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Abstract


By Alicia McCarty, M.A.

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts at Virginia Commonwealth University.

Virginia Commonwealth University, 2013.

Major Director: Dr. Catherine Roach, Assistant Professor, Director of Graduate Studies, Department of Art History

The Richmond Printmaking Workshop (RPW) was in operation from 1978 to 1991 during a nationwide print revival. From the 1960s through the 1990s, hundreds of new printmaking workshops and cooperatives sprung up across the country. This newfound popularity in the medium led to a boom in the print market and resulted in widespread experimentation of the medium. The RPW, founded by artists Nancy David and Gail McKennis, began in response to these trends and demonstrates how the print resurgence operated on a local level. Like many other small printmaking workshops of the period, it provided printmaking equipment to artists and promoted the print medium through classes, lectures, and membership in a Print Club. The locally-oriented workshop was a place for artists to meet, work on art, and form a supportive printmaking community. The RPW provided artists with opportunities to create portfolios, mount exhibitions, and experiment with new printmaking techniques. The
various programs sponsored by the RPW were meant to engage both the professional printmakers and amateur artists of Richmond. An extensive print collection was formed from the various activities of the organization. A portion of the collection was eventually donated to the University of Richmond Museum in 2001. This collection of 253 prints spans the duration of the RPW’s existence and demonstrates the wide variety of prints created at the workshop and the diverse programs they organized. Although the workshop closed in the early 1990s, the RPW’s significant influence on the artists involved, the Richmond art scene, and generations of printmakers to follow is evident. This thesis provides an institutional history of the organization to give context to the print collection and provide a sense of how the nationwide print revival operated on a local level.
Introduction

This thesis provides an institutional history of the Richmond Printmaking Workshop (RPW), which was in operation from 1978-1991, and gives context to a print collection that was donated to the Joel and Lila Harnett Print Study Center at the University of Richmond Museum. The collection of 253 prints was created by fifty-seven artists working at the RPW.

The RPW was one of the few places in Richmond, outside of the universities, where print artists could meet, discuss their craft, and produce artwork, but its history has not been documented. Primary source documents and interviews with the artists who worked at the RPW are referenced to establish the history of the organization. Indeed, through researching the history of the RPW, the careers of the artists represented in the collection, and the origins of the prints themselves, this thesis demonstrates the historical importance of the RPW to the printmaking community of Richmond. Furthermore, it reveals how the RPW participated in a nationwide resurgence of the print medium that began in the 1960s.

When the RPW dissolved in 1991, its print collection was given to the Hand Workshop Arts Center, now the Visual Arts Center of Richmond. In 2001, the Hand Workshop donated this collection of prints to the Harnett Print Study Center. During the accession process some key information such as dates and artists’ names were not included for some artworks. An additional aspect of this project was to remedy this oversight by filling in the missing data. Though the majority of the RPW collection has not been extensively displayed, the Hand Workshop gift supplemented the university museum’s holdings of works by local artists. Through a
reexamination of the print collection and further research on the RPW, I have improved the accuracy of the object information thus increasing its potential for further exhibition.

This thesis begins in Chapter One with a brief history of the American printmaking scene in the mid-twentieth century, providing important background on the nationwide print resurgence. The descriptions of the print studios and workshops established during this time contextualize the RPW within the larger printmaking scene. Following the history of the overall American printmaking scene, the thesis will provide a short history of the RPW’s formation and its first few years of operation. Chapter Two depicts the next decade of the RPW’s operation after a significant change in mission by describing the staff and artists involved with the print workshop and the programming they offered. The third chapter explores the eventual dissolution of the RPW and the donation of the printmaking collection, first to the Hand Workshop and later to the Harnett Print Study Center, where it remains today. Chapter Four delves into the RPW’s role in Richmond and describes how its distinctive programming and operation by local printmakers were unmatched in the Richmond art scene during the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s. Finally, Chapter Five reviews the literature on American printmaking from the era and compares the RPW with similar, relatively small printmaking workshops. These workshops began around the same time as the RPW and represented the ways in which the print resurgence operated on a local level. The RPW’s significance stems from its participation in this nationwide printmaking revival, along with its role as the only printmaking workshop operating at the time in Richmond.
Chapter One: Printmaking in America and the Beginnings of the Richmond Printmaking Workshop

The RPW was established in May 1978 by artists Nancy David and Gail McKennis to provide Richmond with facilities for printmaking and to establish Richmond’s printmaking scene among the national and international printmaking communities. Its thirteen-year run coincided with a printmaking boom during the 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s during which there was a nationwide movement in the creation of various printmaking workshops and art cooperatives. Printmaking workshops such as the Tamarind Lithography Workshop, Universal Limited Art Editions (ULAE), and Robert Blackburn’s Printmaking Workshop (PMW), were established and there was a tremendous increase in print production throughout the American art scene. In Printmaking in America, Trudy Hansen describes how this “reflected not only new techniques and aesthetic concerns, but also the growing significance of printmaking in the careers of major artists.”¹ The print boom has been partially attributed to changing socioeconomic conditions which increased the affordability of prints for a larger audience and greatly expanded their popularity. An increasing number of artists also became interested in the print medium and took

advantage of its potential for experimentation.\textsuperscript{2} The tremendous increase in the production of prints in the United States from 1960-1990 is known as the “American Print Renaissance.”\textsuperscript{3} ULAE and Tamarind Lithography Workshop served as benchmarks for the explosive growth of print shops throughout the country. ULAE was established in 1957 in West Islip, Long Island, New York, by Tatyana Grosman, wife of the painter Maurice Grosman. Grosman hired Master Printer Robert Blackburn to assist with printing and encouraged artists to try experimenting with lithography, then regarded as an old-fashioned medium. In the early years of ULAE’s existence, the lithography medium was considered to be aesthetically inferior. Grosman struggled to fight this characterization and succeeded in attracting less established artists, including artists in the “second generation” of the New York School such as Jim Dine, Helen Frankenthaler, and Larry Rivers.\textsuperscript{4} Eventually the workshop became known for producing prints and artists’ books. The world-renowned artists who published there include Barnett Newman, Jim Dine, Jasper Johns, and Robert Rauschenberg. Over time, ULAE’s reputation grew and the workshop altered its emphasis on lithography to include intaglio and relief printing, among others.\textsuperscript{5}

Three years after ULAE was founded, June Wayne started Tamarind Lithography Workshop in Los Angeles. Though the two print workshops were among the first group of fine


\textsuperscript{3} Hansen, “Multiple Visions,” 32.

\textsuperscript{4} Hults, \textit{The Print in the Western World}, 802

art print publishers, Tamarind Lithography Workshop differed from ULAE because it was an educational institution whose purpose was to “teach lithography to a new generation of printers before the craft disappeared altogether in this country.”

Wayne’s vision to revive American lithography was ambitious, and together with Associate Director Clinton Adams and Technical Director Garo Antreasian, she developed multiple long-range goals. These goals included creating a pool of master printers in the United States, stimulating the lithography market, and restoring the reputation of the medium. Master printers are highly skilled printers who work closely with artists to produce editions of their work. Tamarind was one of the first print workshops in the country to fully break from the printmaking tradition established in Europe. Under the traditional European system of printmaking, a printer trained in the medium would carry out the artist’s instruction. Newer American printmaking workshops like Tamarind “encourage[ed] the artists’ hands-on involvement in the techniques in printmaking.”

Printmaking became a collaborative effort between the master printer and artist. Indeed, while printers in Europe served an apprenticeship to become master printers, the students at Tamarind were often recent college graduates with studio experience. Tamarind trained many printers who went on to establish their own workshops including Kenneth Tyler (Gemini G.E.L), Jack Lemon (Landfall Press), and even the RPW’s master printer, David Adamson. Though Adamson surely

---


used techniques gained from his Tamarind experience to help print for the RPW, neither he nor the Richmond workshop ever aspired to train future master printers. The Tamarind Institute was later established in 1970 at the University of New Mexico in Albuquerque to serve as a permanent educational and creative center.10

Robert Blackburn’s Printmaking Workshop (PMW), founded in New York City, was one of the most well-known, non-profit, collaborative workshops operating during the period. Begun in 1956 as a cooperative, it became a non-profit organization in 1971 and served as an educational resource to many individuals and schools throughout the city of New York. Blackburn took the experience he had gained as the first Master Printer for ULAE to his printmaking workshop where he shared it with a larger audience in an attempt to make the knowledge and appreciation of printmaking, as well as the facilities, more accessible.11 The PMW established fellowship programs to reach out to both national and international audiences which helped to spread printmaking workshops in the U.S. and to Morocco, Ghana, South Africa, and Australia.12

Following the examples of ULAE, Tamarind, and the PMW, new print shops like the RPW opened during the 1970s and throughout the 1980s. According to scholar Trudy Hansen, by the early 1990s, there were more than three hundred printmaking workshops, presses, and


independent printers in America. Many of these print shops had their own area of expertise, e.g., lithography at Gemini G.E.L. (Los Angeles) and Landfall Press (Chicago), intaglio printing at Crown Point Press (San Francisco). Other printmaking workshops, such as the RPW, offered a range of print processes.

The RPW emerged during this prosperous period for American printmaking when numerous other printmaking workshops were being created, but it was the only printmaking shop of its kind in the Central Virginia area. Indeed, its character and operation on a local level varied greatly from these larger, well-known presses. As a relatively small organization, it was not as commercial as some of the larger presses that printed editions from eminent artists for publishers and dealers. The RPW catered largely to the local printmaking community and art scene of Richmond. It helped a group of local printmakers form their own artistic community where they had a place to print, share their work, and discuss various printmaking techniques.

