's analysis of the text focused on the incarnate or implied author, as distinct from the empirical author, that of Iser focused on the "implied [as opposed to empirical] reader." Iser explained it as a "textual structure," the concept of which "prestructures the role to be assumed by each recipient." Indicating the relevance of this concept to "Warholism," a strategy calculated to invalidate the critic, Iser claimed that this is still the case when texts seem to intentionally overlook or debar their potential recipient.

Iser's concept of the "implied reader" has two aspects: the reader's function "as a textual structure"; the reader's function "as a structured act." Regarding the first of these, three components constitute the prestructured role of reader. First, various "perspectives" epitomized by the text, those that delineate the author's point of view. Second, "the vantage point from which he joins them together," that is, a particular "standpoint" brought about by the text. Third, the meeting point where they converge: the import of the text, which can only be received, or, at least, received with clarity, if it is envisaged "from a standpoint."

Both aspects of Iser's concept of the "implied reader" (i.e., "textual structure" and "structured act") are, necessarily, interrelated as the

reader's function "as a textual structure" will not be realized until it gives rise to "structured acts in the reader." Iser explained that the site where these textual perspectives finally meet, while "given," is "not linguistically formulated," but, instead, must be "imagined." It is thus part of the "ideational activity" of the reader. Briefly explained, "the structure of the text" triggers off a chain "of mental images" that culminate in "the text translating itself into the reader's consciousness."

Finally, there is the issue of the reader's "two selves," those comprising the real and the implied reader. Iser explained that the function assigned by the text will be the most compelling; however, any understanding of it can only take place within the distinctive context of the reader's individual frame of mind. The "content" of the mental images set off by the structure of the text will be influenced to a significant extent by the reader's prevailing fund of "experience." Therefore, the reader's role varies with "historical or individual circumstances" and each "actualization . . . represents a selective realization of the implied reader." In summary, Iser's "implied reader" is explained by him as a way of identifying "the process whereby textual structures are transmuted through ideational activities into personal experiences."[61]

Consistent with these varied literary explorations of the phenomenological theory of art, Kozloff's proposed intentionalist criticism takes into account both the artistic and the aesthetic poles of the work. This is indicated by his declaration that only by examining "intention" is he able to decide upon the character of an art object and only by examining "intention" can he determine the conditions of communication between himself and the same object. Most probably, it also lies behind his understanding – one revealed by his response to Stella's *Die Fahne Hoch* – that the crucial relationship in a work occurs not among "forms on a surface" but, instead, between "itself as a complex event" and the viewer. Abstractionist theory, that is, of the formalist kind that holds that the crucial relationship is enacted by "forms on a surface," "imposes 'apartness' on the work of art [in Lawall's terms, it imposes an external judgment upon it], rather than allowing us to discover it personally for ourselves."[62]

In 1974, Donald Kuspit published an article entitled "A Phenomenological Approach to Artistic Intention," in which, as the title suggests, artistic intention is theorized in phenomenological terms, in particular, those of Husserl's epistemological phenomenology that relate to the intentionality of consciousness and the phenomenological reduction or *epoché*.[63] Part of Kuspit's lengthy article is devoted to a critique of Kozloff's intentionalist criticism, as proposed in the re-publication of Kozloff's paper, under the

title “Critical Schizophrenia and the Intentionalist Method,” in *Renderings* (1968). During its course, and in reference to Kozloff’s questioning of what *he* is seeing and, by these means, examine intention,[64] Kuspit claimed that Kozloff was inquiring not of artistic intention but, rather, of his own:

> “Contrasts, deliberate oppositions, dramatic tensions, clever paradoxes, or just plain inconsistencies and contradictions” . . . are part of his style of seeing and consciousness of art, signifying his intention toward it.[65]

He further observed that Warhol works “exist precisely in terms of the uncertainties and ambiguities of Kozloff’s question.” When confronted by them, the spectator “can no longer take for granted that he is seeing and attending to ‘art’ let alone that there is a unique logic – an unequivocal ‘organizing concept’ – to its execution.” The Warhol artist, however, “does the critic a moral and existential favor by . . . forcing him back upon his intentional consciousness of art, by forcing him to determine what attitudes he brings to his seeing.”[66]

Kuspit’s analysis, essentially, follows the logic of Warholism: because Warholistic works “have no clear ‘organizing concept or integrity’”[67] they “put the immediate burden of the work on the critic” and “necessitate his becoming conscious of his attitude.” Kuspit is guilty, however, of overstating the case. Kozloff’s bid to establish the “organizing concept” of the work was not allied with any expectation of establishing an “unequivocal” one or, for that matter, a “unique logic.”[68] Kozloff asked himself, for example, whether he was seeing “just plain inconsistencies and contradictions.”[69]

The aims of Kuspit’s analysis of Kozloff’s intentionalist method and those of this study follow different courses. Kuspit engaged in a critique of Kozloff’s intentionalist method in terms that, while drawn from Husserl’s epistemological phenomenology, were largely dictated by him. This study aims at a more contextually oriented analysis. It attempts the difficult task of establishing the significance “intention” held for Kozloff. Of relevance, then, is Kuspit’s acute observation that Kozloff “undertakes the search for intention more on emotional than intellectual grounds, partly accounting for his inability to understand the logic of intentionality.”[70]

The findings of this study are that in Kozloff’s proposed methodology there is an overlap and an unclear amalgam of two associations of the term “intentionalist criticism”: phenomenological philosophy; literary criticism, that directed by phenomenological and non-phenomenological precepts. Regarding the first of these, Kozloff’s adherence to the phenomenological precept of the intentionality of consciousness as it relates to “the mutual

shaping of subject and object"[71] was responsible for his insistence on considering both the work and the spectator's consciousness of it or, alternatively, the artistic and the aesthetic poles of the experience. As it concerned literary criticism, Kozloff sought to establish the intention of the artist – that is, his design or purpose – however, only as it was arrived at by "awareness of the organizing concept" of the work, one that was "based upon a visual response," that is, confined to the viewing experience. This would suggest a closer relationship with the consciousness of Hirsch and Lawall's incarnate author rather than with the consciousness of Wimsatt and Beardsley's empirical or historical author.

Kuspit did place Kozloff's proposal for an intentionalist criticism in the context of contemporaneous criticism, seeing it as a reaction to the shortcomings of existing critical criteria, those of both "formalist" and "evocative" criticism that could not view the novel manifestations in art represented by pop and its counterpart in abstraction[72] distinct from their own systems or ideologies. He did not, however, add the important point that Kozloff saw the form of intentionalist criticism envisaged by him as a means of making judgment relevant to each work as well as to each experience of a work inasmuch as judgment must be related to artistic intention, the intention that revealed itself in the experiencing of the work.

In a postscript to the re-publication of this paper in *Renderings*, Kozloff conceded that given the emphasis placed on the idea of "intention" in this study, he had not explored it sufficiently. While he was critical of his own intentionalist proposal, particularly its disregard for evaluation, he was equally critical of its shortcomings as a critical model in general, his objection centring on the difficulty in amassing sufficient evidence to reconstruct artistic intent, or, indeed, worth of intent made explicit.[73] Kozloff's objections to the intentionalist method, at this later time, were similar to those of Wimsatt and Beardsley, critics of the intentionalist method: "The design or intention of the author is neither available nor desirable as a standard for judging the success of a work of literary art."[74] As with these authors, Kozloff had in mind the "intent" of the empirical creator (in Kozloff's case, the artist), as it concerned his purposes or designs. This is despite the fact that Kozloff's attempt at arriving at the "organizing concept" of the work demonstrates a closer affinity with "intentionality" in the phenomenological sense, that is as it concerns the intentionality of consciousness and as it forms a central tenet of both phenomenology and associated literary theory. In the case of Hirsch's and Lawall's respective literary theories, the text is regarded as an act of consciousness and focus is placed on construction (Hirsch) or re-creation (Lawall) of the incarnate or implied

author by means of the aesthetic activity of the interpreter (Hirsch) or reader (Lawall).

On 29 November 1965, some seven months after delivering his paper at the 52nd Biennial Convention of the American Federation of Arts in Boston, Kozloff gave a lecture at Bennington College, Vermont, a revised version of which was published in March of the following year under the title "The Inert and the Frenetic."[75] In this, Kozloff raised issues concerning the character of sixties' art, similar to those he had addressed in the earlier paper: its encouragement of critical emphasis on the viewer's (rather than critic's on this occasion) experience; the need to find an appropriate classificatory approach to art whose meaning had become increasingly obscure, that is, presumably more Warholistic. Clearly inadequate for the task, in Kozloff's opinion, was that based on either major "mythic" contrasts such as "Apollonian-Dionysian, Classic-Romantic, Representational-Abstract" – those which dealt in irrelevant questions and fictitious dualities – or "technical terms" of comparatively definite meaning: "post-painterly, hard edge or soft edge, geometric or biomorphic."[76]

Kozloff's solution was a classification based on "the esthetic 'beat' of a work," that is, "how, figuratively speaking, we 'hear' the visual composition." The underlying hypothesis was explained by Kozloff in the following manner:

> There are units, "beats," which make up the perceptible visual or spatial accents by which the work appears to compose itself. Thus . . . the "tempo" is the rate of "speed" at which these beats occur. And the visual "rhythm" is the particular flow or pattern of beats existing at various tempi.[77]

While the quantifiable characteristics of "image, texture, or . . . pitch, timbre, registration, as well as shading, density, volume, and scale" assume the primary function, they all cut across "'beat'" as in the commonly understood case of the rhythmic use of colour. This "'sonic'" critical method refers more to the conventions directing the emotional experience of the work (its "animal state of excitation") than to those that communicate visual content. He cautioned, however, that the overall effect of the painting cannot be explained in this manner, citing the example of the varied meaning of the equally quick "Cubist Braque" and "Kandinsky improvisation," both from 1911.

In the present pluralistic period of art, "'tempi'" are either exaggeratedly fast or exaggeratedly slow so as to overshadow other pictorial features. Indicative of the work's compliance with current trends is the difficulty it

presents in following through its "rhythmic" purpose. Whereas in Abstract Expressionism the viewer's "experience" unfolds, enjoyably, in a "mimetic discovery of beat relationships," in current art "bodily empathy" is assailed and disconnected. Later in the essay, Kozloff made the related point that the "beat" now creates a "psychological" ploy that renders implausible facile deductions about the work's aesthetic meaning.

In classifying current art in accord with the criteria of "aesthetic beat," Kozloff discerned the co-existence of "idiomatic" opposites: the "inert" and the "frenetic." The "frenetic," a type of "hypermobility," is typified by pop and associated trends in art that are heir to surrealism. The "inert," "an immobility" approaching "paralysis," is typified by current abstraction, including minimal art. This he described as an exaggeration off the "ultra-stabilized" characteristics of "Constructivism and de Stijl."[78] Kozloff substantiated this alleged polarity with the visual evidence presented by numerous, if generalized, examples of sixties' art. In the case of pop art, "the Rosenquists . . . appear to be pictures composed only of other pictures, many pictures within one, all operating at different tempi and . . . with different rhythms."[79]

This "idiomatic" duality, if a feature of art at present, was one also of contemporary film, literature, and music and thus an argument against Greenberg's claims about the essentialist character of modernist art. In the case of literature, Robbe-Grillet, who as a practitioner of "*nouveau roman*" gives in "words" the (presumably denotative) information that would be more vividly described by "images," as well as Beckett, side with the "inert," whereas "picaresque, feverish authors like Barth, Borges, and Heller" take up the cause of the "frenetic."[80]

Having initiated a classification of sixties' art along the lines of the "inert" and the "frenetic," Kozloff, subsequently, undermined it by identifying works that clearly depart from the scheme. Among the examples cited were Warhol's multiples (e.g., the "Brillo boxes") and "serial image canvases," which, consistent with the "imagery and technique" of pop, communicate "multiple, limitless, standardized beats," devoid of both "discernible rhythm" and "tempo." In a further example, Claes Oldenburg, in his "magnifications and environments," illustrates pop art's potential for abstraction and inertia, as does Roy Lichtenstein in his "'ben-day' screened landscape paintings."[81] In an additional undermining of this proposed classificatory system, there are those artists who either consciously explore the potential of both categories or, alternatively, exceed them. He cited Roy Lichtenstein's most recent exhibition as the outstanding example of this dual approach. Obviously referring to Lichtenstein's *Brushstroke* series,[82]

he described it as "depicting the most juicy and violent, dripping and splattering 'action' paintstrokes in comic-strip style," a combination that "mockingly refrigerates the very ideogram of spontaneity."[83]

By examining "the aesthetic 'beat' of a work," Kozloff aimed at drawing attention to another aspect of the viewer's experience of art.[84] That this experience is still understood in phenomenological terms can be argued by recourse to the existential phenomenology of the French philosopher Maurice Merleau-Ponty. Fundamental to this is the concept of the "embodied *cogito*" in which, as James Miller explained, "the true subject of perception was not consciousness as such, but 'existence or being in the world through a body.'"[85] A central feature of this concept is rediscovery of a level of lived experience prior to reflection. Merleau-Ponty described this level, one "anterior to the ideas of subject and object," as "that primordial layer at which both things and ideas come into being."[86] Sensation occupied a prime place in Merleau-Ponty's account of fundamental originary experience. As Rosenthal and Bourgeois observed:

> It is through the sensible body in its sensing that the perceiver has a world. The sensing of the sensible body, as part of the world, reveals the world. . . . [The] focus on sensation clarifies . . . living relations obtaining between the perceiver and his body and the perceiver and the world.[87]

This emphasis on non-cognitive aspects of intentional acts is one that Merleau-Ponty shared with other existential phenomenologists such as Jean-Paul Sartre and Martin Heidegger.[88]

The "self-evident, but also neglected," aspect of the viewer's experience that Kozloff aimed to do "justice to" is, however, not only of a sensory but also of an intersensory nature. To reiterate, Kozloff wanted "to examine . . . the aesthetic 'beat' of the work; how, figuratively speaking, we 'hear' the visual composition."[89] Kozloff thus promoted the idea that while the experience of the work of art may privilege the sense of sight, the work of art is, in effect, an "intersensory object." This idea alluded to Merleau-Ponty's understanding of "the body as a system of intersensorial equivalences." He had in mind the "perceptual synthesis" that is "accomplished by the body rather than by thought."[90] It takes place "in the body anterior to the differentiation of the senses and their resynthesis on the level of reflected thought."[91] This "perceptual synthesis" is brought about by "the phenomenal body's gathering itself together in a unified intentionality and the establishment of the concrete . . . presence of the object" within "a single action."[92] Expressed another way, the "intersensoriality of the object . . . is a product of body teleology as it directs itself to an object."[93] The phenom-

enon by which the body brings about a perceptual synthesis is identified by Merleau-Ponty as "synergy." This he explained in the following manner:

> The senses interact in perception as the two eyes collaborate in vision. The sight of sounds or the hearing of colours come about in the same way as the unity of the gaze through the two eyes: in so far as my body is, not a collection of adjacent organs, but a synergic system, all the functions of which are exercised and linked together in the general action of being in the world, in so far as it is the congealed face of existence.[94]

Kozloff's recourse to phenomenological precepts as a means of responding to sixties' art, art whose Warholistic character forced a re-examination of the critical function, culminated in a paper he delivered at a symposium organized by the Poses Institute of Fine Arts, which was held at Brandeis University in 1967. The symposium topic was "Art Criticism in the Sixties." Kozloff's paper was one of four; the other three were delivered by formalist critics Michael Fried and Barbara Rose (whose allegiance to formalist theory by this stage was confined only to its ruling on quality) as well as the advocate of a return to realism, Sidney Tillim.

The intentionalist criticism that Kozloff had outlined in 1965 drew upon key concerns of phenomenology: the intentionality of consciousness and, consistent with this, the mutual intertwining of subject and object as opposed to their separation in Cartesian rationalism; the establishment of "a cognition that is absolutely certain"[95] by confining investigation to that which one was experientially sure.[96] In the paper delivered in 1967 Kozloff alluded not only to these aspects of phenomenology, but also to others: Edmund Husserl's concept of the transcendental ego as well as, if to a lesser degree, his distinction between the phenomenological and psychological examination of consciousness. Regarding the first and the most marked of these, in the opening stages of his paper Kozloff claimed that art criticism in the past has been a pretext for numerous unworthy practices. Included in the lengthy list that followed was reportage for the press, championing of "one's friends," judgment about what constitutes good art and formulation of aesthetic frameworks. Kozloff's objection to this situation was to its underlying cause: the critic's wariness "of himself, of his own ego." The inverse of this (presumably, trust of his own ego) was distinguished from the critic's elevation of self, one which Kozloff viewed as the consequence of his insistence that he remain detached from the work as opposed to abandoning himself to it and thus to "another man's imagination."

The affirmation of self that Kozloff had in mind was that borne of the critic's ability to see himself in the work and so to acknowledge "that

subject and object, of necessity, mutually shape each other." The question "of what to do with the self," was not one of "scholarship," the values of which are predicated on facts.[97] From a phenomenological perspective, this approach did not bracket "the 'natural standpoint,' which takes for granted normal perceptual experience and identifies reality with the ensemble of empirical 'facts.'"[98] Instead, the problem of self belonged to criticism in which the critic's "feeling" was distorted by either smothering "the work of art with theoretical structures" or by romancing "it away from verifiable consciousness."[99]

Kozloff alluded here to Edmund Husserl's concept of the "transcendental ego," that defended in the Author's Preface to the English edition of *Ideas*, first published in 1931, and outlined, most clearly, in *Cartesian Meditations*, published in the same year. According to Husserl: "The world . . . derives its whole sense and its existential status, which it has for me, from me myself, *from me as the transcendental Ego*, the Ego who comes to the fore only with transcendental-phenomenological epoché." Husserl explained that the "phenomenological Ego [i.e., the "*transcendental Ego*"] establishes himself as '*disinterested onlooker*,' above the naïvely interested Ego," that is, that "naturally immersed in" and "'*interested' in the world.*" This is brought about "by means of a new [both "transcendental" and disinterested] reflection,"[100] one that constitutes "an absolutely independent realm of direct experience,"[101] and is achieved by the previously explained bracketing or phenomenological reduction:

> The Ego's sole remaining interest . . . [is] to see and to describe adequately what he sees, purely as seen. . . . That signifies restriction to the pure data of transcendental reflection which therefore must be taken precisely as they are given in simple evidence, purely "intuitively," and always kept free from all interpretations that read into them more than is genuinely seen.[102]

Husserl posited, in effect, the "transcendental constitution of the world by the ego," and thus "a form of transcendental idealism."[103] However, he made clear that while "the being of the world 'transcends' consciousness . . . it is conscious life alone . . . which specifically, as world consciousness, bears within itself inseparably the sense: world – and indeed: 'this actually existing' world."[104] Husserl further observed: "Phenomenological explication does nothing but *explicate the sense this world has for us all, prior to any philosophizing*, and obviously gets solely from our experience – *a sense which philosophy can uncover but never alter.*"[105] Husserl, for whom consciousness is "at least functionally distinct from the body since

it 'constitutes' its own body as an object for itself," did not break with the mind-body duality of Cartesianism. His position can be distinguished from that of Merleau-Ponty who, in revealing "the indissoluble unity of such mind-body functions as . . . [for example] perception," presented the view "that the one self which is the subject of experience is not a pure consciousness but a completely unified body-mind whole."[106] It was this consciousness that Kozloff alluded to in "The Inert and the Frenetic," in which he classified sixties' art according to the bodily responses of the viewer.

Kozloff made further allusion to Husserl's transcendental ego and its "transcendental constitution of the world"[107] in his distinction between "detachment" (as it concerned the critic's attempt to discard [i.e., bracket] "prejudgments" and, consistent with this, "anti-advocacy" of critical theories[108]) and "neutrality." "Disengagement from ourselves," regardless of how flawed, Kozloff regarded as mandatory if the critic was to face up to the reality of the art work and so illuminate his claim "in the experience." Viewed in this manner, "responsible critics . . . will turn their own psychology into an object for their conscious reflection."[109] Apropos the last assertion, Kozloff implied the subjection of his observable mental processes – the realm "of the psychical" as opposed to that of "the spatio-temporal "[110] – to phenomenological reduction and, thus, transformation of them into "an absolutely independent [transcendental] realm of direct experience"[111] as well as certain knowledge.

A critical stance theorized by phenomenology, which sought to rid the experience of art from all presuppositions, was advanced by Kozloff with certain ends in mind. First, that of dispensing with judgmental criticism predicated on an "arbitrary hierarchy of values" and thus with the type of criticism responsible for the prolongation of outmoded concepts such as "the masterpiece." Second, that of acknowledging the demands of art most relevant to the critic's direct experience, thereby guaranteeing a new chapter in the reception of accomplished art of the past. In a veiled reference to the evaluative function of Greenberg's formalist criticism, Kozloff noted that "stereotypes like 'quality'" have become a feature of criticism because of the critic's need "to jump the gun on history, instead of being an organic part of it."[112]

Kozloff considered that the morals of criticism, as they concern his critical position of "anti-advocacy," one arrived at by becoming acutely sensitized to "the history of one's own moment," fuses "with epistemology – the study of what can be known." In his view, knowledge about works of art is always "relative," that is, shaped by "shifting states of mind" rather than "represented" by art objects *per se.*[113] Observations such as these are only

intelligible in terms of the phenomenological precept of the intentionality of consciousness. With reference to Husserl's concept of intentionality, as outlined in *Cartesian Meditations*, James Miller explained that it

> suggested that consciousness gained its element of intelligibility through a double relation, to the world of objects, which could appear under a variety of different aspects, and to the world of subjective acts, which could apprehend the world of objects in a number of different ways, and with different aims in mind. Husserl thus described a more or less stable structure of objectivity, grasped through the fluctuating relations of a dynamic subjectivity.[114]

While it is the critic's task to project and externalize the "shifting states of mind" that constitute "evidence" of the known, these are not "beyond verification." To illuminate this point, Kozloff called upon the English philosopher Weldon's distinction between levels of inquiry. Relevant to this discussion is his differentiation between "puzzles" and "problems." As Kozloff explained, the solution to puzzles lie in "terms of their own game-like contexts." Problems, however, encompass "the larger issues and general enigmas of life" for which there are no ultimate answers.[115]

Man's typical response to problems is to impose upon them "a *puzzle-like*" resolution, one that transforms ambiguities into certainties and thus truth. This is the case with art that, as Kozloff explained, is a problem when considered "existentially" and a puzzle when considered "practically and professionally." However, when art is treated as a puzzle, "the body of the critical piece and the soul of the judgment" exist side by side as opposed to (and in accord with phenomenological notions of intentionality) "arising from and mutually informing each other." He cited the example of formalist criticism that reduces works of art to either "inventories" or "their geometric" parts. Its elementary misunderstanding occurs because the puzzle, unlike the problem, can be viewed as "'external' to oneself."[116] Kozloff implies here that formalist criticism's fatal flaw, as with that of all other strands of sixties' criticism purported to be impartial, can be traced to its adherence to the subject-object dualism of Cartesianism in which the subject, as characterized by Patricia Waugh, assumes "the detached superiority of the scientist in relation to an inert object of investigation."[117] His alternative critical mode – pivotal on the phenomenological premise of the intertwining of subject and object – was conceived as a corrective to the failings of "'objective'" criticism because it invites "us to step out of ourselves and stay out."[118]

With its exploration of irrational aspects of the experience of art, such as the critic's "feeling," and its either implicit or explicit contrast of these aspects to the overly logical qualities of sixties' "'objective'" criticism, Kozloff's methodology suggests a closer identification with existential phenomenology than the epistemological phenomenology of Husserl. In this, attention is given "to those intentional acts which are not merely cognitive but also . . . are tied up with moods, emotions, and simple feelings."[119]

Kozloff termed the impulse to engage with "the human predicament," as critics' seized upon it "metaphorically in art," as the "final realism." He distanced this impulse from "sentimentalized" humanism, identifying it, instead, with "a self-interest" that accommodates without reserve the ambiguous as well as the "psychologically" foreign.[120] In agreement with the existential phenomenologist Jean-Paul Sartre, Kozloff held "that *existence* comes before *essence*" and that an understanding of subjectivity "must begin from the subjective."[121] This view can be contrasted with that characteristic of humanist discourses: belief in essential subjectivity. Classic liberal humanism, the dominant humanist discourse, for example, argues that man's essence is "rational consciousness."[122]

It was argued in the case of Rose that pragmatist criticism, in which questions concerning the worth of art were relevant only to the intention of the artist as manifest in the individual example, provided a strategy by which critics could avoid the situation in which his evaluations were used for extra-aesthetic ends, as in the case of the capitalist co-option of Greenberg's judgmental criticism. It was argued, also, that broad parallels could be traced between Rose's pragmatist criticism in this "prophetic" form and examples of post-structuralism, notably Foucault's, that critique the relationship between forms of knowledge predicated on foundationalist beliefs, and hegemonic (social, political, and economic) structures.

Kozloff touched on similar concerns when he equated the critic's refusal to distort his "own feeling," in the Husserlian phenomenological sense of confining himself to "reconfirmable descriptions of experience,"[123] with "professionalism" and the latter, in turn, with ethical concerns. He had in mind the critic's avoidance, as far as possible, of the contamination of his response by "knowledge" and, as part of this, his denial of "prejudgments." By these means, and over time, the "field of criticism" will be ridded of subterfuge, as in the case of the securing of self interest that is responsible for "devising power systems of which works of art are the pawns."[124] This, admittedly obscure, recourse to phenomenological precepts as a means of illuminating, and presumably avoiding, the relationship between art

criticism, and thus forms of knowledge, and systems of power was, however, short-lived. At the end of the decade, in response to the heightened mood of social and political unrest in America and amidst a profound questioning of the social and political responsibilities of the critic by critics, as outlined in the previous chapter, knowledge of this sort led Kozloff to reject *all* critical activity. Kozloff saw critics as “a breed made superfluous by the times” and their role of serving the “increasingly boutique mentality of Madison Avenue and downtown dealers” as no longer worthwhile.[125] Kozloff’s way out of this impasse, it would seem, was to write a revisionist, contextual history of post-war American art, including pop, in which its relationship to and indeed collusion with prevailing economic and political structures was traced.[126]

PART FOUR

“Cultural” Critics

7

Susan Sontag

Pop, the Aesthetics of Silence, and the New Sensibility

Susan Sontag's both public and highly successful career has encompassed the roles of cultural essayist, writer of fiction and, since 1969, filmmaker. It began in earnest in 1959 after her arrival in New York, the city of her birth, at the age of twenty-six. Armed with a B.A. from the University of Chicago (1952) and M.A.s in both English (1954) and Philosophy (1955) from Harvard, Sontag was fresh from further study in England (St. Anne's College, Oxford) and France (University of Paris) and, shortly thereafter, the dissolution of her youthful marriage to the eminent sociologist Philip Rieff. After an initial one-year stint as contributing editor of *Commentary*, Sontag supported herself by the combined proceeds of her writing, teaching posts, and grants, including those awarded by the Rockefeller Foundation in 1965 and the Guggenheim in the following year. The sixties, the inaugural phase of her writing career, proved to be highly productive; between 1962 and 1965, alone, Sontag produced some twenty-six essays and her first work of fiction, *The Benefactor*, while for the greater part of this period holding down a teaching position in the department of religion, Columbia University.[1]

In her capacity as a cultural essayist, Sontag wrote a number of articles on contemporary art during the sixties. Contemporary art was discussed in these in a both far-reaching and inter-disciplinary manner, one that was consistent with her friendship, contracted shortly after her arrival in New York, with Marcel Duchamp, John Cage, Merce Cunningham, and Jasper Johns.[2] It was discussed, also, in general terms; occasionally pop art was singled out for mention, however, only either generically, in reference to the movement as a whole, or in general reference to a particular artist's work. Sontag's "post-modernist" theorization of pop, as part of the broader categories of modern and contemporary art, overlapped at a number of points with that of "art" critics. Max Kozloff's formulation of the critical

approach of "anti-advocacy," as it concerned disconnecting the experience of art from all prior knowledge (to the extent that this is possible at all), was preceded and most probably influenced by Sontag's "Against Interpretation" (1964).[3] Sontag's essay, in which her call to silence the critic and thus justify in particular "modern" painting's (both pop and abstract art's) silencing of language, was argued on phenomenological, primarily existential phenomenological, grounds. In another example, Sontag's justification of contemporary art's break with the function and form of traditional art on the basis of the emergence of a unitary culture and corresponding "new sensibility," implies agreement with the "pragmatist" argument put forward by "social" critics: art's responsiveness to ever-shifting societal factors, those that in the twentieth century necessarily include industrialization, means that art itself transforms and on these grounds cannot be evaluated by timeless standards and absolute values.

Despite its diffuse nature, Sontag's criticism is of the utmost importance to the theorization of pop art during the sixties. As much as that of any art critic, it attempted to meet critical challenges posed by key issues of pop. These centred on pop's collapsing of distinctions both between and within cultural realms, its anonymity and its lack of "authorial presence" or a "centred sense of personal identity,"[4] evident in depersonalized technique, a minimal, if any, transformation of source material and obscure or "uninterpretable" "message."

This section will focus on two aspects of Sontag's interpretation of pop art's anonymity. The first, and more important of these concerns the silencing of language. Sontag tackled this issue in two ways: first she explored the aesthetics of silence; second, she justified the silencing, or, as Kozloff would have it, invalidation of the critic by "silent" art. Her inquiry into this matter was symptomatic of a major cultural shift that arose from the persistent questioning throughout the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries by thinkers as diverse as Nietzsche, Wittgenstein, and Heidegger. This concerned the relationship of language to experience, knowledge, and truth and, specifically, the terms in which it had been laid down by traditional or metaphysical philosophy. More immediately, it related to the widespread interest in the fields of art and criticism, primarily literary criticism in America during the sixties and early seventies, in the "aesthetics of silence."

Broad correspondences can be established between Sontag's silencing of language and the parallel, if more intellectually rigorous and ultimately more skeptical, development in France of post-structuralism, especially

in the form represented by Jacques Derrida's critique of logocentrism. Despite variations between the motivating impulse of Sontag's and post-structuralism's respective inquiries into language – in Sontag's case that of recovering a more "authentic" level of experience, one uncontaminated by the mediacy of language, and in post-structuralism's case that of establishing the impossibility of experience, as it concerns consciousness of experience, without the mediation of language – the two had much in common. Both had mutual sources, notably those of Heidegger and Nietzsche. Both resulted in a discrediting of rationality and its role in the formation of authoritative, totalizing systems of thought.

In this regard post-structuralism and the silencing of language, as interpreted by Sontag, belong to that form of post-modernism that centres on the critique of "Enlightenment-style reason" and its complicity with "authoritarian rationalism." In post-structuralism, this critique is undertaken by deconstructive strategies, strictly speaking those of Jaques Derrida that "expose and subvert the unarticulated presuppositions of metaphysical thought that, in remaining unexposed, maintain dominance within Western culture."[5] In the case of the silencing of language, and to the extent that Sontag theorized it primarily by means of existentialist phenomenology, including Heidegger's, it concerns the articulation of the relationship between "situatedness in the world" and a "non-conceptualising embodied language" in which distinctions between mind and body and subject and object are overcome. Cartesianism, the opposing theory of human consciousness, separates "subject and object as a rationalising consciousness shaping an inert material object." Patricia Waugh has explained the "Heideggerian mode" as an attempt to respect the specificity of objects and events "instead of [as in Cartesianism] reproducing them instrumentally through the conceptual categories of the subject."[6]

Sontag's case for silencing the language of both art and the critic, as it concerned his "project of interpretation," rested in no small measure on the need to promote sensory over intellectual experience. Apart from the blunting of the senses brought about by the mediacy of language, that which resulted from both its "fallenness" and inherent inadequacies, there was that brought about by the ills of modernity: the more virulent and exacerbated form of mediacy created by technological reproduction (or "simulacra"); the "sensory anesthesia" directly attributable to "enlightened reason"[7] as in the case, cited by Sontag after Max Weber, of "'bureaucratic rationalization.'"[8] In addition to these trans-national stimuli, there was the more pressing and more immediate one in the form of liberationist

tendencies of the American counter-culture during the 1960s.[9] This last reason, more than any other, provides some insight into the clear priority Sontag gave to sexuality in her aim of sensory recuperation.

The second explanation put forward by Sontag for the impersonal character of pop, on this occasion within the category of *contemporary* art, concerned the merging of "scientific" and "literary-artistic" cultures (and, following on from this, that of other cultural categories, e.g., art and non-art) under the impact of twentieth-century industrialization. The unitary culture effected in this manner had given rise to a "new sensibility," the site of which could be found in the non-literary forms of art that had drawn from science and technology. Accompanying these transformations in the form of art were transformations, also, in its function. No longer was art involved in the representation of and commentary upon material reality, but rather in the modification of consciousness and "programming of sensations." The latter function, as with one aspect of that of the silencing of language, sought to redress the sensory atrophy brought about by "enlightened reason" as it both fuelled and realized modernity's "progressive" ideals. Art concerned with the "programming of sensations" was not only a product of the merging of and thus de-differentiation between cultural realms, the "feelings" as opposed to intellectual responses generated by such art both bridged and rendered meaningless the hierarchizing oppositions within culture itself.[10]

Sontag's seminal critique of language is found in "Against Interpretation" (1964), the target of which was the language of the contemporary critic and, more specifically, his "project of interpretation." The need to silence the critic, Sontag considered as consequential to the continuing influence of "the Greek theory of art as mimesis or representation" on "Western consciousness of and reflection upon art." This led to the assumption "that a work of art *is* its content." It led, also, to the separation of "form" from "content," as well as the associated perception that form is secondary. The legacy of mimesis and its preoccupation with the reproduction of external reality she saw as persisting in the modern period despite the fact that the majority of artists and critics supported the view that art was "subjective expression."[11]

Patricia A. Deduck has explained that the mimetic theory of art, "which had prevailed from classical times," "did not simply imply a copying of life" in the sense of "photographic exactitude" but, rather, "as Aristotle proposed, art was imitative insofar as it was . . . constructed by the interpreting, shaping consciousness of the poet." It was, nonetheless, underpinned by the belief that reality resided "in the objective, external world, and art

was an imitation of this objective form."[12] Deduck's account of mimesis suggests support for David Michael Levin's contention that "beginning with the ancient Greeks, our Western culture has been dominated by an ocularcentric paradigm, a vision-generated, vision-centred interpretation of knowledge, truth, and reality."[13] This was voiced in the context of an introduction to a collection of essays that deal with modifications to the ocularcentric paradigm in the period known as "modernity" as well as "hostility" towards this paradigm on the part of twentieth-century French philosophy.[14] Martin Jay's contribution, as Levin explained, contends that "many French philosophers of this century," for example, Jean-Paul Sartre and Maurice Merleau-Ponty, "finding support . . . in the work of Husserl and Heidegger," have renounced the subject-object dualism of Cartesianism and thus a "'spectatorial and intellectualist epistemology based on a subjective self reflecting on an objective world exterior to it.'"[15] Sontag did not discuss these epistemological associations of mimesis, or, at least, not directly. That she was cognizant of them, however, must be granted as a given in the light of, and as shall shortly be explained, her main means of justifying art's silencing of the critic: a phenomenological (primarily, though not exclusively, existential phenomenological) view of human consciousness.

In terms of art at present, Sontag regarded interpretation as both inappropriate and irrelevant. Much of it is prompted "by a flight from interpretation" and, accordingly, employs strategies that are calculated to resist interpretation: parody and abstraction or that of the transformation of art into either decoration or "non-art." This is especially the case with "modern painting." Whereas the abstract stream evades interpretation by having no "content," pop art achieves the same end by employing one that is literal in the extreme, that is, "'so what it is.'"[16]

The prime mission of "Against Interpretation" is that of providing grounds for modern painting's demonstrated hostility towards interpretation. Ramifications of this hostility, however, extend beyond questions of art. Sontag described interpretation as "the revenge of the intellect upon the world." It impoverishes and depletes the (actual) world by constructing "a shadow world of 'meanings.'" Her proposed solution is one of rigorous inception: banish "all duplicates of . . . [the world] until we again experience more immediately what we have."[17]

Sontag's distinction between the world and the perceiver's interpretation of it constitutes the pivotal assumption of her essay and must, clearly, be placed in the context of phenomenology, if only its subjectivist and objectivist rudiments. Ilona Leki has explained the subjectivist component in the following manner: "No one sees the world as it is; rather . . .

consciousness of an object is always intentional; the object is always restructured by the perceiving mind." Hence, tragedy and absurdity (or, any other idealization) "exist not in the world but in the intentionality of the perceiver's gaze."[18] Maurice Merleau-Ponty, whose existential interpretation of phenomenology places emphasis on the body as "man's vehicle of 'being in the world,'"[19] provides some sense of the objectivist component of phenomenology in his description of it as "a philosophy for which the world is always 'already there' before reflection begins." Phenomenology he saw as aimed at recovering "a direct and primitive contact with the world, and endowing that contact with a philosophical status."[20] Only in Merleau-Ponty's terms can sense be made of Sontag's perception of the consequences of interpretation: turning "*the* world into *this* world."[21]

The influence of phenomenology on Sontag's critique of interpretation is consistent with the extensive philosophical knowledge she has demonstrated throughout her writings. Sohnya Sayres, her biographer has noted, as mentioned in the introduction to this section, Sontag's double M.A. degrees in English (1954) and Philosophy (1955) from Harvard. At Harvard, also, presumably in conjunction with her M.A., or, prior to this, after her initial enrolment as a Ph.D. candidate in philosophy,[22] she had considered writing on the clash between phenomenology and existentialism.[23]

This phenomenological influence was, nonetheless, most probably mediated by Alain Robbe-Grillet's theoretical essays on *nouveau roman.*[24] In the revised version of "Nathalie Sarraute and the novel" (1965), Sontag indicated knowledge of two of these: "On Several Dated Notions" and "Nature, Humanism, and Tragedy," from 1957 and 1958, respectively.[25] A further mediated source was Roland Barthes's essays on Robbe-Grillet, most probably "Objective Literature" (1954) and "The Last Word on Robbe-Grillet?" (1962).[26] It is highly likely that these are the essays that Sontag referred to in an amended version of "Against Interpretation" as among exemplary works that place emphasis on the form of art,[27] thus correcting the perception "that a work of art *is* its content."[28]

Barthes's and Robbe-Grillet's influence on Sontag's critique of interpretation is consistent with her first-hand exposure to French post-war culture. Supported by a grant from the American Academy of University Women, Sontag attended the University of Paris 1957–8 at which time, as Sayres noted, "Robbe-Grillet had finished *The Erasers* [1953], *The Voyager* [1955], *Jealousy* [1957] and had begun writing his essays on the new novel." Sayres saw Sontag's "modernism" as "fused from two cultures," the most important of which drew "from the postwar years in France." The lesser influence she identified as that of the New York intelligentsia, which she

experienced after commencing her career as a writer in New York in 1959.[29] Authority is given to Sayres's claim by the number of contributors to French post-war culture, among those cited by Sayres as an influence on Sontag, that are either discussed within or form the main subject of essays written by Sontag during the sixties. Prominent examples include "Godard" (1968), "Spiritual Style in the Films of Robert Bresson" (1964), and "'Thinking Against Oneself': Reflections on Cioran" (1967). At a later stage, Sontag edited a collection of Roland Barthes's writings, *A Barthes Reader*, for which she produced a substantial thirty-page introduction.[30]

The clearest indication of Robbe-Grillet's phenomenological theorization of *nouveau roman* is given in his essay "A Future for the Novel" (1956). In a spirit similar to Merleau-Ponty's belief that the "world is always 'already there' before reflection begins,"[31] Robbe-Grillet claimed that "since it is chiefly in its presence that the world's reality resides, our task is now to create a literature which takes that presence into account."[32] The proposed form, one consistent with Husserl's strategy of "bracketing" or "phenomenological reduction," was that in which the presence of "objects and gestures" should "prevail over whatever explanatory theory that may try to enclose them in a system of references, whether emotional, sociological, Freudian or metaphysical."[33]

A phenomenological interpretation of Robbe-Grillet's fictional (i.e., *nouveau roman*) writing was undertaken by Roland Barthes in the two previously mentioned essays: "Objective Literature" (1954) and "The Last Word on Robbe-Grillet?" (1962). In the earlier of these, written after the publication of Robbe-Grillet's *Les Gommes* in 1953, he argued that "the author's entire art is to give the object a *Dasein*, a 'being-there,' and to strip it of 'being-something.'"[34] He thus adopted an interpretive model based on Heidegger's existential phenomenology, one that, on the basis of remarks made by Robbe-Grillet in relation to Samuel Beckett's *Waiting for Godot*, he suggested was a conscious influence upon him.[35]

Heidegger used *Dasein* to refer to the human condition. As George Steiner explains:

> *Dasein* is "to be there" (*da-sein*), and "there" is the world: the concrete, literal, actual, daily world. To be human is to be immersed, implanted, rooted in the earth, in the quotidian matter-of-factness of the world. . . . The world *is* . . . We are in it. Totally.[36]

Heidegger's phenomenology is concerned with "*fundamental ontology*, from which . . . all other ontologies originate." Fundamental ontology "must be sought in the *existential analysis* [i.e., analysis of "the

constitution of being of the being that exists"] *of Dasein.*"[37] Barthes, however, used *Dasein* to refer to Robbe-Grillet's treatment of objects in the literary text. His writing, Barthes observed, is the opposite of poetic writing, "it remains on the surface of the object and inspects it impartially, without favoring any particular quality."[38] Maurice Friedman has traced the use of *Dasein* by Heidegger to that of everyday German in which "it tends . . . to stand for the kind of Being that belongs to *persons.*"[39] Barthes, in his interpretation of Robbe-Grillet's literary treatment of the object, used *Dasein* in the manner of traditional German philosophy: "to stand for almost any kind of Being or 'existence' which one can say that something *has.*"[40]

In "The Last Word on Robbe-Grillet?" (1962), Barthes established a further link between Robbe-Grillet and Heidegger in Robbe-Grillet's "'technique'" which he claimed "at a certain moment" was

> radical: the moment when the author believed it was possible to "kill" meaning directly ["description" being the main strategy], so that the work let pass only the fundamental astonishment which constitutes it (for to write is not to affirm, it is to be astonished).[41]

Steiner defined "astonishment," as the term is associated with Heidegger's fundamental ontology, as "a disposition . . . in which and for which the Being of being unfolds." Barthes thus equated Robbe-Grillet's act of writing with Heidegger's belief that "to be is 'to speak being,'"[42] that is "being lives essentially in and through language."

