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Abstract

This thesis, titled Painting in a Digital Landscape, encompasses research conducted in 2010 and 2011 in the Victorian College of the Arts Masters of Fine Arts Course.

The research explores the ways in which the form, process and materials of painting have been affected by new digital media screen technology, particularly through the Internet. The studio practice is based mostly around painting that floats between abstraction and realism. There is also an element of the studio practice that focuses on the use of digital technology and experimentation with digital print encompassing immersive installation. This serves to amalgamate the virtual experience of digital technology with the tangible experience of walking into an actual gallery space.

The supporting exegesis looks at the artists, processes and concepts that influence the studio practice, and follows the history of changes in technology and consequent changes of certain periods in painting.
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Michael Staniak
Preface

The research in this thesis was conducted with the participation of a Paradise Hills gallery in the staging of an exhibition called High Definition in May of 2011. The 16 Australian artists that were featured exemplified work that was indicative of the topic being researched and included a cross section of emerging and established artists of varied age and educational background.

The list of artists involved and contributors to the exhibition is featured in Appendix One of this thesis.
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When Did It All Change

Since the 1500s, painting on canvas was considered a studio-based practise. Apart from decorative and religious architectural murals commissioned since that time throughout different cultures, up to the 1800s most of the paintings we have come to know well today were produced in the studio, with quite traditional and methodical approaches. Improvements and experimentation in visual aid technology, including the discovery of perspective and the invention of the camera obscura, changed painting from flat, symbolic representation to something much different, evolved and realistic. Studies were being conducted into human anatomy and accurate records of flora and fauna collected, to make painting all the more a naturalistic representation of life. Much of the Renaissance saw this sort of luscious growth in realistic depictions of people and architecture. The detail in paintings during the Baroque era, including changes in the depictions of objects and use of paint, became more refined. Painted images that used to be seen as crudely two-dimensional representations of a subject, after some technological advancements, such as the camera obscura and invention of perspective, and changes in painting style, could at times, fool the eye into seeing three-dimensionally. By the eighteenth Century, a new form of technology was being invented that would capture real life more accurately than any brush ever could. This was known as photography.

When photography first arrived in the early 1800s, it was just as awe-inspiring as it was a controversial and feared phenomenon. This sort of technology would challenge the necessity of refined naturalistic painting, and many painters saw this as an opportunity to do something radical and spark the first motion toward Modernism. Artists such as Edouard Manet, Claude Monet, and Paul Cezanne, all began to use paint to do something that the camera couldn’t, to capture something from the human experience or an atmosphere the was not simply seen but also felt.

Art historian T.J. Clark argues one of the organising concepts of modernism was mobility, “steam in the Manet [Railway, 1873] is a metaphor for a general, maybe constitutive, instability – for things in modernity incessantly changing their
shape, hurrying forward, dispersing and growing impalpable.”¹ With constant and rapid improvements in photography and other technology came rapid developments in painting technology. These changes evolved much faster than during the renaissance era. The changes in painting were based on materials and also technique. One of the most significant and possibly the simplest, especially associated with mobility, was the invention of tube paint. Now there was a portability that allowed the painter to act as a sort of camera that captured more than his photographic competitor, especially in the form of landscape painting. There was a speed and immediacy involved in painting. The studio had disappeared replaced by everywhere else. Nature and its surrounds were not methodically studied and reproduced. It was more the immediacy of the moment, something a photograph did flawlessly, that the brush aimed to harness with the conviction and delicacy of human touch.

---

With the advent of the industrial age and the improvement of visual technology, the paintings of many artists began to portray worlds and landscapes that became more sublime but obscured. Whether by referencing the industrial world or unnatural light, or the smoggy bustle of cities built with teeming energy, painting constantly changed like the environment around it. William Turner’s later landscapes are a perfect example. Changes in the presence of industry and machines pushed his paintings into more mystical realms of swirling abstraction, finding within them the exponential growth and chaotic movements of the industrial revolution while also searching for something sublime in nature within these unnatural scenes. William Blake, in his poem London, described the environment of the industrial revolution as lands filled with “dark satanic machines”. As a painter, it seemed that Turner was searching for the sublime in the midst of an industrial change in his environment. Instead of being hampered by all this change, Turner’s painting served to utilize and enhance these new visual stimuli. Rather than technology closing off his channels of imagination and creative freedom, his abstract landscapes became more a new way of seeing nature in the unnatural.

This direct correlation between a revolt against realism and the rise of mechanical technology only reinforced artists’ abilities to find new ways of seeing in changing technological conditions. Mechanical reproduction, in the form of photography and print, did allow Modernist painting to break away from its earlier conventions and quickly assume a different visual language that separated it from being a form of accurate visual reproduction. Of course some painters would soon use photography to paint with more realism, channelling its power to create stunning visual reproductions that seem almost mechanical. This seems to be the two sides of the coin when it came to representation in painting and technological advancement. But for the most part, painting was turning away from tradition and began emphasizing the material form and increasing abstraction, creating an image depicting a new form of representation.

---

2 Blake, William, London, in Songs of Experience, 1794
While I was viewing reproductions of William Turner’s work, it dawned on me that his painting, as well as all other works I was examining, was depicting increasingly obscured and seemingly unrecognisable landscapes. This form of hybridized realism and abstraction as a landscape seemed to serve as a metaphor for new forms of visual progress. It allowed for an interesting dialogue between the production of painting and technology, the impacts of which would engage the eye in examining any of Turner’s landscape painting.

![William Turner, Snow Storm, 1842](image)

Now, digital technology and the social networking platform of the Internet are the new technological tools that have evolved way we see and the ways in which painting can be created and influenced. Artists must venture into and learn to navigate these uninhabitable environments and non-physical spaces. Painting would now have a new dialogue between the virtual, immediate information within the platform of cyberspace.
A New Landscape

The Internet has been widely available to the public for over a decade and was used by most people as a revolutionary education, communication and business tool, and also an outlet for entertainment and escapism. However, the novelty of the Internet was shattered as the formalities of day-to-day chores along with the viral power of commercialism and capitalism infiltrated the World Wide Web. Everything from shopping to banking, to satisfying sexual desires, can be found on the Internet. The accessibility had gone from a once a week visit to use the public library computer, to the snail-paced dial up speed of home Internet browsing, to the advancements of cable and broadband. Now the Internet is more accessible than ever with its speed growing exponentially, paralleling the growth of technology used to view it. It is now portable, readily available and everywhere, just part of life like air or water. The touch screens used are now an extension of the body, an appendage so to speak, and somewhere in this porn filled shopping centre, you can find art as well. All art forms can be found on the Internet but as my main concern is with painting, I will focus on that.

