

Chit Chat Club essay/talk  
Paul Karlstrom/May 8, 2018

Marcel Duchamp and California  
The Conceptual (Art) Conundrum

Our subject this evening could be “what’s in a name?” Labels and titles of art movements are often problematic. What exactly *is* Fauvism, Dada, Impressionism, Futurism, or—surprisingly—Realism? Because the term Conceptualism embraces much of serious art activity of the previous century, understanding what it denotes takes on considerable importance. A single definition of Conceptualism, as widely applied, turns out to be frustratingly unattainable. My wife, Ann, compared the challenge to nailing Jello to a tree.

During my career documenting American art for the Smithsonian’s Archives of American Art, it behooved me to try to grasp the essence of movements, styles, and art production in

general. To that end I would occasionally ask my artist subjects for help: “Who is an artist. What does that connote?” And then, recklessly, “What is *art*?” I was rewarded with: (1) “Anybody who considers himself or herself an artist, *is* an artist.” And furthermore (2) “Whatever they do or make is *a priori* art!” Of course they were being playfully ironic, but especially in connection with Conceptual art, the definition largely applies. But it is inadequate to the task at hand—thinking and writing about art. And where do these *laissez faire* ideas come from, anyway?

In fact, for many traditional art enthusiasts this cavalier claim is annoying if not sacrilegious. So I will try to justify this apparent assault on the sanctity of art with a discussion of the movement’s (or better, “phenomenon’s”) origins. My focus is on California, for our state nurtured some of the best and most influential 1960s and 70s Conceptualists and—especially in Southern California—the related Light and Space artists. The West Coast father of

Phenomenal Art is **Robert Irwin**.<sup>1</sup> Now recognized as at the vanguard of Minimalism, formerly attributed exclusively to New York practitioners, the California version was far more sensual and coloristic than the heavy, often bleak, minimalist sculpture of **Donald Judd**<sup>2</sup> and his colleagues. Bob Irwin was to the Light and Space movement what Judd was to Minimalism. And New York had no answer for this.<sup>3</sup>

**[PAUSE]**

California art in recent years has received—begrudgingly at first—acknowledgment from New York critics such as Peter Schjeldahl (the *New Yorker*) and notably Roberta Smith (*The New York Times*). Smith spent five days in L.A. exploring the massive (30 venues) and historic 2012 *Pacific Standard Time* and wrote home to the Big Apple that the far flung exhibition “way out” in Los Angeles ... “has been touted as rewriting history. It seems equally plausible to say that it simply explodes it, revealing the

immensity of art before the narrowing and ordering of the historicizing process.” For this Irwin’s younger collaborator, **Jim Turrell**, provides compelling evidence.<sup>4</sup>

Wow! Smith’s St.-Paul-on-the-road-to-Damascus report represents nothing less than an attitudinal New York/East Coast about-face from the hitherto disregard for California culture and creativity. This belated recognition gives an indication of the independent significance of much of the art being produced on the West Coast. Indeed, the seminal 1960s–70s period in California Conceptualist art, foreshadowed much of the work being created by young artists today. But first a bit of modernist American art history by way of context.

In the beginning there was Marcel. Contemporary art of the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century is all but unimaginable without the rich history that leads back to **Marcel Duchamp**<sup>5</sup> and then onward to his direct descendents, among the notables Surrealist is

**Salvador Dalí**—the subject of my first Chit Chat paper—and  
**Andy Warhol**.

[PAUSE]

Duchamp emigrated from Paris to New York in 1915, eventually becoming a U.S. citizen—and thereby claimed by us. He arrived a celebrity due to the 1913 New York Armory Show in which his Cubist/Futurist painting *Nude Descending a Staircase*—described by one critical wag (not, as popularly thought, Teddy Roosevelt) as “an explosion in the shingle factory”—created a national sensation.<sup>6</sup> Actually it exploded traditional American art, resulting by mid-century in the eclipse of the previous pervasive influence of Picasso, Matisse, and Diego Rivera. As we will see, Duchamp’s influence went well beyond that initial U.S. cultural shock.

