A SEMINAR IN ART EDUCATION FOR RESEARCH AND CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

COOPERATIVE RESEARCH PROJECT NO. V-002

EDWARD L. MATTIL
PROJECT DIRECTOR

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY PARK, PA.

1966

The Research reported herein was supported by the Cooperative Research Program of the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

THE CREATION OF ART AND THE CREATION OF ART EDUCATION

ALLAN KAPROW
State University of New York at Stony Brook

For more than two millenia it has been supposed that if all the components of artistic creation could be isolated, studied, practiced and reassembled, human beings would be in a better position to appreciate, teach and make art than they have ever been in. It is a compelling notion. If it has been useful at all, it has been only relatively so in those past times when a traditional culture prevailed, when common styles and techniques made it possible to agree on the nature of the artistic goal at hand. In recent Western history, however, this has become scarcely less than batting one's head against the wall for the apparently perverse pleasure of occasionally stopping to catch one's breath. Let us hope that this is one of those pauses.

The last serious attempt at formulation of artistic rules came about as a result of the Napoleonic regime's need for quick norms of both an institutional and an aesthetic kind. The Academy, under the direction of Jacques Louis David, advanced Neo-Classicism as an antidote to the Royalist rococo, genre and pre-romantic styles inherited from before the revolution. And a few years later, Ingres, talented as he was, fought blindly to maintain it as THE standard against the supposed subversions of Delacroix and others of similar persuasion. He became a villain in spite of himself, (althought there are some today who would make him into a martyr). Since then, such attempts to analyze and regulate art invariably have led to academicism.

Moreover, the continuing waves of modernist innovation have been dedicated to the belief that creativity cannot be taken apart because the nature of art cannot be fixed -- a common-sense judgment that can be easily separated from the mystique of holiness that also accompanies this period. We might reflect upon this: most of us are pleased to declare our sympathy with the contemporary arts, but by wishing to systematically investigate creativity for the sake of establishing controls for teaching purposes, we may be unconsciously searching for another, merely updated, academic rulebook. We teachers are natural academicians, for teaching is much easier with such a backing. This teacher, however, is going to propose a much harder way: the way of ignorance and uncertainty. It is a way without rules and without lesson plans. Its only platform is scratch, and its only discipline is trial and error. But to justify this approach to the very pressing educational problem in this country, it is necessary to see why the conventional path to the problem is inadequate, why, in fact, we may be left with no other choice.

Three main questions have been posed by this seminar, concerning the artist's decision-making process as he works, his creative growth, and his relation to the cultural past. (A fourth, asking whether there are not other questions will be considered later.) I think it is important to try to answer these because it will help to understand why they are hopeless queries with no future, and it will lead into what may be more fruitful ones.

The first wonders that are the factors which cause an artist to decide to take, or not to take, the steps he does in his work. We can only speculate here, but some of

them may be the following: A) his particular itch, bugginess, obsession, neurosis or whatever name one wants to give it; B) his knowledge of existing alternatives of action, historical and contemporary; C) his continuing sense of discovery in what he does, or equally, his continuing sense of confirmation of suppositions and intimations he has had all along; D) his sensitivity to day-by-day opinion, voiced by colleagues, critics, public and family; E) his notion (sub specie aeternitatus) of his place, or non-place, in history; and F) his feeling of being someone special: a seer, prophet, elected victim of society, philosopher, moralist, priest, etc.

Now beginning with A), it should be obvious that the preoccupations of artists vary from man to man. One I know is obsessed with archaic philosophy and religion; another with pubic hair, another with anonymith, and another with the ritual of assembly-line living. It is possibly true that each of these is a symbolic form of more personal matters, but it is probably as true that once uncovered, their substrata would prove to be as different from each other as their outward appearance. In any case, whatever bugs an artist will usually determine what he will search out for the rest of his life. Artists are over and over astonished by this fact. When they are on a seemingly new teack, the day comes when they discover that it is the old one in a new guise. In addition, whatever bugs an artist will also tell him, usually consciously, what not to look for, and what to avoid. What not to do is as important to him as what he thinks he should do. The painter concerned with armchair world-systems would be distracted by researches into pornographic art, and might be confused by deliberate propagandistic ventures such as practiced by Ben Shahn or William Gropper.

It is doubtful if anyone but the artist himself can know when the bug itches; surely no teacher can know which are the good itches and which are bad. Nor can he provide enough different kinds of itches to go around to all of his students, for he should be busy scratching his own. But it is fairly certain that without such promptings from obscure sources inside and out, no art will be perceived much less produced.

There have been some investigators who have speculated on the universal itch. They have not found it -- unless we accept life and death as the answer, in which case every man is an artist. But if it were possible to list all the itches of history and weigh these against the itches of our time, in an effort to discover the best ones for the 1960's; and if they were programmed for art educational purposes, all the genuine artists would start to scratch in another place.

So far as a sense of alternatives goes (B), some artists, like Picasso, thrive on encyclopedia involvement with culture, while some, such as Mondrian, might feel that this sort of engagement is like ordering a meal from a Longchamps menu of six hundred entrees: out of desperation they select a cheeseburger and then return to their own cooking. Knowledge in both cases may be as great, but the Mondrian-type of artist may feel it important to deliberately narrow the range. Ultimately, decisions of value must be based on real choices amongst a number of paths of possible action, none of them clearly attractive. To make such decisions an artist must have an itch, for this alone makes choice an ethical activity. How wide or constricted the spectrum of possibilities is for each artist, is a problem to be decided by him only; it cannot be prescribed (though his success or failure at it may be judged by us in retrospect).

To give two examples: In 1912, Picasso's Analytical Cubism was reaching such a point of over-complexity that the precarious balance it struck between several modes of object-reference and abstraction, was in danger of being drowned in dense texture. The choices before him were: to return to Cubism's beginnings in Impressionism and Cezanne, return to a prior simplicity in his own past, give up Cubism for any half dozen other modern styles prevalent then, give up Cubism for an art of pure texture (this in itself justified by its origins in Delacroix and Monet), give up art entirely or find some solution within what he was doing. Deciding upon this last one, he had three more alternatives: simplify Cubism's fragmentary signs for objects, which at that time would have had the effect of reconstituting the whole still-life or portrait and rendering the picture conventional; simplify the emerging vocabularly of pure marks, whereupon he

would have had to sacrifice most of the signs for objects also there; or simplify the syntactic relations between marks and shapes of given classes such as rounds, squares and wave forms. He chose the latter, here as well, and it was lucky he did because by this move he was automatically able to further transform the recognizable objects embraced by these forms while making them simultaneously easier to see but harder to comprehend in a traditional sense.

