

August 19, 1994

JSG Boggs
Fellow of the Center for the Advancement of
Applied Ethics
Carnegie Mellon University
Hamburg Hall 245
Pittsburgh, PA 15213
[fax 412 268 6074]

Dear Boggs:

To boggs

Money originally was just a way of measuring. Cattle at first. When metal: being sure of the weight & purity of the metal. Metal as purchasing power = value as coinage. Bring bullion to the mint: they'd test it, weigh it, and give it back as coins.

Adam Smith, ch 4 (I think).

Gradually became accepted and with acceptance came govtal alteration, abandoning gold st, etc. Money as symbolic now.

Your paintings mock current money system in THREE ways.

First, you go back to the original notion of money. The things are WORTH what's painted on them, for their own sake, much as cattle or bullion were worth what their designated values where. In that way the art is SUPERIOR to current money.

Second, your designations are arbitrary when viewed from viewpoint of usual artistic creations. Big denomin, little denomin, can be equally interewsting paintings, equally difficult to create & equally excellent. But in your ethic, you'll "charge" less for the little denom. This ridicules the arbitrary quality of the current money system by dramatizing the arbitrariness, exaggerating it.

Also a wonderful circle of symbol: like regular money, it's worth something ONLY SO LONG as people ARE WILLING TO PAY FOR IT.

also: must be KNOWN for what it is for the art to work. inconsistent w notion of counterfeit.

also: the art makes the point poignantly. Compare w the tedium of these many paragraphs. So there's no equiv way to make the point.

as to the xeroxes: they pull at the public's belief, much like the increasingly watered dollar does. At what point will the adulterated version of your art be refused as tender? putting the matter most kindly for the govt: at what point will the public's good will and forbearance give out (cf, the good will (approval/favor/fondness) of Boggs fans