The foundational basis for the Conceptual art “movement” is Duchamp’s oft-quoted dictum that **the idea and process involved**

**in art making is the art act itself, not the object that may or may not result.** [REPEAT] Also, Duchamp held that the artwork is unfinished, incomplete, without the viewer. These ideas inform virtually all avant-garde art of the 20th century, including that of and, as now seems evident, Los Angeles super star **Edward Ruscha**.<sup>7</sup>

As a “movement,” Conceptual art emerged in the 1960s among groups of young artists, in this country and abroad, who rejected “traditional modes of art making in the context of enormous cultural and social changes in the society at large.” That is one definition, and it precisely fits the creative Conceptualist outliers **Bruce Conner** (SF) and **Wallace Berman** (LA). Another tells us that through new ideas of place and site, Conceptualism “redefined the idea of an art object and the notion of representation.” A third proposes that California Conceptualists “belong together...not solely by virtue of their geographical place

of residence at the outset of their careers, but even more so by their shared pursuit of a wide range of aesthetic strategies devoted to reinvigorating worn-out practices of art making.” These artists extended the innovations of Minimalism and Pop art by turning away from “medium-specific” painting and sculpture, as in the famous small thin photo books<sup>8</sup> of **Ed Ruscha** and especially *Every Building on the Sunset Strip* (1966).<sup>9</sup>

[PAUSE]

The Conceptualists’ direct debt to Duchamp is identified by San Francisco artist **Tom Marioni** when he described his project as “idea-oriented situations not directed at the production of static objects, but rather one-time performances and repeatable participatory events,” among them his signature *Drinking with Friends* (1970-79).<sup>10</sup> As curator at the Richmond Museum and founder of his own Museum of Conceptual Art (MOCA) in San Francisco, he was the creator of a vital Conceptualist community

in San Francisco. His provocative performances, such as *Piss Piece* of 1970—in which he stood on a ladder and urinated in a galvanized laundry tub—partake of the Body art branch of the movement in which the artist literally becomes the work of art. In 1973 he was handcuffed for seventy-two hours to **Linda Mary Montano** for one of her famous performances—ephemeral except for photo documentation.<sup>11</sup> Marioni and Montano saw art as a social experience. And the related street interventions of the East L.A. Conceptual performance collective **Asco** directly reflect the political engagement of the Chicano mural movement.<sup>12</sup>

This iteration of Conceptualism had the potential to be the most unsettling, as practiced by **Chris Burden** and **Barbara T. Smith**. While still an MFA student at UC Irvine, Burden was already notorious. In *Shoot* (1971)<sup>13</sup> he had himself shot in the arm by a fellow student—trained as a marksman for Viet Nam service—in front of a small group of witnesses. The threats of

danger and injury were reified in other early extreme performances such as being nailed to the hood of his VW.<sup>14</sup> Burden later told curator Tom Garver that he wanted to create an “instant and evanescent sculpture.”

Smith was as resolute in her determination to remove any distinction between public and private acts—purportedly including sexual. In *Feed Me* (performed in 1973 at Marioni’s MOCA), she invited “visitors” one at a time to enter a small room where she sat, naked and vulnerable, a tape repeating, “Feed me, feed me.”<sup>15</sup> The meaning of this openly transgressive performance—and its status as art—inevitably would be debated, especially among sister feminists. Apparently Smith saw her role as passive, with the audience being responsible for what happened. This served to “protect” her by rendering her “visitor” subject to social and psychological consequences. This idea of discovery through real-life social interaction goes to the heart of much Conceptual

activity. And always in the background lies the question: what are the limits of art?

