

Verbatim Transcript: Dialogue with Adolph Gottlieb

May 1968

Interviewer: Andrew Hudson

H I was very delighted when I was asked to take part in this evening's conversation because I had experienced a previous interview with Adolph Gottlieb while I was on the Washington Post and it was one of the most enjoyable assignments I had. As always in the interviews I've also read of Adolph Gottlieb, he expressed himself very intelligently and articulately on his own painting and on his views of the art scene of today and yesterday. I wanted to ask him some questions today which I think maybe haven't been asked him before – sort of to increase our knowledge in the light of his experience.

This show that you have at the Corcoran here was of course shown in New York in two different museums, the Guggenheim and the Whitney. And the Guggenheim showed the pictographs and the Whitney showed the more recent paintings, the Abstract Landscape-type paintings and the Burst paintings, although of course these two series overlapped for about seven or eight years in the 50s.

However, it isn't what we might call a full retrospective, we aren't seeing Adolph Gottlieb's work from before 1941 and I would want to ask him to start with, if he had any memories or reminiscences of the 30s and the kind of discussions that the various groups of artists had in those years. And how it was that he himself changed from his realistic paintings—I've seen one(s) at College Park, the University of Maryland, of some people on a boat deck, I've seen others in reproduction of still-lives of sea objects. How was it that you changed to abstract paintings and the pictographs?

G Well, the 30s was a very special period in American art. As you know, it coincided with the depression of 1929 and every body was broke in 1930. It wasn't very bad being an artist because there was not stigma attached to not having any money. The thing that dominated the artistic scene in the 30s was the general idea of...Well, there were a few things. There was the American Scene, which was being done by painters' like Grant Wood and Thomas Benton, John Stewart Currey, etc., and then there was also another direction in the form of social realism.

My personal feeling was that I was sort of repelled by everything around me, as far as what was being done in American art. I think my background was pretty much like that of any French painter of my generation. I had studied in France and admired Cezanne and the Impressionists and Post-Impressionists, also the Cubists. And it seemed to me that what as being done in this country was provincial. In fact, there was a definite provincial movement: it was called regionalism. The W.P.A., for example, was encouraging this.

There seemed to be an idea that by being provincial you could develop an indigenous art of some kind.

On the other hand, I felt that art was international, that it should be cosmopolitan, it shouldn't be provincial, that art had always been produced in (the) large urban centers. And so that, as a young artists – and I was very young at the time – I was caught between the provincialism of the American art scene and the power of what was happening in Europe. And I felt that as an individualist I had to resist what was happening in Europe because I wanted to be my own man. On the other hand, it was easy to resist what was happening in America because I thought it was no good. So, nevertheless, this left me in somewhat of a dilemma. And so that in a way the story of my life is an attempt to – or at that time it was an attempt to resolve this dilemma. And I must admit that in the 30s I was sort of caught on the horns of this dilemma and I didn't know quite which was to go and I wasn't going in either one of these directions, but trying to steer a course which would enable me to find myself and do what I felt was. something that would be of some significance or anyway related to what I felt was a high standard. I don't know if that helps to clarify what happened in the 30s.

H Were the pictographs a kind of sudden change in your art?

G Well, the pictographs developed...Well, say, I did the first one in 1941 where this present exhibition starts and, well, that's where I sort of made the plunge or the break with everything that was considered to be upright American painting, or painting at all. It just didn't seem at the time as if I even know how to paint. Although. I had some experience as a painter, because in 1929 I won a national competition and had my first one-man show in 1930, so -- Well, in those days, it meant something to have a one-man show. It was different from the way it is today. In fact, this was a recognition that you were a professional and accepted painter. And so then by 1941 I had discarded all the things that might have won me a prize and so with the things I was doing in 1941 I couldn't possibly win any kind of a prize. In fact, I couldn't even get a show because it just looked as if I didn't know how to paint. I wasn't sure that I knew, myself. But I was fumbling, trying to find something which was breaking away from the establishment of that time.

H Did you find it was helpful....I gather there were several who felt that way.... or were your discussions together an encouragement and stimulation? Or do you feel it was something you did on your own?

G Yes...But there weren't many. I knew, for example, in the 30's I could say I knew every painter in New York, because there weren't so many painters, there were very few galleries, etc. In 1941 well, the thing as far as I was concerned started with some conversations that I had with Rothko in which I said, I think that one of the ways to solve this problem that confronts us is to find some sort of subject matter other than that which is around us.

