



Smithsonian
Archives of American Art

Oral history interview with Alfred
Victor Frankenstein, 1965 Nov. 9

Funding for the digital preservation of this interview was provided by
a grant from the Save America's Treasures Program of the National
Park Service.

Contact Information

Reference Department
Archives of American Art
Smithsonian Institution
Washington, D.C. 20560
www.aaa.si.edu/services/questions
www.aaa.si.edu/

Transcript

Preface

The following oral history transcript is the result of a recorded interview with Alfred Victor Frankenstein on November 9, 1965. The interview took place in San Francisco and was conducted by Mary Fuller McChesney for the Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution. This interview is part of the Archives of American Art's New Deal and the Arts project.

The original transcript was edited. In 2022 the Archives created a more verbatim transcript. Additional information from the original transcript that seemed relevant was added in brackets and given an -Ed. attribution. This transcript has been lightly edited for readability by the Archives of American Art. The reader should bear in mind that they are reading a transcript of spoken, rather than written, prose.

Interview

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: Are you picking me up now for practice?

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: Yeah, that's fine.

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: Huh? I said is it okay?

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: All right. Mm-hmm [affirmative].

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: All right. All right. Well, now see I became art critic for *the Chronicle* on December 16, 1934, and therefore, I was—that was after a good deal of this stuff had gone on.

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: Mm-hmm [affirmative].

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: And my first awareness of the whole matter was—as I recall, now this was of course a long time ago, but my first awareness of the whole thing was in the considerable to-do, the controversy over the Coit Tower murals. There was great controversy over them for two or three reasons. One was the subject matter of certain ones, which was far left. John Howard, in particular, had done certain murals that people thought were too radical in their political content and significance.

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: What was their content? What did they look like?

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: They're still there, aren't they? They were pictures of people, protestors, strikes, of picketing in orchards, and things of this kind. And then there were others who felt that the style of the Coit Tower murals was terribly inconsistent because it was kind of an anthology of everything that was going on at the time. There were conservative painters there, and there were experimental painters there, and there were huge number of painters who were very much under the influence of Diego Rivera and the Mexican style of mural painting. And so that the whole thing had no unity, stylistically; it was kind of a hodgepodge. There was much criticism of that. I personally thought it—the hodgepodge quality of it was one of the most interesting aspects of it. I wouldn't—I think all those murals are still there, are they not? I haven't been in the place in years. I really don't know. But that was the first thing.

Then I remember also a good deal of activity with regard to and discussion, not controversy, over murals in the Fleishhacker Motherhouse by Dorothy Puccinelli and Helen Forbes, which I personally think are probably the best monument of the whole period in this neighborhood. And the murals that were done by Lucien Labaudt out at the beach, which I think were pretty well disappeared.

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: No. They're still there.

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: They're still there?

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: Mm-hmm [affirmative]. Was there controversy over that then?

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: No. I don't think any controversy. I don't recall controversy. I only

recall discussion. Interested discussion. In general, I think the feeling was one of considerable enthusiasm for the whole thing around town. At least, certainly among the artists and the people with whom I associated. The feeling that—well, that there was a lift to it. They were getting off dead center. They were—and this was a great opportunity for them both socially and economically and politically—socially, economically, and artistically.

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: Mm-hmm [affirmative].

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: They were able to finally use their talents on something and use it for the public good. And I think it was at this time that there was ingrained in me the idea, which I have been fighting for ever since, of the—of using the artists in public building projects in the community. Is this—is this—

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: Let's play it back, see what happens.

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: Play it back, see what happens.

[Audio break.]

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: I'd like to go back to Coit Tower for a minute. Do you think there was any connection between the controversy over the murals at the tower and the fact that 1934 general strike had occurred in San Francisco or was occurring about that time, and that it was a period of labor unrest in the area?

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: It might have been. I came here after that whole thing was over. I did not arrive in California until December of 1934, by which time the strike was finished and the period of labor unrest and the uncertainty that was involved in it had pretty well blown over. I have vague recollection that there was some quality of that sort in connection with the protest against the Coit Tower murals. But if so, it was not very strong, at least I do not recall it as being very strong.

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: Mm-hmm [affirmative].

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: I recall—my feeling about the whole thing, rather, was simply one of a sense of enthusiasm, growth, of opportunity that—and I remember that all over the community things were being done.

[00:05:06]

There were murals. There were mosaics in the Alameda County courthouse in Oakland. Mosaics and things down in that marine—Maritime—what is now the Maritime Museum. It was then called Aquatic Park. There were sculptures being made for public housing projects. Benny Bufano did some of them. Actually, they were originally done for Aquatic Park, but they're now in the housing projects. I remember much discussion with the administrators of this program. Several of them. Joe Danysh—particularly Joe Danysh and Alexander—what was his first name? John Alexander—Jack Alexander were close friends of mine at the time. And I remember long discussions with them about the potentialities and the general meaning of this whole movement. The artists who were employed, obviously, were—needed the employment and for this reason were very happy to get it, and, I think on the whole, gave most enthusiastically and generously of their time, of their efforts, of their talents. Perhaps all of this is a kind of rosy recollection. Rather rosier recollection conceivably than is actually correct. One I suppose, tends to romanticize things in recollection.

I recall a few instances of trouble. The instances of trouble were over imputations of dishonesty on the part of certain of the artists with regard to stealing materials and things like this, which at the time, seemed enormously difficult, caused a great deal of trouble and friction and unpleasantness. But in the long perspective of time, that kind of thing instantly—immediately disappears. Then I remember also controversies over the subject matters, as I've said, of certain murals, notably the ones at the Coit Tower. Nothing like the controversy that later developed over the Refregier murals in the Rincon Annex post office. But that was a much later project and I think is really outside the scope of your inquiry as of the present moment.

