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overleaf: Jackson Pollock painting Number 32 in the summer of 1950 at his Springs, Long Island studio. In the background is One, painted during the same period. Photo Hans Namuth.
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An uncompromising spirit of revolt made Jackson Pollock the most publicized modern artist of his generation in America, and in many ways, the most influential. In the press he was dramatically identified for the layman with the more expressive and often exasperating contemporary manifestations of artistic freedom. And for a generation of younger artists he had become, before his untimely death in an auto accident last summer, a revered symbol of their new sense of liberation and hopefulness.

With a handful of contemporary painters and sculptors, a heterogeneous group who have been linked in an informal movement sometimes called Abstract Expressionism, Pollock was responsible for injecting into American art a vitality and confidence best compared to that of the period immediately following the Armory Show. His work pointed an unexpected way around the clichés of a doctrinaire non-objective art which dominated advanced American painting in the thirties, and it helped generate new resources in method and released new energies. If Pollock’s painting style was aggressive in its self-determination and finally distinctly American in temper, it was also deeply nourished by the radical modern forms of continental painting, and by spiritual attitudes which recognize no national boundaries. One of his significant achievements was to rejuvenate the European sense of art and make it viable again for native sensibility.

Better than any critic or biographer Pollock was aware of his critical role in contemporary American painting history, although he would have hesitated or resisted acknowledging it in so many words. As a man, he appeared driven by some dispossessing, elemental force, and he was given to extreme reticences and long, intense silences which waived any direct discussion of his art. Verbal communication must have seemed at best a clumsy fiat for probing one’s innermost feelings through art, and he mistrusted words as a diversion and a possible betrayal. But he needed no outsider to impress on him the revolutionary character of his achievement, which he fully grasped and at times did express in conversation with a terrible lucidity. Pollock himself was the best judge of the size of his painting ambition, and the conflicts, perils and risks it necessarily entailed. And, because he was so sensitive to his own artistic purpose and fundamentally uncompromising, when the impulse to paint suddenly eluded him, as it did over periods of prolonged inactivity during the last three years of his life, he was desolated by anxiety and by his own self-rebukes. It is idle to speculate whether he would have again resumed painting with some consistency if tragedy had not intervened. The demands he made on himself during what may have been a temporary lapse, and what it is too easy to say should have been accepted as a deserved respite, were as harsh as those he exacted during ten of the most productive years ex-
perienced by an American artist of modern times. The drama of his life and of his art was their indivisibility; he lived his painting intensely, with a complete absorption, and he painted his life, especially in an early style when he made his own tormented individualism the theme and substance of his art. The problem of painting was identified in a total way in his mind with the problem of existence. In neither were easy solutions admissible. Happening when it did, death may have come as a deliverance from the deep mental anguish of a paralyzing spiritual crisis.

Pollock's serious artistic education began at the age of seventeen when he left Los Angeles to study for two years at the Art Students' League, principally under Thomas Benton. An older brother, Charles, now an art teacher in a western university, had come back to California after working with Benton in New York, and his proselytizing was the first taste Jackson Pollock had of the larger world of American art, and the direct inspiration of what was to become a permanent change in residence from west coast to east. It is curious that an artist as closely identified with the subject matter of American scene painting as Benton should have exercised a formative influence on the rebellious young westerner, if negatively and largely in reverse. (One must add that Pollock himself later acknowledged Ryder as the only American master who interested him at all. And those paintings he did under Benton's influence showed many of the mannerisms and captured something of the emotional atmosphere of Ryder's dream landscapes.) Later the name and style of his most celebrated student were to be synonymous with the free spirit of modernity Benton himself deeply mistrusted and opposed. Yet in Benton's work Pollock might have found hints of that coarseness, rhythmic sweep and the addiction to grotesque caricature which some ten years later characterized his first original painting style. He won his independence finally (and he liked to complain of the intolerable length of the servitude) by pushing his teacher's mannered Expressionism to a point where prevailing interest centered on the expressive pictorial effects themselves apart from anecdotal or representational aims. There remains more than a casual relationship, nonetheless, between such paintings of 1933 as that reproduced on page 7 and even Pollock's first consistently abstract paintings of 1946, *The Blue Unconscious* and *Shimmering Substance* (pages 15, 16).

