24. Andy Warhol. *Portrait of Holly Solomon*. 1966. Silkscreen ink on synthetic polymer paint on canvas; nine panels, overall 6′ 9″ × 6′ 9″ (205.7 × 205.7 cm). Collection Holly Solomon

a coat of silver-aluminum paint and letting them speak of having been silenced into abstract monochromy (plate 301).

SERIAL BREAKDOWN AND DISPLAY

The endless discussions of Warhol's Pop iconography, and, even more, those of his work's subsequent definition in terms of traditional painting,[52] have oversimplified his intricate reflections on the status and substance of the painterly object and have virtually ignored his efforts to incorporate context and display strategies into the works themselves. Features that were aggressively antipictorial in their impulse and evidently among Warhol's primary concerns in the early exhibitions have been obliterated in the process of the acculturation of his art. This is true for his first exhibition at Irving Blum's Ferus Gallery in Los Angeles in 1962 and his second exhibition at that gallery a year later, and also for numerous proposals for some of the subsequent exhibitions, between 1963 and 1966. On the one hand, the installation of the thirty-two paintings at the Ferus Gallery was determined by the number of varieties of Campbell's soup available at that time (Warhol actually used a list of Campbell's products to mark off those flavors that had already been painted). Thus, the number of objects in an exhibition of high art was determined by the

that enablement might appear in the uncensored and unstructured, decentralized and rambling performances by individuals who have not been trained in the professional delivery of visual seduction. Warhol has declared the intentions of his real-time film projects with his usual clarity: "Well this way I can catch people being themselves instead of setting up a scene and shooting it and letting people act out parts that were written because it's better to act out naturally than act like someone else because you really get a better picture of people being themselves instead of trying to act like they're themselves."[50]

The subversive humor of Warhol's reversal of representational hierarchies culminated in his execution of a commission he had received with several other Pop artists from architect

Philip Johnson in 1964 to decorate the facade of the New York State Pavilion at the New York World's Fair. It was for this occasion that the collection of diptychs and single-panel portraits of the *Thirteen Most Wanted Men* (figure 25; plates 287–300) was originally produced, and it comes as no surprise that Warhol's realistic sabotage of a state government's desire to represent itself officially to the world was rejected under the pretext of legalistic difficulties.[51] When Warhol was notified of the decision that his paintings had to be removed he suggested that the pictures of the thieves be replaced by pictures of one of the chiefs, World's Fair director and park commissioner Robert Moses—a proposal that was also rejected. Warhol, with laconic detachment, settled for the most "obvious" solution, covering the paintings with

25. Andy Warhol. *Thirteen Most Wanted Men*. 1964. Installation view, New York State Pavilion, New York World's Fair, 1964

external factor of a product line. (What system, one should ask on this occasion, normally determines the number of objects in an exhibition?) On the other hand, the paintings' mode of display was as crucial as were the principle of serial repetition and their commercial, ready-made iconography. Standing on small white shelves running along the perimeter of the gallery in the way that display shelves for consumer

the same rigor with which those systems of everyday determination deny the experience of subjectivity.

Yet, at the same time, these paintings are imbued with an eerie concreteness and corporeality, which in 1961 had distinguished Piero Manzoni's *Merda d'artista*. But Warhol differs here—as in his relationship to Johns's imagery—in that he transferred the universality of

blue monochrome paintings in the Galleria Apollinaire in Milan in 1957 (repeated a few months later in Paris). Commenting on his exhibition Klein said: "All of these blue propositions, all alike in appearance, were recognized by the public as quite different from one another. The *amateur* passed from one to another as he liked and penetrated, in a state of instantaneous contemplation, into the worlds of the blue.... The most sensational observation was that of the 'buyers.' Each selected out of the... pictures that one that was his, and each paid the asking price. The prices were all different of course."[55]

Klein's installation (and his commentary on it) reveals both the degree of similarity between his attitude and that of Warhol's serial breakdown of modernist painting, and the radical difference between the two propositions, separated by five years. While Klein's high-culture conservatism clearly intended to create a paradox, paralleling that of painting's simultaneous existence as commodity and renewed metaphysical aspirations, Warhol's position of relentless affirmation cancelled any such aspirations and liquidated the metaphysical dimension of the modernist legacy by rigorously subjecting each painting to an identical product image and price.

That the serial breakdown of the painterly object and its repetition within the display were not just a topical idea for his first exhibition but, rather, a crucial aesthetic strategy, became evident in 1968, when Warhol was approached by Mario Amaya to install his first European retrospective exhibition at the Institute of Contemporary Art in London. Warhol suggested the installation of the series of thirty-two Campbell's Soup Can paintings throughout the entire space allocated for his show as the exclusive subject of the retrospective. Amaya refused this proposal just as the curators at the Whitney Museum of American Art in New York refused Warhol's 1970 proposal to install only Flower paintings or Cow Wallpaper (glued backwards onto the exhibition walls) as the contents of his retrospective exhibition at that institution.[56] For his second exhibition at the Ferus Gallery, in 1963 (the first one seems to have been at best a *succès de scandale,* judging by the fact only a few of the paintings, each offered at $300, were sold), Warhol suggested once again a "monographic" exhibition, the recently produced series of single and multiple Elvis images, silk-

26. Installation view, *Campbell's Soup Cans*, Ferus Gallery, Los Angeles, 1962

objects would normally function in a store, the paintings were simultaneously attached to the wall in the way that pictures would be traditionally installed in a gallery (figure 26).[53] And finally, there is the inevitable dimension of Warhol's own biography explaining why he chose the Campbell's Soup Can image: "I used to drink it. I used to have the same lunch everyday, for twenty years, I guess, the same thing over and over again."[54]

All three factors affect the work itself, and take a reading of it beyond the mere "scandalous" Pop imagery for which it mostly became known. What has been misread as provocative banality is, in fact, the concrete realization of the paintings' reified existence, which denies the traditional expectation of an aesthetic object's legibility. Warhol's work abolishes the claim for aesthetic legibility with

corporeal experience onto the paradoxical level of mass-cultural specificity (not bodily consumption but product consumption forms the material base of experience).

