



Robert Hobbs, *Richard Jackson: Expanding Painting's Limits*. New York: Yvon Lambert, 2007.

Text © Robert Hobbs

**RICHARD JACKSON**

Richard Jackson:  
Expanding Painting's Limits  
by Robert Hobbs

*If art and criticism are to continue to play an oppositional and interventionist role in our time, passive acceptance and reproduction of a powerful cultural tradition like abstract art will simply not do.*

—W.J.T. MITCHELL, "Ut Pictura Theoria," 1989

**RICHARD JACKSON'S EXHIBITION** at Yvon Lambert New York provides a unique opportunity to look critically at his work since it surveys two of his important earlier pieces and two new works. The exhibition begins with the type of wall painting Jackson has been creating since the late 1960s, and this work plus his *The Bedroom*—originally produced between 1976–1982, then destroyed, and recreated in a new form in 2002—together with his recent *The Delivery Room* and *The War Room* comprise a mini-survey of his work. Because of its range, this exhibition enables us to consider ways that Jackson has, in his words, "expanded painting." He has broadened its scope by analyzing it epistemologically to ascertain the type of knowledge it has and continues to convey, and his analyses have taken the form of literal and lowbrow equivalents for painting's functions. Not content with presenting these deconstructed elements Jackson has re-inscribed within them the act of painting as a series of premeditated yet incalculable accidents with distinct affinities to the disruptive, immanent force French philosopher Jean François Lyotard has termed "the figural."

Jackson's epistemological analysis of painting connects him to a grand tradition that reaches as far back as Marcel Duchamp's summation work, *Tu'm* (1918) before moving forward to include Robert Rauchenberg's combines such as his parodic *Charlene* (1954) and preposterous *Bed* (1955) as well as such works by Jasper Johns as his *Painting with Two Balls* (1960). This shift in outlook distances itself from (1) the time-honored view of painting as a preeminent form, representing aspects of the world, including the artist's feelings, that harks back to the cave paintings at Lascaux and (2) the more recent celebration of its formal limits, which are a result of the art-for-art's sake tendencies that such nineteenth-century painters as Whistler and Bonnard promulgated. If we are to appreciate Jackson's contributions to this transformed view of painting, we need to consider briefly the nature, origin and scope of knowledge it has been conveying. This is the approach Duchamp was able to initiate several years after formulating his Readymades. Creating these works that are capable of questioning art's ontological status, Duchamp was able to move quickly to the related problem of analyzing painting's variously ascribed functions in terms of equivalent signs taken from both the world at large and his own earlier work.

As Duchamp observed,

*What interested them [traditional painters] was to express their idea of the divinity, under one form or other. Thus, without doing the same thing, there is this idea of mind, in any case, that pure painting is not interesting in itself as an end. For me the goal is something else, it is a combination, or at least an expression that only the grey matter can succeed in rendering.<sup>a</sup>*

Veering away from traditional painting and its long-held aspirations to serve as the springboard for transcendent experiences, Duchamp ushered in a new, analytic role for painting with *Tu'm*, a summa of the art form, made specifically for his friend Katherine Dreier's Connecticut library and a work that was intended to culminate and end painting's paramount role as a viable category.

As a student in 1949 at Black Mountain College, while Abstract Expressionist Robert Motherwell was then compiling *Dada Painters and Poets: An Anthology*, published in 1951,<sup>b</sup> Robert Rauschenberg was, in my opinion, sufficiently versed in the protocols of Duchamp's *Tu'm* to use the dry wit of its critique as a means for undermining the seriousness of Abstract Expressionist painting. In the mid-1950s—just before Motherwell painted his *Je t'aime* series (1955–57) that reverses the order of Duchamp's ironic *Tu'm* in order to underscore his affirmative embrace of painting—Rauschenberg sardonically composed his Neo-Dadaist combine *Charlene*. This combine undermines painting's grandiosity even to the point of deflating the role titles assumed in Abstract Expressionist works, which often relied on atavistic and mythic names to reference the unconscious's presumed



RICHARD JACKSON IN HIS STUDIO,  
January 2007

primordial nature. In this way Rauschenberg was able to parody the vaunted mystery of this type of art, particularly the use of such hyperbolic titles as Motherwell's *Elegy to the Spanish Republic* series (begun 1948) and Barnett Newman's *Onement* (1948), by simply choosing a girl's name as the title for his painting.