**Robert Kinmont**<sup>16</sup> is another prime example of inventive departures from art conventions typical of Conceptualism. *My Favorite Dirt Road* consists of seventeen undistinguished black and white photographs reminiscent of Ed Ruscha. Executing perfect handstands at eight different locations puts the artist literally at the center of the artwork. Kinmont's individual human presence dominates nature, in a sense subverting the long tradition of landscape art. Perhaps more importantly it introduces the element of personal risk, imminent danger of bodily injury and even death—real world, real time. In such works, Kinmont acts out Conceptualism's pushing hard against the outer boundaries of art—as we have seen even more dramatically in the radical “performances” of Chris Burden.

Just how far do these signature Conceptual works wander from our comfortable understanding of what constitutes fine art? Where are the boundaries and limits to preserve the integrity of painting and sculpture? This is a legitimate question. So, I ask you to keep in mind this snapshot of a young Mexican fan palm<sup>17</sup>—transported by the author-as-artist north from Palm Springs to a decidedly less hospitable San Francisco environment. Keep an open mind, please. Perhaps we might even agree that this photo document series recording growth could be described as a legitimate candidate for Conceptual art!

**[PAUSE]**

Another shockingly transgressive art theory from Duchamp was that “originality” is an outmoded concept. He adopted the unprecedented idea that works of art depend upon random change and even significant alteration by viewers and other artists depending upon their interests. Mr. Duchamp entirely approved of

reinterpretation and transformation, by other artists—or anybody for that matter. **Robert Rauschenberg's**<sup>18</sup> famous erasure of a Willem de Kooning drawing is an extreme example. This is radical stuff—the startling appearance of pure artistic freedom, of democracy. As elitist as Conceptual art may seem, it draws upon this underlying—well, proletariat—revolution in what art is and can mean by making it widely available, of not accessible.

In his splendid 1996 biography, Calvin Tomkins succinctly describes Duchamp's major impact upon 20<sup>th</sup>-century art:

Although very far from being the most famous art work of our [20<sup>th</sup>] century, *The Large Glass*<sup>19</sup> may well be the most prophetic. The *Glass*, together with the “readymades”—manufactured items that Duchamp promoted to the status of works of art simply by *selecting* and *signing* them [as in the famous urinal, *Fountain*, signed R.Mutt<sup>20</sup>]<sup>20</sup>—are primary sources for

the approach... that defines art primarily as a *mental act rather than a visual one*. In the years since his death in 1968, Duchamp has come to be considered by many the forerunner of Conceptual art...and virtually every postmodern tendency; the great anti-retinal thinker who supposedly abandoned art for chess has turned out to have had a more lasting and far-reaching effect on the art of our time than either Picasso or Matisse.

Many critics and historians did not sign on, convinced that Duchamp's ideas and example were not just negative but destructive. However, increasingly, younger artists disagreed, embracing the permission to pursue anything that fired their creative juices. Chief among these were **Jasper Johns**<sup>21</sup> and **Rauschenberg**, two of the brightest-shining stars of American post painterly modernist art. Some of you no doubt saw the

Rauschenberg retrospective at SFMOMA earlier this year. If so, you surely remember the “combine painting” Monogram<sup>22</sup> (actually sculpture, the artist liked to combine the two). The stuffed angora goat sporting a tire around its middle recalls Duchamp’s “ready-mades” in the clever “collaborative” use of commonplace found objects. This strategic breaking down barriers between art and life was a goal shared by Rauschenberg and Johns, as well as their avant-garde composer friend **John Cage**. These three rule-breakers—along with modern dancer-choreographer **Merce Cunningham** and San Francisco body performance artist, **Anna Halprin**<sup>23</sup>— became great friends, and collaborators as well. Together, with Cage they combined music, dance, and visual art in a unified partnership that presaged performance art, a significant component of Conceptual art practice. The practice continues with vigor to this day, notably in art schools like San Francisco Art Institute where Brazilian **Guta Galli** earned her MFA last year.

