Since Realism there was... (On the current conditions of factographic art)

by Benjamin H.D. Buchloh

The title of the exhibition "Art & Ideology" seems to invite misconceptions: first of all that the work in this exhibition differs from all other currently produced art in its relationship to ideology. Either the work in this exhibition is the kind of investigation that confronts ideology head on (as opposed to the one that "bathes in it"), or it is, due to its obsessive confrontational involvement with ideology, close to a point of merging with it. It is *ideological* art, as opposed to *aesthetic* art. In any case, the title offers us a liberal choice: we can be, but do not have to be, involved with ideology when we produce/receive art. If, however, we do focus on the ideological nature within which we are constituted, we risk depriving ourselves of the essentially aesthetic experience: the pleasure of symbolic liberation from ideology.

To participate in a venture with this title offers a moment of truth to the artists and to the curator. The artists can reflect upon the actual situation of their work in relation to the ideological apparatus: the social institution of art within which it is contained and the forms of discourse within which it is determined. They can realize that condition as a determining factor and gauge its importance – in comparison with the works' actual claims for political reality, operational interference, and substitution of aesthetic knowledge for ideology. They can, at the same time, reflect upon the degree to which the work has actually taken those determining conditions into account, or whether in its claim for a political confrontation with the conditions of ideology, it has in fact neglected to examine the very root of its proper existence in ideology and therefore has blindly fallen prey to the particular ideological conditions of the apparatus of art and its specific history and discursive features. They can reflect whether the truly ideological moment of the work then might not be the claim to deconstruct ideology effectively, not on the site of its constitution and operation, but outside of it, in a realm of pure intelligibility and practice, whether or not it has been contaminated by the inversion and transformation of meaning that the production of representation entails when it operates without reflection upon the conditions of production and distribution.

For the curator, the confrontation with the work opens a different perspective, the opposite in fact. In flagrante, so to speak, the curator can observe his/her operation within the institutional apparatus of art: most prominently the procedure of abstraction and centralization that seems to be an inescapable consequence of the work's entry into the superstructural apparatus, its transformation from *practice* to *discourse*. That almost seems to have become the curator's primary role: to function as an agent who offers exposure and potential prominence – in exchange for obtaining a moment of actual practice that is about to be transformed into myth/superstructure.

When one of the founding fathers of American Modernism and the first director of the institution that taught the American Neo-avant-garde arrived in the Soviet Union in 1927 on a survey journey to take stock of international avant-garde activities for their possible import into the United States, he saw himself confronted with a situation of seemingly unmanageable conflicts.[1] On the one hand, there was the extraordinary productivity of the modernist avant-garde in the Soviet Union (extraordinary by the numbers of its constituency, men and women, its modes of production, ranging from Malevich's late Suprematist work through the laboratory period of the Constructivists to the Lef Group and the Productivist Program, from Agit Prop-theatre productions to avant-garde film production for mass audiences). On the other hand, there was the obvious general awareness among artists and cultural producers, critics and theorists that they were participating in a final transformation of the modernist aesthetic, which would irretrievably and irrevocably alter the conditions of production and reception as they had been inherited from bourgeois society and its institutions (from Kant's aesthetics and the modernist practices that originated in them). Moreover, there was the growing fear that the process of that successful transformation might be aborted by the emergence of totalitarian repression from within the very system that had generated the foundations for a new socialist collective culture. Last of all and crucial, there was Alfred Barr's own disposition of interests and motivations of action within that situation: searching for the most advanced modernist avant-garde in a moment and place where that social group was just about to dismantle itself and its specialized activities in order to assume a new role and function in the newly-defined collective process of a social production of culture.[2]

The reasons why Alfred Barr, one of the first "modern" art his-

torians, then just about to discover and establish the modern avant-garde in the United States, was determined (in the literal sense) to fail in comprehending the radical change that those artists and theoreticians introduced into the history of aesthetic theory and production in the twentieth century, are obviously too complex to be dealt with in this context. One point, however, has to be developed since it applies immediately to the questions that are generated in regard to the work of Fred Lonidier and Allan Sekula, the contemporary artists in this exhibition, who, as we suggest, have decided to continue and expand the tradition of factographic production.