Jasper Johns was also subject to some of the same mid-century Abstract Expressionist and Dadaist forces at work when the New York School was still in its hegemony and the Duchamp revival was beginning to gear up interest. Unlike Rauschenberg who enacted a slap-dash and seemingly freewheeling critique of painting so improvisational in its appearances that it seemed serendipitous (an approach Rauschenberg brilliantly cultivated), Johns undertook a focused and unrelenting look at New York School painting. He staged a series of small ruptures that denaturalized painting as an art form, so that it could once again be seen as a highly artificial means for conveying meaning. In his work, art becomes a means for enumerating and questioning naturalized processes and assumptions so that applied paint can be seen as thoughtful, inspirational, accidental, and even mindless and still be understood as the basis for legitimate painting. In some of his pieces, he has included a number of simple devices for applying paint, including brooms and rulers that appear to regulate different individual strokes or merge them together like a squeegee would. Rather than actually cohering passages of oil paint, these devices—most notably *Device Circle* (1959)—serve mainly a decorative and thematic purpose in encaustic works. Just as these nontraditional painterly instruments make fun of the Abstract Expressionists' pride in using such industrial materials as Duco enamel and house painters' brushes, so Johns' decision to open the surface of a canvas in *Painting with Two Balls*, in order to insert two small spheres into the resultant, almost vaginal-like interstice, makes fun of the idea of Abstract Expressionist macho posturing. In addition to originating these ways to transform painting from a preeminently representational medium to a critical one intent on reframing painting's assumed *modus operandi* in absurdist terms, Johns has emphasized the materiality of paint and canvas instead of dwelling on only surface effects. Early in his career he attached the front of a small stretched canvas to the surface of a large one in a work positivistically labeled, *Canvas* (1956), thus revealing its stretchers, and then he covered both in encaustic. In other works of the late '50s he has parodied painting's assumed role as a place for hanging ideas or enclosing them by making the subject of one work a clothes hanger and another an image of a drawer.

Since 1960, Richard Jackson has continued to be deeply impressed by Johns' interrogative and parodic work. His first personal encounter with it had all the force of a conversion. As he has recounted:

*In 1960 there was a guy in Sacramento who owned a music store. His wife was into contemporary art, and she liked my work and that of another artist. So they decided to underwrite a trip for us to go to New York and see the newest art there. It was during Christmas time that we went. I remember seeing a Franz Kline show as well as Jasper Johns' Painting with Two Balls—it was either in an art gallery or at the Whitney—I don't remember which. And it was the most amazing painting I had ever seen. I believe that I saw Johns' Numbers at the Guggenheim. I also saw Stella at the time but was not much impressed with his work at the time.<sup>c</sup>*

Over the years, Jackson has titled two of his works after Johns' *Painting with Two Balls*. "One," he recalled, "is very traditional and what I would call romantic and the other is more of a performance piece. In my mind what I'm trying to do is what I've always done: to extend painting. In this case, it's a specific painting."<sup>d</sup>

Just as Johns picked up on both Duchamp's and Rauschenberg's epistemological approaches and personalized them in his encaustic paintings, so Jackson continues Johns' questions about painting's role even though he is not restrained by Johns' existential views of it as constituting an absurd yet necessary set of conventions. Jackson's move away from existentialism enabled him to separate himself from the dominant question that had served as a frame for Duchamp's, Rauschenberg's, and Johns' art, namely, "what is painting?" and to ask instead, "why painting?" This subtle yet important distinction has enabled him to take painting in an entirely new direction. In his lexicon, painting is not a given that must be perpetuated even as it is being critiqued. Instead, he considers that painting, including its prerogatives and unknowns, must be reestablished with each new work. For him, painting is not a freely given legacy as it was for the three aforementioned painters because it must be regained as an unknowable element haunting each new work.

