



The American Federation of Arts

Fifth Annual Directors Forum

A UNIQUE PERSPECTIVE

Exploring the Big Impact of Small Museums

November 8-10, 1998

Contents

Introduction
Directors Forum Staff
Sponsors
Foreword

Opening Address
Schuyler G. Chapin

Unique Exhibitions: Small Museums as Advocates and Innovators

Nancy M. Doll
Jane Delgado
Denise Dickens
Lucinda Barnes
Fred Wilson

Myers-Briggs Type Indicator Workshop: The Implication of Personality Type for Managerial Styles and Interpersonal Relations

An Overview

If You Build It, Will They Come?: The Pros and Cons of Expanding Programs and Facilities

DeCourcy E. McIntosh
Elaine Van S. Carmichael
Lyndel King
Dennis Fiori
Robert Knight

Collaborative Leadership: The Many Ways of Being a Trustee

Dr. Evan Turner
Paula Fried, Ph. D
Leonard Lauder
Meryl Meltzer

Excerpts from the Subsequent Question and Answer Session

Ownership Issues: Stolen Art and Repatriation

Hugh M. Davies

Transcripts made possible by The Joe and Emily Lowe Foundation
©1999 The American Federation of Arts
41 East 65th Street, New York, NY 10021
Phone: 800-232-0270; Fax: 212-861-2487; E-mail: services@afaweb.org

Permission is granted to reprint or duplicate the text portion of this transcription. Credit should read: "Reprinted with permission from The American Federation of Arts."

Introduction

Responding to requests from the field, The American Federation of Arts established the Directors Forum program in 1994 to provide a networking opportunity designed primarily for the leaders of smaller art museums. However, since most the themes are universal, the directors of large institutions are also encouraged to participate.

The Directors Forum has quickly become a conduit for information and inspiration. Through a series of panel discussions and workshops, participants learn from the successes and obstacles encountered by their colleagues as they advance their mission within a broad range of communities. Most of all, the conference is a confirmation of the power of art to captivate, motivate, and educate.

Over the past five years, 395 directors from across North America and abroad have discovered the value of the Directors Forum. Attendees consistently give high marks to the program in annual evaluation surveys. One recently commented that, "The bold, ground-breaking ideas here were encouraging and impressive." Others found the experience "eye-opening and helpful" and related that, "It was great to hear stories from the trenches".

To participate in the Directors Forum, individuals must be full-time, paid professional directors of nonprofit art museums or galleries open to the public on a regular schedule. Members of the American Association of Art Museum Directors and directors of artist-managed institutions are not eligible.

We encourage you to share this information within the museum community. Permission is granted to reprint or duplicate the text portion for educational purposes only. Photo reproduction is strictly prohibited.

Directors Forum Staff

Program Coordination

Cary F. Gouldin
Museum Services Coordinator

Program Assistance

MiJin Hong
Museum Services Associate

Transcript Coordination and Printing

Jessica Kessler
Museum Services Associate

Contributors

The American Federation of Arts would like to thank the following for their generous contributions to the 1998 Directors Forum:

Major Support:

The Joe and Emily Lowe Foundation, Inc.

Program Printing:

Phillip Morris Companies Inc.

Event Sponsorship:

BRAVO, The Film and Arts Network

Christie's

The Getty Leadership Institute for Museum Management

Huntington T. Block Insurance Agency, Inc.

Image Directory

Lucent Technologies

TIAA-CREF

In-kind Gifts:

American Express Business Travel Center

McGraw-Hill Home Interactive

MoMA Retail, The Museum of Modern Art, New York

STREETWISE® Maps

International Ventures and Travel, Inc.

Foreword

Over the last five years The American Federation of Arts' Directors Forum has hosted hundreds of directors of small to mid-size museums and reached many more through these transcripts after the proceedings. The New York City venue affords an opportunity within three days to visit our museums and to meet, network and share ideas with their leadership. The panel discussions by outstanding experts have covered a wide range of practical subjects among them: leadership challenges, relations with boards, staff, service providers, patrons; fundraising, marketing, earned income, budgeting, asset management; issues of stolen art; internet and other electronic opportunities; social and political and cultural change, expansion of programs and facilities and next fall, entertainment versus education, corporate support and sponsorship, intellectual property and the internet, and living artists' place in museums.

Interest in and attendance at museums is at an all time high nationwide and museums of all sizes have become valuable additions to America's cultural landscape. The Joe and Emily Lowe Foundation had been honored to underwrite the Forum since its inception and to have played a tiny role in helping directors deliver new services and programs to this growing public, especially our children.

Ellen Liman, President
The Joe and Emily Lowe Foundation

Opening Address

Schuyler G. Chapin

Commissioner, Department of Cultural Affairs
City of New York

I came here to deliver a keynote address. Now, I get very spooked by the phrase "keynote," particularly when one is looking at an audience of people who are spending their lives with the arts, and most particularly, in your case, with museums, large ones, medium sizes ones, and small ones. So rather than the speech I prepared for this evening—an interesting speech looking at the arts in several ways—I am going to do it a little differently because I think the most important two elements that we have to begin to realize about the arts and the United States are basically the economic importance of the arts to our cities and other areas of the United States, and secondly, arts education. So these are the two topics I am going to talk about, but before I do, I'm going to make a little prelude.

When Mayor Giuliani was thinking of appointing me to this post, he did this by an invitation to meet him on the 30th of December, 1993, two days before he took over as Mayor, at his transition headquarters. Now transition headquarters of newly incoming political figures resemble nothing so much as a combination of a Feydeau farce and "Fiorello." There were people of every conceivable size, shape, and color wandering around. And a few minutes past 10, I was taken into Mr. Giuliani's office. When we sat down, I said to him that I was aware he was an opera buff and I'd heard rumors that his favorite soprano was Kiri Te Kanawa. He looked at me, smiled and said yes, she is wonderful but, he said, patting his heart, my heart is forever with Renata Tebaldi. When I said, well she was wonderful, but when I was general manager of the Met, it became my sad duty to realize that this distinguished artist's voice was falling apart at every performance. And I certainly did not want to hear a New York audience boo her. So Giuliani looked at me and asked, "Well, what did you do?" I said I asked if I might come to see her, but she insisted on coming to my office. When she did, I asked as politely and as affectionately, as professionally, as sincerely, and as definitely as possible that she look at some other repertoire. Now Giuliani became the prosecuting attorney. He looked at me, and he said, "What repertoire?" And I said, "Dido," "Delilah," "Carmen," but that's as far as I got because she looked at me with hate coming out her eyes, arose, wrapped her mink around her, left my office, and never spoke to me again. And in an amusing way, she had had a kind of revenge on me four years later. Giuliani looked at me and said, "What do you mean revenge?" I said, and this is a true story, I was at the Roosevelt Hospital in New York for a major operation requiring a lot of blood being taken. And at 4 o'clock in the morning of my first day in the hospital, I was awakened by a blood technician who pulled my arm rather forcefully down, put on a very uncomfortable tourniquet and with a large needle poised on my arm, looked at me, and speaking in a middle-European accent said: "Why were you so cruel to Tebaldi?" I said, "What?" He said, "Why were you so cruel to that great artist?" Now, may I remind you that it was 4 o'clock in the morning, and I am all alone. I am in the hands of an opera nut. So, I looked at the long needle and suggested he perhaps should finish what he came to do and then we could talk. And he put the needle in and my entire life went past me: my wife, my children, my grandchildren, and it is all over. I mean I'm going to die in this man's hands. Finally, he removed the needle and, as soon as I was free of it, I looked at him and said, "I wasn't cruel!" and told the story that I've just told you. This guy never took his eyes off me. When he finally finished his work and got to the door of my hospital room, he looked back at me and said, "You were cruel. You were mean to that great artist, and that great woman." And closed the door. At this point (Mayor) Giuliani was on the floor with laughter. He said, "You know, I know about your work in opera and music, but what about the other arts?" I said, "Well, Mr. Giuliani, I have lived in this city all my life and for 45 years have been involved in the visual arts, performing arts, and arts education." And because he was the Mayor-elect of the City, I said to him, "how do you feel about the arts?" He repeated his remarks, adding that if you took, as an example, the fashion industry and coupled it with the cultural life of the City; you had the fuel that runs the engine that is New York.

Well, I had never heard an elected official speak this way about the arts. So, I said to him, if you really feel that way, it would be nice if you used that right up front in your inauguration speech. We then had a chat about various things and I went away thinking this is not the guy I thought he was. So on January 1, 1994, I turned on the television and right at the top of his inaugural address was the comment about the arts. And I thought to

myself, if this guy asks me to take this job, I am going to do it. And he did, on the 20th of January 1994.

Now, I said to you that I was going to talk basically about two things: the economics of the arts and arts education. Economics and the arts are often thought to be oxymoronic or at least something that diminishes the elegance of the arts. That of course is absolute nonsense, because we have just completed a survey on what the arts actually mean to New York City. And the results of this, the McKinsey Report, are staggering. It shows without question that \$11.1 billion a year flows through New York because of the arts. People do not come here to look at our traffic. They come to look and listen to our treasures. And that means the arts in general in this City are second only to Wall Street as income producers.

I suggest to you that nationally we have to begin to look at public/private partnerships. What does that phrase actually mean? Historically, in this City, it began in 1870, after the Civil War, when a group of citizens approached the then Mayor with the idea of building a museum of science for children, a Museum of Natural History. The proposal put to the mayor was very simple: take city land, build a building for us and lease it to us, and we will be responsible for the contents. And after mayoral discussions with the governor, that was agreed, and the Museum of Natural History was built where it stands now on 76th Street and Central Park West, and all subsequent additions have been under city auspices. A second group of citizens, a group of art lovers, then approached the mayor with the idea of doing the same thing for art collections. That was the start of the Metropolitan Museum. The original building, which is still in use, and all of the buildings around it, are owned by the City. And so it is for 34 institutions, including the Botanical Gardens, the zoos, Carnegie Hall, the Brooklyn Museum of Art, the Museum of the Moving Image, and our latest member of what is known as the Cultural Institutions Group, the Museum of Jewish Heritage. Now, who pays for this? The City pays the CIG bills for electric power, air conditioning; all of that for those 34 institutions at special rates that are established by Con Edison and the City. Capital expenditures, on the other hand, are always public/private. That formula has worked in this City for years, and this is a formula that has to be looked at outside of New York.

Congress doesn't like New York City. People who don't live here are often deeply suspicious of this City, but the fact remains that this public/private partnership is something that is going to have to extend not only in the United States, but to Europe as well. So, the amount of money that annually ends up in the legislative-executive negotiations for the Department of Cultural Affairs is just under \$200,000,000 a year—\$100,000,000 programming and \$100,000,000 capital. Very few people in the City of New York know what the Department of Cultural Affairs does, but it is important that you as museum directors should know this because while every city has its different texture and its different appeal to people, the basic idea of public/private partnership is what we should be looking at nationally.

The second point I want to speak about tonight is arts education, and I am going to tell you the story of what's happening here in this City. When Mayor Giuliani and I had the meeting I described earlier, one of the questions he asked me was if I were to be given this job, what would my top priority be? And I said that's simple; you have to get the arts back into the New York public school system. I noticed that when I said this his face had a rather quizzical look, but he made no comment, just sort of nodded. When, in fact, I had been in this post for 4 months, I received a telephone call from Vartan Gregorian, then president of Brown University and also the overseer of the Annenberg Education Fund, some \$500 million that Walter Annenberg put out to improve public education. Gregorian told me he had given two grants to the City of New York, one in the humanities, one in the sciences that the humanities were limping along but the sciences were dead in the water. Even so, he thought there ought to be the possibility of a grant to encourage the return of the arts to the schools and what did I think about that?

Obviously I thought this was terrific. I went up to Providence to meet with him. And in September of 1994 we had a meeting in my office with the then Schools Chancellor Ramon Cortines and Gregorian plus several other people from the private sector. Now, the Department of Cultural Affairs over the years has provided some funding for a number of organizations like Studio in a School, Arts Connection, and Young Audiences, that literally went into schools where the principals invited them to come. And gradually the arts institutions of the City began to find that the audiences were all turning gray; there was no new blood, no new young people. This was not a problem that had been ignored, but one that had not been solved. In the 1970s, when the City went through its economic crisis, the

arts were the first things removed from the public schools. And so it was agreed between Cortines, Gregorian, and myself that there should be a plan created for the reinstatement of the arts. And the Aaron Diamond Foundation offered to pay for a plan to be created by Arts Vision, to take about a year and a half. And on that September afternoon, when the meeting broke up, I thought that we were finally on the way to doing something about this problem.

All this was grand, except I awoke one morning and realized that I had never mentioned a word of this to the Mayor, not one word. So, I thought you really better get your act together. And at a staff meeting a couple of days later in a casual way, I said oh, by the way, there is one other thing I should tell you about. And I gave them a briefing on what I had just told you, that it was 21 years that the arts had been out of the schools and we really had to get them back. And I waited, and he looked at me and he said, "Can you tell me why the arts were ever taken out of the schools system?" And I said, no, Mr. Mayor, I can't. At that point in the meeting, somebody who must have been 12 years old in 1970 said, "I can tell you why. It was the cost of teaching teachers." So then there was a general discussion about this, and I just sat there waiting. And finally, Mayor Giuliani looked over at me and, cocking his finger, said: "Good. Keep me informed." And I said I would be delighted to do that. We began a series of meetings with the Board of Education, with the teachers union, and with arts education funders. We began, and it took seven versions before the Annenberg plan was completed, and just as this happened, Cortines resigned his job. I immediately received a call from Gregorian saying that everything is on hold until we know what the new Schools' Chancellor has to say. I don't know anything about the new Schools' Chancellor except that he comes from Spokane, which is a perfectly nice place, but what it has to do with the schools of New York City was a bit of a mystery. However, we are flexible in this City, extremely flexible. I went to hear this chancellor speak at a breakfast meeting of the Association for a Better New York, and the first thing he said was that New York City had just lost the best schools' chancellor in the country. And I thought to myself "this is a classy guy." He then proceeded to speak for about 10 minutes not on what he was going to do, but what he hoped would be the thrust of education in the future. It was a masterful presentation. I went up to him afterwards, introduced myself, and said that I really had to see him immediately about the arts education. One of his aides came to me and asked if I could be at the Chancellor's office the next morning at 9 o'clock. I said absolutely and I went into the chancellor's office, Chancellor Rudy Crew by name, and this incredible man was there with his deputy for programs. There were just the 3 of us. I explained that we were poised for a grant, but I had to know how he felt about arts in the school. And he looked at me and he said, "Commissioner, it is very simple. The arts are the answer to illiteracy." He then proceeded to make it totally clear that this was a major, major project. So, I asked him if he would send a letter to Gregorian telling him the same thing. I gave him a draft of the letter, and the letter went out the next day. And then in 1996, we got the grant. This was all the Mayor needed and he not only gave money to support the Annenberg Initiative, but, working with the Chancellor, set up Project ARTS, which literally means Arts Restoration Throughout the Schools. This restoring of the arts will take 3 to 5 years to cover all 1,100 schools in the system with their 1,100,000 school children. Project ARTS is for the curriculum. The Annenberg grant is for schools themselves to make individual partnerships with arts organizations in this City, music or visual arts, theater or dance. And the way I know this was going to work without any question was a speech the Mayor gave in January of 1997, his State of the City speech. This speech was going to be not only his resume of what had happened during his first 4 years, but was also going to be the opening gun for his reelection campaign for a second term. He asked me if I was going to be there, and I said, no. I had to do something else. He said, no, try to be there. Okay. I arrived to find myself seated with the Police Commissioner and the Schools' Chancellor. I'm looking around, what is this? He talks about the Police Department, about the education matters, and then almost as a throwaway he says: "Oh, before I leave education, there is one more subject I want to speak about." And he comes down into the well of the City Council chamber, says that 25 years ago a decision was made that is now to be rescinded: the arts are going back into the New York public schools. The place exploded. I mean, I am looking out at all these firemen and policemen and civil servants, and his remarks got more applause than anything else he said. Then he held up his hands, and using his fingers, said: "painting, sculpture, music, theater, dance, poetry. These open children's minds," — I mean I sat there thinking, this is the second most important elected official in the United States and he is standing here talking about the arts and education. And in 3 minutes, he had summed up why this was important. And he concluded by saying that perhaps the most important reason of all was that they brought beauty into the lives of children who frequently have very little in their own. And there was more applause. And it was obvious that this was going to happen. And it is happening, in a major way. It is a miracle. Miracle is the only way to put it. Two and a half years later and the arts are on the

way. The reason for this is obviously the partnership between the Schools' Chancellor and the Mayor, but what moved the Mayor to feel so strongly about this? I finally asked him. And he told me that when he was 12 years old, he was headed for a street career until a music teacher came along and turned him on to a love of music. When you get an elected official and a chancellor of a school board that feel that this has to be done, the rest is relatively simple. So, I suggest to you that arts education within your own communities has got to be a priority, a priority that for every reason, including the one that Chancellor Rudy Crew gave me from the first day I met him, the answer to illiteracy, illiteracy of all kinds, the opening of children's minds and imaginations, this is what we have to do.

So, now we have in fact two big thrusts, the economic side, which is very important and something that has to be looked at in a different way in the future, and we have arts education. And if we pay attention to those two things nationally, nationally we will be a long way towards saving and increasing the importance of what we all do. I remember once many years ago in Notre Dame, St. Mary's College, when I was in the music management business, St. Mary's was one of my clients for their performing arts series. And Sister Mary Madeleva, who ran the college, was a big lover of the arts and believed very strongly about the importance of arts education for her girls. She built one of the first all-purpose art studies gallery-theaters in the country. When the building was about to be opened, I looked at the cornerstone and on it was the definition that is the best I have yet seen about what we all do. It said very simply, "art is the signature of man."

I do thank you all for being a wonderful audience and the opportunity to talk to you tonight. We are all in the fight for arts together, and we are all going to win.

Unique Exhibitions: Small Museums as Advocates and Innovators

Nancy M. Doll, Director, Weatherspoon Art Gallery

Welcome, and good morning. To kick off this conference on the big impact of small museums, our first session will look at some of the ways in which smaller institutions serve as innovators in their approach to exhibitions and programs. To do so, we have a highly qualified panel whom I will introduce one by one as they make their presentations. I will also try to keep us on track so that we have time for questions at the end, but first I would just like to make a few introductory comments.

The advantages and disadvantages of being either a large or small museum are arguable. While large museums have more considerable resources at their disposal in terms of space, staff size, general size and scope of collections, and funding, it can also be these very things which prevent larger institutions from responding to, or enacting, change. Small museums on the other hand, while usually lacking in these very resources I just mentioned, may be more adept at turning such drawbacks into strengths and using them as catalysts for innovation.

On several levels, small museums may have the advantage: 1) administratively in the ability of staff to work cross-departmentally as a team, if departments even exist; 2) programmatically in being able to take more risks, not only in the content of exhibitions, but also in interpretive and educational programs and even in the formats in which they are presented; and 3) in terms of audience. Small museums can often involve their communities and build new audiences in more direct and meaningful ways. I know I am not telling you anything you don't already know, or that hasn't been thought about or discussed before. In fact, it's at least a decade-old discussion. In a talk entitled, "A Meditation on Small and Large Museums," which is reprinted in, "Rethinking the Museum," Stephen Weil cites a definition of a museum adopted by ICOM (International Council of Museums) in 1974, "A museum is a non-profit making, permanent institution in the service of society and its development." In 1984, the Canadian-based International Movement for a New Museology declared that, "The new museology is primarily concerned with human development, reflecting the driving forces in social progress and associating them in its plans for the future." I think our panelists this morning will give evidence of how some small museums are doing just that.

