

CONDITIONS OF USE FOR THIS PDF

The images contained within this PDF may be used for private study, scholarship, and research only. They may not be published in print, posted on the internet, or exhibited. They may not be donated, sold, or otherwise transferred to another individual or repository without the written permission of The Museum of Modern Art Archives.

When publication is intended, publication-quality images must be obtained from SCALA Group, the Museum's agent for licensing and distribution of images to outside publishers and researchers.

If you wish to quote any of this material in a publication, an application for permission to publish must be submitted to the MoMA Archives. This stipulation also applies to dissertations and theses. All references to materials should cite the archival collection and folder, and acknowledge "The Museum of Modern Art Archives, New York."

Whether publishing an image or quoting text, you are responsible for obtaining any consents or permissions which may be necessary in connection with any use of the archival materials, including, without limitation, any necessary authorizations from the copyright holder thereof or from any individual depicted therein.

In requesting and accepting this reproduction, you are agreeing to indemnify and hold harmless The Museum of Modern Art, its agents and employees against all claims, demands, costs and expenses incurred by copyright infringement or any other legal or regulatory cause of action arising from the use of this material.

NOTICE: WARNING CONCERNING COPYRIGHT RESTRICTIONS

The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specified conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction is not to be "used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research." If a user makes a request for, or later uses, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes in excess of "fair use," that user may be liable for copyright infringement.

The Museum of Modern Art Archives, NY	Collection:	Series.Folder:
	PI/COMMS	IV.A.17

22 PAINTERS:
2 Picket

NEW YORK MIRROR, SUNDAY, APRIL 24, 1960

Continued from Page 3

but the protest is even more serious—for it comes from some 22 painters many of whom are recognized and respected as leaders in contemporary art. Many of them, such as Edward Hopper, Henry Varnum Poor, Raphael Soyer, Joseph Hirsch and others, have been represented in the Whitney and the permanent collections of leading institutions.

In a letter signed by all 22, they wrote Whitney director Lloyd Goodrich, "We are deeply disturbed by the role of museums in the contemporary art scene."

Pointing out that the Whitney's most recent annual show featured 145 paintings of which 102 were nonobjective, 17 more abstract and another 17 semi-abstract, they note with bitterness that this left "only nine paintings in which the image has not retreated or disappeared."

This, they call "insistence on one form of expression," and they say it "has resulted in conformism and a stultifying atmosphere. It has," they contend, "created a situation inimical to the true development of the individual artist and American art."

Insistently they ask, "Is it not time for the Whitney Museum to reevaluate its policy?"

TROUBLED, GOODRICH commented yesterday, "I don't understand what they're getting at." Many of the artists are his friends. He said he would answer their letter—after devoting further thought to it. It's not fair to say the Whitney ignores representational art, he maintained, pointing to a current second-floor showing of the works of Philip Evergood.

At the Museum of Modern Art, director Rene d'Harnoncourt turned the other cheek. "The Museum," he said, "has always welcomed comments on its program." Some comments, he said, are expected to be unfavorable. Twenty years ago, he pointed out, artists picketed the place because they wanted to see more abstracts there, not fewer.

But that doesn't quite brush off the revolt, which may turn the whole art world, so long upside-down, right side up again.

Painters Give Contemporary Art the Brush

By CHARLES WAGNER and HARRY ALTSHULER

A painting titled "Fountain," that looks as if a fountain had splashed it on the canvas...

Horizontal and vertical lines, painted apparently at random... Something that might well be the rag on which a painter wiped off his brushes, but framed and hung on a museum wall...

Something else: possibly the footprints of an Abominable Snowman who forgot to wipe his feet on the doormat...? Smears...

Daubs... Squirms... Freckles... AND TO TOP IT OFF, a stinging blank of nothingness at all in a frame. With a stiff price paid for it. Something for the critics to murmur ecstatically over.

This is Art, with a capital A...

Oh, but definitely. At least, it's what you'll find a lot of, in such recherche, elegant haunts of the troubled psyche as the Museum of Modern Art at 11 W. 53d St. and the Whitney Museum of American Art at 22 W. 54th. The man in the street has long passed this stuff by with an un-

comprehending snort, or in an idle moment, stopped in for a good laugh. Well, who cares about the common people; let them go.