Guta Galli's, recent Market Street sidewalk performance, *Bridge*,<sup>24</sup> follows in the radical feminist footsteps of Linda Montano in her 1972 street performance, *Chicken Dance*.<sup>25</sup>

Johns drew from Duchampian thinking a kind of formulation for his own cerebral painting. He wrote of Duchamp: "He was the first to see or say that the artist does not have full control of the aesthetic virtues of his work; others contribute to the content and determination of quality." At his Pasadena first solo exhibition he was photographed in the gallery playing chess with a young nude woman.<sup>26</sup> Marcel's idea of multiple contributors inheriting, directing, and altering the meaning of the work is also a defining hallmark of Conceptualism. The outlandish notion that a work of art has an entirely autonomous existence, often disconnected from the artist's intent, is another key feature—once again indebted to Duchamp.<sup>27</sup> The concept was taken further by later artists who all but denied the exclusive claims of the originator. The meaning of

an art work is “appropriated” and “deconstructed” by the viewer, as with post-Structural literary theory in which the original text temporarily becomes the “property” of the reader. The meaning changes hands readily. The highly influential French literary critic/philosopher Roland Barthes describes the situation in terms of “death: of the author and proprietary ascendancy of the reader: “A text’s unity lies not in its origin but in its destination.” Substitute viewer for reader and we have Conceptual art.

Julius Wasser’s iconic photo was taken in fall 1963 at the Pasadena Museum of Art prior to the opening of Duchamp’s first solo exhibition—anywhere. *The Large Glass* appropriately hovers over the chessboard. The 19-year-old busty, and pregnant by her own account, Eve was the girlfriend of curator Walter Hopps who to her pleasure walked in on the unexpected scene. The willful teenager was not pleased when told she couldn’t attend the opening party (presumably, Mrs. Hopps would not have been pleased). So,

part of the conceptual *meaning* of this image becomes Eve's revenge and protest piece—as described to me in an interview for the Archives of American Art. Robert Irwin, Ed Ruscha, Larry Bell, Ed Kienholz, and even Andy Warhol in from New York, were on hand to honor their hero. The artists recognized that this was an historic occasion. And indeed it was.

[PAUSE]

Three crucial L.A. artists, **Michael Asher**<sup>28</sup>, **Maria Nordman**, and **Bruce Nauman** each have one foot in Light and Space and the other in Conceptualism. In his *Los Angeles Times* obituary Asher, the most obsessively cerebral of the trio, was described as a “dean of the Conceptual Art movement.” Although associated with Light and Space, especially in the 1960s, he preferred the term “situation aesthetics” to describe his practice. **Nordman** is celebrated for her use of light to redefine space, a major objective of minimalist art, as the creator of “mind bending”

interplay between walls and light.<sup>29</sup> However, she denies being part of the movement, insisting that her work is about people and “situations.”

**Bruce Nauman**, with his extraordinarily fecund and wide-ranging creative imagination, is among those Californians whose work—such as *Hand to Mouth* of 1967<sup>30</sup>—defines the thrust of Conceptualism internationally. With the goal of altering space and dematerializing if not entirely eliminating the physical object, their art is solidly idea-based. However, Nauman reminds us that really smart artists know there is not just one road to travel.<sup>31</sup> Nauman’s installations also challenge preconceived notions of interior space and our relationship to it. Another memorable bare room had two ceiling speakers insistently ordering visitors to “Get out of my mind; get out of my life.”