William Turner may have been the forerunner for envisioning new ways of creating images in an age of industrial revolution. Industry was exponentially increasing, but it had not halted the progress of creative endeavour. It just challenged it. And like everything that has a competitive spirit, art not being the exception, new creative developments were meeting the challenges. Modernism appeared around the time photography, radio, film and television (new media) were becoming broadly used. Post-Modernism emerged during the electronic media age of the 1960s and 70s. And now most recently, global art seems submerged in the digital age. The era since the 90s, which was now referred to as contemporary art, had begun to change around the time the Internet was commonplace in the public domain. We are at a stage now that seems to carry the broadest stylistic trends in painting and art in general, where all imagery is free to distribute through Internet communication means. Throughout history we can see that changes in technology were revolutionising artistic processes. Technological change, as some may have wrongly feared, was not diminishing creativity but forcing it to re-invent beyond itself. In a catalogue for the
exhibition *Imagination Becomes Reality: An Exhibition on the Expanded Concept of Painting*, Stephan Urbaschek states that, “painting strategies are no longer solely developed with paint on canvas”, and go on to describe painting as encompassing photography and video, all being products of organic, mechanical and electronic painting seen as mark making through the interaction of the eye, hand and mind.³

With continued appearances of new developments in art, there comes a point where most possibilities for change and recreation are explored and the “new” is just no longer new but recycled. The terms “avant-garde”, “post”, “neo” and “emerging” seem to be exhausted. So in an age of the digital technology and the Internet, where visual novelty is so abundant and technology changes more rapidly than ever, how is contemporary painting responding and adapting to this new environment, and in which direction is the painted image heading?

The next sections of this exegesis will explore the state of painting in the Internet age, especially from the point of view of an artist working in Australia. The two sides of the digital coin will be examined – the hyperrealistic and the abstract – that have both seemed to emerge in painting at this time. Comparisons will be made to international artists from the 20th and 21st Centuries that have faced similar challenges, focusing on materiality, imagery, form and process in a time of great technological pioneering. It will also focus on common elements and characteristics between these paintings. Some references will be made to local and international contemporary artists that concentrate on similar themes to my own. The paper will then go on to explore what painting may face in the “Post-Internet” future.

The Virtual Gallery and its Inherent Problems

Recently, room has been made for what could be considered the world’s biggest gallery, a virtual, infinite space accessible anywhere and at anytime through the Internet. The Google Art Project allows a viewer to travel around the world and tour the inside of the world’s most famous art museums. It’s platform mimics the 1990s style 3D computer games such as Wolfenstein and Doom, where the player navigates in first person through corridors and rooms like an endless maze searching left and right to find doors that lead to more corridors. Instead of battling Nazis or zombies, the Google Arts Project allows one to navigate museum rooms without battling anything: no crowds or security guards admonishing you for getting too close, no entry fees and coffee shops. There is a freedom in this movement that allows contemplation, examination and instant comparison of works that cannot be achieved in the physical world. Moving from the Louvre to the Prado in seven seconds is not yet possible, and teleportation seems a while away. The only battles you face in these virtual tours are the limits of copyright law (something I will get into in more detail shortly).

![Google Arts Project (MOMA New York)](image)

One of the most amazing features of this Arts Project lies in the ability to view each work in full High Definition, an unprecedented feature yet to be used to its

full potential on the Internet. We may be used to watching sports and movies on Full High Definition televisions but to view an artwork and examine its every detail closer than physically possible in a public domain has opened doors to a new way of viewing a work. In this medium, painting is becoming equivalent in importance to popular culture, something it has been at odds with for quite some time. The bourgeois aura and sometimes intimidating atmosphere of the art gallery and museum has successfully fended off the many people not involved in the arts scene. Not everyone may enjoy art but the general public can now access many important museums from the comfort of their own home. This may educate a wider audience and create some new art lovers. But much of what was intimidating had more to do with art of recent times than the works of the classical masters, who have come to be more accepted over time in a conservative environment. Renaissance masters, Realism, Romanticism, Impressionism and even Surrealism, are well marketed to the public, the monetary value of many works becoming a massive draw card for the likes of anybody that wants to see something precious.

Convenience, navigational ease and historical context, gives the Google Arts Project a distinct advantage over any other virtual gallery on the Internet. It is a diamond on the bed of a river surrounded by common stones. A current of information flows over it, making it is easy to miss this wonder. However, even if you do happen to find it, it does not address the problem discussed earlier: where is contemporary painting in all of this? It is a wonderful tool for examining some traditional forms of painting, however, these are all still digital representations of a few physically painted objects from the history of painting. The digital version of more recent paintings can be found in the stones that surround the diamond, the websites that are scattered across the endless virtual universe of the Internet. These works cannot be viewed in High Definition, as the classical works are, because of copyright restrictions. When one roams around the Google Arts Project museums, there are many blurred objects on the wall. These are the more recent works that exist in physical reality but cannot be reproduced in the virtual High Definition gallery of Google Arts Project because of copyright laws.
So the artist must venture elsewhere to research and explore all that is possible in the contemporary streams of painting. Print is a good source of imagery, however is not nearly as extensive and current, not to mention cost effective, as browsing the Internet. The journey though the Internet is a difficult one, sifting through the river bed to find a few precious images is based in part on luck and refined searching skills. For the most part, the quality of images on the Internet is quite poor. Hito Steyerl, in the essay “In Defense of the Poor Image”, describes how bad images are commonplace on the web and compares these rogue elements to pirated DVDs found littered across the tables of back alley markets. Much of contemporary art is contained in these easily accessible “black market images”. They are quick to upload and usually avoid copyright detection but compromise on quality in a dramatic way. The poorly reproduced quality of contemporary painting as viewed online obscures visual and often conceptual content, unavoidably influencing future painting. However, recently this poor reproduction also applies to a lot of other source material for painters.

