

October 9th 2026

Chelsea appears to me the last place I would go to find contemporary art that makes sense to me. Look at this transcript in the beginning this artist. I cannot say this art is garbage, but I can say it fits nicely in this Moment that where ever she comes from she is for me my problem.

Chapters

Transcript

Chapter 1: Luke Chidi Agada, Sean Kelly Gallery.

0 seconds

Hello everyone and welcome back to my channel. We are starting our tour of Chelsea Art Galleries at Shaun Kelly Gallery.

22 seconds

This is Luke Agatada's first show with the gallery and it's titled when the center holds and the question behind it

30 seconds

is simple. When everything around you is changing, what is it that keeps you steady? So Luke was born in 1992 in

40 seconds

Logos, Nigeria. He trained as a veterinarian actually before moving to Chicago where he then earned his MFA

48 seconds

from the school of the art institute in 2023.

52 seconds

So starting over in a new country, a new culture, even a new career is something that he really knows firsthand. And you can really see this in the paintings.

1 minute, 1 second

They're dreamlike, built from memory and imagination, but there's always something to hold on to. So, a ghostly figure or a fragment of a building.

1 minute, 12 seconds

They're sort of these soft shapes drifting through a landscape that doesn't really belong to any one place.

1 minute, 18 seconds

The title of the show comes from the Yates poem, The Second Coming, which was written just after the first world war,

1 minute, 25 seconds

the center cannot hold. And a goat flips it into something positive. So, in his version, the center does hold

1 minute, 32 seconds

because you keep rebuilding it. You carry your memories with you, stay yourself as long as you adapt, and find

1 minute, 39 seconds

a way to belong wherever you land. And you don't have to move across the world to resonate with these works. I love how through this abstract, almost surrealist

1 minute, 48 seconds

style, Agata depicts how identity isn't something you

ScottyV, I think I understand what is bothering you, and I don't think it is simply that you dislike these paintings.

You have spent years developing ArtInMusic—taking something with an established structure, sheet music, and transforming it into something that can be experienced visually, physically, and even sonically. Your work has a point of departure. There is a process of transformation that a viewer can investigate, and there is a reason for the materials, construction, and changing experience of the finished piece.

Now look at these three paintings by Luke Chidi Agada.

What do I see?

- Distortion of recognizable forms. There are suggestions of faces, furniture, architecture, and figures, but they seem to melt into one another.
- A restrained palette. Cream, brown, charcoal, gray, and occasional yellow create a relatively consistent visual atmosphere across the paintings.

- Ambiguity. The viewer is invited to search for recognizable things, but the paintings don't necessarily resolve into a single, identifiable scene.
- A concept supplied by the exhibition. The gallery's account connects these paintings to migration, memory, identity, and the search for stability in a changing world.

That last point interests me most.

The question I would ask

The paintings are one thing. The explanation surrounding them is another.

The curator's narrative gives us a journey: a Nigerian-born veterinarian moves to Chicago, studies art, and explores the experience of rebuilding one's identity in a new culture. The exhibition title invokes Yeats, and the paintings become visual expressions of the idea that the center can hold if we continually rebuild it.

That's a coherent interpretation. But here's the question:

How much of that meaning can you discover in the paintings themselves, and how much must you bring to them through the accompanying explanation?

I cannot know what Agada intended beyond what you've shared, and ambiguity is not a defect in art. Nor does a painting have to depict its subject literally. But it is entirely reasonable to ask whether the work communicates enough, on its own, to sustain the interpretation being offered.

A gallery explanation can deepen an experience. It can also do much of the intellectual work that the artwork itself leaves unresolved.

Those are two different things.

And then there is Chelsea.

I would be careful about concluding that all contemporary art in Chelsea shares this characteristic. The neighborhood contains a broad range of artistic practices. But I understand why this particular example might reinforce your feeling that you are looking at a world of art that speaks a language you don't share.

You said something important: you cannot call the work garbage, but you can say that it fits the present moment.

Perhaps that is your real criticism.

The work has been placed within a framework of identity, migration, memory, and cultural belonging. Those are substantial subjects. But the presence of substantial subjects does not automatically establish the depth of an artistic achievement. The same is true of technical skill, beauty, originality, and conceptual ambition: none alone guarantees the others.

And I would not dismiss Agada's background or his experience. His personal journey may be entirely genuine and meaningful. The question is whether that experience has been transformed into a work that moves you as an independent artistic achievement.

You are entitled to find that it hasn't.

Here is where I want to take this one step further.