The paradigmatic change that occurs in the emergence of productivist factography is the reversal of the Kantian conception of Modernist art production as an essentially disinterested activity that opposes all other forms of activities of human labor and production. With the productivist position, modernism entered a stage where the activity of the artist was not only equated with all other social forms of production, but was no longer and in no way considered desirable or virtuous to support the special activity of the unique concentration of talent. Furthermore, it was supposed to programmatically merge with the social forms of production and integrate itself in the collective where the artist as chosen individual and specialist would take his/her role side by side with all other professions and functions in society.

The present social and political situation differs drastically from that in which the Productivist avant-garde found itself, for example, in regard to its audience relationship. The Bolshevik revolution of 1917 was not only a radical political and socio-economic transformation of the feudal society of Russia, it also introduced the delayed industrial revolution. We can in fact assume that artists such as Eisenstein and Vertov, Rodchenko and Lissitzky who insisted on the technology of their production as much as on the actual dissemination of their work to a mass audience, reached an audience that was not only eager to learn and share the new representations and meanings that the cultural revolution produced and disseminated, but were also physically, emotionally, and intellectually enchanted with the new images and sounds that photography, radio, and film had to offer.

Even when Brecht and Benjamin developed productivist aesthetics for the historical conditions of the Weimar Republic – such as Brecht's "Radiotheory"[3] or Benjamin's major theoretical tractatus "The Author as Producer," both of which were a direct outcome of the authors' confrontations with these theories during their visits to the Soviet Union and their encounter with Tretyakov – they were not simply proposing utopian phantasms as strategies, but they argued for an understanding of the actual conditions for the transformation of hitherto passive, receptive audiences into active participants and producers, the transformation of art from catering to an existing apparatus to dismantling and changing that existing apparatus, and their theories were based on a materialist study of the actual and potential realities of the historical moment.

One has to be very careful in even establishing a reference to those circumstances from a contemporary perspective, especially one that operates from within the artworld, which has a habit of pilfering historically available positions, extracting them from their context and transplanting them onto a contemporary avant-garde production which in itself is in constant need of renovating its instantly bought-off radicality. Obviously the situation is entirely different in the present moment, where mass audiences are not only locked up firmly in the terminal grip of the media, but where the access that artists have to the actual apparatus of ideological production is at very best that of a parasite who mimics and excells in the strategies of the consciousness industry and who is furbishing new stylistic gadgets to the producers who need avant-garde creativity to renovate their rapidly worn out strategies and styles. On the other hand, artists who position themselves in relation to analysis and criticism with respect to the monolithic institutions become quickly aware that marginalization seems to be the alternative option to becoming a parasitical beneficiary of the consciousness industry. They have to take into consideration that the claim for a position and practice of criticism of ideology that might be made in the work itself is ultimately falsified by the fact that the work remains passively confined to the position of powerlessness to which it is relegated by the centralized institutions of the ideological apparatus. That instant falsification – which is expressed already in the term "political art," a categorization most often used to contain and frame practice in a type of art that connotes "obsolescence, isolation, inefficiency," is obviously not – as it seems at least to most at the present moment – the condition of those artists who deliberately remain with their production inside the traditional framework of the modernist high art avant-garde. They do not engage in the argument with the totalitarian institutions of television and advertising, of corporate and state power, but they remain safely installed within the controllable confines of the traditional setup of the discourse of the artistic individual producer, the modes of production that go along with it (painting, sculpture, drawing, etc.), the distribution forms by which these objects are disseminated (the individual dealer, the individual collector, the

museum institution) and the position of the discourse itself (its universality as *art* – as opposed to the vulgarity of the culture industry or the nebulous realm of ideology – by implication and tradition therefore instantly associated with the inevitability of truth content).