In the summer of 1977, artists Nancy David and Gail McKennis dreamed of a space that would attract experienced printmakers, give artists working in other mediums a chance to try printmaking, and give people who had some experience with the medium a place to practice their new skills. This dream became a reality in May 1978 when the Richmond Printmaking Workshop opened its doors in downtown Richmond. The workshop was established in the 1,700-square-foot first floor of a former funeral home on 1529 West Cary Street that was owned by

---


Nancy and her husband John David. It was launched with $13,000 in grants from the Virginia Commission for the Arts which included a $6,000 grant for a master printer.¹⁵

Co-founders David and McKennis both received their Bachelors of Fine Arts, and McKennis her Masters of Fine Arts, at Virginia Commonwealth University School of the Arts. David’s art career started relatively late as she earned her degree in Painting and Printmaking in 1971 while in her forties with three children at home.¹⁶ Before establishing the RPW, the Milwaukee native assisted Virginia artist Marilyn Bevilaqua and taught printmaking workshops at the Virginia Museum of Fine Arts (VMFA).¹⁷ She realized that access to print presses was extremely limited for printmakers in Richmond. The only presses available were at Virginia Commonwealth University (VCU) and the Virginia Museum of Fine Arts—both of which were only available to students. This awareness of the lack of facilities led her to form the RPW with Gail McKennis.¹⁸

McKennis was also very conscious of Richmond’s need for an additional printmaking facility. She established what could be considered the first incarnation of the RPW in 1967—the similarly named Richmond Print Workshop. The workshop was founded in a converted pet shop on 308 North Robinson Street in downtown Richmond, with a $1,800 Professional Fellowship Grant that McKennis received from the VMFA. She used the majority of the grant to purchase an


¹⁷ Laura Pharis, VMFA Artist File, VMFA, Richmond.

etching press for $1,650. The Richmond Print Workshop was the first of its kind in Richmond and was utilized by approximately twenty-five Richmond artists, ten of whom regularly worked there during the week. This workshop served as a model for the RPW in its structure, financial support, and role as a cooperative studio for printmakers. Like the system the RPW would later implement, the Richmond Print Workshop had members who paid dues for use of the facilities and patrons who made contributions and, in return, received an etching every year from a portfolio kept by the artists.\textsuperscript{19} The Richmond Print Workshop closed in 1969 for unknown reasons,\textsuperscript{20} and McKennis left her job at VCU to move to North Carolina to teach printmaking at the University of North Carolina in Wilmington for two years. After teaching in North Carolina, she moved to London to study color etching at the Royal College of Art. She returned to Richmond in 1973 and opened Scott-McKennis Fine Art at 3465 West Cary Street. The gallery specialized in contemporary prints and photographs.\textsuperscript{21}

McKennis’s experience in establishing and running two art organizations helped her form the RPW in 1978. Co-founders McKennis and David envisioned their workshop as a connection between Richmond and the world of international printmaking. Their goal for the workshop was to have notable artists come to Richmond to create editions alongside the master printer, much

\textsuperscript{19} “Artists Join Forces Here to Break into Print,” \textit{Richmond News Leader}, October, 9, 1968.

\textsuperscript{20} Through my research, I was unable to determine the reason for the closure of the Richmond Print Workshop. Most members of the RPW I interviewed did not even know of the existence of this earlier workshop and Gail McKennis passed away on June 7, 1996. I speculate that the closure of the Richmond Print Workshop and her subsequent move to North Carolina might have resulted from her realization that because there were no tenured female faculty members in the VCU School of the Arts, it was a dead end for her teaching career. Author Robert Merritt mentioned this detail about McKennis’s professional aspirations at VCU in his article about Scott-McKennis Fine Art, “Gallery Took its Own Course,” for the \textit{Richmond Times Dispatch} on September 23, 1979.

like another well-known press of the time, ULAE.\textsuperscript{22} To fulfill this vision, David and McKennis appointed David Adamson, a printmaker from England, to come to Richmond to be the RPW’s master printer. As master printer, he was to work closely with artists to print editions of their work. Printmaking can be a technical and arduous activity that many artists prefer to hire master printers to help with the edition process. During this process, the professionally-trained master printer physically prints sets of the work designed by the artist. David and McKennis envisioned artists collaborating with Adamson to print lithography prints in editions of less than one hundred. The RPW supported Adamson in this role.

Born in Country Durham, England, Adamson was a young, emerging printer having graduated with his master’s degree from Slade School of Fine Art in London in 1974. Following his graduation, a Fulbright Travel Scholarship brought him to the United States for a teaching assistantship with the eminent printmaker Garo Z. Antreasian at the Tamarind Institute. After his Fulbright experience he worked for London’s Petersburg Press where he printed for artists Henry Moore, David Hockney, and many others.\textsuperscript{23} Adamson taught at two of the most important art schools in London, the Central School of Art and Design and Saint Martins School of Art. He organized the printmaking and reprographic departments at both schools.\textsuperscript{24} His experience and connections with the printmaking community were essential to David’s and McKennis’s vision for the RPW.

\textsuperscript{22} Merritt, “Printmaking Workshop Turns New Leaf for Brighter Future.”


\textsuperscript{24} Thompson, “A New Boost for Art in the Southeast.”
Artist Laura Pharis also became involved with the workshop in its early stages. Pharis, a Roanoke, Virginia native, graduated from VCU with a BFA in Painting and Printmaking in 1970. After receiving an advanced studies diploma in printmaking at the Central School of Art and Design, she returned to Richmond in 1977.\textsuperscript{25} She soon became associated with McKennis and worked at her gallery. McKennis also let Pharis use her print press in her personal studio. When the RPW opened, Pharis was hired as the Technical Assistant. Pharis had previously become acquainted with Adamson while he taught lithography at the Central School of Art and Design while she herself was a student. Though she never took a course with him, Adamson knew she lived in Richmond and asked to stay with her while he looked for an apartment when he first arrived in the country.\textsuperscript{26}

With Master Printer David Adamson, Co-Directors Nancy David and Gail McKennis, and Technical Assistant Laura Pharis, the RPW opened as a non-profit workshop devoted to lithography and etching.\textsuperscript{27} In its initial years, the workshop offered three main services. The first was a facility rental program for artists with experience and proficiency in printmaking who could benefit from occasional technical assistance. Artists paid a sum of eight dollars per day or thirty dollars per month for use of the facilities which were open from 7 am to 10 pm every day of the week. Renters were granted access to the large Brand printing press and other studio equipment including solvents, blotters, acids, newsprint, and other supplies furnished by the

\textsuperscript{25} Laura Pharis, VMFA Artist File, VMFA, Richmond.

\textsuperscript{26} Laura Pharis, telephone interview by author, Richmond, VA, August 16, 2013.

\textsuperscript{27} The RPW was granted temporary non-profit status in 1978 from the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) but it was not until June 3, 1980 that it was granted officially after the organization proved they met the necessary requirements. ("Grant Proposal," Greater Richmond Community Foundation, Fall 1989)
RPW. They would, however, be expected to provide their own papers, ink, plates, and hand tools.\textsuperscript{28} By the beginning of 1979, there were approximately a dozen artists renting the facility.\textsuperscript{29}

The second service offered by the RPW was a custom printing program through which an artist could work closely with Adamson to create an edition of prints. This service was for artists who worked and proofed their plates but found the editioning process too demanding. The RPW started a print archive by requesting a print from everyone who produced an edition there. Many of these prints ended up in the Hand Workshop gift of the RPW collection.

Finally, the RPW offered workshops to those who had a background in printmaking.\textsuperscript{30} An RPW flyer listing the workshops for the summer of 1978 names various classes including “Advanced Techniques in Lithography,” “Mezzotint for Artists,” and “Etching for Artists,” specifying how it catered to artists familiar with the medium rather than the general public. During the first few years of its operation, the RPW hosted visiting artists to teach various workshops. One of the first visiting artists was Martin Axon, who introduced a course on platinum printing in August 1978.\textsuperscript{31}

When the RPW opened, it became the first non-school-affiliated spaces in the city that provided studio space, printing equipment, and technical advice from a master printer. Printmakers without their own equipment or university connection benefitted from the use of the Brand etching press, Chandler letterpress for wood engravings and woodcuts, darkroom, and

\textsuperscript{28} Flyer, VMFA Richmond Printmaking Workshop File, VMFA, Richmond.


\textsuperscript{30} “No place to print?” \textit{Federated Arts Council Newsletter}, October 1978.

\textsuperscript{31} Flyer, VMFA Richmond Printmaking Workshop File, VMFA, Richmond.
space for papermaking and hand bookbinding that the RPW provided.\textsuperscript{32} Printmaking equipment was prohibitively expensive for most artists, with a home etching workshop costing around $6,000 at the time, while a home lithographic workshop cost as much as $14,000. Additional costs came from having to create adequate ventilation systems and housing the presses on the required concrete flooring.\textsuperscript{33}

The RPW was intended first and foremost as a place for artists knowledgeable about the print medium. Its goal was not to provide studio art experience to beginners, but to assist artists with their own printmaking and to print editions for those willing to pay. The services that the RPW provided were unmatched in the Richmond area, and it was through provisions such as rental and supply fees that its founders hoped to maintain the RPW as a self-sufficient organization. Thus, the RPW was formed to support the printmaking community of Richmond and announce its presence to the much larger national and international community.


\textsuperscript{33} Proctor, “Workshop Planning Print Club.”
Chapter Two: Revised Mission of the RPW

Nancy David and Gail McKennis had high expectations for the RPW. However, their original vision for the workshop did not develop the way they expected. Their conception of the RPW as a place for well-known artists from all over the world to come, create prints with the master printer, and expose the Richmond community to the world of printmaking never materialized. Though Adamson did create editions for a number of artists, the RPW had limited success in attracting international artists. It also had limited involvement within the artistic community and among art appreciators of Richmond. One of the biggest changes to the organization came when Adamson left the RPW to form his own lithography studio in Shockoe Slip.