Maturing as an artist in the late 1960s and early '70s when both Minimalists and Conceptual artists were seriously questioning painting's legitimacy, Jackson was aware that if one accepts at the outset painting as a norm, one is barred from interrogating art as a category, because painting already accepts many preconditions identified with art. Since his Los Angeles-based Eugenia Butler Gallery also represented Conceptual artist Joseph Kosuth,<sup>e</sup> Jackson was fully aware of Kosuth's observation that painting precludes artists from making the type of critical assessments about art in general that Kosuth and other Conceptual artists were deeming necessary. At a time when both Jackson and Kosuth were showing at the Eugenia Butler Gallery, Kosuth was pointing out Conceptual art's

ability to stratify formerly sacrosanct boundaries by working within as well as outside the limits of such established media as painting:

*Rather than presenting an inward-turning world, as painting had, I saw this new work doing quite the opposite: it began the process of looking outward, making the context important. I began to realize that the issue for art was to examine its context, and in the process one would be investigating meaning, and ultimately, reality. An important point then, about so-called "minimal art," was that it was neither painting nor sculpture, but simply art.<sup>f</sup>*

Jackson's first mature works, his *Wall Paintings*, which were initiated in the late 1960s and created mostly in the '70s, accord with this argument for an outward move, which Jackson regarded literally as a wonderfully absurd proposition. For him, it involved a process of refocusing while expanding painting's traditional purview, involving transgressing the space circumscribed by his canvases in order to embrace the walls supporting them. Although these early works might appear to have a basis in Robert Motherwell's group of monumental works from the early '50s, which are also called *Wall Paintings*, in actual fact they are sustained meditations on Frank Stella's *Protractor Series* and also critiques of them. Stella's large series of monumental shaped canvases from the late 1960s were ostensibly based on the overall decorative patterns attainable by using the graduated semicircular drafting tools known as protractors, which enable one to draw and measure angles. Turning his canvases into painted surfaces for creating monotype-like impressions before employing them as rudimentary protractors, Jackson places them face down against a wall before moving them in one direction and then leaving them firmly in place with paint acting as the binder connecting them to the wall. Often he employs several canvases to create a pattern of multiple arcs or quadrants resulting in his distinctive *Wall Paintings*, which consist of both painted designs and the canvases used to realize them. Jackson's *Wall Paintings* are thus specific installations rather than portable precious objects. Playing with critic Clement Greenberg's dogmatic and reductive views regarding modernist art, which is supposed to be both self-evident and self-reflexive and as concerned with itself as well as with its inherent materials and mode of being made, Jackson pastiches these ideas by redirecting them to dramatically new ends in his *Wall Paintings*.

The ensuing mixture of tasteful design and brash mode of achieving it that distinguishes Jackson's *Wall Paintings* and is also important for his later works has antecedents in his early years in Sacramento, California. A student at Sacramento State College from 1959-61 where he studied art and engineering, Jackson remained in Sacramento in order



to run the school's art gallery. While living there he established contacts with faculty and students at the neighboring University of California, Davis, which is located just across the river. At Davis such artist/faculty members as Robert Arneson and Wayne Thiebaud were each becoming known in the 1960s for work involving a healthy disrespect for tradition. Arneson celebrated the fecundity of bad taste, which was important for his transformation of Japanese-inspired pottery into a funky and critical medium joining aspects of painting with sculpture. One of his most infamous early pieces was a riff on Duchamp's urinal that assumed the form of an eccentric ceramic toilet complete with turds in it. Although Thiebaud appeared to be more circumspect than his colleague Arneson, he reconfigured painting as an ersatz confection bordering on cake decoration, which he analogized in terms of images of deli cases filled with cakes and pies and other mass-produced food-stuffs. Both artists provided Jackson as well as his close friend Bruce Nauman, an Arneson student, with a respect for breaking rules and disparaging sacrosanct traditions.

As part of this quest for irreverence, which, according to Jackson, has distinct affiliations with Chicago's Hairy Who,<sup>9</sup> Jackson organized an exhibition at the Sacramento State art gallery focusing on Peter Saul's *Vietnam* series and even acquired a work from this series for the school's collection.<sup>11</sup> An important influence on the Hairy Who, Saul has managed in his work to insult as many constituencies as possible by creating distinctly hot-hued paintings jostling with quirky imagery that join high-art means, zany *Mad Magazine*-type comics, bathroom humor, and political critique.