The absurdity of the individual, aesthetic decision-making process becomes all the more patent in the variations of details in the soup-can labels. It is precisely in the exact imitation of the minute variations and in the exact obedience to the available range of products that the series of Campbell's Soup Can paintings goes far beyond what has been perceived as a mere iconographic scandal.

Inevitably, the Campbell's Soup Cans of 1962 and their installation recall a crucial moment of neo-avant-garde history when seriality, monochromy, and mode of display broke down the reign of the easel painting: Yves Klein's installation of eleven identical

screened on large monochrome silver surfaces. In fact, he apparently suggested that the "paintings" should be installed as a "continuous surround," and he shipped a single continuous roll of canvas containing the silkscreened images to Los Angeles.[57]

As in his first installation in Los Angeles, this proposition threatened the boundaries of painting as an individual and complete pictorial unit. But now it not only subverted what remained of that status via serial repetition, but destroyed it altogether by the sheer spatial expansion of that repetition. What had been a real difficulty for Pollock, the final aesthetic decision of how and where to determine the size of painterly action, or, as Harold Rosenberg put it, how to avoid crossing over into the production of "apocalyptic wallpaper," had now become a promise fulfilled by Warhol's deliberate transgression of those sacred limits.

It was, therefore, utterly logical that Warhol conceived an installation of wallpaper for his supposedly final exhibition as a "painter" at the Leo Castelli Gallery in 1966, wallpaper imprinted with the by now notorious (then utterly bland) image of a cow, that animal whose reputation it is to have a particularly vapid and intent gaze. Juxtaposed with the Cow Wallpaper was Warhol's series of floating silver "pillows," the Silver Clouds, which moved through the gallery, animated by air and visitors' body movements (plates 302, 305). Rumor has it that Warhol said of the cows, "This is all of us." But the decor would not have needed that statement to make its point: all of modernism's most radical and utopian promises (to evolve from pictorial plane through sculptural object to architectural space, to shift the viewer from iconic representation to the self-reflexive, the indexical sign and the tactile mode of participation) are annihilated in this farcical sacking of the modernist legacy, the atopian *finale* of the first ten years of Warhol's art.

Warhol's art until 1966 (as opposed to his films) thus oscillates constantly between an extreme challenge to the status and credibility of painting and a continued deployment of strictly pictorial means operating within the narrowly defined framework of pictorial conventions. Inevitably, the question arises (and it has been asked again and again) whether or why Warhol never crossed the threshold into the actual conception (or, rather, reconstitution) of the ready-made object. Except for the occasional joke campaign, such as signing actual Campbell's soup cans, Warhol would never use the three-dimensional ready-made object in its unaltered industrial existence, as a raw object of consumption. Yet at the same time he would go further than any of his peers in Pop art (not, however, as far as many of his peers in the Fluxus movement) to challenge the traditional assumptions about the uniqueness, authenticity, and authorship of the pictorial object, the very foundations upon which high modernist art had rested until Duchamp defined the Readymade in 1917, and upon which the reconstruction of modernism had rested in the New York School until the arrival of Warhol in 1962. Again and again, Warhol tantalized collectors, curators, and dealers by generating doubts about the authenticity and authorship of his work and actually succeeded in destabilizing his own market. For example: "I made multiple color silkscreen painting—like my comic strip technique. Why don't you ask my assistant Gerard Malanga some questions? He did a lot of my paintings."[58]

Two contradictory explanations seem to be necessary here. The first is that Warhol emerged from a local tradition of artists who had distinguished themselves by pictorializing the Dada legacy in their engagement with the heroic tradition of the New York School. In the early sixties Warhol aspired to the power and success of Johns and Rauschenberg, not to the increasing marginalization that awaited artistic practices that had abandoned picture making (Happenings and Fluxus, for example). The critical distance that Warhol wanted to insert between himself and his two major predecessors would thus still have to occur first of all within the means of painting. Warhol, therefore, had to work through the last phases of the pictorialization begun by Rauschenberg and Johns, and go to the threshold of painting's abolition, a consequence which would soon emerge, mediated to a considerable degree by Warhol's work, in the context of Minimal and Conceptual art.

The second explanation is more speculative and assumes that Warhol was so deeply involved with the pictorial medium, the autonomy of aesthetic conventions and the stability of artistic categories inherent in that medium, because he gradually had learned to accept the relative conventionality of his audience and of the institutional control and validation of that medium. Therefore, he decided not to transgress these conservative limitations inherent in painterly practice and refrained from acquiring (or reconstituting) the status of the unaltered Readymade in any of his works until 1966. Perhaps it was Warhol's skeptical and opportunistic positivism (to anticipate that all radical gestures within the framework of high-art production would end up as mere "pictures" in a gallery) that allowed him to avoid the mistakes inherent in Duchamp's radical proposition of the Readymade. Duchamp had in fact been oblivious to both the false radicality of the Readymade and the problem of its inevitable aestheticization. One of the rare comments Duchamp actually made about Warhol's work seems to indicate that he himself understood that implication after all when looking at Warhol's work: "What interests us is the *concept* that wants to put fifty Campbell's Soup cans on a canvas."[59]

RECEPTION

The recognition of Warhol's ingenuity and radicality obviously depended to a considerable degree on the historical limitations of his original audiences: in fact his strategies could appear to be scandalous only in the face of the New York School climate of the late fifties and that generation's general indifference, most often fused with aggressive contempt—as exemplified by Clement Greenberg—for the Dada and Duchamp legacy. By contrast, Warhol's interventions in the aesthetics of the early sixties would seem fully plausible and necessary to a viewer aware of the implications of the Dada legacy in terms of that movement's continual emphasis on and reflection of the symbiotic ties between the aesthetics of art production and those of commodity production.