No, my feeling is—in other words is that there—there's a lot of work being done, a lot of very effective work being done, was not only being done by painters working on mural projects, it was being done by that very extraordinary group who put out that very extraordinary

production called *California Art Research*. There's some 20 volumes of history of art in California, that is to say 20 mimeographed volumes, was put out under a friend of mine named Cornell Whengell [ph]. A volume—a series of volumes that people have repeatedly referred to, it's not the best thing in the world, it's not the most authoritative thing in the world, it's not the most complete thing in the world, but it was a beginning, and inevitably for anyone who was dealt in the history of art in California, this has got to be the starting place.

Then I remember also easel projects. Painters who were employed to—simply to paint easel pictures, many of which were collected, I suppose, later in Washington. I don't know quite what happened to some of them. I remember that certain painter friends of mine were almost saved from perdition by it. I know painters who were just absolutely down and were giving up what art they were able to do and going in for menial mechanical jobs and ready to chuck the whole thing. This helped them enormously, and saved them. Certain painters of considerable distinction as, I recall, actually, got their start that way. Dong Kingman, for example, I believe did the first really good things—almost the first things he ever did in his life, on the WPA easel project.

My feeling about the whole thing is very positive and if you can say optimistic in retrospect [laughs] that's the way it is. What other questions you got about it?

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: Do you remember any particular changes that occurred in the style of the artists' work during this period? You came in '34, so that you weren't too aware of what had been happening in San Francisco in the art world before, but you must have sort of got some idea of what had been going on. I was wondering what kind of an impact the WPA projects had stylistically on the artists, or were there much?

[00:10:08]

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: Well, I certainly think it had a great deal to do with the style of the mural project. I mean if you've got a wall to paint on, you're going to paint bigger than if you've got a piece of paper to paint on. And a great many of these people who had never worked on walls before began to work on walls and used, obviously, as their model the mural paintings that were already here, namely those of Diego Rivera. Rivera, remember, had been here, had painted the murals still on the walls of the Stock Exchange Club and of the California School of Fine Arts, as was San Francisco Art Institute today. Those, I think, had a great impression. And a great many people worked in that manner, partly also because of using the same technique, that is to say, they were using fresco. And how many of them continued to use this manner, and how many of them—well obviously, many of them could not continue to use this manner because after WPA collapsed, there weren't any walls to paint on, and whatever they were doing, they weren't doing that anyhow.

I don't think it made an awful lot of difference to most of them stylistically. I can't see that it did. Of course, a great many of them actually kind of vanished after this period. There were, I think, quite a few painters and artists in general who worked on these projects, whose work is perhaps embalmed in WPA records or WPA archives of one kind or another and they've never been heard of since.

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: Mm-hmm [affirmative].

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: What else?

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: From what I've gathered, talking to the artists in the area about that period, there seem to be quite a bit of difference between the development of the East Bay area and in San Francisco. Hans Hofmann had been here in the East Bay and there were a group of younger painters who were also on WPA who were working much more abstractly than the Rivera influence in San Francisco and I was wondering if you were aware of anything different about that.

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: No.

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: You mentioned at Coit Tower that there were experimental artists working there.

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: Well, experimental for their time.

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: Mm-hmm [affirmative].

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: I was thinking at that moment particularly of Jane Berlandina, who had been a pupil of Matisse, and who did a series of paintings there in Coit Tower mostly in line. This was a very experimental and radical idea for—particular for mural painting in this time. The idea of painting almost exclusively in line. They were flat—as I recall, they were very largely, flattish-line drawings, although they're executed on the walls in oil paint. And this was, for its time, quite experimental. I don't necessarily mean that there was experiment in abstraction; there wasn't. Obviously, the main concern with murals of this kind is subject matter and the opportunity to do abstract murals, I don't—as I recall, did not come until later. As I recall, the first one we ever had in this town was in the place on California Street. It was done by George Harris. California—it was the—I believe it was some sort of Chamber of Commerce building. At the moment I can't recall exactly where though.

Now, as regards—I'm very much interested in your observation as regards to Hans Hofmann and the influence of Hans Hofmann in the East Bay at this time. If that—I'm quite sure that influence did exist, but for me it was not very visible. Now this may be that I was myopic. It may be that I didn't see it just because I didn't want to see it or couldn't see it, or rejected it as a matter of taste. Well, I don't think so. My observation is that the painting that I saw mostly from the East Bay was in a style I came to call the Berkeley School, and the term was later taken up and bandied about more or less cynically. This was a style that was actually much more derived from Raoul Dufy than from anybody else. It was a style, a rather splashy painting in line, in brilliantly colored line and with the brilliant colored areas that did not stay within the lines. It bled out on the sides of the line, draw a building in paint and then sort of arbitrarily fill it in with color and the colored blocks would very frequently overlap the line, you know how—this sort of thing. And it was a cute style, it was a decorative and friendly and pleasant style. It was not a major style, and a style, I repeat, which is much more derived from Dufy than from anybody else. This is what I recall as early East Bay style.

[00:15:00]

People like John Haley, who has since changed totally, of course, were doing that at that time. And there was a girl named Patricia Johnson [ph], I remember, who was extremely clever at it. Whatever happened to her, I don't know. She was wife of Gordon Johnson [ph] who I think is still very active as a member of the state legislature. And there were others, but this Hans Hofmann influence did not, so far as I'm concerned—my observation is concerned, begin to manifest itself until a long time later.