But now there's a significant revolt brewing.

The artists are sick of it, too. Today, two young artists are picking out of their studios to picket the Museum of Modern Art as a sign of their disgust. They are John Dobbs and Daniel Brown.

They paint things that are recognizable—not just spots, smears and squares. Nor blanks.

WITH ITS PREFERENCE for the smears, squirms, etc., the Museum is stifling the development of American art, they cry. It has become a club of the initiated elite," they assert in a strongly worded handbill they have been busy distributing all over town.

At best, what this pushing of abstract art does is elevate handicrafts, industrial design and children's art to the highest form of human endeavor," they charge.

AROUND THE CORNER at the Whitney there are no pickets,



Woman view abstract painting in Museum of Modern Art. But is it art? That's a messy question. (Photo by 1960 M.A.A. 11/11/60)

Continued on Page 22

The Museum of Modern Art Archives, NY	Collection:	Series.Folder:
	PI/COMMS	IV.A.17

Photo File - Picketing

NEW YORK (N.Y.)
HERALD TRIBUNE

Circ.: m. 335,466
S. 527,002

Front Page Ed. Page Other Page

Date: APR 26 1960

Strife Among the Artists

Art controversy is as old as art itself; back in prehistoric times there probably were critics to say disparagingly "Call that a mastodon?" when they were shown the latest cave-drawings.

So the pickets who marched in front of the Museum of Modern Art stand in a tradition of protest, however unorthodox their means of expressing it. Their complaint is that the museum is slighting other styles in favor of abstract art, a view which can usually be counted upon to arouse a degree of instinctive public sympathy. However, the Museum, which was prompt to hand out statements of its own position, is unlikely to lose either public favor or patronage as a result of the dispute.

Picket placards are on the whole a neglected and undeveloped form of art. And perhaps the most regrettable aspect of the Museum of Modern Art affair is the poor artistic quality of the signs carried by the marchers, most of which were scrawled or crudely printed. In fact, passing observers from somewhat more professional unions might even feel impelled to ask in the immemorial manner of art critics: "Call that a picket sign?"

Pails and Palettes

As is usual in the history of art, there comes a time when being avant-garde is not avant-garde enough.

Hence the interesting spectacle of artists picketing New York's Museum of Modern Art for not displaying "contemporary schools of art."

This is undoubtedly good exercise for the pickets—just as similar museum picketing of two or three decades ago was good for those artists who wanted to get into museums the nonobjective paintings that today's pickets want to get out. It may also prove a timely warning for the Museum of Modern Art, which before long will have to cope with a more nonobjective rival on Columbus Circle.

We agree with what we presume the pickets are intending to point out—that the great American bastion of the modernist movement could stand a little more diversity in its diet of

contemporary work. If romanticism is reviving, the new romantics ought to get some gallery room.

But it's hard to follow the pickets' vexation over displays of "such things as boat propellers, ice-cream scoops, ball bearings, kitchen pails, and food grinders, which are not objects of art."

One of the greatest services rendered by the sometimes controversial museum on 53d Street has been its devotion to seeing that these simple things which touch everyday life have become more pleasingly and more usefully designed. If the museum wants to devote one of its rooms to encouraging propellers that are as beautiful as Brancusi sculpture, let it.

The museum apparently isn't adverse to pickets for art's sake. In turn, the pickets ought to be equally tolerant toward art for propeller's sake.

Editorial BOSTON CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR 4/28/60

The Museum of Modern Art Archives, NY	Collection:	Series.Folder:
	PI/COMMS	IV.A.17

NEW YORK (N.Y.)
HERALD TRIBUNE

Circ.: m. 335,466
S. 527,002

Front Page Edit Page Other Page

Date: APR 26 1960

Strife Among the Artists

Art controversy is as old as art itself; back in prehistoric times there probably were critics to say disparagingly "Call that a mastodon?" when they were shown the latest cave-drawings.

So the pickets who marched in front of the Museum of Modern Art stand in a tradition of protest, however unorthodox their means of expressing it. Their complaint is that the museum is slighting other styles in favor of abstract art, a view which can usually be counted upon to arouse a degree of instinctive public sympathy. However, the Museum, which was prompt to hand out statements of its own position, is unlikely to lose either public favor or patronage as a result of the dispute.