For the second example we may consider the problems faced by a man predisposed to working in the Hard Edge style today. He cannot help being aware of its thematic and technical relations not only to Pop, Op, and OB Art, but indirectly, through its frequent large scale and immediacy, to Action Painting, Matisse's late cut-outs, the development of geometrical abstraction in the 'twenties, as well as to the whole history of idealist aesthetics in the West since Plato. This network of allusions binds him inescapably to culture and forces upon him subtle but pressing paradoxes of attraction and repulsion to much outside of his particular work at hand. How he uses these connections, and in what combination he puts them, will probably contribute to the judgment by posterity of his quality. But now, this year, his assessment of the situation must be an unanalyzable blend of factual knowledge and intuition -- acted on in much the same way as a general planning a military campaign. Applying this lesson to teaching art should lead to thoughts about the value of training in making choices among numbers of attractive alternatives. But the selection of these alternatives by the teacher is the critical issue. How does he know which to select? And even if he is lucky in this respect, once they are fixed into curricula, all may be lost.

As to the matter of an artist's ability to constantly discover the old world anew (C), if he is incapable of this sort of wide-eyedness and curiosity at heart, he is finished, and hopefully goes on to something else. But this state of being, like the artist's itch, is unteachable; and, moreover, is clearly no different from what is necessary for a business man or scientist to keep going. If it is supposed that the artist needs it to a greater degree, there exists no standard by which one would measure, no more than if there were a standard could anyone apply it. The whole question of "inspiration" is hopelessly personal, and despite our assumption that it really exists to serve men in their hour of need, any attempt to systemize it runs the risk of becoming mere prejudice in the hands of well-meaning tyrants and moralists.

The artist's responses to outside opinion (D) are also quite sensitive; even highly cultivated. He eagerly reads the signs of approval and disapproval around him, and in spite of frequently feigned indifference, he instantly recognizes intelligent judgment compared with that made by idiots; and he is deeply disturbed when those he respects reject him and those he disdains applaud. Sometimes he is better off when no one applauds, for at least then he supports his precarious self-esteem with the silent but powerful tradition of artistic self-sacrifice. Sometimes he fares better when everyone applauds. Unfortunately, it is hard to know how many whiplashes or how many pats on the back a man needs, and much harder to know who should administer them. I have seen over again entire styles given up, or marginal interests suddenly bloom into major preoccupations, due to causes that can be in great part attributable to outside opinion of an artist's work.

Assuming that a teacher stands for all the facets of this opinion to the student he teaches, not only must he be a shrewd judge of what are the real issues in the art world at a moment (a big order for anyone), but he must possess a sense of timing that will tell him exactly when to hurt, and when to heal, a young artist's feelings. There is after all, a rationale for both sadistic teaching and loving teaching, and these are supported by the tempermental differences people are born with, as much as by the peculiar cultural biases of an era. Some artists thrive by responding to the varied opinions of others, and to the changing appetites of fashion, while some find this, especially today, quite debilitating. The gregarious, or restless, artist will subtly sponge up all viewpoints in the interest of "range," and the loner will turn his back on them, using the defense of "single-mindedness" and saying that "success kills." They are both right, and their prototypes in the elementary schools are right also. A teacher is a saint if he can cope with such problems; and he is a sinner if he doesn't.

And the more he tries to do so, the more he will fail. Intuition does not respond to forcing or theory.

It follows that a place in the historical sun (E) will mean a great deal to an artist, although in different ways. The twentieth century is history-conscious and artists cannot escape this fascination even when they want to. A few of them, in reaction to such excessive preoccupation with destiny, work at remaining anonymous, at eliminating themselves as unique personalities. But because this denial of self-importance must be conducted within the world of culture if its lesson is not to be lost, the artists become better and better known for trying to become unknown -- like Marcel Duchamp. Most, however, will try to fix their position in the archives very early in the game: if the pioneers of modern art have publicly denied history, they are known privately to have altered the dates on their canvas stretchers in order to insure priority when the chronicles were written. Today it is common to find artists not only printing carefully-compiled curricula vitae for frequent distribution; it is also not the rarest of events to find their contents revised year by year, if not in the spirit of truth, doubtlessly in the spirit of self-advancement.

But the President of the United States and Henry Ford, Albert Einstein and Babe Ruth, also have had thoughts about history's provision for them. Like public opinion, concern for the judgment of all time may profoundly influence the course of work. Those who seek the public eye also seek the infinite gaze of eternity. The question, usually unstated, is: "Will history be on my side?" Socialist art theory is not more aware of historical "role" than purist aesthetics, which asserts that the inevitable direction of painting is towards abstraction; both are deterministic. School children in art class catch on to this very quickly. Their works are pinned up to the wall, sold at PTA bazaars and art galleries, increasingly discussed by the teacher reproduced in national and professional magazines, and paid tribute to by the professional artists themselves. As their schooling progresses, it is a simple step from thoughts about their place in the classroom to their place in the pantheon. There is nothing demonstrably wrong with this: some can take it and some can't. The best efforts of the former are often sparked by intimations of immortality while the latter find the challenge murderous and distracting.

The problem remains how to utilize such facts. If the teacher is a mouse, he will act one way; if he is a lion he will act in another. Children of the opposite temperament from him may find themselves at the very most encouraged. Lesson plans and pedagogy will not help, for such motivations as we are speaking of are the sort of dynamite one dares not treat casually. Only men and women of exceptional wisdom and insight may face them, but how are we going to find ten thousand of these to staff our schools? Shall our graduate schools turn their energies to the mass production of geniuses?

In itself, the idea of genius (F), of the man of quality, is an imponderable. Its importance in most major cultures, particularly in the West, makes it presence as a force inescapable. All artists harbor feelings of being unusual in a positive (as much as negative) sense: they are keepers of man's spirit, searchers after truth. A mixture of the shaman and the philosopher pervades their inner core, and even if it is exaggerated as a self-defense against public indifference, it does play as strong a part in their decision-making as their sense of destiny. It given them permission to be curious about unknowns, to do things not generally approved, and also promoted the psychological strength to keep going when their work is flagging.