In the world of art – as opposed to that of the media and ideology – one operates under the assumption that social relations are still transparent and that the forms and means of production and distribution are owned and controlled by the artist/producer and, for example, the individual dealer. Furthermore, the social institution that legitimizes and contains the discourse of art production, the museum, is assumed to be beyond doubt and it is venerable in its universal commitment to cultural truth, and as a nonprofit organization, it does not serve anybody's particular economic or political interests. These bucolic conditions of art production, however, appear gradually in a different light with the realization that most of the assumptions with which the mythology of these conditions of the production of aesthetic knowledge have been maintained – as opposed to the collective falsity of ideology and the consciousness industry – are in their own way constantly falsified by the operations of the apparatus of the institutions that support and contain the discourse of art production. The fact is that the hieratic image of individual knowledge and social truth content constructed in the name of art, does by no means find its way through the liberal institution of the market into the hands of the individual devoted to the furthering and sustaining of the conditions of individual knowledge as they are evidenced in the work of art, but that more often than not the individually-crafted artifact enters the anonymous corporate collection or the art investment bank, and it becomes the subject of systematic tax evasion schemes and fulfills political purposes within the legitimization process of museum institutions. As Hans Haacke has clarified frequently and convincingly in his work, one does not have to dig very deep to discover the intersection between cultural devotion and ideological political and massive economic interests.[4]

Signs without referents, practice without matter, discourse without institution – these seem to be the ideal conditions of contemporary aesthetic production, or more correctly, the conditions that exclusively generate aesthetic *pleasure*, which after all, has been the criterion to establish the specificity of the aesthetic experience against all other experiential modes. Aesthetic pleasure (as in the play of the signifier or the rupture of the symbolic system) is defined in opposition to all other pleasures and certainly even more so in opposition to all other physiological, perceptual or psychological interactions with the objects of reality and their material transformation, in the process of labor, or learning, and in the production of knowledge. Kant's rigorous confinement of the aesthetic to the disembodied and the disinterested became the cornerstone of the prisonhouse of modernism. It corresponded to the increasing need for the division of labor in the process of industrialization and the necessity of specialization and legitimized the foundation of the modernist avant-garde as a group of specialists of vision, perceptual exploration, construction of representation, and innovators of perceptual codes. This group was in itself disembodied from the totality of productive processes in society, opposing in heroic acts of negation and refusal of the totalitarian subjection of the forces of production to utilitarian interests, i.e., the maximization of profit. This opposition resulted in the formation of a social character, the avant-garde artist and the "exclusive concentration of artistic talent in the individual and the corresponding repression of artistic talent in the masses.[5] That confinement of the aesthetic to the anti-utilitarian and that delegation of artistic production to the artistic specialist have governed the notion of aesthetic experience and pleasure and have placed it in opposition to all other forms of social production.

Yet this privilege of disembodiment (literally the freedom from manual labor and the utilitarian function, but not from the commodity form and the market), has throughout the history of modernism been perceived by artists as the stigma that tainted their claims for the essentially realistic nature of their pursuits. Hence we witness the history of the disavowal of the aesthetic within the modernist work itself, its constantly reiterated quests to abolish the aesthetic status of the constructs, the anti-artistic impulse that distinguishes the relevant art of modernism from Courbet onwards and insists on its association with the paradigms of science (as, for example, in the case of the Impressionists) or on its association with the general conditions of production in society (the paradigm of the industrial mode as opposed to the individual craft production, e.g. Duchamp and Constructivism). The anti-aesthetic impulse not only insisted on the potential equality of all social forms of production and tried to abolish the special status that had been assigned to the aesthetic construct, but also on the essential reality (i.e., the labor of production) of the sign, *as well as* that of the referent. This position which Lonidier and Sekula assume in their work refuses to see artistic practice as being disembodied from the matter of the social and political reality upon which it is imposed as a superstructural function and it insists on a dialectical

critique and tries to dismantle the very centralizing institutions within which it is constituted, contained, and isolated as a discursive practice. Their work, once placed in the institutional context of an exhibition, asks: what potential of oppositional practice is historically still inherent in the discourse of art? And what is the need to define oppositional practice in terms of art, and place it inside the social institution of art and address its particular limited audience and what is the need to accept the confinement that those attachments imply? Why should artists not attempt to define the practice of cultural resistance outside of the existing institutions, outside of the historicity of the discourse and thereby address different audiences altogether?