Barthes considered that the "originality" of Robbe-Grillet's enterprise derived "from the fact that the question [the implied one of "what is 'is'?"] was not supplied with false answers."[43] He so suggested that Robbe-Grillet broke away from the limitations of conventional language and alluded to Heidegger's attempt to pose "what is 'is'?" "nakedly," in a manner that has not been done in "Western thought since the pre-Socratics and that Western systematic philosophy has . . . done everything to conceal." Steiner refers, here, to the limitations of human speech caused by such factors as the demands of "conventional logic" and "rational grammar" that precludes it from giving "an answer that simultaneously *answers to* . . . the nature of the question, *and* satisfies normal criteria of intelligibility."[44]

In the later essay, Barthes acknowledged, however, that Robbe-Grillet was mistaken in his assumption "that there is a *Dasein* of things, antecedent to and exterior to language" (impossible in Heidegger's terms).[45] This he equated with "literary realism," which he termed "a certain way of *copying* reality [i.e., as concerned with mimesis] . . . as if reality were antecedent to language and the latter's task were somehow to pursue the for-

mer until it had caught up." Robbe-Grillet's realism maintains the tenets of traditional literary-realism inasmuch as "it is based on a relation of analogy (the slice of tomato described by Robbe-Grillet resembles a real slice of tomato)." However, it is innovative to the extent that "this analogy refers to no transcendence" but is "satisfied when it has . . . designated the notorious *Dasein* (being-there) of the object" (i.e., the slice of tomato refers to nothing other than its external appearance). Robbe-Grillet's objects, including the tomato of *Les Gommes*, Barthes observed, engage both the "anecdote" and its "characters" in a "silence of signification."[46] By these means Robbe-Grillet espoused the phenomenological position that "meaning did not exist without man, that objects in themselves carried no hidden significance."[47] Whereas *nouveau roman*, or, at least, *nouveau roman* as understood by both Barthes and Leki, stopped short of the radical post-structuralist position that "language determines what is (thought to be) known," it must be regarded as a proto-consciousness of post-structuralism's critique of the view that language served "as the medium through which knowledge independent of language is publicly expressed."[48]

Sontag qualified interpretation as a deliberate intellectual operation which demonstrates definite "'rules' of interpretation." Its "modern" method aims at demolishing the "text" in order to unearth the authentic text: the "sub-text" that lies beneath. The "modern" creeds (i.e., "metanarratives") of Freud and Marx are nothing more than intricate interpretive perspectives. In the case of Freud, "observable phenomena are bracketed . . . as *manifest content*," which must be investigated and then discarded if the authentic meaning – the "*latent content*" – is to be revealed. For Marx, "social" incidents, and for Freud, incidents in the lives of individuals as well as "texts," are meaningful only when interpreted, an act which, in Sontag's view, "restate[s] the phenomenon."[49]

Her analogy between the process of interpretation and excavation had been previously employed by Roland Barthes in "Objective Literature." Portending Sontag's binarism of "text" and "sub-text" by that of "surface" and "depth," Barthes likened the traditional novelist's role to that of the archaeologist and his mission of excavation or mining out, one that stemmed from the novel's conception "as the experience of a depth: a social depth with Balzac and Zola, a 'psychological' depth with Flaubert."[50]

By use of the term "bracketed," Sontag refers to the methodology formulated by the epistemological phenomenologist Edmund Husserl and known as "the phenomenological reduction or *epoché*." This was aimed at ensuring that the nature of essences (i.e., that which makes "a thing 'what it is'") and essential truths (i.e., "Propositions that take essences as their

subject-matter") could be described "without dealing with the ontology of universals."[51] It is the latter situation, as it concerned the "myth of human essence," that is the province of the traditional novelist and that directed his "endoscopic function." Consistent with phenomenology and its employment of the *epoché* as a means of avoiding universal essences, Robbe-Grillet's "endeavor," according to Barthes,

> seeks to establish the novel on the surface: interiority is put in parentheses; objects, spaces, and man's circulation among them are promoted to the rank of subjects. The novel becomes a direct experience of man's surroundings, without this man's being able to fall back on a psychology, a metaphysic, or a psychoanalysis in order to approach the objective milieu he discovers.[52]

The term "bracketing" was deliberately mis-interpreted by Sontag in order to draw attention to the experience of the work – distorted, in phenomenological terms – when filtered through Freudian and Marxian or any other form of hermeneutics. Husserl advocated that one bracket "the natural standpoint," that is, "our belief in the independent existence of the world we see," to enable us to describe not "the world and its objects," but, rather, "consciousness and its objects."[53] Sontag, in effect, proposed that Marx and Freud have bracketed "observable phenomena" (in the phenomenological sense, "intentional objects or phenomena") in order to allow the presuppositions of interpretations imposed upon what we see to prevail. As Sontag observed: "To understand *is* to interpret. And to interpret is to restate the phenomenon."[54]

Sontag's suggestions for a non-interpretive form of criticism or "commentary" is indebted to the role accorded "description" in phenomenology. To the extent that phenomenology is aimed at recovering "direct and primitive contact with the world," the world which is already there, prior to reflection, it is, as Merleau-Ponty explained "a matter of describing, not of explaining or analysing."[55] Consistent with this view, in "A Future for the Novel" (1956) Robbe-Grillet prophesied that the favoured language of the future novel would be "the visual or descriptive adjective, the word that contents itself with measuring, locating, limiting, defining." Only language of this type would eradicate "depth" and ensure that "the *surface* of things has ceased to be . . . the mask of their heart, a sentiment that led to every kind of metaphysical transcendence."[56]

In her own attempt to formulate critical approaches that curtail interpretation, Sontag outlined two applications of description. First, the silencing of interpretation by comprehensive "descriptions of *form.*" Sontag

equated superior criticism with the type that disperses reflections on content into those on form.[57] She neither explained nor demonstrated how this was to be accomplished, preferring, instead, to allow cited examples, including Barthes's essays on Alain Robbe-Grillet,[58] to speak for themselves.

Unlike Sontag, Robbe-Grillet offered an argument against that "leaky old boat," the "academic opposition of form and content."[59] He explained that "the work of art contains nothing, in the strict sense of the term"; it is not "a gilt paper around a package of cookies." Instead, in envisaging a novel the writer is preoccupied with a particular mode of writing or style. Just as the painter gives form to his ideas by means of line and colour, the novelist does the same with the tools of writing, for example specific "vocabulary," "grammatical constructions" and "rhythms of sentences."[60]

Most probably, it is Robbe-Grillet's argument that Sontag had in mind. In "Nathalie Sarraute and the novel," Sontag, in reference to Robbe-Grillet's theoretical essays, including the source of the previously quoted passage, remarked upon the unfailingly clear manner in which he overturns the outworn opposition between form and content.[61] In "On Style," published in 1965, the same year as the amended version of "Nathalie Sarraute and the novel," Sontag attempted to bring together the issues of form and content by focusing on "style." She then described art as simply different methods of "stylized dehumanized representations" (a reference to the distance between art and the "lived reality" portrayed). Sontag claimed therefore an "organic relation between style ["which functions like the notion of form"] and content."[62]

In the second application, Sontag referred to examples of criticism that described the world's appearance in "loving" and "accurate" terms, those that exposed its "sensuous surface" but at the same time left it intact. Once again, Sontag was content to cite exemplary essays, in this case those dealing with film and literature.[63] Sontag's choice of adjectives such as "sensuous" and "loving" precludes identification of the descriptive response she advocated with reduction to either the strictly sensory or a single optical sense. Nonetheless, an analogy can be drawn between Sontag's promotion of description as a means of avoiding interpretation and Robbe-Grillet's nomination of sight as the "privileged sense." Only by granting a clear priority to sight could he ensure that the "object does not exist beyond its phenomenon"[64] and thus launch an attack on "the old myths of depth," that which, apropos humanism, clogs Nature with an "anthropomorphic vocabulary."[65]

It has been argued that Sontag's case against interpretation, and suggestions for the form of non-interpretive criticism or commentary that

would replace it, was influenced by both Robbe-Grillet's phenomenological theorization of *nouveau roman* and Barthes's phenomenological theorization of Robbe-Grillet's *nouveau roman.* Clearly, there is a correspondence between the figurative art of pop that frustrates interpretation by being "so 'what it is'" (in phenomenological terms, the "essence"[66] of the thing) and the revisionist realism of *nouveau roman* that presents the literary object independent of metaphorical associations. Sontag did not admit to this correspondence in "Against Interpretation," the focus of its argument being justification for silencing the critic. She did, however, in "The Aesthetics of Silence" (1967) in which, as the title of her essay makes explicit, she explored the ways in which "silent" art refuses formation of meaning and thus resists interpretation. In this essay, Andy Warhol's "silk-screen paintings and early films" and the phenomenological novels of Robbe-Grillet from the early part of his career, in which language's function is confined "to bare physical description and location," are cited as examples of "brutal nominalism," her term for a specific response to the "corruption of discourse."[67]

Sontag's identification of pop art and *nouveau roman*,[68] if only directly acknowledged in the later essay, was one that had previously been made in the infancy of the American pop art movement. This was before it was definitively labelled "pop" and before it was distinguished from a contemporaneous trend in France – *le nouveau réalisme* – which also focused on the common, mass-produced object and in a similar "factual" manner.

The *New Realists* exhibition, held at Sidney Janis Gallery 1 November–1 December 1962, and comprising painting and sculpture from France, England, Italy, Sweden, and the United States, encouraged precisely this understanding. Sidney Janis, in the catalogue that accompanied the exhibition, referred to the artists, generically, as the "new Factual artist." He recognized this term as having local variants: "the *Pop Artist* in England, the *Polymaterialist* in Italy, and here [in America] as in France, as the *New Realist.*" Alternatives to this last term included "*Commonists; New-Dadaists; Factualists; Artists of Pop Culture* and *Popular Realists.*" Janis's settling on "new realists" to describe the exhibits as well as to title the exhibition was, presumably, in recognition of both the alleged local currency of the term and, significantly, its theorization by largely French sources. These took the form of catalogue entries from Pierre Restany, the critic and co-founder, along with the artist Yves Klein, of *le nouveau réalisme* in France in 1960, and John Ashbery, the American critic who resided in Paris 1960–65, during which time he was employed as art critic on the Paris *Herald Tribune.* Janis described the new realist as

> a kind of urban folk artist. Living in New York, Paris, London, Rome, Stockholm, he finds his inspiration in urban culture. He is attracted to abundant everyday ideas and facts which he gathers, for example, from the street, the store counter, the amusement arcade or the home.[69]

Confirming this definition, the exhibits fell into a number of groups: the use of the readymade, inspiration from the mass media in the form of the "billboard, magazine, comic strip, daily newspaper" and the accumulation of either "painted or gathered" mass-produced objects. In the case of American exhibitors, the first category (the readymade) included Peter Agostini, Jim Dine, Claes Oldenburg, and George Segal. The second category (inspiration from the mass media) included Robert Indiana, Roy Lichtenstein, Harold Stevenson, Tom Wesselmann, and Andy Warhol, and therefore the greatest concentration of artists who, subsequently, became central figures in the New York chapter of American pop art. The third category (the accumulation of mass-produced objects) was left to Claes Oldenburg's and Wayne Thiebaud's depiction of food.[70]

Exhibits were confined to those produced in the sixties by artists who rose to prominence during that decade. The neo-dadaists Robert Rauschenberg and Jasper Johns were not represented, despite their placement in inclusive canons of pop such as Lawrence Alloway's, because, as Janis explained, their "techniques are less factual than they are poetic or expressionist."[71] Janis's insistence on the "factual" calls to mind that of Alain Robbe-Grillet: the presence of "objects and gestures" should "continue to prevail over whatever explanatory theory . . . may try to enclose them in a system of references.[72]

In the preface to the catalogue, and in reference to the new realists' literal treatment of the object, John Ashbery strengthened this association: "Today it is possible no longer to speak in metaphors, whereas in the twenties a poet such as Eliot could not evoke a gas-works without feeling obliged to call the whole history of human thought into play." He identified their treatment of the object with the "advanced stage of the struggle to determine the real nature of reality," and, specifically, with that represented by "the 'objective' [*nouveau roman*] novels of Robbe-Grillet and Sarraute, or the inportance [*sic*] of objects, especially artifacts, in the last films of Resnais and Antonioni."[73]

Excerpts from Pierre Restany's *A Metamorphosis in Nature* were reprinted in the catalogue to *New Realists*. These also stress the new realists' non-interpretive or "factual" depiction of the man-made world, one similar to *nouveau roman's* treatment of the literary object.[74] Part of the

Restany material had appeared previously, under the title "La Réalité Dépasse La Fiction," in the catalogue accompanying the exhibition *Le Nouveau Réalisme à Paris et à New York.* This was held at Rive Droite, 23 Fauborg Saint-Honoré-VIII, June 1960. In this particular essay, Restany distinguished between the European and American artists represented in the exhibition. The former group, which included Arman, Yves Klein, Jean Tinguely, Niki de Saint-Phalle, Raymond Hains, and Cesar, was described in the following manner: "*Plus rigoreux dans leur logique, plus simples et plus précis dans leur présentation, plus directement appropriatifs dans leur démarche, les européens, pour la plupart, demeurent à tous les sens du terme des 'nouveaux réalistes.'*" The American artists – Jasper Johns, Robert Rauschenberg, John Chamberlain, Richard Stankiewicz, and Lee Bontecou – all of whom came to prominence during the fifties (Bontecou's first solo exhibition had been held in 1959, at Gallery G, New York) – were characterized quite differently: "*Romantiques de coeur cubistes d'esprit et baroques de ton, plus disponibles aussi à la tentation surréalisante, ceux qu'on appelle déjà les 'néo-dadas' américains sont en train de reconstituer un fétchisme moderne de l'objet.*"[75]

Rauschenberg and Johns, as previously mentioned, were excluded from the *New Realists* exhibition because of their non-"factual" "techniques." As "the important directions of *Collage* and *Assemblage*" were not represented, a range of works absent also were the "assembled sculptures by Chamberlain and Stankiewicz."[76] All these artists had been represented in *Le Nouveau Réalisme à Paris à New York.* The differences that Restany had then perceived between the European and the American exhibitors – and thus between the European "nouveaux réalistes" and the American "neo-dadas" – were reaffirmed by the latter group's exclusion from *New Realists.*

The distinction made by the *New Realists* between neo-dada and pop art, on the basis of the association of the more "factual" qualities of the later group with the new realists (i.e., "nouveax réalistes") in France, anticipated the type of distinction that American critics would later make not only between neo-dada and pop artists but, in addition, between pop artists and other common-object artists of their generation. This is despite the fact that this distinction was made on quite different grounds and despite the fact that there was incomplete agreement as to where the categorical lines should be drawn.[77]

Notwithstanding the common phenomenological basis of Robbe-Grillet's and Barthes's theorization of *nouveau roman* and Sontag's theorization of pop and abstract painting's "flight from interpretation," and by

these means invalidation of the interpretive function of the critic, the critical tasks of Robbe-Grillet and Barthes, on the one hand, and Sontag, on the other, were not identical.

The immediate target of *nouveau roman*, or, at least, as identified by Robbe-Grillet, was the ideology inherent in the language of the traditional novel. According to Robbe-Grillet, the narrative of the traditional novel represents a "natural" order which is connected to a rational organizational scheme, the maturation of which coincides with the ascendancy of "the middle class." Its technical elements, such as methodical deployment "of the past tense and the third person," "chronological" ordering of events and movement of them "towards a conclusion," establishes an impression of a fixed, unending and unambiguous world, the meaning of which is totally determinable.[78] This ideology is dependant upon a particular notion of reality, one that, as already explained by Deduck, relates to the assumption underlying the mimetic theory of art: reality resides "in the objective, external world, and art was an imitation of this objective form."[79] This same assumption relates to a further non-phenomenological one concerning the relationship between the perceiving subject and his or her world. Robbe-Grillet, in reference to critics of his impoverishment "'of the old myths of depth'" claimed that the traditional novel was premised on the firm accord "between our mind and the world," art in this scheme of things being confined "to its 'natural,' reassuring role as mediator."[80] He alludes here to the "fantasy of a self-certain and guaranteed truth, a truth unmediated by anything extraneous [which] haunts Western knowledge"[81] and which underpins the spectatorial and intellectualist epistemology of Cartesianism. Elizabeth Grosz has termed the "impossible . . . ideal" upon which this "truth" is based "a prime *logocentric* presupposition."

> Logocentrism presumes that being, language, knowledge are self-evident, neutral and transparent terms. Being can be known and experienced in its immediacy; language transfers meaning neutrally without interfering in the underlying thoughts it "expresses"; knowledge undistortedly reflects reality in truthful representations.[82]

The second issue raised by Robbe-Grillet's critique of the traditional novel concerns its use of the "neutral and colourless" sign that, as in the case of Barthes's critique of the realist sign, "effaces its own status as a sign" and, hence, "*productive* character of language."[83] For Robbe-Grillet, the autonomy of modern art is not only a rejection of the philosophical basis of mimesis – that is, its postulation of the existence of a fixed and determinable reality – but, also, a means of subverting ideology, of escaping

from the "prisonhouse of language." Ideology, he wrote, "institutes a meaning which proclaims itself . . . the truth for ever." Modern art, presumably in recognition of the "transparence" of the realist sign, avoided this situation by drawing attention to its "artificiality."[84]

Sontag's characterization of pop's and abstract painting's destruction of language as a "flight from interpretation" is one that necessarily encompassed a flight also from ideology.[85] For Sontag, however, this issue was secondary in importance to the task of re-defining the critical role of the critic thus silenced. Sontag identified the characteristic predicament of present-day culture as "the hypertrophy of the intellect at the expense of energy and sensual capability." Accordingly, her critique of the critic's project of interpretation was conducted in the name of a comprehensive recuperation of the senses – those that have been further dulled by the circumstances "of modern [urban] life," notably its congestion and material abundance. Not only must we "learn to *see* more," but, also, "to *hear* more, to *feel* more." Rather than maximizing the content of a work of art, we must cut it back "so that we can see the thing at all." Criticism must aim at making the experience of art "more, rather than less, real." Its purpose "should be to show *how it is what it is*, even *that it is what it is*, rather than to show *what it means.*"[86]

One possible source of Sontag's plea for a recuperation of the senses was Nietzsche whose philosophy formed an interweaving strand of influence throughout Sontag's non-fictional work. Nietzsche made mention of the blunting of senses in musical appreciation that results from looking "for the sense, that is . . . what 'it means' and not 'what it is.'" Similarly, "certain painters have rendered the eye more intellectual, and have gone far beyond that which was formerly called pleasure in colour and form." This leads to a situation in which "the seat of pleasure is moved into the brain, the organs of the senses themselves become dulled and weak, the symbolical takes more and more the place of the actual – and thus we arrive at barbarism in this way as surely as in any other."[87]

Sontag's emphasis on sensory and thus bodily experience is consistent with the efforts of the existential phenomenologists to marry "consciousness" with "concrete worldly existence."[88] While these begin with Heidegger's understanding of man's fundamental condition as that of "Being-in-the-world," they culminate in Merleau-Ponty's concept of "bodily consciousness" or the "embodied *cogito.*" As explained in the previous chapter, Merleau-Ponty revealed the "indissoluble unity" of "body-mind functions," such as "perception." Unlike Husserl, for whom the subject of experience was "pure consciousness," in this maintaining the body-mind

dualism of Cartesianism, for Merleau-Ponty it was "a completely unified mind-body whole."[89] Merleau-Ponty took the view that the "body is our general medium for having a world"[90] and "it is through the sensible body in its sensing that the perceiver has a world."[91]

At the conclusion of "Against Interpretation," and thus to her guide to the existential phenomenological experience of art, Sontag gave clear priority to sexuality in her aim to reinstate bodily consciousness: "In the place of a hermeneutics we need an erotics of art."[92] Her understanding of both the unity of body-mind functions[93] and the status of sexuality in the sensing of the sensible body is illuminated by her essay "Psychoanalysis and Norman O. Brown's *Life Against Death*" (1961), written in response to the publication of a paperback edition of Norman O. Brown's *Life Against Death* (1959).

Sontag considered that, along with Marcuse's *Eros and Civilization* (1955), Brown's study had transformed Freudian theory from a type of treatment that reinforces people's "conflicts" by sending them back to their societal source into a universal thesis about "human nature."[94] Brown's achievement was to demonstrate the correspondence between "psychological" and "bodily" classifications. For him, psychoanalysis brings the promise of a restoration of unity "between the mind and the body: the transformation of the human ego into a body ego." According to Sontag after Brown, "we are nothing but body" and the crux "of human neurosis" is the inability of man to dwell in his body, "to live (that is, to be sexual) and to die."[95]

Sontag regarded Brown as critical, in particular, of those aspects of Freud which are descended from "the Platonic tradition of Western thought": polarity "of mind and body," evident, for example, in his ranking of sexuality below "sublimations in art, science, and culture"; his emphasis on "self-consciousness" as well as faith in its salutary worth. Contrary to these assumptions, Brown espoused a "Dionysian (or body) consciousness" as opposed to an "Apollonian (or sublimation) consciousness." To set the body and mind in opposition, in the manner of Apollo, and thus to segregate "self-consciousness" from bodily experience, is to engage in "the life-denying denial of death."

Sontag's obvious approval of Brown's espousal of a "Dionysian (or body) consciousness" was consistent with her own advocacy of existential phenomenology, specifically in the form assumed by Merleau-Ponty's "bodily consciousness." Her prime motivation for advancing this view, however, may be found less in European philosophy and more in the iconoclastic spirit of the American "counter-culture" of the 1960s and its call

for sexual liberation. In her review of Norman O. Brown's *Life Against Death*, Sontag observed that the paired topics "of eroticism and liberty," while those of serious and continuous contemplation in France since "Sade, Fourier, Cabanis, and Enfantin," are beginning only now in America to command similar attention.[96] Presumably, it is these same paired topics that Andreas Huyssen had in mind when he identified one aspect of Leslie Fiedler's post-modern argument as "genital enlightenment" and its localized relevance, one arising from the liberationist tendencies of the counterculture, as evidence of an American "avantgardist post-modernism of the 1960s," so-called because of its revitalization of the "European avantgarde" along "the Duchamp-Cage-Warhol axis."[97]

"Against Interpretation," it has been argued, has two interrelated aims: justification of the invalidation of the critic, or, at least, of his interpretive function, by modern art's silencing of language and the promotion of non-interpretive modes of criticism. "The Aesthetics of Silence" (1967) aimed, instead, at giving grounds for the artist's voluntary and deliberate silencing of language as well as identifying strategies by which he achieved this end. Phenomenology, in its existentialist form, remained a definite, if still undeclared, influence on Sontag's theorization of "uninterpretable" or silent language. It was joined by a medley of other influences, some shadowy, as in the case of Roland Barthes, particularly as it concerned his concept of "zero degree writing,"[98] as well as others that were acknowledged outright and given greater definition, the most prominent being Wittgenstein and Nietzsche.

Sontag established two, overlapping frames of reference for her analysis of "silent" art in the modern and contemporary period: long established mystical practice in which enlightenment is sought in experiential realms beyond speech; a critique of language that took place, primarily, on philosophical and sociological grounds and that centred on the inescapable mediacy of language, its shortcomings on this count relating to its both acquired and inherent limitations.

At the outset of the essay Sontag proclaimed the spiritual mission of modern art, the emergence of which dated from the time of "art." Under this broad rubric she grouped artists from numerous fields, including poetry, music, painting and dance. Indicating some sympathy with Rosenberg's conception of modern art as an "anxious object," Sontag considered that the breadth of occupations subsumed under this heading defined it as a dubious enterprise, one whose methods and, indeed, very claim to being can be challenged. The very uncertainty of art's situation, however, unleashed in it a ceaseless redefining of aims and remapping of "conscious-

ness," ranking it among the most vital symbols of the "spiritual" venture in the modern period.[99]

Excluded from Sontag's argument was consideration of the role played by the abandonment of the Enlightenment essentialist aim of developing "autonomous art according to . . . [its] inner logic"[100] in the succession of art by "'art.'" Nor did she consider the impact of Enlightenment thought on religion. This was described by Nietzsche as shaking "the dogmas of religion" and inspiring "a deep mistrust" with the result that "religious feelings" have been displaced from the "religious sphere" into art and "in a few cases into political life, even straight into science."[101]

At the time "'art'" replaced art, the key legend associated with art – the consummate nature of the artistic enterprise – was born. Two versions of the legend arose. The first and less reflective of these regarded art as an embodiment of "human" awareness as well as an exercise in self-awareness.[102] As Fredric Jameson observed "the problem of expression is itself closely linked to some conception of the subject as a monadlike container, within which things felt are then expressed by projection outward." According to this view, "individual subjectivity" is constituted "as a self-sufficient field and a closed realm." Jameson distinguished between the centred subject of modernism and the decentred one of post-modernism, the "cultural pathology" of the two being represented by "alienation of the subject" and "fragmentation" of the subject respectively. The decentred post-modernist subject is thus characterized by a "waning of affect" because "there is no longer a self present to do the feeling."[103] Quite apart from Jameson's Marxist sympathies and, hence, understanding of the subject as constituted by social relations, those determined by different and distinct phases of the capitalist organization of society, his analysis of post-modernism was dependent on the structuralist and post-structuralist rejection of the Cartesian epistemological tradition – one characterized by its "first-person standpoint" – including its phenomenological variant. Sontag, however, was untouched by post-structuralist theory. Because of her clear adherence to an existential phenomenological view of consciousness, it can be assumed that she was committed to the "first-person standpoint," and in this regard to Cartesianism, as well as to further aspects of existential phenomenology that broke with Cartesianism or, more specifically, its mind-body and subject-object dualisms.

Sontag, then, needed to provide an alternative explanation for those, in the main, newer, examples of modern art, notably pop, that lack any sense of authorial presence. Hence, in the second, more recent version of the myth, with its "post-psychological" understanding of consciousness, art

assumed certain of the contradictions implicated in the realization of a complete state of existing. Just as the mystic attains this coveted condition only by negative means, including that of the silence that lies outside speech’s range, art must move in the direction of opposing art, of eradicating subject-matter, representation, and the art entity, of replacing “intention” by “chance” and of striving for silence.[104]

Unlike the earlier version, in which art was related to consciousness in a linear movement, in the more recent one (and it is towards the illumination of this version that Sontag directed her findings on the aesthetics of silence) art is engaged in a debate with “consciousness.” A conflict is enacted between the “spirit” that manifests itself in art and the inescapably concrete nature of the latter. To the extent that the artist’s enterprise is blighted by “mediacy” – that resulting from the indirectness of his impressions, in particular, those occasioned by the duplicity of “words” – art itself becomes the prime obstacle in achieving his goal of “transcendence.”[105]

“Silence,” then, was the artist’s form of protest over the mediacy of language and, in this manner, art. While this strategy freed the artist from menial enslavement to his audience (including the “patron” and “distorter [critic?] of his work”), in its ultimate and extreme form – notably Duchamp’s turn to chess – it was practised by very few and then only by those who, as in the case of Duchamp, were blessed with “genius” and had employed it decisively. More common than literal silence – that is, the renunciation of art – was the artist’s continuing to speak, however in a way that was experienced by the spectator as unintelligible, invisible, or inaudible. She cited, for example, the symbolic silence implied by the commonplace and inaminate subjects of pop art and the absence of emotion in “‘minimal’” structures.[106]

The bulk of Sontag’s essay was devoted to an exploration of various strategies of silence; however, it was either interspersed or interwoven with identification of grounds for silence. As previously indicated, these had arisen from the artist’s frustration over the mediacy of his activity, as it concerned the both inherent and acquired limitations of language. Sontag’s understanding of *inherent* limitations of language was indebted foremost to the linguistic philosopher Ludwig Wittgenstein. She quoted him to the following effect: “Everything that can be thought at all can be thought clearly. Everything that can be said at all can be said clearly. But not everything that can be thought can be said.”[107] Sontag’s source, though unacknowledged, is clearly *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus* (first German edition, published in 1921, first English edition, with a translation, published

in London, 1922). The task of *Tractatus*, as Wittgenstein established in the preface, was to set "the limits of language" and, by means of the critique of language that this task entailed, to solve the problems of philosophy that were posed because of a miscomprehension of the logic of language. David Pears amended Wittgenstein's aim to that of setting "the limits of factual language," thereby indicating Wittgenstein's exclusion of religion and morality (i.e., ethics) from the realm of what can be said.[108]

Sontag's quoting of Wittgenstein, however, did not signal uncritical endorsement of his views. With regard to this particular quotation, she played with it, making it appear somewhat absurd. She noted his avoidance of the "psychological," categorized by Wittgenstein as beyond the factual and thus beyond the limits of what can be said, and, therefore, his failure to address in what situation an individual would be desirous of transposing into word-form "everything that can be thought" or articulating "everything that could be said."[109]

Wittgenstein's early philosophical beliefs, as outlined in *Tractatus*, were nonetheless most probably behind Sontag's querying the value of speech: the truth cannot be spoken, regardless of the fact than an individual (and hence the speaker) "can *be* the truth."[110] She alludes, here, to truth's belonging to an ethical rather than a factual realm and so to Wittgenstein's understanding of truth as beyond the limits of factual discourse. For Wittgenstein "What can be said can only be said by means of a proposition."[111] He defined a proposition as "a picture of reality" and as "a model of reality as we imagine it."[112] In other words, "it has, and shows, the same logical FORM as that reality."[113] Propositions, however, "can express nothing that is higher"; because "ethics cannot be put into words," they are "transcendental."[114] Wittgenstein concluded *Tractatus* with the oft-repeated remark: "What we cannot speak about we must pass over in silence." Things that cannot be put into words Wittgenstein termed "mystical."[115] Despite its limitations, Sontag ascribed to speech and, therefore to language, a number of uses, including that concerning its ability to "silence" in the sense of denying or immobilizing meaning. She saw it, for example, as a means of avoiding speech's closing off thought, as in the critical endeavour. This point was returned to at a later juncture of the essay. Then Sontag observed that it was the spectator's inability to acknowledge the fundamental uncertainty of art that prompted him to interpret it and so bring it to closure; this, in turn, was directed by the (presumptuous) notion that the purpose of art was communication.[116]

A further reference to Wittgenstein's philosophical beliefs took the form of his celebrated argument, also outlined in *Tractatus:* "the meaning is the

use."[117] This resulted from his observation that a frequently occurring feature of language is "that the same word has different modes of signification – and so belongs to different symbols – or that two words that have different modes of signification are employed in propositions in what is superficially the same way." As an example of the former case he cited the proposition "Green is green" – where the first word is the proper name of a person and the last an adjective – these words do not merely have different meanings: they are *different symbols.*"[118]

Sontag called upon Wittgenstein's argument to theorize a shift in the sense in which "'meaning'" was understood to be the measure of art, from reference, that is, allusion to something that lies beyond the art object itself, to "use," this particular development being an outgrowth of the modernist understanding of art as "autonomous." It is in these terms that Sontag sought to explain the ploy of "*literalness*," which she considered an important advancement in the aesthetics of silence. While "literalness" is a distinguishing feature of pop art, specifically of Warhol's and Lichtenstein's examples in which sources are unmodified or only minimally so, Sontag restricted substantiation of her claims to literary examples: the narratives of Kafka and Beckett in which their authoritative use of language derived directly from the bareness of meaning.[119]

In reference to the *acquired* limitations of language, Sontag claimed that, despite its entrenchment in the enterprise of "transcendence," art is failing under the insupportable load of "self-consciousness" brought about by the supreme accomplishment of European reflection: "secular historical consciousness." As a result, the artist can hardly engage in communication, regardless of whether written, visual or bodily, without calling to mind past achievements. She substantiated this observation by quoting the German philosopher Frederick Nietzsche, from an unacknowledged source, to the effect that "in the age of comparison . . . our instinctive activity is to compare an unheard number of things."

Sontag conceded, however, that the "community" and historical authenticity of the artist's methods were latent in his intersubjective condition: that of "being-in-a-world."[120] Martin Heidegger explained intersubjectivity in the following manner: "Being-with existentially determines Da-sein [man's fundamental condition of "being-there," in the world] even when an other is not factically present and perceived."[121] Heidegger also explained the relationship between language and intersubjectivity:

> The unity of the conversation consists in the fact that in the essential word there is always manifest that one and the same thing on which we

> agree, and on the basis of which we are united and so are essentially ourselves.[122]

In Sontag's view, however, language was not something merely shared. It was also debased and burdened by "historical" accretion. In the creation of a work of art the artist deals with two possibly conflicting realms of meaning: his intended meaning, or, alternatively, intended absence of meaning; the "second-order meanings" that continue his language as well as handicap, weaken, and corrupt it.[123]

Sontag expanded upon the issue of the affliction of historical consciousness in another essay from 1967: "'Thinking Against Oneself': Reflections on Cioran." In this, she focused her attention on its role in ending "philosophy" and, subsequent engendering of skepticism about all systems of thought and the language (code) that communicates them. The "historicizing perspective," which, for over a century, has been at the centre "of our ability to *understand* anything at all," Sontag saw as responsible for undermining the "value" and "claim to truth" of achievements of the human mind.

> We understand something by locating it in a multi-determined temporal continuum. Existence is no more than the precarious attainment of relevance in an intensely mobile flux of past, present, and future. But even the most relevant events carry within them the form of their obsolescence. Thus, a single work is eventually a contribution to a body of work; the details of a life form part of a life history; and individual life history appears unintelligible apart from social, economic, and cultural history; and the life of a society is the sum of "preceding conditions."[124]

In this essay, as in "The Aesthetics of Silence," Sontag's notion of historical consciousness was strongly influenced by Nietzsche: a foremost exponent of the post-philosophic tradition.[125] Just as Sontag linked "our ability to *understand* anything" with the "historicizing perspective," Nietzsche claimed:

> Immediate self-observation is not enough . . . to enable us to learn to know ourselves. We need history, for the past continues to flow through us in a hundred channels. We ourselves are . . . nothing but our own sensation at every moment of this continued flow.[126]

Historical consciousness, while necessary, is therapeutic only in the correct amount: "knowledge of the past is only desired for the service of the future and the present, not to weaken the present or undermine a living future."[127]

Sontag’s allusions to the alienation incurred by the undue weight of historical consciousness, in both “The Aesthetics of Silence” and the passage quoted above from “‘Thinking Against Oneself’: Reflections on Cioran,” especially this source, were, no doubt, indebted to Nietzsche’s warning about the perils of thinking in an excessively historical manner.

> The extreme case would be the man without any power to forget, who is condemned to see “becoming” everywhere. Such a man believes no more in himself or his own existence, he sees everything fly past in an eternal succession, and loses himself in the stream of becoming.[128]

In further warning he claims that there is a “degree . . . of ‘historical sense,’ that injures and finally destroys the living thing, be it a man or a people or a system of culture.”[129]

The silencing of art, Sontag regarded as the artist’s bid to escape his shameful subjugation to a particular moment in time. His desired goal of ahistoricity was, however, one effected by the spectator. Silent art, Sontag claimed, elicits a “stare.” Unlike the “look” evoked by traditional art, which is unforced and varies in strength as its centre of interest moves through the sequential stages of adoption and depletion, the “stare” exhibits traits of obsession: it is unwavering, uninflected, and immovable. The stare, allowing no relief from concentration, provides the furthermost point from history that art in the present period can attain.[130] In “The End of the Renaissance? Notes on the Radical Empiricism of the Avant-Garde” (1963), Leonard B. Meyer referred to a similar idea but explained it in terms of the radical empiricist aesthetic of the post-war avant-garde. Art that was syntactically organized, he considered, embodied “relational concepts such as beginning, middle, and end, antecedent-consequent, or periodicity.” The non-relational forms of the avant-garde, by way of contrast, did away with ordered time. In support of this claim, Meyer quoted the critic Robert Goldwater’s response to Mark Rothko’s reductionist compositions: “the apparent end lies close to the apparent beginning – so close in fact, or in apparent fact, that they are almost indistinguishable.”[131]

In a related vein, Sontag observed that a great deal of contemporary art – through strategies that silence language such as “blandness,” “reduction,” “deindividuation,” and “alogicality” – aspires to a perfect completeness that requires no (and, in fact, makes superfluous any) contribution from the spectator. Experience of this fullness, however, was dependent on such art evoking a particular perceptual response. That this entailed entering into a meditative state in which the mind can be cleansed only by alluding to a state of active awareness was intimated by Sontag’s quoting of John

Cage from an unacknowledged source: "'No one can have an idea once he starts really listening.'" By association, silent art, calculated to attain a perfect completness, functions in the manner of a yantra (a visual aid to meditation), a point that further illuminates its engendering of a "stare" as opposed to a "look."

Just as silence is a means of escaping the affliction of historical consciousness, it is also a way of counter-acting "inauthentic" language. By this she meant language disconnected from the "body" and thus from "feeling," language unacquainted with either "the sensuous presence and concrete particularity of the speaker" or the particular circumstances under which it was employed.[132] As with her allegations about the contamination of language by excessive historical consciousness, Sontag alluded to a context drawn from existentialist beliefs, fundamental to which is man's resolutely "first-person standpoint" and prime condition of being in the world. She referred, for example, to a pivotal tenet of existential phenomenology: "authenticity." Prominent among the many explanations of this principle is Heidegger's distinction between "authenticity" and "inauthenticity," between "true *Dasein*, which is self-possession" and "*Verfall* ('a falling away from . . . ')": "the collective indiscrimination of an existence conducted in terms of 'oneness' and 'theyness.'"[133] As Heidegger explained:

> As an authentic potentiality for being a self, Da-sein has initially always already fallen away from itself and fallen prey to the "world." Falling prey to the "world" means being absorbed in being-with-one-another as it is guided by idle talk, curiosity, and ambiguity. . . . Inauthenticity does not mean anything like no-longer-being-in-the-world, but rather it constitutes precisely a distinctive kind of being-in-the-world which is completely taken in by the world and the *Mitda-sein* of the others in the "they."[134]

Sontag's reference to the relationship between a lessening of speech and an increased awareness of "one's physical presence in a given space"[135] suggests Maurice Merleau-Ponty's "body-in-the-world" inflection to existential phenomenology and its inquiry into the foundations of existence, one based on an understanding of the body as "our general medium for having a world."[136]

> In so far as I have a body through which I act in the world ["being," if equated with "consciousness," is "nothing but a network of intentions"], space and time are not, for me, a collection of adjacent points nor are they a limitless number of relations synthesized by any consciousness,

> and into which it draws my body. I am not in space and time, nor do I conceive space and time; I belong to them, my body combines with them and includes them.[137]

Following her claims about "inauthentic" speech, and by way of an explanation for it in the modern period, Sontag pointed to the debasement of language in "mass society," especially among its educated members. Two factors, in particular, she saw as responsible: infinite "'technological reproduction'" and worldwide distribution of language in its "printed," spoken and visual forms; the deterioriation of language in the popular domains of "politics," "advertising and entertainment."

