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I appreciate the use of politics as a subject matter in art. I am drawn to literature, films, songs, and visual art that share or influence my political views. I have often found myself listening to a song for the umpteenth time, and realizing, when I stop to really listen to the lyrics my mouth is already singing, that I have understood and agreed with what that artist is saying all along. It is a mini-epiphany that I find quite satisfying. This is what has drawn me to the idea of doing my honors thesis project on art, politics and how they fit together for me.

In the beginning stages, I had delusions of grandeur about a project that would tackle the association between art and politics throughout history and explore every facet of the relationship in regards to contemporary artists. I then found myself backpedaling as fast as I could. The issue of art that makes a political statement is so broad and extensive that I realized I would totally lose the focus of my project. However, there remain many areas I hope to address in this thesis: What are my influences for creating what I do? What are the stances I’ve taken towards these objects I’ve made? Finally, what stigmas are associated with making political art? In this essay political art will refer to human made objects that create a visual experience with the intent of present a political view. This essay will serve as an explanation of my thesis project, which will culminate February 24 when I will be displaying a series of political works I made with this project in mind. The exhibit will be up for one week.
Examples of Political Art throughout History

Art has been around since the Stone Age. Humans painted on cave walls 35,000 years ago. With the development of complex societies, we see the emergence of a secondary but key figure that allowed for the production of political art. Important in art is the role of patrons, usually rulers, who paid for or ordered artists to create work for them and often dictated key elements in the piece. This has happened throughout history and is the basis for political views that find an outlet in art.

*Stela of Naramsin* is a stone carving from around 2220 BCE. This work “commemorates a military victory of Naramsin… and is an early example of a work of art created to celebrate the achievements of an individual ruler” (Stokstad, 1995, p.74).

In Stokstad we learn that this piece has very significant symbols that do more than commemorate the king’s victory. The three suns are “solar deities” and the crown on Naramsin’s head has horns, which are used to identify the gods. This piece expresses the divine approval of Naramsin’s reign as well as his existence as more than merely human.

In short, this was a propaganda piece designed to elevate Naramsin to a position that would be respected by the people.

In 1787 CE, Marie-Louise-Elisabeth Vigée-Lebrun painted a portrait of Queen Marie Antoinette. This was not an unusual thing for Vigée–Lebrun, since she was a court painter for the queen and painted more than twenty portraits of the queen throughout her
career (Stokstad, 1995). The painting, titled *Portrait of Marie Antoinette with her Children*, was an attempt by the queen to sway public opinion of her. The portrait, depicting her with her children, shows her to be fulfilling the responsibilities of a mother at the time. This is an excellent example of propaganda because it was a widely held public belief that the queen was in fact very evil. Many pamphlets and stories were circulated about her and depicted her to be an extravagant, deviant, and careless queen. Many of the allegations presented within these pamphlets are believed to be false, but they had a very negative impact on the way the public viewed the queen. The portrait was made to combat these detrimental stories by attempting to show the queen as a caring mother and a woman doing her duty. The goal of the painting was not achieved and the queen was executed in 1793 during the French Revolution.

In David Smith’s artist statement he asserts that, “[Art] has existed in the minds of free men for less than a century. Prior to this, the direction of art was dictated by minds other then the artist for exploitation and commercial use” (Wilkin, 1984, p.109). The examples I have listed thus far address art that was commissioned in one form or another. As art has become a more unique individual experience existing outside of the realm of patronage, the politics in art have done the same. One such example is George Grosz, who used painting and drawing to speak out against fascism in Germany. His monumental painting, *Pillars of Society* depicts five individuals that represented classes...
of people that Grosz pointed out as problems in society. "Grosz brought together personifications of the major forces that held the Weimar Republic together; The ex-fraternity man with his dueling scars, his saber, his beer mug and his Nazi stick pin; the fat German Nationalist with his head full of manure; the red-nosed clergyman who blesses everything indiscriminately; the ruthless, dogged military man, wielding his pistol and bloody sword; the reactionary journalist with a palm leaf in his hand and a chamber pot on his head" (Schneede, 1977, p. 157). This painting expresses Grosz’s personal disagreement and frustration with the German ruling class, a subject explored in many of his works.

