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Foreword

Over the past 25 years, the Meadow Brook Art Gallery has acquired many excellent contemporary art samples from the Richard Brown Baker collection. The opening debut of the Meadow Brook Art Gallery in 1966 featured paintings and drawings from the Baker Collection in an exhibition entitled “A Point of View.” Through this exhibition, the university community was provided with an opportunity to view abstract expressionists and pop artists such as Franz Kline, Hans Hofmann, Andy Warhol, Jasper Johns, and Robert Rauschenberg. Since that time, the Meadow Brook Art Gallery has featured from the Baker Collection “American Realism Post Pop” in 1973, “Prints by Contemporary Artists” in 1975 and “America in the 70s as Depicted by Artists” in 1979.

The collection entitled “Expressive Visions and Exquisite Images: Two Aspects of Art of the 80s from the Richard Brown Baker Collection” was developed by Kiichi Usui, Curator of the Meadow Brook Art Gallery, who consulted with Mr. Baker to create the exhibit. This collection reflects the Curator’s philosophy of artistic art works of the 80s. According to Usui, “During the 80s many visual art expressions of previous generations were appropriated by younger generations which had a strong impact in forming the artistic characteristics of the 80s, particularly in the revival of natural representation and the expressiveness of contemporary anxiety.”

The Baker Collection is recognized as one of the most prestigious private collections of contemporary American art, and has received numerous acknowledgements and recognitions. Oakland University is indebted to the unfailing generosity of Mr. Baker and the cooperation of the Yale University Art Gallery, the current custodian of many art works from the Baker Collection.

John De Carlo
Interim President
Oakland University
A DECADE OF APPROPRIATION
By Kichi Usui, Curator
Meadow Brook Art Gallery

To those reasonably well-informed of contemporary art, the phenomenon of the return of realism in the post-modern era is somewhat uncomfortable to accept as a progressive movement. After all, most of the accomplishments in visual art in the past nine decades have been motivated by the renunciation of the 19th century natural representation in art.

Many of us who learned and struggled to memorize and try to comprehend numerous “isms” and “movements” of 20th century art, through the chronological family tree graphically representing artistic branches stemming out from father Cezanne, find realism too easy to understand as an art form of our time.

We are almost conditioned to disentangle the visual puzzles to satisfy our intellectual curiosity or put ourself emotionally in the luminous color of the surface of the canvas.

We tend to do a double-take when encountering a simply beautiful landscape painting or the depiction of commonplace scenery, such as North End Diner (Cat. #4), by John Baeder or a movie house marquee in Davis Cone’s Wilkes (Cat. #16). We immediately seek some kind of intellectual trickery or sophisticated gimmickry in the painting and try to convince ourselves into accepting it as a contemporary expression.

In fact, when photorealists began sweeping the art scene in the early 70s, audiences were startled by their extreme accuracy and mechanical perfection — transfixing what the camera eye catches. We saw the inhuman eerie atmosphere as a reflection of contemporary society and accepted it as a new form of realism, something different from what 19th century artists accomplished.

However, paintings produced in the 80s appear in a more habitable world and warmer atmosphere. Furthermore, revered historical predecessors were conveniently appropriated in various forms and styles — although photorealism has never been accepted with overwhelming enthusiasm, as abstract expressionism did in the mid 50s, or as pop art caught the imagination of the general public in the early 60s. The interest in representation in art seemed broadened, slowly but surely penetrating in the minds of artists and the art public throughout the 80s.

The grandeur of the Hudson River school is seen to be coming back in the landscape of Laurel Lane (Cat. #40), by Sarah Supplee, although it is not the heroic vision of Frederic Edwin Church (1826-1900) or the glorious mountains of Albert Bierstadt (1830-1902). The power generated by a single country road penetrating three dimensional depths in Laurel Lane is unforgettable. The artist's will and straightforward “realism” catches the viewer's unanticipated attention.
40. Sarah Supplee
*Laurel Lane* 1983
62 x 105, oil on canvas

4. John Baeder
*North End Diner (Torrington)* 1984
30 x 48, oil on canvas

16. Davis Cone
*Wilkes* 1981
45 x 45, acrylic on canvas
In Gowanus Canal (Cat. #20), by Randy Dudley, the toxic-ridden stagnant channel which divides the Bronx and Brooklyn is transformed to an almost poetic beauty of 17th century Dutch painting. Dudley states: “The Canalscapes suggest through thin layering and overlapping of debris and accumulated rubble a visual record of time past and present. What it is today is indistinguishable from what it was in the past, and the remains of years past stand silently mocking the canal of today. This synthesis of histories is what makes the Gowanus Canal unique.”