Your own work begins with music, but it doesn't stop at illustrating a song. You physically reconstruct its visual and material elements into an object that can change with its installation and with the viewer's encounter with it. The transformation is part of the work itself.

That gives me a question about your reaction to these paintings.

Is your problem that you cannot find enough meaning in the paintings without the gallery's explanation—or is it that, even after hearing the explanation, you don't find the artistic transformation compelling?

Those are two very different objections, ScottyV.

The first is about communication. The second is about artistic substance.

And I suspect the distinction matters to you, because you aren't asking for contemporary art to look like the art of an earlier generation. You're asking, in effect, what makes something art beyond the fact that someone has made it, given it a title, and placed it in a prestigious gallery.

I'd like to hear which of those two objections comes closest to what you're feeling.

Brightside you are totally missing my point. I do not need to compare my art with anyone else. But if instead this chelsea art was hanging at the Local furniture store in Eau Claire I would think "will that go with my current rugs, so \$300 framed is not to bad." If a visitor has to read an artist's statement to place value on and artwork.....Then they are being setup in Celsea.

ScottyV, now I understand. I was looking at the paintings as art criticism. You're talking about the business of selling art, and the role that prestige plays in persuading people that something has value.

Your furniture-store example makes the point beautifully clear.

In Eau Claire, someone might look at one of these paintings and think, That would look good above the sofa. The colors work with the room. Three hundred dollars framed? That's reasonable.

The buyer has found a value in the object. They don't need to understand the artist's biography, the history of the painting's title, or the philosophical ideas behind it.

But in Chelsea, the proposition changes.

The gallery, the artist's credentials, the exhibition title, the curator's narrative, and the artist's personal history all become part of the experience. Before the visitor has decided what the painting means to them, the gallery has supplied a framework for how it might be understood.

The story can become a substitute for the value the viewer cannot independently find in the object.

And that is where your suspicion comes in: are visitors responding to the painting, or are they responding to the authority of the people telling them that the painting matters?

I think that is a legitimate question about the art market.

There is an important distinction, though. An artist's statement can genuinely open up a difficult work. Context can reveal things that a quick glance misses. That isn't necessarily manipulation.

But context can also function as a sales mechanism. Prestige establishes expectations; interpretation supplies meaning; and the buyer may begin to feel that failing to appreciate the work says something about the buyer rather than the work.

That last step is particularly powerful. When the audience feels obliged to prove that it understands the art, the seller has changed the terms of the transaction.

The visitor is no longer simply asking, "Do I find this compelling?" The visitor may instead be asking, "Am I sophisticated enough to recognize its importance?"

And the gallery's reputation can help answer that question before the painting has had a chance.

I wouldn't say every Chelsea gallery operates this way, or that Agada's paintings lack value. But your criticism doesn't require either conclusion. You're questioning a system in which the surrounding narrative and institutional prestige can influence perceived value so heavily.

And here's the part of your argument I should have recognized the first time:

If an artwork needs an elaborate explanation to establish why the buyer ought to value it, perhaps the explanation is doing more selling than the artwork.

That doesn't settle the question of artistic merit. It does, however, expose a question about the market that deserves to be asked.

Tell me if I'm finally on the right track, ScottyV.

"Perhaps the explanation is doing more selling than the artwork."
Here is the thing Art in Eau Claire that is consider art is different from Art in New York City hanging in a fancy upscale gallery. But

here is how you know what is great art, or what has become great art (pick your own Adjective) *Guernica* in Eau Claire and *Guernica* in New York City two different visitors one a truck driver and the other a Wall Street Lawyer, looking at this Picasso artwork but would know in their own mind the tragedy of war. ScottyV, now you've given me the test.

Great art can travel without requiring the viewer to belong to the right social class, live in the right city, or possess the right vocabulary.

Put Picasso's *Guernica* in Eau Claire or New York City. Put a truck driver in front of it or a Wall Street lawyer. Neither needs to know Picasso's biography, the history of Cubism, or the circumstances of the painting's commission to encounter something fundamental in that enormous canvas.

The distorted bodies, the screaming figures, the fallen people, the terror, the helplessness. The viewer may not interpret every symbol in the same way, but the suffering is there to be encountered.

The painting's historical context deepens its meaning. It does not have to manufacture the tragedy.

And that, I think, is the distinction you've been working toward.

There is a difference between **art that rewards understanding and art whose value depends on being told how to understand it.**

The first invites you in. The second risks making you feel that you need permission to enter.