There’s no doubting that the digital image ripped from the Internet has an effect on the final outcome of a painting. Source material from technology is not a new thing, but it now has a distinct place and creates a certain colour range in many paintings of the last decade. Also the loss of information, or hybridization of several elements of information, has been more of a concern in recent painted work.

An artist who could be considered a predecessor in exploring glitches in appropriated source material is Gerhard Richter. In his paintings since the 1960s, Richter used many photographs as source material. His blurred brush strokes and monochromatic palette addressed the inconsistencies and imperfections of photography. These common signifiers of photography allowed his paintings to be read more as photographs than as paintings. The works mimicked the “flaws” of photography, with concentrated focal points and blurred or lens flared sections, creating something that the eye naturally couldn’t. Since the 1960s, the use of photographs as source material has become commonplace.

The easily portable camera has replaced the clumsiness and sheer size of the camera obscura. Now, technology has evolved to the digital camera, which offers instant feedback and has made available digital image files, which are easily uploaded to the Internet, where low resolution versions of collective human experience rest.

![Image](image.jpg)

*Gerhard Richter, Emma: Akt auf Einer Treppe, 1966*

Viewing painting online has its benefits. These days with the thousands of artists making significant work around the world, it is impossible to physically view every exhibition and see work by standing in front of it. This is now a luxury. Local contemporary work however gains importance from an audience that actually visits a gallery space, the exception to this being the occasional international showcase that travels to select galleries and institutions. The most common way to view an infinite library of images is via the Internet. Social networking websites embedded on the Internet and the browsing technology used, enable a new form for instantly sharing images with greater ease, therefore making many artists’ work accessible from anywhere in the world, albeit at quite
low resolution. Does it come as a surprise then that most, if not all, physical galleries have an extensive virtual gallery that exists on the web? An exhibition lasts for three weeks but galleries' online content stays up for as long as the website exists, thus the virtual content proving to be more accessible and almost more important than the physical.

The artist, in this era, also assumes a role as not only a producer of artwork but also a curator, director, dealer and art critic, as pointed out by writer Paco Barragan.\(^6\) With social media such as the Internet, artists can instantly publish their own work onto their own online virtual galleries. And the galleries are quite alike with the ones created by actual existing galleries, making the relevance of the two indistinguishable. Artists can then recycle these new galleries on the Internet, and republish, copy and consume all at the same time making the artist a “post-producer”, a term in art essentially coined by Nicolas Bourriaud.\(^7\) Also the context of paintings exhibited on the Internet is altered quite significantly, making viewing painting online in virtual galleries quite a different experience to that of viewing them in a physical space. Gustavo Fares in his book *Painting in the Expanded Field*, looks at this phenomenon, comparing the difference between seeing a Van Gogh in a house and in a museum as seeing almost two different works.\(^8\) Now with the multitude of versions of particular paintings on the Internet, painting must respond to several readings being viewed physically and virtually.

This raises a few interesting ideas about the relationship between physical and virtual paintings. For now we will focus on the Web’s impacts on physical painting.

In a recent curated exhibition at Paradise Hills and Ausin Tung galleries in Melbourne (see Appendix I), paintings of young emerging and mid-career


\(^7\) Bourriaud, Nicholas, *Relational Aesthetics*, Les Presse Du Reel, 1998

painters were exhibited together with a common theme in mind. The exhibition was titled High Definition and explored the relationship between digital screen technology, the Internet and local painting in Australia. The artists were chosen somewhat randomly in order to demonstrate the influence of digital technology on some forms of recent painting, not just in concept but also in materials, process or colour range. The work in the exhibition was quite diverse, mostly consisting of a resurgence of refined naturalism or pure abstraction. Only a couple of works seemed to linger in the tradition of classically observed representation with a natural palette, more as a protest against the overwhelming use of digital technology. Such works do still acknowledge the overwhelming influence of technology on the current state of painting by consciously choosing to rebel against it.

From this exhibition, two things seem to emerge when paintings are influenced by source imagery that is digital and taken or sourced from the Internet. One needs to keep in mind that these are all artists that live and work in Australia. The geographical isolation of a country like Australia will make seeing many international works consistently in the flesh a very difficult and costly endeavour. Therefore the Internet is a tool much more commonly used as a form of not only source imagery but also of research and technical education. The phenomenon of digital image technology seen on screens seems to produce work that is more refined and closer to naturalism than ever before. However, very often the paintings also focus on their materiality, which much like the Modernists that concerned themselves more with materials and colour. In the catalogue for Imagination Becomes Reality, Peter Weibel states, “Artists today leave out at least one or more traditional elements [of painting]... The whole turmoil involved in breaching convention arises from this experimental investigation by painters of the changing visual element in today’s society.”

Through new forms of abstraction, paintings concentrate on new materials instead of just traditional oil paint on canvas.

Hyper Definition Naturalism versus Super Gloss Materiality

The screen technology of the 20th Century proved to be captivating and reproduced a convincing imitation of reality. However, it did not succeed to fool the eye as a window, with analogue signals and low definition fuzziness creating a veil between the image and the technology it was housed in. With Plasma screens came a new digital output and suddenly the resolution of the screen exploded exponentially. Adding Full High Definition, images are now seen with more clarity than ever before. Screens that surround us are unavoidable, whether artists deny their use or not. So in what way would this affect image making?

The German philosopher Friedrich Schlegel stated that, “Painting cannot deceive us for it does not have at its disposal the real hue of light.”\textsuperscript{10} More recently Paul Virilio claimed that the advent of live television brought us this “real hue of light” thus taking images one step closer to cloning of reality.\textsuperscript{11} Of course, we know what we see is a screen, but the images glowing off it look as real as gazing through a window. Painting naturalistically can in this case be seen as a futile endeavour. How can it stand up to such an onslaught of realism in screen technology? Despite this, the High Definition exhibition demonstrates that a form of realistic painting is very much evident and new processes and technical reinventions are emerging.