Jane Delgado
Executive Director
The Bronx Museum of the Arts

I would like to tell you a little bit about small museums and talk about some programs that I believe nurture and bridge artists and community together. First, a little bit about the Bronx Museum of the Arts.

The Bronx Museum of the Arts was conceived in the 1960's by a group of local residents to bring the visual arts to the Bronx as part of the borough's revitalization efforts. The Museum's guiding principle has been to make arts and arts education programming more available to its culturally diverse constituency and to stimulate participation in contemporary visual art through its exhibitions, interpretive programs and materials, and education outreach and training. Since 1983, we have occupied a 45,000 square foot facility. It's a former synagogue that, through considerable capital renovation, has become a fully accessible Museum, and we are located on 165th Street and the Grand Concourse right there in the Bronx.

The Bronx Museum has ongoing exhibitions of twentieth century and contemporary art on site and at other locations throughout the Bronx; strong visual arts education programs for youth and adults; a permanent collection of works by artists of African, Asian, and Latin American ancestry; and regular community programs, performing arts events and lectures. From the onset, we have always viewed ourselves as a community-based institution that

would have a unique relationship with artists and audiences. We accomplish this through our solo and group exhibitions that address contemporary and historical issues of relevance to the Bronx and its residents; solo and group exhibitions of emerging, mid-career, and mature artists; and exhibitions based on the permanent collection, as well as thematic exhibitions that stimulate and expand discourse and scholarship, and promote cross-cultural exchanges. Through our programming, we offer programs that specifically nurture artists. In some instances, these programs not only nurture artists, but also unite artists and residents. What I would like to do is give you some examples of these programs and then later on, talk specifically about them.

First, the highly regarded annual Artist in the Marketplace program has been around for 18 years. This program provides professional career development, encouragement, and an exhibition venue for talented, emerging artists who have had little or no exposure. Since 1980, 36 artists living in the New York Metropolitan area have been invited to participate in a 12-week seminar program. Led by professionals connected to the art business, the seminars provide valuable information that enhances the participants' skills as career artists, and the program traditionally culminates with an exhibition of Artist in the Marketplace participants' works. Artist in the Marketplace alumni include leading contemporary art figures and is usually favorably reviewed by art critics. The Collaborative Arts Program, an initiative that builds upon the Satellite Gallery Program, also began in 1980. The Satellite Gallery Program basically brought exhibitions to nontraditional settings in the borough. What we did was we looked at the program and recognized that there was an opportunity to strengthen it. CAP took the Satellite Gallery Program to another level, that is, thematic exhibitions at these sites were the product of a dialogue between artist and clients of non-art community based organizations. Clients are no longer passive participants. Indeed, they are part of an arts production experience with an assigned resident artist and a museum educator, and the subject of the art project relates to the concerns, issues, and/or themes they identified as being important. The art production experience can be an individual effort or a collaborative one, involving each one of the participants and artists. Program sites have included Bronx libraries, social service agencies and centers, hospitals, and youth recreational facilities. Through this interaction, CAP artists are not only developing new work, but also have an opportunity to receive feedback on their work. For the participants, CAP offers a glimpse at how the visual arts can be a part of their every-day life. We have had projects relating to the immigration experience. And using an art-making process to discuss that immigration experience, we have an adult literacy project. We use that project as a way of addressing some of their literary issues and also give people an opportunity to document their lives and the highlights of their lives that are important to them. We also have an education gallery. We invite local community groups to sponsor exhibitions in that space. Basically we are looking to attract different kinds of community based organizations who feel that art is a wonderful process for addressing their issues. So these are not professional artists, but they start to understand how art can be very functional in keeping with the issues and concerns that they have.

Because we are a small, community-based organization, we can conceptualize and present unique exhibitions. Solo exhibitions afford an artist an opportunity to develop new work for the exhibition, in addition to including a survey of his or her art production over a period of time. Generally, we will encourage the artist to include work, which may have informed or led to the new work, although that is not always the case. We provide the artist with support for the research needed to develop the new work. This could include traveling funds or facilitating interaction with individuals and/or groups. Often, we have no idea what the product will look like until the installation actually takes place. It also means, on these occasions, we don't have a catalogue when the show opens, since we generally are photographing the new work five days before the opening reception. An example of this is one of our recent exhibitions, *Double Happiness*, which featured the work of Tomie Arai. Tomie Arai is a contemporary artist who presented an installation relative to the Chinese Diaspora. Through oral histories and the collection of memorabilia, *Double Happiness* featured members of the Chinese Caribbean and Chinese Latino community. Using several banquet tables, the artist presented quotes, beliefs, and values of the individuals represented at each table, and audiotapes included excerpts of the oral histories taken. Working with the Museum of the Chinese in the Americas, we trained persons in taking oral histories and conducted outreach to identify the Chinese Caribbean and Chinese Latino participants. The artist interacted personally with all the individual artists involved and the participants were very pleased to be a part of the exhibition that recognized their special heritage. All of them attended the opening this past spring. I was really a wonderful event. Many of these individuals were part of the programs that we developed in response to *Double Happiness*.

The last example I want to share with you relates to exhibiting, in three parts, our permanent collection during our 25th anniversary. We didn't have the money that we wanted or needed to do the big bang that we were hoping for, so basically we started looking around and thinking. We then realized that we had this small, but very special and very unique collection and decided that what we would do is present a series throughout the year of our collections, and we called it *Talk Back: The Community Responds to the Permanent Collection*. Basically, we decided to be a museum of wonderful, different galleries. We didn't go through the traditional interpretive process as part of our exhibition because what we wanted to do is invite all of our visitors and audiences and community to basically tell us what they thought, what they felt this communicated to them, did they like it? We asked a series of questions to try and get the dialogue going. Essentially, we brought out objects and asked our audience to comment on the works. These comments were typed on cards and clipped onto a hook that rested beneath each object. We took these cards and color-coded them to make a distinction between the curators, artists, and everybody else. Additional color-coded cards were added at the end of each week and became part of the interpretive labels. The objects that received the most attention during one exhibition were shown again in another gallery in a specific area. We would put them on a particular wall, in a particular gallery, and they kind of became the Hall of Fame because it was very clear that these were favorites and people had a response to them. It was really quite wonderful because *Talk Back* enabled our audience to participate in the curatorial as well as in the interpretive process generally reserved for our education staff. It was such a successful approach that we have decided to include some form of it when we inaugurate our permanent collection gallery in April, 1999. I am not saying that we are going to do it quite the same way, but I am certain we are going to find a way to have people tell us what kind of objects they would like to see in the gallery and continue that dialogue.

Our goal is for our audience to have ownership of the collection. I think that it's a splendid way to ensure that our community views the Bronx Museum of the Arts as an important resource that can promote pride and cultural self-affirmation.

Thank you for your attention.

Denise Dickens
Executive Director
Contemporary Art Museum

I am going to start by giving you a little background and context for my talk about these projects that we are doing. The Contemporary Art Museum was founded in 1983 as a direct result of the City of Raleigh's plan to spur economic development in a part of downtown that was pretty burned out. Who else is going to do this kind of work other than contemporary art museums or contemporary centers? The idea was to serve as a window for our community into what was happening in the contemporary art world, and as I said, the City really found us. We were established as a private, non-profit museum with an independent board of trustees. Originally, two-thirds of our budget came from the City of Raleigh, and we called ourselves the City Gallery of Contemporary Art. The first couple of slides are installations from an exhibition we did with Robert Rauschenberg.

Our budget size was around \$400,000, with a staff of four full-timers and one part-timer, 16 trustees, and over 30 volunteers and college interns. Our physical space was 7,000 square feet with about 5,000 of that dedicated to exhibition space. Our average attendance was about 27,000-30,000 annually, which was remarkable to us. There was also an additional 10,000 students participating in our programs through their schools.

I want to describe our community to you, because some of what we do grows out of where we work. We are part of the Triangle Region, consisting of four cities and seven counties. It's home to nearly one million people, and that number is growing at an extremely high rate. It is also a very transient community. People tend to live here on the average three to four years and then move on. The primary industries are the universities. There are four major universities, along with several smaller schools. We actually have more Ph.D.s per capita than the Silicon Valley. Teaching hospitals, pharmaceutical companies, the state government, and high technology companies also play a large role in our economy. We have a very high growth rate due to the many young families and the growing retiree population moving into our region.

This [slide] is an exhibition we did with Robert Lobe, an artist from New York. I want to give you an idea of what our space looked like. This is one of the shows that we did prior to closing our space called the *Open Artist Hanging*. I am sure many of you that operate a space that focuses on bringing in art from somewhere else have heard the familiar request from the local artists for venues that show their work, or work of regional artists. We came up with a way of addressing that need. It's literally called the *Open Artist Hanging*. For two weeks, any artist can bring one work of art. It's not juried or judged. They literally hang it up on the wall themselves. It's also a big party. We interviewed the artists and played the video back during the show. The event attracts both the established artists that are living and working in the area and the young and emerging artists. We have had established artists come in with their child and put their work up together. It also gives us the opportunity to paint our walls from top to bottom once a year. We usually spackle and paint, so that when the show ends, we start from scratch.

This [slide] is an installation by the Japanese artist, Yoji Matsumria. We like to bring in artists and have them work in the gallery space for a period of time. It gives the community a chance to come in and talk with the artists and see the process of the actual exhibition taking form. Clearly, we don't know precisely what it's going to be like until it's up, until it happens, and some of the artists don't know either, because it's evolving. I mean, it really is a work in progress. When Yoji was installing his new work, he also held workshops with teachers, so there was a lot of mingling with schools and students.

I show you Yoji's work because I really think it symbolizes our mission: to support, present, and give people an opportunity to experience the art of our time and the art-making process. We aim to provide a place where people can learn about the interrelated nature of the times we live in and the art being created. Sometimes, as a direct result of that, the work tends to be political or political in nature. It's very timely, and I am setting you up for what came next for our museum.

In 1993, we started making plans to purchase a building in 1996, which marked the end of our 10-year lease. Our space in a once burned out section of town slowly attracted other businesses in the area, including a new museum across the street. But as the political climate changed, the conservative right moved in, we fell out of favor with the City of Raleigh. In 1996 we started the year with \$90,000 in the bank to help us with a down payment on a new building. Then, as I say, all hell broke loose.

This [slide] was the headline in 1996, as we were poised to buy a building and secure our future. After ten years of support from the City of Raleigh, we lost our funding for basic operations. And I know you all know Jesse Helms, our senator. Well, his nephew became our new mayor pro-tem. Our new mayor was the handpicked golden boy of the Congressional Club. The mayor ran his campaign against a piece of public art. We were really an easy target for reducing taxes and cutting funding for the arts. We knew our days were numbered, and we lacked the political clout necessary to prevent the inevitable. All this happened while we were in the planning stages for a building campaign and two weeks before our new fiscal year was to begin. It was unprecedented and completely unplanned for, but suddenly, our funding went from being cut in half down to zero. I wish we had had more politically savvy and connected people on the board, but we didn't, so we had to come up with a strategy to keep our presence. As one of our board members said, and I have a group of mavericks on our board of trustees, "We are not going to let the bastards get us down."

What we look like today: we have a budget of \$200,000, and a staff of two full-timers and two part-timers. We still have a board of 16 trustees. I will tell you, and this is interesting, our average age on our board is 37-39 years old. I look out at that board table and realize that we are planning for the long-term. Ten years from now, we will have built some really strong loyalty for the institution. That's the way we think about the future now. We know we are very much dedicated to surviving and keeping our mission alive. We can look at the growth in our community and understand that we need to be there. It's only a matter of time. Our region has become our physical space, our landscape, our community, anyplace that fits the exhibition needs.

You are looking at a slide now of a show done in Memphis, Tennessee. *Long Memory, Short Memory; Ten Israeli Artists* opens in Atlanta this week. The traveling exhibitions have helped us to keep a presence regionally. Our imagination and the financial resources have

been our only restraints. Our average attendance is immeasurable. For some of these projects, I can give you estimates, but we no longer count them off. We now reach millions.

Our challenge to be visible and to be viable while in the process of buying a building was two pronged. Regionally, we sponsored traveling exhibitions and programs, but we felt that the majority of the money for the Capital Campaign would have to come from the local level. Our local exhibitions have come from unusual collaborations with Triangle institutions.

This [slide] is a poster from the Czech poster show that we put together several years ago. It had been sitting in storage, until the National Humanities Center in Research Triangle Park agreed to host the exhibition. We realized we had the ability to take our programs to the streets. This [slide] is an example of one artist, Jane Fish, from Durham, North Carolina. We approached a festival that takes place downtown twice a year, and offered our services as a visual arts expert to identify artists and projects that would enliven the festival. And we got them to pay us! As you can see, [slide] we chose artists and projects that would be very interactive, very fun. I would say over a two-day period, this festival draws about 30,000-60,000 people to downtown in all. This [slide] is by the artist Saio Eio from Greenville, North Carolina. This [slide] is a work by Will Hooker, a very large bamboo construction. The challenge of taking art out of the museum is to still get visibility. We work really hard to keep our name attached. We can come up with the ideas and we can get the work out to people, but we still want them to know that the museum is behind it. It's a continual challenge.

Me And My Community is the other project started just before we closed [slide] and one we have gotten a lot of mileage from. Basically, it was a show of 25 posters by middle school students in the Triangle. It grew out of a workshop for teachers with design professionals in our community. It's about communication, design, and the graphic arts. We framed the posters, and the students wrote about their work and their perception of their community. This show now has traveled to such places as hospitals, nursing homes, malls, bank lobbies, a bookstore, and the airport. There is a bit of irony here; the show's last venue is at City Hall. There's a big reception for it later on this month. I am looking forward to that.

Another collaboration [slide] was done with a colleague at The Light Factory in Charlotte, North Carolina. *Troubled* consisted of photography, film, and video from Northern Ireland. We also used a vacated Chevrolet showroom downtown for the *Wild Wheels* art car exhibition. That's the Button King, Elmer Fleming, also known as Spoon Man [slide]. Harrod Blank stands with his camera van from San Francisco [slide]. In another project, *What's in Store*, we had students and professional artists create installations for vacant downtown storefront windows. The installations [slide] remained for about a four-month period. As you can imagine, the pieces really helped energize and enliven these otherwise run down parts of town. It is also a great selling point when you are trying to get businesses and people to come downtown.

I am going to finish up with a project that's called *The Larger Canvas*. We commissioned North Carolina photographer, Elizabeth Matheson, to create billboards from her black and white contemplative photographs [slide]. Working along with a billboard artist, she adjusted her images and we installed them along Interstate 40, where they appear like visions or dreams. Again, this sort of display is a challenge since no one really knows we are doing them unless we get a write-up in the paper. Luckily, we have been successful at that. The billboards are really beautiful. They are all on very busy highways, and they are really just beautiful, beautiful. We estimate literally millions of people have seen and been touched by them. We are going to do another series.

I will mention very briefly a project we have on the books for this year: *99 days of art in 1999*. We are going to commission four artists to do temporary outdoor works that will be displayed during a 99-day period. Some of these works will actually be created during the 99 days. We are also joining other art organizations to market tourism, come in and get your theater tickets, travel around, and see the artwork.

I just want to tell you there is light at the end of the tunnel. We bought a building [slide], a 20,000 square foot warehouse. We asked ourselves two questions 2 years ago: Can we exist without a building temporarily, and what's that going to look like? Today, we ask ourselves: What's possible with our human and financial resources? Does this idea,

exhibition, project, move us closer to being in our building? Does it help us fulfill our mission? Somewhat. Are we having any fun? That's important. And what do plans B, C and D look like? We are constantly reminding ourselves, what if, what if this, what if that? I will wrap up by telling you we have a new state senator, I am really pleased to announce. One more to go. (We have the same mayor until 1999.)

Lucinda Barnes
Executive Director
The Boise Art Museum

I am going to focus on how, in a small museum through exhibitions, we can be advocates and be innovators. Each exhibition and program that the Boise Art Museum presents, whether it originates in-house or not, offers an opportunity to be unique and innovative, and to be inventive while still addressing the issue that all of us share -- limited resources. And when referring to resources, I am referring not just to funding. I am talking about labor and sometimes objects and space. But first I want to talk to you just a little bit about the Boise Art Museum.

I really describe this as a small and a big museum at the same time. On the big side, we are the sole visual arts museum in the State of Idaho. It's a big state, but it's defined largely by wilderness. The museum was established in 1932, as a joint venture between the City of Boise and the Works Progress Administration. The building you see in this slide is our original 1937 WPA building. The organization started as a volunteer non-collecting art association, a non-profit educational association for the benefit of the people of Boise, Idaho and the Northwest. It became a collecting institution in the 1970s. It was renamed the Boise Art Museum in 1988. In 1987 we renovated and extended the facade a bit. This was an addition by the San Francisco architect, Mark Mack. One of the features of the '87 addition is an interior atrium, which incorporates the original entrance to the museum. In 1997, just a few months before I arrived, the museum completed its third expansion. We increased the total space by about one-third. Now our space totals about 34,000 square feet. You are looking at a new interior courtyard added to the opposite end of the original 1937 building. We have about 60,000 visitors a year and we serve a 300-mile radius (this is just in the immediate state). Our most recent expansion includes additional temporary exhibition galleries, first time permanent collection exhibition galleries, an education center, indoor sculpture court, an outdoor sculpture garden, and we expanded our store. Just to fill the new galleries, our exhibition programs have increased by 50%.

We are a general-purpose art museum, with exhibitions and curatorial driven programs. We present about 20 exhibitions a year addressing a wide spectrum of historical periods. Visitors generally can see about 4 kinds in the museum simultaneously, starting with major exhibitions of national significance. These are largely loan or traveling exhibitions, often historical in nature. The new space has allowed us to introduce a program of smaller focused exhibitions dedicated to mid-career artists who are living in Idaho and the Northwest. These are not meant to be retrospective exhibitions. They are meant to deal with specific bodies of work. We have also introduced a small, very low-budget series of exhibitions focusing on emerging regional artists specific to our immediate area. And then we have long-term permanent collection exhibitions going on continuously. Our permanent collection consists of about 1,700 objects. It's a very particularized collection. There are some rather big gaps. The larger focus is contemporary art, particularly Northwest artists; on contemporary American realism and contemporary ceramics. We have a growing collection of Asian ceramics and African objects as well.

Our ambition and our intentions are big. Our community is big and expansive, and our responsibility is big. Our immediate responsibility is to the entire state. That's large. But our resources are limited, small relative to our audience and the scale of what we offer. We have a full-time staff of 14. Our staff essentially did not change when we finished the new building (we converted 3 part-time positions to full-time). On the programming side, we have a curator of exhibitions, curator of education, registrar, 2 preparators, an assistant curator, and a couple of curatorial assistants who also have other functions within the museum structure. On the administrative side, we have myself, we will soon add an assistant director, a financial manager, and a store manager. So you see, it's quite a small staff to accomplish and maintain what we do. Small as we are, we can and must achieve on a big scale, but also on a scale that is ever mindful of our own community and mindful of our primary purpose to meaningfully impact the lives of people in our community and to

make a difference while we are also preserving, interpreting, collecting, and following the highest museum standards.