Taken together, the interplays in Arneson's, Thiebaud's, and Saul's work between painting as good and bad taste, a subject for discussion and critique, a means for action as well as a category of thought, and a structure to be emulated and also desecrated provided Richard Jackson with a healthy disrespect for the vocation of becoming a painter.

Added to this was the Americanization of Zen, which also became an important California pop-culture phenomenon that transformed this Eastern philosophical approach into a hedonistic, yet wholly disrespectful feel-good means for coming to terms with the ever-present now. Taken together these various influences comprise a number of vital components that have made Jackson such a skeptic of painting's established means and methods and such a celebrant of its possibilities. Apropos the subject of Zen, Jackson noted that it was "a big influence on the West Coast" and then quipped, "There must be something to it because nobody is going door-to-door trying to sell it."<sup>11</sup>

With the *Wall Paintings* Jackson enacts a shift of paramount importance to both his overall work and his conception of the artist's role. Although he might remain the artist, who sets

in process a series of actions, it can be argued that, beginning with the *Wall Paintings*, he diminishes the preciousness associated with the painter's traditional role. Even though he might apply paint to his canvases in a variety of configurations and then push the wet canvas along a wall so that distinct patterns result, the painted canvas collaborates in making the art in qualitative ways that differ from using traditional brushes and palette knives. In this respect Jackson's work can be considered in terms of such mid-twentieth-century innovations as (1) Yves Klein's anthropometrics where women's bodies were covered with paint and then used to make paintings, (2) Jean Tinguely's metamechanics or painting machines, and (3) Niki de Saint-Phalle's shooting paintings made with a .22 caliber rifle that exploded paint containers, which in turn spilled their contents over a wooden base board. While sustaining this tradition of making art through indirect means so that the artist's new tools participate in the process, Jackson's series also makes fun of the highly lauded, 1950s-era *ARTnews* series that regularly chronicled one painter working on an individual work. In each of these essays, the painter in question is viewed as a heroic figure wrestling with an intractable material in order to realize his or her vision. Differing from this broadly existential approach toward creativity, Jackson's laid-back attitude is more in line with nineteenth-century art-for-art's-sake thinking, albeit with a distinctly ironic twist since the canvas is active rather than passive. No longer remaining an inert surface that is the intended recipient of the artist's feelings, goals, etc., the canvas is an active participant that supplants the brush and paints its own picture on its background wall, thus bringing into focus the room where the work is created and presented. Although some people consider these works theatrical in their outlook, Jackson has adamantly maintained that they are not:

*The wall paintings were never performances. They are evidences of performances. I like to activate a work in private. Viewers see how the work was performed; they take their ideas from the completed piece. People need to imagine how a work is made.<sup>1</sup>*

Of crucial importance to these *Wall Paintings* yet overlooked in the critical literature on them is the role played by the painted surface of the canvas itself, which is never revealed to the public. In place of Greenberg's emphasis on the instantaneity of seeing a given modernist painting, Jackson opts for the delays involved in reconstructing a given work's past. Its privacy symbolizes the unknown factor in all painting—the unquantifiable element that can never be entirely predicted at the outset and the ongoing mystery that Jackson has decided to preserve and even enhance in his completed work.

In Zen fashion, Jackson connects painting's unknown with the present and severs its

connections with both the past and the future so that it constitutes one incalculable and, at times, explosive moment. As he has emphasized:

*Again the thing that is wrong with the painting process is that it is an editing process, you make ten paintings and have an exhibition showing the best five. My work doesn't edit anything, it's evidence of a work performed, of a process.<sup>k</sup>*

Over the years and in a number of works, Jackson has emphasized the act of painting as the unknown inhabiting his painting. In the 1980s he created a series of works in which the entire painted surface is hidden, and he called them *Big Ideas*. Consisting of stacks of literally hundreds and even several thousand paintings stacked together with thickly applied paint acting as a type of mortar, these works are not tremendous in size, even though they are enormously ambitious, particularly when one considers that they were entirely made and financed by a single person. Jackson has emphasized the work component in his *Big Ideas*:

*In every case (1,000 pictures, 800 paintings, 3,000 paintings) the artist made every stretcher, stretched, primed, painted, and stacked each painting. This is important to note, 100 per day, 3,000 in 30 days. Scale is only important if accomplished by an individual. If a company makes 100 canvases a day, no big deal, if an individual does 100 after working all day, it has a different scale about presentation, knowledge.<sup>l</sup>*

In this statement Jackson sounds as if he is recasting the type of Zen koan that underscores the prosaic nature of experience both before and after enlightenment when he



RICHARD JACKSON'S STUDIO

succinctly concludes, "That is what the stacked paintings are about, one idea and a thousand paintings." His emphasis on the work component involved in making this art focuses entirely on the prosaic aspects of constructing so many paintings and leaves the poetics of such an enterprise unspoken. In this situation, art may be regarded as the sum total of the artist's activity that pokes fun at Abstract Expressionist histrionics regarding monumental wall paintings and meaningful content inherent in abstract form. Even more importantly, Jackson's stacked works dramatize the fact that the act of painting itself remains a mystery to viewers who are never made privy to the artist's painted surfaces. In this way, he has truly extended painting into a realm that can neither be rationally understood nor subjected to visual review: it becomes a sign of the inscrutability of life itself that is found in even the most mundane activities.

The same conjunction between an inordinate amount of preparatory work and a rapid improvisational painting process that is found in the *Big Ideas* series also occurs in Jackson's two *Bedrooms* (1976-1982 and 2002 respectively), *The Delivery Room* (2007), and *The War Room* (2007). The main difference between his *Big Ideas* and his room installations is that the artist himself undertook all the work in the former series, while in the rooms he has employed machines to disperse the paint, making one think of the film *What a Way to Go* in which Paul Newman played an expatriate American in Paris, who created giant robots capable of translating sounds into brushstrokes, thus creating paintings by proxy.<sup>m</sup> Jackson's four rooms belong to an even larger group of enclosures that the artist envisioned in a 2005 drawing, listing the following types of rooms: drawing, board, dining, living, bed, family, laundry, mail, delivery, waiting, green, war, bath, clean, viewing, bar, trophy, front, ball, maid's, powder, cloak, ladies, mens', cutting, dark, and weight room.<sup>n</sup> His *Bedrooms* no doubt were intended to appropriate and extend Rauschenberg's infamous combine *Bed*, which simulates the artist's own sleeping accommodation complete with a Log Cabin quilt—an oblique comment no doubt on American history and the U.S.'s post-World War II artistic developments—that is partially overlaid with highly aggressive doodles, daubs, and drips of paint, which literalize the Abstract Expressionists' quest to come to terms with their unconscious dreams. Apropos of Jackson's first *Bedroom*, museum curator Walter Hopps noted, "All this served for the most excessive drenching, splattering, and whip lashing of paint I've ever experienced. This work was 'action panting' taken to its literal extreme," referring, of course, to the term critic Harold Rosenberg popularized in the early '50s as a way to categorize the gestural abstraction of such artists as Jackson Pollock and Willem de Kooning.<sup>o</sup> Raising the ante in his later *Bedroom*, Jackson constructed a mechanical lift to hoist a bed liberally covered with paint to the ceiling of his specially constructed room before spinning it around to create a circular ceiling painting before lowering it down to its original height.

The resulting installation painting, which was completed before viewers were allowed to see it, creates a vertiginous effect that is both visceral and disconcerting. Again, painting in this piece, as in other Jackson work, is realized in a momentary act, which the artist may have set in action but which is ultimately beyond his control.

In *The Delivery Room* and *The War Room* Jackson plays with painting's potentially creative and destructive roles, with one implicated in the other, as he once again equates painting less with a medium than with the force of life itself. The narrative metaphor for *The Delivery Room* is the racetrack with the husband/cameraman/voyeur wearing the chequered black-and-white colors of a NASCAR referee as he urges the woman, red-hot with heat, to keep delivering babies, i.e. to keep creating. His view is legitimized through his TV camera that records his spouse's and also her doctor's activities that are occasions for the eruption of paint-cum-bodily-fluids that are spattered throughout this installation soon after it is first installed, and this image is played in turn on a television monitor outside the room and in the gallery where the installation is located. In addition to this mechanized perspective, viewers are provided with a peephole that characterizes their looking as voyeuristic. In this piece, paint is equated with fluids attending the arrival of new life. Seen in conjunction with the companion piece, *The War Room*, this emphasis on new life assumes tragic proportions when one realizes that the metaphor of birth has been used repeatedly by Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice to characterize the new order that the Iraqi war is intended to realize.