Warhol's "scandalous" assaults on the status and the "substance" of pictorial representation were motivated by the rapidly dwindling options of credible artistic production (a fact that had become more and more apparent as the conventions of modernism and avant-garde practice had been finally rediscovered) and even more so by the increasing pressure now exerted by the culture industry on the traditionally exempt space of artistic marginality. Iconography and blague, production procedure and modes of display in Warhol's work mimetically

internalize the violence of these changing conditions. His paintings vanish as artistic objects to the same degree as the option to sustain dissent disappears within an organized system of immediate commercial and ideological recuperation.

But of course, as had been the case with Duchamp and Dada before, these practices vehemently celebrated the destruction of the author and the aura, and of artistic skill, while at the same time they recognized in that destruction an irretrievable loss. And yet within this moment of absolute loss, Warhol uncovered the historical opportunity to redefine (aesthetic) experience. To understand the radicality of Warhol's gesture, both with regard to the legacies of Duchamp and Dada and with regard to the immediately preceding and contemporary artistic environment of the Cage legacy, does not minimize his achievements at all.

Quite the contrary: the ambition to make him an all-American Pop artist belittles Warhol's historical scope as much as it underrates the universality of those conditions of experience determining Warhol's work. As early as 1963 Henry Geldzahler described the reasons for this universality with the breathtaking frankness of the imperialist victor: "After the heroic years of Abstract Expressionism a younger generation of artists is working in a new American regionalism, but this time because of the mass media, the regionalism is nationwide, and even exportable to Europe, for we have carefully prepared and reconstructed Europe in our own image since 1945 so that two kinds of American imagery, Kline, Pollock, de Kooning on the one hand, and the Pop artists on the other, are becoming comprehensible abroad."[60]

In the advanced, capitalist European countries Warhol's work was adamantly embraced (at first in West Germany, but subsequently also in France and Italy) as a kind of high-culture version of the preceding and subsequent low-culture cults of all things American. It seems that these cult forms celebrated in masochistic folly the subjection to the massive destruction that the commodity production of late capitalism would hold in store for the postwar European countries. Inevitably, Warhol's work would acquire the suggestion of prophetic foresight.

Therefore, it cannot surprise us to find entrepreneurs, industrialists, and advertising tycoons among the key collectors of Warhol's work in Europe. It seems that they recognize their identity just as well in Warhol's work and perceive it as cultural legitimization. While they are instrumental in inflicting those conditions of enforced consumption that Warhol's work seems to condone passively as "our universal nature," it would still seem that they are mistaken in reading his postures and his artifacts as an affirmative celebration of theirs.

Warhol has unified within his constructs both the entrepreneurial world-view of the late twentieth century and the phlegmatic vision of the victims of that world view, that of the consumers. The ruthless diffidence and strategically calculated air of detachment of the first, allowed to continue without ever being challenged in terms of its responsibility, combines with that of its opposites, the consumers, who can celebrate in Warhol's work their proper status of having been erased as subjects. Regulated as they are by the eternally repetitive gestures of alienated production and consumption, they are barred—as are Warhol's paintings—from access to a dimension of critical resistance.

NOTES

1. Quoted in Gretchen Berg, "Andy: My True Story," *Los Angeles Free Press* (March 17, 1967), p. 3 (reprinted from *East Village Other*); and Gregory McDonald, "Built-in Obsolescence: Art by Andy Warhol," *Boston Sunday Globe* (October 23, 1966), p. 17.

   For generously sharing research and detailed knowledge of Andy Warhol's work with me in the preparation of this essay, I would like to thank the Department of Painting and Sculpture of The Museum of Modern Art. Equally, I would like to thank The Andy Warhol Foundation for the Visual Arts, for giving me information and access to its archives.

2. *See* Frayda Feldman and Jörg Schellmann, eds., *Andy Warhol Prints: A Catalogue Raisonné* (New York: Ronald Feldman Fine Arts, Editions Schellmann, and Abbeville Press, 1985), pp. 106–07.

3. Patrick Smith has suggested that the script is actually the handwriting of Warhol's mother and that Warhol had a stamp made so he could replicate his mother's naive handwriting at any time. *See* Patrick S. Smith, *Andy Warhol's Art and Films* (Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1986), p. 32.

   The pun on his telephone number, Murray Hill 3-0555, seems to have been a persistent joke; thus, in 1954 he had published an advertisement in *Ergo*, a cooperative brochure by a group of free-lance commercial artists, listing his phone as "Mury heel." *See* Andreas Brown, compiler, *Andy Warhol: His Early Works 1947–1959* (New York: Gotham Book Mart Gallery, 1971), p. 14.

4. Theodor W. Adorno, "Rückblickend auf den Surrealismus," in *Gesammelte Schriften* 11 (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1974), p. 103.

5. Rosalind H. Williams, *Dream Worlds* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982), p. 67; quoted in Simon Frith and Howard Horne, *Art into Pop* (New York and London: Methuen, 1987), p. 12.

6. This change of professional identity was, of course, not that abrupt; it appears that Warhol continued to work as a commercial designer at least until 1962.