[PAUSE]

It becomes apparent that California art had become as imaginative—and serious—as that of New York or Europe. However, it wore lighter clothing and presented itself in a variety of guises, from the playful visual puns and deadpan humor of **Ed Ruscha** to the glorious minimalist environments of the Light and Space masters. Initially considered a Pop artist, Ruscha is now recognized as a pioneer of Conceptualism and finds himself the subject of PhD dissertations at Yale and the Sorbonne. In fact, he may well emerge as one of the leading figures of Conceptual art.<sup>32</sup> His Duchampian egoless approach to subject matter is apparent throughout his career, as in the headlight frame from his favorite car parked behind his Culver City studio.<sup>33</sup> During a recent Paul studio visit with my wife, Ed expressed his personal relationship to his subjects: “You know, I want to respect and honor the most humble things around me.” [February 2017]. San Francisco’s highly respected Conceptualist, **David Ireland**, also favored

humble utilitarian objects—such as *Broom Collection with Boom*—which he, like Ruscha, elevates to fine art status.<sup>34</sup>

\*\*\*\*

Once again, Roberta Smith came to the defense of California Minimalism as equal to that of New York, perhaps going even further in moving beyond formalist painting and sculpture. Among the chief offenses leveled by East Coast critics was that the West Coast version was superficial and seductive—lacking gravitas. But as Smith and many others on both coasts now wonder, what's wrong with sensuality and beauty?<sup>35</sup>

[PAUSE]

In *The End of Art Theory*, Historian Victor Burgin describes Conceptualism as a major revolt against modernism—specifically as formulated by the powerful American critic Clement Greenberg. Greenberg defined modernism as the *historical tendency of an art practice towards complete self-referential autonomy*. This

formalist creed posits purity in art through a reductive abstraction completely separate from the everyday world of social and political life. Burgin credits Conceptualism with undermining the critical stranglehold formalism exerted during the 1960s. It seems to me that Greenberg and company fell out of favor largely due to the limitations arrogantly imposed upon artistic imagination and art itself.

**[PAUSE]**

In an effort to personalize the liberating effect of Duchamp and Conceptualism, I asked four artist friends whose art is often associated with the movement to choose a work or two they considered exemplary. Their responses will conclude my talk.

**[Note:** the artists supplied photographs which then appeared in the CCC talk. However, unfortunately, most are not available in published form.]

**Greg Colson**

Based in Venice, CA, **Greg Colson** is among our leading contemporary Conceptualists, although—like many of his colleagues—he seldom applies the term to his art. This pie chart portrait<sup>36</sup> is typical of Colson’s critical examination of the circumstances of contemporary life through the widely used method of assigning proportionate importance to human experience through statistical graphics and prevalence charts. What distinguishes this example is that it is the first to feature an individual—and, yes, your speaker was the fortunate trial portrait subject.

**Greg’s Statement:**

On occasion my work has been referred to as ‘conceptual art,’ whatever that means. Some people have a purist definition of conceptual art, as art focused only on ideas, with little or no concern for visual and material qualities. I see it as a more integrated situation in which the visual/material aspects of art

trigger thoughts about concepts, processes, perception, consciousness— and refrain from the tradition of purely decorative and visually pleasing elements... At any rate, I try to shake things up a bit in my art and examine the poignant and amusing ways in which we as individuals and societies attempt to ‘get organized,’ find meaning, and get things ‘right’.”

## **Paul Kos**

San Francisco artist **Paul Kos** has been at the forefront of Bay Area Conceptual Art since the 1960s, and he is probably the most prominent proponent, along with Tom Marioni, working in San Francisco today. He is reticent to talk about his work, believing language is misleading, inadequate to the rigorously experiential—as opposed to theoretical—nature of his art.<sup>37</sup>

**[PAUSE]**

**Kos’s Statement** consists of three published KQED Spark quotes relevant to our subject:

(1) All art should have good craft—but good craft is not good art.

Art is that magic that happens somewhere between the viewer, the object, and the artist.

(2) A conceptual artist, unlike the painter or sculptor, begins with a concept. And then finds the material that best suits the concept that somehow has qualities that tell the artist what to use.

(3) Art works should not necessarily be read like language—left to right top to bottom. The work has its own language system.

