

Fall 2017

**Review of Rachael Z. DeLue. *Arthur Dove: Always Connect*.
Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2016. 311 pp.**

Charles J. Palermo

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.wm.edu/aspubs>

 Part of the [English Language and Literature Commons](#)

Meloni's text provides a fascinating and well-documented history of the way in which the facts of heredity were actively commandeered, by many of the same scientists who discovered them, to advocate a bewilderingly wide variety of social and political ends.

The methods of science are unparalleled at discovering the facts of nature. But neither these facts, nor the recommendations of their discoverers, provide ready guides to the moral dimensions of the ends to which those facts might be employed. Such value-based determinations are the responsibility not of "science" or scientists but of every individual in a liberal and compassionate democracy. Meloni's book reminds us of this fact.

NORMAN MACLEOD (BSc, MSc, PhD, FGS, FLS) is a researcher at the Natural History Museum (London) having formerly been that institution's Keeper of Palaeontology (2001–2012) and dean of postgraduate education and training (2012–2016). MacLeod is also honorary professor at University College London and a visiting professor at the Nanjing Institute of Geology and Palaeontology, Chinese Academy of Sciences. He is the editor of *Automated Taxon Identification in Systematics: Theory, Approaches, and Applications* (2007), the author of *The Great Extinctions: What Causes Them and How They Shape Life* (2013), the editor-in-chief of *Grzimek's Animal Life Encyclopedia: Extinctions* (2013), and the coeditor with Marcelo R. Sánchez-Villagra of *Issues in Palaeobiology: A Global View—Interviews and Essays* (2014). He is currently writing a book on the mathematical analysis of morphology. Professor MacLeod also serves as cochief editor of *Palaeoworld*, associate editor of *Systematic Biology*, and an editorial board member of *Royal Society Proceedings B (Biological Sciences)*.

Rachael Z. DeLue. *Arthur Dove: Always Connect*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2016. 311 pp.

CHARLES PALERMO

Rachael Z. DeLue's study of Arthur Dove's career makes some bold choices and reveals a remarkable array of forces at work in what is probably the best body of painted work in the circle around Alfred Stieglitz. DeLue avoids many classical approaches, questions, and issues; instead, she delivers a visual cultural investigation of historical discourses—about weather, sound recording and broadcast, shorthand, and others—that pays substantial dividends when DeLue returns to discuss the paintings. This is an exemplary art historical appropriation of visual culture, and it puts forward a strong thesis about what motivates Dove's major works of 1921 to 1946.

The thesis identifies basic themes: language, translation, and intersubjectivity. A page from Dove's diary shows, at the top, a barometer reading ("30.35") and a temperature ("34°"); below, "ptl klw," "Sea gulls flying high in a mackerel sky," and "Warm 'soft' day" (p. 114). The entry combines instrument readings, speedwriting ("ptl klw"), a term of "weather wisdom" ("mackerel sky"), and a "verbal description" ("Warm 'soft' day"), thereby juxtaposing languages. Instrument readings describe weather. Speedwriting approximates sounds of spoken language. "Partly cloudy" becomes "ptl klw." Weather wisdom— clichés like "Red sky at night"—records weather like instrument readings, but unscientifically. (A "mackerel sky"'s clouds resemble the scales of a mackerel and supposedly foretell a storm [p. 108].) Finally, by describing a day metaphorically, Dove translates weather yet again (pp. 114–15).

This is intersubjective because—this is weather's significance—weather connects us all. It impinges on us—as barometric pressure—and we represent that to ourselves.

(Is a barometric pressure reading a representation? This becomes an interesting question.)

Now take a painting: *Sun Drawing Water* (1933). Thin blue paint mimics water. The shore rises toward a hazy sky. Two not-quite-vertical forms jut from the land into the clouds, visualizing the Sun “drawing water.” The expression is a misunderstanding of the shafts of light (“crepuscular rays”) that sometimes shine down from the clouds (p. 105). While one can see crepuscular rays (Dove paints something one sees), one cannot see evaporation (Dove paints what cannot be seen). Sinewy lines of paint trace the sky and plunge and rise inside the elongated ovals, picturing light piercing haze, water becoming vapor, and paths of birds flying across the clouds, rendering visual the pressure and substance of air (pp. 12–14).

Dove similarly translates recording technology to figure the angular formal qualities of modern music but also the pressure of sound on the Victrola’s diaphragm, the turning of the Victrola’s hand crank by the painter every four minutes, and the transmission of sound through the air as waves in a “record painting” like *George Gershwin—Rhapsody in Blue, Part I* (1927).

“The record paintings” are “pictorial translations of music, music-listening, and listening technologies that amounted to a reconstituted composite of these three things” (p. 159). Dove’s is music understood as a fully embodied and mechanical experience. Metallic paint and aluminum support, a clock spring, even the reference to the division of Gershwin’s piece into two parts (for the two-sided record)—all point toward DeLue’s view.