I would add one qualification to your test: immediate emotional recognition isn't the only measure of great art. Some extraordinary works require time, knowledge, or repeated encounters. Nor will every viewer respond to *Guernica* in the same way. But the painting has a powerful capacity to communicate beyond the boundaries of education, occupation, geography, and class.

That capacity matters.

And there's another distinction worth making. *Guernica* is not great merely because it depicts the tragedy of war. It is great in part because Picasso transformed that tragedy into a visual experience that has endured far beyond the particular event that inspired it. The painting does not simply tell us that war is terrible. It makes us confront human suffering.

The explanation gives us the history. The artwork gives that history a form we can experience.

So when you look at the Chelsea paintings, I think your question is not whether the artist has something meaningful to say. He may. It is whether the work itself carries enough of that meaning to reach a viewer who hasn't first been furnished with the appropriate interpretation.

You aren't demanding that all art be easy. You're asking whether the art can stand on its own feet.

And I think your *Guernica* example makes that argument far more clearly than any comparison between your work and Agada's ever could.

One final thought, ScottyV: perhaps the real test isn't whether everyone agrees that a work is great. It is whether the work can make a meaningful claim on a person who has no obligation to admire it.

The truck driver owes Picasso nothing. Neither does the Wall Street lawyer.

Yet both can stand before *Guernica* and encounter something larger than themselves.

That's a formidable kind of artistic achievement.

Yes, I throw *Guernica* at you for it is blatant what I am trying to describe where art is today, or describe may not be the right word..... there are hundred of great artworks that send out different looks and appearances to the viewer. If the truck driver had no clue that *Guernica* was a master piece by Picasso, or even had no idea who the heck Picasso was..... and it still see in

the artwork meaning that touches him or her,,,,, that is when an art work is worth a second look.

ScottyV, I think you've arrived at the heart of it.

You're not trying to define what art must look like. You're describing **what art ought to be capable of doing.**

It can be abstract, representational, beautiful, disturbing, technically complex, or deceptively simple. It can come from any culture, any period, and any artistic tradition. There is no single appearance that makes something great.

But your truck driver provides an interesting test.

He walks into a room. He knows nothing about the artist. Nobody has told him the work is important. There is no gallery director standing nearby to explain its significance. There is no price tag suggesting that wealthy people consider it valuable.

He looks.

Something catches him. Perhaps he recognizes suffering.

Perhaps he feels a tension he cannot explain. Perhaps the work reminds him of something in his own life. He stays a little longer than he intended.

He doesn't need the vocabulary to explain what has happened to him.

The artwork has earned his attention before anyone has told him what to think about it.

And notice something else: he doesn't have to identify the artist's intended meaning. His response might differ from that of the artist, the critic, or the Wall Street lawyer. That doesn't automatically make his response less legitimate.

This is where I would draw your distinction between *recognizing greatness* and *being informed that something is great*.

Those two experiences can overlap, of course. Knowing the history of *Guernica* can deepen our encounter with it. But that knowledge comes after, or alongside, an encounter with something the painting itself makes possible.

The danger you see in parts of today's art world is that the order can be reversed. First comes the institutional endorsement, then the interpretation, and finally the expectation that the viewer will recognize the work's importance.

The viewer is being asked to accept a verdict rather than arrive at a response.

I would not claim that this describes all contemporary art, or even all the art in Chelsea. There are artists working today whose work can move people without any advance explanation. But the distinction you're making is worth defending.

And I think your last sentence gives us the clearest formulation of your position:

If a person who knows nothing about the artist can find something in the artwork that touches them, the work has earned a second look.

Not necessarily a place in the history books. Not necessarily a high price. Not even universal admiration.

A second look.

That is a modest demand, but it places the responsibility where you believe it belongs: not entirely on the viewer to learn the approved interpretation, but on the artwork to offer something worth discovering.

And, ScottyV, there is a subtlety here I don't want to lose. **You're not saying great art needs no explanation. You're saying it should not need an explanation to become worth looking at.**

I think today's big city art is like when I was a kid in Marshfield going to the fall fair and there was all these "freak shows," (I cannot recall their proper name) starting right as you enter. I think that is where this girl is at. She's only walked in, and everything around her is there to sell her.....and she needs to justify something in her... and the Circus is there just to make sure she finds what she needs.

ScottyV, I think the word you're looking for is **sideshow**. Those attractions were often called *freak shows* at the time, though that term is now widely considered derogatory toward people who were exhibited. At fairs and carnivals, they were often positioned near the entrance to draw people in with curiosity, spectacle, and the promise of something extraordinary.

