

1.

GOOD APPROPRIATION BAD APPROPRIATION COMMUNIST PROPAGANDA AND CAPITALIST ADVERTISING SHAKE HANDS

Last week I received in the mail an offer to go on some newpayment scheme from my current ISP, Ihug. The envelope had a huge image of Fidel Castro holding his clenched fist in the air, and the type was set about him in such a way as to reference Russian Constructivism. Inside the pamphlet attempted to clarify the analogies by referring to their new pricing schemes as "REVOLUTIONARY".

Use of "revolutionary", often Communist imagery such as, Che Guevarra and Fidel Castro, to sell product is currently very popular in NZ adevertising.



Popular Wellington Cafe is called "Fidel's". It has pictures of Castro and Guevarra on the walls. Frequented by fashion conscious, educated and employed, 'cool' customers . . . very popular with graphic designers.



Poyner refers to this as **"the drainage of meaning"** [page 76]

image/form is often appropriated devoid of it's original meaning . . . left **"hollow"**.

Poyner accuses Garret's work of this.

IS THE ORIGINAL MEANING IMPORTANT? →

Where the work implies nothing more than a historical reference . . . **simply 'pastiche'** . . .

FAMILIARITY: APPROPRIATION RELIES ON THE AUDIENCE KNOWING THE FORM/IDEA THAT IS BEING USED . . . MEANING/INTENTION IS OTHERWISE LOST.

Where the work implies some idea in relation to the historical reference . . . that is satirical and/or humorous . . . **'parody'** . . .

Is Garret's work [as shown in this chapter] inherently any better than the junk mail I received from my ISP?

Paula Scher's Swatch poster?

Saville's record cover for Movement?



Twin Peaks book?

Mute newspaper?

Where the work implies some idea in relation to the historical reference . . . that is not satirical or humorous . . . that is, perhaps, **ambiguous** . . . *[2.]

Saville's cover for Movement?

Saville's cover for Theives like us, or Closer?

2. THE 3RD IDEA, THE HYBRID AND THE MULE

OR, HOW I LEARNED TO STOP WORRYING AND LOVE PETER SAVILLE AGAIN

PARODY as employed by the example of the Twin Peaks guide book . . . forces us to re-evaluate a format/context we take for granted.

While not an actual 'found object', this book operates in a very similar way - it destabilizes the 'everyday' . . . as does the TV show the book is referencing.

Is this because the result equals more than the sum of it's [appropriated] parts?

Has something 'new' been uncovered/illuminated?

Is this what Poyner means by parodic resonance?

* Appropriation can occur in relation to, or attempts at, uncovering something new.

Poyner refers to the attempt to create a "third idea in the imaginative space between image and subject matter" in Peter Saville's work.[page 80]

A HYBRID

Jamie Reid's work for the Sex Pistols also creates hybrids by appropriating and reconfiguring existing imagery to make new meanings within a new context . . .

however:
Reid's work is not ambiguous
Once it has been understood or received, it is finished.
→ it is **INFERTILE**

For me this is successful primarily because of the **ambiguity** in the connection between the subject/music and the image/aesthetic presented by the designer.

It had been bothering me that Saville admitted to his "selections" being more or less **arbitrary** . . . but now I can see the value in this . . .

The 3rd idea/Hybrid is created in the mind of the receiver. It is therefore unstable and renewable
→ it is **FERTILE**

OF THE EXAMPLES USED IN THIS CHAPTER WHICH DO YOU FIND MOST CONVINCING IN TERMS OF SOME 'ADDED VALUE' BEING BROUGHT TO THAT WHICH IS BEING APPROPRIATED?

3.

THE GOOD THE BAD AND THE UGLY [ART CHANTRY] [TIBOR KALMAN] [AND THE VERNACULAR]

TIBOR KALMAN REMINDS ME OF GARY COOPER IN 'HIGH NOON' →

I MUCH PREFER CLINT EASTWOOD'S EARLY ROLES IN SPAGHETTI WESTERNS LIKE THE ONE REFERED TO ABOVE ... CLINT EASTWOOD IS MORE LIKE ART CHANTRY.

THERE IS A SENSE THAT CERTAIN PEOPLE HAVE A 'RIGHT' TO APPROPRIATE CERTAIN THINGS?

Lisa mentioned something to me about my own appropriations having either integrity or authenticity [? – can't find the right email now] because of my background in that kind of culture. So if I was some rich kid from Auckland would that mean that the work would fail? How important are notions of authenticity and integrity to our everyday jobs as [generally anonymous] graphic designers?

I have this ongoing argument with my girlfriend, Anna, about a similar issue . . . She can't stand Elvis Presley, and I really like him [well actually only his early stuff before he started doing films – call him Elvis on Sun, or Skinny Elvis]. Anna sees Elvis as corrupt because much of what he did was taken from Black musical forms and performances of the time. I agree, but don't see it as being a problem [and actually I wouldn't blame Elvis either – he wasn't that smart]. When we really get some steam up though is when I bring up the fact that a lot of the music she likes is actually just the same – she listens to a lot of new Dub/Reggae that's happening in NZ right now – and it's all made by well-to-do white kids from Wellington and Auckland!

While I know I talked about authenticity as a part of my 100 images when we met, I think I might have changed my mind? I think we can't be too precious about cultural cross-overs, as these hybrids that are created can be rich and valuable in themselves.

Kalman is critical of Scher's work, yet to me [within the context of this chapter anyway] his work sits alongside Scher's when compared with examples like the Twin Peaks book, and Saville's record covers. In reference to the Kalman vs. Duffy debate, Kalman's holier than thou attitude seems to be based on intentions . . .

← DO INTENTIONS MATTER? DOES INTENTION RESIDE IN THE WORK?

For Kalman vernacular design's appeal lay in it's **authenticity** "purest and most honest" he says. . . . Poyner, however, points out the contradiction [page 84] ↓

KALMAN: KNOWINGNESS AND CALCULATION IS KALMAN'S FAKED NAIVETY CONVINCING? COULD IT HAVE BEEN? DOES IT NEED TO BE?

Poyner cites Art Chantry as a designer who's work is perhaps more 'authentic', by his being "able to reanimate his sometimes trashy sources without beautifying or sanitizing them" [page 85]. He also states that there is nothing "patronizing" about Chantry's appropriations.

IS KALMAN'S WORK PATRONIZING? IS THIS DUE TO EXECUTION? INTENTIONS? CONTEXT?



← **IS CHANTRY'S WORK MORE CONVINCING WHEN WE KNOW ABOUT HIS BACKGROUND:** not working for big corporations, never having made much money, drives an old beat up rusted truck, wears old worn out [vernacular?] clothing