



*From the desk of Pierre Beaudry
The Hudson River School Series, Part VI*



GEORGE INNESS: THE BRITISH BARBIZON MOLE INSIDE THE HUDSON RIVER SCHOOL.



by Pierre Beaudry, 7/30/2008

1. HOW BRITISH FREE TRADE DESTROYED THE HUDSON RIVER SCHOOL

George Inness (1825-1894) was not a member of the Hudson River School, and he was not a loner artist either: he was a Barbizon plant who became entirely the synthetic creature of the Boston Tory art dealers who used him to destroy the spirit of Cooper and of Morse in the Hudson River School. George Inness was the free trade revenge of John Trumbull, of the Tory Clubs of New York City and of Boston that included such speculators as, financier and steamship owner, Marshal O. Roberts, railroad man and banker, George I. Seney, N.Y department store owner, Benjamin Altman, Ohio coal mine owner and banker, James W. Elsworth, and financier art collector, Richard H. Halsted. Later, the control of the Inness operation was put into the hands of the foremost American art collector, Thomas B. Clarke with his Boston art sales firms, Williams & Everett and Doll & Richards. Those were only a few of the rich art trade patrons behind George Inness and who were the sworn enemies of the Hudson River School.

The Barbizon style of painting was introduced in the Hudson River School by Inness and was used to infect primarily Whittredge and Gifford, but also others such as John Kensett and John Casilear. Barbizon is the name of the village located next to the forest of Fontainebleau in France, from where the founders of the school, Theodore

Rousseau and Jean-Francois Millet, crawled out. Their trademark, and that of their followers, was to use art for the purpose of expressing anti-industrial and anti-science tendencies. In short, it was a British-French existentialist counter-cultural operation that was introduced in the United States with the purpose of stamping out the Cooper Cultural Revolution. Barbizon was also called “pre-impressionism” in France and the “luminist school” in the United States. The "luminist" style was a term invented by some New York Art critics and historians in order to create tendencies among the Hudson River School painters and pin them against each other on matters of method, as a divide and conquer type of tactical psychological warfare against the older and more mature members of the school.

As a painting style, Barbizon "luminism" is nothing but a form of sophistry that became a mannerist fad expressing different existentialist moods, and its counter-cultural purpose was to literally induce the impression of dreaminess and melancholy in artists as well as in the general population. It was used systematically to entertain the intellectual elite of America and make them feel good and drowsy. The French school artists most popular in the United States were Jean-Baptist-Camille Corot and Charles-Francois Daubigny. The main counter-cultural function of Barbizon was to destroy the rigor of the classical artistic composition that came out of the classical Dusseldorf School, from Westphalia, Germany, and out of the National Academy of Design in New York by emphasizing sense perception as opposed to the creative powers of the mind. The pictorial aim was to eliminate the method of expressing ironies and paradoxes in a painted landscape and replace them by an overdose of luminism and impressionistic effects as the replacements of the actual subject matter. Luminism and impressionism, thus, became the two most important fallacies of composition that ultimately took over the Hudson River School and destroyed it completely during the late 1870's.

In reality, this so-called “luminist” style is simply a finishing technique, which helps hide brush strokes and eliminates strong delineation of objects. And that is all that it should be: a very useful device. Leonardo da Vinci called this technique “sfumato.” Every landscape artist has to use some kind of finishing technique in order to give a more or less dense consistency to the atmosphere, smoothing over strong shadows that strongly delineate the contour of objects, depending on the overriding intention of the subject. However, when it is used otherwise than a technique, it becomes sophistry. The same thing happens when rhetoric replaces the moral intention in speaking language. If one abuses of this technique, it will ultimately erase the form of objects and all that will be left will be a light impression of what was once there. That is how the fakery of Barbizon became the subject matter of artistic composition in the United States.

Art historian Charley Parker succinctly identified how George Inness began his career as a student of the Hudson River School, and became opposed to the school’s principle right after he returned from his first trip to France in 1854. Even though he was not a member of the school and was never related to any of its members, Inness, nonetheless always wanted to be identified with the Hudson River School, regardless of his opposition. Parker wrote as per a prescribed biographical script from the art dealers:

“At a time when his fellow Hudson River painters were searching for the most wild, untamed and dramatic landscape subjects they could find (or sometimes combine and invent, in the case of Frederic Church), George Inness chose to paint settled and cultivated lands, the farms and fields in which both God and man had made their mark.