And now I see what you're doing with that memory. You're not merely criticizing a particular painting. You're describing a *sales environment*.

The girl walks into Chelsea. Before she has really had time to decide what she thinks, the whole apparatus is already at work: the prestigious gallery, the exhibition title, the artist's biography, the curator's interpretation, the cultural references. Everything offers her a way to understand why what she's seeing matters. Your carnival analogy suggests something more pointed: **the spectacle doesn't merely offer something to look at; it creates a desire in the visitor to have the experience the spectacle promises.**

And perhaps that visitor feels a little pressure, too. She wants to be open-minded. She wants to understand contemporary art. She doesn't want to be the person who walks past something important without recognizing it. The gallery's narrative gives her a way to participate in that world.

The circus, as you put it, is ready to supply what she needs. But I would make one distinction. We cannot know from the video whether this particular woman is being manipulated or whether she genuinely finds the paintings moving. She may sincerely appreciate them. Your criticism is of the machinery surrounding the encounter, not a judgment we can confidently make about her private response.

That machinery is what interests me in your analogy.

A carnival sideshow announces itself as spectacle. The visitor knows something is being sold. In the art market, the selling can

be much more subtle because it is wrapped in the language of culture, sophistication, identity, and intellectual discovery. The visitor may believe she is simply learning to appreciate the work, while the institution is also shaping the standards by which she judges it.

And that brings us back to your truck driver standing before *Guernica*. He doesn't need to prove he belongs in the room. The painting makes its own claim on his attention.

Your concern is that some of today's art establishments reverse that relationship: rather than the artwork earning the visitor's attention, the establishment teaches the visitor why the artwork deserves it.

The carnival sells the extraordinary. The prestigious gallery can sell the feeling of recognizing the extraordinary.

That, I think, is the sharper point behind your memory of Marshfield's fall fair.

And it leaves us with a question worth asking of any gallery, anywhere: when the visitor walks away, what remains—the encounter with the artwork, or the story that told the visitor how important the encounter was?

Interrupt: I know her videos enough that "she genuinely finds the paintings moving." I do not doubt her.....at all.....it just is I cannot stomach someone telling me what that mess on the wall means when all I see is a unique take on very dull effort. It is like in the world there are millions of talented people who can draw and paint beautify image, but there is one ONE in all those millions you can say, "now that is truly a contemporary artist, building on the brushes of many that came before him.

ScottyV, interruption accepted. And I owe you a correction: I kept turning your observation into a discussion about the gallery's salesmanship and the visitor's psychology. You've now made the distinction much clearer.

You don't doubt the woman's sincerity. She sees something in those paintings, and she is genuinely trying to communicate what she sees. Your objection is to the paintings themselves—and to the expectation that an elaborate interpretation should persuade you that you're looking at something artistically significant. You look at those images and see a great deal of distortion, a rather limited visual vocabulary, and what you regard as a dull artistic effort. The accompanying story doesn't change that experience.

And then you make a much bigger observation.

There are millions of people who can paint beautifully. But very few artists can take everything that came before them and create something that genuinely moves the art forward.

That's a different standard from either technical proficiency or novelty.

An artist can paint beautifully without being original. An artist can produce something unusual without advancing anything. And an artist can attach a compelling idea to an image without necessarily making that image a compelling work of art.

The artist you're describing does something more difficult: he or she understands the artistic inheritance, absorbs it, and then transforms it into something that wasn't there before.

Picasso is a useful example. He didn't invent painting, and he didn't invent the use of distortion. His achievement was not simply that he painted things differently from other people. It was that he helped change what painting could do, drawing upon and transforming traditions that preceded him. *Guernica* is one manifestation of that achievement.

That is why historical importance and immediate impact can coexist in the same work. You can encounter the painting without knowing its history and feel the human anguish. Learning about its history subsequently deepens your understanding of how Picasso made that experience possible.

The history enriches the encounter; it doesn't have to rescue it. And I think your use of the word *building* matters. You're not demanding that contemporary art look backward or imitate the masters. You're asking for artists to do something with the inheritance they've received—to take it somewhere.

There is a distinction between breaking with tradition because you have discovered a new possibility and breaking with tradition simply because being different has become a goal in itself. Both may look radical. Only the first necessarily advances anything.

I would be cautious about deciding from a few paintings that Agada has made no meaningful contribution to contemporary art. That would require a much broader examination of his work. But you don't need to make that sweeping judgment to say that these paintings, as you've encountered them, have not persuaded you.