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: Mm-hmm [affirmative]. Of course, people that I've talk to were people whose work of this period I haven't seen but who, when they talked about it, said that they have been influenced by him because they studied with him, and two people I interviewed, Beckford Young and a woman named Molly Dennett [Maulina Dennett Pendergast] had gone to Germany and studied with him there.

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: Oh, I'm sure of that, yeah. [Cross talk.]

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: This may be a great deal of their distortion over 30 years, too [laughs].

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: [Laughs.] Well, yeah. The distortions over 30 years that you're going to get are really amazing, and when you put them together the composite picture of all of this will cover such a wide spectrum that you may not be able to get the—make any sense out of it. I don't know.

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: [Laughs.] I was going to ask you about the Aquatic Park Project. Hilaire Hiler. Did you—you must have known him.

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: Yeah, I know him quite well. Very nice guy. Most delightful guy. His —

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: His murals, looking at them now, are so different from the murals at Coit Tower.

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: [Inaudible.]

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: I was wondering if you had anything to comment about that,

how it happened that they were so different.

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: Because he—[laughs] because he managed to—because he'd come from Paris. He had gotten outside the Diego Rivera influence. He had had—he'd gotten—he'd come under the influence of certain people in Paris, the names of whom I cannot recall at this moment. But people who had a lot of color theories. This was a great day of color theories in Paris. And he worked largely within this framework. I remember he used to do things in very elaborate spectrum. He used to divide his color in extremely subtle gradations and things of this sort. All in terms of various and sundry [ph] color theories that he'd picked up in Paris. He had never been—never—he hadn't been here long enough to be under the Diego Rivera influence. He'd never been in Mexico. Perhaps just temperamentally, he rejected it. But in all events, this was the reason. He was primarily concerned—primarily influenced by things in Paris rather than things in Mexico City or New York. And he taught courses here, as I recall, in color theory and things of this sort. Had an old father who was a most delightful primitive painter, and I often wonder what happened to his pictures. Some of them are better than Hiler's himself.

Then also Sargent Johnson was very active in that thing. Did those quite remarkable mosaics that are still there. And he was one of the best people around here. Benny Bufano did those birds and animals for that walkway which were then—which were later put around in housing projects. Some of them are still around, very good ones.

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: Do you remember Bufano controversy about the St. Francis and that sort of thing? Were you involved in that?

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: Well, I wasn't involved in it except insofar as I stood on the sidelines and reported the facts. Bufano had an idea that he wanted to put up a statue of St. Francis. It would be, I think, something like 16 stories high on the top of the Twin Peaks, and he had a grand scheme for it, which he had submitted to certain city agencies. The thing that shut it down more than anything else was the fact that a architect who was very sympathetic to Bufano made a public statement that it would never—would not stand the wind pressures up there. I'm trying to remember this man's name. He was the architect of the Golden Gate Bridge, and it is a great misfortune to me that at the moment I cannot recall his name. He was one of the most delightful men I'd ever known, and a real force around here. He was a fine architect, and he is responsible for the design of the towers of the Golden Gate Bridge. That's more his monument than anything else. I'm sorry at the moment I cannot recall his name. You'll find it in the archives somewhere, without any trouble at all.

In all events, this gentleman, who, I repeat, was a very progressive and forward-looking person and very friendly and sympathetic to Bufano, nevertheless felt that the scheme that Bufano had for the structure was completely unsound and that the object as—merely as a structure, quite regardless of its sculptural or aesthetic qualities, simply would not take it, and this was the end of it, I think, generally speaking—for people from this point on. There was no more discussion about it.

[00:20:12]

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: Mm-hmm [affirmative].

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: Bufano did, of course, finally bring back from Paris that stone St. Francis that he'd made there. You remember that story, how he went to Paris under the impression that he had had a commission to do a St. Francis for the space between the opera house and the Veteran's Building on Van Ness Avenue. He went to Paris believing—whether correctly or not, I do not know—that some important people in San Francisco had commissioned him to do such a statue. He spent a great deal of time, a whole winter, I believe, working on this. Not opening his mail, not bothering to communicate with anybody. Meanwhile, it developed that the project for the backing of this thing collapsed in San Francisco, and Bufano did not know or claimed he didn't know. He finished his statue, and then he discovered that he had no commission. The statue, therefore, stayed in—remained in storage for many years in Paris, and it was finally brought over here. Then it was in Oakland for a long time, and it is now, if I'm not mistaken, down in there in the Longshoremen's Hall—outside the Longshoreman's Hall on North Point or Jefferson Street.

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: Mm-hmm [affirmative]. That's the same one that was in front of

St. Mary's Church in North Beach?

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: That's right. Yeah, it was put up in St. Mary's Church and it was—the priest there didn't like it, then they moved it to a store in Oakland, and now it's down there in that Longshoremen's Hall.

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: Do you remember any of the other St. Francis' that he did during that period? I was very surprised when I talked to him to hear him say that he made a large St. Francis on horseback. You remember any of that?

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: Yes, I do, but I would never have remembered it if you hadn't mentioned it.

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: Oh [laughs].

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: I remember the very dramatic and very remarkable silhouette of that statue. And at this moment, this memory is so tricky, I cannot recall whether I ever saw the statue itself or saw simply a photograph of it.

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: Mm-hmm [affirmative].

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: Bufano, of course, has been a very controversial character in this town, and may I take a moment to digress on one of the great Bufano stories?

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: Certainly.

