Interview with Bucknell Art History Professor Roger Rothman and Neil Anderson, Started summer 2016

RR:

Let's begin with question about your commitment to abstraction, ok?

NA:

Abstraction is the road I took to discover non-representational painting. At the moment this non-representational pursuit is being eclipsed by a return to representation. I use the example of Nicole Eisenman as someone who represents what's going on right now. She references a lot of earlier painting.

This is where we all began, but then we all moved from that and to see it re-occur is an odd feeling. For me it's somewhat disturbing because my teachers all said, "Destroy representation, if it appears in your work, you must cover it and remove it." They were abstract expressionists.

RR:

But, you didn't follow their dictum for a while, right? We were just back in your studio a few days ago looking at works that were explicitly derived from nature and maintained their connection to it, you can see leaves and branches.

NA:

For a while I did. You're right. I always thought that in that project I was dealing with what I thought was an abstract pattern, even though recognizable, much like in an oriental rug. But everybody saw only the leaves, so part of the reason for abandoning that project was, among others, people were not attending to what I thought I was talking about, which was this all over pattern that occurs in nature. If you take a camera and walk across the ground, aim it down, you gather this rectangle of information and then the piece that I had done around 1970 where I recorded a section of ground for one year, keeping the F-stop constant, recording every day, the changes that took place.

That was called "Year" with music by Bill Duckworth. From that project came the idea of making a painting from an individual slide . I thought I was dealing with a kind of Pollock-like all over patterned composition, where the recorded ground was like the ground of the painting. They were called ground paintings because they made reference to the ground of the painting and the ground that was being photographed.

RR:

Okay, good. If you had been going to school where you were told it is fine perhaps to start from nature but you are going to have to get away from it, why were there even residual connections that were still visible, like the painting in the library that is inescapably recognizable as a large red leaf? Why did you retain the connection to nature there?

NA:

Well at the time I thought people, as I just said, would understand that what I was dealing with here was an abstraction and that people wouldn't just call that a leaf. That was naïve of me, I think.

RR:

If you didn't want them to be interested in the leaf, then why make it recognizable as a leaf?

NA:

Because it is part of the visual world. It is just part of that array of things that appear before your eyes and you record it because no one part is more interesting than another, but you are not interested in it as a subject as in a portrait where the subject matter is significant. The subject matter is the occasion for color, texture. It is not a value statement like that is a leaf and what is next to it is not the leaf. It is all one thing, in my mind.

RR:

So those paintings were in a sense an occasion for the viewer to move from the world of reality and its comprehensibility and its utility to the world of pure shape and color?

NA: I was thinking that.

RR:

You were thinking that it would help them to move from the real into the realm of the purely formal?

NA:

Well I think the subject matter meant more to the people who were looking at the work than to the person who was making the work.

RR: Aha.

NA:

I mean, for me it was an occasion not an end in itself. An occasion for what I described as color, texture, interesting shapes, and whatnot. I think that was probably naïve on
my part.

RR:

How many years did you make work like that? At least 5 right?

NA:

Oh more than that. I showed them at Fischbach Gallery in New York from ... At least 10 years, yeah, before I finally

RR:

In your description of it, saying that you wanted the viewers to get to a place that at least some, too many for you, were resistant to go because they kept stumbling on the objects being depicted. It is almost the reverse of the problem that Kandinsky described where he said he needed to gradually walk viewers from the shore of figuration into the ocean of abstraction and couldn't just toss them in the deep end all at once or they will they drown.

NA: He was right.

RR:

When you think back on this gradual transition did you feel like it was difficult to let go of the natural world? You

NA:

I think so. I did not feel that as it was happening but in retrospect yes it was difficult to let go completely. As I was hanging on to the shapes and the details from natural phenomena they would appear there and they would be recognizable to people and people would then see them as recognizable and therefore assume that I was making a statement about nature, which I wasn't. I didn't think I was.

RR:

But still that connection to nature must have been important to you because by the 1970s artists were making entirely abstract paintings, and one didn't need a justification in the way that Kandinsky or Mondrian did.

NA:

That is an interesting point. I mean, I probably, again in retrospect, needed to go at it the way I did step by step rather than making a leap from what I was doing then to totally break and go into something else. But I have never been able to generate imagery on my own. I've always had to get it from somewhere just to get started, you know being faced with a blank canvas and all that. I had to build this system that I use now for making the paintings which was to make the drawing which is projected photographically from natural material that surrounds my studio.