“Inness started his career painting in a style in keeping with the other Hudson River School artists, but his trips to Europe exposed him to the artists of the Barbizon School of France, which changed his palette and approach. Inness eventually eclipsed the Hudson River School painters and was regarded as the finest American landscape artist.

“In his later career, he was exposed to an influence of another kind that also changed his painting dramatically. He became enthralled with the theological philosophy of Emanuel Swedenborg, a Swedish scientist, philosopher and Christian mystic who believed (among other things) in a direct relationship between the natural and spiritual worlds. Inness took Swedenborg’s model of “as above, so below” to heart as a belief that the divine could be revealed by contemplation of the natural world, and attempted to convey that divine essence in his paintings.” www.linesandcolors.com/2006/12/20/george-inness/



Figure 3. George Inness, *Gray, Lowery Day*, c. 1877.

What Parker does not say, however, is that “the finest American landscape artist” was an invention of the new York Times, and that Swedenborg was a freemasonic cult figure of the Martinist Synarchy variety which created a mystique around Inness. But, it is the synthetic aspect of the Inness method that reveals most vividly that this was a British operation from the top down. As his son, George Inness Jr., put it, the trip of his father to the Barbizon School in France “opened up new fields of vision and new avenues of thought. They took him out of the narrow confines of the Hudson River School, and placed him in the rarer atmosphere of the masters of the world.” (George Inness Jr., *Life, Art, and Letters of George Inness*, New York, The Century Company, 1917, p. 29.) His son never knew how right he was. Here is how George Inness Jr., naively explained the synthetic Barbizon method of his father:

“ ‘There A ---, slam in a thunder-cloud in the right hand corner; and you, B -- , rush a battery of light down in that middle distance; and C – keep hammering away at the foreground. Never mind if you are out of tone, we’ll get a harmony when we put a glaze over the whole thing and then with a little tickling up here and there with pigment we will have finished the greatest landscape that ever was painted.’ And this is not at all imaginary, for that was one of my father’s pet theories. He thought he could direct any man or group of men to paint in this way, and produce as great a picture as he could paint himself. At times, he seemed to be obsessed with the idea that painting a picture was purely mechanical, needing only the master brain to direct.” (George Inness Jr., *Op. Cit.*, p. 76.)

Gray, Lowery Day is, in point of fact, the proof of the synthetic method of Inness described by his son: A - the thunder-cloud; B - the light in the mid section, and C - the “tickling” in the foreground. Inness told art collector Thomas B. Clarke, that *Gray, Lowery Day* would be exactly done according to his theory, and was going to be a masterpiece. Indeed, a lot of “tickling” here and there did the job. When Clarke saw the implications of this method, he bought the painting from Inness for \$2,000 and took over management of his paintings. First, Haggerty had Boston art dealers, Williams & Everett, selling all of his Inness works, good or bad tickling alike, made by both him or his son, especially to rich New York patrons. Then, sometimes in the 1870’s Clarke took over the job. This Inness fraudulent method was completely vindicated at the famous Clarke auctioning of *Gray, Lowery Day*, in New York in 1899. This was the ultimate proof of how the “tickling” method of Inness worked as a Barbizon fraud.

After Williams & Everett suffered major losses during the Boston fire of 1872, Inness started painting for another Boston art dealer firm, Doll & Richards. Doll revealed the true nature of their business relationship with Inness. In the biography of his father, George Inness Jr. reported that Doll once said to an art collector, Mr. (?) Maynard, that he had “a knife in Inness and could twist it at any time.” (*Op. Cit.*, p. 87.) Doll owned everything Inness had, including his toothbrush. For the last 16 years of Inness’s life, it was Thomas B. Clarke who ended up managing Inness’s paintings through Doll & Richards. Clarke was a lace and linen manufacturer from New York who had become the nation’s foremost art collector at the end of the nineteenth century. Among his other art patronage functions, Clarke was also the treasurer of the National Society of Art and

chairman of the Union League Club's art committee. His dream was to get Inness to become president of the National Academy of Design, the controlling institution of the Hudson River School. Thus, George Inness was nothing but a *singe savant* who was on the leash of free trade art dealers all of his life.

After the *New York Times* had bragged for several years that this particular painting was the greatest American scenery ever painted, the famous Thomas B. Clarke auction of February 1899 confirmed the veracity of the fallacy of composition. In its usual inimitable telegraphic style, the *New York Times* article of that day stated "The bidding on Inness's '*Gray, Lowery Day*,' which selling for \$10,150 broke not only the record of the sale, but of all previous auction sales of American pictures, was most lively and exciting." (*New York Times*, Feb. 17, 1899.) Unless anyone had any doubts, this is how the fad of American Barbizon was sold to rich New Yorkers. After three nights of bidding, the Clarke auctions sold for a total of \$165, 315 worth of paintings, all of the higher price ones were from George Inness.