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: Remember that until two months ago, I was music critic of my paper as well as art critic. I resigned as music critic two months ago, which is to say in September of 1965, in order to devote myself full time to art. But for 31 years, I was music critic as well as art critic. So, I was intimately involved in this matter, as well. Benny Bufano was appointed to the San Francisco Art Commission largely through the influence of certain journalistic friends of his who thought it would be—he would create good copy for them, and how. [Mary Fuller McChesney laughs.] The first thing Benny Bufano did was insist that the art commission sponsor—this was during the war—that the art commission sponsor the San Francisco Symphony in camps, in military camps around the Bay Area. And he was unaware of the fact that the San Francisco Symphony was already doing this. Made a considerable to-do about the lack of interest of the San Francisco Symphony and its backers, in playing the cantonments, when in actuality, it was doing so. This whole thing was a curious sort of fantasy in never-never-land that he was involved in.

And he made other statements about the San Francisco Symphony, which became a sort of a *bête noire* in his mind. All of which were—most of which were just as far from the point as the one I just cited. He gave out statements regarding the price that the San Francisco Symphony charged for its tickets, which were entirely incorrect, and so forth and so on. Well, all of this arrived at a—the curious point of the establishment of a rival orchestra to the San Francisco Symphony under the aegis of Benny Bufano and a man by the name of Nicholas Johnston [ph]. Nicholas Johnston [ph] was a photographer who, at this time, which is to say 1945—'44, '45—was making a great deal of money, mostly in taking portraits of servicemen. And Benny Bufano and Nick Johnston [ph] decided that they were going to establish what they called the People's Symphony Orchestra of San Francisco.

[00:25:00]

Remember [ph], Bufano was still a member of the city art commission. Bufano went to New York, and he interviewed various people—I will shorten this story quite a bit. Ultimately, he engaged Sir Thomas Beecham to come to San Francisco to conduct the People's Symphony Orchestra. Sir Thomas—during the period of the United Nations conference, Sir Thomas Beecham later told me that both he and his manager were under the impression that he, Sir Thomas, had been engaged to conduct the San Francisco Symphony, not this rival orchestra. In all events, Sir Thomas came out here, and San Francisco Symphony then stirred its stumps, and engaged Eugene Goossens to conduct the big orchestra. So that they had this entirely incredible and somewhat disgraceful spectacle of two rival orchestras giving public concerts at the time of the United Nations conference. One of them led by Sir Thomas Beecham, who was then certainly the leading conductor of the British Empire, if there was such a thing in those days; and the other Eugene Goossens, who was one of the leading conductors of the British Empire [laughs] and these two gentlemen, as it were, sort of

competing with each other, and the thing just ultimately broke Johnston completely. They gave two concerts and Johnston was never heard of again. I think he absorbed practically everything he ever had, and that was the end of that, but it was such a—it was so dramatic and so useless and so futile and so time-wasting, and so—ultimately so insignificant a gesture. It was kind of sad.

Well, this is a pure aside issue, I realize, and perhaps it shouldn't be in this record at all, but one of my liveliest recollections of this particular character.

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: Were you around when he was finally fired from the WPA for the trouble at the George Washington High School, or do you remember that at all? And Sargent Johnson took over that project. It was a frieze around the athletics field there.

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: Yeah.

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: And Sargent finally finished it. In fact, did a completely new design.

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: Yes. I remember—now that you mention it, I remember particularly that Jack Alexander, to whom I referred a moment ago, who was one of the administrators of the Project, was very much agitated about this whole affair. I don't recall why it was that he was fired, do you?

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: I've heard about three different versions, so I'm really not sure what the truth was.

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: Mm-hmm [affirmative]. I really don't know either. I'm sorry. I do remember that he was fired from the project and that—is that frieze still there, or was it— [Cross talk.]

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: I haven't seen it, but I think it is. Sargent—I've interviewed Sargent, and he said it was still there as far as he knew.

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: I know that the Arnautoff murals in that school are still there, and they're still among the best, too.

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: Oh, I didn't know that he'd done murals.

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: Oh yes, he did, and they're some of the best Diego Rivera style murals in this town. If you go there, take a look sometime. I had a son who graduated from there a number of years ago, and so I had occasion to be inside the building.

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: Mm-hmm [affirmative].

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: And I took a look around. I hadn't been there in 20 years and they're still very effective murals indeed. Victor Arnautoff was one of the best painters in that style around here. And those are still there, and someday somebody ought to try to preserve them a little. They're not in too good shape. But whatever happened in regard to the matter of the frieze, I don't know.

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: Do you remember the WPA projects at the old State College? See Maxine Albro did some mosaics that were outside.

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: Very good ones. They're still there too, aren't they?

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: I don't know. I think it's been torn down.

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: Oh, has it?

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: I should go check.

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: I think—well this was—became the university Extension Center.

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: Mm-hmm [affirmative].

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: It was the University of California extension—was in there for a long—maybe they've—I don't know, but I remember those. I remember they were very

effective, and that people liked them. And the name Maxine Albro goes way back. I'd forgotten all about her.

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: Oh.

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: She's one of those people that, perhaps whom I, subconsciously or unconsciously, had in mind when I spoke of people who were of importance in that period who have never been heard of since or to any great degree.

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: She's still painting and showing in Carmel.

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: She is?

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: Mm-hmm [affirmative].

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: Well, all right, fine.[They laugh.]

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: I was wondering—I was going to ask you about Reuben Kadish's murals. Do you remember those at State? They were rather unusual, compared to the others in the sense that they seem to be—seem to have some sort of a surrealist influence going on.

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: I only remember the name Reuben Kadish.

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: But not the murals?

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: No. I remember the murals of—murals in Toland Hall at the University of California Medical Center. Bernard Zakheim. Do you remember him and—

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: Mm-hmm [affirmative].

[00:30:03]

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: —those things? They were in a sort of crude style. They were kind of—they had some power though. They were later covered over, and I got a long letter from Zakheim about it only a few weeks ago. He was still agitating to have the covering removed and have the murals fixed up again, but I don't think it will ever happen.