So how do we satisfy the seeming disconnects of big dreams, big energy and ambition, and small resources? I think we do this through skillful, efficient, inventive, and full use of resources, and that means objects, staff and expertise, and funding. We are experts at multi-tasking. We are an exhibition and presentation-based museum with education, appreciation and enjoyment as the cornerstones of these activities (those words have always been part of our mission). Everything we do feeds into these directives. We operate more out of the box than not, because by necessity, we have to move around ideas and situations quickly and with as few encumbrances as possible. There is little separation between brainstorming and action. We don't have the luxury to be able to add steps to that, and when it's all clicking together, this is a very exciting and rewarding way to work.

I want to focus on a specific upcoming project at the museum as an example of how we can and must be inventive in expanding the scope of our impact. This is the exhibition [slide] entitled *Trashformations*. It's a traveling exhibition focusing on contemporary artists who create works of art using recycled materials and/or found objects. It's a strong, thoughtful, well-planned exhibition with wonderful, engaging works of art. You are seeing an installation shot here. The work on the left is composed entirely of clothing tags, and the next work is largely based on the use of pieces of microfilm, and the kind of grid like piece in the background is made from coat hangers. But this exhibition comes to us with a few challenges. (Based on my experience and a certain amount of assisted coaching, I have come to view challenges as potential opportunities in disguise, sometimes in deep disguise.) Challenge number one: to educate and facilitate understanding, appreciation, and interest beyond our traditional, loyal audience. We, like all expanded or new facilities, must increase the range of our audiences. We need to reach more people. For many people in the State of Idaho, in order to get to the museum, have to travel across a mountain range or two. The exhibition will open in February. This is the heart of ski season. Probably our biggest competitor in Idaho is the outdoors. Trying to get people indoors when, like myself, they would prefer to be outdoors, is a challenge. People live to play outdoors in this state. We have a modest budget for this exhibition and equally modest funding sources at this particular time, so we are really not able to do extensive marketing. Challenge, or I should say, opportunity number two: we have an existing commitment with seed money and a ticking clock to inaugurate an interactive, multi-media, educational based gallery. I came on just about eight months ago and this was handed to me with very little clear form. In its preliminary guise, it was unmanageably ambitious, rather static in its conception and very problematic to fully fund or to sustain over time. But at the heart of this was a really great idea. Opportunity number three: the museum web site was well meaning, but dull. It had an ineffective and obsolete internal computer system leaving us with ineffective e-mail and no designated technical staff, bits and pieces of technical skills spread around the staff, and absolutely no budget to fund improvements in these areas. As one friend of mine would say, "You are in big trouble." This was the scenario just a couple of months ago. The complexity and urgency of this led me to look at these problems really as an opportunity to be creative, to experiment, and to achieve multiple goals by leveraging resources.

Let's return to the *Trashformations* exhibition. The exhibition will be accompanied by standard didactic educational materials, programs, labels, gallery hand-outs clearly and succinctly discussing individual artists, the works of art themselves, and in-gallery artist and curator talks. The point of expansion comes largely through this interactive gallery initiative, which remember, I have a little bit of money to develop, but not enough to address the originally proposed form. I decided to do a little matchmaking here, with the *Trashformations* exhibition and our interactive gallery. We redesigned the gallery to make it more effective, more manageable and to include the introduction of a new web site. We have gotten a small supplemental grant so we can upgrade all of our internal systems. That really provides a foundation for this gallery. In addition to the expected education information about the museum, which we will have on a web site, we are using this exhibition as a programming model for the interactive gallery and the web site, focusing on various materials that are used by artists in the exhibition, like paper, metal, and glass. This information will set the stage for workshops and artist demonstrations to take place in the interactive gallery during the course of the exhibition. The web site and the linked interactive gallery program will also highlight works from our permanent collection.

This [slide] is a work by the artist James Castle. Castle was an extraordinary self-taught Idaho artist who created haunting and puzzling drawings and constructions made from

scraps of paper, cloth, string, cardboard, et cetera. In this particular work, he rubbed and moistened tissue paper, using it both as pigment and form. He was entirely self educated. He made his own graphite from soot and spit, and I should say that Castle was born deaf and never learned to speak or sign. His art was his form of daily language. So what we are doing is using the *Trashformations* exhibition and linking it to our own collection and branching it out in as many ways as possible to develop audiences as broadly as possible. When *Trashformations* is followed at the museum by an exhibition of 20th century American drawings, Castle's works again will be featured in our electronic programming, moving from a focus on materials to an emphasis on process and drawing techniques. So we create a kind of continuity with our permanent collection to our ongoing exhibition programming. Through this format we can extend the parameters of our temporary exhibitions to the specificity of our own collection. We are, in a sense, partnering with the resources of temporary exhibitions and at the same time, developing another layer of interpretation and scholarship around the objects from our collection.

Just one more detail about *Trashformations*: When this exhibition opens, we will also use the web site to link with community sites on issues of environmental awareness and advocacy, and we are talking with a local waste management company about being a partial sponsor of this exhibition, linking up some programs with them. In short, we look at our exhibitions and programs not as isolated entities, but as institution-wide projects, and we do so not because we need to share resources like labor and money, but because out of these kinds of collaborations and partnerships, I think, we end up with much more creative and rewarding results. And if we can amplify and improve our impact in meaningful ways, we are doing a better job of fulfilling our purpose, which is, in small and big museums alike, to make a positive difference in the quality of people's lives.

Fred Wilson
Artist

It's been my experience that small museums have a bigger opportunity to be responsive to needs of artists, ideas, and new trends. And I do believe that in my experience, small museums can absorb, learn from, put into action, and critique in ways that large museums cannot. Of course, I am sure this reason is very clear to all of you who deal with unusual subjects by laying the groundwork in local communities, not by assuming, as large museums do, that they need not engage or know the public because their collections will draw the crowds, but by educating the public prior to the exhibition in an ongoing relationship.

The first thing I thought I would show is slides of very big museums. This is my small show at the great British Museum [slide]. I did a project there a little over a year ago, and it couldn't have been a more opposite experience from what I am used to. However, I acted in the same way that I would in a small museum. I realized one of the problems with doing projects of this nature is that time is the major factor. How much I can do and how deeply I can cut into the fabric of the institution is vital, and with the British Museum, I would need many, many years to actually get to the core of that institution to really understand it. What I ended up doing was, instead of using the ancient Egyptian art, I found many labels and display boxes from the nineteenth century for Egyptian artifacts and I displayed those. So what you see here are labels from that time period and various antique display mounts. They were just sitting around rather unceremoniously in the basement storage. I left the dust on them. Many of the mounts and labels have quite interesting writing on them. In hand painted gold leaf, they describe the ancient art in royal, biblical, or seemingly poetic terms, like the glass and wood display case that read "figure of a person not named" or "hand of a king left wanting." I exhibited tiny glass beads with miniscule accession numbers written on them. I researched and displayed the history of the family of calligraphers who, generation after generation, painted the numbers and wrote the labels for all the objects in the collection. In this slide, we have an Egyptian fist made of granite surrounded by a huge mass of concrete—never to be removed again. The techniques of display seem to parallel the relationship between Great Britain and Egypt at that time, so I was literally and figuratively interested in the "framing" of Egypt by the British. Though I was invited by the energetic and interesting Egyptologist and curator, James Putnam, I always got the feeling that the rest of the curatorial staff either were not paying attention to me or were watching me very closely from a distance, or both at the same time, in British style. In small museums, I am able to meet with the director, the board of trustees, the staff, and local community. It's impossible in an institution like the British Museum or other large museums to do that. There are always layers that you never really get to, and in

order to do what I do, in order to effect some kind of change, all layers of the environment have to be worked with, so this project remained on the surface for me.

The box with the glass front on your right was the original box that the Rosetta stone was displayed in. As you came up to this empty box it read at the bottom, "What are you looking at?" It's just a big empty box. My thinking here was that in art museums, people come in droves, maybe once in their life, to see things that they will stand in front of and stare at because they know it's there and it's important, like the Rosetta stone. But most tourists can't read ancient Greek, demotic, or hieroglyphics. They can't even see the object with the crowds around it, so "What are you looking at?" I think is an important question in large museums in general. Here is another example of some issues that come up when working with a museum that has many, many, many layers. Beneath the bust of Belzoni, an early archeologist and carnival strongman who brought back many of the important Egyptian sculptures to England, it says, "Remember me?" Opposite him is an Egyptian sculpture, a head of an Egyptian pharaoh, and it says, "Remember when." And then the third is a photograph on the wall of a glass bell jar with a mummy's skull complete with skin. It's the one thing from their collection that I asked for that they would not allow me to put on display for some unexplained reason, though they have mummies and skulls on display elsewhere in the museum. The fact that the head was disemboweled under the bell jar like a Victorian curiosity could have had something to do with it. Anyway, under the photograph it says, "Remember this." Again, though I was invited to do this project, I never had the opportunity to discuss the situation, the reasons for wanting to put the skull on display, so when the kinds of conversations that need to go on get truncated in huge museums, the project also gets truncated.

This [slide] is from the Studio Museum in Harlem. It's a project called *Local Color* that I did with their collection. On the shelf are the figures from their African collection. Above it are two dolls in very Afro-centric garb that I bought across the street from a street vendor. I was really thinking about how African culture exists both inside the museum and outside the museum. I show this installation because using museum-like wall colors, such as deep green, matte black, and dark red, which are also the colors of the black liberation flag, albeit darker, I was showing how even the wall paint contains symbolism. In museums, deep, rich hues often seem to express value or preciousness; the darker colors sometimes infer mystery and the spirituality of cultures in ethnographic collections. Coupling this with the colors of a flag readily recognizable to the local community made this dual symbolism clear, though subtle. This group of colors was not lost on any of the public when I used them.

In the Indianapolis Museum of Art, I created a display of things seen here in the slide. Borrowing from their Asian art collections, I placed stone Buddha heads on their sides rather than on the mounts made for them. I was not as interested in the beauty of the objects, which was apparent at all angles, but how they came out of China at the end of the nineteenth century. The mounts hid the fact that the heads were hacked from the living rock to be brought to the west, leaving behind the vandalized ruins of a destroyed ancient temple. This vitrine was part of a larger installation called *The Spiral of Art History*, which looked at the meanings and relationships between the color-coded organization of galleries in the museum. Had I been there longer I would have been able to work with the local communities more and this project would have taken on a larger, more contextual focus.

This [slide] is from my exhibition at the Museum of Contemporary Art in Chicago, where I borrowed this bronze sculpture by the sculptor Malvina Hoffman from the Field Museum's collection of "ethnographic types," and the standing figure in the slide was in the MCA's collection. While the museums' assumed I would do something about race, I did not start out with this as a premise. I never do. However, in this case, I actually did end up thinking about race. I had this nude white gentleman by Duane Hanson, which I found in MCA's storage, placed in the gallery. As you see, the Malvina Hoffman busts of "ethnic types" gazed at him and into the space. It was interesting. The Malvina Hoffman sculptures, when on view in the Field Museum, eradicate any kind of actual importance of the individual depicted in the sculpture. They are just nameless "race" types. Removing them from the context, of the natural history museum and placing them in the art museum context you can see them as fine sculptures by a classically trained sculptor, full of the humanity and individuality of those portrayed. I placed the Hoffman busts and the Hanson sculpture in the gallery that exhibited the model of the then future museum. This was right before they built the museum, or they were trying to gather funds for the new museum. Rather than remove the model and reinstall the gallery entirely, I left the model there and added a few things.

In addition to the busts and contemporary sculpture, I added the floor plans of Cabrini Green and other neighboring housing projects. I placed them on the wall next to the new museum's floor plan, comparing spaces for living and spaces for art. To me it begs the question, "Who is the museum presently for?" and "Who is the new museum going to be for?"

What I like about small museums is that the public actually can reach the curator and the director, and a dialogue can go on. At the Seattle Art Museum, several of the rooms I created for my installation, *The Museum: Mixed Metaphors*, fostered a dialogue. One of them was in this gallery [pictured in slide] of early twentieth century art. This is how it looked before I transformed it. The art is displayed like all other galleries of its type in the U.S. This next slide is what I did to it: I used dramatic lighting and had the walls painted dark green. Most startling was the positioning of the art. As you see, sculptures and paintings are clustered together in a frenetic arrangement. While other displays I created may have been overlooked, this display was not missed by anybody. When a viewer asked why the Matisse was in front of the Arp, and why a Giacometti was in front of the deKooning, the curator, Patterson Sims said, "Well, Fred Wilson did this, and he did this because that's how we display the ethnographic art on the floor below." I did this primarily just to understand what happens when art of other cultures is displayed in this particular way. What changes in the meaning of the object? What changes in how you view the artist?

I've just returned from Melbourne, Australia. I created an exhibition there at the brand new and beautifully designed Ian Potter Museum of Art. I titled my project, *Viewing The Invisible*. Really, I was thinking about the invisible process of museums, the invisible history in Melbourne and Victoria, and some actual invisible qualities of the museum. They have these wonderful automatic sliding glass doors. Unfortunately, right after the museum opened, people were walking into the glass doors because they couldn't see them. However, they have since changed that. I became interested in this particular museum because it has a very strong conservation department. I often work with conservation departments very closely, because conservation departments can keep something from happening. I always make sure the conservators know me and understand what I'm doing. I've worked in museums and I think they appreciate the fact that I am as concerned about the care of the art as they are. So here I worked with the conservators because there were a lot of them. They had done some infrared work on this particular painting [pictured in the slide] showing how the painter had relocated some of the figures. This is one of the most famous paintings in Australia. From this I decided to do an exhibition of landscape paintings from the nineteenth century, looking at various paintings through the use of the infrared camera. Of course, the notion of landscape in Australia and in the United States in the nineteenth century was very similar. It was all about nation-building and Manifest Destiny and getting European people in and indigenous people out of the way. I was inspired by the infrared work that they had done and had infrared works created of all the paintings, however, they were fake infrared images. The infrared images are actually photoshopped versions of the paintings. With the computer, I collaged in other images from the same time period, as if they were something that I found behind the image. I layered drawings from the nineteenth century of various conflicts between Aboriginal people and Europeans, images I found in the national archives. I didn't tell anyone they were fake, however. If you didn't know, they would catch you off guard. I never said in the wall labels that they were really infrared images. I simply juxtaposed the manipulated faux "infrared" pictures next to the paintings, so viewing the exhibition, one felt as if you were looking through the nineteenth century society's notion and propaganda about the Australian landscape to see the actual sad history. I did a bunch of other things as well. I thought the cleaning trolley was quite a beautiful object, so I placed it on a pedestal. In addition, you see the brown [manikin] hands of the cleaner, the only brown-handed person in the museum beside myself, and he removed the trolley every morning for about an hour. If you came early you could see him take it off the pedestal, clean and put it back on. Of course there was a label thanking him for loaning the trolley. Again, trying to reveal for the public some of the invisible processes of a museum. Certainly, a museum would be a different place without the cleaner. Using architecture as well, I found there was a wonderful thing that the architect had done where the old building is attached to the new building. The facade of the old building is still there, now visibly a part of the interior wall of the new building. The brick of the facade and some of the windows of the original building are visible, which will eventually be the entrance to a gallery of ancient Greek and roman art, but are empty now. Within these vacant rooms, I added objects. I put the objects in the room behind the glass windows. Through the windows you could see busts of men of science and learning and other objects I culled from Melbourne University's collections, but

they seemed to be holographs due to the unique qualities of the glass. While you stood there looking through the windows, there were voices of men talking; the men talking represented those "great men" who created the world we live in. Basically they were talking to each other and nobody else. Outside of this gallery of men talking to each other and in front of the windows are two busts of Truganini and Woudreddy, two historic and famous aboriginal people. Supposedly, Truganini was the last aboriginal Tasmanian, which is a fallacy, but it suited the world's imagination until recently.

The last image I will show you is from the Maryland Historic Society, probably the greatest experience with an institution's collection I have ever had. I asked them for a torn painting. Every museum has one. Of course, nobody will admit it. They gave me one. I said, "I don't want that one, give me another one," and they found me one where the tear was exactly where I wanted it, and I placed it on view and had a video monitor behind the painting of the maintenance man, a black man's face visible through this nineteenth century white gentleman's face, speaking to the viewer, saying things like, "Nobody knows I'm inside of you except mama, and she lives far away. But you have to live with me, reminding you of who you are and where you have been until the day you die." My grandmother and many other people in my family, older generations, have told me stories about African American people with very light complexions moving north and disappearing into white American society, and I often thought about those people who had made that transition for whatever reason they felt they had to make it. However, when the docents got together and discussed this particular painting and what I was doing, they were all a little disturbed, saying, "Why do we have to explain this to young children?" "This is an old thing," "Who cares about this anymore?," "It's over with." And then one of the gentlemen in the group announced that he was African American. No one up until that point in the Maryland Historical Society had known he was African American. He had seen no reason to tell anyone. Indeed no one in the museum discussed their heritage much, as the museum had highlighted the elite of Maryland. A sure silencer of difference.

With this one exhibition, *Mining the Museum*, the relationship between the docents had shifted, as had the relationship between the docents and the public, the museum and the public, and most dramatically, the relationship between African Americans and the museum. So in many ways, if difficult topics in art exhibitions are dealt with in an open, fluid and compassionate fashion, it can move the museum in a positive direction and change the public's relationship with the museum in a way that is not only positive, but lasting.

Thank you.

Myers-Briggs Type Indicator Workshop: The Implication of Personality Type for Managerial Styles and Interpersonal Relations

An Overview

On Monday, November 9, the Directors Forum offered a special MMI workshop utilizing the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI), a diagnostic tool in the form of a questionnaire that can help people in organizations to:

- Make constructive use of individual differences
- Communicate more effectively with others
- Learn the approaches that are most likely to facilitate agreement and cooperation from each type
- Understand and adapt to differences in management styles
- Enhance organizational effectiveness, problem solving, and decision making

The session was led by Allan H. Church, Ph. D. and Janine Waclawski, Ph.D., principals with W. Warner Burke Associates, Inc. (WWBA), a consulting firm specializing in organizational change and executive development.

How it worked

WWBA mailed questionnaires to participants to complete and return before the Directors Forum. WWBA scored the questionnaires, and generated a 30-page profile for each participant.

The MBTI profile assessed participants' personal preferences along four dimensions: Extravert-Introvert, Sensing-Intuition, Thinking-Feeling, and Judging-Perceiving. During the session, Drs. Church and Waclawski explained the origins and uses of the MBTI, and offered practical advice designed to enhance managerial effectiveness. Participants also had an opportunity to experience the impact of MBTI preferences in the workplace by participating in interactive exercises.

For more information about the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, please contact Allan H. Church, Ph.D. or Janine Waclawski, Ph.D. at W. Warner Associates, Inc., 201 Wolfs Lane, Pelham, NY 10803 or call (914) 738-0080.

