

Mapping the Pedagogy of the New York Studio School

Jennifer Sachs Samet

“Despite diverse aesthetic points of view as represented by individual artists on the faculty, the School represents a particular attitude toward the study of art...The study is demanding and difficult; it places emphasis on what is learned rather than what is produced, on deep rooted insight into art of the past as well as of the present, on individual authenticity rather than borrowed idioms of fashion...”

—Mercedes Matter (1913-2001)¹

“I was told, all my life, in art school and beyond, you’re not allowed to draw, you’re not allowed to paint; you certainly shouldn’t paint with images....The way I teach is the way I would have liked to have been taught.”

—Graham Nickson²

The New York Studio School was founded in 1964 by Mercedes Matter, in collaboration with a group of students and faculty, during a time of cultural ferment. To this day, it is bound by a sense of mission, one that has often stood in counterpoint to the prevailing tastes of the art world. During the heyday of Pop, conceptual art, and minimalism, the School emphasized drawing, working from life, and a sustained studio practice. To delve into the history, however, is to become aware of the contradictions inherent in a school run by some of the most passionate minds of the New York art world. This essay represents a first attempt to trace a pedagogical map of the New York Studio School, one that connects the school’s teaching to a multiplicity of influences.

The School’s history can be loosely divided into four periods. The early years, under Matter’s influence, began with no director, and culminated with the avant-garde composer Morton Feldman as Dean. In the 1970s, Mercedes Matter officially became Dean, the influence of Philip Guston was particularly felt, and the school held summer sessions in Paris taught by Elaine de Kooning and Leland Bell, among others. The late 1970s and 80s were a transitional administrative period that included the Australian

painter William Wright, Bruce Gagnier, and, for one year, Robert Storr and Jackie Brookner as Deans. Since 1989, Graham Nickson has assumed stewardship of the School.³

Because of its emphasis on working from life, the school has sometimes been perceived as a conservative institution. However, the school's origins as a collaborative project between students and teachers point to its intrinsic—and under-recognized—radicality. Furthermore, the school has been, and continues to be, a locus of advanced intellectual activity, not only in its diverse roster of teachers, but also in its ongoing lecture series and exhibition program. Meyer Schapiro, who was involved in the School from its earliest days, gave four important lectures. Dore Ashton, Leo Steinberg and Hilton Kramer have also been frequent lecturers throughout the past forty years. Buckminster Fuller first presented his *World Game* over a number of days in 1967. De Kooning visited the school and participated in a dialogue with Matter. Milton Resnick gave a series of provocative lectures and critiques in the 1960s and 70s. Morton Feldman held concerts and lectures in the early years of the School and even lived there, composing his music, while he was Dean.

A School Founded Out of a Common Need

The catalyst for the founding of the School was an article published by Mercedes Matter in *Art News* in September 1963, entitled “What’s Wrong with U.S. Art Schools?” Matter, the daughter of painter Arthur B. Carles, studied in the 1930s with Hans Hofmann, who profoundly influenced her teaching methods. She was an original

member of both the American Abstract Artists group, and the only original female member of the Artists' Club.

At the time of her *Art News* article, Matter had been teaching at Pratt Institute, and the Philadelphia College of Art. She criticized the state of art education for lacking the continuity of work in a studio. Art education, she maintained, taught students about the state of the art world—"what is going on"—but never actually to draw. Matter noted that the dim, quiet, dusty world of the old academy had been replaced by a frenzied atmosphere in which students dashed between short classes, through which art-making was fragmented into separate activities according to class period and instructor. Matter, who found homework assignments and exercises superficial, and believed only in sustained studio practice, called for a corrective: to "restore the conditions for working which make the study of art possible," and "strip away everything but its basic, serious components: drawing, painting, sculpture, history of art."⁴

A group of her Pratt and Philadelphia students, including Marc Zimetbaum and Chuck O'Connor, insisted that she found a school based on the ideal she outlined in print. Students agreed with Matter's charges, that they simply did not have enough uninterrupted time in the studio. O'Connor, who frames the founding of the School in the larger context of 1960s student agitation and interest in alternative education, recalls his frustration that a sculpture class at Pratt, taught by Sidney Geist in his first year, had reverted to a three dimensional design course taught by a graduate student in the second year.⁵ The frustration that students felt of having studio time interrupted by degree requirements, is corroborated even in a critical response to Matter's article, published simultaneously in *Art News*, by Howard Conant. Conant, who was then chairman of the

art department at New York University, criticizes Matter for a “hankering-for-the-good-old days conservatism,” but writes that “one must openly admit the accuracy of Miss Matter’s pointed criticism of such undeniable weaknesses in art education programs as fragmented curricula, too-short classes, a stress on quick results and experiments rather than long-term projects...”⁶