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: Oh. I've never seen them.

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: No, they've been—

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: I've seen the one of his at Coit Tower, of course.

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: Yeah.

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: I was going to ask you, this influence of surrealism or whatever it really was, it's sort of a peculiar kind of thing in this WPA period, also showed up in some of the lithographs in the lithography project, and I was wondering if you, as the art critic of *the Chronicle* were aware of how this ever came about, because most of the artists that I talked to who were actually doing this kind of work—all they could remember was that they thought perhaps there had been a show of Dali's at the museum or Max Ernst had been showing around in San Francisco?

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: Yeah.

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: You remember—it seemed to be—it seemed sort of strange because here was this very powerful Rivera influence and then some of these other people are going off in this direction of doing this sort of—

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: Well, I think there's a distinction there, which is—still exists between a public style and a private style. If you're working on a wall and you're especially working on a wall in a public building, your imagery is not going to be hermetic or enigmatic. First of all, this kind of such imagery as you use has to pass a committee to start with. And it's likely to be much more obvious and much less likely to go off in the direction of any private expression. Whereas, if you're working on a lithograph or an easel painting or something of this kind, where you're dealing with private expression, then all kinds,

obviously, of private imagery and personal enigma can come in. And of course, people were—it's impossible ever, it seems to me, to account for these tides, styles, fads, if you want, that sweep the whole country. I don't think you can put your finger on one particular surrealist exhibition in San Francisco and say this was the source of San Francisco's surrealism. It's not as simple as that. Much more complicated. People would—surrealism was one of the styles of the period. It's the style that one was—one had to be aware of. It was in all the exhibitions. Globally, it was in all the art magazines. It was everywhere. So, naturally it would show up here in the private style, [inaudible]. I don't know any instances of it showing up in the public style. For obvious reasons, I've said that the public style is a different matter.

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: You remember much of the easel paint that was done on the WPA Project in San Francisco? Or any of the painters who were—[Cross talk.] [Inaudible.]

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: I mentioned one particularly, and that was Dong Kingman, because Dong Kingman ultimately became a friend of mine. And he really did get his start there on the WPA, painting watercolors. I don't recall exactly how many others were involved. Was your husband, Bob McChesney, involved in that? Did he—

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: Not in the easel project. He was on the Treasure Island murals.

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: I see. Mm-hmm [affirmative]. And if you would give me some names, I might be able to recollect something. At the moment, other than Kingman, I don't really recall any names. I recall a man named Herman Volz, I believe, was mixed up with the lithography and graphics program as a whole. Do you remember this name?

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: Yes, and he also was the head of that huge mural they did on the federal building at Treasure Island. Do you remember that? That's the one that Mac [ph] worked on.

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: [Inaudible.]

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: I don't remember it all well, and it's hard to find any photographs, but it was the biggest mural, I think, ever done west of the Mississippi or something like that. They did it in house paint, house paint on plywood on the outside of the federal building at the fair.

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: I'm sorry to say I don't recall it at all.

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: Oh.

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: As far as the fair is concerned, I recall certain pieces of sculpture more than anything else. There was a fountain about which there was a little controversy at one time. I think most of the figures were done by Jacques Schnier. They were Eskimos and Indian figures around a fountain, which was—I liked very much indeed. Again, how much of this had anything to do with WPA or not, I couldn't say.

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: It was a strange way of working. It seemed the city was paying part of it, WPA was paying part of it. Very complicated sort of arrangement. You remember Ralph Stackpole's work?

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: Very well, indeed. Sure. Now were those sculptures down there on the Stock Exchange, were they a WPA thing, or city thing, or a combination?

[00:35:06]

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: I think—who was the architect? Pfluger? Remember?

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: Yeah, sure. Very well.

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: I think he was the architect who brought Rivera up to do that mural—

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: Indeed, he was.

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: —and then he, somehow or other, got the money together for Ralph to do those sculptures.

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: Pfluger was one of the most influential people of that kind that this town ever knew.

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: I was going to ask you about this relationship between the architects and the artist at that period. It seems to have been very close.

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: Very close, indeed. Pfluger was more active, I think, in this direction, however, than anybody else. And almost always, when you got back to an architect, he was the architect you found behind the things. He's celebrated in the Rivera mural itself in the—[coughs] pardon me—in the school. He's one of the figures that stands in one of those panels, inspecting a blueprint.

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: Did you know him yourself?

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: Yes. Never terribly well, but I'd met him a few times. I think he died not too long after I got here. I may be wrong about that. I don't remember the exact date of his death. I met him a few times. He was a frightfully busy man. He was always running around with a—doing all kinds of things. [Inaudible] he wore himself out.

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: What was the buildings—the main buildings they did in San Francisco? The Stock Exchange, I guess.

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: 450 Sutter Street, I remember, was one of Pfluger's buildings. I recall he did a good many domestic buildings, a lot of houses around in the city and the suburbs.

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: He didn't do the School of Fine Arts?

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: No.

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: No.

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: No. That was well before his time. I don't think he'd ever be caught in anything so romantic as that anyhow.

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: That's right, that was built in the '20s, wasn't it?

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: Yeah. And it's still one of the most fantastic examples of a certain kind of Ramona romanticism around this town, I don't know anything about.

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: Well, Coit Tower has a very peculiar style of architecture.

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: Oh, yeah.

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: That building must have been designed for murals, though, wasn't it? And as just [ph] a monument?