If Althusser's argument is correct that the aesthetic constitutes itself viably only inside the ideological, what then is the nature of the practice of those artists who, as we are suggesting, are in fact trying to develop a practice that is operative outside and inside of the ideological apparatus? The first argument that will of course be leveled against this type of work is that it simply cannot be "*art*" – and this accusation has in fact been made against artists like Lonidier, Hatch, Rosler and Sekula (in the very same way that the work of the Productivists and the factographic writings, or the production of John Heartfield have been excluded – perhaps to their advantage after all – from acceptance into the history of modernist art production). Furthermore it will be argued that this work lacks the essential quality that has defined art throughout its history: the experience of disinterested pleasure – which the interested didacticism of this work opposes by its explicitness in taking positions, its clarity of informational instruction, the concreteness of its actual involvement with the particular segment of reality that it has chosen to be engaged with in an approach of interference and operational transformation. If we follow Althusser's definition of ideology as a system of representations in which real relations are transformed into imaginary relations, and, furthermore, that these imaginary relations are endowed with a material existence, then the question of the interrelationship between art and ideology assumes in fact a degree of complexity that the forthright claims to a dimension of practice in this contemporary political art will have to confront.[6] We do not have to mention of course, that the opposite kind of work, that which seems to resolve the dialectic by simply aligning itself in its entirety with the ideological apparatus (the traditions of the discourse, the position within the institution, its conventions of audience address), and the power of the governing conditions would have resolved any aspect of that question. Quite the contrary, its very existence, its modes of reading and reception, as well as its forms of production and circulation are entirely exhausted and compressed into the dominant practices of ideological representations.

Simply put, the question could read as follows: How progressive can aesthetic production be under the historical conditions of aggressive conservatism? Or, otherwise: Can this production be perceived as "aesthetic" if it denies the validity and deliberately ignores the essential historical material reality of those conditions that produce the representations of ideology? Hoelderlin's famous question "Why would there be poets in sinister times?" pointed to the contradictory nature of the situation: if aesthetic production is a discourse that is contained within a society at any particular moment in history (which implies that the discourse of art is always legible only by the oppressor and is only directed at the oppressor) and if its historical reality (i.e., its legibility and efficiency of meaning) is dependent upon that audience – not upon the utopian anticipation of different social and political conditions and representations of the oppressed – then what can the "reality" of an aesthetic production be that in fact addresses a different audience altogether, but within the system and the language of art and with the means of the apparatus that the bourgeois definition of art has provided for the contemporary producer?

This dichotomy can probably only be resolved by realizing that it is precisely our perceptual apparatus (that domain of the primary process where we are constituted in ideology and where aesthetic perception is anchored and generated) by which we abide most solidly to the social demands that guarantee the continuation of the order of the relations of production. It seems therefore that it is precisely the dimension of aesthetic pleasure which will have to be sacrificed in the perceptual system that provides the basis for ideological reproduction in art that should be seriously questioned. In a way we should be grateful to those contemporary artists who currently receive the attention of the apparatus that they offer us such blatant and profound insight into the relations between "aesthetic pleasure" and reactionary power that the apparatus of art production as a subsection of the general ideological apparatus is capable of producing at this point in history. They help us in fact to gradually disentangle and disassociate ourselves from the seemingly insurmountable fixations upon those primary pleasures of aesthetic experiences. We recognize, after all, that it is our desires and our pleasures as they can be fulfilled by contemporary art production which are the most secret and reliable agents of dominant ideology: like all other superstructural instances (the moral and the legal code, religious belief, family structure and the

construction of sexuality), it is the attachment to aesthetic desire and aesthetic pleasure that guarantee the continuation of our archaic modes of perceptual and cognitive behavior.