2. JAMES PINCHOT AND THE DEMISE OF WORTHINGTON WITTREDGE.

Ever since 1853, when he first attempted to join the National Academy of Design, George Inness wanted to become a member, but most of the artists of that patriotic institution refused to recognize Inness as more than a mere "associate" with a French synthetic pedigree. At any rate, Inness's patrons finally succeeded in getting Inness a membership in 1868, and then, worked night and day to get him to become president of the most important art institution in the United States, in 1873. This last promotion of Inness was timed to coincide with the preparatory selection phase for American artwork to be submitted to the 1876 Centennial Exposition of Philadelphia. Inness became president of the National Academy of Design in 1874. That was to be the crowning of his efforts of imposing the Barbizon disease on the population of the United States. With this last deed came the last blow that destroyed the Hudson River School.

In a desperate attempt to save the institution, the members of the Academy chose Worthington Whittredge to replace Inness as president of the National Academy of Design in 1874-75. This was a last ditch effort to sell some of the school's work and save the school from bankruptcy. This fight was so rough that Whittredge went onto a state of depression, from which he never truly recovered. Regardless, during those two years, Whittredge's mission was to save the Academy, which was going under right at the time it was needed the most. Whittredge spent more time fighting against private clubs and shareholder value, than promoting the works of the Hudson River School. In the end of his second year, exhausted, Whittredge was forced to resign for health reasons. Then, it was Sanford Gifford who took on the challenge to save the Academy. However, the fight against the private clubs and the art dealers was so nasty and unfair to American artists of the Hudson River School, that by the end of 1876, it was Sanford Gifford's turn to resign, exhausted, from the presidency of the Academy, after one year.

Then, in May of 1876, the fight waged by the clubs and art dealers against the National Academy of Design reached a climax. Weak as he was, and still in a depressed state, Whittredge accepted to be in charge of the committee of American Art for the Centennial celebrations in Philadelphia. As former president of the National Academy, he attempted to get the works of most of his closest associates from the Hudson River School into the exhibit. However, he was only able to have more than one third of the school representation. The majority of the good hanging spots for the exposition went to the American Barbizon artists. This became a major bone of contention. The choice of individuals to serve on the Centennial hanging committee was made with the explicit purpose of dispersing or eliminating the works of the Hudson River School. This committee was made up of the New York engraver, James David Smillie, Hudson River School senior artist, Worthington Whittredge, Philadelphia engraver, James Sartain, and William Perkins of Boston.

On May 3, 1876, when the committee met to discuss the choice of works that would be the most representative of America, a virtual war broke out over the Barbizon American painters versus the Cooper-Morse movement of the Hudson River School and their National Academy of Design. Everybody on the committee nearly resigned because Sartain would not compromise on his choice of the Barbizon school of artists reflecting the new America. The advocates of the Cooper and Morse school were forced to retreat while the private clubs, their art dealers, and the controlled press moved in for the kill with loads of money and propaganda to impose the Barbizon art faction on the United States at its own Centennial anniversary. Barbizon became the cultural smallpox of the Philadelphia Centennial. By the end of May, the fight had reached a fever pitch within the clubs against the Hudson River School, and the Barbizon school of shareholder value won the day. Whittredge recalled that this was in his own words, “the gravest crisis” for the Hudson River School and the worst turning point of his life.

To highlight a few salient points about the financial situation of that period, on September 21, 1871, Whittredge had warned his financial advisor and “art collector,” James Pinchot about his own difficult financial situation and that of the Academy. Pinchot recommended that Whittredge take a holiday to Europe. Whittredge replied to him that he had become ambiguous about returning to Europe in order to resolve the crisis he was in. Whittredge knew he was being pushed to a crisis point beyond which the National Academy of Design and the Hudson River School might not survive, but he did not realize that the man he was writing to was precisely the man who was orchestrating the demise of these institutions. With amazing lucidity and frankness about the Barbizon school, Whittredge wrote to Pinchot: “For all I care about Europe is its art and artists and what they are doing. I am forced to admire it while I don’t like it. I admire their knowledge *but* despise their *souls* if one can speak so.” (Whittredge letter to Pinchot, Sept. 21, 1871.)