If You Build It, Will They Come?: The Pros and Cons of Expanding Programs and Facilities

DeCourcy E. McIntosh, Executive Director, Frick Art & Historical Center

This has been a very interesting couple of days, and the experience is going to continue today. Though we have confined ourselves to small museums, we have certainly been privileged to see fabulous contemporary and modern art at the Fisher Landau Center, at P.S.1, The Drawing Center last night, and now here at the New Museum. I think one of the pleasures of this conference is that John and Serena have arranged for us to get around to sites in this city that we might not ordinarily be able to fit into the typically brief, economy-fare visits we make to New York, if we're coming from any distance.

I also want to note, because it made such a strong impression on me yesterday, that it seems to me that one of the really interesting, dynamic advantages of small museums is that they are, in fact, an ideal setting for the residency of a living artist, a setting where the creative process can be foregrounded more effectively, more immediately for audiences than may be possible in a larger institution. I think in smaller museums there is a fantastic opportunity for having artists help to shape the overall perception of the institution.

I think I was chosen to chair this session because of a strategic - I don't want to say "mistake," but strategic - mistake that I made. One of the things my little evaluation said yesterday from the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator Workshop was I ought to listen more to my own intuition. Well, I don't know about that, because five or six years ago, we at the Frick, which is a combination of a small art museum and a historic house museum on a late 19th century estate, were approached by a well-known local collector of antique automobiles, who was looking for a permanent resting place for his collection. He wished to consider our place, and I told him we were very flattered. We met immediately, and the thing moved along very, very quickly. Ultimately, hardly more than a year later, we opened an expanded car and carriage museum. We already had a small carriage collection in an outbuilding, but we expanded it and attempted to tell the little known story of the automobile industry in Pittsburgh. So we opened a new car and carriage museum, and it's not that they didn't come; it's just that they didn't come in the numbers we would have liked. They're coming in dribs and drabs, and attendance is building, but I cannot say the museum is an unqualified success at this point. Yet there is a silver lining in the cloud: our struggles since the opening of the Car and Carriage Museum have prompted us to look ever more deeply into the educational implications of this new installation; and we thereby have discovered some fantastic educational opportunities that are really going to enrich our whole education program and give it a new dimension. So, that's my war story, and maybe it will be the last of the war stories today.

Elaine Van S. Carmichael
Principal
Economics Research Associates

A lot of times when I visit a museum that's contemplating an expansion, or meet with a group of impassioned museum directors who want to build a museum, I'm the last one on the scene and the one who has to throw cold water on the dreams and expectations. So what I'm going to do is tell you in advance the cold-water economic assumptions that go with contemplating an expansion or a new facility, because those that work are fabulous, but there have been some very public failures of new museums and new large expansions in the last couple of years. I think we all know about those situations, and I don't want these nightmares to happen to any of you.

First, why expand programming or facilities? The reasons people give are all well intentioned; it's just whether or not they are valid. Things that people tend to cite are 1) telling a missing piece of a story or, 2) they've identified some market niche that they feel isn't being served particularly well or that is desirable in some way because it offers good visitor profile: people who spend a lot of money or have repeat visitation characteristics. Then there's the kind of situation Dick described where there's some sort of major

acquisition going on or some donor has turned up with a large collection looking for a home. Sometimes it's simply to protect the collection assets or improve service delivery. Creating revenue generation delivery is the most complicated reason for expanding museums, and that's the one I'm really going to focus on. To be honest with you, sometimes expansions go forward simply to accommodate boredom or to gratify big egos, and the egos can belong to the boards members, the director, the mayor of the town, sometimes the governor, and other times the university president. All sorts of people can decide that an expansion or new building is necessary. Sometimes it's a major donor who wants to see their name on a rather large plaque. Lastly, there're reasons that have to do with reinforcing the tourism development strategy or expanding as part of a relocation, say to get museums together in a cluster.

You really need to understand both the overt and the hidden agendas associated with the desire to expand. Moreover, you really need to be clear on how the expansion relates to your mission and whether it relates to your mission.

I think that the days have, thankfully, gone by when museum directors felt obligated to accept any collection that came their way. When someone dies and the family has things they don't want to keep, let the historical societies deal with that. Stick with your interpretive mission and the content mission.

Now for some thoughts about market and financial analysis that may strike you as counterintuitive. It's very easy to believe that the past is the best predictor of the future, but it isn't, because there're a lot of financial relationships that are not directly proportional. It's very easy to start assuming that, well, if we have 100,000 square feet today and we have 200,000 square feet tomorrow everything will double, but again, it doesn't. First of all, from a market demand standpoint, the reason that's not true is that you're still competing for effective board members, donors, grants, and so forth and the supply of those resources is still the same. In terms of attracting additional visitors, it's easy to view your competition as being limited to other museums, but really your competition is much bigger than that. It encompasses any activity that wants a piece of leisure time, and so it's television, sporting events, spending time at home, work at the office, cleaning the garage, and, perhaps, planting daffodil bulbs in the fall. It's only once people get to the point that they decide that they have leisure time that you really start competing with other leisure activities and destinations. Then you have to win a further segment of that pie, of the market, that has crossed all of those thresholds or gone through all those hoops to the point where they're actually ready to go to a museum, and only then are you prepared to deal with other segments of your market.

So, attendance and square footage are not directly proportional, as I mentioned, because you still have to think about what segments of the market have affinity for the experience you offer. Not only that, but neither attendance nor square footage is directly proportional to revenue. People think, well, we've proven that we can jack the attendance up 25%, therefore spending in the store and spending on membership and everything else is also going to grow 25%. That's not true either. A lot of it has to do with the ways in which you expand. The incremental visitors you get may not yield proportional incremental revenues. If you expand in a certain way, say by adding to your collection, you are opening your museum not necessarily to just more people like the ones you've already got. You may be going for a special niche market, in which case the new visitors are going to spend more or they may spend nothing, because what you've really done is promote your museum to people who recognize it as a low-cost experience opportunity. Not only that, there's a big difference between gross revenue and net income, and the cost of getting that incremental revenue can be extraordinary, and that's especially true for very large, aggressive schemes, like deciding that we're going to have a catalogue and we're going to sell our stuff on web sites or let's license our stuff out to Ethan Allen. All of that stuff is extraordinarily expensive in terms of product development and staff time. All those strategies create operations costs, and it's not just during the growth. It's construction, it's planning, it's before and it's also after, and never assume that the people that you have working for you can just all do a little bit more, because they can't. Even if they could do that, they don't necessarily have the skills you need to get to that expansion. You don't necessarily have what it takes to manage a construction project or do that thing with the furniture or line up an affinity card with Visa or whatever it is you're trying to do.

Here are some more bad assumptions people make. Once you have decided that you're going to expand, beware the temptation to believe that future performance will follow

today's patterns. The future can't be represented with a straight curve. Attendance does not go in a straight curve when you expand. What happens is that there is an initial bump at the beginning as the curiosity seekers and the friends and other die-hard fans visit, and then it tails off, and then word of mouth takes over and it filters down to the rank-and-file visitor who show up only when there's something new to see and do at your institution. That drives visitation up again, and then around year 5 or 6 or 7 it will drop if you don't do something new again. You have to constantly refresh your content, and an expansion is just a fancy way of refreshing the content, particularly if you don't have a new place that you're doing it in.

Another bad assumption about expansion is that renovation is cheaper than new construction. Not necessarily, especially if you have an old building with asbestos and you have to re-point the bricks and you wind up with a space that doesn't even make sense as far as the particular attraction is concerned. Think through that one.

Another bad assumption: a fabulous building envelope yields a fabulous exhibit space. What happens with a lot of museums is that an architect designs a great exterior, people fall in love with the pretty pictures, but then the interior is not suitable for exhibit space. There's never enough money to do the planning, so if your Board goes out and hires an architect to do a rendering of a beautiful building —and they do. I'm working with one now. It's a fabulous building and it's going to look like the Sydney Opera House when it's done, but there're no interior plans for this building. It's a shell. God help us if the interiors can't match up. Look at the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame in Cleveland. You've been there. Neat building. Big problems. They're having to remodel inside.

Another bad assumption: more stuff translates into longer lengths of stay. First, people get museum fatigue. Second, people behave out of a notion that—this, again, goes back to time constraints— that you go to a museum for a discrete block of time that exists within the context of other activities: the two hours before it's time to pick up the kids from soccer, just an hour here before we go to the next place on the list. Also, for the same reason, more stuff doesn't necessarily translate into the ability to charge a higher admission. Admission and the value of the experience have to do with the time people want to spend. People are willing to spend about \$3.50 an hour. Think about that. It's a movie, \$7. Disneyland, 10 hours, \$30. About \$3, \$3.50 an hour.

More stuff also doesn't translate— I'm using the term "stuff" loosely to cover any content— more stuff also does not translate into more school visits, or more tourist visits. I proved this to a client recently who was convinced they were going to get more school visits as a result of growing. She was positive that because the school children spent a lot of money at the museum, they should expand the gift shop. Consequently, the museum store had a lot of candy and young kids jumping around, and the adults didn't go inside. This was all right initially, because the students were a very important part of this institution's attendance, but what drives school visits is the school system's policies, and the schools have policies about how many museums and how many field trips those kids can make every year and how they tie into the curriculum. So school visits weren't going to go up and we wound up recommending expanding the museum store with adult-oriented merchandise instead.

Members of the business community on your board don't necessarily understand museum economics. Don't let them forget that.

Some expansion strategies do work. Increasing activity and creating a museum experience where the outcome may be different from one time to the next, so that there is less predictability, works. Enabling people who can't use or don't want to try the interactive programming to enjoy watching other people works, because they don't know what the outcome is going to be. Creating opportunities for special events, and exhibits space works. It doesn't really matter as far as attracting tourists, unless you're into blockbusters, but it matters for residents and repeat visitation. Adding space for catering kitchens works, not only because you make money from the event, but you also expose a museum to a future group of aficionados. Improving the location, expanding along the way, tying into a festival, and going to a cluster, can all work too.

Avoid adding diluted elements and making premature "fair share" market assumptions, and by that I mean that just because the other two IMAXs in town worked, doesn't mean that you have to build one also. Things like that are becoming a bit old. Museums are in a

critical phase right now because they're so popular. You all are very fortunate. People are building museums all over the place. It's time to make sure that they don't fall into the same problems as the IMAXs. Do you remember what a big deal it was when Planet Hollywood and Hard Rock Cafe first arrived and people were lining up all the way down the block to pay \$11 for a crummy hamburger? Now they're in every city in the country, and it's "Who cares?"

I know that all of your collections are unique, different, and wonderful in their own ways, but don't overestimate people's ability to distinguish one museum from another, particularly in fine arts. You've got to make sure that, whatever your growth strategy is, that the new content appeals to both residents and tourists, that it's going to increase exposure, and also that it increases repeat visitation.

Figure out whether your plan is going to sap local donor and foundation capacity and patience, because if you are trying to expand by raising \$500,000 a year for the next 20 years you're going to wear everybody out, so if you can't put the money together relatively fast, don't do it. Try to figure out how to endow the operating budget. It's really easy to get people to give you money for bricks and mortar, but the museum's base of support will have to change when you're finished building. Assume delays, assume you'll need more staff, assume you'll need more volunteers and get the PR machine rolling.

Think through deaccession. We could talk forever about that, but it leads me to a point. You can help pay for your expansion through deaccession of objects you don't really need, and you can also create space.

What I want to close with is some suggestions for things you can do instead of expanding that are still true to your mission. You can recapture space that you're currently not using very well. Offsite storage is a really wonderful thing. You don't have to have everything all right there. You can join forces with other institutions. You can have a piece of another attraction, essentially a second location that's basically run somewhere else, like at a university. You can rethink current exhibits. It's very easy to develop rooms that never change. You can take your programming offsite. You can take your programming to the schools instead of assuming that the schools are coming to you.

Finally, I want to leave you with a reiteration. That is, more square footage doesn't necessarily do it. It doesn't necessarily fulfill your mission, and it doesn't necessarily make you money. It doesn't necessarily make your life easier, and it's awfully difficult. That having been said, when expansion works, it's great. The places that have seen the kind of success that my co-panelists describe are just great. It seems to me that expansion is never really neutral. It's either pretty good—20, 40, sometimes 60% of the time increasing attendance—or it's really horrible and it can kill you. So I'm not trying to scare you, but absolutely question every assumption and double-check every financial or attendance projection. Thanks.

Lyndel King

Director and Chief Curator
Frederick R. Weisman Art Museum

The Weisman Art Museum at the University of Minnesota was founded in 1934 and opened the doors of its new, Frank O. Gehry-designed facility in 1993. It is located on the limestone bluffs overlooking the Mississippi River, right in the center of the campus. It's obviously related to the new Guggenheim Museum in Spain - we sometimes call it "baby Bilbao." Bilbao's metal skin is titanium and ours is pretty ordinary stainless steel - the kind you find on the inside of elevators- but it ripples and reflects the light in the same way the river does, and is quite a bit less expensive than titanium!

Our museum is a landmark building and it has already become the symbol of the University in the 21st century. It also works well as a museum. We're very happy with our interior gallery space. It is totally flexible. Our ceilings are 22 feet high, with hanging height at 16 feet. The top of our highest skylight is about 55 feet. Our skylights have shades so we can control the light when we show works of art on paper. Our shades are not computer controlled. We have a pretty simple system that we operate manually, and we have only two settings for the shades- closed or open. We knew when we made the decision for

skylights that we'd have to have them closed some of the time, but we also knew that natural light in galleries is wonderful, and particularly in Minnesota in the winter. When we raise some additional money, we'll install additional layers of shades so we can sometimes have the skylights open but with reduced light levels. We installed what we could afford when we built the building, and I still think we made the right choice. We'd never be able to go back and add skylights, but we will be able to add more flexibility to the system we have.

The issues we've had to deal with in the space are actually fairly minimal. We have a large volume space, so one might think we could show only very large works of art. This isn't true. Clever installation design makes it work. Last summer we had an exhibition of Renaissance drawings that looked absolutely beautiful, as did an exhibit of ancient Native American Mimbres pots a few years ago.

Our site was extremely challenging for the architect. It was on a small hill surrounded by a "moat" that was a highway exit ramp. We were committed to it because we wanted to be a drop-in place, not a destination point, and our site was the last remaining one in the center of campus. Our main entrance is on the most-traveled path on campus. Right outside the museum is a very large bridge across the Mississippi with a pedestrian walkway on top. It connects the east bank and west bank campuses. The main library is on the west side of the river; the main student union is just past the museum, so everyone walking from the library to the student union goes by our front door, which is sheltered by a giant metal canopy that announces the entrance. We have big picture windows that look into the galleries so students walking by can see in. It's a department store trick to attract people to come inside. It was important to us that we attract not just students who were taking art history classes and who would go to a museum anyway. We wanted to attract students who might be passing by on the way to class, look in our picture window, and drop in because something caught their eye.

Our other entrance is by elevator from the parking garage under the building. In Minnesota it's important to be able to tell people they can park and come into the museum without ever going outside. A lot of people also are intimidated about coming to campus because the University has the reputation of being a

difficult place to park and find your way around in. Just being able to tell people they can park under the museum has been a huge help in attracting a community audience. Our attendance increased from 30,000 a year in our old space to 150,000 the first year after we moved. The second year it dropped to 127,000, and now, in our fifth year, we're back up to 150,000 again. Our membership has quadrupled and it is holding steady. Our new museum is about five times larger than our former quarters.

Let me backtrack and explain our history. This building is actually our first permanent home. In 1934, when we were founded, we were put up in some unused rooms in a then-new auditorium building. It was the 1930s. Times were hard. The University president believed the arts could provide vision and values for students to help them face the tough economic times when they left the University. He started a little art gallery on the third floor of the new auditorium building with the idea that if it were successful, the University would find a better place for it. Fifty-nine years and 15,000 works of art later, we moved into our first permanent home.

To tell you how long it took, conversations about a better location started in about 1935, but due to a variety of factors, nothing happened. In 1981 I became director with the notion that we must move out of the rooms in the auditorium because we simply could not fulfill our mission for the University or the community, or properly take care of our collection there. In 1985 we received a commitment of \$ 4 million from an unallocated bequest that the University president assigned to our building fund, if we could match it.

It took some work to convince the University administration that a new museum facility should be a priority. Oftentimes in a university your boss doesn't have anything at stake in your success, and may not even support the idea that the arts are an important part of a University education. But, we took advantage of an enlightened president who was able to be convinced that, with some seed money, we could raise the funds. Sometimes I think the President made the commitment to keep us quiet. He really didn't think we'd be able to raise the match so he wouldn't really have to come through with the money. But, in 1989

we received a \$3 million commitment from Frederick Weisman, who lived in Los Angeles but was born in Minneapolis and attended the university for one year in the 1930s. With the million we had already raised, we matched the \$4 million and were able to proceed. The final total project cost was about \$15 million, all raised from non-legislative funds. It wasn't quite this easy or smooth, but I'll leave out the really bumpy parts!

In 1989 we hired Frank Gehry as our architect after a fairly rigorous selection process. It was the first art museum he had designed from the ground up. Our selection committee did a lot of talking about whether we wanted to have a landmark building or whether we wanted to just have a really functional building. Fortunately, we decided we didn't have to choose, that we could have both. I think we have.

Because of our history, we knew how important good gallery and workspaces are. Having been, for more than 50 years, in a building that gave no clue that an art museum might be inside we also knew how important it was to have a real identity -an identifiable image. Our new building has given us both.

Because we had been thinking about our expansion for so long, we also had a really good idea of what kind of spaces we needed. This was key to our success. We had a really clear understanding of what kind of space we needed to realize our dreams. We did the program ourselves and gave it to Frank Gehry's office in about March 1990. Construction started in February 1991 and we opened in November 1993. We are celebrating our fifth anniversary this year, 1998. I believe it is fair to say we built it and, yes, they have come. Our anniversary party will include a light show on our west facade. We're considering calling it "Field of Beams."

We chose an architect who was open to collaboration, even though he was known for his landmark designs. From my experience I have become convinced clients must bear some of the responsibility for failures. If you don't know what you want, you can't communicate it to your architect. If what you get doesn't work, part of the reason may be because you didn't have a clear vision.

One of the most important requirements for our success, both before and after our new building opened, was a personal commitment, you might even say a passionate personal commitment, by all our staff and a few other people - few in the beginning anyway. We realized that if we were ever going to raise money for a new building we needed to be better known in our community. In 1984, on the fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the museum, we started an advisory board and a membership organization. It was a ragtag little bunch who met in the hallway because we didn't have a room big enough for us all to have lunch together. We started small, with people who had been supporters of the museum for a long time - people who believed in the value of the visual arts in a university education. They brought their friends to our exhibitions and programs and shared their passion and their dreams about what we could become. It was truly an example of networking that worked.

We also developed very strong exhibitions and education programs in our old space. We didn't say to the community, "Well, if you'll just give us some money to expand we can do some great programs." We were able to say, "Look what we've been able to do here, and think what could happen in a real museum space." We were competitive at the national level, with the NEA and NEH. Those agencies were willing to provide support based on the quality of our ideas. Corporations seemed to be looking more for public relations and marketing opportunities, which we really couldn't provide from our rooms in the attic of an auditorium building. The funding from the NEA and NEH helped us establish a track record, so by the time we started fund-raising for the new facility, a lot of people were already convinced we had ideas and could do good programs.

