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This paper explores the influence of graffiti writing on three artists, Jean-Michel Basquiat, Keith Haring, and David Wojnarowicz. It discusses the political, economic, and social environment of the United States in the 1980s and how it contributed to the formation of the graffiti subculture. Graffiti art emerged in the 1970s and 1980s in New York City. This new art form arose in beleaguered communities as a way for graffiti writers to assert control over their urban environment. While Basquiat, Haring, and Wojnarowicz did not call themselves graffiti writers, their techniques, concepts, and attitudes influenced their oeuvres and how each artist presented himself to the art market. This paper demonstrates how these three artists claimed control over their bodies of work rather than become influenced by commercial art galleries. All three of these artists challenged mainstream gallery art by producing works more accessible to the general public. Basquiat, Haring, and Wojnarowicz each represented a wider spectrum of society and groups that were not normally depicted in art. They were not afraid to address issues or problems that society would rather ignore.
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INTRODUCTION

In the 1970s, beleaguered urban communities across the United States started to become covered in spray paint. Stealth artists, who called themselves “writers” rather than “painters,” plastered their signature “tags” all over buildings and subway cars. In New York City especially, graffiti writers created “pieces,” or graffiti-style murals sometimes the size of a whole subway car. The creation of these large pieces by the new subculture of graffiti writers caught the attention of the art world. Graffiti writing influenced many artists in New York City and led to the formation of the graffiti art movement, in which artists created artworks influenced by the techniques and look of graffiti writing.

Modern graffiti writing transformed New York City and greatly impacted the art market. The movement transformed the East Village neighborhood into a burgeoning art district, attracting wealthy collectors and influential art dealers from nearby SoHo. Graffiti writing gave artists the opportunity to bypass the often-elitist art world. As a form of anti-art, graffiti writing called for destruction and antagonized government and corporations. Writers looked down on the art market and gallery and museum exhibitions. These daredevil types found satisfaction and fame in tagging difficult-to-reach locations. Graffiti writers opposed the commodification of art that came with traditional, art-establishment shows.

From 1982 to 1984, graffiti art reached its peak in the New York City art world. The movement claimed the spotlight for this period of time. An underground art, film, and music scene developed in the East Village neighborhood. Artists took notice of the tags left behind by graffiti writers. Inspired by the tag’s ability to be viewed by a wide audience, artists began to incorporate various techniques of graffiti writing into their artworks. This
paper will discuss the work of Jean-Michel Basquiat, Keith Haring, and David Wojnarowicz, three artists active in the 1980s in New York City. These artists each worked in the realm of graffiti for a short period before pursuing their careers in the traditional art market.

While Basquiat, Haring, and Wojnarowicz did not consider themselves graffiti artists, each experimented with writing or drawing on city walls before entering the art world and their careers owe much to the movement. Throughout their careers, each borrowed from the techniques and concepts introduced by graffiti writers. Graffiti writers were once complicit and subversive with the system. Subversive complicity refers to the undermining of established systems to “disrupt our basic assumptions about the world.”

Much like the modern avant-garde, graffiti writers practiced this technique to force the viewer to question the status quo.

Basquiat, Haring, and Wojnarowicz began their careers on the street, creating works influenced by the graffiti subculture. These artists used the techniques and concepts of graffiti writing once they began professional careers with galleries. By doing this, these artists were able to control the production of their artworks and evade the influence of gallery owners. This allowed these artists to voice dissenting opinions of marginalized groups such as gay men (Haring and Wojnarowicz) and African Americans (Basquiat). This paper will examine how each artist transitioned from working on the street to showing in professional galleries while preserving their unique voices and control over their artwork.

---

The War on Culture

For decades, the United States has experienced a so-called “War on Culture,” also known as the culture wars. Conservative, right-wing political leaders, armed with standards of “normality” and “decency,” have continually attacked various aspects of advanced culture.² Art spearheaded many of these battles. Since the inception of the nation, Americans have viewed art with suspicion. The Founding Fathers viewed art as "elitist" and undemocratic.³ Art was not something produced for the people but rather a luxury associated with kings.⁴ Even more offensive to contemporary conservatives, artists often depicted subject matter that threatened their conservative agenda.

A growing number of artists who embraced the outsider status emerged in the late 1970s and early 1980s. These artists documented racism, sexism, AIDS, homosexuality, and sexual experiences and often questioned conventional or religious beliefs. Conservative leadership feared these outsiders’ views because they created unwanted controversy and challenged the status quo of not only the art world but American society as a whole. The War on Culture sought to stifle the voices of outsiders. Conservative congressmen tried to silence these voices by limiting federal funding to this group.

Established by Congress in 1965, the National Endowment of the Arts strives to fund and promote opportunities in the arts. It partners with state arts organizations and other federal agencies to support arts programming. Additionally, the NEA provides grant money to organizations and individual artists. Beginning in the mid-1980s, many conservative

³ Ibid., 11.
⁴ Ibid.
Congressmen and Senators began to attack artworks considered “outrageous.” They wanted to stop funding artists and arts organizations that created or exhibited artworks that went against public “decency.” However, these politicians were only fighting against the creation of artworks that challenged their conservative views and the status quo. They resented the fact that taxpayers funded programs that created venues for this type of work. Into the 1990s, conservatives continued to oppose funding art or artists deemed immoral, indecent, and sexual, among other labels. The decrease in public funding for artists greatly impacted the art world and its relationship to government.

Elected officials attacked the NEA, seeking to cut its funding. Politicians argued that tax dollars should not pay for art that taxpayers dislike or find offensive. Furthermore, arguments against the agency increased. Increased inflation in the 1970s led to tax increases. With the administration of President Ronald Reagan in the early 1980s, Americans experienced tax cuts as well as cuts in government spending, resulting in “a climate of scarcity.” Politicians argued that necessities like public education, police, and other infrastructure deserved priority tax dollars.

