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The *National Drawing Annual* project was launched in 2005 in an effort to support the recognition, documentation, and publication of excellent, current, and relevant works of drawing in the United States and beyond. It is an extension of Manifest’s Drawing Center mission, which promotes, features, and explores drawing as a rich and culturally significant art form through the pursuit of scholarly activities.

For the 2006 *NDA* Manifest received over 350 entries from 121 artists in 27 states and 6 countries. This exhibit-in-print includes 68 works by 33 artists from 16 states and 4 countries, including England, Russia, Scotland, and the United States.

Six people qualified in the fields of art, design, and art history juried the 2006 *National Drawing Annual*. The process of selection was by anonymous blind jury, with each jury member assigning a quality rating for artistic merit to each work submitted. The entries receiving the highest average combined score are included in this publication.

This second edition of the *National Drawing Annual* marks a milestone for Manifest and this fledgling project. If two points make a line, and a line possesses a trajectory, then with the *NDA* in its second year we now have a clear idea of where the project is headed long term.

With a significant increase in the number of entries, artists selected, and works included, the project is proving to be a satisfying success. Furthermore, the quality of work continues to meet the high standards of our jury, which involves an intense process supported by professional and academic advisors.
As is often the case in Manifest projects, a theme inevitably arises out of the collection of works chosen by our jury. Interestingly, this year’s *Annual* contains a great deal more abstraction than the 2005 volume and I do not believe this is reflective of the personal tastes of our jurors, but rather a coincidence related to the nature of the artists’ mindset.

A prevalent undercurrent in this collection of drawings is the suggestion of systems and organic processes through which things are changed or in the process of changing. This underlying theme permeating the project is expressed primarily in the abstract works, but even the representational images echo the idea. We view this, at least initially, as being indicative of the foremost thinking of contemporary artists as they approach drawing as an art form, but also as a conceptual trend in creative work being made today in all media.

The works of prize winners Karol Shortt, Michael Nichols, and Jennifer Jenkins represent this trend perfectly. Shortt’s huge charcoal drawing graces the ‘great hall’ of a nuclear power plant, not so subtly representing or memorializing the shift from antiquated fuel supplies (charcoal) to futuristic, if no less volatile, processes. The swarming spheroid forms in Shortt’s composition *Fission II* can be found echoed, eerily (because these two artists do not know each other), in Jenkins’s machine embroidered *Arranging and Aftermath*. Even the titles of these two works underscore the process/transformative theme of the 2006 NDA. Michael Nichols’s drawings, although at first apparently quite straightforward, actually reveal double-images of his subjects. It is as if the artist is drawing what he sees perfectly (rather than a frozen memory of a single moment), and because the subject is alive he must draw it in constant motion. His application of the media suggests process nicely, but it is the subtle multiple imagery which provides the key Einsteinian weirdness that merrily haunts this entire collection of drawings.

This volume also includes an essay by PhD candidate and 2005 NDA participant Deborah Harty. In her text Harty contributes momentum to the unifying theme found in the visual works by discussing the role of process as it relates to communication, creation, and perception.

With this I am delighted to introduce the 2006 *National Drawing Annual* containing 68 exceptional works of drawing from around the world!
DRAWING EMOTIVE RESPONSES

AN ESSAY BY DEBORAH HARTY

phd candidate, loughborough university leicestershire, england
Is it possible to communicate to a viewer the nature of a lived experience through drawing? To create an emotive response in the viewer that echoes the original experience of the artist? Avis Newman (2003, p 41) states, ‘When we look, we enter the intimate space of a work that is as close to the action of an artist’s thought as one can get.’ If this is to be believed it would be reasonable to assume that it is possible. But, when drawing, what are the thoughts that pass through the mind and are these always intentional? To have the intent to create a work that conveys a particular experience may be quite different from the thoughts and states of consciousness that are the artist’s experience of making. However, if it were possible to induce the characteristic of that experience through the process of making would it be more likely to translate to the viewer? The focus of this text is to discuss the ability of a repetitive process of drawing to communicate a particular emotive experience; based upon a personal experience of grief.