## **Tucker Nichols**

**Tucker Nichols**, is another leading figure in the Bay Area contemporary Conceptual Art world. His work is distinguished by humor and wordplay (again, reminiscent of Rushca), surprising juxtapositions contained within a sophisticated and thoughtful knowledge of art history.<sup>38</sup>

**Tucker's Statement:** Conceptual art tends to be boring, ubiquitous, invisible, and occasionally profound. Of course any

creative work can be considered conceptual, sometimes to great effect. As a term, it's meaningless to me—unless you mean historical conceptual art, which is often marked by a feeling in the viewer that they should understand something that they don't. That's kind of interesting, but it's not felt in the heart, so it tends to fade quickly. But if you mean art that draws you in, feeds you in ways you can't quite track, and makes you think about something that's otherwise hard to think about, then I'm a sucker for it every time. Art is horrible at saying anything specific, but it's often our only hope for expressing something beyond words. So I guess I'm a fan.

## **David Jones**

I have known **David Jones** and his work since 1974. Years ago, at the original San Francisco Museum of Modern Art, I commented to then director Henry Hopkins that David is an unusually smart artist. His enigmatic response was, “Maybe *too*

smart.” It occurs to me now that the deeper meaning of David’s work—he was the youngest artist in the historic 1976 exhibition *California Painting and Sculpture: The Modern Era*—was too difficult, even inaccessible to many viewers, unfortunately including some of the collectors he ardently sought. Smart and relatively inaccessible—or at least elusive—may well describe the majority of Conceptual art.<sup>39</sup>

**David’s Statement:**

Do I consider myself a conceptual artist?—Well, visual matter, written or image, filtered through decades of artistic production, education, public exhibition, and the vagaries of the art world, filters my coupled choices of idea (concept) and image (retinal information). Pure conceptual art is Platonic by nature: an idea residing solely within the mind, requiring no addition, and may be fully understood and appreciated without the benefit of the visual. In other words an individual without sight can consume

100% of the idea. I engage the intellect and the eye. So be it. Call it what you wish.

### **Informal Conclusion:**

Finally, I promised to conclude with a seemingly frivolous proposition that my ongoing **Paulm Project**,<sup>40</sup> begun with planting in 2012 and photographed numerous times at irregular intervals over subsequent years, could—conceivably—qualify as Conceptual Art. Well, here are my arguments for that: (1) Rather than the planting and watering, the art is in the process of thinking beyond gardening; (2) If the planter considers himself an artist and thinks of the palm as material for an artwork—it qualifies; (3) Process is a major component of Conceptual art, as are documents; (4) If straight photography is not the artistic goal but rather the means of documentation, the many photos are not the art objects but rather the record of idea and process. The objective was not aesthetic but rather measurement and documentation of

comparative growth—change over time. The Conceptual “meaning” is contained in the following question: when will the palm achieve the same height as the gardener? But the question remains: is it art?

[BRIEF PAUSE]

**Formal Conclusion:**

In one way or another, the works—the artists—brought together here under the rubric of Conceptual art are idea-based and devoted to positioning the viewer in relationship to his/her environment.

The traditional object displayed in art gallery or museum space is rejected or at least seriously and thoughtfully modified. For a period of phenomenally fruitful artistic endeavor, these

Duchampian concerns and legacy became the project of California art.

Having said all this about Conceptualism, and with admiration for the primacy of ideas, we should remember that

great art has the ineffable aesthetic power to engage the senses and deeply stir emotions. Full disclosure: Conceptual art does not, Irwin's disks excepted, often provide me an encounter with aesthetic beauty. For that experience, I return again and again to Renaissance Italy and my favorite painter, **Piero Della Francesca**, especially his magnificent *Legend of the True Cross* at San Francesco in Arezzo.<sup>41</sup> In simple terms it's a matter of thinking vs. feeling, and I suspect Conceptual art seeks to get it both ways. And, we might ask, why not keep trying as Conceptualism proceeds well into the 21<sup>st</sup> century?

**[PAUSE]**

Final Image: Return to Duchamp portrait. Leave photo on for background during traditional audience comments.

