

PART 1

WENDY L-J. MACNEIL

Welcome, everyone, to the Guggenheim. Tonight’s event is being presented, as you know, by the Associate’s Committee, and I would like to extend a very special thank you to our co-chairmen, [Jamie Zokie?] and Karen Gallagher, for all of the effort and the support that they give to this committee, for this program as well as the others that are put on throughout the day — or the year, excuse me. Our lecture, “Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow: A History of the Guggenheim Museum,” will begin with Peter Lawson-Johnston, who will talk about the founding of the museum by his grandfather, Solomon R. Guggenheim. He will also highlight important phases of the institution’s development over the past 50 years.

Thomas Krens, director of the Solomon R. Guggenheim Foundation, will follow with an overview of ongoing projects and future goals for this internationally renowned museum [00:01:00] of twentieth-century contemporary art.

Peter Lawson-Johnston graduated from the University of Virginia, majoring in philosophy in 1951. During his career, he has served as director on the boards of numerous companies, including Kennecott Copper. Currently, he is the chairman of Zemex, a mining company, director of McGraw-Hill, and chairman of the Harry Frank Guggenheim Foundation, which gives grants to those who shed light on man’s relation to man. He is a trustee of his alma mater, the Lawrenceville School. He is a member of the Jeffersonian Restoration Advisory Board, the purpose of which is to restore Thomas Jefferson’s academical village at the University of Virginia, and he has served as chairman of that board during the years of 1985-89. He is also director for the Council of the United States in Italy. [00:02:00] His able leadership as president of the Solomon R. Guggenheim Foundation since 1969 has greatly benefited the public at large, who continue to enjoy the original works collected by Solomon as well as the special editions which have been acquired over time. With very biased admiration, I introduce to you my father, Peter Lawson-Johnston. (applause)

PETER LAWSON-JOHNSTON

A rather biased introduction I would say, too. I’m very proud to be introduced by my daughter, who has taken an enormous interest in this institution over a good many years. She had much to do with starting our associate’s program both here and in Venice and is a very active trustee. [00:03:00] I gave this same lecture, more or less, at the instigation of my wife, Dede, some months ago, and I was so pleased when it was over that I threw away my notes, and so my daughter, Wendy, who asked me to do this, made me resurrect my notes. The last time, to the best of my knowledge, people did not pay to hear me talk, and I hope that I can justify your expenditure.

And with apologies to Ward Jackson, who has been sort of the Guggenheim historian over the years, this is a presentation, as Wendy said, of a colorful history of the family [00:04:00] and our two museums. When I am from time to time at a dinner party or wherever, I usually say I’m involved with the Guggenheim, then if it comes to their attention that I’m president, they’re

usually quite surprised, and they ask me why. And I either say “Because Solomon Guggenheim was my grandfather” or “If my mother had been my father, my name would have been Guggenheim.”

At any rate, this is a slide presentation. This is a picture of my grandfather, Solomon Guggenheim. His parents arrived from Switzerland in 1848. [00:05:00] They were penniless. They settled down in Philadelphia, and I will tell you more about how they proceeded to succeed in life. He died in 1949, 10 years before this museum opened to the public, at the age of 88. I was 22 at the time. I remember him very fondly. He was a great raconteur. He loved to play golf. He loved to shoot. He loved to work at the office. I visited him many times with my mother. He had homes in Charleston, South Carolina, a lovely home on the Battery that Dick Jenrette of Donaldson, Lufkin, & Jenrette now owns. He had a ranch in Idaho, a lovely place in Port Washington, Long Island with a golf course, where I learned how to play [00:06:00] the game, and I’ll tell you more about him later, but just suffice it to say that he and I had a very wonderful relationship as far as I was concerned.

This was a picture of my mother. She was the youngest of my grandfather’s three daughters, and to be very, very candid with you, Mom was much more interested in horses than she was in art. But she raised me following her divorce from my father. I was three years old and have very little recollection of that particular separation. One of the things, not knowing my father as I grew up, that made me sort of admire him without knowing him was that whenever I did anything wrong she [00:07:00] would always say, “You’re just like your father.” She served as a trustee here at the Guggenheim until she had a stroke.

One of her cause célèbres was over the question of who it was that brought Frank Lloyd Wright to my grandfather’s attention. It’s been commonly stated in John Davis’ book and in other books about the Guggenheims, that the baroness Hilla Rebay was responsible. My mother always told me and everyone else that it was her mother, Irene Guggenheim — and by the way, this auditorium is named in her memory.

Just to show you that [00:08:00] I did have a father, whom I did meet finally when I got out of the Army around 1947. He was from the [Bavro?], if you’ve ever heard of that horrible drink in England. A British family, my great-grandfather, invented that horrible drink, and that was the family business. Dad attended Eton and was in both the British Home Guard and the American Army during World War II, and quite candidly, I don’t know whether that’s the British or an American uniform. When I was running the Excelsior Hotel in Rome as a sergeant in the Army, Lawrence Tibbett, who some of you who are a bit older will remember was an opera singer, came to Rome, stayed at the [00:09:00] Excelsior Hotel, and when I took him up to his suite, I asked him whether there would be anything else, and he said, “Yes, find me a chap by the name of Lawson-Johnston,” and I said, “Well, that’s me.” He said, “Well, I’ve just left Paris, and your father is a good friend of mine, and he’s very eager to meet you. Here’s his address. I suggest you correspond. When you do meet him, he’s a little sensitive over the fact that he’s had five wives, so don’t dwell on that when you meet your father.” (laughter)

So when I got out of the Army and came back to New York, the big day occurred at the Plaza Hotel, and we were to meet down in the Palm Court. I was very prompt, and an older gentleman

[00:10:00] sat next to me looking quite nervous, looking at his watch, and I said, “I beg your pardon, sir, but who are you waiting for?” And this fellow stood bolt upright, and he said, “It’s none of your damn business.” (laughter) And it was not my father. (laughter) But I’ve heard stories about the Plaza since.

But in any event, (laughter) I did meet Dad, and he said, “By Jove, you’ve grown,” (laughter) and, you know, from the age of 3 to 20, you do that. But we went into the Oak Bar, and we had a Scotch — several Scotches — and thinking about his fifth wife, I said, “Dad, I understand that you have remarried.” That was pretty tactful, I thought. But anyway, he was a great [00:11:00] guy, and he died about 10 years ago in Switzerland where he lived for many years with his fifth wife. And by the way, he was married to her for 25 years.