RR:

Can you say a little bit more about that this now you have an image archive, I assume, of 35 millimeter slides?

When did you start making them? How many do you have? Do you continue to make them?

NA:

I continue to make them. I have probably a thousand and I edit them down to maybe a couple hundred that I use alternately. It doesn't seem very important to me now which ones I use. You know, you rearrange them, you turn them 90 degrees or upside down or whatever and continue using them. It is mainly a way to get the drawing on the canvas, to get a kind of loose grid which is what I begin working from.

RR:

Now I am going to ask a little technical question. How do you go ahead making 35 millimeter slides today?

NA:

There is one place left in the United States that will process them. I can still buy the film there and I can still process the film there. I know some day it is all going to have to be digital but it hasn't happened and I'm not looking forward to making the transition. I am comfortable with the process because I have been using it for a long time and I can achieve high resolution at a low cost.

I project the 35 millimeter slides onto the surface of the canvas and work from maybe a half a dozen or a dozen slides, doing different sections until I fill out the whole surface. Out of the semi-darkness the drawing emerges, without intention or purpose. Intention comes only after the drawing exists.

RR:

What role then does the drawing play, because typically one thinks about the drawing as the mock-up for painting, right? First you have the drawing and then you maybe grid out the drawing and map it onto the painting or you take a picture of the drawing and you project that onto the painting. But you say you don't do it that way?

NA:

No. I am projecting the imagery from the slides onto the canvas and drawing from the image as they are projected.

When the painting is finished what you see is the kind of negative arrangement of lines that was the drawing. In that sense the lines are negative or gradually disappear and/or become the edges between shapes.

RR:

This method of working with photographed imagery of nature as a means of jump-starting the process of producing the painting is one that you have been using now for well over a decade. Is that right?

NA:

Yeah, right.

RR:

During that period, the work has shifted, changed, evolved. What do you think distinguishes this most recent body of work from what you have been doing?

NA:

Scale, number one. The range of shapes is greater. There is more detail in these pieces than in the earlier ones. More complexity, and also more refinement. I just simply learned as I've worked how to make this kind of painting better and better and these shown here are the best I have made. The others seem now to me to be cruder attempts, which is probably only because this is where my head is now.

RR:

Regarding complexity and refinement: they are not quite identical, are they?

NA: They are not identical but related.

RR:

I would like us to have a chance to talk about both. Let's start with refinement. In what way are these more refined than previous paintings?

NA:

Well it's hard to be that specific, but what ... the ideas that I think I am working with, I think are more clearly stated here than they were previously. Meaning the control of the texture, the balance of the colors, the refinement of the shapes. The development of the painting ideas are simply more sophisticated than they were. I developed the idea of the thick and thin painting, the veils of color versus some more opaque colors.

RR:

You have had veiled colors and opaque colors before.

NA:

They have been used increasingly to pull together details ... Well something that you pointed out yourself before that larger shapes and the smaller shapes within the larger shapes, so that when you step back you see the larger form and when you move closer you see details in the larger forms.

RR:

When you use the two words refinement and complexity it is that ladder aspect that I would associate with complexity more-so than refinement, which is why I wanted you to talk a little bit about what you meant by refinement. Certainly these paintings do look to me more complex. Because you use such a large scale, you can engage in levels of complexity as you move downward from the largest size shapes, for example if we turn our attention to Number Two we have this large blue shape.

NA:

Right.

RR:

In my viewing, the large and dominant shapes often break down into smaller fractured forms when you looks at them closely. One registers a large shape first and then zooms in a little bit, and catches another shape. Here I think we could perhaps start talking about Gestalt principles right? When you sense a shape and it has boundaries but the more you look closely at them, the more the boundaries disappear, which reminds me to some extent of what is said about the fractal nature of a coastline.

RR:

Like the length of the Eastern seaboard when you measure it is going to be dependent on the size of the yardstick, on the stick that you use, right? The shorter the stick you use the more you zero in the more you notice the little nooks and crannies in the space. I think that applies here as well, so that strikes me as far more complex.

Can you say more about "refinement"?

NA:

I mean the refinement of the idea. In other words, there is an idea that is being stated generally and over a period of years, but gradually I am getting clearer and clearer about what it is I am doing, and that to me is what I mean by refinement.