We had the obligatory feasibility studies done, which showed we couldn't raise the money to expand. But we knew the feasibility study was done in a totally objective way, and without someone who really cared, without an advocate, we were going to get ho-hum answers at best, and negative at worst. So we weren't surprised and didn't pay too much attention to the results of the feasibility study. We didn't ignore it completely, though. From it we learned people's reasons for giving negative answers. We learned the questions we were going to have to answer to conduct successful fund-raising. We took a couple of years to regroup and figure out how to respond, but we never gave up.

We learned to articulate our vision very well. We thought through what kinds of things our expansion would allow us to do that we couldn't do now. And, we had to figure out who would care if we were able to do those things, and how to convince the people who didn't care that what we wanted to do was important and of value to the community.

There were also some personal things I learned during this process. I learned I really shouldn't expect other people to make greater commitments than I was willing to make myself. I learned to be more inclusive, an instinct that doesn't always accompany a personal passionate vision. This may be your baby, but after it's born it really does take the village to make it successful. To engage the village, everyone has to feel a sense of ownership. One way we built that was to offer hardhat tours weekly, after the building got to a certain stage. You can't take hordes of people through, but you can take 10 or 15 people at a time. Of course we took donors, but we also took public school teachers and University faculty. We invited everybody from the art history and art departments, for example, to come one week and everybody from American studies and history the next. Anyone who showed up got a tour. Yes, it was time consuming, but it built pride and ownership in a lot of people.

Also, it's important not to ignore the staff when you try to develop this sense of ownership. Most people do want to be part of something wonderful, but they have to feel their contribution is recognized and is important. We didn't have the "bridge funds" other museums in our community have had for the expansion transition, but we had really great people on our staff. We hired a lot of temporary art crew people, but apart from that, we moved with the same staff we had had in our old space. Our staff members were able to expand their abilities more than I ever thought they would and they came through in a big way. Working day and night toward a common goal certainly builds esprit de corps! Because we didn't have a lot of extra staff during the transition, we weren't faced with laying off a lot of people shortly after we opened, as some other museums have had to do when the "bridge funds" ran out.

The down side is that people get burned out. We had a lot of trouble with false fire alarms during our first few months, and I used to joke when I was touring people through the building by saying, "Don't worry if the fire alarm goes off; it's just the staff upstairs burning up!" But, I think it is important to note that every senior staff member who went through our first year also went through our next five years with us. We didn't have a huge turnover in staff after we opened. We didn't have the money for fancy stress management seminars, so we used bath salts instead. I brought in huge jars of relaxing bath salts and put them in the workroom with scoops and plastic bags. It was a gimmick, of course, but it at least got everyone to laugh about our situation. Laughter worked, even if the bath salts didn't!

At a certain point, about nine months before we moved, we finally realized we had to decide what was absolutely essential to have done by the time we opened, do it really well, and leave the rest for later. For example, we decided we didn't need to move the whole collection before we opened, just what was going to be in the opening show. So, we concentrated on a wonderful opening installation and moved the rest of the collection over the next year, when we could do it in a more orderly way, without the stress of the opening date facing us. We planned to have explanatory labels for every work of art up in the galleries when we opened. We gave that up. Instead of mediocre labels for every piece, we focused on writing really good labels for the most important ones and added the rest over the next year.

One of the hardest, and most unexpected, things we had to face after we opened was unrealistic public expectations. Because the museum building gave us a big persona, the public expected that we were a big museum when, actually, we still were a pretty small museum. Our own expectations for ourselves were unrealistic, too. It was hard for us to be satisfied with reality when we knew the public expected us to perform as if we were a much larger museum than we actually were.

We also learned that production standards must increase when you have a wonderful new space. Expenses for things like label production and lighting increased more than we had anticipated. The competition for museums isn't other museums. It's Niketown. It's the amusement park. It's MTV. Our audiences are used to highly produced spectacles, and when they come to a museum, they want to see very high production values. This costs money - more money than we had anticipated.

We also didn't anticipate how much the building would be used. We did plan the building so our "hospitality" space could be rented. We built a catering kitchen, but we were very quickly deluged with requests. We had to expand our events staff immediately after we opened. We have become a gathering place for the University, and a place where the University and the community join together. We like being that kind of place, but it is not without wear and tear on the building, the staff, and the art.

In conclusion, I think the most important thing I learned is that the project isn't over when you open your expansion. The grand opening is just the beginning. We found that the greatest gratification is that we are able to do all these things that we said we could do. We are able to realize our vision and our dreams because of our expansion. It's the reason you expand that is important, not the expansion itself. If you only build it, they'll come for a year but won't come back. After five years, our greatest pleasure is that we built it and they are still coming.

Dennis Fiori

Director
Maryland Historical Society

I'm going to talk about the fate of two institutions. I'm from a city which probably generates more museums per square foot these days than any other city in the country. New museums are continually opening. Unfortunately, there are museums that are not surviving. I'm going to talk about two of these.

The first one I'm going to talk about—actually, I'm going to talk about them together, because their stories are intertwined, is the Baltimore City Life Museum [slide]. This building was constructed around an iron facade that was disassembled approximately 10 years ago in downtown Baltimore. It was restored in Arizona and re-erected by a local architect to create a new core museum for the Baltimore City Life Museum [slide]. I have another shot of the interior [slide]. You see some of the exhibition spaces. The second institution I'm going to talk about is the Columbus Center, which is the next slide [slide]. The Columbus Center museum is that sort of high-tech German tent you see off to the side. The Columbus Center was a biotech museum, designed to talk about the Chesapeake Bay. The Maryland Historical Society became involved with both of these museums at different stages in their lives. With City Life, we were involved when it was floundering and needed someone to try to save the institution, to keep it running. With the Columbus Center, we were involved at the very beginning of the project as collaborators and advisors on the historical components.

This is a cautionary tale, one that talks about two institutions that were both undertaking significant capital projects. Both also had significant operating expenses as a result of these projects. The Columbus Center was to run almost exclusively on earned income. The Baltimore City Life Museum was expecting to get approximately 50% of its operating budget from earned income. They both lacked a stable means of support. Both claimed to have carefully studied their audience and were confident of meeting income and attendance projections. At least this is what they said in public. Both opened with great fanfare and public acclaim as great new attractions, the Columbus Center right on the Inner Harbor, the great waterfront attraction area of Baltimore, and the Baltimore City Life Museum just a block or so from there. The Baltimore City Life Museum closed 13 months after the opening of its new facility. The Columbus Center closed within eight months of opening. How did they get to this state? Rather than talk about the details of what happened, I want to discuss the warning signs, unheeded by both institutions. But first, briefly, the Columbus Center is not going to reopen. An alternative use for the space is being sought. The same is true with the facilities of the Baltimore City Life Museum. The Maryland Historical Society absorbed the collection, which we are now integrating into our own. We acquired their assets and, unfortunately, their debt, which has been retired.

Let's get back to the warning signs. This is a personal analysis. I hope the MHS, as it takes on a significant increase in the size of its facilities, will avoid these problems. Many are the same things that Lyndel (King) mentioned. First of all, the projects simply took too long. The City Life Museum was raising funds for 10 years. In the case of the Columbus Center, they were raising funds, I think, for almost 8 years and never quite got there. At some point, someone should have said, "maybe nobody cares if you open this new facility" and/or the funding isn't in the community. At the same time City Life was looking for funds, the

Baltimore Museum of Art was able to successfully undertake a \$10 million campaign. The Walters Art Gallery did the same. The Maryland Historical Society also launched \$20 million campaign for expansion of its facilities. We have nearly exceeded our goal and will vote soon to increase the goal. Funds are available in the community, they simply were not going to these two institutions. A second related warning sign was that by the last years of the City Life campaign, only the CEO was raising the money. The trustees were nowhere to be seen. No one was out banging on doors and bringing in funds. It was all dropped on the staff of the City Life Museum. The story with the Columbus Center was no different. I should pause and mention that the total investment by the community to build these two failed institutions was \$35 million. Between them, they had \$9 million in unsecured loans. Unfortunately, some of the banks thought the loans were secured, either by endowment funds or by the value of the collections, but they were not. Restricted endowment funds can not secure a loan, and the banks soon found that out.

Both institutions did something that was rather foolish. As the fund-raising continued, both museums needed to justify how they were going to meet operating expenses. In order to do so, they began manipulating the attendance figures provided by Elaine (Van S. Carmichael) and her group. When problems arose, they blamed the consulting firm, claiming they were not given correct figures. What actually happened is that they either ignored the statistics generated and/or didn't revisit these projections when they scaled back their exhibits and programs and reduced marketing dollars in the face of lagging fund-raising. These museums, as many similar institutions, were undercapitalized. Not enough money was available to produce a compelling product. They kept scaling back the exhibitions within the very expensive facilities they were creating. They couldn't afford these exhibits as the building cost escalated, acerbating the lackluster fund-raising. This also meant they lacked the money to market that product once it was in place. Also unavailable was a reserve fund to support the first two or three years of startup expenses. Again, they were dependent on earned income.

Lyndel had mentioned the importance of building community support. The Baltimore City Life Museum, in one form or another, had been in existence for about 50 years when the MHS took it over. At the time of take-over, they had 425 members. City Life simply had not built a constituency. A significant part of the problem was caused by city funding which, by agreement, dried up the year the new facility opened. Much of the community felt, as with the public library, that City Life was supported by tax dollars, so there was no need to join. In any event, they did not make a very compelling case for membership. The Columbus Center had a similar problem. It was more an attraction than it was a museum. It had no members.

Along the way, neither institution took a "reality check." They fooled themselves and they fooled those who were supporting them. In talking with the director of each museum as their plans developed, they knew that they would have troubles, but they were committed to moving ahead. They believed in their own hype. They had raised nearly enough money to get the structures up. Everyone had waited so long. What were they going to do now? They felt they had to go ahead.

What were the lessons learned from this situation, lessons I've applied to my own situation as the MHS looks at approximately \$14 million worth of renovations and construction to its facilities? We have been very, very lucky at the Maryland Historical Society. A combination of bequests, an aggressive campaign, and a healthy climate for investment have meant a substantial growth in endowment. We have a strong, caring base of support. We have decided to build only what we can afford and have the means to support. Do it in stages if you have to. Be ruthless and systematic about keeping operating costs low, particularly when it comes to increasing staff. Don't expand beyond what you can afford. Sounds simple, but this common sense warning is often ignored. Begin bringing staff salaries into your operating budget as you work towards the opening. For instance, we built a larger development staff. We moved from three development positions to seven, knowing that when we ended our campaign, we could not afford these positions. We have disciplined ourselves to increase the operating budget each year, charging less and less of these salaries off as a campaign expense. This avoids the crunch you have when you get to the end of the campaign and have to meld-in staff not funded in the operating budget. Be realistic. Don't fool yourself by not establishing this discipline. Another important step is to employ a consultant or a strong financial manager as an unbiased third opinion. We hired someone not familiar with museums, but with not-for-profit management experience, as our CFO/COO. He is a respected voice in determining what we're not going to be able to

afford, what we can build and not build. It is very important to have that "outsider" to critique where you're going. A common sense rule, often neglected, is if you're going to borrow, make sure you know where you're going to get the money to pay it back. Retiring a loan with the same earned income you are going to use to fund operations is often overly optimistic. Both City Life and the Columbus Center had only the vaguest idea of how they were going to pay back the loans. I mention again, have in place those resources to underwrite the first two or three difficult transition/startup years.

It is particularly important for the CEO to remain creative and flexible. Don't become overly attached to the manifestation of your goals or vision, but do keep the goals and vision in mind. Do not become so attached to this "masterpiece" you are building that you do not see creative ways of achieving the goals that may be less expensive. We were in danger of doing just that. We had a major site, most of a city block in Baltimore, on which we were going to build a stunning new facility. What we did instead was to buy neighboring buildings. One such structure we bought for \$14 a square foot and restored it for \$10 a square foot. This is instead of the \$150 a square foot we would spend on a new facility. These rehabilitated buildings are for housing staff and storing collections. We want new spaces for exhibitions, but for these other functions, we are putting them slightly off site at considerably less cost than a new facility. You have to be willing to take advantage of the opportunities that come along and be prepared to live with less than the ideal. Constantly revisit your projections and assumptions.

Two pieces that I think are the most important. One is assert leadership. If you're running an institution, run the institution. Be frank about the problems. I've talked to directors that have said, "If I tell the board what I really think, now that I have got them to this point, they're going to fire me." What I've learned is that more people have lost their jobs for not telling the board about a problem with the facility expansion than have lost their jobs for being honest. I have been there. Our expansion at the Concord Museum went through some of those bumps that I now hope to avoid. A powerful board member who contributed significant funds for the new facility wanted to move ahead with construction before all the money was raised and sufficient endowment in place. I should have been more assertive, because it was rough for a few years after we opened.

Again, it is important someone cares if you survive or fail. It's that buy-in Lyndel mentioned. I didn't lose my job, but I did lose the confidence of some trustees. With City Life and the Columbus Center, few cared whether they lived or died. They received a great deal of attention when they opened, but when in peril, there were few letters to the editor and little outcry. Let me give you a dramatic example. Some of you may have heard about the Valentine Museum in Richmond and its problems. It is interesting to compare the "tale of two cities." In Baltimore, the debt of the City Life Museum was rather modest. They owed loans of approximately \$2.2 million. The Valentine, on the other, hand owed roughly \$11 million by the time it ran into trouble. The Valentine is still alive today. The \$11 million debt was retired or restructured thanks to the intervention of local government, foundations, and corporations. They felt the institution was too important to Richmond's cultural life and economy to allow it to fail. The Valentine had a large membership that cared. City Life had no one stepping forward to take on its debt. The bank that loaned City Life the funds would not consider restructuring the debt. In the end, both the City Life Museum and the Columbus Center ceased to exist because few people cared. This ends my cautionary tale.

Thank you.

Robert Knight
Director
Scottsdale Museum of Contemporary Art

Before I address issues of expansion, I'd like to provide a little background information on our organization. The creation of the Scottsdale Museum of Contemporary Art is currently the top planning priority of the Scottsdale Cultural Council, a 501(c)(3) private, non-profit arts management corporation, founded in 1987 and under contract with the City of Scottsdale to provide opportunities for its citizens and the surrounding region to experience quality arts, cultural and educational activities.

The key strength of the Cultural Council is the successful management of the performing and visual art programs for our community, including the administration of the City of Scottsdale's Public Art and Fine Art Collections. This has been accomplished through a combination of a mutually beneficial ten year contract with the City of Scottsdale, a strong and dedicated Board of Directors, a well-qualified professional management staff, innovative marketing, thorough planning, and the production and presentation of creative, high quality arts and arts education programs.

The Cultural Council is in the process of facilitating the purchase and renovation of an existing discount movie theater adjacent to the Scottsdale Center for the Arts in downtown Scottsdale, Arizona. The intent of this acquisition is to establish a new 20,200 square foot visual arts exhibition pavilion which, when combined with the existing 8,800 square feet of visual arts galleries at the Scottsdale Center for the Arts, will create a new entity within the Center for the Arts cultural campus, the Scottsdale Museum of Contemporary Art.

International in scope, the museum's fundamental mission is to collect, preserve, exhibit, and interpret visual art, architecture and design for the public good. It is dedicated to advancing the understanding and appreciation of contemporary culture through visual art, architecture and design exhibitions, publications, educational lectures, and workshops for both children and adults. The museum explores ideas of our time, presenting visual art, architecture and design programs.

Building on the successful heritage of the Scottsdale Center for the Arts as one of the leading art organizations in the state, the Cultural Council's planning strategy is focused on establishing a new collecting art museum of national prominence. The museum's six strategic goals call for: 1) developing and supporting a permanent contemporary art museum that has a clear and regionally unique mission; 2) supporting exemplary, creative, and challenging visual arts, architecture and design exhibits and programs; 3) collecting, displaying, and preserving tangible contemporary art, architecture and design objects of the highest quality; 4) expanding the museum's art education programs; 5) providing the opportunity for the general public to develop significant levels of aesthetic sophistication, connoisseurship, and design expertise through access to the museum's exhibitions on a regularly scheduled basis; and 6) maintaining a highly qualified, creative professional staff. Construction will be completed next week, and we are planning on opening this Valentine's Day, February 14, 1999. The new museum will be our Valentine's gift to the community, and we are very excited that it is about finished.

We got to the point of where we are today by carefully considering what and why we were creating a new institution. I believe we instinctively understood that in order to be successful we had to establish a differentiation strategy that would create a unique identity for the museum in the greater metro Phoenix area. After much discussion and debate we decided to focus exclusively on contemporary art, architecture and design. That was a big step for us, and in order to accomplish this goal we knew we had to split our identity from the Center for the Arts, which historically has been known, for the most part, as a performing arts center.

The next, and very important, step was to begin meeting with small groups of people, which included our Board of Directors, the City Council, community representatives and potential donors. Once the Board was convinced that we had established a firm base of support, they made a commitment to make the museum a reality.

We conducted a national search for an architect (and the topic of hiring an architect is an entirely separate issue and could be a session unto itself). But we really felt it was important to, if at all possible, hire an Arizona architect. Ultimately, that's what we did and it has turned out to be one of the best moves we could have made. The big advantage is that he is on site all the time. This has become his personal pet project, and it's been a wonderful journey.

I really encourage any of you that are planning an expansion to visit other museums with your board, your key staff, and your architect. We put together what we called "the Good, the Bad, and the Ugly Tour" of 17 museums around the country. We talked to the directors in advance and said, "Please treat us like we're works of art arriving on your loading docks." They were all very gracious hosts and we learned a lot about not only *what* to do, but *what not* to do. Perhaps even more importantly, we developed a common language

with the representatives from our Board of Directors – a shared vision that carried over into subsequent meetings once we arrived back home.

Another thing to consider is managing the expectations of the Board and staff. It's important for you to understand that the minute you mention expansion, everybody is going to want a piece of the action. The hardest thing for me to do was to keep everyone focused on the fact that we needed more exhibition space that was our critical need. As Elaine (Van S. Carmichael) already mentioned, we knew we could accommodate our office and storage needs off-site. Our expansion is ground floor, prime real estate and I believed should be preserved for public use. Building usage requests included a new boardroom, a decent library, an education studio, et cetera, all worthy projects. But we were lucky in that, in the end, we held to the initial design of pure exhibition space, with the only other features being a new bookstore, new restrooms, and a state-of-the-art loading dock. This space also allows an opportunity for catering receptions and other private after-hours parties.

If I can share any advice, it would be that you need to really have a compelling reason for your expansion. In our case it was to differentiate our self from the Center for Arts and other museums in and around our city. In your case it may be addressing under-served populations in your community. But you need to have a very clear sense of why and what you're doing. I cannot emphasize enough the importance of getting solid support from elected officials, as well as major movers and shakers in your community. Get as many people excited and sharing the vision ahead of time, so that they will become knowledgeable and conversant ambassadors of what you're doing.

Create a logical and defensible business plan. Do it yourself if you can't afford to hire an outside consultant. A lot of it is just common sense; it is a matter of sitting down and asking the questions that you anticipate people in the community are going to ask.