This resulted in major cuts in NEA funding, limiting the number of grants awarded. Fewer grants from the NEA meant artists would not have the funds to create as many artworks. Furthermore, conservatives wanted to amend NEA legislation to include certain “decency” requirements for grant recipients. The government walks a fine line when trying to act as an art patron. Because it is bound by the First Amendment, the NEA cannot dictate what or how an artist chose to express. According to attorney Kathleen Sullivan, this decency language poses problems because artists may feel pressured to avoid what the

5 Ibid., 265.
public finds objectionable. Additionally, discrimination may occur in the grant decision-making process, making it possible for talented, deserving artists to go unfunded because their work is too outrageous in the eyes of conservatives.\(^6\) The decency stipulation makes it nearly impossible for an artist to challenge the status quo, preventing thoughtful discussion and social change.

Fewer grants from the NEA also created more competition for private grants. It also made artists more reliant on commercial art galleries to display and sell their artwork. During this time, however, the art institutions remained focused on the movements of Minimalist art and Conceptual art. These once radical and anti-commercial art forms now failed to challenge the status quo or bring anything new to the table. Art institutions, which also vied for grant money from the NEA, were unlikely to take a chance on an outsider artist for fear of upsetting the conservative agenda. This made art institutions even more exclusive.

The exclusivity of the professional art world and its dependence on the marketplace set the stage for a renewed interest in public art.\(^7\) A large gap existed between the inaccessible art world and the average person. What would an everyday individual find interesting or relatable in elitist museums and galleries? Furthermore, why would artists attempt to penetrate this environment if they knew the public was not going to pay attention? Artists needed to seek out mediums that would allow them to address the public and to bring to the forefront matters that conservatives in politics and the art world would rather ignore. The solution was simple: separate the artist and the work from the institution by presenting the art directly to the public on the street. Graffiti gave artists a

\(^6\) Ibid., 237-39.
\(^7\) Ibid., 53.
way to voice their opinions and break the barrier between the public at large and art. It allowed artists to exercise independence and to organize their own exhibitions.

Hip-Hop Culture and the Emergence of Modern Graffiti

Graffiti dates to the ancient world. Interestingly, the ancient city of Pompeii contains more than 11,000 examples of unsanctioned writing. When the city was excavated during the eighteenth century, explorers described the writing with the Italian word "graffito," which means "scratching." In contemporary times, people use its plural form "graffiti" to describe an image or text illegally placed on a surface. In Pompeii, graffiti became negatively associated with the lower levels of society. However, graffiti was not restricted to one area or social class. People often used graffiti to communicate, scratching messages on clay pots, which acted as message boards. This practice is similar to modern graffiti writing, in which graffiti artists write tags and draw images on subway cars. The cars traveled throughout the city and disseminated the artist’s work, communicating with the public at large.

Modern graffiti emerged in the late 1970s and early 1980s in New York City and Philadelphia. After World War II, government and corporate investors soon found promising opportunities in the suburbs and began to focus on these developments, driving people and money away from the inner city. As a result, urban communities like the Bronx faced economic decline and general neglect by society. Later, government and private

---

9 Ibid., 26-27.
10 Ibid., 7.
investors would attempt to revitalize lower-income urban areas through urban renewal plans. However, projects did little to improve conditions or create vital economies.

In 1975, President Gerald Ford infamously told New York City to “‘Drop Dead.’”11 The president vetoed a federal bailout of the city, leaving New York poverty-stricken and in near ruins. Drug use and crime were all too common in the vacant and unprotected buildings and streets. According to cultural critic Glenn O’Brien, the daily line for heroin “would sometimes extend around the corner, like for a big movie opening.”12 Rent was comparatively inexpensive – close to $100 per month in some neighborhoods – although many squatted in vacant buildings or in apartments of friends.

This downtrodden New York City produced a generation of modern graffiti writers. Graffiti writing became a way for young people in these neglected communities to channel their “frustration and boredom into making visual art.”13 Graffiti writers wanted to take back their neighborhoods from neglectful government agencies and corporations and to assert their individuality and independence.

Graffiti writing can be defined as the practiced skill of typography and stylized letter formation. Modern graffiti writers spent a great deal of time creating an internalized code only understood by other graffiti writers. Graffiti writers possess a great concern for aesthetics, typography, and technique.14 Although many outside the subculture of graffiti consider it the criminal activity of vandalism, it is important to understand that graffiti

---

11 Sam Keller and Dieter Buchhart, Jean-Michel Basquiat (Berlin: Hatje Cantz, 2010), vi.
12 Ibid.
13 Lewisohn, Street Art, 31.
14 Ibid., 19.
writing is not “simple trespass and vandalism” but “an inherently stylish activity.” Writers have a great concern for advancing their technique and improving and refreshing their style to keep up with one another.

The main concern for graffiti artists is the tag, the artist’s signature symbol or name. These tags act as *noms de guerre* for the artist, allowing him or her to establish an alter ego to conceal his or her real identity. Writers want to achieve fame by placing their tag in as many locations as possible. It is important to attain mass coverage to claim control over as many wall or buildings as possible, described by graffiti writers as “going citywide.” The element of illegality allows graffiti writers to be creative. Writers compete with one another to have the freshest look or technique, constantly focusing on their letter formations to one up each other.

As graffiti writers became better and better at tagging, they started to produce large, mural-like pieces to give themselves more of a challenge and to continue to build their credibility and stature within the graffiti subculture. Writers would create pieces on large sections of walls and on the exteriors of subway cars. Writers would often collaborate with one another to work more efficiently and to quickly paint large pieces. This led to the formation of crews, collectives of graffiti writers. Crews helped writers “accelerate the technical precision and style of their work” and also created a “collective aesthetic energy” for writers to draw from.

Graffiti is part of the larger hip-hop culture, which constitutes an “expansive, ever-proliferating synthesis of word, sound and image in a subculture which embraces painting,

---

17 Ferrell, *Crimes of Style*, 51.
poetry, music, dance, and fashion.”  

Painting refers to the act of graffiti writing, hip-hop’s “visual parallel.”  