Take for example the work of Australian artists Sam Leach, Juan Ford or Sophia Hewson. All use the classical techniques of oil painting but have refined them to such an extent that the brush, in some cases, tends to disappear in the sharpness of the image. In particularly, Ford’s sublimely rendered paintings of leaves bound with hazard tape and portraits of solemn figures one flat backgrounds, distinctly reveal every detail of what one is meant to see in physical reality but without any distortions, paralleling “Photoshopped” images displayed on new iPhone 4

\textsuperscript{10} Schlegel, Frederich, contained in Virilio, Paul, \textit{A Landscape of Events}, MIT Press, USA, 2000, p 44

\textsuperscript{11} Virilio, Paul, \textit{A Landscape of Events}, MIT Press, Massachusetts, 2000, p 44
“retina display” screens. One can see a range of international painters that support this spawning of hyper-realism in painting. A notable inclusion to this group is American painter Ben Grasso, whose images of exploding buildings fail to miss any detail, as every component of his structures is rendered as though it was modelled by 3D technology. His paintings compare to recent CGI developments like those in Michael Bay’s “Transformers”, where every mechanical part of his robots is perfectly rendered and visible. Here nothing is out of focus.

Ben Grasso, Caution, 2011

It seems that instead of “giving in” to digital photography and screen technology, painting has seemingly stepped up to it. Painting has been challenged, as happened earlier when photography arrived, but it is now familiarizing itself, trying to understand the ways in which our eyes are adapting to screen technology. The portability and accessibility of screen technology now allows

12 http://www.apple.com/iphone/features/#retina
13 Bay, Michael, Transformers, Dreamworks SKG/Paramount Pictures, 2007
many painters to work directly from the screen, in other words they totally skip
the step of printing a source or reference image into the physical and they make
use of the light of the computer to enhance their visual acuity. It doesn’t always
work like this though; the resolution quality of the images must be of a high
standard, so that the Hyperrealist painting can succeed in rendering every detail.
So in most cases the source imagery of this type realism, as in the case of Ford
and Hewson, is captured and composed directly by the artist from a high mega-
pixel camera and not from imagery source on the Net.

But perfect naturalism is not enough to deduce that screen technology is
influencing painting to such a degree. There is something else accompanying this
hyperreal rendering that goes beyond that of the photorealists of the 1970s and
80s. Nicholas Bourriand, who formulated the term “relational aesthetics”, in his
essay on relational aesthetics and the screen, describes technology as doing two
things: it either renders a particular artistic pursuit obsolete or it can enhance an
aspect of creativity by encouraging new discoveries in materials and technique.14
For example, with the advent of photography, realistic painting began to regress
while tube paint and plein-air painting with its instantaneous brushwork paved
the way for paint to do something beyond duplicating nature. As alluded to
before, photography dawned the time of impressionism which then lead to
Modernism and abstraction. The Modernists explored the painted surface
through combining new and traditional processes in painting, and now it seems
there is a new resurgence highlighting the importance of surface and clarity
emerging amongst painters.

The paintings by Leach and Hewson contain a relatively new material that has
been implemented in their works. It has enhanced the clarity and depth of colour
as may similarly be experienced through digital screen technology. Epoxy resin
is poured over the painted image and set as a smooth surface, resembling a pane
of glass permanently fixed to the surface. However, unlike a protective sheet of
glass that can be seen in front of many priceless paintings in museums around
the world, the resin is a fixed part of the work. It is almost impossible to remove.

Maybe what is happening here is similar to what Gerhard Richter was trying to achieve when he blurred his painting to mimic the characteristics of photography. His technique revealed the “flaws” of that particular technology. Leach’s and Hewson’s techniques also reveal something about screen technology: the ultra perfection of the surface. For some this extreme sheen maybe a positive, just as blurring in a photograph may provide an added uniqueness or atmosphere. Through this glassiness the blacks are deeper and the colours are more vivid. Many painters have used high gloss varnish to the same effect, but nothing can create a gloss surface such as resin. However, the resin causes a particular type of imperfection that Richter’s feathering of the paint also achieved. The images seem to be distant behind their plastic coat. They are vivid yet unreachable, the connection with the paint being lost and the existence of a plastic barrier forming between the subject and onlooker. And maybe this is just the condition of being part of an era where screen technology is so prevalent. The effort of the painter to create something that masters the clarity and illusion of High Definition technology seems to both obstruct and simultaneously enhance the image, drawing the viewer in with detail while
pushing the viewer back with its glossy barrier. Yet at the same time these resined works cause familiarity as finally the eye can adjust to something with which it is accustomed, however in a painted realm.

I can only give examples of the surface of recent hyperreal paintings in Australia, as most of the other research had been done on the computer screen through the Internet. Looking at paintings through this medium, it seems quite an arbitrary feat to create a painting that is so close to imitating a screen when most often it will be viewed on a screen. However, as mentioned earlier, this is one of the conditions of this type of painting, and painting in general, that more and more painting is viewed online. Here all painting surfaces seem uniform on the glossy screen. In consequence, much of this hyperreal painting strives for a perfect physical finish. Is it any surprise then that painters like Leach, Ford and Hewson, produce similar effects in their naturalistic painting? This is could especially be caused by the tyranny of distance, whereby Australian artists, unless very well travelled, are subjected to viewing most International art online. This problem in Australian painting has already been consciously tackled by some Australian artists in the 80s and 90s such as Imants Tillers, through his use of photocopying, reproductions and magazine collages, aimed to examine the simulacra of imagery viewed in Australia due to distance and location, rather than scrutinizing the originals. However, in the examples of works given from the High Definition exhibition, the effects of distance may no longer be conscious and the changes in use of materials and non-traditional finishes could now just be caused by the way painting and images can be viewed and represented digitally.