The crucial factor here is that the idea which artists have about their ultimate role is supported by the idea conveyed by most lecturers and writers on art, namely that art contains some kind of special wisdom. Whether it is true or not that art is the exclusive source of this intelligence, the fact is that we look for it there. If art education does not even touch on this matter, it is perhaps because the few in charge who are aware of it, know how elusive it is. Paradoxically, the more art is made available in the United States, the more it becomes unapproachable because we seem not to be able to agree on what it is. Teachers cannot assume that by not mentioning the "ineffable" it will take care of itself. It doesn't, paradoxically.

The second question raised by this seminar, about how an artist "matures," is difficult to answer. It is never clear what we mean by "maturation." Sometimes the "mellowing of rash youth" is meant; sometimes we delight in the man of increasing years who keeps up with the young revolutionaries. In general we mean to say that as an artist matures, he gets better. But obviously this is subject to all kinds of interpretations, and few of us bother to say what our standard is before we start talking about a particular artist's rise or fall.

In any case, whatever we want "maturity" to mean, the consensus at this particular time (a consensus that will likely change and keep on changing) at least agrees that artists tend to peak at different ages: Rimbaud at nineteen years, Yeats at fifty, Braque at thirty-two.... Many, like Vlaminck, peter out after three or four years of intense productivity; some, like Rothko maintain an even keel. Others, such as Mondrian, gradually improve with age, "as a fine wine ripens" we are tempted to say in old-world lingo. But still others go up, down and up again, like Matisse or Beethoven. The idea used here is a vague sort of cultural Darwinism: one goes, or should go, onward and upward in quality. But the history of art reveals no such evolution, nor does the history of individual artists. It is nice to want art to contain a built-in-improvement principle but we ought to be suspicious of it. When it has been used against all evidence to the contrary, as if there were a disease or failure-syndrome to be cured, it has produced platitudes at best and hidebound rules at worst.

Why artists get "better" or "worse" or "stay the same" is partly a problem of accounting for changes in professional and public taste: Gainsborough was high on the list in 1910; now he is low. It is also a matter of tackling the enormous job of assessing both the "salient" values of an era, with the "salient" features of an artist's biography. The detailed account of Van Gogh's life reveals a set of possible causes for his art involving family, social and professional entanglements, intellectual aspirations, and religious yearnings -- all of these quite distinct in character from the more meager record of the life of Jacques Louis David. But these are only "possible" factors. What of those we have no information on? It is not inconceivable that if we came up with a police document proving Van Gogh to have been a youthful murderer, his steadily psychoanalyzed paintings would take on a new meaning. And our notion of his "maturity" would change. However, most "salient" biographical information is almost impossible to obtain, and even amongst contemporaries, probings into the privacy of an artist's life is not likely to be met with cooperation. Yet if any sense is to be made of how an artist "grows," in order to determine if indeed he has grown, then such data is essential. Add to this the necessity of knowing the biography of a period, especially the period under our noses, and the whole business of analyzing and controlling "maturity" becomes futile.

The third and last question, regarding the connection that exists, or should exist, between the artist and the art traditions, is simple and complicated. The simple side of it is this: it is no longer a real issue to ask whether the artist should be "cultured." He usually is today (although I am not referring to refinements of taste, to aristocratic manners, or to specialized knowledge of the so-called classics, which have often enough been confused with culture). I am suggesting that because of his college education, and the continuous dissemination of information by the mass media, the average artist cannot avoid a broad familiarity with the developments of his field and related fields. Obviously, as pointed out in question one, this is what makes the artist so history-conscious and anxious to compare himself with the past. The difficulty, again lies in how the artist makes use of this culture. His personal sense of choice is involved, as well as the pressure of opinion around him. Insight into the consequences or implications of his (or anyone's) work is very clearly going to be bound up with his judgment of its meaning within the total picture of culture, and therefore with his judgment of its value.

Hence we can see how purposive the recurrent waves of anti-art have been in the last half-century. Their militancy has been invariably proportional to the amount of culture possessed by their proponents, and the stance was taken for the sake of liberations from habit rather than from art as such. In this light, a disavowal of the

traditions is actually a form of deep respect (as is the rejection of a father by a son), and may rise to real innovation. But the uses and disuses of the past by artists are always hard to evaluate until later on. With this problem as with the others in the foregoing, testing and programming are next to impossible. The right path is always after the fact, and by that time new paths are being trodden nearby to death. Educational theory cannot hope to keep in step with what we are actually doing and with what we care most about if it continues to pursue the chimera of analysis and generalization. The greatest present value of analysis and generalization, the value I am trying to point out here in using the method myself, is that it is conclusively self-defeating. I proposed in question one, that an artist's decision made during his work involve understanding of what not to do, as much as, and perhaps even more than, knowing what to do. the same applies to art education.

We might begin to see that slicing up art and artists is pointless, especially for us living in 1965. We know too little to go about it. In another sense, we know too much (and this sense prevents us from improving ourselves in the first). I said the above that we have digested a great deal of art history. The efficient distribution of books, magazines, exhibitions and films, the growing popularity of art societies and art lectures all over America, the ease of foreign travel, have made much and, potentially, all of the entire culture of mankind available to us. The revolution in taste that this has caused, has eliminated in fifty years the last possibility of aesthetic parochialism, and with this, aesthetic certainty.

We can admire "Krazy Kat," a Japanese Zen master's caligraphy, a Mayan figurine of a priest dressed in the skin of his sacrifical victim, a Gaboon mask, a southwest Indian sand painting, a Brady Civil War photo, a Faberge jeweled Easter egg, a Quaker buggy, an Egyptian pyramid, old poster type-faces, a piece of driftwood, Ottonian manuscripts, Victorian machinery, the art of the insane, the scrawls of children, Assyrian reliefs, a factory smokestack, a giant earthmover, Times Square's lights and so on and on and on -- as easily as we can admire Rembrandt or the Parthenon. No one with any kind of intellectual honesty can say that one of these is better than another, for there is no criterion that can embrace all of them without reducing their differences to absurdity. All that he can do is profess personal faith in whatever he finally likes most. The number of motives which generated this range of art, and the great number of reasons why we respond to it as well as the quasi-art included, are (if we could list them) probably so diverse that merely contemplating the possibility renders our ability to use them as bases for future acts of art highly doubtful. One man's faith, after all, is another man's arbitrariness.