Sontag implied that language reproduced by modern technology can be equated with speech segregated from the speaker's "sensuous presence and concrete particularity,"[138] speech that alienates man from himself and the remainder of the organic world. In this regard, she inferred a prophetic understanding (one shared by the "social" critics featured in this study) of Jean Baudrillard's contention that today we are experiencing "the stage of 'simulation proper' . . . in which simulation models [aided by the media in their role of key simulation machines] come to constitute the world, and overtake and finally 'devour' representation."[139]

Further indication of her negative view of mass communications is evident in her criticism of their role in the devaluation of language. In contradiction of Huyssen's associated claim of early post-modernism's "next to total abandonment of an earlier American tradition of a critique of modern mass culture,"[140] it implies a siding with cultural theorists, such as Dwight MacDonald, who were critical of the decline of cultural standards under capitalism. In the case of mass society's educated members – those in whom the adulteration of language is most marked[141] – the enemy is not so much "Masscult" as the more insidious "Midcult," which obscures "Masscult" characteristics with a "cultural figleaf."[142]

Sontag's singling out of technological reproduction as a more recent factor in the mediacy of language was prophetic of Charles Jencks's claim that "simulacra and processed reality [i.e., in the form of the "information world"] have taken over from the previous mediation." However, because simulacra, and other systems of mediation (e.g., symbolism) "started *with* language and thus must be well over half a million years old" he disagreed with those, such as Jean Baudrillard, who saw it as constituting "the essence of post-modernism."[143] Technological reproduction of language in its sophisticated, post-war form, as previously established, is a defining characteristic of post-modernity and, moreover, has undoubtedly drawn

attention to the mediate nature of language. On these grounds it may well contribute to, if not constitute, the essence of post-*modernity* and assume an important position in post-modernist arguments that, as in the case of Baudrillard's, or, more accurately, as interpreted by others, link the cultural (post-modernism) and the social (post-modernity).

In reference to Rainer Maria Rilke's attempt, in the fourth and ninth *Duino Elegies*, to overcome the estrangement of "consciousness" by not going beyond language but, rather, by severely pruning both its range and deployment, Sontag observed a further factor in the acquired deficiency of language: the falleness of the human condition. Because of this, "human beings . . . must start with the simplest linguistic acts: the naming of things." Only in this abbreviated capacity can speech escape its near universal degradation.[144]

Sontag's thesis – the estrangement of consciousness from itself can be overcome by recovering an earlier, simpler stage of language – brings to mind the distinction made by Steiner after Heidegger between the pre-Socratic "thinkers," those that "belonged to a primal . . . experience of thinking, in which beingness was immediately present to language," and the "philosophers" who followed, that is Socrates and Plato who "were the first to take 'the steps into philosophy' . . . [and] to pose the question of existence in an analytic-rational guise."[145]

The "benign nominalism" put forward and performed by both Rilke and Francis Ponge, however, was distinguishable from the more "brutal" sort practised by artists in the modern period. Whereas Rilke's and Ponge's "benign nominalism" humanized things, modern artist's "brutal" variant confirmed their disregard for "human" matters. As examples of "brutal nominalism" Sontag cited Andy Warhol's "silk-screen paintings and early films" (presumably including Warhol's short portrait films of Sontag from 1964) and the (phenomenological) novels of Alain Robbe-Grillet in which the role of language is stripped back to "physical description and location."[146]

Given the extent to which *Tractatus* is addressed in "The Aesthetics of Silence," it is reasonable to assume that Sontag conceived of "nominalism" in the sense of Wittgenstein's "simple signs" or "names." Conflation of the two terms was effected by Wittgenstein in the proposition numbered 3.202: "The simple signs employed in propositions are called names."[147] Fogelin has provided a succinct explanation of their meaning:

> As *simple signs*, they are signs that admit of no further analysis via other signs. They are rock-bottom on the side of language. As *names*, they

> represent things . . . this rock-bottom level of language locks into the rock-bottom level of the world:
> "3.203 A name means an object. The object is its meaning."[148]

Sontag made one further distinction between benign and brutal nominalism. Rilke and Ponge adhere to traditional hierarchical ordering of both concerns and significance. They believe, for example, that "vacuous" entities can be contrasted and found inferior to "rich" ones and that modes of genuine awareness can be contrasted and found superior to those of inauthentic ("language-clogged") awareness. Brutal nominalists hold the view, however, that art should not countenance any one experience but, instead, be receptive to experience in its full diversity. She saw their view, which led to art based on inventories, catalogues, and "surfaces" as well as on "chance" – forms which have in common a standardization of worth[149] – as most elegantly formulated by Cage. In its verbal, as opposed to musical formulation, Sontag, no doubt, had in mind Cage's *Silence* (1961), which she quoted from in both "The Aesthetics of Silence" and "'Thinking Against Oneself': Reflections on Cioran."

In the last-mentioned essay, Sontag expanded upon Cage's abandonment of dualistic thinking and therefore upon its binarisms or categorical antinomies such as "good" and "bad, " "clean" and "dirt[y],"[150] which lead to an evaluation of experience (i.e., the privileging of one term over another: the target of Derrida's deconstruction) as well as mis-representation of it by the superimposition of conceptualizations on the flow of experience. In this manner, she refers to those aspects of Cage's thought that provide some explanation for modern artists' departure from the form of "nominalism," adopted by Rilke and Ponge, which maintain customary hierarchies of interest and meaning. Among the binarisms dismantled by Cage was that of error and non-error, the consequence of which, Sontag wrote, "proposes the perennial possibility of errorless behavior." Sontag quoted from Cage's explanation of this claim in *Silence:*

> Error is a fiction, has no reality in fact. Errorless music is written by not giving a thought to cause and effect. Any other kind of music always has mistakes in it. In other words there is no split between spirit and matter.[151]

Meyer, in "The End of the Renaissance? Notes on the Radical Empiricism of the Avant-Garde," had previously referred to the same aspect and the same example of John Cage's thought[152] in support of his claim about the avant-garde's radical empiricist critique of the causality of traditional

Western thought. Unlike Meyer,[153] however, neither in "The Aesthetics of Silence" nor in "'Thinking Against Oneself': Reflections on Cioran" did Sontag acknowledge Cage's indebtedness to non-Western, in the form of Zen Buddhist, philosophy. In a further distinction from Meyer's prior theorization of the silencing of language,[154] Sontag did not, then, observe a broad correspondence between Zen Buddhist and existentialist streams of thought in post-war American culture, as it concerned the common objective of pre-suppositionless experience.

As explained by Ninian Smart, the Rinzai sect of Zen Buddhism is the best known in the West, primarily through the writings of D. T. Suzuki (1870–1966); it "aims at sudden illumination and is more anti-intellectualist" than the Soto sect, the other main sect in Zen Buddhism. Yogacara metaphysics is "a form of absolute idealism, in which pure consciousness . . . is identified with the Buddhist nature." Despite the fact that it assumes the "starting point" of the Rinzai form of Zen Buddhism, its "ultimate conceptual distinction between the Absolute and phenomena, or between nirvana and empirical existence" is rejected.

> If all discriminations, perceptual and otherwise, are illusory, so likewise is the distinction between the Absolute and phenomena. There is no gap between the spiritual and the secular, and so one should not strive to gain illumination.[155]

The implied path to illumination – that of "effortlessness" – one explained as "in line with the Taoist concept of 'acting through not acting'"[156] – moulded Sontag's understanding of Cage's thought, as indicated in the following passage from "'Thinking Against Oneself': Reflections on Cioran":

> Cage proposes for our experience a world in which it's never preferable to do other than we are doing or be elsewhere than we are. "It is only irritating," he says, "to think one would like to be somewhere else. Here we are now."[157]

In the concluding stages of "The Aesthetics of Silence," and reminiscent of Max Kozloff's earlier proposal for a categorization of sixties' art along the lines of the "inert" and the "frenetic" – the categories based on how the aesthetic beat of the work was heard[158] – Sontag observed that silence assumed two styles in modern art: "loud" and "soft." Both were in reaction to art's pure objectives and both were disdainful of "'meanings'" put in place by the "culture" of bourgeois rationalism. The loud style of silence tended to be over-wrought and usually "apocalyptic." Protagonists

included Burroughs, the futurists, and certain dada artists. The soft style she identified with Jasper Johns and John Cage. It appeared as a continuation of traditional classicism's interest in rules of decorum, however the emphasis had shifted from edifying solemnity to "ironic" impartiality.[159]

Pop art, with its bold, magnified images as well as simplified and, frequently, centralized composition, presumably, belongs to the "soft" category. Sontag's reluctance to make this association, however, can be viewed as tacit agreement with Kozloff concerning pop's subversion of any binding aural categorization of art. In a revised version of an article initially published in 1965, "Non-Writing and the Art Scene," Sontag then described the "detachment" of pop as "a complex kind of irony,"[160] irony being a feature of the "soft" style of silence. More recently, S. L. Bindeman, in *Heidegger and Wittgenstein: The Poetics of Silence*, has described irony as a "mode of indirect discourse" and as a metaphorical expression of silence: "the keeping silence that has something to say."[161]

Sontag's and post-structuralism's respective critiques of language both contribute to and draw from the inquiry into the relationship between language and experience, knowledge and truth that had been initiated at the end of the nineteenth century. Many of the sources of Sontag's theorization of the silencing of language coincide with the "classical modernists" that Andreas Huyssen saw as holding "centre stage" in French post-structuralist theory. The three members of this group that he cited as influential on Derrida – Nietzsche, Heidegger, and Mallarmé[162] – are either mentioned in or leave an unmistakable imprint on Sontag's "Against Interpretation" and "The Aesthetics of Silence."[163]

Notwithstanding this overlap in sources, the relationship of Sontag's and post-structuralist's critiques of language to this tradition varies. Post-structuralism is, in many ways, a culmination of this tradition, or, as Huyssen would have it, "an *archeology of modernity*, a theory of modernism at the stage of its exhaustion."[164] This is most strongly argued on the grounds of its subversion of the authority of the logocentrism of Western metaphysics and, hence, of foundational beliefs upon which totalizing systems of thought (or, as they assume the focus of Lyotard's inquiry in *The Postmodern Condition*, the metanarratives of modernity) are predicated. Jacques Derrida's strategy of deconstruction, a means of exposing the "often covert rhetorical machinery"[165] of language, represents the most sustained critique of this kind. As discussed in some detail in the chapter on Alloway's criticism, Derrida's critique of logocentrism was directed at its order of meaning – one that exists as foundation "prior to and independent of signs, appearances . . . in which it may be manifested."[166] In this re-

gard, Derrida shares Heidegger's understanding of language as the medium for consciousness: "It is in words and language that things first come into being and are."[167]

While Sontag failed to address this particular aspect of Heidegger's existential examination of the "experience of thinking," that is, the unity of language and experience, she addressed, instead, the associated one that concerned the distortions imposed upon the "experience of thinking" by language's mediate nature. In this regard, her efforts to either silence language or, alternatively, to justify the silencing of language must be seen in the light of the existential phenomenological concern for the foundations of existence and associated aim of recovery, as George Steiner puts it, of a more "primal, therefore 'more authentic' dimension or experience of thinking."[168]

Her criticism of the mediacy of language, then, is pivotal on those aspects that most undermine the existential phenomenological understanding of man as "not a detachable consciousness who can abstract himself from the world around him" but, rather, as "essentially [a] 'being-in-the-world.'"[169] One example given by Sontag, and discussed in this chapter, was the corruption of language by "historical" accretion,[170] a situation in which, as explained by Nietzsche, Sontag's main influence in this regard, excessive knowledge of the past both "weaken[s] the present" and "undermine[s] a living future."[171] Another was "bad" or "inauthentic" speech. By this, Sontag meant speech dissociated from the "sensuous presence and concrete particularity of the speaker," one that was exacerbated by the infinite "technological reproduction of language" in its "printed," verbal and visual forms.[172] As indicated by this last-mentioned consequence of mediacy of language and as indicated, also, by Sontag's call to end the project of interpretation in the interests of recovery of sensory experience, including that of art, Sontag's understanding of situatedness in the world took the form of "bodily consciousness." This revealed an affiliation with Merleau-Ponty's conception of the body as "our general medium for having a world"[173] as well as an understanding that the subject of experience was "a completely unified body-mind whole."[174]

Patricia Waugh regarded Sontag, along with poet Charles Olson and the academic Ihab Hassan, as among a group of American literary figures who have engaged in a "postmodernist critique of grand narratives and subversion of the purely rational." They did this by way of a "Heideggerian notion of radical situatedness," which takes place in a world "which preexists us (and which cannot be conceptualised through an overlay of rationalism)" as in Cartesianism. This Heideggerian notion was sometimes

(as in Sontag’s case) transferred “to an emphasis on bodily experience” as well as accompanied (also as in Sontag’s case) by a concern for “recovery of intensity through aesthetic experiences which collapse the mind/ body distinction.” Waugh identified “situatedness in the world” as a form of critique of Enlightenment that took place in “Romantic writing.” For this reason, she perceived the form of post-modernism based on the same premise as a “late modern Romanticism” and not “simply a mode of counter-Enlightenment.”[175]

From Waugh’s perspective, the American form of post-modernism, including its sixties’ phase to which Sontag contributed, has been “conceived in relation both to an indigenously defined and a European Modernism.” Superficially considered, this is strikingly similar to Huyssen’s perception of the Euro-American character of 1960’s avantgardist post-modernism. The “European Modernism” that American post-modernism has drawn upon, however, is not in Waugh’s argument, as in that of Huyssen, the “European historical avantgarde.” Instead, it is identical to the source of European forms of post-modernism: “a theoretical or philosophical tradition” which includes the “post-phenomenological critiques arising out of thinkers such as Heidegger . . . [and] Derrida.”[176] Presumably, to indicate the accessibility of this “theoretical or philosophical tradition” to American culture, Waugh drew attention to use of the term post-modernism in American literary criticism during the 1950s to label Charles Olson’s effort to characterize “a new non-anthropocentric” trend in poetry, the means of which was indebted to Heidegger’s existential phenomenology.[177]

Despite Sontag’s and post-structuralism’s varied relationship to the twentieth-century critique of language, one characterized by their respective associations with Heidegger, certain correspondences exist between the strategies of “deconstruction” and “silence.” In the case of Derrida, his systematic dismantling of the “rhetorical machinery” of logocentric texts by deconstruction was focused on the hierarchizing binary oppositions, the means by which metaphysics are structured. As Derrida observed: “One of the two terms controls the other (axiologically, logically, etc.), holds the superior position.”[178] The simplest form of intervention advocated by Derrida is reversal of the position of the hierarchizing terms. This bears comparison with the target of “brutal nominalism,” identified as a strategy of silence by Sontag and exemplified by Warhol’s “silk-screen paintings and early films.” Sontag saw “brutal nominalism” as aimed in the first instance at reducing language to its minimal function of naming and by these means, hopefully, preserving it from widespread degradation. However, in this both severe and evenly valued state of reduction, hierar-

chical ordering of meaning and interest[179] has been abolished. Sontag identified this approach with John Cage's philosophical beliefs and, hence, Zen Buddhism and its intended end to the dualistic structures or categorical antinomies of Western thought and so the hierarchizing, binary logic of logocentrism.

Post-structuralism's more systematic critique of language is due, foremost, to its ethical function, as defined by Griffin, of forestalling "totalitarian systems."[180] This derives from a conception of language as "the place where actual and possible forms of social organization and their likely social and political consequences are defined and contested."[181] Derrida's "deconstruction" – a method that in its dismantling of the "rhetorical machinery" of logocentric texts illuminates the ways in which meaning is constituted in such texts – is envisaged as a means of "continual critique." In addition, it can be put to the broader purpose of cultural critique as in the case of Derrida's alignment of his critique of logocentrism with "'its extrinsic conditions of practice'" in *Truth in Painting.*[182]

Sontag regarded the silencing of language as indicative of contempt for "'meanings'" and hence ideology instituted by the "culture" of bourgeois rationalism.[183] Its means of thwarting ideology, however, is identical to its means of thwarting all other shortcomings associated with the mediacy of language: the destruction of language in order to restore it to its original state of unity.[184]

Ihab Hassan, it should be noted, minimized distinctions between the strategies of deconstruction[185] and silencing of language by his subsuming of both under the rubric "indeterminacy" or "*indeterminacies.*" As with "immanence" or "*immanences*," he regarded this as one of the "two central, constitutive tendencies of [his expansive category of] postmodernism." Hassan had previously described "the figurative state of silence" as at the "far limits of indeterminacy."[186]

The discussion so far has been devoted to Sontag's interpretation of the lack of authorial perspective in aspects of modern art as concerned with the silencing of language and, in the case of "Against Interpretation," silent art's invalidation of the critic's interpretive role. She theorized this perspective, principally, by means of an existential phenomenological view of human consciousness. In "One Culture and the New Sensibility" (1965), Sontag construed related, similarly anonymous, characteristics – on this occasion, restricted to their incidence in contemporary art – as resulting from the emergence of a unitary culture and a corresponding "new sensibility" within industrialized society. Sontag based this particular line of inquiry on social and cultural theory.

The catalyst for "One Culture and the New Sensibility" was refutation of C. P. Snow's allegation of a gulf between the "literary-artistic" and "scientific cultures," dating from the time of the Industrial Revolution.[187] Sontag refers, here, to the Rede Lecture, delivered in 1959 and published in 1965, the same year as the publication of Sontag's article, in which Snow – by training a scientist and by vocation a writer – argued that "the intellectual life of the whole of western society is increasingly being split into two polar groups," those of literary-intellectuals and scientists. Snow perceived "no place where the cultures meet," scant evidence of the assimilation of science into "twentieth-century art" and an increasingly "less bridgeable" separation "between the scientists and non-scientists."[188]

Contrary to Snow's case, Sontag considered that belief in the existence of "two cultures" was a fallacy, born of the view that while science and technology change the arts perform static, universal roles such as enlightenment and escapism. While art did not "progress" as did science, it did evolve and, in accord with the lines of Sontag's argument, in a manner that narrowed distinctions between the two cultural realms. What was taking place, in Sontag's opinion, was less a clash between cultures and more the formation of a new and singular "sensibility." Catalysts for its emergence at this time lay in unprecedented human experiences, experiences that resulted from the impact of twentieth-century technology (including its manifestation in mass communications and capitalist-consumer production) on social life.

This situation has brought about not the demise of art, as forecast by certain "literary-intellectuals and artists" on the grounds that art would be without a role in a culture characterized by science and automation, but, rather, the transformation of its function from, in recent times, representing and "commenting" on material reality to "modifying consciousness" and formulating "new modes of sensibility." The site of this "new sensibility" was "non-literary culture," specifically "music, films, dance, architecture, painting, sculpture," culture that is unconcerned with "content" and "moral judgment" (criteria of the traditional literary paradigm of creativity), and that draws from "science and technology."[189]

Attendant upon this change was art's co-option of "'non-art'" means and media, including those drawn from "industrial technology" and the commercial art sphere (as in the prime example of pop). Also attendant upon this change was art's reassertion of "its existence as 'object' (even as manufactured or mass-produced object, drawing on the popular arts)," a claim substantiated by Lichtenstein's manufactured multiple sculptures of common objects,[190] as opposed to "'individual personal expression.'" By virtue

of characteristics such as “coolness,” precision and “sense of ‘research’ and ‘problems,’” art indicative of the “new sensibility” proximates the attitude of science rather than art in the conventional sense. This is also the case with the reduction of the artist’s work to his “idea,” as exemplified by Andy Warhol’s delegation of production tasks, such as the application of colour, to others, for example “a friend or the local gardener.” While not an exclusive feature of contemporary art (she mentions, for example, the collaborative practices of both architecture and renaissance painting), in the contemporary period this relinquishment of individual authorship takes on a radical cast, indicating a change in the fundamental principles that classify a given object as art.[191]

The “new sensibility” no longer conceived of art as a category of “moral journalism” and thus as a critique of life in the sense espoused by the two-culture apologist and “literary-intellectual” Mathew Arnold.[192] Instead, it saw art as an “extension of life” and in this role as preoccupied with “programming sensations.” Art, understood in this way, renders meaningless distinctions between “‘high’ and ‘low’ culture”: “the feeling (or sensation) given off by a Rauschenberg painting might be like that of a song by the Supremes.”[193] The sociologist Daniel Bell has succinctly defined this aspect of Sontag’s position as “democratization of culture in which a radical egalitarianism of feeling superseded the older hierarchy of mind.”[194] It is, presumably, this aspect of Sontag’s argument about “modern mass society,” as opposed to that which is critical of the role played by technological reproduction of language in “dissociated speech” (speech that undermines bodily consciousness) that coloured Andreas Huyssen’s perception of a direction within American (avantgardist) post-modernism characterized by an indiscriminate ratification of “popular culture” as a provocation to the standard of “high art,” both “modernist” and “traditional.”[195]

At this juncture of the essay, Sontag’s argument coalesced with one feature of that used to justify pop’s and abstract art’s silencing of the critic: the blunting of the senses due to the ills of modernity.

> Western man may be said to have been undergoing a massive sensory anesthesia (a concomitant of the process that Max Weber calls “bureaucratic rationalization”) at least since the Industrial Revolution, with modern art functioning as a kind of shock therapy for both confounding and unclosing our senses.[196]

Sontag refers, here, to the German sociologist Max Weber’s critique of Enlightenment thinkers’ espousal of the “strong necessary linkage between the growth of science, rationality, and universal human freedom.”[197]

Far from fulfilling these utopian expectations – dubbed the "project of modernity" by the contemporary German sociologist Jürgen Habermas,[198] and reviser of the Weber-Adorno line of Enlightenment critique[199] – Weber saw "bureaucratic rationality" as creating an "'iron cage' . . . from which there is no escape."[200]

> Together with the machine, the bureaucratic organization is engaged in building the bondage houses of the future, in which perhaps men will be like peasants in the ancient Egyptian State, acquiescent and powerless, while a purely technical good, that is rational, official administration and provision becomes the sole final value, which sovereignly decides the direction of their affairs.[201]

The characteristic of "enlightened reason" that allows for this reversal is the "identification of rationality and understanding with the subsumption of the particular under the universal." Reasoning of this sort "disregards the intrinsic properties of things . . . for the sake of goals and purposes of the subject." The perversion of reason under the influence of subsumption is explained as following:

> When subsumptive rationality came to be considered the whole of reason, then the possibility of cognition of the particular in its own right and the ends for the sake of which enlightened rationality was undertaken became occluded. Without the possibility of judging particulars and rationally considering ends and goals, the reason which was to be the means to satisfying human ends becomes its own end, and thereby turns against the true aims of Enlightenment: freedom and happiness.[202]

Reaction to the doomed project of modernity and, hence, criticism of Enlightenment thought, is continued by post-structuralist post-modernism. Post-structuralist thinkers, including those who align their theories to post-modern notions of periodicity, turn their attention to the development of methods able to subvert modernism's "manipulative reason and fetish of the totality."[203] Among these is Lyotard's concept of paralogy. In a period marked by "incredulity towards metanarratives," one that corresponds to "the crisis of metaphysical philosophy," and, hence, by "obsolescence of the metanarrative apparatus of legitimation," paralogy, by virtue of its faulty or contradictory reasoning, is aimed at destabilizing "the capacity for explanation, manifested in the promulgation of new norms for understanding."[204] Though its frame of reference reached back beyond the modern period, to the beginnings of the logocentric tradition in the Classical period, a further example is Derrida's deconstruction of logocen-

trism. It concerns, in particular, his subversion of hierarchizing binary oppositions, the covert structure of totalizing systems of thought, undertaken, however, from the perspective of the rhetoric and poetics of language.[205]

Regardless of whether argued in terms of the silencing of language or of the "new sensibility" that has arisen from the merger of literary-artistic and scientific cultures, Sontag interpreted both modern and contemporary art's promotion of sensory over intellectual experience as having two functions. On the one hand, it shared the post-structuralist counter-Enlightenment aim of discrediting rationality and its role in "enlightened reason,"[206] as in the case of Weber's "'bureaucratic rationalization.'" On the other hand, it was therapeutic in its redressing of the "sensory anesthesia" that is consequent to the ills of modernity, including "enlightened reason." Both functions related to the role of the senses in, as previously explained, the "non-conceptualising embodied language": the outcome of a "mode of being" in which distinctions between mind and body and subject and object are abolished[207] and that was closer, in theory at least, to a more authentic originary level of experience. Sontag's emphasis on the sexual, however, lends an indigenous cast to her case for sensory recuperation. Its probable catalyst in the liberationist tendencies and utopian ambitions of the American counter-culture in the 1960s, provides grounds for those commentators, most notably Andreas Huyssen, who argue the case for a specifically American avantgardist phase of post-modernism during the 1960s.

Conclusion

It has been argued in this study that during the sixties in America a post-modernist critical consciousness arose in response to those aspects of American, or, more accurately, New York pop that could not be adequately accommodated within existing formalist and realist critical canons. In the face of their abject failure to come to terms with the character of an art as complex as pop, together with the character of the society that gave it birth, critics turned to a range of radical sociological and philosophical theories. These same theories, as in the prominent cases of pragmatism and phenomenology, we may now retrospectively identify with deconstructive notions of post-modernism and post-modernity.

Critical interest in pop art (or, for that matter, the production of art indebted to pop ideas) did not suddenly cease with the time frame of this study: the sixties and shortly thereafter. To the contrary, pop art's unabated relevance is attested by the substantial body of literature on the subject that stretches in an unbroken fashion from the movement's inception to the present time. Post-modernism's emergence as a worldview in the mid-seventies, however, undoubtedly endowed pop with a further lease of life: by affirming the movement's significance, it stimulated a new wave of critical attention. As Lynne Cooke has rightly pointed out, the principal issues of "simulation and appropriation" and "commodification of the artwork" in Warhol's pop especially (particularly the last) coincided with those at the heart of the post-modernist controversy of the eighties.[1] What follows is offered as a brief survey of major directions in critical responses to New York pop, post-modernist included (apart from those examined in previous sections of the study), in the period from the early seventies to now.[2]

Arguably the first direction to emerge resulted from an examination of the ideological implications of pop art's subject-matter, style, and techniques. The conclusion drawn – that pop reinforced the status quo – rep-

resented a continuation of the case instigated by Rosenberg in the previous decade. Casting its shadow over this line of inquiry was the neo or critical Marxism proposed by theorists associated with the Frankfurt School (e.g., Theodor Adorno, Max Horkheimer, and Herbert Marcuse). This had been arrived at by overturning traditional Marxism's perceived neglect of the roles played by culture, specifically mass culture, in the reproduction of capitalist societies. The need to redress this disregard became intensified after consumer culture's "dramatic emergence" in the post-war period,[3] a situation that was mirrored in pop art's obsessive simulation of its myriad signs.

Max Kozloff's lengthy article "American Painting During the Cold War" (1973) provided early evidence of the trend just described. In many ways, this must be seen as a logical extension of the intense campaign that he had waged in the previous decade against criticism, especially his own, serving "power systems" and that had culminated in his rejection (temporary it would seem) of all critical activity. Kozloff formed his view about pop art's reactionary character (thus renouncing his earlier perception of "Warholism" as subversive) after examining it alongside other contemporary American painting within the economic and political contexts of post-war America. This was when America's military and economic powers were at their peak and, as evidenced by America's role in the Vietnam War, aggressively deployed with the ultimate aim of bringing about American world hegemony. Prompted by its showing in a "lavish installation at the 1967 São Paulo Biennial," as well as the charge of chauvinism that followed its display, Kozloff suggested that pop art – "a product of the 'Great [American capitalist] Society'" – was a not so subtle weapon in the armory of American imperialist ambitions. Central to Kozloff's case was pop art's "camp attitude": the reason it was acculturated and co-opted by the mass media and hence by capitalist-consumerism. Remote from "cynicism" as well as "moral judgments," it allowed audiences to "assimilate" and yet feel distanced from "events and objects" considered offensive in the normal scheme of things.[4]

Donald Kuspit's "Pop Art: A Reactionary Realism," published three years later, provided a far more probing analysis of pop art's collusion with capitalism. The basic premise of this was that the mass media disseminated "stereotyped ways of viewing reality"[5] or, as Janet Wolff would term it, the "partial perspective . . . of the group in power in society."[6] Consciousness of this false or standardized sort advanced the cause of "commerce" and exerted "social control." It functioned as a barrier to recognition of "social and personal reality" as well as to the individual's "re-cognition of it."

Kuspit conceived of both “fine art” (and hence pop art) and “popular culture” as “superstructures” that obscure “the real workings [from a Marxist perspective, the economic base structure] of the world they originate in.” Pop art’s “reactionary” stance was evident in its failure to reveal critical detachment towards mass media imagery. Instead, it dignified this imagery (the stylization of which had already raised “ordinary phenomena”) by placing it within the context of art. Kuspit considered that pop not only acted as a publicist for commodities but also made its own commodity status clear. It did this by idealizing “a visual cliché into a luxury product,” a product that “‘sells’” because of its (high) “art-status” and because of its familiarity, its image already publicized by advertising. However, Kuspit did not regard the hold of either pop art or advertising on the consumer as absolute. The perceived discrepancy between “the ordinariness of experience,” and the truth (or lies) it reveals about “advertised reality,” and “the publicized look” triggered the consumer’s critical powers. “Anxious doubt” he termed positively “the weapon of psychic freedom.”[7] Kuspit’s critique of pop is couched in clearly Marxist terms. It differs little in spirit, however, from Rosenberg’s Marxist-existentialist perspective, as outlined, for example, in “Warhol: Art’s Other Self” from five years earlier. Both were predicated on the understanding that the precious freedom of the individual was dependent on his or her liberation “from the ‘alienations’ and ‘mediations’ of capitalist society”[8] and that the sure route to its realization was the assertion of authentic selfhood.

Kuspit’s thesis that pop had entered into a symbiotic relationship with consumer culture would be resurrected almost two decades later by Christin J. Mamiya in his book-length study *Pop Art and Consumer Culture: American Super Market* (1992). According to Mamiya, while pop art benefited from the striking impact and familiarity of advertising imagery, in its “content, form, and presentation” it perpetuated “the power and authority of the media” and, hence, its particular construct of reality.[9]

Mamiya reflected the perspective of critics and scholars who began their careers in the eighties and beyond. Their formative views were shaped by post-structuralist theory (including its central feature: the death of “man”), neo-Marxist accounts of capitalist-consumerist society (by now, notably those of Jean Baudrillard), and, importantly, experience of this society in its mature form. Mamiya’s retrospective reading of pop illuminated the movement’s relationship with capitalist-consumerism at a time that art’s propensity for basing itself on a “corporate model” in his view had escalated. Consistent with the attempt of the post-structuralist Foucault, or, for that matter, the Marxists Kuspit and Rosenberg, to diminish structures

of social power by revealing their sources and mechanisms, Mamiya did so with reformatory intent. Mamiya, however, departed from Kuspit's and Rosenberg's similarly held faith in the transformative potential of subjectivity and so in the individual as an agent of social change. In keeping, instead, with the depressing view of capitalist-consumer society voiced by the critical Marxists associated with the Frankfurt School,[10] or, for that matter, with the bleaker one of their descendent Jean Baudrillard,[11] he considered commodification as entrenched to the point of constituting "a totalizing social process."[12] For this reason, Mamiya dismissed the challenge to "the commercial orientation of the art world" on the part of post-structuralist theory as of little consequence. He refers, here, to post-structuralism's role in privileging interpretation, that of either the viewer or the critic, over "artist's intention,"[13] and hence critiquing of humanism. As explained by Eric Fernie, the humanist understanding of language as a transparent medium through which the individual communicates "fixed meanings," has resulted in an emphasis on the artist as creator of the work as well as belief that the latter's success (financial as well as critical) can be measured against the knowable artist's intention.[14]

A major line of inquiry into pop in the eighties and beyond, one that further illuminated pop's promotion of capitalist interests, concerned its embracement of "other-directed" values. These were the values that the sociologist David Reisman identified three decades earlier as belonging to the social type that takes its lead from other people known either first-hand, or, vicariously, through the media.[15] Pop art's other-directedness represented a tragic *volte-face* on the abstract expressionist tradition in modernist art, central to which was the preservation of "the inner life of the individual."[16] Kuspit, in *The Cult of the Avant-Garde Artist* (1993), explained that spontaneity was valued above all in this tradition because of its disruptive power, one capable of countering the smotherment of one's self "by the world's conventions" and the entombment of one's self "in its systems of meaning." Consistent with the, by now, psycho-analytical framework for his writings on art, Kuspit termed "spontaneous expression . . . a reactive secondary narcissism" on the grounds that it was "an attempt to exist without relating to the world's objects, and ultimately to deny being-in-the-world." Kuspit's defense of the Abstract Expressionist tradition took place when its central feature of "spontaneous expression" was under threat by post-modernism. Warhol, for Kuspit, epitomized its "'realist,' [in the sense of "coldblooded and calculating"] objective attitude" towards art.[17]

The grounds for Kuspit's support of Abstract Expressionism differed little in essence from those voiced by the champions of this tradition over

thirty years before, then in reaction to the emergence of pop, specifically to the reason for its emergence: capitalism's encroachment on "high" culture. In "Action Painting: Crisis and Distortion," Harold Rosenberg discussed the Abstract Expressionist tradition in painting in terms of the gestural wing of its most recent manifestation: the movement commonly referred to as Abstract Expressionism. In Rosenberg's view, action painting conceived of art's function "as the action that belonged" exclusively to the artist. Acted out on the "blank canvas," it resisted being "seized upon" by the "depersonalizing" forces of totalitarianism in either its capitalist or communist guise.[18] As with modernist art in general, action painting attempted to work in a "'pure space' *outside* capitalist culture,"[19] a space that was untainted by either "commercialism" or "careerism." Rosenberg realized, however, that no "space" was immune to capitalist violation. The premises of action painting – while perennially "valid for individual beginnings" – had fallen prey to the "joys of professionalism," as witnessed by action painting's degeneration into Style and subsequent demise.[20]

Rosenberg refers to the perversion of art by the success ethos, that which fuelled spiritually bankrupt consumer society and that which Donald Kuspit after the American pragmatist philosopher William James graphically described as "the bitch goddess" that was "the American deity."[21] Adorno and Horkheimer noted the success orientation of capitalist society as early as 1944.[22] They considered it a prime strategy by which consumers were enslaved by "capitalist production": "As naturally as the ruled always took the morality imposed upon them more seriously than did the rulers themselves, the deceived masses are today captivated by the myth of success even more than the successful are."[23] Since the early 1970s, critics perceived pop, alternatively, as an instrument, beneficiary, and manifestation of American society's – and hence capitalist society's – obsession with success. Kuspit discussed its role in creating an aura of confidence at a time this society was at its zenith.[24] Kozloff referred to the part it played in American imperialist success,[25] while Kuspit viewed Warhol's "cynicism," "social indifference and mock individualism," negatively, as symptomatic of the corrosive effects of this easily gained success.[26] Both Mamiya and Kuspit attributed pop's success – commercial, not critical, success, that is – to the movement's adoption of the promotional strategies of, in Mamiya's words, "corporate society," thereby ensuring the effective marketing of the movement.[27] Mamiya also explored the role played by pop's patrons – patrons whose professions linked them to the "corporate environment" – in pop's commercial success. He considered the appeal of pop for these collectors lay in its consumerist imagery (and, presumably,

high art sanctification of this imagery).[28] Bruce Althuser argued that pop provided prestige for collectors distinguished by their "new wealth," pop in this sense being not a mirror but a constituent of the "American Dream."[29] Finally, Kuspit explored the pop artist Roy Lichtenstein's complex, allegorical treatment of success in his surrealist painting from 1978. Central to this was the "seductive, breasty, fleshy [and blonde] bathing beauty" who represented in part "the bitch goddess of success."[30]

A major outcome of the success-orientation of capitalist-consumer society was the pursuit of celebrityhood or stardom with the intent of elevating the "exchange-value" of the individual. Kuspit discussed this issue, generally, in terms of the neo-avantgarde or post-modernist artist for whom Warhol provided the blueprint. More commonly, however, critics, including Kuspit, discussed it solely in terms of Warhol and his art. This focus on Warhol was due not only to his tireless pursuit of fame throughout his career but, also, to the prominence (arguably, dominance) of the theme of celebrityhood in his art and associated Art-Business activities. It was particularly evident in his celebrity portraiture in painting, in his book *Andy Warhol's Exposures* and in his publishing venture, *Interview* magazine.

The relationship between Warhol's publicity-formed persona and his art had been initially examined by Harold Rosenberg in "Warhol: Art's Other Self" (1971). He had then pointed out Warhol's investment of creative energy in the production of his "brand-name" to the detriment of his art. By publicizing this manufactured and media-staged "self" – by simply making it well known – Rosenberg contended that Warhol was able to manipulate the art world's reception of his art, that is to by-pass the artist's traditional route to prestige: production of significant art and subsequent (richly deserved) critical acclaim.[31]

In an article written eleven years after "Warhol: Art's Other Self," but patently in its shadow, the Australian expatriate critic Robert Hughes expanded upon Rosenberg's account of Warhol's publicity-driven career. He focused especially on the role played by photography in the creation of Warhol's fame as well as that of his subjects in *Andy Warhol's Exposures* and *Interview*. Hughes referred to photography's power to democratize fame – to replace its traditional markers of aristocratic birth and extraordinary human achievement with, as Hughes claimed, the "'interesting.'"[32] Rosenberg had recast Descartes' aphoristic expression of the rational subject of liberal humanism ("I think, therefore I am") as "I am recognized, therefore I am" to account for Warhol's publicity formed identity.[33] Hughes recast it yet again as "I am flashed, therefore I am" to make emphatic his

point about the crucial role played by photography, especially press photography, in the manufacture of this same identity.[34]

Both Rosenberg and Hughes were scathing of Warhol's exploitation of the media that they construed as evidence of careerism and, in this manner, degradation of the values of high culture. This attitude forms a stark contrast with that of those in the main younger writers. Their account of Warhol's manufacture of a "brand-name" took place outside the prejudicial terms of the oppositional, two-culture debate and at a time that these terms, particularly those concerning the proposition that art *could* remain steadfast against commercial blandishments, no longer compelled conviction. Jack Banowsky, in an article penned in 1989, argued that "confusion of the famous personality and his artistic achievement" posed the main threat to "Warhol's canonization." In a repudiation of Hughes and Rosenberg's position that Warhol's persona overshadowed his art, Banowsky argued that an important contribution of Warhol's art to "the visual-arts culture" was his "self-promotional" enterprise. This illuminated the "instruments and strategies" of the marketing of the artist "that museum culture inevitably obscures."[35] He expressed, in this manner, tacit agreement with Barbara Rose's identification of Warhol as a key practitioner of "didactic art" – "art whose *primary* intention is to instruct"[36] – from two decades earlier.