As in all instances where the self seems to be most secure in desire and where identity seems to be guaranteed in gratification and pleasure, one might have to realize that what applies to the narcissistic pleasures and gratifications of fashion and consumption in which the self is most clearly constituted in ideology and where the ideological apparatus is most successfully at work, by now applies equally to the traditional modes of generating aesthetic pleasure. They have historically become the most effective maneuvers to inscribe the order of the relations of production into the representations of identity and imbue them with the authority of legitimation that only high art seems to offer. In the era of corporate state power where the consciousness industry is systematically organized to prohibit and destroy individuality and identity, the public notion of individuality itself becomes a strategy of oppression and the means to achieve a semblance of the fetishized concept of individuality must by necessity be the fetishistic production procedures and materials that Arvatov identified so clearly in 1926:

> While the entire technique of capitalist society is based on the most advanced and most recent achievements and represents a technique of mass production... bourgeois art has remained in principle on the level of crafts and therefore it has been removed from the general social practice of mankind and shifted into the realm of pure aesthetics.... The lonely master – that is the only type of artist in capitalist society, the type of that specialist of "pure art," who works outside of the immediately utilitarian practice since it is based on advanced machine technology. From here we derive the illusion of art being its own purpose, from here its bourgeois fetishism.[7]

This need for the supply of mythical images of individuality and identity, which dominant ideology currently imposes on aesthetic production, would also explain the miraculous rediscovery of European art by the section of the ideological state apparatus that is called the "artworld." As in late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century "primitivism" as an inspirational force for the definition of the "modern idiom," when African and Asian artifacts were "discovered" for the practice of high art at a moment when imperialist politics had successfully eradicated authentic cultural practice in the colonies, so now do the old European nation states supply idioms for the fetishized concept of individuality at a moment when multi-national corporate state power and its consciousness industry have successfully deleted the last vestiges of practices of representation, learning and knowledge in the sphere of collective public experience. At a historical moment when there is every reason to be terrified at the perspectives that Reaganism opens up economically and politically and every evidence that there is no national autonomy when it comes to vital questions such as missile deployment and nuclear armament – at that moment we are told by German Neo-Expressionist artists and their critical spokesmen that they have successfully performed the labor of mourning about fascism in their paintings and that they have thus established the images of a new national identity. Thus:

> The new German painters perform an extraordinary service for the German people. They lay to rest the ghosts – profound as only the monstrous can be – of German style, culture and history, so that the people can be authentically new. They are collectively given the mythical opportunity to create a fresh identity.... Thus to see these pictures is to be confronted with the special necessity and special freedom of the Germanic today.[8]

Allan Sekula's work, *Sketch for a Geography Lesson* (1983), offers us a different picture of what links contemporary American politics with the mythical tendencies as they originated in the German Romantic past of the nineteenth century. It negates the mythification of historical fact in the guise of the aesthetic and his work provides the synecdochic information that has since the inception of Realism asked the viewer/reader to confront the reality of the referent as much as the reality of the sign. The false globality and universality with which contemporary paintings treat historical subject matter (e.g. the mourning of the unfathomable German past) is substituted here with concrete information about the global interrelationships of present day American politics. The myth of the national character (from which the original need for expression supposedly springs) appears here in a detail that reminds us of the transition from agricultural production and its close affiliation with mythical and religious practices and their lasting impact on the formation of a national character that is historically ill-equipped to come to terms with the industrial reality of corporate capitalism. As Theodor Adorno once pointed out, it is the discrepancy between scientific and technological progress on the one hand and the retardation of social progress and political participation on the other hand that generates the cyclical reoccurrence of the need for mythical and religious explanations in advanced capitalist societies. In the juxtaposition of the rural