7. Andy Warhol, "Happy Butterfly Day," published by *Vanity Fair*, c. 1955. The Estate of Andy Warhol.

8. *See* Trevor Fairbrother, "Warhol Meets Sargent at Whitney," *Arts Magazine* 61 (February 1987), pp. 64–71.

9. "New Talent U.S.A.," *Art in America* 50 (1962), p. 42. A reproduction of Andy Warhol's painting *Storm Door*, 1960, was surprisingly included in the "prints and drawings" section of this issue, selected by Zachary Scott, an actor and print collector. The size is incorrectly indicated as 36 × 34″ (as opposed to the painting's actual size of 46 × 42⅛″), which causes one to wonder whether inclusion of the work in this section required some adjustment of medium and size.

10. Perry Anderson, "Modernity and Revolution," *New Left Review* (London) 144 (March–April 1984), p. 106.

11. Allan Kaprow, "Should the Artist Become a Man of the World?" *Artnews* 63 (October 1964), p. 34.

12. Nan Rosenthal has recently discussed the details of the curriculum at Carnegie Institute of Technology and its profound impact on Warhol's education, in a paper delivered at the Warhol symposium organized by the Dia Art Foundation in New York in April 1988.

    Patrick Smith has suggested a comparison between Warhol's mechanization of fine-art production procedures and the ideas taught by Moholy-Nagy at The Institute of Design in Chicago and in his writings, in particular *The New Vision* (1930). Apparently, this book was well known to Warhol and discussed by him and his friends in the late forties. *See* Smith, *Andy Warhol's Art*, pp. 110–12 and nn. 191–205.

13. Douglas Arango, "Underground Films: Art or Naughty Movies," *Movie TV Secrets* (June 1967), n.p.

14. Gretchen Berg, "Nothing to Lose: Interview with Andy Warhol," *Cahiers du Cinéma in English* 10 (May 1967), pp. 38–43.

    In 1971 Warhol said: "If I remember correctly, I felt that if everyone couldn't afford a painting the printed poster would be available...." (Gerard Malanga, "A Conversation with Andy Warhol," *Print Collector's Newsletter* 1 [January–February 1971], pp. 125–27.)

    The same argument for the egalitarian conceptions motivating Pop art was made by Claes Oldenburg, for example: "I think it would be great if you had an art that could appeal to everybody." (Bruce Glaser, "Oldenburg, Lichtenstein, Warhol: A Discussion," *Artforum* 4 [February 1966], pp. 20–24.)

    It is all the more astonishing that one of Pop art's early critical opponents (and subsequent converts) refused to acknowledge the egalitarian potential of Pop art from the beginning (and, in retrospect, it turns out that the skepticism was wholly justified). In her review of Lawrence Alloway's 1963 exhibition *Six Painters and the Object* at The Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, Barbara Rose wrote: "In the past, when an artist like Courbet or van Gogh appropriated material from popular culture, it was with the intent of reaching a larger public—in fact of producing a kind of elevated popular art. *Pop art in America had no such intention; it was made for the same exclusive and limited public as abstract art*" [italics mine]. ("Pop Art at the Guggenheim," *Art International* 2 [1963], p. 20.)

15. Walter P. Paepcke, "Art in Industry," *Modern Art in Advertising* (Chicago: Paul Theobald, 1946), n.p.

16. *The Philosophy of Andy Warhol (From A to B and Back Again)* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1975), p. 92.

17. "Boxing Match," *Time* (May 15, 1964), p. 86.

18. Warhol was notorious for consciously employing other people's ideas, and he was quite candid (and coy) about this supposed absence of originality: "I always get my ideas from people. Sometimes I change the idea to suit a certain project I'm working on at the time. Sometimes I don't change the idea. Or, sometimes I don't use the idea right away, but may remember it and use it for something later on. I love ideas." (Malanga, "A Conversation with Andy Warhol," pp. 125–27.)

19. G. R. Swenson, "What Is Pop Art?: Answers from 8 Painters, Part I," *Artnews* 62 (November 1963), pp. 24–27, 60–63.

20. Martha Jackson, letter to Andy Warhol, July 20, 1962. The Estate of Andy Warhol.

21. A similar hesitation with regard to style can be found in the early work of Roy Lichtenstein, who in the late fifties was making the transition from Abstract Expressionism to the deployment of ready-made imagery and ready-made (commercial) techniques of pictorial execution. This led to Warhol's surprise discovery that he had not been the only one to use the iconography of comic strips in his work. What was worse for Warhol was that Leo Castelli at that time believed that his gallery should show only one artist using this type of imagery. Lichtenstein has recorded his memory of his encounter with Warhol's work of this kind: "I saw Andy's work at Leo Castelli's about the same time I brought mine in, about the spring of 1961.... Of course, I was amazed to see Andy's work because he was doing cartoons of Nancy and Dick Tracy and they were very similar to mine." (Glaser, "Oldenburg, Lichtenstein, Warhol," p. 21.)

22. Emile de Antonio's commentary has been reported in two versions. In the first, he said, "One of these is crap. The other is remarkable—it's our society, it's who we are, it's absolutely beautiful and naked, and you ought to destroy the first and show the second." (Jesse Kornbluth, "Andy," *New York* [March 9, 1987], p. 42.)