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: Oh, yes. As far as I know. I can't—can't conceive of it as being anything else. It's a monument to a woman who was an honorary member of the San Francisco fire department. And she used to go to fires and generally just sport herself in a most unladylike manner, as I understand. And this is characteristic of this town that at one period that they put up a monument to a person like that.

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: I didn't know that was the story behind it. Did she have a lot of money? Who paid for it? [She was Lily Hitchcock Coit who left money in her will for the building of Coit Tower. -Ed.]

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: I really don't know. [Mary Fuller McChesney laughs.] Worth looking into sometime.

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: What?

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: It's worth looking into sometime.

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: It would be. Mm-hmm [affirmative]. Curious.

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: I'm sure you'll find the very extensive files in all the newspaper

offices around town. Her name is Lillie Hitchcock Coit, as I remember it.

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: Lillie Hitchcock Coit.

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: Mm-hmm [affirmative].

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: I did want to ask you something about the Refregier murals that you mentioned earlier, the controversy that developed. That was the Treasury Department project.

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: Yes.

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: Which, as I understand the story, Ref had gotten the commission before the war—or it was a contest and he had won the contest.

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: Mm-hmm [affirmative].

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: And I guess his designs had been approved and then there was a delay because of the war, in completing it.

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: That's right. Mm-hmm [affirmative].

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: How did that controversy ever start? I just remember it very vaguely.

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: Well, the controversy was a very complicated affair. I wrote a whole—I wrote four long articles about it. I investigated the whole matter in some detail, and I would like to deposit a copy of those articles in the Archives. I think this would be worth doing.

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: Oh, very much so.

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: Because it rounds up everything. My—I started investigating this matter, I must say, in the spirit of complete friendliness and defensiveness toward Refregier, and I came out of it not nearly so friendly and not nearly so defensive. My impression is, first of all, that he changed a great many of his designs in the period between their approval and their putting on the walls. Took advantage, in other words, of the long interval, the long hiatus, which had been brought about by the war, to import into these murals motifs which had not originally been approved. And that many of motifs had a strong—and still have because they're still there—a very strong leftist tinge, I think is without any question whatsoever.

[00:39:55]

And the problem, of course, for me, was not at all—first of all, the problem was to determine the facts because there was some misrepresentation of the facts on both sides, of the side of those who were opposed and those who defended. And second, the problem of whether or not they ought to be removed. There was a congressman, whose name was Scudder, who was—strangely enough, did not represent San Francisco at all. He was from Sonoma or someplace outside—

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: Sebastopol.

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: Sebastopol, that's right. [Cross talk.] [They laugh.]

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: I remember that name now.

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: Yeah, that's right. And he made [inaudible] propaganda for removing them. Well, the town rallied to keep them there, and there they still remain. But the idea of their being totally lacking in some of the symbolism and some of the forces and some of the ideas that Refregier—some of the ideas that Scudder objected to just won't wash. It isn't true. As I say, the whole thing is there. I think I have here in this office a copy of those articles. I'll give them to you. You can take them home.

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: Marvelous. The thing that always amazed me about— [inaudible] artists, from what I would just generally hear was that there was this objection to a portrait of President Roosevelt in the murals. Do you remember that? That always seemed

so peculiar, because it seems awfully difficult for me—to me that you could interpret a portrait of President Roosevelt as left-wing propaganda. [There's a buzzsaw-like sound in the background. -Ed.]

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: Well, I don't think that actually there was much controversy over that. I think the problem was not that there was a portrait of President Roosevelt. I think also this was part of the misrepresentation that was involved. The portrait of President Roosevelt was one of the things that had been changed in the intervening period.

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: Oh, I see.

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: You see? And it was pointed out that such and such and such had been changed. That the murals as finally painted disagreed with the—disagreed with the original plans or sketches in such and such and such particulars, and one of them was the portrait of Roosevelt.

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: Yeah.

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: And this was immediately seized upon by those friendly to the artist, as indicative of—well, something they could very easily drive home because Roosevelt was extremely popular and so on, but it wasn't only Roosevelt that was involved.

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: Yeah.

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: It was a lot more than that.

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: How do you think the murals of Refregier stand up compared to the other murals in San Francisco, artistically?

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: It's hard for me to say because they're the only ones I regularly see.

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: Oh. Mm-hmm [affirmative].

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: I go there all the time. I'm in and out of Rincon Annex post office two or three times a week, and consequently, I have seen them repeatedly over a very long period. The others I seldom ever see, as you know—as you observe, I can't even remember—didn't even know a moment ago whether the Coit Tower murals are there or not. I think they still are.

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: Yeah [laughs].

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: And I haven't seen those at the beach in years—once in a very long while when my children were small, I used to see those in the zoo. Haven't seen those in years, and so on. I think that the Rincon Annex murals hold up for me very, very well, indeed. There are certain panels in them which seem to me in very questionable taste for a building of this character. Nevertheless, as works of art and as—in general, I think they're very effective indeed.

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: I should go back and look at those. I haven't seen them for a long time.

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: Yeah.

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: Have you seen much WPA art in different cities of the United States, besides San Francisco? I ask because I was wondering if you thought you could make any kind of comparison between what happened here in this time and what happened, say, in Los Angeles or what happened on the East Coast.

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: No. I'm sorry to say, I can't. I really can't say anything about that at all. I'm not much aware of what happened elsewhere. And most of what happened elsewhere has long since washed away anyhow. So, I really can't make that comparison.

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: Yeah.

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: Sorry.

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: You mentioned earlier that the enthusiasm that was engendered in this area around the WPA projects and other government projects led you to the conviction that it was a very good idea for artists to be used by the government in decorating buildings. Do you have any thoughts about how this might be done in a way that would be possibly less—more successful?