Picket placards are on the whole a neglected and undeveloped form of art. And perhaps the most regrettable aspect of the Museum of Modern Art affair is the poor artistic quality of the signs carried by the marchers, most of which were scrawled or crudely printed. In fact, passing observers from somewhat more professional unions might even feel impelled to ask in the immemorial manner of art critics: "Call that a picket sign?"

Pails and Palettes

As is usual in the history of art, there comes a time when being avant-garde is not avant-garde enough.

Hence the interesting spectacle of artists picketing New York's Museum of Modern Art for not displaying "contemporary schools of art."

This is undoubtedly good exercise for the pickets—just as similar museum picketing of two or three decades ago was good for those artists who wanted to get into museums the nonobjective paintings that today's pickets want to get out. It may also prove a timely warning for the Museum of Modern Art, which before long will have to cope with a more nonobjective rival on Columbus Circle.

We agree with what we presume the pickets are intending to point out—that the great American bastion of the modernist movement could stand a little more diversity in its diet of

contemporary work. If romanticism is reviving, the new romantics ought to get some gallery room.

But it's hard to follow the pickets' vexation over displays of "such things as boat propellers, ice-cream scoops, ball bearings, kitchen pails, and food grinders, which are not objects of art."

One of the greatest services rendered by the sometimes controversial museum on 53d Street has been its devotion to seeing that these simple things which touch everyday life have become more pleasingly and more usefully designed. If the museum wants to devote one of its rooms to encouraging propellers that are as beautiful as Brancusi sculpture, let it.

The museum apparently isn't adverse to pickets for art's sake. In turn, the pickets ought to be equally tolerant toward art for propeller's sake.

The Museum of Modern Art Archives, NY	Collection:	Series.Folder:
	PI/COMMS	IV.A.17

NEW YORK (N.Y.)
HERALD TRIBUNE

Circ.: m. 335,466
S. 527,002

Front Page Edit Page Other Page

Date: APR 26 1960

Strife Among the Artists

Art controversy is as old as art itself; back in prehistoric times there probably were critics to say disparagingly "Call that a mastodon?" when they were shown the latest cave-drawings.

So the pickets who marched in front of the Museum of Modern Art stand in a tradition of protest, however unorthodox their means of expressing it. Their complaint is that the museum is slighting other styles in favor of abstract art, a view which can usually be counted upon to arouse a degree of instinctive public sympathy. However, the Museum, which was prompt to hand out statements of its own position, is unlikely to lose either public favor or patronage as a result of the dispute.

Picket placards are on the whole a neglected and undeveloped form of art. And perhaps the most regrettable aspect of the Museum of Modern Art affair is the poor artistic quality of the signs carried by the marchers, most of which were scrawled or crudely printed. In fact, passing observers from somewhat more professional unions might even feel impelled to ask in the immemorial manner of art critics: "Call that a picket sign?"

Pails and Palettes

As is usual in the history of art, there comes a time when being avant-garde is not avant-garde enough.

Hence the interesting spectacle of artists picketing New York's Museum of Modern Art for not displaying "contemporary schools of art."

This is undoubtedly good exercise for the pickets—just as similar museum picketing of two or three decades ago was good for those artists who wanted to get into museums the nonobjective paintings that today's pickets want to get out. It may also prove a timely warning for the Museum of Modern Art, which before long will have to cope with a more nonobjective rival on Columbus Circle.

We agree with what we presume the pickets are intending to point out—that the great American bastion of the modernist movement could stand a little more diversity in its diet of

contemporary work. If romanticism is reviving, the new romantics ought to get some gallery room.

But it's hard to follow the pickets' vexation over displays of "such things as boat propellers, ice-cream scoops, ball bearings, kitchen pails, and food grinders, which are not objects of art."

One of the greatest services rendered by the sometimes controversial museum on 53d Street has been its devotion to seeing that these simple things which touch everyday life have become more pleasingly and more usefully designed. If the museum wants to devote one of its rooms to encouraging propellers that are as beautiful as Brancusi sculpture, let it.

The museum apparently isn't adverse to pickets for art's sake. In turn, the pickets ought to be equally tolerant toward art for propeller's sake.

Editorial BOSTON CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR 4/28/60