These three works are examples of how politics have found their way into art. First, which still happens today, as a means of making money or attaining political favor. This led to the evolution of art production as an individual expression of political beliefs. Today the term political art is very broad. It encompasses everything from activism to subtle art that hides the meaning of a piece making it apparent to a selected few.

"Political Art" as a Label

After I had submitted my proposal for this project I began talking with some professors about what I was doing. I received almost the same immediate response from three different professors. "Hmmm... Yeah, well I don’t really like political art.” I took this statement as distaste for the way political art looks. All three of these artists/teachers
are at different points in their careers, from different backgrounds, and I respect all of their opinions. Needless to say, this response was a little discouraging.

Jack Dollhausen was one of the artists that had this immediate reaction. Upon further reflection he explained a piece that he made. Jack does electronic sculpture and is constantly searching for devices that produce a random electronic impulse. This adds an element of spontaneity to his work. He has used many different devices to achieve this spontaneity; motion detectors, sound sensors and many others. For one piece, he used a Geiger counter. Jack explained that the result was a large quasi “bird shape” set in a rather two-dimensional cage made of wire. This bird would burst into a fountain of light every time the Geiger counter was triggered. As you may know, a Geiger counter is a small instrument that clicks every time a radioactive particle connects with the meter. Jack used this to trigger the rest of the piece. Hence, the piece would be more active in areas of higher radiation or times when radioactivity was increased. He named the piece *Miner’s Canary*, referencing a tool, the canary, used by coal miners. The miners would take a canary into the coal mine with them. When gas leaked into the mine, the canary would die, warning the workers of the dangerous gas. So Jack explained this was a rather political piece about nuclear devices and the constant amount of radiation with which we are bombarded. Despite this piece, in looking at Jack’s body of work, there is no way he could be labeled a “political artist”.
What I have deduced is that many artists are not against voicing political views through their art, but in fact, are trying to avoid the label “political artist”. I think that the label political art is avoided because of two reasons. First, it can have a tendency to lock an artist into a specific genre. Second, I think many artists want to be taken seriously as artists, not as political activists who paint, draw, or sing. Art and activism can be similar in purpose but they differ in language, the opinion is expressed through different means. It is my belief that the term “political artist” implies an activist approach to changing one’s opinion and not that of a more visual language that may be the goal of artists.

Politics is one of the many topics people think about. Generally speaking, one’s thoughts enter into his or her work. This gives politics a way of occasionally creeping into the work of some artists simply as an expression of what they have experienced or are influenced by. I would not categorize myself as “political,” although I recognize I think about political issues; therefore, politics often enter into my subject matter.

Ambiguous vs. overt.

During one conversation with another artist I respect, the question over ambiguity came up. He said, “Political art must be direct. If you want to make an anti-abortion statement, it has to be in your face and ugly.” I disagree with this statement. I understand that ambiguity may mislead an audience; it may close out a portion of the viewers, perhaps even a large percentage of them. Blatantly stating an issue can
completely express the meaning to the viewer, therefore, I feel that directness is not a
mandatory element in political art. I have found that a variety of approaches can be taken
when asserting one’s view. Some artists have used humorous satire; others have used
very subtlety elements. There are many varying degrees of directness or subtly that can
be employed by artists to convey meaning to their audience.

Mel Chin is, by far, the artist that influences my work the most. His work is difficult
to categorize and includes many different mediums. Many of his pieces deal with social
issues and the symbolism he uses is very strong. The Extraction of Plenty from what
remains: 1823 is a cornucopia made of various materials sandwiched between two
pillars, which reference those on the capitol building. The message of the piece is not
entirely apparent right away. With an examination of the materials list, a statement about
the United States’ squeeze on another country may begin to come through. Honduran
mahogany, first on the list, immediately brings up Honduras, a country in South America.
Bananas, coffee, and goats would fit with items found in South America. Finally, by
looking into the date, 1823, one realizes the Monroe Doctrine is referenced. So the piece
begins to become more apparent to us. Chin’s statement is about the exploitation of
South America by the United States.