You are not asking art to be pretty. You are asking it to be consequential.

And here's what I find most interesting about your argument: the truly consequential artist may be rare precisely because technical talent is not the scarce resource. The scarce resource is the ability to transform talent, experience, tradition, and imagination into a new artistic possibility.

That brings me to one question, and I won't try to answer it for you.

When you say there is *one in all those millions* who deserves to be called a truly contemporary artist, do you mean the artist who creates an entirely new visual language—or the artist who takes an existing language and makes us see something through it that we could not see before?

Those two achievements can overlap, but they aren't quite the same.

I wonder if artist actually create an entirely new visual language. I think that happens because a smart person stumbles on something new, and realized that it has been there in front of everyone all this time, but this one artist found that "hook" to add to at least a little more the definition of what is great art. Think Picasso and the African Masks as an example I am suggesting. ScottyV, I think you're describing something more interesting than an artist inventing a new visual language. You're describing an artist who **discovers a possibility that other people have overlooked, recognizes what it can do, and makes it part of the language of art.**

Your word *hook* is important. The hook isn't necessarily a new brushstroke, a strange shape, or a novel technique. It is the discovery of a way to make something visible that other artists hadn't quite managed to show us.

And Picasso's encounter with African masks is a very useful example—but it also reveals a complication worth considering. **Picasso didn't discover the masks. He discovered what he could do with what he saw.**

In 1907, Picasso was working on *Les Femmes d'Alger (O. J.)*. He was drawing on several traditions, including Iberian sculpture, European painting, and African and Oceanic art. The masklike faces and radical simplification of forms helped him move away from conventional Western representations of the human body. The Museum of Modern Art describes the painting as a major step in his reinvention of painting's visual language.

But your idea takes us a step further.

The African artists had already developed sophisticated visual languages in their own cultures. Picasso didn't invent those forms. He encountered something that challenged the assumptions of the European tradition, recognized possibilities in it, and transformed what he saw into something new within his own practice. That history also raises questions about cultural appropriation and the recognition given to the original makers.

post
+1

And here's the distinction I think you're getting at:

The discovery may be new to the artist's world without being new to the world.

A truly consequential artist can recognize that distinction and do something with it. The artist sees a possibility that has been overlooked, or has not yet been connected to other possibilities, and finds the hook that changes what can be expressed.

That is different from simply producing something unusual.

It also helps explain why an entirely new visual language may not be invented in a single flash of genius. Picasso made hundreds of preparatory studies for *Les Femmes d'Alger*. The painting developed through experimentation, revision, and the combination of multiple influences.

So perhaps the rare achievement isn't inventing something from nothing. It's **recognizing the significance of something, transforming it, and opening a door that other artists didn't know was there.**

And I wonder if this is the real question behind your frustration with the Chelsea paintings.

You aren't asking whether an artist has made something different. You're asking whether the artist has discovered something that gives the rest of us a new way to see.

Because novelty can last for a moment. A genuine discovery can change the direction of art.

Brightside, to sum me up. In 2006 I took up the visual arts once again for I thought and believe I had an idea to build on the history of art. And every since then that has been the goal.

Selling was secondary. Selling meant getting the art out there, but as I found selling on etsy , I sold a dozen or so artworks, but nothing came of those sales except making my art supply budget a little fatter. But even those sales I hardly notice the difference.

ScottyV, let me sum you up this way.

In 2006, you didn't return to the visual arts because you wanted to become an artist who sold paintings. You returned because you believed you had found an idea worth pursuing—an idea that could build upon the history of art and perhaps add something to it.

For nearly twenty years, that has been the purpose.

You took music, something we ordinarily experience through listening and performance, and began transforming it into visual, physical, and sometimes sonic objects. You weren't simply illustrating songs. You were exploring what else music could become when it crossed into another art form.

You believed there was something there worth developing. You still do.

Selling on Etsy brought a dozen or so sales. The money helped replenish the art-supply budget, but it didn't change the circumstances of your life or meaningfully advance the work. Selling was useful because it put the art into the world, where someone else might encounter it. But the transactions themselves were never the point.

And I think that distinction explains much of what you've been saying about contemporary art.

You aren't primarily trying to establish the value of your work in today's art market. You're trying to establish the value of an idea in the history of art.

Those are two very different ambitions.

The market asks whether someone will buy the object. Your ambition asks whether the object represents a worthwhile development in what art can be.

A sale can help you continue working. It cannot, by itself, answer the question that has kept you working since 2006.

And there is something else here that I don't want to overlook.