**Paul J. Karlstrom © May 2018**

**Main Sources**

This essay follows draws upon my review of two books for *CALIFORNIA HISTORY* (The journal of the California Historical Society), 90:2, 2013, 78-82.

1. *State of Mind: New California Art 1970*, Berkeley, University of California Press, 2012. Constance M. Lewallen and Karen Moss, with essays by Julia Bryan-Wilson and Anne Rorimer. [**State of Mind**]

2. *Phenomenal: California Light, Space, and Surface*, Berkeley, University of California Press, 2012. Robin Clark, with essays by Michael Auping, Stephanie Hanor, Adrian Kohn, and Dawna Schuld. [**Phenomenal**]

### **Other Consulted Sources**

Calvin Tomkins, *Duchamp: A Biography*, New York, Henry Holt and Company, Inc., 1996. [**Tomkins**]

### **Also:**

Victor Burgin, *The End of Art Theory: Criticism and Postmodernity*, Atlantic Highlands, NJ, Humanities Press International, Inc., 1986.

Patricia Norvell, *Recording Conceptual Art*, Berkeley, University of California, 2001.

## Acknowledgements

Special thanks to participating artists—**Greg Colson, David Jones, Paul Kos,** and **Tucker Nichols**—who shared their thoughts on Conceptualism and how it informed art. For producing the beautiful power point illustration program I thank my close friend and new Chit Chat Club member, photographer Dennis Letbetter.

PJK

## Notes on Illustrations in Power Point

Many of the images are subject to copyright approval and were intended only for this talk. However, some appear online (artist and title). Many were photographed from the books listed above, notably the first two, which could be consulted as visual references. The text also benefits from comments and observations by a few of the authors listed, for which I express gratitude.

PJK

## ILLUSTRATIONS

The following list consists of each illustration numbered in order as they appear in and relate to the text. The main visual source books (**State of Mind, Phenomenal, Tomkins:** see above) appear after the numbers of

individual photos listed with mostly published sources to assist the dedicated reader. Not all of the images in power point appear below. Internet designation is suggested for likely sources.

---

- <sup>1</sup> Robert Irwin, *Untitled Disks*, 1968 and 69. **Phenomenal 24.**
- <sup>2</sup> Donald Judd, *To Susan Buckwalter*, 1964. **Internet.**
- <sup>3</sup> Robert Irwin, *Square the Room*, 2007. **Phenomenal 106.**
- <sup>4</sup> James Turrell, *Afrum (white)*, 1966. **State of Mind cover and 40.**
- <sup>5</sup> Man Ray. Marcel Duchamp photo portrait, 1930. **Tomkins cover.**
- <sup>6</sup> Marcel Duchamp, *Nude Descending a Staircase No.2*, 1912. **Tomkins 82.**
- <sup>7</sup> Edward Ruscha, *Corn Popped Ruscha*, 1963. **Cotton Puffs, Q-Tips, Smoke and Mirrors: The Drawings of Ed Ruscha, Fig. 26 (p. 68).** Whitney Museum/Abrams, 2004.
- <sup>8</sup> Edward Ruscha, display of various photo books, 1962-72. **State of Mind 137.**
- <sup>9</sup> Edward Ruscha, *Every Building on the Sunset Strip*, 1966. **Ibid. 22-23.**
- <sup>10</sup> Tom Marioni, *The Act of Drinking Beer with Friends is the Highest Form of Art. SFMOMA, 75 Years of Looking Forward, 2009 (p. 207).*
- <sup>11</sup> Mary Montano and Tom Marioni, *Handcuffed*, 5 November 1973. **State of Mind 134.**
- <sup>12</sup> Asco, *First Supper (After a Major Riot)*, 1974. **State of Mind 168.**
- <sup>13</sup> Chris Burden, *Shoot*, 1971. **State of Mind 84.**
- <sup>14</sup> Chris Burden, *Trans-fixed*, 1974. **Internet.**
- <sup>15</sup> Barbara Smith, *Feed Me*, 1973. **State of Mind 59.**
- <sup>16</sup> Robert Kinmont, *8 Natural Handstands*, 1969/2009. **State of Mind cover and 20-21.**
- <sup>17</sup> Paul Karlstrom, *Paulm Project 7 July 2013*. Multi-year series of photo documentation. **Author.**

