

# Richard Prince

## Executive summary

Richard Prince (born 1949) is a pivotal American artist whose practice helped define late-20th-century “appropriation” strategies across photography, painting, and object-making—most famously by rephotographing and recontextualizing mass-media images (advertising, pulp fiction covers, jokes, and later social-media posts) to pressure-test authorship, originality, and the economics of the image. Primary biographical sources consistently emphasize that Prince’s early years in New York involved working with magazine “tear sheets” at Time Inc. <sup>1</sup>, a job that directly shaped both his methods (cropping, reframing, repetition) and his core subject (American commercial mythologies). <sup>2</sup>

Artistically, his career is often read through several durable bodies of work: rephotographed advertisements (including the Marlboro-cowboy motif), “Girlfriends” (biker-magazine imagery), “Jokes” (one-liners sourced from joke culture and magazine cartoons), industrial “Hoods” (car hoods treated as sculptural/relief objects), and the “Nurses” (paintings derived from paperback nurse-romance covers). These series are regularly framed—by museums and the artist’s primary gallery—as sustained experiments in “decontextualization” and cultural semiotics: how an image’s meaning mutates when dragged from commerce into the white cube, or from the internet into the auction market. <sup>3</sup>

Prince’s legal history is not peripheral—it is structurally entangled with how his work is valued and debated. Landmark litigation over the “Canal Zone” paintings (built from photographs in *Yes Rasta* <sup>4</sup>) produced one of the most cited U.S. fair-use decisions in contemporary art: a 2011 district-court ruling that found infringement and ordered severe remedies (including impoundment/destruction of unsold works), followed by a 2013 appellate reversal holding most works to be fair use and rejecting a requirement that appropriation must “comment on” the source. <sup>5</sup> A later “New Portraits” wave of lawsuits—about Instagram-sourced “portraits”—ended in final judgments (2024) enjoining further use and awarding damages tied to sale prices, underscoring a tightening judicial tolerance for near-verbatim reuse when transformation is minimal. <sup>6</sup>

Market-wise, Prince is a blue-chip figure with especially strong demand for the “Nurses” and iconic cowboy photographs. Public auction reporting from major houses and their analytics shows his top prices concentrating in a handful of “signature” series (notably a 2021 record for *Runaway Nurse* at Sotheby’s <sup>7</sup>), while gallery retail pricing (including the much-debated “New Portraits”) has also become part of the discourse around appropriation, value extraction, and consent. <sup>8</sup>

## Biography and career milestones

Prince was born in the Panama Canal Zone <sup>9</sup> and, according to gallery and museum biographies, grew up largely in the Boston suburb of Braintree <sup>10</sup> after relocating there as a child. <sup>11</sup> After applying unsuccessfully to the San Francisco Art Institute <sup>12</sup>, he moved in 1973 to New York City <sup>13</sup>. <sup>11</sup>

A repeatedly documented hinge point is his employment handling magazine clippings/tear sheets at Time Inc. <sup>1</sup> (often characterized as the “tear-sheet department” in educational and curatorial materials). This work placed him literally inside the infrastructure of mass reproduction—surrounded by advertising pages and the grammar of consumer desire—and catalyzed his early “rephotography” strategy: photographing printed images, cropping away textual copy, and re-presenting commercial pictures as art objects. <sup>14</sup>

By the late 1970s and early 1980s, Prince is consistently situated among artists who foregrounded media critique and image-circulation (often grouped—historically—under the “Pictures”/postmodern constellation). Museum discussions of this context stress that Prince’s “author” is frequently the system (advertising, magazines, cultural myth) rather than an individual photographer, and that his craft lies in selection, cropping, scaling, and display logic. <sup>15</sup>

A later life/career milestone is his move to upstate New York (museum teaching materials date this to 1996), which becomes both a geographic base and a thematic engine: “upstate” photographs of vernacular objects (hoops, pools, vehicles) and the expansion of installation projects. <sup>16</sup>

## Major works and series

Prince’s best-known series can be mapped as a sequence of “image economies” he raids—advertising, subculture magazines, joke/caption culture, pulp publishing, and social media—each time converting distributed imagery into scarce objects (unique paintings, limited photographs, or editioned objects) whose meaning is inseparable from their displacement.