He turned in his resignation July 1, 1980, in a move that surprised many of the members and staff of the RPW. Adamson’s unexpected departure led many members to conclude that his resignation correlated with his recent procurement of the Green Card that David and McKennis helped him acquire. Laura Pharis described the quandary in which this put the workshop and how everyone thought, “Oh no, Chicken Little was right, the sky is falling.” Adamson had helped run the RPW since its foundation and his edition services had been a substantial part of its operation. A news article described how Adamson “took the lithographic expertise with him and

---

34 Pharis, interview; Mary Holland, interview by author, Richmond, VA, November 8, 2012.
left the workshop at a temporary loss.” Adamson opened Atlantic Editions in Richmond but left after only a year to work in Washington, D.C. His studio in D.C. would go on to become one of the first digital print studios in the country. Ultimately, the staff of the RPW was left without a master printer and forced to reevaluate the purpose of the workshop.

Faced with this new reality, Pharis, the former technical assistant, took over as general manager of the RPW. McKennis had become less involved with the workshop over the years, focusing instead on her gallery. She left when she got married in the early eighties and moved away from Richmond. David became Chairman of the Board of Directors and frequently volunteered at the workshop where she gave Pharis free rein to manage. Under Pharis’s management, the organization developed a new outlook and philosophy concentrating on local community involvement. She wanted to increase the RPW’s role “as a facility serving the artists, art appreciators and students of Virginia.” Pharis described the mission change as informal. She noted that the changes she made were to adapt the workshop to the present needs of its members to keep the workshop going. After reevaluating the needs of the organization, she decided that providing editioning services would no longer be a priority. Her justification was that having


36 Adamson realized that the majority of artists he was editioning for lived in Washington, D.C. Thus, it made sense for him to be centrally located. In D.C. he printed for artists like Kevin MacDonald, James Sundquist, Gene Davis, and Andrew Hudson while also operating a gallery with his wife. (Ken Oda, “David Adamson: On Launching and all-digital Printmaking Studio,” www.koanart.com/david.html (accessed October 5, 2001). VMFA Artist File, VMFA, Richmond)

37 Merritt, “Printmaking Workshop Turns New Leaf for Brighter Future.”

38 Pharis, interview.

39 Merritt, “Printmaking Workshop Turns New Leaf for Brighter Future.”
someone continually editioning prints occupies the press, making it unavailable for renters. Rather than compete with larger, more well-established printmaking workshops for artists’ involvement, Pharis thought the RPW would better serve Richmond if it worked to strengthen its own small printmaking community. She thought it was more crucial to appeal to the needs of regional artists than to attract well-known artists from around the world to create editions of their work. With this in mind, she focused on organizing additional classes for the upcoming fall of 1980.

The workshop became a place where printmakers could print for themselves and a center for classes in different types of printmaking and other art disciplines.40 Well-known local artists including Jack Glover and Willie Anne Wright led workshop series in woodcutting and pinhole photography as the RPW reached out to both professional and amateur artists. The RPW also offered classes in life drawing and papermaking.

To further achieve their goal of becoming more involved in the Richmond community, Pharis and the RPW’s members expanded its Board of Directors to include Gerry Donato, a painting professor at VCU; Cynthia Schaal, the director of the local Hand Workshop from 1979-80; and Joe Seipel, former Chair of the VCU Sculpture Department and current Dean of the VCU School of the Arts. The board expanded to include artists, collectors, and art administrators, as well as business and professional people. Pharis described these changes as a way for the RPW to “do just what [the] Richmond and Virginia art communities need[ed] . . . [by] . . . remain[ing] flexible enough to respond to needs wherever they develop[ed].”41

40 Proctor, “A Party in the Etching Room.”

41 Merritt, “Printmaking Workshop Turns New Leaf for Brighter Future.”
The workshop settled into its new role as a studio facility for regional independent printmakers as well as an educational institution. The Virginia Commission for the Arts (VCA), the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA), the Greater Richmond Community Foundation, and other private foundations, corporations, as well as membership and fees from the workshops and studio rental provided the financial support for the RPW. This funding helped to support the RPW’s annual budget which remained at approximately $20,000 during its operation.

Renters of the RPW’s facilities contributed about half of the income of the organization. Rental rates for members remained minimal from thirty dollars per month during the first few years to only thirty-six dollars per month a decade later. This rent supported artists’ use of the workshop’s equipment for etching, mezzotint, drypoint, engraving, wood engraving, relief printing, book binding, and papermaking.

Besides the income generated from rent, the RPW earned income from a program called the Print Club where patrons paid a yearly fee to support the workshop. The Print Club was established in 1979 to “serve the public’s interest in fine prints, and to provide an annual source of operating revenue,” according to an early flyer. The RPW staff was confident that the workshop’s facilities would sustain the interest of printmakers, so they focused on creating interest in the connoisseurship of prints among the general public. By educating people about printmaking, they could stimulate appeal in the medium and create a market for their prints.

The Print Club had several categories of membership—from Associate ($25-100 per year) to

---

42 Flyer, VMFA Richmond Printmaking Workshop File, VMFA, Richmond.
43 Proctor, “A Party in the Etching Room.”
44 Flyer, VMFA Richmond Printmaking Workshop File, VMFA, Richmond.
45 Proctor, “Workshop Planning Print Club.”
Angel ($1,000 or more per year). Members of the Print Club received a quarterly magazine with information on classes and art events, articles on printmaking, and invitations to special events sponsored by the RPW. Print Club members were also invited to attend an average of six meetings a year. Examples of these meetings and special events held for members are outlined in a news article from 1981. In the May meeting of that year, artist Bruce Schnabel of the New York Center for Book Art and the Meadow Bindery discussed traditional and experimental approaches to fine binding. A second meeting included a talk by paper conservator John Field to discuss the care and handling of fine prints. Another meeting involved a screening of a BBC documentary about Norman Ackroyd, a well-known British printmaker who produced prints at the RPW in 1979. These meetings took place on Sundays and provided a place for the artists to discuss techniques and meet with other artists and art appreciators spanning many different fields. These Print Club meetings gave members a chance to socialize over cheese and wine and bond over one of their passions—printmaking.

Higher level contributors received an original limited edition Patron’s Print. Every year one or two well-known local printmakers were selected to produce a Patron Print. Some of these Patron’s Prints can be found in the Hand Workshop donation of the RPW collection at the

__________________________

46 Flyer, VMFA Richmond Printmaking Workshop File, VMFA, Richmond.


48 Flyer, VMFA Richmond Printmaking Workshop File, VMFA, Richmond.

49 Pharis, interview.

50 This price fluctuated from $50 annually in 1982 to $150 in 1989 (Flyers, VMFA Richmond Printmaking Workshop File, VMFA, Richmond.)
University of Richmond. A print by renowned artist Norman Ackroyd, *Strathmore Sunset*, was the first print created for the program and is represented in this collection. Ackroyd studied under Julian Trevelyan and later lived for several years in the United States. He was elected to the Royal Academy of Art in 1988 and in 2007 was made Commander of the Most Excellent Order of the British Empire (CBE) for services to Engraving and Printing. Additional artists who provided a Patron Print include Ann Chenoweth, Gerald Donato, Stephen Fisher, David Freed, Walter Garde, Michael Harrison, Laura Pharis, Barbara Tisserat, Ruth Bolduan, Willow Winston, Nancy Witt, and Willie Anne Wright. Though prints from these artists are included in the RPW collection donated by the Hand Workshop, it is unclear whether or not these particular prints were the selected Patron’s Prints.

Another essential activity of the RPW was the creation of print portfolios. The printmakers assembled portfolios that were sold to increase awareness and raise money for the RPW’s collection. One of the largest portfolios in the early years of the RPW was the *Virginia Artists Portfolio*. This portfolio project, unveiled in 1980, was intended to serve as an introduction of the newly reorganized workshop to the Virginia public. The National Endowment for the Arts and the Virginia Commission for the Arts provided grants that funded the portfolio. The RPW invited well-known Virginia painters and sculptors to participate in creating collaborative portfolios while working alongside professional printmakers. Fifteen artists were selected to make editions of either lithographic or intaglio prints with the help of the RPW staff.

---


52 Flyer, VMFA Richmond Printmaking Workshop File, VMFA, Richmond.

53 Flyer, VMFA Richmond Printmaking Workshop File, VMFA, Richmond.
Each artist created one image on a plate or stone with the assistance of RPW staff members who then supervised the printing.\textsuperscript{54} The RPW intended to generate interest in printmaking by demonstrating the creative possibilities of the medium. The portfolio, and the publicity that came with it, helped to solidify their role in the state art community as an educational institution as well as a printmaking facility for experienced printmakers and novices. Ten of the works created for this portfolio are included in the University of Richmond collection including A.B. Jackson’s \textit{Circle of Friends} (1980), Willie Ann Wright’s \textit{Bird of Paradise} (1980), James Wall’s \textit{Glade} (1980), and Joan Pienkowski’s \textit{My Magical Hat} (no date). The \textit{Virginia Artists Portfolio} was exhibited at the Virginia Museum of Fine Arts from November 17\textsuperscript{th} to December 31\textsuperscript{st}, 1980 and across the state, including Longwood College’s Bedford Gallery in early 1982.\textsuperscript{55}

Other portfolios developed at the RPW include the \textit{Landscape Portfolio}, \textit{Unwritten History Portfolio}, and \textit{Edgar Allen Poe Portfolio}. The \textit{Unwritten History Portfolio} was inspired by Margaret Gibson, a poet who was a visiting artist at VCU at the time. RPW members created portfolio prints inspired by her apocalyptic poem “Unwritten History.” With the help of RPW members, Gibson created \textit{Titlepage}, a print of her poem to serve as the title page for the portfolio.\textsuperscript{56} Three copies of Gibson’s print and the rest of the portfolio are part of the University of Richmond collection.