This is the genealogical chart. I told you that my great-grandfather Meyer came over from Switzerland. He married Barbara Meyer — that just happened to be her last name, no relation — and they settled down in Philadelphia, as I said, in 1848, and he and his father, until his father died, sold stove polish — they were basically peddlers — and furniture polish. And they were very successful at that, [00:12:00] and Meyer and Barbara — Meyer is the fellow with the beard in the middle there — they had seven sons and two daughters, and he was a tough taskmaster with his sons, and they were quite successful. I think they got into the lace business. And ultimately, Meyer invested in a silver mine in Leadville, Colorado. And the mine had been flooded, and he invested \$25,000 in it, which was quite a lot of money back then, and to make a long story short, it was a great success, a bonanza, and the seven sons got into the mining business. And there’s a story about Meyer and his seven [00:13:00] sons gathering, perhaps it was in that office, and he passed out seven sticks, and he handed each one of them a stick, and he said, “Break that stick,” which they did. And then he put seven sticks together, and he said, “Try to break them,” and they couldn’t. And the moral, of course, was if you stick together, you’re going to do well. And they did, and they became known as the Copper Kings in mining in this country, and they got into diamonds and all sorts of things. They were very successful in the early 1900s.

After they made their money, they decided to give some of the money back to the country that they’d grown up in and formed quite a few foundations. The John Simon Guggenheim Foundation is probably the best known. It gives grants to people in the arts and sciences. The Daniel and Florence Guggenheim [00:14:00] Foundation did much in this country for aviation and rocketry — pioneers, really. And in the case of Goddard in rocketry, when the United States government wouldn’t support him, the Guggenheims did, and he was the father of rocketry in this country. The [Marian Lionni?] Foundation was a dental clinic, which got so much competition from the public sector that that folded not long ago, and then my grandfather, of course, formed the Solomon R. Guggenheim Foundation, which now operates this museum as well as the one in Venice.

My sense of humor doesn’t respond too enthusiastically to this cartoon, and I wouldn’t have included it, but I knew you’d be interested. (laughter) It was a cartoon that came out at the time when they were forming all these foundations. This is Eleanor, [00:15:00] my grandfather’s oldest daughter, my mother’s older sister, and I’m now getting into the next generation. She was at the coronation of George VI in this picture. She left the United States and moved to England

at a pretty early age, married the Earl of Castle Stewart, and lives to this day in Sussex outside of London. I adore this woman. She’s 93 years old. I never go to Venice without stopping in London and seeing her. My last visit I said, “How are you getting along, Eleanor?” She said, “Well, sometimes I just sit and think.” She said, “Come to think of it, sometimes I just sit.” (laughter)

This is Peggy Guggenheim with Nicolas Hé lion, the young man in the middle, [00:16:00] and an unidentified girlfriend. Peggy Guggenheim, of course, was Benjamin’s daughter. Benjamin is one of the Guggenheim brothers who went down on the *Titanic*. He’s the one that said, “If I’m going to die, I’m going to die like a gentleman.” He put on his black tie and went down like a gentleman. She was considered by the more conservative branch of the family, which was everybody but her, I guess, as sort of the hippie of those days, and she, in spite of her criticism, really, of the stodgy uncles in the United States, when her father died on the *Titanic*, she was the beneficiary of some [00:17:00] trust that the brothers got together and set up for her. She was never enormously wealthy, but these little trusts did help quite a bit. She wrote a book called *Out of This Century* way back then, and I can remember my mother and grandmother referring to the book as *Out of My Mind*. (laughter) I’ll say more about Peggy later. This is another picture of her with Jackson Pollack.

This is a slide of Harry Guggenheim, also the next generation. He was Dan’s son, my grandfather’s nephew. He was my predecessor as president of this foundation. He was a wonderful man, as far as I’m concerned and as far as most people are concerned. He was ambassador to Cuba. He [00:18:00] did much of what was done by that foundation, which focused on aviation. He was a great friend of Charles Lindbergh, and he was a perfectionist in everything that he did. He got into the racehorse business and the breeding line, and to this day most of the best horses, thoroughbreds, are the result of the breeding that he instituted. He won the Kentucky Derby — that was probably the highlight — with Dark Star that beat Native Dancer quite a few years ago. He had a tough time in the early part of his presidency of this foundation. He was dealing with prima donnas, Frank Lloyd Wright, James Johnson Sweeney, our second director. He had problems with the baroness [00:19:00] Hilla Rebay, who as you know I will speak of more later but who really was responsible for the Guggenheim collection that my grandfather collected. His problems with the baroness basically evolved from the fact that she really was not — she was brilliant. I think everyone agrees she was a fabulous woman in what she did in the field of nonobjective art and what she did for this institution. But I wouldn’t call her a team player and certainly not a professional director. And so after my grandfather died and she was the director, it was very, very difficult for the board to put up with her ups and downs. So anyway, [00:20:00] Harry did have that responsibility. That’s just another official portrait of him.

Now, Hilla, whom I just mentioned, she was the daughter of a German military officer. This picture was taken at the [Bough?] House in [Desson?] in 1930, and it shows on the left my grandfather, Hilla Rebay, Kandinsky, and my grandmother Irene. Hilla was an artist, and she was a portrait painter, and she was introduced to my grandfather, perhaps to my grandmother’s later regret, by my grandmother, and she did my grandfather’s portrait. And during that [00:21:00] process, she said, “You’ve been a big success in the mining world. Why don’t you change and be a success at something else?” And he became intrigued with nonobjective art and

her, not necessarily in that order, and the two of them really made many trips to Europe and started collecting madly, and, as you know, we're famous for our Kandinsky collection, perhaps more than anything else that was acquired during that period, and she's totally responsible for that. I have always referred to her as my grandfather's confidante — I think that's a nice word — and during these years when she was [00:22:00] collecting, she was literally competing with Peggy Guggenheim, and they did not admire one another or get along too well. But it's sort of interesting that the Guggenheim is the beneficiary of two wonderful individuals, the baroness Hilla Rebay and Peggy Guggenheim, both of whom are women and who did so much for us.

That's a picture of Hilla and my grandfather at his plantation down in Yemassee, South Carolina. This is the Museum of Nonobjective Painting, which was at 24 East 54<sup>th</sup> Street, and I think that my grandfather rented this space on June 1, 1939, [00:23:00] and before this museum was built, that's where a lot of the collection was shown. Prior to that, I can remember my grandfather in the Plaza Hotel. He had quite a large suite there, and many of the original paintings hung there.

This is the Kandinsky exhibition in 1945 in that same location. I was in the Army that year and missed that. This is Frank Lloyd Wright, as you all know, with a model of this museum. I remember seeing that model in the Plaza when he came in to show it to the baroness and to my grandfather, and I can remember how excited they were. This, I believe, was in [00:24:00] the middle '50s. That's a picture of him taken in 1959, which is the year he died, and it's also the year that we opened. My grandfather, as I said earlier, died 10 years earlier in 1949, and this building opened, as I said, in 1959. When Hilla became impossible, the board asked her to step down as a director, kept her as a trustee, and engaged the services of James Johnson Sweeney in 1952, so he was our second director. He did a fabulous job of collecting. He filled gaps in the collection before he left in 1960. [00:25:00] And some examples of what he acquired for us — here's the Cézanne 1954. I understand that the museum paid \$100,000 for this back then in 1954. That was considered to be a lot of money in those days.