### Core series overview

Series (approx. start)	Typical source material	Typical form	What changes (and why it matters)	Anchor primary sources
Rephotographed ads / “Cowboys” (early 1980s)	Marlboro cigarette ads (cowboy myth)	Chromogenic photographs, cropped, scaled	Removes copy and commercial framing; elevates a mass-circulated myth into a museum/market image, stressing how “Americana” is manufactured. <sup>17</sup>	<sup>18</sup>
“Girlfriends” (1980s–1990s)	Biker/subculture magazine images of women	Photographs / grids / re-presentations	Treats subcultural pin-up imagery as both document and stereotype; foregrounds gaze, desire, and subculture as media product. <sup>19</sup>	<sup>19</sup>

Series (approx. start)	Typical source material	Typical form	What changes (and why it matters)	Anchor primary sources
"Jokes / Cartoons" (from 1984)	One-liner gag cartoons (notably from The New Yorker <sup>20</sup> ) and joke culture	Works on paper; later large canvases with text	Moves "low" humor into "high" painting, forcing viewers to confront how context manufactures seriousness and value. <sup>21</sup>	<sup>21</sup>
"Hoods" (late 1980s onward)	Muscle-car hoods / auto culture	Sculptural relief objects	Converts fetishized industrial surfaces into painterly, atmospheric art objects; materializes pop desire as sculptural artifact. <sup>22</sup>	<sup>22</sup>
"Nurses" (premiered 2003)	Pulp medical romance covers	Inkjet + acrylic on canvas; drips/gestural paint	Fuses mass-market erotic fantasy with painterly "high" gesture; debated as critique vs. exploitation. <sup>23</sup>	<sup>24</sup>
"Canal Zone" (2007–2008)	Photographs from Yes Rasta <sup>4</sup>	Collage/painted works incorporating photos	Became the basis of a landmark fair-use fight; legally and critically reframed what "transformation" can mean. <sup>25</sup>	<sup>25</sup>
"New Portraits" (2014)	Instagram <sup>26</sup> posts (screenshots)	Inkjet on canvas with social-media UI + comments	Collapses "feed" culture and commodity culture; central to later copyright judgments restricting reuse. <sup>27</sup>	<sup>27</sup>

### "Spiritual America" and the ethics of recontextualization

A special case is *Spiritual America* (1983), a work reproducing a 1976 nude photograph of a 10-year-old actress Brooke Shields <sup>28</sup> made by Garry Gross <sup>29</sup>. Museum interpretation emphasizes that the work's meaning is inseparable from its recontextualization—invoking capitalism, sexualization, and the public circulation of youth imagery—yet that recontextualization has repeatedly triggered legal/ethical alarm rather than neutral "artworld" reception. <sup>30</sup>

A key disputed/contested point in scholarship and criticism is whether such re-presentations function primarily as critique (exposing exploitative image economies) or as reiteration (reproducing harm while profiting from it). The debate resurfaces whenever the piece is exhibited, especially outside the "protected zone" of specialist art audiences. <sup>31</sup>

## Primary-source image links with captions

The links below point to official museums, major galleries, or major auction houses that publish images or installation views.

**Cowboy motif (museum exhibition page + context).** *Richard Prince: Untitled (cowboy)* (2017–2018) exhibition page at Los Angeles County Museum of Art <sup>32</sup>, including curatorial framing and press-access image package. <sup>33</sup>

<https://www.lacma.org/art/exhibition/richard-prince-untitled-cowboy>  
<https://www.lacma.org/press/richard-prince-untitled-cowboy>

**“Nurses” (gallery show page).** “Nurse paintings” exhibition page from Gagosian <sup>34</sup> (2008), with contextual text and images. <sup>35</sup>

<https://gagosian.com/exhibitions/2008/richard-prince/>

**“New Portraits” (gallery show page).** 2014 “New Portraits” exhibition page (screenshots printed on canvas), central to later litigation and criticism. <sup>36</sup>

<https://gagosian.com/exhibitions/2014/richard-prince-new-portraits/>

**Auction-house images + object metadata (often with deep zoom).** *Runaway Nurse* lot page (object details; results sometimes require login) and public *Price Realised* reporting for the artist. <sup>37</sup>