    The other version confirms the assumption that there was a moment of real hesitation in Warhol's early work: "One day he put up two huge paintings of Coke bottles. Two different ones. One was, I could say, an early Pop Art piece of major importance. It was just a big black-and-white Coke bottle. The other was the same thing except it was surrounded by Abstract Expressionist hatches and crosses. And I said to Andy, 'Why did you do two of these? One of them is so clearly your own. And the second is just kind of ridiculous because it's not anything. It's part Abstract Expressionism and part whatever you're doing.' And the first one was [the only] one that was any good. The other thing—God only knows what it is. And, I think that helped Andy make up his mind as to—you know: that was almost the birth of Pop. Andy did it." (Smith, *Andy Warhol's Art*, p. 97.)

    Warhol followed this advice only partially: he exhibited the "cold" version at his first New York exhibition at the Stable Gallery in 1962 but did not destroy the other version.

23. *See* Carter Ratcliff, *Andy Warhol* (New York: Abbeville Press, 1983), p. 17: "Though Warhol has never changed his personal style, he did abandon commercial art as decisively as he possibly could. The line between his first and second

careers is astoundingly sharp."

24. Allan Kaprow, "The Legacy of Jackson Pollock," *Artnews* 57 (October 1958), p. 56.

25. Ibid.

26. For an early example of this argument, *see* Robert Rosenblum, "Pop and Non-Pop: An Essay in Distinction," *Art and Literature* 5 (Summer 1965), pp. 80–93.

   See also Alan Solomon, *Andy Warhol* (Boston: Institute of Contemporary Art, 1966), n.p.: "In a broader sense, I suppose the prevalence of cool passivity can be explained as part of the reaction to abstract expressionism, since the present attitude is the polar opposite of the action painting idea of kinetic self-expression. (This has a great deal to do with Warhol's attitudes toward style and performance.)"

   For a more recent example, proving the persistence of this simplistic argument of stylistic innovation, *see* Ratcliff, *Andy Warhol*, p. 7.

27. Kaprow, "The Legacy of Jackson Pollock," p. 56.

28. *See* Michael Crichton, *Jasper Johns* (New York: Whitney Museum of American Art/Harry N. Abrams, 1978), p. 30. Andrew Forge described this new collaborative aesthetic in the context of Rauschenberg's work in terms that equally de-emphasize visuality: "The idea of collaboration with others has preoccupied him endlessly, both through the medium of his own work and in an open situation in which no single person dominates. In *Black Market* (a 1961 combine painting) he invited the onlooker to exchange small objects with the combine and to leave messages." (*Robert Rauschenberg* [New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1972], p. 15.)

29. According to Eleanor Ward, *Dance Diagram (Tango)* was included in Warhol's first individual New York exhibition at her Stable Gallery in 1962 and installed on the floor. *See* Ward's recollection of that exhibition in John Wilcock, ed., *The Autobiography & Sex Life of Andy Warhol* (New York: Other Scenes, 1971), n.p. Subsequently, a *Dance Diagram* was installed in a horizontal position in Sidney Janis's exhibition *The New Realists* in October 1962 and in Warhol's first "retrospective" exhibition, in 1965 at the Institute of Contemporary Art in Philadelphia. It was a particularly Warholian irony, even if unintended, that the attendance at the exhibition's opening was so great that all the paintings (not just those on the floor) had to be removed from the exhibition for the duration of the preview.

30. Harold Rosenberg, "The American Action Painters," *Artnews* 51 (December 1952), pp. 22–23, 48–50.

31. Quoted in Annabelle Melzer, *Dada and Surrealist Performance* (Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1980), p. 17.

   Such a moment of the "breakdown" of the strategy of the monochrome is poignantly described by Michael Fried in a review of an exhibition of Newman's work in 1962, which he published (as historical chance would have it) side by side with his review of Warhol's first New York exhibition: "From the start—which I take to be the late forties—his art was conceived in terms of its absolute essentials, flat color and a rectilinearity derived from the shape of the canvas, and the earliest paintings on view have a simplicity which is pretty near irreducible. . . .

   "When the equilibrium is not in itself so intrinsically compelling and the handling of the paint is kept adamant the result is that the painting tends not to hold the eye: the spectator's gaze keeps bouncing off, no matter how hard he tries to keep it fixed on the painting. (I'm thinking now most of all of the vertical painting divided into unequal halves of ochre yellow and white dated 1962 in the current show, in which the colours themselves, unlike the warm fields of blue that are perhaps Newman's most effective element—have no inherent depth to them and end up erecting *a kind of hand-ball court wall for the eye*)" [italics mine]. (Michael Fried, "New York Letter," *Art International* 6 [December 1962], p. 57.)

   That the monochrome aspects in the work of Newman were subject to a more general reflection in the early sixties was also indicated by Jim Dine's rather unsuccessful parody *Big Black Zipper*, 1962 (The Sonnabend Collection, Baltimore Museum of Art).

32. A typical example was Rothko's refusal to supply the meditative panels for the Seagram Building's corporate dining room. Kaprow in 1964 cited "the blank canvas" among these critical acts in which the elitist hermeticism and the metaphysical claims of monochromy had been revised: "Pursuit of the idea of 'best' becomes then (insidiously) avoidance of the idea of 'worst' and Value is defeated by paradox. Its most poignant expressions have been the blank canvas, the motionless dance, the silent music, the empty page of poetry. On the edge of such an abyss all that is left to do is *act*." (Kaprow, "Should the Artist Become a Man of the World?" p. 34.)

33. Allan Solomon made the connection between the monochrome paintings and the floating Silver Clouds in 1966, albeit in the rather evasive language of the enthusiastic critic: "When Warhol made the *Clouds* which are floating plastic sculpture, he called them paintings, because he thought of filling them with helium and sending them out of the window, never to return. 'That would be the end of painting,' he said, as serious as not. (He also likes the idea of plain surfaces as ultimate art. Many of his paintings have matching bare panels which he feels increase their beauty appreciably.)" (Solomon, *Andy Warhol*.)