In the beginning Pollock was not primarily concerned with pure pictorial values. His power of communicating and expressing emotion was so elementary that it made him impatient of Parisian esthetics. His own turbulent emotionalism led him to the more strenuous painting manners of his day, to painting which gained an impressive force in an over-sophisticated, over-complex society by its violent, direct handling and controversial subject matter. Thus, in the middle and late thirties he went to
Mexican painting for inspiration, drawing on Orozco’s blunt, angular forms and mechanistic symbolism to express the romantic protest of the individual against the machine age. Whatever elements of social optimism may have been present in the nationalistic art of the Mexicans were absent from Pollock’s adaptations. During the same period Pollock paid at least one call on David Alfaro Siqueiros at the New York studio he maintained during a brief American residence, and to his interest in Siqueiros we may possibly attribute a subsequent thickening and roughening of pigment texture, and a muddying of tonality. The expressionist violence he found in Orozco and Siqueiros confirmed a development that was already proceeding powerfully under its own inner propulsion. As in his relationship to Benton’s work, however, Pollock’s alliance with these styles was neither superficial nor perfunctory. One has the impression through the early course of his painting that he required fierce and total commitments, perhaps to insure a more decisive renunciation at some later date.

The dynamics of the development of Pollock’s abstract painting style which was germinating in the thirties would seem to have sprung from a strong tension of renunciation, as if in the role of the revolutionary he had constantly to remind himself
of his spiritual chains in order to spur his progress towards freedom. There was also a certain American appropriateness in his manner of arriving at abstraction and in the way he permitted naturalism to re-assert its claims at a much later date; both were part of a related pattern. His most resolutely non-objective manner always carried with it a vague halo of ideas and near-images and intermittently uncovered in its depths some residual ties to natural reality. As late as 1951 there reappeared, almost as involuntary formations, the recognizable anatomical figuration of earlier modes. Yet are not such apparent reversals in style best understood as pretexts the artist has invented in order to be able to re-enact the destruction of natural appearances once again, so that he may arrive at the abstract picture with fresh tension? Out of some qualms of conscience or simply to restore their own convictions, many contemporary American abstract artists still feel compelled periodically to re-experience and bare the origins of an art remote from anecdote and representational subject matter.

Even as he was responding sympathetically to Mexican painting, Pollock’s interests were being diverted to Picasso and the fresher formal viewpoints of Paris. The main elements of his first original painting style in the early forties were directly precipitated by Picasso and Surrealism. These were the influences, too, that had so much to do with the whole astonishing, vital burst of energy in American abstract art in the years between 1943 and 1948. Picasso’s Cubism gave Pollock his first intimations of the radical nature of modern painting, impressing on him the overriding importance and the transforming function of plastic values. A vivid appreciation of the painting surface as a potential architectonic organism has lent a consistent stylistic logic throughout his career even to Pollock’s freest inventions. Equally important were the suggestions he found in Picasso’s paintings of the thirties that abstraction could be more than a language of pure esthetic relation, and could embody its creator’s fancies, disquiet and passions. By the late thirties Pollock was filling notebooks with fantastic drawings that were free variations on the Spanish master’s figuration in the Guernica period (page 10). But some ineradicable suspicion of authority impelled him to fragmentize Picasso, to create more evenly distributed effects and continuous linear rhythms. These random, undirected doodles supplied many of the aggressive animal motifs for Pollock’s paintings of the early forties and also anticipated a later cursive writing which dispensed with image suggestion entirely. Apart from a huge mural painting executed in 1944, however, there was no final commitment to abstraction until 1946.

Pollock’s first public exhibition was held in 1943 at Peggy Guggenheim’s Art of This Century. It could be said to have taken place in the shadow, if not under the
direct auspices, of the international surrealist movement with which the directress and most of the European exhibitors in the gallery associated themselves. And his paintings showed the influence of the “automatism,” the attitudes of revolt and the “sacred disorder” which such expatriate artists as Ernst, Matta and others propounded in New York to the young American avant garde during the war years. To them Pollock owed his radical new sense of freedom, and he spoke more than once of his debt to their unpremeditated and automatic methods. By elevating the appeal to chance and accident into a first principle of creation, the Surrealists had circumvented the more rigid formalisms of modern art. But Pollock and a number of his contemporaries were quick to adapt surrealist strategies to their own artistic needs.