<https://www.christies.com/en/artists/richard-prince>  
<https://www.sothebys.com/en/articles/46-richard-prince>

## Exhibition history and institutional footprint

Prince’s exhibition history is unusually central to how his work is interpreted because many series are legible as “tests” of the institution itself: what happens when a Marlboro ad, a joke caption, or an Instagram post is granted museum attention and market legitimacy. Museum biographies summarize his career as a sequence of major survey exhibitions across the U.S. and Europe, with especially consequential institutional moments in the early 1990s (midcareer surveys), 2007–08 (Guggenheim overview), and the 2010s (renewed attention to the cowboy motif and the rise of the “New Portraits”). <sup>38</sup>

## Institution key used in the chronology section

A = Whitney Museum of American Art <sup>39</sup> (survey exhibition noted as a first major museum survey) <sup>40</sup>  
B = San Francisco Museum of Modern Art <sup>41</sup> (New Work: Apr 29–Jul 25, 1993) <sup>42</sup>  
C = Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen <sup>43</sup> (survey listed in museum biography summaries) <sup>44</sup>  
D = Museum für Gegenwartskunst <sup>45</sup> (survey listed with touring venues) <sup>46</sup>  
E = Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum <sup>47</sup> (Spiritual America overview exhibition, 2007–08) <sup>48</sup>  
F = Walker Art Center <sup>49</sup> (Spiritual America travel venue, 2008) <sup>50</sup>  
G = Serpentine Gallery <sup>51</sup> (Prince: May–Jun 2008) <sup>52</sup>  
H = Los Angeles County Museum of Art <sup>32</sup> (Untitled (cowboy): Dec 2017–Mar 2018) <sup>33</sup>  
I = Tate Modern <sup>53</sup> (Pop Life controversy, 2009–10) <sup>54</sup>

## A note on gaps and extractable detail

Even major institutional biographies do not always publish complete checklists of solo exhibitions and group-show participation, and many web records emphasize only “major surveys.” For example, museum summaries list survey sites and years but often omit month/day ranges (except where archival “exhibition pages” exist, as with the 1993 San Francisco presentation). <sup>40</sup>

## Legal controversies and copyright litigation

Prince’s controversies cluster into two overlapping domains: (1) *copyright/obscenity concerns* around sexualized imagery of minors, and (2) *copyright/fair use litigation* about appropriation as artistic method. Both domains hinge on “context”: not only what the image depicts, but where and how it circulates. <sup>55</sup>

### “Spiritual America” censorship and the Shields/Gross legal backdrop

In 2009, *Spiritual America* was removed from exhibition at Tate Modern <sup>53</sup> after police advised the image could be “indecent” under the UK’s Protection of Children Act 1978 and that continued display (and sale of the catalogue) risked prosecution; contemporaneous reporting and later documentation confirm the museum temporarily closed the gallery space and withdrew the work. <sup>56</sup>

The work’s source-image history is inseparable from a related (earlier) legal dispute about the underlying 1976 photo: in *Shields v. Gross* (1983), the New York Court of Appeals <sup>57</sup> held that an adult Shields could not disaffirm the unrestricted consent executed by her mother/guardian and could not maintain a privacy-based action under New York Civil Rights Law §§ 50–51 against the photographer for republication. <sup>58</sup>

**Implication for Prince.** Even when the underlying image’s legality is resolved in one doctrinal lane (privacy/publicity consent), it can remain legally precarious in another (obscenity/“indecent”) as displayed to a general public) and ethically volatile as norms shift. A later retrospective reflection on the Tate incident explicitly frames the museum’s mass public access as changing the calculus: once outside specialist artworld interpretation, the image “looks very different.” <sup>31</sup>

## Cariou v. Prince

### Timeline and procedural arc

Photographer Patrick Cariou<sup>59</sup> published *Yes Rasta* in 2000; Prince later incorporated images from the book into “Canal Zone” works shown in 2007–08 and in a major gallery exhibition in 2008, prompting the lawsuit.<sup>60</sup> A 2011 decision by the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York<sup>61</sup> granted summary judgment against Prince and imposed sweeping relief—including delivery of unsold works for “impounding, destruction, or other disposition” determined by the plaintiff, and notification requirements to owners that works could not lawfully be displayed under 17 U.S.C. § 109(c).<sup>62</sup>