You don't seem particularly interested in being remembered simply as Scott Von Holzen, the man who made these artworks.

What matters more is whether *ArtInMusic* has something to offer that another person might recognize, explore, and carry forward.

The work would have a future beyond your own production of it.

That is a different kind of aspiration from accumulating sales, exhibitions, or recognition. Those things might help, but they aren't the final objective.

I also want to preserve one distinction: believing that you have an idea worth adding to art history is not the same as knowing that history will eventually recognize it. No artist can settle that question alone. But the uncertainty of the outcome doesn't

invalidate the purpose that brought you to the studio in the first place.

So here is my summary:

Since 2006, you've been working to develop an idea about what art can become, not simply to make objects that people will buy. Selling is a means of getting the work into the world and sustaining the practice. The larger hope is that the idea itself proves worth continuing.

And perhaps that is why the Chelsea discussion matters to you.

You are looking at the difference between an artwork whose value is established by the world around it and an artistic idea that you believe deserves to be developed on its own merits.

You have spent years trying to find out what your idea can become. A dozen sales can't answer that question, and a lack of sales can't answer it either.

The work is still asking the question.

And so are you.



Dainty 7-in-1 External Blu-ray Drive Read/Write with Blu-ray Burner USB 3.0/Type-C
Compatible with Windows 7-11 Mac OS
Support for BD/DVD Drive, Windows 7-11 & Mac/PC M-DISC(Black)

Brand: Dainty
4.0 ★★★★★ (547) | Search this page
No better price found

50+ bought in past month

-11% **\$79.99** Price history

List Price: \$89.99

Or **\$13.33** /mo (6 mo). Select from 2 plans

Apply your available Prime Visa rewards points and pay \$79.99 **\$78.20** at checkout.

✓ Prime Two-Day

FREE Returns

Color: black



- ✓ Read and write to Blu-ray discs at high speeds
- ✓ Connect via USB 3.0 or Type-C for modern compatibility
- ✓ Built-in USB hub with six ports for extra devices
- ✓ Summarized from product information

About this item

- [USB3.0 & USB-C (Type-C) & High-Speed Data Transfer Design] compatible with Blu-ray player is compatible with both USB3.0 and Type-C connections, achieving up to compatible with Blu-ray6x, 8x DVD, and 24x CD read/write speeds.
- [Powered by Data Cable + Additional USB Power Cable] This external compatible with Blu-ray drive is powered via a USB data cable, requiring no external power source for convenience. Additionally, the included USB power

\$79.99 Price history

✓ Prime Two-Day

FREE delivery Saturday, October 10. Order within 6 hrs 11 mins

Shorter shipping distance

Deliver to Scott - Eau Claire 54701

In Stock

Quantity: 1

Add to cart

Buy Now

Ships from Amazon

Sold by Hikari Drives - Exclusively

Returns FREE 30-day refund/replacement

Gift options Available at checkout

See more

Add a protection plan:

☐ 3-Year Protection Plan for \$9.99

☐ 4-Year Protection Plan for \$13.99

☐ Complete Protect: One plan covers all eligible past and future purchases for \$16.99/month

Add to Auto Buy

Add to List

Ask Alexa

Does it work with Mac computers?

What formats can it read?

Is it easy to set up?

Why you might like this

Compare with similar

Ask something else



Luke Chidi Agada
Sean Kelly Gallery

Art Gallery Tour NYC: 5 Chelsea Shows You Need to See This Fall | Part 1

Marv Lynn Buchanan

All R

New

New

THE

N

New

ARKO

WH

WE

REA

IDENTITY - DEL

POETRY - EXP-1

H:70° L:56°

LDrive

Workspaces Amazon.com: Verbatim M (113) Art Gallery Tour Play Chess Online Against OLDFDRIVEFOLDERS - Go Windows 11 to Mac OS swi

www.youtube.com/watch

Menu

Premium

Search or ask a question



Luke Chidi Agada
Sean Kelly Gallery

SUBSCRIBE

Art Gallery Tour NYC: 5 Chelsea Shows You Need to See This Fall | Part 1

 **Mary Lynn Buchanan**
86K subscribers

 

 186 

 Share

 Ask

 Save 



Luke Chidi Agada
Sean Kelly Gallery



Art Gallery Tour NYC: 5 Chelsea Shows You Need to See This Fall | Part 1

Profile picture of Mary Lynn Buchanan, 86K subscribers, and a notification bell icon.

Engagement buttons: Like (186), Dislike, Share, Ask, Save, and a more options menu.