In the West alone, content or expressive focus in art has been so varied and so dependent on the social and political circumstances of the respective periods, that artists and connoiseurs might realistically wonder how to apply all this to the present. Except in the most allusive or symbolic ways, it seems impossible. Effortlessly, a slow-motion film of inedibles unrolls: THE IDEA FIXES OF THE AGES! Romanesque art preoccupied with the punishments of hell! Gothic art with heavenly salvation! French Rococo with fantasies of innocent dalliance! Neo Classicism with middle class duty! Romanticism with heroism and escape! Realism with reportorial detachment! Impressionism with ephemeral Springtime! Dada with absurdity! Surrealism with the opiate unconscious! Action Painting with existential crisis! If, as we have painfully learned from the lesson of Western history, attempts at archaism always end in spiritual impotence and artistic failure, we still cannot explain what to do about our attractions to the past. How can our taste for Medieval art, Benin bronzes, Italian mannerism, or Art Nouveau, be translated into contemporary idioms?

We may learn another point from Picasso, in this respect. In his so-called Negro phase he was struck by the (to Western eyes) barbarous effect of African sculpture, yet realized that he had not only an expressive goal in mind which these strange works might benefit, but he also had a purely Western concern for constructional processes. He therefore insightfully avoided the symmetry of the Gaboon and Dahomey figures he liked, and substituted his own taste for asymmetry. He must surely have realized how

absolutely essential such symmetry was to the unmoving terror of the African pieces. But he also knew he was not an African, and could not be one if he wanted; thus by deliberately "misunderstanding" his inspirations and utilizing only a part of them, he was able to satisfy both of his goals by turning the African sculptures rough and intense geometry into his pro-to-Cubistic style. Shortly thereafter he gave up the remaining superficial earmarks of masks and ancestor images.

One may try to get around this in another way by recourse to "collective characteristics." Inasmuch as the "itches" of many artists contemporary with each other will overlap and combine to make "periods," and periods will join to make cultures, the idea of utilizing "traditions" suggests itself. As syntheses of geo-cultural characters, world-views, individual deviations and pure habit, these traditions -- like the Far Eastern tradition or the Western European tradition -- supposedly can be absorbed on an intuitive level by artists without any reference to styles per se. Yet it is a question whether such abstractionizing isn't just wishful thinking: can we really separate a tradition from its embodiment in particular works of art, made by particular artists at a particular time? That is, can we derive a principle, let us say a baroque principle, which is entirely different from all historical works called baroque? I doubt this very much, for one yet has told us how and all the evidence points to its unlikeliness. In fact, it seems that in spite of our "tradition" of individualism, we also have a "tradition" of traditionalism.

The traditions of art tend to move us by relatively small groups of events rather than by such macrocosmic affairs as may describe the difference between East and West. If we must deal today with traditions rather than THE tradition, they are still tangible collections of human products. But we face again the same problem of selection as we did in trying to account for our appetite for many kinds of aesthetic objects. Whose winner is the best winner? If anyone proposes the Italian Renaissance, I can propose the French Romanesque; if he bets on French Impressionism, I can put my money on the T'ang Dynasty's I P'ing or "untrammeled" style, in which the painter uses his own head as a paint brush or drags a friend covered with ink over his paper; if he says he likes Action Painting, I can say I like riding horses in a Happening because there is even more action in this. You pays your money and you takes your pick. With such knowledge of the variousness of our standards, who can confidently set down the problems and the curricula for an education in art?

There is one recent theory which claims to have solved once and for all the problem of finding a unifying ingredient of all the different kinds of art that exist or may exist in the future. This is the formalist theory. The contention is that art is the practice of a special procedure called "composition." It is not simply what art depicts; it is how something is depicted that counts. Whatever else a painting or sculpture may convey, its first and final obligation is to satisfy the most exacting standards of form. The idea paralleled the emergence of abstract art, which for a while seemed to prove that form is both means and end, "how" and "what," simultaneously. Form-mindedness, in turn, helped to reinterpret the figurative art of the past and present for modernist requirements. Armed with this Rosetta Stone at last everything could be explained and a program in art education could be put into operation.

Form became the theology of the purist, from which he deduced his method of worship, and the appearance of his sacraments. The purist saw form as an a priori, closed system of relationships existing between discrete, colored shapes, spots or atmospheric areas, distinct from their possible identification as can-openers, Ginko trees or mud-puddles. A well-formed picture is like a finely-tooled machine: everything "works." The artist's biography, the cares of society, the influences of art history, the fact that the blue in the painting goes with the blue of a nearby couch, are all irrelevant considerations. Form is contained within the work. The artist's sole job is to bring this about, as though he were a mere catalyst, an intermediary between the apparently real and the truly real. Once done, he cuts the umbilical cord.

Thus defined, the whole is made up of coherent parts, whose division into large groupings may be of two kinds: symmetry and asymmetry. From the latter are derived the

sub-categories of over-all distribution, circularity, iteration, and juxtaposition. Amongst these, coherence is achieved by harmonic composition, which joins strongly contrasted elements through transitions; by enharmonic composition, which joins strongly contrasted elements by relating one or more of their qualities (the red of strawberry jam and of a fire engine, for instance); and by non-harmonic composition, which reverses the process and begins with basically similar material, and then makes (relatively small) contrasts or variations of it to sustain interest. The artist's training consists in practicing these arrangements, and the test of his talent is to reveal through such practice the music of the spheres.

The trouble with this theory of art, and its derivative, "significant form," has been tentatively remarked by DeWitt Parker and Morris Weitz: it is that it cannot be proven to be characteristic of art and art alone. The purist's compositional types can be found in shrubbery, clouds, beehives, molecules, universes, and any square inch of sidewalk. They can be found as well in poor art and good, and in fact in every human action. Moreover, no one has been able to say what particularly distinguishes their presence in good art from their incidental presence in everything else including the kitchen sink. Indeed, it may never be possible to differentiate them since the structure of the brain makes it unlikely that any other forms can be thought of, much less perceived. If, then, these formal categories are nothing but truisms of nature as a whole, their preeminence as aesthetic criteria is a delusion.

All the niceties of the virtuoso formalist -- that specialist at architectonics, at manipulations and embroideries of the rhymes and variations of shape themes, that magician at making us feel an order has been crystalized into being by an act of genius -- can be found in anyone's backyard. Given an agile eye, and a mind tuned to games of complex interrelation, suddenly the children's toys, the forsythia bushes, the cedarpost fence, the just-visible aerial of a passing car, the blades of uncut grass, a bluejay on a branch ... are guaranteed to fall into a scheme that will stand up to any painting. I personally derive as much pleasure from a printing press as I do from Poussin's "Rape of the Sabine Women." Compositionally, they are both elegant. Compositionally, just about anything I take the time to look at, is elegant. Form, and therefore art, it may turn out, lies not only in the mind of the beholder; it is lying around all over, free for the asking. And lying around that way, it hardly will serve as the basis for comprehending the art of all time, or for making an art of our time.