In 2013, the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit<sup>63</sup> reversed in part and vacated in part, holding that 25 works made fair use, remanding five for further consideration, and vacating the district court’s injunction (explicitly rejecting destruction as improper and against the public interest if liability were ultimately found).<sup>64</sup> The dispute later settled (public reports emphasize settlement rather than a final merits determination on the remaining five works).<sup>65</sup>

### Legal reasoning that mattered

The district court treated “transformative” use as requiring some form of commentary/critical reference back to the source and emphasized the defendant’s testimony about lacking an intent to comment; it found the fair-use factors weighed against Prince.<sup>66</sup> The appellate court rejected the “commentary requirement” and shifted the focus toward an objective assessment of how the works appear to a “reasonable observer,” allowing transformation to be grounded in altered composition, palette, scale, and aesthetics rather than explicit critique.<sup>67</sup>

### Implications for appropriation art

This case became a doctrinal flashpoint because it encouraged courts to conduct quasi-aesthetic judgments (“reasonable observer” comparisons) while insisting they were not acting as art critics—an approach that scholars argue can make outcomes dependent on taste and institutional authority rather than stable rules.<sup>68</sup>

### “New Portraits” litigation and final judgments

The “New Portraits” works—screenshots of other users’ Instagram posts printed on canvas with platform UI and Prince’s added comments—triggered multiple lawsuits by photographers. Reporting notes these works were initially sold at \$100,000 each in the 2014 gallery presentation, amplifying the claim that value was being extracted from others’ labor with minimal transformation.<sup>69</sup>

### Key decisions and endpoints

In 2017, in litigation brought by Donald Graham<sup>70</sup>, the district court denied a motion to dismiss on fair use, emphasizing the fact-intensive nature of fair-use analysis and finding that, on the pleadings, the work was not clearly transformative as a matter of law.<sup>71</sup> A later 2023 opinion granted partial summary judgment for gallery defendants on certain *profits* theories (finding an insufficient causal connection

between one allegedly infringing work and profits from sales of other works, and rejecting “unrealized profits” from a hypothetical resale). <sup>72</sup>

The cases ultimately terminated with “final judgments” (January 2024) that (a) entered judgment for plaintiffs, (b) dismissed defenses with prejudice, (c) imposed injunctions restricting further reproduction/sale/distribution of the underlying photographs and the Prince works at issue, and (d) awarded damages pegged to “five times” the sale/retail price plus costs “as agreed-upon by the parties”—language consistent with negotiated resolution rather than a fully litigated trial verdict. <sup>73</sup>

The judgment against Prince and [entity[["organization","Blum & Poe","contemporary art gallery"]] in the Kim Gordon dispute awarded damages based on five times the sale price of the infringing work and enjoined distribution of both the underlying photograph and the Prince “portrait.” <sup>74</sup> The analogous judgment in the Graham dispute included injunction language covering the underlying photograph, the Prince work, associated catalog/book, and a billboard reproduction. <sup>75</sup>

**Broader implication.** Compared with the permissive arc many associated with *Cariou*, these outcomes illustrate a more skeptical stance toward “transformation” claims where the secondary work preserves the core expressive content and merely overlays a thin contextual frame (UI, comments, cropping). This skepticism aligns with wider judicial narrowing of “transformative use” analysis in the wake of high-profile fair-use disputes involving commercial licensing markets. <sup>76</sup>

## Market data and collecting

Prince’s secondary-market profile is unusually legible because specific series dominate top prices—and because those prices are in turn cited in criticism as evidence of how appropriation converts ubiquitous imagery into scarce financial instruments. <sup>77</sup>

### Auction records and series concentration

Public auction analytics from Sotheby’s <sup>78</sup> list Prince’s top results (2018–H1 2023) with the “Nurses” repeatedly at the top, including *Runaway Nurse* selling in Hong Kong (June 18, 2021) for about \$12 million. <sup>78</sup> Christie’s <sup>79</sup> publicly reports a prior *Runaway Nurse* sale (May 2016) at \$9,685,000, reinforcing the series’ role as the principal driver of record pricing. <sup>80</sup>