Following an untimely death of someone close, the experience of a night sky had a profound effect on my state of consciousness. The experience is recounted and noted as such:

Driving through the sombre darkness of night, moving through time, the lulling sound of the engine in the background, the mind partially detached, partially focused on moving the vehicle forward, body negotiating the tasks of gear change and brake, all happening on automatic pilot as if physical presence is no longer required. Nothing different about the day, the heaviness and despair ever present, darkness surrounds but for the intermittent flashing from the lights of other vehicles on the road. Keep focusing on the infinite darkness, the dense perceived weight accentuating the personal struggle. Alone, disconnected, desperate for release. Staring into the vast darkness, a burst of moonlight radiates across the blackness through a gap in the dense clouds, its brilliance is breathtaking, unexpected, overwhelming, it warms as it comforts and is over in an instant. An intense effect, altering the state of consciousness, lifted, elated, removed from despair, an awareness of self within something greater, a sense of belonging, a reconnection to the world and an incredible sense of calm, hope and peace. A sudden confrontation, consuming, but offering space to reconsider, contemplate, belong.

The effect on my state of consciousness had been extremely disorientating. A sense of removal from reality, but conversely rooted in the present, a sense of calm, self-awareness and understanding of my own existence in the world, which made my perception of the experience appear to be contradictory, existing on the periphery of tranquility and unease.
When trying to communicate a series of narratives through drawing, complex systems of composition and marks and tone come into play, but the desire to create a specific emotive response led to different considerations. Through a series of experimental drawings, a process of repetitive mark making was developed. The main discovery was that this induced a similar state of consciousness as the original experience but as a consequence, subverted my usual practice of creating works that relied on intuition and spontaneity.

A systematic approach was taken to the production of the subsequent drawings based upon the previous work. With the strategy for the drawing decided a commitment was made to follow the repetition of marks until its completion. Deanna Petherbridge (2006) notes that the process of repetition, ‘delays decision making’ but that the hypnotic state created by this systematic approach to drawing is capable of producing, ‘creativity as a premium.’

During times of lucidity within the process of making, reflection on what is being produced will be noted but not implemented in the current drawing. These reflections will, in part, determine the starting point for a subsequent drawing. The process initiates the conditions for ‘clarity’ of thought, partly due to the repetitive process allowing the mind to disconnect. Whilst at times this will induce a hypnotic almost ‘non-thought’ state equally it can provide a space for calm contemplation.

During the making of a drawing that consisted of a process of perforating the paper before applying a dense layer of compressed charcoal, it was noted that the process allowed a certain detachment. The physical self completing the task and allowing the mind to be intermittently detached and engaged. These observations of the effect of the process on my state of consciousness were noted as such:

*Drawing, body as machine, maneuvering across the surface with methodical, rhythmical motion, mind disconnected from the activity, a robotic almost liminal state and yet grounded, all too aware of the now, the space is confined, a tension in the body as the only contact with the surface is through the tool, an extension of the hand, perforating the paper as it negotiates the surface, rasping and grating sounds reverberating around the room, the chalky air, an awareness of dust particles floating, visible in the shaft of daylight streaming in through the window, a distinct smell and residue flowing in and out with the breath, a discomfort in the hand as pressure is applied and released, a heightened awareness of self amidst the apparent removal of thought, a meditative contemplation of self, as soon as recognized all but gone and the tedium of the process is apparent again, calm and ease dissipated, irritation and unrest again discernible.*
This process of making creates the conditions necessary to reflect the fluctuating state of consciousness of the original experience. A heighten awareness of the environment as the senses note the details of the surroundings. The process of repetitive mark making not only induces the sense of meditation whilst working but the marks themselves when completed create a harmonious and continuous surface.