With the advent of modern art in this century, sensual physiques and verismilitude and high finish of western tradition, were virtually forgotten. However, with the revival of realism in the 70s, modern virtuosity in depiction of nature reached its peak in the early 80s. Seemingly unpretentious Self Portrait (Cat. #8), by William Beckman, prompted one to apply the word “exquisite,” to characterize the theme of this exhibition.

Admirers of Dutch still life will be satisfied by viewing the sumptuous color of Two White Onions (Cat. #19), by James del Grosso and a small gem by Steven Assael. Assael’s work has been compared with Thomas Eakins, Gericault and even Rembrandt by some critics. Half a Glass of Water (Cat. #2), invokes an other worldly atmosphere by mysterious light sources and a glow against a dark background.

Mr. Baker’s latest acquisitions in the realistic vein is The Portrait Gallery (Cat. #26), oil on wood panel, and A Girl Standing (Cat. #27), graphite on paper with oil and wax, by David Hollowell. Nineteenth century American tradition of tromp l’oeil, which was created with the intention to deceive the eye, is successfully revived by Hallowell.

Hollowell achieves an enchanting effect by applying another 19th century French invention, pointillism. Like his predecessors, using a shallow space and manipulating illusionistic effects cause the viewer to wander from where the girl stands in spacial relationship with the picture plane and frame in A Girl Standing. Viewers may fail to notice that the broad frame of The Portrait Gallery is painted on the canvas as a part of the painting. It is not a frame of the painting.

20. Randy Dudley
Gowanus Canal from 3rd Street Bridge 1987
28 1/2 x 58, oil on canvas
8. William Beckman  
*Self Portrait* 1981-82  
50 x 30 1/2, oil on oak panel

19. James Del Grosso  
*Two White Onions* 1988  
32 x 50, oil on canvas

2. Steven Assael  
*Half a Glass of Water* 1989  
13 3/8 x 10 3/8, oil on board
The use of photography in realistic painting is well known since its invention in the mid-19th century. Cross breeding of photography and drawing or painting is represented in this exhibition by three artists, John Baldessari, Joseph Picillo, and Chuck Close.

Recognized as one of the first conceptual artists in the early 70s, Baldessari was a pioneer in using imagery drawn from popular media: television, movies, newspapers and advertising. He appropriated (Cat. #5), seemingly unrelated images, such as a juggler’s hand and a diver. The artist has no concern or intention to control what these images evoke in the viewers minds.

The top half and bottom part are compositionally connected by repetition of formal elements of circular forms – juggler’s ball and divers buoy contrast between agile hand movement and graceful line of the diver. We should note that Baldessari has been very influential to younger artists as a teacher at the California Institute of Arts in Valencia. Among his students David Salle is a well known painter for the similar juxtaposition of seemingly unrelated subjects in his painting.

The drawing with graphite and pencil on paper by Joseph Picillo (Cat. #36), creates a worldly sublime atmosphere with meticulous craftsmanship and stark chiaroscuro – somewhat reminiscent to the eerie photographs of Robert Mapplethorpe. The viewers will be fascinated by the technique of using ink pad fingerprints to create the photographic effects in Leslie (Cat. #14), by Chuck Close.