Business people want to see the bottom line, so do a very careful financial analysis of your project and make your financial goals realistic and achievable. You want to succeed, so don't get caught up in doing something that is so grandiose that you're not going to be able to be successful. In addition, you'll need to create a compelling artistic vision for those who are more interested in the programmatic side. If at all possible, set up an endowment. It may just be enough to keep the doors open, but at least you will be able to ensure the public that your building will continue to operate after the novelty of new construction fades. Create a marketing plan, because you really need to tell the world about what you're doing. We hired an outside PR firm, and I've got to tell you that it has made all the difference in the world.

And finally in closing, perhaps the most import advice I can share with you is that whatever anybody tells you when you begin your project – double it. If someone states that your building expansion will cost X (or take X number of years to build) – in your mind think X times two. It always takes longer and costs more than anyone initially believes. And NEVER, under any circumstances, mention a fund-raising number to a potential major donor until you are absolutely sure what you want, or need, from them. If you give them a range, they will always remember the lowest number, and in your mind you will always remember the higher. It's hard to go back and restate something you've already said.

Expansion is not for everybody, but for us I think it was the right move at the right time. We've got an entirely new group of people invested in what we're doing, and it's been a wonderful experience. So, if you're ever in Scottsdale, please come and visit.

Collaborative Leadership: The Many Ways of Being a Trustee

Dr. Evan Turner

Trustee

The American Federation of Arts

My name is Evan Turner and we have gathered together this afternoon to discuss museum trusteeship. There are three members of the panel. I shall introduce them in alphabetical order as a matter of principle. Paula Fried brings management expertise to this group. She is active with the Salina Arts Center. That's her primary activity from the point of view of this discussion. She's a psychologist who has a most extraordinary understanding of the artist's method, and one of her most impressive publications she has recently written with her mother is *Bullies And Victims*, so she has that significant contribution to make to our group. The second member of our committee is Leonard Lauder, who has been very active from the past to the present, currently as the Chairman of the Whitney Museum. One of his specific statistics that I found interesting is that with his brother he has created the Lauder Center for International Studies. The third member of the group is Meryl Meltzer, who has a remarkably wide-ranging experience. Meryl has been a trustee for the International Center of Photography in New York City. She has been very active with Artists Space and is much involved and very articulate in the subject of school administration. She's really doing very interesting work for the public school system.

I have one given in my thinking about this program, and that is I'm deeply interested in what are the common problems. In my opinion, Salina and the Whitney are institutions that may have immensely different programs, quite different finances, but from the point of view of what we're talking about, the trustees, they have very similar programs. The problems that the Whitney has are the problems that the Salina Art Center or the International Center for Photography or Artists Space can have and the problems that each of you can have. In other words, I'm not too interested in the differences that come from ambitious programs or less costly projects, but I'm interested in the comparisons, because I think that makes it more interesting to you. Having started off with that statement, Paula will get the ball rolling.

Paula A. Fried, Ph.D.

Trustee

Salina Art Center

It is a great privilege to be here today, just as it is a great privilege to serve as a trustee of the Salina Art Center. In preparing for this panel, I've appreciated the opportunity to give specific thought to what it means to be a trustee at the Salina Art Center, and I think it might be helpful to begin by telling you a little about the Salina Art Center so you can understand the context in which our board functions.

The Salina Art Center is located in Salina, Kansas, a community of 45,000 in the center of the state. Our annual budget is close to \$500,000, and last year we had 27,000 visitors to our programs and exhibitions at the Art Center. We offer a variety of programs, including small outreach exhibitions at public sites in our community throughout the year, as well as a more formal touring exhibition program that serves smaller communities all across the state. At the Art Center, we have a varied and ambitious schedule of six to eight exhibitions each year. In the past year, exhibitions included a still life show from the Metropolitan Museum of Art, which was a stretch for us financially, and an installation of 75 standing figures made of animal bones, which was a different kind of stretch for us. We offer a variety of programs, classes, and tours on site, including a hands-on interactive area, as well as programs in the schools, and we recently opened a state-of-the-art cinema that brings independent and international films that would otherwise not come to our community.

In Salina, the Art Center enjoys wide community support and ownership. Our community has come to know the Art Center as a place of discovery, where perception is broadened, ideas are developed, and personal experience is enhanced through encounters with contemporary art. Our trustees recently revised our mission statement to more accurately express the dynamic quality that characterizes our institution: The Salina Art Center exists

to create exchanges between art, artists, and audiences that reveal life. There is a degree of intimacy at a place like the Salina Art Center that may not exist at larger institutions, a sense of connection on many levels that may foster some of the characteristics that I think make our board effective. And yet, I would imagine these characteristics to be shared by effective trustees at institutions of any size.

At our small Art Center, I see three significant attributes of effective board leadership: first, beyond serving as a trustee to benefit the institution and community, our board members are effective because of their expectation that serving as a trustee will be a challenging and provocative experience on a personal level. When we were revising our mission statement eighteen months ago, the board was engaged in lively debate about our aspirations for our institution and our audience. Words like "transform" and "inspire" were offered up, and we discussed at length whether these were too ambitious or even presumptuous expectations to have for our Art Center visitors. At one point, our facilitator asked how many of us around the table would say that we had had "life-changing" experiences at the Salina Art Center, and all of us were startled into silence when we looked around to see that nearly every hand was raised. Lest you think our board is an exotic group of New Age truth seekers or is overpopulated with psychologists, I want to assure that, demographically speaking, our board is the conventional mix of middle-aged physicians, community volunteers, business people, arts patrons, and, as to be expected in Kansas, Republicans, that is probably typical of most other boards. Most of our board members come to the board table, and to the Art Center itself, open and expecting to be stimulated, challenged, and even changed as a result of their relationship to the institution and to each other.

Second, our board members are effective because they understand that we can only expect from others whatever commitments we are willing to make ourselves. For us that means if we want others to financially support our institution and attend our programs, then, of course, we must financially support our institutions and attend our programs. But it means much more than check-writing and good attendance. If we want our audience to tolerate the discomfort of challenging and difficult objects and images in our gallery, we must commit to grappling with them too. If we want our community to be open to different perspectives and points of view on contemporary issues, then we must speak candidly with each other and be open to conflicting opinions at the board level. If we want our staff to continually push themselves and therefore our exhibitions and programs, to ever-increasing levels of success, then we cannot be complacent about our current accomplishments.

Third, our board members are effective because of their willingness to personally engage with the work in our exhibitions. For the past five years, our monthly board meetings have been preceded by an hour-long board class taught by our director, Saralyn Reece Hardy. At times, these classes have been didactive/interactive sessions on a specific topic, like three-dimensional art, or the body as subject, where the board reads material to prepare for class; at other times, our director may show slides or images from recent exhibitions she has seen in other cities. Most often, though, the class deals with our current exhibitions and finds us in the gallery engaged in some kind of exercise that stimulates personal connections with the works of art themselves. Our director's unabashed expectation that life can be revealed in an exchange between the viewer and the art, and her rare gift in providing tools to make such exchanges meaningful, has been a powerful stimulus for our board, and our institution as a whole. Varying levels of experience with contemporary art among trustees enrich our discussion, and, over time, the experience of working with ideas, images, and objects as a group has honed personal responses and developed a deeper sense of collective understanding. I would guess that every one of our board members would say that the board class is one of the most rewarding parts of the trustee experience.

As I reflect on our institution and the role of our trustees, I think that the Art Center has continued to develop as a vital, active institution because of the commitment to active growth and development at every level of our organization. Our audiences' deepening relationship with the Art Center parallels our board's deepening relationship with the exhibitions at the Art Center, which in turn parallels our executive director's increasing clarity about the role of art, artist, and audience in our community.

Thank you.

Leonard A. Lauder
Chairman of the Board
Whitney Museum of American Art

I've been on the Whitney board for over twenty years, and I was President for four of those years and Chairman for another four years. My passion is that I love the Whitney Museum. I love its staff and its trustees. I love everything that it stands for. As we go through the lists of what are the ways of being a good trustee, the key word I hope that you will all remember is "passion," because if you aren't passionate about what you're doing in your trusteeship, I don't think the institution can go as far as perhaps you'd like to see it.

Our topic today is "The Many Ways of Being a Trustee." The traditional role of a trustee is to give or to get. Yes, trustees should give money, and all of our trustees do. I know that all of your trustees, for the most part, do give some money, but you didn't invite me here to simply hear me say "give or get." Most trustees can't, or will never ever try to get. Those of you who have ever tried to get a board to raise money on your behalf, remember: most people are terrified of asking. The most you can get some of them to do is to write a letter, but don't try.

What are the other ways of being a good trustee? I've listed a few of them that do have applicability to both large museums and small museums:

First –and this is not necessarily in order of importance – is leadership. Leadership in committees, the budget, operations, investment committees, acquisition committees, education committees, et cetera. The committee structure at the Whitney Museum is a very important one, because it's the way that we expand our reach into special interest groups: people who are interested in photography, prints, drawings, painting, sculpture, contemporary painting, et cetera, without having to have a board of 200 people. So the committee leadership becomes extremely important for us.

Secondly, our board members bring special skills to the table. Those skills may be legal, in real estate, such as in sales and merchandising, or one which is not listed on anyone's resumes: contacts, knowing who to call - when and where - to get some help at the right time in the right place.

Third, what I call "special projects." What are special projects? The Whitney created a very wonderful program called "Whitney Abroad," which was created, run and managed by one of our most creative trustees, Adriana Mnuchin. Another example, of trustee involvement came when we needed to have our restaurant and cafe upgraded. It was Adriana who conceived of bringing Sarabeth's to the Whitney Museum. This was not a staff job, but negotiated by one of our trustees.

Fourth, networking: don't forget the importance of networking in running an institution, be it political, financial or social. Your trustees, in many ways, are the door openers and the people you'll need from time to time to help you over some very difficult humps.

Fifth, remember the Andy Warhol phrase that "life is just showing up." Our trustees show up at openings, because we want to have the artists and our supporters see our trustees, and sometimes here in New York City, just to show up is the toughest thing of all.

Number six I list as "advice and counsel." Our trustees are not a rubber stamp board. They indeed do give us advice and counsel. There are a number of things that we wrestle with, the budget being just one example. To give you an example of one item that we wrestle with every few years is our insurance coverage. We have a very large and extraordinarily valuable permanent collection. Neither we, nor any museum in the nation, have the money to fully insure the complete collection. Who's going to decide whether our coverage should be 25%, 50% or 100% of the value? Our trustees are the ones who decide, and that's one of the many major things that they do. That's the advice and counsel we cherish.

Seventh, they must defend the institution. In some cases, that may not be very important for some of your museums. In the case of the Whitney Museum, which is always "out there," always on the edge, often criticized, we need defenders of the institution. Many of you have read the sad tale of what happened with the Robert Mapplethorpe show at the Corcoran in Washington, DC. Where were the trustees when that institution needed to be defended?

Eighth, the board of trustees must hire and fire the director. We have a wonderful new director, Maxwell Anderson, whom I hope you'll all meet.

Ninth, and I think most important, our trustees and your trustees have to be a "trustee." What do I mean by that? The institution is held in trust by your trustees and they have to protect it, as well as to insure the longevity and the security of your institution. Many trustees forget what the name "trustee" means. "Trusteeship" means just that. You are entrusted with something very important.

I've just given you a quick laundry list of things that I think are important. Later on I'd be happy to answer questions. Please understand that a large museum, a mid-sized museum or a small museum all have the same challenges, and the same problems, and that whatever is good for one is good for the other. Thank you.

Meryl Meltzer

Trustee

Studio in a School Association

After these two previous speakers I feel somewhat in awe to say anything. First of all, let me start off by saying I thoroughly agree with what both my colleagues here have said as far as what exactly trustees do and what is expected of them, and I certainly agree with Leonard (Lauder) on what a trustee can bring to an individual organization.

I approached what I was going to say from the experience I have had working with two smaller institutions here in New York. One is the International Center of Photography, which many of you may be familiar with. ICP is twenty-five years old. It was originally founded by Cornell Capa with a focus on photojournalism. It was a kind of memorial to Mr. Capa's brother Robert, who was killed while on assignment in Indochina in the '50s. It was a very interesting board because it was in an institution that was very much under the control of its founding director. Half of the board were old-time supporters of Cornell, who had been there when the museum didn't have a home, and helped him acquire the building on Fifth Avenue and 94th Street. They were just saying yes to Cornell and were very generous in writing checks. The newer members of the board, of which I was one, were brought on because of their interest in photography, and we had different interests, and wanted the exhibitions to have a more contemporary perspective. So we were able to bring up other areas of photography that maybe the museum wasn't exploring, and certainly the program today shows that they took notice of us. In the ICP board, as on many boards, there's always a core group of people who do the majority of the work. In a smaller institution there tends to be a lot of day-to-day things that are done by a smaller group of people working very closely with staff. So I think the role of a trustee at a smaller institution can sometimes be helping with very menial things. I know I started to volunteer and chaired several committees and although I'm no longer on the board, I am still co-chair of the exhibition committee and still feel very much connected to and involved in the work of ICP.

I've also served on the board of Artists Space. Artists Space is an alternative space downtown that was started in the mid-'70s as a place to show artists not involved with a gallery. This was a night-and-day experience for me, from uptown to downtown. Artists Space had a staff of five. The board was heavily weighted with artists, museum professionals, dealers, who certainly do not have a place in most museums boards, and other individuals such as myself who were collectors. We all worked for Artists Space and wore many hats. I was on the budget and finance committee, although I had no great financial experience. I chaired benefits for them. I did the events for them, and there it was, again, a very hands-on experience for me. I think what they wanted from me as a board member was to be enthusiastic, to bring in my friends and to spread the word on their mission. One thing that strikes me in the role of a trustee is the importance of board leadership, and I don't mean board leadership vying with the director, but, rather, working

in close concert with the director of the organization, and also directing the attitude of the board for complete support of that director. I agree with Mr. Lauder that a role of the trustee is to stand behind decisions of the director and the curators, and that this kind of atmosphere is really established by the leadership of the board. When I was on the ICP board and Cornell Capa stepped down, the new director was the former deputy director, but it was still a big change. The founding director became director emeritus. The new director, who had worked with him, had his own ideas, and I think the board president was pivotal in making the transition very smooth.

My personal experience in working with smaller boards has been that I've been able to see the results of projects I had embraced quickly, that hands-on work got relatively good results quickly. I think the particular benefit I got from serving on two boards that were such different institutions was the fact that all institutions have the same problems, regardless of the size. Whether you're in a rented space downtown in Soho or in a townhouse that you own uptown on Fifth Avenue, you have problems keeping your membership levels up, increasing your constituency, making sure your programming is a reflection of what you value in the areas in which you're exhibiting. In addition, I think that the passion that Mr. Lauder talked about is number one for getting board members involved, because if you're not passionate about the institution you're working for you tend to fall by the wayside. If you make sure that all of us bring something to your board, as a result, we feel more gratified and satisfied with what we are doing. I think that the honor of being asked to serve on a board is something wonderful, but I found the most gratifying part of it was my interaction not only with my other board members, but with the director and the curators of these various institutions. I felt that I got a lot out of it. It became a vast learning experience, so that I came away not only feeling that I had helped them accomplish something, but I had learned something also.

Excerpt from the Subsequent Question and Answer Session

TURNER: What do you feel are the qualities that you're looking for in your director, in your professional staff, as opposed to your corporate kind of staff?

FRIED: I know it's critical for an institution to have a proactive director working with the board. It was really helpful for us to have someone who could really help us in terms of interpreting contemporary work. It's our job to raise money and set policy to make that happen, but we need someone who is out there.

LAUDER: When I first became the president of the Whitney Museum in 1991 the first thing I did was review our bylaws, and I found, much to my surprise, that I and the president were the chief executives of the museum, and I don't know who had put it in there, when and how, but my first official act was to get the board to vote that the chief executive of the museum is the director. The chief executive is the leader; not only of the museum, but in truth he is the leader of the museum's policies and the museum's board. Yes, the president is there to be a leader. The chairman does great things, et cetera, but if you don't have a director who understands the responsibilities and the authorities of being a chief executive, then that person shouldn't be the director, so you're the boss, not the president.

MELTZER: I was on the search committee at Artists Space when one director resigned, and we hired another one who did not stay very long and was then replaced by the current director. In a small institution like that we were very concerned with someone who not only had a vision of where the exhibition program was going and was working with the artists on the board, but also was fiscally responsible, because in very small institutions with very small budgets you can't spend money you don't have. It was very important to us that fiscal responsibility was going to be a main characteristic of that person. The person who's come on has turned it around beautifully with proper spending, and part of that has to do with the fact that a very small organization like that, it was a result of saying, everybody wore many hats, nobody was so finely dedicated to a particular department at ICP. When a replacement was brought in to replace Cornell I think they felt very strongly although there was a wealth of talent out there who were eligible for the job, that Buzz brought with him a very clear vision of where to lead ICP over the next 20 years. He was very familiar with the institution. His understanding of the budgetary constraints, because, again, it's an institution with no endowment to speak of, and I think the vision that a director brings with them is particularly important, and their enthusiasm and how they are able to assemble their board and encourage their board to produce great things for them. It's very important.

TURNER: I urge all of you to go back and be sure who is the CEO of your organization, because I think some of you will be quite astonished that your role is not clear. I might say that it's going to emerge that it's very important who is the CEO, because I had the experience where the museum I work for purchased a great masterpiece by Poussin which the French argued had been illegally taken from France and it should be returned. Obviously the fine points of the legal issues I think are irrelevant at this point. As we said, the French government now accepts Cleveland's ownership, but the person who was of prime importance was the CEO. If he or she were in Paris they could be arrested and then the case could be opened in the French courts. As a result, I couldn't go to France for six years, so that's when it really matters. I would ask one more question before I open it up. I think in this day and age the matter of museums' exhibitions and other programs has become a grave issue. I think museums are facing problems of a grave, grave nature, and it's hardly surprising, because, after all, especially dealing with contemporary art, the real artist is a person who by definition challenges you, the viewer. If the audience is not challenged, then I don't think it's a really great artist. You don't go to a museum just to have some fruit and tea and flowers. You go to have some teeth, too, as well. I think museums are having great problems, and each institution responds to that problem in a rather different fashion, and I would be interested in what each of you think.

MELTZER: Shortly after I joined the board at Artists Space we mounted a show called "The Witnesses," and at this time, this was right after the Serrano/Mapplethorpe explosion, and this was a show that was documenting the loss of friends of various artists from AIDS. It was about AIDS, and it seems that in our budget we had a \$5,000 grant from the NEA. That

grant was rescinded. We stayed behind the show. It was a very popular show. The reason they took the money away from us was because there was extreme nudity. Most of this nudity appeared in photographs. Being an alternative space, those of us on the board felt work like that was very much the kind of work we should be showing. We all stood up to the cause. Here in New York, we got attention only because of the rescinding of the grant, not because of the content of the work in the show. It was not at all shocking to downtown New York audiences, and I think our audiences probably quadrupled because of all the press. We felt very secure in our staff, and everybody on the board certainly stood together, so in my experience, I know at ICP we had mounted another show that they at one time were questioning whether there was going to be any trouble, but the board met, stood behind the opening of the show, and really I think in a city like New York one can't predict what will blow up. Sometimes you think it will and it doesn't, and when you think it will be calm something comes up.