This is a Braque that he was responsible for acquiring, (inaudible), and he also acquired many examples of Pollock, de Kooning, Calder, Max Ernst, Picassos, and so forth.

This is Tom Messer, who many of you may remember. He came to this country from Czechoslovakia, served as a director of [00:26:00] another museum or two before coming here in 1961, and he was the director here for 27 years. I was very lucky to be associated with him as president the last 20 years and prior to being president. He is still on our board of trustees. He is really responsible for our acquiring the Thannhauser collection, which as you all know is an incredible collection, as well as the Peggy Guggenheim collection. Both of these individuals were, as most major collectors are, not too easy to get along with, not too easy to entice into leaving them your collection, and Tom, of course, [00:27:00] in addition to those major collections acquired many works of art. He instituted very large retrospective exhibitions at this museum over the years, which were fabulous as well as single artist exhibitions. There is a Rothko 1949 that he's responsible for, and the ones I'm showing now are ones that he acquired.

This is a Picasso that we acquired through the Justin Thannhauser collection. That was done in 1900. Van Gogh — that's also from the Thannhauser collection, 1889. That is the Brancusi Muse done in 1912.

Everybody has to credit Sweeney [00:28:00] and Tom Messer for this beautiful sculpture. The reason for that is that there was a man by the name of Bulova who left this Brancusi to us. We were happy to have it, and a little time went by, and Mr. Brancusi’s widow — actually she was not his widow, because they were divorced when he died — she took the position that this Brancusi belonged to her, that he had no right to give it to us, that he didn’t know anything about art or Brancusi, and that Brancusi was a friend of hers, and that she, in fact, had acquired it when she was married to him. Naturally we struggled in court to retain [00:29:00] the *Muse*, and we won, and then they appealed, and we won, and they appealed, and it went up to the New York State of Appeals, and we lost. And Tom Messer was absolutely in tears when they came to take it away. And he never forgot it. And many years went by, and the former Mrs. Brancusi for one reason or another sold it, and we reacquired it a few years ago. So I have to give both directors credit for having acquired that sculpture.

This is a Giacometti, *The Nose*, done in 1947, and this is a Pollack that we acquired through the Peggy Guggenheim collection.

Now, I didn’t say much earlier about Hilla Rebay, but just a few examples of works that she acquired — this is a Clay, 1922. [00:30:00] There’s a Kandinsky 1923, Modigliani 1917 — I remember that one. When I was a little boy running around the Plaza Hotel, that made an impression. (laughter) This is a Delaunay 1910, and this is a Kokoschka 1915 that we acquired through the Nierendorf collection, which was during her directorship. There’s a Franz Mark 1911 and [Schlegell?]. I mentioned Justin Tannhauser. This is Justin Tannhauser and his wife, Hilla, and Harry Guggenheim looking at a model of a gallery that we were putting aside for their collection. [00:31:00] Their collection has been a fabulous enhancement of ours, and Harry Guggenheim and I and Tom Messer spent a lot of time trying to keep Justin happy, and I think we succeeded more or less. And when he died things got off the track a little bit with Hilla. And I’m happy to say that when Tom Krens, our new director, came with us a year and a half ago, he repaired that relationship, which is so important to us.

This is the inside of the Tannhauser collection. On the right is a Matisse, which we did not get from Tannhauser. [00:32:00] This was the result of a swap with the Museum of Modern Art that Tom Messer accomplished prior to his retirement.

This is a picture of some of the family, Peggy on the right, a fellow by the name of Oscar Strauss next to her, Joan [Vandemal?], myself, my mother, and my younger brother. Incidentally, my mom had three husbands, and Michael is the result of her second marriage. Out of all those marriages, there are only three kids, so everybody was pretty conservative. (laughter)

This picture was taken on the occasion of her collection being shown here at the Guggenheim in 1969. It was an important event, [00:33:00] because I think Harry said, “Come home, Peggy, all is forgiven.” And, you know, they were cousins, and she had become a little less critical of the old conservative group back here in the United States, and it was during this visit that we really cemented the relationship whereby she left us her collection and her Palazzo in Venice. Peggy and I got on quite well, because Harry was very sick about the time this happened, and he told her that I was going to carry on and that she could trust me, and I’m so pleased that she did. I

think it would have been interesting to have known her a little earlier in her life, but I really enjoyed the relationship. I remember [00:34:00] one time in the garden in Venice, she wrote me a letter that she was going to bury her dog — she loved her little dogs — in a certain area there, and she wrote me a letter, and she said, “Promise me that you won’t let Tom Messer destroy my graveyard for my dogs,” (laughs) and I assured her that as long as I was alive and had anything to do with it that that would not happen. And much to my surprise, maybe she didn’t believe me, because when she died, her ashes were placed right next to the graveyard for her dogs.

This is a picture of Tom Messer on the right and myself and Max Ernst on the occasion of a show he had quite a few years ago. I had just returned from seeing Peggy in Venice, and I thought [00:35:00] that was something that would interest him since he’d been married to her, and I told him I’d just returned from Venice, and I’d just seen Peggy. He said, “Peggy? Peggy who?” (laughter)

Now these are some slides of the Palazzo. That’s the Grand Canal. That’s the roof of the Palazzo, which is an unfinished palace. I think a neighbor complained about the fact that it was just quite high enough it would impede the view if it went any higher. This is from the Grand Canal, facing the museum. That’s another view of it. That is the front entrance with the Marino Marini sculpture. That’s Peggy’s bedroom with the Calder bedstead that he made for her. That used to be the dining room, and that’s [00:36:00] now space where we exhibit. And this is an example of some of the art in Peggy’s collection. This is a Magritte 1932. Speaking of Max Ernst, this is an Ernst that he did in 1940. This is a Picasso 1937 and a Tanguy 1937.

This is a picture of when Peggy died, which was around Christmas time in 1979. We took possession of the Palazzo, and this was the official opening in April. It was an awkward experience for me, because — incidentally, that’s [00:37:00] Philip Rylands, who is still the director of the museum there. That’s Tom Messer, and I don’t remember who the others are. What was awkward was that Peggy had really not left much to her progeny, and at this dinner, of course, we had her family invited for the dinner that evening, and her son, Sinbad, was definitely disturbed over the fact that — he took it out on me, as though I was inheriting this collection, (laughs) and obviously it had nothing to do with me. But he would look at me and think that I had something to do with her decision, which I really didn’t. Quite frankly, I did feel, and I still feel, a little sorry for her grandchildren, [00:38:00] who really got very little. And in their view, if she had just sold one painting, it could have done an awful lot for them. So that was not a happy occasion for me personally, because I had very mixed emotions.