Because everybody was painting the American scene: Mark was painting people in subway stations... I said, well, why not try to find a good subject that's different from these subjects -- and maybe it'll lead to something. I said, how about some classical subject matter like mythological themes? And, well, we agreed to do that, and Mark chose to do some themes from the plays, of Aeschylus and I tried, played around with the Oedipus myth which was both a classical theme and a Freudian theme. (And as a result) we found very quickly discovered that by a shift in subject matter we were getting into formal problems that we hadn't anticipated. Because obviously we weren't going to try to illustrate these themes in some sort of a Renaissance style. We were exploring. So we suddenly found that there were formal problems that confronted us for which there was no precedent, and we were in an unknown territory.

- H** What happened during the 40's? Did you find it very hard to find a public for your work, a public who were interested in it? Did they think it was not acceptable, when you started painting that way?
- G** Well, yes...it was very difficult to get an exhibition and....nevertheless, we managed-to show our paintings and I would say that by the middle 40's there was a lively interest in what we were doing and that and at the time when Peggy Guggenheim had her gallery, and Kootz had opened his gallery, there were a number of galleries of that time that were ready to show new work which seemed to be avant-garde .
- H** Did you become aware of other people coming along who were also going out in new directions, too? When would you say this Abstract Expressionist group kind of jelled? as a group? Were you aware of this developing?
- G** I think there's a certain myth about this being a group. There was never any group. Actually, like I knew Mark Rothko probably since around 1929 – let's say, 1930 – but I wasn't aware of the other people. We didn't know each other. We were all separated. All we know was that we were isolated, alienated, and nobodies. We didn't count in the art scene at the beginning. However, by 1945, 46, there suddenly seemed, to be an awareness that something new was happening. And so that certain dealers became interested in showing this work. And, well, it didn't really sell; there was no market at all.
- H** When did this change? Can you point to a certain year when you felt it was beginning to sell or the attitude, of the public was changing?
- G** Well, I think by the late 40's my paintings began to sell and so did some of the other people who were of my generation. They were selling very cheaply, but we sold a bit. In fact I would have a contract with somebody like the Kootz Gallery where I would get like a minimum wage salary.

- H** Would it be true to say that the time when you all protested the Metropolitan's showing of contemporary art was the first time that you were all together in a group, when you were called the Irascibles, when Life magazine photographed you all together?
- G** I think that's the one and only time that we acted as a group. Otherwise, there was no sense of solidarity; there was no ideology. If there was any sense of solidarity it was just out of a sense of mutual self-protection...like everybody else was against us, so we had to stick together a little bit....
- H** You didn't show together like the Impressionists did?
- G** No -- except insofar as certain dealers would handle certain of these painters. But it didn't really constitute a group. However I think it was interesting that...I may as well claim the credit because I started that thing of the Irascibles. I think the point about that was that the Metropolitan Museum did the sort of stupid thing that Museums frequently do -- they made a tie-in with industry; in this case, it was industry; at other times, it's other things...But they made a tie-in with Pepsi-Cola company and they arranged, contracted to have a series of shows for three years in a row and the principle involved was that this would be like a great regional contest and Pepsi-Cola invited eminent people in the art world to be jurors and these people traveled to various sections of the country and they then set up these juries in different geographical regions and then the idea was that all of these selections from these various regions would come to New York and then they would be weeded out in New York, so that you would have the cream of what was going on throughout the country.

Well, the actual truth was that nothing very good was going on throughout the country. Everything always was happening in New York. So we used to have something called The Club down on 8th Street and after one of the meetings I said, why don't we do something about this Pepsi-Cola show? It's ridiculous -- why should some beverage company determine what happens in art? Why don't we get together and issue a statement and condemn it? So a number of people thought it was a good idea and we had some meetings and issued a statement, like a manifesto, condemning this alliance of the Metropolitan Museum and Pepsi-Cola. So we said that we would refuse to submit to these juries.

Well, the only thing that caused a commotion was that Life magazine asked us to be photographed and they wanted us to come to the steps of the Metropolitan Museum with paintings under our arm and to stand there and be photographed. So we said, we don't mind being photographed, but we're not going to be photographed that way, under those circumstances. Because that would look as if we were trying to get into the Metropolitan and we were being turned down on the steps. So they said, well, how would you like to be photographed? And we said, well, just hire a studio and take a photograph of us, that's all, in neutral territory, not on the Metropolitan steps.

So they were very much surprised at this, because nobody refuses anything to Life magazine. So they agreed and they took the photograph and they hired a studio and photographed us. And then the New York Times had an editorial -- it was unusual that the New York Times had an editorial -- calling us the Seventeen Irascibles. That's how the term started.

