

A.N.C. May 96

Endless column on Judd.

The first point of entry into the thesis of Judd is his insistence to eliminate implications of a universal order, or generality.

Judd insists that the words Structure and Order be eliminated because they imply a *making* and thus favor an order, or mechanistic view. He pits against this the specific and *empirical*.

By leaving open parts of what imply contained forms, and not titeling his pieces, although describing their materials and dimensions to utmost detail is a titleing, he does this.

But isn't every thing made? And if we aren't able to ascertain or are distracted by the qualities of some form or object isn't that still an underlying premise even foundation to our seeing? Is it really possible as Judd suggests, to make a work of art so denuded of syntax and authorship that we are entranced to a state of pure seeing with out existential even, bodily relation?

In Judd's last retrospective catalogue at the Whitney Museum in the essay obviously co-written by \_\_\_\_\_, it states, "after 198\_ Judd realized that even when the viewer is deceived a piece can be viewed logically, so he went on to make \_\_\_\_\_, and \_\_\_\_\_ etc., and \_\_\_\_\_ for Satchie like Pollack in terms of its complexity. Is this why he liked Oldenberg, Chamberlin, and seemed to silently acknowledge the equal stature even possible more advanced Irwin?

Bergson shows why numbers are so important, and why it is an a real subject in regards to perception, abstraction, time, space, etc. It may be the gateway to language origionally.

Yves Allain Bois is good on Judd.

He points out that Judd rejects painting as fundamentally *idealist*. That he stated, "It is one kind of skenticism to make the work so strong

and material that it can only assert itself." And that what struck Judd in Bontecou's reliefs was the coincidence between the "image," the material structure, and the field. That Judd distinguished between, the spacial illusionism that is proper to painting and all other forms of illusion. Also that he saw no difference between things naturally "found," and things fabricated.

It's interesting though, that Bois suggests that Judd increasingly moves *toward* Bergsonian models in the end, for me especially, because I began with Bergsonian models.

The Judd quote: "...by now it is too chic to quote Wittkenstein, but he would mention that it is always so difficult to find the beginning, I would go further, and add that it's hard to start at the beginning instead of starting somewhere later." Gertrude Stein on "making the beginning."

Judd using the word busy.