Both hip-hop and graffiti originated in neglected urban neighborhoods of New York City. These hip-hop artists, break dancers, and DJs often had great talent but no instruments, causing them to create the genre of rap music.  

Both groups wanted to speak to the society that ignored them. Hip-hop graffiti “became a kind of spray can rap.”  

As hip-hop culture and rap music grew in popularity, so did graffiti. Hip-hop culture helped the graffiti movement spread worldwide. Soon graffiti became an international phenomenon, with European art curators seeking out New York City graffiti artists for international exhibitions. 

Writers tagged and pieced subway cars incessantly, spreading their work throughout New York City. Soon writers moved into other neighborhoods of the city, including the Lower East Side. By the mid-1980s, the East Village surpassed SoHo to become the preeminent gallery district. The economically depressed area supported an evolving underground art, music, and film scene since the 1970s. This artistic activity led to the growth of cafes, nightclubs, and art galleries where artists would congregate and exchange ideas. The cheap rent and independent nature of the city transformed the East Village into a haven for artists, writers, and creative types. The condition of New York allowed them to work a noncommittal part-time job or to make money only when needed.
and to focus on their art. During the early 1980s, graffiti art put the East Village in the spotlight. The subsequent media attention only added to the neighborhood’s growth.²³

Graffiti art soon became subject to scrutiny by art critics. It is important to note that critics were not analyzing graffiti writing found on the streets but rather the movement that it influenced. While some graffiti writers do not consider themselves artists and actively condemn conventional art institutions, some did start to practice art in other ways, establishing the movement known as graffiti art. Some critics linked graffiti art to bohemianism and primitivism. They believed that it “indulged ‘bourgeois’ sentimentality” by representing groups at the fringes of society.²⁴ Others viewed the movement as a celebration of polyculturalism and urban vitality.²⁵ They believed artists were integrating with rather than exploiting those on the fringes. The movement served as a counter to the pretentiousness of high art.

Graffiti artists began to cross over into more conventional gallery exhibitions during the early 1980s. Groundbreaking exhibitions like the Times Square Show (1980) and New York/New Wave (1981) showcased emerging contemporary art movements like graffiti art and neo-expressionism. These shows also featured new artists like Basquiat and Haring, who applied the techniques they learned while practicing graffiti writing to express viewpoints seen as unacceptable by society as well as art institutions.

²⁴ Ibid., 19.
²⁵ Ibid.
BREAKING INTO THE ART WORLD THROUGH GRAFFITI

Jean-Michel Basquiat

Basquiat was born on December 22, 1960, in Brooklyn, New York. Growing up in this neighborhood exposed the young artist to the formation of the graffiti art movement. He grew up in a middle class neighborhood, raised by a father of Haitian descent and a black Puerto Rican mother. Basquiat was bilingual, learning both English and Spanish during his childhood. The future artist read avidly, everything from comics to textbooks like *Grey's Anatomy*.

While attending City-As-School, an alternative school that emphasized experiential learning, Basquiat became friends with Al Diaz, future graffiti and street artist. The duo created the well-known tag SAMO©, which started as a private joke. One day while smoking marijuana, Basquiat described it as the “same old shit.” Diaz joked about selling packets of “sam-o” to others. The phrase quickly transformed itself into the fictional pharmaceutical SAMO©, a drug that provided spiritual salvation to the person who ingested it. The idea further developed in stories and comics the two authored for the high school magazine *Basement Blue Press*. The young artists drew comics depicting people before and after using SAMO©. Basquiat wrote a story about a man searching for religion. He met a salesman who told him of Christianity, Buddhism, Judaism, and other religions before pulling out SAMO©. The salesman called it the “guilt free religion.” Their tag functioned to mock established social structures of religion and capitalism.

---

28 Ibid.
Basquiat and Diaz worked hard to make their styles of writing look similar to create a singular voice for SAMO© and to effectively interrupt pedestrians’ normal patterns of thought. The artists wanted to make people stop and think. The tag called for “an end to mindwash religion, nowhere politics, and bogus philosophy.” It mocked the average person’s tendency to be “hustled” and to rely on commodities for happiness. Messages like “SAMO© AS AN END 2 NINE - 2 - FIVE NONSENSE WASTIN’ YOUR LIFE 2 MAKE ENDS MEET TO GO HOME AT NIGHT TO YOUR COLOR T.V.” (Figure 1) served to make fun of the corporate, yuppie lifestyle.

Basquiat and Diaz painted the tag primarily in the gallery district of SoHo and the Lower East Side rather than on subway cars. They avoided tagging individuals’ private property, instead targeting government and corporate properties, further confronting mainstream society and institutions of power. According to Henry Flynt, the context of the writings was essential to the formation of their cultural meaning. Placing messages like “SAMO© AS AN END TO ALL THIS MEDIOCRE ART” (Figure 2) in the SoHo gallery district directly mocked the art world, criticizing the conservative art of the 1970s. SAMO© functioned as anti-art. The writers’ anonymity made it possible for them to criticize the art world without fear of repercussion.

Although young Basquiat thought little of the mainstream art world, he still sought the attention of galleries. The artist’s main goal was fame. He repeatedly said “I’m going to become famous.” The crown symbol seen in many of his artworks reflects his desire not

29 Taka Kawachi, King for A Decade: Jean-Michel Basquiat. (Kyoto, Japan: Korinsha Press, 1997), 14.
30 Flynt, “Viewing SAMO©”
31 Ibid.
32 Kawachi, King for a Decade, 11.
only for fame but also domination of the art world. The artist borrowed the crown symbol from the graffiti subculture. A graffiti writer would use the crown symbol to declare himself “king” when he had solidified his status in the subculture. Often kings would move on from tagging to piecing to show their more advanced artistic skills.

