

Biennials and Texanicity in Contemporary Art: A Survey of Surveys¹

By Benjamin Lima

Within the field of contemporary art, a gap has opened between the etymology of the term “biennial” and its common usage.² That an exhibition takes place every two years is not the main significance of the term “biennial.”³ Rather, the term commonly refers to large-scale exhibitions of contemporary art that connect a particular city with the global art world through the display of work by an international roster of artists. In that sense, the Texas Biennial is unusual in defining its scope by work made within the borders of a state.⁴ Flanking Texas to the east and west, the Prospect New Orleans and SITE Santa Fe biennials are more conventional examples of the exhibition form as it has come to be known; like most others, they share the names of their cities (not states or countries) and emphasize an international roster of contributors.⁵ It would be tempting to see the present exhibition’s Texanicity as reflecting both a swaggering independence and a conscious distancing from the trends and fashions of the international art world.⁶

As perhaps befits a place that experienced nine years of sovereign independence in the nineteenth century and today counts a population greater than that of Australia or the Netherlands, Texas has produced and received a number of serious published surveys of its art history.⁷ Many of these fit the historical art of Texas into the broader currents of American and world art history. They make clear that movements such as regionalism and modernism, which interpret social transformations such as the Industrial Revolution or the information economy, apply both locally and globally.⁸

A good way to orient oneself to the field is to consult publications that encompass the entire art history of the state. A 1983 Austin exhibition, *Images of Texas*, surveyed the history of Texas artists’ treatment of their environment and came to conclusions already familiar from pop-culture stereotypes. In the words of curator Becky Duval Reese, “Cows and cowboys, oil wells and rockets, landscapes with wide-open spaces, and a look that has come to be called Texas chic” evolved over the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, beginning with “a strongly felt sense of romanticism” and later also appearing in a parodic mode.⁹ In an accompanying catalogue essay, the historian William H. Goetzmann traced a series of key moments in the state’s art history: its vast scale and varied environments daunting efforts to “capture” it artistically in the 1840s; the arrival of European-trained patrons and artists with the German Adelsverein by 1850; the state legislature’s sponsorship of official history painting in 1873; the rise of the cowboy as icon, above all with Frederic Remington in the 1880s; a preference first for impressionism, then regionalism (against avant-garde modernism) through the early twentieth century; expressionism and muralism as responses to the Depression; the rise of modernism (often affiliated with university art departments) after World War II; and Dave Hickey’s Austin gallery, A Clean Well-Lighted Place, as a symbol of countercultural cosmopolitanism in the 1960s.¹⁰

The most comprehensive published survey, *Texas: 150 Works from the Museum of Fine Arts, Houston* covering all of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, followed two exhibitions at the Museum of Fine Arts, Houston: *Texas Myths and*

ART LIES
A Contemporary Art Journal

TX★11
TEXAS BIENNIAL

1. Although “Texan” is standard and “Texanicity” is not, the latter more clearly refers to an abstract quality, not an individual, and acknowledges Roland Barthes, who found “Italianicity” in a Panzani pasta advertisement; Barthes, “Rhetoric of the Image,” *Image, Music, Text* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1977), 32–51.
2. Elena Filipovic, Marieke van Hal, and Solveig Østvebø, eds., *The Biennial Reader* (Bergen: Bergen Kunsthall and Ostfildern: Hatje Cantz, 2010) is an essential resource for grappling with the phenomenon.
3. The quinquennial *Documenta* exhibition in Kassel, Germany, is a frequent point of reference in the literature; also triennials such as the Asia Pacific.
4. The California Biennial does the same; the quinquennial *Greater New York* exhibitions at P.S. 1 cover the metropolitan area; and the Whitney Biennials have historically been limited to U.S. artists (less so recently).
5. In this, they share the characteristics of all other descendants of the Venice Biennale, established in 1895, as does Houston’s *FotoFest*, the biennial photography survey.
6. The 2009 exhibition’s curator, Michael Duncan, made comments to this effect; see below.
7. My research here is based on a study of published catalogues (that is, excluding exhibitions without them) and not meant to be an exhaustive list, but I apologize for any errors or omissions. I was unfortunately unable to examine unpublished sources for the many exhibitions that were not accompanied by catalogues. I also consulted published literature that was not occasioned by an exhibition, as well as selected periodical sources. I thank Robert Hower and the UT Arlington Art & Art History Department for research support.