For the “Cowboys,” a verified public result shows *Untitled (Cowboy)* selling at Christie’s (May 2016) for \$3,525,000, underscoring that Prince’s rephotography can command prices associated with the upper tier of the photography market—despite its foundation in existing commercial photographs. <sup>81</sup>

### Primary gallery pricing and market framing

The initial “New Portraits” retail pricing—reported at \$100,000 per work—became inseparable from debates over whether the series was institutional critique, cynical market trolling, or both. <sup>82</sup> This pricing context mattered legally as well, because courts evaluating fair use repeatedly foreground commercial purpose and market substitution as part of the statutory analysis. <sup>83</sup>

## Collecting patterns and major intermediaries

Prince's primary-market position is heavily shaped by Gagosian <sup>84</sup>, which publishes dense documentation of exhibitions across multiple cities and frames his practice as a long-running inquiry into ownership and aura. <sup>84</sup> At the same time, institutional and private collections remain part of his public narrative: for example, his gallery biography lists a 2004 exhibition centered on collecting Prince over decades (Rubell Family Collection, Miami) and frequent museum survey venues, indicating sustained collector attention well beyond a single speculative cycle. <sup>85</sup>

## Critical reception, influence, and ethics

Prince's influence is often described as structural rather than stylistic: younger generations inherit not "how his work looks" but the permission (or provocation) to treat circulation itself as medium—to make selection, screenshotting, reposting, and reframing the real subject. Museum pedagogy explicitly names this as "appropriation" and "rephotography": extracting images (often "without permission") and forcing meaning through new context. <sup>86</sup>

## Influence and art-historical positioning

Museum accounts place Prince inside a post-1970s shift in which the author-function is destabilized and the commodity image becomes raw material; his early ad rephotography is repeatedly held up as paradigmatic, especially the cowboy motif as a machine for American myth. <sup>87</sup> In critical legal literature, *Cariou* and its afterlife are treated as reference points for how courts struggle to evaluate aesthetic "difference" without becoming arbiters of artistic merit—an influence that reaches well beyond Prince into appropriation's broader legal ecology. <sup>88</sup>

## Ethical considerations critics foreground today

A consistent ethical critique is that appropriation can function less like "commentary" and more like extraction: capturing attention, value, and prestige while externalizing cost onto subjects and original makers. This critique intensified with the "New Portraits," where the source images were often personal photographs posted to social media and then sold as high-priced objects, raising questions of consent and power asymmetry. <sup>89</sup>

A second ethical axis is *harm via replication*, not just via theft: *Spiritual America* became a recurring case study because even if the conceptual framing is anti-exploitative, the work requires reproducing an image of a nude child. The Tate episode—and later reflections on it—shows how institutional context, public accessibility, and changing social norms can reconfigure what counts as "acceptable" display even when the work is historically canonical in the art world. <sup>90</sup>

A third debate concerns gender and desire in the "Nurses": auction-house and gallery texts frequently describe the series as lurid/erotic and "iconic" within Prince's oeuvre, but critical audiences remain split on whether this is critique of pulp fantasy or a profitable amplification of it. <sup>91</sup>

## Scholarly literature highlights

A minimal “core shelf” for rigorous study is unusually stable across museum discourse:

- Nancy Spector <sup>92</sup>, *Richard Prince* (Guggenheim Museum exhibition catalogue, 2007). <sup>93</sup>
- Rosetta Brooks <sup>94</sup> et al., *Richard Prince* (Phaidon Press, 2003). <sup>95</sup>
- Lisa Phillips <sup>96</sup>, *Richard Prince* (Whitney Museum catalogue, 1992). <sup>97</sup>

For legal scholarship (peer-reviewed), heavily cited treatments include case notes and articles in the Harvard Law Review <sup>98</sup> (on *Cariou*), and sustained debates in technology/IP venues (e.g., Berkeley Technology Law Journal) about whether “transformativeness” collapses into taste when courts do side-by-side aesthetic comparisons. <sup>99</sup>

## Chronology table

The table below integrates major biographical milestones, exhibitions (using the institution key A-I from the exhibition section), and major legal events.