The young artist, however, had little money to purchase art supplies or canvases. Instead, he made drawings on everyday objects such as refrigerators, doors, windows, and other objects as an extension of his graffiti writing. Basquiat caught the attention of gallery owners at the 1981 exhibition *New York/New Wave* organized by curator Diego Cortez, who gave the young artist funds to buy art supplies for the exhibition. Held at P.S. 1, *New York/New Wave* showcased artists such as Robert Mapplethorpe and Haring. Basquiat displayed more than twenty paintings and drawings. His work attracted the attention of Emilio Mazzoli, who organized his first solo exhibition in Italy, and Annina Nosei, who gave Basquiat a studio space in the basement of her gallery.

Basquiat wanted success not only for the fame but to become “an artist of historical importance.” However, he refused to play into the stereotypic signs of cultural differences established by art institutions. To accomplish this, Basquiat developed a hermetic code of words and symbols that concealed themes of political, social, or racial problems. This coded system combined with his heroin use makes Basquiat’s artworks especially difficult to decipher. Like with the interpretation of graffiti, the viewer must be privy to covert

---

33 Ferrell, *Crimes of Style*, 76.
34 Keller and Buchhart, *Jean-Michel Basquiat*, 33.
38 Kawachi, *King for a Decade*, 156.
39 Pearlman, *Unpacking Art of the 80s*, 74.
40 Kawachi, *King for a Decade*, 97.
symbols to make sense of the work. The artist used distinctive, dramatic painterly gestures and pictorial fragmentation in his paintings. His works often have no beginning or end. The viewer can start at any point, ensuring that no two viewers understand any particular artwork in the same way. Basquiat also valued “the magic of the moment.” When creating an artwork, the artist would take in the information and influences around him and then reorganize it “with divine judgment and artistic elegance.” His method of painting in the moment allowed him to avoid attempts by gallery owners to influence his work once he began to create artworks for commercial galleries.

This violation of established norms of traditional painting is visible in Basquiat’s *Famous Negro Athletes* (Figure 3) from 1981. Originally created on a wall on Houston Street, the artist later created a copy on paper for Glenn O’Brien, writer and TV host as well as an avid collector of Basquiat’s work. The drawing reflects society’s idolization of black athletes, a phenomenon the artist resented. In this work, Basquiat disparages black sport heroes. He disliked the fact that black people could dominate the realm of sports but not the realm of art. The work suggests his battle with the predominantly white art world.

Basquiat also referred to black stereotyping in the painting *Hollywood Africans* (Figure 4) from 1983. The artist takes fragmentation and coded systems to the next level in this work. The title refers to the stereotype of black people as criminals. Symbols of criminality are found throughout the artwork. First, the canvas mimics the look of a vandalized wall. The title, written three times across the top of the canvas, alludes to the stereotype of the outlaw. Near the title, Basquiat writes “1940,” a reference to the

---

41 Keller and Buchhart, *Jean-Michel Basquiat*, iii.
42 Ibid.
43 Kawachi, *King for a Decade*, 157.
Hollywood era during which the outlaw stereotype and the gangster movie genre dominated films. “Gangsterism” is written across the bottom along with “tobacco” and “sugar cane,” commodities often traded on the black market. These two phrases have a double meaning as they also refer to cash crops grown by plantation owners with the help of black slave labor. The phrase “what is bwana?” denotes the East African phrase referring to a master or boss. His references to black servitude express his experience as an African American living as a second-class citizen. He felt that people treated him differently due to his race. Taxi drivers would often pass him by to pick up white passengers instead although Basquiat had plenty of money.45

Three faces appear in the middle of the canvas. The artist captions the face on the right with the text “self portrait as a heel #3.” This reveals that Basquiat identified with the outlaw type represented in the painting.46 The mask-like faces refer to African masks that allow the wearer to see into other realms.47 Basquiat’s paintings often had multiple layers as the artist wanted to draw the eye to a second “layer of reality.”48 He wants to prevent viewers from drawing “predictable conclusions” by adding layers of meaning based on a variety of iconography.49

Basquiat tried to break down stereotypes by violating boundaries in the painting. A white line divides the painting between the legitimacy of a Hollywood career and the illegitimacy of a gangster lifestyle. The phrase “200 yen” is repeated both above and below the line, blurring the division between legitimacy and illegitimacy. Additionally, the

45 Keller and Buchhart, Jean-Michel Basquiat, vii.
46 Pearlman, Unpackaging Art of the 1980s, 80.
47 Keller and Buchhart, Jean-Michel Basquiat, iii.
48 Ibid., xiii.
49 Pearlman, Unpackaging Art of the 1980s, 80.
painting itself represents common boundary markers such as street walls and doors that may be vandalized by graffiti artists. The artist also crosses out many of the words written on the canvas, creating tension as the viewer attempts to decipher the texts. Basquiat does this to bring attention to words, believing that “‘the fact that they are obscured makes you want to read them.’” Basquiat purposefully violates boundaries in an attempt to shatter the barriers imposed by society.

Although Basquiat gained great fame and success through his gallery career, he placed little value on money. His handling of finances was careless. The artist didn’t have a bank account and hid his money in books around his studio and apartment. He didn’t even keep record of who purchased his paintings, according to former girlfriend Suzanne Mallouk. Basquiat held opinions “that were not very flattering about certain people in the art world.” However, he took their money, something that caused the artist to believe that he betrayed himself. Basquiat was a frequent drug user and Nosei believes that he used to self-medicate. Unfortunately, the artist could not gain control of his drug problem, dying of a heroin overdose on August 27, 1988.

Keith Haring

Much like Basquiat, young Haring showed great artistic potential as a child. Born May 4, 1958, in Reading, Pennsylvania, he began drawing at the age of four. After a brief stint at New York City’s School of Visual Arts, the artist left to pursue his artistic career.