36. Joseph Picillo
F42 Study 1986
39 x 74, no. 1947, charcoal on paper
5. **John Baldessari**  
*Juggler's Hand (with Diver)* 1988  
55 1/4 x 27 1/8, no. 1478, lithograph and silkscreen

14. **Chuck Close**  
*Leslie* 1981  
48 x 30 1/2, no. 1150, stamp pad ink on paper
One of the functions of realistic painting is its narrative elements, either telling stories by depiction of scenery or evoking poetic or surrealistic images. John Hull tells stories in his painting (Cat. #30), in a rather calm and undramatic fashion — until the viewer realizes the story behind the scene — an illustration of a scene from an Ernest Hemingway novel, set in Cuba.

Interestingly, three artists in the exhibition, Roy DeForest (Cat. #18), Leonard Koscianski (Cat. #33) and Susan Hall (Cat. #25), use canine images to convey different human psychological interplay — docility, meekness, hidden aggression, yearning to wilderness, and wild phantasmagorical landscapes.

While the return of realism is enjoying a warm welcome by a large audience and skeptical appraisal by intellectuals, it is the expressionistic trend that brought the energy and exuberance that was missing from its predecessors of conceptual art and minimalism in the 70s.

Cuban born Luis Cruz Azaceta’s Self Portrait as Guinea Pig (Cat. #3), reminds us of Matisse’s Fauve Period, Portrait with Green Stripe, of 1905. Ironically, the similar green on the face, the red and orange depicting some medical apparatus in Azaceta’s Self Portrait, convey a sense of desperation instead of the joyous vigor felt in the early 20th century youth. Drugs infiltrating the urban decay is reflected on the fretful expression of the young artist’s face.

Another despairing energy permeates from Jackson Pollock (Cat. #1), acrylic and oil stick on paper, by Robert Arneson. Under the bold depiction of Pollock’s face covered with energetic gestural drippings, piercing dark eyes capture both Pollock’s and Arneson’s suffering.

23. Guy Goodwin
Pearl 1988
65 x 75, oil on linen, no. 1473
33. **Leonard Koscianski**  
*Hunting Ground* 1982  
48 x 64, no. 1192, oil on canvas

1. **Robert Arneson**  
*Jackson Pollock* 1983  
41 1/2 x 30, acrylic, oil stick on paper

25. **Susan Hall**  
*Autumn Chemistry* 1981  
48 x 72, no. 1172, acrylic on canvas
Abstract Expressionism is alive and well in the heavily painted abstract by Guy Goodwin (Cat. #23). The viewer can detect either a still life or landscape element underneath the rich, dense and brusque surface. Sensuous and meditative, yet powerful composition reminds us of the weighty Georges Rouault's strength and dynamism.

More vivacious and joyful energy jumps out from the colored woodcut, 
*Melon* (Cat. #35), by Judy-Pfaff. Compared to her earlier frenzied energy of wall construction, recent prints are more controlled and restrained, recalling Matisse's paper cutouts.

A precursor of abstract expressionism, or historically acknowledged as the most influential movement to the development of abstract expressionism, surrealism is kept alive by younger generation artists represented in the exhibition: David Humphrey, Robert Jessup, and Garret Huddleston.

Curiously, it is not difficult to identify sources of influence directly or indirectly, from previous generations, such as Picasso, de Chirico, Rene Magritte, Salvador Dali, Max Ernst, and the more recent progenitor, Philip Guston.

The grotesque goblin-like figure reminiscent of a prehistoric animal skeleton stands on a shallow stage of space creating a nightmarish ghostly atmosphere in *Pennsylvania* (Cat. #29), by Garret Huddleston. The robust painterly composition *Still Life with Reluctant Bird* (Cat. #32), by Robert Jessup, reminds us of the neoclassic period of Picasso.

Perhaps among contemporary so called neo-surrealists, David Humphrey created the most original visual language that evokes viewers curiosity. Unlike his earlier works (Meadowbrook Art Gallery exhibited his *Afterwork* in the exhibition: "Magic in the Mind's Eye," from the Kempf Hogan Collection in 1987), *In Pursuit of an Analogy* (Cat. #31), shows an organic form reminiscent of a kidney or uterus. It contains a botryoidal form suspended in a sterilized clinical interior scene. One may interpret this enigmatic composition in a variety of ways. Perhaps the image will haunt one even after leaving the gallery.