H You said something to me about you were protesting social realism and you compared say to what you might call social realism today -- would you have any comments on the situation of today compared with that of that time?

G Well, there is no such thing today really as a movement that might be called social realism. You see, the social realism movement in those days was really Marxist inspired. The Communist party had a strong hold on what was happening in art, and they were encouraging the idea of social realism. I thought it was ridiculous, because if you want to influence people, you can't influence people through paintings. Television, radio, and movies are much better; they have much more force. I think a painting is the weakest way of influencing anyone. We're not in the period of Daumier. We have mass media that are very potent. So I thought it was ridiculous and it eventually proved to be so because even though they still have this line in the Soviet Union, I guess, I question very much how much influence it's had. I think they just do it out of a kind of stupidity about art...

H Talking about mass media, wouldn't you say the situation is different today in the fact that there's a kind of mass audience for art? There seems to me far more exhibitions of art, museum shows, and a much larger public to see exhibitions...Do you have any feelings about this? Do you think it's better for the artist today?

G I don't know....a very difficult question....because at that time....I think up to a few years ago, there was a cleavage between the artist and the general public, you know, like the mass public -- a mass audience -- in fact I think that artists were rather conscious about the fact that they were alienated from a mass audience and they wanted to retain this alienation because this seemed to produce pretty good art. However, with the cultural explosion that we've had there seems to be a blurring of these lines of demarcation. You don't have the distinction any more between the artist and the civilian -- as they used to call it. Artists are more prosperous now and everything is "avant-garde", so that what you have is culture is sort of homogenized -- like -- nobody wants cream, they want half-and-half in art.

I think that the trouble, is -- that nobody -- you don't have an avant-garde, because an avant-garde is underground, they're like guerilla-fighters, you see, and today everybody is exposed to the glare of limelight, and I mean, you don't -- like in those days it was like prohibition: if you wanted to find art you had to knock on a door and say "Joe sent me."

H So you would say from your experiences that that was a good situation in terms of...

- G** Well, it was a difficult situation. We had financial problems. But I think it was sort of healthy...there was a healthy feeling that there was an opposition, today there's no opposition.
- H** -- to fight against? –
- G** Everything is like rubber. You have this vast general public which is like rubber, there's no resistance. And it doesn't matter whether it's good or bad, it's not a question of quality -- I mean I'm not attacking the public, I'm just describing the general situation. Of course this audience -- this is an art audience, this is not a mass audience, so let me say I'm not trying to insult anybody here -- you know by definition this would be an art audience, it would not be the mass public that expects to learn about art on television programs...
- H** Do you think you can learn about art on television programs? I would doubt it; you have to experience it-- Can I ask you a question about your own art now? You've said many times you don't regard your own work as abstract – or as abstraction. I was wondering if you could elaborate on this and also perhaps talk about how you feel about interpretations of your paintings. Many people think the more recent work, the "Burst" paintings, are symbolic of what you might call elemental forces, like male and female, Yin and Yang, or Heaven and earth, or what you like...Do you object to this- or do you think it's in the work?
- G** I don't object to it – I think it's fine, I think the more associations and interpretations that people can find in the work, that's so much the better. I think that it confirms my belief that there's something to the work for people to experience. However, my own attitude to my work is that I think that all these things are ambiguous. I feel that I would like them to remain ambiguous. In other words, I'm sort of in a center, let us say, between two directions which I would say are literal. In other words, you can have work which is definitely figurative and when you see a work which is definitely figurative, well, there's literally a figure there. You know it's a portrait, a face, a body, or what have you. On the other hand, at the other pole you have work which is non-figurative, in other words, non-objective, and this then becomes an object which is also literal, in fact the people who paint that way say that they don't want any associations, they want the painting to be an object, that is, purely an object. Of course, everything is an object in a sense, but I don't want it to be literally an object and I don't want it to be literally a representation so therefore it's ambiguous and I see this, that forms can – you can say well if a painting is divided in half, there's a horizon and this may suggest a landscape, well I don't intend to create a landscape, I may decide that I want to divide a canvas in half. Then if people have the landscape association I think there's nothing wrong with that, in fact, I don't see how they could avoid it. But nevertheless it is not literally a landscape. On the other hand it isn't an object painting which is just a canvas divided into two parts. I don't know if that answers the question.