Not all Internet based imagery is perfect; actually most of the images on the Internet are poor, “rubbish versions” of something that was captured at quite a high resolution. Therefore not all painters create hyperrealist representation. Many images of art found on the Internet are of a very low resolution, lack detail and, unless well documented, lack the clarity of a select few images. In few cases this can iron out the imperfections of paint, leading to the perception of many naturalistic paintings viewed online being hyperreal. In other cases, it can recreate an image involving something totally new: a mutant or hybrid creation, usually accidental in nature. This mutation of an image into a pixelated
abstraction can be the catalyst for another type of painting that has emerged in the last few years.
Abstract Collage Digitised Expressionism

Stephan Urbansek states in the *Imagination Becomes Reality* catalogue that more and more young artists are increasingly gathering “raw material” for their images from “the inexhaustible source of the Internet”. This can prove to be a difficult process. One of the most frustrating experiences on the Internet can be attributed to researching image material, to use it as a reference to artistic processes and also as source imagery for painting. Frustration can occur for two reasons: a viewer can be bombarded with images that have no use and were not intended to be viewed, this could happen via things like false links, the other is the sheer amount of small, low quality images floating in the millions of websites in cyber space. In order for websites to run smoothly, images need to be reduced in file size. The Internet is still in its infancy and as a result is still only crawling. But in order for viewers keep up to date with happenings around the world, it is still the most instantaneous and current method of research. This can be advantageous for artists such as Francis Van Hout, where collecting arbitrary images from sources such as flickr he creates small expressionist works. However, images are on the back foot for now, treated as visual candy with little regard for quality or substance. These two frustrating factors pose interesting issues in the digital retranslation of smaller image files. Colours maybe altered, glitches occur, warping, decoding or morphing of the image may arise. The true nature, and by nature meaning the substance or code, of the digital image is exposed and can influence painting in potentially exciting ways.

Within the High Definition exhibition, juxtaposed to the hyperreal painting was a high percentage of work that seemed to utilize rudiments of abstraction and/or a montage of different imagery, and especially material elements. Like the painting of Hewson and Leach, some of the more abstract painting sought to redefine itself by experimenting with new materials that are not traditionally associated with painting and yet somehow form a relationship with digital technology. In

---

particular, Camille Hannah, Joseph Flynn and Andre Piguet, all created unique abstraction that pushed their respective materials towards a screen aesthetic and found uniformity between each other’s form and finish. Hannah, Flynn and Piguet have utilized new painting practices to reference paint and surface that informs us and creates a dialogue with current new media instead of being in opposition.

When we travel back to the 1940s to 70s, during a similar and recent time of a media and communications revolution, an example of this sort of interaction with materials through abstraction could be seen in many of the works of the Abstract Expressionists. The Abstract Expressionists were responding to an environment that was bound by the boom of new media and communication technology. They acted more like the Impressionists, trying to pull away from incorporating new media references and materials. There is a sense of the tradition in many of the paintings, in particularly with the handling of paint and surface not veering too far away from oil on canvas. The abstract works in High Definition were far from traditional oil on canvas paintings.

Before going into the specifics of how the materiality, colour and techniques of certain abstract painting have been redefined by current technology, it is important to understand when painting and technology began to reference one another and form a bond rather than conflict.

Peter Weibel claims that, “once paintings lost their monopoly and their function (starting with the appearance of photography) there was a triple reaction in an effort to move painting on: 1) a shift in accent, e.g. from perspective to colour, 2) the absolute predominance of a single component (e.g. colour), and 3) the replacement of traditional painting materials by others... the third is typical of the present – car paint instead of oils, concrete and wood instead of canvas, the small screen instead of the easel.”16 Painting began to form a strong relationship

________________________

with new media in the 1960s. The Fordist revolution was being replaced by a Post-Fordist electronic age and mass media technology. New ways of editing and collaging images were being introduced into advertising and print media. And with television speeding up the reproduction of reality images, it was only a matter of time before artists responded. The works of two prominent artists of this time, Andy Warhol and Robert Rauschenberg, were not traditional “window on the world” paintings. The tromp l’oeil visual effects of the baroque were challenged by glossy magazines and flickering television screens and this type of painting was seen as unnecessary and redundant. Warhol and Rauschenberg’s painting now presented a montage of signs, symbols and icons drawn from the media. Cubists and Abstract Expressionists had started to reject classical realist representation, but even their most abstracted compositions still seem to incorporate a sense of perspective which allowed their works to be viewed as vertical windows. However, when Rauschenberg’s montage imagery appeared accompanied by Warhol’s repetitive canvases, painting began to form a new style of image making that mimicked ways in which images were seen and used on screens.

Leo Steinberg coined the term “flatbed painting” in his book Other Criteria. This was an observation and reference to the way images were laid out in a flatbed printing press, a procedure appropriated by the above-mentioned artists. Their painting lacked a sense of illusion that acted like a window or mirror. The absence of perspective and lack of gravity gave the painting a sense of weightlessness, and their montage works can be viewed in almost any direction, as could be view in many of the paintings of Robert Rauschenberg. Several windows appeared on the one canvas and open-ended narratives replaced a traditional linear narrative. This complex format can be perceived as a predecessor to Photoshop. Rauschenberg’s paintings were a fascinating example of amalgamating several styles of painting into a multi-image system. His paintings utilized a design that seemed to foresee the multiple window formats

17 Steinberg, Leo, Other Criteria: Confrontations with Twentieth Century Art, Oxford University Press, USA, 1975, p 82
that we currently use on our own personal computers. Even the word “desktop”, referring to the computer home screen, suggests a flat working surface, while it still aims to reproduce “real experience” through open “windows” floating within the desktop screen. Curator and art historian, Gregor Jansen, points out, “Leon Battista Alberti referred to paintings as ‘windows’ long before Apple appropriated the term, as a way of describing a make-believe situation that is at once composition and interpretation.”18 Currently, things seem to have come full circle. Computers these days are littered with windows that simulate depth and reality yet are as flat as the screens on which they float. And seemingly multiple windows are appearing on canvases just like in Rauschenberg’s work of the 70s, both in certain examples of abstraction and in representational work, interpreting the screen as a new visual reality.

Robert Rauschenberg, Estate, 1963

The mechanical process of painting was changing in this period as well, adapting to the increasingly mechanized culture. Andy Warhol, coming from a background in graphic design, was one of the first to implement automatic, mass-reproduction image making techniques to painting. His interest in the mechanics of print and fascination with mass culture, enabled Warhol’s repetitive images of mundane products or iconic celebrities to be iconic within his “new media” based artistic practice. His work challenged the handmade traditions of painting and also begged the question of whether the artist’s hand was necessary at all. It was one of the first times technology fully infiltrated the process of painting, whereby the techniques emotionally distanced the artist from painting. Screen-printing was one major “print making technology” that abolished the mark of the hand. He also employed a lot of assistants in his “Factory”, quite different from the Modernist notion of the artist solely making the work in a studio. This was a new element of industry that was also implemented into a studio practice, making the creative process more mechanical and detached. Recent figures who use this in their artistic process, much like Andy Warhol did, are Jeff Koons, Takashi Murakami and also Anselm Reyle. Some artists use this sort of personnel out of necessity, purely because of the scale and multiplicity of skills involved in their concepts. Some of these artists include Anish Kapoor and Olafur Eliasson.