The RPW organized several annual group exhibitions which were displayed in venues across Virginia and around the country. Many of these were organized by the ONE/OFF group of
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Richmond printmakers sponsored by the RPW. Members of the RPW helped form ONE/OFF in 1983 with an original membership of a dozen artists. ONE/OFF’s initial idea was to bring artists together into the workshop and assemble exhibitions. Many of the artists were professors or alumni of VCU. The group of Virginia-based artists represented a wide range of technical and aesthetic approaches and held meetings at the RPW. Their first exhibition, one of many, was held in 1983 at the Reynolds Minor Gallery, then located on Franklin Street in downtown Richmond.57

Another one of the changes to the RPW in the early 1980s was the expansion of classes offered by the staff. The RPW offered weekday workshops and weekday classes that typically ran in six-week sessions. Pharis expanded the RPW’s offerings to include figure drawing, monotype printing, collographs, pinhole photography, paper marbling, papermaking, and more.58 Opportunities frequently arose for impromptu classes when friends of RPW members and artists visiting the area would come to the RPW and teach workshops.59 Pharis recalled a time when Bruce Schnabel from the Center for Book Arts in New York showed up one day and asked if they wanted someone to teach a course in book art. His offer was enthusiastically accepted and the RPW offered its first course in book art.60 The RPW typically had six to nine different classes per season with approximately four to twelve participants in each.61 The cost of classes covered
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tuition and use of the facilities. They were taught by members of the RPW, staff, and artists whose areas of expertise were in mediums besides printmaking.\textsuperscript{62}

During this period, 1981 to 1991, the RPW established itself as a studio facility for printmakers and as an educational institution. Manager Laura Pharis was described as running the studio efficiently by keeping the studio clean and organized and maintaining a professional atmosphere.\textsuperscript{63} The studio had separate areas for the presses, acid vats, and other equipment. When fellow printmaker and RPW member Willie Anne Wright suggested that Pharis get her Master’s Degree if she wanted to continue to teach, Pharis agreed and left the RPW in the mid-eighties to get her MFA at the University of Wisconsin.\textsuperscript{64} Mary Holland took over Pharis’s position in September 1985. Like many of the other RPW members, Holland had recently received her MFA in printmaking from VCU.

Holland ran the workshop for the next four years. She respected the RPW as a place “to support the making of contemporary art through the mediums of printmaking and papermaking, and to provide the public with the opportunity to learn about and contribute to that art.”\textsuperscript{65} She expanded the increasingly popular papermaking facilities and returned lithography to the workshop. Former RPW member and current Associate Professor in Painting and Printmaking at VCU, Barbara Tisserat, recalls how Holland was an excellent administrator. She described her as having the perfect temperament for the position: patient, good with people, and not easily flustered. Tisserat stated that if Mary Holland had not kept the RPW running so smoothly, it
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most likely would have closed earlier than it did. Holland was an effective fundraiser and a knowledgeable grant writer. After Holland left to become Director of the Virginia Museum’s Studio School, Deborah Roth took over and remained the director for the next two years.

Roth became director of the RPW in 1989 shortly after graduating with her MFA from VCU. She had heard about the workshop through her professors David Freed and Barbara Tisserat who were RPW members. When she arrived at the RPW, the day-to-day operation and programs were running fairly smoothly and the organization was still earning income on a portfolio they produced in the late 1980s. She was optimistic about the RPW and full of new ideas. During her tenure, the RPW produced two additional portfolios. The organization also received a grant for a lithography press which they intended to use for edition services.

The change of emphasis in the RPW after David Adamson left ended up serving the RPW well. It gained distinction as a place for VCU alumni, printmaking professionals, and amateurs to create unique, innovative prints. Through its Print Club, lectures, and workshops, the RPW also succeeded in educating amateur artists and art enthusiasts of Richmond about the art of printmaking. It is these two roles that distinguished the RPW from other art organizations of the time in Richmond.
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Chapter Three: Dissolution of the RPW and Donation of the Print Collection

The RPW played a prominent role in the Richmond arts community for over a decade and served as the only public facility with access to printmaking equipment beyond the universities. Regrettably, this was not enough to sustain the arts organization, and it closed its doors in late 1991. Due to a gradual financial decline and lack of strong management, the workshop became unsustainable and was dissolved thirteen years after it was established.

Financial issues were the main reason for the decline of the workshop. Funding and budget cuts, along with an overall decline in the print market during its last few years of operation, led to its dire financial situation. The RPW received funding from the Virginia Commission for the Arts (VCA), the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA), the Greater Richmond Community Foundation, and other private foundations and corporations. Due to the dependence of the RPW’s operating budget on financial support from these organizations, general funding cuts impacted it greatly.68

In 1991, the VCA coped with a 70% budget cut by the state due to a decline in state revenue. Virginia Governor Doug Wilder proposed complete elimination of state funding for the arts and the elimination of the VCA as a separate agency. His proposal requested the transfer of the VCA’s work to one staff member at the Virginia Museum of Fine Arts.69 In response to this intended plan, the NEA warned the state government that this would affect their federal funding.

68 Roth, e-mail.

The state also faced strong opposition to the proposed cuts among art supporters and art organizations. Though the budget was eventually cut to $1.5 million, the administration withdrew the proposal to abolish the VCA. Unfortunately, the reduced budget had a devastating effect on the arts throughout the state and caused the demise of many small arts organizations and new programs. In 1979, the state of Virginia had ranked 18th among states in per capita appropriations for state arts commissions, however, by 1992, it ranked 47th.

According to the RPW’s Board Minutes from March of 1991, the RPW received half of the funding it had received the previous fiscal year. The VCA had always supported the RPW and helped pay the Director’s salary so these cuts had dire consequences. Most positions at the RPW became volunteer at this point. The operation of the RPW was challenging without having people in the workshop managing the day-to-day business. Nonetheless, many of the members attempted to alleviate the RPW’s financial stress. A “peril letter” was sent out asking for funding. Deborah Roth offered to do a minimal amount of administrative work for no pay if that would keep the doors open. The RPW also decided to concentrate on media coverage rather than printing and mailing flyers as postage had gone up. It saved costs by skipping the summer newsletter that year. The RPW also started an Artist Membership category for fifty dollars annually. These members would be able to give input into RPW projects and events, and have opportunities to exhibit. During the past few years, there had been waning interest in the
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organization by non-RPW members so it was hoped that the creation of this membership category would attract more local artists and increase class participation.\(^{73}\)

Unfortunately, these changes barely impacted the RPW’s financial status and the director’s salary was not paid in April. Roth continued to provide administrative support without compensation for the next four months.\(^{74}\) The peril letter they had sent out in March yielded a little over $1,000 and Roth reported the RPW had almost 100% Board participation in monetary giving that year.\(^ {75}\) However, with the funding cuts and declining interest in the organization, these efforts were not enough. Former Director Mary Holland had always concentrated on the fundraising efforts of the RPW. Roth, however, was not as skillful of a fundraiser. She was not from Virginia originally so she did not know as many people in the area. Though Roth has said she considered herself successful in promoting the classes, facility rental, and grant applications for the RPW, she found it difficult to obtain big donor support. Roth continued to seek funding for the RPW but she “felt that there was very little Board collaboration and support in coming up with a solution for moving forward.”\(^ {76}\) Eventually, Roth left the RPW in August 1991 when her husband was accepted into a graduate program in Pennsylvania.\(^ {77}\)

Despite the RPW’s various sources of income (membership, fees from the classes and workshops, and studio rental), the workshop did not have an effective business model. The RPW, like many print workshops, had always been artist-led. It was difficult for the artists to balance
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the management of the print presses, the marketing of the prints, and the creation of their own artwork. Furthermore, the RPW could never rely on a specific number of printers renting the facility or taking classes, and private financial support from the Print Club was unpredictable. Building owner John David had occasionally reprieved the RPW of their monthly rent to give them some respite from their difficult financial situation. Eventually though, he was unable to waive the rent, and it became financially impossible to continue at the location on West Cary Street. The RPW could no longer pay its rent and was forced to dissolve. The irregularity of private financial support, fluctuations in governmental funding of the arts, and the difficulties inherent in managing a small non-profit organization all led to RPW’s dissolution.

The late 1980s had marked the apex of the print boom. Prices for new prints were at an all-time high, and prints at auction sold for exorbitant prices. However, the market for prints saw a sharp decrease in the 1990s and production declines. As the economic recession was affecting more and more of the country, people were less able to spend money on nonessential luxuries like art. Publishers and dealers had to cut back on the price and number of editions published. Though the economic recession especially affected the larger print presses, scholar David Mickenberg describes how this depression of the print market was also hard on smaller print shops like the RPW. Indeed, according to Roth, by 1990 it seemed that interest in the RPW had waned. Though the core group of printmakers remained, it was difficult to fill the workshops and
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classes. The printmakers also found it challenging to sell their prints. The difficulties resulting from the print market decline and funding cuts resulted in the closure of many printmaking workshops across the country.

After its closure in late 1991, the assets of the RPW, including the collection of prints, financial records, and printmaking equipment, were given to the Hand Workshop. The Hand Workshop was founded in 1963, changed its name to Visual Arts Center in 2005, and continues to serve Richmond as a place for members of the community to create art, exhibit, and teach art to children. Paula Owen, who had occasionally worked at the RPW, was the director of the Hand Workshop at the time. She had contributed a print as part of the 1986 RPW Print Exchange where artists made editions of their prints and swapped them with each other. She recalled how “[she] was invited to make a print and this was something that the print workshop did to remind artists of how wondrous the printmaking process is and enliven the printmaking workshop.”