50 Kawachi, *King for a Decade*, 97.
52 Keller and Buchhart, *Jean-Michel Basquiat*, iii.
54 Ibid., 86.
55 Ibid.
Although he did not complete his formal training, Haring’s instructors believed that his skills “were fully developed” after his first year.\textsuperscript{56} While enrolled, Haring learned about the field of semiotics, a study of communication codes predicated on socially ratified meanings. This concept allowed the artist to move away from “privileged views of art” propagated by art world institutions.\textsuperscript{57} Haring believed that art was a form of two-way communication between the artist and the viewer; no two individuals would understand a work of art in the same way. Therefore, art institutions could not dictate which works of art had value or what a work of art meant.

Haring’s main goal was to communicate with as wide of an audience as possible, an audience that lay outside the elitist art world. His style worked against Conceptual and Minimalist art of the 1970s, which was too “intellectual and in need of explanation.”\textsuperscript{58} Haring, influenced by semiotics, created a system of symbols to communicate. His ideograms, a unique range of icons and symbols that he repeatedly combined to create different designs and narratives, drove his artworks.\textsuperscript{59} Symbols like the “radiant child” functioned similar to a graffiti writer’s tag. Haring used them as self-promotion, drawing the symbols in New York City subway stations and eventually creating merchandise to sell in his Pop Shop. His style became recognized and copied all over the world.\textsuperscript{60}

\textsuperscript{56} Mark Coetzee, \textit{Against All Odds: Keith Haring in the Rubell Family Collection} (Miami: Rubell Family Collection, 2008), 30.
\textsuperscript{57} Ibid., 120.
\textsuperscript{59} Pearlman, \textit{Unpackaging Art of the 1980s}, 88.
\textsuperscript{60} Coetzee, \textit{Against All Odds}, 88.
Haring greatly admired graffiti writers’ mastery of drawing and color as well as the direct relationship between the artist and the audience. The artist’s series of subway drawings stand as his most obvious connection to graffiti writing. Haring called this series of drawings his most important works in an interview with Jason Rubell. From 1980 to 1985, Haring created chalk drawings on the blank panels meant for advertisements (Figure 5). The depressed New York City economy created “unsold billboards that gave Keith places to draw.” Haring wished to make the world a museum, bringing art to those who did not have access to or knowledge of museums. His drawings aimed to blur “the boundaries between a museum environment and everyday life.”

Although he did not call himself a graffiti writer, the artist was inspired by the vigor and immediacy of graffiti writing. Haring used bold lines, simple forms, monochrome backgrounds, and strong contrasting colors to create legible and visually effective drawings. His drawings made use of a variety of his pictograms, including the radiant child, barking dog, flying saucer, and groups of androgynous people. While creating the subway drawings, Haring learned to draw with time constraints but without comprising his forms. According to Marc Gundel, he became a master of the “short message … the synthesis of content and concept.” This skill was integral to communicating in the urban environment, where people process information in fractions of a second. Like Basquiat’s

---

62 Coetzee, *Against All Odds*, 92.
65 Ibid., 7.
66 Ibid., 10.
work, his pictures “have no beginning or end.” Haring understood that viewers would draw their own conclusions as they “filter out and edit in their own minds what comes in.” Haring focused on strong images rather than text. He used his pictograms to create simple and legible images from a distance. Another strength of the artist was his ability to creatively react to the issues of the present. His subway drawings communicated a variety of subjects including world events, religion, the influence of television on culture, and the dangers of nuclear energy.

The artist made between 5,000 and 6,000 drawings, documented by photographer Tseng Kwong Chi. Haring considered these artworks as “performance” drawings. Like Basquiat, the artist relied on spontaneous bursts of energy rather than pre-planned compositions. He created these works of art to defy traditional standards of ownership and authority, a critical component of graffiti writing. Haring did not want any person or corporation to claim ownership of any chalk drawing, although some of the drawings were taken down by subway-goers. He considered his drawings “momento mori of performances rather than works of art.” Haring valued the act of creating the work over the resulting object.

By taking the space normally occupied by advertisements, the artist works to undermine the “hegemonic hold of corporate and government style over the urban environment and everyday life.” His drawings occupied the totality of the space, ensuring that no other entity could add or change Haring’s original image, which acted as a message

---

67 Ibid., 12.
68 Ibid., 14.
70 Coetzee, *Against All Odds*, 36.
71 Ferrell, *Crimes of Style*, 176.
of sorts to onlookers. His drawings disrupt the normal patterns of thought experienced by subway-goers, further pulling their attention to the works and the absence of advertisements. Haring intentionally created ambiguous signs and symbols in his drawings. He did not want to tell people what to think, rather hoping that people would figure it out for themselves. Haring intended to inform people of the potential for a different aesthetic for public space, which is normally dominated by corporate and government interests. While he left the drawings ultimate message open to interpretation, Haring created the drawings as a “rebellion against the commodification of art.” The artist stated that the purpose of the subway drawings was to rebel against the art market because he didn’t create them to be sold.

Haring learned from the feedback he often received while creating the drawings. Many would stop to watch the artist as he worked in the subway. Working in the urban environment and observing the reactions of the public allowed Haring to understand how people would respond to his images. This caused him to gain a better understanding of how to best communicate with the public.

By 1986, Haring had stopped making his famous subway drawings. He stated that they “‘had run their course.’” He felt as though his drawings had effectively communicated with a large, diverse audience. Additionally, more and more people began to take the drawings to sell as Haring’s artwork became more valuable. One street artist went

---

72 Coetzee, *Against All Odds*, 78.
73 Ibid., 96.
74 Ibid., 90.
so far as to mimic the look of the advertising panels with black paper that could easily be removed. He would quickly collect Haring’s completed drawings this way.\textsuperscript{77} Although the artist never signed or dated these drawings or intended to sell them on the art market,\textsuperscript{78} his growing popularity made the drawings valuable works to collect.