RR:

In some cases though I can imagine refinement leads to simplicity—Mondrian, for example.

NA:

You could. You could see it that way.

RR:

In your case refinement seems to be moving towards greater complexity.

NA:

Yeah it seems to be, doesn't it? Well the simplicity of the largeness is what you pointed out is a larger shape which comes from all the smaller shapes, and so I think the refinement is about making the larger shapes and the smaller shapes come together so that you can read it as you had said before from a distance, and you can read it up close. However, it should be clear that I make the paintings up close and so I am looking at different little fragments at a time all over, and then stepping back and trying to fit those fragments in the larger whole. So that blue triangular shape emerged gradually. I didn't see it in the beginning. There were several other kinds of shapes there, and it was only through lots of changes that the larger blue shape emerged.

RR:

I am glad to hear you say that because I was imagining that you started with larger shapes which are then slowly fractured and deconstructed but in fact it is the other way around.

NA:

It is the other way around. You start with the details and then the details have to finally be submerged into the larger whole without losing the richness of the detail. Part of the reason for the details is to get the richness of the all over surface. Something you learn from looking at Pollock's paintings for instance. It is a richness of the whole.

RR:

Here you mention Pollock, but earlier when I was thinking about your work and then again when you were describing your process in which small shapes then suggest or compel the construction of larger shapes and yet those forms themselves have to be made to cohere with what is happening perhaps as far apart as the far corner of the painting. It reminds me of famous line by Cezanne as his description that with every stroke of paint, every addition of paint, that addition must function in relationship to all the other strokes of paint that had been previously placed on the canvas.

NA:

Absolutely. Though in my case it is not strokes of paint, it is discrete areas, areas of paint because the strokes have disappeared here.

RR:

Right, and in your case there is no such thing as a stroke. It is always a shape, right?

NA:

It is always shape, yeah.

RR:

The shape has scale, but it also has properties of regularity, irregularity, the organic and the angular.

NA:

One of the reasons for blotting the colors is to get the semi-transparent quality. Incidentally, I blot all the colors as I lay them down so the edges don't build up so that they will lay flat onto the surface, so that you don't get ridges of paint along the edges of forms which disturb me greatly. That is just a little technical detail that has a lot to do with the all over look.

RR:

Why do the edges disturb you?

NA:

Well if you paint ... Some painters paint so that the edge when they paint up to an edge they will leave a ridge of paint along the edge. Do you understand what I mean?

RR:

But why did that disturb you?

NA:

Because then your eye doesn't flow into the next shape evenly.

RR:

Ah, I see.

NA:

It doesn't ... I mean the edge breaks the surface and becomes too important.

RR:

So in an area like this you wouldn't have been able to encapsulate this section of juxtaposed shapes if there had been ridges at the point at which they met?

NA:

That would break the all over feeling of the surface. It would disturb the connection from one shape and the next, one line and the next, and so on.

RR:

I want us to keep talking about process if we can, and I know from our conversation with Charles on our drive down here we talked about how many of these procedures and considerations are largely unconscious. They have become so incorporated that they don't have to pass through a linguistic mediator. But I want to ask you to do that for us and I want to see if I can get you to speak concretely about decisions that you made in ways that might go beyond calling them "spontaneous." One way to get at this perhaps is to ask what was the last shape you put on here? Can you remember? And can you remember when you decided it was done and how you concluded it was done? Again, for the sake of this interview we are looking at Quartet for America number two.

NA:

What was the last shape? Probably the blue large, the dominant blue shape from the top that ends up down below.

RR:

All the way down at the bottom?

NA:

All the way to the bottom.

RR:

Really?

NA:

Now, what happened was those shapes at the top and the bottom were there but they weren't connected. Now they are connected through the work in the middle. The blue is connected. This was here, that was here, this was more broken up. Now the parts are joined.

RR:

Sounds like a kind of evolutionary process.

NA:

That's right. That is important that they are not there until they appear. They may not appear. In other words when you start working you don't know what is going to happen. You don't know ahead of time that it will be that blue shape that is going to emerge.

RR:

Or that they will connect.

NA:

Or that they will emerge by connecting.

RR:

Right.

NA:

So, early on the painting was more like this side which was much more broken up, right? I felt the need at some point to pull parts of the painting together and if you go around different parts of that painting you see how blue is used to do that.

RR:

Used to do what?