In *The War Room* Jackson takes both Buckminster Fuller's Dymaxion map, which was patented in 1946, and Jasper Johns' 1967 painted version of it to create the inside and outside surfaces of his polyhedral model of planet earth, which is populated by ducks dressed as generals.<sup>9</sup> The use of these two Dymaxion map projections impacts our understanding of this piece since this map exhibits less distortion of the relative sizes of land masses and bodies of water than Mercator projections and less deformation of overall land and sea masses than Gall-Peters maps. In both its accuracy and its refusal to subscribe to the cultural biases of earlier global views that regarded the northern hemisphere as superior to the southern one, the Dymaxion map presents a more level playing field for war games than is usually the case. Buckminster Fuller regarded the Dymaxion map as an important tool in helping to solve world problems because it accurately presents the world without previous misconceptions and biases. When he helped to establish the World Game Institute in 1972, Fuller built on a host of ideas formative to the creation of the Dymaxion map, including the development of realistic solutions for waging war on humanity's true enemies, which include hunger, illiteracy, insufficient health care, and pollution of the environment. He believed that one of the first steps in waging war on these enemies was

to formulate a more realistic view of planet Earth. In *The War Room*, this objective and idealistic field of action that is the stage for Jackson's work gives rise to one-foot-tall oil derricks that pump paint instead of oil over the piece after it is set up for the first time. Instead of remaining analogous to bodily fluids, as is the case with *The Delivery Room*, paint in *The War Room* is equated with the earth's viscous energy resource, oil, which continues to be a background issue for the Iraqi War and a reason for many of the world's long-term energy and pollution problems. In *The War Room* Jackson's ducks—wearing uniforms making them resemble World War I soldiers—call to mind an often discussed 1970s book entitled *How to Read Donald Duck: Imperialist Ideology in the Disney Comic* by Ariel Dorman and Armand Mattelart. This critique of Disney's ideological treatment of third-world citizens may have been a factor in Jackson's use of these birds in *The War Room*, particularly when one considers his recent statement, "You don't have to be PC to be a great artist—and Disney was a great artist."<sup>9</sup> Both the oil derricks and the ducks in charge of the Dymaxion-mapped territory in *The War Room* dramatize the absurdity of combat as well as the problems of climate change, depletion of natural resources, and the concomitant problem of population explosion that the artist has pointed to as issues relevant to this work.<sup>1</sup> Created as a stage for painting, this work mirrors on a global level the potent creative/destructive aspects that such resources as oil are capable of engendering socially, economically, and politically, and paint is capable of representing symbolically.

This creative/destructive capacity brings us closer to Jackson's understanding of painting, which assumes the unpredictability of an immanent and inexplicable force capable of breaking out of the structures from which it originated. His conception of painting moves beyond Duchamp's, Rauschenberg's, and Johns' because it is pre-semiotic and thus unable to be reduced to sets of codes. While it exhibits parallels with Johns' incommensurabilities—his nonaligned colors and names of colors—it goes beyond them to resemble a libidinal force and unpredictable release even though it emanates from machines and mannequins attached to these machines. While Jackson follows the three aforementioned artists in their epistemological quest to deconstruct and debunk truisms about the established traditions of painting that preceded each of them, he takes the additional step of allowing painting the power to disturb his own ongoing system of finding literal equivalents for known artistic functions, thereby remaining intractable. This type of extraordinary disruption that constitutes the act of painting in Jackson's art is akin to Lyotard's figural, which opposes and deregulates systems of discourse and rational thought. As Lyotard concluded in "Painting as a Libidinal Set-up":

*Our hypothesis (and our conviction) here, based on the movement of polymorphism in contemporary painting and economy, has been that the force of what is*

*painted does not reside in its referential power, in its seduction, its "difference," in its status as signifier (or signified), and that is to say, in its lack, but in its plenitude of switchable libido."*<sup>5</sup>

In its plenitude and sheer excess, Richard Jackson's painting shares the openness and quixotic nature of the libido described by Lyotard. But even while it appears to celebrate aspects of the human, his painting is being extended to mannequins and machines that betoken its potential post-human role, thus continuing Jackson's professed goal to extend painting's limits.