A second work of Chin’s that I find particularly powerful is Fan Club. A three-foot
Japanese fan is made from a baseball bat that has been sliced into thin ribs. Chinese
calligraphy hangs on the wall next to it. The piece was made in 1994 and under Chin's list of materials are blood on silk and ink on paper. The meaning of the piece is not overt and upon first glance it comes across as quite elegant, although the use of blood obviously makes this impression questionable. The real meaning of the piece becomes apparent with the translation of the Chinese calligraphy, which states “Something to whip up the baseball fans- a setting sun fan. In memory of Vincent Chin and all victims of racial violence.” The piece is a memorial to Vincent Chin (no relation to Mel Chin), a Chinese American, who was beaten to death by two disgruntled American autoworkers. The two men from Detroit began calling Chin racial slurs and blamed him and those “like him” (they had mistakenly identified him as a Japanese man) for the layoffs at the Chrysler manufacturing plant, where one of the men had lost his job. What I find appealing about Chin’s work is his use of hints found in titles and throughout his pieces that serve as political and historical references.

The Use of Text

From what I am told, most of the information I have explained of Mel Chin’s work is generally posted on the wall next to the piece. Text can be a very effective way to explain to your audience what you are trying to say. It is used in many different settings, such as galleries, museums, and catalogs. A short write up or explanation is a very
acceptable means for an artist to explain a little about the piece he or she has made. I have chosen not to accompany my work with a write up.

I have noticed that when people look at art in a museum, they generally look at the piece for a short time, then look at the label accompanying the piece, read it, look at the piece again and continue on their way. I feel we live in a society that is, in many ways, defined by our communication system. Whether written or spoken, language is the most common type of communication. It is my belief that art can also be an effective way to inform each other. Using visual symbols, including different colors and materials, is a way to communicate with each other. This type of communication is often less practiced and many times less direct but it is a way to invoke a response none the less.

What I aim to do is communicate through a visual language, rather then a written language. For this reason I will have title cards listing the materials used for each piece and a short written artist’s statement explaining why I chose to do this exhibit for my honors thesis. That will be the only text accompanying my work.

I also worry that text may disengage the viewer. The audience may become more focused on the literal meaning of the work, than the visual experience it is meant to provide. I fear it will offer viewers little chance for self-interpretation and force them either to approve or disapprove of the statement on the wall. So in the end, it becomes more about the text on the wall, than about the work hanging next to it.
Many artists have used text in another way. Text may be directly applied to the actual piece of art. This has been done many different times by many different artists. I have seen a large amount of student work in which text is used. The use of text is very difficult; it must be thought out very carefully and can lead to undesirable consequences if not used properly. Text can become overkill very easily.

A piece displayed in a student show immediately comes to mind. Scrawled down a long sheet of metallic material, in what appeared to be red lipstick, were multiple issues dealing with feminism in the United States. One of the issues raised was that most health insurance will cover a prescription for Viagra but not for birth control pills. The other statements pointed out more issues along the same lines. I understood what the artist was saying and could see the frustration depicted through the piece. I worry that a viewer experiencing this piece may become overwhelmed by the information given. I worry that this type of text presentation does not engage a viewer's curiosity, but in fact their defense mechanism. By being so obviously confrontational the piece may lead to a simple dismissal by the viewer, which will not aid in further investigation by those looking at the piece. It is this fear that has led me to refrain from using text in my work. It is my goal to engage the curiosity of the viewer through hints and visual elements. It is my hope that this curiosity will lead to further investigation of the issue by the viewer.
This is not to say that all art including text always pushes the artist's opinion on a specific issue. I had the opportunity to discuss the use of text with Tad Savinar. Savinar uses text repeatedly in many of his pieces; in some, text is the main element. I spoke to him about his use of text in a print he had designed which dealt with genetic engineering. The print depicts a tree that has the base of an oak tree, but towards the center changes to a fire tree, so that the top of the tree tapers to a point. Underneath was the phrase, “Next Year’s Model”. This obvious statement brings up issues of genetics: humans altering their environment, here through the simple grafting of trees. The piece never declares what the artist’s view is. There seems to be no defining element urging the viewer to condone or condemn the issue of genetic alteration. Savinar explained that his intent was to simply raise the issue of genetic alteration, thus, pushing the viewer to think about this large and difficult topic. The intent was not to sway the audience one way or the other. So there are instances when an artist's only goal is to stimulate thought about an issue and/or create a dialogue about a political topic. This also illustrates the point that not all text in art will overstate a case and run the risk of overwhelming your audience.