NA:

Pull parts together and so that it is not all fractured, as
it is more fractured on the right hand side, less on the left
hand side.

RR:

This happens to be one of my favorites and I think it is this play between this large dominant shape and then the way it expands, contracts, solidifies, dissolves, crumbles, in various areas. So that was the last part, the last formal element of the painting. What happened, what did you see in this painting that led you to conclude that it is now done?

NA:

Well I was stunned by the emergence of the blue shape and never got over that, and that was a unifying factor obviously.

Unifying but not so unifying that it obliterated the all over complexity. I mean you could after all paint out everything and have a simple shape, but keeping the complexity but also pulling the complexity together into a whole. When I developed a blue shape that happened to also make sense out of the lighter shapes on either side and the details on the left-hand side.

RR:

Has there been a felt sense of incompletion throughout the process?

NA:

Oh yes, that is what keeps you going.

RR:

Then at a certain point everything feels right?

NA:

Yes. Step by step by step and finally right. It always feels right at some point. Now sometimes I will look back at that and say well that was an illusion, it wasn't true, it didn't work. But for the most part, as in the case of this piece, it still holds together for me. The balance between the parts we are talking about.

RR:

Do you still feel connected to natural shapes and forms at this point let alone abstractions?

NA:

No. No less so, much less so. No, these exist in a world that is painting. Pure painting. Very little connection I would say to natural phenomena. Even though it may have had its origin there.

RR:

Can you talk a little bit about the separate panels?

NA:

Yes. The dual panels started as a practical measure but it is interesting to me as a formal device because you are always composing from the edges in, whatever edges you have. Now, with a rectangle you only have four edges but I have two more edges here, so I worked from the center out and from the outside in. Then you are trying at the same time to see the whole rectangle together because I work on them as one connected whole. But I am using the center line as a way to focus attention on composition that defines the whole rather than allows the center to disappear as is often the case where you don't have the dividing device in the middle. Now it has become another compositional element for organizing the whole.

RR:

A moment earlier I had an odd sense looking at these paintings. Typically, the first thing you do is you look for the center, right, and you tend to stand in the middle when you look at the painting. But if I am standing in the middle I am just looking at the edge and this is a little disturbing. Normally the edges are in your peripheral field, they frame your vision, but instead of having the edges frame my vision now I am actually confronted with the edge right in the middle of the painting.

NA:

Well, clearly you either try to obliterate it by acting as though it is not there and letting the imagery go back and forth from side to side or acting self-consciously as though it is there and having everything butt against it. Well I am trying to do both. I am trying to have some forms stop at the edge and center edge, which you can see on the upper left hand, the left panel at the top of the blue. The blue as it moves over to the lighter area. Then having it do the opposite when the blue connects with the opposite side. So you play it back and forth all the way up and down that edge.

RR:

Has your thinking and interests in the center line shifted at all as you began using it as a device?

NA:

I use it in some case and not in others. The most recent pieces use a dual panel.

RR:

Let's jump back to the broader, more, I guess, existential question that you were raising.

Art today doesn't have the kind of mass audience that film has so by being a painter in the first place you are already engaged in a practice that you must have accepted is going to communicate to a far smaller audience.

NA:

True.

RR:

Although the audience is smaller, one might wonder why this issue even crosses your mind? Why does it seem to trouble you or become something that you notice?

NA:

Because it is about communication. I don't make these paintings just for myself. I make them to go out of my studio to enter the world and be received however. Once they leave then they belong to whoever is out there, whoever wants to take possession of them by looking or whatever, but I am addressing the issues that I like to believe other people would be interested in, the issues of visual communication. Purely visual communication. Aside from story telling because I don't think there is a story here to be told.

RR:

Recently, there has been an increasing talk about "affect"— focusing less strictly on the communicative functions of works of art and more on emotions, affects, and taking those affects seriously. One thing I am wondering is what kind of emotion or experience are you having when you look at the painting, at different parts of it? What emotions or experiences do you imagine your ideal viewer having?

NA:

Hard to speak for the ideal viewer. I think since I am focused on the way things look I am hoping the viewer can focus on what is in front of their eyes when they are looking at the painting because that is what I am looking at, that is what the piece is about. It is about what you see, and in that respect a lot of it is self referential. It does not refer to things outside the painting as much, even though I think that is not literally the case. The focus is meant to be on what you see. The joy of visual experience, and that satisfaction that I get out of it when it is complete, when things fit together I get a joy…a satisfaction.