Catalogues include *Texas Painting and Sculpture: The 20th Century* (Dallas: Pollock Galleries, 1971); William H. Goetzmann and Becky Duval Reese, *Texas Images & Visions* (Austin: Archer M. Huntington Art Gallery, University of Texas at Austin, 1983); *Texas Realism* (Dallas: Meadows Museum, 1991); Cecilia Steinfeldt et al., *Art for History’s Sake: The Texas Collection of the Witte Museum* (Austin: Texas State Historical Association for the Witte Museum of the San Antonio Museum Association, 1993); Edmund P. Pillsbury and Richard R. Brettell, *Texas Vision: The Barrett Collection: the Art of Texas and Switzerland* (Dallas: Meadows Museum, 2004); and Robert Summers, *Texas Treasures: Early Texas Art from Austin Museums* (San Marcos: Center for the Advancement and Study of Early Texas Art, 2009).
8. A special mention should be given to studies of the iconography of the Texas cowboy. These including Caleb Pirtle and Jack Bryant, *XIT: Being a New and Original Exploration, in Art and Words, into the Life and Times of the American Cowboy* (Birmingham: Oxmoor House, 1975), and Donald E. Worcester, *The Texas Cowboy* (Fort Worth: TCU Press, 1986).
9. Becky Duval Reese, “Preface,” in *Texas Images & Visions* (as in note above), 10.
10. William H. Goetzmann, “Images of Texas,” in *Texas Images & Visions* (as in note above), 15–44.

Realities (1995) and *Texas Modern and Postmodern* (1996).¹¹ In an ambitious, scholarly catalogue essay, Alison de Lima Greene used four topics as analytical concepts to draw together a vast range of historical and contemporary material: the landscape, the spiritual and visionary, modernism, and postmodernism. Most interestingly, Greene considered many examples of work that would test conventional boundaries of school and genre. For instance, she discussed Vernon Fisher's postmodern compositions or Rackstraw Downes' Galveston views as examples of "Texas landscapes"; the universalist spiritualism sponsored by the Menils and the impact of Mexican religiosity on a range of artists; Donald Judd turning the isolation of West Texas to advantage; and the way that general ideas of postmodernist pastiche and hybridity have played out in a specifically Texan context.

Certain cohesive groups, based in individual cities, have received fuller scholarly treatments in the form of book-length studies based on in-depth historical research. If we contrast the "Lone Star Regionalism" preceding World War II, rooted in a sense of local distinctiveness and the challenges of the Depression, with the Fort Worth Circle's "Intimate Modernism" following the war, a self-consciously internationalist group working in a context of peace and affluence, we may see how artists' groups that spring from similar social environments nonetheless turn out to have fundamental differences on questions of artistic theory and practice.¹² Whereas the Dallas Nine and their circle were concerned with "the regional artist's relation to his or her environment—not only the land but the people as well"—the Fort Worth Circle was "the state's first colony of artists to embrace and manifest a clearly nonregional aesthetic" and "Texas' first genuinely cosmopolitan movement."¹³ Both, however, were small, cohesive groups of artists including individuals who provided ambitious leadership, and were supported at key points by local institutions; that is, they conformed to the standard model of modern art movements more generally.

Also at the level of the individual city, leading museums have sponsored long-running series of contemporary art exhibitions that mix local, national and international art, allowing artists on the local scene to evaluate and respond to different work flown in from around the globe. This mixing is a goal also shared by standard biennial exhibitions. Examples here would be the *Perspectives* series at the Contemporary Arts Museum Houston, the *Focus* exhibitions at the Modern Art Museum of Fort Worth and the *Concentrations* and *Encounters* series at the Dallas Museum of Art.¹⁴ A similar stimulus has been provided by fellowship and residency programs that promote contact between insiders and outsiders, such as the Artpace International Artist-in-Residence Program in San Antonio, the Core Program at the Glassell School of Art in Houston, Centraltrak: The UT Dallas Artists Residency and the Chinati Foundation's Artist-in-Residence Program in Marfa.¹⁵ All of these exhibitions and residencies have provided for a cross-pollination of the Texan and non-Texan that seems crucially important for a growing, thriving art scene.