The drawing is created within the parameters of the paper. The paper creates delineation, an edge, a surface on which to exist. This creates an order, a definition of a beginning and an end, control and a limitation. In contrast the marks on the surface appear limitless and could be a continuum, a selection of infinity, a ‘wholeness,’ no composition or direction across and through the work. Avis Newman (2003, p 170) states, ‘It is the rhythm of marks that frames and gives internal coherence to an image. The rhythm in a drawing allows one to experience the thing. It takes the eye from place to place.’ The repetitive process of the drawings creates a rhythmic quality on the surface that reflects the nature of its production.

During the process of drawing a succession of pencil lines over a charcoal blackened surface, a sense of rhythm is created. This relates to the speed of application, pressure applied and distance between marks and is created when absorption in repetitive motion has occurred. Breaks in concentrated effort or fluctuations in states of consciousness affect the rhythm of the mark and are perceptible in the surface of the drawing. This reflects the nature of production; conveying not only the individual marks as the pencil is moved across the surface but also the varying densities of weight of line and pressure through the reflective qualities of the medium. These can be translated into the shifting perception and fluctuating states of consciousness occurring during the repetitive process.

Speaking of the work of Agnes Martin, De Zegher (2005, p 32) states, ‘Her work has been described as leading the viewer into contemplative spaces where the processes of making and viewing have become fused.’ Drawing has the potential to communicate a particular experience to a viewer, through the ability of the repetitive process, to bring the nature of the lived experience and translate its essence into marks on paper. Through the discovery of the close relationship of the nature of the original experience to be communicated and the experience of making, it is reasonable to assume that as the space between artist and work is lessened, so the space between work and viewer will also be.
Fission II is based on the chain reactions that go on to produce energy and how only tiny elements and particles can ultimately produce vast amounts of energy. This compares to the relatively small number of people working at the power station who contribute to a greater network of energy for communities in Britain.

The hands are important because they represent the uniquely individual tools/symbols with which we all work.

As a student I had been interested in the physics of energy, thermodynamics, states of order and disorder and how all of this tied into process and repetition in making art, and processes and repetition in nature. Fission, as a term in history, was originally only used for the division of living cells, so the drawing’s association with living things recalls its past.
created for the Torness Nuclear Power Station administration building, Dunbar, Scotland

DETAILS OF FISSION II
charcoal on paper 30' x 19'
2006
KAROL E. SHORTT  edinburgh, scotland

FISSION II  charcoal on paper  30' x 19'

2006
I find inspiration in various depictions of temporal and spatial absurdity. One example is William Hogarth’s ‘False Perspective.’ His image is seemingly irrational with unusual overlapping and reverse foreshortening. It challenges our perceptions and offers us an unconventional alternative to the way we perceive space.

Drawing allows me to explore some of the paradoxical issues of time and space. Some of my images refer to cubism. They depict objects seen through multiple vantage points. Others attempt to examine the pictorial possibility of multiple objects/bodies occupying the same space simultaneously. The images are my personal investigations of things that are otherwise impracticable in the physical world. Ultimately, they help me question the nature of my existence in a multi-dimensional universe.
MICHAEL NICHOLS  bowling green, kentucky

SUBSIST  pastel on paper  18" x 24"

2006
SUBSIST/SUBSIDE  pastel on paper  18" x 24"  2006
Compositionally and conceptually I begin with the microscopic world. Having pursued a premedical undergraduate degree, I came to appreciate the sciences visually through an inundation of the charts, diagrams, outputs, scans and drawings of largely unseeable phenomena. It was the visual artist in me, which then became both fascinated and frustrated with the unease by which we are able to observe such a vast world. I needed to see everything first hand and was therefore reluctant to accept the intermediary representations provided by others. Artistically I struggled intensely with this invisible muse. This frustration evolved into a dramatic artistic redirection. Although I am still immensely inspired by microscopic imagery, I am no longer concerned with the fidelity of my representations. I instead use these forms freely as elements within my imaginative microscopic landscapes. Formally, I look for a natural order, an honest spontaneity and the narrow space within which these two elements maintain a compelling equilibrium. The search for this narrow space is the essence of my artistic drive. The process of making has become an internal performance, an acting out and a reigning in. At its most basic level I create mess, chaos and destruction solely for the satisfaction of finding and pulling out order, structure and calm. It is an act of reassurance and of hope; an odd construct for exacting control and having a say.
SNAFU