---

**ROBERT HOBBS** holds the Rhoda Thalheimer Endowed Chair in the Department of Art History at Virginia Commonwealth University and is Visiting Professor at Yale University. He is the author of many books, including monographs on Edward Hopper, Mark Lombardi, Lee Krasner, Robert Smithson, Kara Walker, and John Wesley.

## NOTES

- a Robert Motherwell, ed., *The Dada Painters and Poets: An Anthology* (New York: Wittenborn, Schultz, 1951).
- b Ibid.
- c Richard Jackson, Interview with Author, 7 December 2007, Miami.
- d Richard Jackson, "Unusual Behavior: Ping Pong: Internet Interview with Hans-Ulrich Obrist and Alberta Mayo," 7 September 1998, in *Richard Jackson: Deer Beer* (Zurich: Hauser & Wirth Gallery and Oktagon, 1998), p. 20.
- e Other artists at this prescient gallery included John Baldessari, James Lee Byars, Richard Hamilton, Ed Kienholz, and Dieter Roth.
- f Joseph Kosuth, *Art After Philosophy and After: Collected Writings, 1966-1990*, ed. Gabriele Guercio (Cambridge and London: MIT Press, 1991), p. 90. This statement is from an unpublished lecture delivered to art students in 1971 at the University of Chile, Santiago; Cleveland Art Institute; and Coventry College of Art, Coventry, England. Although his lecture was not published, it presents in a concise form Kosuth's ideas that were widely available elsewhere. It is cited here because of its precision.
- g Jackson, Interview with Author, 7 December 2006.
- h Ibid.
- i Ibid.
- j Ibid.
- k Jackson, "Unusual Behavior: Ping pong: Internet Interview with Hans-Ulrich Obrist and Alberta Mayo," p. 18.
- l Jeffrey Browning, "An Architecture of Paint: Richard Jackson's Installations," *Arts + Architecture* 3, No. 4 (1985): 46.
- m *What a Way to Go* was directed by J. Lee Thompson in 1964.
- n In 2004 he created *Living Room*, a small replica with a floor attached to a motor capable of rotating it as well as the objects in it at such a velocity that when the artist poured buckets of paint into it, splatters covered the room and extended to the gallery floors and walls.
- o Harold Rosenberg, "The American Action Painters," *ARTnews* 51, No. 8 (December 1952).
- p In consideration of Jackson's interest in hunting, which because the subject of his *Deer Beer* installation in 1997-1998 at Hauser & Wirth, Zurich, it is tempting to connect his subsequent reference to giants ducks in *Ducks in the Men's Room* (2006) and *The War Room* to duck blinds, which are places where hunters position themselves in order to see ducks. In hunting, blinds are places for hunters to see their prey without being seen; in art the word "blind" refers, of course, to the non-seeing that is part of the social critique in Jackson's work. In *Richard Jackson*, a catalogue that builds an extended metaphor between hunting and painting, edited by Angela Kotinkaduwa, Jennifer Liese, and Samantha Tsao (New York, London, and Paris: Haswelllediger & Co. Gallery, Nyehaus, Hauser & Wirth, Galerie Georges-Philippe & Nathalie Vallois, 2004) a photograph of Jackson resting adjacent to a duck blind with his dog Molly is reproduced on page 16. Alberta Mayo, Jackson's wife, made this photograph. In relation to Johns' famous work *Decoy* and Johns' importance for Jackson, it is tempting to view the hunting analogy as a response to this work by considering the lure as a duck decoy. In relation to the painting/hunting analogy, it is worth noting that Jackson makes the prey—the deer, ducks, and bear mannequins populating his installations—machines that generate painting, so that it becomes a mediated affair by creatures that appear natural even though they are highly artificial.
- q Jackson, Interview with Author, 7 December 2006.
- r Ibid.
- s Jean-François Lyotard, "Painting as a Libidinal Set-up" in Keith Crome and James Williams, eds., *The Lyotard Reader & Guide* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2006), p. 329.