Most recently however, American artist Parker Ito has gone one step further in this type of production, paralleling that of the mass consumerism of Chinese industrial ready-mades. The images Ito desires to be painted are sent via the Internet to China and there they are reproduced as hand made paintings. They are then shipped to selected galleries all over the world. This tends to the blur boundaries of authorship and the hand made, much like the images that are recycled and reproduced on the Internet. However, back to Warhol, again through this industrial use of personnel, he explored the role of modern technology in image production and manufacturing, thereby eliminating the artist’s touch to only a minor stake in the whole creative process. “Human touch” through error was still visible though, as his machine-like reproductions could never be repeated with the accuracy of a machine, and the accidental flaws and irregularities implied human agency.
Warhol was not the only artist to change the way paintings could be produced. In the 1960s, Sigmar Polke also began to invent his own painting process by producing what he called his machine paintings, a fundamental change, as he had mostly been a traditional painter in his short career. He suddenly disposed with traditions and embraced the progressive ideas of technology. Unlike Warhol, who began his carrier utilizing mechanical techniques in painting, Polke acknowledged a necessity to explore new technologies in painting later in his career. He subsequently exploited new technologies as an avenue for producing painting. Roy Lichtenstein successfully combined the painterly with the look of the machine-made with his flat, brightly coloured paintings of blown up, print-like characters, replicating images of abstract strokes of paint. Lichtenstein was literally aiming to replicate paint in print using paint, uniting the technology of his time with the artist’s mediums.

Sigmar Polke, Beyond the Rainbow, 2007

Jansen states that in the Imagination Becomes Reality Exhibition at the ZKM/Museum of Contemporary Art, Karlsruhe 2007, “Gunther Forg, Roy
Lichtenstein, Albert and Marcus Oehlen, Sigmar Polke, Robert Raushenberg, Gerhard Richter, Andy Warhol and others [...] work shares a fundamental distinction between idea and material, between construction or composition [...] Far more strongly than ever before, the spotlight today is focused on material."\(^{19}\) In contemporary painting, the flipside of the representational coin, abstraction, shares similar qualities that reference the ever increasing influence of screen technology. The most common attribute amongst both forms of painting is the surface and its finish. Like the high-gloss smooth surfaces of Hewson and Leach’s paintings, similar materials and effects are utilized in recent abstraction that allows a reading of screen-like qualities. It hasn’t been more than 5 years, but since then most digital screens have been made gloss, the last to change were computer and laptop screens. Now screens that are mostly used for browsing the Internet and used as communications technology (mobile phones, touch pads, laptops, portable music devices etc) have adopted the high-gloss, high-contrast, full high definition resolution, producing deeper blacks and stronger, brighter colours with a strange smoothing or flattening effect. “There is scarcely a field of human endeavour that hasn’t been affected in some way by new forms of visualisation in electronic bits and bytes” through screens.\(^{20}\) As a consequence, and this may be a subconscious decision, many paintings including recent abstract works, have high-gloss, smooth and flattening effects applied in the process of painting. Of course, when viewed on the screen, all works have this effect now, for obvious reasons.

The example of the three abstract painters mentioned in the High Definition exhibition – Camille Hannah, Joseph Flynn and Andre Piguet – all employ a similar finish. This is achieved by using relatively new materials to art that are either used as a surface to paint on or used to paint with. In calling these


\(^{20}\) Baume, Nicholas, *Supervision*, Institute of Contemporary Art, Boston, 2006, p 26
materials relatively new to art, I am referring to actual materials discovered in the last few decades, only a short period in the entire history of painting. These materials seem to be consistent in all three of the above-mentioned High Definition artists’ practices. Some of the materials used as a painting surface include acrylic (Perspex), aluminium, and Diabond (a coated aluminium sheet). Not one of these abstract painters uses canvas or linen, traditionally associated with painting. Even when abstraction in painting occurred in the 1940s and 50s, most artists were bound by the same materials used in traditional painting. Only a couple of artists, notably Jackson Pollock, explored the brand new plasticity of enamel paints. But all painted on canvas, keeping to the traditions of Western painting. Hannah, Flynn and Piquet are part of an emerging group of painters that choose to create work on modern industrial surfaces that have a machine-like quality about them, which enhances the high-gloss effect.

It is not only the surface alone that can generate a finish that imitates the screen. The three mentioned painters also use materials that further exemplify glossy screen technology. Enamel paint, aerosol acrylics and epoxy resin, are poured, dripped, scraped and sprayed, achieving abstraction that does not just explore paint as a material but also conceals, confuses and disrupts it. You only have to look at the massive abstract works of American artist Sterling Ruby to see how using materials like aerosol can be implemented to give the effect of a surface that’s blurred and out of focus. His paintings play with urban undertones of graffiti whilst also using hues, lines and grids that explore the more digital process of pictures taken out of focus or with a lowered resolution. In the High Definition exhibition, Camille Hannah does use more traditional oil paint, however, mixed with a glossy viscous medium and spread evenly onto both sides of one millimetre acrylic sheeting, the result is far from traditional. Her abstractions create an optical effect that deconstructs the idea of just a two-dimensional surface and ventures towards a multiple layer screen-like effect. The forms and colours are sourced and then broken down from versions of classical painting, the result being almost the epitome of abstraction influenced by poor digital Internet images. There is a similarity here to the paintings of Kristin Baker, whose acrylic sheet paintings deconstruct images to their very
essence of form while at the same time highlighting hyper coloured details of shapes that resemble computer graphic qualities. Computer graphics are therefore inferred in Baker’s paintings, albeit in a more geometric form but with similarly organic gesture as Hannah’s large-scale works.