RR:

You don't want to use the word joy?

NA:

All right I will use the word joy. I think the joy of accomplishment.

RR:

So that's your accomplishment as a painter. You set yourself a challenge.

NA:

Start with the parts.

RR:

And it is a question of how to construct a whole out of these parts and you describe this as the process.

NA:

Hold the randomness together. Absolutely. This is the day-to-day act of painting.

RR:

Then at some point you conclude you've succeeded or you scrap the painting, right? But all the paintings on view, you concluded that you have succeeded.

NA:

I have a clearer idea of what it is I am trying to do and so will eventually be able to, almost always, conclude the process. It may take longer or shorter periods of time.

RR:

What is the experience that you have being a viewer of the painting?

NA:

Oh, as I say the joy of resolution. All over rightness. That's the best I can say.

RR:

Do you get a sense that the experience of these works is different on account of these different colors and shapes? I mean is there a different temperament that these paintings have or affect or emotion that they seem to provide or embody on account of the particular colors, particular color combinations?

NA:

Well, I wanted to address this theme which emerged as the first piece was near completion and I saw the red, white and blue of the American flag as a possible reference.

RR:

But when you understand something as a quartet as you have, you are imagining, I take it ...

NA:

Quartet in the sense of music, a musical quartet.

RR:

Right, but of having different movements.

NA:

Yes.

RR:

Then these different movements have different temperaments about them.

NA:

That's right. The were meant as four temperaments, that would be a good way of putting it.

RR:

Now that we are looking at No. 3 (page 17) how would you compare the temperament of this to the one we spent so much time with No. 2 (page 27)?

NA:

Quieter. Closer relationships. Less contrast. I had in mind in making this painting the third movement in a quartet which is usually the quieter one. By that I mean, the colors are pulled closer together in value and as far as the distribution of colors fewer. Fewer colors, mainly blues, blue greens, a little bit of yellow, ochre, so on. The idea is to pull the whites and the colors next to them closer in value so that the whites didn't come off the surface.

RR:

Let's see if we can again zero in on specific aspects of the painting, to put into words some of the things that you are seeing in it. I want to ask you two questions. One: is there
a particular part of this painting that causes you the most delight or interest or excitement? Two: is there a part that you have some lingering doubts about and if you could talk about both?

NA:

The lingering doubts have disappeared but yes there is a section here and this section here that roughly work particularly well and they do because of this section here and this one because of those around it. This would be in relation to this. What I like in this painting is the relationships of the linear elements to the forms around them. In other words, the white shapes here and the shapes around that. Now in this painting they are closer together. They are much closer together.

RR:

Closer together in what sense?

NA:

In value. Closer in value (narrower range from light to dark). That is what this painting is a about really. In other words, when you step back different parts of the painting come together, connect, and later on when you look at it other parts connect and so on. It is kind of constantly, unfolding complexity.

RR:

Constantly emerging complexity.

NA:

Yeah.

RR:

Is that something too that you value in a painting— that when you look at it one day you notice and derive pleasure from a certain section and then when you come back the next day it is not just that section that you derive pleasure from, but some other section?

NA:

That is the kind of thing that you hope for when you are making the painting since you are working on it every day. It has got to be interesting everyday. It has to be complex enough so that every day you see new parts, new things come out. Now, I haven't seen this particular painting for maybe a month. Now I see things here that I didn't see before.

I guess I am attracted to the details in the parts that I mentioned, but I know that the details in the part I mentioned could not exist without what is outside them, so it is just a matter of speaking. It is all interconnected. You can't separate one thing out, except to speak about it.

RR:

This section is of interest to you for the way that it enables the elements to emerge in all of its complexity and richness?

NA:

Yes. I think the language… I cannot think of the language to talk about the fact that it is all interrelated even though we speak about different parts. The different parts are dependent on the whole. It is a matter of pulling something out to speak about it, but actually it can't come out, it can't be pulled away. It has to be part of everything else or it couldn't exist.

RR:

Can you say more about the title of the show— "Quartet for America"?

NA:

Over the years I have become more and more conscious of being an "American artist." I think because I see it as under threat from inside and outside. I am much more aware of the privilege of being able to pursue my career as an artist in this country and how others don't have that privilege for various reasons.

RR:

So it is a dedication to the career, the career being the career of an American artist.