It begins to appear that we know just enough to see that we have a very unreliable notion of art in general, and of standards of art in particular. The fact is that we can neither define art verbally, nor can we point to a body of activity and objects which we would indicate by gestures of some sort, so that these could be depended on for all future acts of art. From what we understand of everything called art up to this minute, there are so many alternatives, motives and contradictions of value -- even in our own time -- that any stand taken risks being deliberately parochial or totally experimental. Therefore, if we cannot say, and only barely sense, what art is, then we must admit we are just as foggy about what an artist is, what he does, how, why, and for whom he does whatever it is he does. It seems to me that an attitude of childlike curiosity and intellectual uncertainty would be our proper course rather than a dependence on the analytical investigative procedures we now are engaged in.

The assumption that art, artists, motives, and publics can be atomized presupposes that such objects, people, and conditions are stable, and will sit still during and after one operates. As I have tried to show, they are engaged in a very unruly business of transformation: Greek art for us is not what it was for the ancients and our view of it changes almost every few years. Things, people and their needs sit still only when our mind substitutes for them a stable concept. We then analyze the thought instead of the reality, and the thought is what we want art to be, not what it sometimes is or what it may be tomorrow. Perhaps this is the nature of understanding, and perhaps action is impossible otherwise; but our concept of art and art education has not panned out and so we ought to look for a different one.

Educationists naturally have to have art educable; which requires a great deal of systemization; most artists, including those who teach too, have more ambivalent feelings toward the matter. They want to preserve the mystery or magic of their pursuits, recognizing that whatever this may mean, it is extremely valuable. They also want to reveal this in full-strength to a responsive audience. Systemization so far, has invariably killed magic, and has broadcast false or dull values and senseless activities, in the opinion of all artists as well as many educators sensitive to what has happened in the schools. The problem of art education may be an eternal dilemma, in the sense that we cannot have a packaged, full-strength mystery for thousands of teachers in charge of millions of children. But must we think in terms of neat packages? If we are going to fail for the most part, can we not fail more interestingly, that is with a little color? We might even succeed a little here and there....

To find out whether this is so may be our only possibility. Instead of extrapolating criteria from what artists seem to do in so-called professional situations, for application to school situations, it might be a good idea to see what happens when an artist interested in school children tries to convey his magic in the classroom. It might be that we are really asking about a truly theatrical atmosphere. It might be that our curiosity should take us to the remnants of side-shows, circuses, parades, magician shows, to whatever captures kids' attention on television and the movies. It might be that in paying too much attention to what we want art to be and do for society, we have made of it an enormous "lesson plan" full of bad acts. This, in answer to the seminar's fourth question, is a far more fruitful area in which to be curious.

I should like to propose experimenting in this direction, with no holds barred and loaded with dangers. Artists will play the principal roles in the experiment, although it is hoped that children will soon take over in the degree of their participation. At the same time, professional observers from related intellectual disciplines, and the public in certain communities, will take on subordinate parts. Eventually, we may learn more about art this way and more about art education; or we may learn absolutely nothing. The chance is worth taking, for lacking any other radical alternatives, we may have to settle for more refined and sophisticated versions of what we have had all along. And that, I would judge, is beyond improvement.

But first, a summary of what makes up the educational scene today is necessary. It may not be the scene that the brighter educationists would like to think it is; however, I believe it fairly well describes what is going on wherever art and art education are taught.

From the professional artist's viewpoint, especially from the viewpoint of those who are also teachers, art education in the primary and secondary schools suffers from one simple defect: no contact with art. Such training as exists in this country, whether in appreciation or creative work, is woefully ignorant of real works of art, and of what is now (as well as what has been) involved in the making of art. Remote from the art which artists and connoisseurs know, the "aesthetic world" of the lower schools is a vague compound of notions of social adaptability and group therapy, with a filing cabinet of unconnected techniques, both gleaned from early twentieth century thought and art. But worse than that, in their present form, these ideas and techniques appear in methods textbooks which are many times removed from their origins. Instead of benefiting from a healthy intellectual evolution, art teachers are confronted with little more than good intentions and senseless course plans.

Art-educational theory today consists of two main branches of overlapping study. One is based on individual and social psychology (as implied above) and the other on formal analysis of artistic activity and certain kinds of art works. The first appears sympathetically human and the second strikes people as inhumanly scientistic, as if it were a laboratory procedure.

The first sees a man as naturally expressive and gifted, a born artist, whose outlets are stifled by personal and social pressures. Young children, however, are still innocent and flexible enough to be saved with the help of kindness and the proper

motivation. But, however warmly disposed, such judgments unfortunately lead to platitudes about the value of the fulfilled human being, his creative goal in life, a good family background and a clean classroom. In too many cases, such wishful thinking is simply a disguise for sentimental moralizing and a bland, utopian ethics with nest to no contact with reality, artistic or otherwise.

The second school of thought divides the artist and his work into little pieces and tries to develop each piece separately, according to the belief that all of the pieces will knit together at the end of a course. Students of this approach conceive of art as a progressive series of geometric and biomorphic diagrams filled with arrows telling the viewer how stimulus leads to conception, which leads to expression, which leads to communication, which leads to feedback from the communicant to the artist and so forth; and how the essentials of this interchange are shapes, lines, tones, colors and patterned relations, all leading to and from each other with more little arrows .... This theory is really a disguise for a preoccupation with analysis as an end in itself. Its recommended exercises are an embodiment of it, and children as well as teachers-in-training who are subjected to it, are not being exposed to any sense for art but are guinea pigs for an experiment in destruction.

Both of these approaches offend artists because to them art is neither so sentimentally moralistic, nor is it understood and made in such a fragmentary way. It is at once more spiritually demanding in function and more organically simple in conception. The sad fact is that educators seem unaware of this. The gap between real art and the nonsense conducted in the schools widens every year as more well-meaning theorists contribute to the very emptiness they are trained by.

Understandably, as mentioned above, the reason for this separation is that in an effort to provide for mass education, teacher-planning has substituted broad generalizstions of assumed human importance for an activity that is frighteningly individual and/or highly specialized. "Everyone Is An Artist," "You Can Paint," "Express Yourself!," "Art Appreciation Made," are titles of popular books that reflect this attempt to reduce and "democratize" something that is not so much exclusive as it is far more mysterious.