   A year later Warhol described the project in more concise terms: "I didn't want to paint anymore so I thought that the way to finish off painting for me would be to have a painting that floats, so I invented the floating silver rectangles that you fill up with helium and let out of your windows." (Berg, "Nothing to Lose," p. 43.)

   Later, Warhol remembered that it was on the occasion of his exhibition at the Ileana Sonnabend Gallery in Paris, where he had installed the Flower paintings on the recently designed Cow Wallpaper, that he decided to publicly declare the end of painting (or at least his involvement with it): "I was having so much fun in Paris that I decided it was the place to make the announcement I'd been thinking about making for months: I was going to retire from painting. Art just wasn't fun for me anymore." (Andy Warhol and Pat Hackett, *POPism: The Warhol '60s* [New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1980], p. 113.)

   It seems noteworthy, once again, that while Warhol considered it appropriate to emphasize ironically that "Paris was the place to make the announcement," some American critics have not been able to acknowledge that Warhol's declaration of silence placed him in a Rimbaud/Duchamp tradition of self-imposed refusal to produce art. *See* Ratcliff, *Andy Warhol*, p. 7, where Warhol's renunciation of painting is identified as a "Garboesque" decision.

   Ten years after his first declaration Warhol, after having taken up painting again, still struggled with the problem (or the pose): "I get so tired of painting. I've been trying to give it up all the time, if we could just make a living out of movies or the newspaper business, or something. It's so boring, painting the same picture over and over." (Quoted in Glenn O'Brien, *High Times* 24 [August 1977], p. 21.)

34. Barry Blinderman, "Modern 'Myths': An Interview with Andy Warhol," *Arts Magazine* 56 (October 1981), pp. 144–47. (Reprinted in Jeanne Siegel, *Artwords 2* [Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1988], p. 16.)

35. One could refer to the complexity of Warhol's critical reflection on *all* of the implications of modernist pictorial conventions and his actual decision to feature these in rather unusual displays in order to point out—if it were not already obvious—how tame and conservative by comparison the so-called Neo-Geo and the neo-Conceptualist artists are in their simple-minded and opportunistic "painting and sculpture" mentality, disguised behind the facade of postmodernist pretense.

36. Roger Vaughan, "Superpop, or a Night at the Factory," *New York Herald Tribune* (August 8, 1965). Ironically, as a member of the staff of the Castelli gallery recalls, many collectors left the blank panel behind when acquiring a diptych by Warhol at that time.

37. One of Rauschenberg's Blueprints was shown in the exhibition *Abstraction in Photography* at The Museum of Modern Art, New York, in May–July 1951, and was listed in the catalogue as *Blueprint: Photogram for Mural Decoration*.

   An article on Rauschenberg's photograms/blueprints was published in "Speaking of Pictures," *Life* (April 19, 1951). *See also* Lawrence Alloway, "Rauschenberg's Development," *Robert Rauschenberg* (Washington, D.C.: National Collection of Fine Arts, Smithsonian Institution, 1976), pp. 16, 63.

38. The complex relationship between Warhol, his

slightly older peer Robert Rauschenberg, and his slightly younger, but considerably more established, peer Jasper Johns remains somewhat elusive. Apparently, Warhol's ambition to be recognized by these two artists was frustrated on several occasions, as Emile de Antonio has reported, for two reasons: first, because Warhol's background as a real commercial artist disqualified him in the eyes of these artists who, if they had to make money, would decorate Bonwit Teller windows under a pseudonym; and second, because, it seems, they sensed that Warhol's work was outflanking theirs. Warhol later reflected on their relationship in a conversation with Emile de Antonio, who remarks: "You're too swish, and that upsets them.... You are a commercial artist, which really bugs them because when they do commercial art—windows and other jobs I find them—they do it just 'to survive.' They won't even use their real names. Whereas you've won prizes! You're famous for it." (POPism, pp. 11–12.) Or: "Rauschenberg and Jasper Johns didn't want to meet Andy at the beginning.... Andy was too effeminate for Bob and Jap.... I think his openly commercial work made them nervous.... They also, I think, were suspicious of what Andy was doing—his serious work—because it had obvious debts to both of them in a funny way." (Smith, Andy Warhol's Art, pp. 294–95.)

Leo Castelli remembers Warhol visiting his gallery in 1958–59 as "a great admirer of Rauschenberg and Jasper Johns and he even bought a drawing, a good one, a light bulb drawing of Jasper Johns." (In David Bailey, Andy Warhol: Transcript of David Bailey's ATV Documentary [London: Bailey Litchfield/Mathews Miller Dunbar Ltd, 1972], n.p.) See also Ann Hindry, "Andy Warhol: Quelques grand témoins: Sidney Janis, Leo Castelli, Robert Rosenblum, Clement Greenberg," Artstudio (Paris, 1988), p. 115. Recognition by his peers seems to have occurred after all, since in the mid-sixties both Johns and Rauschenberg became owners of one or more paintings by Warhol.

39. For example, both Kaprow and Robert Watts were already omitted from Sidney Janis's crucial exhibition The New Realists in 1962, and their absence was explained in Sidney Janis's preface to the catalogue as due to "limitation of space." See Sidney Janis, "On the Theme of the Exhibition," The New Realists (New York: Sidney Janis Gallery, 1962), n.p.