There are two reasons I have decided not to tell my audience what I am thinking about through text. First, I want them to view these pieces as works expressing ideas through a concrete language, although different from that of a written form of communication. Second, it also seems to me that text can be stifling if used ineffectively. Confronting
viewers with an opinion may overwhelm them and does not engage their own thinking abilities. Chin is very adept at leaving hints. On first sight, I found his work eye catching and interesting. Then I began to explore the context of his work and the subject matter with which he was dealing. It was very ambiguous at first, but after some research I began to understand more of what he was talking about. This is what I strive for in my work. In an ideal situation, I will have provided enough hints for viewers to investigate my feelings and come to understand the statement I wish to make, while at the same time exploring their own thoughts on the topic presented. I may not succeed in all of these pieces, but it is my goal.

What Constitutes “Successful” Political Art?

There are two obvious types of success in political art. The first is success in terms of the message. By this I mean the viewer sees your point of view and is then confronted with his or her own thoughts on the topic. The second is artistically. In this case, the viewer finds the work aesthetically pleasing, or admires the work for its formal and visual qualities. Obviously, these two aspects of success will vary depending on the viewer. A person’s aesthetic opinions and interpretations are so strongly based on individual experience that anticipating everyone’s reaction is impossible.

Obviously, there are some things that are fairly universal and will immediately jump out to the viewer. Eyebrows Raised uses many universal symbols that strongly influence
the viewer. The three most recognizable elements in this piece are the American flag, the middle finger, and a hangman’s noose. These are obvious symbols that most people can identify. Unfortunately, this may be a problem as well. The symbols are so strong that they may overpower the piece. Just as text can overwhelm the viewer, so can strong symbols. By coupling the flag with a noose and a rude gesture, this piece is immediately perceived as a negative reference to the United States. Other things may begin to stand out after a second glance: the muddling of the flag as it gets lower, the set of hands imprisoned near the bottom, and the sign language across the top that reads, “APATHY”.

All of these elements combined make this piece seemingly adverse to patriotic viewpoints. The negative perceptions viewers may have of this piece can overpower the real issue I was exploring, which was questioning classism in America. The overt use of strong symbolism may remove this piece from a questioning position to one of a blatant statement.

There is one element about this piece that I find particularly successful, and that is the use of sign language across the top. I completed *Eyebrows Raised* before I was introduced to the work of Chin. The sign language element is, in fact, what drew me to Chin’s work. Not immediately recognizable, the sign language allows for future discovery for viewers. It becomes something that they can work out for themselves, look into later, or in some cases be completely surprised by. It was the reaction people had to
the sign language that drew me to political art work like that of Chin’s. I found the slightly hidden element of sign language to be the most successful aspect of this piece.

Craftsmanship is a very important aspect in dealing with the aesthetics of any visual piece, but is even more important when creating art that is confrontational. Unresolved formal elements or poor quality distract the viewer. Technical flaws can be used to discount the artist’s stance on the issue that is being addressed. Someone who disagrees with the political stance can simply dismiss the work for technical reasons, without even addressing the subject matter of the piece. At some point, critics may overstate technical flaws and their stance towards an issue is weakened by their unwillingness to deal with the political statement in question. My goal is to reach a level of craftsmanship that forces a critic to accept the work visually, and thus examine the issue raised. At the heart of this matter I feel that political art can stand and be successful even if the politics are misunderstood or not apparent. However, the politics will always have limited effects if the artistic elements fail. For this reason, political art must be created as art first and as politics second.

There is a third type of success in the making of art, yet to be discussed. It is one of a much more individual nature. It is the satisfaction I have enjoyed while creating these pieces. Working through the visual problems and watching a piece emerge from my plan allows for further and more intimate self-reflection than I had intended. I have difficulty
describing this, but there is an aspect of enjoyment for me in the construction of this work. This enjoyment is not praise that I may receive from other people, or a satisfaction in presenting a political view. It is a simple matter of working through problems of a technical or intellectual nature, by myself or in discussions with close friends, that justify this work for me; I can only hope that it can be a similarly satisfying visual experience for others as well.