It has been the obvious hope that if principles could be discovered in human behavior and in art situations, then teaching methods could be devised that could be applied by an college graduate from Peoria to Baton Rouge, and would thus serve millions of youngsters across the country. Unfortunately, we have seen that it has not worked out this way; for if it had, we would not be involved now in trying to correct a bad situation.

No one knows at this time what, if anything, will "work." But we can learn from what hasn't worked and avoid repeating a mistake. Since the non-artist's way has not worked, perhaps the artist's will. It is only a hunch. It may turn out to be inadequate; it may have to be modified as one goes along; it will most certainly arouse criticism; and there is the possibility that it will be a complete failure. One has to face the gamble and admit frankly to going ahead with an experimental attitude, some inner conviction and little else. In any case, the gamble will be worth taking because something can be learned that simply cannot be learned under present conditions.

The gamble is this: Let us consider one of the prevailing attitudes artists have about their work and their field in general, and try to learn a lesson from it. All artists know that whay they do is very much a matter of fantasy, of dreaming. They dream of adventures, love affairs, glory, hell (sometimes self-imposed), the music of the spheres, the light of absolution, intellectual triumphs, pure games, secret knowledge of the physical and metaphysical universe, murders, insanities -- and a thousand other preoccupations. Whatever their particular dream is, they are conjuring up a picture of a world they experience, or would like to experience (a world which, incidentally, may correspond to the dreams of others, but need not).

Verbalized this way, we are invoking just another aesthetic theory, the very respectable Art-as-Imagination theory; and as such, it is an interesting and as useless as

any other ideas. But, in the artist's sense of Being, in his active participation in the life of imagination, he may, as an example to philosophers and particularly as a teacher to young children, exude the power of dreams so directly, that the theory ceases to be a THEORY (and a lesson-plan) and simply exists as a way to be alive. This, artists feel, is close to being a prelude to art, for all the philosophy and professionalism of the art discipline follow from it.

The value of imagination cannot be taught to teachers-in-training, much less conveyed by them, if they aren't imaginative in the first place. Artists who have imaginations know this and it is the one thing they share with the very young, before it is stifled out of the latter. What school children need is a Pied Piper, lots of Pied Pipers, not social workers and lab technicians. The Pied Piper had magic and this is what is important about his story. Like magicians, artists deal in a sort of magic, and it is proposed here that some of them can double as Pied Pipers and lead school children along roads they are pressured to avoid and soon forget. (It is the primary school that I am most concerned with, for genuine work with high school students can be done, I believe, only after they have been reached at an earlier age. High school students, in my experience, are already very cynical creatures.)

The objective is, therefore, to bring to the lower schools as many artists as possible, with no preconceived plan on our part of how they will conduct their classes. They themselves, may have plans, but each artist will be responsible for his or her own approach. Such classes should be instituted as pilot experiments spotted around the country, and in the beginning, at least, on a relatively modest scale. In order to avoid curriculum conflicts with existing educational systems, the classes should be adjuncts of the program of particular elementary schools. These schools should be approached first to find out if they are interested in cooperating with such an experiment, and if they are, their responsibility would at first be limited to providing no more than space and facilities, while the Federal Government would underwrite the expenses of salaries and supplies. The individual schools should hardly feel imposed upon, the pressures and influence of often recalcitrant school boards and district supervisors would be reduced to a minimum, and regular teachers at the school and in surrounding area could study the experiment and discuss it with the artist-teacher, as it goes along.

The staffing of this experiment would be derived from three sources: the large roster of American artists of acknowledged reputation, the even greater number of art major graduating from universities and professional schools, and a hard-to-estimate number of generally ignored but often gifted, men and women conducting community art classes, slum-reform recreations, and "Y" or church activities. (Obviously, although the public schools cannot be expected to provide the kind of talent needed, there may be exceptional teachers here and there, and these will be as helpful in the experiment as the predominantly "unofficial" person we are looking for.)

As for the first source, the well-known artists, the chances are that few will be willing or able to contribute their time to school children. Some, of course, will be helpful and we should certainly welcome their participation. But the majority of even these will probably be most useful in a consultative capacity or in a different, though related, plan to teach and advise in education colleges, so that our point of view can be simultaneously conveyed on more than one level.

In contrast to those with "big names" the hundreds of young artists graduating from colleges and art schools every year are an extremely important mine of potential vitality. They are at this moment of their lives full of zeal, while having little prospect of exhibitions, sales of work, or fame. As active as the art scene is today, and as quickly as it is becoming a part of the national consciousness, it cannot absorb the growing backlog of young artists, either critically or financially. At such a moment, many of them would welcome the experimental challenge, the rather unusual autonomy, the sense of a concrete goal, and the financial security, promised by our project. Relating to the Peace Corps, it would help to solve the problem, faced by every young artist, of what to do constructively with his life; and it would make positive use, for our purpose,

of talent and energy which otherwise might wither in a few years from discouragement. This double advantage is significant, for both art and good teaching would be fostered. Young artists emerging from the universities and technical centers of this country do not like the idea of going into teaching in the public school: they remember and know what it is like. Our idea may change their minds.

The third source of Pied Pipers constitutes a sort of "pariah" of the teaching profession. It is made up of people who are lacking in the "right" background and so have no accreditation, who are sometimes colorfully individual and so would not easily function in a regimented or conventional atmosphere, who are still struggling without recognition in their own creative endeavors, -- but who, in the artist's opinion, are the best art teachers anywhere. Examples of such individuals are known to nearly everyone in the art world and a list of their names could be drawn up very easily. These men and women, who earn little money, work under conditions that are often sub-minimal, possess a dedication to their job which is just short of being a religious calling; and they inspire in the children a spirit of inventiveness and magic that is almost unbelievable. They are our greatest immediate proof of the validity of the proposed experiment. It is to them that we look for guidance in setting our plan in motion. They are the ones who really know what is at stake.

In sum, what we are proposing is an approach to art education which has in mind only an awareness of the basic mystery of art and a belief (supported by ample evidence) that artistic people are best suited for revealing this to youngsters. Not every artist is so able, of course, but those of us who teach and are deeply concerned with the place of art in the school life of American children, have no trouble in distinguishing the ones who are able. We can smell a magician at twenty yards, without looking at his credentials! The simplicity of this approach may well be its best recommendation. Eventually, all art teachers may be working artists.

Furthermore, our project's purposely limited scope and relatively modest requirements, should be inexpensive, and cause little risk to individuals, school officials or children. The possible rewards could far exceed the investment.