Exhibitions, such as the current Texas Biennial series, that take up Texanicity as a theme have had many forms and sizes. One frequently occurring type is the small- or medium-scale group show that may take place at a museum, a

11. Alison de Lima Greene et al., *Texas: 150 Works from the Museum of Fine Arts, Houston* (Houston: Museum of Fine Arts, 2000).
12. Rick Stewart, *Lone Star Regionalism: The Dallas Nine and Their Circle, 1928–1945* (Austin: Texas Monthly Press, 1985); Scott Grant Barker and Jane Myers, *Intimate Modernism: Fort Worth Circle Artists in the 1940s* (Fort Worth: Amon Carter Museum, 2008).
13. As in note above, Stewart, p. 12, and Barker and Myers, p. 11, 36.
14. See Richard R. Brettell, *NOW/THEN/AGAIN: Contemporary Art in Dallas 1949–1989* (Dallas: Dallas Museum of Art, 1989) and Lynn M. Herbert et al., *Perspectives@25: A Quarter Century of New Art in Houston* (Houston: Contemporary Arts Museum Houston, 2004).
15. See *Core: Artists and Critics in Residence* (Houston: Museum of Fine Arts, 2008) and *Dreaming Red: Creating ArtPace* (San Antonio: ArtPace, 2003).

commercial gallery or an alternative space, whose title announces the included artists' Texas identity as a basis for the show. The accompanying catalogues often center on each artist's individual work more than synthetic discussions of the whole.¹⁶ Several larger-scale exhibitions have also presented selections of Texas-based work distinguished primarily by a general criterion of quality or interest as the main rationale, rather than verbally developing a thematic argument at great length.¹⁷ Another approach is to select a group of works primarily through an aspect of identity that the included Texas-based artists share in common; a prime example would be those shows that have focused on the work of women artists in Texas.¹⁸ Curator Lynn Adele's study of self-taught artists in Texas is also framed in this manner.¹⁹

Probably only in recent decades have the art scenes in each of the largest Texas cities developed to a point where a survey exhibition or publication can be both of a substantial size *and* highly selective of its list of artists, as is typical for biennials. Curators have developed thematic concepts that unify groups of selected artists, responding in various ways to the conventional wisdom that a national or international public may be presumed to hold about Texas. In a 1986 survey of contemporary Texas art published by Chronicle Books in San Francisco, Annette DiMeo Carozzi (now deputy director of the Blanton Museum of Art) first acknowledged the existence of familiar stereotypes old ("a vast frontier...a sparse population of good ol' boys") and new ("the mad for-profit oil magnate...the urban cowboy") before moving beyond them to more relevant and productive concepts. She noted that Roberta Smith in 1976 had written appreciatively in *Art in America* of the state's "weirdness and fantasy...a fresh, direct appeal, an uncensored humor and personal immediacy missing in the mainstream art centers," but worried that the state's "eccentricity, colorful hyperbole, and outrageous characters" were disappearing under the pressures of urbanization. Selecting a diverse list of 50 contemporary artists, Carozzi identified three themes of broader relevance: "Art that conveys a spiritual search," especially of a visionary or autobiographical nature; "Art that evaluates the myths of American life," especially to satirize, parody and mock over-inflated myths and icons; and "Art that responds to other art," especially European and Latin American surrealism.²⁰

Examining the second half of the twentieth century for a book published in Australia, critic Patricia Covo Johnson highlighted the Chicano movement, the border with Mexico and rapid urbanization as main influences on the current scene, before nominating three themes as crucial to the state's artistic identity: "a sense of spirit," i.e., "intuition, metaphysics, and magic"; "the concept of assemblage" in both material and symbolic terms; and irony, generated by the gap between myth and reality, or between life and larger-than-life. (In his foreword, Walter Hopps also noted the connection to Mexico and the importance of visionary artists.)²¹ In a more recent exhibition catalogue, curator Suzanne Weaver and critic Lane Relyea placed Texas work of the 1980s and '90s in the context of the art-school/art-market nexus and the Internet.²² Reflecting on the process of "growing up in public," Relyea discussed the direct connections between MFA programs, galleries interested in promoting young artists, and the art fairs, *Kunsthalles* and adventurous museums that commission work by such