Owen thought that because the RPW and the Hand Workshop had similar missions and audiences, and because the Hand Workshop did not have printmaking facilities, it seemed natural that they would merge. The Hand Workshop was acquiring added space in the building at 1812 West Main where the equipment could go, so the merger would make it possible for the RPW to continue operating. It was clearly more efficient from an administrative point of view: one staff,
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one board, and a single publication rather than two.\(^{85}\) Former director Deborah Roth was glad the equipment had been moved to the Hand Workshop, because, since printmaking is a very specialized area of visual arts, it seemed practical to incorporate it into a larger, more successful organization. Roth thought the Hand Workshop was a good choice because of the variety of mediums and instruction it provided, it appealed to a much larger audience.\(^{86}\)

Artist Barbara Tisserat worked with Owen to arrange the transfer of the works and equipment to the Hand Workshop.\(^{87}\) Members of the RPW were initially optimistic that they could continue working in the Hand Workshop which would function as a rental space. However, the space the Hand Workshop provided did not have adequate ventilation—an issue with which printmakers were beginning to become more aware. Many forms of printmaking involve the use of acids, inks, solvents, and various other chemicals that can be harmful as upper respiratory, mucous membrane, and dermatologic irritants. Some of these irritants include organic or inorganic etching acids, alkali, hydrofluoric acid, nitric acid, lead, and magnesium.\(^{88}\) Thus, the studio where printmakers work with these harmful chemicals needs to be well-ventilated to remove toxic fumes from the space and reduce the health concerns of the process.\(^{89}\) The RPW members did not want to be held liable for renting a facility space where people might become sick. VCU alumus and ONE/OFF member Warren Corrado attempted to remedy the
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situation. He contacted financial backers and arranged a money matching situation for any funding that the RPW members could raise to pay for renovations to the Hand Workshop’s ventilation system. Unfortunately, the Hand Workshop’s Board was already considering a large renovation and did not want to put money into something that would be changed shortly. The ventilation issue ended up becoming insurmountable for the RPW and the members began moving on and finding other places to rent.90 After thirteen years of operation within the Richmond art scene, the RPW was no more.

In 2000 and 2001, the RPW print collection held by the Hand Workshop was divided and donated to the Harnett Print Study Center at University of Richmond and the Anderson Gallery at Virginia Commonwealth University. What began as a small archive of prints collected from artists’ editions during the first few years of the RPW’s operation had grown to include approximately six hundred prints by the time the workshop dissolved. The prints range over the lifespan of the workshop and demonstrate a wide variety of techniques in the print medium such as etching, aquatint, lithography, linocut, and woodcut. The prints come from the artists who created editions during the RPW’s early years, the Patron’s Prints from the Print Club, and the print portfolios assembled there. The remaining works in the collection were left at the RPW and never claimed, though Tisserat tried her best to track artists down and return their work. Thus, the collection can be seen as a reflection of the activities of the workshop during its thirteen-year operation. Nevertheless, the Hand Workshop was not a collecting institution and it did not have adequate storage facilities to house the prints. The steward of the workshop’s collection, Ashley Kistler, the curator of the Hand Workshop from 1999 to 2008, actively sought to guide the donation of the print collection to more suitable institutions. In an interview she described this as

90 Tisserat, interview.
her primary motivation for finding a new home for the collection which had come to the Hand Workshop before she was hired.91
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Chapter Four: Local Significance of the RPW

The expansiveness and variety of the 253 prints in the Hand Workshop gift of the RPW collection represent the workshop’s role as a “facility serving the artists, art appreciators and students of Virginia.”92 In its thirteen years of operation, the RPW served this important role in the art scene of Richmond. The workshop fulfilled, as co-founder Gail McKennis originally envisioned, “a definite need both for teaching and rental.”93 The significance of the RPW on a local level can be understood within several contexts. The RPW influenced both the professional and artistic development of the artists involved and enabled them to form an inclusive printmaking community. It also was important to the city of Richmond as it was one of the first studios of its kind to offer facilities and classes in printmaking. Though many members of the workshop were professional printmakers, the RPW also attracted amateurs interested in learning about the medium. The RPW’s model of supporting the production of contemporary prints and engaging the public through workshops, lectures, and exhibitions has since been imitated by Studio Two Three, a printmaking organization currently operating in the city. Finally, the RPW’s continued impact on Richmond’s art scene is evident through the ONE/OFF printmaking group that was founded at the RPW and has remained in existence for thirty years.

One of the RPW’s lasting legacies is its formation of a distinctive printmaking community that impacted the professional and artistic development of the artists who had the
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opportunity to work there. Many artists came to the RPW after they graduated, early in their artistic careers. The majority of them, including co-founders Nancy David and Gail McKennis, graduated from VCU with degrees in printmaking. After graduation many soon realized that they no longer had anywhere to continue developing their printmaking unless they were fortunate enough to teach at VCU or the Virginia Museum, or own their own presses. In addition to the loss of facility access for printmaking, many former RPW members mentioned how, after spending so much of their time immersed in an academic community with artistic peers, they felt at a loss after graduation.\textsuperscript{94} Many were used to the cooperation and companionship from fellow classmates. The RPW became a place for them to come together and discuss various printmaking techniques and the projects they were working on. Since many were young artists, they had yet to develop an extensive body of work and were more flexible and open to new ideas and techniques.

Artist Dennis Winston described how he enjoyed working at the RPW because it was almost like a support group. He recalled how nice it was to be around others with similar interests—“people of like mind.”\textsuperscript{95} Though Winston’s primary medium is woodblock printing, a technique that does not require a printing press, he often came to the RPW to discuss new ideas with fellow printmakers and have a good time. He had also hoped to get back into etching so access to the equipment was an advantage. Similarly, many artists used their time at the RPW to explore techniques and mediums they were unfamiliar with or wanted to study in-depth. Barbara Tisserat, who worked at VCU while she was a member of the RPW, described how the RPW provided a venue to try new techniques in a private setting. Though she had access to work in the
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VCU classrooms whenever she liked, she found that she needed a more private studio where she could concentrate. The facilities at the RPW provided her with a studio that she was not directly responsible for and where she would not be continually asked questions by inquisitive students.  

Like Winston, Tisserat gained a sense of kinship at the RPW. The workshop was a place that reinforced her beliefs and where, as she put it, “people appreciated the nuances of print that not everyone would know.”

While at the RPW, printmakers found themselves surrounded by fellow artists who understood the subtleties of printmaking. The printmakers frequently worked together and shared presses and inks. Nancy David noted that “part of the idea of a workshop is that you are fairly cooperative with one another.” Indeed, the community they formed did not end at the door. Many of the artists worked together and then would “have lunch each day at Border Café with people from VCU.” In general, as Dennis Winston remarked, “being a part of [the RPW] was very enlightening and inclusive.” Laura Pharis revealed that being a member and manager of the RPW was the most fun she ever had. She lamented the loss of what she described as a “café society” when she moved to Wisconsin for graduate school. As for her position, she described it as a labor of love and an important time both for her artistic career, and for the other artists.
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The RPW did not simply affect the individuals involved, but also the art scene of Richmond as a whole. Not only was it one of the earlier art organizations in the city, but it was one of the first organizations in Richmond to cater exclusively to printmakers. The RPW was formed during a crucial time for non-profit art organizations in the city. According to Adrienne G. Hines, former Executive Director of the Arts Council of Richmond, “[the city] began to see sustained growth of arts organizations”\textsuperscript{102} in the mid-seventies. The Hand Workshop, where the RPW collection was eventually donated, had been going strong for over a decade and had just moved to a new location at 5-7 N. Sixth Street in downtown Richmond in what one newspaper article called “a first step in the development of a major arts center.”\textsuperscript{103} 1708 East Main, now 1708 Gallery, was also established mere months after the RPW in September 1978. The gallery was established as an alternative space by a group of artists whose mission was “to fill the gap between what museums and commercial galleries are willing or able to do for contemporary art and what the artists themselves need and the public domain deserves to see.”\textsuperscript{104} Another organization, the Reynolds Minor Gallery, now the Reynolds Gallery, was founded in 1980. Owner Beverly Reynolds had started the gallery out of her home in 1976 but did not move to a public space until 1980. Reynolds Gallery, which doubled in size in 2004, remains an important art organization in the city.\textsuperscript{105} Finally, the creation of the Institute of Contemporary Art (ICA) at the VMFA in 1979 added yet another dimension to Richmond’s “increasing awareness of new
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artistic trends”\textsuperscript{106} with an emphasis on audio and video art. The ICA was the museum’s attempt to give space to some of the more experimental activities of the art world. Though all of these new arts organizations broadened Richmond’s artistic awareness, none of them could offer what the RPW did—printmaking facilities and membership in a local printmaking community. Former RPW member, Ann Chenoweth, recalled how 1708 was started by painters and sculptors and that there was always a division with the printmakers. She noted that since 1708 was not serving the needs of printmakers, local print artists like David Freed brought people to the RPW where they were able to exhibit their print work.\textsuperscript{107} The RPW connected the printmakers in the area while engaging the general public by teaching non-artists about the printmaking medium and how to collect. Mary Holland considered the participation and support the RPW received from both of these groups in return to be rare.\textsuperscript{108}

The workshop also served as an inspiration and organizational model for the contemporary Richmond print workshop, Studio Two Three (S23), established in 2008. S23 was originally founded a block away from the former RPW building before it moved to 1617 West Main Street in 2010. The non-profit print studio is devoted to “providing an accessible workspace and engaging the public through workshops, exhibitions, and outreach.”\textsuperscript{109} S23’s founding members, Sarah Watson Moore, Emily Gannon, and Tyler Dawkins, were aware of the RPW’s existence because they were students of Barbara Tisserat at VCU and knew Mary Holland. Current Executive Director Ashley Hawkins described how during the planning stage
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of S23’s creation they met with Holland who shared material from the RPW, including old flyers, board agendas and minutes, and strategic planning documents. They also traveled to several print workshops and communal artist studios such as Zygote Press in Cleveland, Space 1026 in Philadelphia, and Pyramid Atlantic in Maryland, to “see how different variations on the theme of nonprofit print shop functioned to find the formulation that would work best for . . . [them] . . . and for Richmond.”