One of the things we did when we first acquired the museum was to form a board — an advisory board — for the Peggy Guggenheim collection. We were the new boys on the block. We knew very little about Venice, and we needed advice. And we formed the board, and these two people are Maria Pia Fanfani on the right and Claude Pompidou on the left, who is the chairman of our Peggy Guggenheim Collection Advisory Board. And we are working towards having 50 members of that board. We meet twice a year, joining and then a couple of thousand dollars a year on a continuing basis, and that’s been a great success, and everybody enjoys it, and we’ve met in other places, which makes it quite exciting.

This is the original design of the expansion, which as you know was revised. That’s a side view from the 89<sup>th</sup> Street side. I knew that that design was not going to fly when somebody referred to it as the tank of a toilet bowl. (laughter)

This is the current design, [00:40:00] and there you can see we were trying to show the city that we really were pretty small potatoes. People worried about our expansion when you see what was around us. I’m going to get to Tom in a second. I just want to say something about this expansion that’s underway. Quite a few years ago, when we built the original annex, I was very much involved with that. William Wesley Peters, who is Frank Lloyd Wright’s son-in-law, was our architect. And we had no problems from the city or the public or anybody else. Everybody thought it was just fine. We only built four stories, because that’s all we could afford, but Mr. William Wesley Peters talked me into putting in foundations [00:41:00] strong enough so that someday when we could afford it and we went up, the foundations would justify that, and we wouldn’t have to go through that again. So when the time came — five years ago it’s been — when we decided that we really must expand, to me it was phase two of something that had always been planned, and I was very surprised at the first meeting before the Board of Standards and Appeals that the chief witness for the opposition — the people who were opposed to our being permitted to expand and to build this structure — was William Wesley Peters, and he made the statement at that meeting that it was never envisioned by Frank Lloyd Wright that there would be a tall building on that site. So here’s one person that is awfully glad that we persevered. [00:42:00] We can understand people who lived behind us having their views blocked. Progress does create problems, and nobody loves this museum more than we do. And we were made to appear in the press as though we just didn’t care about Frank Lloyd Wright or the building, and as you all know, that’s far from the case.

I just want to say one more thing, and that is that I said earlier that Tom Messer was just the right man for his era, and I think that Tom Krans, who will be speaking to you in a few minutes, is just the right man for the next quarter century. We’re very, very lucky to have this young, dynamic man, whom I will introduce in a minute. If [00:43:00] you have any questions, I’ve been asked to respond to questions if there are any. I can’t see anybody. (laughter) Yeah, that’s better. Does anybody have any questions? Okay. I’m relieved.

When Tom came on board a year and a half ago, he inherited a lot of headaches — the expansion headache that I have told you about; the fact that the original building, which is now 30 years old, is in need of renovation; storage has been a terrible problem; financial pressures have been a terrible problem; and he has hit the ground running, as I have said many times, [00:44:00] and he has convinced the Board of Trustees, the wonderful staff that he inherited and that he has added to, he has impressed us with his vision. He has a global vision of our niche, which he, I am quite confident, will tell you about. Thank you very, very much. (applause)

THOMAS KRENS

You know, I feel a little bit like the ghost of Christmas yet to come. After [00:45:00] hearing Peter’s history of the Guggenheim and its development over the last 50 years, it occurred to me that I’m only going to be talking about things that I hope will come true. I hope to be able to influence the direction of this institution in a very positive way. I thought it might be useful —



Guggenheim Museum Archives Reel-to-Reel collection

“Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow,” with Peter Lawson-Johnston and Thomas Krens, 1990

and I’m going to try to keep my comments very brief — to try to suggest, based on Peter’s talk, something about the dynamic that is in place in the growth of an institution.

Now what you’ve seen here is that there is an extraordinary relationship in any museum between the art, the objects that come together under a certain individual’s vision, the spaces that are made available for [00:46:00] the display of that art, and the Guggenheim began really first with a collection that was displayed at the Plaza Hotel. It then grew to a space that had been a used-car dealership, as Peter pointed out, on 54<sup>th</sup> Street and Madison Avenue. An interesting feature is that our current foundation offices, when they moved uptown from lower Manhattan, happened to land at 54<sup>th</sup> and Madison at the same address. And from that used car dealership became a museum, first of nonobjective art, the Guggenheim that now inhabits the space on 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue and 88<sup>th</sup> Street was built and opened in the 1950s, and that wasn’t an easy process, either. Sites were explored around Manhattan. At one time, there was an expectation that this museum might be located further uptown, and indeed, the site itself [00:47:00] had a great deal to do with Frank Lloyd Wright’s design, and his designs had some influence on the development of the collection.

You’ve also seen the Guggenheim expand to Venice, and in many ways that is a unique feature of the institution. We are the only museum that I know of, and art museum in the world that actively operates on two continents, that operates two museums. But it may be that that move to Venice was a function of the fact that the foundation wasn’t allowed to take Peggy’s collection out of Venice and bring it back to New York, because in the early 1980s or the late 1970s, the notion of operating a museum at such disparate locations was a difficult one, I assume, for Tom and the board. However, the opportunity to add such an [00:48:00] extraordinary collection as Peggy Guggenheim’s to the existing strengths of the Guggenheim collections was overpowering, and so an accommodation was made. We became an Italian foundation. We operate the museum at two locations. I came to the Guggenheim... [00:48:21]

## PART 2

### THOMAS KRENS

The shape of that space has been determined by a variety of considerations again, some of them aesthetic, some of them administrative, and some of them political. The space that we ultimately had to settle for required [force?]. A reduction in program. And it’s meant that we’ve had to look for other alternatives, both in Manhattan offsite and elsewhere, to be able to satisfy several of the objectives, perhaps, or the destinations, you might say, of an evolving institution. Because, I think, for the Guggenheim, we have to realize, or, at least, examine, what the charter of an institution of twentieth-century art is. Now, do we have an obligation to maintain the Guggenheim collection as it was delivered to us by its founder? Is there a clear charge to expand the collection, and, if there is, in what direction? [00:01:00]

Peter referred to James Johnson Sweeney’s accession of the Cézanne. That became a very important event for the institution, because it moved us into the field of non-objective art. In other words, the field of figurative art began to open up for the institution, and, clearly, the

addition of Peggy Guggenheim’s collection and the Thannhauser collection changed the course of the direction of the institution. It broadened it. It made it an institution fully of twentieth-century culture, and it suggested that the priority and the mission of the institution, as it moved forward, was to expand that vision, to expand that understanding of twentieth-century art to the fullest extent.