To announce the School, a poster was created by Mercedes’ husband, Herbert Matter, a noted graphic designer and photographer. It read “A School Founded by Students Out of A Common Need,” and reproduced three canonical images: a Cézanne, a Giacometti and a Poussin. It listed the original faculty: Matter, Charles Cajori, Nicholas Carone, Geist, Guston, John Heliker, Alex Katz, Earl Kerkam, George Spaventa, and Esteban Vicente, as well as Meyer Schapiro for art history. Gabriel Laderman and Edwin Dickinson were also listed, although they did not ultimately join the faculty. Dore Ashton published an article in *Studio International* announcing the School’s founding, which attracted the initial group of applications from around the country.

The Pratt administration, concerned about bad publicity, tried to dissuade Zimetbaum and O’Connor from starting another school by telling them they could design their own curriculum and still graduate. By this time, however, the students—led by Zimetbaum, and also including Richard Castellana, Joseph Eletz, Larry Faden, David Lawless, Marjorie Kramer, Irene Peslikis, and Norman Turner—were determined. The group eventually located a loft downtown at 646 Broadway. Students worked together to construct the worktables and modeling platforms, and, within a few months, in

September 1964, the School was open. The space was divided by movable walls into separate areas for painting, sculpture, and drawing.

In the first year, the School was run with a communal spirit: it had no director or financial manager; students had keys to the space and worked there at all hours unsupervised. The students themselves decided on the tuition of five hundred dollars a year and helped to choose the faculty. By November, however, money ran out. The Kaplan Fund came to their aid, with the proviso that a financial advisor be hired. This role was filled by Mrs. Henry Epstein, a friend of Vicente's. Cajori recalls the passionate debates about how the School should be run, which took place at Mrs. Epstein's art-filled Fifth Avenue apartment.⁷

The School spent two and a half years in the Broadway loft. When Matter began looking for a larger space, she learned that the former Whitney Museum building on Eighth Street was available. Matter was determined to have it for the School. It became possible with the tragic death of a twenty-one year-old student, Claudia Stone, who left the School a significant portion of her inheritance. It is in this building, now a national landmark, that the School remains: a labyrinth of inner staircases and rooms, which include Gertrude Vanderbilt Whitney's legendary salon, with Robert Chanler's chimneypiece of wild, fiery sculpted plasterwork.

Drawing ... A Way of Beginning

The story of the School's origins, as it is told and re-told, has acquired a mythic quality. Far more complicated, however, is the actuality of the School's educational

system, and the differences between individual teachers. This essay attempts to outline crucial differences of educational philosophy among Studio School teachers.

Any evaluation of the School must consider whether a Studio School “style” in fact exists. Studio School work has been characterized as gestural figurative painting, and drawing with the anguished commitment of de Kooning and Giacometti. However, in looking at alumni work, we find a full spectrum of differentiated approaches that nonetheless carry underlying traces of the School. For example, the “word” paintings of Christopher Wool—a student in the 1970s—seems to mark a radical departure from the School’s aesthetic, yet Wool’s more recent paintings reincorporate and contemplate the hand, the act of drawing and obsessive erasure, which reflect something of his experience at the School.⁸ The variety of work produced by alumni ultimately points to the differences between teachers, and the open-endedness of interpretation that their teaching in fact allowed.

Robert Storr says that he was attracted to teaching at the Studio School because he found the teaching method based in “an empirical looking and finding and making process that seemed a very legitimate way to get people started. I also was aware that many of the people who went to the Studio School ended up someplace very different, so it was not a matter of teaching a particular style...but rather a way of beginning.”⁹

Drawing has indeed been the core of the School’s educational system. The still life—and the actual set-up—were the focus of Matter’s teaching and her own art. Through careful, exact arrangement of objects, Matter hoped to create an awareness of pictorial dynamics and spatial relationships. She was known to search out the most beautiful and luxurious elements for her set-ups, irrespective of cost. With Matter, one

learned to draw in a certain way through intense engagement with the still-life elements. The arrangement itself—along with some awareness of Matter’s own way of drawing, and group osmosis—became the instructional device. A founding student, Marjorie Kramer (who donated a portion of her small inheritance to pay the School’s first month’s rent of \$500), recalls that in Matter’s still-life set-ups, “there was electricity between the different points in space. I didn’t know how she did that, like when you look at a Giacometti drawing or a Cézanne still life, when you worked from her still-life set-ups, you sensed that it was a very personal statement.”¹⁰