They purged the style of mystification and literary content and applied its quality of freedom to rehabilitating pure pictorial values. In their hands the expressive means of painting rather than associated ideas became the essential content of the work of art. Although American vanguard artists were drawn to Surrealism because its exasperations and atmosphere of scandal suited their sense of crisis, they were not driven into an art of fantasy and private dreams primarily, as might be expected, but one of immediate sensation. They revealed themselves as sensitive materialists even when they crusaded against the materialism of contemporary American culture.

In 1946 Pollock eliminated from his work those medusa images and fearful presences which had been released with such facility in his first two exhibitions. His surrealist symbolism was part of the romantic commitment to the self, but once he had discharged his own rancors, fears and more disturbing fancies, he was free to break the limits of the self. He then could rediscover himself more coherently in the objective action of the painting and in its internal dynamics. From 1946 to 1951 he painted entirely non-objective works. The painting was now conceived as an intrinsic creation, a work that should stand by a miracle like a house of cards, “sustained by the internal force of its style,” in Flaubert’s phrase. All emotion, no matter how extravagant, was translated into convincing pictorial sensation. Yet his most abstract flights then and since retained something of the darkling romantic mood of his totemic paintings and betrayed many of the formal obsessions of his figurative style.

Perhaps that was because Pollock always saw the painting field as an arena of conflict and strife, on which, according to the stage of his stylistic evolution, recognizable forms or abstract configurations were locked in violent combat. Each picture became the representation of a precarious balance in the play of contending forces. His bursting masculinity had to contend not only with itself, but with a delicate and often exquisite sensibility in line and color. Time has taken some of the sting from Pollock’s
Pollock's studio in Springs, 1951. At this time he often painted a number of works serially on the same long strip of unsized canvas, preserving their separate identities with a narrow margin between each painting. Tacked to the wall at top right is Number 27. Photo Hans Namuth

left: Jackson Pollock in the fall of 1955, Photo Hans Namuth

center: Drawing, 1938-43. Ink, 12 3/8 x 10". Collection Lee Krasner Pollock
wrath, and today we begin to see that his paintings seduce as readily as they bruise. Within the general framework of abstraction he could be grave, tender, angry and meltingly lyric by turns. In any case the motivation of his non-objective paintings remained impure, humanized, one is almost tempted to say, by the pressures of a variety of emotional atmospheres.

Key works of 1946, the turning point in Pollock’s career, are *Shimmering Substance* and *The Blue Unconscious*. The rich pigment paste of *Shimmering Substance* points to the densely woven webs of aluminum and enamel paint in such capital examples of later years as *Lavender Mist*, 1950 (page 26), and *Number 4*, 1949, and also to the thick, pitted surface of *Ocean Greyness* of 1953 (page 31). It was in 1949 and 1950 that Pollock perhaps attained the ripest expression of his vital material sensibility, building up his surfaces rhythmically by dripping commercial paint from a stick or a can, or spraying it on the canvas with a syringe. Then in 1953, with some relaxation of intensity, he turned back once again to a more conventional use of tube pigment and brush.

*The Blue Unconscious* uses thinner medium and depends almost exclusively on nervous, broken, linear arabesques to create space, linking it with a more vehement graphic manner which was to come. A cadenced linearism, Gothic in its aspiration, has been one of the strongest facets of Pollock’s style. Did it reflect indirectly the Anglo-Saxon’s nagging Puritan conscience, born of some misplaced trust in elevated sentiment over the evidence of the senses? With his great black and white paintings of 1951 and 1952 Pollock came face to face with the radical asceticism which tentatively announced itself in 1946. The results were the most drastic, but also among the gravest and most handsome, inventions of his painting career. An excellent example is *Number 14*, 1951 (page 30), a work powerful in its plasticity exactly because it has been wrung, under conditions of great intensity, from the narrowest pictorial means.

But Pollock’s most critical and exciting artistic contribution was reserved for the period that began with the aluminum pictures such as *Cathedral* (page 21) in 1947 and continued through 1950. These paintings, a number of them of colossal size, still pose a challenge to advanced styles of our day. Pursuing further the logic of the directions of 1946, he exploded the traditional unities of easel painting. From 1947 his pictorial energies were released centrifugally, no longer respecting either the delimiting spatial boundaries of the picture frame or the traditional uses of paint matter. The applications of silver and enamel paint, and his “drip” methods were designed to destroy the very integrity of medium, to free those forces within it constrained by association with weight, mass and the physical properties of bodies. But all such associations,
built into painting by history, custom and rule, comprise the very flesh of the oil medium. When Pollock broke down conventional painting means with his radical techniques, his works were drawn into a new gravitational system and could unfold a stirring new drama of space.