Then, two years later, on September 19, 1873, “Black Friday,” Whittredge lost most of his investments in the stock market crash. He was on the verge of the breaking point, both physically and psychologically. On February 15, 1874, still unaware that Pinchot was undermining his lifework, Whittredge sent him another letter in which he

identified that the markets were rigged against the Hudson River School and that Pinchot should do something about it. Whittredge wrote: “Immense numbers of pictures however are imported and seem to find sale, some at enormous prices, while the Bierstadts, the Churches, the Giffords and Johnsons, are not sold or even wanted. Some better disposition must be shown by the public for at least our good artists, or art here and our art institutions must die out. It now became, I think, a little too much the custom to depreciate everything produced here, and over estimate everything brought from abroad.” (Whittredge letter to Pinchot, Feb. 15, 1874.)

Finally, it appears that Whittredge never discovered that it was Pinchot, personally, who had been sabotaging his own art sales and was behind the operation to destroy the National Academy of Design and the Hudson River School. American publisher and art essayist, William C. Brownell captured the situation after the 1876 Exposition. He wrote: “The year 1876-77, may be said to mark the beginning of a new epoch... Before that year, we had what was called, at any rate, an American school of painting, and now, the American school seems to have disappeared. We are beginning to paint as other people paint.” William C. Brownell, *Young Painters in America*, *Scribner's Monthly* 20, 1 (May 1880): 1-15; (July 1880): 321-35. Quoted from Thurman Wilkins, *Thomas Moran: Artist of the Mountain*, University of Oklahoma Press, 1998, p. 146.) By the time he became 65, in 1885, Worthington Whittredge was bankrupt. On March 9, 1887, he was forced to auction over seventy of his paintings at the *Ortgies' Art Galleries* of New York City for which he only got a pittance. In February of 1900, nineteen of Whittredge's paintings were auctioned for an average of \$40.00 each. All of this was done under the patronage of art collector, Mr. “shareholder value” James W. Pinchot.

Ultimately, the free trade stockholder infection and the Barbizon disease took over the entire Hudson River School, as if a plague had hit the American school of art. Almost all were infected, including prominently Worthington Whittredge, Sanford Gifford, John Kensett, and John Casilear. Art historian, Anthony F. Janson, identified clearly the disease that caused the tragedy. “By the time he stepped down as its president (of the National Academy of Design), Whittredge had saved the Academy from ruin, but he could not restore its luster. Nor was he able to stem the tide of Barbizon that soon engulfed the Hudson River School and transformed his own work as well.” (Anthony F. Janson, *Worthington Whittredge*, Cambridge University Press, New York, 1989, p. 153.)

3. SANFORD GIFFORD: THE TRAGIC IRONY BEHIND *HUNTER MOUNTAIN*, *TWILIGHT*.

Sanford Robinson Gifford (1823-1880) had traveled extensively with Bierstadt and Whittredge in Europe and was originally influenced by the Dusseldorf Academy. However, he also became a victim of French Barbizon, and as soon as he was able to establish a studio at the Tenth Street Building, in New York City, where Bierstadt and Church had their own studios, he introduced the Barbizon infection that he had caught from George Inness. Gifford quickly abandoned the Dusseldorf method and adopted the more popular French Barbizon luminist manner. A good example of how Gifford

expressed this “luminist” technique is illustrated in his famous impressionistic *Kauterskill Clove*, of which Gifford has made no less than four copies.



Figure 4. Sanford R. Gifford, *Kauterskill Clove*, 1863.

There is no doubt that Gifford's picture is highly superior to any of Inness's mechanical, or mystical experiments. A close study of the scenery of *Kauterskill Clove* shows that Gifford is not interested in Inness's fraudulent method of "tickling" and that he demonstrates a definite mastery of his means. However, "luminism" is clearly what overshadows everything else in Gifford's painting; to the point that it is that finishing technique of increasing the density of the atmosphere with humidity and languid sunlight that ultimately overwhelms the spectator with passivity as it takes over the actual subject matter of the painting. Here, it is clear that luminism was so powerfully used as a field perspective technique that it actually swallowed the mountains themselves. But, look at the difference with *Hunter Mountain, Twilight*.



Figure 5. Sanford R. Gifford, *Hunter Mountain, Twilight*, 1866.