But if the work is a “registering system” meant to “‘play’ music” (p. 159) is it then like a barometer—a device for registering physical force visually? And if so, again, is the result a representation?

An antirepresentational dimension builds throughout DeLue’s argument. Discussing *Flight* (1943), DeLue writes of “the automatism resident in human-machine relationships” (p. 136) and affirms Dove’s attraction to the automaticity of the pantograph (which he used on *Flight*), the phonograph, and the barometer—to their “self-action” (p. 136). This is again a metaphor, according to DeLue. Barometers, and other such objects, work “by their own devices,” but “their automatic operations proceeded from a human-machine collaboration” (p. 137).

But even collaboration imputes to the device a human-like agency. So, do “things” have agency? “Thing” is Dove’s name for works that incorporate objects. It is also a key term in recent debates about their agency.

Martin Heidegger, Bruno Latour, Alfred Gell, Ian Bogost, and others join in DeLue’s reflection on Dove’s “things.” The field ranges from Heidegger’s deeply human (I might have said anthropocentric, but that sounds like an accusation) phenomenology to Bogost’s anticorrelationism. Where do DeLue and Dove stand? Things are “not alive” but “have lives of their own” (p. 219). DeLue balances on a knife-edge, treating the agency of things now metaphorically, now literally.

Eventually, DeLue shows her cards. Considering Dove’s interest in natural history dioramas, she explains, they share with his works

an impulse to dismantle the dividing lines between seemingly opposed categories or realms, including human and animal, animate and inanimate, life and art, and even life and death. Although he worked in a context still flush with the possibilities of animation and animism, Dove, far from wanting to talk to the animals or wishing to claim that pictures are people too . . . instead identified a model system in the life group and the diorama that posited the featured specimens *as if* alive. . . . Diorama vitality, as a condition of lifeless aliveness, models the transference between animate and inanimate entities that Dove strove for in his assemblages, and in his paintings as well. [Pp. 244–45]

DeLue opts for a traditional account of objecthood and agency.

This knife-edge walk, the interpretive rewards of her visual cultural history, her readings of paintings—these are the great virtues of DeLue's project. But it has also placed Dove within a modernism that often flirts with the power of literal presence and its hostility to representation. Dove always returns to representation.

CHARLES PALERMO is professor of art history in the Department of Art and Art History and director of film and media studies at the College of William and Mary. He is also a founding editor of *nonsite.org*. His current research project is an account of monetary exchange as a metaphor for photography. His most recent book, *Modernism and Authority: Picasso and His Milieu around 1900* (2015), describes the crisis of authority in artistic representation around the turn of the twentieth century in the symbolist circle around the young Picasso and Apollinaire.

Hermann Kappelhoff. *The Politics and Poetics of Cinematic Realism*. Trans. Daniel Hendrickson. New York: Columbia University Press, 2015. 280 pp.

BRIAN PRICE

Throughout the history of film theory, the relationship between aesthetics and politics has been cast in a paradoxical way. If the project of political film theory is to imagine a privileged mode of emancipation in relation to what any given theorist takes to be the determining characteristics of a medium and the expressive norms of its culture, what so often comes forward instead—and expressly in the guise of an emancipatory aesthetic to be repeated everywhere—typically does so in the form of newly drawn categorical imperatives. Sometimes it appears as though film theorists have never really rejected the idea of norms and categories so much as they have wished for a set of conditions and parameters that makes emancipation possible by way of aesthetics and do so as if category itself was not a barrier to aesthetic or political experience. In this regard, the history of film theory is a record of incommunicable grievances about the necessary relation between style and emancipation. What remains incommunicable in these histories is owed to a tendency to understand aesthetics and politics as a relation guided by necessity and never contingency—or, at least, by a pervasive tendency to confuse contingency with necessity on the force of our respective political enthusiasms. It is just that when we voice our own principles, as opposed to the moments in which we absorb the sounds of someone else's, they feel less like principles than they do justice, which might amount to nothing more or less than a life lived without difference or disagreement. After all, are there not differences that we prefer more than some others? Can we still regard as a difference a wrong that we nevertheless believe to have been redressed? If we do, the form such an acknowledgment takes is typically nothing more than a moral reduction of aesthetic experience that comes in the form of lists, an assemblage of acceptable styles, which makes for an even more limited understanding of politics as always already revolutionary or retrograde, always already in opposition to what can be named as permanently different, permanently other. If so, what use could film really be for politics?

One very promising answer to that question is to be found in Hermann Kappelhoff's *The Politics and Poetics of Cinematic Realism*. As Kappelhoff suggests at the outset, his book takes its title from a book that accompanied Documenta 10 in 1997, which he rightly indicates as an important moment at which cinema enters the art world. Not only that, it is also a moment at which the very notion of what counts as a medium, and thus a discipline, becomes questioned in ways that have now become rather impor-