It is little things in this process of creating that strike me as interesting. For one of the pieces in the show I use Mars, the Roman god of war as subject matter. At a point in the piece I used some black paint for a design element. It was just regular black acrylic paint, but when I looked at the jar, I had to smile because the color printed on the front of the jar was “Mars black”. I had seen this label before and often wondered what Mars had to do with black, but at that moment I just found it humorous and interesting. This is just a little thing that had nothing to do with politics, but lent to my enjoyment of creating the piece.

Ironically, another example of the personal introspection I had while creating this piece came from the material I carved. The foam was a found object; I still have no idea what its original purpose was, or from what it was made. About halfway through the creation of this piece I began to wonder about the fine dust settling all over my studio from the carving of this foam. Was this something I should really be breathing?
Likewise, the gray material that covered the foam had a fibrous quality that indicated a fiberglass material. This is also not good to breathe, not to mention the irritation it caused my hands and arms. This became an interesting point for the piece. The very material I was using could very well be the exact problem I wanted to address. At the same time, it took on a sinister aspect because it was possibly detrimental to my health.

Although viewers may not interpret all the underlying political messages in this work and others won’t find the work pleasant, if the show is enjoyable and interesting for a few people or begins a few conversations, then I feel it is successful. The process I have gone through, the experience I have gained, and the reflection this show has given me is justification enough for me.

An Explanation of Each Piece

Eyebrows raised

This piece is older than any of the other pieces in the show. It has gone through the most revisions and since it has been with me the longest, has given me the most time to reflect on it. Due to its early construction this piece does not implore the techniques that I am striving for and have seen in the work of Mel Chin. I feel it is too overt and may present viewers with my stance rather immediately.

This piece began as an assignment for a sculpture class in which we were asked to make a statement about our culture. This piece is intended to depict the different classes
I see people in. I tried to be as self-critical and to bring many different viewpoints into
the piece as possible. Unfortunately, the hands that I feel stand out the most are the set
that gesture with a raised middle finger. In depicting a middle finger, my intent was not
to give the United States “the bird” but to look at the pair of hands as a whole, one hand
disapproves, while the other hand beckons for and receives the rope for which it asks.
This set of hands is placed relatively high in relation with other hands. These two hands
are about my realization that the same government I criticize is lending me money to
fund my college education. The height of the hands symbolize a self-realization of my
rather high standing on the social economic ladder.

My intent was to depict different situations that people may be in. There is a set of
hands that are too busy fighting to accept the rope. Some hands try to help those below
them, only to tighten the noose or pull the rope further out of reach. One set hoists
themselves up, trying desperately to get as high as possible. The hands nearest the top
collect the rope, hindering those that could be helped by it. The main issue of the piece is
the relationship the rope has with the hands at the bottom of the piece. One set of hands
is tied up, which shows with my views on how society views criminals and what exactly
constitutes criminal behavior according to the laws we have adopted. The hands
stretching for the rope that is out of reach deal with our opinion of the poor in our
country, those that are viewed as simply lazy or deserving the predicament they are in.
The dead hands being hung by a noose demonstrates how I feel this society takes an apathetic view of the death of some people. This issue is two fold as seen in the justified killing of individuals (capital punishment) as well as issues of complacency (malnourishment and starvation of children).

The fading of the vibrant colors to murky browns at the bottom of the flag can mean many different things to a number of different people. It could be a statement of racial inequality. It could be the view of “deserving” poor and the negative view this society fosters for those less fortunate. It could also represent the degradation of the individuals towards the bottom as the flag receives degradation as well.

The final element of the piece is the title. *Eyebrows Raised* refers to the sign language at the top of the piece. The American Sign Language (ASL) at the top spells out “APATHY”. The title, *Eyebrows Raised*, indicates to the facial expression used in ASL that signifies a yes/no question being asked in American Sign Language. This was an attempt to turn this statement into a question, by asking the viewer if they agree with what has been asserted by the piece.