Serving as the modern incarnation of the RPW, S23 provides facilities for young artists to come together, work on their printmaking, and form their own printmaking community. Like the RPW, S23 offers monthly and hourly facility rentals, courses in printmaking, and organizes print exhibitions. Additionally, it is the only printmaking workshop in Central Virginia that sustains a community of artists similar to the one at the RPW. S23 even utilizes a lithography press that was once at the RPW. The press, which had been sold to the University of Richmond in the early 1980s, was donated to S23 by Tanja Softic, Associate Professor of Art at the university. She was impressed with the new workshop and how it reaches out to schools and other arts organizations. In an interview, she discussed that though many printmaking workshops have existed through the years, the successful ones stay alive by providing more than just facilities; they provide services to communities and make themselves known.

Hawkins described that though the RPW model was initially intimidating to the fledgling S23 organization, it did give them ideas regarding workshops and educational programming as well as fundraising ideas. They particularly looked to the RPW as an example during their quest
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for non-profit status which they achieved in May 2011. They now have over fifteen artist renters and a board of twelve people, including Mary Holland, Barbara Tisserat, and Tanja Softic.\footnote{\textit{``ONE/OFF Printmakers November 2012,''} Studio Two Three, http://studiotwothree.com/one-off-printmakers (accessed March 12, 2013).}

The creators of S23 have also been able to learn from the RPW by analyzing some areas of weakness in its strategic plan. The primary areas of weakness the founders’ perceived were the unrealistically low rent the RPW charged for its printmaking facilities and the RPW’s inability to pay staff as finances declined.\footnote{Hawkins, e-mail.} This knowledge made them mindful of the need to raise funds through individual donations and grants to ensure the studio’s sustainability. Most importantly, the creators of S23 put more emphasis on their Artists in Residence program that earns them enough revenue to pay their operating costs. This makes them less reliant on private financial support and funding from organizations such as the NEA and VCA, two issues that led to the dire financial situation of the RPW.

S23’s creation strengthened Barbara Tisserat’s optimism about opportunities for printmakers in Richmond. When the RPW dissolved, its members had to find new places to work. Ann Chenoweth bought a press, Mary Holland used the equipment at the Virginia Museum where she worked, and Barbara Tisserat continued working at VCU’s facilities. However, Tisserat is encouraged that there is now a place for people, especially recent graduates, to rent. She stated how it has been a long time coming for this opportunity to return.\footnote{Tisserat, interview.}

The RPW’s significance in the community can also be seen in the continued presence of ONE/OFF, the printmaking group formed at the RPW in 1983. Remaining in existence for thirty years, the group continues to organize collective exhibitions and projects. In creating a name for
the group, the artists wanted to emphasize a shared interest in innovative approaches to printmaking, thus the decision to use “one off,” a term designating a unique printed impression. They began with a dozen members and have since expanded to include over twenty-five artists. Admission to the ONE/OFF group is open only by invitation and the membership has changed over the years as people have moved and passed away. ONE/OFF has never had a president and has no official committees. Different members volunteer to head certain projects and exhibitions.\textsuperscript{116} The group originally held meetings at the RPW while it was still in operation but have met at the Studio School at Virginia Museum since its closure. Their success is evident through their organization of more than fifty exhibitions in venues across the world, from local shows to some in England, Scotland, Italy, and Peru.\textsuperscript{117} Most recently the group had a show at Studio Two Three in November 2012, and at the Virginia Museum’s Studio School in March 2013. They have published seven print portfolios over the years, some of which have traveled to statewide institutions through the Virginia Museum’s Statewide Exhibition Program. Their first portfolio was produced in 1986 after several members of the group suggested putting one together. It was intended to educate people about printmaking and included examples of the four major print groups: lithography, relief, intaglio, and screen printing. The edition of twenty-five portfolios was completed in 1987 with partial funding from the Virginia Commission for the Arts.\textsuperscript{118}

Though the RPW has been closed for over twenty years, its significance to the artists who worked there and its effect on the Richmond art community, remain. Its role as a model for
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Studio Two Three and the continuing success of the ONE/OFF printmaking group serve as its legacy. Laura Pharis revealed her thoughts on the influence of the workshop when she said, “[i]t allowed me to keep making prints, to keep learning about making prints and books, and to live a life in art. I was so lucky to have had that opportunity.” Indeed, although the sign out front of 1529 West Cary Street no longer carries their emblem of an octopus and an ink roller rolling out the words “Richmond Printmaking Workshop,” the RPW has made a lasting impression on the art scene and on the artists who were involved.

Laura Pharis, e-mail correspondence, August 21, 2013.
Chapter Five: Significance of the RPW amid the Nationwide Print Revival

Literature on American printmaking from the mid-to late-twentieth century has generally focused on the major print presses and the well-known artists who worked with them. Major printmaking anthologies and exhibition catalogues convey the history of the nationwide print revival by focusing on Tamarind Lithography Workshop, ULAE, and Gemini G.E.L., among others. These principal organizations run by pioneers in the printmaking field like Tatyana Grossman and June Wayne, helped to shape the resurgence of the medium. Their involvement with well-known artists like Dine and Rauschenberg certainly brought further attention to the previously overlooked medium. Tamarind Lithography Workshop established a network of highly skilled master printers and helped revive lithography while ULAE demonstrated the varied use of the medium and helped generate a multitude of skillfully-produced prints and artists’ books.

Scholars such as James Watrous, Susan Tallman, and Linda Hults have further directed the focus of printmaking revival scholarship to concepts of collaboration developed in these large workshops, as well as the techniques of individual renowned artists. Linda Hults argues that the proliferation of print workshops in America reintroduced artists to ideas of collaboration with master printers—a process that, while invented centuries ago and still practiced widely in Europe, never made much of an impression in the country until the 1960s and 1970s.\footnote{Hults, \textit{The Print in the Western World}, 801.} In fact, many scholars discuss this element of “increased acceptance of collaboration as a working
method as an essential part of the print revival. The idea of the individual artist creating work unaided shifted to allow for the acceptance of collaborations between artists like Jasper Johns and Master Printer Robert Blackburn at some of the large print presses. Printmaking scholarship frequently focuses on these relationships and what resulted from the partnership. Much has also been written about how individual artists, including Frankenthaler, Dine, and Rauschenberg, were introduced to printmaking in the 1960s and 1970s and how they each went on to interpret the medium in various ways and generate new perspectives. Nonetheless, these narratives about collaboration and the big-name artists who participated in the movement generally ignore the small print workshops that made their own distinctive impression within the communities where they were established. Many of these relatively small workshops never dealt with this artist/master printer dynamic but were composed of groups of artists sharing ideas and cooperating rather than collaborating with their printmaking. Indeed, after the RPW’s mission change in the early 1980s, its programming and operation focused on engaging local printmakers rather than attracting well-known artists to collaborate on projects.

It is only in the last two decades that the contributions of small, local workshops in operation during this time have been addressed. Workshops such as the Women’s Studio Workshop in Rosendale, New York, Pyramid Atlantic in Silver Spring, Maryland, and Anchor Graphics in Chicago, which are comparable to the RPW in scope and intent, have not received the attention commonly focused on larger printmaking organizations. Comparisons of the RPW with small printmaking workshops like these can offer a better sense of how the printmaking revival operated on a local level.

The Women’s Studio Workshop was established in 1974 by four artists, Tatana Kellner, Anita Wetzel, Ann Kalmbach, and Barbara Leoff Burge. Like the RPW, the Women’s Studio Workshop was a small, non-profit, unaffiliated studio committed to creating a space for artists to create new work and share skills. However, the Women’s Studio Workshop was open only to women and its programs were “often informed by feminist values.”

In its early years, the workshop offered courses in etching, papermaking, and screen printing in its studios located in a two-story single-family house. Their programming included regular workshops and special programs that featured the work of women artists. However, like the RPW, the Women’s Studio Workshop evolved after several years and altered its original mission. As described in the exhibition catalogue *Hand, Voice & Vision: Artists’ Books from Women’s Studio Workshop*, the workshop shifted its focus from local arts education to artists’ residencies in papermaking and printmaking. The workshop now offers Artist-in-Residence grants and internships, and has a Summer Art Institute. Though they still offer several classes in papermaking, printmaking, book arts, and related media, they now focus on hosting visiting artists as they reach out to a larger national and international community of printmakers. This change reflects the similar fluidity of the RPW in adjusting to meet the needs of the community and the artists who worked there.

The Women’s Studio Workshop’s change in emphasis was productive for the organization and it is now the leading women’s art facility in the country. The workshop attracts women artists from all over the world and they are the largest publisher of handmade artists’

---
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books in the United States. The Women’s Studio Workshop exemplifies some of the characteristics shared by many of the small, non-profit workshops that arose during the print boom.

Another printmaking workshop similar in scale and purpose to the RPW, Pyramid Atlantic, was formed in 1981 by noted artist and teacher Helen Frederick. Originally opened in Baltimore, Maryland, the workshop moved to Riverdale, Maryland in 1990 and eventually to Silver Spring, Maryland, in 2003 where it remains today. Like the RPW, the non-profit arts center provides a variety of classes in several printmaking methods as well as papermaking. Besides classes, Pyramid Atlantic offers studio rentals, artists’ residencies, exhibitions, and outreach programs. As their mission states, all of their programming is designed “to build communities that give life to printmaking, papermaking, and the book arts.” Much like the RPW, their programs help to connect the community to the arts and create interest in the print medium. They also promote the collaborative exploration of art media, an objective that founder Frederick aimed to facilitate in the creation of the workshop. Frederick’s sense of collaboration is also evident due to the fact that she travelled to the RPW to teach a monotype class in the 1980s. In a twenty-five year retrospective of the arts center, Jane Farmer describes how “[i]t was always—and still is—the collaboration experience that is Frederick’s passion.”


Helen Frederick and Jane M. Farmer, Collaboration as a Medium: 25 Years of Pyramid Atlantic (exhibition catalogue) (Silver Spring, MD: Pyramid Atlantic Art Center, 2005), 86-91.