16. Characteristic examples for which I was able to consult published catalogues include *Twelve Artists Working in North Texas* (Dallas: Museum of Fine Arts, 1979); *Paperworks: An Exhibition of Texas Artists* (San Antonio: San Antonio Museum Association, 1979); *Third Coast Review: A Look at Art in Texas* (Aspen: Aspen Art Museum, 1987); Surpik Angelini, Bert Long, and Thomas McEvilley, *Another Reality: An Exhibition* (Houston: Hooks-Epstein Galleries, 1989); Jim Edwards, *The Perfect World in Contemporary Texas Art* (San Antonio: San Antonio Museum of Art, 1991); *Capirotada: Eight El Paso Artists* (El Paso: El Paso Museum of Art, 1991); Patrick McCracken, *Reunion: The Young Texas Artist Series* (Amarillo: Amarillo Art Center, 1993); Benito Huerta, *Establishment & Revelation* (Dallas: Dallas Visual Art Center, 1997); Dana Friis-Hansen and Lynn M. Herbert, *Artistic Centers in Texas: Houston/Galveston* (Austin: Texas Fine Arts Association, 1999); Charles Wylie and Suzanne Weaver, *Artistic Centers in Texas: Dallas/Fort Worth* (Austin: Texas Fine Arts Association, 2000). Robert Summers provides a historical survey of prize competitions in *Arthouse Texas Prize 2005* (Austin: Arthouse at the Jones Center, 2005).

Related exhibitions for which I was unable to examine publications but that bear mentioning include *Nexus Texas* (Contemporary Arts Museum Houston, 2007), *I-35 Biennial* (Dunn and Brown Gallery, Dallas), *New Art in Austin* (Austin Museum of Art), *Amarillo Biennial 600* (Amarillo Museum of Art), *Houston Area Exhibition* (Blaffer Gallery, Houston), and Artadia-related exhibitions (DiverseWorks, Houston).

17. These include *Fire: An Exhibition of 100 Texas Artists* (Houston: Contemporary Arts Museum Houston, 1979); *SAMA Open: A Juried Regional Contemporary Art Exhibition* (San Antonio: San Antonio Museum Association, 1986); and Louise Dompierre et al., *Texas/between Two Worlds* (Houston: Contemporary Arts Museum Houston, 1993).
18. Patricia D. Hendricks, *20th Century Women in Texas Art* (Austin: Laguna Gloria Art Museum, 1974); Marcia Tucker, *Woman-in-Sight: New Art in Texas* (Austin: Women & Their Work, 1979); *150 Works by Texas Women Artists* (Dallas: Dallas Women's Caucus for Art, 1986); Sylvia Moore, *No Bluebonnets, No Yellow Roses: Essays on Texas Women in the Arts* (New York: Midmarch Arts, 1988); Regine Basha et al., *The Activist Impulse: 30 Women and Their Work* (Austin: Women & Their Work, 2008); Kippa D. Hopper and Laurie J. Churchill, *Art of West Texas Women: A Celebration* (Lubbock: Texas Tech University Press, 2010); and Jo Williams, *Pioneers in Modernism: TWU Women Artists, 1920s–1970s* (Denton: Greater Denton Arts Council, 2010).
19. Lynn Adele, *Spirited Journeys: Self-Taught Texas Artists of the Twentieth Century* (Austin: Archer M. Huntington Art Gallery, 1997).
20. Annette Carozzi, "Introduction," in Carozzi, Gay Block, and Laurel Jones, *50 Texas Artists: A Critical Selection of Painters and Sculptors Working in Texas* (San Francisco: Chronicle Books, 1986).
21. Patricia Covo Johnson, *Contemporary Art in Texas* (Roseville East, NSW: Craftsman House, 1995).
22. Suzanne Weaver and Lane Relyea, *Come Forward: Emerging Art in Texas* (Dallas: Dallas Museum of Art, 2003).

artists, leading to increased levels of opportunity, risk and pressure in the early years of a career. These developments affect artists both here and internationally.²³ Weaver addressed the convergences and divergences between “real,” embodied experience and “virtual,” cybernetic experience as a central theme of both local and wider significance.²⁴