Cézanne and Giacometti were, in fact, the ethical and aesthetic models of the School. Matter adhered to the intense, seeking nature of their process. Her belief was that every mark has consequences, leading to a working method that some found painful in its intensity. Sidney Geist is critical of this teaching method for being too much about erasure, because it can transmit an unfortunate message to students to, in his words, “work, work, suffer, fail.”¹¹ However, for Matter, erasure was a crucial form of questioning and refining. In a 1966 article that functioned as a manifesto for the importance of the practice of drawing, Matter writes that “the primary character” of drawing is “its attritional process of defining, its adjustments toward precision, which sharpen awareness and forge visual consciousness.”¹²

Distinctions between teachers were crucial to students, who often ended up aligned with a specific teacher’s philosophy. Throughout the 1960s and 1970s, Nicholas Carone taught drawing, along with Matter. Carone had also studied with Hofmann, and describes his own teaching as reflecting this lineage, but also individuated from it, most significantly because of Carone’s interest in esoteric philosophy and surrealism. This is a

critical distinction, in a school that originally taught formal values and discouraged concerns of content and narrative. Many students of the 1970s considered Carone's and Matter's methods of teaching drawing as representing two distinct perspectives.¹³ After studying with Hofmann, Carone traveled to Italy and met Italian Futurist and Metaphysical painters, such as Severini, de Chirico, and Morandi. He also became a close friend of Matta.

A central issue for Carone is the picture plane, which he believes has the capacity to metaphorically acquire another dimension through content. The paradox of the inherent two-dimensionality of the picture plane, and the necessity to deal with three-dimensionality while acknowledging this, was at the core of Hofmann's teaching. Hofmann himself was influenced by the German sculptor Adolf Hildebrand, who articulated the paradox in *The Problem of Form* (1893).¹⁴ Although his American students insist he never spoke of such things, Hofmann was interested in metaphysics, and like Kandinsky, believed in the fourth dimension, and the life force or magic, that was implicit in creating plasticity and dynamic composition. Carone, who studied Gurdjieff, incorporated these ideas into his teaching.

Carone saw the original, blank picture plane as perfectly in balance spatially. Any mark made on the page disrupted this balance, and the process of working was a continual attempt to restore it. Although students were drawing from life, the composition was seen in a basically abstract way. In fact, many of the students from this period took their work into pure abstraction. Matter was more interested in a planar, cubist space, more insistent on the necessity of working from observation, and more focused on the existential, searching nature of the endeavor. As Emily Cheng, a student

in the 1970s, explained, Carone believed something must result from the drawing process, and he transmitted an optimism that it was possible to make a memorable image.¹⁵

Graham Nickson, the current Dean of the School, states, “We live in a time when the teaching of drawing has dropped off. So you’re dealing with really good students and very interesting people who had no knowledge whatsoever of perceptual drawing or drawing in general.” Nickson considers drawing “basically the philosophy of the artist. Apart from it being the quickest way of expressing your experience or ideas or perception, it also is the thing that keeps you grounded. It keeps you thinking about the nature of painting as well but it gives you a faster route to that experience.”¹⁶

Nickson was born in England in 1946. He brought to the Studio School the influence of his own training at the Camberwell School of Art, where he had studied with Euan Uglow, who in turn had worked under William Coldstream at the Slade. The influence of Coldstream, Uglow and the Slade, with its exacting system of measurement, is a new element in the mix of teaching ideologies at the school, brought via Nickson and other British teachers he has employed. Yet, according to Ruth Miller, Matter herself was actively interested in incorporating this empirical British tradition into the educational system of the Studio School.¹⁷ Coldstream was also the mentor of Miller’s late husband, Andrew Forge (1923-2002), who was part of the School throughout the years.

Nickson has extended Matter’s tradition of elaborate set-ups: he creates entire landscape-like environments in which several figures pose. But where Matter’s set-ups

were designed more to provoke an awareness of spatial problems, Nickson's set-ups appear more referential, and suggest a psychological theatricality.