When you say others don't have that luxury what are you referring to?

NA:

Well, I am referring to people in other countries who don't have that privilege for numbers of reasons. Either political, financial, or people in this country who don't have that privilege.

RR:

So this is a privilege you need to acknowledge...

NA:

Well I don't need to but I do. I am acknowledging it as a reflection on a career of having done what I have done. Being able to do that and being able to continue. I am just more aware of threats to the life we took for granted.

RR:

Can you say more about that?

NA:

Well yes, I am talking about political forces that are destructive in our country. What I am hearing is the language I remember of fascism—supporting bigotry, racism and intolerance.

RR:

So, for you, abstraction — in addition to all the other aspects that it takes on — is now or perhaps more so than ever responding a sense of freedom under threat?

NA:

Yes, that's correct. That's a good way to put it. Freedom under threat. Now that's just how I perceive what's going on. Kerry Mae Weems has suggested artists might dedicate their work to the memory of the Obama presidency. That would be a great purpose for my "Quartet."

I am more conscious of these issues than I have been. Obviously this kind of painting does not make a direct political statement except for the fact it exists. That it can exist or that it exists. That's a statement within itself. That the object is possible and the place to show it is possible and here it is.

RR:

This is number one. Why did this take the most time?

NA:

Well, it didn't work out at first. This is where I defined what I was trying to do in this series and the others came faster because by then I knew where I was going. This one went through many changes while I discovered what it was that I was doing.

CB:

For instance, what kind of changes?

NA:

Well, the colors, the value of how you balance one part and another…how you get parts to fit together so one part doesn't get overwhelmed. At one point the red shapes all seemed to pull away from the ground on which they existed. I worked on the edges to get the adjacent white shapes to keep the reds in position.

CB:

So the idea emerged here.

RR:

One thing that strikes me about your painting in comparison to other abstract paintings—maybe I am thinking about mostly minimalists abstraction Ryman, Brice Marden, Agnes Martin, and Frank Stella—Our conversation has lasted over an hour that we have been talking, within that hour we have been working through these paintings taking a long time to absorb them. I am trying to imagine sitting in front of a painting by say, Agnes Martin, (this is not a value judgment). I don't think we would sit here in the same way. One would not experience things in an hour in front of an Agnes Martin that you didn't have five minutes into it.

NA:

Well, I do think these paintings emerge more slowly because of their complexity. Absolutely. That's intentional. I have resisted the path of reduction as a solution to abstraction. Maximal rather than minimal.

RR:

So what artist do you think of that work in a more maximalist vein?

NA:

Well…you know I thought about Brice Marden's work a lot although I have a different sense of scale. But I also thought about, as you mentioned before, Kandinsky and some other early abstractionists who were more interested in complexity.

RR:

With the colors and shapes here, for example, I immediately think of Matisse. But, I also see some of the early abstract expressionists. I see de Kooning and in the larger shapes I see Frankenthaler. But, mostly ... if I had to pick an American painter it would be de Kooning.

Not in the application of paint but in terms of a painting that really requires a tremendous amount of time to feel as though you have grasped it.

NA:

Well, I think de Kooning would be a good comparison—what we both have in common a sort of cubist structure and the intricacies of the all-over composition.

I have seen certain paintings of Pollock, like "Autumn Rhythm," maybe twenty-five times and each time I have seen something new. I can't say that about everybody else's work. Let's say Frank Stella's black paintings are not visual in the same sense but instead, they are very clear, didactic statements, rationalist painting.

CB:

Much more about what?

NA:

Details.

CB:

Yeah. For instance the areas that almost have webbing affects, which you have used in many paintings, not just the Quartet.

NA:

Yeah, they are. They are webbing. That is their origin anyway.

RR:

Can you say a little more about this issue of freedom and its relationship to perhaps to painting in general then abstraction a little bit more precisely and then your particular mode of abstraction?

You describe a certain kind…precarious nature of freedom around the globe and even in the US.

NA:

Well, you know paintings like I am doing are not for everybody and so it requires indulgence and a tolerance to allow them to exists even. Because they won't really contribute to the all over good. The world could probably survive without them, so I am appreciative of the fact that I have been allowed the time and energy to do this work, to accept my idea of what is worth doing. Also, I would like to thank the Bridgette Mayer Gallery for investing the time and money in bringing this work before a wider audience. That's about all I can say.