What happens, I suppose, in the twenty-first century will be a problem that will be that of my successor. I see my ideas, my vision for the institution, to be largely [00:02:00] shaped by the conditions that I inherit: the existence of the collections in New York and Venice in their present conditions, the structure of the building, the building programs that were put in place at that time. I see my charge to strengthen the institution, to try to make it the very best that it can be, and, indeed, with a certain amount of hopeful energy applied to the task, I think to make it the best institution of its kind in the world. Now that’s sort of a tall order, but I think that that’s an order. That’s an order, if I can use that redundancy of words, because what it means — I think that to create a vitality for the institution, to not have it lapse simply into a mausoleum to display objects of a set period in time, that we have to be thinking about the future. We have to be thinking constantly about reinterpretation, re-understanding the objects that are made [00:03:00] at a given time, reevaluating and adding to our overall knowledge of the development of culture. Those are some pretty broad general guidelines for the Guggenheim. What do they mean, finally? What do they mean about the future? What we have to do, finally, is going to be determined by the same kinds of practical considerations that you saw unfold in Peter’s story. We are going to have to deal with boards of directors who have specific ideas. We are going to have to deal with artists that have specific ideas, audiences that have specific ideas. We bring professional people to the staff to solicit their ideas and to try to fashion that into a coherent vision. We’re going to run up against political roadblocks in terms of what we’d like to do. We’re going to have to deal constantly with economic realities. Can we make all this fit together? Can we afford it? What’s the context in which we can afford to continue to develop the institution? [00:04:00] You know, very briefly, the board of trustees and I have worked for the last 18 months to articulate, to develop and articulate a vision. The staff has contributed to this enormously, and part of, I think, my major message tonight, really, is to give you a glimpse of what that vision is, what the Christmases yet to come will look like here at the Guggenheim.

Finally, what I’m going to be talking about, really, is the relationship between the art and the space. I point out this kind of dynamic. There is a sort of symbiotic relationship, or, at least, a linked relationship. It’s a little bit like the walls. In other words, you had the collection to begin with. The collection was important. You create a space. The first museum, the second museum space that’s probably a little bit larger than the collection so you have room to expand it. People have ideas about which way the collection should expand. If you’re successful at what you do, you can attract collections. [00:05:00] You can bring new people to the cause. You can add new works of art. You can excite artists. (clears throat) You can excite collectors. Your collection grows. It reaches a point, where it is right now, where we feel that we cannot show the very best of our permanent collection. The whole rationale for the new addition is that we can show more of the collection that’s now kept in storage. The great masterpieces of the twentieth century that are in the custody of the Guggenheim can be made available to the public on a more regular basis, without sacrificing the interpretive function that special exhibitions bring to the overall enterprise. We also get a sense, however, that, with this addition, we’re probably approaching

our limits. That's a physical reality that we have to address. The difficulty that the Guggenheim has had obtaining permission, the difficulty of building this new building, has certainly taken its toll. And if you look around, [00:06:00] and you look at the trouble that the Whitney is having, for example, in moving forward with its expansion, one gets a sense that, at least for the foreseeable future, the 1990s and beyond, that the physical expansion of museum spaces in New York City probably has reached its limit. After the Met's new round of expansion and their completion of their master plan, there probably will be no subsequent development in the foreseeable future in Central Park. What this all runs, however, against — it runs counter to the intuition that we've just seen. I posed the hypothetical question, for example, is that, “What if the Guggenheim is as successful in the next 50 years at attracting adherents to its cause?” Attracting collectors, attracting artists, perhaps. What if we're successful in building our collections, as successful in the next 50 years as we were in the [00:07:00] five decades that we've just seen? Where are we going to put that art? How are we going to do it? And if we deny ourselves the opportunity to grow, what will the institution look like? What we've evolved for the Guggenheim, we feel, is a direction that takes advantage of our current assets. You know, I like to say that the Guggenheim, as I look at it, has to operate in the 1990s, in a very difficult economic environment. I see that, in general, the operating activities of cultural institutions are going to become more and more difficult to maintain at a break-even level. Revenue streams are levelling off. Audiences are not growing at the rate that they used to. Endowments don't produce the income that they did when they were first created for the institutions because museums have tended to [shade?] [00:08:00] spending on endowment income, and endowments have actually declined relative to the growth of operating budgets. Certainly, government support in this country has been declining. Tax laws have made it difficult for cultural institutions to continue to attract gifts, particularly of works of art. On the other side of the ledger, we see the expenses rising at an alarming rate. Every time a new record is set at auction, insurance prices ripple up on the permanent collection, but particularly on special exhibitions. It makes it more difficult for museums even to contemplate definitive and great exhibitions, because the cost of moving the objects, the cost of insuring them, is becoming prohibitive. There's an upward pressure on salaries. There's an upward pressure that's created by the needs to adapt to new technologies.

Finally, we are in the information business, after all. We need computers just like businesses. [00:09:00] In fact, we probably need them even more, and there is an enormous latent demand in the opportunities for technology as a function of the imaging capacity of the computers that are just around the corner. Make photography, perhaps, obsolete. We'll be able to experience works of art, research works of art, understand works of art in ways that we weren't able to do in the past. And this will create, again, a demand pressure on the expense side, pushing these things up. So, as I say, I see a difficult operating environment for institutions. I see, however, also, the need to maintain an optimistic future, an open future that allows some room for expansion, room for redefinition, room for change. And it has to be a vision that the staff, that the board of trustees, and, indeed, our audience understands. It has to be a vision that's articulated clearly, and it has to be a vision that's attainable.

I'm going to spend the last five minutes talking about that vision. [00:10:00] I can't, as I said, I think there's a dynamic between space and objects. I'm just going to assume that we're going to have to — there's going to be a dynamic of people. We're going to need talent to make that

happen. We're going to need talent in our support groups. We're going to need talent on our boards. We're going to need talent on our staff. But, beyond that, there's going to be a dynamic between art and space. I can't really talk about the art, because that art is yet to come. The Guggenheim is at a crossroads. We have to assess our spatial needs. We have to assess the scale of our operations in the United States, but we also have to take a look at what kind of profile we want to have abroad.

Now, like Peter, I brought a few pictures along. If I can make this work... Can somebody back there help me? Ah, yes. We don't need to take a look at that. That's the condition I describe. I used these slides this morning, actually, for a meeting of our Business Committee, and I wanted to scare them a little bit, [00:11:00] so I showed a curve where the costs were far outstripping the revenues.