One of the major changes Nickson brought to the School's educational system was his introduction of the Drawing Marathon, in which students work at a sustained level of intensity during a two-week period. During the Marathon, Nickson has his students work on a variety of systematic exercises. Although this differs from Matter's approach, the exercises are ultimately designed to demonstrate principles the two agreed on: spatial relationships, awareness and activation of negative space. The Marathon concept may seem to mark a shift from the slow, existentialist process of looking and working espoused by Matter and others at the School, but Nickson argues that the two ways of working are not contradictory. He sees the Marathon as an opportunity for an uninterrupted span of working, in which the student can make huge advances, and then put these advances into practice in "that slow, deliberate way that is the normal procedure."¹⁸

Where Nickson's teaching is also most distinct from Matter's is in his focus on "intentionality." In critiques, Nickson in effect asks students to create a manifesto for their work: to define their intent. He states that, "instead of imposing ideas and styles and attitudes on people," he tries to "find out the implications of what their work is about, and use the information that's in front of me to go to the next stage."¹⁹

Points in Space ... the Sculpture Studio

For many years, work in sculpture was required of all students. In the first years of the School, George Spaventa (1918-1978) taught in the morning, while evenings were with Sidney Geist. Larry Faden, a student in 1964-66, recalls that Spaventa was more virtuosic, concerned with delicate facture, and less doctrinaire, while Geist was intellectual (as an art historian he has written on Brancusi and Cézanne) and was focused on planes, structure, and overall form.²⁰ Spaventa was close to the Abstract Expressionist painters, and it is said that he played an instructional role in de Kooning's sculptural work. His teaching was focused on the hand: he often modeled directly into student work, leaving them wondering how they might accomplish such delicacy on their own.²¹

Although Geist was himself an abstract modernist sculptor, he taught his students in the antique manner to copy plaster casts, before a live model was introduced. He states, "the plaster cast is an object and it gives you a vocabulary."²² After students had progressed to working from life by modeling with clay, Geist might introduce direct plaster work, which was where they began to work more abstractly.

Peter Agostini (1913-1993) taught along with Geist in the clay studio. Where Geist was more planar, Agostini had a more painterly touch. Agostini had received little formal training himself, and as Gagnier recalls "was involved with the Renaissance, and didn't like Cubism."²³ The distaste for Cubism differentiated Agostini from teachers such as Matter and Carone. Although Agostini emphasized the process of looking—creating awareness of a constellation of anatomical points in space to locate forms—he was not a systematic teacher. As Bruce Gagnier recalls, with Agostini, "we also learned to model using light: to see sculpture as a painterly field of movements in value relations."²⁴

Gagnier's own teaching at the Studio School reflects his study with Agostini and Carone at Columbia. Gagnier connects himself to the lineage of Hildebrand. His goal is to "teach for the plastic consciousness, get the students to evolve to a consciousness that is involved with a tactile sensibility to the extent that it evokes their sixth sense."²⁵ Gagnier emphasizes that this teaching is not specifically "figurative"- the model is used as a motif, a form in space, so that students learn how to understand space in plastic terms.

Garth Evans, who currently runs the sculpture department is, like Nickson, British, and attended the Slade. He tried to unify the sculpture department, which he found, upon arriving at the School in 1988, had been broken into two factions: those working abstractly and those working from the figure. He trains his own students to work using a system of measurement reflective of the Slade's, yet he believes that measurement is only an aid, and encourages his students to work towards some sense of truth rather than simply strict accuracy.

"The School of Form": Teaching Painting

These same issues—of working from observation versus the independent creation of form, and between formalism and content—apply to the teaching of painting at the Studio School.

Charles Cajori's still-life set-ups are spare in comparison with Matter's and Nickson's; one student even described them as Morandi-like.²⁶ Cajori states that in his teaching, "Perception is recognized as a theme, a way of looking, which involves the motion of the eye. Since the focal area is very small, your eye has to move in order to

take charge of [a form]. My teaching consists of a very long, arduous process of watching and seeing that kind of shifting in the world.”²⁷ Barbara Gross, a student in 1992-95, explains that Cajori taught “how one mark relates to another, how all of that relates to the edge, and how the small spaces between the mark alter everything; therefore, how specific you need to be.”²⁸

In teaching painting, Esteban Vicente (1903-2001) was a voice for color. He demonstrated how to mix a full range of colors, while using a small palette. The limited palette he recommended to students consisted of ultramarine blue light, viridian green, cadmium orange, cadmium red light, cadmium yellow light, alizarin crimson, and a white.²⁹ From these, he encouraged students to mix their own earth tones. Vicente spoke about how colors relate to one another and come alive through interaction.³⁰