While I was examining the complete works of Sanford Gifford, I was looking for a singularity, an extraordinary landscape, with the mark of a paradox, or an anomaly, an idea, something provocative that would reflect the school's intention as was expressed by Cooper, Morse, Whittredge, Bierstadt, Church, or Duncanson. Suddenly I came across what might have been Gifford's most beautiful painting! That was the paradox I was looking for. This was the most unusual landscape of Gifford, because it explicitly excluded what was expected to be there. Luminism was not there, but the truth was. I was genuinely and happily shocked. The landscape was called *Hunter Mountain, Twilight*, painted in 1866, and without the Barbizon affectation. Why?

I asked myself: why would Sanford Gifford, a prominent artist of the Hudson River School, paint *Hunter Mountain, Twilight* as a desolate moonscape covered with tree stumps and overcast by a heavy acidic-like Saturn yellow twilight over a denuded hill? What could have prompted Gifford to abandon his luminist Barbizon method and paint this most devastated landscape of the Catskills instead? Why such depressing brownish slash and burnt tones? Was he going through a melancholic phase which usually comes with the Barbizon disease? Similarly, why would Whittredge also paint the same scene, from the very same spot, and at the same time?



Figure 6. Worthington Whittredge, *Hunter Mountain*, 1866.

Could it be a war remembrance landscape? Though the two paintings were done shortly after the end of the American Civil War, and Gifford had himself played his part in it, *Hunter Mountain* happens to be near the Hudson River. It is nowhere near any of the battlegrounds. What did Gifford and Whittredge see on that mountain that would call for such a truthful anti-luminist effect to be set on two separate canvases? Was Gifford warning the general public against some impending catastrophe? Even more intriguing was the question: why was that unusual painting hidden from the general public for more than ninety years?

What the general public does not know is that *Hunter Mountain, Twilight* was the representation of another terrible war that the artists of the Hudson River School were waging against their own patrons, the controllers of the American art market, the war against shareholder value. That is the true subject of this landscape. Hunter Mountain was the first ecological scandal of deforestation in America to be put on record, and the man responsible for this state of affair was the most important ‘friend’ of the Hudson River School: rubber baron, James Pinchot, the New York City lumbering millionaire who befriended Whittredge and Gifford for his own financial benefit. However, this ecological deforestation was used to cover up a more sinister disaster: the “twilight” of the Hudson River School itself.

It was James W. Pinchot who bought *Hunter Mountain, Twilight*, and put it up as a mantelpiece over his family home fireplace, in order to hide it from the general public and use it as a Damocles’ sword over the head of his own son, warning him against the dangers of public opinion. Pinchot had baptized his son “Gifford” after the artist who painted that ominous truth, and even went as far as making Sanford Gifford his godfather. The picture was first exhibited at the National Academy of Design, and was later chosen to be exhibited at the Paris Exposition Universelle in 1867. The painting was a smashing success and soon became the talk of all art lovers.

Though an article of the *New York Evening Post* of February 27, 1866 reported on the academy’s exposition, the newspaper chose to speak of every other thing except *Hunter Mountain, Twilight*. Art critic Eugene “Sordello” Benson saw right through the landscape and wrote: “If Mr. Gifford’s picture were less complete in rendering of his theme, we might right more about it; but because it is so entirely so, it is difficult to give it another expression, that is, transpose it into language...” (Kevin J. Avery and Franklin Kelly, *Hudson River School Visions, the Landscapes of Sanford R. Gifford*, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, 2003, p. 4.) As for the nasty pre-Raphaelite *New York Daily Tribune* critic, Clarence Cook, he gloated over the fact that he was happy to see Gifford responding to the credo of John Ruskin with a “true to nature” landscape. At the Paris exposition, the British responded by saying that “from the nature of the subject...[that it had] a more somber character than the majority of Mr. Gifford’s pictures. There is a fine feeling of the mystery of twilight in it...” (“Fine Arts, National Academy of Design, II, “The Albion 44. No. 19 (May 12, 1866), p. 225.)

When he saw that most of the astute critics were pointing at the truth about the painting, he realized the potential danger of having public opinion informed by the existence of such a revelation, Pinchot became unusually scared and made sure that no such works would ever be brought before the American or British public again. Thus, he bought *Hunter Mountain, Twilight* for his own private collection and began to take control of numerous other works of the Hudson River School in order to preserve them from public viewing. The irony is that the so-called authorities on Gifford, Kevin J. Avery and Franklin Kelly, spent no less than ten pages in attempting to cover up the truth about *Hunter Mountain, Twilight* by making believe that its intention was to express memories of the Civil War with “postbellum overtones.” (Kevin J. Avery and Franklin

Kelly, *Hudson River School Visions, the Landscapes of Sanford R. Gifford*, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, 2003, p. 4; 42-46; 175-178.)