LAUDER: If you have about eight hours I can tell you about the crises of the Whitney in the past eight days or eight weeks. I don't know if any of you remember the cartoon character Li'l Abner. No matter where he was walking there was a rain cloud over his head. Well, having been in a position of leadership at the Whitney Museum for eight years, I can tell you that that rain cloud seems to hover over the Whitney's head and always has from the moment it was founded in 1931.

FRIED: We have not backed away from work that is controversial. We've had two shows that larger institutions in major metropolitan areas canceled because of a national controversy. The most important thing to say is that we really work on our relationship with the community, and I think we've worked on that with so many different ways, and there really is trust in our relationship, trust not only that they'll be comfortable with what they see, but that there is a reason for what we're doing. We have never been requested to bring a show down. We have been requested for specific pieces to be removed from a show, and, as you say, it's very clear in our policies that that is simply not an option. Once the show is up it's got to stay up the way it's been hung. We are sometimes sensitive to which pieces to hang in which galleries, and we encourage teachers and parents from the school to come first to make sure they're comfortable with the show and make a choice of running down the gallery. I don't think it's been a really big issue. Every now and then a specific issue might raise a specific concern. I go back to our board's experience. The level of expectation has changed in our community, and it's not anymore whether it's right or wrong or pornographic or not. There's a different set of questions that people are asking themselves when they come into our institution, and I think our board has been very effective in terms of raising those kinds of questions and that kind of dialogue with the community.

TURNER: I think it's an area where there are a great many problems. This week I had an interesting problem. I was doing an educational tour for a small group of children, and they were children being educated at home. This is allowed legally in Cleveland if the children pass the proper tests at the end of each year. Before I began my tour the parent who was in charge of home education said, given the nature of their Christian beliefs, would I please not show the children anything that was unflattering to Jesus Christ. That was an interesting example of censorship that I have never experienced before.

LAUDER: What did you do?

TURNER: As a matter of fact, I acquiesced because I was so pleased to have them in the museum. There were so many religions, Buddhism, ancient Egypt. There was no subject they put restrictions on, just that one, so it's-not-for-me-to-judge-his-faith, that kind of thing. You can see you've got a group of people who have done a lot of thinking up their sleeve now. What about questions?

AUDIENCE QUESTION: Clearly, all three of you are stakeholders in your institutions and have demonstrated how very supportive you are of the institution, of the decisions that have been made. As stakeholders, though, what is your expectation in the decision-making process? And let's go specifically to exhibitions. Is it your expectation that you have an active say in what exhibitions are coming to the institution?

FRIED: As a condition of being a trustee I do serve on our exhibition committee, and by our organizational structure that committee really has no power. It's not a board committee. It's

an advisory committee to our director, so she uses us at her discretion. It is really one of the most stimulating experiences that I get to have on a regular basis. The people by and large on the exhibition committees are not people who are major donors at the arts center. I think it's very clear about our role as a trustee. It's not our job to buy exhibitions or to throw our weight around, trying to influence. Trustees don't have any power individually. We only have power as a collective entity by our organizational structure. We've really never run into that by a board member inappropriately trying to influence things.

LAUDER: From the Whitney's standpoint, we do not have, nor ever had, nor hopefully ever will have, an exhibition committee. That is strictly for the staff to do, for the curators to do, and it's under the director's area. From time to time the director will give us a preview as to the forthcoming programming. We may have some questions or some comments, but that's where it ends. The exhibition program is the strict purview of the director and his or her curators, and it is not a board function.

TURNER: Just a moment. The board and staff would be at least responsive to show that they have thought about your questions?

LAUDER: We expect them to be responsive, and we do have some conversations, because we do like to talk about art rather than fundraising, so discussions about art are very important. Now, for example, many of you may have seen the reinstallation of the Whitney's permanent collection on the fifth floor. That came about from a very intensive trustees' all-day meeting whereby all the trustees said, "Where is the permanent collection?" And the result of the questioning resulted in the permanent collection being reinstated on the fifth floor, so that the staff is responsive to our thoughts. However, they do have the absolute authority. In other words, we cannot and will not either vote to approve or disapprove a show. That is not in our purview, and we all feel very, very strongly about that. Tempting as it may be, because that's the fun part, we won't do it.

MELTZER: At the ICP I am co-chairman of the exhibition committee, but it is not a committee that formulates what the exhibitions will be. This committee came about as a result of the fact that the budgets there are so tight that the exhibition curator had no leeway. If he wanted to mount a small show of a photographer's work, he couldn't commit in any way, because there was no money unless he went through a bureaucratic system. The exhibition committee that I co-chair, is a group of people who work with the exhibition curator. We are slowly and surely creating a fund, so the curator can come to us with some of his ideas, and we vote on where we'd like our money to go. We are not creating these budgets; they're coming to us from the curator through the institution.

TURNER: They are carrying the responsibility if you vote.

MELTZER: We carry the responsibility only in the sense that we are willing to put up money for investigative work on an exhibition, or we will fund that exhibition, but it doesn't mean it can't be funded elsewhere. We're just saying we will commit these funds.

TURNER: So it's almost an extension of the economic organization?

MELTZER: It is. What happens, to put it in clearer terms, the former exhibition curator at ICP became incredibly frustrated by the fact that in the photography world a lot of young photographers come through the city with their portfolios. They're looking to have a show mounted. By the nature of the ICP's exhibition schedule, there may be a room where you can mount 20 photographs, but we'd like someplace where you can mount one or two months from now, not a year from now or two years from now, but there was no money even to do that. So that's why this fund came around, and since then it's increased. We may choose not to fund one thing, but it doesn't mean that it won't get funded through normal channels. We just provide a funding source.

TURNER: Interesting, a good example of the complexity of the moral support in the relationships. Any other questions?

AUDIENCE QUESTION: I wonder, how do each of you find new board members? How do you find the passionate people to support your institution when they're not on the board

yet or they're not even donors, but they're someone you would love to have on your board for other reasons? Also, what is the system within the board that brings new members? How does that happen?

FRIED: We have a nominating committee that makes those kinds of decisions, and we're actually beginning to think about trying to do that in a less traditional way than we normally have. The way it's worked in the past is this committee meets every year and generates new names. We've always tried to have a good eye towards looking for good board members, but we're aware that there are people that may not be connected to our institution yet. We are just beginning to explore how we as a board can cultivate people, by inviting them into gatherings at our homes or at the institution so that we can have a better sense of whether they would be appropriate board members for us.

TURNER: What role does the director have in that?

FRIED: Our director sits in on the nominating committee, and she has a good feel in a way that we may not about who's coming through.

LAUDER: We're in a city where there is huge competition to see who can go on a board. We're in competition not only with the AFA, but with the Metropolitan, the MOMA, the Guggenheim, The New Museum and a host of others, so that everyone is pushing and pulling for the same few rich people who can write checks. We have a few things that we look for in board members, number one, do they like art? You may say, well, that's obvious, but if they don't like art they really in the long run aren't happy in our place, and do they like art? Do they like people? Do they get along? As I mentioned to you earlier, are they willing to show up? There's nothing more frustrating than getting a new board member who says, "Yes, I'll join your board," and then that board member doesn't show up. That becomes an embarrassment not only for the board member, but an embarrassment for us who invited that board member onto our board.

MELTZER: When you talk about sources for finding new members, I think your board members themselves become a repository, because they bring in their friends and they tend to know people who have similar interests. At ICP, interestingly enough, the education department has brought people in, because people get hooked on the courses there and their photography classes, so that's been another way that people have come through the ranks.

AUDIENCE QUESTION: Do you ever have photographers on the board?

MELTZER: No, not at ICP.

LAUDER: Nor at the Whitney.

MELTZER: But Artists Space is very in love with the artists.

TURNER: So that's a different philosophy.

MELTZER: Exactly. It's interesting that people who show up at your opening are people who will get involved in the patron level. All of a sudden you see a new name on the patron list. You wonder what their interest is. I thoroughly agree that if they don't love art or they don't love photography their interest burns out very quickly.

TURNER: You're saying you have to love art; you're not saying they have to collect?

MELTZER: Right.

LAUDER: By the way, there's nothing wrong with collecting and giving us your whole collection.

TURNER: What a surprising observation.

AUDIENCE QUESTION: I am the director of a state university museum, the Florida International University in Miami. Have any of you ever served on a board of a university or a state university? We have advisory boards, but, as you probably know, the board members play a very different role, and it's difficult for some of us who have come from other museums.

LAUDER: I think I can possibly help you with that. I serve on the board of the University of Pennsylvania, and we have two museums, the ICA, which is an independent museum associated with the university - I think the university owns the building - and the Arthur Ross Gallery, and the director and CEO just this afternoon, which is totally under the universities' aegis, I really can't talk about the financial challenges that the Arthur Ross may face, but I know that the ICA faces enormous financial challenges because they're a teeny-weeny institution in a big city, and a big conservative city, and that the search—and here is a real key problem—that search for a new director, which is just about commencing now, there's a search committee, which is basically an academic committee. You know how academics love fund-raising —forgive me if there are any academics here in the room - and so that they're faced with a challenge as to—if it were a totally lay board they would find someone that knows how to raise money and knows how to run an exhibition schedule, but if it's an academically oriented search committee they're going to get Dr. so-and-so, who has published a great deal and who may be terrified of the thought of asking anyone for money. So that therein lies a problem in many university-connected art museums, although I certainly don't say all of them, because, without mentioning names, one of the most effective university museum fundraisers is in the room this afternoon, so it runs the whole gamut from "I don't care about it," to "I'm there."

TURNER: The university museum is certainly a very particular problem. Not only are they not very good fundraisers, but I find that they're self-serving. They're thinking about what they want to achieve in their own work and programs and not thinking sufficiently about the needs of the museum and the university.

AUDIENCE QUESTION: I've served on several boards, and it's always very tricky, but everybody here I'm sure would like to know how you can discreetly approach, and what the timing is with respect to financial commitment, potential board members.

LAUDER: I'm not shy, so the mechanics become fairly straightforward and fairly easy. When we invite someone to come on our board we tell them right up front what their financial expectations are, how much we expect from them in giving and if there's going to be a capital campaign next year or in three years or five years, so there's no surprises. You get into trouble if you surprise your new trustees. Never do that. If you are afraid to tell them up front, the easiest time to deal with the money problem is when you invite them. If you say please join our board and then don't say anything until they come on, then you have somehow or another betrayed the trust that person had in you, and it's always a downhill slope after that. We have found that the most generous board members are those who we've been honest with up front.

FRIED: The only thing I would want to add is that in our institution we definitely need the board to be key donors and fundraisers, but we also need people on our board who have other skills or gifts to bring, so that we don't take quite the same position, but I would say where we have been most effective is where we have board members who set the leadership by their own generous philanthropy.

TURNER: Will the Whitney take on someone who has other contributions to offer than financial resources?

LAUDER: Absolutely. We have a number of people who are there for other purposes. I was answering the question just from a one-sided thing of how do you deal with someone who is there for money. Now, I would also love to take on my board someone who has an incredible collection of Abstract Expressionists. If any of you in the room know of someone here, I would love you to just pass me their name later on, but they don't have to give any money.

TURNER: The famous three Ws, work, wealth and wisdom, and the idea was that the ideal board member ought to have two of the three.

AUDIENCE QUESTION: Do you have any expectations that you express?

FRIED: Again, I think we are saying it would depend on what we're hoping that board member could contribute, so I think if resources is what we need from them we'll certainly be aware of that, but I can't think of a time where we've brought someone on and said we're expecting a certain level of giving.

MELTZER: At ICP you knew exactly when you went on the board exactly how much you were expected to give, and this same financial commitment has carried over to the committee today.

AUDIENCE QUESTION: Can you tell us either the amount or the range?

MELTZER: I believe it was \$10,000 at that time. My exhibition committee is \$5,000.

LAUDER: In our case we do have a specific amount we try to—really, it would not be fair to tell you, but in our acquisitions committee we have a very interesting structure whereby there's a pooling of interest. It's not too different from your exhibition committee, where each member of that particular acquisition committee throws a certain amount of money into the pot and the curators go and take pictures or photographs or whatever that they think are worthy of acquisition, and there's a very lively discussion about that particular piece of art, or many of them, and there's a vote as to what should be acquired from their joint funds, so that amount of money is fairly well proscribed. I just wanted to give you a footnote. Looking around the room, I don't imagine many of yours have permanent collections, do they? We do something which I want to share with you which has worked very well for us in our acquisitions committee, and that is that if something comes into the acquisition committee, there may be a painting that costs, say, \$50,000 and that would use up a rather substantial percentage of our funds. We will do something, which is called trustee preemption. We will allow a member of that acquisitions committee, if that piece of art has been presented to the committee, we'll allow the member of that acquisitions committee to buy it for his or her own personal collection as long as it's made as a promised gift. We would also have, if something comes up for auction and say something has an estimated cost of \$250,000, highest, we will say to one of our acquisition committee members or a trustee that if you will go 250 we'll go any amount over and above that and then we'll take a remainder interest in the piece and you'll have a lifetime interest. So that collector can have that piece of art on their wall and they know exactly how much money they have to spend and upon their death it comes to the Whitney Museum. That can work very well for us also.

TURNER: Do you have a legal document that your lawyers have drawn up to protect you?

LAUDER: Yes. It's not theirs. Yours.

AUDIENCE QUESTION: I have a question of a difficult case scenario. What do you do when you have a small institution, a board president that gives a lot of money and a lot of time to the institution, but also isolates about three-quarters of the community and causes the staff great emotional distress? How does the director handle that, on the one hand, and how does the board handle it, on the other?

MELTZER: I personally would not be very comfortable sitting on a board where I felt alienated by the board president. I think that would be a grossly unsatisfying experience as a board member, so I would probably leave the board.

LAUDER: One should have as a case study like in the Harvard Business School the Pasadena Art Museum, which was renamed the Norton Simon Museum after its then president, Norton Simon, who came in to save the museum and as part of the saving of the museum insisted that he have a majority of the board, which the board acceded to. That majority of the board then promptly commenced deaccessing all paintings that did not particularly fit into Mr. Simon's idea of his interest in collecting, including paintings that had been given to the museum by most of the members of the board. There was a lawsuit which the board members who brought the suit lost, and so this is a very, very tricky situation, but the Pasadena Art Museum, the Norton Simon Museum nee Pasadena Art

Museum, is probably the classic example where one can speak about where that situation is almost impossible to get your arms around.

FRIED: My only thought is I think those are the moments that define what we really believed and wanted for our institution and community, and I could imagine some things that could get in place to perhaps head that off, like we have a retreat where we bring in an outside facilitator to grapple with some of those larger issues, getting some of the board members involved in vision and taking responsibility on that level. It reminds me of something that was said by a minister who did a lot of therapy with individuals but who did a lot of consulting with churches and synagogues, and he made the point that there is no minister or rabbi who can turn a prune into plum. I think some systems, perhaps, are prunes.

TURNER: I think you all agreed that when faced with such a situation one can very surely confront it. Don't put it off, because it will only get worse.

AUDIENCE QUESTION: How many trustees are on each of your boards and what are their terms of office?

MELTZER: The ICP board may be four people. The Artists Space I believe was 24. Term of office, if I remember correctly, was about four years.

TURNER: Renewable?

MELTZER: Yes.

TURNER: Immediately?

MELTZER: Yes and there was no mandate of rotation.

LAUDER: The Whitney is 33 members, more or less down by one or two, three-year terms, renewable, no retirement age and no mandatory rotation off the board.

FRIED: We have 18 members, terms of three years. A trustee can serve two terms, and it has to go off the board for at least a year before it can be invited back on.

AUDIENCE QUESTION: How about the executive committee on the board and the relationship between the director and the executive committee?

MELTZER: We work very closely with the director, and, I would say that the director was very much responsible for a large part of the organization at those meetings.

AUDIENCE QUESTION: Was the director bullying members?

MELTZER: No, I don't believe so.

LAUDER: With the Whitney it's the same thing, but the word "vote" is a loose word. You're never going to have a vote where it's six-five and therefore you outvote the director or the director casts the deciding vote and alienates everyone. It's just that our director is an ex officio member of every committee, the executive committee and the board, and as such has a full vote, but let's not take the word "vote" too seriously, because most museums must operate with consensus.

FRIED: I agree with that. Our executive committee works very closely with our director. Our board really wants to be active. We are not a board where the executive board makes a decision and we all sort of just sign off on them, but the executive committee can be more efficient.

AUDIENCE QUESTION: I have a question for Mr. Lauder. Unless I misunderstood, you seem to feel that boards don't in general like to ask for money. If that's not a responsibility of the board where do you feel that responsibility lies, the director?

LAUDER: No, I didn't say that it was the responsibility of the board. I was just giving a factual case, that I've been on boards where the president of the board, or whatever it is, says every member of the board should go out and raise money, but that doesn't happen. What we'll do very often is we'll ask our board members to join us on solicitation calls, so a board member would go in with the director or another trustee on solicitation calls. Where our trustees have been most effective in the getting area is those trustees who are in the corporate world have been able to raise corporate memberships, and we have a very large corporate membership program which falls in between the membership fees, and what we get from their use of our facilities is well over a million dollars. In that case, many members of the board are quite helpful there, but you simply don't call 30 people into a room and point out to somewhere in the sky and say, "Go out and get money," because it doesn't work that way.

TURNER: I hope that each one of our panelists will linger for a few minutes. If you have questions, I'm sure they'll be game to consider them. In any case, thank you very much for being such a committed audience.

Ownership Issues: Stolen Art and Repatriation

Hugh M. Davies

The David C. Copley Director
Museum of Contemporary Art, San Diego

I come here as a past president of the Association of Art Museum Directors to update you on AAMD's task force on the issue of looted art in World War II in Europe during the Nazi era from 1933 to 1945. On my watch for the 12 months I was president of AAMD, the most important issue to us was spoliated art. I had no idea what the word "spoliated" meant at the time I first heard someone use it, but soon learned that this was the correct term for art that was essentially stolen, misappropriated from private institutions, persons, and institutions during the World War II era. I am further qualified to have been president during this issue since mine is a contemporary museum, the Museum of Contemporary Art in San Diego. None of the art in our collection was purchased prior to the Second World War. Indeed, none was made prior to the Second World War, so there is no risk of a conflict of interest.

Many of you are perhaps familiar with this topic, and I apologize if I go over ground that you've already heard, but it's important to set the stage for this terrible episode in history and in art history. During the Nazi era – from 1933 when Hitler came into power until the Armistice in 1945—hundreds of thousands of pieces of artwork and furniture were looted in France alone. By the time of the liberation, the Nazis had pillaged a third of all the art in private hands in France. Bare in mind that Paris was the capital of the art world and there were enormous holdings in that country. It is astonishing to note that fully a third of all the art had been looted. At the height of the misappropriation of artworks, from 1940 to 1942, the Nazis had as many as 60 people cataloging and arranging for shipping artworks that had been stolen in and around Paris and in France. No less than 20,000 objects, an enormous number, were sent to Germany alone, many of them stamped "Property of the Third Reich," and they still bear that stamp on the back of them. In Poland in 1939–40, 95% of that country's art was lost in six months. An incredibly efficient piece of work.