Year	Major event	Notes / significance	Core sources
1949	Born in the Panama Canal Zone	Origin point often echoed later (e.g., “Canal Zone” as biographical return).	<sup>11</sup>
1954	Family relocates to Braintree, MA	Suburban upbringing appears in later “vernacular” interests.	<sup>100</sup>
1973	Moves to New York City; works handling magazine tear sheets	Establishes the material workflow that becomes “rephotography.”	<sup>11</sup>
Early 1980s	Begins exhibiting “Cowboys” (rephotographed Marlboro ads)	Iconic appropriation of advertising myth.	<sup>101</sup>
1983	“Spiritual America” work made (and tied to later censorship controversies)	Becomes a recurring flashpoint for legality/ethics of display.	<sup>102</sup>
1984	Begins “Jokes and Cartoons”	Moves one-liners into art context; later scales up.	<sup>21</sup>
1992	Survey exhibition at A	Often cited as first major museum survey of the artist.	<sup>40</sup>
1993	“New Work” survey at B (Apr 29–Jul 25)	Archive page documents dates and installation views.	<sup>103</sup>
1993	Survey exhibition at C	Listed as a major survey venue in museum biography records.	<sup>44</sup>

Year	Major event	Notes / significance	Core sources
1996	Moves upstate (NY); expands installations/vernacular photography	Upstate becomes both subject and production infrastructure.	16
2001	Survey at D (with touring venues)	Consolidates European museum recognition.	46
2003	"Nurses" premiered	Major late-career market driver and critical debate generator.	104
2005	"Second House" gifted/acquired by Guggenheim Foundation	Later lightning strike becomes notorious "art-life" episode.	105
2007	"Second House" struck by lightning (June)	Publicly reported damage; emblematic for Prince's installations.	105
2007-08	Major overview at E	The "Spiritual America" overview becomes a reference point.	106
2008	Overview travels to F; exhibition at G	Consolidates institutional framing internationally.	107
2009-10	"Spiritual America" removed at I	Police warning and removal formalized in documentation.	108
2011	<i>Cariou</i> (district court) finds infringement; orders extreme remedies	"Destroy/impound" posture becomes famously controversial.	62
2013	<i>Cariou</i> (appeals court) finds fair use for most works	Rejects "commentary requirement"; remands five.	64
2014	"New Portraits" debuts; later lawsuits begin	Gallery pricing becomes part of controversy.	109
2017-18	Cowboy-focused exhibition at H	Documents continued return to the cowboy motif.	110
2021	Auction record: <i>Runaway Nurse</i> at Sotheby's Hong Kong	Confirms "Nurses" as top market engine.	78
2024	Final judgments in "New Portraits" copyright cases	Injunctions + damages tied to sale/retail price; defenses dismissed.	111
2025	"Folk Songs" announced as a major new series	Major late-career body of work exhibited by primary gallery.	112

timeline

title Richard Prince – selected milestones

1949 : Born in Panama Canal Zone  
 1973 : Moves to New York; works with magazine tear sheets  
 1983 : Spiritual America (work) created  
 1984 : Begins Jokes/Cartoons  
 1992 : Major museum survey (Whitney)  
 1993 : SFMOMA New Work survey (Apr-Jul)  
 2003 : Nurses premiered  
 2005 : Second House gifted/acquired by Guggenheim Foundation  
 2007 : Second House struck by lightning; Guggenheim overview opens  
 2009 : Tate removes Spiritual America from Pop Life  
 2011 : Cariou district court finds infringement  
 2013 : Cariou appellate reversal (most works fair use)  
 2014 : New Portraits debuts  
 2021 : Runaway Nurse reaches ~12M at auction  
 2024 : Final judgments in New Portraits copyright cases  
 2025 : Folk Songs series announced at Gagolian

1 10 25 60 64 67 94 <https://blogs.library.duke.edu/scholcomm/files/2013/04/138475739-Cariou-v-Prince-2nd-Circ.pdf>

<https://blogs.library.duke.edu/scholcomm/files/2013/04/138475739-Cariou-v-Prince-2nd-Circ.pdf>

2 3 9 14 16 17 18 34 43 49 86 87 93 95 97 101 104 [EDU•SF.curric guide](https://www.guggenheim.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/12/guggenheim-teaching-materials-richard-prince.pdf)