slaughtering ritual in a German village with the American television images choosing that very landscape as "theatre" for wargames, that discrepancy of an uneven development of technology and social and political consciousness becomes obvious. The terror of irrationality here, however, is emanating from the corporate television's wargame, not from the expressive imagery of the rural slaughtering. In the same manner as the color photographs of the "German Romantic" landscape that seems to have endured from Caspar David Friedrich's vision onwards, are devalidated not only by the presence of signs that remind us of the actual situation of that landscape (to function as wargame terrain for the American forces in Germany), but also in the way that they reveal the irretrievable moment of history when landscape imagery could still carry the meaning of the conflict between the mythical and the rational. Sekula's work addresses the reality of a contemporary experience – that which links the American public actually, rather than aesthetically, to the geo-political reality of West Germany (a strategic and economic ally at the forefront of the border with the rivalling economic and political system, the war theatre where a potential conflict between the two superpowers could be possibly resolved without actually involving the American population on its own terrain). The work assembles the elements of representation (past and present) through which this experience is mediated: the photographs of the romantic German landscape and its preindustrial agrarian rituals, the Cold War "popular imagery" from Sekula's high school textbook that depicts the Madonna as being assaulted by the masses of Red Army soldiers and the photographs from an American TV program of a wargame that is situated in the rural area in West Germany, near the East German border that Sekula depicts also in his tourist photographs. It is this analytical approach to the construction of representation and its mediations that justifies and requires the work's display and insertion into an aesthetic context (such as this exhibition). On the other hand, it is the work's "factographic" approach – its insistence on the necessity to explore and clarify the construction and operation of representation within present day reality and to make that reality transparent rather than mythify it, which distinguishes the work of Allan Sekula from most contemporary aesthetic practice. It is therefore neither confined or limited to the traditional institutions of art mediation nor is it restricted in its reception to the exclusivity of an artworld audience. Without assuming or suggesting the falseness of a popularization of high-art traditions, it addresses a concrete instant in the conditions of contemporary experience and its constitution in ideological representations. Thus the work becomes both accessible as an analysis of ideological representations to multiple audiences and it takes its place in the necessary formation of a culture of resistance. To develop a more specific audience relationship is a crucial interest of Allan Sekula's and Fred Lonidier's work. That means to address the specific needs and interests of a particular audience as much as it implies to move out of the institutional confines of the artworld. Both artists have produced work that operates primarily in situations that are not part of the existing exhibition and distribution system, not in order to emphasize the problematic legitimization of that system, but more so to actually enter the spaces where the concerns of the new audiences are at stake. As Tretyakov suggested in his essay "From the Photographic Series to the Systematic Investigation" in 1931, this involvement with a new audience will have to gradually increase their participation and emphasize the necessity of self-representation of these audiences. That requires more than the token commitment that previous art practices have offered to different audiences by splashing the work with hints of popular culture, for example, participatory gadgets, or by dressing it up in a crude "proletarian" materiality. Allan Sekula's work, *School is a Factory* (1979 – 80), for example, was primarily conceived for display and interaction with the audiences of students at community colleges, since the work investigated the interrelationships between the interests and needs of corporations in certain areas of California and the educational programs that the community colleges in that area offered. Fred Lonidier's work, *The Health and Safety Game: Fictions Based on Fact* (1976), a documentation and analysis of individual experiences of work-related injuries and the neglect with which the victims are treated by the responsible corporations, was shown primarily at spaces where large numbers of workers would regularly pass through, such as labor council halls, shopping malls, a museum of Science and Industry and union halls. His more recent work which is his contribution to this exhibition, *L.A. Public Workers Point to Some Problems: Sketches Of The Present For Some, Point To The Future For All?* was published in excerpts in two issues of the weekly paper *The Citizen*, the official publication of the Los Angeles County Federation of Labor, AFL-CIO and was exhibited in both union halls and at the Los Angeles Institute of Contemporary Art.[9] The work addresses the questions of the detrimental impact, not to say disastrous consequences of federal and state legislation in favor of corporate and entrepreneurial interests on those sectors of public life and culture, that we would not normally be confronted with as a museum- or gallery-visiting art audience, since the system of rep-