40. Arango, "Underground Films."

41. Richard Morphet, "Andy Warhol," in Warhol (London: Tate Gallery, 1971), p. 6. Another, equally desperate attempt to detach Warhol's iconography from the reading of his work in order to force it back into the discursive strictures of (Greenbergian) modernism was made on the occasion of Warhol's exhibition at the Stable Gallery in 1962 by Donald Judd: "The subject matter is a cause for both blame and excessive praise. Actually it is not very interesting to think about the reasons, since it is easy to imagine Warhol's

paintings without such subject matter, simply as 'overall' paintings of repeated elements. The novelty and the absurdity of the repeated images of Marilyn Monroe, Troy Donahue and Coca-Cola bottles is not great.... The gist of this is that Warhol's work is able but general. It certainly has possibilities, but it is so far not exceptional. It should be considered as it is, as should anyone's, and not be harmed or aided by being part of a supposed movement, 'pop,' 'O.K.,' neo-Dada or New Realist or whatever it is." (Donald Judd, "Andy Warhol," Arts Magazine [January 1963], reprinted in Donald Judd, Complete Writings 1959–1975 [Halifax and New York: Press of Nova Scotia College of Art and Design and New York University Press, 1975], p. 70.)

42. Barbara Rose, "Pop Art at the Guggenheim," pp. 20–22. (It is not quite clear from the text whether this statement relates to Warhol or Lichtenstein, but, in any case, it indicates the intense shock of factuality that the new mass-cultural iconography of Pop art provided even to well-prepared eyes.)

In 1962 Sidney Janis identified the artists in his exhibition The New Realists as "Factualists," and distinguished them from Rauschenberg and others who are "less factual than they are poetic or expressionist." (Janis, New Realists.) In his review of Warhol's movie The Chelsea Girls, Andrew Sarris recognized this "factualist" quality in Warhol's work and went as far as comparing Warhol's film to one of the key works in the history of documentary film: "The Chelsea Girls is actually closer to Nanook of the North than to The Knack. It is as documentary that The Chelsea Girls achieves its greatest distinction." (Andrew Sarris, "The Sub–New York Sensibility," Cahiers du Cinéma [May 1967], p. 43.)

43. For a recent discussion of the history of British Pop art, see Brian Wallis, This Is Tomorrow Today (New York: Institute for Art and Urban Resources, 1987).

44. Bill Manville, "Boris Lurie, March Gallery, Images of Life," The Village Voice (June 16, 1960).

45. Kaprow, "The Legacy of Jackson Pollock," p. 57.

46. It should be remembered that the identification of the artist with the criminal is one of the topoi of modernity since Baudelaire and that the identification of the two roles would have been familiar to Warhol from his readings of Jean Genet, to whom he referred on several occasions. Of course, as has been pointed out before, the conflation of the artist's portrait with the police mug shot goes back to Duchamp, who had superimposed the image of the artist over that of the "Most Wanted Man" in his rectified Readymade Wanted $2,000 Reward, 1923. Duchamp had included a replica of this Readymade in his Boîte-en-valise in 1941, and had also used the image quite appropriately for the poster of his first American retrospective at the Pasadena Art Museum in 1963. Warhol attended the opening of this exhibition and it is quite likely that the poster initiated Warhol's Thirteen Most Wanted Men in 1964. Furthermore, as Patrick Smith has pointed out, Rauschenberg had

used an FBI "wanted" poster in Hymnal, 1955.

The use of the photo-booth strip leads directly into the work of Jasper Johns, particularly in the image of an unidentified man in Flag Above White with Collage (1955), but also the self-portraits by Johns used in Souvenir I and II, 1964.

For the cover of Time magazine in 1965 Warhol used a whole series of photo-booth pictures, and there are still dozens of photo-booth strips of Warhol and his friends in the Warhol archives.

47. Warhol, as quoted by Peter Gidal, Andy Warhol: Films and Paintings (London and New York: Studio Vista, 1971), p. 38.

48. Bailey, Andy Warhol: Transcript.

The statement about the anonymous people who built the pyramids is of course an unconscious quotation from Bertolt Brecht's famous poem "Questions from a Worker Who Reads." An early argument for the profound influence of Brecht's work on Warhol had been made by Rainer Crone in his monograph (Andy Warhol [New York: Praeger, 1970]), partially on the evidence of one reference by Warhol to Brecht in his 1963 interview with Gene Swenson. More recently, Patrick Smith has anxiously attempted to detach Warhol from this political affiliation on the grounds of totally unconvincing "memories" by early acquaintances of Warhol, who were interviewed by Smith. See Patrick S. Smith, "Theatre 12 and Broadway," in Warhol: Conversations About the Artist (Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1988), p. 41; and Smith, Andy Warhol's Art, pp. 78ff.

49. Berg, "Nothing to Lose," p. 40. In this regard, Michael Fried's brilliant review of Warhol's first New York exhibition has been proven wrong, since it is not the dependence of Warhol's images on mass-cultural myths but participation in mass-cultural experience that animates the work: "An art like Warhol's is necessarily parasitic upon the myths of its time, and indirectly therefore upon the machinery of fame and publicity that markets these myths; and it is not at all unlikely that these myths that move us will be unintelligible (or at best starkly dated) to generations that follow. This is said not to denigrate Warhol's work but to characterize it and the risks it runs—and, I admit, to register an advance protest against the advent of a generation that will not be as moved by Warhol's beautiful, vulgar, heart breaking icons of Marilyn Monroe as I am." (Fried, "New York Letter," p. 57.)