Since the rise of deconstructive post-modernism and corresponding loss of faith in the sovereign and essentialist subject of Cartesianism, a number of critics perceived Warhol's art as having drawn attention to *reasons* for the phenomenon of celebrityhood: the loss of personal identity in contemporary society. Carter Ratcliff, in a review of Warhol's *Andy Warhol's Exposures* from 1980, argued that Warhol's "snapshots and anecdotes of the stars" collectively make the point that "to be famous is *to be*, to possess one's existence with a certainty denied the not-famous."[37] In a publication from some eight years later, Kuspit contended that the "vulnerability" of the subject in the contemporary period "leads the self to find succor in fame." The prime reason for this weakness was the "devaluation of personal identity"[38] that he viewed after Leo Braudy as ineluctably tied to "'the technology of image reproduction and information reproduction.'"[39] As indicated by Warhol's art and the "appropriation/simulation" art descended from it, "the act of reproduction" does away with "the subjectivity invested in society."[40]

Critical focus on the issue of celebrityhood in Warhol's art encompassed his development of a so-called fame aesthetic. Ratcliff, in the previously discussed review, argued that Warhol's artistic treatment of fame entailed

his self-conscious transformation from artist to fan. He consequently presented "in an esthetic mode the image of awe creating its object and so becoming identical with it." The "irony" or detachment that "tints" this image, Ratcliff saw as resulting from his "self-creation" of a world that if habitable for "Warhol-the-fan" offered "only solitude for Warhol-the-artist," despite the fact that "artist and fan" are in the end indistinguishable.[41]

Kuspit also discerned a fame aesthetic in Warhol's treatment of the celebrity image. He described "popular fame" as "the saturation of public space with a standardized appearance constructed in a standard way." Repetition of images, or "seriality," he construed as an expressive device used by Warhol to communicate "the banality of fame, as well as its power to banalize." That "the popularly famous were nothing more than their appearance" was made abundantly clear in Warhol's depiction of them as "empty and unchanging," a message embodied as much in his generic persona as in his art. In accord with his sustained attack on neo-avantgardism or post-modernism, Kuspit viewed Warhol's fame aesthetic as symptomatic of "the abandonment of the therapeutic intention" (i.e., faith in art's ability to cure the soul), the cornerstone of modernist or avantgarde art. Warhol's artistic treatment of fame, nonetheless, contained the kernel of reform. The feeling of discomfort – "depression," in fact – experienced by the viewer was proof of the existence of "one's true self" as well as its potential for reinstatement, regardless of the extent to which "one's false self" had surrendered "to envious identification with a celebrity."[42] In a related vein, Steven Kurtz viewed celebrities in Warhol's art as in part "objects of jealousy" because they represent "the perfection that flesh" with all its shortcomings, including inevitable "decay," "will never attain."[43]

Explanations for Warhol's *own* pursuit of celebrityhood were frequently sought in the artist's psyche. Bradford R. Collins, in an article published in 1988, linked reasons for Warhol's "psychological problems" to his biography: his lowly beginnings as the son of poor immigrants and his well-documented dissatisfaction with his unattractive appearance measured in conventional terms. Collins claimed that Warhol's fame meant not only "acceptance and integration into the mainstream culture," but also transformation of "his coarse Slavic face into the beautiful visage of an American deity." Warhol thirsted for fame because the "metaphysical nosejob" that it represented altered "appearances" by changing in a fundamental way "how others see us." Implying agreement with Ratcliff's identification of the irrational impulse fuelling the fan's perspective of awe as the "crush" or "starlust,"[44] Collins argued that "fame, like love or beauty, is in the eye of the beholder."[45]

Five years later, Kuspit, in *The Cult of the Avant-Garde Artist*, engaged in a more probing psychoanalytic analysis of Warhol's pursuit of celebrity status, one that he divorced, however, from the particularities of Warhol's biography. Kuspit considered that Warhol sought fame in an attempt to alleviate his "paranoid feeling of being nothing." Achieving it, however, only aggravated Warhol's sense of inadequacy, providing the reason for his insatiable need for fame as well as motive for revenge in which he turned "everything he touched into nothing," be that "name-brand things" or "famous people." Warhol demonstrated conclusively "that fame, the last therapeutic hope [sought in a misguided attempt at the recovery of "self"], does not heal."[46]

Warhol's self and Warhol's art – in both cases, only "nominally" his own – were cobbled together from "the apparent selves of others and from existing imagery." Kuspit described this self as "relational." By this, he meant, "a self that has learned the language of social relationship but not its emotional substance" and a self that was "dissolved in" as well as dictated to by the "shifting trends" of the "social scene." While prompted by the absence of an "autonomous self," Warhol's relationality was marked by a "tone of indifference" that placed it beyond the bounds of usual "postmodernist relationality" and gave rise to a "pseudo-self." Conceived as a defence against incurable "anxiety," Warhol was cognizant that this simulated self was a "prosthetic." It was, however, the self of his celebrity persona that he needed to become famous and so gain a sense of self.[47]

Since the eighties, a further area of investigation into pop has concerned the movement's dependence on mass media imagery. While an extension of the largely Marxist-directed critique of pop art's complicity with the mass media and hence capitalism from the previous decade, it extended beyond pop to encompass its descendants: art similarly engaged in duplicating the appearance of – and, in some instances, reproducing – media imagery. Donald Kuspit's attack on "media-mimesis" – art that exhibits passivity towards the "lifeworld" – was part of a broader attack on neo-avantgarde or post-modernist art because of its betrayal of modernist and avantgarde art's transformative and therapeutic goals. In this scheme of things, the artist's "imagination" provides the key tool for change and healing. It "subtly changes our [the viewer's] sense of reality by subtly changing us."[48]

Kuspit's disapproval of "'media-mimesis'" was absolute. In an article from 1987, he branded the reformatory intention of "social moralists," such as Barbara Kruger, Jenny Holzer, and Hans Haack, as misguided. While they may launch an assault on "obvious authoritarian targets that control

the levers of the social machine," they dismiss "the generative power of imagination."[49] In the following year (1988), Kuspit included these artists in a larger group that he then described as practitioners of American activist art. His point then was that this group's playing "to the common – crowd – experience" only reinforced "the very structures it seeks to undermine."[50] Kuspit, it would seem, sought to discredit Hal Foster's previous identification of this art as radically deconstructionist. Consistent with post-structuralism and therefore with the post-structuralist postmodernism he perceived as existent in "American cultural politics" at the time,[51] Foster claimed that the interest of artists such as Barbara Kruger, Jenny Holzer, and Sherrie Levine lay not with producing art. Rather, it was located in manipulating signs, the clear target of which was subversion of the status quo.[52]

The emergence of an art in which the duplication of media imagery was more literal than pop (e.g., Barbara Kruger et al.) as well as an "academic version" of pop (David Salle and Jeff Koons) brought about a softening of attitude towards pop itself, or, at least, towards some aspects. The Whitney Museum of American Art, New York, staged a retrospective exhibition of James Rosenquist's work in 1986. When reviewing the exhibition, Hughes distinguished Rosenquist from Oldenburg and Warhol whom he described as pop ironists. With the passage of time and resultant deflection of interest from Rosenquist's "billboard manner" and "devices from advertising," Hughes considered that his subject had come sharply into focus as "the vicissitudes of a certain kind of American dream."[53] Transformations in the style of pop over time yielded a similar re-evaluation of its significance. Kuspit's experience of Lichtenstein's recent surrealist paintings in 1979, in which sources had "been transcended, or . . . transvalued," lead to his reinterpretation of pop in general as "an examination of the subjective import of signs – the way they are *felt* and thereby influence the formation of personal values."[54]

In some instances, this re-evaluation extended to Warhol, despite the photographic basis of his imagery that Hughes construed, negatively, as dealing "hands-off with the world" in the manner of a "spectator."[55] Thomas Crow, in an article published in 1987, described Warhol's early paintings on the subject of death – that of people known to us only "through the illusory intimacy of celebrity" – as adding up to "a stark, disabused, pessimistic vision of American life." An import of such dramatic weight was communicated not by merely reproducing commercial imagery but, instead, by orchestrating it in accord with Warhol's subjective vision. Crow's analysis of the *Marilyn Diptych*, painted shortly after

Monroe's death in 1962, aimed at demonstrating how Warhol's use of the expressive devices of colour, monochrome, clarity of image, and reduction of it to a "trace" – all within a "limited technical scope" – communicated an "unresolved dialectic of presence and absence, of life and death."[56]

The impact of Jean Baudrillard's anti-capitalist writing (both neo-Marxist and post-structuralist) on American intellectual life during the eighties was clearly felt. Kuspit and Hughes obviously shared Baudrillard's concern for the threat to human freedom posed by "the 'alienations' and 'mediations' of capitalist society."[57] Unlike Baudrillard, however, they did not conclude that in present (consumerist) society alienation is complete so as to preclude "transcendence" or a critical "perspective on itself."[58] Kuspit therefore disputed Baudrillard's reduction of "selfhood to a gross social product" (i.e., a subject of consumption) and both Kuspit and Hughes rejected his claim that the media totally mediated "consciousness."[59] Baudrillard's depressing vision of insurmountable alienation ran counter to their own in which the key to social change lay firmly within the individual's grasp: the exercise of his or her imaginative faculties. Kuspit argued his case by analyzing the "psycho-impulses" behind Warhol's "simulations – 'hyper-realizations' of his subjects"[60]; Hughes dismissed Baudrillard (and his thesis of hyperreality) somewhat scathingly as a reassuring presence for artists incapable of rising above "the banal discourse of mass media"[61] and thus afflicted by a poverty of imagination.

Lisa Phillips's essay in the catalogue accompanying the exhibition *Image World: Art and Media Culture*, held at the Whitney Museum of American Art in 1989, revealed a markedly different attitude towards artists' dependence on media imagery as well as towards Baudrillard's theories. Indeed, prefacing Phillips's study is a quotation by the French post-structuralist and neo-Marxist in which he questions "whether the world itself isn't just here to serve as advertising copy in some other world."[62] Baudrillard makes reference in this way to his arcane notion of an "aestheticized hyperreality": the illusory, mediate world effected by the media in its role of simulation; a situation in which the real is "beyond representation because it functions entirely within the realm of simulation."[63]

The bulk of Phillips's essay comprises a brief historical survey of how artists in the twentieth century, especially in the contemporary period, have reacted to "the mass media's increasing authority and dominance." This was due to their shaping of "our collective sense of reality" by the mediation of objects (including art) and events as well as to their superior communicative powers. Robert Rauschenberg and Andy Warhol, for example, developed the "new hybrid form" of photo silkscreen on canvas in

which "the photograph became the origin of the image." Warhol, moreover, incorporated the processes of the media "into the construction and *conception* of his work," as evidenced by media characteristics such as "depersonalization," use of "stereotypes and repetition" and emphasis on "surface."[64]

Phillips, nonetheless, stopped short of wholesale adoption of Baudrillard's ideas, at least with regard to pop art. In contravention of Baudrillard, she did not view pop as concerned exclusively with the reproduction of signs of consumer society. It was not then symptomatic of "the end of perspective" in art and, by inference, the end of "transcendence" in consumer society.[65] James Rosenquist's *F - 111* (1965) as a case in point was "clearly political" and a comment "on the sinister nature of military technology." She noted, however, the ability of the capitalist system to nullify dissent as attested by the large price Rosenquist's work attracted in 1965 when bought by Robert Scull as well as the sale's "front-page coverage in *The New York Times*." Since the time of Rosenquist's *F - 111*, Phillips, consistent with the perception voiced by Mamiya some three years later, considered that the commercial orientation of the art world had escalated, in this reflecting the larger society in which commodification now amounted to "a totalizing social process."[66] During the past decade – at a time in which artists and other professionals in the art world had featured in the popular press "as the latest chic commodity" – Phillips questioned whether artists co-opted "media strategies" with the intent of exposing them or, alternatively, with that of gaining exposure of themselves.[67]

Consistent with post-modernism's maturation into a "world view,"[68] in the past decade, a number of critics and historians of pop have retrospectively identified the movement as post-modernist, including those discussed in earlier sections of this study such as the Marxist cultural theorist Fredric Jameson. Implicated in all of these identifications is consideration of pop's relation to the salient characteristic of post-war society: the symbiosis represented by capitalist-consumerism and mass communications. Kuspit, as previously discussed, argued that the emergence of post-modernism or neo-avant-gardism signalled a break with modernism or avant-gardism's faith in the therapeutic and transformative potential of art. Warhol's art, he termed the first genuine expression of post-modernism, basing his case on Warhol's refusal to transform the "public language" of consumer culture and so challenge "the psychosocial status quo."[69] In the conclusion to *Pop Art and Consumer Culture*, Mamiya traced pop art's "rise and acceptance" to its co-option of marketing

strategies of consumer culture, those of "promotion, publicity, and advertising." Pop, in this manner, drew attention to the "postmodern" art world's "consumer orientation," one that Mamiya after Andreas Huyssen and Fredric Jameson termed its "most decisive characteristic."[70]

As opposed to interpreting pop as post-modernist, the unmistakable imprint of post-structuralist and, hence, deconstructive post-modernist theory is evident in the methods of analysis employed in recent studies, including the previously cited case of Mamiya. In a publication from 1997, Steve Jones, consistent with post-structuralist notions of textuality, shifts the focus from interpreting Warhol's work – from decoding Warhol's "message" (or lack of it) embodied in the text – to the individual reception of it. He argues that Warhol's iconic presentation of cultural icons or "iconic texts" has given and continues to give rise to complex readings based on interaction between the icon's "mythic past" and the reception of it "in the present," the "dynamically subjective, transformative present."[71]

In five discrete studies published in the same year under the title *A Taste for Pop: Pop Art, Gender and Consumer Culture*, Cécile Whiting examines various aspects of the relationship between pop art and consumer culture. In these, she stresses what she terms the feminine aspects of consumer culture – "feminine spaces, feminine motifs, or feminine viewing practices." Whiting places equal emphasis on the manufacture of divisions between high and low culture as enacted by pop paintings and "artifacts" from consumer culture (e.g., "collectors' interiors, fashion layouts, advertisements"). Exhibiting the relativism that marks post-structuralism, or, for that matter, the accompanying strands of thought assembled under the rubric "deconstructive post-modernism," Whiting undermines the authority of all accounts of the relationship between pop art and consumer culture, whether from the sixties or since, including her own. She views these as not establishing "historical verities" but, instead, as "acts of interpretation and reinterpretation" and exhorts us to ask how these divisions came about "and to whose benefit."[72]

As such, Whiting's study reflects the critique launched against traditional art history since the early seventies, particularly for its failure to account for "structures of social power."[73] Among the streams of thought responsible for this attack are feminism and post-structuralism. In her concern for the non-essentialist subject – both in the passive sense as socially and culturally constructed and in the active and potentially reformatory sense as self-fashioned – regardless of gender, Whiting is indebted to the overlapping fields of feminist and post-structuralist theory. This debt is especially evident in the study that deals with a feminist revision of the

contemporaneous critical reception of Marisol's sculpture as well as that concerned with the question of identity in Warhol's portraits and "public persona" of the 1960s. In the study of Marisol, Whiting's concern for self-fashioning takes an explicitly feminist turn. This is evident in her reference to feminist strategies for blocking the patriarchal exercise of power (that which renders the feminine subject a mere cipher or end-product of patriarchal relations of power), for example, the "masquerade, or the simulation that is femininity."[74] In her concern for the manufacture of divisions between pop art and consumer culture and in her skepticism of the "truth-value" of such constructions, Whiting reflects the post-structuralist "analysis of the meaning of meaning."[75] As it concerns the cultural critique undertaken by Foucault, she reflects equally post-structuralism's ethical concern for the production of truth and its relation to operations of power. Whiting's addressing of aspects of the new art history, specifically feminism and post-structuralism, as well as pop art's relationship with consumer culture – and thus examination of pop within a broad and fluid cultural field – places her study in the newly emerged, interdisciplinary domain of visual culture. Whiting in this manner alludes to the "fine art – pop art continuum": the inclusive cultural theory formulated by Lawrence Alloway in 1958 and subsequent basis of his claim that American pop art was primarily about signs and sign-systems. Alloway, we can recall, arrived at this position on culture by viewing mass and fine art in the functionalist sense as communication and therefore as constitutive channels in a "general field of visual communications."[76]

With a firming of the contours of capitalist-consumerist society, critical responses to pop art in the last three decades have, if anything, increased the pronounced sociological cast they assumed at the outset. In almost all cases, these have echoed Harold Rosenberg's discontent with the ills of this society as measured by its erosion of the autonomy of both "self" and high culture (especially the last). Reformatory measures adopted by critics in the post-1960s period took one of two routes, those that represented a clear demarcation between a modernist (and avantgardist) and postmodernist critique of pop. The first promoted a variation of the Marxist-existentialist argument put forward by Rosenberg: by not acquiescing to the "partial perspective" of the ruling class and so to inauthenticity, as had Warhol in a striking fashion, the individual had it within his (subjective) power to initiate social change. Consistent with French post-structuralist theory, more specifically the post-structuralist-neo-Marxist hybrid represented by the mature writings of Jean Baudrillard, the second and more recent measure was premised on the following: the "alienations" and

"mediations" of capitalist-consumerism in its present advanced form were established to the point of excluding significant change. This was patent in the increasingly commercial orientation of the art world of which pop's ultra-commodified character, particularly Warhol's uncompromising variant, was an extreme manifestation. For critics of this persuasion, the goal was not so much the dismantling of structures of capitalist power as the more modest one of rendering them visible. In this they complied with the partial aim of Michel Foucault's copious post-structuralist writings: identification of existing forms of social power. More closely, they assented to that common to Marxism in its traditional and revisionist forms: illumination of the relationship between superstructures (culture, in this case) to the capitalist base structure of society. In addition to these reformatory measures, one must consider recent relativist interpretations of pop that were predicated on post-structuralist methods of analysis. Cécile Whiting's comprehensive application of post-structuralist principles to relativist ends proposed a further solution to the problem broached by Barbara Rose and Max Kozloff three decades before, then amidst the pronounced anti-capitalist climate of the New York art world: How does the critic prevent his or her manufacture of knowledge serving the workings of power? Rose, if we recall, sought a solution in pragmatism and Kozloff in phenomenology, philosophies that, as with post-structuralism itself, we now regard as synonymous with deconstructive post-modernism.

Notes

INTRODUCTION

1. For example: Fredric Jameson, *Postmodernism, or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism* (London: Verso and Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1991; London and New York: Verso, 1992), 1; Steven Connor, *Postmodernist Culture: An Introduction to Theories of the Contemporary* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1989), 238; Andreas Huyssen, "The Search for Tradition: Avantgarde and Postmodernism in the 1970s," *After the Great Divide: Modernism, Mass Culture, Postmodernism* (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1986), 161.
2. For the purposes of this study, pop art is what the critics say it is and pop artists are those identified as such by critics. Issues concerning the identity of both pop art and the pop artists have been taken up in other studies, most notably Carol Anne Mahusen, *Pop Art and the Critics* (Ann Arbor and London: U.M.I. Research Press, 1987).
3. Hans Bertens, *The Idea of the Postmodern: A History* (London and New York: Routledge, 1995), 34.
4. Lawrence Alloway, "The arts and the mass media," *Architectural Design* 28 (February 1958): 85.
5. Leo Steinberg, "The Eye is a Part of the Mind," *Partisan Review* 20, no. 2 (March–April 1953), 196.
6. Terms indebted to Alan M. Wald, *The New York Intellectuals: The Rise and Decline of the Anti-Stalinist Left from the 1930s to the 1980s* (Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1987), 366.
7. Sohnya Sayres, *Susan Sontag: The Elegiac Modernist* (New York: Routledge, 1990), 30.
8. This observation is indebted to David Ray Griffin, introduction to *God and Religion in the Postmodern World: Essays in Postmodern Theology* (Albany: State University of New York, 1989), x.
9. Ibid.; Patricia Waugh, *Practising Postmodernism: Reading Modernism* (London, New York, Melbourne, Auckland: Edward Arnold, a division of Hodder & Stoughton, 1992), 15–16.
10. David Lyon, *Postmodernity* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994),

11–18; Zygmunt Bauman, *Intimations of Postmodernity* (London and New York: Routledge, 1992), 48–53.

11. Andreas Huyssen, "Mapping the Postmodern," in *The Post-Modern Reader,* ed. Charles Jencks (London: Academy Editions, and New York: St. Martin's Press, 1992), 47–52. This last point relates to the interrelationship Huyssen perceived between the avantgardist character of American postmodernism of the sixties and its catalyst in a range of historical factors that were no longer relevant or, alternatively, were less relevant in the next decade (52).
12. As listed by Jencks, and apart from Baudrillard, these critiques of post-modernity include those of Jürgen Habermas, Fredric Jameson, Terry Eagleton and Hal Foster. See Charles Jencks, "The Post-Modern Agenda," in *The Post-Modern Reader,* ed. Jencks, 17. Jencks's essay was published in 1992 and, therefore, does not make mention of more recent publications such as those by sociologists David Lyon and Zygmunt Bauman in which critical reactions to post-modernity are *less* pronounced. The sociological model of post-modernism contained in these form an important reference point for identifying post-modernist aspects of the critical consciousness of "social" critics featured in this study, especially that of Alloway and Rosenberg.
13. Ibid., 10.
14. Lawrence Alloway, *American Pop Art* (New York: Macmillan, 1974).
15. Leo Steinberg, "Other Criteria," chap. in *Other Criteria: Confrontations with Twentieth-Century Art* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1972; London, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press paperback, 1975).
16. See the following sources: Steinberg, "The Eye is Part of the Mind," 196; Leo Steinberg, "Jasper Johns," *Metro,* nos. 4/5 (1962), 92.
17. Barbara Rose, "ABC Art," *Art in America* 53, no. 5 (October–November 1965), 61, 66.
18. Harold Rosenberg, "Virtuosos of Boredom," *Vogue,* no.147 (September 1966), 296.
19. Clement Greenberg indicated in "Modernist Painting" that he identified his understanding of the essentialist nature of modernist art with the "self-critical tendency" that began in the philosophy of the Enlightenment philosopher Immanuel Kant (*Arts Yearbook* 4 [1961]: 103).
20. Jencks, "The Post-Modern Agenda," 15.
21. Barbara Rose in *Elitist Vs. Popular Criticism: Proceedings of the Conference on Art Criticism and Art Education in New York, Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, May 15–16, 1970,* by School of Education, New York University and the New York State Council of the Arts, 11, 17.
22. Richard Gill and Ernest Sherman, introduction to *The Fabric of Existentialism,* eds. Richard Gill and Ernest Sherman (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Educational Division, Meredith Corporation, 1973), 19–20.
23. Huyssen, "Mapping the Postmodern," 47. This neglect has been redressed somewhat in a recent publication. See Bertens, *The Idea of the Postmodern,* 28.
24. Jencks, "The Post-Modern Agenda," 17.
25. For example, Griffin, introduction to *God and Religion in the Postmodern World,* x; David Harvey, *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change* (Cambridge, Mass., and Oxford: Blackwell, 1990), 53.
26. Waugh, *Practising Postmodernism,* 3–16 passim.

CHAPTER 1. POST-MODERNIST ASSUMPTIONS

1. David Harvey, *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change* (Cambridge, Mass. and Oxford: Blackwell, 1990), 53.
2. Charles Jencks, "The Post-Modern Agenda," in *The Post-Modern Reader,* ed. Charles Jencks (London: Academy Editions and New York: St. Martin's Press, 1992), 10.
3. John Rajchman, "Postmodernism in a Nominalist Frame," *Flash Art,* no. 137 (November– December 1987): 49.
4. David Ray Griffin, introduction to *God and Religion in the Postmodern World: Essays in Postmodern Theology* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1989), x. Also quoted (with slight changes) in Jencks, "The Post-Modern Agenda," 33.
5. Jencks, "The Post-Modern Agenda," 16; Jencks reserves the term "post-modernism" for an alternative, "*revisionary*" form which "seeks to overcome the modern worldview not by eliminating the possibility of worldviews as such, but by constructing a postmodern worldview through a revision of modern premises and traditional concepts" (ibid., 33).
6. Andreas Huyssen, "Mapping the Postmodern," in *The Post-Modern Agenda,* ed. Jencks, 47, 49.
7. Chris Weedon, *Feminist Practice and Poststructuralist Theory* (Cambridge, Mass., and Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1987), 20.
8. Michel Foucault, *The Order of Things,* trans. from the French (London: Tavistock Publications, 1970); Jacques Derrida, *Of Grammatology,* trans. G. C. Spivak (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1976); Jacques Lacan, *Ecrits: A Selection,* trans. A. Sheridan (New York: Norton, 1977). The American academic Paul de Man's *Blindness and Insight: Essays in the Rhetoric of Contemporary Fiction* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1971) "relies," as Berman notes, "upon Derrida" (in this, reflecting Derrida's renown in American literary circles since his presentation of a paper, entitled "Structure, Sign, and Play" [see Richard Macksey and Eugenio Donato, eds., *The Structuralist Controversy,* Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press, 1970], at a conference held at Johns Hopkins in 1966). Art Berman, *From the New Criticism to Deconstruction: The Reception of Structuralism and Post-Structuralism* (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1988), 114–15, 199, 223.
9. Jean Francois Lyotard, *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge,* trans. Geoff Bennington and Brian Massumi, with a foreword by Fredric Jameson (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984), xxiii.
10. Patricia Waugh, *Practising Postmodernism: Reading Modernism* (London, New York, Melbourne, Auckland: Edward Arnold, a division of Hodder & Stoughton, 1992), 23.
11. Robert C. Solomon, ed., *Phenomenology and Existentialism* (New York, Evanston, San Francisco, and London: Harper & Row, 1972; Savage, Md.: Littlefield Adams Quality Paperbacks, 1980), 32.
12. Griffin, *God and Religion in the Postmodern World,* x.
13. Kenneth Baynes, James Bohman and Thomas McCarthy, eds., introduction to the philosophy of Charles Taylor, *After Philosophy: End or Transformation?* (Cambridge, Mass. and London: MIT Press, 1987), 461.

14. Waugh, *Practising Postmodernism,* 15–16, 19, 23.
15. Ibid., 3. Waugh, it must be assumed, views "post" in the sense of critical of Husserl's epistemological phenomenology, central to which is the transcendental ego, as opposed to that which is "embodied" and thus firmly situated in the world. For Heidegger and Derrida, situatedness in the world, necessarily, equates with situatedness in language. See George Steiner, *Heidegger,* 2d ed., rev. and enl. (Hammersmith, London: Fontana Press, An Imprint of HarperCollins, 1992), 10, 36.
16. Ibid., 19.
17. Susan Sontag, "One culture and the new sensibility," chap. in *Against Interpretation and Other Essays* (New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux, 1966; London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1967), 302.
18. Richard J. Bernstein, introduction to *Habermas and Modernity,* ed. Richard C. Bernstein (Cambridge: Polity Press and Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1985), 5, quoted in Harvey, *The Condition of Postmodernity,* 15.
19. Cornel West, *The American Evasion of Philosophy: A Genealogy of Pragmatism* (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1989), 197.
20. Sandra B. Rosenthal and Patrick L. Bourgeois, *Pragmatism and Phenomenology: A Philosophic Encounter* (Amsterdam: B. R. Grüner, 1980), 39.
21. William James, *The Meaning of Truth* (New York: n.p., 1909), vii, quoted in Paul Edwards, ed., *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (New York: Macmillan, 1967; New York: Macmillan & Free Press, and London: Collier Macmillan, repr. ed., 1972) s.v. "Pragmatism," by H. S. Thayer.
22. *Collins Dictionary of Philosophy,* 1990 ed., s.v. "pragmatism."
23. Rosenthal and Bourgeois, *Pragmatism and Phenomenology,* 186.
24. Berman, *From the New Criticism to Deconstruction,* 72.
25. Griffin, *God and Religion in the Postmodern World,* x.
26. Barbara Rose, "The Problems of Criticism V: The Politics of Art, Part II," *Artforum* 7, no. 5 (January 1969): 47.
27. Cornel West, *The American Evasion of Philosophy,* 212–13, 235.
28. David Lyon, *Postmodernity* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994), 18, 70.
29. Ibid., 7.
30. Ibid., 18.
31. Zygmunt Bauman, *Intimations of Postmodernity* (London and New York: Routledge, 1992), 51–2.
32. Lawrence Alloway, "Personal Statement," *Ark* 19 (Spring 1957): 28.
33. Bauman, *Intimations of Postmodernity,* 49.
34. Harold Rosenberg, "The Mona Lisa without a mustache: Art in the media age," *Art News* 75, no. 5 (May 1976): 48.
35. Harold Rosenberg, "Warhol: Art's Other Self," chap. in *Art on the Edge: Creators and Situations* (London: Secker & Warburg, 1976), 98, 101.
36. Bauman, *Intimations of Postmodernity,* 52.
37. Douglas Kellner, *Jean Baudrillard: From Marxism to Postmodernism and Beyond* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1989), 68.
38. Clement Greenberg, "Modernist Painting," *Art and Literature* (Spring 1965).
39. Andreas Huyssen, "Mapping the Postmodern," in *The Post-Modern Reader,* ed. Jencks, 47, 49.

40. This study bases its findings on the "post-modernist" consciousness of critics (in the main, "art" critics). That of Huyssen, by way of contrast, is only partly based on the consciousness of critics and, even then, only that representative of a small number: Susan Sontag, Leslie Fiedler, and Ihab Hassan. While Huyssen classifies them as "literary" critics (ibid., 44, 47), this study includes Susan Sontag and, to a lesser degree, Ihab Hassan in the broader category of "cultural" critic.
41. Huyssen, "Mapping the Postmodern," 47, 49–50.
42. Barbara Rose in *Elitist Vs. Popular Criticism: Proceedings of the Conference on Art Criticism and Art Education in New York, Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, May 15–16, 1970,* by School of Education, New York University and the New York State Council of the Arts, 11, 14–16.
43. Susan Sontag, "One culture and the new sensibility," 298–9.
44. Sontag, "The Aesthetics of Silence," *Aspen,* nos. 5 and 6 (1967), chap. in *A Susan Sontag Reader,* with an introduction by Elizabeth Hardwick (New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux, 1982; reprint, New York: Vintage Books, Random House, 1983), 194–5.
45. Huyssen, "Mapping the Postmodern," 67.
46. Lawrence Alloway, "The arts and the mass media," *Architectural Design* 28 (February 1958): 85.
47. Huyssen, "Mapping the Postmodern," 47; Huyssen's failure to acknowledge the pragmatist strain of 1960's American post-modernism can be accounted for on two grounds: it pre-existed the reinvigoration of pragmatism in American philosophical circles; Huyssen's "Mapping the Postmodern," the prime source of his account of the American avantgardist phase of post-modernism in the 1960s, was initially published in 1984 and hence prior to pragmatism's rise to prominence in accounts of deconstructive post-modernism (see, for example, David Harvey, *The Condition of Postmodernity, 9, 52;* Griffin, introduction to *God and Religion in the Postmodern World,* x). For this reason, Huyssen does not consider pragmatism in the section of his essay devoted to later phases of post-modernism ("Mapping the Postmodern," 66–69).
48. Ibid., 47, 61.
49. For example, see Harold Rosenberg, "Warhol: Art's Other Self," 98–108 passim.
50. Jencks, "The Post-Modern Agenda," in *The Post-Modern Reader,* ed. Jencks, 17.
51. Bernstein, introduction to *Habermas and Modernity,* 5, quoted in Harvey, *The Condition of Postmodernity,* 15.
52. Herbert Marcuse, *One Dimensional Man* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1964; London: Sphere Books, 1968; London: Abacus, Sphere Books, 1972), 14–15; Jean Baudrillard, *Simulations,* trans. Paul Foss, Paul Patton, and Philip Beitchman (New York: Columbia University, 1983), 103–11.
53. Richard Gill and Ernest Sherman, introduction to *The Fabric of Existentialism,* eds. Richard Gill and Ernest Sherman (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Educational Division, Meredith Corporation, 1973), 19–20.
54. West, *The American Evasion of Philosophy,* 213.
55. May Natalie Tabak (Mrs. Harold Rosenberg), interview with Ann Eden Gibson, 19 April 1982, Ann Eden Gibson, *Issues in Abstract Expressionism: The Artist-Run Periodicals* (Ann Arbor and London: U.M.I. Research Press, 1990), 39.
56. Huyssen, "Mapping the Postmodern," 61.

57. Gill and Sherman, introduction to *The Fabric of Existentialism,* 20.
58. West, *The American Evasion of Philosophy,* 4, 226.
59. Huyssen, "Mapping the Postmodern," 52.
60. Susan Sontag, "Psychoanalysis and Norman O. Brown's *Life Against Death,*" chap. in *Against Interpretation,* 256–7.
61. Huyssen, "Mapping the Postmodern," 47.
62. Ibid., 49–50.
63. Ibid., 48, 50.
64. Harold Rosenberg, "D. M. Z. Vanguardism," *The New Yorker* 28 (September 1968), 161.
65. Rose, "Problems of Criticism V: The Politics of Art, Part II," 47.
66. Harold Rosenberg, "D.M.Z. Vanguardism," 158.
67. Huyssen, "Mapping the Postmodern," 49.
68. Rose, "The Problems of Criticism V: The Politics of Art, Part II," 47.
69. West, *The American Evasion of Philosophy,* 235, 237.
70. Ihab Hassan, "POSTmodernISM: A Paracritical Bibliography," *New Literary History* 3, no. 1 (Fall 1971), 11.
71. Ibid., 27–28.
72. Jencks, "The Post-Modern Agenda," 15.
73. Hassan, "POSTmodernISM: A Paracritical Bibliography," 25.
74. Hassan traces his initial use of the term post-modernism to "Frontiers of Criticism: Metaphors of Silence," *Virginia Quarterly* 46, no. 1 (Winter 1970). Prior to this time, he considered that he had used both "anti-literature" and "the literature of silence" in a "proximate sense" in, for example, "The Literature of Silence," *Encounter* 28, no. 1 (January 1967). Ihab Hassan, "Culture, Indeterminacy, and Immanence: Margins of the (Postmodern) Age," chap. in *The Postmodern Turn: Essays in Postmodern Theory and Culture* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1987) 94, n. 3.
75. Included in the list were Sontag's "The Aesthetics of Silence," *Aspen,* no. 5 & 6 (1967), as well as collections of essays: *Against Interpretation* (New York: n.p., 1966); *Styles of Radical Will* (New York: n.p., 1969). Hassan, "POSTmodernISM: A Paracritical Bibliography," 14.
76. Hassan, "Culture, Indeterminacy, and Immanence," 75.
77. Hassan, "POSTmodernISM: A Paracritical Bibliography," 15–16.
78. Ibid., 25–26.
79. Patricia A. Deduck, *Realism, Reality, and the Fictional Theory of Alain Robbe-Grillet and Anais Nin* (Washington, D.C: University Press of America, 1982), 5.
80. Jay, "Sartre, Merleau-Ponty, and the Search for a New Ontology of Sight," 143.
81. Ibid.
82. Ilona Leki, *Alain Robbe-Grillet* (Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1983), 13.
83. Sontag, "Against Interpretation," 227, 230.
84. Deduck, *Realism, Reality, and the Fictional Theory of Alain Robbe-Grillet and Anais Nin,* 5.
85. Morse Peckham, *Man's Rage for Chaos,* no further publication details provided, quoted in Hassan, "POSTmodernISM: A Paracritical Bibliography," 28–9.
86. Hassan, "Culture, Indeterminacy, and Immanence," 49, 51.
87. Ihab Hassan "Making Sense: The Trials of Postmodern Discourse," *New Literary*

History 18, no. 2 (Winter 1987), 453. Hassan drew his explanation of James's "'pluralistic universe'" from the following texts by James: *Pragmatism* (New York: n.p., 1955); *A Pluralistic Universe* (Cambridge, Mass.: n.p., 1977); *The Will to Believe and Human Immortality* (New York: n.p., 1956).

88. Ihab Hassan, "Prospects in Retrospect," chap. in *The Postmodern Turn,* 230.
89. Hans Bertens claimed that in "Making Sense: The Trials of Postmodern Discourse" (1987) Hassan, giving way to "his lingering humanism," "turns to the American pragmatic tradition" (*The Idea of the Postmodern: A History,* [London and New York: Routledge, 1995] 46). Bertens, however, fails to acknowledge the presence of pragmatism, albeit minor, in Hassan's essays from the previous decade: "POSTmodernISM: A Paracritical Bibliography" (1971) and "Culture, Indeterminacy, and Immanence" (Winter 1977–78).
90. Hassan, "Making Sense: The Trials of Postmodern Discourse," 451–2, 455. Hassan refers to the ideas of Michael Polanyi and Harry Prosch, *Meaning* (Chicago: n.p., 1975), 10f.
91. Berman, *From the New Criticism to Deconstruction,* 173.
92. Terry Eagleton, *Literary Theory: An Introduction* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1983), 138.
93. See, for example, Margaret A. Rose 's account of Derrida's application of "deconstruction" to cultural critique in *The Post-Modern and the Post-Industrial* (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 41. This same issue is discussed in Chapter 5 of this study.
94. Huyssen, "Mapping the Postmodern," 61.
95. West, *The American Evasion of Philosophy,* 226.
96. Huyssen, "Mapping the Postmodern," 49.
97. Andreas Huyssen, "The Search for Tradition: Avantgarde and Postmodernism in the 1970s," *After the Great Divide: Modernism, Mass Culture, Postmodernism* (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1986), 164.
98. Hassan, "Prospects in Retrospect," 215–16.
99. Hassan, "Pluralism in Postmodern Perspective," *Critical Inquiry* 12 (Spring 1986), 504–05.
100. Jencks, "The Post-Modern Agenda," 21.
101. Greenberg, "Modernist Painting," *Arts Yearbook* 4 (1961), 103–04.
102. Harvey, *The Condition of Postmodernity,* 19.
103. Steinberg, "Other Criteria," 68.
104. Lawrence Alloway, *American Pop Art* (New York: Macmillan, 1974), 9; Lawrence Alloway, "An Interview with Lawrence Alloway," interview by James L. Reinish, *Studio International* 186 (September 1973): 62.
105. Harold Rosenberg, "Toward an Unanxious Profession," chap. in *The Anxious Object* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1966; Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, Phoenix edition, 1982), 17.
106. André Breton and Diego Rivera, "Manifesto for an Independent Revolutionary Art," in *What is Surrealism? Selected Writings,* ed. Franklin Rosemont (London: Pluto Press, 1978), 183.
107. Clement Greenberg, "Avant-Garde and Kitsch," *Partisan Review* 6, no. 5 (Fall 1939), in William Phillips and Philip Rahv, eds., *The Partisan Reader 1934–1944* (n.p.: Dial Press, 1946), reprinted in *Mass Culture: The Popular Arts in America*

eds. Bernard Rosenberg and David Manning White (New York: Free Press, 1957, 1964), 99, 102–3.

108. Ibid., 102.
109. Alloway, "The arts and the mass media," 84.
110. Rose, *Elitist Vs. Popular Criticism,* 11.
111. Greenberg, "Avant-Garde and Kitsch," 102–3.
112. Rose, *Elitist Vs. Popular Criticism,* 11.
113. Greenberg, "Avant-Garde and Kitsch," 103.
114. Rose, *Elitist Vs. Popular Criticism,* 17.
115. Rosenthal and Bourgeois, *Pragmatism and Phenomenology,* 36–7.
116. Rose, "The Problems of Criticism V: The Politics of Art, Part II," 47.
117. Ibid., 49; Barbara Rose, "The Problems of Criticism V1: The Politics of Art, Part III," *Artforum* 7, no. 9 (May 1969), 46.
118. Lawrence Alloway, in *Fathers of Pop (The Independent Group),* by Reyner Banham and Julian Cooper (London: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1979), film, quoted in Nigel Whiteley, *Pop Design: From Modernism to Mod* (London: The Design Council, 1987), 46.
119. Milton C. Nahm, *The Artist as Creator: An Essay on Human Freedom* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1956), 328.
120. Herbert Read, *Art and Industry: The Principles of Industrial Design,* 5th ed. (London: Faber and Faber, 1966), 60.
121. Max Kozloff, *The Critic and the Visual Arts: Papers delivered at the 52nd Annual Convention of the American Federation of Arts in Boston, April, 1965,* by the American Federation of Arts, 48.
122. Max Kozloff, "Psychological Dynamics in Art Criticism in the Sixties," chap. in *Renderings: Critical Essays on a Century of Modern Art* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1968), 314, 317.
123. Quentin Lauer, introduction to *Phenomenology and the Crisis of Philosophy* by Edmund Husserl, trans. Quentin Lauer (New York, Evanston, and London: Harper & Row, Harper Torchbooks, 1965), 4.
124. Deduck, *Realism, Reality, and the Fictional Theory of Alain Robbe-Grillet and Anais Nin,* 5.
125. Alloway, *American Pop Art,* 7.
126. Bauman, *Intimations of Postmodernity,* viii.
127. Deduck, *Realism, Reality, and the Fictional Theory of Alain Robbe-Grillet and Anais Nin,* 5.
128. Martin Jay, "Sartre, Merleau-Ponty, and the Search for a New Ontology of Sight," in *Modernity and the Hegemony of Vision,* ed. David Michael Levin (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 1993), 143.

CHAPTER 2. LAWRENCE ALLOWAY: POP ART AND THE "POP ART–FINE ART CONTINUUM"

1. David Ray Griffin, introduction to *God and Religion in the Postmodern World: Essays in Postmodern Theology* (Albany: State University of New York, 1989), x.
2. Zygmunt Bauman, *Intimations of Postmodernity* (London and New York: Routledge, 1992), 51–2.