---gap between tape---

and it might be that sort of thing where I have a multiplicity of forms like the one you're describing and I do something very simple. Why I change that way I don't know. It's a matter of mood, and I get bored, I might get bored with them or something. I might do a number of green paintings and get bored, so I'll do red paintings. And I keep changing and there seems to be no end. So far there doesn't seem to be any end to what I can find to do. So that I'm not bored with what I'm doing.

H I notice that you included nothing, or I should say, only one small thing, in the show from 1967 and otherwise you had no more recent work. Was that a deliberate choice on your part? For the show?

G Well I thought it stopped at 66 -- I mean that was the plan, to show only work that was done in 66. Well, I don't know, the reason was that since it was such a big survey there wasn't any particular point in showing my very newest work. Well, then people would say, well, that's the very newest thing. Well, I'll show that when I'm ready to show my very newest.

H I know that you've been doing some new ventures recently, you've been doing some designs for tapestries which have been executed and you've also been doing some sculpture -- I think you've had one made, you told me. Would you have any comments on these new developments?

G Well, I like to play around with these various things, media -- and I deliberately didn't include any in the show because I think they're peripheral to the main things which I'm interested in, which is painting. And in the case of tapestries for example, they're executed by someone else. It's not my own hand work so I think they're interesting, but I didn't see any point in showing them; it's a painting show. The same thing with my sculpture, I'm not a sculptor, I'm a painter, but, so well -- I do a little sculpture in my spare time...

-- question from the audience --

G I think there's a tendency for people to have a kind of stereotyped image of, let us say, a disc and a splash as characterizing a style. I don't think this has anything to do with style. This is merely an image and subject matter that I use and I think that it has the possibility of infinite variation. I don't know what everybody's reaction was but some people have told me that they were surprised when they saw my show, that having this notion of a stereotype they were surprised that the paintings were so different.

-another question-

G Well, I have a certain amount of stability -- so I don't suddenly get an impulse to let us say to do a painting of a pretty sunset, to take an extreme example you see....So my mind gets into a certain a pattern where I'm following up certain ideas and then there's both logical and consistent to follow through and were I to feel that there were no further possibilities in the direction which I've chosen, if I felt that it were exhausted, then I would have to search for something else that I felt could -- which I felt could express myself in a significant way, and. I think as the survey indicates, there have been certain crises in my work where I've made changes. But I hope that on the whole it shows that there is a certain consistent style. Now my idea. of style is something which is also not literal. In other words I don't think that style should be dependent on , Let's say, using a particular material, for example, making all your paintings by putting cement on the canvas, let us ay -- you know, I can think of any number of examples. And I see a lot of styles that are based on -- well, so-called styles -- that are based on some kind of application. I think, I feel that a style if it has, I mean if it's a style I the high sense it can withstand almost any sort of application, you can use almost anything, and the sense of style will come through...

H You mean it's the way you do things -- something like that?

G Yes. It's the way you think, and the way in which you handle materials. It's not the dependence on a particular material -- like...People have an idea, some people say they like texture in painting. Well, usually what they mean is that they like a rough texture. It doesn't occur to them that something like glass has texture too, it's smooth, that's all -- it's just a different texture...

-- another Selby question --

G I think that's all part of the style. For example, the Cubists had a style and they also had a subject matter. Now all good Cubist paintings stuck to the restrictions of the particular subject matter that they developed along with the style -- in other words, you cannot take a style and apply it to any subject matter whatsoever, indiscriminately. I think you'll find this throughout the history of art, that there is a certain relationship between a way of painting and the subject matter that relates to this way of painting. Like you can't imagine an impressionist painting of a historical subject like, I don't know, let's say, Washington crossing the Delaware. You know a pointillist or an impressionist couldn't paint that kind of subject because the style was developed for the painting of things outdoors, things that were there in front of them. This was the whole concept, it was tied together.

Now the Cubist concept was tied to the subject matter of café life, and the studio: the mandolin, the clay pipe, the French newspaper and so forth, these were the common objects that were found both in the café and the studio. And when a painter like Andre Lhote started applying the Cubist style to subjects like football games and soccer games it became ludicrous, and it was a really academic application of the Cubist style to an unrelated subject

matter and so... Well, I feel that the style I've developed is suitable for the subjects that I paint which are subjective images, and I try to be consistent about that.

