

For and Against:
Views on the Infamous
1913 Armory Show

Kenyon Cox

Arthur B. Davies

Frederick James Gregg, editor

Frank Jewett Mather, Jr.

Walter Pach

Francis Picabia

Theodore Roosevelt



WWW.HOLARTBOOKS.COM

TUCSON, ARIZONA

FOR AND AGAINST Views on the Infamous 1913 Armory Show
www.holartbooks.com/books/a-028.html

[SAMPLE]



Hol Art Books, 2009

The text of this book is in the public domain

All other rights reserved

Printed in the United States of America on recycled paper

Reprint Edition

For more information about this book please e-mail info@holartbooks.com

First published 1913 by the Association of American Painters and Sculptors

ISBN 978-0-9823257-1-1

ISBN 978-0-9823257-0-4 (hardcover, combined with *The New Spirit*)

ISBN 978-0-9823257-3-5 (e-book bundle, combined with *The New Spirit*)

holartbooks.com

For and Against was first published by the Association of American Painters and Sculptors in 1913, and sold at the Chicago venue of their International Exhibition of Modern Art—familiarily known as the Armory Show. Theodore Roosevelt’s “A Layman’s Views of an Art Exhibition” was not included in that original publication, but appeared in *The Outlook* magazine at that same time. More about this and other Armory Show publications follows the main text in this volume.

CONTENTS

The Statement <i>Arthur B. Davies</i>	15
The New York Exhibition <i>The Association of American Painters and Sculptors</i>	17
Letting in the Light <i>Frederick James Gregg</i>	21
Hindsight and Foresight <i>Walter Pach</i>	29
The New Art <i>Kenyon Cox</i>	33
The Great Confusion <i>The Chicago Evening Post</i>	41
Cubism by a Cubist <i>Francis Picabia</i>	45

As to Futurists	49
The Cubist Room <i>Walter Pach</i>	51
Old and New Art <i>Frank Jewett Mather, Jr.</i>	55
A Layman's Views of an Art Exhibition <i>Theodore Roosevelt</i>	63



<i>The Armory Show and its Publications</i>	71
<i>Contributors</i>	74
<i>Further Reading</i>	76



The Statement

Arthur B. Davies

THE FOLLOWING OFFICIAL STATEMENT AS to the attitude of the Association of American Painters and Sculptors was given out by Mr. Arthur B. Davies, the President, on the last day of December, 1912:

“On behalf of the Executive Committee I desire to explain the general attitude of the Association, and especially in regard to the International Exhibition.

“This is not an institution but an association. It is composed of persons of varying tastes and predilections who are agreed on one thing—that the time has arrived for giving the public here the opportunity to see for them selves the results of new influences at work in other countries in an art way.

“In getting together the works of the European Moderns, the Society has embarked on no propaganda. It proposes to enter on no controversy with any institution. Its sole object is to put the paintings, sculptures, and so on, on exhibition so that the intelligent may judge for themselves by themselves.

“Of course, controversies will arise, just as they have arisen under similar circumstances in France, Italy, Germany, and England. But they will not be the result of any stand taken by

this Association as such. On the other hand, we are perfectly willing to assume full responsibility for providing the opportunity to those who may take one side or the other.

“Any individual expression of opinion contrary to the above is at variance with the official resolutions of this Association.”

A Layman's Views of an Art Exhibition

Theodore Roosevelt
[*The Outlook*, March 29, 1913]

THE RECENT INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITION OF Modern Art in New York was really noteworthy. Messrs. Davies, Kuhn, Gregg, and their fellow-members of the Association of American Painters and Sculptors have done a valuable work of very real value in... securing such an exhibition of the works of both foreign and native painters and sculptors. Primarily their purpose was to give the public a chance to see what has recently been going on abroad. No similar collection of the works of European "moderns" has ever been exhibited in this county. The exhibitors are quite right as to the need of showing to our people in this manner the art forces which of late have been at work in Europe, forces which cannot be ignored.

This does not mean that I in the least accept the view that these men take of the European extremists whose pictures are here exhibited. It is true, as the champions of these extremists say, that there can be no life without change, and that to be afraid of what is different or unfamiliar is to be afraid of life. It is no less true, however, that change may mean death and not life, and retrogression instead of development. Probably we err in treating most of these pictures seriously. It is likely

that many of them represent in the painters the astute appreciations of the power to make folly lucrative which the late P. T. Barnum showed with his faked mermaid. There are thousands of people who will pay small sums to look at a faked mermaid; and now and then one of this kind with enough money will buy a Cubist picture, or a picture of a misshapen nude woman, repellent from every standpoint.

In some ways it is the work of the American painters and sculptors which is of most interest in this collection, and a glance at this work must convince any one of the real good that is coming out of the new movements, fantastic though many of the developments of these new movements are. There was one note entirely absent from the exhibition, and that was the note of the commonplace. There was not a touch of simpering, self-satisfied conventionality anywhere in the exhibition. Any sculptor or painter who had in him something to express and the power of expressing it found the field open to him. He did not have to be afraid because his work was not along ordinary lines. There was no stunting or dwarfing, no requirement that a man whose gift lay in new directions should measure up or down to stereotyped and fossilized standards.