As mentioned earlier, poor resolution images on the Internet have been partially responsible for the strange results in some new abstract painting. Surface and materiality is one thing but colour and composition is also responding to digitised effects as well. Hito Steyerl, in her essay “In Defense of the Poor Image”, states that the poor image on the Internet is the one that “has been uploaded, downloaded, shared, reformatted and reedited [...] It transforms quality into accessibility, exhibition value into cult value, films into clips, contemplation into distortion.”21 This distortion, the stretching, re jigging, warping and discolouring of the image, is what probably influences new abstraction the most. Opposite to the high definition image, but running parallel with it, is the low-resolution copy of an original. It is no wonder then that two branches of painting are occurring at this time – hyper realistic and abstract. German artist Anselm Reyle constructs

abstraction paintings based on juxtaposing new materials, mainly acrylic sheets, and contrasting colour to make compositions that at once have the surface of a computer generated image but reveal some of the glitches evident within the deterioration of a digital image. Imagining colours such as fluorescent, phosphorescent and artificial plastic pigments in a painting would not be possible if it wasn’t for the technology that went into making the materials. Also the strange flashes of uncanny and unnatural colour that are embedded deep within a digital image only appear once they have been degraded to something of a pixelated representation of an original. Looking more locally, the painting of Andre Piguet in the High Definition exhibition provides the clearest example of where new technologies in material and paint are coinciding with each other to make reference to the poor image on the Internet. His pigmented resin and fluorescent colours are sprayed, poured and scraped on both sides of an acrylic sheet. The swirls of colour that result look just as much like a modern screensaver, as it also resembles an undistinguishable composition of a deteriorated digital photo. A hint of Sterling Ruby’s abstract aerosol creations can be seen here, he too seems to mask a deeply embedded image under the milieu of soft layers of highly toxic colours in his paintings. There is an element of chaotic representation poking its head through the obscured surface. But it is only a marginally small narrative and a greatly concealed one that manages to escape all of the distortions. Finally, the montage of cropped abstract windows on top of one another gives the painting the “desktop” formula that was alluded to earlier.
Post-Internet Painting: From Virtual to Physical to Virtual and so on

“The creative act appears suspect in the electronic age because we constantly look through our anonymous media spectacles and are slaves to the ideology of the objective image which we confuse with information.”

– Hans Belting

A point has been reached in this exegesis where we begin to explore the future of painting. What does it mean to paint now in an age overwhelmed by interactive screen technology and will painting always remain physical? People are no longer viewing images passively through a screen. Anyone can now simply edit and create on easy-to-use computer systems and screen technology is being utilised more and more everyday as a tool in producing and manipulating images. This poses the question of whether paint is outdated or not.

As discussed earlier, painting is reacting stronger than ever visually to a screen environment and moving further into the realm of actually using the screen and digital technology to paint. This is becoming more prevalent in a time we can now call the “post-Internet” age. It is only normal that artists become curious when new technology is so freely accessible, however to “paint” on a screen seems increasingly popular. So in trying to uncover where painting goes from here, we must first look at what “digital painting” is doing now.

American artist Marisa Olsen in an interview in 2008 first used the term “post-Internet”. It does not suggest that we have moved past the Internet or that the Internet is out of date. It simply means that what we now used the Internet for

22 Belting, Hans, On Lies and Other Truths in Painting, contained in Henschel, Martin, Sigmar Polke: The Three Lies About Painting, Hatje Cantz, Ostfildern, 1997, p 132

has evolved into something more of a free social media tool rather than a research tool. As Gene McHugh describes, the shift in the Internet has occurred “from a specialised world for nerds and the technology-minded, to a mainstream world for nerds, the technology-minded and grandmas and sports fans and business people and everyone else”. In other words, anybody can be an author on the Internet and not just people that know code. This in turn means that now the distribution of images on the Internet can be much more rapid and the evolution of the images tracked, followed, reproduced and recycled, to the extent that creativity is universally dispersed by anyone with creative inclination. The resulting morphed and warped and simulated image, the poor image, which was described earlier, is now in the most part regarded as the real image and has replaced the original, the original being insignificant. And no matter how much artists may avoid the Internet, they will be in contact with it in some way, whether directly using it as a tool for producing work, finding source material or as a medium for the work to be displayed. And it may not be intentional that the work ends up there, but ultimately it does and therefore will somehow have to respond or subconsciously “work” as an artwork existing on the Internet. Oliver Laric describes this phenomenon as “versions”.

Responding to the Internet being a gallery where contemporary art is scrutinised and valued, does not mean that painters must create animated gifs instead of painting on canvas. However, the artist must at least acknowledge how the work may be read through the digital format of the Internet, what Guthrie Lonergan describes as “Internet-aware”. So therefore Post-Internet art does not just exist as a totally new media or novel form of creating but more so acknowledges the inevitability of new technology or new media impacting on the work in some way. So rather than just making work that responds to new technology, as the previous recent painters mentioned, some “painters” are approaching the new

media head-on and using it to respond to painting during a time of Post-Internet awareness.

Artie Vierkant states that Post-Internet art is caught somewhere between the two poles of conceptualism and New Media Art. He writes that, “Post-Internet objects and images are developed with concern to their particular materiality as well as their vast variety of methods of presentation and dissemination.”27 What Vierkant is saying here is that as much as artists, for example the Post-Internet painters, are concerned with the new media they are using (digital vector or imaging programs, three-dimensional rendering etc), they are also concerned with the place inside the Internet, ways in which the work will be viewed and read and distributed amongst the ever expanding web of blogs, social-networks and websites. A great example of one such group of painters is the team behind the website PAINTFX.28

Anonymous, PAINTFX.biz


28 http://paintfx.biz/
The PAINTFX collective was founded and is composed of five artists – Parker Ito, Jon Rafman, Micah Schipps, Tabor Robak and John Transue. The site comprises an almost endless page of digital paintings: explorations into ways in which digital painting can be rendered, coloured, distorted and replicated. It is almost an Abstract Expressionist gallery of the digital age. As you scroll through the site one can see the evolution of the styles and technical aspects of this new media, while the work remains anonymous. There are definitely different styles evolving amongst the images, but the evolution is seemingly endless and denies ownership. It is without ownership that these works can be distributed virally in High Definition, as they no longer have to answer to copyright laws. It may be the first examples of contemporary art on the Internet that rival works on the virtual walls of the Google Arts Project in clarity of reproduction.