---

30. **John Hull**  
*My Old Man* 1989  
24 x 35, no. 1472, oil on canvas

35. **Judy Pfaff**  
*Melon* 1987  
Impression 24/2555 1/4 x 63 1/2, no. 1456, colored woodcut
31. David Humphrey
*In Pursuit of an Analogy* 1989

32. Robert Jessup
*Still Life with Reluctant Bird*
60 x 72, no. 1494, oil on canvas

29. Jarett Huddleston
*Pennsylvania* 1989
60 x 36, oil on canvas
Appropriations from Picasso and Gorky are very apparent in *Edith Piaf* (Cat. #15), by George Condo. Mr. Baker’s experience concerning the purchase of this work and *Honey, it’s the Whitney* (Cat. #22), by James Gingerich, is described in the excerpt from his diary that accompanies this catalog.

A senior member of contemporary surrealists who explored the psychological twilight zone and fetish-like pinned objects, Lucas Samaras (Cat. #37), continues to produce strong images with an ink drawing of a brooding face staring outward to viewers with an aura of menace.

Similarly, Israeli-born Izhar Patkin’s bizarre, yet humorous, *Tom* (Cat. #34), a perforated photocollage, conveys a satanic gaze with hypnotic air.

Influential elements in the development of modern art since the early part of the century including savagery from Africa, Oceania and Australian Aboriginy, still echoes through art produced in the 80s.

From completely different backgrounds, English born John Walker, a short-lived graffiti artist from Brooklyn; Jean Michel Basquiat and New Guinea born Erik Stotik, seem to have something in common: The glimmer and uncanny fascination of savages. Walker’s abstract painting, with its rough attractive surface, reminds us of the power of an Oceanic wooden shield.

Two small paintings by Erik Stotik will grip viewers’ attention with enigmatic subject matter and faint indications of religious atmosphere. Stotik grew up in New Guinea, the son of missionaries, graduated from Pacific Northwest College of Art in Portland, Oregon, and now lives in Tucson, Arizona. One of his paintings depicts a crowd of people frightened, resigned and desperate, in a tiny space.

The scene is reminiscent of the recent tragic events of southeast Asian refugees or the ocean crossing Haitian immigrants. The painting dramatically conveys an impending sense of terror. Curiously, the people are depicted in a racially mixed group – a man standing, hands tied by rope which is tied around the neck of a Caucasian who has a cynical smile on his face. There is not a hint or clue as to the story of this drama. Only its name: *Untitled Vol. 148 No. 310* (Cat. #39). On the back side of the painting, the artist attaches a photocopy of a photograph depicting a struggle between a man and an animal. It appears to be an Oceanic carving.

After examining the artworks in this exhibition, one may conclude that the art created during the 80s is more or less a reworking of various prevailing styles of the previous century. One of the often used words is “appropriation” to describe trends of the late 80s and perhaps that is partially true.

When I discussed this exhibition with Mr. Baker, he pointed out that the present selection, since it is limited by the wall spaces in our gallery, fails to include many artists whose work would qualify as representative of trends appearing during the 80s. Among the styles of art that has continued to be practiced is abstraction. In his opinion, excellent abstract art was produced in the 80s and he thinks highly of abstractions from that decade that have entered his collection.

The return of realism in the current fashion causes concern among many art professionals who dedicated their careers to the promotion of progressive art under the placard of avant-garde art. Is it digression or ingratiation on the part of artists?

However, the development of abstract art in the early 20th century came from various stimuli through different cultures that were outside the western tradition. It is a well documented fact that there was an African influence on Picasso, Islamic art on Matisse, Egyptian mural designs on Paul Klee and Pre-Columbian art upon Henry Moore’s sculpture.

There have been so many forms of visual expression in human history other than the western tradition of perfection of representation of nature. In other words, the notion of progress in 20th century art toward abstraction, reaching minimalism and conceptual art is a false conviction on our part or, perhaps the idea that abstract art is the creation of our century is conceit.