Peter has pointed out that this is our new addition. As you walk out tonight, you can see that we've got steel up through the eighth floor. There should be about two and a half to three more floors erected in the next three to four weeks. Cladding will go up on the outside of the building, and it will be available for occupancy probably late 1990. The museum will close to the public, unfortunately, in May of this year, for about 18 months, while the new building is brought online, and the existing Frank Lloyd Wright building completely restored. And I'll talk a little bit about the elements of that restoration. I think the point to understand about our current project is that it really has four major elements. It is the new addition that Peter referred to, but it also is about the restoration of the Frank Lloyd Wright building, and the maximization [00:12:00] of its spaces for public access. What does that mean exactly? Well, you see the smaller building to the left of the two Frank Lloyd Wright masses. That's been called, in the past, the Monitor building. And, traditionally, except for the second floor, which was part of the Thannhauser Collection, the Monitor building has been used for administrative purposes. We will have, in our new annex building, tower, whatever we finally decide to call it, four floors of exhibition space, and three floors of that exhibition space will be double-height, so we'll be able to display in a flat, rectilinear space, essentially, an effective foil to the curve. We'll be able to display works of art — at least, we'll have the potential of displaying works of art of considerable scale. There will be two floors of office space on the top of the building, and two floors of office space on the ground floor and the first floor below. That will then be complemented by [00:13:00] the office and an administrative function that was in the Monitor building, will move to the new building, and the Monitor building will be open to the public completely. There is a second rotunda in the Monitor building. Smaller, of a different design than the great rotunda that you're all familiar with, but not often a space that's been seen by the public. We open that space up to the public. We will move the restaurant, which is now not functioning because we had to close it during construction. The restaurant will go back to its original space in the space at the far right of this complex, on the ground floor at the corner of 88<sup>th</sup> Street and Fifth Avenue. That space has now been occupied by the conservation facility. The conservation lab and a number of our technical services will move to another offsite location. We have purchased an eight-story, double-height, fireproof building on the west side of midtown Manhattan. We will have at that location [00:14:00] a large part of our technical services, all of our storage. We, by the way, rent storage space in Manhattan and the surrounding area at eight different locations for our collection and a variety of functions. It's highly inefficient. It's even a dangerous situation, because it's very difficult for us to guarantee

the security at those sites. So what you will see is that the large building, the complete restoration of Frank Lloyd Wright, inside and out, including new climate control, new security systems, all new glazing. We'll be replacing all the windows with ultraviolet glass that will filter out any of the dangerous rays, and we will completely restore the exterior facade of the building, which, as I'm sure you've noticed, is in a state of disrepair. We will then develop the facility on the west side of Manhattan, and we will also excavate underground, one level down, in fact, the space surrounding this auditorium. [00:15:00] We will have improved facilities for this auditorium. Some of our onsite technical services will be located in these spaces. So really the Guggenheim expansion is a four-pronged expansion here in New York. The price tag is in excess of \$40 million, but we do feel that it will have an effective impact of doubling the exhibition space that we have and the amount of permanent collection that we can display, and it will still give us a great deal of flexibility for doing important world-class exhibitions. Now, I can move through these very quickly. You obviously know the rotunda. I just was making the point about — we'd have to replace the skylights over the large rotunda and essentially refurbish the interior.

This is a photograph of the model. Unfortunately, the glass slide cracked, so there's that line through it, but you get a sense, and there's a figure in the back for scale. You get a sense of the quality of the space [00:16:00] with the kinds of lighting systems that we're going to be having in this space. We'll have galleries like this on three floors of approximately 3,000 square feet per gallery. Essentially, it's a fairly long room. A little over 30 feet in one dimension, and about 100 feet in the other dimension. These galleries will join the rotunda on the top ramp, the seventh floor, the fifth floor, the fourth floor, and the second floor. So the access to these galleries will be, essentially, the access through the elevator shaft that's the museum right now, and there will be an additional elevator shaft at the far northern part of the space. This is a photograph of the smaller rotunda that I talked about. This space will become entirely open to the public. It will be gallery space at the top three levels, and the museum store will expand by about 400 percent. Most of the downstairs area [00:17:00] that's now occupied by administrative offices, restaurants, and store will be located in the expanded space. The store will inhabit the space that those functions now inhabit. So all together, we feel that we are going to be strengthening this institution significantly to allow it to do what we feel it does very well, to develop collections of twentieth-century art, and to continue to preserve and interpret those collections, and, indeed, the major movements of the twentieth century.

Now, coming to the Guggenheim, I also had to think a little bit about what to do with Venice. About the only thing that the museum in Venice, the Peggy Guggenheim Collection in Venice, shared with the Guggenheim Museum in New York is a director. I inherited that position from Tom Messer. But it's the size of the two institutions, the fact that, in terms of [00:18:00] operating scale, Peggy is about one-tenth of the size of New York. In terms of space and staff, it's about similar proportion. And the fact that the Peggy Collection has historically been a major part of the permanent presentation in Venice, that's really denied any opportunities for a collaboration. So there were no particular economies that could accrue from a cooperation between the two institutions. In fact, the programs ran essentially independently of one another, except for an occasional overlap. One of the challenges that we had was how to make Peggy more relevant to New York, and vice versa. And immediately that ran up against, or it

Guggenheim Museum Archives Reel-to-Reel collection

“Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow,” with Peter Lawson-Johnston and Thomas Krens, 1990

suggested, a conclusion, as that space and this dynamic of art versus space was the issue. Now, in this photograph of the Grand Canal, if I can figure out how to turn this light on...

FEMALE 1

It's on.

THOMAS KRENS

It is on. Is it?

FEMALE 1

(inaudible)

THOMAS KRENS

Oh, yeah. Oh, I see. Or do I? [00:19:00]

FEMALE 1

(inaudible)

THOMAS KRENS

I have to push. Well, I'll tell you what I'm going to do. I can't use that. I don't understand technology. This is Peggy right here. Oh, you got it. Fantastic. Here we are. There's our palazzo on the Grand Canal, and you can see Santa Maria della Salute here, the Dogana building, the Monaco, and the San Marco is sort of back off the map. Our first move in Venice was to look at ways of trying to expand the efficiency of the Peggy Guggenheim Collection's home on the Grand Canal, despite the fact that we were not allowed, several centuries ago, to continue above the ground floor. It doesn't look like we'd be able to get permission from the Italian government to go any further. [00:20:00] The Superintendent of Monuments is not sympathetic to our initial explorations of possibilities of expansion on our current site. If anything, Venice is a little bit more difficult to develop in than in New York City. So we had to look for other alternatives, and one of those alternatives was to look at the space adjacent to the Peggy palazzo, and we did find a building in back which is owned by the Fondazione Levi, a foundation dedicated to music, and they were willing to lease it to us for 20 years. So we worked out an agreement with the officials in Venice that the two courtyards can be joined. We will open a passageway in the wall, being very careful not to disturb either the ashes of Peggy or the bones of her dogs, and, in effect, expand the courtyard of the palazzo. [00:21:00] In this space, we will develop, essentially, a support service area. We will put in a restaurant. We will put in a bookstore. We will put in administrative offices, and we will put in storage facilities. Again, in Venice, we rent storage space at locations other than our current site. That will then allow us to maximize the space of the current palazzo for the display of works of art. It will take the commercial function, the cloakroom and other activities, out of the palazzo, and it will relocate them, we feel, in less central areas. We feel that the courtyard back here — there's a quite wonderful porch in the back that will become, essentially, a porch for the restaurant. And also this provides an entrance off the Fondamente in the back, so we will actually be able to use this as a major entrance to the collection, or we can still use the present entrance [00:22:00] off to the side. But it gives us a little bit more breathing room at our main site in Venice. But our explorations have not stopped there, with the Fondazione Levi property. We have, over the past two years, been looking extensively at other spaces in cooperation with various groups and