Leland Bell (1922-1991), who taught painting from 1968-77, was especially adept at bringing formal issues to life through musical analogy. He analyzed paintings by diagramming the arrangement of forms, demonstrating correspondences of shape and color, and picking out visual rhythms. Bell’s gift was his almost ecstatic ability to transmit his enthusiasm for specific artists, old and new (such as the later Derain, the Le Nain brothers, or Corot) in lectures that often took place in museums like the Barnes Foundation, The Phillips Collection (where Bell had his own initiation into painting), and in Paris during the Studio School’s summer sessions there. While these artists might be outside the currents of early 1970s taste, Bell’s students came to see them as a pantheon of inspirational figures. Bell would perform a “tactile dance in front of paintings,”³¹ demonstrating, with the movement of his hands, be-bop noises and simulated jazz rhythms, how planes of color moved in depth, and how the weight of color alone moved

the eye spatially.³² Although Bell taught painting from life, he taught it as a kind of formalist abstract painting. An alumni describes how thirty years later, he can still hear Bell's voice as he paints, telling him to "find the masses."³³

The dialogue between the formal elements of painting and the image or content was fluid in the teaching method of George McNeil (1908-1995). McNeil had been a close student of Hofmann. McNeil demonstrated Hofmann's spatial theories clearly to his students, but also brought an automatist element into his teaching. His class was experimental; his set-ups might be piles of junk, and the model's presence was not necessarily important. McNeil worked alongside his students, using all kinds of materials, pouring paint, and working from the set-up into abstraction. From abstraction, a figure might emerge, unrelated to the actual model. McNeil, when pressed, characterized the Studio School as a school of form – of form-making.³⁴ A former student states that, "McNeil wanted to directly get you into a semi-mystical state, almost a trance. Guston was not quite the same. He wanted you in front of the canvas not thinking...unafraid."³⁵

Guston, who taught in the 1960s and 70s, encouraged personal content in his students work. He emphasized the need for "a personal vision."³⁶ Guston's influence at the School was particularly felt in the 1970s, as he was making the transition in his own work from abstraction into figuration. He encouraged in his students a process of image formation—not in a literal or narrative form—but rather, poly-referential work to which one could respond in a visceral way.³⁷

It was one of Guston's figurative paintings, *The Painter's Table*, reproduced in *The Herald Tribune*, that compelled Andrea Belag to enroll in the Studio School in 1971. Belag belonged to a small group of students—centered around Steven Sloman—who

critiqued each other's works. Yet, despite Guston's lead, when she began to introduce personal content into her work, she did so in secret, and actually hid these works from her peers. Guston's interest in personal content was the exception, and narrative content still generally anathema to the School.

Nickson's tenure over the last fifteen years has encouraged a greater acceptance of content in painting that is in keeping with the tenor of the times. Nickson, who in his own work has successfully transposed the ancient motif of the Bathers into a contemporary milieu, is open to a wider variety of psychological nuance and narrative diversity among his students' work. He always demands, however, that the students approach issues of content with a clear intentionality that can be both defined and defended.

The Next Forty Years...

Contradiction and passionate difference of opinion pervades the history of the New York Studio School. This, despite the fact that, as Gagnier notes, many of the teachers were perhaps "closer to each other than they were to the rest of the world."³⁸ At many times in the course of its history, the School has been in a state of flux (Geist calls it "a-tilt"³⁹) in terms of differences of personality. Many acknowledge Nickson's unique ability to restore a balanced state to the School. The spirit of fruitful disagreement, however, is inevitable in an atmosphere as electric as the Studio School. Matter's personal friendships and relationships brought figures like Giacometti to the School to visit during his only trip to New York in 1965. Marjorie Kramer recalls, "Mercedes

would say, ‘Oh yes, Giacometti was here last night and I showed him some of the students’ work.’⁴⁰ At the end of his life, Hofmann also had the opportunity to visit, talking to students about their work, and eventually taking one student’s drawing, bisecting and reorganizing it, in the way he was known to teach at his own school.⁴¹

While founders may reminisce about the early days, most visitors still sense the singular atmosphere—a warm but deeply serious community—that feeds and informs the School. Graham Nickson has extended the atmosphere of the school with the Evening Lecture series, which has brought hundreds of leading artists, critics, and art historians to the School. The programmatic intensity of his marathons and critiques challenges students to question their received knowledge about the process of making art, and to make them believe that there is nothing more important than what they are doing, and no place better to do it.