- 
- <sup>18</sup> Robert Rauschenberg, *Erased de Kooning Drawing*, 1953. **SFMOMA: 75 Years... (op. cit.), 107.**
- <sup>19</sup> Duchamp, *The Large Glass*, 1915-23. **Tomkins 2 and Internet.**
- <sup>20</sup> Duchamp, *Fountain*, 1917. **SFMOMA, 75 Years... 30.**
- <sup>21</sup> Jasper Johns, *Land's End*, 1963. **SFMOMA, 75 Years... 129.**
- <sup>22</sup> Rauschenberg, *Monogram*, 1955-59. **Internet. Fig. 2.6, p. 130.**
- <sup>23</sup> Anna Halprin, *Parades and Changes*, 1970. **State of Mind 130.**
- <sup>24</sup> Guta Galli, *BRID(G)E*, 2018. **Internet/Artist's Site.**
- <sup>25</sup> Linda Mary Montatno, *Chicken Dance: Streets of San Francisco*, 1972/73. **State of Mind 199 (fig. 3.2)**
- <sup>26</sup> Julian Wasser, Duchamp playing chess with nude Eve Babitz, 1963. **Tomkins 425.**
- <sup>27</sup> Peter Mendenhall (photo), Elizabeth and Paul (author) Imitating Eve Babitz and Duchamp, at Robert Berman Gallery, Santa Monica, CA.
- <sup>28</sup> Michael Asher, *Untitled* (aluminum framing), 2008. **Internet.**
- <sup>29</sup> Maria Nordman, *Room with Two Doors*, 1989. **Photo source unknown. Internet.**
- <sup>30</sup> Bruce Nauman, *From Hand to Mouth*, 1967. **Internet.**
- <sup>31</sup> Bruce Nauman, *Green Light Corridor*, 1971. **Phenomenal 50 (fig. 1.30).**
- <sup>32</sup> Edward Ruscha, three images: *Hollywood*, 1970. **Cotton Puffs...Drawings 127 (plate 85); Royal Road Test**, 1967 ; *39 Ford*, 1960. **Cotton Puffs...54 (plate 12) Monographs and catalogues via Internet.**
- <sup>33</sup> Edward Ruscha, *GOD*, 2010. Photo by author. **Internet.**
- <sup>34</sup> David Ireland, *Broom collection with Boom*, 1978/1988. **SFMOMA 209.**
- <sup>35</sup> Robert Irwin, *La Jolla Museum installation with ocean view*, 1997. **Phenomenal 71 (fig. 1.53).**
- <sup>36</sup> Greg Colson, *Portrait of Paul Karlstrom*, 2010. Author's photograph. **Internet.**
- <sup>37</sup> Paul Kos, two images: *Sounds of Ice Melting* (1970) and *A Trophy/Atrophy* (1972). **State of Mind 92 (fig. 1.77) and 109 (fig 1.97).**
- <sup>38</sup> Tucker Nichols, *Four Bottles on Stone Base* (undated conceptual sculpture). **Internet.**

---

<sup>39</sup> David Jones, *The Aesthetic Waters Test*, undated. **Artist's photo; internet?**

<sup>40</sup> Paul Karlstrom, *Paulm Project 24 July* and *April 3, 2018*. **Series photo documentation with author.**

<sup>41</sup> Piero della Francesca, *The Annunciation*, fresco detail, *Legend of the True Cross* (1447-1466), Basilica San Francesco, Arezzo. **Internet, widely reproduced.**

**Illustrations selected by Paul Karlstrom. Power Point produced by Karlstrom and Dennis Letbetter, May 2018.**