Hitler was an avid collector of art, which I think led to the zest with which this was pursued. He was an amateur painter himself. He sought art for his own museum, which he planned to open in Linz, Austria, and he was particularly interested in so-called "German" art. Part of the irony of this situation was that part of his passion was to repatriate to Germany and Austria works of art that had been spoliated by Napoleon, and he felt that works by such important "German" artists as Rembrandt [sic] and others should be returned to their homeland. Hitler's partner was Hermann Goering, a passionate collector of art throughout his life, who attempted to assemble an extraordinary collection. Between the 2 men, there was one trainload of no less than 30 crates that went from Paris to Berlin.

As I said, Hitler's main passion was so-called German art and his loose interpretation of it, and apparently, the subject that he admired the most was that of Leda and the swan. Apparently, if you were an aspiring German artist during the Nazi era and you entered an art contest, and if you had as your subject matter Leda and the magic swan, you would win a gold medal no matter how incompetent your art. It is estimated that 80% of that art was restituted, so a significant part of the problem was solved within a threshold period following the Second World War. This was partly due, ironically, to the efficiency of the Nazis' record keeping and the efficiency of their storage systems in the salt mines, but also largely due to the considerable work of members of the Fine Arts Commission of the United States Army. There are people like Dr. Drake, who, following the war, did extraordinary work – researching, traveling, tracking down these objects, and making sure that they were returned to their original owners, and that artworks should not be forgotten. There are 2 source books I can recommend to you with greater detail and lots of good information about this era of spoliation. The first is by Lynn Nicholas, *The Rape of Europa* (Knopf, 1994), a very readable text which covers the entire situation in Europe; the second is Hector Feliciano's *The Lost Museum* (Basic Books, 1997), which focuses in on France and particularly on fine Jewish collections that were well-documented. Both of these authors are also very good speakers, if you want to follow up on this issue in your communities.

Since so much art was changing hands illegally in Europe during this era, it also coincides with the time when the U.S. art market was robust, in the 1930s and '40s. It's very logical to assume that of the 20% of works that were not returned, some—we don't know how

many—entered this country and are conceivably in private collections, may already be in museum collections, or might even be offered to your collections in the coming years.

To put this issue in perspective, you should imagine yourself as a museum director in the 1960s. One of your donors comes in and says that she and her husband have a Matisse that has been in their family for fifteen or twenty years, and they would like to give to the museum. Your first reaction is not to say, "Yes, but wait a minute, we want to see if this is a looted work, don't try to pawn it off on us." Rather, your first reaction is, "Thank you, donor, we'll take it." I think it's also true that, historically, dealers and collectors and museums have been very discreet, if not secretive, about the idea of confidentiality. Unfortunately, anonymity, for whatever reasons, has been part of the culture of museums throughout this century, and I don't know what accounts for that. Is it fear of theft—if it's found out that you're donating those pictures, they'll come out to your house? Is it fear of the IRS? Probably not. Is there a family member that you don't want to know what you're doing; or is it because, in fact, these works do have questionable histories? To a certain extent, museums may willingly or unwillingly have been complicit in the movement of these artworks because we did not want to make waves with generous donors and we felt that this object, now coming into a public place, made amends for its checkered past. I also would add that previously, there was some acceptance of the condition of historic bounty—of spoils of war—and the irony that Hitler was trying to make amends for spoliation of works from Germany and Austria.

What really brought this to the attention of the AAMD was the investigation of and press attention to Swiss banks that were holding gold from Nazi victims. This triggered people to think about other assets, including spoliated artwork, that might now be held both privately and publicly. In addition, Feliciano's and Nicholas's books triggered a lot of thinking about this subject, in the art world as well as among the general public. The 50th anniversary of the end of the Second World War caused certain archives to be opened, and a flood of information emerged, not only from those sources, but also as a result of the tearing down of the Berlin Wall and the Iron Curtain. Information came out of Eastern Europe that amplified knowledge and discussion of spoliated artworks.

AAMD's involvement began later in this sequence of events, in the fall of 1997 when the Museum of Modern Art had a very trying experience with 2 Schiele paintings, which were identified as works from Jewish families that had been stolen from them in the Second World War. First, I had talks with AAMD Executive Director, Mimi Gaudieri, and then very soon after, contacted Ned Rifkin, Director of the High Museum, who at that time was chair of the AAMD art issues committee and an AAMD trustee. We realized that it was very much in the interest of, and in fact was the obligation of, the AAMD to take a position on this issue, and, in some way, to try to assert leadership. Mimi Gaudieri and I both felt that the best person to chair a task force would be Philippe de Montebello, director of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, the largest museum that had probably the most art at stake. The other members of the task force included Robert Bergman of the Cleveland Museum, James Wood of the Art Institute of Chicago, Anne d'Harmoncourt of the Philadelphia Museum of Art, Mimi Gardner Gates of the Seattle Museum of Art, Earl Powell III of the National Gallery of Art, and Glenn Lowry of the Museum of Modern Art, who was enormously helpful throughout this process. Also very helpful were Malcolm Rogers of the Boston Museum of Fine Arts, and John Walsh of the J. Paul Getty Museum.

Usually in the AAMD, we try to balance all our committees between large, mid-sized, and small museums. However, in this instance, we went for the heaviest of heavies we could summon in our ranks. We felt it was very important for AAMD to come out early and clearly with a strong statement that museums would do the right thing in terms of questioned artworks, would conduct the necessary research, and would respond by restituting works that were in their collections inappropriately. The committee's task force convened in January 1998, during our meetings in Los Angeles, and we started holding working sessions. I remember one painful 4-hour session as 8 A-type museum directors tried to hack out a 2-page press release. By the end of 4 hours of critiquing every single word for its spin and nuance, we decided that it made a lot more sense to give it back to Philippe to give it to his press people and make it a real document that we would vote on, and we did. This was a process that was duplicated in subsequent meetings.

What characterized a lot of the incoherence, if you will, in trying to draft this document was its going to press and committing everyone in the field to a course of action, potentially putting the committee through a lot of research, and instigating for our colleagues a

considerable amount of work sifting through collections. On the other hand, the dual risk was to do too little too late and drag our feet, being perceived as not living up to our commitment to the field in the future. And I can tell you, I think without violating confidences, that Glenn Lowry was enormously helpful in steering that, especially since he had recently been involved in very tense press negotiations concerning the Schiele situation. He was constantly reminding us: "Yes, it's helpful; yes, it's expensive; yes, it's time consuming; and yes, it will take you from your upcoming show. But it's essential that you do this work now, and that you do it well, and that you do it openly."

In February 1998, a month after our initial meeting, the House of Representative's Banking Committee called upon members of the museum profession. Rep. Jonathan Leach chaired the committee and summoned them to present before Congress. Several members of the AAMD task force—Philippe de Montebello, Robert Bergman, Glenn Lowry, Rusty Powell, Jim Wood, and others—presented very well on that occasion, and were quite forthcoming with the field's commitment to "doing the right thing." They also had the opportunity to point out to the legislators that proper research takes a great deal of time, that you need qualified researchers, and that this often takes money. It wasn't that the museums were trying to hide anything, just that they were trying to be diligent in this very important issue.

Also, in their quiet way, these speakers very importantly drew a distinction between banks and museums, and pointed out that even though they were before the House Banking Committee, other parallels were not there. In essence, banks are private. They held this gold continuously since it was either given to them in good faith by Jewish families or placed there by those who took it from these families, and the banks were using this gold as an asset within their portfolios. On the other hand, museums are third-party owners of assets—artworks—that may come into our collections.

Museums do occasionally purchase works, but collections more typically are built through bequests from collectors or philanthropists who have owned the works through a long chain of purchasers, many of those purchasers, Jewish, in fact. Very different from banks. In fact, museums do not conceal their assets. We exhibit our art. We publish our art. We lend our art to exhibitions in other museums. To the contrary, we pray for attention for our collections. We brag incessantly to the public about this. And, again, I think there was a sense for many of us who work in museums that, after decades of art having passed through different sets of hands, there's a great sense of fulfillment when these works come to rest in a great public institution.

The AAMD task force continued to meet in March, April, and May of 1998. They were very long meetings, and most were attended both by legal counsel from the museums and by public relations people. The report we finally pulled together was issued in June. It was discussed by the AAMD membership, and a press release was issued. In essence, the report says that museums should conduct an extensive review of their collections, using not only traditional research methods, but also the new databases that have become available: web sites, computers, and the like. Museums should respond promptly to claims, and they should resolve matters "in an equitable, appropriate, and mutually agreeable manner." In this process of restitution, where appropriate, we should attempt to use mediation so that all parties concerned can avoid going to courts of law, a situation that doesn't always lead to the best resolution. Mediation can also be incredibly important both for the claimants—the families of the victims—and for the museums that are put in the position of having to defend their claim. I heard one attorney quoted who said, "If the art that you, a claimant, are trying to get back is worth less than \$3 million, it's probably not worth your while to pursue a court claim," a fact which is devastating, since obviously many of these works won't be worth nearly that much.

Further, the AAMD report called for museums to seek information before acquiring or accepting gifts or bequests and making purchases, indicating, "If there is evidence of unlawful confiscation and there is no evidence of restitution, the museum should not proceed to acquire the object." The report went on to state that no museums ought to borrow confiscated non-restituted art. A second press release went out in June 1998, which I believe summarizes the spirit of the AAMD report better than I can. Commenting on it, Philippe de Montebello stated that the task force, "placed themselves on record as committed to acting swiftly and proactively to conduct the necessary research that will help us learn as much as possible about works for which full ownership records previously have not been available."

To date, there have only been a few claims, and we have no reason to believe that, as of now, there will be any greater number of future claims resulting from the Nazi era. In full recognition of all our legal and moral obligations, the press release goes on to say, the AAMD task force offers a statement of principles recognizing and deploring the unlawful confiscation of art that constituted one of the many horrors of the Holocaust. It sets guidelines to assist museums in resolving claims, reconciling the interests of people who possess works of art with the heirs, together with the fiduciary responsibilities and legal obligations of art museums and their trustees to the public for whom they hold the works of art in trust. Finally, it offers specific recommendations for the creation of data banks and computerized research files with cross-referenced claims and claimants, works of art having been confiscated during the Nazi era, and works of art later restituted.

One of the clear impediments or difficulties is that records on the private ownership and transfer of art are, in the best of times, incomplete and, during wartime, chaotic. When you're looking at clouded ownership, questions arise, such as, did the collector sell their work before the war at a fair price? It's quite conceivable that in 1936, a Jewish collector might have sold something from their collection and received a fair market price, and the records may not indicate that. Did the collector sell their work during the war or just prior to the war at an absolute rock bottom price, an unfair price, in order to escape or in order to fund the escape of their relatives? And then, of course, there were thousands of works that were confiscated and no price was paid for them.

A museum has to be diligent in responding to these claims. Do the family or their heirs have evidence that this work was in their family's collection, that they legally owned this work, that it was in fact taken during the war, that it was not restituted following the war? Art was returned. Much was sold after World War II in the art market, as everyone recovering from the devastation of the war tried to do business. The overly cruel factor is that the best-documented collections were obviously those of the wealthiest families, who, in some ways, may not have lost as much during the war. They tend to have exhibition records of where the works were being exhibited in museums. They might have photographs of the interiors of their homes. They might have much more accurate records of ownership of the artworks.

It is a sort of poetic justice and irony that, because of the Nazis' very good record keeping, a lot of the work has been done for us in trying to determine whose art was stolen. The Nazis used the hideous euphemism "abandoned property," said that they were going to pay a resident to take the art off the walls of a house, and assured the owner that they kept very good records. There were also very accurate shipping records – what went in what carton in what box car—but because of the very intensive volume of this activity, even those records are not as complete as the Nazis would have liked.

We are very fortunate at this time that there are new tools of research in addition to the traditional methods of manually searching through museum exhibition records, art dealers' records, and so forth. There are two Jewish organizations that are leading this research work. Connie Lowenthal is perhaps the most important person doing this work, and she leads the Commission for Art Recovery, which was established by the World Jewish Congress. Among other things, they have a very detailed form which claimants can submit that outlines the circumstances of ownership and circumstances of the loss, asking claimants whenever possible to give a description of the objects, if not a photograph. In addition, they are developing a list of "red flag" names, names of victims whose art was stolen – obvious names like Rosenberg, Warfield and Kahn, but also names of unscrupulous dealers in Europe, a number of whom would, with the Nazis, seize the art and then go on to sell it. Some of these "red flag" names will thus potentially trigger concern about a claim of title. The Commission for Art Recovery also established an advisory committee, and I'm pleased that Robert Bergman, a former president of both the AAM and AAMD, has agreed to serve on that committee. In addition, the National Jewish Museum has set up a Holocaust Art Restitution Project, which is initiating a database to identify lost works. Both of these organizations have affiliated and are linking their work with the art loss registry, which, as you know, is the standard first port-of-call in tracking down lost or stolen objects. Our hope is that as increasingly more museums have web sites, they can post information about questionable objects or help them search by linking these web sites, so that one can pool the information.

To underscore the difficulties of some of these claims, I want to give you a few examples. Perhaps the most public of these is the Henri Matisse painting in the collection of the

Seattle Art Museum. The Matisse, from 1927, is *Oriental Woman Seated on a Floor*. It was given to the Seattle Art Museum within the last five years upon the death of its owner, Mr. and Mrs. Bloedel, who had purchased the Matisse from Knoedler Gallery in 1954, shortly after the gallery acquired the work from a defunct Parisian gallery. When Hector Feliciano's book was published, one of its examples was this Matisse painting, and a member of the Rosenberg family, in fact, saw the book, recognized the picture from their family's collection, and notified Mimi Gates, director of the Seattle Art Museum. The museum immediately embarked on research and found out that there is very good evidence that the picture belonged to Paul Rosenberg and his collection prior to the war. It was published in catalogs of exhibitions at the Paul Rosenberg Gallery in both 1937 and 1938, so there was very clean title at that time. It was published in an official French government catalog as one of the looted works that had yet to be restituted following the Second World War.

The museum does not contest the claim that the Rosenbergs have, but they do have a claim against the gallery which sold it to the Bloedels. Their claim is that the gallery at the time of the sale, on the part of the then-owners, told Bloedel that before the war, in 1937-38, it was in Matisse's own collection when in fact it was in the Rosenberg collection. They also had in their possession in the gallery at that time, copies of both these catalogs, part of the Rosenberg collection. So, as a result, the museum is in the awkward position of wanting to do the right thing, wanting to restate this art, but because they hold the work in public trust and don't want to just hand over assets without responsibly pursuing it, have filed against an owner for an "uncommitted fraud, negligent misrepresentation, and breach of warranty of title" when it sold the work to the Bloedels. Therefore, now the Knoedler Gallery has the problem, and they would probably, I assume, go after the Parisian gallery from which they acquired the work. However, this gallery is no longer in business. They're defunct. So I'm not sure how this case will be resolved.

Another instance, with a happier ending, took place at the Art Institute of Chicago, and in this case a benefactor purchased a Degas work on paper with the advice of one of the museum's curators. The family of the owner came to claim the work, a legitimate claim. This was settled very amicably by the benefactor of the museum, who donated half of the work to the museum while the museum purchased half the work from the family. Therefore both parties—the original owners and the then-current owners—participated in bringing the work into the public domain in the museum, and the catalogue will hereinafter reflect the history of this object's travels prior to arriving at the Art Institute.

Another example is a museum in Europe which identified a still life as having been Nazi looted and announced publicly that it had this work and it did not know who the owners were. The museum wanted to restate it, but it was of such a generic subject matter that immediately there were 20 families who stepped forward and remembered that in their childhood it was in their home. The problem was that in these upper-middle-class homes, such artworks weren't well documented and the refugee families likely didn't carry photographs as they fled Europe, so there are no concrete records. It's very hard to prove who actually owned these works, even though in this instance, the museum in Europe wanted and tried to do the right thing.

This leaves perhaps one of the thorniest areas of this topic: so-called "heir-less" art. This is a thorny issue, because, first of all, it's difficult to determine if art is in fact heir-less if there are no living heirs. Did someone from the family survive the Holocaust? A remote cousin or distant relative? If so, they might have a legitimate claim to this object, but there are different points of view. There are some groups, such as the Jewish Congress, which are advocating that any works found that are heir-less should be put up at auction and the proceeds used to benefit Jewish organizations. There are other people who are calling for works that are heir-less to be sent to the Israel Museum in Jerusalem, but this raises the issue of works that are in public collections then being sold and the proceeds being distributed to beneficiaries who may not be direct heirs. It's a tricky situation.

Glenn Lowry, who, as I have said, is a voice for reason in this debate, has been on record as saying that public museums are ultimately the best repository for heir-less works of art. He doesn't specify how to get there, but it's important to bear in mind that if this work goes back into the private domain, there will be a secondary victim—the public—who would otherwise have access to this work. I think all of us agree that if an heir-less work remains in a museum collection, it should be properly labeled and should in perpetuity credit the obviously fallen owners and acknowledge the Holocaust.

Two other museum acquisitions of originally questionable works have happy endings. In 1997, MoMA acquired a Matisse. In the process of doing research, the museum felt that it was part of the Kahn family collection, a collection that had been appropriated by the Nazis. The museum stopped their acquisition proceedings to do further research. They subsequently found clear evidence that the work had been returned to Kahn after the war, that he had put it up for sale, and therefore it was on the market without title; the museum proceeded to acquire this great work of art, which is now in MoMA's collection. Another example, from 1993, is a van Gogh acquired by the Metropolitan Museum, a work that, we believe, had originally been from the Mendelssohn collection. As the Mendelssohns fled Germany during the war, they left their works in the custody of a farmer, rolled up and stored. After the war, the Mendelssohn family returned, found its works intact, and then sold the van Gogh to a gallery in Europe. Subsequently, Mendelssohn family members stepped forward to attest that title was clear, and that work is now in the Metropolitan Museum of Art collection.

An important international conference will take place in Washington, D.C., from November 30 to December 2, 1998, entitled the "Washington Conference on Holocaust Era Assets," co-hosted by the U.S. Department of State and the U.S. Holocaust and War Memorial Museum. Approximately 60 countries are expected to be represented at this conference. Philippe de Montebello will represent the AAMD task force on that occasion.

At this stage, you may be wondering what you can do, and all I can ask is that you please be conscientious in researching your own collections. It's an enormous commitment, but also a very moral task to find out as much as you can about your collection and its origins. If you do find evidence of spoliated art, please come forward with that information. The question may be, how do you come forward? Well, you can put the information on your web site. You can publish it in a catalogue or your newsletter. You can send the information to the AAM or AAMD, and we can publicize that fact. I exhort you to do these things to the best of your ability.

I will end with a quote from Philippe de Montebello, who has been a remarkable spokesperson for this issue: "In the end, it's in everyone's interest to marry simple justice and public interest. Oh, would that it be so easy."

Thank you very much.

About the AFA

The American Federation of Arts is a nonprofit art museum service organization that provides traveling art exhibitions and educational, professional, and technical support programs developed in collaboration with the museum community.

Through these programs, the AFA seeks to strengthen the ability of museums to enrich the public's experience and understanding of art.

Goals:

- To make art accessible to a broad range of people through a program of traveling art exhibitions
- To provide educational experience for diverse audiences as an integral part of AFA exhibitions
- To promote scholarship and research through exhibitions and publications
- To provide professional training and development opportunities for museum leaders
- To facilitate communication and collaboration within the museum community
- To assist museums with exhibition preparation and circulation by offering a broad range of technical support services