Frederick and Farmer, Collaboration as a Medium, 13.
Since its formation in 1981, Pyramid Atlantic has grown to fit the needs of the area and the expansion of its programming has made it an indispensable part of the local art community of Maryland. Its success in hosting hundreds of artists in residence, publishing numerous print and artist book editions, and curating exhibitions both locally and throughout the world has enabled the workshop to achieve certain distinction. Had the RPW not closed due to financial decline, it might have expanded its offerings and developed into the sort of art center that Pyramid Atlantic is today.

Anchor Graphics was founded by David Jones in 1988, ten years after the RPW, yet the similarities between the two workshops are striking. Like the RPW, Anchor Graphics is locally focused, though in the Chicago area. It “integrat[es] the teaching and promotion of printmaking within a professional collaborative workshop,”129 and is comparable to the RPW in its operation and financial base. Anchor Graphics is a non-profit studio that supplements its government grants with fees from studio rentals, contract printing, and sales from a subscription program that is markedly similar to the Print Club of the RPW.130 This type of financial structure, with an assortment of income sources, was shared by many small, non-profit workshops, including the RPW.

Initially, Anchor Graphics offered printmaking classes, exhibitions, and access to printmaking equipment. The organization expanded its services in 1998 and launched an Artist-in-Residency program.131 In 2001, Anchor Graphics started Press on Wheels, a program that takes a portable etching press into Chicago Public Schools. This offers students a chance to


130 Ibid.

experiment with printmaking. The service is provided for schools that could not otherwise afford such specialized programming. Anchor Graphics became a part of Columbia College Chicago on January 1, 2006 which provides the organization with “access to the resources of Columbia College, allowing . . . [their] . . . programming to be carried out to its fullest potential and to reach an even wider audience, while ensuring the longevity of the organization.”132 This partnership is surely beneficial for the organization and likely guarantees that it will not face the same sort of financial instability that plagued the RPW and led to its closing.

Similarities between the three organizations and the RPW are evident. All were formed within fifteen years of each other during the print boom in the United States when interest in the print medium was at an all-time high. They were all established as non-profit, non-affiliated print workshops, though Anchor Graphics later partnered with Columbia College Chicago. All four workshops were intended to support printmakers and promote printmaking within the local area. Likewise, the missions of the three extant workshops are similar and reference the importance of community participation to the organizations—whether that includes building new local groups or bringing together existing ones. Pyramid Atlantic’s mission is the most succinct as it simply states its objective “to build communities that give life to printmaking, papermaking, and the book arts.”133 The mission of the RPW “to encourage and provide for the creation of original prints by artists,” does not explicitly state an aim to foster community participation within the organization. However, the RPW’s programming and inclusion of various members of the Richmond art community, speak to this goal. This involvement with the local arts scene, as well
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as the unique printmaking communities formed amongst the artists working at the facilities, differentiate these small workshops from the larger, more well-known printmaking organizations.

Pyramid Atlantic, Women’s Studio Workshop, and Anchor Graphics are just a few examples of the numerous “small, non-profit, unaffiliated workshops that maintain similarly innovative approaches to the study of printmaking and to developing a rapport with various aspects of the community.”¹³⁴ They serve as excellent comparisons to the RPW for determining what the Richmond workshop might have done differently to possibly remain open. The first major difference between the extant workshops and the RPW is that the other workshops provided a broader range of programming. All three workshops have artist-in-residency programs that attract a wide range of artists to their workshop. Though the RPW often had guest artists, it was unable to maintain a regular program. Additionally, the three workshops offer internships while the RPW did not. Yet perhaps the biggest difference is that Pyramid Atlantic, Women’s Studio Workshop, and Anchor Graphics have outreach programs that engage a younger audience. The RPW maintained its role as a facility for professional artists and those interested in the medium, but never instituted any programming for children. Pyramid Atlantic has a program where it brings the arts of papermaking, printmaking, and bookmaking to K-12 classrooms. Similarly, the Women’s Studio Workshop dedicates twelve weeks of the year to bring students in grades 5-12 to the studios. Anchor Graphics also has a few programs that involve younger audiences. The workshop offers free classes for high schoolers and the Press on Wheels program brings printing presses to underprivileged schools. Indeed, these three workshops serve a larger portion of their communities than the RPW ever did. Deborah Roth,

who worked at the New York Printmaking Workshop under Robert Blackburn after leaving Richmond, lamented this shortcoming of the RPW. The now-defunct New York Printmaking Workshop, though larger than the other workshops mentioned, did a lot of outreach to underserved children and others. Much of their success came as a result of serving these communities. Roth acknowledged that at the RPW “[they] really limited [themselves] by appealing to only a certain set of people instead of being diligent with community outreach.”

Had the RPW not shut down when it did, or had it merged with the Hand Workshop as planned, outreach programming might eventually have been established. This would certainly have expanded their audience and potentially aided the organization’s sustainability.

As Laura Pharis revealed to an interviewer in 1981, the RPW “isn’t the kind of place that draws droves of people, but we’re very important to the people who rent our facilities and take classes here.” Interviews conducted with the artists involved did not reveal any overwhelming interest for the RPW to have expanded its programming. In fact, many members of the workshop were content with the RPW’s role as a small, intimate printmaking organization invaluable to its members and did not feel the need to reach a wider audience. As Tanja Softic noted during an interview, “each [printmaking] studio is an amalgamation of what people bring to it.”

The members of the RPW brought their creativity and passion for printmaking to the workshop and created lasting relationships with each other and the medium itself. Though it only lasted for thirteen years, the RPW’s significance within the printmaking community of Richmond is

135 Roth, e-mail.
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evident. It emerged during a particularly important era for printmaking, served its role as Richmond’s only printmaking workshop, and has since gone on to inspire others in their own printmaking endeavors.

It is essential to consider the RPW within the context of the American print resurgence of the 1960s-1990s in order to understand its relevance to the Richmond and nationwide printmaking communities. The RPW is especially significant when understood alongside similar small, non-profit printmaking studios to recognize how the printmaking revival operated on a local level. Comparisons of the RPW with Pyramid Atlantic, Women’s Studio Workshop, and Anchor Graphics reveal similar missions and operation models. Nonetheless, each organization differed in how it responded to the varying needs of the particular art community in which they resided. It was the needs of the Richmond arts community and, in particular, the individual printmakers working there, that made the RPW what it was and shaped how its legacy continues to unfold.
Conclusion

During its thirteen years of operation, the Richmond Printmaking Workshop significantly influenced the artists involved, the Richmond art scene, and generations of printmakers to follow. Its formation in 1978 coincided with the American Print Renaissance and was one of hundreds of printmaking workshops, presses, and independent printers in America created during that time. It was originally founded by Nancy David and Gail McKennis as a facility for print artists and a studio to edition prints. David Adamson’s resignation, however, compelled the staff to deviate from the studio’s initial focus on providing edition services and reevaluate the RPW’s mission. During this period of reorganization under the new management of Laura Pharis, the workshop developed into a more locally-oriented workshop. It became a place for artists to come together, work on art, and form a supportive printmaking community. The workshop presented artists with opportunities to mount exhibitions, create portfolios, and experiment with new printmaking techniques. The RPW was also effective in promoting the printmaking medium within Central Virginia. By appealing to artists working in different media, and people less familiar with the process, the RPW encouraged experimentation with the versatile print medium.

The various programs sponsored by the RPW were meant to engage both professional printmakers and amateur artists of Richmond. The Print Club was created to educate the general public about the connoisseurship of prints, and thus create a market for the printmakers’ work. The RPW held workshops with regional artists as well as well-known visiting artists. This
variety of programming helped to foster a printmaking community in Richmond composed of print artists and art appreciators alike.

Nonetheless, although the services provided by the RPW were unmatched in Richmond, the fees collected from classes, rentals, and the Print Club were unable to financially sustain the workshop despite the passion and good intentions of the members. Similar to other workshops at the time, the RPW’s reliance on decreasing government funding and volatile private financial support led to its closure in late 1991. The goal that founders David and McKennis originally envisioned for the non-profit facility, to eventually become self-sustaining on its rental and class fees, did not come to fruition.

The rise and decline of the workshop reflected the nationwide trend of the American print revival. Though many print workshops survived the decline of the print market and reduction of government funding for the arts in the early 1990s, others like the RPW did not. Thus, the comparison of the RPW with similar local organizations can give one an idea of how the print revival operated on a local level, as well as conditions that enabled some to survive while others closed their doors for good. Comparing the RPW with Pyramid Atlantic, Women’s Studio Workshop, and Anchor Graphics demonstrates the importance of local community engagement for small organizations. The RPW and the other workshops initially operated in a similar manner, providing comparable programming, and offering inclusion to unique artist communities. However, the other organizations demonstrated an evolving community-engagement practice that grew even more inclusive. While the three surviving workshops eventually began reaching out to a younger audience, the RPW did not. By becoming deeply invested in a larger portion of the community, the other workshops were able to form many layers of community that helped sustain them. The RPW instead focused on the needs of the
artists who worked there. The artists involved wanted the workshop to continue operating as it had and remain a place for them to interact and share their work and love for printmaking. If the RPW had altered its mission and embraced a larger portion of the population, the workshop may have lost the qualities that made it so significant to the printmaking community in the first place. Additionally, if the RPW had attempted to reach out to a more inclusive audience and provide more programming for youth, it would have been competing with the nearby Hand Workshop which was already doing that and offering a variety of classes in different mediums. In the end, the RPW stayed true to its mission, even if that meant shutting down. The closure of the workshop coincided with many factors that were out of the printmakers’ hands. Hopefully S23 does not run into similar issues and continues to be successful since it is the only printmaking facility of its kind in Central Virginia. Indeed, S23 has resources the RPW did not initially have—namely, experienced advisers like Mary Holland and Barbara Tisserat. These veteran artists and administrators are able to share their accumulated knowledge from years of running and being part of a similar organization. Perhaps Tisserat’s newfound optimism about opportunities for university graduates with a printmaking degree is justified. With a new printmaking facility, a greater number of galleries in the city, and the expansion of the VCU School of the Arts, Richmond has plenty to offer members of the printmaking community.