<https://www.guggenheim.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/12/guggenheim-teaching-materials-richard-prince.pdf>

4 29 68 88 92 99 [https://harvardlawreview.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/vol127\\_cariou\\_v\\_prince.pdf](https://harvardlawreview.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/vol127_cariou_v_prince.pdf)

[https://harvardlawreview.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/vol127\\_cariou\\_v\\_prince.pdf](https://harvardlawreview.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/vol127_cariou_v_prince.pdf)

5 62 66 <https://cases.justia.com/federal/appellate-courts/ca2/11-1197/100/0.pdf>

<https://cases.justia.com/federal/appellate-courts/ca2/11-1197/100/0.pdf>

6 71 76 83 <https://copyrightalliance.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/Graham-v-Prince.pdf>

<https://copyrightalliance.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/Graham-v-Prince.pdf>

7 54 56 61 102 108 <https://www.theartnewspaper.com/2009/10/01/richard-prince-photo-withdrawn-from-tate-exhibition-after-met-threatened-organisers-with-sex-offenders-register>

<https://www.theartnewspaper.com/2009/10/01/richard-prince-photo-withdrawn-from-tate-exhibition-after-met-threatened-organisers-with-sex-offenders-register>

8 59 77 78 98 [46. Richard Prince](https://www.sothebys.com/en/articles/46-richard-prince?utm_source=chatgpt.com)

[https://www.sothebys.com/en/articles/46-richard-prince?utm\\_source=chatgpt.com](https://www.sothebys.com/en/articles/46-richard-prince?utm_source=chatgpt.com)

11 41 45 100 <https://www.mnuchingallery.com/artists/richard-prince>

<https://www.mnuchingallery.com/artists/richard-prince>

12 110 <https://www.lacma.org/art/exhibitions/past?page=17>

<https://www.lacma.org/art/exhibitions/past?page=17>

13 105 [https://www.artsjournal.com/culturegrrl/2007/07/lightning\\_devastates\\_guggenhei.html](https://www.artsjournal.com/culturegrrl/2007/07/lightning_devastates_guggenhei.html)

[https://www.artsjournal.com/culturegrrl/2007/07/lightning\\_devastates\\_guggenhei.html](https://www.artsjournal.com/culturegrrl/2007/07/lightning_devastates_guggenhei.html)

15 The Pictures Generation, 1974–1984

[https://www.metmuseum.org/exhibitions/listings/2009/pictures-generation?utm\\_source=chatgpt.com](https://www.metmuseum.org/exhibitions/listings/2009/pictures-generation?utm_source=chatgpt.com)

19 57 <https://www.portlandartmuseum.us/mwebcgi/mweb.exe?request=record%3Bid%3D57544%3Btype%3D101>

<https://www.portlandartmuseum.us/mwebcgi/mweb.exe?request=record%3Bid%3D57544%3Btype%3D101>

20 38 40 44 46 47 79 <https://whitney.org/artists/3382>

<https://whitney.org/artists/3382>

21 53 <https://www.guggenheim.org/teaching-materials/richard-prince-spiritual-america/jokes-and-cartoons>

<https://www.guggenheim.org/teaching-materials/richard-prince-spiritual-america/jokes-and-cartoons>

22 39 70 <https://www.guggenheim.org/artwork/15761>

<https://www.guggenheim.org/artwork/15761>

23 24 35 <https://gagosian.com/exhibitions/2008/richard-prince/>

<https://gagosian.com/exhibitions/2008/richard-prince/>

26 27 36 63 109 Richard Prince: New Portraits, 976 Madison Avenue ...