Haring opened his own boutique called the Pop Shop at 292 Lafayette Street in the SoHo district of New York (Figure 6).\textsuperscript{79} Haring saw the store as “an extension of his work.”\textsuperscript{80} He wanted it to be accessible to the widest audience possible. In regards to his philosophy about the boutique, Haring stated that he “wanted to continue this same sort of communication as with the subway drawings … to attract the same range of people … to be a place where, yes, not only collectors could come, but also kids from the Bronx.”\textsuperscript{81}

The artist created a variety of merchandise such as t-shirts, buttons, magnets, posters, and home décor each with his trademark pictograms. Haring wanted his artworks to invade peoples’ lives. He wanted people to connect with his imagery on a personal level rather than at arms-length as often happens in the museum or gallery setting. His goal was to saturate his audience with his imagery.\textsuperscript{82} The Pop Shop also collaborated with other artists such as Basquiat and Kenny Scharf to create merchandise with their imagery. Haring also used the Pop Shop as a semi-gallery space, painting floor-to-ceiling murals utilizing his funky designs.
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Although it appears that the artist sought to commodify his work, Haring viewed it as an artistic statement. He saw his merchandise as “art objects,” his designs packaged as wearable art. The Pop Shop was “always more about art than commerce.” By making products out of his artworks himself, he prevented corporations and museums from trying to make a profit off his work. He believed this would cheapen the value of his art. The artist sold his posters for $1.00 and his buttons for $0.50, as “making money was never Haring’s intent.” Haring instructed the Keith Haring Foundation, which operated the Pop Shop after his death, to donate all profits to a variety of organizations, including children’s charities, educational programs, and AIDS related causes.

Entering the commercial realm allowed him to achieve his goal of communicating with the widest audience possible. The Pop Shop allowed him “to reach millions of people whom I would have not reached by remaining an unknown artist.” This gives evidence of graffiti writing’s influence on the artist. While Haring chose not to be anonymous, he identified with the tactic of communicating with a wide audience. In 1987, Haring opened a second location of the Pop Shop in Tokyo, Japan. Because the artist wanted full artistic control over the boutique to ensure that it fit his philosophy, the Tokyo location was only temporary and closed a year later.

The artist controlled his artwork and messages even in works created for commercial galleries. Haring’s painting The Great White Way (Figure 7) from 1988 reveals
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his tendency to create “overtly sexual objects”\textsuperscript{88} for galleries. He wanted to address “sexuality as the driving force in life”\textsuperscript{89} as well as society’s influence and control over its expression. The title of the work refers to Broadway, specifically the busy nightlife and gay cruising that surrounded it. Additionally, the title refers to the duct in the penis through which semen passes. Haring created the work on a large, phallus-shaped canvas. Its shape evokes the look of a stele, a monument erected by Mesopotamian and Mesoamerican cultures to mark sacred locations or to commemorate rulers or battle victories. Haring used the painting to explore stifled male eroticism, namely gay eroticism as the pink color of the canvas evokes “gay associations.”\textsuperscript{90} He wanted to show how government, business, and society condemn the sexuality of gay men.

Haring’s imagery illustrates “the processes, conditions, and artifacts of modern life”\textsuperscript{91} and how these effect male eroticism. At the base of the phallus, a man tries to free himself from the coils of a snake. He holds two ropes that tie around two men on either side of him. These men possess crucifix-shaped penises. Above, a crowd of people fights amongst each other, struggling to climb onto a man that is morphing into a machine. This machine man, whom Haring paints with a dollar sign on his torso, represents business, revealing how industry can control and almost enslave workers. Figures struggle to turn the cogs and handles where his head should lie. A platform above the machine man holds two men supporting a crown. Men pierced by crosses sit on either side of the platform. Above this platform, a man brings forth other men.\textsuperscript{92}
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On the next level, Haring paints two pigs sneering at a man bound and hanging from a vaguely human figure that forms part of a chain. The chain also binds two pregnant women on either side. Guns, knives, dollar signs, a bomb, a tank, and a nucleus surround the bound figure. At the tip of the canvas, a woman with one head and two bodies gives birth to the last link in the chain. Her outstretched hands hold two more wombs with babies. Haring paints the gender symbol for female on her torso. A winged man with an erection sits at the head of the phallus. He holds two men emerging from other men with condom-shaped bodies. Overall, the painting expresses the notion that society, government, and business function to stifle gay eroticism. The work also shows Haring’s control over the production of his artwork. He wasn’t influenced by the more conservative art world and continued to make art that expressed his views as a gay man.

Throughout his career, Haring rejected the conservative ideals of art institutions. He took control of the production away from galleries and museums by placing his drawings and designs directly in front of the consumer. This allowed him to break the barriers that existed historically to separate the general population from the elitist art world. He didn’t give museums and galleries the chance to take credit for his subways drawings or public murals. Haring was able to control his messages while also gaining widespread popularity. He expressed many opinions such as the dangers of nuclear energy and crack cocaine as well as the dire need for AIDS funding and research as well as safe sex education. The artist himself died from AIDS related complications on February 16, 1990.
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David Wojnarowicz

Born September 14, 1954, in Red Bank, New Jersey, Wojnarowicz experienced a brutal upbringing by his alcoholic father. From an early age, the artist knew he was gay and felt alienated in a society that failed to represent homosexuality. As a child, he created collages with the Archie comics, cutting and pasting the characters of Archie, Veronica, Reggie, and Betty together in sexual scenarios. He felt better after creating something that reflected a wider range of the human experience. The artist ran away from home to live in New York City as a teenager. He worked as a hustler and lived on the street during this time. Living in the city exposed Wojnarowicz to the rise of modern graffiti writing. The writing surrounded him during his teenage years and young adulthood.

Wojnarowicz discovered the underground world of the Hudson River piers while living on the streets. During the late 1970s and early 1980s, gay men met here for anonymous consensual sex. The artist started to use the abandoned piers as a studio and sketchbook, experimenting with painting, graffiti, film, and photography.\(^{95}\) Wojnarowicz experimented with graffiti writing here, creating poetic writings and drawings to express his sexuality. The artist most likely identified with the anonymous nature of graffiti writing, allowing him to express his feelings and opinions without drawing attention to his identity. The artist had a quiet, shy disposition and did not share many of his hardships with his closest friends and family. Despite danger and privation, the piers gave him a space to express himself and communicate without fear of criticism.