machine embroidery, monoprint, india ink on silk

27' x 40' x 3'

2006
JENNIFER JENKINS  savannah, georgia

ARRANGING AN AFTERMATH  machine embroidery, monoprint, india ink on silk  25' x 31' x 3'

2006
detail arranging an aftermath
STEPHAN'S TREE  graphite on paper  11.5" x 9"  2004
DANIEL  graphite on paper  11.5" x 9"  2004

OLIVER'S TREE  graphite on paper  11.5" x 9"  2004
DENYCE CELENTANO  baton rouge, louisiana

FLEEING — AFTER FIRE  charcoal on paper  47” x 68”

2006
DALE CLIFFORD
Savannah, Georgia

SECRET GARDEN I
Monotype with charcoal, graphite, and chalk, 30" x 22"

2006
SECRET GARDEN II
monotype with charcoal, graphite, and chalk 30" x 22"
2006

SECRET GARDEN III
monotype with charcoal, graphite, and chalk 30" x 22"
2006
LISA PARKER HYATT EHRlich  
bethesda, maryland

THREE  
graphite on paper  
28" x 48"  
2006
UNTITLED GIBRALTAR

graphite on paper 29" x 23"

2003
KATHY GOODELL  new paltz, new york

FIRMAMENT 300X  oil, pigment, water, and lacquer based ink on paper  60" x 48"  2006
FELICE GRODIN  miami beach, florida

BLOOD, SWEAT & TEARS  ink on mylar  24" x 36"

2005
Kris Jones, Grand Rapids, Michigan

BIB, ink and watercolor on stonehenge, 50" x 40" 2006
MARC LEONE  mesa, arizona

CRATER #1217  graphite on paper  32" x 32"  2006

CRATER #1225  graphite on paper  32" x 32"  2006
ALEXIS K. MANHEIN  moss beach, california

WEEDS TEND TO BE OPPORTUNISTS  pastel and ink on paper  30" x 23"  2006
BASHO'S REVENGE  pastel and ink on paper  23" x 30"  
2006
TODD MCGILL  athens, ohio

MAW  graphite on paper  22" x 30"  2006
ASCENSION top  / CONNECTIVE bottom

graphite on paper  22" x 30"

2006
JORDAN MCKENZIE  london, england

UNTITLED: AT ARM’S LENGTH  graphite, wood, performance

2005
RICHARD MONAHAN  devon, england

PORTRAIT WITH CIRCLE  oil on canvas  79" x 55"

2005
KEVIN O'GRADY  st. michael's, arizona

INNAMORATO  watercolor and paper collage  9" x 12"

2006
BLONDE MARAUDER  watercolor and paper collage 9" x 12"  
2006
TIM PARSLEY  cincinnati, ohio

CLEAN  ebony pencil on mylar  3.5" x 9.5"

2006
MARY PENN

ann arbor, michigan

ADrift Under Night Skies

charcoal, conte, colored pencil, and spray paint on paper 22.5" x 29"

2005
CORRELATION IN VOIDS & VOLUMES
charcoal, gouache, graphite, pastel, colored pencil, and spray paint on paper 28.25" x 22.5"
2005
UNTITLED  mixed media  17" x 9.5"  2006
LESLIE REUTHER
st. louis, missouri

ARTIST STATEMENT #4

india ink on paper 12" x 9"