McHugh describes the PAINTFX website as an example of painting as a “meme” expanded into the digital era. 29 Richard Dawkins coined the term meme in 1976 in his book The Selfish Gene to units of cultural data replicating, spreading and mutating in response to certain demands of the culture into which they are entering. 30 As painting has mutated through history by critically defining itself in particular cultural environments, the PAINTFX website displays an almost instantly updated or live view of this sort of mutation in the Post-Internet era. The works always remain anonymous and as their authorship no longer matters they can be easily copied and spread throughout the Web. By doing this, they promote a sort of morphing into new hybridised images, just as Dawkins describes the meme. However, for the first time, these works can be mutated in High Definition, resulting an evolution the can play with different digital effects yet avoids being tagged in to the category of the poor image.

The evolution of techniques and programming employed within programs that render these digital paintings is most important, some works are creating effects


that are very close to the look of “real” painting displayed on a screen. However, as one scrolls through the PAINTFX site, it is easy to lose track of what you have seen. There exists an immense number of works in this one location. It does not allow a moment for contemplation and each work is easily forgotten. Perhaps this is why some artists, such as Australian painter Stephen Bush, known for his slightly surreal paintings of Babar and his grand swirling abstraction, repeats one of his paintings many times over in separate exhibitions, giving the image a freshness for audiences after it has been forgotten time and time again. This feature image could be easily lost throughout the plethora of images bombarding us daily, especially within the Internet. But Bush avoids this through repetition, and many images on the Internet are usually remembered in the same way, embracing replication as a form of survival.

As mentioned just before, the growth in digital painting on the Internet does not just explore new ways in which to use virtual reality, rather it is seemingly aiming to imitate physical painting by copying it as close to reality as possible. Digital painting is striving to enter a realm where it is considered a traditional way of painting and is therefore moving away or denying its digital roots. This is quite the opposite of when painters were trying to understand print and new media by imitating print techniques and mechanically printed finish with the medium of paint. Examples of this are seen in Polke or Lichtenstein’s paintings where the Benday dot had been introduced and brushed strokes were smoothed away. Now, digital painting is moving towards trying to explore and “become” real paint. In retrospect, both seem quite redundant pursuits, however they create an interesting dialogue and result between painting and digital technology.

The final step for this type of “digital painting” moving closer to reproducing “real strokes of paint”, is for the digital to be brought back to the physical world through the form of print, which is still considered a form of painting as
described before by Stephan Urbaneschke. One such artist in the High Definition exhibition pursues this sort of approach to painting. Ry David Bradley uses similar programmes and processes as the artists in the PAINT FX collective, manipulating digital reproductions of found images and classical paintings sourced from the Internet. His results are then translated to digital print, which he has produced onto many unconventional surfaces including aluminium, silk, Perspex and various metallic papers. All of these print surface materials serve to imitate the screen from which the images came from, but now in a more physical painterly form. His digital paintings are transformed to print pigment applied to a surface, much like bound pigment in the form of paint is applied to a canvas, and then hung “traditionally” on a wall as a two dimensional object. This form of experimentation with different forms of new media can be described as “immediatization”, a term used by Peter Weibel. In describing immediatization, Weibel states that, “‘Immediatization’ is my term for the process of going through different types of media to produce a ‘painting’ that restates the issue of

the visual element: painting not as something that undercuts the media and techniques it uses but outdoes and transcends them.”

In the High Definition exhibition, Bradley, like other artists such as Parker Ito and David Harley, uses his tools not to reference digital media so much as he references painting. Similarly, painters at the turn of Modernism used their tools, namely tube paint and canvas, as a way to reference photography and think photographically within their painting. According to Nicholas Bourriaud, this was the most groundbreaking form of conceptualisation in painting during technological change, “The most fruitful thinking came from artists who, far from giving up on their critical consciousness, worked on the basis of possibilities offered by new tools, but without presenting them as ‘techniques’. Degas and Monet thus produced a ‘photographic way of thinking’ that went well beyond the shots of their contemporaries.”

By David Bradley shows elements of the painterly without presenting his work as obviously digital thus producing work that reflects Bourriaud’s ideology. But can it still be considered a painting? After all it has no evidence of paint or use of the hand. According to Bourriaud, this would be digital technology thinking as a painting and not the other way around, but somehow the lines are blurred in this case and it is still inferred as a painting without any use of paint, mostly through presentation. In Paco Harragan’s “Multiple Inclusion Diagram”, he explores the expanded field of painting, encompassing painting in all forms of media, including digital media through


“techno painting” or computerised painting. Therefore, it is conceivable that painting has officially branched into its digital form, only currently in its infancy.

Painting Forever? The inevitability of the Digital Realm

Nicholas Bourriaud states that, “We are a long way from the idea of asserting any kind of superiority of painting over the [new] media.” This may be true, however painting has come a long way, constantly mutating and amalgamating through many forms and processes. Experimentation, it seems, has never ceased and in this era, where technology grows and changes exponentially, so too does the way we paint.

Being exposed to screen technology on a daily basis has neither improved or diminished painting but has definitely changed aspects – presentation, surface, material, palette, form, as well as subject matter – and it may be a permanent change. Classical traditions of oil on canvas may slowly be disappearing or at least taking a back seat to the uses of new materials. Painting’s evolution could be leading it into a digital form, where the boundaries between hand and machine, between craft and automation, are unseen. But will the digital soon totally replace physical painting? There is already evidence of amalgamation between digital print and painting. However, the examples of works in the High Definition exhibition point to “painting with paint” as still being a primary form of producing the painted image, even if new materials are being trialled and tested.

The interaction between painting and digital representation is now commonplace and whether painting will take on totally digital production and form is to be seen. However, paintings are now being turned into digital form through the Internet, which in turn makes the works digital. So maybe painting has already become unavoidably digital, not in its origins but more in the simulacra that are reproduced and distributed online. Although the online viewing of paintings dominates as a form of research and art appreciation, painting is still being made primarily for the gallery space, to be viewed in physical reality. However, the recent rise in number of online galleries and even

art fairs, like the VIP International Art Fair\textsuperscript{36}, art, especially work that is predominantly two-dimensional, can now be made with the intentions to be viewed solely in digital form. As an interesting footnote, even this could be a little confusing for something like an online art fair, where work is sold not as a digital product but only through a digital forum.

The future is unclear where painting will be in five years or fifty, but it is safe to say that although the boundaries between digital and physical paintings are blurring, and materials are changing, the physical act of painting and producing a tangible object is not disappearing anytime soon.

\textsuperscript{36} https://www.vipartfair.com/
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