official agencies in Venice, both with the Commune and with private foundations. We've explored possible associations with existing foundations like Giorgio Cini, but it seems to be that we're moving toward a solution, which is now being commented more and more on in the Italian press, and it's one that I feel we can begin to talk about a little bit here in New York City, in that the space that we have determined that we would most like to occupy in Venice — we feel is potentially the most exciting location in Venice, and that's right at the end of the Grand Canal. This building here. Punta della Dogana. [00:23:00] It's the old customs house, and it's not really used for its original purpose. There had been some speculation, from time to time, of using this space for the Biennale. We are prepared to take this space, if we can negotiate a successful contract with the finance ministry to bring it under the wing of the Guggenheim, to create an exhibition space for special exhibitions that will allow us to do programming both in New York and Venice at the same time. We feel that we can realize certain economies of scale, and we also feel that we will then have the potential to continue to develop the expansion of our collections, which are now somewhat at the saturation point, even in terms of the available space we have in New York, and even with the new building. And we feel that these two institutions, which will — by the way, one vaporetto stop services both. You just have to walk in two different directions. We feel that this addition to the Guggenheim Museum [00:24:00] will allow us to realize, as I said, certain efficiencies of operation, because we have a fairly substantial audience at the palazzo, about 170,000 visitors a year. And when you consider that our exhibition space is only about 3,000 square feet, the ratio of attendance to area, in terms of what we're able to show, is very high. We feel that, at this location, based on some statistical analysis of the success of Palazzo Grassi on the Grand Canal, that we should probably be able to realize a visitorship that's roughly equal to what we'll be able to have here in New York City, and we feel that would be a very positive benefit for the foundation, and it would certainly help us to discharge our function in the future. So I can talk with a certain amount of guarded optimism, and, from time to time, if Tom Messer were here, he would caution me to knock on wood. I'm learning how to do that, apparently. Guggenheim Museum directors have had that habit, from time to time.

But I also thought [00:25:00] that it might be interesting to share with you — well, actually, let me just sort of comment finally. I think this is the best photograph of all. It shows the proximity of the Punta della Dogana to San Marco. Our palazzo is right there in the corner of the Giudecca, and, of course, the Grand Canal right here. A sensational space, we feel, and, if we're able to realize our ambitions in Venice, we feel it will enormously strengthen the Guggenheim's capacity to operate internationally. And a detail of the Dogana building from the air from the Giudecca side. Now there is another project that the Guggenheim is actively exploring, and I feel that I can, perhaps, publicly comment on this for the first time, because there was an article in, I believe, a New York newspaper several weeks ago which referred to the fact that the [00:26:00] Guggenheim Museum was developing a feasibility study for a possible museum in Salzburg in Austria. There's a long and curious story to this project. It began some two years ago when Peter and I were approached by a group of citizens from Salzburg when we were in Venice for our advisory board meetings, proposing what we thought then was the preposterous idea of a museum in Salzburg. It seemed to us that Salzburg was, number one, too small; number two, too inexorably linked to Italian baroque architecture and music to have any room for visual cultural development; three, we thought it was too close to Venice, and it didn't seem to fit what we were interested in in terms of continuing to develop the institution. After that, I

think about a year and a half, it took, of saying no. And [00:27:00] for those of you who are Austrians in the audience, you have a reputation of being a determined and stubborn people, and our no's were never fully accepted. And finally, in May of last year, I went to Salzburg at the invitation of a group of citizens and the chancellor, and it was my intention to emphatically and definitively point out that their proposal was unrealistic. That there was no way that we could ever do it, because, first and foremost, where in Salzburg could you put it? For those of you that know Salzburg, if there's any place on earth where touching the architecture may be more difficult than Venice, which is more difficult than New York, it would probably be Salzburg. You can't change a doorknob there without having permission, and we just didn't see it. We didn't see occupying an existing building. We didn't see looking for a larger space at the edge of town. We didn't see a new building. A new building wouldn't somehow fit in to the character [00:28:00] of the place. It didn't seem to make sense. There was, however, a proposal that had a fairly substantial impact on us, that changed our mind and predisposed us to work with the Austrian government to see if, in fact, it was possible to create a new institution in Austria, in effect, a collaboration between a group of cultural entities in Austria and the Guggenheim here in New York. And the fulcrum for that, the catalyst for that event, actually was an architectural competition that was conducted by the Bürgermeister of Salzburg, and the idea was to develop a hypothetical museum that would be located inside the Rock in Salzburg. For those of you that know Salzburg, there is this sort of sweeping, arcing cliff rock that cuts right through [00:29:00] the center. It really wraps around the center of the town. There's town on this side, and there's town on that side. There's really nothing on the top except a gambling casino that some people don't like. A water tower that exists and served part of the need of the city at one time, but now largely doesn't have any useful function. But the notion here was to make a museum with no face, a museum that had no exterior identity, and to put that museum totally inside the rock. Now, on the face of it, the notion of a museum underground doesn't really seem like an exciting one, but this is a museum like no other that I've ever seen. Right here on top of the rock, you really can't see it, but there are a series of skylights. First of all, the designer who won, the architect who won the competition, was Hans Hollein, an Austrian architect, and it was an international invitational. [00:30:00] Seven architects from seven different countries were invited. James Stirling was one of the architects that was invited, from England. They were all European. But Hollein's design won the competition. There's a little sort of indentation, a little valley, up here and in that valley Hollein placed a series of skylights that's really pretty much on the ground. You really can't get the sense of how high the trees rise up around this. And actually, in this declension, it's a little bit like a ravine, really. There are no major trees that would have to be removed to excavate down and place these skylights over the top of the spaces. The distinctive feature, however, is the fact that there is a central rotunda, which is under this dome right here, that actually goes all the way down to the ground floor, and so that the entrance to the museum would actually be in this courtyard of a building called the Bürgerspital. That courtyard also has an entrance to a parking [00:31:00] garage that's buried inside the rock. And again, for those of you that know Salzburg and attend the music festivals there, the Festspielhaus is also built partially inside the rock, so there is a tradition of making one's mark inside the rock in Salzburg, which makes the consideration of this museum with no face not such a preposterous idea, after all. Anyway, if you look at this rotunda, you will see, actually, that it is carved out of solid rock to be able to get you down to the ground level, and, from the ground floor to the top, it's about 40 percent taller than the Guggenheim here in New York. So that really is clearly an extraordinary dramatic space. And this entity of the architecture right here is actually a light