3. Alloway, *American Pop Art* (New York: Macmillan, 1974), 47.
4. Charles Morris, *Signs, Language and Behavior* (n.p.: Prentice-Hall, 1946; reprint, New York: George Braziller, 1955), v.
5. Sandra B. Rosenthal and Patrick L. Bourgeois, *Pragmatism and Phenomenology: A Philosophic Encounter* (Amsterdam: B. R. Grüner, 1980), 39.
6. Biographical details taken from the following sources: curriculum vitae supplied by Alloway's widow, Sylvia Sleigh; *Who's Who in America,* 1990 ed., s.v. "Alloway, Lawrence."
7. Lawrence Alloway, *Six Painters and the Object,* exhibition catalogue (New York: Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, 1963), no pagination.
8. Lawrence Alloway, *Six More,* exhibition catalogue (Los Angeles: Los Angeles County Museum of Art, 1963), no pagination.
9. Lucy Lippard, ed., *Pop Art,* 3d ed., rev. (London: Thames and Hudson, 1970) 68–138.
10. Lawrence Alloway, "Popular Culture and Pop Art," *Studio International* 178 (July–August 1969): 17–21.
11. Alloway, *Six More,* no pagination.
12. Lawrence Alloway, interviewed by Patrick S. Smith, 9 November 1978, in "Art *In Extremis:* Andy Warhol and His Art" (Ph.D. thesis, Northwestern University, 1982), 391.
13. Presumably, Alloway is referring to Roy Lichtenstein, *Look Mickey,* oil on canvas, 1961, collection of the artist, reproduced in Alloway, *American Pop Art,* fig. 7.
14. Alloway, *American Pop Art,* 7, 78.
15. Lawrence Alloway, "An Interview with Lawrence Alloway," an interview by James L. Reinish, *Studio International* 186 (no. 958, September 1973): 62.
16. Alloway, "Popular Culture and Pop Art," 19.
17. Ibid.
18. Alloway, "Popular Culture and Pop Art," 17.
19. Ibid., 19.
20. Lawrence Alloway, "Art as Likeness," *Arts Magazine* 41, no. 7 (May 1967): 34, 37–8.
21. David Robbins noted that Alloway "brought his interest in communication systems to his analyses of specific works of Pop Art and to his historical interpretations of the movement." See David Robbins, "Alloway," in *The Independent Group: Postwar Britain and the Aesthetics of Plenty,* ed. David Robbins (Cambridge: M.I.T. Press, 1990), 163. Donald Kuspit claimed that Alloway "strongly approves of Pop art because it exists in terms of what he has called the 'fine art-pop art continuum.'" See Donald Kuspit, preface to *Network: Art and the Complex Present,* by Lawrence Alloway (Ann Arbor: U.M.I. Research Press, 1984), xiii. Neither author, however, explored the connections between pop art and the "fine art-pop art continuum" (and, thus, communication systems) in further detail.
22. Graham Whitlam, "Chronology," in *The Independent Group,* ed. Robbins, 15.
23. Lawrence Alloway, "The Independent Group: Postwar Britain and the Aesthetics of Plenty," in ibid., 49.
24. Whitlam, "Chronology," 22.
25. Alloway, "The Independent Group," 50.
26. Nigel Whiteley, *Pop Design: From Modernism to Mod* (London: The Design

Council, 1987), 45, 48. Both Whiteley and Alloway refer to the second series of seminars as the 1954–1955 season. See Whiteley, ibid., 48, and Alloway, "The Development of British Pop," in Lippard, *Pop Art,* 32. The topics described by Whiteley and Alloway, however, are consistent with those of the Spring 1955 session (running from 11 February to 15 July). A copy of this program, taken from the original, mimeographed document, claimed to be the only surviving record of a season of Independent Group meetings, is included in *This is Tomorrow Today: The Independent Group and British Pop Art* (n.p.: Institute for Art and Urban Resources, 1987), 87–88. This dating of the series is endorsed by Graham Whitlam in "Chronology," 30–31.

27. David Robbins observed that John McHale cited Alloway's "concept of a 'fine art/popular art continuum'" – in "Gropius and the Bauhaus," *Art* (London), March 3, 1955, and assumed from its application (to critique the "Bauhaus legacy") that it was in use at the time (1955) in "IG discussions on popular culture." See Robbins, "Alloway," 164, n. 1.
28. Lawrence Alloway, "The arts and the mass media," *Architectural Design* 28 (February 1958): 85.
29. Lawrence Alloway, "Personal Statement," *Ark* 19 (Spring 1957): 28.
30. Lawrence Alloway, "Pop Art: *The Words,*" *Auction* 1, no. 4 (February 1968), chap. in *Topics in American Art Since 1945* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1975), 119–20.
31. George Gerbner, "Mass Media and Human Communication Theory," in *Human Communication Theory,* ed. F.E.X. Dance (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1967), in *Sociology of Mass Communications,* ed. Denis McQuail (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1972), 39.
32. J. Gould and W. L. Kolb, eds., *A Dictionary of the Social Sciences* (n.p.: Free Press, 1964), 413, quoted in ibid., 40–41.
33. Gerbner, "Mass Media and Human Communication Theory," 38.
34. B. Ifor Evans, introduction to *Studies in Communication,* by A. J. Ayer and others, eds. (London: Martin Secker & Warburg, 1955), 1–2.
35. Appendix, *This is Tomorrow Today,* 88.
36. Graham Whitlam, "Chronology," and "Exhibitions," in *The Independent Group,* ed. Robbins, 30, 147. Alloway had met Eames and first seen *A Communication Primer* during a visit to America 1953–54 which he undertook with Toni del Renzio and John Holroyd. Anne Massey, *The Independent Group: Modernism and Mass Culture in Britain, 1945–59* (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press) 99.
37. A. J. Ayer and others, *Studies in Communication,* 2.
38. Whitlam, "Chronology," 34.
39. Whitlam, "Exhibitions," 147.
40. Lawrence Alloway, "Allan Kaprow, Two Views," a composite of "Art in Escalation," *Arts Magazine* 41, no. 3 (December 1966–January 1967) and *The Nation,* 20 October 1969, chap. in *Topics in American Art,* 200. McLuhan is also cited in Alloway, "Popular Culture and Pop Art," 17, and Alloway, *American Pop Art,* 4.
41. *The Joy of Life Encyclopaedia,* 1978 ed., s.v. "Cybernetics."
42. Norbert Wiener, *The Human Use of Human Beings: Cybernetics and Society,* rev. ed. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1954; New York: Da Capo Press, 1989) 7, 11–12.

43. Ibid., 16.
44. Ibid., 17–18, 27.
45. Lawrence Alloway, review of the Cambridge Group show at New Vision Centre, London, February 1960, "Notes on Abstract Art and the Mass Media," *Art News and Review* 12, no. 3 (27 February-12 March 1960): 3.
46. Alvin Toffler, *Future Shock* (New York: Random House, 1970), 4, 309–10.
47. Alloway, "Popular Culture and Pop Art," 17.
48. Alloway, "Allan Kaprow, Two Views," 200.
49. Lawrence Alloway, interview by Jacquelynn Baas and David Robbins, 23 October, 1987, David Robbins, "American Ads," in *The Independent Group,* 59.
50. Reprint of schedule of Independent Group seminars for the Spring 1955 session, in *This is Tomorrow Today,* 88.
51. Marshall McLuhan, *The Gutenberg Galaxy: The Making of Typographic Man* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1962), 5.
52. Alloway, "Personal Statement," 28.
53. Alloway, "Popular Culture and Pop Art," 17.
54. David Riesman, *The Lonely Crowd* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1950), 20–2, 26.
55. David Lyon, *Postmodernity* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994), 58–59.
56. Alloway, "The arts and the mass media," 85.
57. Riesman, *The Lonely Crowd,* 169.
58. John McHale, "The expendable ikon 1," *Architectural Design* (February 1959): 82.
59. Alloway, "The arts and the mass media," 84.
60. Clement Greenberg, "Avant-Garde and Kitsch," *Partisan Review* (Fall 1939), in *The Partisan Reader 1934–44,* eds. William Phillips and Philip Rahv (n.p.: Dial Press, 1946), reprinted in *The Popular Arts in America,* eds. Bernard Rosenberg and David Manning White (New York: Free Press, 1957, 1964), 103, quoted in Alloway, "The arts and the mass media," 84.
61. Ibid.
62. McHale, "The expendable ikon 1," 82.
63. Lawrence Alloway, in *Fathers of Pop (The Independent Group*), by Reyner Banham and Julian Cooper (London: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1979), film, quoted and paraphrased in Whiteley, *Pop Design,* 46.
64. Herbert Read, *Art and Industry: The Principles of Industrial Design,* 5th ed. (London: Faber and Faber, 1966), 57–8, 60, 62.
65. Cornel West, *The American Evasion of Philosophy: A Genealogy of Pragmatism* (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1989), 4.
66. Lawrence Alloway, "Technology and Sex in Science Fiction: A Note on Cover Art," *Ark* 17 (Summer 1956), 19, quoted in Whitlam, "Science Fiction," in *The Independent Group,* ed. Robbins, 61.
67. Alloway, "Notes on Abstract Art and the Mass Media," 3.
68. Alloway, "An Interview with Lawrence Alloway," 62.
69. Whitlam, "Chronology," 26, 41.
70. Alloway, "The arts and the mass media," 85.
71. Reyner Banham, "Vehicles of Desire," *Art,* no. 1 (1 September 1955) in *This is Tomorrow Today,* 66.

72. *Collins Dictionary of Philosophy,* 1990 ed., s.v. "pragmatism."
73. Alloway, "Personal Statement," 28.
74. Alloway, "An Interview with Lawrence Alloway," 63.
75. Alloway, *American Pop Art,* 18–19.
76. Alloway, "Notes on Abstract Art and the Mass Media," 3.
77. Richard Rorty, *The Consequences of Pragmatism (Essays: 1972–1980)* (Great Britain: Harvester Press, 1982), xviii.
78. Anne Massey, "The Independent Group: Toward a Redefinition," *Burlington Magazine* 129, no. 1009 (April 1987): 241. Massey erroneously referred to Korzybski's system as "logic" (the same error was made in the description of the seminar entitled "Dadaists as Non-Aristotelians," in the schedule of the second series, reprinted in *This is Tomorrow Today,* 88). Korzybski stressed that his system is one of "*evaluation*" and not of "logic." See Alfred Korzybski, *Science and Sanity: An Introduction to Non-Aristotelian Systems and General Semantics,* 4th ed. (Lakeville, Connecticut: Institute of General Semantics, 1958), xxix.
79. Massey, "The Independent Group: Toward a Redefinition," 241.
80. Whitlam, "Science Fiction," n. 2, 62. Similar information is provided by Massey, *The Independent Group,* 85.
81. Massey, "The Independent Group: Toward a Redefinition," 241.
82. In a later publication Massey cites *Astounding Science Fiction* as an example of "post-war science fiction magazines" that were a source of Van Vogt's writings. See Massey, *The Independent Group,* 85.
83. Whitlam, "Science Fiction," 61.
84. Lawrence Alloway, "Retrospective Statements," in *The Independent Group,* ed. Robbins, 187.
85. Alloway, "The Development of British Pop," in *Pop Art,* ed. Lippard, 202. Nigel Whiteley named Edward Wright and Alloway as the presenters of this session (Whiteley, *Pop Design,* 48). The schedule taken from the only surviving record of a season of Independent Group meetings lists the "main speakers" as John McHale, Anthony Hill, Donald Holmes, and Toni del Renzio (reprinted in *This is Tomorrow Today,* 88); Alloway, interview with Banham, *Fathers of Pop,* quoted in Massey, *The Independent Group: 1945–59,* 85.
86. Alloway, "The Development of British Pop," in *Pop Art,* ed. Lippard, 202.
87. *This is Tomorrow Today,* 88.
88. Korzybski, *Science and Sanity,* xx.
89. Ibid., xx, xxi, xxxiii, 1xxxi.
90. Ibid., xxxviii. For example: *Categories, On Interpretation, Prior Analytics, Posterior Analytics, Topics, On Sophisticated Refutations, Collins Dictionary of Philosophy,* 1990 ed., s.v. "Aristotle."
91. Ibid., xxxviii.
92. Ibid., xxi.
93. Ibid., xxi, xxxii, xxxv, 1.
94. Korzybski. *Science and Sanity,* xix.
95. George Steiner, *Heidegger,* 2nd ed. rev. and enl. (London: Fontana Press, 1992), 153.
96. Korzybski, *Science and Sanity,* acknowledgments, unpaginated.

97. First English edition, with a translation, published in 1922; first German edition published in 1921.
98. Ludwig Wittgenstein, *Tractatus-Logico-Philosophicus,* new trans. D. F. Pears and B. F. McGuiness, with an introduction by Bertrand Russell (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1961), 3, 151.
99. Alloway, "Personal Statement," 28.
100. Alloway, "Popular Culture and Pop Art," 18.
101. Ibid., 93.
102. Alloway in *Fathers of Pop,* by Banham and Cooper, quoted in Whitlam, "Chronology," 43.
103. Jean Baudrillard, *The Mirror of Production* (St. Louis, Mo.: Telos, 1975), 144, quoted in Lyon, *Postmodernity,* 16.
104. Alloway, "Notes on Abstract Art and the Mass Media," 3.
105. Peter Selz, "A Symposium on Pop Art," *Arts Magazine* 37, no. 6 (April 1963): 43.
106. Alloway, "The Uses and Limits of Art Criticism," chap. in *Topics in American Art Since 1945,* 267.
107. Morris, *Signs, Language and Behavior,* 118, 120.
108. Robbins, "The Independent Group: Forerunners of Postmodernism?," in *The Independent Group,* ed. Robbins, 239.
109. *This is Tomorrow,* catalogue for exhibition held at Whitechapel Art Gallery, London, 8 August-9 September 1956, reproduced in *The Independent Group,* ed. Robbins, 158.
110. Alloway, *American Pop Art,* 4, 7, 16, 18.
111. Wolfgang Iser, *The Act of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Response* (London and Henley: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1978), 65.
112. Alloway, *American Pop Art,* 78.
113. For an example of its use, see Raymond Willliams, *Britain in the Sixties: Communications* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1962), 27–62.
114. Alloway, *American Pop Art,* 78.
115. Fredric Jameson, *Postmodernism, or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism* (London: Verso and Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1991; London and New York: Verso, 1992), 15, 17.
116. Morris, *Signs, Language and Behavior,* 118–20.
117. Charles Peirce, unacknowledged source, quoted in ibid., v.
118. Morris, *Signs, Language and Behavior,* v.
119. Alloway, "The Uses and Limits of Criticism," 267.
120. Robbins, "The Independent Group: Forerunners of Postmodernism?," 239.
121. Colin Cherry, "'Communication Theory' – and Human Behavior," in *Studies in Communication,* 62.
122. Cherry uses the term "Theory of Communication" to refer to what is more commonly designated "Information Theory." See ibid., 48.
123. Ibid., 64–5.
124. Ibid., 49, 65. David Robbins quoted part of this passage in Robbins, "The Independent Group: Forerunners of Postmodernism?," 239. In this same source, Robbins identified the diagrams of communication in the Group 12 section of the *This is Tomorrow* catalogue as the Claude Shannon "source-destination formula for

information decoding," referred to by Cherry in "'Communication Theory' – and Human Behavior." Cherry, however, did not include an illustration of this model in his essay.

125. Morris, *Signs, Behavior and Language,* 118–20.
126. Alloway, *American Pop Art,* 18, 47.
127. Ibid., 78, 91, 113.
128. Morris, *Signs, Language, and Behavior,* 118–19.
129. Alloway, *American Pop Art,* 42, 47.
130. Soren Kierkegaard, *The Present Age,* trans. Alexander Dru (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1962), 35, 40, quoted in ibid.
131. Soren Kierkegaard, *Kierkegaard,* with an introduction by W. H. Auden (London: Cassell, 1955), 35.
132. Ibid., 42, 47.
133. Gerhard Hoffman, Alfred Hornung, and Rüdiger Kunow, "'Modern,' 'Postmodern' and 'Contemporary' as Criteria for the Analysis of 20th Century Literature," *Amerikastudien* 22 (1977): 40, quoted in Hans Bertens, "The Postmodern *Weltanschauung* and its Relation with Modernism: An Introductory Survey," in *Approaching Postmodernism: Papers Presented at a Workshop on Postmodernism, 21–23 September 1984, University of Utrecht,* eds. Douwe Fokkema and Hans Bertens (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1986), 46.
134. Donald B. Kuspit, "Postmodernism, Plurality and the Urgency of the Given," in *The Idea of the Post-Modern: Who is Teaching It? Proceedings of Symposium held at the Henry Art Gallery, University of Washington, 20 April 1979,* by Henry Art Gallery, University of Washington, 20–21.
135. Ibid., 21; David Robbins claimed that both "Brutalist texture" and "pop figuration" (e.g., Richard Hamilton's paintings from the fifties that employed mass culture imagery in collage-like compositions) promoted an "interpretive freedom that was to be theoretically elaborated into a reception-based aesthetic within the IG." However, he provided no explanation of the nature of this aesthetic or, for that matter, its underlying assumptions. Robbins, "The Independent Group: Forerunners of Postmodernism?," 246.
136. Alloway, "Personal Statement," 28.
137. Lawrence Alloway, "The Long Front of Culture," *Cambridge Opinion* 17 (1959) in *This is Tomorrow Today,* 32–3.
138. John McHale, "The Fine Arts in the Mass Media" (excerpts), *Cambridge Opinion* 17 (1959) in *The Independent Group,* ed. Robbins, 183.
139. Zygmunt Bauman, *Intimations of Postmodernity,* 49.
140. Ibid., 51–2.
141. Iser, *The Act of Reading,* 54–5.
142. Alloway, "The Long Front of Culture," in *This is Tomorrow Today,* 31.
143. Jonathon Culler, *Saussure* (Hammersmith: Fontana, 1986), 19.
144. Ferdinand de Saussure, *Course in General Linguistics,* eds. Charles Bally and Albert Sechehaye in collaboration with Albert Reidlinger, trans. Wade Baskin (London: Peter Owen, 1960), 101–2.
145. Lawrence Alloway, "The Complex Present," *Art Criticism* 1, no. 1 (1979), chap. in Alloway, *Network: Art and the Complex Present,* 29.
146. Ferdinand de Saussure, *Course in General Linguistics,* 16, quoted in ibid.

147. Art Berman, *From the New Criticism to Deconstruction: The Reception of Structuralism and Post-Structuralism* (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1988), 4, 173, 208.
148. Douglas Kellner, *Jean Baudrillard: From Marxism to Postmodernism and Beyond* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1989), 90.
149. Berman, *From the New Criticism to Deconstruction,* 173.
150. Bertens, "The Postmodern *Weltanschauung,*" 46. Bertens does not credit this observation with a post-structuralist origin.
151. Alloway, *American Pop Art,* 47, 80.
152. Kellner, *Jean Baudrillard,* 68.
153. Ibid., 146.
154. Jean Baudrillard, "The Hyper-realism of Simulation" (excerpts), section of *L'Echange symbolique et la mort* (Paris, 1976); translated by Charles Levin as *Symbolic Exchange and Death* in *The Structural Allegory,* ed. J. Fekete (Minneapolis, 1984); this translation reprinted in Mark Poster, ed., *Jean Baudrillard: Selected Writings* (Stanford, 1988); reprinted in *Art in Theory: 1900–1990,* eds. Charles Harrison and Paul Woods (Oxford and London: Blackwell, 1992; Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell, 1993), 1050.
155. Baudrillard, *Simulations,* 144. Since his earliest writings, Baudrillard had been in the habit of demonstrating his difficult theories at the level of art. Pop was particularly useful in this regard. In "Pop – An Art of Consumption" (1970), Baudrillard viewed pop "as a sign of the logic of consumer society" (Kellner, *Jean Baudrillard,* 110). In reference no doubt to pop's minimal transformation of commercial sources and thus pre-existing signs, Baudrillard described this movement as engaged not in "'realism'" but, rather, in "recognition of the obvious fact of consumer society: namely, that the truth of objects and products is their *mark.*" It heralds, therefore, a decisive break with previous art which was "based on a vision of the world 'in depth'" (i.e., art which "feeds on . . . transcendence"). Pop, by way of contrast, "claims to be homogeneous with that *immanent order of signs* – homogeneous with their industrial and serial production, and thus with the artificial, manufactured character of the whole environment – homogeneous with the *in extenso* saturation as much as culturalized abstraction of this new order of things" (Jean Baudrillard, "Pop – An Art of Consumption, from "*La societé de consommation: ses mythes, ses structures* [Paris: Gallimard, 1970], chap. in *Post-Pop Art,* ed. Paul Taylor, trans. by Paul Foss [Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1989], 34, 36, n. 3, 44).
156. Baudrillard, *Simulations,* 83, 111.
157. Kellner, *Jean Baudrillard,* 30.
158. Kellner afterJacques Derrida, *Of Grammatology* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1976), pagination unspecified, in *Jean Baudrillard,* 90.
159. Ibid., 64.
160. Bauman, *Intimations of Postmodernity,* 150–51.
161. Ihab Hassan, "Toward a Concept of Postmodernism," in *The Dismemberment of Orpheus: Towards a Postmodern Literature,* 2d ed., rev. (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1982), chap. in *The Postmodern Turn: Essays in Postmodern Theory and Culture* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1987), 92–3.
162. Morris, *Signs, Language and Behavior,* v.

CHAPTER 3. HAROLD ROSENBERG: POP ART AND THE "DE-DEFINITION" OF BOTH ART AND "SELF"

1. Harold Rosenberg, "Towards an Unanxious Profession," in *The Anxious Object* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1966; Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, Phoenix edition, 1982), 16–19.
2. Alan M. Wald, *The New York Intellectuals: The Rise and Decline of the Anti-Stalinist Left from the 1930s to the 1980s* (Chapel Hill and London: University of North Carolina Press, 1987), 222.
3. May Natalie Tabak (Mrs. Harold Rosenberg), interview with Ann Eden Gibson, 19 April 1982, in Ann Eden Gibson, *Issues in Abstract Expressionism: The Artist-Run Periodicals* (Ann Arbor and London: U.M.I. Research Press, 1990), 39.
4. Wald, *The New York Intellectuals,* 222.
5. Biographical notes, Harold Rosenberg, *The Case of the Baffled Radical* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1985), no pagination.
6. Barbara Rose, *Autocritique: Essays on Art and Anti-Art 1963–1987* (New York: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1988), xii. Rosenberg's career in advertising, obliquely at least, followed on from the position he held during World War II in the Office of War Information: deputy chief of the domestic radio bureau. Wald, *The New York Intellectuals,* 222.
7. Robert Storr, review of *Art and Other Serious Matters* and *The Case of the Baffled Radical,* by Harold Rosenberg, in *Art Journal* 46, no. 4 (Winter 1987): 325.
8. Ibid., 326.
9. Clement Greenberg, "Avant-Garde and Kitsch," *Partisan Review* (Fall, 1939), in *The Partisan Reader 1934–1944,* eds., William Phillips and Philip Rahv (n.p.: Dial Press, 1946), reprinted in *The Popular Arts in America,* eds. Bernard Rosenberg and David Manning White (New York: Free Press, 1957, 1964), 103.
10. Harold Rosenberg, "Warhol: Art's Other Self," chap. in *Art on the Edge: Creators and Situations* (London: Secker and Warburg, 1976), 98.
11. The exhibition, entitled *Andy Warhol,* was first shown at the Pasadena Art Museum 12 May-21 June, 1970, and then at other locations, including the Whitney Museum of American Art, New York, in 1971. See Kynaston McShine, ed., *Andy Warhol: A Retrospective,* exhibition catalogue (New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 1989), 415.
12. Rosenberg, "Warhol: Art's Other Self," 98–9, 105–08.
13. Rosenberg, "Toward an Unanxious Profession," 17.
14. Hans Bertens claimed that "the 'true' beginnings of the debate" on post-modernism can be situated "in the early 1960s." While this debate "has its origins in American literary and cultural criticism," it soon "moves into all the other fields and disciplines." Amongst the evidence put forward by Bertens to support this claim was Harold Rosenberg's writings on the "anxious object." Bertens, however, explained neither the definition of this term nor the nature of the post-modernism it encompassed. Hans Bertens, *The Idea of the Postmodern: A History* (London and New York: Routledge, 1995), 14–15, 17.
15. Rosenberg, "On the De-definition of Art," chap. in *The De-definition of Art* (New York: Horizon Press, 1972), 12.

16. Rosenberg, "Warhol: Art's Other Self," 98–9, 101.
17. Walter Benjamin, "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction" (excerpts), *Zeitschrift für Sozialforschung* (New York) 5, no. 1 (1936), chap. in *Illuminations,* ed. Hannah Arendt (London: 1973) 219–53, reprinted in *Art in Theory 1900–1990: An Anthology of Changing Ideas,* eds. Charles Harrison and Paul Woods (Oxford: Blackwell, 1992; Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell, 1993), 514–15.
18. Harold Rosenberg, "The Mona Lisa without a mustache: Art in the media age," *Art News,* 75, no. 5 (May 1976): 48.
19. Ibid., 50.
20. Rosenberg, "On the De-definition of Art," 13.
21. Rosenberg, "Warhol: Art's Other Self," 99.
22. Harold Rosenberg, "Keeping Up," chap. in *The De-definition of Art,* 225–9.
23. Dwight MacDonald, "Masscult and Midcult," *Partisan Review* (Spring 1960), chap. in *Against the American Grain* (New York: Random House, 1962), 37.
24. Clement Greenberg, "Avant-Garde and Kitsch," 103.
25. Dwight MacDonald, "A Theory of Mass Culture," *Diogenes,* no. 3 (Summer 1953) in *Mass Culture,* eds. Rosenberg and White, 59. This article, according to Alan M. Wald (*The New York Intellectuals,* 406), originally appeared in 1944 in *Politics* as "A Theory of Popular Culture."
26. Greenberg, "Avant-Garde and Kitsch," 101, 103.
27. Harold Rosenberg, "Everyman a Professional," *Art News* 7 (November 1956), chap. in *The Tradition of the New* (New York: Horizon Press, 1960; New York: Da Capo Press, 1994), 60.
28. Harold Rosenberg, "Criticism and its Premises," chap. in *Art on the Edge,* 139.
29. Christopher Brookeman, *American Culture and Society Since the 1930s* (London and Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1984), 43.
30. Clement Greenberg, "Modernist Painting," *Arts Yearbook* 4, 1961: 103–04, 108.
31. Ibid., 99–100.
32. Ibid., 102.
33. Harold Rosenberg, "D. M. Z. Vanguardism," *The New Yorker,* 28 September 1968, 158. See Renato Poggioli, *The Theory of the Avant-Garde,* trans. Gerald Fitzgerald (Cambridge, Mass. and London: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1968), 108.
34. Ibid., 158, 161.
35. Rosenberg, edited version of "D. M. Z. Vanguardism," chap. in *The De-definition of Art,* 219.
36. MacDonald, "A Theory of Mass Culture," 63–64.
37. Zygmunt Bauman, *Intimations of Postmodernity* (London and New York: Routledge, 1992), 49–50, 52.
38. Harold Rosenberg, "Art and Work," *Partisan Review* 32, no. 1 (Winter 1965): 53. While Rosenberg for the purposes of this argument assembles all pop artists under the generic "anonymous" art, he does not view pop art as uniformly devoid of personal expression. See, for example, Rosenberg, "Warhol: Art's Other Self," 102, 105, and Rosenberg, "Marilyn Mondrian: Roy Lichtenstein and Claes Oldenburg," chap. in *The De-definition of Art,* 117–18.

39. Ibid; In "Mobile, Theatrical, Active" (chap. in *The Anxious Object,* 268), Rosenberg argued against this view somewhat. Then he considered that pop art aired the links between art and applied art without compromising its status as art.
40. Rosenberg, "Art and Work," 54.
41. Ibid.
42. Ibid., 54–55.
43. Harold Rosenberg, "The Herd of Independent Minds," *Commentary* 6, no. 3 (September 1948), chap. in *Discovering the Present: Three Decades in Art, Culture, and Politics* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1973), 16.
44. Wald, *The New York Intellectuals,* 222
45. Harold Rosenberg, "Death in the Wilderness," chap. in *The Tradition of the New,* 250.
46. Wald, *The New York Intellectuals,* 6–8, 366.
47. Rosenberg, "Death in the Wilderness," 250–51.
48. Karl Marx, *Communist Manifesto,* ed., Engels, trans. Samuel Moore (London, 1988), in *Marx-Engels Reader* (n.p., n.d.), 353, quoted in Marshall Berman, *All That is Solid Melts Into Air: The Experience of Modernity* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1982), 97.
49. Rosenberg, "Art and Work," 51, 55.
50. Ibid., 55–6.
51. Harold Rosenberg, "Action Painting: Crisis and Distortion," chap. in *The Anxious Object,* 45.
52. Ibid., 39.
53. MacDonald, "A Theory of Mass Culture," 71.
54. Wald, *The New York Intellectuals,* 366.
55. Ibid., 369.
56. Maurice Friedman, ed., *The Worlds of Existentialism: A Critical Reader;* with introductions and a conclusion by Maurice Friedman (New York: Random House, 1964; London: Humanities Press International, 1991), xiv, 10.
57. Ibid., 9.
58. Harold Rosenberg, "The American Action Painters," chap. in *The Tradition of the New,* 32.
59. Richard Gill and Ernest Sherman, eds., *The Fabric of Existentialism* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Educational Division, Meredith Corporation, 1973), 15.
60. Vincent Descombes, *Modern French Philosophy,* trans. L. Scott-Fox and J. M. Harding (Cambridge, London, New York, New Rochelle, Melbourne, Sydney: Cambridge University Press, 1980), 31.
61. Rosenberg, "Action Painting: Crisis and Distortion," 40.
62. Rosenberg, "Art and Work," 55. In the "Herd of Independent Minds" (27), Rosenberg claimed that "only the individual can communicate experience, and only another individual can receive such a communication."
63. Gill and Sherman, eds., *The Fabric of Existentialism,* 15–16.
64. Rosenberg, "The American Action Painters," 34.
65. Harold Rosenberg, "A dialogue with Thomas B. Hess, "*Catalogue of the Exhibition: Action Painting,* exhibition catalogue (Dallas: Dallas Museum for Contemporary Arts, 1958), quoted in ibid., 28.
66. Jean-Paul Sartre, *Existentialism* (excerpts), trans. by Bernard Frechtman (New

York: Philosophical Library, 1947) in *The Worlds of Existentialism,* ed. Friedman, 136.
67. See Rosenberg, "Action Painting: Crisis and Distortion," 45.
68. Rosenberg, "Art and Work," 56; Rosenberg elaborates the relationship between art and the "revolutionary epoch" in "Criticism and its Premises," 136.
69. Rosenberg, "Art and Work," 56.
70. Rosenberg, "Warhol: Art's Other Self," 108.
71. Gill and Sherman, eds., *The Fabric of Existentialism,* 19–20.
72. Soren Kierkegaard, *The Sickness Unto Death,* trans. Walter Lowrie (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1941), no pagination specified, quoted in ibid., 19.
73. Rosenberg, "Action Painting: Crisis and Distortion," 38; Rosenberg, "The American Action Painters," 32.
74. Gill and Sherman, *The Fabric of Existentialism,* 21.
75. Harold Rosenberg, "The Orgamerican Phantasy," chap. in *The Tradition of the New,* 271, 273–4, 283.
76. Soren Kierkegaard, "That Single Individual," in *The Point of View,* ed. and trans. Howard V. Hong and Edna H. Hong, with an intro. and notes by Howard V. Hong and Edna H. Hong (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1998), 112. Dwight MacDonald expressed a similar existentialist-directed objection to abstract schematizations of the human subject in his denunciation of the term "the masses." See Dwight MacDonald, "A Theory of Mass Culture," 69–70.
77. Rosenberg, "The Herd of Independent Minds," 27.
78. Gill and Sherman, eds., *The Fabric of Existentialism,* 15.
79. Friedman, ed., *The Worlds of Existentialism,* 9.
80. Rosenberg, "Action Painting: Crisis and Distortion," 42, 45–6.
81. Rosenberg, "Art and Work," 54.
82. Rosenberg, "Criticism and its Premises," 139.
83. Rosenberg, "Action Painting: Crisis and Distortion," 39.
84. Harold Rosenberg, "Virtuosos of Boredom," *Vogue,* no. 147 (September 1966), 296–7.
85. Ibid., 296.
86. Ibid.
87. Chris Weedon, *Feminist Practice and Poststructuralist Theory* (Cambridge, Mass. and Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1987), 27, 80.
88. Alain Robbe-Grillet, "On Several Obsolete Notions" in *For a New Novel: Essays on Fiction,* trans. Richard Howard (New York: Grove Press, 1965), 28.
89. Jean Bloch-Michel, "The Avant-Garde in French Fiction," *Partisan Review* 25, no. 3 (Summer 1958): 468–9.
90. Bernard Pingaud, quoted in ibid., 469.
91. Descombes, *Modern French Philosophy,* 31.
92. Weedon, *Feminist Practice and Poststructuralist Theory,* 28.
93. Descombes, *Modern French Philosophy,* 31.
94. Rosenberg, "Virtuosos of Boredom," 296.
95. Ibid., 328.
96. Gill and Sherman, eds., *The Fabric of Existentialism,* 20.
97. Martin Buber, *I and Thou,* trans. Ronald Gregor Smith (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1958), 3.

98. Ibid., 6.
99. Dore Ashton in Peter Selz, “A Symposium on Pop Art,” *Arts Magazine* 37, no. 6 (April 1963), 39.
100. Henri Michaux, unidentified source, quoted by Ashton, in ibid.
101. Rosenberg, “Virtuosos of Boredom,” 296.
102. Ihab Hassan, “POSTmodernISM: A Paracritical Bibliography,” *New Literary History* 3, no. 1 (Fall 1971), 15.
103. Susan Sontag, “The Aesthetics of Silence,” *Aspen,* nos. 5 and 6 (1967), chap. in *A Susan Sontag Reader,* with an introduction by Elizabeth Hardwick (New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux, 1982; repr. New York: Vintage Books, Random House, 1983), 196.
104. Harold Rosenberg, “French Silence and American Poetry,” chap. in *The Tradition of the New,* 88.
105. Clement Greenberg, “After Abstract Expressionism,” *Art International* 6, no. 6 (October 1962), chap. in *The Collected Essays and Criticism: Volume 4, Modernism with a Vengeance 1957–1969,* ed. John O’Brian (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1993), 123.
106. Rosenberg, “Criticism and its Premises,” 139, 152.
107. Marshall Berman, *All That is Solid Melts Into Air: The Experience of Modernity* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1982) 27.
108. Ibid.
109. Ibid., 28–9.
110. Berman in ibid., 30–31, does not identify Rosenberg with the “great nineteenth-century critics.” Instead, he regards him, along with Lionel Trilling, Renato Poggioli, and Leo Steinberg, as responsible for one of the models of modernism developed during the sixties: “modernism as an unending permanent revolution against the totality of modern existence.” Rosenberg’s contribution to this model is his conception of modernism as “a tradition of overthrowing tradition,” presumably an abbreviation of “the only vital tradition of twentieth century art to which criticism can appeal is that of overthrowing tradition” (Harold Rosenberg, “Revolution and the Concept of Beauty,” chap. in *The Tradition of the New,* 81).
111. In “The Game of Illusion: Pop and Gag,” chap. in *The Anxious Object,* Rosenberg distinguished pop from the mimetic concerns of traditional representational paradigms. He considered that artists today did not merely picture the external world, but, instead, created an “invented” one. In this, they drew upon their experience of daily life, dominated as it was by “simulated nature,” i.e., the plethora of signs disseminated by mass communications (61–62).
112. Rosenberg, “Marilyn Mondrian: Roy Lichtenstein and Claes Oldenburg,” 109–10, 112–14. Gablik, following the lead of critics Barbara Rose and Robert Rosenblum, stressed American pop art’s stylistic associations with”Minimal and Hard-Edged” art. See Suzi Gablik and John Russell, *Pop Art Redefined* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1969), 10–11; Waldman alluded to Greenberg’s notion of “self-definition” in her account of Roy Lichtenstein’s “reconciliation [of three-dimensional forms] with the picture plane,” a strategy that “allows an object both its original [three-dimensional] identity . . . and a new [formal] one.” See Diane Waldman, *Roy Lichtenstein,* exhibition catalogue (New York: The Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, 1969), 13–15.

113. Gablik, *Pop Art Redefined,* 11.
114. Rosenberg, "Marilyn Mondrian: Roy Lichtenstein and Claes Oldenburg," 111–12.
115. Rosenberg, "Action Painting: Crisis and Distortion," 46.
116. Rosenberg, "Criticism and its Premises," 135, 137.
117. Fredric Jameson, "Postmodernism and Consumer Society," in *Postmodern Culture,* ed. Hal Foster (London and Sydney: Pluto Press, 1983), 114.
118. Rosenberg, "Criticism and its Premises," 139
119. Rosenberg, "Toward an Unanxious Profession," 17.
120. Rosenberg, "The Game of Illusion: Pop and Gag," 75.
121. Rosenberg, "Warhol: Art's Other Self," 98.
122. Fredric Jameson, *Postmodernism, or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism* (London: Verso, and Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1991; paperback edition, London and New York: Verso, 1992), 15.
123. Richard Gill and Ernest Sherman have pointed out that a belief in "man's alienation from his social environment" is one that an existentialist such as Kierkegaard shared with Marx. While existentialists attribute man's alienation to factors beyond the "material causes" cited by Marx, they do not dismiss the role played by "historical and material conditions." This is substantiated by Kierkegaard's *The Present Age* (1847), published two years before Marx's *Communist Manifesto.* See Gill and Sherman, eds., *The Fabric of Existentialism,* 25.
124. Herbert Marcuse, *One Dimensional Man* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1964; London: Sphere Books, 1968; London: Abacus, Sphere Books, 1972), 14–15.
125. Ibid., 14.
126. Gill and Sherman, *The Fabric of Existentialism,* 15.
127. Friedman, *The Worlds of Existentialism,* 9.
128. To the extent that Rosenberg saw Action Painting (art as action) as a means "of liberation, from Value – political, esthetic, moral" (Rosenberg, "The American Action Painters," 30), it is related in spirit, if not in letter, to post-modernist attacks on modernism's "manipulative reason and fetish of the totality" (Terry Eagleton, "Awakening from modernity," *Times Literary Supplement,* 20 February 1987, no pagination given, quoted in David Harvey, *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change* [Oxford and Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell, 1990], 9) such as Derrida's deconstruction of Western metaphysics or Lyotard's proposed destabilization of "the capacity for explanation, manifested in the promulgation of new norms for understanding," by the faulty, or contradictory, reasoning of parology (Jean-Francois Lyotard, *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge,* trans. Geoff Bennington and Brian Massumi, with a foreword by Fredric Jameson [Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984], 61).
129. Gill and Sherman, *The Fabric of Existentialism,* 14–15.
130. Harold Rosenberg and Benjamin Nelson, "Art and Technology: A Dialogue between Harold Rosenberg and Benjamin Nelson," interview by Robert Boyers and Dustin Wees (Skidmore College, Fall 1972), *Salmagundi* (Summer/Fall 1974), chap. in *The Case of the Baffled Radical* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1985), 181.
131. Ibid., 177. Also quoted in Jerome Klinkowitz, *The Postmodern Habit of Thought* (Athens and London: University of Georgia Press, 1988), 22.