- H** You've kind of, you've been talking about groups of painters like the Impressionists and Cubists – you've implied that as well as a personal subject matter, a personal style there can be something which is shared between painters in a certain period. Do you have any definition of what you feel perhaps was the subject matter and the style of your generation in New York?
- G** Well, I think so. I think I could roughly characterize it as dealing with a kind of subjective imagery. It has no relation or very little relation to the external world. It doesn't simulate nature. It's some sort of an obsessive image, which is subjective in nature, and – well, I think that fairly well covers it, because...I think that you have to remember that most of the painters of my generation formed their style out of Cubism and Surrealism, so that you have the emphasis on a formal structure and you also had an emphasis on the irrational and this irrational element was very important because it had a relationship to Freud and Jung and that sort of thing and it also philosophically expressed the feeling that a lot of us felt. I think that we were sort of existentialists. You couldn't rationalize everything. In other words, you could rationalize things, but you didn't necessarily act in a rational way. We thought in a rational way, we thought rationally, but great many of our actions are irrational and a purely rational type of painting, like Mondrian's, for example, well, in a sense denies that existence of the irrational element in men and so I think that Surrealism and the work of my generation and what I did was steeped in this idea that you have to face the irrational aspect of human existence.
- H** Do you see there's any signs of the painters who came after you, of a new style, a new subject matter?
- G** Well, yes, I do. I see it all around. I don't know how new it is because I don't know what made me think of it, but coming up on the plane from New York, I was thinking of 1929. There was a painter who most of you probably don't remember or never heard of by the name of John Graham, who was very influential in a way. He was a close friend of Stuart Davis and Bill de Kooning and he was also a friend of mine. And in 1929 he had a show at Dudensing Galleries, on 57th Street, of a series of paintings which he termed at that time "minimalism". And I can describe the paintings: they were painted with enamel and every painting was divided in half. The upper half might be white and the lower half might be brown – or some other colors – there were all sorts of variations of these colors, but the format of the paintings, they were almost all very much alike like that and that was all there was to them.
- H** Just a white area and a brown area?

G White and brown, or black and green, or whatever it happened to be. I don't remember just what the colors were. But I remember that form. The colors varied from painting to painting. And they weren't large. And he definitely termed it "minimalism" at the time; in the catalog it was called an exhibition of minimalism.

So...well, it fell sort of flat; nobody knew what it was about; it just seemed eccentric -- And of course, now we have a big thing about "minimalism". But nobody knows about John Graham and minimalism in 1929. So I don't know...I see that there are a lot of things that are supposed to be new, but I think some of the things are highly questionable...as to whether they're new or not.

H Would, you say the same about Pop art? Many people have talked about it as being a new Dadaism.

G Well, I've seen some things that look an awful lot like Schwitters. But, anyway, you don't really think it matters so much whether these things are Immaculate Conceptions. I don't know if it really matters. What really matters in the end is how good they are.

H Yes. Well, I think art comes from something, anyway. All art comes out of some other art.

G You think so?

H Yes. It starts that way.

G Well, what do you think being creative is? You don't think it's possible to make something out of nothing?

H No.

G You mean that metaphysically this is an impossible concept?

H Yes.

G Well -- do you believe in God?

H ...Well, let's talk about art.

G Well, that's what I meant. I think that in art you make something out of nothing. I think that certain things can be made out of nothing. I think that there's autonomy in art, but that you don't have a logical sequence. I mean, it isn't like science, where you have a certain progression -- you might have regression. Or you might have a period in which nothing is created, or areas where nothing is created. I think the whole progress is very mysterious...I

don't really know. I was just needling you. But I think it's a mysterious process and we don't really know what these things come out of.

H No. But I think artists absorb things from previous, art and then they create something new if it really is new -- but it starts...it has something to do with what they've absorbed already. I don't think an artist suddenly creates work who's lived all his life, say, in the middle of nowhere, and never seen paintings.

G I agree.

H So maybe I'm right: it doesn't come out of nothing.

G No -- it comes out of culture. Something like that.

-- another question --

G Well, I didn't read Suzanne Langer until after I stopped doing pictographs.

H Did she write before then?

G I don't know...I wasn't...I didn't really intend the Pictographs to be read like a rebus, for example. Actually, I didn't know what most of the symbols that I used meant. I believed in a theory of a kind of collective unconscious, which is Jung's theory around that time. In other words, it seemed possible to me that an Aborigine in Australia and an African Native could both make an egg-shape form and think of it as a symbol of fertility. And if they could think of it, why couldn't I think of it? I didn't have to copy it from them. Because I was operating in an area that in this country was sort of primitive. And I admit that I was very naïve about a lot of the symbols that I used. I still probably don't know what they all mean. And anyway, I didn't want them to be read as overt symbols. What I wanted was to combine these images so that in the unusual juxtapositions in which they were placed whatever the meaning was, would be changed, and there, would be a different meaning. I didn't know what meaning, but anyway, it was irrational, as I've said before. It was not an attempt to use a Morse code or something like that....