Similarly, the two most recent series of efforts to establish a recurring statewide survey (preceding the present series) both focused on broader themes in contemporary art, as opposed to a Texan essence. In brief introductory remarks for a 1988 Texas Triennial at the Contemporary Arts Museum Houston, the curators noted the strength of both abstract and figurative painting, and the pluralism and variety of the state’s art scenes.²⁵ David Ross (then director of the Boston Institute of Contemporary Art) had begun with a preconceived idea of a “Texas mythology...everything larger than life, everyone richer, meaner, smarter, more passionate...just plain bigger in every way,” but concluded that the best artists were instead focused on trans-regional issues such as terrorism and AIDS.²⁶ Five years later, for a biennial exhibition in Dallas, curator and gallery director Al Harris F. argued for the central place of irony, “a blurring and interweaving of fact and fiction,” and that “the mass media and advertising shape not only our social relations but our identities”; in other words, central themes of postmodernism per se.²⁷ If these exhibitions signaled the integration of Texas art into the wider contemporary art world, their unintended one-off status indicated that they did not securely establish themselves within the local one, their appearance and disappearance constituting what Bill Davenport called a “classic boom-and-bust cycle.”²⁸

By contrast, the most recent institutional configuration has so far been able to sustain its momentum through a record four consecutive editions. The 2005 exhibition was “a bootstrap effort by five small artist-centered spaces in Austin, with the help of colleagues from across the state,” a “do it yourself biennial” on a “shoestring budget,” in what could be seen as self-reliance in an honorable frontier tradition, with Austin artists most strongly represented.²⁹ The 2007 jury was more heavily slanted toward museum curators; nonetheless, there was some continuity in the roster of artists, with Candace Briseño, Heyd Fontenot, Peat Duggins and William Betts represented for the second time.³⁰ Notably, the 2009 exhibition was placed in the hands of a single curator from outside the state, Los Angeles-based Michael Duncan, bringing it closer to the established biennial model in which a single “exhibition-maker” is given a significant degree of authorship over each new edition.³¹ At this point the range of exhibition venues remained in Austin, while the central place given to the work of Kelly Fearing invited viewers to interpret contemporary work from a historical perspective. In an interview with Andrew Long, Duncan offered a reason to think that his exhibition might be more surprising and rewarding than any given stop on the international “biennial circuit”:

Museum curators often float the same cornucopia of well-known names. That’s a quota they feel they have to fill. The premise of the Texas Biennial is to surprise people, and there are so many great Texas artists who have not been discovered.³²

23. Lane Relyea, “Growing Up Absurd,” in *Come Forward* (as in note above), pp. 8–13, “growing up in public,” p. 11.
24. Suzanne Weaver, “Are You Experienced?” in *Come Forward* (as in note above), pp. 14–20.
25. Marge Goldwater, David A. Ross, and Marilyn Zeitlin, *The First Texas Triennial Exhibition* (Houston: Contemporary Arts Museum Houston, 1988).
26. *Ibid.*, 11.
27. Chris Cowden, Al Harris F., Benito Huerta, and Marti Mayo, *1993 Texas Biennial Exhibition Presents: Eighty Texas Artists* (Dallas: Dallas Artists Research & Exhibition, 1993).
28. J. R. Compton, “The Texas Biennial” (2005), *Glasstire: Texas Visual Art Online*, <http://glasstire.com>, accessed February 14, 2011.
29. Rebecca S. Cohen, “Texas Biennial 2005,” *Art Lies* 46 (2005), <http://www.artlies.org>, accessed February 14, 2011; Robert Faires, “Do It Yourself Biennial,” *Austin Chronicle* (March 4, 2005), <http://austinchronicle.com>, accessed February 14, 2011.
30. Elaine Wolff, “Reading Between the Pixels,” *San Antonio Current* (March 14, 2007), <http://www.sacurrent.com>, accessed February 14, 2011.
31. Harald Szeemann was the pioneering figure in this regard in contemporary art; more recently, Hans Ulrich Obrist, Okwui Enwezor and Robert Storr have occupied similar positions (along with many others). For the 2009 exhibition, several single-artist outdoor installations were co-curated by Duncan and Risa Puleo.
32. Andrew Long, “State of Wonderment,” *Austin Chronicle* (March 6, 2009); <http://austinchronicle.com>, accessed February 14, 2011.