After all, abstraction and representation of nature appear cyclically throughout human history in various cultures.
15. George Condo

*Edith Piof 1987-88*

60 x 72

22. James Gingerich

*Honey, It's the Whitney 1987*

70 x 90, oil on canvas

39. Erik Stotik

*Val. 148 1989-90*

17 x 14, no. 310, acrylic on linen on wood
Reasoning that I’ll never be able to afford a painting by A. R. Penck, I abandoned my recent decision to postpone art purchases until at least March. Making eye signals to the saleswoman until she was moved to interrupt her chat and ask: "May I help you?" I led her, after she broke off her long conversation, into the adjacent room to see Penck’s woodcuts. She said they were published by a woman she named in Germany. She herself likes them all. I was moved only by the one I’d first seen and proceeded to buy it. So much for consistency!

Then I walked downstairs to the painting gallery and saw Dine’s large, powerful paintings, whose prices I didn’t ask. However, while there, I recollected a drawing by one George Condo that months ago was brought for consideration before the Whitney Drawing Committee. I’d never heard of Condo myself, but I voted to buy it.

The majority of the committee rejected those drawings, expressing active disapproval.

Pace is Condo’s dealer. Douglas Baxter, who works now for Pace, was with Paula Cooper for years and once spent an hour showing me drawings by Jonathan Borofsky. I asked for him, but he is in Europe. It was suggested that if I could wait for another salesman, Peter Boris, he could show me Condo’s drawings. I said I’d return in about half an hour. So I walked west to Frumkin/Adams to look at the Gingerich’s, especially the painting Alan sold me in November. They are figurative works. Mine features the painter at his easel beside the sea positioned among odd objects, such as the depiction of a refrigerator with its door open, paintings standing on edge by themselves at an angle, a bottle of champagne, etc.

The canvas I’d acquired was not to be seen in the main gallery. George Adams, who came forward to welcome me, explained why it hung in the back room. He took me there to see it and introduced me to the artist himself.

Gingerich had come to the gallery bringing a number of charcoal drawings and lithograph works on paper that were spread on the floor for George to see. I was at once taken by a vertical charcoal drawing, a grim scene but impressive to my eye. Before I left, I agreed to buy it.

Having already acquired Honey, It’s the Whitney, I thought it intelligent to include another aspect of Gingerich’s talent in my collection. I haven’t altered my long-standing policy against loading up with quantities of works by a particular artist – 22 paintings, 12 prints and seven drawings, for example, by the same individual, thereby creating an unbalance in my holdings – but I do oppose limiting myself to one work apiece. It was clearly a mistake never to buy a second oil by Franz Kline and to resist acquiring a small Pollock from the first show that Janis mounted after his death. That included several excellent small Pollocks.

I am proud, however, that I bought four oil paintings by Hans Hofmann during his lifetime and certainly don’t regret possessing myself of three paintings, a drawing and several prints by Roy Lichtenstein early in his career.

Gingerich, a tall handsome young man, and I chatted for a while. He says he is content with his present price range. I invited him to tell me the significance of the various components of my painting. They reflect the spiritual and the sensual according to him. One purposely blob-like bit of the sand, if viewed sideways, can be perceived as the bearded face of Henri Matisse looking up towards the sky as if Matisse’s body were buried, except for his face, near the waterline. A dolphin leaping up from the sea far offshore reflects Gingerich’s personal familiarity with dolphins in Florida. The large tipped canvas that fills the lower right hand corner of my painting depicts a young woman in bridal attire as she is being painted. The artist’s hand and palette are visible in the foreground. Her face is sensual. Among the other paintings hung in the main gallery is one of a refrigerator with open door before which squats a naked girl. In my painting a reduced version of that canvas is distantly produced set up on an easel almost at the water’s edge.

In my Honey, It’s the Whitney, the artist himself faces on the easel another canvas to the left, brush in hand and palette in hand. The middle of the strange shore scene is dominated by the figure of his wife or girlfriend, standing with her back to us scantily clad in a bathing suit and holding in her hand a telephone. The telephone explains the title, for she is calling him to it with the glad news that the Whitney Museum wants to speak to him.