CHAPTER 4. LEO STEINBERG: POP, "POST-MODERNIST" PAINTING, AND THE FLATBED PICTURE PLANE

1. Leo Steinberg, "The Eye is a Part of the Mind," *Partisan Review* 20, no. 2 (March-April 1953), 194–212.
2. Steinberg has held the following teaching posts in art history: associate professor, Hunter College, City University New York, 1961–66, professor, 1966–75; professor, Graduate Center, City University New York, 1969–75; Benjamin Franklin professor of art history, University of Philadelphia, 1975–91, professor emeritus, 1991–. Since the mid-seventies Steinberg's publications have been predominantly in the field of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Italian art. Biographical information supplied by the following publications: *Who's Who in American Art,* 1990 ed., s.v. "Steinberg, Leo"; *Marquis Who's Who,* 1994 ed., s.v. "Steinberg, Leo."
3. Leo Steinberg, "Jasper Johns," *Metro,* nos. 4/5 (1962): 87–109. This article was completed in December 1961, see note accompanying the revised version, "Jasper Johns: The first Seven Years of his Art," chap. in Leo Steinberg, *Other Criteria: Confrontations with Twentieth-Century Art* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1972; London, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press paperback, 1975).
4. Steinberg, *Other Criteria: Confrontations with Twentieth-Century Art,* vii-viii.
5. Leo Steinberg, "Other Criteria," chap. in ibid., 55.
6. Leo Steinberg, "The Eye is a Part of the Mind," 196.
7. Steinberg, "Jasper Johns," 92.
8. Steinberg, "Other Criteria," 82, 84, 90.
9. The term "post-Modernist painting" was used in conjunction with the concept of the "flatbed picture plane" which "was introduced only in the later revision as published in *Other Criteria.*" Sheila Schwartz, per Leo Steinberg, to the author, 5 June 1995.
10. Steinberg, "Other Criteria," 91.
11. This is a reference to Francis Frascina's likening of Alfred H. Barr Jr.'s formalist critical model, which he developed during the thirties, to a paradigm, in the sense proposed by the philosopher of science Thomas S. Kuhn and, initially, outlined by him in *The Scientific Revolution* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1962). Frascina thus described a paradigm as "a model by which the practitioners of any discipline, for our purposes art historians and critics, define *their* field of problems, a 'field' is that which any group of practitioners needs to circumscribe in order to do any productive *work.*" He cited Greenberg's accommodation of abstract expressionism within the paradigm's "narrowly circumscribed set of problems" as an example of the latter and "Modernist Painting" (1961) as the provider of its "theoretical rationalizations." Francis Frascina, ed., *Pollock and After: The Critical Debate* (London: Harper & Row, 1985), 10, 11.
12. Steinberg, "Other Criteria," 63.
13. W. K. Wimsatt, Jr. and Monroe C. Beardsley, "The Intentional Fallacy," chap. in *The Verbal Icon,* by W. K. Wimsatt Jr., and two preliminary essays written in collaboration with Monroe C. Beardsley (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1954; Kentucky Paperbacks, 1967), 4.
14. Richard Shusterman, *Pragmatist Aesthetics: Living Beauty, Rethinking Art* (Oxford and Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell, 1992), 84–5.

15. Steinberg, "Other Criteria," 64.
16. Ibid., 66.
17. Leo Steinberg, "Jasper Johns," 87–8.
18. Leo Steinberg, in "A Symposium on Pop Art," ed. Peter Selz, *Arts Magazine* 37, no. 6 (April 1963): 39–40.
19. Clement Greenberg, "Modernist Painting," *Art and Literature* (Spring 1965) in *The New Art: A Critical Anthology,* ed. Gregory Battock (New York: E. P. Dutton, 1968)102, quoted in Steinberg, "Other Criteria," 67. In this same source (407, n. 19), Steinberg incorrectly claimed that "Modernist Painting" first appeared in *Art and Literature* (Spring 1965).
20. Steinberg, "Other Criteria," 68.
21. Greenberg, "Modernist Painting," 102, quoted in ibid., 68.
22. Greenberg, "Modernist Painting," 103–04, quoted in ibid., 69.
23. Steinberg, "Other Criteria," 70.
24. Ibid., 69.
25. Greenberg, "Modernist Painting," 107, quoted in ibid., 71.
26. Clement Greenberg, "Modernist Painting," *Arts Yearbook* 4 (1961): 109.
27. Steinberg, "Other Criteria," 71.
28. Greenberg, "Modernist Painting," 104.
29. Steinberg, "The Eye is Part of the Mind," 196, 211–12.
30. Greenberg, "Modernist Painting," *Forum Lectures* (Washington, D.C.: Voice of America), chap. in *Clement Greenberg: The Collected Essays and Criticism, Volume 4, Modernism with a Vengeance 1957–1967,* ed. John O'Brian (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1993), 90–91. Presumably, Greenberg refers, here, to the centrality of "sense-data" theory in scientific method. *Collins Dictionary of Philosophy,* 1990 ed., s. v. "science, philosophy of."
31. Ibid., 91.
32. Steinberg, "Other Criteria," 76.
33. Ibid., 76–82.
34. Ibid., 90–91.
35. Ibid., 85.
36. Steinberg, "Jasper Johns," 92.
37. Clement Greenberg, "After Abstract Expressionism," *Art International* 5, no. 8 (October 1962), in *Clement Greenberg: The Collected Essays and Criticism,* 126.
38. Michael Fried, "Art and Objecthood," *Artforum* 5, no. 10 (June 1967), in *The New Art,* ed. Battock, 116–47.
39. Benjamin H. D. Buchloh, in "Theories of Art after Minimalism and Pop," edited transcript of discussion between Benjamin H. D. Buchloh, Michael Fried, and Rosalind Krauss, in *Discussions in Contemporary Culture,* ed. Hal Foster (Seattle: Bay Press, 1987), 72.
40. Maurice Merleau-Ponty, *Phenomenology of Perception,* trans. Colin Smith (London, 1962), n. 1, 309, quoted in James Miller, *History and Human Existence: From Marx to Merleau-Ponty* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1982), 200.
41. Michael Fried, in "Theories of Art After Minimalism and Pop," in *Discussions in Contemporary Culture,* 56.

42. In particular, those of Morris concerning gestalt psychology and phenomenology: "Notes on Sculpture. Part 1," *Artforum* 4, no. 6 (February 1966): 42–4; "Notes on Sculpture. Part 2," *Artforum* 5, no. 2 (October 1966): 20–23. Excerpts from both in *Art in Theory 1900–1990: An Anthology of Changing Ideas,* eds. Charles Harrison and Paul Woods (Oxford, London: Blackwell, 1992; Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell, 1993), 813–19. In "Art and Objecthood" Fried did not cite the source and, in some instances, the authorship of individual remarks. Instead, he listed a number of sources from which these were taken. Michael Fried, "Art and Objecthood," 117, n. 1.
43. Ibid., 117–18.
44. Ibid., 120.
45. Michael Fried refers to observations made by Clement Greenberg in "Recentness of Sculpture," in *American Sculpture of the Sixties,* exhibition catalogue (Los Angeles: Los Angeles County Museum of Art, 1967), reprinted as a chap. in *Clement Greenberg: The Collected Essays and Criticism,* 256. See Fried, "Art and Objecthood," 123, n. 3, 120.
46. Ibid., 125. Fried is indebted, in particular, to the observations of Robert Morris published in "Notes on Sculpture, Part 2," in *Art in Theory 1900–1990,* ed. Harrison and Woods, 818.
47. Ibid., 140.
48. Ibid., n. 4, 123–4.
49. Fried, in "Theories of Art After Minimalism and Pop," in *Discussions in Contemporary Culture,* 73. Fried's revision of the essentialist premises of Clement Greenberg's modernist theory represents an attempt to do what Thomas Kuhn claimed scientists do when confronted by an anomaly: "They will devise numerous articulations and *ad hoc* modifications of their theory in order to eliminate any apparent conflict" (*The Structure of Scientific Revolutions,* 78).
50. Rosalind Krauss, in ibid., 60.
51. Steinberg, "Other Criteria," 84, 90.
52. Lawrence Alloway, *American Pop Art* (New York: Macmillan, 1974), 7.
53. Steinberg, "Other Criteria," 84.
54. Alloway, *American Pop Art,* 7.
55. Steinberg, "Other Criteria," 90.
56. Jean Baudrillard, "The Hyper-realism of Simulation" (excerpts), section of *L'Echange symbolique et la moret* (Paris, 1976); translated by Charles Levin as *Symbolic Exchange and Death* in *The Structural Allegory,* ed. J. Fekete (Minneapolis, 1984); this translation reprinted in *Jean Baudrillard: Selected Writings,* ed. Mark Poster (Stanford, 1988); reprinted in *Art in Theory 1900–1990,* eds. Harrison and Woods, 1050.
57. Ihab Hassan, "Toward a Concept of Postmodernism," chap. in *The Dismemberment of Orpheus: Towards a Postmodern Literature,* 2d ed., rev. (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1982), reprinted as chap. in *The Postmodern Turn: Essays in Postmodern Theory and Culture* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1987), 93.
58. Steinberg, "Other Criteria," 84.
59. David Robbins has pointed to the similarity between "Steinberg's 'tabletop' information plane" and the "more literal model" of the Independent Group's "tackboard." David Robbins, "The Independent Group: Forerunners of Postmodernism?," in *The*

Independent Group: Postwar Britain and the Aesthetics of Plenty, ed. David Robbins (London and Cambridge, Mass.: The M.I.T. Press), 242.

60. James Miller, *The Passion of Michel Foucault* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1993; London: HarperCollins, Flamingo, 1994), 150.
61. Michel Foucault, *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences,* trans. from the French (London: Tavistock, 1970; London and New York: Tavistock/Routledge, 1974), xi.
62. Ibid., xxi–xxii.
63. Douglas Crimp, "On the Museum's Ruins," in *Postmodern Culture,* ed. Hal Foster (London and Sydney: Pluto Press, 1985), 45.
64. Foucault, *The Order of Things,* xxii.
65. Ibid., ix.
66. Ibid., xiv.
67. Maurice Merleau-Ponty, "The Spatiality of One's own Body and Motility," chap. in *The Phenomenology of Perception* (excerpts), trans. C. Smith (New York: Humanities Press, 1962), reprinted under the title "The Body, Motility and Spatiality," in *Phenomenology and Existentialism,* ed. Robert C. Solomon (New York, Evanston, San Francisco, and London: Harper & Row, 1972; Savage, Md.: Littlefield Adams Quality Paperbacks, 1980), 379.
68. Hal Foster, "(Post)Modern Polemics," chap. in *Recodings: Art, Spectacle, Cultural Politics* (Seattle and Washington: Bay Press, 1985), 121.
69. Ibid., 129–30.
70. "The essence of Modernism, as I see it, lies in the use of the characteristic methods of a discipline itself not in order to subvert it, but to entrench it more firmly in its area of competence." Clement Greenberg, "Modernist Painting," *Art and Literature* (Spring 1965), quoted in Foster, ibid., 130.
71. Foster, "(Post)Modern Polemics," 128.
72. Foster used this term in accord with its philosophical meaning: "of or relating to knowledge obtained by reason and argument rather than intuition." *Collins English Dictionary and Thesaurus,* 1993 ed., s. v. "discursive."
73. Foster, "(Post)Modern Polemics," 130.
74. Steinberg, "Other Criteria," 91.
75. Foster, "(Post)Modern Polemics," 131.
76. Terry Eagleton, *Literary Theory: An Introduction* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1983), 138.
77. Foster, "(Post)Modern Polemics," 131.
78. Jonathon Culler, *On Deconstruction: Theory and Criticism after Structuralism* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1982; Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell Paperbacks, 1983), 32. Foster interpreted the "textual 'impurity'" of post-modernist art as concerned with "the interconnections of power and knowledge in social representations" ("(Post)Modern Polemics," 131). He failed to provide grounds for this claim but, presumably, had in mind post-modernism's "subversion of the interconnections of power and knowledge" by means of deconstructive strategies. See, for example, Jacques Derrida, *The Truth in Painting,* trans. Geoff Bennington and Ian McLeod (Chicago and London, 1987), 19, quoted in Margaret A. Rose, *The Post-modern and the Post-industrial* (Cambridge, New York, Port Chester, Melbourne, Sydney: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 41.

79. Steinberg, "Other Criteria," 68, 91.
80. Alloway, *American Pop Art,* 9.
81. Lawrence Alloway, "An Interview with Lawrence Alloway," interview by James L. Reinish, *Studio International* 186 (September 1973): 62.
82. Alloway, *American Pop Art,* 3.
83. Steinberg, "Other Criteria," 85.
84. Baudrillard, "The Hyper-realism of Simulation" (excerpts), 1050.
85. Ihab Hassan, "Toward a Concept of Postmodernism," 93.
86. Steinberg, "Other Criteria," 90.

CHAPTER 5. BARBARA ROSE. POP, PRAGMATISM, AND "PROPHETIC PRAGMATISM"

1. It is an important feature of Max Kozloff's writings on pop, if not of those examples considered in this study. See, for example, Max Kozloff, "Modern Art and the Virtues of Decadence," *Studio International* 174, no. 894 (November 1967): 189–99.
2. William James, *What Pragmatism Means* (n.p., 1907), quoted in Barbara Rose, "Problems in Criticism V: The Politics of Art, Part II," *Artforum* 7, no. 5 (January 1969): 46.
3. Robert C. Solomon, *Phenomenology and Existentialism* (New York, Evanston, San Francisco, and London: Harper & Row, 1972; Savage, Md.: Littlefield Adams Quality Paperbacks, 1980), 4.
4. Cornel West, *The American Evasion of Philosophy: A Genealogy of Pragmatism* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1989), 4.
5. Barbara Rose in *Elitist Vs Popular Criticism: Proceedings of the Conference on Art Criticism and Art Education in New York, Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, May 15–16, 1970* by School of Education, New York University, and the New York State Council of the Arts, 16.
6. Rose also studied at Barnard College and the Sorbonne. Barbara Rose, *Autocritique: Essays on Art and Anti-Art 1963–1987* (New York: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1989) xi, 295; Biographical notes, *Art Criticism in the Sixties: Proceedings of the Symposium, Brandeis University, Waltham, Massachusetts, May 7, 1966,* by the Poses Institute of Fine Arts, introduction by William Seitz (New York: October House, 1967), no pagination; *Who's Who in American Art,* 1990 ed., s.v. "Rose, Barbara."
7. Rose, *Autocritique,* xi.
8. Barbara Rose, "Dada Then and Now," *Art International* 7 (January 1963): 22–8.
9. Rose has also been contributing editor of *Vogue* magazine since 1964 (*Who's Who in America,* 1990 ed., s.v. "Rose, Barbara").
10. Rose, *Autocritique,* xi–xiii, xv–xvi, xviii, 295; biographical notes, *Art Criticism in the Sixties,* no pagination.
11. Barbara Rose, "Pop in Perspective," *Encounter* 25, no. 2 (August 1965): 62.
12. Clement Greenberg, "Modernist Painting," *Forum Lectures* (Washington, D.C.: Voice of America, 1960), chap. in *Clement Greenberg: The Collected Essays and Criticism. Volume 4: Modernism with a Vengeance, 1957–1969,* ed. John O'Brian (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1993), 85–6.
13. "Art in any medium, boiled down to what it does in the experiencing of it, creates

itself through relations, proportions. The quality of art depends on inspired, felt relations or proportions as on nothing else . . . The superior work of art . . . exhibits . . . rightness of 'form.'" Greenberg, "Avant-garde attitudes," *Studio International* 179, no. 2 (April 1970), 144–5.

14. Clement Greenberg, *Post Painterly Abstraction,* exhibition catalogue (Los Angeles: Los Angeles County Museum of Art, 1964), no pagination specified, quoted in Rose, "Pop in Perspective," 62.
15. Greenberg, "Modernist Painting," *Arts Yearbook* 4 (1961), 109. At the time of publication of "Pop in Perspective" in 1965 it is possible that Rose was unaware of Greenberg's "Modernist Painting," the article in which his modernist and formalist theory of painting is most comprehensively outlined. "Modernist Painting" was initially published as a pamphlet (in a series produced by the Voice of America) in 1960 and, subsequently, as an article in 1961. However, it is more commonly cited in its slightly modified form: Clement Greenberg, "Modernist Painting," *Art and Literature* (Spring 1965). In an article from 1970 (unpublished at the time), Rose cited the later version. See Barbara Rose, "Criticism as Propaganda" (unpublished, 1970), chap. in *Autocritique,* 221.
16. Rose, "Pop in Perspective," 62.
17. Barbara Rose, "Pop Art at the Guggenheim," *Art International* 7, no. 5 (May 1963): 22.
18. Rose, "Criticism as Propaganda," 221.
19. Barbara Rose, "The Value of Didactic Art," *Artforum* 5, no. 8 (April 1967): 32–3.
20. Clement Greenberg, "Post Painterly Abstraction," *Art International* 8, no. 5–6 (Summer 1964): 63.
21. Rose, "The Value of Didactic Art," 35.
22. Ibid. Presumably, a reference to George Kubler, *The Shape of Time: Remarks on the History of Things* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1962). Kubler states: "Prime objects and replications denote principal inventions, and the entire system of replicas, reproductions, copies, reductions, transfers, and derivations, floating in the wake of an important work of art" (p. 39).
23. Rose, "The Value of Didactic Art," 33.
24. Greenberg, "Modernist Painting," *Arts Yearbook,* 104.
25. Rose, "The Value of Didactic Art," 32–3, 36, n. 5.
26. Rose's distinction between Warhol and the remainder of the pop artists, in this manner, is consistent with her perception – present in her earlier writings on the subject – that pop is not "an *art style,*" rather it is "subject matter" that provides the link between pop artists. See Rose, "Pop Art at the Guggenheim," 22.
27. Rose, "The Value of Didactic Art," 36, n. 1.
28. See, in particular, Peter Selz's contribution to the symposium on pop art, held at the Museum of Modern Art, December 13, 1962. Moderated by Peter Selz, Curator of Painting, Sculpture Exhibitions at the Museum of Modern Art, in Peter Selz, "A Symposium on Pop Art," *Arts Magazine,* 39, no. 6 (April 1963): 43.
29. Carol Anne Mahsun, *Pop Art and the Critics* (Ann Arbor and London: U.M.I. Research Press, 1987), 41, 45–7, 61.
30. Rose, "The Problems of Criticism V: The Politics of Art, Part II," 44. Rose refers, here, to Greenberg's view that American Abstract Expressionism was a continua-

tion of the European avant-garde tradition and heir to the School of Paris. See, for example, Clement Greenberg, "'American-Type' Painting," *Partisan Review* 22, no. 2 (Spring 1955): 179–96 passim.

31. Greenberg, "Post Painterly Abstraction," 63.
32. Rose, "Problems of Criticism V: The Politics of Art, Part II," 44.
33. Ibid. This connection was made in the exhibition *The American Scene 1900–1970,* held at the Indiana University Art Museum, Bloomington, Indiana, April 6–May 17, 1970. See the catalogue accompanying the exhibition: *The American Scene 1900–1970,* with a foreword by Thomas T. Solley and an essay by Henry Radford Hope (Bloomington: Indiana University Art Museum, 1970).
34. Rose, "Problems of Criticism V: The Politics of Art, Part II," 44.
35. Ibid., 44, 47.
36. Clement Greenberg, "'American-Type' Painting," 179–96 passim; Greenberg, "Post Painterly Abstraction," 63.
37. Rose, "Problems of Crticism V: The Politics of Art, Part II," 46.
38. Constance Rourke, "American Art: A Possible Future," chap. in *The Roots of American Culture and Other Essays,* ed., with a preface by Van Wyck Brooks (Port Washington: Kennikat Press, 1965), 284.
39. Ibid., 285–6.
40. Rose, "Problems of Criticism V: The Politics of Art, Part II," 47.
41. Ibid., 46.
42. Ibid., 47.
43. West, *The American Evasion of Philosophy,* 4–5,
44. William James, *The Meaning of Truth* (New York: n.p., 1909), vii, quoted in Paul Edwards, ed., *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (New York: Macmillan, 1967; New York: Macmillan and Free Press, repr. ed., 1972), s. v. "Pragmatism," by H. S. Thayer.
45. Rose, "Problems of Criticism V: The Politics of Art, Part II," 45.
46. Irving Sandler, in his overview of 1960's American art, claimed that the source of Donald Judd's "tough-minded empiricism – going by the facts, by concrete sensations" was "William James's Pragmatism." Barbara Rose (in "Problems of Criticism V: The Politics of Art, Part II"), he considered, took "her cues from Judd." *American Art of the 1960s* (New York: Harper & Row, 1988), 65.
47. Rose provided a good account of pragmatism, see the passage she quotes from William James's "Beauty is Truth," *What Pragmatism Means,* in ibid., 46.
48. Ibid., 49.
49. Morse Peckham, *Man's Rage for Chaos: Biology, Behavior, and the Arts* (Philadelphia: Chilton, 1965), x-xi, 10–11.
50. Barbara Rose, "Problems of Criticism V1: The Politics of Art, Part III," *Artforum* 7, no. 9 (May 1969): 46, 51, n. 3.
51. Rose, "Problems of Criticism V: The Politics of Art, Part II," 47.
52. Peckham, *Man's Rage for Chaos,* 311.
53. Ibid., 47, 49.
54. Rose, "Problems of Criticism V: The Politics of Art, Part II," 48.
55. Ibid., 49.
56. In philosophical terms, relativism "means the position that there are no absolute truths or values." *Collins Dictionary of Philosophy,* 1990 ed., s. v. "relativism."
57. Rose, "Problems of Criticism V: The Politics of Art, Part II," 49.

58. Rose, "Problems of Criticism V1: The Politics of Art, Part III," 46.
59. This text was based on lectures on aesthetics that Dewey "delivered as the first William James lecturer at Harvard" in 1932. Notes from cover of John Dewey, *Art as Experience* (New York: Capricorn Books, 1958).
60. Rose, *Autocritique,* xiv. Rose is, most probably, referring to the early sixties. Judd undertook an M. A. at Columbia 1957–62. Colin Naylor and Genesis P-Orridge, *Contemporary Artists* (London: St. James Press, and New York: St. Martin's Press, 1977), s. v. "JUDD, Donald," by Don Judd.
61. Rose made the observation that Peckham's *Man's Rage for Chaos* seemed indebted to Dewey's *Art as Experience* ("Problems of Criticism V: The Politics of Art, Part II," 49).
62. Dewey, *Art as Experience,* 309–10.
63. Roger Scruton, *Kant* (Oxford, Toronto, and Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1982), 20, 36.
64. Dewey, *Art as Experience,* 309.
65. Rose, "Problems of Criticism V: The Politics of Art, Part II," 49.
66. Rose," Problems of Criticism V1: The Politics of Art, Part III," 46.
67. Dewey, *Art as Experience,* 300.
68. Clement Greenberg, "Avant-garde attitudes," 142.
69. Rose, "Problems of Criticism V: The Politics of Art, Part II," 44–5, 47.
70. John McHale, "The Plastic Parthenon," *Dotzero Magazine* 3 (Spring 1967), quoted in Rose, "Problems of Criticism V1: The Politics of Art, Part III," 51, n. 1.
71. John McHale, "The expendable ikon 1," *Architectural Design* (February 1959): 83.
72. Rose, "Problems of Criticism V: The Politics of Art, Part II," 47.
73. Ibid., 46–7.
74. Ibid., 47.
75. Ibid., 44, 47–8. While this observation follows a discussion concerning Donald Judd's account of his own (minimalist) aesthetic, presumably, it is intended to apply to the shared character of pop and minimal art.
76. Ibid., 44.
77. Barbara Rose, "ABC Art," *Art in America* 53, no. 5 (October-November 1965), 61.
78. Ibid. In the introduction to *Autocritique* (xiv), Rose claimed that Jean Lipman, editor of *Art in America* at the time, had suggested both the "title" and "concept" of "ABC Art."
79. Rose, "ABC Art," 62. Irving Sandler undertook a similar mission in an article he published in January of 1965, the year in which "ABC Art" was initially published. In the survey of post-abstract expressionist art contained in this article, Sandler identified a category of "cool art," so-called because of its "mechanistic" and "deadpan" character, "devoid of signs of emotion." The "most extreme" exponents included Frank Stella, Larry Poons, Donald Judd, Andy Warhol, and Roy Lichtenstein; as a category of art, it thus bridged the styles of op, pop, and minimal art. Irving Sandler, "The New Cool Art," *Art in America* 53, no. 1 (January–February 1965): 96.
80. Rose cited the source of this quotation as "Alain Robbe-Grillet, 'Une voi pour le roman futur,' 1956, from *Pour un nouveau roman.*" Presumably, the passage in question was translated by Rose. Rose, "ABC Art," 66.
81. Ibid.
82. West, *The American Evasion of Philosophy,* 212–13, 235–7. The third

"fundamental historical process" cited by West was "the decolonization of the third world" (237). As shall shortly be explained, this is relevant to Rose's alignment of criticism of the judgmental nature of Greenbergian formalism with that of the prevailing capitalist system. Rose, herself, stopped short of aligning these criticisms with a further one: American imperialism and its consequences, such as the Vietnam War. However, other critics during this period (the most notable case being Gene Swenson) did align critiques of the New York art world with those of a larger imperialist system.

83. Greenberg, "Avant-garde attitudes," 142.
84. Dewey, *Art as Experience,* 299.
85. Ibid.
86. Ibid., 300, 304.
87. Clement Greenberg, "Counter-Avant-Garde," *Art International* 15, no. 5 (May 1971): 18.
88. Rose, *Elitist Vs. Popular Criticism,* 16. Rose's observations about judgmental criticism in the sixties, contained in this conference paper, veer from specific references to Greenberg's example to those of a more general nature. It is presumed in this study, however, that even in her general observations about judgmental criticism Rose implicitly refers to that of Greenberg.
89. Donald B. Kuspit, *Clement Greenberg: Art Critic* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1979), 13.
90. Rose, *Elitist Vs. Popular Criticism,* 16, 18.
91. Clement Greenberg, unspecified source, quoted in Kuspit, *Clement Greenberg: Art Critic,* 145.
92. Rose, *Elitist Vs. Popular Criticism,* 13.
93. Greenberg, "Modernist Painting," *Arts Yearbook,* 108.
94. Rose, *Elitist Vs. Popular Criticism,* 13.
95. Barbara Rose, *Art Criticism in the Sixties,* no pagination.
96. Rose, "Problems of Criticism V: The Politics of Art, Part II," 47.
97. Rose, *Elitist Vs. Popular Criticism,* 17.
98. Ibid., 9.
99. See Clement Greenberg, "Avant-Garde and Kitsch," *Partisan Review* 6, no. 5 (Fall 1939) in *The Partisan Reader 1934–1944,* eds. William Phillips and Philip Rahv (n.p.: Dial Press, 1946), reprinted in *Mass Culture: The Popular Arts in America,* eds. Bernard Rosenberg and David Manning White (New York: Free Press, 1957; New York: Free Press Paperback Edition, 1964), 98–107.
100. Rose, *Elitist Vs. Popular Criticism,* 10–11,
101. Greenberg, "Avant-garde attitudes," 145.
102. Clement Greenberg, "Where is the Avant-Garde?," *Vogue* (June 1967) in *Clement Greenberg: The Collected Essays and Criticism,* ed. O'Brian, 263.
103. Greenberg, "Avant-Garde and Kitsch," 103.
104. Greenberg, "Where is the Avant-Garde?," 264.
105. Greenberg, "Modernist Painting," 103.
106. Rose, *Elitist Vs. Popular Criticism,* 11.
107. Greenberg, "Avant-Garde and Kitsch," 102.
108. Rose, *Elitist Vs. Popular Criticism,* 11.
109. Greenberg, "Avant-Garde and Kitsch," 103.

110. Dwight MacDonald, "A Theory of Mass Culture," *Diogenes,* no. 3 (Summer 1953), reprinted in *Mass Culture,* eds. Rosenberg and White, 60–1.
111. Ibid., 60.
112. Rose, *Elitist Vs. Popular Criticism,* 11.
113. Zygmunt Bauman, *Intimations of Postmodernity* (London and New York: Routledge, 1992), 49–52.
114. Rose, *Elitist Vs. Popular Criticism,* 11.
115. Leslie Fiedler, "Cross the Border – Close the Gap," *Playboy* (December 1969), chap. in *The Collected Essays of Leslie Fiedler* (New York: Stein and Day, 1971), 478, 482.
116. Rose, *Elitist Vs. Popular Criticism,* 11.
117. Marshall Berman, *All That Is Solid Melts Into Air: The Experience of Modernity* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1982), 32. Fiedler used the term "post-Modernists." Fiedler, "Cross the Border – Close the Gap," 483.
118. Berman, *All That is Solid Melts Into Air,* 32.
119. Ihab Hassan, "Toward a Concept of Postmodernism," chap. in *The Dismemberment of Orpheus: Toward a Postmodern Literature,* 2d ed., rev. (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, n.p., 1982), reprinted in *The Postmodern Turn: Essays in Postmodern Theory and Culture* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1987), 90–1.
120. Greenberg, "Avant-Garde and Kitsch," 103.
121. Greenberg, "Where is the Avant-Garde?," 263–4.
122. Rose, *Elitist Vs. Popular Criticism,* 16–17. Rose refers to Jacques Ellul, *Propaganda: The Formation of Men's Attitudes,* trans. Konrad Kellen and Jean Lerner (New York: Vintage Books, Random House, 1973; repr. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1965).
123. Ibid., 13.
124. Barbara Rose, "Criticism as Propaganda," 224–5.
125. Rose, *Elitist Vs. Popular Criticism,* 14.
126. Rose, "Criticism as Propaganda," 225.
127. Rose, *Elitist Vs. Popular Criticism,* 18.
128. Gregory Battock, "Gene Swenson: A Composite Portrait," in *Gene Swenson: Retrospective for a Critic,* exhibition catalogue (Lawrence: The University of Kansas, 1971), 14.
129. Ibid., 13.
130. Gene Swenson, "From the International Liberation Front," Gene Swenson File, Lucy Lippard Papers, Archives of American Art, Washington, D.C. Part of this passage, as well as additional passages, are quoted in Gregory Battock, "Gene Swenson: A Composite Portrait," in *Gene Swenson: Retrospective for a Critic* (14). According to the same source, this document was read by Swenson "at the historic Open Hearing at the School of Visual Arts [New York] on April 10, 1969" and "was printed in the Art Worker's Coalition 'Open Hearing' volume in 1969."
131. Lawrence Alloway, "The Uses and Limits of Art Criticism," chap. in *Topics in American Art Since 1945* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1975), 260–1. According to this source, the essay represents an expansion of "three lectures given at the Art Students League, New York, in 1973" (251).
132. See Max Kozloff, *Elitist Vs. Popular Criticism,* 68, quoted in ibid., 260.
133. Rose, *Elitist Vs. Popular Criticism,* 16.

134. Hilton Kramer, in ibid., 23.
135. Art Worker's Coalition File, Lucy Lippard Papers, Archives of American Art, Washington, D.C.
136. Rose, "Criticism as Propaganda," 221.
137. Rose, *Elitist Vs. Popular Criticism,* 18.
138. Michel Foucault, "Truth and Power," chap. in *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972–1977,* ed. Colin Gordon, trans. Colin Gordon, Leo Marshall, John Mepham, and Kate Soper (New York, London, Toronto, Sydney, Tokyo, Singapore: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1980), 133.
139. Margaret A. Rose, *The Post-modern and the Post-industrial* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 41.
140. Jacques Derrida, *The Truth in Painting,* trans. Geoff Bennington and Ian McLeod (Chicago and London, 1987), 19, quoted in ibid.
141. Terry Eagleton, *Literary Theory: An Introduction* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1983), 142.
142. Foucault, "Truth and Power," 117, quoted in ibid., 224.
143. West, *The American Evasion of Philosophy,* 4.
144. Michel Foucault, "The Subject and Power," *Critical Inquiry* 8, no. 1 (Summer 1982): 777–8, quoted in ibid., 224.
145. West, *The American Evasion of Philosophy,* 226.
146. Art Berman, *From the New Criticism to Deconstruction: The Reception of Structuralism and Post-Structuralism* (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1988), 187.
147. Elizabeth Grosz, *Sexual Subversions* (St. Leonards, NSW: Allen & Unwin, 1989), 28.
148. Charles Harrison and Paul Wood, eds., *Art in Theory 1900–1990: An Anthology of Changing Ideas* (Oxford, London: Blackwell, 1992; Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell, 1993), 918.
149. Rose, *Elitist Vs. Popular Criticism,* 18.
150. Berman, *From New Criticism to Deconstruction,* 174.

CHAPTER 6. MAX KOZLOFF: A PHENOMENOLOGICAL SOLUTION TO "WARHOLISM" AND ITS DISENFRANCHISEMENT OF THE CRITIC'S INTERPRETIVE AND EVALUATIVE ROLES

1. Susan Sontag studied at the University of Chicago 1950–51 inclusive. Sohnya Sayres, *Susan Sontag: The Elegiac Modernist* (New York: Routledge, 1990), 50–1.
2. Kozloff was also awarded the National Endowment Arts Criticism Fellowship in 1984. *Who's Who in American Art 1989–90,* 1990 ed., s.v. "Kozloff, Max."
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid.
5. Max Kozloff, *Renderings: Critical Essays on a Century of Modern Art* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1968), 13.
6. Phenomenological issues were being addressed by philosophers in America during the sixties as indicated by the publication of a collection of papers on the subject: James M. Edie, ed., *Phenomenology in America,* with an introduction by James M. Edie (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1967). The papers were taken from those pre-

sented at the third, fourth, and fifth meetings of the Society for Phenomenology and Existential Philosophy: Yale University, October 22–24, 1964; University of Wisconsin, October 28–30, 1965; Pennsylvania State University, October 20–22, 1966. In the same publication, Edie points out that English translations of "major works of European phenomenologists" were available in America during this period (7–8). The following texts are proof of this claim: Maurice Merleau-Ponty, *Phenomenology of Perception,* trans. by Colin Smith (New York: Humanities Press, 1962); Edmund Husserl, *Cartesian Meditations: An Introduction to Phenomenology,* trans. by Dorion Cairns (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1960).

7. Robert C. Solomon, ed., *Phenomenology and Existentialism* (New York, Evanston, San Francisco, and London: Harper & Row, 1972; Savage, Md.: Littlefield Adams Quality Paperbacks, 1980), 21, 32.
8. Ibid., 4–5.
9. Max Kozloff, "'Pop' Culture, Metaphysical Disgust, and the New Vulgarians," *Art International* 6, no. 2 (March 1962), 35.
10. Clement Greenberg, "After Abstract Expressionism," *Art International* 6 (October 1962), chap. in *Clement Greenberg: The Collected Essays and Criticism,* ed. John O'Brian (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1993), *Volume 4: Modernism with a Vengenance, 1957–1969,* 133.
11. Max Kozloff, "A Letter to the Editor," *Art International* 7, no. 6 (June 1963): 88–92.
12. Greenberg, "After Abstract Expressionism," 133–4. Presumably, this last-mentioned group is a reference to pop art. Greenberg published this essay during the early stages of the pop art movement, prior to its definitive labelling.
13. Clement Greenberg, "Counter-Avant-Garde," *Art International* 15, no. 5 (May 1971): 16–18.
14. Kozloff, "A Letter to the Editor," 88.
15. Presumably Kozloff refers to works similar to those represented in the *New Realists* exhibition held at Sidney Janis Gallery, November 1–December 1, 1962. The exhibits were confined to sixties' examples of the "commonplace." American artists represented included Andy Warhol, Tom Wesselmann, Roy Lichtenstein, James Rosenquist, Robert Indiana, and Claes Oldenburg. See *New Realists,* exhibition catalogue (New York: Sidney Janis Gallery, 1962), no pagination.
16. Kozloff, "A Letter to the Editor," 88.
17. Ibid.
18. Ibid.
19. Kozloff, "A Letter to the Editor," 90, 92.
20. Max Kozloff, "Lichtenstein at the Guggenheim," *Artforum* 8, no. 3 (November 1969): 41.
21. Kozloff, "A Letter to the Editor," 92.
22. Ibid., 88, 92.
23. This is particularly the case with his observation that pop art's "magnified canvases," in which "incidents" were both few and large, "resisted visual comprehension – because . . . [they] suggested the illimitable." The end result was that the spectator was unable to retain his identity "as separate from the painting" (ibid., 90).
24. Max Kozloff, in *The Critic and the Visual Arts: Papers delivered at the 52nd Annual Convention of the American Federation of Arts in Boston, April, 1965,* by The American Federation of Arts, 47–8, 50.

25. Michael Fried, "Art and Objecthood," *Artforum* 5, no. 10 (June 1967): 12–23. This issue is discussed in Chapter 4 of this study.
26. Kozloff, in *The Critic and the Visual Arts,* 50.
27. Kozloff quoting the critic Philip Leider, the source of which he identified as "*Artforum* (December 1964)" (ibid., 51). Patrick S. Smith considered that "Warholism" in *Warhol's* art is concerned with situating "art as a hermeneutic transmutation." Drawing from Warhol's philosophical statements about his art, Smith explained that "any 'meaning' occurs because of the transaction between his [Warhol's] creative consciousness and the unconsciousness of his interpreter (assistant, viewer or critic)." Patrick S. Smith, "Art in *Extremis:* Andy Warhol and his Art" (Ph.D. diss., Northwestern University, 1982), 347. Warhol claimed that he preferred to "work with people who" misunderstood his ideas. This led to the transmutation rather than transmission of them. Andy Warhol, *The Philosophy of Andy Warhol (From A to B and Back Again)* (New York and London: Cassell, 1975), 99, quoted in ibid.
28. Ibid.
29. Susan Sontag, unacknowledged source, quoted in Kozloff, ibid. The quotation is from "Against Interpretation," initially published in *Evergreen Review,* 1964. See Susan Sontag, "Against Interpretation," in *Evergreen Review and Reader 1962–1967: Vol. 11,* ed. Barney Rossett (New York: Grove Press, 1980), 230.
30. Kozloff, *The Critic and the Visual Arts,* 51.
31. Ibid., 51–52.
32. Donald Kuspit, "A Phenomenological Approach to Artistic Intention," chap. in *The Critic is Artist: The Intentionality of Art* (Ann Arbor, London: U.M.I. Research Press, 1984), 12.
33. W. K. Wimsatt, Jr., and Monroe C. Beardsley, "The Intentional Fallacy," *Sewanee Review* 54 (Summer 1946). Reprinted in the following source (the one referred to by Kuspit): W. K. Wimsatt, Jr., and two preliminary essays written in collaboration with Monroe C. Beardsley, *The Verbal Icon* (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1954; repr. in paperback, 1967).
34. Source of this quotation is unacknowledged. Presumably, it is taken from the authors' short article entitled "Intention," *Dictionary of World Literature,* ed. Joseph T. Shipley (New York: n.p., 1992).
35. Wimsatt, Jr., and Beardsley, *The Verbal Icon,* 4.
36. Kozloff, in *The Critic and the Visual Arts,* 51–3.
37. Richard Shusterman attributed the long reign of authorial intention as "interpretation's alleged aim and criterion" to the following paradox: on the one hand, it "offers the security of objective truth"; on the other, it provides "the security that the objective truth or meaning cannot be conclusively demonstrated . . . thereby ensuring the continued demand for interpretation." Richard Shusterman, *Pragmatist Aesthetics: Living Beauty, Rethinking Art* (Oxford, London, and Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell, 1992), 84–5.
38. E. D. Hirsch, Jr., *Validity in Interpretation* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1967), 1.
39. Ibid., 8.
40. Kozloff, in *The Critic and the Visual Arts,* 52.

41. Hirsch, Jr., *Validity in Interpretation,* 143.
42. Kozloff, in *The Critic and the Visual Arts,* 52–3.
43. Hirsch, Jr., *Validity in Interpretation,* 242–3.
44. Ibid., 218, n. 12.
45. *Collins Dictionary of Philosophy,* 1990 ed., s. v. "Husserl, Edmund."
46. Hirsch, *Validity in Interpretation,* 218.
47. Sandra B. Rosenthal and Patrick L. Bourgeois, *Pragmatism and Phenomenology: A Philosophic Encounter* (Amsterdam: B. R. Grüner Publishing, 1980), 107.
48. Hirsch, *Validity in Interpretation,* 218.
49. Ibid. As indicated in the same source, n. 13, Hirsch refers, here, to Edmund Husserl, *Logische Untersuchungen, Zweiter Band: Untersuchungen zur Phänomenologie und Theorie der Erkenntnis, I Teil* (2d ed. Halle: n.p., 1913), 96–7.
50. Ibid., 219. As indicated in the same source, n. 14, Hirsch refers, here, to Edmund Husserl, *Logische Untersuchungen,* 91.
51. Sarah Lawall, *Critics of Consciousness: The Existential Structures of Literature* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1968), 8.
52. Ibid., vii-viii, 6.
53. Ibid., 7, 267.
54. Hirsch, *Validity in Interpretation,* 242–3.
55. Lawall, *Critics of Consciousness,* 14–15.
56. Rosenthal and Bourgeois, *Pragmatism and Phenomenology,* 174. Rosenthal and Bourgeois's observation about Merleau-Ponty is made on the basis of Maurice Merleau-Ponty, *The Visible and the Invisible Eye* (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1968).
57. Lawall, *Critics of Consciousness,* 15.
58. Wolfgang Iser, *The Act of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Response* (London and Henley: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1978), 20–1.
59. Ibid., 21.
60. Astradur Eysteinsson, *The Concept of Modernism* (Ithaca, N.Y. and London: Cornell University Press, 1990), 216.
61. Iser, *The Act of Reading,* 34–8.
62. Kozloff, in *The Critic and the Visual Arts,* 50, 53.
63. In order to achieve pure phenomenality – "the only absolute data" with which a "genuinely reliable knowledge" could be construed – Husserl proposed the technique of reduction or *epoché,* the first stage of which is phenomenological reduction (Quentin Lauer, introduction to *Phenomenology and the Crisis of Philosophy* by Edmund Husserl [New York, Evanston, and London: Harper & Row, Harper Torchbooks, 1965], 4).
64. Kozloff, in *The Critic and the Visual Arts,* 53.
65. Kuspit, "A Phenomenological Approach to Artistic Intention," 13.
66. Ibid., 13–14.
67. Ibid., 13. Kuspit appears to misquote Kozloff who, in the source referred to by Kuspit, makes no mention of "or integrity." See Max Kozloff, "Critical Schizophrenia and the Intentionalist Method," chap. in *Renderings,* 309.
68. Kuspit, "A Phenomenological Approach to Artistic Intention," 13–14.
69. Kozloff, "Critical Schizophrenia and the Intentionalist Method," 309.