-- another question --

G I always like the last thing I worked on best.

H What did you feel like, seeing them all together in the museum show? Was that a kind of revelation to you about your own work?

G Well, I had very mixed feelings. I felt that...how did I manage to do all this work?And then it was also an opportunity for me to look at my work because you never have an opportunity to get 100 odd things together in one place to look at them. So this was something that I attach value to. And then I wouldn't say that I looked at them critically, because what's the use? They're done already and I can't do anything about it....So, there they are....I should also say, that I don't think I learn anything from looking at my own work. You have to have something that....When you paint you don't look at your past things and then try to improve on them.

I can remember from way back when I was young that we thought Andrea del Sarto was a very bad example to follow because he was considered the perfect painter. He combined all the virtues of Titian and Tintoretto, and he had everything in his work – color and drawing and chiaroscuro and perspective and anatomy and I don't know...Probably it was Bernard Berenson I think who denounced him as being an example of a bad painter who was extremely good. You know, a guy who could make a perfect picture, but it lacked the real spark of the other painters who didn't have all of these virtues combined in one painting.

-- another question --

G No, it's an extension of my painting, except that it's three-dimensional, that's all. It's also sort of irrational.

-- another question --

G I'm a fast painter. You know, Rubens could paint a life-size nude in a morning. It's not hard to paint fast. Yes, I paint daily. I have nothing else to do.

-- another question --

G Well, yes, I think there are more because there are so many more painters. There aren't more of the best painters but there are more good painters. Maybe there are fewer best painters – I don't know. I think the level is higher, but I don't know what that means, really. I don't know if that's significant. Because instead of having a lot of bad painters, suppose you have a lot of mediocre painters - I don't know if it's better. I despised it (what Social Realists were doing.) I thought it was just bad painting.

P.R. Are you that confident -- about all the paintings you see around you?

G No, because I'm not fighting the painting that's around me. This is the problem of the young people – they have to fight me. I think then the question is...I was very much aware when I was young that you may reject your father, but if he's good you have to respect him. And I respected the good painters like Cezanne and Picasso and so on. I didn't want to kill them. I just wanted to kill what I thought were the false values, and I thought that social realism and

regionalism and the American Scene represented either false values or values that were not high enough. And in other words, as I said, I was brought up like a French painter of my generation. I was brought up on things that were good.

-- another question --

G Well, I may be wrong, but I felt that when I started with the Pictographs, it was getting away from Cubism, I was trying to get away from it. Well, I can tell you very simply. I think the principle of Cubism is this -- of overlapping planes; and in the Pictographs, my planes were like this -- at least, I tried to make them that way. Well, maybe there was a relationship in that, in the rectilinear frame of reference -- but there wasn't as much spatial recession. That's what I think. And I think of course, that since then I've moved further away from Cubism. I think Cubism is one of the greatest movements in several hundred years.

-- another question --

G Well, I don't know. The problem as I see it is that I started early, a lot earlier than some of my colleagues, and I've survived a lot of my colleagues. I mean, you take Pollock and Kline and Tomlin and Baziotes, who've died at an early age, I don't know what they might have done if they had continued to live. On the other hand, if you take someone like de Kooning, who is just about my age, he didn't start exhibiting until much later than I did. So, well, he may have had other phases that we don't know about. But, well, I had my first one-man show in 1930; de Kooning had his first one-man show in 1950, or 49, something like that and...so...I don't know, it's very hard to make these comparisons. I'm a, little too close to it, I guess.

-- another question --

G Before we finish, I'll just make one comment in reference to that, and that is, that an artist can, by reason of longevity, like Bonnard for example, continue working in a style like Bonnard was/still working as an impressionist during the period of Cubism, and this was perfectly valid. And on the other hand, you can have a painter like Manet who developed, who had a very highly developed style and toward the end of his career he picked up ideas from the Impressionists -- he didn't hesitate. And it's a way of keeping alive, I suppose, Not to close your mind. Well, Picasso's done this. Picasso's picked up things of Surrealism, he's introduced surrealist elements into his work. Picasso once did a painting that's based on some of my pictographs. It's called "The Kitchen." Clement Greenberg reproduced it once. So you have to -- you just have to survive, in any way that you can.

H Do you feel you've picked up things?

G Oh, sure --

END.