The aim of this thesis was to create an institutional history for an influential organization that is little known by the majority of the population of Richmond. It has, however, remained alive in the minds of the artists and members of the community fortunate enough to have worked there, as well as through the print collection donated to the University of Richmond. By reexamining the source of the prints and improving the accuracy of the information available, I hope to stimulate interest in the collection. Through research of primary source documents and
interviews with the artists involved in the RPW, I have been able to improve the information included in the collection. Initially there were thirty-five prints unassociated with an artist’s name. Through my research, I have been able to positively identify twelve of these works. I have also been able to correct data concerning the dates and mediums associated with particular prints. I hope that this new information, as well as the expanded historical commentary of the source of the prints, will improve the University of Richmond Museum’s confidence in displaying the collection in the future. Further research might continue to improve the information included in the collection and inspire the Anderson Gallery to embark on a similar mission to assess the accuracy of their documentation of the 352 works in their RPW print collection.

Though it closed its doors over twenty years ago, the RPW will continue to impact the Richmond arts community through the persistent operation of the ONE/OFF print group, the continued success of S23, and the University of Richmond’s further utilization of the print collection.
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Appendix A:

List of prints, arranged by artist, in University of Richmond Museum’s Hand Workshop Donation

Note: Data in bold was added or corrected through the author’s research for this project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artist</th>
<th>Title/Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ackroyd, Norman, b. 1938</td>
<td>Strathmore Sunrise, 1979, multi-plate aquatint and spitbite on paper, H2001.09.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adamson, David</td>
<td>Schematic #1, 1979, lithograph on paper, H2001.09.11.a</td>
<td>Schematic #1, 1979, lithograph on paper, H2001.09.11.b</td>
<td>Schematic #1, 1979, lithograph on paper, H2001.09.11.c</td>
<td>Schematic #1, 1979, lithograph on paper, H2001.09.11.d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schematic #1, 1979, lithograph on paper, H2001.09.11.f</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Technique</td>
<td>Catalog Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>woodcut on chine colle,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Trapped Memory</em>, n.d., woodcut on</td>
<td></td>
<td>on chine colle,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H2001.09.07.a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Trapped Memory</em>, n.d., woodcut on</td>
<td></td>
<td>on chine colle,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H2001.09.08.a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Trapped Memory</em>, n.d., woodcut on</td>
<td></td>
<td>on chine colle,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H2001.09.09.a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H2001.09.12.b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>color lithograph on paper,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H2001.09.12.c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>color lithograph on paper,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H2001.09.12.d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brisbane,</td>
<td><em>Untitled, Virginia Artists Portfolio</em>,</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Two-plate etching with line,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>aquatint, and drypoint,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H2001.09.13.a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Two-plate etching with line,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>aquatint, and drypoint,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H2001.09.13.b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Two-plate etching with line,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>aquatint, and drypoint,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H2001.09.13.c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Two-plate etching with line,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>aquatint, and drypoint,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H2001.09.13.d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chenoweth, Ann</td>
<td><em>Woods Walk Fan</em>, 1990, etching and</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>etching and aquatint with soft</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 1952</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ground on paper,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H2001.09.01.b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cole, Frank</td>
<td><em>Untitled (Water level)</em>, 1989, etching</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>etching with spitbite on paper,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H2001.09.52.a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>etching with spitbite on paper,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H2001.09.52.b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>etching with spitbite on paper,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H2001.09.52.c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>etching with spitbite on paper,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H2001.09.52.d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cramer, Margaret Sturm</td>
<td><em>Untitled</em>, 1978, lithograph on paper,</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>lithograph on paper,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H2001.09.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David, Nancy,</td>
<td><em>The Moon Laughed</em>, 1986, open bite</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>etching on paper,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 1925</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H2001.09.03.c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>etching on paper,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H2001.09.06.a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>etching on paper,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H2001.09.07.c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>etching on paper,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H2001.09.08.c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>etching on paper,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H2001.09.09.b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>Work Description</td>
<td>Accession Number</td>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>Work Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title and Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
View Near Afton, Virginia Artists Portfolio, 1979, four-color lithograph with crayon and spatter, H2001.09.19.a |
| Humphreys, Robert | *The Soil is Rich There*, Fall 1990, lithograph and chine colle on paper, H2001.09.19.b  
*The Soil is Rich There*, Fall 1990, lithograph and chine colle on paper, H2001.09.02.c |
| Hurley             | *Untitled (dog behind bars)*, 1975, paper, H2001.09.41 |
| Jackson, Alex B.   | *Circle of Friends*, Virginia Artists Portfolio, 1980, etching with softground, hardground, and spitbite aquatint, H2001.09.17.a  
*Circle of Friends*, Virginia Artists Portfolio, 1980, etching with softground, hardground, and spitbite aquatint, H2001.09.17.c  
| Jones, Douglas, b. 1949 | *French Postcard*, 1986, drypoint and aquatint on paper, H2001.09.03.h  
| Kaminskas, Kathleen | *Autumn Falls*, 1986, etching and aquatint on paper, H2001.09.03.i |
| Mauger, Laura      | *Natures Way*, 1988, woodcut, H2001.09.07.g  
*Natures Way*, 1988, woodcut, H2001.09.08.e  
<p>| Nottingham, John | <em>Unwritten History</em>, <em>Unwritten History Portfolio</em>, 1988, etching with aquatint on paper, H2001.09.07.j | <em>Unwritten History</em>, <em>Unwritten History Portfolio</em>, 1988, etching with aquatint on paper, H2001.09.08.h | <em>Unwritten History</em>, <em>Unwritten History Portfolio</em>, 1988, etching with aquatint on paper, H2001.09.09.g |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Catalogue Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nottingham, Paula</td>
<td>Ceremony of Summer, 1989, wood engraving on paper, H2001.09.06.c</td>
<td>Unwritten History: Pandora's Box, Unwritten History Portfolio, 1988, wood engraving, etching on paper, H2001.09.07.k</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unwritten History: Pandora's Box, Unwritten History Portfolio, 1988, wood engraving, etching on paper, H2001.09.08.i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owen, Paula Hovde</td>
<td>Backstage, 1986, collograph on paper, H2001.09.03.g</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Missing, n.d., linocut with stamp, H2001.09.09.h</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unwritten History, Unwritten History Portfolio, 1988, color etching with hand coloring on paper, H2001.09.07.m</td>
<td>Unwritten History, Unwritten History Portfolio, 1988, color etching with hand coloring on paper, H2001.09.08.k</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Capitol of Virginia, Richmond, 1980, etching and aquatint on paper, H2001.09.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Untitled, n.d., woodcut on paper, H2001.09.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Untitled, n.d., woodcut on paper, H2001.09.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>My Medieval Hat, Virginia Artists Portfolio, ca. 1980, lithograph, crayon drawing on stone, hand-colored, H2001.09.20.a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This is where we found them..., 1990, hand pressed woodcut on paper, H2001.09.01.e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roth, Deborah</td>
<td>Titlepage, Landscapes Portfolio, 1990, paper, H2001.09.01.f</td>
<td>This is where we found them..., 1990, hand pressed woodcut on paper, H2001.09.02.e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rufty, Eleanor</td>
<td>The Body Was Quite Warm, 1990, lithograph on paper, H2001.09.04.f</td>
<td>The Body Was Quite Warm, 1990, lithograph on paper, H2001.09.05.f</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Delphic Window, Virginia Artists Portfolio, 1980, two-plate etching with hardground, softground, aquatint, and open bite, H2001.09.51.a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Catalog Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artist</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Catalog No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Untitled (desk and chair), n.d., lithograph on paper, H2001.09.44.a</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>Untitled (Desk and Chairs), n.d., lithograph on paper, H2001.09.44.b</td>
<td>Untitled (Cat in chair), n.d., line etching and aquatint on paper, H2001.09.54.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Catalog Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan L. Gaustad</td>
<td>Untitled (Red Woman in Hat), n.d., woodcut on paper</td>
<td>H2001.09.56a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan L. Gaustad</td>
<td>Untitled (Red Woman in Hat), n.d., woodcut on paper</td>
<td>H2001.09.56b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan L. Gaustad</td>
<td>Untitled (circle containing two figures), n.d., linocut on paper</td>
<td>H2001.09.56c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams, D.</td>
<td>Panic in the Rue Morgue, 1990, woodcut on Goyu paper</td>
<td>H2001.09.05.h</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witt, Nancy, b. 1930</td>
<td>Calling Down the Moon, 1989, wood engraving on paper</td>
<td>H2001.09.06.e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Womack, Catherine Roseberry</td>
<td>All There is--St. Joan in Rapture, 1988, linocut on paper with burnt edge</td>
<td>H2001.09.07.n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright, Willie Anne, b. 1924</td>
<td>Bird of Paradise, Virginia Artists Portfolio, 1980, lithograph, crayon drawing on plate</td>
<td>H2001.09.15.a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bird of Paradise, Virginia Artists Portfolio, 1980, lithograph, crayon drawing on plate</td>
<td>H2001.09.15.b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bird of Paradise, Virginia Artists Portfolio, 1980, lithograph, crayon drawing on plate</td>
<td>H2001.09.15.c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| **Four Handed Gourd Game**, 1983, aquatint etching with spitbite on handmade paper, H2001.09.48.a |
| **Four Handed Gourd Game**, 1983, aquatint etching with spitbite on handmade paper, H2001.09.48.b |
| **Four Handed Gourd Game**, 1983, aquatint etching with spitbite on handmade paper, H2001.09.48.c |
| **Four Handed Gourd Game**, 1983, aquatint etching with spitbite on handmade paper, H2001.09.48.d |
| **Four Handed Gourd Game**, 1983, aquatint etching with spitbite on handmade paper, H2001.09.48.e |
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