70. Kuspit, "A Phenomenological Approach to Artistic Intention," 12.
71. Kozloff, "Critical Schizophrenia and the Intentionalist Method," 306.
72. Kozloff, ibid., 304, quoted in Kuspit, "A Phenomenological Approach to Artistic Intention," 11.
73. Kozloff, "Critical Schizophrenia and the Intentionalist Method," 311–12.
74. Wimsatt, Jr., and Beardsley, "The Intentional Fallacy," 3.
75. Max Kozloff, "The Inert and the Frenetic," *Artforum* 4, no. 7 (March 1966): 40–4.
76. Ibid., 40.
77. Ibid.
78. Ibid., 40–2.
79. Ibid., 42.
80. Ibid.
81. Ibid., 42–3.
82. As typified by *Big Painting,* oil and magna on canvas, 1965, private collection, reproduced in Lucy Lippard, *Pop Art,* 3d ed., rev. (London: Thames and Hudson, 1970), 87, fig. 67.
83. Kozloff, "The Inert and the Frenetic," 44.
84. Ibid., 40.
85. Maurice Merleau-Ponty, *Phenomenology of Perception,* trans. Colin Smith (London: n.p., 1962), n. 1, 309, quoted in James Miller, *History and Human Existence: From Marx to Merleau-Ponty* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press, 1982, 200.
86. Maurice Merleau-Ponty, *Phenomenology of Perception,* trans. Colin Smith (New York: The Humanities Press, 1962), 219, quoted in Rosenthal and Bourgeois, *Pragmatism and Phenomenology,* 128.
87. Ibid., 126.
88. Solomon, ed., *Phenomenology and Existentialism,* 31–2.
89. Kozloff, "The Inert and the Frenetic," 249.
90. John F. Bannan, *The Philosophy of Merleau-Ponty* (New York, Chicago, San Francisco, and Atlanta: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1967), 92.
91. Martin Jay, "Sartre, Merleau-Ponty and the Search for a New Ontology of Sight," in *Modernity and the Hegemony of Vision,* ed. David Michael Levin (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press, 1993), 167.
92. Bannan, *The Philosophy of Merleau-Ponty,* 92.
93. Peter J. Hadreas, *In Place of the Flawed Diamond: An Investigation of Merleau-Ponty's Philosophy* (New York, Berne, and Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1986), 87.
94. Merleau-Ponty, *Phenomenology of Perception,* 234, quoted in Rosenthal and Bourgeois, *Pragmatism and Phenomenology,* 129–30.
95. Lauer, introduction to *Phenomenology and the Crisis of Philosophy,* 4.
96. Terry Eagleton, *Literary Theory: An Introduction* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1983) 55.
97. Max Kozloff in *Art Criticism in the Sixties: Papers delivered at Brandeis University, May 7, 1967,* by the Poses Institute of Fine Arts, reprinted under the title "Psychological Dynamics in Art Criticism in the Sixties," chap. in *Renderings,* 313–14.

98. Jay, "Sartre, Merleau-Ponty, and the Search for a New Ontology of Sight," 144.
99. Kozloff, "Psychological Dynamics in Art Criticism in the Sixties," 314.
100. Edmund Husserl, *Cartesian Meditations: An Introduction to Phenomenology,* trans. Dorion Cairns (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1977), 26, 35.
101. Edmund Husserl, *Ideas: General Introduction to Pure Phenomenology,* trans. W. R. Boyce Gibson (n.p., 1931; repr., London: George Allen & Unwin, and New York: Humanities Press, 1972), 11.
102. Husserl, *Cartesian Meditations,* 35–6.
103. Miller, *History and Human Existence,* 144, 146.
104. Husserl, *Cartesian Meditations,* 62. In *Phenomenology and Existentialism* (24) Robert C. Solomon distinguished between Husserl's use of the term *epoché* (or *phenomenological reduction*) in early works (e.g., *Ideas*) and later works (e.g., *Cartesian Meditations*).
105. Husserl, *Cartesian Meditations,* 151.
106. Edie, introduction to *Phenomenology in America,* 22–3.
107. Miller, *History and Human Existence,* 146.
108. Kozloff described his critical position in this manner in the commentary accompanying the reprinting of his contribution to *Art Criticism in the Sixties* under the title "Psychological Dynamics in Art Criticism in the Sixties," 320.
109. Ibid., 315.
110. Lauer, introduction to *Phenomenology and the Crisis of Philosophy,* 11.
111. Husserl, *Ideas,* 11.
112. Ibid., 316–17.
113. Kozloff, "Psychological Dynamics in Art Criticism in the Sixties," 317–18.
114. Miller, *History and Human Existence,* 145.
115. Kozloff, "Psychological Dynamics in Art Criticism in the Sixties," 318. Kozloff did not acknowledge the source of these ideas beyond attributing them to "the English philosopher Weldon."
116. Ibid., 318–20.
117. Patricia Waugh, *Practising Postmodernism: Reading Modernism* (London: Edward Arnold, 1992), 23.
118. Kozloff, "Psychological Dynamics in Art Criticism in the Sixties," 320.
119. Solomon, ed., *Phenomenology and Existentialism,* 32.
120. Kozloff, "Psychological Dynamics in Art Criticism in the Sixties," 320.
121. Jean-Paul Sartre, *Existentialism Is a Humanism* (excerpts), trans. Mairet (London: Methuen, 1948), 26.
122. Chris Weedon, *Feminist Practice and Poststructuralist Theory* (Cambridge, Mass., and Oxford: Blackwell, 1987), 32, 80.
123. Solomon, *Phenomenology and Existentialism,* 5.
124. Kozloff, "Psychological Dynamics in Art Criticism in the Sixties," 315.
125. Max Kozloff, *Elitist Vs. Popular Criticism: Proceedings of the Conference on Art Criticism and Art Education in New York: Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, May 15–16, 1970,* by School of Education, New York University and the New York State Council of the Arts, 68.
126. Max Kozloff, "American Painting During the Cold War," *Artforum* 11 (May 1973), revised version of the introduction to the catalogue of the exhibition *Twenty-Five*

Years of American Painting 1948–1973, Des Moines Art Center, March 6–April 22, 1973, reprint. in *Pop Art: A Critical History,* ed. Steven Henry Madoff (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press, 1997): 354–69.

CHAPTER 7. SUSAN SONTAG: POP, THE AESTHETICS OF SILENCE, AND THE NEW SENSIBILITY

1. Sohnya Sayres, *Susan Sontag: The Elegiac Modernist* (New York: Routledge, 1990), 5–6, 23, 27–30, 32–4. During her marriage to Philip Rieff (1950–58), and prior to the commencement of her career as a writer in New York, Sontag collaborated with Rieff on the publication, credited to him, *Freud, the Mind of the Moralist* (ibid., 31–2).
2. Ibid., 6.
3. Susan Sontag, "Against Interpretation," reprinted in *Evergreen Review Reader 1962–1967: Vol. II,* ed. Barney Rossett (New York: Grove Press, 1980).
4. David Harvey, *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change* (Cambridge, Mass. and Oxford: Blackwell, 1990), 53.
5. Patricia Waugh, *Practising Postmodernism Reading Modernism* (London, New York, Melbourne, and Auckland: Edward Arnold, a Division of Hodder & Stoughton, 1992), 68, 71.
6. Ibid., 15–16, 75.
7. J. M. Bernstein, introduction to *The Culture Industry: Selected Essays on Mass Culture* by Theodor W. Adorno, ed. J. M. Bernstein (London: Routledge, 1991), 4.
8. Susan Sontag, "One culture and the new sensibility," chap. in *Against Interpretation and Other Essays* (New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux, 1966; London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1967), 302.
9. Hans Bertens, "The Postmodern *Weltanschauung* and its Relation with Modernism: An Introductory Survey," in *Approaching Postmodernism: Papers presented at a Workshop on Postmodernism, 21–23 September 1984, University of Utrecht,* eds. Douwe Fokkema and Hans Bertens (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1986) 14, 18.
10. Sontag, "One culture and the new sensibility," 293–4, 296–9, 302–3; Hans Bertens claimed that although "Susan Sontag . . . never uses 'postmodern' or 'postmodernism' in such seminal essays as 'Against Interpretation' (1965) or 'One culture and the new sensibility' (1965) . . . the art and the sensibility that she discussed were widely called postmodern by the late 1970s." Hans Bertens, *The Idea of the Postmodern: A History* (London and New York: Routledge, 1995), 14.
11. Sontag, "Against Interpretation," 227–8
12. Patricia A. Deduck, *Realism, Reality and the Fictional Theory of Alain Robbe-Grillet and Anais Nin* (Washington, D.C.: University Press of America, 1982), 5.
13. David Michael Levin, introduction to *Modernity and the Hegemony of Vision,* ed. David Michael Levin (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press, 1993), 2.
14. Ibid., 2, 12; Levin dated "modernity" from "the 'discovery' of perspectivism and the rationalization of sight in the Italian Renascimento of the fifteenth century" (ibid., 2).

15. Martin Jay, "Sartre, Merleau-Ponty, and the Search for a New Ontology of Sight," in ibid., 143, also quoted in Levin, introduction to ibid., 12.
16. Sontag, "Against Interpretation," 230.
17. Ibid., 229.
18. Ilona Leki, *Alain Robbe-Grillet* (Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1983), 13.
19. James Miller, *History and Human Existence: From Marx to Merleau-Ponty* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press, 1982), 200.
20. Maurice Merleau-Ponty, *Phenomenology of Perception,* trans. Colin Smith (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, and New York: Humanities Press, 1962), vii.
21. Sontag, "Against Interpretation," 229.
22. Sontag first enrolled as a Ph.D. student at Harvard shortly after the birth of her only child in 1952; 1966–7 she was employed as "a teaching fellow in philosophy at Harvard while working on her doctorate," which she later abandoned. Sayres, *Susan Sontag,* 28–9, 31–2.
23. Reviews of Sontag's initial publication of *Against Interpretation* in 1966 acknowledge the influence of phenomenology on her criticism. See the following sources: Stephen Koch, "On Susan Sontag," *Tri-Quarterly* 7 (Fall 1966): 154; Jack Behar, "Against the Self," *The Hudson Review* 19, no. 2 (Summer 1966): 349.
24. Irving Sandler has acknowledged the influence of Alain Robbe-Grillet, among others, on Sontag's critique of interpretation in "Against Interpretation." See Irving Sandler, *American Art of the 1960s* (New York: Harper & Row, 1988), 77.
25. Susan Sontag, "Nathalie Sarraute and the novel," chap. in *Against Interpretation,* 111.
26. Roland Barthes, "Objective Literature," chap. in *Critical Essays,* trans. Richard Howard (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1972); Roland Barthes, "The Last Word on Robbe-Grillet?," chap. in ibid.
27. Chap. in *A Susan Sontag Reader,* with an introduction by Elizabeth Hardwick (New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux, 1982; repr. New York: Vintage Books, Random House, 1983), 23.
28. Sontag, "Against Interpretation," *Evergreen Review Reader,* 227.
29. Sayres, *Susan Sontag,* 3–4, 30–2.
30. Roland Barthes, *A Barthes Reader,* edited, and with an introduction by Susan Sontag, new. ed. (London: Vintage, 1993). Direct experience of French post-war culture, it must be stressed, was not a prerequisite for its influence on American art criticism during the sixties. Apart from the influence of Alain Robbe-Grillet's theoretical essays on an initial understanding of pop art in America, an issue that will be discussed in this section, they provided a common means of theorizing minimal art. In "ABC Art," *Art in America* 53, no. 5 (October-November 1965): 66, Barbara Rose quoted from Alain Robbe-Grillet, "Une voie pour le roman futur" (1956), *Pour un Nouveau Roman* (Paris: Les Editions de Minuit, 1963). In the "Inert and the Frenetic," *Artforum* 4, no. 7 (March 1966): 258, Max Kozloff quoted Alain Robbe-Grillet, "Dehumanizing Nature" (amalgamation of the following: "A Fresh Start for Fiction," trans. Richard Howard, *Evergreen Review* 1, no. 3, 1957, 99–104; "Three Reflected Visions," trans. Bruce Morrisette, ibid., 105–7; "Old 'Values' and the New Novel," trans. Bruce Morrisette, *Evergreen Review* 3, no. 9, 1959, pp. 100–18), in *The Modern Tradition: Backgrounds of Modern Litera-*

ture, eds., R. Ellmann and C. Feidelson, Jr., (New York: Oxford University Press, 1965), 364, 376.

31. Merleau-Ponty, *Phenomenology of Perception,* vii.
32. Alain Robbe-Grillet, “A Future for the Novel,” chap. in *For a New Novel: Essays on Fiction,* trans. Richard Howard (New York: Grove Press, Inc., 1965), 23.
33. Ibid., 21.
34. Barthes, “Objective Literature,” 15; In “Nathalie Saurraute and the novel,” Sontag cited “Heidegger’s phenomenology” as a “powerful influence” on novels produced in France during the 1950s, including those of Michel Butor, Nathalie Sarraute, Claude Simon, and Robbe-Grillet, all contributors to *nouveau roman* (104).
35. See Alain Robbe-Grillet, “Samuel Beckett, or Presence on the Stage” (1955 and 1957), chap. in *For a New Novel,* 111, for the medium-specific context (theatre) of Robbe-Grillet’s observation, a fact not acknowledged by Barthes.
36. George Steiner, *Heidegger,* 2d ed., rev. and enl. (London: HarperCollins, Fontana Press, 1992), 83.
37. Martin Heidegger, *Being and Time,* trans. Joan Stambaugh (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1996), 11.
38. Barthes, “Objective Literature,” 14.
39. Maurice Friedman, ed., *The Worlds of Existentialism,* with introductions and conclusion by Maurice Friedman (New York: Random House, 1964; London: Humanities Press International, 1991), 95.
40. Ibid.
41. Barthes, “The Last Word on Robbe-Grillet?,” chap. in *Critical Essays,* 203.
42. Steiner, *Heidegger,* 31, 50.
43. Barthes, “The Last Word on Robbe-Grillet?,” 203.
44. Steiner, *Heidegger,* 153.
45. “It is in words and language that things first come into being and are” (Martin Heidegger, undisclosed source, quoted in ibid., 37); Barthes, “The Last Word on Robbe-Grillet?,” 203.
46. Ibid., 197, 199.
47. Leki, *Alain Robbe-Grillet,* 13.
48. Art Berman, *From the New Criticism to Deconstruction: The Reception of Structuralism and Post-Structuralism* (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1988), 173. By the time of the writing of “The Last Word on Robbe-Grillet?,” Barthes was under the sway of the non-representational premises of Saussure’s structuralist theory of language (a prelude to the post-structuralist discarding of all “objective knowledge”). In the preface to the 1970 edition of *Mythologies* (Paris: Collection “Points,” Le Seuil), Barthes acknowledged the indebtedness of the genesis of his semiological analysis of culture, the subject of his study, to Saussure’s semiotic theory of language. Roland Barthes, *Mythologies,* select. and trans. Annette Lavers (London: Jonathan Cape, 1972; St. Albans: Paladin Frogmore, 1973), 9.
49. Sontag, “Against Interpretation,” 228.
50. Barthes, “Objective Literature,” 23.
51. Robert C. Solomon, ed., *Phenomenology and Existentialism* (New York, Evanston, San Francisco, and London: Harper & Row, 1972; Savage, Md.: Littlefield Adams Quality Paperbacks, 1980), 27–9.

52. Barthes, "Objective Literature," 23–4.
53. Solomon, *Phenomenology and Existentialism,* 21.
54. Sontag, "Against Interpretation," 228.
55. Merleau-Ponty, *Phenomenology of Perception,* vii-viii.
56. Robbe-Grillet, "A Future for the Novel," 24.
57. Sontag, "Against Interpretation," *Evergreen Review Reader,* 231.
58. Amended version of "Against Interpretation," chap. in *A Susan Sontag Reader,* 23.
59. Alain Robbe-Grillet, "On Several Obsolete Notions," chap. in *For a New Novel,* 42.
60. Ibid., 44–5.
61. Sontag, "Nathalie Saurraute and the novel," 111.
62. Susan Sontag, "On Style," chap. in *A Susan Sontag Reader,* 150.
63. Sontag, "Against Interpretation," 231.
64. Barthes, "Objective Literature," 14–15.
65. Robbe-Grillet, "A Future for the Novel," 57, 73.
66. Solomon, ed., *Phenomenology and Existentialism,* 27.
67. Susan Sontag, "The Aesthetics of Silence," *Aspen,* nos. 5 and 6 (1967), chap. in *A Susan Sontag Reader,* 231.
68. Irving Sandler has pointed out that in 1964 (in "The New Cool Art," *Art in America* 53, no. 1 [January–February, 1965], "compilation of material that first appeared in a series of reviews in the *New York Post* in 1963–64") he "drew parallels between him [Alain Robbe-Grillet] and American Pop and Minimal artists" (*American Art in the 1960s,* 76, n. 1, 83).
69. Sidney Janis, "On the Theme of the Exhibition," in *New Realists,* exhibition catalogue (New York: Sidney Janis Gallery, 1962), no pagination.
70. Ibid. The following two works are the only American ones included in the third category: Claes Oldenburg, *Pastry Case,* metal, glass, plaster and paint, 1962, private collection; Wayne Thiebaud, *Salads, Sandwiches and Desserts,* oil on canvas, 1962, Thomas C. Woods Fund of the Nebraska Arts Association.
71. Ibid.
72. Robbe-Grillet, "A Future for the Novel," 21.
73. John Ashbery, foreword to *New Realists,* no pagination.
74. Pierre Restany, excerpts from "A Metamorphosis in Nature" (1962), trans. Georges Marci, in *New Realists,* no pagination.
75. Pierre Restany, "La Réalité Dépasse La Fiction," in *Le Nouveau Réalisme à Paris et à New York,* exhibition catalogue (Paris: Rive Droite, 1960), no pagination, in Leo Castelli Papers, Archives of American Art, Washington, D.C.
76. Janis, "On the Theme of the Exhibition," no pagination.
77. See, for example, Alan R. Solomon, "Jim Dine and the Psychology of the New Art," *Art International* 8, no. 8 (October 1964): 52. Solomon regarded the art of Lichtenstein, Warhol, Rosenquist, and artists of a similar mind, as characterized by "detachment and impersonality" and thus as close in style to the new realists identified by Janis. However, while Janis considered new realism an international aesthetic, one arising from trans-national, urban and, one could add, phenomenological experience, Solomon saw the group identified above in nationalistic terms. Their attitude – "incomprehensible to Europeans" – was a direct outcome of the experience of "contemproary [sic] American life."

78. Alain Robbe-Grillet, "On Several Obsolete Notions," 32.
79. Deduck, *Realism, Reality and the Fictional Theory of Alain Robbe-Grillet and Anais Nin,* 5.
80. Alain Robbe-Grillet, "Nature, Humanism and Tragedy," chap. in *For a New Novel,* 49–50.
81. Elizabeth Grosz, *Sexual Subversions. Three French Feminists* (St. Leonards, NSW: Allen & Unwin, 1989), 28.
82. Ibid.
83. Terry Eagleton, *Literary Theory: An Introduction* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1983), 136.
84. Alain Robbe-Grillet, "New Novel, New New Novel," interview by Katherine Passias, *Sub-Stance,* no. 13 (March 1976): 134, quoted in Ben Stoltzfus, *Alain Robbe-Grillet: The Body of the Text* (Rutherford, Madison, and Teaneck, N.J.: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, and London and Toronto: Associated University Presses, 1985), 62.
85. See Sontag, "The Aesthetics of Silence," 203.
86. Sontag, "Against Interpretation," 229–31. In an essay that represents a precedent for Sontag's inter-disciplinary and trans-national theorization of the silencing of language, Leonard B. Meyer saw the radical empiricist aesthetic of the 1950's avant-garde (a category that includes *nouveau roman,* the music and writing of John Cage, the painting of Abstract Expressionists such as Mark Rothko and Jackson Pollock) as concerned with a similar elevation of sensory over intellectual experience. Apropos its destruction of the "structured syntax of pattern and form" (one that mirrors the structure of traditional Western thought), Meyer observed: "the more one perceives the relationships among things, the less one tends to be aware of their existence as things in themselves – pure sensation." Leonard B. Meyer, "The End of the Renaissance? Notes on the Radical Empiricism of the Avant-Garde," *The Hudson Review,* 16 (Summer 1963): 175.
87. Friedrich Nietzsche, *Human, All too Human,* 1 (excerpts), trans. Helen Zimmern, reprinted under the title "Art and Beauty," in *The Philosophy of Nietzsche,* ed., with an introduction by Geoffrey Clive (New York: New American Library, 1965), 522.
88. Solomon, ed., *Phenomenology and Existentialism,* 34.
89. James M. Edie, introduction to *Phenomenology in America,* ed. by James M. Edie (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1967), 22–3.
90. Maurice Merleau-Ponty, "The Spatiality of One's Own Body and Motility," chap. in *The Phenomenology of Perception,* 146.
91. Sandra B. Rosenthal and Patrick L. Bourgeois, *Pragmatism and Phenomenology: A Philosophic Encounter* (Amsterdam: B. R. Grüner Publishing Co., 1980), 126.
92. Sontag, "Against Interpretation," 231.
93. Edie, introduction to *Phenomenology in America,* 23.
94. Susan Sontag, "Psychoanalysis and Norman O. Brown's *Life Against Death,*" chap. in *Against Interpretation,* 258.
95. Ibid., 258–9.
96. Ibid., 256–7, 260–1.
97. Andreas Huyssen, "Mapping the Postmodern," in *The Post-Modern Reader,* ed.

Charles Jencks (London: Academy Editions, and New York: St. Martin's Press, 1992), 47.

98. Of relevance to modern poetry and its drive towards autonomy, "zero degree writing" destroyed modes of writing (i.e., it "destroyed relationships in language and reduced discourse to words as static things"), leaving it with only style. "Style," Barthes considered, "is never anything but metaphor, that is, equivalence of the author's literary intention and carnal structure." Roland Barthes, from "*Writing Degree Zero,*" chap. in *A Barthes Reader,* 33, 59.
99. Susan Sontag, "The Aesthetics of Silence," 181–2.
100. Jürgen Habermas, "Modernity – An Incomplete Project," in *Postmodern Culture,* ed. Hal Foster (London and Sydney: Pluto Press, 1985), 9, quoted in Harvey, *The Condition of Postmodernity,* 12.
101. Nietzsche, *Human, All Too Human,* 1, 516–17.
102. Sontag, "The Aesthetics of Silence," 182.
103. Fredric Jameson, *Postmodernism, or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism* (London: Verso, and Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1991; paperback ed., London and New York: Verso, 1992), 14–15.
104. Sontag, "The Aesthetics of Silence," 182.
105. Ibid.
106. Ibid., 183–4, 186.
107. Ibid., 193.
108. David Pears, *Wittgenstein* (London: Fontana, 1971; London: Fontana/Collins, 1971), 55. According to a translation first published in 1961, Sontag referred to the proposition numbered 4.116. However, there are some changes. The second sentence should read "Everything that can be put into words can be put clearly." Second, this translation omits the final sentence of Sontag's quotation: "But not everything that can be thought can be said." This can, however, be related to remarks Wittgenstein made in the author's preface: "the aim of the book is to set a limit . . . not to thought, but to the expression of thoughts: for in order to be able to set a limit to thought, we should have to find both sides of the limit thinkable (i.e., we should have to be able to think what cannot be thought). It will therefore only be in language that the limit can be set, and what lies on the other side of the limit will simply be nonsense." Ludwig Wittgenstein, *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus,* trans. D. F. Pears and B. F. McGuiness, with an introduction by Bertrand Russell (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1963), 3, 51. Irving Sandler has claimed that "because of the artists' growing concern with factuality in the middle and late sixties, references to Wittgenstein became common in art criticism [during this period]." He has further noted that "Michael Fried gave a book by Wittgenstein to Frank Stella and Barbara Rose as a wedding gift." See *American Art in the Sixties,* 77, 87, n. 98.
109. Sontag, "The Aesthetics of Silence," 193.
110. Ibid.
111. Ludwig Wittgenstein, *Notebooks 1914–1916* (Oxford: n.p., 1961), 25, quoted in *Collins Dictionary of Philosophy,* 1990 ed., s.v. "Wittgenstein, Ludwig."
112. Ludwig Wittgenstein, *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus* (London: n.p., 1922), proposition 4.01, quoted in *Collins Dictionary of Philosophy,* 1990 ed., s.v. "Wittgenstein, Ludwig"; Wittgenstein, *Tractatus,* 37.

113. Wittgenstein, *Notebooks,* 25, quoted in *Collins Dictionary of Philosophy,* 1990 ed., s.v. "Wittgenstein, Ludwig."
114. Wittgenstein, *Tractatus,* propositions 6.42, 6.421, pp. 145–7.
115. Ibid., propositions, 6.522, 7, p. 151.
116. Sontag, "The Aesthetics of Silence," 193, 201.
117. Ibid., 201.
118. Wittgenstein, *Tractatus,* proposition 3.323, p. 29.
119. Sontag, "The Aesthetics of Silence," 200–1.
120. Ibid., 189–90.
121. Heidegger, *Being and Time,* 113.
122. Martin Heidegger, *Existence and Being* (excerpts), with an introduction by Werner Brock (Chicago: Henry Regnery, 1949; Gateway Books, 1960), in *The Worlds of Existentialism,* ed. Friedman, 185.
123. Sontag, "The Aesthetics of Silence," 190.
124. Susan Sontag, "'Thinking Against Oneself': Reflections on Cioran," chap. in *Styles of Radical Will* (New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux, 1969), 74–5.
125. Ibid., 78.
126. Friedrich Nietzsche, *Human, All Too Human,* 11 (excerpts), trans. Paul V. Cohn, reprinted under the title "History," in *The Philosophy of Nietzsche,* ed. Clive, 246.
127. Friedrich Nietzsche, *Thoughts Out of Season,* 11 (excerpts), trans. Adrian Collins, reprinted under the title "History," in ibid., 233.
128. Ibid., 220.
129. Ibid.
130. Sontag, "The Aesthetics of Silence," 190–1.
131. Robert Goldwater, "Reflections on the Rothko Exhibition," n.p., n.d., 43, quoted in Meyer, "The End of the Renaissance?," 182.
132. Sontag, "The Aesthetics of Silence," 191, 194.
133. Martin Heidegger, *Sein und Zeit,* n.p., n.d., quoted in Steiner, *Heidegger,* 97.
134. Heidegger, *Being and Time,* 164. Quoted also in Steiner, ibid., from a different source which is not specified.
135. Sontag, "The Aesthetics of Silence," 194.
136. Merleau-Ponty, "The Body, Motility and Spatiality, 146.
137. Ibid., 121, 140.
138. Sontag, "The Aesthetics of Silence," 194–5.
139. Douglas Kellner, *Jean Baudrillard: From Marxism to Postmodernism and Beyond* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1989), 79.
140. Huyssen, "Mapping the Postmodern," 51.
141. Sontag, "The Aesthetics of Silence," 195.
142. Dwight MacDonald, "Masscult and Midcult," chap. in *Against the American Grain* (New York: Random House, 1962), 37.
143. Jencks, "The Postmodern Agenda," 31.
144. Ibid., 197.
145. Steiner, *Heidegger,* 27.
146. Sontag, "The Aesthetics of Silence," 97–8.
147. Wittgenstein, *Tractatus,* 23.
148. Robert J. Fogelin, *Wittgenstein,* 2d ed. (London and New York: Routledge & Kegan

Paul, 1987), 29; Wittgenstein, proposition 3.203, unspecified source, quoted in Fogelin, *Wittgenstein.*

149. Sontag, "The Aesthetics of Silence," 198.
150. Sontag, "'Thinking Against Oneself': Reflections on Cioran," 93.
151. John Cage, *Silence,* n.p., n.d., quoted in Sontag, ""Thinking Against Oneself': Reflections on Cioran," 93.
152. Meyer, "The End of the Renaissance?," 182.
153. Ibid., 174.
154. Ibid.
155. Paul Edwards, ed., *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (New York: Macmillan, 1967; New York: Macmillan & Free Press, and London: Collier Macmillan, repr. ed., 1972), s.v. "Zen," by Ninian Smart.
156. Ibid.
157. Cage, *Silence,* quoted by Sontag, "'Thinking Against Oneself': Reflections on Cioran," 94.
158. Max Kozloff, "The Inert and the Frenetic," *Artforum* 4, no. 7 (March 1966): 40.
159. Sontag, "The Aesthetics of Silence," 203.
160. Susan Sontag, "Non-Writing and the Art Scene," *The New York Herald Tribune,* 25 July 1965, revised version in *The New Art: A Critical Anthology,* ed. Gregory Battock (New York: E. P. Dutton, 1968), 156.
161. S. L. Bindeman, *Heidegger and Wittgenstein: The Poetics of Silence* (Washington, D.C.: University Press of America, 1981) ,128–9. Ihab Hassan conceives of irony as a feature of (deconstructive) post-modernism and symptomatic of a period in which no single "principle or paradigm" holds sway. Along with "perspectivism" and "reflexiveness" it expresses the "recreations of mind in search of a truth that continually eludes it, leaving it with only an ironic access or excess of self-consciousness." See Ihab Hassan, "Pluralism in Postmodern Perspective," chap. in *The Postmodern Turn: Essays in Postmodern Theory and Culture* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1987), 170.
162. Huyssen, "Mapping the Postmodern," 61.
163. In the case of Mallarmé, see Sontag, "The Aesthetics of Silence," 196.
164. Huyssen, "Mapping the Postmodern," 61.
165. Berman, *From the New Criticism to Deconstruction,* 208.
166. Jonathon Culler, *Saussure,* 2d ed. (Hammersmith: Fontana, 1985), 122.
167. Martin Heidegger, unacknowledged source, quoted in Steiner, *Heidegger,* 37.
168. Steiner, *Heidegger,* 27.
169. Solomon, *Phenomenology and Existentialism,* 32–3.
170. Sontag, "The Aesthetics of Silence," 190.
171. Nietzsche, *Thoughts Out of Season,* 11 (excerpts), 233.
172. Sontag, "The Aesthetics of Silence," 194–5.
173. Merleau-Ponty, "The Body, Motility and Spatiality," 146.
174. Edie, introduction to *Phenomenology in America,* 23.
175. Waugh, *Practising Postmodernism,* 15–16, 19, 23.
176. Ibid., 3–4. Waugh, it must be assumed, uses "post" in the sense of critical of Husserl's epistemological phenomenology, central to which is the transcendental ego (as opposed to that situated in the world and, in a point of agreement between Heidegger and Derrida, situated in language).

177. Ibid., 4. Waugh does not provide details of the sources of this alleged interpretation of Olsen's Heideggerian theorization of a "non-anthropomorphic poetry, " save to refer to Charles Olson, *Causal Mythology* (San Francisco: n.p., 1969). Hans Bertens indicates a range of interpretations of *Charles Olson's* use of the term post-modernism during the 1950s, including that indebted to Heidegger's existential phenomenology ("The Postmodern *Weltanschauung,*" 11–13, 20–5). Bertens also draws attention to the claim of Jerome Mazzaro that the American poet Randall Jarrell had used the term in a Heideggerian sense in 1948 and thus prior to Olson (ibid. 12, see also Jerome Mazzaro, *Postmodern American Poetry* [Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1980], viii, quoted in ibid., 12). In view of information provided by Bertens, Andreas Huyssen is incorrect in his dating of the emergence of the term in American literary criticism from the time of Irving Howe's and Harry Levin's use of it in "the late 1950s" ("Mapping the Postmodern," 44).
178. Jacques Derrida, *Positions* (Paris: n.p., 1972), 52, *Diacritics* 2, no. 4 (Winter, 1972): 36, Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, translator's preface to *Of Grammatology,* by Jacques Derrida (Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1976), 1xxvii.
179. Sontag, "The Aesthetics of Silence," 197–8.
180. David Ray Griffin, *God and Religion in the Postmodern World: Essays in Post-modern Theology* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1989), x.
181. Chris Weedon, *Feminist Practice and Poststructuralist Theory* (Cambridge, Mass. and Oxford: Blackwell,1987), 21.
182. Jacques Derrida, *The Truth in Painting,* trans. Geoff Bennington and Ian McLeod (Chicago and London: Chicago University Press, 1987), quoted in Margaret A. Rose, *The Post-modern and the Post-industrial* (Cambridge, New York, Port Chester, Melbourne, and Sydney: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 41.
183. Susan Sontag, "The Aesthetics of Silence," 203.
184. Mazzaro, *Postmodern American Poetry,* viii, quoted in Bertens, "The Postmodern *Weltanschauung,*" 12. Mazzaro considered that "silence or the destruction of language," which seeks to restore language to its "original state," represents a modernist solution to language's "fall from unity." Post-modernism, by way of contrast, "accepts the division and uses language and self-definition . . . as the basis of identity" (ibid.).
185. Distinctions between Hassan's and Derrida's respective conceptions of "deconstruction" is discussed in chapter 1 of this study.
186. Ihab Hassan, "Towards a Concept of Postmodernism," chap. in *The Postmodern Turn,* 92–3; Hassan, "Culture, Indeterminacy, and Immanence: Margins of the (Postmodern) Age," chap. in ibid., 75.
187. Susan Sontag, "One culture and the new sensibility," 293–4.
188. C. P. Snow, *The Two Cultures: And a Second Look* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965), 1, 3, 16.
189. Sontag, "One culture and the new sensibility," 295–8.
190. For example: Roy Lichtenstein, *Ceramic Sculpture 12,* glazed ceramic, 1965, collection John G. Powers, Aspen, Colo., reproduced in Lucy Lippard, ed. and contrib., *Pop Art,* 3d ed., rev. (London: Thames and Hudson, 1970), 126, fig. 105.
191. Ibid., 297–8.

192. In the case of Mathew Arnold, "two-culture" refers to his belief in an oppositional and heirarchical relationship between high and low culture. Arnold was a nineteenth-century British poet, critic, religious thinker, and educationalist, this last role having a decisive effect on his belief in the civilizing benefits of high culture. See Mathew Arnold, "Sweetness and Light," chap. in *Culture and Anarchy: An Essay in Political and Social Criticism* (London, Edinburgh, Dublin, and New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1869), 95, 125–6.
193. Sontag, "One culture and the new sensibility," 300–3.
194. Daniel Bell, "The Sensibility of the Sixties," chap. in *The Cultural Contradictions of Capitalism* (New York: Basic Books, 1976), 130.
195. Huyssen, "Mapping the Postmodern," 51.
196. Sontag, "One culture and the new sensibility," 302.
197. R. Bernstein, introduction to *Habermas and Modernity,* ed. R. Bernstein (Cambridge: Polity Press in association with Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 1985), 5, quoted in Harvey, *The Condition of Postmodernity,* 15.
198. Jürgen Habermas, "Modernity Versus Postmodernity," *New German Critique* 22 (Winter 1981), reprint. Under the title "Modernity – An Incomplete Project," in *Postmodern Culture,* ed. Hal Foster (London and Sydney: Pluto Press, 1985), 8.
199. Adorno's argument was advanced in the context of his critique of the "Marxist belief that capitalist forces of production when unfettered from capitalist relations of production will generate a free society" – one that places "capitalism into a naive narrative of the progress of freedom and reason." Adorno saw, instead, fascism and not socialism arising from western rationality: "No universal history leads from savagery to humanitarianism, but there is one leading from the slingshot to the megaton bomb." Bernstein, introduction to *The Culture Industry,* 3; Adorno, unspecified source, quoted in ibid.
200. R. Bernstein, introduction to *Habermas and Modernity,* quoted in Harvey, *The Postmodern Condition,* 15.
201. Max Weber, unspecified source, quoted in Robert Nisbet, *The Sociological Tradition* (London: Heinemann, and New York: Basic, 1967), 299 [sic], quoted in David Lyon, *Postmodernity* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994), 31.
202. Bernstein, introduction to *The Culture Industry,* 4.
203. Terry Eagleton, "Awakening from Modernity," *Times Literary Supplement,* 20 February 1987, quoted in Harvey, *The Postmodern Condition,* 9.
204. Jean Francois Lyotard, *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge,* trans. Geoff Bennington and Brian Massumi, with an introduction by Fredric Jameson (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984), xxiv, 60–1.
205. Kenneth Baynes, James Bohman, and Thomas McCarthy, eds., *After Philosophy: End or Transformation?* (Cambridge, Mass: M.I.T. Press, 1987), 6.
206. Bernstein, introduction to *The Culture Industry,* 4.
207. Waugh, *Practising Postmodernism,* 15.

CONCLUSION

1. Lynne Cook, "The Independence Group: British and American Pop Art: A 'Palimpcestuous' Legacy," in *Modern Art and Popular Culture: Readings in High*

and Low, eds. Kirk Varnedoe and Adam Gopnik, excerpt reprinted in *Pop Art: A Critical History,* ed. Steven Henry Madoff (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press, 1997), 392.

2. The following brief survey of this literature will, as in previous sections of this study, attempt to delineate the main lines of New York criticism as made apparent in critical responses to pop art. However, consistent with pop's passing over into history and thus becoming the subject of retrospective studies, many of them book-length and produced in a range of academic contexts, it is necessary to expand the frame of reference somewhat beyond the strict confines of art criticism and, in some instances, beyond the New York critical milieu.
3. Douglas Kellner, *Jean Baudrillard: From Marxism to Postmodernism and Beyond* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1989), 7.
4. Max Kozloff, "American Painting During the Cold War," *Artforum* 11 (May 1973), reprint. in *Pop Art: A Critical History,* ed. Steven Henry Madoff (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press, 1997), 355, 365–6.
5. Donald Kuspit, "Pop Art: A Reactionary Realism," *Art Journal* 36, no. 1 (1976), chap. in *Pop Art: The Critical Dialogue,* ed. Carol Anne Mahsun (Ann Arbor and London: U.M.I. Research Press, 1989), 204, 208.
6. Janet Wolff, *The Social Production of Art* (London and Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1981), 52.
7. Kuspit, "Pop Art: A Reactionary Realism," 208–10, 212–13.
8. T. B. Bottomore and Maximilien Rubel, introduction to *Karl Marx: Selected Writings in Sociology and Social Philosophy,* by Karl Marx, eds. T. B. Bottomore and Maximilien Rubel, trans. T. B. Bottomore (Harmondsworth, New York, Ringwood, and Ontario: Penguin, 1978), 43.
9. Christin J. Mamiya, *Pop Art and Consumer Culture: American Super Market* (Austin: University of Texas, 1992), 71, 111.
10. "The triumph of advertising in the culture industry is that consumers feel compelled to buy and use its products even though they see through them." T. W. Adorno and M. Horkheimer, "The Culture Industry: Enlightenment as Mass Deception," chap. in *Dialectic of Enlightenment* (Ringwood, N.J.: Allen Lane, 1973), abridged version in *Mass Communication and Society,* eds. James Curran, Michael Gurevitch, and Janet Woolacott (London: Edward Arnold in association with The Open University, 1979), 383.
11. "There is no transcendence any more, no finality, no objective: what characterizes this society is the absence of 'reflection', of a perspective on itself." Jean Baudrillard, *La Société de Consommation* (Paris: Editions Denoël, 1970); *The Consumer Society: Myths and Structures,* with an intro. by George Ritzer, foreword by J. P. Mayer (London, Thousand Oaks, and New Delhi: Sage, 1998), 192.
12. Kellner, *Jean Baudrillard: From Marxism to Postmodernism and Beyond,* 18.
13. Mamiya, *Pop Art and Consumer Culture,* 171.
14. Eric Fernie, *Art History and its Methods: A Critical Anthology* (London: Phaidon, 1995), 352.
15. David Riesman, *The Lonely Crowd* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1950), 20–2, 26.
16. Donald Kuspit, *The Cult of the Avant-Garde Artist* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 62–3.