[https://gagosian.com/exhibitions/2014/richard-prince-new-portraits/?utm\\_source=chatgpt.com](https://gagosian.com/exhibitions/2014/richard-prince-new-portraits/?utm_source=chatgpt.com)

28 81 Richard Prince (B. 1949), Untitled (Cowboy)

[https://www.christies.com/en/lot/lot-5994678?utm\\_source=chatgpt.com](https://www.christies.com/en/lot/lot-5994678?utm_source=chatgpt.com)

30 The Pictures Generation, 1974-1984 @Met

[https://collectordaily.com/the-pictures-generation-1974-1984-met/?utm\\_source=chatgpt.com](https://collectordaily.com/the-pictures-generation-1974-1984-met/?utm_source=chatgpt.com)

31 55 90 <https://www.theguardian.com/artanddesign/2025/may/01/tate-modern-25-jaw-dropping-and-unforgettable-moments-from-the-first-25-years>

<https://www.theguardian.com/artanddesign/2025/may/01/tate-modern-25-jaw-dropping-and-unforgettable-moments-from-the-first-25-years>

32 84 85 96 112 <https://gagosian.com/artists/richard-prince/>

<https://gagosian.com/artists/richard-prince/>

33 <https://www.lacma.org/press/richard-prince-untitled-cowboy>

<https://www.lacma.org/press/richard-prince-untitled-cowboy>

37 91 <https://www.christies.com/en/lot/lot-5994659>

<https://www.christies.com/en/lot/lot-5994659>

42 103 <https://www.sfmoma.org/exhibition/richard-prince/>

<https://www.sfmoma.org/exhibition/richard-prince/>

48 Richard Prince: Spiritual America

[https://www.guggenheim.org/exhibition/richard-prince-spiritual-america?utm\\_source=chatgpt.com](https://www.guggenheim.org/exhibition/richard-prince-spiritual-america?utm_source=chatgpt.com)

50 51 Walker Art Center Presents Acclaimed Guggenheim ...

[https://walkerart.org/press-releases/2008/walker-art-center-presents-acclaimed-guggenhe?utm\\_source=chatgpt.com](https://walkerart.org/press-releases/2008/walker-art-center-presents-acclaimed-guggenhe?utm_source=chatgpt.com)

52 Richard Prince: Spiritual America

[https://www.guggenheim.org/teaching-materials/richard-prince-spiritual-america?utm\\_source=chatgpt.com](https://www.guggenheim.org/teaching-materials/richard-prince-spiritual-america?utm_source=chatgpt.com)

58 <https://www.casemine.com/judgement/us/5914c3abadd7b049347c8398>

<https://www.casemine.com/judgement/us/5914c3abadd7b049347c8398>

<sup>65</sup> <https://www.hollywoodreporter.com/business/business-news/appropriation-artist-richard-prince-settles-689402/>

<https://www.hollywoodreporter.com/business/business-news/appropriation-artist-richard-prince-settles-689402/>

<sup>69</sup> <sup>82</sup> <sup>89</sup> <https://www.theartnewspaper.com/2023/09/14/gagosian-wins-lawsuit-brought-by-photographer-over-richard-prince-new-portraits-series>

<https://www.theartnewspaper.com/2023/09/14/gagosian-wins-lawsuit-brought-by-photographer-over-richard-prince-new-portraits-series>

<sup>72</sup> <https://www.nysd.uscourts.gov/sites/default/files/2023-09/15cv10160%20Opinion%20and%20Order%20sept%2011%202023.pdf>

<https://www.nysd.uscourts.gov/sites/default/files/2023-09/15cv10160%20Opinion%20and%20Order%20sept%2011%202023.pdf>

<sup>73</sup> <sup>74</sup> <sup>111</sup> <https://www.courthousenews.com/wp-content/uploads/2024/01/mcnatt-prince-judgment.pdf>

<https://www.courthousenews.com/wp-content/uploads/2024/01/mcnatt-prince-judgment.pdf>

<sup>75</sup> <https://business.cch.com/ipld/GrahamPrince20240124.pdf>

<https://business.cch.com/ipld/GrahamPrince20240124.pdf>

<sup>80</sup> Richard Prince | Art for sale, auction results & history

[https://www.christies.com/en/artists/richard-prince?utm\\_source=chatgpt.com](https://www.christies.com/en/artists/richard-prince?utm_source=chatgpt.com)

<sup>106</sup> <https://brooklynrail.org/2007/11/artseen/prince/>

<https://brooklynrail.org/2007/11/artseen/prince/>

<sup>107</sup> <https://walkerart.org/press-releases/2008/walker-art-center-presents-acclaimed-guggenhe>

<https://walkerart.org/press-releases/2008/walker-art-center-presents-acclaimed-guggenhe>