shaft, a skylight really, that brings natural light to a big gallery space that's down on the ground floor. [00:32:00] Most of the gallery space, however, is occupied near the top of this gigantic rotunda, and you can see that the facades and walls of this space actually take advantage of the natural cut of the stone. While there are artificial walls here for the display of fairly large scale works of contemporary art and sculpture that can be designed and installed here, essentially the space itself is the work of art, actually which I kind of like, because what it says, in a way, is that you give the architect his due. He creates, essentially, a sensational interior space, and then you make the rest of the spaces — design the rest of the spaces so they'll be suitable for the display of art. And you can see the relationship between this great rotunda and two floors of gallery space that nestle under the skylights on the top. There's a series of fairly conservative rectilinear spaces on both sides of a large open 4,000 square foot atrium space; [00:33:00] a second level of gallery spaces underneath these on the right, and underneath these on the left; and a ring of gallery spaces around the outside. The project in Salzburg, you can see it from this design, this is one edge of the rock. This is another edge of the rock. This is ground level. There's a tunnel that goes through right here. This is the Festspielhaus. This is where the emperors used to wash their horses. This is the entrance to the museum, through the Bürgerspital. Those of you that know that great hotel in Salzburg, the Goldener Hirsch, it's right here. The service entrance to this museum is actually from the back side, through a tunnel that comes in underneath and allows you to deliver to storage and elevator shaft underneath in the back. This is where the entrance to the museum would be. Now it's quite a remarkable piece of architecture. In fact, in Salzburg, it would be completely invisible. The only way to see it, really, would be — to see the museum from the outside — would be via helicopter on the top. [00:34:00] This is the shaft of that water tower that I talked about a little earlier. This is the fountain for the horses, and that's the entrance to the Bürgerspital right there. So this would be what you would see to the entrance of the museum. The ground floor of the museum would be hollowed out of space. You can see where the service road comes in, three large storage areas of 4,000 square feet apiece, a 5,000 square foot, double-height exhibition space. In fact, since this is on the ground floor, and the distance between the ground floor and the next floor is some 80 feet, the height of these spaces could be anything that one wanted. A series of exhibition spaces carved out — some of these things will have to be redesigned. This is a theater, and this is the entrance from the Bürgerspital. Finally, that's what it would look like at night if you had a helicopter and were flying to the gambling casino. Now will we realize this? What happened in January [00:35:00] was that Minister [Buse?] created a commission. The commission invited the Guggenheim to undertake a feasibility study. They provided full funding in excess of half a million dollars to realize the project. We are doing a major exhibition this summer, which will be at the Biennale, on the art around Mondrian. In effect, an exhibition that traces the development from impressionist to fully abstract art. That will be at Fondazione Giorgio Cini in Venice for the summer. It will then open in Salzburg at about the time the feasibility study finishes. If the project is successful, if it's accepted, the various agencies at the level of the stadt, the city, the state, and the federal government will be responsible for covering all construction costs and providing an operating endowment sufficient to — [00:36:00] or a guarantee on the operating costs of the institution sufficient to run the museum substantially at a break-even point. Now, we feel, at that point, I mean, I'm sort of talking about, now, several steps. We open the museum here in 1991. We have a program in place for the development in Venice that we would like to see realized by 1992, because that's an important year for Italian-American cooperation. We would like it to mark the 500<sup>th</sup> anniversary of Italian-American relations, and we think an

Guggenheim Museum Archives Reel-to-Reel collection

“Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow,” with Peter Lawson-Johnston and Thomas Krens, 1990

appropriate way to do that would be with the Guggenheim. And if we're successful, this museum would be schedule to open in 1995, which just happens to be the millennial birthday of Salzburg. Salzburg is one thousand years old that year. Whether all this happens remains, finally, a function of a conjunction of an extraordinary number of forces. [00:37:00] Will the necessary support and constituency develop within Europe to fund a museum of this scale and this size? The fact is it's a little bit easier to conceive of that as a government event in Europe than it is in the United States. There's more of a history of cultural support for the arts. Indeed, what it would do for us is that it would allow us to continue to use our collections. It would allow us to continue to develop our collections, we feel, in an absolutely appropriate way that's consistent with the mission of the institution. Will it all happen? I don't know. It remains to be seen. As I said, the forces are complex, but we do feel that we need a vision for the Guggenheim for the future. We feel that this is a coherent, a consistent, a supportable program for the development of the museum in the face of some of the conditions that we're forced to operate in at the moment. We feel it provides a measure of excitement. We feel it's also consistent with forces that are mobilizing throughout the world. The world is becoming [00:38:00] increasingly international. We feel that we can deal with some of the rising cost issues by being able to control our own institutions at different locations, and one of the ways of thinking about it is that it's not so different from the Whitney's notion of operating satellite spaces around Manhattan. We've just realized that perhaps the world is a little bit larger than just New York City, although New York City will be our base.

In any case, I hope that I've given you a glimpse of the future, created a little bit of excitement for the Guggenheim as it faces the 1990s. I know that there are lots and lots and lots of questions that still have to be answered before we can guarantee that these projects, indeed, will come to fruition, but there are dedicated people here that work at the museum. We have a visionary board. We have an enthusiastic and growing audience. We feel we have a real shot at doing it.

In conclusion, I was coached to say two things. First of all, Wendy informed me that I was to invite you all to [00:39:00] a cocktail reception in the rotunda at eight o'clock. So consider yourself invited, and I hope to have a word with you all upstairs. And I'd like to conclude by thanking Wendy and the associates. It's been a great pleasure for me to work with Peter. It's becoming a greater pleasure to work with Wendy and to continue the tradition that the Guggenheim Family has had at the institution. I think the success of this event is largely due to Wendy's energy and initiative. Wendy, thank you very much. (applause)

WENDY L-J. MCNEIL

That's all there is. (laughter) Drinks upstairs. [00:40:00]

END OF AUDIO FILE

615213T30\_01\_615213T31\_01\_History-of-the-Guggenheim.mp3

*Yesterday, Today, Tomorrow: A History of the Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum / Peter Lawson-Johnston, Thomas Krens. 1990/1/29. Reel-to-Reel collection. A0004. Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum Archives, New York*