[00:45:13]

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: Yeah. Sure, I mean, my idea about it has always been, A: that the artists being used in the public buildings should be obviously chosen by, and work in the immediate direction with—in association with the architects. This obviously is the first thing. I mean, you can't put up a building and then have somebody else come along and slap art in it. This is—this makes no sense at all. But if the artist and the architect can work together harmoniously to start from scratch, then something of considerable interest might happen. And when I say artists, I don't necessarily mean always mural painters and sculptors. I can conceive of situations where weavers and ceramicists and craftsmen of all kinds would be of—perhaps of greater value than the more formal and, in quotation marks, "high artists" might be. I would like to see a situation where an artist of all kinds—craftsmen as well as the painters and sculptors, might be used.

There's a proposal now—but we're having a little problem over it—that two percent of the building cost for every building—major public building in San Francisco might—may be, at the discretion of the art commission, used for things of this kind. This is a proposal which has—or a stipulation that has been used in many other places. Some places it's much more than two percent. I believe in Stockholm it's something like 10 percent, and in various eastern cities in this county and in many cities in Europe, there is a stipulation that when a public building is erected, a certain amount—certain percentage is to be used for the adornment or the amelioration or whatever you want to call it thereof, by painters, sculptors, craftsmen, and so forth. This proposal has been bandied about in San Francisco, to my certain knowledge, for at least 20 years.

The first expression of it was a resolution adopted by the Art Commission in 1945, and since, from 1945 to 1965, this idea has been agitated. And it was finally passed on July 26, 1965 by the Board of Supervisors, but passed in so weak and insignificant of form that it's even worse than if it hadn't been passed, because the present—the legislation drawn and passed by the Board of Supervisors this year states only that the Art Commission may recommend the use of this money for the use of painters and sculptors and artists in general. It does not require that the Art Commission may demand it. In other words—

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: Oh, I see.

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: —the Art Commission can—anybody who wants to defy the Art Commission and disregard the Art Commission's recommendations is going to do so, and the Art Commission has enough trouble making its recommendations—or making its demands stick. I mean, there are certain areas of municipal life where the Art Commission has mandatory powers. And very frequently, an effort is made to defy those mandatory powers. Sometimes successfully. Well, if that's the case, if the Art Commission is placed in this situation, where its powers are not mandatory, but merely recommendatory, then the legislation is, in my opinion, even worse than if it hadn't been drawn because it makes—it gives the impression that something has been done, when actually nothing has been done.

And for this reason, I think another version of this bill will shortly be drawn. Another version of this ordinance, in fact, will shortly be introduced giving the Art Commission these mandatory powers. Then, maybe something will happen. I don't know. Anyhow, to be sure, this is not going to create another Florence or another Athens inside of six months in San Francisco, but it's a little bit better than nothing.

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: What do you think of Johnson's program? The development of the arts [inaudible]—

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: I'll know a lot more about that after next Monday. I'm going to New York to a meeting of the committee. The committee for this National Foundation of the Arts is meeting the press from all over the country next Monday in New York, and they're going to give us all the low-down. I'll know a lot more about it then. At this moment, I really don't know enough about it to say.

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: Yeah.

[00:50:06]

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: It looks interesting. There are always the dangers, and there are dangers inherent within the program that I've been talking about, of the mediocrity of government functionaries coming in between the artist and the public. These things are never totally the answer, but at least it's more of an answer than no answer. And certainly, the experience that we had with the WPA, however bad it was, I mean, however inadequate it was—it wasn't bad.

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: No.

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: However inadequate it was, and however limited it was, and however troublesome it was, still provided us with the experience that shows that something really good could happen. And it seems to me one of the most hopeful, fruitful things in the American past that the present can learn from. One of the most useful episodes in the usable past, let me put it that way.

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: [Laughs.] It's really incredible how much was accomplished in only eight years.

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: Yeah. Very short—

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: Very short period of time.

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: Very short period. Another aspect, by the way, that was interesting in that period was the Index of American Design.

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: I was going to ask you.

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: Yeah, some very nice things were done here. I think those things are all on file in Washington somewhere.

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: Mm-hmm [affirmative].

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: But they did some very interesting recording of decorative art, of iron work, of architecture, and whatnot, and all of this material, or some of it, was later published by—what was his name? I've forgotten. I know some of it was later published in a very interesting book, and all of it is on file in Washington, and all of it will be available, is available, ought to be available, at least to the Archive, and so on. This was a very good thing.

Whether this new thing of—this new National Arts Foundation will produce anything that good, I don't know. Of course, the National Arts Foundation is working from a totally different basis. As I understand it, on the basis on what I have learned already, which is from a quick scanning of the bill, and the bill is enormously complicated and very difficult to read. The bill is one of those pieces of legislation that seems to be drawn in such a way that nobody can really understand it. But I mean, it's almost deliberately, you feel, that it's been drawn to be as obscure as possible. From what I can gather from reading the bill, and from a discussion with a man who is going to be its secretary, or one of its secretaries, who was here a few weeks ago, they are going, particularly, to finance projects of various kinds.

For example, one of the things that he mentioned to me is a small grants project for composers and for artists. He points out that artists very frequently—sculptors perhaps more frequently than painters—are unable financially to ship their works to exhibitions, and this happens repeatedly. The opportunity for exhibition will come up, either through the submission or through invitation, and the relatively simple matter of crating and shipping works of art is more than the artist can take. This, I know, has happened, I've run across it myself.