Finally, in order to see any results and judge their merits, the experiment must be undertaken with active support for at least ten years. Less time than that might either produce false hopes over momentary achievements, or no clear conclusions at all, because the stew is still cooking. We should guard against impatience and ten years seem a reasonable limit to hasty evaluations. During this time, however, it would be good to have a team of observers (rather than jurors) made up of interested educators, social scientists, artists, and perhaps even scientists and mathematicians periodically write illustrated reports for publication. These could be distributed to all those participating in the experiment, to the public schools and to the art departments of colleges of education. Everyone will be kep informed in this way, and it might prove indirectly beneficial in its persuasive effect upon ingrained educational attitudes. In any event, as was point out earlier, even negative results will be instructive.

The main hope for this proposal is that, if put into practice, it will act as a sort of Spring jousecleaning. Some good things may have to be thrown out along with the dead weight of over-intellectualized and generally lifeless classroom methods now taking up the space. But with a clean floor, most people feel the urge to furnish the room again and, at the very least, fresh energy rises to the occasion.

EXCERPTS FROM THE DISCUSSION WITH MR. KAPROW

Mr. Kaprow: I should like to add that currently I am attempting to put this proposal into practice and if any of you have any suggestions, I would like to know about them informally.

Audience: Mr. Kaprow, we are experimenting now with something similar to this, but we would like to know how you "smell" a magician because that has been our problem.

Mr. Kaprow: It has to do with a good show. That's my answer. Don't spell it. Don't worry.

Audience: I said "smell" it.

Mr. Kaprow: Oh, I thought you said "spell" it. Well, my answer still goes. It smells something like fire and brimstone. You get that awful odor. Believe me, it doesn't smell like ivory soap, and that's a smell that I know very well.

Audience: Do you intend to propose a similar experiment at the secondary school level on let's say the east side of New York or in Harlem in New York?

Mr. Kaprow: I would be afraid to. I don't know enough about this yet. As I said before, I think older kids are pretty tough, and their toughness consists largely in a kind of resistance to any changes in their thinking. So, perhaps after the first period of experimenting with young kids, it might seem feasible to build up the experiment with older children. I don't know this, but I would hesitate right now, simply because I am scared.

Audience: Suppose I don't know what criteria you are using?

Mr. Kaprow: Well, this really is the criterian because you are asking me for verbal distinction here, and I refuse to go any further than I have because I think it is now largely in the hands of offensive definitions. It's just simply how good a show can be put on. It boils down to theater.

Audience: What does that mean?

Mr. Kaprow: It means the kind of thing that attracts people's imaginations, it seems to me, speaking now as an artist rather than a word merchant. I don't know. I have seen and I have watched my own kids and I have watched a lot of kids and they seem very nicely to respond to the same oddnesses, strangenesses and theatric shows that I would say are the earmarks of the kind of thing we are talking about. It's like a painting. It's like music; anything else that we call or have called art. It has that kind of compelling attractiveness to it, and there "ain't no other way to define it". All I am asking for is a chance to find out whether I am wrong. I can't explain it.

Audience: What you just said includes the effects of tough and dirty shirts, making love to your girl friend, all formed into this scope of what you just said--bug show, you can feel it, you can smell it, it's got magic. So how do you know the difference or is it that "difference" doesn't matter?

Mr. Kaprow: It doesn't matter. I really don't know what art is. I really don't know, except I know what a certain number of examples of art are. I don't know what it "can be tomorrow", and I have to admit that my own conception of art allows anything under the sun, including the "rain of China", to creep in as a possibility.....Pop included. It's all kind of visionary, and at the same time very hard and sentimental. You know, like a blast in the face. This is the kind of thing I think we have to worry about "turning on" kids with that kind of hard stuff. It should have the same kind of potentiality with love or otherwise, the same kind of electrifying effect as a blood purge without actually bleeding people. In other words, I am ready for shaking magic sticks and wands and turning the house up-side-down if that's what's going to do it.

Audience: All of us here are interested in I assume upgrading and improving the teaching of art in the schools, public and private--but if you are really serious about your not understanding what art is, then how in the world are you going to conduct an experiment designed to improve a situation?

Mr. Kaprow: All because I have a couple of backyard magicians that I know. I propose that we turn them loose. Let's not worry about defining your criteria and your standards.

That's the trouble with the whole blasted business up till now. You are making doilies and this and that, and it comes out awful.

Audience: No one here is interested in turning out doilies.

Mr. Kaprow: We reach a point where all verbage is verbage. Let's have a good show. Let's forget the definitions; afterward if you want to play around and see what happens, that's okay with me. I'm saying forget the verbage. I don't know how many times I can say it without your really thinking I'm lying, but I really mean that.

Audience: I get the feeling that you consider yourself the kind of Pied Piper that you are talking about --

Audience: I was just going to ask you if you could "role play" for us how you would go about your magic.

Mr. Kaprow: It takes me a little time to prepare my act.

Audience: But when would these children come to you? Would they come when they are ready or when you are ready or your act is ready?

Mr. Kaprow: If you are speaking about yourself, which I hope you are, because as I said I don't pretend to have the confidence to go into the classroom of little kids. You know what you hear slowly out of the mist, boom! boom! boom! and it will get louder and louder and you will see a shadow on my head as I come through that door. Then you will say is that guy a nut?

Audience: You've got to deal with fourteen-year-old kids in Harlem?

Mr. Kaprow: I said I'm not. Incidentally, I have worked with fourteen-year-old kids. They are pretty great. I think I can handle that kind, but it's pretty frightening. I don't always know whether I can contain the situation, so it is purely out of respect to my inadequacies that I hold off. But your kind of kid, yes, absolutely. It sounds terribly presumptuous, but it is the only way I can really convey how important this kind of magic is. I think I can turn you on.

Audience: Could I ask you something else? Do you advocate a teaching methodology based on this kind of magic, I'm serious, or do you advocate getting rid of all methodology?

Mr. Kaprow: No. As I said, I don't advocate getting rid of whatever an artist wishes to use in the way of methodology. That is his privilege. But I am saying that we as theorists, as professors, (being one myself; you see I can include myself in this sort of thing) get rid of our theories and methods, and just let these other fellows play around a bit and see what happens. Ten years worth of playing. You know, fun and games. Backyard rituals. Cellar orgies. Whatever you want.

Audience: Are you talking about people who are really excited about what they are doing, or are you talking about people who are going to excite others?