*Of Mythology, Horoscopes, and Mentality*

This piece came about when a friend left a piece of foam in my studio. I had been reading “The Rich get Rich and the Poor get Prison” by Jeffrey Reiman. This book is a sociological study of the American legal system and how those in lower income brackets
generally end up serving longer and harsher prison sentences than those of higher incomes. I began playing with the idea of using the foam as a two-sided piece contrasting one aspect of our society with a view that was not generally recognized. One subject raised by Reiman under the heading “Waging Chemical Warfare Against America” spoke strongly to me. He discusses how American policy makers have done an inadequate job controlling pollution, cigarette smoke, and food additives. He continues by explaining that these causes of cancer are a much larger threat to the lives of Americans than other threats such as homicide and other physical violence. At one point Reiman places cancer in the role of a foreign invader and asks: “How much of an effort...would the nation make to stop a foreign invader who was killing a thousand people a day and bent on capturing one-quarter of the present population” (Reiman, 1998 p.81). One paragraph even compares the amounts that the United States spent in the Gulf War to the amount it spends on protection from these problems that cause cancer.

This piece would fall under the label of an anti-war statement. However, this piece is more of a question or a series of questions than a direct statement. Why is cancer not viewed as a top priority by politicians, but the possibility of a threat from another country is seen as justified cause for enormous amounts of money and man power? Why is war often considered the only answer to problems and because of this, viewed as a justifiable cause of death? Whereas cancer is seen as an inevitable part of life why can it not be
approached as something preventable? Is this view preventing us from exploring the real possibilities for cancer reduction?

The side with the skeletons, which symbolize death, represents cancer. The pattern of dots and lines is the astrological map of the constellation Cancer. Another aspect, which was pointed out to me, is that the constellation looks like a simplified trail with a fork in it. I like this comparison because when one comes to a fork in the road a decision must be made. I felt this referenced the choice we as a society are faced with.

The other side represents war. The low-relief carving is derived from a drawing I did. The man looks somewhat decrepit and subservient to the younger man standing behind his shoulder. The older man is intended to be marked by the suit he wears as a politician or at least someone in a position of power but his gesture is left for interpretation by the viewer. Is he shackled off of the edge of the piece? Is he shrugging? Is he surrendering? I feel that this gesture presents an adequate feeling and invokes the desired mood of the piece although it is not overtly distinguishable. The young man drawn behind the older fellow is drawn in the likeness to a Roman god. The god, as indicated by the red dot in the lower left-hand corner, is Mars. He is the Roman god of war, whose lust for violence and love of bloody battles fits the mentality that I see today embodied by some of the people in our nation. The iron piece at the bottom has two functions: first to draw
attention to the violent and dangerous context of the piece. Second, to present this choice as something that we are stuck upon unable to move away from.

**Self-Reflection/Reflection of self: an open invitation**

It has been my experience that the longer I am at college, the less I find I know. I have found that questions I had thought answered long ago merrily led to more questions. Things that appeared to be and dry, right and wrong, no longer present themselves with such an ease of understanding. This piece is my version of a modern day *Thinker*. I find myself unable to assert my own experiences and insights over another’s. This leaves me in an awkward position when trying to discuss my opinions with others. The idea behind this piece is to view the broken and worn obelisk, which is fashioned to resemble the Washington Monument, When the piece is displayed it will be accompanied by to seats facing the bronzes faces. The intent is to offer the viewer an opportunity to sit and join the faces in contemplating the many issues that we hear about every day. Is the obelisk beyond repair or still being built? Is our country crumbling away at all? I look back at our history and see many mistakes. I worry that we will not learn from these errors. Are we taking the right steps to correct the mistakes of the past? As time progresses will we see the blunders of today? This piece shows my inability to answer these questions and deals with being forced to sit and think, maybe never coming to a conclusion.
Conclusion

I was very reluctant to include the preceding section in this essay. After explaining my stance on the use of write-ups that explain the context of the piece I am now providing that very thing to those reading this paper. I have justified this because the intent of the paper is to explain what have influenced my thoughts and feelings about political art. I feel that the work I have created is a large part of this explanation and therefore essential to this discussion. This is why I have included the preceding section. However, when the show is exhibited in Honors Hall these explanations will not accompany the pieces for because my attempt to communicate through this highly visual language. The show will be a continuation of my exploration of this topic. The dialogue raised and experience of presenting this small body of work will bring this particular experience to a close but continue to influence my thoughts on art, politics and our society in general.
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Bronze & Ceramic, 96x48x24”
By Daniel Alley
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