He first picked up the camera in 1972 and constantly took photos. *Arthur Rimbaud in New York*, one of the artist’s earliest photographic series created in 1979, contains

around thirty photographs of the artist and friends wearing a deadpan mask of the French poet Rimbaud (Figures 8 and 9). In the series, Wojnarowicz plays with the ideas of “historical time and activity” by combining the French poet with New York City “activities mostly illegal in nature.”\textsuperscript{96} The artist most likely identified greatly with Rimbaud, the poète mandit, or a poet who lived outside or against society.\textsuperscript{97} The nineteenth-century poet was homosexual, alcoholic, and lived on the streets. By wearing the mask of the poet, Wojnarowicz draws parallels between his own experience and that of Rimbaud. Both sought a sense of freedom and release in societies that attacked their different sexuality.

The photos always show Rimbaud in conservative dress facing the camera, confronting the society that seeks to push him out. The mask seems to appear “as almost real.”\textsuperscript{98} The whiteness of the mask makes it the initial focal point in each photo before the surroundings are taken in.\textsuperscript{99} The series shows Rimbaud in a variety of situations, including on the subway, eating in a diner, shooting up heroin, and performing sexual acts with another man. Eight photos were taken in the Hudson River piers. These photos feature some of Wojnarowicz’s graffiti writing, including “The Silence of Marcel Duchamp is Overrated,” in reference to the performance art by conceptual artist Joseph Beuys, among other poetic writings.

The \emph{Arthur Rimaud} series stands as the artist’s first permanent visual artwork. The photos reflect his feelings of alienation and his idea of “being an observer of my own life as it occurs.”\textsuperscript{100} The photos function almost as an autobiography by allowing Wojnarowicz to
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represent and examine himself while also stepping outside his being.\textsuperscript{101} The series evokes a sense of rebellion and contain guerilla overtones. Many of the scenarios portray activities that mainstream society condemns, including gay sex, drug use, and graffiti writing. Wojnarowicz uses the series to express his personal history and to create “a record of the times” that would otherwise remain unspoken.\textsuperscript{102}

The artist transformed portions of the pier into murals in 1983. His murals can be seen as an extension of graffiti writers’ pieces. Like graffiti and street artists, the context of the artwork was significant. By creating his murals in this location, Wojnarowicz sought to draw attention to the danger and illegality of the location. He wanted to show the world what mainstream society wanted to keep a secret.\textsuperscript{103} His murals create a record of the location’s history and purpose.

Two murals painted by Wojnarowicz demonstrate his experiences as a gay man in the public realm. The first mural of a pterodactyl represents his ability to live without deception (Figure 10). The artist painted a life-size pterodactyl in one corner of a debris-filled room. Animated black dots and dashes emanate from his beak, representing its call. The figure soars without limits, a representation of being queer in the public realm.\textsuperscript{104} This mural shows the feeling of living without deception about one’s sexual needs and desires. The pterodactyl represents the adoption of certain survival skills needed as a gay man in order to resist societal pressures. The creature uses aggression and predation to survive. The black dots reveal he is unafraid to speak out against his enemies.\textsuperscript{105}
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The second mural represents the opposite experience of the pterodactyl. A cow appears in the throes of death (Figure 11). His eyes look frozen in anguish, flames shoot from his nostrils, and his tongue hangs from his gagged mouth. The earth hovers above the cow’s tongue with scatted plus signs surrounding the whole mural. Unlike the pterodactyl, the cow used the tactic of silence to combat society. Instead of fighting, the cow kept a low profile in order to not draw attention to his unfavorable sexual orientation. He chooses to accommodate society’s dominant views and as a result “faces the terror of slaughter.”106

Wojnarowicz continued to use his artwork to address his experience as a gay man. Painting spaces like the Hudson River piers gave him a public platform for his ideas and allowed him to step out of the silence that society wished to impose on his views. He carried this technique of direct communication over into his later painting and collage works, which he showed at the East Village gallery Civilian Warfare. The artist created a number of photo-text images, layering his photographs with excerpts of his writing. Wojnarowicz evolved from his more cryptic iconography of the Arthur Rimbaud photographs and pier murals to straightforward communication in these photo-text images, which allowed him to ensure powerful and direct communication with audiences.

In 1987, Wojnarowicz was diagnosed with AIDS, another factor that influenced this switch to more straightforward, powerful imagery. His works functioned as “a kind of summing up” of his beliefs.107 The artist began to face his mortality. Untitled (One day this kid...) from 1990 illustrates the artist’s desire to live without society’s condemnation of homosexuality (Figure 12). Wojnarowicz places a school portrait of himself from the 1950s in the center of the work. He flashes a wide, toothy smile with neat hair and dress. He
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appears to represent the wholesome, all-American image, until the viewer begins to read the text, which describes the experience of someone subject to homophobia. The artist uses the work to give a voice to the gay community, whom mainstream society wishes to silence and ignore.

The text serves as a powerful, attention-seeking device. It examines how family, school, church, the medical community, and the government work to attack gay men. According to John Carlin, the work represents “a correspondence between self and society that is distorted and hidden in the mass media.” After the 1950s, American culture appeared homogenous due to the limited representation of minority groups in the media and elsewhere. The work examines how society forces homosexuals “to conform or be silent” or else they will “face the discipline of society.”

Wojnarowicz’s photo-text reveals his decision to do neither. He chooses to speak against the homogenous standards of society instead. The text that surrounds the image describes how men “attempt to silence him with strangling, fist, prison, suffocation, rape, intimidation” among other things and subject him “to loss of home, civil rights, jobs, and all conceivable freedoms” as of result of his “desires to place his naked body on the naked body of another boy.” Wojnarowicz takes a strong stand against those who condemn his way of life. He uses the artwork to confront the society that wants to ignore and repress him.