50. In Andy Warhol's Index (Book) (New York: Random House, 1967), n.p.

51. The argument was that some of the criminals depicted in the Thirteen Most Wanted Men had already received fair trial and that their images could therefore no longer be publicly displayed. Previously (see Crone, Andy Warhol), this decision was attributed to Governor Nelson A. Rockefeller; however, recent research has placed this in some doubt, suggesting that the decision was made by the fair's officials. Apparently the decision to censor the second proposal by Warhol as

well caused a considerable strain on Philip Johnson's relationship with Warhol: "'And then he proposed to show a portrait of Robert Moses instead of the *Thirteen Most Wanted Men*?' 'Yes, that's right...since he was the boss of the World's Fair, but I prohibited that....Andy and I had a quarrel at that time, even though he is one of my favorite artists.'" (Crone, *Andy Warhol*, p. 30.)

52. The first step in this direction was, as usual, to convince Warhol that each work had to be signed individually by him (no longer by his mother, for example, as in the days of being a commercial artist), in spite of the fact that he had originally considered it to be crucial to *abstain* from signing his work: "People just won't buy things that are unsigned....It's so silly. I really don't believe in signing my work. Anyone could do the things I am doing and I don't feel they should be signed." (Vaughan, "Superpop," p. 7.)

53. As early as 1961–62 Claes Oldenburg created a programmatic fiction of a store (*The Store*) as a framing institution for the production and reception of his work.

54. Swenson, "What Is Pop Art?" p. 26.

55. This is not to suggest that Warhol knew about Klein's exhibition; quite the opposite. The parallels indicate to what extent these gestures originated in a universal condition. However, one should note that Klein had an exhibition at the Leo Castelli Gallery in New York in April 1961 and in May–June of the same year at the Dwan Gallery in Los Angeles, both titled *Yves le monochrome*. Warhol was certainly interested in Klein's work at a later point in his life, when he acquired two paintings by Klein in the mid-seventies. For an extensive discussion of Klein's project and his own commentaries on this exhibition, *see* Nan Rosenthal, "Assisted Levitation: The Art of Yves Klein," in *Yves Klein* (Houston and New York: Institute for the Arts, Rice University, and Arts Publisher, 1982), pp. 91–135.

56. For an excellent, detailed discussion of Warhol's reflections on exhibition formats, *see* Charles F. Stuckey, "Andy Warhol's Painted Faces," *Art in America* (May 1980), pp. 102–11. My remarks are indebted to this essay in many ways, as well as to a presentation by Stuckey at the Warhol symposium at the Dia Art Foundation in New York in April 1988.

57. *See* John Coplans, "Andy Warhol and Elvis Presley," *Studio International* (February 1971), pp. 49–56. There are slightly conflicting opinions about who made the decision to stretch the canvas on stretchers: Coplans suggests that it was Warhol who sent the stretchers prefabricated to size from New York (which doesn't seem to make a lot of sense); Wolfgang Siano, in his essay "Die Kunst Andy Warhol's im Verhältnis zur Oeffentlichkeit" (in Erika Billeter, ed., *Andy Warhol* [Bern, 1971]), suggests (without giving his source) that it was originally Warhol's intention to install the canvas roll continuously along the perimeter of the gallery walls and that it was the decision of Irving Blum to divide the canvas roll into segments and stretch them as paintings. More recently, Gerard Malanga has voiced doubts that a roll of that size could have been screened continuously in the space available at the Factory at that time.

58. *See* Nat Finkelstein, "Inside Andy Warhol," *Cavalier Magazine* (September 1966), p. 88.

As late as 1971 Warhol would still dispute the curator's and collector's insistence on the stability of artistic categories (and thereby weaken his work's institutional value): "I suppose you could call the paintings prints, but the material used for the paintings was canvas....Anyone can do them." *See* Malanga, "Conversation with Andy Warhol," p. 127. Even after he resumed painting in 1968 Warhol disseminated rumors that the new paintings were in fact executed by his friend Brigid Polk. As she stated in *Time* magazine (October 17, 1969): "Andy? I've been doing it all for the last year and a half, two years. Andy doesn't do art anymore. He's bored with it. I did all his new soup cans."

By contrast, since the mid-seventies, quite appropriately for both the general situation of a return to traditional forms of easel painting and his own complacent opportunism, Warhol recanted those rumors, not, however, without turning the screw once again. Answering the question of whether collectors had actually called him and tried to return their paintings after Polk's statement, Warhol said: "Yes, but I really do all the paintings. We were just being funny. If there are any fakes around I can tell....The modern way would be to do it like that, but I do them all myself." *See* Blinderman, "Modern 'Myths': An Interview," pp. 144–47; and Siegel, *Artwords 2*, p. 21.

A similar attitude is displayed by Warhol in a series of photographs that were used as endpapers for Carter Ratcliff's monograph, where Warhol, staring into the camera, displays the tools of painting.

59. Quoted in Gidal, *Andy Warhol*, p. 27.

According to both Teeny Duchamp and John Cage, Marcel Duchamp was apparently quite fond of Warhol's work (which does not really come as a surprise); *see* David Bailey's interviews with Teeny Duchamp and John Cage in his *Andy Warhol: Transcript*.

60. Henry Geldzahler, in Peter Selz, ed., "A Symposium on Pop Art," *Arts Magazine* (April 1963) pp. 18ff. Ten years later Geldzahler would address the question of the European success of Pop art once again, slightly toned down, but no less imperialist in attitude, and certainly confusing the course of historical development: "And the question is why would Germany be particularly interested in this American phenomenon and the reason goes back, I think, to a remark that Gertrude Stein made quite early in the twentieth century which is that America is the oldest country in the world because it entered the twentieth century first and the point really is that the Germans in their postwar boom got into a mood that America was in in the twenties and Andy essentializes the American concentration on overabundance of commercial objects." The fact is that the "mood that America was in in the twenties" had been the mood that the Europeans had been in in the twenties, as well, and that mood had generated Dadaism, the very artistic legacy at the origin of Pop art.