The special qualities of delirium and rapture he brought to the heightened lyricism of this period, a lyricism epic in its sweep and baroque in its expansive energies, testify to a fresh birth in the realm of contemporary art. In such paintings as *One* (pages 18-19) and *Autumn Rhythm* Pollock burst through mighty boundaries and attained, momentarily and precariously, a state of absolute freedom. His painting world, which seemed to revolve around some radical new principle of indeterminacy, was remote from the closed and intelligible universe of post-Renaissance art where man cut space to his own measure. It belonged rather to the vast free spaces of modern science and, in pictorial metaphor, showed the limits of the modern individual’s rational powers by opening up glimpses of a nature essentially irrational and chaotic.

In the beginning Pollock had felt his artistic mission was to disorient, to unsettle and to promote disorder, and with an unexampled savagery he proceeded to make of his art a kind of wrecking enterprise. His first exhibited work looked somewhat like a battlefield after a heated engagement, strewn in this case with the corpses of Picasso, the Surrealists, Miro, Kandinsky perhaps, and fragments of American Indian art. The accelerating tempo of his revolt led him to search for a total freedom that would transcend his artistic sources and his own mood of crisis. He created finally an autonomous and sovereign artistic reality, powered by its own dynamism, monumental in its scale and breadth of feeling. Yet the loaded surfaces and aggressive industrial textures of his best work continued stubbornly to point up an attachment to immediate, concrete sensation, as if Pollock partly mistrusted the intangible free spaces to which his powerful imagination had propelled him.

In his unapologetic materialism there are refreshing and unregenerately American qualities, as there are in his effort to breathe spirit into the refractory matter he chose to make the substance of his art. These distinctly native qualities mix matter-of-fact realism with respect to materials, and an innocent idealism. Only a supreme innocent would have felt free to disregard the intrinsic appeals and cultivated uses of the language of paint, and gambled with raw pictorial effects to the degree that Pollock did. And only an idealist of transcendent powers could have won from such patently non-artistic content a deep and moving lyricism.

*S. H.*
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My work with Benton was important as something against which to react very strongly, later on; in this, it was better to have worked with him than with a less resistant personality who would have provided a much less strong opposition. At the same time, Benton introduced me to Renaissance art.

I accept the fact that the important painting of the last hundred years was done in France. American painters have generally missed the point of modern painting from beginning to end. (The only American master who interests me is Ryder.) Thus the fact that good European moderns are now here is very important, for they bring with them an understanding of the problems of modern painting. I am particularly impressed with their concept of the source of art being the Unconscious. This idea interests me more than these specific painters do, for the two artists I admire most, Picasso and Miro, are still abroad.

The idea of an isolated American painting, so popular in this country during the thirties, seems absurd to me just as the idea of creating a purely American mathematics or physics would seem absurd. . . . And in another sense, the problem doesn’t exist at all; or, if it did, would solve itself: An American is an American and his painting would naturally be qualified by that fact, whether he wills it or not. But the basic problems of contemporary painting are independent of any country. (Bibl. 14)

My painting does not come from the easel. I hardly ever stretch my canvas before painting. I prefer to tack the unstretched canvas to the hard wall or floor. I need the resistance of a hard surface. On the floor I am more at ease. I feel nearer, more a part of the painting, since this way I can walk around it, work from the four sides and literally be in the painting. This is akin to the method of the Indian sand painters of the West.

I continue to get further away from the usual painter’s tools such as easel, palette, brushes, etc. I prefer sticks, trowels, knives and dripping fluid paint or a heavy impasto with sand, broken glass and other foreign matter added.

When I am in my painting, I’m not aware of what I’m doing. It is only after a sort of “get acquainted” period that I see what I have been about. I have no fears about making changes, destroying the image, etc., because the painting has a life of its own. I try to let it come through. It is only when I lose contact with the painting that the result is a mess. Otherwise there is pure harmony, an easy give and take, and the painting comes out well. (Bibl. 15)
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