Maybe only artists in New York will understand that title. I interpret it to mean that the painter
depicted is successful enough to be under consideration by the curators of the Whitney for inclusion in the Whitney Biennial.

Whether the Whitney Museum has yet taken notice of Gingerich, I don’t know. My conjecture derived from the fact that a cord emerges from the picture’s bottom left corner to connect with the red telephone held in the young woman’s hand. She is summoning him to the phone. I remarked to Gingerich that cordless phones are much used today, especially outdoors, but I could see that he needed the cord to divide up the yellow area of the sand in the picture’s left bottom corner. He agreed. He has handled his composition excellently in this picture.

Due to our chat, I was later than I intended in returning to the Pace Gallery. Peter Boris came down to the second floor to meet me and then took me many floors up to a locked viewing room.

How remarkably the Pace Gallery has expanded since Arnold Glimcher first established it in New York in the autumn of 1963! I hate to contemplate its present overhead: rent, salaries of employees, publication expenses, guarantees to artists, etc.

Three works on paper by Condo were pinned to three walls. All these drawings are much larger than those Richard Marshall brought to the Drawing Committee. They are also more expensive. My modest intention of acquiring a minor work by a potential developing star seemed doomed. I didn’t care for two of the drawings. The one I liked best is too big for convenience.

Peter Boris had two moderate sized paintings brought to the viewing room. These appealed to me more. An exhibit of George Condo’s new work is to open on March 11th. Evidently others are on his trail, for both of these paintings are already sold. Boris next invited me to accompany him into the adjacent storage area to see bigger paintings. The third that he had pulled from the racks at once excited me by its vitality. Horizontal, complex, full of curves and bright colors, it shows an unmistakable influence from Picasso, Arshile Gorky and possibly Matisse. In my opinion, it surmounts its influences to be a thing alive, I fell for it at once. I expressed my enthusiasm.

Boris intimated that it was everybody’s favorite.

“Has it been sold?”

“No yet.” He had it carried into the viewing room where I could sit back and contemplate it.

George Condo being so little known to me, I was horrified to learn that its price was $30,000. Condo, Connecticut-born according to Boris, is now 29 and lives in Paris. He exhibited previously in SoHo in Shafrazi’s Gallery along with artists more familiar to me: Keith Haring, Basquiat and Kenny Scharf. Condo’s work sells, Boris said. If it didn’t, Pace wouldn’t be taking him on. I’m pretty sure.

My initiative in seeking to acquire a drawing thus proves less ahead of the game than I imagined.

Who are those people that have thought well of this painting that nobody has yet bought?” I asked. “Curators, collectors, dealers?”

“Collectors. There’s a great deal of interest in it.”

A feature of this work is its combination of a collage of papers with luscious, sensuous application of paint. Wasn’t it about 15 years ago that painterly surfaces went out of favor with the then new wave of artists, many of whom embraced the minimalist aesthetic?

One perceives, amidst all its abstract areas, a rather unexpected recumbent nude female whose hips and breasts curve voluptuously and whose face is of paper: Edith Piaf, whom I heard sing in Paris in 1945.

Recollecting my experience with the abstract artists of the 1950s, I would have believed then that the introduction of a clearly identifiable figure in the middle of an abstraction was a fault. I would have interpreted it to mean that the painter hadn’t truly mastered abstraction, that he was at heart still a representational artist experimenting because of the new vogue, with a way of painting that wasn’t really natural to him. He was a follower struggling to catch up with the avant-garde.

In respect to George Condo’s painting I feel differently. Condo wasn’t even born when the artists I refer to were trying to overcome old habits. What he rebels against perhaps is the minimalist approach that developed in the sixties and seventies in opposition to the personal expressionist element in action painting.

Whether it is true only of American artists in this century I’m unsure, but my own impression that formed during the past 30 or more years, is that every so often (indeed with increasing frequency) the leading artists who emerge in their twenties seek to make their work differ from the styles popularized by their most successful seniors.

After reserving Condo’s Edith Piaf, studying a color transparency of it over the weekend, and returning for a second look at the original, I undertook to buy it on February 23, 1988.
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