Mr. Kaprow: It is almost always the case that if a guy is turned on by himself, he happens to be one of these magicians (of course not everybody is). This will be infectious; it is like disease. You know, you get within twenty feet and typhus! You know what I mean? I am trying to bring this down to really hostile grounds now. You know, like really "play the issue" for what it is worth. I think it will be infectious, yes.

Audience: Now, what will be infectious -- the individual's or his excitement about what he is doing?

Mr. Kaprow: I don't think that one can distinguish or needs to. What I have seen, and perhaps you have, also, is a man or woman here or there working in these store frontsor church basements or whatever have you conducting classes for kids the results of which and comradry of which is just overwhelming. Compared to this the school stuff I have seen

is rubbish. Now, that's what I am talking about. I wouldn't touch them because I just don't know how. I work with your type and my type, and I just cut myself out of this. I simply am trying to propose something of which I am aware, and it may be very risky, and as I said before, a complete flop. But I am only saying let's take the chance. Why not? Nothing else is doing any good.

Audience: In your talk of an experiment of this type, what kind of teachers can be drawn on? The artist and painters in our colleges and young people coming out might want to develop this with you. Is there something we can do in preparing these people to make them better art teachers?

Mr. Kaprow: I don't think so. Except to encourage them in this experiment. You say to some guy or girl when they are graduated, "Look, there is this here job. I have been watching you from behind my shades, and I think you may have something to offer. Would you like a chance at it? They pay you ten grand a year to do this, and at the end of the year if you don't like it, then try somebody else." Really make it a prestige job and encourage such people as you think might be able to succeed to go into it. That's where you could help, but as far as the training you give them or I give them, forget it.

Audience: But earlier you talked about the artist. I think one of the characteristics of a highly artistic person is that he puts everything else down. I think one who is truly committed to his art and his way is to say that what everyone else is doing isn't really what I am doing.

Mr. Kaprow: This is truly not supported by the evidence. It's not; but I am pushing this act right now and making it as ugly as I can. But, believe me I am a very, very sane kind of mind about my own work. I am obsessed with it, but the evidence happens to be that a number of my students are fairly well known artists today, and their styles and their work is quite different from mine. The sympathy I have shown and help I have given to certain artists who are not my students are also known. I am saying this only to indicate that as crazy a guy as me even likes other persons' work. Now there are people who are not nearly as crazy as I am, and their generosity is enormous. It really isn't true that artists are so exclusive that they can't see beyond the tip of their paint brush. It's not true.

Audience: I don't mean to imply that they can't see beyond the end of their paint brush, but how are they going to function in a conservative institution, and a school is a conservative institution?

Mr. Kaprow: It comes to this now. I was hoping we could avoid this, but you have got a real problem there of which I am quite sensitive. There is a little town in Missouri -- let's say St. Joseph. I've been there, so I am thinking of that -- and it just happens to be out of Kansas City or St. Louis. An artist graduates who would be a beautiful candidate for a school which is sympathetic to such an idea. First thing you run into is parents. What's this wild and woolly guy doing to my kid? What are they doing in that classroom? Look at the nonsense they are making. The guy's got "nits in his hair". It's a problem. So my feelings here, they are very tentative ones, are to suggest that we need social scientists to help, otherwise known as "p.r. men". Like advance guard, they set up the scene, they do reconnaissance, they soft-soap, they persuade. They say, "look here, this guy's got gold in his hands, he's got fever on the brain but it's worth it; and your kids will benefit". Now, you can't say it the way I am saying it. That's why I wouldn't dare try this, but it all boils down to that "cold turkey stuff". That's why in my proposal I have suggested that we get social scientists to work along with us, and educators, in fact if any of you are sympathetic to this because in this area you and others really are helpful. No doubt about it. Community relations are very, very important, and I didn't want to get into this problem because it is something I shall be talking about in a conference that I hope to be able to organize in the fall. The reason I don't want to talk about it is because I don't know how to handle the problem right now. I think I have just intuition -- a hunch -- that in principle the idea is worth trying, on a very limited scale, to be sure.

Audience: A limited scale, as far as I can see, would only give findings from one relationship because that is the only relationship in which you would be operating. How could this

be generalized?

Mr. Kaprow: I don't think so. Let's take positive advantage of mass hysteria and group feelings. You get one person who operates on a different kind of level than he does with his cohorts. Pied pipers (according to the story) or the pied piper function takes advantage of mass hysteria. The crowd roars and boy it's infectious. Isn't very civilized what I am saying, is it? Okay, let's run that danger. I think what you are going to find out is that the people of whom I am thinking about are the most ethical in the world. If you are not willing to take that chance, you may be running a metaphysical risk. What are you afraid of, magic sticks! I am willing to be sort of dogmatic here because I think it brings issues to a head. Are we setting up conditions of acceptance and good cheer, blandness, etc., or are we willing to take chances with what may possibly have to do with art? At least I have been asked to come here as an artist. I dropped my academic garb outside the door, and so I am trying to speak, perhaps, unkindly now for the sake of my colleagues, but I am trying to speak for them. This may possibly be what we need to think about now. What does this kind of character represent? Is he the model of virtue and politeness? I can be as kindly and well mannered as the next man, and most of the time I think I am. I am forcing the issue right now by trying to be otherwise because I think that maybe this is the way to get to the point that art just has nothing to do with all these little politenesses and verbages and analyses and clean classrooms. It just hasn't got it as far as I am concerned.

Audience: Will you elaborate on what you mean by nothing else is working?

Mr. Kaprow: Well, what are we here for if not to try to do something about the art education predicament in this country? Obviously, we are explicitly admitting to a pretty bad situation. We all agree. That's why we are here.

Audience: No I'm not admitting to your predicament.

Mr. Kaprow: We are not here to celebrate. All right. I'll be fair. I don't want to be fair though. I mean, this act doesn't permit that. You understand what I am talking about, you know, man to man and objectively speaking. Obviously here and there, thank Heaven, something is going on. I've seen it, too, even in the school system. By and large, we are here because, by and large, it "ain't no good", and we are all trying to do something about it. Now, I don't have the exclusive answer, but my act called for my saying it, only to push this one little suggestion. Here is a solution, possibly, a suggestion. Obviously some others have perfectly good suggestions, too. But slowly I can see the suit of clothes coming back on me. I'm throwing off this magic stick and time is drawing to a close, and I say, look, let's all try our best. We'll do a little this way and a little that way and maybe something will happen. Tomorrow night the magic stick starts waving again. Thank you very much.