2005
PROCESS

stamp ink and graphite on paper  19.5" x 14.75"

2006
Natalia Rosenbaum

The Sleeping

Gouache on paper 39" x 27"

2005
MICHELLE ROZIC  bloomington, indiana

GERMINATION 2  color mezzotint  6.75" x 24"

2006
GARDEN VARIETY
color mezzotint and digital print 6.75" x 24"
2006

details garden variety
GRETCHEN SCHARNAGL  miami, florida

GROUNDWORK  graphite on paper  12" x 396"  2004
Kendrick Shackelford  Chicago, Illinois

**UNTITLED**

Charcoal, graphite, erasure, and pigment on paper  30" x 22"  2004

**PROTO 1**

Charcoal on paper  60" x 100"  2004
**AGENT ORANGE**
charcoal and pastel on paper  97" x 77"
2004

**THE HYPOCRITE**
charcoal and pastel on paper  72" x 50"
2005
BENJAMIN SHAMBACK  mobile, alabama

TWO CONCH SHELLS  charcoal on mylar  17" x 14"  2006
MALE POSTERIOR 3  charcoal  30" x 20"
2006
KATE SMITH  derby, england

PINCH  pencil on paper  48" x 34"

2006
ROB TARBELL

SMOKES: DIVING HORSE

smoke on paper 30" x 22"

2006
SMOKES: ELEPHANT

smoke on paper  30" x 22"

2006
BRENT THOMAS  institute, west virginia

STUDY HARD BOYS  graphite/digital output  31.5" x 24"

2006

detail study hard boys
NO MATTER WHERE SOMEBODY KNOWS YOU

graphite/digital output 24" x 47.5"

2006
TRAVIS TOWNSEND  lexington, kentucky

HAPPY HOME INVASION

ink, graphite, marker, spackling, paper, and acrylic paint on wood  23" x 23" x 3"

2006
FLOATER

ink, graphite, marker, paper, and acrylic paint on wood 14" x 14" x 3"

2006
KERRY WALTON  leicestershire, england

TRIPTYCH 1  cartridge paper, black ink, tracing paper  8" x 12"  2006
TRIPTYCH 2

TRIPTYCH 2

cartridge paper, black ink, photocopy, tracing paper 6” x 8”

2006
DANIEL WICKERHAM  
BALTIMORE, MARYLAND

UNTITLED  
WHITE BFK CUT PAPER INSTALLATION  
11' H X 6' W X 5.5' D  
2006
UNTITLED  cut paper and mixed media on bfk 22" x 18"
2006
HANNAH ZURKO  wooster, ohio

UNTITLED DRAWN

fabric, plaster, polyurethane, mat construction board, electrical tape  10’ x 6’ x 2’

2006
details untitled drawn
ABOUT MANIFEST
Founded in May of 2004, Manifest Creative Research Gallery and Drawing Center is a 501(c)(3) non-profit arts organization headquartered in the urban neighborhood of East Walnut Hills in Cincinnati, Ohio. The elegant street-level exhibition space is minutes away from downtown Cincinnati, and the numerous academic institutions of higher learning in the region. It is also within easy walking distance of a diversely populated historic neighborhood with residents from all walks of life. The galleries are free and open to the public five hours a day, five days a week, presenting works by students and professionals from around the world.

Manifest is supported by grants and public donations and has the goal to support student professionalism, integrate the arts into the urban residential community and raise the bar on artistic standards. The mission also includes the exploration of the relationship between art and design, as well as the ongoing support and display of drawing in all its various forms.

**MISSION**
Manifest Creative Research Gallery and Drawing Center enhances the role of art and design in society by cultivating and focusing the transformative power of creativity in the visual arts. Manifest benefits people in the global and local community, including professionals, students, and the public, by creating quality-centered experiences focused on contemporary visual arts and related activities in the context of creative exploration.

**executive director**
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*senior project architect, architecturesplus*
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kristin cullen
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