Well, this is a small grants project, which would enable people to draw funds to send their works to exhibitions. Another thing of the same sort—this sounds perhaps picayune but it isn't. Another thing of the same sort, which I have heard all my life, and that is that it costs in the neighborhood of \$1,500 to \$2,000 to prepare a piece of music for performance by a symphony orchestra. I have known instances where composers have received a grant of

\$1000 from the symphony orchestra and spent \$1,500 to get it—getting the work in order. Getting the parts copied, particularly, more than anything else. It's very expensive. Well, this is a small grants project that will take care of that. That will make it possible, in other words, for more American music to get around among the orchestras. There's a whole series of grants, in a small way, to facilitate movement, let's put it that way. Now this is the least important, perhaps, aspect of the whole matter and I'm quite sure the very important programs of other sorts will be announced at this meeting next week. But the general impression of the intent of the bill or the intent of the administrators is more toward making grants for people to work at what they have already decided to do, than creating new projects. It isn't connected with any big public building program or anything of that size.

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: Mm-hmm [affirmative].

[00:55:25]

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: Anything else?

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: No. I guess that's just about it. Oh, I was going to ask you one thing. The style that developed in the frescos, that sort of WPA-style that developed here in San Francisco appeared to sort of disappear, and you mentioned that probably one of the reasons was that there were no longer any walls to paint on. What was the next sort of change that happened in the art of the area, just in very broad terms? Did any of this influence linger over in any way that you were you aware of, or was there a rapid change because of the war?

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: There was a very rapid change because of the influence of the California School of Fine Arts and the sudden breaking of Abstract Expressionism, more than anything else. I assume there must have been some sort of hiatus due to the war, but it couldn't have been very long. But my impression—which is grossly telescoped in memory, I'm quite sure—but nevertheless, my impression is that, after this period that we're speaking of, the WPA period and so on, there came almost immediately this incredible, drastic, cataclysmic expression of Abstract Expressionism, which came in here largely through the influence of the California School of Fine Arts and Douglas MacAgy and the group of painters that he got together, the teachers that he got together. I remember the first expressions of Abstract Expressionism—I hate to keep using this phrase, expression of Expressionism. But in a sense, it's all right. I remember the first instances of Abstract Expressionism that I saw on the walls of the California Palace of the Legion of Honor. They were painted by Hassel Smith. Huge paintings. Enormous, as I recall. And for me, utterly bewildering and almost incomprehensible.

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: You remember what year that was?

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: '45, '46 possibly. Somewhere in there. I—

What happened then was that Abstract Expressionism came in and sort of swept everything around here for a long period. Everybody jumped on board that bandwagon, whether they did it proper—or whether they did it successfully or skillfully or not.

But this was a period of, also—oh, I'm rambling a little bit, but sometimes the ramblings are more valuable than more formal recollection. This was a period when there was enormous influence willfully of both Douglas and Jermaine MacAgy. Jerry, at that time was the assistant director—deputy director of the California Palace of the Legion of Honor. Tommy Howe [ph] being at war. Jerry MacAgy was, to all intents and purposes, the director, and she was very sympathetic to all of these new people and new movements. Douglas MacAgy was director of the California School of Fine Arts and brought out here numerous people, notably Clyfford Still.

The influence of these people and their—the influence of Abstract Expressionism then became the great wave that just knocked everything down, and everything in front of it for a very long time. And it created some very peculiar problems and peculiar situations. I was told—I remember one incident when a group of young artists, students at the California School of Fine Arts, established a gallery on Bush Street, it was called Metart. M-E-T-A-R-T. This was a place where all kinds of Abstract Expressionist things by the young students at the California School of Fine Arts were being exhibited. The most celebrated painters to come out of that were Hubert Crehan, Jorge Goya, and a number of others. Again, memory isn't good at the moment.

[00:59:54]

But I remember writing something about the fact that these students had been heavily influenced by the Abstract Expressionism practiced by Clyfford Still, and Hassel Smith, and various others who were teaching then at the California School of Fine Arts. And receiving a long and exceedingly indignant letter from one of the artists whom I've mentioned, a young man named Jorge Goya, in which he said that this was a complete distortion of history, and that the professors at the California School of Fine Arts had leapt aboard the Abstract Expressionist bandwagon in order to keep up with their students. Now whether this is true or not is another matter, but it's a very interesting idea and—[they laugh]—whether or not, actually, the influence came from the students to the professors or from the professors to the students, I don't know, but this is a notion at least I would love to get into the historic hopper at this moment [they laugh] for somebody to think about. That certainly was—that's the way I recall it, again, it's distorted by recollection and distorted by lack of specific facts in front of me, and I'm quite sure if I'd go back over the clippings over the years, I'd find many different things, but that's the way I recall it now. What else?

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: Well, let's see. What's happening now? [Laughs.]

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: Now, here in San Francisco? Well, it seems to me, there's an awful lot of good painting going on, but rather more—seems to be rather more invention and daring going on in the sculpture than in the painting. And I'm thinking about people like Robert Hudson and McClintock, is his name, has a show or at least had a show at the San Francisco Museum and—or in general, it seems to me that when the big shows come together, they—people like this Roger Jacobsen showing at the Dilexi, and so on. It may be that we're in a period when there's more invention going into three-dimensional media than in the two-dimensional media, which brings me to a question, what is Bob McChesney doing nowadays?

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: He's doing assemblages of cattle bones. [Laughs.]

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: Is he?

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: Yeah, you must come have a look at them. I'll turn this off.

ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN: This sculpture then? This is three-dimen—

[Recorder stops, restarts.]

MARY FULLER MCCHESENEY: This has been an interview with Alfred Frankenstein, the art critic of *the San Francisco Chronicle*, conducted by Mary McChesney. The date was November 9, 1965.

[END OF TRACK AAA_franke65_3915_m.]

[END OF INTERVIEW.]