He also suggested themes that might be seen as tying the exhibition together, including “Artists positioning themselves against the world,” or put slightly differently, “Texas art is about cultivating interior vision—artists feeling at odds with the place but doing their own thing regardless.”³³ We could read this as a reference to the quirky counterculture that is distinctive of Austin (and for which that city is known well beyond Texas) or, just as much, of the fortitude required of such artists who settle away from Austin in any of the state’s less self-consciously artsy neighborhoods. In another context, Duncan returned to similar themes:

Loners who know what’s up, these Biennial artists function on the periphery of the powers that be, satisfying aesthetics they’ve developed largely on their own. No copycats allowed....Texas seems largely a self-contained world and that’s what’s good about it.³⁴

Reviewing the exhibition for *Art in America*, critic and art historian Frances Colpitt saw Fearing’s work as exemplary of this theme and “emblematic of the isolation and independence of the Texas artists [the curator] admires.” She viewed the show as consonant with Duncan’s larger vision, one “[p]artial to narrative painting and, especially, Magic Realism,” and to “championing sincere, underrecognized artists.”³⁵ Another critic, Robert Faires in the *Austin Chronicle*, saw the 2009 biennial as covering “technology, identity, the environment, a culture driven by information at a faster and faster pace” and suggesting a trajectory that runs “from the stresses of our technologically fractured society to the enduring power of nature and the saving grace of pure, simple color.”³⁶ The value placed on individual independence, outsider or renegade status and, implicitly, liberation from the stresses of modern, mass, metropolitan society, suggests that the outsider artists surveyed by Lynn Adele may be not simply models of “outsider art,” as such, but could also have a privileged status within the broader field of Texas art as a whole.

Although the format of the Texas Biennial has evolved over time, one continuing emphasis seems to be a predominant focus on early- to mid-career artists who are unambiguously identified with Texas as a base or site for their work.³⁷ While this focus is highly valuable to the development of artistic culture here, it also tends to de-emphasize certain classes of artists who nonetheless have a major influence on relations between local and wider artistic worlds. In the present moment, while artists whose careers are primarily concentrated in Texas fully deserve to be the focal point of a Texas biennial, it may also be the case that Texas art is significantly shaped by artists who count as “Texan” to greater or lesser degrees.³⁸

As a thought experiment, I could list three of these categories. The first group are non-Texan residents who have contributed to the state through their presence here—among a wide range of examples, we could include Peter Saul, Michael Smith, Teresa Hubbard and Alexander Birchler, Richard Patterson, Erick Swenson and, last but not least, Donald Judd. The second group are natives of the state who maintain an active presence through working or exhibiting here, while at the same time building their careers more widely: Nic Nicosia and Dario

33. Ibid.

34. Jeanne Claire van Ryzin, “Ten days till the Texas Biennial,” *Austin Arts: Seeing Things* (February 24, 2009), <http://austin360.com>, accessed February 14, 2011.

35. Frances Colpitt, “Texas Biennial,” *Art in America* (June 16, 2009), <http://artinamericamagazine.com>, accessed February 14, 2011.

36. Robert Faires, “Texas Biennial 2009—DIY: Double Wide,” *Austin Chronicle* (April 10, 2009), <http://austinchronicle.com>, accessed February 14, 2011.

37. One possibility is that this results from self-selection among the artists who participate in the open submission format.

38. In the 2011 Biennial, curator Virginia Rutledge has included work by artists such as Trenton Doyle Hancock and Mary Ellen Carroll, which may be considered ambiguously or quasi-Texan in ways that I discuss below.

Robleto would be examples. The third group are natives of the state who have made more or less definitive moves to pursue lives and careers elsewhere, but whose art could nonetheless serve as significant monuments to some aspect of Texas artistic culture, in some cases even illuminating a point by their very abandonment of native soil. These would include Robert Rauschenberg (born 1925, Port Arthur; died 2008, Captiva Island, Florida), Max Neuhaus (born 1939, Beaumont; died 2009, Maratea, Italy), Robert Wilson (born 1941, Waco), Kay Rosen (born 1949, Corpus Christi), Richard Hawkins (born 1961, Mexia), Nathan Carter (born 1970, Dallas) and Ryan Trecartin (born 1981, Webster). Of course, these names represent only the smallest sample of the diverse tendencies within the state, but they do suggest how permeable the boundary is between Texas and beyond. They might also indicate that the impact of Texas artists on American art, and American artists on Texas art, is underappreciated. Every survey exhibition, by its nature, makes explicit or implicit arguments about inclusion and exclusion. As we consider the history of efforts to define what is Texan in visual art, it is provocative to imagine examples of the semi-Texan, formerly Texan or newly Texan, demonstrating that independence and interdependence can coexist in the same state.

Benjamin Lima (Benlima.info) teaches the history of modern and contemporary art at the University of Texas at Arlington. His research on German and Latin American art in the years since World War II addresses themes of national and international identity. He has published criticism in Art Lies, Art in America, Art News and Artforum.com.