resentation that we traditionally refer to as "the aesthetic" by definition extracts itself – as it seemed – from the economic and the political reality of the basis of culture in everyday life, in order to construct the aesthetic mirage that generates pleasure due to its mysterious capacity to disembody and disassociate our perception from the weights and demands of the real. Lonidier's work successfully counteracts that tendency – which is as compulsive in aesthetic production as it is firmly embedded in the conventions of aesthetic reception – by not only systematically exploring the basis of culture, i.e., labor, but also by specifying the connections where the global system of political and economical determinations concretely manifests itself in the conflicts of individual existence. Self-representation of those individuals is as important in Lonidier's work as is his interference in the construction of what he calls "Fictions based on Facts" (what Brecht said about the insufficiency of the photograph of the factory is also true, much more so, for the portrayal of the individual working in the factory: its "truth" has to be constructed). That strategy of self-representation is not only one of the many necessary steps to develop different and multiple audiences for the production of cultural interference in the seemingly hermetically closed system of ideological representation, it is also a necessary condition for that practice to resist centralization and the immediate extraction from practice by the cultural apparatus. Perhaps even more than the difficulty of successfully developing new modes of presentation, display and interaction with different audiences, the work of Lonidier and Sekula faces the problem of how to protect itself from the effects that the traditional audience of the cultural apparatus has to offer. Marginalizing the central authority of the apparatus of "Art," and its institutions: the critics and the magazines as much as the museums, the galleries, and the collectors, seems for the time being one of the successful strategies that these artists and others working with similar means and intentions have employed.

Notes

1. For detailed information on Barr's unsuccessful search for easel paintings in the homes of the Soviet avant-garde, his encounters with Rodchenko, Lissitzky, and Tretyakov in particular, see: Alfred H. Barr, Jr., "Russian Diary 1927 – 28," in *October* 7, Winter 1978, p. 21.
2. What happened instead was predicted in 1926 by Boris Arvatov, along with Tretyakov and Taraboukine, the third of the Productivist theoreticians, when he wrote about the painters who did not join the group of the Productivists: "Those on the right gave up their positions without resistance...either they stopped painting altogether or they emigrated to the foreign countries in the West, in order to astonish Europe with homemade Russian Cezannes or with patriotic-folkloric chicken paintings." Boris Arvatov, *Kunst und Produktion*, Munich, 1978, p. 43.
3. See for example: Bertolt Brecht, "Radio as a Means of Communication." English translation in *Screen*, vol. XX, Winter 1979 – 80. Recently reprinted in *Communication and Class Struggle*, vol. II, edited by Armand Mattelart and Seth Siegelaub (New York: 1983).
4. Hans Haacke, *The Master Chocolate Maker* (Toronto: 1983) as well as *Mobil Observations* (Saskatoon: 1982), and, of course, *Framing and being Framed* (Halifax/New York: 1976).
5. K. Marx/F. Engels, "Die Deutsche Ideologie," in *Marx, Engels, Lenin ueber Kultur, Aesthetik, Literatur* (Leipzig: 1968), p. 113.
6. Louis Althusser, *Lenin and Philosophy* (London: 1971). Particularly the essay: "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses," p. 127 ff.
7. Arvatov, loc. cit. p. 12.
8. Donald Kuspit, "The American Case Against German Expressionism." *Expressions* (St. Louis: 1983), p. 46 and passim.
9. *The Los Angeles Citizen*, vol. 83, no. 17 and 18, September 1979.

Benjamin Buchloh is a critic and teaches modern and contemporary art history at the State University of New York at Westbury.