Moreover, since slashing and burning the American forests was not going to be very popular with public opinion, Pinchot resolved to create the Yale University School of Forestry. A fox would not have been more careful inside of the Hudson River chicken coop? Pinchot's son, Gifford, was born in 1865, the same year that Gifford the artist began making sketches for this damning painting. Gifford Pinchot grew up to become the most notorious environmentalist friend of Theodore Roosevelt, and later became Governor of Pennsylvania for two terms. It was quite an irony that, in collusion with the kooky grand daddy of environmentalism, John Muir, Gifford Pinchot, was to become the first director of the United States Forest Service under the Roosevelt presidency, and the most prominent conservationist in America. Pinchot was the controller of slash and burn as well as conservation.

So, *Hunter Mountain, Twilight* was a hidden "smoking gun" until the painting was retrieved after the death of Gifford Pinchot in 1946, and was exposed in Chicago's Terra Museum of American Art where it now hangs. According to an investigative reporter, Jim Lane, over 200 works of the Hudson River School had disappeared at the personal hands of James Pinchot, just like *Hunter Mountain, Twilight* did, and were found hidden, 90 years later, in the basement of the Pinchot residence. However, those paintings did not enjoy the same recovery, as did Gifford's *Hunter Mountain, Twilight*. Lane reported the truth of what happened to those 200 paintings. He wrote: "Pinchot family members believe they may have simply been left there in the basement of the house where they were stored and been bulldozed over when the structure was demolished and the area reforested. Today, such nineteenth century Hudson River School paintings bring five and six figure bids at auction. Thus, in the greatest irony of all, valuable art was likely sacrificed in the name of conservation." (Jim Lane, *Hunter Mountain, Twilight* for humanitiesweb.org.) What Lane did not say, however, was that this deliberate destruction of works of art was part of a British free-trade operation aimed at the destruction of the Hudson River School.

However, Lane added an interesting comment about this sordid affair. He said: "Today, photos of Hunter Mountain show a rich, vibrant, reforested green. The small farms have been abandoned; the Adirondacks have become a woodland recreation area. Large scale lumbering has largely moved to Muir's backyard where, ironically, Pinchot's forest management philosophy prevails - a shifting from art to science. And just as ironically, Muir's pristine wilderness ideals now dominate the area just north of New York where the city has been buying up thousands of woodland acres to protect its natural water supply and avoid the cost of large filtration plants. And in doing so, it has necessarily placed these areas off-limits to hiking, camping, and other forms of human encroachment." (Jim lane, Op. Cit.,) I wonder how much of Muir's interests are now under the control of New York City Mayor, "Benito" Bloomberg?

CONCLUSION

Not only did the nineteenth century free trade financial warfare against the Hudson River School succeed in hiding into private collections so many masterpieces of the American school of classical artistic composition, but the British-controlled American art traders made sure that the majority of the extant works of such great artists as Morse, Whittredge, Bierstadt, Church, Duncanson, and Gifford remained inaccessible to the public for another 111 years after the Philadelphia Centennial Exposition. In other words, it was not until 1987 that a retrospective of the works of the Hudson River School was restored for entertainment of Americans at the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York City, under the title: *American Paradise: The World of the Hudson River School*.

But even then, the Hudson River School was not revived for its own specific value, and merit. It was revived in order to coincide with the environmentalist concern of the 1980's and to serve the opportunistic purpose of the anti-science and anti-technology ideology. The exhibition of *American paradise: The World of the Hudson River School* was nothing else but an environmentalist paradise. This is how the foolish art historian, Louise Minks, dubbed this new fallacy of composition: "In an American society dominated by technology, the remaining landscape is again regarded as a repository of "high and holy meaning," and an "oasis." As the protection of the natural world from destruction is now of national concern, the reverence for nature embodied in early American landscape art reminds us of ideals relevant today." (Louise Minks, *The Hudson River School*, Barnes & Noble, New York, 2006, p. 18.)

What folly this is, once again, to divert the intention of art away into still another public opinion fad, rather than to reestablish the only true purpose for which art has ever been in existence; that is, for the ironic truth of developing creativity. Therefore, it should not surprise you to find that in the year 2008, that is 132 years after the destruction of the Hudson River School, the respect due to the creative process of these artists is still wanting, and will continue to be wanting, until the moment comes when the Anglo-Dutch Liberal *shareholder value system* is finally replaced by the American *principleholder value system*.

FIN