17. Ibid., 55, 62–3.
18. Harold Rosenberg, "Action Painting: Crisis and Distortion," chap. in *The Anxious Object* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1966; Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, Phoenix edition, 1982), 39.
19. Bradford R. Collins, "The Metaphysical Nosejob: The Remaking of Warhola, 1960–1968," *Arts Magazine* 62 (February 1988), reprint. in *The Critical Response to Andy Warhol,* ed. Alan R. Pratt (Westport, Conn., and London: Greenwood Press, 1997), 168.
20. Rosenberg, "Action Painting: Crisis and Distortion," 45, 47.
21. Kuspit, "Pop Art: A Reactionary Realism," 215; see also Donald Kuspit, "Lichtenstein and the Collective Unconscious of Style," *Art in America* (May-June 1979), chap. in *The Critic is Artist: The Intentionality of Art* (Ann Arbor and London: U.M.I Research Press, 1984), 224.
22. Adorno and Horkheimer's "The Culture Industry: Enlightenment as Mass Deception" was first first published in German in 1944. See Christopher Brookeman, *American Culture and Society Since the 1930s* (London and Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1984), 79.
23. Adorno and Horkheimer, "The Culture Industry: Enlightenment as Mass Deception," 359.
24. Kuspit, "Pop Art: A Reactionary Realism," 215.
25. Kozloff, "American Painting During the Cold War," 366.
26. Kuspit, *The Cult of the Avant-Garde Artist,* 87.
27. Mamiya, *Pop Art and Consumer Culture,* 1; Kuspit, "Pop Art: A Reactionary Realism," 213; Kuspit, ibid., 21.
28. Mamiya, ibid., 147.
29. Bruce Althuser, excerpt from "Pop Triumphant: A New Realism," in *The Avant-Garde Exhibition: New Art in the 20th Century* (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1994), chap. in *Pop Art: A Critical History,* ed. Madoff, 401.
30. Kuspit, "Lichtenstein and the Collective Unconscious of Style," 223–4.
31. Harold Rosenberg, "Warhol: Art's Other Self," chap. in *Art on the Edge: Creators and Situations* (London: Secker and Warburg, 1976), 101.
32. Robert Hughes, "The Rise of Andy Warhol," *The New York Review of Books* (18 February 1982), reprint. in *Pop Art: A Critical History,* ed. Madoff, 378.
33. Ibid., 105.
34. Hughes, "The Rise of Andy Warhol," 382.
35. Jack Bankowsky, "Words Around Warhol," *Artforum* (April 1989), reprint. in *The Critical Response to Andy Warhol,* ed. Pratt, 210.
36. Barbara Rose, "The Value of Didactic Art," *Artforum* 5, no. 8 (April 1967), 32.
37. Carter Ratcliff, "Starlust, Andy's Photos," *Art in America* (May 1980), reprint. in *The Critical Response to Andy Warhol,* ed. Pratt, 133.
38. Donald Kuspit, preface to *The New Subjectivism: New Art in the 1980s* (Ann Arbor and London: U.M.I Research Press, 1988), xvii.
39. Leo Braudy, *The Frenzy of Renown: Fame and its History* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986), page not cited, quoted in ibid., xviii.
40. Ibid., xvii.
41. Ratcliff, "Starlust, Andy's Photos," 135–6, 138.
42. Kuspit, *The Cult of the Avant-Garde,* 65–6, 69, 78.

43. Steven Kurtz, "Uneasy Flirtations: The Critical Reaction to Warhol's Concepts of the Celebrity and of Glamour," in *The Critical Responses to Andy Warhol,* ed. Pratt, 255.
44. Ratcliff, "Starlust, Andy's Photos," 132, 137.
45. Collins, "The Metaphysical Nosejob," 185.
46. Kuspit, *The Cult of the Avant-Garde,* 64–5.
47. Ibid., 81–2.
48. Donald Kuspit, "Beuys or Warhol?," *C Magazine* (Fall 1987), chap. in *The New Subjectivism: Art in the 1980s,* 403–5.
49. Donald Kuspit, "Regressive Reproduction and Throwaway Conscience," *Artscribe* (January/February 1987), chap. in *The New Subjectivism: Art in the 1980s,* 413–14.
50. Donald Kuspit, "Notes on American Activist Art Today," *Artforum* (May 1988), chap. in *The New Subjectivism: Art in the 1980s,* 419.
51. Hal Foster, "(Post)Modern Polemics," *New German Critique* 33 (Fall 1984) and *Perspecta* 21 (1984), chap. in *Recodings: Art, Spectacle, Cultural Politics* (Seattle: Bay Press, 1985), 121, 129.
52. Hal Foster, "Subversive Signs," *Art In America* (November 1982), chap. in ibid., 100.
53. Robert Hughes, "James Rosenquist," *Time* (1986), reprint. in *Nothing if Not Critical: Selected Essays on Art and Artists* (London: Collins and Harvill, 1990), 322–3.
54. Kuspit, "Lichtenstein and the Collective Unconscious of Style," 222.
55. Robert Hughes, "The Rise of Andy Warhol," 379.
56. Thomas Crow, "Saturday Disasters: Trace and Reference in Early Warhol," *Art in America* (May 1987), 129, 134, 136.
57. Bottomore and Rubel, introduction to *Karl Marx: Selected Writings in Sociology and Social Philosophy,* 43.
58. Baudrillard, *The Consumer Society,* 192.
59. Donald Kuspit, "Andy's Feelings," *Artscribe* (June/July 1987), chap. in *The New Subjectivism: Art in the 1980s,* 401; Hughes, "Jean Baudrillard's *America,*" *The New York Review of* Books (1989), reprint in *Nothing if Not Critical,* 379.
60. Kuspit, "Andy's Feelings," 400–1.
61. Hughes, "Jean Baudrillard's *America,*" 379, 385.
62. Jean Baudrillard, *America,* trans. Chris Turner (London: Verso, 1988), 32, quoted by Lisa Phillips, "Art and Media Culture," in *Image World: Art and Media Culture,* by Marvin Heiferman and Lisa Phillips with John G. Hanhardt (New York: Whitney Museum of American Art, 1989), 57.
63. Jean Baudrillard, "The Hyper-realism of Simulation" (excerpts), section of *L'Echange symbolique et la moret* (Paris, 1976); trans. Charles Levin as *Symbolic Exchange and Death* in *The Structural Allegory,* ed. J. Fekete (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984); this translation reprinted in Mark Poster, ed., *Jean Baudrillard: Selected Writings* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1988); reprint. in *Art in Theory: 1900–1990,* eds. Charles Harrison and Paul Woods (Oxford: Blackwell, 1992; Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell, 1993), 1050.
64. Phillips, "Art and Media Culture," 57, 60.
65. Baudrillard, *The Consumer Society,* 116, 192.

66. Kellner, *Jean Baudrillard,* 18.
67. Phillips, "Art and Media Culture," 61–3, 69.
68. Charles Jencks, "The Post-Modern Agenda," in *The Post-Modern Reader,* ed. Charles Jencks (London: Academy Editions, and New York: St. Martin's Press, 1992), 10.
69. Kuspit, *The Cult of the Avant-Garde Artist,* 66.
70. Viewed solely from an aesthetic perspective, Mamiya also argued in the conclusion that pop was illustrative of post-modernism's relationship to each of three "modernist scenarios": post-modernism understood "as a chronological continuation of modernism, a rejection of modernism, or a retrospective reading of modernism." Mamiya, *Pop Art and Consumer Culture,* 160–1, 165, 188, n. 14.
71. Steve Jones, "Andy Warhol's Allegorical Icons," in *The Critical Responses to Andy Warhol,* 277–8.
72. Cécile Whiting, *A Taste for Pop: Pop Art, Gender, and Consumer Culture* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 4–5, 233.
73. Fernie, *Art History and its Methods,* 18.
74. Celia Lury, *Consumer Culture* (Cambridge: Polity, 1996), 144.
75. Fernie, *Art History and its Methods,* 352.
76. Lawrence Alloway, "Personal Statement," *Ark* 19 (Spring 1957), 28.

This page intentionally left blank

Index

Abstract Expressionism, 23, 40, 69, 70, 78, 84, 86, 90, 118, 120, 121, 125, 148, 149, 150, 161, 211, 212, 224n11, 249n30, 264n86
action painting, 2, 78, 79–80, 81–2, 84–5, 86, 87, 89, 90, 91, 212, 243n128
Adorno, T. W., 21, 93, 206, 209, 212, 269n199, 270n10
alienation, 61, 75, 78, 89, 93, 189, 194, 210, 218, 221
Alloway, Lawrence, aesthetic theory, 6, 16, 33, 50–51, 67; critical philosophy, *see* Korzybski, Alfred, Morris, Charles, De Saussure, Ferdinand, postmodernism, sociological model of, pragmatism, 51–2, 67, pragmatist semiotics, 38, 59–61; cultural theory, 2, 5, 16, 31, 33, 42–3, 45, 47, 49, 51, 53, 55–6, 64, 124, 128, 221, 231n21, 232n27, *see also* Greenberg, Clement, 48–9; science fiction, influence of, 50–51, 52; pop art, interpretations of, 2, 6, 16, 18, 27, 30, 37, 38, 40–42, 60–62, 66, 106–07, 116, 183, 221; social theory, 21, 46, 47–8, 56, 63, *see also* reception theory, 64; *see also* author, absence of, 56, 57–8, 59, 60, author, presence of, 60–61, pop art, artists of, 56, Lichtenstein, Roy, 40, 57, 58, 67, Rosenquist, James, 56, 61, Ramos, Mel, 42, Warhol, Andy, 61, pop art, audience of, 38, pop art, use of term, 43, semiotics, 41, 62, 64–6, 106, information and communication theory, 61, 62
Althuser, Bruce, 213
Althusser, Louis, 13
American dream, 213, 217
American imperialism, 209, 212, 252n82
Andre, Carl, 118, 119, 130.
Arnold, Mathew, 205, 268n192
artist, decentrement of, 91
Ashbery, John, 182, 183
Ashton, Dore, 89
authenticity, 7, 69, 82, 84, 88, 89, 94, 173, 192–3, 195, 201, 207, 210
author, absence of, 3, 11, 56, 57–8, 59, 60
author, presence of, 59, 60–61, 72
avant-garde, 12, 22, 24, 31, 32, 73, 75–6, 87, 109, 121, 133, 135–6, 138, 149, 188, 194, 198, 202, 250n30
avantgardism, 4, 12, 19–20, 22, 23, 28, 29, 32, 215, 216, 219, 221, 227n47, 224n11

Banham, Reyner, 42, 51
Banowsky, Jack, 214
Barthes, Roland, 3, 27, 65, 89, 177–80, 181, 182, 185, 188, 262n48, 264–5n98
Baudrillard, Jean, 4, 13, 17, 22, 66–7, 94, 107, 111, 196, 197, 210, 218, 219, 221, 237n 155, 270n11
Bauhaus, 49, 73, 90
Bauman, Zygmunt, 34, 18, 19, 63, 67, 76, 97, 107, 137
Beckett, Samuel, 161, 177, 192
Bell, Daniel, 205
benign nominalism, *see* Sontag, Susan, 197, 198
Benjamin, Walter, 71
Berman, Art, 65
Berman, Marshall, 79, 90, 138, 242n110
Bertens, Hans, 1, 62, 63, 64, 238n14, 260n10, 229n89, 267–8n177
Bindeman, S. L., 200
Bonnefoy, Yves, 27
Brookeman, Christopher, 74
Brown, Norman O., 22, 25, 187–8
brutal nominalism, *see* Sontag, Susan, 182, 197, 198, 202
Buber, Martin, 88
Bürger, Peter, 23

Cage, John, 20, 25, 33, 123, 124, 128–9, 131, 171, 188, 194–5, 198, 199, 200, 203, 264n86
Cambridge Group, 233n45
camp, 209, *see also* Sontag, Susan, art, theories of, 7, 20
Campbell, John W., 51
capitalism, 3, 6, 11, 16, 17, 18, 19, 23, 29, 30, 31, 33, 49, 54, 55, 56, 58–9, 63, 70, 75, 76, 79, 90, 91, 93, 106, 108, 132, 137, 140, 141, 142, 143,

Index

capitalism (*cont.*)
145, 167, 189, 196, 204, 209, 210, 212, 213, 216, 218, 219, 221, 222
Caro, Anthony, 105, 106
Cartesianism, 14, 15, 22, 26, 34, 147, 163, 165, 166, 173, 175, 185, 187, 189, 201, 214
celebrityhood, *see* Warhol, Andy, 213–16
Cherry, Colin, 59–60
colour-field painting, 24, 103, 105, 106, 116, 120, 150
commodification, 19, 23, 31, 32, 74, 76–7, 208, 210, 211, 219, 222
constructivism, 161
consumer, the, 18, 38, 47, 48, 56, 63, 137, 210, 217, 270n10
consumer freedom, 18, 47, 63, 76, 137
consumerism, 3, 6, 11, 17, 18, 19, 30, 33, 37, 38, 47, 63, 69, 76, 108, 137, 140, 141, 142, 204, 209, 210, 212, 213, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222
counter-culture, 25; American, 4, 20, 22, 29, 174, 187, 207
counter-Enlightenment, 15, 202, 207
Cooke, Lynne, 208
Crimp, Douglas, 13, 108
Crow, Thomas, 217
cybernetics, 67, 107, *see also* Wiener, Norbert

dada, 12, 53, 118, 121, 124, 129, 135, 138, 151, 200
Dasein, 177–9, 200
deconstruction, 14, 17, 19, 24, 27, 29, 38, 107, 109, 143, 203, 208, 214, 220, 222, 227n47, 247n78, *see also* Derrida, Jacques
Deduck, Patricia A., 174, 185
Del Renzio, Toni, 57
Derrida, Jacques, 12, 13, 15, 17, 65, 66, 92, 129, 143, 172, 173, 198, 200–01, 202, 203, 206–07, 225n8, 226n15, 229n93, 243n128, 267n176 Saussure, Ferdinand, 28, 64–5, 66, *see also* Barthes, Roland, 262n48
Descartes, René, 213
Descombes, Vincent, 87
De Wald, Alan, 78–9, 80
Dewey, John, 15, 101, 126–7, 132–3, 251n59
didactic art, *see* Rose, Barbara, contemporary art, theories of, 118–20, 190
Dine, James, 39, 121, 123, 124, 148, 183
Duchamp, Marcel, 20, 103, 118, 119, 121, 135, 171, 188, 190

Eagleton, Terry, 28, 123
Eames, Charles, 44, 232n36
Ellul, Jacques, 139, 142
Enlightenment, 14, 15, 17, 21, 30, 93, 94, 110, 173, 189, 202, 205–06, 224n19
enlightened reason, 173, 206
Eurocentrism, 121, 122
existentialism, 80, 81, 82, 199, 210, 221, *see also* Buber, Martin, Friedman, Maurice, Gill, Richard and Sherman, Ernest, Kierkegaard, Soren, Rosenberg, Harold, critical philosophy, existentialism, Sartre, Jean-Paul
existentialism, literary, *see* Lawall, Sarah
expendable aesthetics, *see* Banham, Reyner, 51
expendable ikon, *see* McHale, John, 49, 51, 53

fame aesthetic, *see* Warhol, Andy, 214–15
feminism, 220–21
Fernie, Eric, 211
Fiedler, Leslie, 20, 23, 137, 188
fine art–pop art continuum, *see* Alloway, Lawrence, cultural theory, 2, 16, 33, 42, 43, 45, 47, 49, 51, 53, 55, 56, 64, 221, 231n21, 232n27
flatbed picture plane, *see* Steinberg, Leo, contemporary art, theories of, 19, 97, 103–04, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 224n9
formalism, 2, 3, 8, 11, 16, 23, 29, 30, 33, 84, 85, 110, 118, 119, 138, 163, 208, 244n11, *see also* Greenberg, Clement, 2, 15–16, 23, 29, 30, 31, 33, 75, 97, 99, 109, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 125, 127, 132, 133, 134–5, 138, 139, 140, 141, 145, 147, 149, 150–51, 249n15, 252n82, Foster, Hal, 109, 110, Fried, Michael, 105, Kozloff, Max, critical philosophy, critique of formalism, Rose, Barbara, contemporary art, theories of, 119, 125, critical philosophy, formalism, Steinberg, Leo, contemporary art, theories of, 97–8, 100, 102–03
Foster, Hal, 13, 108, 109, 110, 217, 247n78
Foucault, Michel, 13, 17, 29, 108, 143, 144, 167, 221, 222
foundationalism, 14, 16, 17, 32, 38, 51, 65, 115, 123, 167, 195, 200
Frankfurt School, 21, 209, 211
Frascina, Francis, 244n11
Freud, Sigmund, 177, 179, 180, 187
Fried, Michael, 97, 104, 105–06, 151, 163, 246n49, 265n108
Friedman, Maurice, 80, 178

Gablik, Suzi, 91, 242n112
Geneva School, 154
Gerbner, George, 44
Gibbs, Josiah, 45
Gill, Ernest and Sherman, Richard, 88, 93, 243n123
Goldwater, Robert, 194
Greenberg, Clement, 2, 3, 15–16, 23, 29, 30–32, 33–4, 37, 41, 48–9, 70, 73–5, 77, 78, 90, 97, 99, 100, 101–02, 103, 104, 105–06, 109, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 125, 127, 131, 132, 133, 134–6, 138, 139–40, 141, 142–3, 145, 146, 147, 148–9, 150–51, 167, 224n11, 224n19, 245n30, 246n45, 246n49, 248–9n13, 249n15, 249–50n30, 252n82, 252n88
Griffin, David Ray, 3, 4, 12, 16
Grosz, Elizabeth, 185

Index

Haack, Hans, 216
Habermas, Jürgen, 266
Hamilton, Richard, 236n135
Hassan, Ihab, 1, 7, 20, 24–6, 27–9, 34, 67, 107, 111, 138, 203, 228n74, 229n89, 267n161
Heidegger, Martin, 3, 5, 12, 13, 15, 17, 25, 55, 154, 162, 173, 177, 178, 192, 195, 197, 200, 201–02, 226n15, 262n34, 262n45, 267n176, 267n177
Hirsch, E. D., 152–4, 155, 156, 159, 160
Holzer, Jenny, 216, 217
Horkheimer, Max, 21, 93, 209, 212, 270n10
Hughes, Robert, 213–14, 217, 218
humanism, 50, 144, 151, 152, 167, 181, 229n89; subject of, 33, 94, 167, 211, 213, *see also* Descombes, Vincent, Weedon, Chris
Husserl, Edmund, 26, 34, 147, 148, 154, 155, 163, 164–5, 167, 175, 179, 180, 226n15, 267n176, *see also* Lauer, Quentin, 257n63
Huyssen, Andreas, 4, 7, 12, 19–20, 21, 22–4, 28, 29, 188, 196, 200, 202, 205, 207, 220, 224n11, 227n40, 227n47
hyperreality, see Baudrillard, Jean, 66–7, 94, 107, 111, 218, 219
hypotactical, *see* Hassan, Ihab, 138

immanence, *see* Hassan, Ihab, 67, 107, 111, 203
inauthenticity, 7, 195, 196, 198, 201, 221
Independent Group, 42, 44–5, 52, 234n85, 236n135
Indiana, Robert, 149, 183, 255n15
information and communication theory, 44, 62–3, *see also*, Alloway, Lawrence, cultural theory, Cherry, Colin, Gerbner, George, McLuhan, Marshall , Morris, Charles, Shannon, Claude, Wiener, Norbert, Young, J. Z
Institute of Contemporary Art, 44, 50–51
intentionality, 7, 14, 15, 26, 34, 98, 115, 175–6, 180, 190, 211, 215, *see also* Hirsch, Jr., E. D., Kozloff, Max, critical philosophy, intentionality, Kuspit, Donald, 157–8, 159, Rose, Barbara, critical philosophy, pragmatism, 126, 145, Shusterman, Richard, W., Wimsatt, Jr., W. K. and Beardsley, Monroe C.
intersubjectivity, 192
Iser, Wolfgang, 64, 155–7

James, William, 15, 27, 123, 124, 212, 250n46
Jameson, Fredric, 13, 58–59, 93, 189, 219, 220
Janis, Sidney, 182, 183, 263n77
Jay, Martin, 175
Jencks, Charles, 4, 6, 12, 21, 25, 196, 225n5
Johns, Jasper, 5, 39, 40, 97, 98, 103, 104, 118, 148, 171, 183, 184, 200, 244n3
Jones, Steve, 220
Judd, Donald, 105, 124, 126, 130, 250n46, 251n79

Kandinsky, Wassily, 149, 160
Kant, Immanuel, 30, 101, 109, 110, 123, 126, 133–4, 136, 224n19
Kellner, Douglas, 66
Kierkegaard, Soren, 61, 67, 81, 82, 83, 93, 154, 243n123
kitsch, 31, 32, 70, 136, 138, 149
Konstanz School, 156
Koons, Jeff, 217
Korzybski, Alfred, 52–5, 128
Kozloff, Max, 146; contemporary art, theories of, 4, 146–7, 148, 149–50, 151–2, 160–62, 199, 209, 212, 255n23; critical philosophy, 25, 141, 146–7, critique of formalism, 149, 150, 151, 157, 159, 165, 166, intentionality, 147, 151–2, 153, 157, 158–60, phenomenology, 3, 7, 13–14, 21, 33–4, 115, 147–8, 150, 158–60, 162–4, 165–7, 172, 222, politics, 168
Kramer, Hilton, 141–2
Krauss, Rosalind, 13, 106
Kruger, Barbara, 216, 217
Kubler, George, 118, 249n22
Kuhn, Thomas, 246n49, 244n11
Kuspit, Donald, 62–3, 64, 152, 157–8, 159, 209–10, 211–12, 213, 216–17, 218, 219

Lacan, Jacques, 13
language, silencing of, 13, 14, 15, 89, 190, 203, *see* also, Hassan, Ihab, 7, 25, 228n74, Kozloff, Max, contemporary art, theories of, 4, critical philosophy, 25, critical philosophy, phenomenology, 7, 13–14, 21, Mazzaro, Jerome, 268n184, Sontag, Susan, art, theories of, 4, 25, 172–3, 174, 182, 188, 190, 194–5, 199–200, 203, 207, 264n86, critical philosophy, phenomenology, 7, 21, 26, 197, 202, social theory, 196–7, Steiner, George, 25, Warholism
Lawall, Sarah, 154–5, 156, 159–60
Leki, Ilona, 175, 179
Levin, David Michael, 175, 260n14
Levine, Sherrie, 217
Lichtenstein, Roy, 39, 40, 57, 58, 66, 67, 91, 99, 103, 117–18, 119, 148, 150, 161–2, 183, 192, 204, 213, 217, 251n79, 263 n, 77, *see also*, Waldman, Diane, 242n112
Lippard, Lucy, 39, 116, 140, 142
logocentrism, 13, 16, 129, 143, 144, 173, 185, 200, 202, 203, 206
Louis, Morris, 75, 102, 148
Lyon, David, 3–4, 17, 18, 48, 97, 107
Lyotard, Jean-Francois, 13, 17, 29, 143, 200, 206, 243n128

MacDonald, Dwight, 73, 74, 80, 136, 196, 241n76
McHale, John, 43, 48, 49, 51, 63, 128
McLuhan, Marshall, 45, 46–7
Mahsun, Carol Anne, 120
Mamiya, Christin J., 210–11, 219–20, 273n70
Mandel, Ernest, 58
Marcuse, Herbert, 22, 91, 93–4, 187, 209

Index

Marx, Karl, 78, 79, 90, 93, 179, 180, *see also* Berman, Marshall, 79, Gill, Ernest and Sherman, Richard, 93, 243n123
Marxism, 2, 13, 21, 58, 69, 71, 79, 80, 84, 86, 87, 89, 93, 144, 180, 189, 209, 210, 211, 216, 218, 219, 221, 222
mass communications, *see* mass media
masscult, *see* MacDonald, Dwight, 73, 196
mass media, 3, 6, 11, 16, 17, 18–19, 20–21, 26, 30, 34, 44, 68, 70, 73, 75, 82, 85, 86, 91, 92, 98, 107, 110, 127, 128, 133, 135, 139, 140, 141, 142, 183, 196, 204, 209, 210, 216, 217, 218, 219, 242n111, *see also* Alloway, Lawrence, social theory, Rose, Barbara, critical philosophy, ethics, 139–40, 142
Mazzaro, Jerome, 267–8n177, 268n184
Merlau-Ponty, Maurice, 26, 104, 109, 147, 154, 155, 162–3, 165, 175, 176, 177, 180, 186–7, 195, 201
Meyer, Leonard B., 194, 198–9, 264n86
midcult, *see* Greenberg, Clement, 70, MacDonald, Dwight, 73, 196
Miller, James, 162, 166
mimesis, 27, 30, 34, 178, 216, *see also* Deduck, Patricia A.
minimal art, 5, 15, 24, 33, 116–17, 118, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 127, 130, 131, 132, 135, 190, 251n79, 263n68, *see also* Fried, Michael, 105–06
modernism, 2, 6, 12, 19, 20, 21, 23, 25, 26, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 42, 43, 49, 51, 62, 73, 99, 100, 101, 102, 109, 129, 130, 135, 136, 137–8, 151, 161, 175, 176, 179, 185, 188, 189, 192, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 202, 205, 207, 212, 215, 216, 219, 221, 242n110, 243n128, 247n70, 273n70, *see also* Mazzaro, Jerome, 268n184
modernity, 15, 20, 21, 42–3, 51, 91, 93, 111, 143, 173, 174, 175, 186, 200, 205–06, *see also* Levin, David Michael, 260n14
Morris, Charles, 38, 57–8, 59–60, 61, 67
Morris, Robert, 105, 118, 125, 130, 246n42, 246n46

narcissism, 211
neo-avantgardism, *see* post-modernism, 213, 215, 216, 219
neo-dada, 85, 116, 118, 149, 182, 183, 184
neo-modernism, 12
New Realism, 149, 182–4, 255n15, 263n77
new sensibility, *see* Rose, Barbara, contemporary art, theories of, 130, Sontag, Susan, art, theories of, 7, 20, 172, 203, 204, 205, 207
Nietzsche, Friedrich, 5, 13, 17, 27, 173, 186, 188, 189, 192, 193–4, 200
nihilism, 12
Noland, Kenneth, 75, 102, 103, 148
non-Aristotelian, *see* Korzybski, Alfred
nouveau réalisme, 130, 182, 184
nouveau-roman, 26, 87, 89, 179, 183, 262n34, *see also* Barthes, Roland, 3, 179, 184–5, Robbe-Grillet, Alain, 3, 6, 161, 176, 177, 179, 182, 184–5, Rose, Barbara, critical philosphy, *nouveau roman*

Oldenburg, Claes, 91, 119, 121, 123, 124, 125, 129, 148, 161, 183, 217, 263n70
Olitski, Jules, 75, 100
Olson, Charles, 201, 267n177
other-directedness, *see* Riesman, David
Owens, Craig, 13

Packard, Vance, 94
Paolozzi, Eduardo, 56
paratactical, *see* Hassan, Ihab, 138
parology, *see* Lyotard, Jean-Francois, 343n128
Pears, David, 191
Peckham, Morse, 27, 124–5
Peirce, Charles, 15, 55, 124, 128
phenomenology, 6, 8, 13, 15, 21, 26, 32, 115, 147, 208, 222, *see also* Barthes, Roland, 177–80, Kozloff, Max, critical philosophy, phenomenology, Robbe-Grillet, Alain, 177
phenomenology, existentialist, 13, 14, *see also* Heidegger, Martin, Merlau-Ponty, Maurice, Sontag, Susan, critical philosophy, phenomenology, 186–7, 201, 203
phenomenology, epistemological, 13, *see also* Husserl, Edmund
phenomenology, in America, 254–5n6
phenomenology, theory of art, *see* Iser, Wolfgang
Phillips, Lisa, 218–19
Pingaud, Bernard, 87
Poggioli, Renato, 32, 75
Polanyi, Michael, 28
Pollock, Jackson, 102, 264n86
Ponge, Francis, 197, 198
pop art, artists of, 56, *see also* audience of, 38; interpretations of, 1, 3, 11, 232n23, *see also* artist, decentrement of, 91, Alloway, Lawrence, cultural theory 2, pop art, interpretations of, Ashton, Dore, Banowsky, Jack, Baudrillard, Jean, 237n155, Crow, Thomas, Gablik, Suzi, Hughes, Robert, 213–14, 217, Huyssen, Andreas, 20, Jones, Steve, Kozloff, Max, contemporary art, theories of, 4, 146–7, 148, 149–50, 151–2, 160–62, 209, 212, 255n23, Kuspit, Donald, 209–10, 211–12, 213, 216–17, 218, 219, Lichtenstein, Roy, Mamiya, Christin J., mass media, 210, New Realism, 182–4, Oldenburg, Claes, Phillips, Lisa, 218–19, Ratcliff, Carter, Robbe-Grillet, Alain, 6, 261n30, 263n68, Rose, Barbara, contemporary art, theories of, 15–16, 23, 24, 27, 33, 117–20, 121, 122–4, 125, 127, 129–30, 131, 135, 214, 249n26, Rosenberg, Harold, contemporary art, theories of, 6–7, 21, 23, 24, 32, 68, 70, 84–6, 90, 91–5, 107, 209, 213, 214, 239n38, 240n39, 242n111, Rosenquist, James, Solomon, Alan R., 263n77, Sontag, Susan, art, theories of, 4,

Index

34, 151, 172, 174, 175, 182, 190, 197, 200, 202–03, 204–05, Steinberg, Leo, contemporary art, theories of, 5, 99, 103, 104, Warhol, Andy, Wesselmann, Tom, Whiting, Cécile, 220–21; use of term, 43; symposium on, 88, 96, 249n28
post-Marxism, 13
post-modern society, *see* post-modernity
post-modernism, 1, 4, 8, 11–13, 14–15, 17–18, 21, 24, 27, 29, 38, 68, 76, 92, 93, 107, 108, 115, 148, 171, 188, 196–7, 208, 211, 214, 216, 217, 219, 220, 221, 227n47, 243n128, 247n78, 268n184; American avantgardist, 4, 19–20, 22–3, 29, 187–8, 196, 205, 207, 224n11, 227n47, 273n70; decentered subject of, 58; sociological model, 3–4, 7–8, 11, 17–18, 37–8, 97, 115, 197, 224n11, 224n12, *see also* Bauman, Zygmunt, Lyon, David; philosophical model, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 12–13, 14–15, 16, 38, 115, 148, 172–3, 202–03, 208, 267n176, *see also* Griffin, David Ray, Waugh, Patricia; *see also* Bertens, Hans, Griffin, David, Hassan, Ihab, Jencks, Charles, Kuspit, Donald, 62–3, 213, 214, 215, 216–17
post-modernist painting, 19, 37, 97, 108, 109–10, 244n9
post-modernity, 4, 6, 7, 17, 18, 19, 21, 24, 30, 76, 94, 97, 115, 132, 197, 208
post-phenomenology, see Waugh Patricia, 202, 226n15
post-pop, 41
post-structuralism, 5, 8, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 21, 24, 27, 28, 29, 38, 65–6, 93, 108, 110, 115, 123, 143, 144–45, 167, 172–73, 189, 200–01, 202, 203, 206, 207, 210, 211, 217, 218, 220, 221, 222, *see also* subject, decentrement of, 93
post-structuralist post-modernism, 13, 15, 109, 110, 189, 206, 217
Poulet, Georges, 155
pragmatism, 8, 12, 15, 21, 32, 33, 51–2, 67, 115, 116, 123–4, 128, 129, 131, 145, 208, 222, 227n47, 229n89, *see also* Alloway, Lawrence, aesthetic theory, Dewey, John, Hassan, Ihab, 27–9, James, William, Peckham, Morse, Peirce, Charles, Rose, Barbara, critical philosophy, pragmatism, Sontag, Susan, critical philosophy, pragmatism, West, Cornel
pragmatist semiotics, 38, 59, 60, *see also* Morris, Charles
precisionism, 121.prophetic pragmatism, 22, *see also* West, Cornel

Rajchman, John, 12
Ramos, Mel, 41
Ratcliff, Carter, 214, 215
Rauschenberg, Robert, 72, 103–04, 108, 111, 129, 183, 184, 205, 218–19
Read, Herbert, 33, 42, 49–50
realism, 3, 8, 11, 26–7, 30, 34, 37, 41–2, 90, 99, 106–07, 137, 208, 211, *see also* Baudrillard, Jean, 237n155
reception theory, 64, 236n135
relativism, 12, 98, 125–6, 165, 220, 222, 250n56
Reinhardt, Ad, 189
Restany, Pierre, 183–4
Rieff, Philip, 171, 260n1
Riesman, David, 47–8, 83, 86, 211
Rilke, Rainer Maria, 197, 198
Robbe-Grillet, Alain, 3, 5, 26, 86, 87, 88, 89, 130–31, 161, 176, 177, 178–9, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184–5, 197, 261n30, 262n34, 263n68, Rosenberg, Harold, contemporary art, theories of, 6, Sandler, Irving, 261n24
Rorty, Richard, 15, 28
Rose, Barbara, 116, 163, 265n108, contemporary art, theories of, 15–16, 24, 27, 33, 117–24, 125–6, 127, 129–30, 131, 135, 137, 214, 249n26; critical philosophy, 122, 138–40, 141, 142–3, 145, 251–2n88; critical philosophy, formalism, 117, 118–19, 121, 125, 130, 134, 249n15; critical philosophy, *nouveau roman*, 129–31, *see also* Robbe-Grillet, Alain, 5, 130–31; critical philosophy, pragmatism, 3, 15–16, 24, 27, 115, 116–17, 118, 121, 123–4, 126, 132–3, 134, 145, 148, 167, 222, *see also* Dewey, John, 126–7, relativism, 125–6; cultural theory, 6, 20, 23, 32, 135–9
Rosenberg, Harold, 150, 211, contemporary art, theories of, 6, 7–8, 18–19, 21, 23–4, 68–9, 70–71, 72–3, 77–8, 79–80, 82, 83, 84–6, 90, 91–2, 107–08, 188, 208–09, 213, 214, 239n38, 240n39, 242n111, *see also* action painting, Berman, Marshall, 242n110, Bertens, Hans, 238n14, Lichtenstein, Roy, 91, Warhol, Andy, 70–71, 72, 76, 82, 83–4, 90, 93–4; critical philosophy, *see also* language, silencing of, 89; critical philosophy, existentialist influence, 2, 6–7, 22, 33, 69, 80–81, 82–3, 89, 90, 94, 210, 221, 240n62, *see also* Berman, Marshall, 90, Buber, Martin, 88, Gill, Ernest and Sherman, Richard, 88, 93, subject, self creation of, 79–80, 81–2, 94–5; critical philosophy, Marxist influence, 2, 69, 78–9, 210, 221, *see also* Robbe-Grillet, Alain, 87; critical philosophy, social factors, 4, 79, 85, 92–3, 221; criticism, purpose of, 69; cultural theory, 18–19, 23–4, 30–31, 32, 71–3, 74, 75–6, 77–8, 138, *see also* Poggioli, Renato, 75
Rosenquist, James, 39, 40, 56, 61, 148, 161, 217, 219, 255n15, 263n77
Rosenthal, Sandra B. and Bourgeois, Patrick L., 162
Rothko, Mark, 264n86
Rourke, Constance, 122

Salle, David, 217
Sandler, Irving, 250n46, 251n79, 261n24, 263n68, 265n108
Sarraute, Nathalie, 26, 181, 183, 262n34

Index

Sartre, Jean-Paul, 22, 25, 26, 69, 154, 162, 167, 175
Sayres, Sohnya, 176
Scruton, Roger, 126
Scull, Robert, 219
Seitz, William, 41, 121
semiotics, 64–5, *see also*, De Sassaure, Ferdinand, Alloway, Lawrence, pop art interpretations of 60–62, 66, 106
Shannon, Claude, 57, 60, 235–6n121
Shusterman, Richard, 256n37
Smart, Ninian, 199
Snow, C. P., 204
Solomon, Alan R., 263n77
Sontag, Susan, 22–33, 151, 171, 260n1, 261n22; art, theories of, 7, 20, 22–3, 171–5, 181–2, 186, 188–90, 194–5, 197, 198–200, 202–03, 204–05, 207, 264n86, *see also* Bertens, Hans, 260n10, language, silencing of, 25, 89; critical philosophy, phenomenology, 3, 7, 14, 15, 21, 22, 26–7, 34, 172, 173, 175–6, 179–80, 184–5, 186–8, 189, 197, 201–02, 203, 261n23, *see also* Heidgger, Martin, 191–3, 195, Merleau-Ponty, Maurice, 195–6; critical philosophy, pragmatism, 172; social theory, 20, 196–7, 204–06, 207; *see also* Nietzsche, Friedrich, 192, 193–4, Wittgenstein, Ludwig, 190–2, 265n108
Steinberg, Leo, contemporary art, writings on, 96, 97; contemporary art, theories of 5, 19, 30, 97–9, 100–04, 106–11, 244n9, 246–7n59; critical philosophy, critique of formalism, 2, 5, 97–8, 102–03, *see also* Greenberg, Clement 99, 100, 101–02, 103; critical philosophy, *see also* intentionality, 98
Steiner, George, 125, 177, 178, 197, 201
Stella, Frank, 103, 116, 151, 251n79, 265n108
Structuralism, 189, *see also* Barthes, Roland, 262n48, De Saussure, Ferdinand
subject, 91, 93, 106, 144, 206, agent of social change, 211; artist as, 70, 91; decentrement of, 29, 84, 86–7, 93, 107–08, 110, 189, 218; essentialist, 58–9, 167, *see also* Cartesianism, humanism, subject of; existential, 80, 81, 94, 241n76; feminine, 220–21; phenomenological, 14, 104, 108–09, 115, 154, 155, 158–9, 162, 163–5, 167, 173, 175, 186–7, 201–02, 207, *see also* Hassan, Ihab, 26, 34; non-essentialist, 86–7, 200; postmodernist, 58–9, 93, 189; self creation of, 79, 81, 94–5; post-structuralist, 123, 143–5; pragmatist, 115, 144
subjectivity, 13, 14, 81, 84–5, 94, 100, 123, 130, 134, 144, 154, 155, 156, 166, 167, 175–6, 214, 217, 220, 221; transformative potential of, 211; *see also* Cartesianism
surrealism, 12, 85, 90, 161, 213, 217
Suzuki, D. T., 199
Swenson, Gene, 116, 140–41, 251–2n82, 253n130

textuality, 28, 110, 156, 157, 220, 247n78
Thiebaud, Wayne, 183, 263n70
This is Tomorrow, 45, 57
Tillim, Sidney, 163
Toffler, Alvin, 46
totalitarianism, 12, 16, 22, 28, 83, 84, 91, 203, 212
transcendence, 179, 180, 190, 192, 218, 219, 237n155, 270n11
Trotskyism, 78

ultra-avantgardism, 29
ultramodernism, 12

vanguardism, *see* Rosenberg, cultural theory, 32, 75
Vietnam War, 116, 140, 141, 209, 251–2n82
Vogt, A. E. van, 52

Waldman, Diane, 91, 242n112
Warhol, Andy 19, 20, 25, 39, 58, 61, 66, 70–71, 72, 76, 82, 83–4, 93, 94, 103, 118, 119, 123–4, 130, 158, 161, 183, 188, 192, 197, 202, 205, 208, 211, 213–16, 217–18, 219, 220, 222, 249n26, 251n79, 263n77
Warholism, 256n27, *see also*, Kozloff, Max, contemporary art, theories of, 147, 151–2, 160, 209, Kozloff Max, critical philosophy, phenomenology, 163, Kuspit, Donald, 158
Waugh, Patricia, 3, 14, 166, 173, 201–02, 226n15, 267n176, 267n177
Weber, Max, 91, 173, 205–06, 207
Weedon, Chris, 13, 87
Wesselmann, Tom, 42, 183, 255n15
West, Cornel, 16–17, 24, 28–9, 131–2, 143–4, 251–2n82
Whiting, Cécile, 220–21, 222
Whyte Jnr., William H., 83
Wiener, Norbert, 45–6, 53
Wiesel, Elie, 25
Wimsatt, Jr., W. K. and Beardsley, Monroe C., 152, 159
Wittgenstein, Ludwig, 5, 12, 13, 25, 55, 130, 172, 188, 190–91, 197–8, 200, 265n108
Wittkower, R., 44
Wolff, Janet, 209

Young, J. Z., 44

Zen Buddhism, 25, 128–129, 199, 203