For all of this there can be only hearty praise. But this does not in the least mean that the extremists whose paintings and pictures were represented are entitled to any praise, save, perhaps, that they have helped to break fetters. Probably in any reform movement, in any field of life, the penalty for avoiding the commonplace is a liability to extravagance. It is vitally necessary to move forward and to shake off the dead hand, often the fossilized dead hand, of the reactionaries; and yet we have to face the fact that there is apt to be a lunatic fringe among the votaries of any forward movement. In this recent art exhibition the lunatic fringe was fully in evidence, especially in

the rooms devoted to the Cubists and the Futurists, or Near-Impressionists. I am not entirely certain which of the two latter terms should be used in connection with some of the various pictures and representations of plastic art—and quite frankly, it is not of the least consequence. The Cubists are entitled to the serious attention of all who find enjoyment in the colored puzzle pictures of the Sunday newspapers. Of course there is no reason for choosing the cube as a symbol, except that it is probably less fitted than any other mathematical expression for any but the most formal decorative art. There is no reason why people should not call themselves Cubists, or Octagonists, or Parallelopipedonists, or Knights of the Isosceles Triangle, or Brothers of the Cosine, if they so desire; as expressing anything serious and permanent, one term is as fatuous as another. Take the picture which for some reason is called “A naked man going down stairs.” There is in my bath-room a really good Navajo rug which, on any proper interpretation of the Cubist theory, is a far more satisfactory and decorative picture. Now if, for some inscrutable reason, it suited somebody to call this rug a picture of, say, “A well-dressed man going up a ladder,” the name would fit the facts just about as well as in the case of the Cubist picture of the “Naked man going down stairs.” From the standpoint of terminology, each name would have whatever merit inheres in a rather cheap straining after effect; and from the standpoint of decorative value, of sincerity, and of artistic merit, the Navajo rug is infinitely ahead of the picture.

As for many of the human figures in the pictures of the Futurists, they show that the school would be better entitled to the name of the “Past-ists.” I was interested to find that a man of scientific attainments who had likewise looked at pictures had been struck, as I was, by their resemblance to the later work

of the paleolithic artists of the French and Spanish caves. There are interesting samples of the strivings for the representation of the human form among artists of many different countries and times, all in the same stage of paleolithic culture, to be found in recent number of the *Revue d'Ethnographique*. The paleolithic artist was able to portray the bison, the mammoth, the reindeer, and the horse with spirit and success, while he stumbled painfully in the effort to portray man. This stumbling effort in his case represented progress, and he was entitled to a great credit for it. Forty thousand years later, when entered into artificially and deliberately, it represents only a smirking pose of retrogression, and is not praise-worthy. So with much of the sculpture. A family group of precisely the merit that inheres in a structure made of the wooden blocks in a nursery is not entitled to be reproduced in marble. Admirers speak of the kneeling female figure by Lehmbruck—I use “female” advisedly, for although obviously mammalian it is not especially human—as “full of lyric grace,” as “tremendously sincere,” and “of a jewel-like preciousness.” I am not competent to say whether these words themselves represent sincerity or merely conventional jargon; it is just as easy to be conventional about the fantastic as about the commonplace. In any event one might as well speak of the “lyric grace” of a praying mantis, which adopts much the same attitude; and why a deformed pelvis should be called “sincere,” or a tibia of giraffe-like length “precious,” is a question of pathological rather than artistic significance. This figure and the absurd portrait head of some young lady have the merit that inheres in extravagant caricature. It is a merit, but it is not a high merit. It entitles these pieces to stand in sculpture where nonsense rhymes stand in literature and the sketches of Aubrey Beardsley in pictorial art. These modern sculptured caricatures in no way approach the gargoyles of Gothic cathedrals, proba-

bly because the modern artists are too self-conscious and make themselves ridiculous by pretentiousness. The makers of the gargoyles knew very well that the gargoyles did not represent what was most important in the Gothic cathedrals. They stood for just a little pint of grotesque reaction against, and relief from, the tremendous elemental vastness and grandeur of the House of God. They were imps, sinister and comic, grim yet futile, and they fitted admirably into the framework of the theology that found its expression in the towering and wonderful piles which they ornamented.

Very little of the work of the extremists among the European “moderns” seems to be good in and for itself; nevertheless it has certainly helped any number of American artists to do work that is original and serious; and this not only in painting but in sculpture. I wish the exhibition had contained some of the work of the late Marcius Symonds; very few people knew or cared for it while he lived; but not since Turner has there been another man on whose canvas glowed so much of the unearthly “light that never was on land or sea.” But the exhibition contained so much of extraordinary merit that it is ungrateful even to mention an omission. To name the pictures one would like to possess—and the bronzes and tanagras and plasters—would mean to make a catalogue of indefinite length. One of the most striking pictures was the *Terminal Yards*—the seeing eye was there, and the cunning hand. I should like to mention all the pictures of the President of the associations, Arthur B. Davies. As first-class decorative work of an entirely new type, the very unexpected pictures of Sheriff Bob Chandler have merit all their own. The *Arizona Desert*, the *Canadian Night*, the group of girls on the roof of a New York tenement-house, the studies in the Bronx Zoo, the *Heracles*, the studies for the Utah monument, the little group called *Gossip*, which has something

of the quality of the famous Fifteenth Idyl of Theocritus, the *Pelf*, with its grim suggestiveness—these, and a hundred others, are worthy of study, each of them; I am naming at random those which at the moment I happen to recall. I am not speaking of the acknowledged masters, of Whistler, Puvis de Chavannes, Monet; nor of John's children; nor of Cézanne's old woman with a rosary; nor of Redon's marvelous color pieces—a worthy critic should speak of these. All I am trying to do is to point out why a layman is grateful to those who arranged this exhibition.



Hol Art Books is an independent press dedicated to publishing and promoting exceptional writing on visual art—classic works of art criticism and history, artist texts and biographies, foreign literature in translation, and the best of contemporary writing.

In a departure from traditional publishing, Hol brings authors and publishing professionals together online to collaboratively identify, evaluate and develop its titles. This unique model is designed to create a more open and dynamic environment in which to publish books that meet high standards of excellence and have lasting resonance with readers.

Join us.

Visit holartbooks.com to find and publish great books on visual art.