The artist also fought against those who wished to silence him and other alternative artists by speaking up against conservatives who tried to use his artwork against him. Methodist minister Donald Wildmon published a pamphlet with the American Family
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Association to condemn NEA funding of Wojnarowicz and other "indecent" artists. The pamphlet reproduced portions of the artist’s work, mostly gay pornographic images.

Wildmon lifted images from the artist’s work entitled The Sex Series (Figure 13). Wojnarowicz created the eight prints by “putting color slides in an enlarger and exposing them directly on black and white photographic paper,” which gave the images “an eerie negative quality.”\textsuperscript{110} He then layered the image with various elements such as small circular images and text to create collage-style prints. In one of the works, Untitled from the Sex Series, the various circular images show scenes of police officers fighting back a crowd, cells under a microscope, an article from a newspaper, and explicit sexual activity. He layered the images with a photograph of a train and some text written by the artist about AIDS. Wojnarowicz combined a large amount of material in each print “to suggest their complex interrelation.”\textsuperscript{111} The series is meant to be viewed together to create the most impactful message. The artist used the series to examine his own mortality, as well as the mortality of many friends, in the face of the AIDS virus. The series deals with issues of loss, desperation, and death. However, Wildmon took the images out of context, skewing the overall meaning of Wojnarowicz’s work.

The AFA sent the pamphlets to every member of Congress and to more than 3,000 Christian leaders, and 2,500 media outlets.\textsuperscript{112} Wojnarowicz sued the organization under New York Artists’ Authorship Rights Act, which protects an artist from the attribution of his
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or her work if altered and if such alteration causes harm to his or her reputation.\textsuperscript{113} The court ruled in favor of Wojnarowicz and issued an injunction against the AFA, which was also required to distribute a correction to all original recipients. The court awarded the artist nominal damages of one dollar. Although he failed to win more monetary compensation, Wojnarowicz secured a moral victory. He joked to friends that he couldn’t decide if he should spend the dollar on “an ice cream cone or a condom.”\textsuperscript{114} His victory was an important step toward affirming artists’ rights.

After the death of his close mentor and lover Peter Hujar in 1987, Wojnarowicz’s work became more politically charged. His last works deal with society’s condemnation of homosexuality, the AIDS crisis, and the imminence of death in a direct and challenging way. His artwork transformed into activism. Like many of his friends and peers, Wojnarowicz contracted the AIDS virus. He succumbed to the disease on July 22, 1992.

CONCLUSION

Like graffiti artists took control of their urban environments from the government and corporations, Jean-Michel Basquiat, Keith Haring, and David Wojnarowicz took control of their artistic careers from the professional art world. They borrowed the concepts of freedom of expression and direct communication from the subculture of graffiti. The artists used these techniques early in their careers to assert their independence from art institutions and to differentiate themselves from the intellectual and elitist movements of Conceptual art and Minimalism. These artists continued to use these concepts as they
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established professional careers in commercial galleries. They clung to their independence to keep control of their oeuvres so that they could address important social issues, such as gay rights, AIDS, and racial discrimination.

Before entering the professional art world, Basquiat made a name for himself with the tag SAMO©. His tag proclaimed his critique of society, corporate culture, religion, and the art world. The anonymity of the tag allowed Basquiat to express himself without fear of backlash. SAMO© captured the attention of thousands of New Yorkers as well as gallery owners and critics. Once he entered the art world, many already “knew” Basquiat as SAMO©. His success afforded him the ability to create paintings to express his disdain for his treatment as an African American. As Suzanne Mallouk describes it, his artwork was “a sweeping account of the black American experience through a young black man’s eyes.”

Basquiat employed a wide variety of iconography. Like graffiti writers, he created his own language that many may not understand. His paintings revealed his resentment of the various stereotypes assigned to African Americans in society. He wanted to give African Americans the chance to rule realms other than sports, for instance, by achieving fame and success in the art world, in which few African Americans participated.

Haring made it impossible for the professional art world to take credit for or make a profit off of his work through the creation of his subway drawings. Although not graffiti writing, Haring’s subway drawings communicated directly with the public. By creating the artworks in the subway, he was able to observe how people reacted. This allowed him to understand how to best communicate with the public at large. He continued to break barriers between the general population and the elitist art world by opening his Pop Shop.
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His “wearable art works” were more than just a moneymaking venture. Haring embraced commercialism to keep control of his image and messaging and also to make his art more accessible, although he cared little about making a profit. His popularity made it possible for him to show his artworks in many commercial galleries. Through many of his gallery works, the artist expressed his frustration as a gay man and the repression he experienced in addition to other issues such as drug use, AIDS, nuclear energy, and more. Haring excelled at reaching a wide, diverse audience through his accessible art.

Wojnarowicz, like the other two artists, began his artistic career experimenting with graffiti. He worked mostly in the Hudson River piers, creating poetic graffiti writing on the walls. His photography series *Arthur Rimbaud in New York* documented some of his writings while also exploring his feelings of alienation as a homosexual. Additionally, Wojnarowicz painted large murals, which also expressed his exclusion from society based on his sexuality. The piers gave him the freedom to create without the influence or control of a gallery owner, allowing the artist to refine style and voice. As Wojnarowicz began showing with galleries, he retained his same voice. His work became increasingly activist in nature, reflecting his experience as a gay man in a society that chose to ignore, repress, and condemn this group. His work gave a voice to this ostracized group.

All three of these artists challenged elitist art by producing works more accessible to the general public. Basquiat, Haring, and Wojnarowicz represented a wider spectrum of society and groups that were not normally depicted in art. They were not afraid to address issues or problems that society would rather ignore. By starting their careers experimenting with graffiti, the artists discovered techniques and attitudes that allowed them to make their artwork more accessible and that put them in control of their careers.
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