The ongoing legacy of the School may be best assessed by looking at the many alumni who now teach. Their varying approaches to art education reflect the diversity of the education they received at the School, yet all share something of the depth of commitment that they experienced in their time at the School. It is this legacy, along with the constantly evolving character of the School itself that augurs best for the next forty years.

¹ Mercedes Matter, journal, Mercedes Matter Estate, Mark Borghi Fine Art.

² Graham Nickson, personal interview, December 8, 2004.

³ Directors and deans at the school have included, in addition to Mercedes Matter and Graham Nickson, the following: Sidney Geist (Director, 1965-66); Marc Zimetbaum, (Director, 1966); Morton Feldman (Dean, 1969-71); Andrew Forge (Associate Dean, 1973-74); William Wright (Associate Dean and Program Director, 1976-79); Bruce Gagnier (Dean, 1979-86); Robert Storr (Acting Dean, 1987-88); and Jackie Brookner (Acting Dean, 1987-88).

-
- ⁴ Matter, "What's Wrong with U.S. Art Schools?" *Art News* (September 1963), pp. 40-41, 56-58.
- ⁵ Chuck O'Connor, personal interview, September 15, 2004.
- ⁶ Howard Conant, "What's Wrong with U.S. Art Schools? A Reply," *Art News* (September 1963), pp. 41, 43, 58.
- ⁷ Charles Cajori, personal interview, September 14, 2004.
- ⁸ Christopher Wool's 2004 paintings were recently exhibited at Luhring Augustine Gallery, New York, November 6 – December 23, 2004.
- ⁵ Robert Storr, personal interview, October 14, 2004
- ⁶ Marjorie Kramer, personal interview, August 5, 2004
- ¹¹ Sidney Geist, personal interview, September 28, 2004.
- ¹² Matter, "Drawing." In *Notes from the New York Studio School*, November 1968.
- ¹³ Elena Sisto, conversation with author, January 4, 2005, and Robert Bordo, conversation with author, January 5, 2005.
- ¹⁴ Adolf Hildebrand, *The Problem of Form in Painting and Sculpture*, trans. Max Meyer and Robert Morris Ogden (New York: G.E. Stechert & Co., 1907).
- ¹⁵ Emily Cheng, conversation with author, January 10, 2005.
- ¹⁶ Nickson, personal interview, December 8, 2004.
- ¹⁷ Ruth Miller, personal interview, December 7, 2004.
- ¹⁸ Nickson, personal interview, December 8, 2004.
- ¹⁹ Nickson, personal interview, December 8, 2004.
- ²⁰ Larry Faden, conversation with author, December 20, 2004.
- ²¹ Faden, conversation with author, December 20, 2004, and Hearne Pardee, conversation with author, December 21, 2004.
- ²² Geist, personal interview, September 28, 2004.
- ²³ Bruce Gagnier, personal interview, October 15, 2004.
- ²⁴ Gagnier, conversation with author, January 4, 2005, and Christopher Cairns, conversation with author, January 4, 2005.
- ²⁵ Gagnier, personal interview, October 15, 2004.
- ²⁶ Barbara Gross, personal interview, November 19, 2004.
- ²⁷ Cajori, personal interview, September 14, 2004.
- ²⁸ Gross, personal interview, November 19, 2004.
- ²⁹ Tine Lundsryd, email to author, January 5, 2005.
- ³⁰ Elisa Jensen, conversation with author, December 28, 2004.
- ³¹ Richard Pitts, conversation with author, December 2004.
- ³² Richard Pitts, conversation with author, December 2004, and Gagnier, conversation with author, January 4, 2005.
- ³³ Carl Plansky, conversation with author, January 9, 2005.
- ³⁴ Bruce Gagnier, email to author, January 4, 2005.
- ³⁵ Michael Tcheyan, conversation with author, December 21, 2004.
- ³⁶ Elliott Bassman, conversation with author, December 22, 2004.
- ³⁷ Steven Sloman, conversation with author, January 15, 2005.
- ³⁸ Gagnier, personal interview, October 15, 2004.
- ³⁹ Geist, personal interview, September 28, 2004.
- ⁴⁰ Kramer, personal interview, August 5, 2004.
- ⁴¹ Marc Zimetbaum and Norman Turner, "Studio School Remembrance," April 19, 1993. Unpublished typescript, New York Studio School, 10; Faden, conversation with author, December 20, 2004.